

**Many Calls, Little Action:  
Global Illiteracy  
in the United States**

**by**

**Dr. Robert A. Scott, President  
Adelphi University**

---

Invited Keynote Address at the “National Language Conference: A Call to Action,” June 22–24, 2004.  
Co-sponsored by the Department of Defense and the Center for the Advanced Study of Language at  
the University of Maryland, the conference audience of 400 included Members of Congress, U.S. Army  
Generals, and other senior officers, Department of Defense and Department of State officials, notable  
academic linguists and language specialists, and corporate executives.

---



# Many Calls, Little Action: Global Illiteracy in the United States

---

by

**Dr. Robert A. Scott, President**

**Adelphi University**

---

## Introduction

My assignment today is to discuss the university's role in preparing graduates for an increasingly interdependent world in which the knowledge of other languages and cultures is—again—a critical need. I will review the many calls for global understanding and language competence, the barriers to sustained follow-up and action, and the consequences for national security, economic competitiveness, and a globally aware citizenry. Finally, I will present several recommendations for universities to undertake in partnership with schools, states, businesses, NGO's, and the federal government.

The nature of the problem before us may be revealed by several quotations:

Prior to September 11, the Intelligence Community was not prepared to handle the challenge it faced in translating the volumes of foreign language counterterrorism intelligence it collected.

Agencies within the Intelligence Community experienced backlogs in material awaiting translation, a shortage of language specialists and language-qualified field officers, and a readiness level of only 30% in the most critical terrorism-related languages used by terrorists.<sup>1</sup>

So said the Joint Inquiry of Congress. But this assessment must be put in historical context. As Rose Hayden once said,

America's educators took very much to heart the isolationist dictates of the Founding Fathers.

Schools were tools consciously and relentlessly employed to "Americanize" an immigrant population. For America's schools to internationalize a now overly parochial population flies in the face of two centuries of educational thinking and practice in the United States. Yet fly we must.<sup>2</sup>

Consider this assessment by former U.S. Senator Paul Simon:

To speak another language has been a matter of shame, not pride. Even third, fourth, and fifth generation Americans are caught in this. There is no sense that they have a resource, important to them personally and to the nation. So we have this unusual, deep-seated phenomenon: a historical cultural barrier to the learning of another language in a land of great ethnic diversity.<sup>3</sup>

Quoting Simon again, this historical context has deep roots.

...in 1895 (when less than 4% of high school graduates went to college), nationally there were at least 3,000 elementary pupils enrolled in French classes and 23,000 in German classes, reflecting the immigrant background of the students... The high point... appears to have been reached shortly before World War I. With the arrival of World War II, attempts to exclude foreign elements from the curriculum had great popular appeal. German, in particular, suffered. By 1922, the number of students who studied German had declined by 98% from 1915 levels.

Some states attempted to ban the teaching of all foreign languages.<sup>4</sup>

Before World War II, 36 percent of high school students studied a foreign language.<sup>5</sup> Then, after the start of hostilities, the U.S. military found itself with a critically short supply of linguists.

Finally, James B. Conant, in his landmark 1959 study, *The American High School Today*, stated,

At no time in the educational history of this country has mastery of a modern foreign language come to be recognized as the hallmark of a well-educated man or woman.

## Many Calls

Because of concerns about the nation's readiness to communicate with people in other countries, whether for purposes of trade, diplomacy, defense, or culture, many educators and policy leaders have called for improvements in our national foreign language capabilities. Some significant moments in the past, that is, other "calls to action," include the following:

- During advocacy for a League of Nations (1918-1940) and for a United Nations (1945), there were many calls for foreign language competency.
- During World War II, the War Department issued urgent calls for linguists.
- In the 1940's, the American Council of Learned Societies and the Modern Language Association developed language programs.

