

Education for Global Leadership



Committee for Economic Development
2000 L Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
Phone: (202) 296-5860 Fax: (202) 223-0776
www.ced.org

Education For Global Leadership

The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language
Education for U.S. Economic and National Security



A Statement by the Research
and Policy Committee
of the Committee for
Economic Development



CED

ΣΤΟΥΔΕΣ ΓΙΑ
ΔΙΕΘΝΗ
ΔΙΗΚΗΣΗ

Ausbildung zu globalen
Führungsqualitäten

التعليم للقيادة العالمية

La formation vers
un leadership mondial

آموزش مدیریت جهانی

创领导全球之能力的教育

Educação de
Liderança Mundial

Küresel Önderlik için Eğitim

Educación Para
un Liderazgo Global

グローバル リーダーシップのための教育

विश्वीय नेतृत्व के लिए शिक्षा

Подготовка лидеров мирового масштаба

세계 지도자 양성 교육

Educazione per una
leadership globale

תימלוע תוגיהנמ ועמל רונח

Education For Global Leadership

The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language
Education for U.S. Economic and National Security

A Statement by the Research
and Policy Committee
of the Committee for
Economic Development



Education for Global Leadership: The Importance of International Studies and Foreign Language Education for U.S. Economic and National Security

Includes bibliographic references

ISBN: 0-87186-180-1

First printing in bound-book form: 2006

Printed in the United States of America

COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 700, Washington, D.C., 20036

(202)-296-5860

www.ced.org

Table of Contents

PURPOSE OF THIS STATEMENT	vii
I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY.....	1
II. CHALLENGES	5
The Challenge to Our Economy	5
Knowledge of Foreign Languages and Cultures is an Economic Necessity	6
U.S. Employees Lack Foreign Language Skills and International Knowledge	6
The Challenge to Our National Security.....	8
The Challenge to Our Multicultural Society.....	10
III. GLOBAL EDUCATION TO MEET THE CHALLENGES	13
Student Knowledge of International Studies and Foreign Languages.....	14
School System Barriers to Foreign Language and International Education.....	15
The Benefits of Foreign Language Study and Early Learning	16
Internationalizing College and University Campuses to Meet New Global Challenges	16
Foreign Language Enrollments and Requirements	16
Study Abroad	17
“Internationalizing” Campuses	17
Foreign Students At U.S. Schools.....	18
The Demand for International Studies	18
The Supply of International Studies and Foreign Language Teachers	18
Higher Education and the Needs of Business	19
The Media’s Role in Educating Citizens on International Issues	19
IV. MOVING GLOBAL EDUCATION FORWARD.....	21
Encouraging Programs and Developments	21
New Interest in the Study of Middle Eastern and Asian Languages.....	21
U.S.-China E-Language Learning System	21
The e-Less Commonly Taught Languages Initiative	21
Centers for International Business Education and Research	22
State Leadership to Upgrade International Education.....	22
New Models for Internationalizing Our Schools.....	23
Recent Foreign Language and International Studies Legislation	24
Visas for Foreign Students at American Colleges and Universities	24
V. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION	25
CED Recommendations	26
Conclusion	29
APPENDIX I: A TIMELINE OF IMPORTANT DEVELOPMENTS IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION	31
APPENDIX II: MAJOR FEDERAL LEGISLATION PERTAINING TO INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AND FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION	37

Responsibility For CED Statements On National Policy

The Committee for Economic Development is an independent research and policy organization of over 200 business leaders and educators. CED is non-profit, non-partisan, and non-political. Its purpose is to propose policies that bring about steady economic growth at high employment and reasonably stable prices, increased productivity and living standards, greater and more equal opportunity for every citizen, and an improved quality of life for all.

All CED policy recommendations must have the approval of trustees on the Research and Policy Committee. This committee is directed under the bylaws, which emphasize that "all research is to be thoroughly objective in character, and the approach in each instance is to be from the standpoint of the general welfare and not from that of any special political or economic group." The committee is aided by a Research Advisory Board of leading social scientists and by a small permanent professional staff.

The Research and Policy Committee does not attempt to pass judgment on any pending specific legislative

proposals; its purpose is to urge careful consideration of the objectives set forth in this statement and of the best means of accomplishing those objectives.

Each statement is preceded by extensive discussions, meetings, and exchange of memoranda. The research is undertaken by a subcommittee, assisted by advisors chosen for their competence in the field under study.

The full Research and Policy Committee participates in the drafting of recommendations. Likewise, the trustees on the drafting subcommittee vote to approve or disapprove a policy statement, and they share with the Research and Policy Committee the privilege of submitting individual comments for publication.

The recommendations presented herein are those of the trustee members of the Research and Policy Committee and the responsible subcommittee. They are not necessarily endorsed by other trustees or by non-trustee subcommittee members, advisors, contributors, staff members, or others associated with CED.

Research and Policy Committee

Co-Chairmen

PATRICK W. GROSS
Chairman, The Lovell Group
Founder, AMS

WILLIAM W. LEWIS
*Director Emeritus, McKinsey
Global Institute*
McKinsey & Company, Inc.

Vice Chairman

IAN ARNOF
Chairman
Arnof Family Foundation

REX D. ADAMS
Professor of Business Administration
The Fuqua School of Business
Duke University

ALAN BELZER
*Retired President and
Chief Operating Officer*
Allied-Signal Inc.

LEE C. BOLLINGER
President
Columbia University

ROY J. BOSTOCK
Chairman
Sealedge Investments

JOHN BRADEMÁS
President Emeritus
New York University

DONALD R. CALDWELL
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Cross Atlantic Capital Partners

DAVID A. CAPUTO
President
Pace University

MICHAEL CHESSE
*Chairman, President and
Chief Executive Officer*
Great Plains Energy Services

CAROLYN CHIN
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Cebiz

RONALD R. DAVENPORT
Chairman of the Board
Sheridan Broadcasting Corporation

RICHARD H. DAVIS
Partner
Davis Manafort, Inc.

RICHARD J. DAVIS
Senior Partner
Weil, Gotschal & Manges LLP

FRANK P. DOYLE
Retired Executive Vice President
General Electric

W. D. EBERLE
Chairman
Manchester Associates, Ltd.

EDMUND B. FITZGERALD
Managing Director
Woodmont Associates

HARRY L. FREEMAN
Chair
The Mark Twain Institute

CONO R. FUSCO
Managing Partner-Strategic Relationships
Grant Thornton

GERALD GREENWALD
Chairman
Greenbriar Equity Group

BARBARA B. GROGAN
President
Western Industrial Contractors

RICHARD W. HANSELMAN
Former Chairman
Health Net Inc.

RODERICK M. HILLS
Chairman
Hills & Stern, LLP

EDWARD A. KANGAS
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer,
Retired
Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu

CHARLES E.M. KOLB
President
Committee for Economic Development

BRUCE K. MACLAURY
President Emeritus
The Brookings Institution

LENNY MENDONCA
Chairman, McKinsey Global Institute
McKinsey & Company, Inc.

NICHOLAS G. MOORE
Director
Bechtel Group, Inc.

DONNA MOREA
President
CGI-AMS, Inc.

STEFFEN E. PALKO
Retired Vice Chairman and President
XTO Energy Inc.

CAROL J. PARRY
President
Corporate Social Responsibility
Associates

PETER G. PETERSON
Senior Chairman
The Blackstone Group

HUGH B. PRICE
*Former President and
Chief Executive Officer*
National Urban League

NED REGAN
University Professor
The City University of New York

JAMES Q. RIORDAN
Chairman
Quentin Partners Co.

LANDON H. ROWLAND
Chairman
Everglades Financial

GEORGE RUPP
President
International Rescue Committee

SARAH G. SMITH
Chief Accounting Officer
Goldman Sachs Group Inc.

MATTHEW J. STOVER
Chairman
LKM Ventures

JOSH S. WESTON
Honorary Chairman
Automatic Data Processing, Inc.

Subcommittee on International Education and Foreign Language Studies

Co-Chairmen

JOHN BRADEMÁS
President Emeritus
New York University

CHARLES E.M. KOLB
President
Committee for Economic Development

ALFRED T. MOCKETT
Chairman and CEO
Corinthian Capital LLC

Trustees

BRUCE K. MACLAURY
President Emeritus
The Brookings Institution

COLETTE MAHONEY
President Emerita
Marymount Manhattan College

STEFFEN E. PALKO
Retired Vice Chairman and President
XTO Energy, Inc.

DONNA E. SHALALA
President
University of Miami

HAROLD M. WILLIAMS
President Emeritus
The J. Paul Getty Trust

Guests

MICHELE ANCIAUX AOKI
Project Director, State Innovations Grant
Washington State Coalition for
International Education

BARBARA CHOW
*Vice President, Education and
Children's Programs*
National Geographic Society

KAREN CLANCY
President, Board of Education
Belmont-Redwood Shores School District

BETSY DEVLIN-FOLTZ
Program Director
Longview Foundation

KATHLEEN DIETZ
Chairperson
Office of the New Jersey State Board
of Education

LINDA FREY
Senior Fellow, Global Affairs Initiative
The William and Flora
Hewlett Foundation

JOHN GRANDIN
*Executive Director, International
Engineering Program*
University of Rhode Island

TERESA KENNEDY
*Director, International/U.S. Partnerships
and Outreach*
The GLOBE Program

BARBARA KNAGGS
Program Manager
Texas Education Agency

GARY KNELL
President and CEO
Sesame Workshop

MICHAEL LEMMON
Former Ambassador to Armenia
Faculty Advisor
National War College

MICHAEL LEVINE
Executive Director, Education
Asia Society

DAVID SKAGGS
*Executive Director, Center for Democracy
& Citizenship*
Council for Excellence in Government

VIVIEN STEWART
Vice President, Education
Asia Society

SHUHAN WANG
*Education Associate, World Languages &
International Education*
Delaware Department of Education

JEYA WILSON
Director
United Nations Development Programme

Project Director

DAN SCHECTER
President
Dan Schecter Associates

Project Associate

RACHEL DUNSMOOR
Research Associate
Committee for Economic Development

Purpose of This Statement



“America’s leadership and national security rest on our commitment to educate and prepare our youth for active engagement in the international community. I call on schools, teachers, students, parents, and community leaders to promote understanding of our nations and cultures by encouraging our young people to participate in activities that increase their knowledge of and appreciation for global issues, languages, history, geography, literature, and the arts of other countries.” President George W. Bush¹

The Committee for Economic Development (CED) has long been a business voice on education reform and globalization. From preschool to higher education, recent CED reports such as *Cracks in the Education Pipeline* (2005), *Preschool for All* (2002), and *Measuring What Matters: Using Assessment and Accountability to Improve Student Learning* (2001) have called for reform of our school system to prepare today’s children to become tomorrow’s educated workforce. CED’s globalization statements have focused on enhancing the education and training of the workforce to maintain U.S. economic competitiveness. Such reports include *Making Trade Work* (2005), *Promoting U.S. Economic Growth and Security through Expanding World Trade: A Call for Bold American Leadership* (2003), and *American Workers and Economic Change* (1996).

In the policy community at large, the education reform movement of the 1980s and 1990s urged a greater focus on standards and accountability in our schools, particularly in subjects such as reading, science and mathematics. At the same time, however, the globalization of the world’s economies has created a host of new and different demands on our workforce, our citizens, and our students. CED is concerned that the recent trends in these two policy areas may be pulling us in opposite directions. Full participation in this new global economy will require not just

competency in reading, mathematics and science, but also proficiency in foreign languages and deeper knowledge of other countries and cultures. Our efforts in education reform must be harmonized with global realities if we are to confront successfully a multitude of new and growing challenges to America’s security and prosperity.

We are now at a critical moment in our history. The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks demonstrated to many Americans that movements from across the globe impact our country in ways never before imagined. Despite America’s status as an economic, military and cultural superpower, we risk becoming narrowly confined within our own borders, lacking the understanding of the world around us that is essential to our continued leadership role in the world community. The day has long passed when a citizen could afford to be uninformed about the rest of the world and America’s place in that world. CED therefore believes it is critical to ensure that all students become globally competent citizens who will lead our country in the twenty-first century.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the dedicated group of CED Trustees, advisors, and guests who served on the subcommittee that prepared this report (see page vi). We are grateful for the time, effort, and insight that each contributed to this project.

Special thanks go to the subcommittee co-chairs, the Honorable John Brademas, President Emeritus of New York University, Charles E.M. Kolb, President of the Committee for Economic Development, and Alfred T. Mockett, Chairman and CEO of Corinthian

Capital LLC, for their guidance and leadership. We are also particularly grateful to project director Dan Schecter, President, Dan Schecter Associates, as well as Joseph J. Minarik, CED's Senior Vice President and Director of Research, and Donna M. Desrochers, Vice President and Director of Education Studies at CED, for their direction and advice. We also thank Rachel E. Dunsmoor, CED Research Associate, for her substantial contributions to this report.

Many thanks go to Martha Abbott, Director of Education at the American Council on the Teaching

of Foreign Languages, and her colleagues for providing the multi-language translations on the cover.

Patrick W. Gross, *Co-Chair
Research and Policy Committee*
Chairman, the Lovell Group
Founder, AMS, Inc.

William W. Lewis, *Co-Chair
Research and Policy Committee*
Director Emeritus, McKinsey Global Institute
McKinsey and Company, Inc.

I. Introduction and Summary



As we begin the twenty-first century, technological, economic, political, and social forces have created a new era. Technological advancements and lower trade barriers have paved the way for the globalization of markets, bringing intense competition to the U.S. economy. Political systems and movements around the world are having a profound impact on our national security, as well as on our human security. The increasing diversity of our workplaces, schools, and communities is changing the face of our society. To confront the twenty-first century challenges to our economy and national security, our education system must be strengthened to increase the foreign language skills and cultural awareness of our students. America's continued global leadership will depend on our students' abilities to interact with the world community both inside and outside our borders.

While globalization is pushing us to expand our students' knowledge, the education reform movement, though laudable in its objectives, has led many schools to narrow their curricula. Reforms like those outlined in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 (NCLB) hold states accountable for student achievement in reading, science, and mathematics, thereby encouraging schools to devote more time to these subjects. While students certainly need to master reading, science and math, schools must move beyond these subjects if they are to prepare students for our global society. Many schools do not afford all children the opportunity to study foreign languages and learn about other countries and cultures.

Approximately one-third of seventh to twelfth grade students study a foreign language and fewer than one-in-ten college students enroll in a foreign language class.² Introductory language courses continue to

dominate enrollments. Spanish, the most commonly studied foreign language, accounts for nearly 70 percent of enrollments in secondary schools and just over 50 percent of enrollments in institutions of higher education.³ Few students study the less-commonly taught "critical languages" that are crucial to national security, such as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Persian/Farsi, Russian, and Turkish. While Arabic is attracting an increasing number of students, it still accounts for just 0.8 percent of foreign-language enrollments in American postsecondary institutions.⁴

State high school graduation requirements often include only minimal course work in international studies, such as world history, geography, political science, and area studies, and some states require none at all. As a result, many students only have rudimentary knowledge of the geography and culture of world regions. Approximately one percent of undergraduates study abroad, and teacher education requires few courses on international topics.⁵ We cannot afford to give our students a pass on developing the understanding of other cultures and world regions that will be vital to America's prosperity in the coming decades.

Outside of school, the American public gets most of its information on international trends and issues from the media. The media can play an important role in increasing Americans' knowledge of foreign affairs by devoting more time to coverage of world events in their local broadcasts. Our continued ignorance jeopardizes both American economic prosperity and national security.

To compete successfully in the global marketplace, U.S.-based multinationals as well as small businesses must market products to customers around the

globe and work effectively with foreign employees and business partners. Our firms increasingly need employees with knowledge of foreign languages and cultures. For example, cultural competence and foreign language skills can prove invaluable when working on global business teams or negotiating with overseas clients.

The need for foreign language skills is even more acute for our national security. The FBI and other federal government agencies lack sufficient linguists to translate intelligence information in critical languages in a timely manner. Furthermore, our diplomatic efforts often have been hampered by a lack of cultural awareness. President George W. Bush has encouraged Americans to learn the languages and cultures of the Middle East, and in early 2006 introduced the National Security Language Initiative to increase the number of Americans with advanced proficiency in critical languages.⁶ This new initiative proposes increased funding for early language education in elementary schools, expanding the number of foreign language teachers, and strengthening immersion and study abroad programs.

It is increasingly important that America be better versed in the languages, cultures, and traditions of other world regions, particularly the Middle East, so we can build a more secure future for both our nation and the world. As citizens of the world, we must teach our students the importance of working well with other countries to advance our common goals of peace and prosperity.

In 1998, television interviewer Larry King asked former President Gerald Ford—then 85 years old—what he worried about most for our country. President Ford replied: “I worry about the possibility we might drift back into isolationism.”⁷ America must be engaged with the rest of the world: an isolated or insulated America is an America in jeopardy. When attacked by a terrorist movement from beyond our shores, as we were on September 11, 2001, we must resist the impulse to circle the wagons—to cut ourselves off from the rest of the world. In short, we must re-define, as each generation has done, what it means to be an educated American in a changing world. The educated American of the twenty-first century will need to be conversant with at least one

language in addition to his or her native language, and knowledgeable about other countries, other cultures, and the international dimensions of issues critical to the lives of all Americans.

CED recommends that international content be taught across the curriculum and at all levels of learning, to expand American students’ knowledge of other countries and cultures. At the federal level, legislative incentives to design and create model schools with innovative approaches to teaching international content can help develop programs that can be replicated in all schools, and thereby provide a new generation of students with global learning opportunities. Increased professional development funding will assist teachers in incorporating international perspectives in their classes, so that international knowledge can be integrated into each state’s K-12 curriculum standards and assessments. Efforts now underway in high school reform should require high school graduates to demonstrate proficiency in at least one language in addition to English, and include in-depth knowledge of at least one global issue or the history, culture, and geography of at least one world region. Colleges and universities should internationalize their campuses, by, among other things, devoting more resources to expand study-abroad opportunities. The business community itself can play an important role in internationalizing American education by supporting programs that promote increased international knowledge throughout the education pipeline.

To improve our national security, **CED recommends expanding the training pipeline at every level of education to address the paucity of Americans fluent in foreign languages, especially critical, less-commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Persian/Farsi, Russian, and Turkish.** The federal government should expand its support for loan forgiveness and fellowships for students who pursue careers as language professionals in critical languages. Additionally, funding should be increased for federal programs supporting increased foreign language education in the elementary grades, as well as developing a pipeline for critical language learning. Business schools, in particular, should institute foreign-language requirements and include courses on world regions that are growing in economic

and business importance. Governors should provide incentives for alternative teacher certification routes to encourage native speakers of critical languages to become foreign language teachers.

Finally, **CED recommends that national leaders—political leaders, as well as the business and philanthropic communities, and the media—inform the public about the importance of improving education in foreign languages and international studies.** Both national and state leaders should discuss ways to strengthen the international and language education of American students. Business leaders must champion the issues of international studies and foreign language education by articulating why globally literate employees are essential to their success in a global economy. Through partnerships with local schools and universities, business can support international education efforts, and even provide more international internships for American students. Private philanthropic foundations should

support projects to increase international content in the curriculum, as well as innovative approaches to teaching and learning about other world regions. The media should increase their coverage of the important international trends and issues that affect Americans' economic and national security.

The time to act is now. Keeping America's economy competitive requires that we maintain our position as a leader in the global marketplace, obtain a foothold in important emerging markets, and compete successfully with countries that boast multilingual, multicultural, and highly skilled workforces. Keeping America safe requires that we strengthen our intelligence gathering and analysis, conduct international diplomacy and explain America's identity and values more effectively, increase our military's capabilities, and protect American soil from global threats. Keeping America's education system strong requires that we provide our students with the tools they need to communicate and work with their peers overseas and at home.⁸

II. Challenges



The Challenge to Our Economy

“All business is global, yet all markets are local. This globalized multicultural world needs leaders with a keen understanding of national cultures. By learning from other countries, these leaders develop the best thinking and best practices from around the world enabling them to leverage culture as a tool for competitive advantage.” Robert Rosen, author, *Global Literacies*⁹

Globalization is driving the demand for a U.S. workforce that possesses knowledge of other countries and cultures and is competent in languages other than English. Most of the growth potential for U.S. businesses lies in overseas markets. Already, one in five U.S. manufacturing jobs is tied to exports.¹⁰ In 2004, 58 percent of growth in the earnings of U.S. businesses came from overseas.¹¹ Foreign consumers, the majority of whom primarily speak languages other than English, represent significant business opportunities for American producers, as the United States is home to less than five percent of the world’s population.¹² And trade is shifting to different parts of the world; our annual trade with Asia is now approaching \$800 billion—out-pacing our trade with Europe.¹³

Our own markets are facing greater competition from foreign-owned firms, many of which manufacture products on U.S. soil. United States affiliates of foreign companies directly employed more than 5.4 million workers in the United States in 2002.¹⁴ Global mergers and acquisitions have resulted in more U.S. companies being owned by foreign parent companies, such as DaimlerChrysler AG, Bertelsmann, and BP Amoco.¹⁵ Future careers in business, government, health care, and law enforcement will require global knowledge and skills.

