

**ASSESSMENT OF THE FULBRIGHT-HAYS
GROUP PROJECTS ABROAD – ADVANCED
OVERSEAS INTENSIVE LANGUAGE
PROGRAM -
OMB CLEARANCE REQUEST**

JANUARY 21, 2009

U.S. Department of Education
International Education Programs Service
1990 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW 1

 INTRODUCTION 1

 BACKGROUND..... 1

 STUDY OBJECTIVES 2

2002-2008 Fellows 3

2009 Fellows..... 4

GPA Past and Current Project Directors 2002-2009..... 4

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT 6

 A. JUSTIFICATION 6

 B. DESCRIPTION OF STATISTICAL METHODS 12

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. Department of Education, International Education Programs Service (IEPS), requests clearance for data collection to conduct an assessment of the Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad (GPA) – Advanced Overseas Intensive Language Program. The study, conducted under a contract with the American Institutes for Research (AIR), will survey past and present Project Directors of the GPA program along with 2002-2009 alumni to gather information on the implementation of the GPA Program and inform program improvement.

This document contains three sections. The first section is a description of the assessment of the GPA Program and provides context on the data collection instruments for which we are seeking clearance. The second section contains Parts A and B of the supporting statement for the Paperwork Reduction Act Submission. The appendices contain the instruments for which we are requesting clearance, along with additional supporting documentation.

BACKGROUND

In establishing the Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad in 1961—which was in response to world events that challenged assumptions about the preparedness of the United States to compete with other nations—Congress acknowledged the critical need to strengthen foreign language instruction in the United States. Yet, 48 years after the authorization of the Program, the need to train students in foreign languages in order to compete in the global marketplace is more essential than ever. In a world in which the military, economic, and environmental security of the United States are closely intertwined with other nations, it is imperative that American students be proficient in the multitude of languages spoken around the globe.

Since the first GPA competition, the Program has made great strides in bolstering the foreign language capacity of the United States. As noted in the recent report from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) reviewing the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs, instruction in less commonly taught languages has increased and numerous teaching materials have been

developed for use in a variety of educational settings.¹ The NAS noted, however, that 14 Title VI programs as well as the Fulbright-Hays GPA program had yet to comprehensively assess the degree to which the projects funded under the statute had demonstrated an effect on international education and foreign language instruction in the United States. Consequently, the level of preparedness of U.S. students to compete globally remains unclear.

STUDY OBJECTIVES

The Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad (GPA) program is designed to contribute to the development and improvement of the study of modern foreign languages and area studies in the United States by providing opportunities for teachers, students, and faculty to study in foreign countries. Four categories of projects are eligible for funding under the GPA. At this time, the International Education Programs Service (IEPS) of the U.S. Department of Education is interested in an assessment of one of the types of projects - the Advanced Overseas Intensive Language Program.

According to the program regulations in 34 CFR 664.14, The Advanced Overseas Intensive Language Program is designed to take advantage of the opportunities present in the foreign country that are not present in the United States when providing intensive foreign language training. Projects may be carried out during a full year, an academic year, a semester, a trimester, a quarter, or a summer. Generally, language training must be given at the advanced level, i.e., at the level equivalent to that provided to students who have successfully completed two academic years of language training. The language to be studied must be indigenous to the host country and maximum use must be made of local institutions and personnel. Generally, participants in projects under this program must have successfully completed at least two academic years of training in the language to be studied.

The scope of this study will be restricted to fiscal years 2002 through 2009 which encompasses funding cohorts of 2002-2004, 2005-2007, and 2008-2011. As part of the assessment, AIR will develop and administer three surveys: one survey will be developed for

¹ National Research Council (2007). *International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America's Future*, Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs, M.E. O'Connell and J.L. Norwood, Editors. Center for Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

those participants from 2002 through 2008 and another will be developed for the recent alumni of 2009. While many of the questions in those two alumni surveys will overlap, detailed career information and questions about continued study of the GPA language will only be asked of the 2002-2008 alumni. In addition, a third survey focusing on past and current Project Directors will be developed. All surveys will be administered electronically (web-based), with an option of pencil and paper if requested.