- In 1946, the Fulbright Act, supporting international study and exchanges, was adopted.
- In 1958, in response to the Soviet Union's Sputnik launch, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act, including the historic section, Title VI, entitled "Language Development."
- In 1960, the Ford Foundation undertook grant-funded initiatives to advance foreign language and area studies.
- In 1961, Congress passed the Fulbright-Hays Act to support Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchanges.
- In 1966, Congress passed the International Education Act.
- In 1973, Richard Lambert issued his landmark assessment of foreign language faculty and programs.
- The Helsinki Accords of 1975, signed by the U.S., called for increased cooperation and the need for countries to understand each other's culture and language for improved communication and respect for human rights.
- In 1979, following the Helsinki Accords, President Carter appointed the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, chaired by James Perkins, which issued a momentous study, "Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability."
- In 1980, then U.S. Congressman Paul Simon, a member of the Carter Commission, published his book, *The Tongue-Tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis*, with recommendations.
- In 1980, after two decades of expansion in its purpose and scope, Congress folded Title VI of NDEA into the Higher Education Act.
- In 1981, the Educational Testing Service issued the report, "College Students' Knowledge and Beliefs: Survey of Global Understanding," a project on which I was privileged to serve.
- In 1984, The American Council on Education (ACE) published, "What We Don't Know Can Hurt Us."
- In 1987, 165 education organizations, many of which had never before found common cause, joined together to create CAFLIS (the Coalition for the Advancement of Foreign Languages and International Studies) and to advocate for federal support of foreign language policy and programs.
- In 1989, Richard Lambert published his new assessment entitled "International Studies and the Undergraduate," with specific references to foreign language learning.
- In 1989, ACE updated its calls to action with "What We Can't Say Can Hurt Us: A Call for Foreign Language Competence by the Year 2000."
- In 1989, the National Governors' Association issued its report on global literacy and foreign language proficiency.
- In 1991, after several years of advocacy, the National Security Education Program (NSEP), the so-called "Boren Bill," became law.
- In 1994, ACE issued its report entitled, "Spreading the Word: Improving the Way We Teach Foreign Languages."
- To assist universities in developing programs, in 1995 ACE issued "Educating Americans for a World in Flux: Ten Ground Rules for International Higher Education," which included foreign language study.
- In 1998, with the endorsement of seven other national organizations, ACE published "Educating for Global Competence: America's Passport for the Future."
- In 1999, President Bill Clinton issued his "Memorandum on International Education," updating President Carter's call to action and committing the federal government to support foreign language and culture learning and international education.
- In 1999 and 2000, the National Foreign Language Center issued several important reports and testified before Congress on the "state of foreign language capabilities in national security." A 2000 report was prescient in the need for foreign language capabilities in the Departments of Defense, Intelligence, Justice, and State. It received little attention.

Given this history, we should undertake any new call to action with caution.

## **Many Calls, Little Action**

As we can see, there have been many calls for action. Why have there been so few results? Why are we in the state we find ourselves? Surely one reason is cultural and historical. Conant and Hayden said it well. The movement for "Americanization," starting in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and exacerbated by the two World

Wars, overwhelmed the priority for language study even when needed in the 1940's. Yet, we find support now—even before September 11, 2001—for international education and language study. According to an ACE study, “Eighty-five percent of the public (in a poll conducted in 2000) thought that knowing or learning a second language was important (compared to 65 percent in 1965). Three-quarters of the respondents favored making it a requirement in high school, and 70 percent thought it should be required in college.”<sup>8</sup>

Perhaps we have new momentum. But this public support could wane, and it alone is not sufficient. In an era of “tax cuts” as a priority, “small government” as a mantra, and “market solutions” as a guiding principle, necessary government support has declined. Federal funds for Title VI and the National Security Education Act have been a fraction of those promised; the International Education Act and the Clinton “Memorandum” were never funded at all. “Combined federal spending under the largest (international education) programs in the U.S. Departments of Education, State and Defense... amount to less than 1% of federal discretionary programs for higher education,” according to ACE.<sup>9</sup>

Existing federal funding is threatened further not only by tax cuts but also by attitudes similar to those expressed one hundred years ago: the study of foreign languages and culture is somehow “anti-American.” Section 633 of the current House version of the Higher Education Act calls for the establishment of an advisory board to “review, monitor, apprise(sic), and evaluate the activities” of international studies

programs.<sup>10</sup> And, of course, new administrations bring new priorities. The Bush Administration has given more attention to elementary and secondary education basic skills than to either foreign languages in particular or higher education in general.