As one of the world’s most open economies, the United States already faces intense global competition, and new competitors are emerging. Several seemingly unrelated developments over the last several decades have contributed to increased globalization—the end of the Cold War, the dot-com bubble and the overinvestment in fiber-optic telecommunications cable, and the advent of new Internet and software technologies—enabling companies in less-developed countries, which previously lacked the necessary economic and technological infrastructures, to compete directly and on a more level playing field with Western companies. With the aid of inexpensive computers and Internet access, consumers and producers have almost unlimited data and markets at their fingertips. This shift in the global marketplace has meant that professionals from countries such as China and India are more likely to stay in their home countries, rather than come to the United States for better opportunities.¹⁶

As former North Carolina Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. stated, “Countries such as China and India are no longer low-wage, low-tech. Now, many of these countries have become low-wage, *high-tech*.”¹⁷ Indian and Chinese companies selling unfinished textiles, finished computer chips, or even computer services are penetrating the American market. In 1994, machinery, electronics, and transport equipment constituted 18.1 percent of Chinese exports. By 2003, the percentage had more than doubled to 42.9 percent of exports, and, as one might expect, total exports from China have experienced similar dramatic increases. It is no coincidence that as the Chinese exported an increasing quantity of these types of goods, the U.S. global trade balance in advanced technology products decreased and ultimately became negative.¹⁸

Knowledge of Foreign Languages and Cultures is an Economic Necessity

It is becoming increasingly important for U.S. companies of all sizes to succeed in overseas markets. Many small- and medium-sized businesses from New England to the Pacific Northwest are now finding it necessary to do business in the languages and cultural environments of the world's emerging markets. Some small businesses especially need employees with foreign-language skills, as managers must often communicate directly with foreign customers.¹⁹ However, small companies are not able to acquire employees with foreign-language expertise as easily as multinationals.* Without foreign-language skills and cultural knowledge, small businesses face greater difficulties exporting to overseas markets.²⁰

For U.S. multinationals, conducting international business effectively is a necessity, as their production operations are located around the globe, and sales from their foreign subsidiaries comprise a greater share of their profits. Over 70 percent of Coca-Cola's profits, for example, come from outside the United States.²¹ Thus, American multinationals' success in expanding their operations and increasing their sales in overseas markets depends on their understanding of the culture, language, and customs of local markets.

U.S.-based multinational corporations employed 21.8 million workers in the United States in 2003, accounting for one-fifth of total U.S. non-government employment.²² American workers in multinational corporations deal with the changing nature of work in the global economy through their involvement in multicultural teams. Many of today's global business challenges are too complex, occur too quickly, and involve too many resources for *local* teams or leaders to handle on their own.²³ Instead, *global* teams include individuals of different nationalities who work together across cultural barriers and time zones for extended periods of time. These teams work on projects serving a wide set of customers, solve problems across borders, and significantly improve an organization's profitability and services. The success of multicultural teams is becoming critical to success in the global marketplace.

* Several large companies, including Procter & Gamble, IBM, and Intel, compensate employees who learn a foreign language for business purposes (Gretchen Weber, "English Rules," *Workforce Management*, May 2004, pp. 47-50).

American companies lose an estimated \$2 billion a year due to inadequate cross-cultural guidance for their employees in multicultural situations.²⁴ Companies could be spared these financial losses if employees possessed the necessary cross-cultural skills to interact successfully with their foreign counterparts.

U.S. Employees Lack Foreign Language Skills and International Knowledge

U.S. students often lack the cross-cultural skills of their foreign peers. When the RAND Corporation surveyed respondents from 16 global corporations, many were highly critical of U.S. universities' ability to produce graduates with international skills. One marketing manager said that, compared to their counterparts from universities in other parts of the world, U.S. students are "strong technically" but "shortchanged" in cross-cultural experience and "linguistically deprived." Another corporate human resource manager explained: "Universities don't think globally—it's not ingrained in their philosophy and curriculum to create the global worker." One corporate respondent went even further: "If I wanted to recruit people who are both technically skilled and culturally aware, I wouldn't even waste time looking for them on U.S. college campuses."²⁵

It may come as no surprise then, that a 2002 survey of large U.S. corporations found that nearly 30 percent of the companies believed they had failed to exploit fully their international business opportunities due to insufficient personnel with international skills. The consequences of insufficient culturally competent workers, as identified by the firms, included: missed marketing or business opportunities; failure to recognize important shifts in host country policies toward foreign-owned corporations; failure to anticipate the needs of international customers; and failure to take full advantage of expertise available or technological advances occurring abroad. Almost 80 percent of the business leaders surveyed expected their overall business to increase notably if they had more internationally competent employees on staff.²⁶

Employees' lack of foreign language skills and international knowledge can result in embarrassing and costly cultural blunders for individual companies. For example, when Microsoft Corporation developed a time zone map for its Windows 95 operating system, it inadvertently showed the region of Kashmir lying outside the boundaries of India. India banned the

The Boeing Example

The recent experience of the Boeing Aircraft Corporation reveals how the need to compete in a global marketplace is prompting some American companies to develop a more internationally literate work force. At Boeing, the transformation from a company designed to build aircraft primarily for the U.S. market into a multi-national corporation marketing its products throughout the world fueled the need for international education within the company. In response, Boeing established a range of international training options for its employees and executives. These programs included: a Global Leadership Program, in which executives spend a month abroad improving their business problem-solving skills while immersed in the culture, business, and politics of another country; and a course on globalization for employees interested in advancing their professional development and international skills. Boeing values international knowledge so highly that it has become linked to future promotion.²⁷

software, and Microsoft was forced to recall 200,000 copies of the offending product. Other examples of such avoidable mistakes include software distributed in Turkey that contained a map that explicitly labeled “Kurdistan,” a crime in Turkey, or the video game that offended Arab countries by including Arabic chanting of the Koran to accompany violent scenes in the game.²⁸ In addition to the adverse economic consequences of such mistakes to individual companies, they foster negative attitudes toward America, as the mistakes are rarely viewed as accidents by the offended countries, but instead are considered negligent indifference or intentional slights attributed to all U.S. companies.

The need for language expertise and cultural competence is only expected to grow. About 40 percent of the companies in a 2002 survey reported that their international sales are growing more rapidly than domestic sales, and more than 60 percent said that over the next decade they expected the proportion of their sales revenue from other countries to increase.²⁹

America may be the world’s only military superpower, but U.S. businesses cannot always insist on their way of doing things if they want to do business with the rest of the world.³⁰ To be successful abroad, American business leaders have to understand the minds and preferences of people and cultures very different from their own. However, American business executives lag behind their European peers when it comes to language skills. The average number of languages spoken by American business executives is 1.5, compared with an average of 3.9 languages spoken by business executives in the Netherlands.³¹ In international business negotiations, managers are at a disadvantage if they must rely on a translator to communicate their message. Speaking the language of their counterparts

allows executives to build relationships and earn respect more easily.³²

For Richard Wagoner, the President and CEO of General Motors, learning Portuguese while on assignment in Brazil increased his effectiveness in working with the Brazilian business community. Douglas Daft, the former chairman and CEO of the Coca-Cola Company, spent nearly three decades living in Asia while working for Coca-Cola. He believes that the cultural knowledge he gained from his time in the region shaped his ability to lead the company, and considers understanding and valuing other cultures to be an essential skill for anyone working at Coca-Cola.³³

A 2004 survey of graduates of one of America’s leading international business schools, Thunderbird – The Garvin School of International Management, further demonstrates how important international knowledge and skills are in today’s business environment. For over 50 years, the Garvin School has required students to complete four semesters of a foreign language for graduation. Over 80 percent of the 2,500 graduates from 1970 to 2002 reported that foreign language skills gave them a competitive advantage in the workplace. Even more important than language skills, however, was their understanding of other cultures. Nearly nine in 10 of the graduates said their knowledge of other cultures gave them “some” or “a significant” competitive edge. They said that this knowledge helped them understand the business environment in other countries, earned them respect and credibility with foreign business people, and enhanced their negotiation success.³⁴

Many corporations, especially multinationals, tend to emphasize cultural competence more than foreign

language skills,* but many still rate language skills as important.³⁵ In fact, in one survey of human resource managers, participants reported that proficiency in a foreign language was a consideration in hiring decisions at 42 percent of firms, and 66 percent considered it in making retention decisions.³⁶ For businesses of all sizes, having an appreciation for cultural differences and a global business perspective are very important for all employees and managers, even for those in domestic positions.³⁷ Looking across all sectors (public, for-profit, non-profit), cross-cultural competence[†] was rated as the fifth most important attribute (of nineteen) of a successful professional in an organization with a global mission.³⁸ Employees who demonstrate cultural competence are more likely to be selected for and perform well on global teams, which can lead to greater success and advancement within the organization.

The cross-cultural competence that is needed to succeed in the business world may require a combination of foreign language skills, international knowledge, and international experience. Employers value meaningful international experience such as study abroad, as well as the application and development of the international skills learned in the classroom. Education abroad must be well designed to be truly effective; the ability to work with people of other cultures and function effectively in a foreign country is not as easily attained if students take courses from U.S. professors and socialize with other Americans while abroad.³⁹

U.S. businesses are concerned with developing the workforce that they need for the United States economy to retain its position as the global leader. Foreign language skills, knowledge of other world regions and cultures, and overseas experience all

* One explanation for why foreign language skills are not as highly rated is that employers see foreign language education as more literary (e.g., reading and writing) than applied (e.g., speaking skills for social and business interaction) (Tora K. Bikson, Gregory F. Treverton, Joy Moini, and Gustav Lindstrom, *New Challenges for International Leadership: Lessons from Organizations with Global Missions* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2003), p. 25, Table 4.5).

† Cross-cultural competence is defined as the ability to work well in other countries and with people of different cultures (Tora K. Bikson, Gregory F. Treverton, Joy Moini, and Gustav Lindstrom, *New Challenges for International Leadership: Lessons from Organizations with Global Missions* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2003), p. 25, Table 4.5).

contribute to creating the employee who has the cross-cultural competence needed by American businesses in the twenty-first century.

The Challenge to Our National Security

“Immediately after September 11, 2001, Americans found themselves again facing a Sputnik moment. They realized that they were caught flat-footed, unprepared to confront Al Qaeda terrorists. We need a national commitment to languages on a scale of the National Defense Education Act commitment to science, including improved curriculum, teaching technology and methods, teacher development, and a systemic cultural commitment.”
Representative Rush Holt (D-NJ)⁴⁰

In the post-Cold War era, new national security challenges, such as the international war on terrorism, are coming from non-state actors, and human-security challenges, such as the AIDS pandemic, environmental degradation, and Third World poverty, have become global problems. Technological advancements have led to an explosion in new media markets and outlets, which, in turn, has expanded access to information and knowledge to a greater segment of the world’s population. One result has been an increase in the audience for America’s public diplomacy.⁴¹ These trends underscore the need for citizens with enhanced global knowledge and skills. Over time, our effectiveness in communicating America’s message to the world could be decisive in encouraging countries throughout the Middle East and South Asia to embrace democratic pluralism and reject violent extremism. To make our case persuasively, we will need credible, articulate representatives who have attained a high degree of proficiency in a host of strategic languages and dialects as well as an understanding of the cultures and geographic contexts of these regions.

Michael Lemmon, former Ambassador to Armenia and former Dean of the School of Language Studies at the State Department’s Foreign Service Institute, commented on how language shortcomings are affecting the war on terrorism: “Part of the reason for our difficulty is that we simply don’t have enough competent speakers of Arabic with credible policy context and an ability to connect with the intended audience so they will at least listen to what we are trying to say and give us a hearing.”⁴²

America's national-security institutions—the military, the Foreign Service, and the intelligence agencies—lack sufficient personnel with international knowledge and foreign language skills. The language needs are most acute in such critical, less-commonly taught languages as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Persian/Farsi, Russian and Turkish. According to the Chief Translator of the National Institutes of Health, more than 80 federal agencies, from the State Department to the Patent and Trademark Office, employ individuals with proficiency in more than 100 foreign languages.⁴³ Our international knowledge needs are just as severe in critical but poorly understood world regions such as the Middle East, Eastern Europe, Africa, Central Asia, South and Southeast Asia, and China.

The September 11th intelligence failures provide considerable evidence of our shortage of expertise in Arabic and Asian languages and cultures. The Army, for example, had authorization for 329 translator and interpreter positions for its five critical languages (Arabic, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Persian/Farsi, and Russian) in fiscal year 2001, but was able to fill only 183 of them, a shortfall of 44 percent.⁴⁴ Prior to September 11th, our intelligence community was at 30 percent readiness in languages critical to national security.⁴⁵

In the CIA's Clandestine Service, the end of the Cold War did not bring about changes in hiring practices. New recruits were hired with skills similar to those of current officers and "were not equipped to seek or use assets inside the terrorist network."⁴⁶ CIA recruits require five to seven years of training, language study and experience to become fully equipped. The FBI's counter-terrorism efforts have also been hampered by a lack of trained linguists, translators, and area experts. The 9/11 Commission found that, "The FBI did not dedicate sufficient resources to the surveillance and translation needs of counter-terrorism agents. It lacked sufficient translators proficient in Arabic and other key languages, resulting in a significant backlog of un-translated intercepts."⁴⁷

Although the number of linguists being hired by government agencies is on the rise, the backlog of material waiting to be translated continues to grow. For example, four years after September 11th, thousands of hours of audiotapes remain un-translated or un-reviewed, and the amount has more than doubled from

April 2004 to March 2005.⁴⁸ In fact, since September 11th, some 20 percent of audio recordings in critical languages have yet to be translated.⁴⁹ Moreover, bureaucratic processes have worsened the backlogs—the average time to hire a linguist has grown from 13 to 14 months, while the FBI has failed to meet its hiring targets in more than half of 52 languages.⁵⁰ This backlog has weakened the FBI's ability to locate and monitor terrorists and other violent criminals.⁵¹

After September 11th, the Departments of State and Defense expanded training in certain critical languages to help meet short-term needs. Nevertheless, the federal government spent 25 percent less (adjusted for inflation) on preparing citizens for advanced foreign language proficiency in 2003 than in 1967.⁵² That figure even includes an additional 20 percent increase in appropriations for Arabic and Middle Eastern studies after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. From 1967 to 2003, the number of fellowships in all advanced foreign language and area studies declined by 30 percent.⁵³ In our Foreign Service, the United States had only eight Arabic speakers at the highest levels of proficiency in August 2004 and 27 Arabic speakers at the second-highest level.⁵⁴ Even more troublesome is that 60 percent of our speakers of Arabic and other critical languages are eligible to retire within five years.⁵⁵

In January 2005, the Department of Defense issued its "Defense Language Transformation Roadmap," a candid appraisal of our defense establishment's ability to meet the need for language skills and international knowledge in confronting current and future national security challenges. The report acknowledges that, "Language skill and regional expertise have not been regarded as war-fighting skills, and are not sufficiently incorporated into operational or contingency planning. Language skill and regional expertise are not valued as Defense core competencies yet they are as important as critical weapon systems."⁵⁶ The report calls for significantly improving the Department's capabilities in regional area expertise and in critical languages, recognizing that national security challenges in the Middle East, Asia, and elsewhere will likely continue.

Already, a shortage of translators is impeding our efforts in Iraq. Gaining the trust and support of the Iraqi public is essential to a successful rebuilding effort. Translators play an integral role in winning public

support and conquering the insurgency. Major General David Petraeus, former Commander of the 101st Airborne Division in Iraq, commented on how a lack of linguistic and cultural understanding of Iraq hampered military efforts: “We had terrific situational awareness; what we lacked was cultural awareness.”⁵⁷ One U.S. military unit had 70 translators, mostly from the local population, but is now down to only four.⁵⁸ Other units lack interpreters entirely. An American soldier doing translation work reported that during pre-deployment training, the Army did not offer him or anyone else Arabic classes.⁵⁹ The problem is pervasive throughout the military, from engineers to the infantry. The United States needs to develop more home-grown translators to develop what President George W. Bush termed a “language-proficient military.”⁶⁰

In an effort to bridge the language gap in Iraq, the Pentagon equipped thousands of American soldiers with a hand-held translation device. Called the *Phraselator*, the device allows soldiers to deliver hundreds of useful phrases, prerecorded in Arabic, to the Iraqis they encounter.⁶¹ It can enunciate such phrases as: “Not a step farther,” “Put your hands on the wall,” and “Everyone stop talking.” Unfortunately, the *Phraselator* is still just a “one-way” translation device. It translates perfectly well from English into Arabic (or any of the 59 other programmed languages), but it is just as incapable of understanding the response—much less its cultural context—as the soldier who wields it.

In order to address America’s language needs, over 300 leaders from federal, state, and local government agencies, academic institutions, business and industry, and foreign language groups convened for the first time at the National Language Conference in June 2004.* One of the suggested actions from the conference was to develop critical language skills by utilizing our heritage language communities, and increasing domestic capabilities by building a new critical-language pipeline from kindergarten through grade 16.

Business leaders are concerned about the nation’s security, not just as American citizens, but also as business people who see a lack of security as threatening

* The conference was sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, along with the Center for Advanced Study of Language, the Department of State, the Department of Education, and the intelligence community. See www.nlconference.org for more information.

our domestic and international markets, as well as their employees and property. To protect our economic and national security, our education system should train students in critical languages, and ensure that our intelligence agencies are prepared to meet the increased threats we face in this post-September 11th world.

The Challenge to Our Multicultural Society

Today’s America is, and will continue to be, characterized by ethnic and linguistic diversity. Citizens experience this diversity every day in our shopping malls, our schools, and in our workplaces. According to the 2003 Census, Hispanics now comprise 13.7 percent of the U.S. population, up from 10.3 percent a decade ago.⁶² Asians’ share of the population rose from 3.6 percent to 4.1 percent over the same period. The Hispanic population is projected to increase by almost 200 percent by 2050, to nearly a quarter of the total.⁶³ The Asian population is also projected to increase by over 200 percent. Currently, racial and ethnic minority groups, when taken together, account for over half the population in California, Hawaii, New Mexico, and Texas, and approximately 40 percent of the population in Arizona, Georgia, Maryland, Mississippi, and New York. The nation will soon follow in the footsteps of these states, with the Census Bureau predicting that by 2050, non-Hispanic whites will constitute only one-half of the U.S. population.

Growing diversity in the economy and population is also evident in other states, such as West Virginia and North Carolina. In 2001, West Virginia conducted \$2.2 billion in foreign trade with such countries as Brazil, China, Italy, and Japan. Seventy-five different international companies have invested in West Virginia, creating 30,000 jobs.⁶⁴ Between 1990 and 2000, North Carolina’s Latino population boasted the highest percentage growth of any state in the nation. In excess of 1,100 international firms currently have operations in North Carolina, and 6 percent of all private sector jobs in the state are the result of foreign direct investment.⁶⁵ Moreover, during the 2003-2004 school year, almost 71,000 North Carolina elementary and secondary students were classified as English language learners (ELL).⁶⁶

Perhaps the best place to see the future demographics of America is in our classrooms. In many urban and suburban school systems—and not just in the major cities, but in many smaller cities and rural areas as well—student bodies are ethnically, linguistically, and nationally diverse in ways that would have been inconceivable a generation ago. For example, the schools of Arlington County, Virginia, a suburb of Washington, D.C., teach students who speak over 70 different languages.⁶⁷ In Portland, Maine, with a public school population of fewer than 8,000 students, 36 languages in addition to English are spoken.⁶⁸ A recent Roper poll found that nearly half—48 percent—of Americans have at least weekly dealings with someone whose first language is not English.⁶⁹ English is, and for the foreseeable future will continue to be, the primary language of the United States. But one survey found that, although 75 percent of Americans think that English should be our official language, the same percentage thought that all students should know a second language.⁷⁰

Non-native English speakers account for an ever-growing percentage of students in the classrooms of this country. During the 2003-2004 school year, there were over 4 million ELL students in elementary and secondary schools, an increase of 51.6 percent over the last decade. ELL students accounted for 9 percent of all students enrolled in American elementary and secondary institutions in 2003-2004.⁷¹

Both white- and blue-collar workers are experiencing a more culturally diverse workplace. In 2004, foreign-born workers comprised 14.5 percent of the U.S. labor force. Of the 21.4 million foreign-born workers in American workplaces, the largest percentage, 26.5 percent, were employed in various management and professional occupations, while 22.8 percent were

employed in service occupations.⁷² The impending retirement of the baby boom generation will open the door for a more culturally and linguistically diverse workplace in the coming decades.

As a result of America's diversity, there are tremendous cultural resources that can be harnessed to educate our students. This diversity is strengthened through exchanges of exhibits, artists, and scholars. The Fulbright Program brings over 2,000 foreign students to study at U.S. universities and nearly 700 scholars to the United States to lecture or conduct research.⁷³ American students and scholars enjoy similar Fulbright exchanges abroad, sharing new cultural experiences upon their return. International art exhibitions hosted by American museums also provide opportunities for cultural exploration. Since 1975, the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act has encouraged international art exchanges by insuring against potential losses, at almost no cost to the taxpayer, when artwork is on loan from other countries. In turn, lending American art to museums abroad enhances the cultural tourism of the United States and exposes people all around the world to American culture without leaving home.