Specifically, the content of the three surveys will focus on the following topics:

2002-2008 Fellows

- career choice(s) ~ types of career, use of language in the career, length of time in each job, language ability as a factor in promotions
- continued language study of the language of the GPA and to what level
- additional language study of another language and to what level
- mechanisms used to maintain and/or enhance proficiency in language of GPA
- education level at the time of the GPA (junior, senior, graduate student)
- degree awarded after GPA
- additional degrees, if any, awarded after GPA and role of language study in the degree program
- any pre- and post-testing results, if known
- internship in country after the GPA
- development of language abilities through simultaneous translations, original conversation, translation (English to host and host to English), amount of interaction with host nationals on internship, presentations made in host language
- primary reason for participating in GPA
- impact on fellow's view of the United States as well as the country visited
- development of teaching materials, articles, and/or books that will aid others (students, educators, policy makers, government officials, etc.) in the field to understand the host language and/or host country

2009 Fellows

- field of study
- number of years of language study prior to the GPA in the language of the GPA
- any other languages studied and for how many years degree program
- career goals
- internship in country after the GPA
- plans for continued study of the language
- impact on future study plans
- any pre- and post-testing results, if known
- primary reason for participating in GPA
- impact on fellow's view of the United States as well as the country visited

GPA Past and Current Project Directors 2002-2009

- fellow level pre- and post-testing instruments and results
- financial details on cost of implementing a GPA project, including those not covered by grant funds
- amount of classroom contact hours and length of program
- outside excursions such as field trip, market shopping, school visits, etc.
- accommodations (hostel, dorm, home stay, etc.)
- how or if gains in cultural competence are assessed
- quality of pre-departure orientation
- appropriateness of data currently collected in IRIS
- changes or additions to the data collected in IRIS
- activities that are not currently authorized in the GPA program regulations that should be considered for the future
- suggested length of time overseas to maximize program effectiveness
- effective recruitment strategies to attract fellows nationally
- assessment of effectiveness of offering the language at the same level annually versus adding an increased level the second year to allow fellows to return on a GPA to achieve a higher level of proficiency

- information on current evaluation models used by GPA grantees and the level of rigor at the project as well as fellow levels
- suggestions of models that sufficiently capture the activities and outcomes of the GPA funding on these programs a standard rubric that could be recommended to evaluate the outputs (i.e., instructor assessment of fellow's foreign language gains) of the GPA funding

Results from these three surveys will be analyzed through a combination of quantitative and qualitative techniques and will inform the writing of a final report documenting the contributions of the GPA Advanced Overseas Intensive Language program to the implementation of the study of modern foreign languages and area studies in the United States.

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

A. JUSTIFICATION

1. *Circumstances making collection of information necessary*

In establishing the Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad in 1961—which was in response to world events that challenged assumptions about the preparedness of the United States to compete with other nations—Congress acknowledged the critical need to strengthen foreign language instruction in the United States. Yet, 48 years after the authorization of the Program, the need to train students in foreign languages in order to compete in the global marketplace is more essential than ever. In a world in which the military, economic, and environmental security of the United States are closely intertwined with other nations, it is imperative that American students are proficient in the multitude of languages spoken around the globe.

Since the first GPA competition, the Program has made great strides in bolstering the foreign language capacity of the United States. As noted in the recent report from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) reviewing the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs, instruction in less commonly taught languages has increased and numerous teaching materials have been developed for use in a variety of educational settings.² The NAS noted, however, that 14 Title VI programs as well as the Fulbright-Hays GPA program had yet to comprehensively assess the degree to which the projects funded under the statute had demonstrated an effect on international education and foreign language instruction in the United States. Consequently, the level of preparedness of U.S. students to compete globally remains unclear.

² National Research Council (2007). *International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America's Future*, Committee to Review the Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs, M.E. O'Connell and J.L. Norwood, Editors. Center for Education, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

2. *Purposes and uses of the data*

The American Institutes for Research (AIR) is conducting an assessment of the Fulbright-Hays Group Projects Abroad (GPA) Advanced Overseas Intensive Language. The data will be used to document the implementation of individual projects abroad as well as of the program collectively and to inform future studies looking at long-term impact. The results from the study can be used to learn what is being accomplished by the GPA Program and to inform program improvement in the future.

3. *Use of technology to reduce burden*

The two alumni surveys will be administered via the web through Survey Gizmo. The use of multiple skip patterns seamlessly integrated through the on-line survey will greatly reduce burden on respondents by only presenting them with the questions relevant to them. The Project Director survey will be disseminated via email and can be filled out directly on a computer in Word (given the small number of respondents, the cost of developing a web version of this survey does not make sense). All respondents will have the option to request the survey in hard copy format. The website for the two web-based surveys will be password protected.