Yet we know that the federal government has a major role to play in creating and caring for the infrastructure of our nation. Let us not allow foreign language instruction to go the way of the railroads, but instead be thought of as important as schooling itself. After all, our future depends on it. And while the market system is excellent at many tasks, there are some which are so big, so costly, and of such high risk that private capital is not readily available; if available, it has to charge so much to obtain a return on the equity that potential customers rarely can afford the prices to be charged.

However, our current state of affairs is not due to government inaction alone. As a society, we rely upon higher education for students to achieve second language competence when most other nations start such study in the early grades. In addition, there is the attitude that language competence is minimally required for college admission and graduation. As a consequence, as David Maxwell writes, language study is viewed as unnecessary, too risky (to grade-point averages), and inaccessible.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, such attitudes and their consequences are not the only problems. We also have structural problems, as delineated by Maxwell and Garrett:

- Enrollment volatility and its effect on staffing
- Program viability as a result of marginal enrollments

- Faculty peer attitudes toward language instructors
- Requirements for admission and graduation
- Articulation between K–12 and college language study (which is virtually non-existent)
- Staff resources for the less commonly taught languages is seriously inadequate
- Heritage language students outside of Spanish have access to few resources to advance their first language competencies
- Curricular emphasis is still on literature that does not lead to “communicative competence”
- Technology is available but its utility is still not well understood<sup>12</sup>

Enrollment in foreign language courses and programs has been studied extensively. Elizabeth B. Welles of the Modern Language Association prepared its fall 2002 report, which will be issued in Winter 2004.<sup>13</sup> She reports that 8.6 percent of students in higher education were enrolled in modern foreign language classes in 2002 compared to 16.1 percent in 1960.<sup>14</sup> Today, nearly 54 percent of students in foreign language courses are studying Spanish, compared to 32.4 percent in 1968; the percentage in Chinese is 2.4 percent compared to .4 percent; the percentage in Russian is 1.7 percent compared to 3.6 percent; and the percentage in Arabic is 8 percent compared to 1 percent. Arabic enrollments have grown to 10,584 from about 1,000.<sup>15</sup> However, most of these enrollments are in first- and second-year courses; proficiency is not the goal at this level.

When one combines these enrollment figures with the percentage of U.S. college students

who study in other countries, never mind the small percentage who study abroad in a language other than their own, and when one then includes the small percentage of U.S. faculty who study in other countries, one gains an understanding of the extent of global illiteracy.

## Consequences of Global Illiteracy

The consequences of global illiteracy in trade, U.S. multinationals' success in other countries, diplomacy, and security are well-documented. More than 80 federal agencies depend in part on proficiency in more than 100 foreign languages and are not staffed for these tasks.<sup>16</sup> "65% of the world is inaccessible to members of U.S. based professional-services associations, e.g., The American Institute of Architects and the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology," reported the Center for Quality Assurance in International Education.<sup>17</sup>

Another consequence is a declining share of foreign student enrollments, as other countries such as Australia and Japan place high priority on recruiting international students and we in the U.S. erect hurdles such as SEVIS, making it difficult for foreign students to study here.

Yet, here we are at this conference. Does our presence here signal a shift in thinking, a new opportunity? If so, can this time be different than the times that followed Sputnik, the Helsinki Accords, the Carter Commission Report? Can we now avoid the "lurch and retreat" actions and reactions of the past? If so, what makes us think so? What is the foundation on which we would build? What are the points of leverage we can use? What is the opportunity before us?

## Can this time be different?

I believe this time can be different. We have a critical need. We have public support. We have programs in place. We have "suits, uniforms, and tweeds" in the same room. What we need is agreement on priorities, the commitment to work together, and political will.