As our communities and workplaces become more diverse, foreign language proficiency and cultural knowledge will become critical in conducting business in the United States. Companies will require such skills to serve culturally diverse domestic customers. To meet the challenges ahead, it will be necessary to do more than educate our diverse immigrant population. We must prepare *all* students to deal competently with the world both inside and outside our shores. Failure to do so will result in a diminished ability to foster the communication among our citizens that is essential to maintaining our civic culture.

III. Global Education to Meet the Challenges



“To solve most of the major problems facing our country today—from wiping out terrorism to minimizing global environmental problems to eliminating the scourge of AIDS—will require every young person to learn more about other regions, cultures, and languages.” Former Secretary of State Colin Powell⁷⁴

Today’s students will soon be finding their place in a world that is interconnected as never before. The changing role of our nation in the international community, the changing face of American neighborhoods, the changing sources of everyday consumer products, the changing challenges confronting science, health, environmental and law enforcement experts—all must be understood and managed by a new generation of citizens, workers, and leaders. Dealing with these and future challenges will require an education system that, from kindergarten through postsecondary education, prepares future citizens and employees to act and lead in a global context. American educational institutions, from elementary schools to professional schools, must be strengthened to prepare students for the twenty-first century challenges to our economy, national security, and society.

An educated American in the twenty-first century should be proficient in at least one foreign language, have studied at least one global issue or region in depth, and be knowledgeable of the geography and history of our country as well as other world regions. Students should demonstrate geographic knowledge such as the characteristics, distribution, and migration of human populations, the complexity of the world’s cultural mosaics, the patterns and networks of economic interdependence, and how the forces of cooperation and conflict among peoples influence the makeup

of our world. Recognizing the need to prepare our students for living and working in the next century, former President George H.W. Bush convened an historic education summit with the nation’s governors in September 1989 in Charlottesville, Virginia, leading to the approval of six national education goals to be achieved by the year 2000. One of these goals reflected a growing awareness of America’s need to compete internationally: “By the year 2000, our children will be first in the world in math and science.”⁷⁵ Another goal required documented competence in five key subjects: English, science, math, history, and geography. In 1994, under President Bill Clinton, the list was expanded to include foreign languages and the arts.⁷⁶

Although inspired by the goals of the Charlottesville summit, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 focused more narrowly on measurable goals in reading and mathematics. Some school districts, understandably, have reacted to NCLB by shifting resources toward the measured goals from foreign languages, social studies, and the arts.⁷⁷ There is evidence that schools are reducing the number of languages offered and even eliminating language courses entirely. In Winthrop, Massachusetts, for example, the high school cut its French program and now offers only Spanish. Fremont High School, in Fremont, Indiana, eliminated some upper-level Spanish courses.⁷⁸ The effects are felt most strongly in high-minority school districts, where a 2003 survey found that 23 percent of principals reported decreased instructional time for foreign languages.⁷⁹ The same survey found that almost half of schools with high-minority populations reported moderate or large decreases in time for social studies.

If we truly do not want to leave any child behind, then we should ensure that all students have the opportunity to learn foreign languages and become knowledgeable of other world regions. Internationalizing the curriculum need not conflict with the aims of NCLB, or with the education reform movement generally. It can start simply with teachers integrating international content into their courses.

Student Knowledge of International Studies and Foreign Languages

Most schools have not responded adequately to the new challenges the nation will face in the twenty-first century. Thus many American students lack sufficient knowledge about other world regions, languages and cultures, and as a result are likely to be unprepared to compete and lead in a global work environment.⁸⁰ Seventy-seven percent of the public believes that high school programs in the United States are not adequately preparing students to understand current international affairs.⁸¹

Statistics show that public opinion is correct. More than 80 percent of New York City eighth graders did not meet the state standards in social studies in 2004.⁸² Moreover, the number of students meeting the social studies standards has decreased by almost 20 percentage points since 2002. The 2001 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) found that only 11 percent of twelfth graders nationwide demonstrated proficiency in U.S. history.⁸³ Students must have knowledge of their own culture and history in order to fully develop an understanding of another country's culture.⁸⁴

Students' performance on assessments of international knowledge is even more discouraging. For example, the National Commission on Asia in the Schools analyzed the growing importance of Asia—home to 60 percent of the world's population and most of the fastest growing economies—and what American students know about this vast region of the world. The Commission concluded that young Americans are "dangerously uninformed about international matters" and in particular about Asia.⁸⁵

Most young Americans lack geographic knowledge. Surveys conducted by the Asia Society in 2001 and by the National Geographic Society in 2002 found that⁸⁶:

- ♦ Although roughly 85 percent of young Americans (between the ages of 18 and 24) could not locate Iraq or Iran on a Middle East/Asia map, most knew that the island featured in the previous season's television show "Survivor" was in the South Pacific;
- ♦ 83 percent could not locate Afghanistan;
- ♦ 25 percent of college-bound high school students could not name the ocean between California and Asia;
- ♦ 80 percent did not know that India is the world's largest democracy;
- ♦ 37 percent could not locate China on a map of Asia and the Middle East; and
- ♦ 56 percent could not find India, despite the fact that China and India are the world's most populous countries, and major emerging markets.

Out of the nine countries surveyed, young Americans finished second to last in the average number of correct answers, ahead only of young adults in Mexico. In publishing its findings, the National Geographic Society identified several factors that influenced respondents' knowledge of world geography. Young adults who spoke more than one language and who engaged in international travel fared better. In Sweden, the top performing country, 89 percent of young adults spoke at least two languages, and 92 percent had ventured outside of their home country within the previous three years. In stark contrast, at the time of the survey, only 36 percent of young Americans spoke more than one language and a mere 21 percent had left U.S. soil in the preceding three years.⁸⁷ In fact, only about 25 percent of all Americans citizens have passports.*

* Passport estimates are based on the total number of passports issued by the State Department over a ten-year period, from 1994-2004, and the July 1, 2004 Census Bureau population data. Passports are valid for ten years for those over the age of 15, and for five years for those age 15 or younger. The number does not take into account death or immigration statistics. In addition, travel to Canada and Mexico by U.S. citizens does not require a passport.

Although high school foreign language enrollments have been growing incrementally since 1985, foreign language instruction is lagging in many American schools, despite surveys reporting that over half of the American public supports foreign language requirements in high school.⁸⁸ Approximately one-fourth of American public elementary schools offer foreign language instruction. In 2000, only about one-third of all secondary school students (grades 7-12) were enrolled in a foreign language course. Only 44 percent of high school students were enrolled in a foreign language course, and only 5 percent of elementary school students were enrolled. Spanish language courses continue to dominate in our schools, and the overwhelming majority of students do not take language courses past the second year of instruction. Spanish accounts for nearly 70 percent of all foreign language enrollments in grades 7 through 12, and introductory-level foreign language courses comprised 78 percent of the total enrollments.⁸⁹

Not only are American secondary school students studying foreign languages too seldom, and with too little intensity, they are failing to study in sufficient numbers many of the languages essential to meeting the challenges of a new era. Although approximately one million students in the United States study French, a language spoken by 70 million people worldwide, fewer than 40,000 American students study Mandarin Chinese, a language spoken by 1.3 billion people.⁹⁰ What is needed is not less study of French and Spanish, but a concerted effort to offer and encourage enrollment in courses in other critical languages.

School System Barriers to Foreign Language and International Education

Opportunities to learn about other languages and cultures are severely lacking in many low-income, minority, and urban school districts. Foreign language instruction is offered in only one-quarter of urban public schools compared with about two-thirds of suburban private schools.⁹¹ At the middle-school level, 78 percent of private (non-parochial) schools report that more than half of their students study foreign

languages, compared with 51 percent of students in public middle schools. In 2003, 29 percent of public-school principals in heavily minority school districts anticipated future decreases in instructional time for foreign languages.⁹² African-American, Hispanic, and American Indian students earn fewer credits in foreign languages than their white peers.⁹³

Increasing access to and enrollments in foreign-language courses in elementary and secondary schools may not, by themselves, be sufficient to improve foreign language proficiency. The average high school student receives about 150 hours of language instruction per year. Experience has shown that 300 hours of instruction spread over two years is woefully inadequate for high-school students to develop any usable level of proficiency. Elementary-school students, who receive only 30-60 minutes of instruction per week, are even more disadvantaged.⁹⁴

Schools may also need to change the way languages are taught. Time on task is important, which may mean greater use of immersion programs and content-based language learning, where subject matter drawn from the school curriculum is delivered in a foreign language. In 2002, only 29 states offered language-immersion programs.⁹⁵

Many schools also lack a framework for implementing global education. Although international education is offered to students in 80 percent of Delaware's schools, which are leaders in this field, fewer than half of the students are actually exposed to meaningful and sustained international education.⁹⁶ Two-thirds of the schools report that resources for teaching international education are inadequate or nonexistent. In addition, over 55 percent of international education is "incidental" and occurs "at the whim of the teacher in response to major world events" rather than from a systematic disciplinary framework.⁹⁷ Delaware is responding to the problem by recommending a statewide curriculum that would infuse international education broadly throughout a student's school experience.

The Benefits of Foreign Language Study and Early Learning

Although there is debate over whether children can learn languages more easily than adults,* beginning language learning in elementary school certainly means that children will have more years of language study and can begin acquiring a third language while they are still in school. Greater language proficiency can be achieved with a longer amount of time on task.⁹⁸ Research indicates that children who are exposed to a foreign language at a young age achieve higher levels of cognitive development at an earlier age.⁹⁹ Many other countries begin foreign language education in elementary school. All but two countries (Ireland and Scotland) in the European Union mandate the study of a foreign language, which usually begins in primary school.¹⁰⁰† With the exception of Italy and Wales, all European students must learn a foreign language throughout their compulsory education.

Not only does foreign language learning help with cognitive skills, but it also exposes children more deeply to other cultures. Research suggests that attitudes about other groups and peoples are formed by the age of ten and are often shaped between the ages of four and eight. Learning a language at a young age helps connect a child with another culture while they are still open-minded and have not yet begun to restrict their views of others whom they perceive to be different.¹⁰¹ For all of these reasons, it is important that foreign language learning begins in elementary school and

* The “critical period hypothesis,” suggests that once children reach adolescence, it is impossible for them to speak a foreign language with the proficiency of a native speaker, especially with respect to pronunciation. However, other researchers dispute this claim and conclude that environmental factors, rather than biological factors, determine a person’s ability to learn a second language, and that time devoted to study, motivation, and a supportive practice environment are vital components of successful foreign language acquisition (Richard Johnstone, “Addressing ‘The Age Factor’: Some Implications for Languages Policy,” in *Guide for the Development of Language Education Policies in Europe: From Linguistic Diversity to Plurilingual Education* (Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, Language Policy Division, 2002), pp. 6-10; see also S.F. Marinova-Todd, D.B. Marshall, and C. Snow, “Three Misconceptions About Age and L2 Learning,” *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 9-31).

† In 2002, half of all European students began learning a language in primary school, while in five countries (Luxembourg, Estonia, Finland, Sweden, and Iceland) students began learning two languages during primary education.

continues throughout the educational pipeline to build on the skills learned at each new level and to achieve greater proficiency.

The benefits of foreign language study last throughout one’s lifetime. Recent research indicates that knowing two languages may help stave off age-related mental decline. Researchers compared monolingual to bilingual adults in a test of cognitive function, and bilingualism seemed to offer a protective benefit.¹⁰² In addition, students who completed at least four years of foreign-language study scored more than 100 points higher on each section of the SAT than students who took a half year or less.¹⁰³ In fact, students who studied four or five years of a foreign language scored higher on the verbal section than students who had studied any other subject for the same number of years.¹⁰⁴ Perhaps this should come as no surprise, as studying a foreign language helps students understand English grammar better and improves their overall communication and problem-solving skills. Beyond the intellectual benefits, knowledge of a foreign language facilitates travel, enhances career opportunities, and enables one to learn more about different peoples and cultures. As President George W. Bush stated, “Learning a language...is a kind gesture. It’s a gesture of interest. It really is a fundamental way to reach out to somebody and say, I care about you. I want you to know that I’m interested in not only how you talk but how you live.”¹⁰⁵

Internationalizing College and University Campuses to Meet New Global Challenges

Foreign Language Enrollments and Requirements

Fewer than one percent of all college students study critical languages, and the number of students in higher education enrolled in any modern foreign language has remained between seven and nine percent for over 25 years.¹⁰⁶ Only 27 percent of four-year colleges and universities had a foreign language requirement for all students in 2001.¹⁰⁷

At business schools, whose MBA graduates are the future leaders of American firms, there are currently very few language requirements. A 1997 survey found that out of 109 MBA programs, less than one-

third (29 percent) had foreign language instruction available.¹⁰⁸ Another survey, conducted in 2003, found that of 17 business schools that offered MBAs related to international business, only four required a foreign language for graduation.¹⁰⁹

Study Abroad

Historically, study-abroad programs, especially in the junior year of college, have been one of the primary means by which American college students have gained first-hand knowledge of other cultures and languages. Among the benefits of studying abroad are attaining a greater proficiency in a foreign language, gaining an appreciation for and understanding of other cultures, and improving communication skills and the ability to live and work effectively in another culture.¹¹⁰ The effects of study abroad are felt long after students return, as 95 percent of the Institute for the International Education of Students' alumni reported that their study abroad experience had a lasting impact on their world view and a majority said that it influenced their career path.¹¹¹

In 1999, nearly half of high school seniors intending to enroll at four-year colleges and universities expected to study abroad while in college.¹¹² September 11th does not appear to have affected the overall support for study abroad, though there is some indication that families are not as inclined to encourage it.¹¹³ In a 2002 survey, 79 percent of the public agreed that students should study abroad during college, while 60 percent of undergraduate students and half of the faculty surveyed were also in agreement.¹¹⁴

Although the number of students enrolled in study-abroad programs has doubled over the past decade, still, only one percent of undergraduates nation-wide study abroad.¹¹⁵ In addition, study-abroad programs, while growing in popularity, are becoming shorter in duration. Over 90 percent of American students who studied abroad in the 2003-2004 academic year did so for one semester or less. Only 6 percent studied abroad for a full academic year, compared with 18 percent in 1985-1986.¹¹⁶ Further, the top five destinations of U.S. students in 2003-2004 were either in Western Europe or Australia. While experiencing these cultures is certainly important, increasing the number of students studying in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East would benefit our national security. A program initiated by the late Senator Paul Simon, the Abraham Lincoln

Study Abroad Fellowship Program, intends to increase the number of American university students studying abroad, especially in nontraditional locations. The program, which provides grants to students, colleges, and universities, aspires to increase the number of students studying abroad to one million annually by 2016-17.¹¹⁷

Why are students not studying abroad in greater numbers despite the many benefits? There are both financial and educational barriers. Many students and families perceive that the cost of studying abroad is too great, and inflexible college curricula may not allow students to incorporate study abroad into their educations.¹¹⁸

“Internationalizing” Campuses

Faculty and administrators could demonstrate a stronger commitment to internationalizing* college campuses. Although several institutions have made efforts in recent years to “internationalize” their campuses, overall there remains a low level of institutional commitment to internationalization, with relatively few institutions including international themes in their mission statements or strategic plans. International education receives support from students and faculty, but many do not participate in international programs on campus. Looking at institution types, community colleges have made significant progress in terms of greater foreign language requirements and study abroad opportunities, though the numbers remain low compared with four-year institutions.¹¹⁹ Such programs are important in ensuring that a greater number of low-income and minority students have access to international education.

Though many colleges and universities need to make greater progress on international education, campus internationalization efforts are on the rise and are gaining recognition.[†] Many U.S. universities now

* Internationalization is defined by the American Council on Education as a measure of foreign language entrance and degree requirements, the number of students studying abroad, international courses in the curriculum, international students and faculty on campus, and the degree of institutional support for international programs.

† The Institute of International Education and NAFSA: Association of International Educators select winners for the Andrew Heiskell Awards for Innovation in International Education and the Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization, respectively.

have campuses abroad. A curriculum review released in 2004 by Harvard University concluded that all of its students must develop “global competence” and be able to function as “global citizens.”¹²⁰ To do so, the Harvard review recommends that students increase their international knowledge and skills through, for example, study abroad. Several universities, including Harvard, have announced plans to expand their study abroad programs and even make study abroad a degree requirement.* Boston College has created a Global Proficiency Program,[†] and the University of California at Los Angeles now awards degrees in Global Studies.¹²¹

Foreign Students At U.S. Schools

It is becoming more difficult for colleges and universities to internationalize their campuses by enrolling foreign students. During the 2003-2004 academic year, the absolute number of international students studying at higher education institutions in the United States declined for the first time in thirty years.¹²² This trend continued, albeit on a smaller scale, during the 2004-2005 school year.¹²³ Although the United States remains the leading destination for foreign students, the competition from other countries is growing stronger. New Zealand, for example, has seen a dramatic 49 percent increase in foreign student enrollments between 2002 and 2003.¹²⁴

Tighter visa restrictions instituted as a result of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks have contributed to the decline in the number of foreign students enrolling in American colleges and universities. Many problems still plague the system for processing and approving visas, including a lack of communication and coordination between the Departments of State and Homeland Security. In addition, virtually all applicants

* The University of Minnesota, San Francisco State University, Michigan State University, and Goucher College are all planning to expand their study abroad programs. (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, *Global Competence and National Needs: One Million Americans Studying Abroad*, (Washington, DC: Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, November 2005)).

† The Global Proficiency Program awards students a certificate for studying, working or volunteering abroad; completing requirements in foreign languages, humanities, social studies, business, or education; participating in additional intercultural community service activities; and completing a “synthesis project” which requires integration and reflection on their experiences with the program.

must be interviewed prior to being approved for a visa, which creates unnecessary delays in the application process and inconveniences for individuals who pose no threat to the United States.¹²⁵

The Demand for International Studies

There is clear demand for greater internationalization. In a 1999 survey of college-bound seniors, 57 percent said that they planned to study a foreign language, and half said that they expected to take courses focusing on the history or culture of another country.¹²⁶ Nearly three out of four students said they believe that their college should offer courses on international topics. Indeed, in 2002, over half of the public indicated that they believed that knowledge of international issues would be important to their careers in the next ten years.¹²⁷ The same 2002 survey noted that 74 percent of the public supported a foreign language requirement in college, and the number who “strongly agreed” has increased since 2000. Seventy-seven percent of the public supports international course requirements at the college level, and more than one-third of undergraduates surveyed reported that they were more likely after September 11th to take courses on global issues and cultures.

The Supply of International Studies and Foreign Language Teachers

Increasing international studies courses at all levels requires more teachers who are knowledgeable of the international dimensions of their subjects. Teachers at the elementary and secondary levels are not prepared to meet the need for international knowledge and skills. Most prospective teachers take very few courses on foreign languages and international issues, which may be due, in part, to teacher certification requirements that do not include international components.¹²⁸ Additionally, fewer than five percent of undergraduates studying abroad are education majors.¹²⁹

A shortage of qualified foreign language teachers, especially in the lesser-taught languages, seriously hampers our ability to develop proficient foreign language speakers. For example, only 192 Bachelor’s degrees, 265 Master’s degrees, and 13 doctorates were awarded in 2000-2001 in foreign-language education.¹³⁰ Dr. Nina Garrett, Director of Language Study at Yale University, stated: “We have nowhere near enough qualified teachers—and very limited prospects for training more than a handful of new ones—in the

Internationalizing higher education programs

*The University of Rhode Island's International Engineering Program (IEP) is built on the philosophy that higher education must be responsive to the needs of global business, and that this can be achieved through partnerships with business and industry. Students devote an extra year to their undergraduate engineering program in order to complete a second degree in a foreign language, and to complete an internship abroad. Partner businesses provide internships, scholarship and programmatic support. IEP's students can take advantage of internship opportunities with over 40 partner firms in Europe and Latin America.*¹⁴⁰

vast majority of the less-commonly taught languages which learners want and need to learn and in which the Nation needs proficiency.”¹³¹ Ambassador Lemmon believes that the only long-term solution is to increase the entire pool of students and trained teachers: “We need wider pipelines of strong speakers, particularly in the less-commonly taught languages, to join the government. The pools of our educational system, together with the reservoirs of ‘heritage speakers,’ are potential sources to help meet these needs, but they need to be expanded far beyond the numbers currently available, and the pipelines need to begin earlier in our children’s learning career.”¹³²

Overall, fewer degrees in foreign languages and area studies are being conferred. Over a thirty-year period, from 1970 to 2000, the number of Bachelor’s degrees in foreign languages fell by 26 percent (from 20,536 to 15,146), while Master’s degrees declined by 46 percent (from 5,217 to 2,801). In 2000-2001, just 73 Bachelor’s degrees were awarded in Middle Eastern Studies, and 693 in Asian Studies. Even fewer Master’s degrees were awarded: 87 in Middle Eastern studies and 271 in Asian studies.¹³³ Many universities do not even offer programs in Middle Eastern languages or area studies. The total number of undergraduate degrees awarded in Arabic in 2002 was six.¹³⁴

Higher Education and the Needs of Business

Over the next decade, many U.S. businesses plan to emphasize international expertise among staff at all levels, adding to the demand for international

education.¹³⁵ * A majority of U.S. universities offer international business classes, due in part to the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business’s (AACSB) accreditation standard that a school’s curriculum must include topics that are “current and relevant” to the needs of the business community, such as the ability to operate in a global environment.¹³⁶ However, in a 1999 survey of multinational business leaders, fewer than one-third agreed that “business schools are currently graduating an adequate supply of qualified entry-level international business personnel.”¹³⁷ Across the public, for-profit, and non-profit sectors, human resource managers and line managers alike complain of a shortage of job candidates with multiple competencies, such as cognitive, interpersonal, and cross-cultural skills.¹³⁸ Indeed, in looking at which curricular areas to improve, business leaders would like to see a more interdisciplinary international business curriculum and a greater emphasis on learning about world regions and markets.¹³⁹

Our education system must be strengthened to produce globally competent citizens. Foreign language learning needs to begin in elementary school and continue through higher education. Elementary and secondary schools, as well as universities and professional schools, must instill in all students a more in-depth, sophisticated, and profound understanding of America’s place in the world, of the issues and cultures of other regions of the world, and of the international forces that affect their lives and their livelihoods.