4. *Efforts to identify duplication*

The assessment of the GPA program represents IEPS's only study currently underway that is aimed at compiling data on each GPA Overseas project to promote foreign language education. IEPS has not conducted any program assessment since the start of the program. Thus no duplication will result as part of the study.

5. *Methods to minimize burden on small entities*

No small businesses or entities will be involved as respondents.

6. *Consequences of not collecting the data*

The GPA is a government funded program. Since it has not been evaluated previously, the IEPS does not know how well it operates. The consequences of not collecting the data will result in having no information on the implementation of the program. Without the data

collected as part of this assessment, IEPS will be unable to identify steps for ensuring that the GPA program meets the foreign language needs of the United States.

7. *Special circumstances*

No special circumstances apply to this study.

8. *Adherence to 5CFR 1320.8 guidelines and consultation outside the agency*

This study was listed in the Federal Register.

To assist with the development of the assessment of the GPA Program and the drafting and vetting of the surveys, project staff has drawn on the input of several outside experts who are world-renowned in the fields of foreign languages and area studies.

The members of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) are as follows:

- **Martha Abbott** – Director of Education, American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)
- **Gerald Lampe** – Former Deputy Director of the National Foreign Language Center (NFLC)
- **Scott McGinnis** – expert in foreign language instruction and pedagogy and currently Academic Advisor and Professor at the Defense Language Institute.

Project staff will use outside experts for consultation on an as-needed basis throughout the study.

9. *Payment or gifts*

No payments, gifts, or incentives will be used in the study.

10. *Assurances of confidentiality*

AIR research staff will be trained to keep all names and any other identifying information completely confidential, and to omit this information while recording information from the surveys. Caution will be exercised in limiting data access to authorized project staff and those who have been instructed in the confidentiality requirements of the study. The data

will contain no information that could be used to identify subjects other than that which is publicly available. No individual identifying information will appear in any of our reports. All materials will be stripped of all individually identifiable information to further protect respondent confidentiality.

11. *Justification of sensitive questions*

No questions of a sensitive nature will be included in this study. Respondents are reporting on project-level activities only.

12. *Estimates of hour burden*

The total estimated hour burden for the entire study is 808.5 hours (or 48510 minutes). The hourly burden breakdown is as follows:

- GPA Project Director survey: 29 respondents * 90 minutes per survey * 100% response rate = 2610 minutes.
- Survey of 2002-2008 fellows: 1600 respondents * 30 minutes per survey * 85% response rate = 40800 minutes.
- Survey of 2009 fellows: 200 respondents * 30 minutes per survey * 85% response rate = 5100 minutes.
- Total burden = 2610+40800+5100=48510 minutes=808.5 hours.

13. *Estimate of cost burden to respondents*

There are no additional respondent costs associated with this data collection other than the hour burden accounted for in Item 12.

14. *Estimate of annual cost to the federal government*

The estimated cost for the 18 month study, including development of data collection instruments, justification package, data collection, data analysis, and preparation of a final report, is \$308,720 per year.

15. *Program changes or adjustments*

The request is for a new data collection. There are no program changes or adjustments.

16. *Plans for tabulation and publication of results*

AIR will submit a final report summarizing the results of the entire study. In drafting the report, AIR will first create an outline of the contents. The contents will include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Executive summary
2. Purpose of project
3. Research methodology
 - a. Survey design
 - b. Data collection procedures
 - c. Database design
 - d. Data analysis
4. Results from the survey of GPA Project Directors and the two alumni surveys.
5. Implications of study and future directions

AIR will write one substantive report, including results for the entire project based on the original analysis plan and any subsequent agreed-upon modifications to the plan. The report will also include a description of the methodology employed, findings and implications. Many of the analyses will report crosstabulations by cohort (i.e., year of program attendance) and country—especially since fellows one year out would not be expected to have the same outcomes as those eight years out. The report will include an executive summary in non-technical language, which will be appropriate for a wide range of audiences. In addition, AIR will prepare three two-page executive summaries that report on key topics of interest to IEPS. The final report and summaries will be provided in three formats: camera-ready copy, Microsoft Word, and a copy compatible with IEPS's Website formatting.

17. *Approval to not display OMB expiration date*

All data collection instruments will include the OMB expiration date.

18. *Explanation of exceptions*

No exceptions are requested.