Instant messages of death, destruction, and desecration remind us of our need to be able to understand others and communicate with them. We have a greater appreciation of critical issues without borders, including acid rain and toxic waste; population growth and the supply of potable water, food, and energy; refugee and immigrant migrations, and so-called "guest workers"; SARS, Mad Cow disease, and HIV-AIDS; and the good and bad that communications technologies can support.<sup>18</sup> Such forces respect no borders, avoid no people.

These forces should persuade us, if the need for trade and diplomacy did not, that we are increasingly interdependent with other nations, cultures, and people. When one combines these issues with concerns about security at home and abroad, one recognizes the importance of knowing other languages and cultures if we are to achieve peace in the world.

Imagine walking the halls of a capitol or corporate headquarters or international organization and not knowing the language and the culture of your hosts, the people with whom you have been sent to negotiate an agreement. How would you feel? It is said that "timing" and "position" are everything in life. But what if your timing is off because you must wait for a translation and your position is weak because

the person with whom you are negotiating has more time to think? More and more people understand this dilemma and we know how to change it.

The foundations for change are in the work of scholars like Richard Brecht, Mary Louise Pratt, Madeleine Green, David Goldberg, Elizabeth B. Welles, David Wiley, Margaret Malone, Richard Lambert, and many others. They have identified the characteristics of successful language programs (Green; Goldberg and Welles); defined critical language needs (Brecht and Walton); identified ways to strengthen program results (Brecht and Rivers); developed taxonomies for the multiple missions of language programs (Brecht and Ingold); researched the forms and sources of language instruction both on and off the campus (CASL, Center for the Advanced Study of Language); found ways to map the location of potential native speakers (MLA); formulated strategies for addressing the deficiencies in language programs (Maxwell and Garrett); studied ways to elevate achievement in language competence (Malone, Rifkin, Christian, and Johnson); cast recommendations by sector, defining the roles of the federal government, state and local government, corporations, and higher education (ACE; Simon); analyzed 40 years of title VI and Fulbright Hays Programs (Wiley; O'Meara, Mehlinger, and Newman); and turned misconceptions and barriers into forceful recommendations (Pratt).<sup>19</sup>

Far be it from me to attempt a critique of their work. It is extensive and validated. We know the differences between sedentary and active language learning. We have the foundation for change. Now we need a fulcrum, a lever for change. I will speak first of universities.

## Points of Leverage for Change in Higher Education

The roles of the university are varied. These unique institutions serve as curator, creator, and critic. Their mission is to advance knowledge, skills, and abilities, and to reinforce values such as respect for diversity and the need for interdependence. They are, or should be, as dedicated to issues of character and citizenship as they are to careers and commerce.

Yet these institutions can also be conservative. They do not always hear the call for change, including calls for change that build upon their missions. Yet they must change because their graduates likely will be supervised by, or will supervise, or will be a neighbor of someone of a different ethnic, national, or religious group. College is the place to prepare for life as well as for earning a living.

In the words of *Changing Our Ways: America and the New World*,

We must re-orient our university curricula and develop new cadres of professionals—not only for government but for business and finance, science and technology, culture and communications. And we must begin before college, imparting to children in elementary and secondary schools the necessary language skills and understanding of other peoples that our international role demands.<sup>20</sup>

Universities prepare the teachers for our schools, both pre-service and in-service, as well as other professionals. So, what are our points of leverage\* for giving priority to foreign language and international studies?

The points of leverage to raise institutional priority for global education in the curriculum and extracurriculum are the same for every campus, although those

employed will vary by circumstance. The key actors in employing these points of leverage will vary as well. They may be the trustees, the president, the academic vice president, a dean, a department chair, a faculty member, all of the above, or some combination. The first step is for the foreign language advocate to persuade one or more of these key actors that the imperatives for language proficiency and global education should affect institutional objectives. Once this occurs, the foreign language and international studies prophet(s) can use these points of leverage found in every institution to ensure that international education's priority is sustained or even increased.