The Media’s Role in Educating Citizens on International Issues

The media—radio, television, newspapers, magazines, and the internet—play a critical role in educating Americans about the world. The explosion in media

* In a 1994 survey of over 100 American CEOs, international business issues were seen as relevant for their firms, and nearly one-third of CEOs responded that international business issues were of critical importance to their company’s success. (Richard C. Hoffman and C. Gopinath, “The Importance of International Business to the Strategic Agenda of U.S. CEOs,” *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 25, issue 3, third quarter (1994), pp. 625-637.)

channels that has occurred over the last decade—the profusion of cable television channels, new applications of the internet and informal news media—present new opportunities to educate the public about other countries and regions, and how our world is becoming increasingly interconnected. However, only 38 seconds of a typical half-hour local newscast is devoted to foreign policy issues, including the war in Iraq.¹⁴¹ The decline in coverage of world events helped create an American populace that was stunned after September 11th because many had never heard of Al Qaeda or understood the threat posed by Islamic terrorists, which had been building for years.¹⁴² There is demand

for more international news: over 70 percent of the American public said they follow international affairs every day.¹⁴³

The media could develop a more culturally aware citizenry who will improve our cross-cultural relationships inside and outside our borders. The media can explain the importance of international studies and foreign language education by increasing coverage of foreign policy, world events, and issues affecting the lives of those outside the United States, as well as important international trends and issues affecting Americans' economic and national security.

IV. Moving Global Education Forward



Encouraging Programs and Developments

Although there remains much to be done, many U.S. institutions—the federal government, schools and colleges, the states, and the business community—have begun to embrace the wider world in the past decade, and especially in the years following the terrorist attacks of 2001. In their actions, which are illustrated in the following section, we find guidance for the more vigorous and far-reaching steps that must be taken in the coming years.

New Interest in the Study of Middle Eastern and Asian Languages

Despite declines over the past 30 years in the number of foreign language degrees being conferred, the 9/11 terrorist attacks and the intensified war against international terrorism have generated renewed interest in the study of some of the lesser-taught languages, especially Middle Eastern and Asian languages, at both the K-12 and postsecondary levels. Even before the 2001 attacks, Americans began enrolling in Middle Eastern language courses in greater numbers. Postsecondary enrollments in Arabic, for example, nearly doubled between 1998 and 2002.¹⁴⁴ The number of Americans studying Arabic at the American University in Cairo also has doubled since 2001, to about 480.¹⁴⁵ In 2002, 85 students in American colleges and universities were enrolled in Persian/Farsi (compared with none in 1998); 14 in Pashto (none in 1998); 314 in Turkish; and 152 in Urdu.¹⁴⁶ Postsecondary enrollments in some Asian languages also have risen. Enrollments in Chinese have increased by 20 percent from 1998 to 2002.¹⁴⁷ At the pre-college level, courses in Japanese and Chinese are being added in some elementary and secondary schools, and new

Advanced Placement exams in those languages will be offered in May 2007.¹⁴⁸

U.S.-China E-Language Learning System

The U.S.-China E-Language Learning System is a partnership between the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China and the United States Department of Education to build an innovative internet English and Chinese language learning program, entitled "Chengo" (Chinese and English on the Go). This joint project is the largest educational cooperative project between the two organizations and is intended to test the feasibility of using Internet-based second-language learning in American and Chinese schools for students from ages 12-18. The program uses 35 episodes that are 50 minutes in length to give a lesson in pronunciation and writing around themes related to Chinese culture, with the overarching theme of the 2008 Beijing Olympics. After mastering the lessons, students play games to practice their new skills. The program is targeted to prepare American students for the Chinese SAT II and Advanced Placement exams and is connected to English curriculum standards in China.*

The e-Less Commonly Taught Languages Initiative

The e-Less Commonly Taught Languages Initiative (e-LCTL) is a joint project among the Higher Education Act (HEA) Title VI Centers for African, Asian, Latin American and Caribbean Studies, International Development, and Women in International Development, and in cooperation with Michigan State University's Title VI Center for Language Education and Research. The e-LCTL Initiative is a multi-

* Visit www.elanguage.us, or www.ells.edu.cn, for more information.

faceted approach for developing capacity in the less-commonly taught languages. The website contains data on an array of topics, including enrollments in less-commonly taught languages, as well as the number and locations of universities and training centers that teach such languages and the variety of languages being taught.* The project has also set out to develop criteria for determining the highest-priority languages, and has created an international on-line database of internet modules for LCTL learning and course-planning that will allow linguists to coordinate their efforts in teaching Americans less-commonly taught languages.¹⁴⁹

Centers for International Business Education and Research

The Centers for International Business Education and Research (CIBER) were created through the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988. These centers are located at 30 universities across the country, with more than 900 programs geared toward increasing the international competitiveness of U.S. firms. Their mission is to serve as a resource for the business and academic communities on international business issues. CIBER institutions teach business techniques and strategies with an international component, provide instruction in foreign languages critical for U.S. business, conduct research and training in the global aspects of trade and commerce, provide an outstanding international business education for students, hold events of interest to local businesses, and serve other regional higher education institutions and faculty. Their results are impressive: From 1989 to 1999, CIBER universities awarded degrees with international business concentrations to 70,000 students; coordinated internationalization workshops for over 18,000 faculty and Ph.D. students; supported 2,400 faculty and Ph.D. international business research projects; taught 3,613 commercial language courses to over 53,000 students; conducted training programs on international business for 56,000 executives; and offered 2,600 workshops and seminars for local business communities.¹⁵⁰

Michigan State University and the University of Washington

Michigan State University and the University of Washington provide two examples of innovative partnerships between businesses and universities. At

Michigan State University, CIBER has developed a web portal, globalEDGE, which provides comprehensive resources on many aspects of global business. It has become the leading online resource for global business knowledge.¹⁵¹

At the University of Washington, programs at the undergraduate and graduate school level pair teams of students with local businesses to work on international business projects. The MBA Field Study Program and the International Projects class offer business school students and undergraduates the opportunity to work on projects with local businesses. The teams develop recommendations to increase their competitiveness and to help them take advantage of business opportunities overseas. Some students even conduct research for Washington businesses while they are studying abroad.¹⁵² The University of Washington boasts the participation of over one hundred companies, including Microsoft and Starbucks.

State Leadership to Upgrade International Education

CED is encouraged to note that several states, and in particular governors, have shown commendable leadership in recent years by undertaking high-profile reforms to upgrade their schools' international education programs. For example:

Delaware: The Delaware Department of Education joined the International Council of Delaware and the University of Delaware in conducting a baseline analysis of Delaware's capacity in international education from kindergarten through postgraduate education. The state created new professional development tracks to prepare teachers in international topics and is creating a recommended statewide curriculum that would infuse international knowledge into all subject areas.¹⁵³

New Jersey: Students must study world history and cultures for a minimum of one year, and are required to demonstrate proficiency in a world language for high-school graduation. An International Education Summit was held in the fall of 2004, and a five-year strategic plan is being developed by an advisory group for submission to the Governor, Commissioner of Education, and State Board of Education.¹⁵⁴

North Carolina: The North Carolina in the World Initiative, based at the University of North Carolina's Center for International Understanding and the

* For more information, visit www.elctl.msu.edu.

Governor's office, is coordinating four leadership teams to develop strategies to expand international education throughout the state's schools.¹⁵⁵

Wisconsin: Wisconsin has created a curriculum guide for teachers demonstrating how to integrate international content into state standards at all grade levels and in all subjects.¹⁵⁶ Wisconsin has formed an international education council, along with four regional leadership alliances, to coordinate and implement international education efforts across the state. The regional leadership alliances will be co-chaired by a business leader and an educator, and will focus on strengthening school and business partnerships.¹⁵⁷ Foreign language enrollment in Wisconsin public schools has increased dramatically over the past decade.

Wyoming: The state legislature appropriated \$5 million in 2004 to implement a K-6 foreign-language pilot program in fifty elementary schools for five years.¹⁵⁸

Many states are beginning to include knowledge of Asia, Africa, Latin America, the Middle East and global issues in their social studies standards. Geography and economics have been incorporated in the standards of many states. The new Advanced Placement exams in World History and Human Geography are growing in popularity, and the decision by the College Board to add the first new Advanced Placement language courses in 40 years—Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and Italian—will give a boost to study in those languages.

New Models for Internationalizing Our Schools

A growing number of schools around the country are demonstrating that it is possible to add international content and skills to the curriculum without diminishing basic subjects such as math, English and reading. They accomplish this in several creative ways, often by integrating international dimensions throughout the curriculum, and by using new technologies to expand the boundaries of learning. These efforts were augmented in 2003, when the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation provided a grant to the Asia Society to develop a network of ten small, international-themed urban secondary schools over five years.¹⁵⁹ The schools will be located in New York City, Los Angeles, Charlotte, and other urban school

districts across the nation. Half of these schools will serve grades 6-12, the other half grades 9-12. The following two schools are models that can be replicated across the country and are among the recipients of the Goldman Sachs Foundation Prizes for Excellence in International Education:*

John Stanford International School

The John Stanford International School is the only public immersion elementary school in Seattle, offering Spanish and Japanese immersion programs beginning in kindergarten. Students learn math and science in their immersion language, while language arts and social studies are taught in English. In addition, children learn about a different continent each year, and the school has "adopted" schools in Mexico and Tanzania. Students routinely score in the 70th and 80th percentiles on standardized tests in English and score well on tests of their immersion language as well.¹⁶⁰ The school was recently recognized by earning a "Best of the Best" 2005 Intel and Scholastic Schools of Distinction Award for its partnerships with the University of Washington Language Learning Center and the Seattle business community.¹⁶¹

International School of the Americas

This small, public high school in San Antonio, Texas, selects its student body through a lottery of middle schools throughout the city, choosing applicants on the basis of interest, rather than achievement. The curriculum has a global focus, with many innovative programs. Freshmen participate in a simulation of the world hunger problem, while sophomores engage in the model United Nations program and journey to Zacatecas, Mexico, to experience first-hand the art, culture, and history of that region. Juniors learn about the immigrant experience through an Ellis Island simulation in their American History courses, and seniors study government and economics at work through a trip to Washington, D.C. Graduation requirements include 120 hours of community service and a career-exploration internship in their junior or senior year. Freshmen and sophomores must earn an 80 average or above in their core academic courses. Student scores usually exceed Texas averages on standardized tests.¹⁶²

* For more information and to see descriptions of other prize winners, please go to www.internationaleled.org/prizes/about.htm.

Recent Foreign Language and International Studies Legislation

Signed into law by President George W. Bush on December 17, 2004, the Intelligence Reform Act includes several important provisions that strengthen programs in strategic languages.¹⁶³ Intelligence agencies such as the CIA and FBI are called upon to develop and maintain their language programs. The bill requires the new National Intelligence Director to undertake a thorough review of the linguistic requirements for the new Intelligence Directorate, and to develop a plan to meet those requirements through the education, recruitment, and training of linguists.

The bill further establishes an Intelligence Community Scholarship Program to recruit and prepare students in critical areas for civilian careers in intelligence agencies. It charges the Secretary of State with increasing the number of Foreign Service Officers proficient in languages spoken in Muslim countries. A Civilian Linguistic Corps pilot program, comprised of individuals who are available to be called upon to perform federal service in areas relating to their language expertise, was authorized in the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

A number of bills have been introduced recently to improve foreign language capabilities and international knowledge. For example, on May 19, 2005, Senator Daniel Akaka introduced the National Foreign Language Coordination Act of 2005, which proposes to create the position of “National Language Director” and a National Foreign Language Coordination Council to develop and manage the implementation of a federal foreign language strategy.¹⁶⁴ The Council would identify priorities, increase public awareness of the importance of foreign language

skills, coordinate efforts across sectors, and oversee the federal government’s foreign language activities. Other bills have targeted world regions, such as the U.S.-China Cultural Engagement Act, or a subject, such as the Teaching Geography is Fundamental Act. (See Appendix I for a timeline of developments in international studies and foreign language education, and Appendix II for an explanation of the major federal legislation pertaining to languages and international studies.)

Visas for Foreign Students at American Colleges and Universities

Recently, the U.S. Departments of State and Homeland Security have issued new rules easing visa restrictions for students and researchers working in fields deemed important to our national security, such as engineering, chemistry, and technology.¹⁶⁵ The Department of State, in particular, has given priority in the visa process to students and scholars, adding 350 additional consular positions, and extending the length of time for which security clearances are valid.

Not only do foreign students contribute an estimated \$13 billion annually to the U.S. economy,¹⁶⁶ but they also allow us to “export” one of our world-leading products: the excellence of our postsecondary educational institutions. For decades, U.S. colleges and universities have trained many of the world’s most influential business professionals, economists, scientists, engineers, and politicians. We have exposed millions of future leaders to our democratic values and market economy, which in turn has facilitated American business and political goals abroad. However, delays in the visa process continue to reduce the number of international students on U.S. campuses.

V. Recommendations and Conclusion

“America now faces critical choices about who it is and wants to be in an increasingly interdependent world—choices that will have a profound impact on Americans, on other peoples and countries, and on future generations. Only a more engaged and more active constituency of Americans can encourage policymakers to support the kind of sustained investments, involvement, and leadership needed from the United States to tackle global challenges effectively.” Stephen Heintz, President, Rockefeller Brothers Fund and Walter Isaacson, President and CEO, Aspen Institute¹⁶⁷

Within the last decade we have begun to glimpse the contours of the twenty-first century. It will be a world transformed by new communications technologies, and by the dismantling of political, economic, and cultural boundaries and barriers. The graduates of our high schools, colleges, and universities will be finding their way, not in the bipolar postwar world we had known for five decades, but in an environment where yesterday’s emerging nations have become the new economic powerhouses. They also will confront new, decentralized threats to our national security, threats that may emerge from nations which practice unfamiliar customs and speak unfamiliar languages.

Historically, external challenges have galvanized America to pay greater attention to other countries’ cultures and languages. In World War II, the Army trained thousands in Japanese, German, and other languages deemed critical to the war effort, and enlisted such scholars as Ruth Benedict to help us understand the history and culture of our adversaries. The Cold War and the challenge of Sputnik in 1957 prompted the Congress to enact the National Defense Education Act, HEA Title VI, and the Fulbright international exchange programs. The National Security Education

Program, begun in the early 1990s, responded to the breakup of the Soviet Union.

The attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001 are the Sputnik of our generation. A comparable response is needed to meet the challenges posed by international terrorism and a global economy.

We must act now because:

- Americans know too little about the world around them and about the international issues that affect their present and their future;
- Too few Americans are proficient in other languages, especially those critical languages that are vital to our security;
- The lack of international skills and knowledge threatens America’s economic competitiveness and national security; and
- Our inattention to other languages and cultures undermines our ability to be good citizens, both in our own country and in an increasingly interdependent world.

To have a citizenry that is knowledgeable of world regions, global issues, and foreign cultures, as well as conversant in other languages, we will need to strengthen the curriculum of the K-12 education system as well as that of our colleges, universities, and professional schools. Although there is much that can be done by states, governors, business leaders, and others, leadership by the Federal government will be crucial in jump-starting this effort. CED estimates that **new federal funding totaling nearly \$175 million per year for five years**, which is outlined in

detail below, would help prepare new and experienced teachers to bring international education into their classrooms; expand, improve, and develop international studies and foreign language education; and encourage students to pursue advanced study and careers in these areas. Recognizing the already enormous U.S. budget deficit, federal funding should be prioritized such that resources for these programs come from spending reductions in other areas.

CED Recommendations

1. CED recommends that international content be taught across the curriculum and at all levels of learning, to expand American students' knowledge of other countries and cultures.

International content should be integrated into each state's K-12 curriculum standards and assessment criteria. While proficiency in the core subject areas of reading, math, and science is certainly important, international studies deserve adequate instructional time in America's classrooms. Students can receive added exposure to international studies by incorporating global content and perspectives into existing curricula. In addition, elementary and secondary schools should increase course offerings focusing solely on international topics, such as geography, world history, and area studies. Reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act should include accountability provisions regarding international studies.

States should require every high school graduate to demonstrate global literacy. High school graduates should achieve proficiency in at least one language in addition to their primary language, and demonstrate knowledge of the geography and cultures of major regions of the world as well as an understanding of global issues (such as economic development, energy, environmental concerns, poverty, and public health).

Congress should enact an Education for Global Leadership Act that provides funds to modernize and globalize the curricula of elementary and secondary schools. Funds should be awarded to help states and school districts design and create curricula with innovative approaches to international content,

and apply new technologies—such as the internet and distance learning—to bring the world into our classrooms. In addition, new model schools dedicated to international studies could develop and disseminate best practices, and train teachers for other schools in the state. The Education for Global Leadership Act would require \$50 million annually for five years, and would complement the NCLB Title V legislation that is dedicated to establishing and improving foreign language programs in elementary and secondary schools.*

Teachers should receive professional development training to ensure that they are prepared to teach an international curriculum. Funding should be provided for professional development initiatives, including teacher training and summer institutes, so that teachers can update and expand their own knowledge of geography, world history, and today's international issues.† An increase of \$10 million in funding to Title II of NCLB should be dedicated for teacher professional development in international studies.‡

Colleges and universities should form partnerships with elementary and secondary schools in order to make available their expertise in international studies. These collaborations should be substantive, multi-disciplinary, and long-term. Many colleges and universities have moved in recent years to expand their international programs and these institutions should work with elementary and secondary schools to do the same.§

Colleges and universities should internationalize their campuses. Internationalization efforts should

* The Education for Global Leadership Act is estimated to cost, on average, \$1 million per state per year, totaling \$250 million over five years.

† Current legislation, the Teaching Geography is Fundamental Act (S. 1376), requests \$15 million annually over five years to provide grants for teacher professional development and other programs specifically focused on improving geographic literacy in K-12 education.

‡ In FY 2005, NCLB provided \$585 million for professional development. Roughly \$50 million was for history or social studies. The proposal is therefore a 20 percent increase in the funding directed to international studies.

§ Funding for partnerships between institutions of higher education and elementary and secondary schools is covered under the increased funding for Title VI of HEA.

include expanding study-abroad opportunities and encouraging greater participation by integrating study abroad into the curricula of all majors, making opportunities affordable for all students, and promoting the importance of overseas experience for personal and career development. To the extent possible, these programs should be at least a full semester in length, encourage study in a language other than English, and allow for greater interaction with host country citizens. Faculty development should include overseas experience, and college and university presidents, provosts, and administrators should champion international education at their schools. Recent funding increases in educational and cultural exchange programs, such as the Fulbright and Gilman Programs, should be maintained. In addition, funding for the ten programs that increase student and faculty expertise in foreign languages and international studies under Title VI of the Higher Education Act should be increased by \$15 million.*

Teacher education programs in colleges and universities should include a strong international component. Current teacher education programs provide little exposure to international topics and few prospective teachers study abroad. To better prepare new teachers to integrate and teach international studies in their classrooms, colleges and universities must incorporate international studies courses into their own teacher education programs. In reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, funding for Title II teacher education programs should increase by \$10 million.†

Corporations should play a more active role in supporting education initiatives that help to produce graduates with cross-cultural competencies. U.S. businesses and multinational corporations should increase their financial support for a broad range of projects to internationalize American education, from the elementary through post-graduate levels. Such efforts might include: offering more international internship opportunities for U.S. students; supporting the use of Internet and distance learning technology to bring global perspectives to elementary and secondary education; and endowing chairs and advanced study centers in U.S. colleges and universities.

2. CED recommends expanding the training pipeline at every level of education to address the paucity of Americans fluent in foreign languages, especially critical, less-commonly taught languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Persian/Farsi, Russian, and Turkish.