The dozen major points of leverage are known to all: the mission statement; the strategic plan; annual academic program and administrative unit reviews; annual goals and objectives for senior officers, including deans; annual budget requests and allocations for continuing and new initiatives; staffing decisions; funds for faculty and curriculum development; annual awards, rewards and other forms of recognition for meritorious service, including appointments, reappointments, tenure, promotion, and compensation; the Trustees' public agendas; regional accrediting and professional program self studies; articulation agreements with community colleges; fundraising materials, drawn from the mission, vision, and strategic plan statements; and other forms of public recognition for people and efforts. Basically, the advocate of higher priority for global education, including foreign languages, wants to ensure that it is a central part of the discussion when any of these points of leverage are employed. I think the reason is obvious. They provide the opportunity to ensure that priority

follows imperative.

The campus mission statement is the institutional expression of educational goals and outcomes; it expresses campus vision, purpose and values. Therefore, it is referenced during discussions of priorities. For foreign languages and international education to be mentioned in the mission statement is the first step toward higher priority. And, as we all know from campus exercises in writing mission statements, these opportunities are available.

The campus mission includes the goals for educating students—the knowledge, skills, abilities, and values a graduate should demonstrate; the purpose and definition of the curriculum and academic degree programs; the kinds of student activities and services; the purpose, form, and membership in college governance; the origin and destination of students, faculty, and staff; faculty scholarship and service; and the nature and structure of joint arrangements between and among institutions, businesses, government, and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) in this country and others.

Strategic plans include sections on institutional strengths, weaknesses, challenges, opportunities, and both on-campus and off-campus forces for change. The “imperatives” cited earlier make it highly likely that foreign languages and international education can gain prominent mention in the strategic plan.

Annual academic program and administrative unit reviews should always refer to the mission statement and strategic plan, thus providing an opportunity to assess the degree to which academic programs and administrative units support foreign language study and global education, and set goals and objectives related

\*I began using the term “points of leverage” in 1988, before learning that Richard Lambert had written an article using the same term.

to them.

This brief review is not intended to make change sound easy; it is not. And of course there are other priorities which claim attention in the mission statement and can use the points of leverage to gain priority. But this systematic approach enhances the possibilities for change, and for global education to receive priority. We at Adelphi used our planning to give priority to joining the United Nations as an NGO, expand foreign language programs, and build on our partnership with Berlitz/ELS. The points of leverage can help institutions respond to societal needs as well as local imperatives.<sup>21</sup>

Consider how higher education institutions, in partnership with foundations and the federal government, responded to other critical needs for talent. In the 1960s, we needed school teachers, especially teachers of math and science, and we produced. Society needed scientists and engineers, and higher education responded. We need nurses, and our programs are answering the call. In the 1980s, when computer scientists were in short supply, we developed programs to prepare mathematicians and chemists to fill the void. Nearly 60 years earlier, colleges and universities responded to the Veterans Readjustment Act. I believe we can respond again.

Of course, other actors have leverage as well. Think of state education standards and requirements, state and federal initiatives to support international commerce, and the federal “No Child Left Behind” legislation, as well as other federal programs. Each can provide leverage to achieve our goal of advancing foreign language proficiency,

especially in critical languages and global understanding. Why can’t a fully funded “No Child Left Behind” include foreign languages as well as English literacy, history, math and science? We can even imagine how heritage communities and study abroad can be components of such a new strategy, even at the elementary school level.

Another opportunity presents itself as well. This year, some 65,000 students will graduate from high school, many at the top of their class and desirous of advanced education, but will not be eligible for college scholarships because they are undocumented immigrants. These young people were brought to the United States by their parents, educated as Americans, in many cases possessing competency in a less commonly taught language, and prepared for further study and productive lives. But the “Dream Act” that could allow them to become talented citizens with critical skills is stalled in House and Senate Committees, and their dreams are denied.<sup>22</sup>

Other suggestions include forgiveness of federal loans for college graduates with critical language proficiency—perhaps connected to the Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps idea described by Kevin Gormley of NSEP, with a relationship to Title VI Centers; student exchanges for students at different age levels; tax credits for businesses that work on language instruction and maintenance with high school and college students and teachers; summer institutes on language learning and pedagogy; professional development grants and leaves for faculty to enhance their skills or even add a new language; rewards for faculty with second and third language competence;

improved career advising; business and college-sponsored merit badges for Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts who achieve designated levels of critical language proficiency; and seeking the assistance of television and film producers to feature as heroes those who are competent in other languages and cultures. Think of other media campaigns and the means used.

Nevertheless, the opportunity is at hand to use the leverage of the existing federal programs for foreign language and international studies, such as Title IV and NSEP; the Dream Act; the evidence outlined earlier; the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act; and the 50-year anniversary of Title VI in 2008, four short years from now, to set a new goal, seek adequate funding for support and incentives, and enter the next decade with an even stronger base, a longer reach, and a better footing for America’s role in the world. The groundwork has been established.

## Conclusion

We have a critical national need to know other cultures and to be competent in communicating with other people. These are not new needs. We have heard many calls to action to address these needs and have the foundation on which to expand our nation’s capacity for dealing with them. We have made so little progress and have prepared so many globally illiterate graduates because universities, states, businesses, and the federal government have been inconsistent in their priorities.

History was against progress, but now seems to be with us. In partnership with government and business, I believe universities are uniquely

positioned to advance our response to the nation's critical needs. But we cannot do it alone. There are five potential partners as identified by Brecht—education, government, the private sector, heritage communities, and services offered in other countries. Each is needed, but none is

a panacea.<sup>23</sup> With understanding and cooperative relations, we can fulfill our missions to respect our nation's heritage, challenge orthodoxy, and prepare new generations of scholars, entrepreneurs, and officials, each of whom must know the lessons of history and be able to imagine

a peaceful future for all—in more than one language. So it is past time for a renewed focus on our role as members of the world community.

Last call; it is time for action!