Federal language initiatives should encourage states and local school districts to implement language programs in the elementary grades and offer more advanced language classes in middle schools and high schools. The pipeline of critical language learners should begin in elementary school and continue through postsecondary education. The Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) under Title V of NCLB, which provides grants to state educational agencies to develop model programs that establish, improve, or expand foreign language study in elementary and secondary schools, should be expanded and an additional \$18 million in funding provided.‡ In addition, the Department of Defense's K-16 Pipeline Project, a component of the National Security Education Program, should be expanded. Currently one university has a K-16 Pipeline project underway, providing Chinese language instruction to advanced students while developing a coherent Chinese language sequence for elementary, middle, and high schools. The Pipeline Project should be expanded to include additional languages with \$3 million in funding.§

* Total funding for HEA Title VI is \$107 million and the International and Foreign Language Studies Act of 2005 (S. 1105), requests appropriations of \$120 million for HEA Title VI programs in fiscal year 2006, an increase approximately equal to this recommendation.

† In FY 2004, \$29 million was granted to 25 colleges and universities to improve teacher education programs, and so this recommendation is approximately a one-third increase.

‡ FLAP grants require that states provide a dollar for dollar match. Currently, 12 states or local education agencies have received grants, and funding in FY 2005 was approximately \$18 million. To broaden the effects of this program and the number of states participating, funding should double to \$36 million annually.

§ The existing K-16 Chinese Pipeline Project has received about \$700,000 in funding. Developing pipeline projects for the additional four languages in the National Flagship Language Initiative is estimated to cost \$3 million.

Expanding foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools, particularly in critical languages, will require increased professional development for teachers and employing the resources of our heritage-language communities.

Higher education institutions should partner with state and local education agencies to provide professional development in foreign language instruction. Funding for these activities, through Title VI of the Higher Education Act, may require \$50 million in new funding.* In addition, Governors should take the lead in developing incentives for alternative certification routes to facilitate native-language speakers into the teaching profession. Schools of education should actively recruit potential teachers of critical languages and support them in high quality pre-service and new teacher induction programs.

To encourage enrollment in higher education programs that lead to careers as language professionals, the federal government should support advanced critical language learning centers and consider incentives, such as loan forgiveness and scholarships.

Over the next decade, tens of thousands of students should be trained in critical, less-commonly taught languages. The Department of Defense's National Flagship Language Initiative, part of the National Security Education Program, establishes critical language training centers at colleges and universities. There are currently language centers for five of the eight critical languages at nine different college campuses. The Flagship programs should be expanded to include other universities and additional languages with \$3 million in new funding.†

In addition, scholarship, grant, or loan forgiveness programs could encourage students to pursue study in critical languages. For example, in a program similar to the National Health Service Corps,‡ undergraduate or graduate students who major in a critical foreign language would agree to pursue a career in the federal government for a given period of time after graduation in exchange for scholarships or federal educational loan forgiveness. A program for critical language graduates may cost about \$5 million a year.§ Similarly, the National Security Education Program (NSEP) awards scholarships to undergraduate and graduate students to study in countries critical to national security in exchange for working in the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, State, or the intelligence

community. To continue to fund NSEP and expand its impact, funding totaling \$8.5 million annually should be provided.** For low-income students, incentives outlined in the proposed National SMART Grant program would provide supplemental Pell Grants to encourage students to major in a critical language.¥ Providing supplemental Pell Grants for third- and fourth-year undergraduates majoring in a critical language is estimated to cost less than \$1 million a year.

To develop a reservoir of critical language practitioners quickly, the federal government should streamline recruitment and training of critical-language and heritage-language speakers. The growing backlog of untranslated intelligence and the increasing need for diplomatic efforts abroad require

* The National Security Language Act (H.R. 115) requests appropriations of \$48 million in FY 2006 (and the following years as necessary) for a grant program to provide professional development through partnerships between local schools and foreign language departments at colleges and universities for increased foreign language learning in elementary schools.

† The National Security Education Program Trust Fund, which funds the Flagship and Pipeline programs in addition to other NSEP programs, will have exhausted its resources in FY 2005. Renewed funding for the existing Flagship and Pipeline programs, though annual appropriations would cost \$7.5 million, and another \$3 million would allow for program expansion of the remaining three critical languages.

‡ The National Health Service Corps, established in 1970, assists localities with too few health care professionals. Health care providers participating in the Corps agree to practice in a targeted area for a designated period of time in exchange for scholarships or federal educational loan forgiveness.

§ The National Security Language Act (H.R. 115) recommends providing \$10,000 in federal loan forgiveness for workers with bachelor's degrees in a critical foreign language and employed as a critical-language elementary or secondary school teacher, or in a federal government agency that requires the regular use of a critical foreign language.

** NSEP funding was approximately \$6.5 million in FY 2005 under the National Security Education Program Trust Fund. Continued funding for this program under annual appropriations would require \$6.5 million and an additional \$2 million would allow for program expansion.

¥ The Higher Education Amendments of 2005 (S. 1614) proposes establishing a National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent Grant (commonly referred to as the "National SMART Grant"), which would award third- and fourth-year Pell Grant-eligible students majoring in math, science, technology, engineering, or a critical foreign language an additional \$1,500 grant for the academic year.

less-bureaucratic processes for recruiting and hiring critical-language speakers. In addition, programs supporting English-language learning for heritage speakers of critical languages should be supported.

University professional programs, such as schools of business administration, engineering, and medicine, should consider incentives to encourage students to pursue high-level foreign language study. Schools of business administration should institute foreign-language requirements, and include classes on the culture and languages of areas of the world, such as Asia, that are growing in business importance.

3. CED recommends that national leaders—political leaders, as well as the business and philanthropic communities, and the media—inform the public about the importance of improving education in foreign languages and international studies.

The President should host a White House Conference on Education for Global Leadership. The Conference would bring together business, education, and national-security leaders to assess how our education system—kindergarten through postsecondary—can be strengthened to ensure that America maintains its economic and national security.

At the state level, governors should take advantage of opportunities to educate their citizens about the link between international commerce and jobs in their states. Some states, such as Delaware and North Carolina, have already convened statewide meetings or taskforces addressing global issues and educational requirements, and additional states should follow suit.

Governors should convene a high-level review of their state’s K-12 curriculum and standards by business and education leaders to determine whether they reflect global content. The state board of education and business leaders should work with the Governor on curricula reviews, which would examine whether policies are in place to promote international knowledge and skills in the schools. The review would include an evaluation of the state’s existing standards, assessments, and graduation requirements to determine whether they include adequate international content.

Business leaders should champion the issues of international studies and foreign language education

by articulating why Americans need to learn more about the world. Corporate leaders should communicate, both within their own companies and to the broader community, why global issues and foreign languages are important to business. Business leaders should make a greater effort to articulate to college and university faculty, administrators, and students, and especially to schools of business, what skills and knowledge are valuable in doing business with the rest of the world.

Private philanthropic foundations should intensify their efforts to support an international perspective in the curricula of our elementary and secondary schools. Foundations can play a larger role in supporting demonstration projects, statewide planning meetings, and innovative approaches to developing programs in international studies and foreign languages, particularly the less-commonly taught languages.

The media should increase coverage of global issues and highlight educational programs that are preparing students to become global citizens. The media should take advantage of every opportunity to call attention to success stories where schools are finding innovative ways of teaching their students about the world, and to inform the public about the important international trends and issues that affect Americans’ economic and national security.

Conclusion

The forces of globalization will continue to present challenges to our economic security, national security, and multicultural society. As national economies grow ever more interconnected, American corporations doing business at home and abroad will increasingly depend on employees who have a broad and sophisticated understanding of the world—its languages, cultures, and politics.

To keep America safe in our rapidly changing world, knowledge of foreign languages and cultures should no longer be considered esoteric skills solely for experts. We cannot allow intelligence information to go months without being translated, our troops overseas to be linguistically isolated, and our cultural diplomacy efforts to be hampered by a lack of foreign-language speakers.

As the United States becomes increasingly diverse within its own shores, knowledge of other countries and languages is essential if our workplaces, schools, and communities are to embrace their diversity and maintain our civic culture.

The new global world in which we live makes a host of demands on Americans and on the education system that prepares them. Leadership in the twenty-

first century will depend not only on strengthening our students' reading, math, and science skills, but also on helping them become citizens of the world by expanding their knowledge of other countries, cultures, and languages. Our national security and our economic prosperity ultimately depend on how well we educate today's students to become tomorrow's global leaders.

Appendix I: A Timeline of Important Developments in International Studies and Foreign Language Education*

1936: At the Pan American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, the U.S. delegation unanimously approves a Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations, one of the first efforts in U.S. cultural diplomacy. The delegation called for exchanges of professors, teachers, and students among American countries.

1946: Congress enacts the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1946 introduced by Senator J. William Fulbright. The original legislation allocated funds for educators to exchange jobs with teachers from other countries.

1948: Congress enacts the United States Information and Cultural Exchange Act of 1948 (the Smith-Mundt Act), establishing the framework for cultural and educational exchange programs.

1957: The Soviet Union launches *Sputnik*.

1958: The National Defense Education Act (NDEA) is enacted, identifying languages deemed essential for the national defense. NDEA's Title VI, called "Language Development," was comprised of two parts: Part A focused on language area centers, fellowships, and research and studies; and Part B's focused on advanced training of elementary and secondary language teachers at language institutes.

1961: Congress updates and expands the 1946 Act and incorporates the framework of the Smith-Mundt Act to pass the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange, or Fulbright-Hays, Act of 1961. The Act

supports academic, professional, youth, and cultural exchange programs, most notably the Fulbright Program, which awards grants to U.S. citizens (students, educators, scholars, and professionals) to study overseas as well as grants to non-U.S. citizens to pursue educational opportunities in the United States.

1962: President Kennedy issues an Executive Order assigning Section 102 (b)(6) of the Fulbright-Hays Act to the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. This section later became a part of Title VI of the Higher Education Act (HEA). The original Section 102(b)(6) of Fulbright-Hays supported four initiatives: Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad; Faculty Research Abroad; Group Projects Abroad; and Foreign Curriculum Consultants (FCC). Although the Consultants program no longer exists, a Seminars Abroad program was added in the 1960s.

1965: Congress enacts the Higher Education Act.

1966: President Johnson proposes the International Education Act of 1966 and, although enacted, never receives funding. The Act called for broad-based programs to internationalize U.S. education and to promote exchanges with other nations.

1969: James Becker and Lee Anderson write, "An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in United States Secondary Schools," a report commissioned by the Office of Education. Despite the report, federal support for international education did not follow.

1977-1979: President Carter convenes the Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies in 1977. The Commission issued its report in 1979 after interviewing representatives

* For information on new legislation related to international studies and foreign language education, please visit the Joint National Committee for Languages and the National Council for Languages and International Studies' website at www.languagepolicy.org.

of business, government, universities, and other nonprofit institutions. The problem, as defined by the Commission, was Americans' "scandalous" incompetence in foreign languages, and the report concluded, "Nothing less is at issue than the nation's security."

1980: NDEA's language programs are included within the HEA as Title VI. A new Part B provides grants for the Business and International Education program.

1983: The National Commission on Excellence in Education released the landmark report *A Nation at Risk*, recommending the study of two years of foreign language for college-bound students as one of the five basic components of a high school education.

1986: Title VI of HEA is reauthorized to include Language Resource Centers in order to improve the effectiveness of the teaching and learning of foreign languages.

1988: Congress enacts the Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) in Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). FLAP provides grants to schools for the establishment of language programs. Title VI of the HEA is reauthorized and the Centers for International Business Education become a new section of Part B.

1991: The National Security Education Act of 1991 establishes the National Security Education Program (NSEP), with resources for scholarships, fellowships, and grants. Its mission is to develop national capacity to enhance U.S. citizens' understanding of foreign cultures, strengthen U.S. economic competitiveness, and enhance international cooperation and security.

1992: Title VI of HEA is reauthorized and two new programs are added: the American Overseas Research Centers, which support centers abroad to promote research and exchange in language and area studies; and the Institute for International Public Policy, which became a section in Part C, and increased the number of underrepresented minorities in international careers. The Foreign Language Incentive Program (FLIP) is included with FLAP, but is not subsequently reauthorized. Under the FLIP program, the Secretary of Education awards grants to public elementary schools for programs leading to competency in a foreign language.

1994: The U.S. Office of Educational Research and Improvement conducts a study of U.S.-based corporations with over 400,000 employees. It finds that U.S. corporations are beginning to value second language proficiency more highly, and that employers view the emphasis on multiculturalism and diversity in college courses as positive preparation for work in a global economy.

March 1994: President Clinton signs Public Law 103-227, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Goal 3 states: "By the year 2000, United States students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over...foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography..." It continues: "the percentage of students who are competent in more than one language will substantially increase; and all students will be knowledgeable about the diverse heritage of our Nation and about the world community."

1998: HEA Title VI is reauthorized to include the Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access Program. Its purpose is to promote innovative uses of technology for collecting and disseminating information from foreign sources.

April 2000: President Clinton issues an Executive Memorandum requesting federal agencies take steps to promote and facilitate international education.

November 2000: President Clinton proclaims the first International Education Week.

November 2000: President and Mrs. Clinton host the first White House Conference on Culture and Diplomacy, chaired by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

2001: The Asia Society releases the report "Asia in the Schools: Preparing Young Americans for Today's Interconnected World," in which they find that American students are "dangerously uniformed about international matters, especially Asia."

Congress passes the No Child Left Behind Act, which recognizes foreign languages as a core subject area, but testing is not required.

April 2001: Introduced by Senators John Kerry and Richard Lugar, the Senate unanimously passes Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, "expressing the sense of

Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy..”

September 11, 2001: Terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon.

December 2001: Senator Richard Durbin introduces Senate bill 1799, the Homeland Security Education Act, which provides grants to colleges to offer math, science, and technology courses in other languages. It also encourages early study of foreign languages and proposes the National Flagship Language Initiative (NFLI).

2002: The National Geographic/Roper survey of young adults shows that U.S. students lag behind their international peers in knowledge of geography and current events.

HEA Title VI appropriations increase by an unprecedented 26 percent, with additional funds targeted on languages and studies related to the Middle East and Central and South Asia. Despite this record increase, the spending does not restore many programs to Cold War appropriations levels.

January 2002: The General Accounting Office releases the report, “Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls.” The report states that for FY 2001, the Army had a 44 percent shortfall in the hiring of translators and interpreters in Arabic, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Persian/Farsi, and Russian. The State Department had a 26 percent shortfall, while the FBI had a 13 percent shortfall.

July 2002: House passes HR 3969, the Freedom Promotion Act of 2002, introduced by Representative Henry Hyde, which provides for several major exchange initiatives to Muslim countries.

September 2002: Congress, through the FY 2003 Intelligence Authorization Act, authorizes NSEP’s effort to implement NFLI and to investigate the feasibility of a Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps, comprised of U.S. citizens with advanced proficiency in foreign languages, which could be called upon to perform duties for the federal government. The NFLI is the nation’s first major partnership between the federal government and higher education to implement a national system of programs designed to produce advanced language competency in critical languages.

March 2003: The U.S. Department of Education releases its plan for FY 2004. Objective 2.5 is to “improve U.S. students’ knowledge of world languages, regions, and international issues and build international ties in the field of education.” Objective 5.6 is to “increase the capacity of U.S. postsecondary education institutions to teach world languages, area studies, and international issues.”

June 2003: The Asia Society and the Goldman Sachs Foundation award their first prizes for Excellence in International Education in order to identify and recognize the best examples of international education in the United States.

September 2003: Representative Peter Hoekstra introduces HR 3077, to reauthorize support for HEA Title VI programs. The bill includes a new, controversial provision, Section 633, which calls for an International Higher Education Advisory Board to ensure that HEA Title VI programs discuss diverse perspectives on international affairs.

November 2003: Senate passes the Homeland Security Federal Workforce Act (S. 589) introduced by Senator Daniel Akaka. The bill proposes programs for the recruitment and retention of federal employees with expertise in areas critical to national security, such as foreign languages.

December 2003: Representative Rush Holt introduces the National Security Language bill (HR 3676) to increase federal investment in foreign language education, especially in critical languages. Among the proposals: provide loan forgiveness for university students who major in a critical language and then work for the federal government or as a language teacher; provide grants to U.S. universities to establish intensive language study programs and develop programs to encourage advanced science and technology studies in a foreign language; and establish grants for foreign language partnerships between local school districts and university foreign language departments.

January 2004: Congress passes the FY 2004 budget, which includes a provision to establish the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship to expand opportunities for U.S. students to study abroad, particularly in developing countries.

June 2004: The National Language Conference takes place at the University of Maryland, bringing together federal and state government agencies, business leaders, academics, and language experts to discuss strategic approaches to meeting the nation's language needs in the twenty-first century.

July 2004: Senator Christopher Dodd introduces the International and Foreign Language Studies Act of 2004 (S. 2727), which would amend Part A of Title VI of the Higher Education Act to extend fellowships for foreign language and area studies to undergraduates and to increase appropriations.

December 2004: President Bush signs Public Law 108-458, the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. The legislation calls on the CIA and FBI to develop and maintain their language programs, and on the Secretary of State to increase the number of Foreign Service Officers proficient in the languages spoken in Muslim countries. There is a provision to establish programs for the expansion of U.S. scholarship and exchange programs in the Islamic world.

December 2004: President Bush signs Public Law 108-487, the Intelligence Authorization Act for FY 2005. It increases funding for the NFLI as well as the number of participating institutions. It authorizes the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence to carry out a program to advance skills in critical foreign languages.

January 2005: Representative Rush Holt reintroduces the National Security Language Act, as HR 115, with the same provisions as HR 3676.

January 2005: Senator Joseph Biden introduces the Targeting Terrorists More Effectively Act of 2005 (S. 12), which provides for increased foreign language expertise in the United States.

February 2005: Representative Patrick Tiberi introduces the International Studies in Higher Education Act of 2005 to amend and extend Title VI of HEA.

February 2005: Senate unanimously passes Senate Resolution 28, designating 2005 as the "Year of Foreign Language Study," introduced by Senator Christopher Dodd. Representative Rush Holt

introduces House Resolution 122 recognizing 2005 as the Year of Languages. Senators Norm Coleman and Jeff Bingaman introduce the American Competitiveness Through International Openness Now (ACTION) Act of 2005, which would amend the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 to develop a strategic marketing plan to attract foreign students, update criteria for visa approval and admittance to the United States, and increase the "timeliness and certainty" in the student visa process.

March 2005: Representatives Jim Kolbe and James Oberstar submit House Resolution 100, which calls for the establishment of an international education policy.

April 2005: Senators Russ Feingold and Chuck Hagel submit Senate Resolution 104, the "People-to-People Engagement in World Affairs Resolution," which calls upon the Secretary of State to coordinate the creation of an online database of international exchange, volunteer, and related programs.

May 2005: The National Security Education Program announces the Chinese K-16 Pipeline Project, which intends to develop a K-16 student pipeline for Chinese language education.

May 2005: Senator Daniel Akaka introduces the National Language Coordination Act of 2005 (S. 1089). This bill creates a National Language Director and a National Foreign Language Coordination Council, which would implement a foreign language strategy for the federal government.

May 2005: Senator Christopher Dodd introduces the International and Foreign Language Studies Act of 2005 (S. 1105), which would amend and extend Title VI of the Higher Education Act.

May 2005: Senators Joseph Lieberman and Lamar Alexander introduce the United States-China Cultural Engagement Act, in order to promote Chinese language and culture education throughout elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education.

July 2005: Senator Thad Cochran introduces the Teaching Geography is Fundamental Act (S. 1376), which focuses on improving the geographic literacy of K-12 students as well as professional development programs for teachers.

July 2005: The House Education and Workforce Committee reauthorizes the Higher Education Act, which includes the International Studies in Higher Education Act.

November 2005: Senator Richard Durbin introduces, and the Senate subsequently passes, Senate Resolution 308, designating 2006 as the “Year of Study Abroad.”

January 5, 2006: President Bush announces the National Security Language Initiative, which aims to help Americans develop advanced proficiency in critical languages by starting language education in elementary school, increasing the number of foreign language teachers, and expanding immersion and study abroad programs.

Appendix II: Major Federal Legislation Pertaining to International Studies and Foreign Language Education

Fulbright-Hays Act (also known as the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act)

Year Enacted: 1946; revised and expanded in 1961.

Supports: Cultural exchange programs for scholars, professionals, and youth (about 20 programs annually); and cultural exchange programs, most notably the Fulbright Program, which awards approximately 1,000 grants to U.S. citizens (students, educators, scholars, and professionals) to study overseas, and awards approximately 3,000 grants to non-U.S. citizens to pursue educational opportunities in the United States. Other exchange programs include the Benjamin Gilman program (providing Americans with financial need opportunities to study abroad), the International Visitor Leadership Program (foreign leaders travel to the U.S. for professional development), and the Citizen Exchange Program (awards grants to U.S. non-profits for professional, cultural, institutional, and community exchanges).

Funding: The Fulbright Program: Appropriation made through the Department of State. Participating governments and host institutions also contribute financial support through direct cost sharing, as well as through tuition waivers, university housing, and other benefits. In FY 2005, the Fulbright program received a Congressional appropriation of \$144.5 million and foreign governments contributed another \$37 million. However, the overall number of grantees has declined from 1993 to 2002 (from 6,518 to 5,099). Educational and Cultural Exchanges (including the Fulbright Program) received an increase in appropriations from \$360.7 million in 2005 to \$431.8 million FY 2006. The “Support for East European Democracy” and

“Economic Support Fund” exchanges received no funding support in the President’s 2006 budget request. These programs foster personal and professional relationships between Americans and countries of the former Soviet Union.

Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965

Year Enacted: HEA was enacted in 1965; Title VI was incorporated in 1980.

Supports: Title VI includes ten programs: the National Resource Centers, Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships, International Research and Studies, the Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language Program, the Business and International Education Program, Centers for International Business Education, Language Resource Centers, American Overseas Research Centers, the Institute for International Public Policy, and the Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access Program. Section 102(b)(6), commonly known as Fulbright-Hays, supports an additional four programs: Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad, Faculty Research Abroad, Group Projects Abroad, and Seminars Abroad.

Funding: Proposed for FY 2006: for domestic programs, \$92.6 million (NRC and FLAS receive about two-thirds of Title VI funds); for overseas programs (Fulbright-Hays), \$12.7 million; and for the Institute for International Public Policy, \$1.6 million, for a total of \$106.9 million. This funding level is the same as FY 2005. However, Title VI funding did increase by \$3.2 million in 2005, after a \$4 million decrease in 2004.

Foreign Language Assistance Program (FLAP) and Foreign Language Incentive Program (FLIP)

Year Enacted: 1988 and 1990, respectively.

Supports: FLAP awards grants of three years to both state and local educational agencies to develop model programs that establish, improve, or expand foreign language study in elementary and secondary schools under Title V of the No Child Left Behind Act. Under FLIP, the Department of Education makes an incentive payment each fiscal year to public elementary schools that provide students with programs leading to competency in a foreign language.

Funding: The President requested no funding for FLAP in the FY 2005 or 2006 budgets. FLAP did, however, receive an appropriation of \$18 million in FY 2005. Seventy-five percent of program funds are targeted for elementary schools. FLIP was included with FLAP in the 1990s, but has not been reauthorized.

The David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991

Year Enacted: 1991

Supports: Three major programs. Two programs support scholarships for undergraduates and fellowships for graduate students to pursue overseas study in languages and area studies critical to national security. Students receiving the awards must agree to work in the Departments of Defense, Homeland

Security, or State, or the intelligence community for a period of time equivalent to the duration of their grant support, but not less than one year.

The third program, the National Flagship Language Initiative (NFLI), supports programs in universities to produce graduates with advanced proficiency in critical languages. The program focuses on Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Persian, Russian, and Turkish. Pilot programs exist for Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Persian, and Russian. The Boren Undergraduate Fellowships program is administered by the Institute of International Education; Boren Graduate Fellowships are administered by the Academy for Educational Development; and the NFLI is administered by the National Security Education Program office and the National Foreign Language Center at the University of Maryland.

Funding: NSEP funding has been provided by the National Security Education Program Trust Fund, which was authorized in the Intelligence Authorization Act. NSEP received an appropriation of \$8 million for the scholarship and fellowship programs. One and a half million of these funds went to the NFLI and an additional \$6 million was transferred from the Intelligence Community Management Account for this program in 2005. The Trust Fund will be phased out in 2006 and funding will come from appropriations. Currently, the Targeting Terrorists More Effectively Act of 2005 (S. 12), would appropriate \$20 million for the NFLI for each fiscal year after 2005.

Endnotes

- ¹ Statement of President George W. Bush for International Education Week, Washington, DC, November 13, 2001.
- ² Jamie B. Draper and June H. Hicks, *Foreign Language Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools, Fall 2000: Summary Report* (Alexandria, VA: American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, May 2002), p. 1; Elizabeth B. Welles, "Foreign Language Enrollments in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2002," *Association of Departments of Foreign Languages Bulletin*, vol. 35, nos. 2-3, Winter-Spring 2004, Table 4, p. 12.
- ³ Draper and Hicks, *Foreign Language Enrollments*, p. 2; Welles, "Foreign Language Enrollments," Table 1a, p. 9.
- ⁴ Welles, "Foreign Language Enrollments," Table 1a, p. 9.
- ⁵ NAFSA, *Securing America's Future: Global Education for a Global Age, Report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad* (Washington, DC: NAFSA, 2003), p. 7.
- ⁶ President George W. Bush, remarks given at the Department of State Swearing-In Ceremony for Undersecretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, Karen Hughes, Washington, DC, September 9, 2005.
- ⁷ Gerald Ford, interviewed by Larry King on CNN's "Larry King Live," July 23, 1998, transcript #98072300V22.
- ⁸ The National Language Conference, *A Call to Action for National Foreign Language Capabilities* (February 2005), available at <www.nlconference.org/docs/White_Paper.pdf> Accessed January 10, 2005.
- ⁹ Robert R. Rosen, Patricia Digh, Marshall Singer, and Carl Phillips, *Global Literacies: Lessons on Business Leadership and National Cultures* (New York, NY: Simon & Schuster, 2000), p. 171.
- ¹⁰ U.S. Census Bureau, *Exports from Manufacturing Establishments: 2001* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, July 2004), Table 2, p. 8.
- ¹¹ James C. Cooper and Kathleen Madigan, "U.S.: Why Profits are Defying Gravity; More Pricing Power and Better Foreign Earnings Will Fuel the Bottom Line," *Business Week*, April 18, 2005, p. 25.
- ¹² Thomas M. McDevitt and Patricia M. Rowe, "The United States in International Context: 2000" (U.S. Census Bureau 2000 brief, Washington, DC, February 2002); Raymond G. Gordon, Jr., ed., *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, 15th edition* (Dallas, TX: SIL International, 2004).
- ¹³ U.S. Census Bureau, *Foreign Trade Statistics: U.S. Trade in Goods (Imports, Exports and Balance) by Country* (June 10, 2005), available at <www.census.gov/foreign-trade/balance/index.html> Accessed June 24, 2005.
- ¹⁴ William J. Zeile, *Operations of U.S. Affiliates of Foreign Companies: Preliminary Results from the 2002 Benchmark Survey* (Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, August 2004), Table 4, p. 200.
- ¹⁵ Kathryn Kranhold, Dan Bilefsky, Matthew Karnischnig, and Ginny Parker, "Lost in Translation?; Managers at Multinationals May Miss the Job's Nuances if They Speak Only English," *The Wall Street Journal*, May 18, 2004, p. B1.
- ¹⁶ Thomas L. Friedman, *The World is Flat: A Brief History of the Twenty-First Century* (Waterville, ME: Thorndike Press, 2005).
- ¹⁷ James B. Hunt, Jr., remarks given at the Committee for Economic Development Subcommittee on International Studies and Foreign Language Education meeting, November 17, 2004.
- ¹⁸ Robert E. Scott, *U.S.-China Trade, 1989-2003: Impact on Jobs and Industries, Nationally and State-by-State*, Economic Policy Institute Working Paper #270 (Washington, DC: The Economic Policy Institute, January 2005), pp. 10-11.
- ¹⁹ Richard W. Moxon, Elizabeth A.C. O'Shea, Mollie Brown, and Christoffer M. Escher, *Changing U.S. Business Needs for International Expertise* (Seattle, WA: Center for International Business Education and Research, University of Washington Business School, 1997), pp. 140-141.
- ²⁰ Thane Peterson, "The Importance of Being Multilingual," *Business Week Online*, September 5, 2002.
- ²¹ The Coca-Cola Company, *Around the World* (2003), available at <www2.coca-cola.com/ourcompany/aroundworld.html> Accessed September 9, 2005.
- ²² U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, "Summary Estimates for Multinational Companies: Employment, Sales, and Capital Expenditures for 2003" (news release, Washington, DC, April 19, 2005).
- ²³ Michael J. Marquardt and Lisa Horvath, *Global Teams: How Top Multinationals Span Boundaries and Cultures with High-Speed Teamwork* (Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black, 2000), pp. 4-6.
- ²⁴ Michael Marquardt, *The Global Advantage: How World-Class Organizations Improve Performance Through Globalization* (Houston, TX: Gulf Press, 1999).
- ²⁵ Tora K. Bikson and Sally A. Law, *Global Preparedness and Human Resources: College and Corporation Perspectives* (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1994), pp. 28-29.
- ²⁶ Ben L. Kedia and Shirley Daniel, "U.S. Business Needs for Employees with International Expertise" (paper prepared for the Conference on Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education at Duke University, Durham, NC, January 2003), pp. 5, 12-14, 17.

- ²⁷ Marta Castaing, *States Institute on International Education in the Schools: Institute Report, November 20-22, 2002* (New York, NY: Asia Society, 2002), p. 28.
- ²⁸ Jo Best, *How Eight Pixels Cost Microsoft Millions* (August 19, 2004), available at <news.com.com/How+eight+pixels+cost+Microsoft+millions/2100-1014_3-5316664.html?tag=nefd.pop> Accessed June 20, 2005.
- ²⁹ Kedia and Daniel, "U.S. Business Needs," pp. 5, 12-14.
- ³⁰ Alfred Mockett, remarks given at the CED Subcommittee on International Studies and Foreign Language Education meeting, Washington, DC, November 17, 2004.
- ³¹ Rosen, Dingh, Singer, and Phillips, *Global Literacies*, p. 60.
- ³² Gretchen Weber, "English Rules," *Workforce Management*, May 2004, pp. 47-50.
- ³³ Institute of International Education, *Interview with Doug Daft, Chairman and CEO of Coca-Cola* (2001), available at <www.iienetwork.org/?p=29253> Accessed October 5, 2005.
- ³⁴ Christine Uber Grosse, "The Competitive Advantage of Foreign Languages and Cultural Knowledge," *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 88, no. 3 (2004), pp. 351-367.
- ³⁵ Kedia and Daniel, "U.S. Business Needs," p. 19; Moxon, O'Shea, Brown, and Escher, *Changing U.S. Business Needs*, p. 140; Marion S. Webb, Kenneth R. Mayer, Virginia Pioche, and Lida C. Allen, "Internationalization of American Business Education," *Management International Review*, vol. 39, iss. 4, fourth quarter (1999), pp. 379-397.
- ³⁶ William Kordsmeier, Joe Arn, and Betty Rogers, "Foreign Language Needs of U.S. Businesses," *Journal of Education for Business*, vol. 75, iss. 3, January/February (2000), pp. 169-171.
- ³⁷ Kedia and Daniel, "U.S. Business Needs," p. 18; Moxon, O'Shea, Brown, and Escher, *Changing U.S. Business Needs*, p. 142.
- ³⁸ Tora K. Bikson, Gregory F. Treverton, Joy Moini, and Gustav Lindstrom, *New Challenges for International Leadership: Lessons from Organizations with Global Missions* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 2003), Table 4.5, p. 25.
- ³⁹ Bikson, Treverton, Moini, and Lindstrom, *New Challenges for International Leadership*, p. 28.
- ⁴⁰ Rush Holt, "Is American Security Being Lost in Translation?" (remarks given at the National Language Conference, June 22, 2004), available at <www.nlconference.org/docs/Holts_remarks.doc> Accessed January 18, 2005.
- ⁴¹ The National Language Conference, *A Call to Action for National Foreign Language Capabilities* (February 2005), available at <www.nlconference.org/docs/White_Paper.pdf> Accessed January 10, 2005, p. 5.
- ⁴² Michael Lemmon, "Meeting the Need for World Languages" (remarks given at the States Institute on International Education in the Schools, November 16, 2004), available at <www.internationaled.org/statesinstitute2004/MichaelLemmon.pdf> Accessed December 9, 2004.
- ⁴³ Theodore Crump, quoted in The National Language Conference, *A Call to Action for National Foreign Language Capabilities*, (February 2005), available at <http://www.nlconference.org/docs/White_Paper.pdf> Accessed January 10, 2005.
- ⁴⁴ U.S. General Accounting Office, *Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls*, GAO-02-375, January 2002, p. 7.
- ⁴⁵ U.S. House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and U.S. Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, *Report of the Joint Inquiry into the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001*, 107th Cong., 2d sess., 2002, H. Rept. 107-792 and S. Rept. 107-351, p. 70.
- ⁴⁶ National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, *The 9/11 Commission Report* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2004), p. 92.
- ⁴⁷ National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, *The 9/11 Commission Report*, p. 77.
- ⁴⁸ Eric Lichtblau, "At F.B.I., Translation Lags, as Does System Upgrade," *New York Times*, July 28, 2005, p. A20.
- ⁴⁹ Eric Lichtblau, "F.B.I. Said to Lag on Translations of Terror Tapes," *New York Times*, September 28, 2004, p. A1.
- ⁵⁰ Lichtblau, "At F.B.I., Translation Lags," p. A20.
- ⁵¹ U.S. General Accounting Office, *Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls*, GAO-02-375, January 2002, p. 2.
- ⁵² Susan Jacoby, "Now That We're Comrades, We Don't Care Anymore," *Washington Post*, November 9, 2003, p. B3.
- ⁵³ Jacoby, "Now That We're Comrades," p. B3.
- ⁵⁴ Jennifer Bremer, "Our Diplomats' Arabic Handicap," *Washington Post*, October 16, 2005, p. B01.
- ⁵⁵ Letter from W. Robert Pearson, Director General, Department of State, to the editor, *Washington Post*, October 24, 2005, p. A18.
- ⁵⁶ U.S. Department of Defense, *Defense Language Transformation Roadmap* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 2005), p. 3.
- ⁵⁷ David Petreus quoted in Michael Lemmon, "Meeting the Need for World Languages" (remarks given at the States Institute on International Education in the Schools, November 16, 2004), available at <www.internationaled.org/statesinstitute2004/MichaelLemmon.pdf> Accessed December 9, 2004.

- ⁵⁸ C. Mark Brinkley, "Translators' Fears Disrupt Vital Lines of Communication," *USA Today*, December 8, 2004, p. 6A.
- ⁵⁹ Matthew D. LaPlante, "Speaking the Language; A Vital Skill: Interpreters in High Demand in Iraq; Understanding Iraqis May be Key to Survival," *The Salt Lake Tribune*, October 13, 2005, p. A1.
- ⁶⁰ President George W. Bush, remarks at the U.S. University Presidents Summit on International Education, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC, January 5, 2006.
- ⁶¹ Robert Mackey, "The Phraselator," *The New York Times*, December 12, 2004, p. 86.
- ⁶² U.S. Census Bureau, *Annual Estimates of the Population by Race Alone and Hispanic or Latino Origin for the United States and States: July 1, 2003* (September 30, 2004), available at <www.census.gov/popest/states/asrh/tables/SC-EST2003-04.pdf> Accessed July 13, 2005; U.S. Census Bureau, *Resident Population Estimates of the United States by Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 1990 to July 1, 1999* (January 2001), available at <www.census.gov/popest/archives/1990s/nat-srh.txt> Accessed December 14, 2004.
- ⁶³ U.S. Census Bureau, *Projected Population Change in the United States, by Race and Hispanic Origin: 2000 to 2050* (March 2004), available at <www.census.gov/ipc/www/usinterimproj/natprojtab01b.pdf> Accessed December 15, 2004.
- ⁶⁴ West Virginia Commission on International Education, *Preparing a Citizenry for the Global Age: The Report of the West Virginia Commission on International Education* (Charleston, WV: West Virginia Department of Education and the Arts, March 2004), p. 3.
- ⁶⁵ The Center for International Understanding, *North Carolina in the World: A Plan to Increase Student Knowledge and Skills About the World* (Raleigh, NC: Office of the State Board of Education, April 2005), p. 2.
- ⁶⁶ Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient Students, National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition and Language Instruction Educational Programs, NCELA FAQ No. 1 – *How many school-aged English language learners (ELLs) are there in the U.S.?* (May 2005), available at <www.ncele.gwu.edu/expert/faq/01leps.htm> Accessed October 5, 2005.
- ⁶⁷ Robert G. Smith, *Superintendent's Proposed Budget FY 2005: Arlington Public Schools* (2004), available at <www.arlington.k12.va.us/finance/budget/downloads/fy05_proposed_budget.pdf> Accessed February 17, 2005, p. 57.
- ⁶⁸ Portland Public Schools, *Portland Public Schools: LEP Students by Language Groups* (2004), available at <www.portlandschools.org/Pages/Contents/PPSData/Languages.htm> Accessed July 13, 2005.
- ⁶⁹ American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, *Americans Talk About Foreign Language Literacy*, Roper poll conducted by NOP World, part of the GfK Group, November 2004.
- ⁷⁰ James A. Davis, Tom W. Smith, and Peter V. Marsden, *General Social Surveys, 1972-2004* (Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center, 2005, poll conducted by Roper Center for Public Opinion Research), pp. 946-947.
- ⁷¹ Office of English Language Acquisition, NCELA FAQ No. 1 – *How many school-aged English language learners (ELLs) are there in the U.S.?*
- ⁷² U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Labor Force Characteristics of Foreign-Born Workers in 2004*, Tables 1 and 4.
- ⁷³ Lesley Moore Vossen, ed., *The 40th Annual Report of the J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board, 2003-2004* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State, 2004), p. 44.
- ⁷⁴ Colin L. Powell quoted in Asia Society, "Closing the K-12 International Knowledge Gap: Putting the World into World Class Education" (press release, Washington, DC, November 18, 2003).
- ⁷⁵ U.S. Department of Education, *Archived Information: Goals 2000: Increasing Student Achievement Through State and Local Initiatives* (April 1996), available at <www.ed.gov/G2K/GoalsRpt/intro.html> Accessed July 12, 2005.
- ⁷⁶ *Goals 2000: Educate America Act*, Public Law 103-227, 103rd Cong., 2d. sess. (March 31, 1994), Sec. 102.
- ⁷⁷ Claus von Zastrow and Helen Janc, *Academic Atrophy: The Condition of the Liberal Arts in America's Public Schools* (Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, 2004), pp. 7-8.
- ⁷⁸ Anne Marie Chaker, "Schools Say 'Adieu' to Foreign Languages," *The Wall Street Journal*, October 30, 2003, p. D1.
- ⁷⁹ Von Zastrow and Janc, *Academic Atrophy*, pp. 17-18.
- ⁸⁰ Jim Clinton, Carol Conway, and Linda Hoke, *2004 Report on the Future of the South* (Research Triangle Park, NC: Southern Growth Policies Board, 2004), pp. 6-7; Partnership for 21st Century Skills, *Learning for the 21st Century: A Report and Mile Guide for 21st Century Skills* (Washington, DC: Partnership for 21st Century Skills, 2004); Harvard College Curricular Review Committee, *A Report on the Harvard College Curricular Review* (April 2004), available at <www.fas.harvard.edu/curriculum-review/HCCR_Report.pdf> Accessed July 22, 2005, pp. 18-19 and 39-42.

- ⁸¹ Foreign Policy Association, *Americans and the World Around Them: A Nationwide Poll*, poll conducted by Zogby International, September 2004.
- ⁸² David M. Herszenhorn, "Most City 8th Graders Miss State Norm in Social Studies," *The New York Times*, May 10, 2005, p. B8.
- ⁸³ Michael S. Lapp, Wendy S. Grigg, and Brenda S.-H. Tay-Lim, *The Nation's Report Card: U.S. History 2001*, NCES 2002-483 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics, May 2002) p. x.
- ⁸⁴ Nancy J. Adler, *International Dimensions of Organizational Behavior* (Cincinnati, OH: South-Western, 2002), p. 86.
- ⁸⁵ Namji Steinemann, Edward B. Fiske, and Victoria Sackett, *Asia in the Schools: Preparing Young Americans for Today's Interconnected World* (New York, NY: Asia Society, 2001), p. 6.
- ⁸⁶ National Geographic Society, *Global Geographic Literacy Survey*, RoperASW poll conducted by NOP World, part of the GfK Group, 2002; Steinemann, Fiske, and Sackett, *Asia in the Schools*, Asia Society poll conducted by Penn, Schoen, and Berland, 1999, p. 20.
- ⁸⁷ National Geographic Society, *Global Geographic Literacy Survey*.
- ⁸⁸ Draper and Hicks, *Foreign Language Enrollments*, Table 1, p. 5; Foreign Policy Association, *Americans and the World Around Them: A Nationwide Poll*, poll conducted by Zogby International, September 2004.
- ⁸⁹ Draper and Hicks, *Foreign Language Enrollments*, p. 1, Tables 1 and 7.
- ⁹⁰ Draper and Hicks, *Foreign Language Enrollments*, Table 7, p. 20; Welles, "Foreign Language Enrollments," Table 1a, p. 9; Gordon, Jr., *Ethnologue*.
- ⁹¹ Lucinda Branaman and Nancy Rhodes, *Foreign Language Instruction in the United States: A National Survey of Elementary and Secondary Schools* (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1999).
- ⁹² Von Zastrow and Janc, *Academic Atrophy*, p. 8.
- ⁹³ National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics 2002*, NCES 2003-060 (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, June 2003), Table 142, p. 164.
- ⁹⁴ Myriam Met, *Improving Students' Capacity in Foreign Languages* (2004), available at <www.internationaleled.org/PDKmet.htm> Accessed July 26, 2005.
- ⁹⁵ Center for Applied Linguistics, *Directory of Foreign Language Immersion Programs in U.S. Schools* (2002), available at <www.cal.org/resources/immersion/ImmersionSearch.jsp> Accessed July 26, 2005.
- ⁹⁶ Fran O'Malley, Jeanette Miller, Shuhan Wang, and Tiffani Harris, *Report on the Delaware K-20 International Education Capacity Study* (Newark, DE: Institute for Public Administration, College of Human Services, Education and Public Policy, University of Delaware, August 2004), p. 15.
- ⁹⁷ O'Malley, Miller, Wang, and Harris, *Report on the Delaware K-20 International Education Capacity Study*, p. 13.
- ⁹⁸ Helena Curtain and C.A. Pesola, *Languages and Children: Making the Match* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1988).
- ⁹⁹ E. Bialystok and K. Hakuta, *In Other Words: The Science and Psychology of Second-Language Acquisition* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1994); Marianne Fuchsen, "Starting Language Early: A Rationale," *FLESNEWS* 2, Spring 1989, pp. 1, 6-7.
- ¹⁰⁰ Eurydice, *Indicators and Statistics: Key Data on Teaching Languages at Schools in Europe—2005 Edition* (2005), available at <www.eurydice.org/Doc_intermediaires/indicators/en/frameset_key_data.html> Accessed September 29, 2005.
- ¹⁰¹ Curtain and Pesola, *Languages and Children*.
- ¹⁰² Ellen Bialystok, Fergus I.M. Craik, Raymond Klein, and Mythili Viswanathan, "Bilingualism, Aging, and Cognitive Control: Evidence From the Simon Task," *Psychology and Aging*, vol. 19 no. 2, 2004, pp. 290-303.
- ¹⁰³ The College Board, *2004 College-Bound Seniors: A Profile of SAT Program Test-Takers* (New York, NY: College Entrance Examination Board, 2004), Table 3-3, p. 5.
- ¹⁰⁴ T.C. Cooper, "Foreign Language Study and SAT-Verbal Scores," *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 71, no. 4, pp. 381-387; P.A. Eddy, *The Effect of Foreign Language Study in High School on Verbal Ability as Measured by the Scholastic Aptitude Test: Verbal Final Report* (Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1981).
- ¹⁰⁵ President George W. Bush, remarks given at the U.S. University President's Summit on International Education, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC, January 5, 2006.
- ¹⁰⁶ Welles, "Foreign Language Enrollments," Table 4, p. 12.
- ¹⁰⁷ Fred M. Hayward and Laura Siaya, *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: Final Report* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2003).

- ¹⁰⁸ Denise W. Koch, "Foreign Languages in MBA Programs," *Journal of Language for International Business*, vol. 8, no. 1 (1997), pp. 53-61.
- ¹⁰⁹ Christine Uber Grosse, "The Competitive Advantage of Foreign Languages and Cultural Knowledge," *The Modern Language Journal*, vol. 88, no. 3 (2004), p. 352.
- ¹¹⁰ Carl A. Herrin, ed., *The State and Future of Study Abroad in the United States: A Briefing Book for the Bipartisan Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program* (Washington, DC: Lincoln Fellowships Commission, 2004), p. B-3.
- ¹¹¹ Yemi Akande and Carla Slawson, *Exploring the Long Term Impact of Study Abroad: A Case Study of 50 Years of Study Abroad Alumni*, in Mary M. Dwyer and Courtney K. Peters, "The Benefits of Study Abroad: New Study Confirms Significant Gains," *Transitions Abroad*, March/April 2004.
- ¹¹² American Council on Education and studentPOLL of the Art & Science Group, Inc., *Survey on Senior High School Students' Interests and Motivations for Higher Education*, 1999.
- ¹¹³ Madeleine Green, Maura Porcelli, and Laura Siaya, *One Year Later: Attitudes About International Education Since September 11* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2002), pp. 5-7.
- ¹¹⁴ Green, Porcelli, and Siaya, *One Year Later*, pp. 5-7.
- ¹¹⁵ NAFSA, *Securing America's Future: Global Education for a Global Age, Report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad* (Washington, DC: NAFSA, 2003), p. 7.
- ¹¹⁶ Institute of International Education, *Open Doors 2004: Report on International Educational Exchange, Duration of U.S. Study Abroad, Selected Years 1985/86-2002/03* (2004), available at <opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=49952> Accessed October 4, 2005; Institute of International Education, "U.S. Study Abroad Increases by 9.6%, Continues Record Growth" (press release, Washington, DC, November 14, 2005).
- ¹¹⁷ Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, *Global Competence and National Needs: One Million Americans Studying Abroad* (Washington, DC: Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, November 2005), p.vii.
- ¹¹⁸ Herrin, *The State and Future of Study Abroad in the United States*, pp. H1-6.
- ¹¹⁹ Fred M. Hayward and Laura Siaya, *Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses: Final Report* (Washington, DC: American Council on Education, 2003), p. viii; Martin Tillman, ed., *Impact of Education Abroad on Career Development: Four Community College Case Studies*, vol. II (Stamford, CT: American Institute for Foreign Study, 2005), p. 5.
- ¹²⁰ Harvard College Curricular Review Committee, *A Report on the Harvard College Curricular Review* (April 2004), available at <www.fas.harvard.edu/curriculum-review/HCCR_Report.pdf> Accessed July 22, 2005, pp. 18-19.
- ¹²¹ Boston College, *Global Proficiency Program Description* (May 2005), available at <www.bc.edu/offices/odsd/intercultural/gp/programdescription/> Accessed October 4, 2005; University of California at Los Angeles International Institute, *Interdepartmental Degree Programs: Global Studies* (2005), available at <www.international.ucla.edu/idps/globalstudies/> Accessed October 26, 2005.
- ¹²² Institute of International Education, "International Student Enrollments Declined by 2.4 percent in 2003/04" (press release, Washington, DC, November 10, 2004).
- ¹²³ Institute of International Education, "International Student Enrollments Declined by 2.4 percent in 2003/04"; Institute of International Education, "U.S. Sees Slowing Decline in International Student Enrollment in 2004/05" (press release, Washington, DC, November 14, 2005).
- ¹²⁴ Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, *Education at a Glance: OECD Indicators*, 2005 edition (Paris, France: OECD Publishing, September 14, 2005), pp. 253-255.
- ¹²⁵ Lawrence H. Bell (Testimony submitted to: Congress of the United States House of Representatives, Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittees on Select Education and 21st Century Competitiveness, Washington, D.C., March 17, 2005), pp. 4-5.
- ¹²⁶ American Council on Education and studentPOLL of the Art & Science Group, Inc., *Survey on Senior High School Students' Interests and Motivations for Higher Education*, 1999.
- ¹²⁷ Green, Porcelli, and Siaya, *One Year Later*, pp. 3-5.
- ¹²⁸ Ann I. Schneider, "The State of Teacher Training for K-12 International Education" (paper prepared for the Conference on Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education at Duke University, Durham, NC, January 2003), pp. 8-9 and pp. 16-17.

- ¹²⁹ Institute of International Education, *Open Doors 2004: Report on International Educational Exchange, Fields of Study of U.S. Study Abroad Students, 2001/02 & 2002/03*, available at <opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=49947> Accessed October 5, 2005.
- ¹³⁰ National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics 2002*, Table 255, p. 309.
- ¹³¹ Nina Garrett, "New Approaches to Language Learning: Extending the Reach" (paper prepared for the National Language Conference at the University of Maryland, University College, Adelphi, MD, June 2004), p. 4.
- ¹³² Michael Lemmon, "Meeting the Need for World Languages" (remarks given at the States Institute on International Education in the Schools, November 16, 2004) available at <www.international.org/statesinstitute2004/MichaelLemmon.pdf> Accessed December 9, 2004.
- ¹³³ National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics 2002*, Tables 252, 253, and 255, pp. 304-307.
- ¹³⁴ National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, *The 9/11 Commission Report*, p. 92.
- ¹³⁵ Kedia and Daniel, "U.S. Business Needs," p. 22.
- ¹³⁶ Webb, Mayer, Pioche, and Allen, "Internationalization of American Business Education," pp. 379-397; The Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, *Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation* (Tampa, FL: AACSB International, 2005), p. 69.
- ¹³⁷ Webb, Mayer, Pioche, and Allen, "Internationalization of American Business Education," pp. 379-397.
- ¹³⁸ Bikson, Treverton, Moini, and Lindstrom, *New Challenges for International Leadership*, p. 31.
- ¹³⁹ Richard C. Hoffman and C. Gopinath, "The Importance of International Business to the Strategic Agenda of U.S. CEOs," *Journal of International Business Studies*, vol. 25, iss. 3, third quarter (1994), pp. 625-637; Kedia and Daniel, "U.S. Business Needs," pp. 27-28; Webb, Mayer, Pioche, and Allen, "Internationalization of American Business Education," pp. 379-397.
- ¹⁴⁰ University of Rhode Island, *International Engineering Program* (2005), available at <www.uri.edu/iep/index.html> Accessed July 29, 2005.
- ¹⁴¹ Martin Kaplan, Ken Goldstein, and Matthew Hale, *Local News Coverage of the 2004 Campaigns: An Analysis of Nightly Broadcasts in 11 Markets* (Los Angeles, CA: The Lear Center Local News Archive, USC Annenberg School for Communication, February 2005), p. 12.
- ¹⁴² Tom Fenton, *Bad News: The Decline of Reporting, the Business of News, and the Danger to Us All* (New York: Regan Books, 2005).
- ¹⁴³ Foreign Policy Association, *Americans and the World Around Them: A Nationwide Poll*, poll conducted by Zogby International, September 2004.
- ¹⁴⁴ Welles, "Foreign Language Enrollments," Table 1a, p. 9.
- ¹⁴⁵ Dan Murphy, "New Surge of Americans Studying in the Arab World," *Christian Science Monitor*, November 10, 2004, p. 1.
- ¹⁴⁶ Welles, "Foreign Language Enrollments," Table 8, pp. 19-22.
- ¹⁴⁷ Welles, "Foreign Language Enrollments," Table 1a, p. 9.
- ¹⁴⁸ The College Board, *AP Subjects* (2005), available at <www.collegeboard.com/student/testing/ap/subjects.html> Accessed July 28, 2005.
- ¹⁴⁹ The e-LCTL Initiative, "U.S. Universities Offering 226 Languages for U.S. International Needs" (press release, East Lansing, MI, February 23, 2005).
- ¹⁵⁰ Centers for International Business Education and Research, *Taking Business into the 21st Century: Ten-Year Accomplishments of the Title VI Centers for International Business Education (CIBERs) 1989-1999* (2000), available at <ciberweb.msu.edu/publications/21stcentury.pdf> Accessed September 19, 2005.
- ¹⁵¹ GlobalEdge, *About GlobalEdge* (2005), available at <globaledge.msu.edu/about_globaledge.asp> Accessed September 19, 2005.
- ¹⁵² Centers for International Business Education and Research, *Taking Business into the 21st Century*, p. 18.
- ¹⁵³ O'Malley, Miller, Wang, and Harris, *Report on the Delaware K-20 International Education Capacity Study*, pp. 32-33, 50.
- ¹⁵⁴ Asia Society, *Directory of State Initiatives* (2004), available at <www.international.org/directory.htm#nj> Accessed July 28, 2005; New Jersey Department of Education, *International Education* (2004), available at <www.state.nj.us/njded/international/> Accessed July 28, 2005.
- ¹⁵⁵ Asia Society, *Directory of State Initiatives*; The Center for International Understanding at the University of North Carolina, *North Carolina in the World: A Plan to Increase Student Knowledge and Skills About the World* (Raleigh, NC: University of North Carolina, April 2005).
- ¹⁵⁶ Asia Society, *Directory of State Initiatives*.
- ¹⁵⁷ Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, *International Education Council* (September 22, 2005), available at <dpi.wi.gov/cal/iecouncil.html> Accessed October 7, 2005.

¹⁵⁸ Asia Society, *Directory of State Initiatives*; Wyoming Department of Education, "Pilot Foreign Language Program Launched" (press release, Cheyenne, WY, June 29, 2004).

¹⁵⁹ Asia Society, "Asia Society Announces \$7.5 Million Initiative For Urban International Studies Secondary Schools" (press release, New York, NY, September 18, 2003).

¹⁶⁰ Emily Sachar, *Schools for the Global Age: Promising Practices in International Education* (New York, NY: Asia Society, 2004), pp. 6-9.

¹⁶¹ "Washington and New Jersey Schools Named Top Winners at Intel and Scholastic Schools of Distinction Awards" (press release, Washington, DC, October 6, 2005).

¹⁶² Sachar, *Schools for the Global Age*, pp. 18-21; Rick Flieger and Mark Larson, *ISA 101: An Introduction to the School* (September 2005), available at <www.neisd.com/isa/isa101.htm> Accessed October 7, 2005.

¹⁶³ *Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004*, Public Law 108-458, 108th Cong, 2d sess. (December 17, 2004).

¹⁶⁴ *National Foreign Language Coordination Act of 2005*, 109th Cong, 1st sess., S. 1089.

¹⁶⁵ "Visa Break," *Washington Post*, February 27, 2005, p. B6.

¹⁶⁶ NAFSA and the Alliance for International Educational and Cultural Exchange, *Toward an International Education Policy for the United States: Summary* (Washington, DC: NAFSA and the Alliance, December 12, 2000), p. 3.

¹⁶⁷ U.S. in the World Task Force, *U.S. in the World: Talking Global Issues with Americans, A Practical Guide* (New York, NY and Washington, DC: Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Aspen Institute, 2004), p. 3.

Objectives Of The Committee For Economic Development

For more than 60 years, the Committee for Economic Development has been a respected influence on the formation of business and public policy. CED is devoted to these two objectives:

To develop, through objective research and informed discussion, findings and recommendations for private and public policy that will contribute to preserving and strengthening our free society, achieving steady economic growth at high employment and reasonably stable prices, increasing productivity and living standards, providing greater and more equal opportunity for every citizen, and improving the quality of life for all.

To bring about increasing understanding by present and future leaders in business, government, and education, and among concerned citizens, of the importance of these objectives and the ways in which they can be achieved.

CED's work is supported by private voluntary contributions from business and industry, foundations, and

individuals. It is independent, nonprofit, nonpartisan, and nonpolitical.

Through this business-academic partnership, CED endeavors to develop policy statements and other research materials that commend themselves as guides to public and business policy; that can be used as texts in college economics and political science courses and in management training courses; that will be considered and discussed by newspaper and magazine editors, columnists, and commentators; and that are distributed abroad to promote better understanding of the American economic system.

CED believes that by enabling business leaders to demonstrate constructively their concern for the general welfare, it is helping business to earn and maintain the national and community respect essential to the successful functioning of the free enterprise capitalist system.

CED Board of Trustees

Co-Chairmen

W. BOWMAN CUTTER,
Managing Director
Warburg Pineus LLC

RODERICK M. HILLS, Chairman
Hills & Stern, LLP

Vice Chairmen

GEORGE H. CONRADES, Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Akamai Technologies, Inc.

JAMES A. JOHNSON, Vice Chairman
Perseus, LLC

ARTHUR F. RYAN, President,
Chairman, and Chief Executive Officer
The Prudential Insurance Company of
America

FREDERICK W. TELLING, Vice
President, Corporate Strategic Planning
and Policy Division
Pfizer Inc.

KENT M. ADAMS, President
Catepillar Financial Services Corporation

REX D. ADAMS, Professor of Business
Administration
The Fuqua School of Business
Duke University

PAUL A. ALLAIRE, Retired Chairman
Xerox Corporation

HERBERT M. ALLISON, JR.,
Chairman, President and CEO
TIAA-CREF

COUNTESS MARIA BEATRICE
ARCO, Chair
American Asset Corporation

IAN ARNOF, Chairman
Arnoff Family Foundation

EDWARD N. BASHA, JR., Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Basha's Inc.

NADINE MATHIS BASHA, Chair
Arizona State School Readiness Board

THOMAS D. BELL, JR., Vice Chairman,
President and Chief Executive Officer
Cousins Properties Inc.

ALAN BELZER, Retired President and
Chief Operating Officer
Allied-Signal Inc.

PETER A. BENOLIEL, Chairman
Emeritus
Quaker Chemical Corporation

MELVYN E. BERGSTEIN, Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Diamond Cluster International, Inc.

DEREK BOK, Professor
Harvard University
National Chair, Common Cause

LEE C. BOLLINGER, President
Columbia University

ROY J. BOSTOCK, Chairman
Sealedge Investments

STEPHEN W. BOSWORTH, Dean
Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy
Tufts University

JACK O. BOVENDER, JR., Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
HCA Inc.

JOHN BRADEMÁS, President Emeritus
New York University

WILLIAM E. BROCK, Chairman
Bridges Learning Systems, Inc.

ROBERT H. BRUININKS, President
University of Minnesota

* FLETCHER L. BYROM, President and
Chief Executive Officer
MICASU Corporation

DONALD R. CALDWELL, Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Cross Atlantic Capital Partners

DAVID A. CAPUTO, President
Pace University

RAYMOND G. CHAMBERS, Retired
Chairman of the Board
Amelior Foundation

ROBERT CHESS, Chairman
Nektar Therapeutics

MICHAEL CHESSER, President,
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Great Plains Energy Services

CAROLYN CHIN, Chairman and Chief
Executive Officer
Cebiz

* JOHN L. CLENDENIN, Retired
Chairman
BellSouth Corporation

FERDINAND COLLOREDO-
MANSFELD, Partner
Cabot Properties, Inc.

DAVID M. COTE, Chairman, President
and Chief Executive Officer
Honeywell International Inc.

DAVID CRANE, President and Chief
Executive Officer
NRG Energy, Inc.

STEPHEN A. CRANE, Chairman,
President and Chief Executive Officer
Alpha Star Insurance Group Ltd.

DENNIS C. CUNEO, Senior Vice
President
Toyota North America, Inc

PAUL DANOS, Dean
The Amos Tuck School of Business
Dartmouth College

RONALD R. DAVENPORT, Chairman
of the Board
Sheridan Broadcasting Corporation

RICHARD H. DAVIS, Partner
Davis Manafort, Inc.

RICHARD J. DAVIS, Senior Partner
Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN J. DEGIOIA, President
Georgetown University

CLARA DEL VILLAR, Vice President
Nortel Networks Corporation

JOHN DIEBOLD, Chairman
The Diebold Institute

*Life Trustee

SAMUEL A. DIPIAZZA, Global Chief Executive
PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP

LINDA M. DISTLERATH, Vice President, Global Health Policy
Merck & Co., Inc.

PATRICK DOLBERG, President and Chief Executive Officer
Holcim (US) Inc.

IRWIN DORROS, President
Dorros Associates

* FRANK P. DOYLE, Retired Executive Vice President
General Electric Company

ROBERT H. DUGGER, Managing Director
Tudor Investment Corporation

T. J. DERMOT DUNPHY, Chairman
Kildare Enterprises, LLC

CHRISTOPHER D. EARL, Managing Director
Perseus, LLC

W. D. EBERLE, Chairman
Manchester Associates, Ltd.

STUART E. EIZENSTAT, Partner & Head, International Practice
Corington & Burling

ROBERT A. ESSNER, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer
Wyeth

DIANA FARRELL, Director
McKinsey Global Institute

KATHLEEN FELDSTEIN, President
Economics Studies, Inc.

TREVOR FETTER, President and Chief Executive Officer
Temet Healthcare Corporation

MATTHEW FINK, Retired President
The Investment Company Institute

*EDMUND B. FITZGERALD, Managing Director
Woodmont Associates

HARRY L. FREEMAN, Chairman
The Mark Twain Institute

MITCHELL S. FROMSTEIN, Chairman Emeritus
Manpower Inc.

CONO R. FUSCO, Managing Partner- Strategic Relations
Grant Thornton

PAMELA B. GANN, President
Claremont McKenna College

JOSEPH GANTZ, Partner
GG Capital, LLC

E. GORDON GEE, Chancellor
Vanderbilt University

THOMAS P. GERRITY, Dean Emeritus
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania

ALAN B. GILMAN, Chairman
The Steak n Shake Company

CAROL R. GOLDBERG, Trustee
The Goldberg Family Foundation

ALFRED G. GOLDSTEIN, President and Chief Executive Officer
AG Associates

JOSEPH T. GORMAN, Retired Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
TRW Inc.

EARL G. GRAVES, SR., Publisher and Chief Executive Officer
Earl G. Graves Publishing Co., Inc.

GERALD GREENWALD, Chairman
Greenbriar Equity Group

BARBARA B. GROGAN, President
Western Industrial Contractors

PATRICK W. GROSS, Chairman,
The Lovell Group
Founder, AMS

JEROME H. GROSSMAN, M.D., Senior Fellow
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University
Chairman, Lion Gate Corporation

RONALD GRZYWINSKI, Chairman
ShoreBank Corporation

STEVEN GUNBY, Chairman, The Americas & Senior Vice President
The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.

JUDITH H. HAMILTON, Former President and Chief Executive Officer
Classroom Connect

WILLIAM A. HASELTINE, President
Haseltine Associates

RICHARD H. HERSH, Former President
Trinity College

HEATHER R. HIGGINS, President
Randolph Foundation

HAYNE HIPPI, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
The Liberty Corporation

JOHN HOFMEISTER, President
Shell Oil Company

PAUL M. HORN, Senior Vice President, Research
IBM Corporation

PHILIP K. HOWARD, Vice Chairman
Covington & Burling

SHIRLEY ANN JACKSON, President
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

WILLIAM C. JENNINGS, Chairman
US Interactive, Inc.