---

### About Dr. Robert A. Scott

Dr. Robert A. Scott has been president and professor of sociology and anthropology at Adelphi University since July 2000. At Adelphi, he has spearheaded international initiatives, advanced foreign language studies, and achieved NGO status at the United Nations for the University. From 1985 to 2000, he was president and professor at Ramapo College of New Jersey—the “college of choice for a global education.” Dr. Scott has been chairman of the American Council on Education Commission on International Education, a member of the board of the National Foreign Language Center, a member of the Advisory Board for American Friends of UNESCO, and a representative of the United States to UNESCO conferences, the creation of UMAP (University Mobility Asia-Pacific), and the World Conference on Higher Education. A forceful advocate for global literacy, Dr. Scott is known for his speeches and essays, including a chapter in *Changing Perspectives on International Education*, an anthology chronicling the forty year influence of Title VI programs.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> Report of the Joint Inquiry into the Terrorist Attacks of September 11, 2001, Systemic Finding 6, p. xvi.
- <sup>2</sup> Hayden, Rose L. "Internationalizing Public Education: What the States are Doing," *Exchange* 12, no. 2 (Fall 1976): 3-8.
- <sup>3</sup> Simon, Paul. *The Tongue-Tied American: Confronting the Foreign Language Crisis*. New York: Continuum, 1980, p. 12.
- <sup>4</sup> Simon, p. 14.
- <sup>5</sup> Simon, p. 14.
- <sup>6</sup> Conant, James B. *The American High School Today*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, p. 4.
- <sup>7</sup> Simon; Green, Madeleine F. "Joining the World: The Challenge of Internationalizing Undergraduate Education," *Change*, May/June 2002, p.13; and Wiley, David, "Forty Years of the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs: Building the Nation's International Expertise for a Global Future." In *Changing Perspectives on International Education*, edited by Patrick O'Meara, Howard D. Mehlinger, and Roxana Ma Newman, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2001, pp. 12 and 13.
- <sup>8</sup> Hayward, Fred and Laura Siaya. "Public Experience, Attitude, and Knowledge: A Report of Two National Surveys About International Education, ACE, 2001. See also Kathryn Kranhold, *et al.*, "Managers at Multinationals May Miss the Job's Nuances if they Speak Only English." *The Wall Street Journal*, May 18, 2004.
- <sup>9</sup> Green, p. 14.
- <sup>10</sup> "AAUP Legislative Action Alert," March 18, 2004.
- <sup>11</sup> Maxwell, David and Nina Garrett, "Meeting National Needs: The Challenge to Language Learning in Higher Education," *Change*, May/June 2002, p. 24.
- <sup>12</sup> Maxwell and Garrett, pages 24 and 25.
- <sup>13</sup> Welles, Elizabeth B. "Foreign Language Enrollments in United States Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 2002." *ADFL Bulletin*, Vol. 35, No. 2, Winter 2004 (forthcoming).
- <sup>14</sup> Welles, p. 6.
- <sup>15</sup> Welles, p. 8.
- <sup>16</sup> Welles, p. 8.
- <sup>17</sup> Crump, T. "Translating and Interpreting in the Federal Government," 2001. Center for Quality Assurances in International Education, "The Globalization of the Professions in the United States and Canada: A Survey and Analysis." Washington, D.C.: CQAIE, 2000.
- <sup>18</sup> *Educating for Global Competence: America's Passport to the Future*. American Council on Education, 1998, p.2.
- <sup>19</sup> Green; Goldberg, David and Elizabeth B. Welles, "Successful College and University Language Programs, 1995-99, Part 1," *Profession 2001*; Brecht, Richard D. and A. Ronald Walton, "National Language Needs and Capacity: A Recommendation for Action (1998), in O'Meara, *et al*; Brecht, Richard D. and William P. Rivers, "Language and National Security for the 21st Century: The Role of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays in Supporting National Language Capacity," "Draft, National Foreign Language Center, 2000; Brecht, Richard D. and Catherine W. Ingold, "Literacy, Numeracy, and Linguacy: Language and Culture and General Education," *Liberal Education*, Fall 2000; CASL, "An Introduction to America's Needs and Resources," Briefing Document, The National Language Conference, 22-24 June 2004; "New Online Tool by the Modern Language Association Allows Quick Searching of Nation's Most Spoken Languages," MLA News Release, June 16, 2004; Maxwell, David and Nina Garrett, "Meeting National Needs: The Challenge to Language Learning in Higher Education," *Change*, May/June 2002; Malone, Margaret E., Benjamin Rifkin, Donna Christian, and Dora E. Johnson, "Attaining High Levels of Proficiency: Challenges for Language Education in the United States," Conference on Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education, Duke

University, January 23-25, 2003; *Educating for Global Competence*; Simon: Wiley; O'Meara, Patrick, Howard D. Mehlinger, and Roxana Ma Newman, *Changing Perspectives on International Education*, Indiana University Press, 2001; and Pratt, Mary Louise, "Building a New Public Idea about Language," *Profession 2003*.

<sup>20</sup> *Changing Our Ways: America and the New World*. Carnegie Endowment National Commission on America and the New World, Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1992, p. 87.

<sup>21</sup> Scott, Robert A. "The Globalization of University Programs." Invited keynote presentation at the North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University Faculty and Staff Institute on "Globalization and Assessment of University Programs," August 16, 1991. Based in part on previous presentations, especially "Strategies for Internationalizing Campus and Curriculum," AASCU, 1991, and "Globalization: Implications for the Academy," Invited banquet address at the 74th Conference of the North Carolina Association of Colleges and Universities, November 3, 1994, Greensboro; and "Campus Developments in Response to the Challenges of Internationalization: The Case of Ramapo College of New Jersey," in O'Meara, et al.

<sup>22</sup> Mead, Julia C. "Ticket to Nowhere." *The New York Times*, June 20, 2004, Section 14, pages 1, 8.

<sup>23</sup> CASL.