JEFFREY A. JOERRES, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer
Manpower Inc.

L. OAKLEY JOHNSON, Senior Vice President, Corporate Affairs
American International Group, Inc.

VAN E. JOLISSAINT, Corporate Economist
DaimlerChrysler Corporation

ROBERT L. JOSS, Dean
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University

PRES KABACOFF, Chief Executive Officer
HRI Properties

*Life Trustee

ROBERT KAHN, Director,
Country Risk Management
Citigroup Inc.

EDWARD A. KANGAS, Retired
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu

JOSEPH E. KASPUTYS, Chairman,
President and Chief Executive Officer
Global Insight, Inc.

WILLIAM E. KIRWAN, Chancellor
University System of Maryland

THOMAS J. KLUTZNICK, President
Thomas J. Klutznick Company

CHARLES E.M. KOLB, President
Committee for Economic Development

EDWARD M. KOPKO, Chairman,
President, and Chief Executive Officer
Butler International, Inc.

THOMAS F. LAMB, JR., Senior Vice
President, Government Affairs
PNC Financial Services Group, Inc.

KURT M. LANDGRAF, President and
Chief Executive Officer
Educational Testing Service

W. MARK LANIER, Partner
The Lanier Law Firm, P.C.

PAUL LAUDICINA, Vice President
and Managing Director,
A.T. Kearney Inc.

ENRICO A. LAZIO, Executive
Vice President, Global Government
Relations and Public Policy
JPMorgan Chase & Co

WILLIAM W. LEWIS, Director
Emeritus
McKinsey Global Institute
McKinsey & Company, Inc.

ROBERT G. LIBERATORE, Group
Senior Vice President, Global External
Affairs
DaimlerChrysler Corporation

IRA A. LIPMAN, Chairman of the
Board and President
Guardsmark, LLC

JOHN LOOMIS, Vice President,
Human Resources
General Electric Company

LI LU, President
Himalaya Management

BRUCE K. MACLAURY, President
Emeritus
The Brookings Institution

COLETTE MAHONEY, President
Emeritus
Marymount Manhattan College

T. ALLAN MCARTOR, Chairman
Airbus of North America, Inc.

ALONZO L. MCDONALD, Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Avenir Group, Inc.

DAVID E. MCKINNEY, Vice Chair
Thomas J. Watson Foundation

LENNY MENDONCA, Chairman
McKinsey Global Institute
McKinsey & Company, Inc.

ALAN G. MERTEN, President
George Mason University

DEBORAH HICKS MIDANEK,
President
Solon Group, Inc.

HARVEY R. MILLER, Vice Chairman
Greenhill & Co., LLC

ALFRED T. MOCKETT, Chairman and
Chief Executive Officer
Corinthian Capital LLC

NICHOLAS G. MOORE, Director
Bechtel Group, Inc.

DONNA MOREA, President
CGI-AMS, Inc.

IKUO MORI, Chairman and Chief
Executive Officer
Daiwa Securities America, Inc.

JAMES C. MULLEN, Chief Executive
Officer
Biogen Inc.

DIANA S. NATALICIO, President
The University of Texas at El Paso

MATTHEW NIMETZ, Partner
General Atlantic Partners

DEAN R. O'HARE, Retired Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Chubb Corporation

RONALD L. OLSON, Partner
Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP

NOBUHARU ONO, President and
Chief Executive Officer
NTT DoCoMo USA

M. MICHEL ORBAN, Partner
RRE Ventures

HIDEAKI OTAKA, President and Chief
Executive Officer
Toyota Motor North America, Inc.

STEFFEN E. PALKO, Retired
Vice Chairman and President
XTO Energy, Inc.

JERRY PARROTT, Vice President,
Corporate Communications &
Public Policy
Human Genome Sciences, Inc.

CAROL J. PARRY, President
Corporate Social Responsibility
Associates

VICTOR A. PELSON, Senior Advisor
UBS Securities LLC

DONALD K. PETERSON, Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Avaya Inc.

PETER G. PETERSON, Senior
Chairman
The Blackstone Group

RALPH R. PETERSON, President,
Chairman, and Chief Executive Officer
CH2M Hill Companies Ltd.

TODD E. PETZEL, President
Azimuth Alternative Asset Management
LLP

HUGH B. PRICE, Former President and
Chief Executive Officer
National Urban League

*Life Trustee

JAMES H. QUIGLEY, Chief Executive Officer
Deloitte & Touche

GEORGE A. RANNEY, JR., President and Chief Executive Officer
Chicago Metropolis 2020

NED REGAN, University Professor
The City University of New York

J.W. RHODES, JR., Manager, Corporate Community Involvement
Chevron Corporation

JAMES Q. RIORDAN, Chairman
Quentin Partners Co.

E. B. ROBINSON, Former Chairman
Deposit Guaranty Corporation

JAMES D. ROBINSON, III, General Partner and Co-Founder
RRE Ventures
Chairman, Bristol-Myers Squibb Company

JAMES E. ROHR, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
PNC Financial Services Group, Inc.

ROY ROMER, Former Governor of Colorado
Superintendent, Los Angeles Unified School District

DANIEL ROSE, Chairman
Rose Associates, Inc.

LANDON H. ROWLAND, Chairman
Everglades Financial

NEIL L. RUDENSTINE, Chair, ArtStor Advisory Board
The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation

GEORGE E. RUPP, President
International Rescue Committee

EDWARD B. RUST, JR., Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
State Farm Insurance Companies

BERTRAM L. SCOTT, President
TIAA-CREF Life Insurance Company
TIAA-CREF

WILLIAM S. SESSIONS, Partner
Holland & Knight LLP

JOHN E. SEXTON, President
New York University

DONNA E. SHALALA, President
University of Miami

WALTER H. SHORENSTEIN, Chairman of the Board
Shorenstein Company LLC

* GEORGE P. SHULTZ, Distinguished Fellow
The Hoover Institution
Stanford University

JOHN C. SICILIANO, President and Chief Executive Officer
John A. Levin & Co., Inc.

RUTH J. SIMMONS, President
Brown University

FREDERICK W. SMITH, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer
FedEx Corporation

JOHN F. SMITH, JR., Retired Chairman
General Motors Corporation

SARAH G. SMITH, Partner and Chief Accounting Officer
Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.

IAN SPATZ, Vice President, Public Policy
Merck & Co., Inc.

STEVEN SPECKER, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Electric Power Research Institute

ALAN G. SPOON, Managing General Partner
Polaris Venture Partners

JAMES D. STALEY, President and Chief Executive Officer
Roadway Corporation
YRC Regional Transportation

CHARLES R. STAMP, JR., Vice President, Public Affairs
Deere & Company

PAULA STERN, Chairwoman
The Stern Group, Inc.

DONALD M. STEWART, Visiting Professor, Harris School of Public Policy
University of Chicago

ROGER W. STONE, Director
Stone-Kaplan Investments, LLC

MATTHEW J. STOVER, Chairman
LKM Ventures, LLC

LAWRENCE H. SUMMERS, President
Harvard University

RICHARD F. SYRON, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Freddie Mac

HENRY TANG, Managing Partner
Committee of 100

JAMES A. THOMSON, President and Chief Executive Officer
RAND

STEPHEN JOEL TRACHTENBERG, President
The George Washington University

TALLMAN TRASK, III, Executive Vice President
Duke University

ROBERT J. VILHAUER, Vice President, Public Policy and Analysis
The Boeing Company

JAMES L. VINCENT, Retired Chairman
Biogen, Inc.

FRANK VOGL, President
Vogl Communications

DONALD C. WAITE, III, Director
McKinsey & Company, Inc.

JERRY D. WEAST, Superintendent
Montgomery County Public Schools

ARNOLD R. WEBER, President Emeritus
Northwestern University

JOSH S. WESTON, Honorary Chairman
Automatic Data Processing, Inc.

*Life Trustee

HAROLD WILLIAMS, President
Emeritus
The J. Paul Getty Trust

LINDA SMITH WILSON, President
Emerita
Radcliffe College

MARGARET S. WILSON, Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Scarbroughs

H. LAKE WISE, Executive Vice
President and Chief Legal Officer
Daiwa Securities America, Inc.

JACOB J. WORENKLEIN, President
and Chief Executive Officer
US Power Generating Co., LLC

NANCY WYSENSKI, President and
Chief Executive Officer
EMD Pharmaceuticals

KURT E. YEAGER, Former President
and Chief Executive Officer
Electric Power Research Institute

RONALD L. ZARRELLA, Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Bausch & Lomb, Inc.

STEVE V. ZATKIN, Senior Vice
President, Government Relations
Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.

EDWARD ZORE, President and Chief
Executive Officer
Northwestern Mutual

*Life Trustee

CED Honorary Trustees

RAY C. ADAM, Retired Chairman
NL Industries

ROBERT O. ANDERSON, Retired
Chairman
Hondo Oil & Gas Company

ROY L. ASH
Los Angeles, California

ROBERT H. B. BALDWIN, Retired
Chairman
Morgan Stanley Group Inc.

GEORGE F. BENNETT, Chairman
Emeritus
State Street Investment Trust

HAROLD H. BENNETT
Salt Lake City, Utah

JACK F. BENNETT, Retired Senior Vice
President
Exxon Corporation

HOWARD W. BLAUVELT
Keswick, Virginia

ALAN S. BOYD
Lady Lake, Florida

ANDREW F. BRIMMER, President
Brimmer & Company, Inc.

PHILIP CALDWELL, Retired
Chairman
Ford Motor Company

HUGH M. CHAPMAN, Retired
Chairman
NationsBank South

E. H. CLARK, JR., Chairman and Chief
Executive Officer
The Friendship Group

A.W. CLAUSEN, Retired Chairman and
Chief Executive Officer
BankAmerica Corporation

DOUGLAS D. DANFORTH
Executive Associates

JOHN H. DANIELS, Retired Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Archer-Daniels Midland Co.

RALPH P. DAVIDSON
Washington, D.C.

ALFRED C. DECRANE, JR., Retired
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Texaco, Inc.

ROBERT R. DOCKSON, Chairman
Emeritus
CalFed, Inc.

LYLE EVERINGHAM, Retired
Chairman
The Kroger Co.

THOMAS J. EYERMAN, Retired
Partner
Skidmore, Owings & Merrill

DON C. FRISBEE, Chairman Emeritus
PacifiCorp

RICHARD L. GELB, Chairman
Emeritus
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company

W. H. KROME GEORGE, Retired
Chairman
ALCOA

WALTER B. GERKEN, Retired
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Pacific Life Insurance Company

LINCOLN GORDON, Guest Scholar
The Brookings Institution

JOHN D. GRAY, Chairman Emeritus
Hartmarx Corporation

JOHN R. HALL, Former Chairman
Ashland Inc.

RICHARD W. HANSELMAN,
Former Chairman
Health Net Inc.

ROBERT S. HATFIELD, Retired
Chairman
The Continental Group, Inc.

PHILIP M. HAWLEY, Retired
Chairman of the Board
Carter Hawley Hale Stores, Inc.

ROBERT C. HOLLAND, Senior Fellow
The Wharton School
University of Pennsylvania

LEON C. HOLT, JR., Retired Vice
Chairman
Air Products and Chemicals, Inc.

SOL HURWITZ, Retired President
Committee for Economic Development

GEORGE F. JAMES
Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida

DAVID KEARNS, Chairman Emeritus
New American Schools

GEORGE M. KELLER, Retired
Chairman of the Board
Chevron Corporation

FRANKLIN A. LINDSAY, Retired
Chairman
Itek Corporation

ROBERT W. LUNDEEN, Retired
Chairman
The Dow Chemical Company

RICHARD B. MADDEN, Retired
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Potlatch Corporation

AUGUSTINE R. MARUSI
Lake Wales, Florida

WILLIAM F. MAY, Chairman and Chief
Executive Officer
Statue of Liberty-Ellis Island Foundation,
Inc.

OSCAR G. MAYER, Retired Chairman
Oscar Mayer & Co.

GEORGE C. MCGHEE, Former U.S.
Ambassador and Under Secretary of
State

JOHN F. MCGILLICUDDY, Retired
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Chemical Banking Corporation

JAMES W. MCKEE, JR., Retired
Chairman
CPC International, Inc.

CHAMPNEY A. MCNAIR, Retired
Vice Chairman
Trust Company of Georgia

J. W. MCSWINEY, Retired Chairman of
the Board
The Mead Corporation

ROBERT E. MERCER, Retired
Chairman
The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.

RUBEN F. METTLER, Retired
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
TRW Inc.

LEE L. MORGAN, Former Chairman of
the Board
Caterpillar, Inc.

ROBERT R. NATHAN, Chairman
Nathan Associates, Inc.

JAMES J. O'CONNOR, Former
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Unicom Corporation

LEIF H. OLSEN, President
LHO GROUP

NORMA PACE, President
Paper Analytics Associates

CHARLES W. PARRY, Retired
Chairman
ALCOA

WILLIAM R. PEARCE, Director
American Express Mutual Funds

JOHN H. PERKINS, Former President
Continental Illinois National Bank and
Trust Company

DEAN P. PHYPPERS
New Canaan, Connecticut

ROBERT M. PRICE, Former Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Control Data Corporation

JAMES J. RENIER
Renier & Associates

IAN M. ROLLAND, Former Chairman
and Chief Executive Officer
Lincoln National Corporation

AXEL G. ROSIN, Retired Chairman
Book-of-the-Month Club, Inc.

WILLIAM M. ROTH
Princeton, New Jersey

WILLIAM RUDER
William Ruder Incorporated

RALPH S. SAUL, Former Chairman of
the Board
CIGNA Companies

GEORGE A. SCHAEFER, Retired
Chairman of the Board
Caterpillar, Inc.

ROBERT G. SCHWARTZ
New York, New York

MARK SHEPHERD, JR., Retired
Chairman
Texas Instruments, Inc.

ROCCO C. SICILIANO
Beverly Hills, California

ELMER B. STAATS, Former Controller
General of the United States

FRANK STANTON, Former President
CBS, Inc.

EDGAR B. STERN, JR., Chairman of
the Board
Royal Street Corporation

ALEXANDER L. STOTT
Fairfield, Connecticut

WAYNE E. THOMPSON, Past
Chairman
Merritt Peralta Medical Center

THOMAS A. VANDERSLICE
TAV Associates

SIDNEY J. WEINBERG, JR., Senior
Director
The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc.

CLIFTON R. WHARTON, JR., Former
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
TIAA-CREF

DOLORES D. WHARTON, Former
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
The Fund for Corporate Initiatives, Inc.

ROBERT C. WINTERS, Chairman
Emeritus
Prudential Insurance Company of
America

RICHARD D. WOOD, Director
Eli Lilly and Company

CHARLES J. ZWICK
Coral Gables, Florida

CED Research Advisory Board

Chairman

JOHN PALMER
University Professor
Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public
Affairs
Syracuse University

RALPH D. CHRISTY
J. Thomas Clark Professor
Department of Applied Economics
and Management
Cornell University

ALAIN C. ENTHOVEN
Marriner S. Eccles Professor of Public and
Private Management
Stanford University
Graduate School of Business

BENJAMIN M. FRIEDMAN
William Joseph Maier Professor of
Political Economy
Harvard University

ROBERT W. HAHN
Resident Scholar
American Enterprise Institute

HELEN F. LADD
Professor of Public Policy Studies and
Economics
Sanford Institute of Public Policy
Duke University

ZANNY MINTON-BEDDOES
Washington Economics Correspondent
The Economist

WILLIAM D. NORDHAUS
Sterling Professor of Economics
Cowles Foundation
Yale University

RUDOLPH G. PENNER
Senior Fellow
The Urban Institute

HAL VARIAN
Class of 1944 Professor of Information
and Management Systems
Haas School of Business
University of California, Berkeley

JOHN P. WHITE
Lecturer in Public Policy
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

CED Professional and Administrative Staff

CHARLES E.M. KOLB
President

Research

JOSEPH J. MINARIK
Senior Vice President and Director of
Research

DONNA M. DESROCHERS
Vice President and Director of Education
Studies

ELLIOT SCHWARTZ
Vice President and Director of
International Studies

VAN DOORN OOMS
Senior Fellow

CAROLYN CADEI
Research Associate

RACHEL DUNSMOOR
Research Associate

JULIE KALISHMAN
Research Associate

Advisor on International Economic Policy

ISAAH FRANK
William L. Clayton Professor of
International Economics
The Johns Hopkins University

Communications/Government Relations

MICHAEL J. PETRO
Vice President and Director of Business
and Government Relations and Chief
of Staff

MORGAN BROMAN
Director of Communications

CHRIS DREIBELBIS
Business and Government Policy
Associate

CHRISTINE RYAN
Program Director

ROBIN SAMERS
Director of Trustee Relations

JENNIFER SEGAL
Development Associate/ Grants
Administrator

RACHEL PILLIOD
Communications and Outreach Associate

Development

MARTHA E. HOULE
Vice President for Development and
Secretary of the Board of Trustees

RICHARD M. RODERO
Director of Development

KATIE McCALLUM
Development Associate/ Corporate
Relations

Finance and Administration

LAURIE LEE
Chief Financial Officer and Vice President
of Finance and Administration

ANDRINE COLEMAN
Senior Accountant

JERI McLAUGHLIN
Executive Assistant to the President

JEFFREY SKINNER
Senior Accountant/Grants Administrator

AMANDA TURNER
Office Manager

JANVIER RICHARDS
Membership and Administrative Assistant

Statements On National Policy Issued By The Committee For Economic Development

Selected Recent Publications:

A New Tax Framework: A Blueprint for Averting a Fiscal Crisis (2005)
Cracks in the Education Pipeline: A Business Leader's Guide to Higher Education Reform (2005)
The Emerging Budget Crisis: Urgent Fiscal Choices (2005)
Making Trade Work: Straight Talk on Jobs, Trade, and Adjustments (2005)
Building on Reform: A Business Proposal to Strengthen Election Finance (2005)
Developmental Education: The Value of High Quality Preschool Investments as Economic Tools (2004)
A New Framework for Assessing the Benefits of Early Education (2004)
Promoting Innovation and Economic Growth: The Special Problem of Digital Intellectual Property (2004)
Investing in Learning: School Funding Policies to Foster High Performance (2004)
Promoting U.S. Economic Growth and Security Through Expanding World Trade: A Call for Bold American Leadership (2003)
Reducing Global Poverty: Engaging the Global Enterprise (2003)
Reducing Global Poverty: The Role of Women in Development (2003)
How Economies Grow: The CED Perspective on Raising the Long-Term Standard of Living (2003)
Learning for the Future: Changing the Culture of Math and Science Education to Ensure a Competitive Workforce (2003)
Exploding Deficits, Declining Growth: The Federal Budget and the Aging of America (2003)
Justice for Hire: Improving Judicial Selection (2002)
A Shared Future: Reducing Global Poverty (2002)
A New Vision for Health Care: A Leadership Role for Business (2002)
Preschool For All: Investing In a Productive and Just Society (2002)
From Protest to Progress: Addressing Labor and Environmental Conditions Through Freer Trade (2001)
The Digital Economy: Promoting Competition, Innovation, and Opportunity (2001)
Reforming Immigration: Helping Meet America's Need for a Skilled Workforce (2001)
Measuring What Matters: Using Assessment and Accountability to Improve Student Learning (2001)
Improving Global Financial Stability (2000)
The Case for Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China (2000)
Welfare Reform and Beyond: Making Work Work (2000)
Breaking the Litigation Habit: Economic Incentives for Legal Reform (2000)
New Opportunities for Older Workers (1999)
Investing in the People's Business: A Business Proposal for Campaign Finance Reform (1999)
The Employer's Role in Linking School and Work (1998)
Employer Roles in Linking School and Work: Lessons from Four Urban Communities (1998)
America's Basic Research: Prosperity Through Discovery (1998)
Modernizing Government Regulation: The Need For Action (1998)
U.S. Economic Policy Toward The Asia-Pacific Region (1997)
Connecting Inner-City Youth To The World of Work (1997)
Fixing Social Security (1997)
Growth With Opportunity (1997)

CED COUNTERPART ORGANIZATIONS

Close relations exist between the Committee for Economic Development and independent, nonpolitical research organizations in other countries. Such counterpart groups are composed of business executives and scholars and have objectives similar to those of CED, which they pursue by similarly objective methods. CED cooperates with these organizations on research and study projects of common interest to the various countries concerned. This program has resulted in a number of joint policy statements involving such international matters as energy, assistance to developing countries, and the reduction of nontariff barriers to trade.

CE	Circulo de Empresarios Madrid, Spain
CEAL	Consejo Empresario de America Latina Buenos Aires, Argentina
CEDA	Committee for Economic Development of Australia Sydney, Australia
CIRD	China Institute for Reform and Development Hainan, People's Republic of China
EVA	Centre for Finnish Business and Policy Studies Helsinki, Finland
FAE	Forum de Administradores de Empresas Lisbon, Portugal
IDEP	Institut de l'Entreprise Paris, France
IW	Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft Koeln Cologne, Germany
経済同友会	Keizai Doyukai Tokyo, Japan
SMO	Stichting Maatschappij en Onderneming The Netherlands
SNS	Studieförbundet Naringsliv och Samhälle Stockholm, Sweden

