

**ENGLISH FOR HERITAGE LANGUAGE SPEAKERS
SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM**

REPORT ON FEASIBILITY STUDY AND PROPOSAL FOR PILOT PROGRAM

Submitted to

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION PROGRAM



Submitted by

Center for Applied Linguistics

JUNE 10, 2005

FEASIBILITY STUDY CONTRIBUTORS

CAL STAFF

Carolyn Adger
Grace Burkart
Donna Christian
Dora Johnson
Deborah Kennedy

CORE ADVISORS

JoAnn (Jodi) Crandall, *University of Maryland, Baltimore County*
Christine F. Meloni, *The George Washington University*

ESL EXPERTS

Miriam Burt, *Center for Applied Linguistics*
Patricia Byrd, *Georgia State University*
Barbara Kroll, *California State University, Northridge*
Victoria Melzer, *Montgomery College*
Joan Morley, *University of Michigan*
Ron Schwartz, *University of Maryland, Baltimore County*
Sharon Seymour, *City College of San Francisco*
Donald Weasenforth, *Collin County Community College*

ASSESSMENT EXPERT

Margaret Malone, *Center for Applied Linguistics*

HERITAGE LANGUAGE EXPERTS

Nesreen Akhtarkhvari
Mahdi Alesh, *Ohio State University*
Scott McGinnis, *Defense Language Institute*
Richard Robin, *The George Washington University*
Sarah J. Shin, *University of Maryland, Baltimore County*
Shuhan C. Wang, *Delaware Department of Education*

Executive Summary

In order to carry out its mission effectively, the U.S. defense and intelligence community needs personnel who are proficient speakers of a number of critical languages. One source of such personnel is communities of heritage language speakers in the United States that include U.S. citizens who are highly proficient in their native languages but lack the English language proficiency to carry out work-related duties effectively.

To address this situation, in 2004 the U.S. Congress amended subsection (a)(1) of section 802 of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1902) to include the provision of scholarships for heritage speakers of languages that are critical to U.S. security interests. The scholarships will enable heritage speakers to study English at U.S. universities. Scholarships will be awarded only to U.S. citizens who agree to fulfill the federal service requirement specified for all scholarship recipients under the Boren Act.

Feasibility Study

In February 2005 the National Security Education Program (NSEP) asked the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to study the feasibility of an English for Heritage Language Speakers (EHLS) program that would implement the legislative requirements of the amendment cited above. CAL collected information from federal agencies and consulted with heritage experts, ESL experts, and ESL assessment experts.

Federal agency respondents indicated that (in rank order) Arabic, Persian, Russian, Mandarin Chinese, Pashto, Urdu, and Korean were the most critical languages. They listed translation, interpretation, conversation, presentations, and reading as the primary work-related purposes for which nonnative speakers of English currently on staff use English, and noted that writing is the skill in which those staffers most need training. Work-related tasks require a minimum proficiency level of 3 on the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) scale.¹

Heritage language consultants in Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Persian, and Russian agreed that the program would need to recruit heritage speakers who were educated through college in the heritage language to ensure professional-level heritage language proficiency. They concurred that the EHLS program would be an attractive opportunity for professional development for heritage speakers who are U.S. citizens. Locating the EHLS program in cities with substantial heritage populations would facilitate recruitment.

The ESL experts made recommendations on program structure, instructional approach(es), curriculum, and support to help participants achieve the target proficiency goals. Instruction

¹ The Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) coordinates language instruction among U.S. government agencies. Its language proficiency scale describes what a person is able to do with language on a scale from 0 (“no proficiency”) to 5 (“functionally native proficiency”). Listening, speaking, reading, writing, and translation are rated on separate scales. Level 2 is considered “general working proficiency,” and Level 3 is considered “general professional proficiency.”

should focus on vocabulary development, sociolinguistic considerations, and fossilized language errors, and should develop metalinguistic knowledge and language learning strategies. Small cohorts of participants from the same language background would allow instruction to address individual needs and specific cross-language issues. The experts also suggested that the program consist of 720 hours (24 weeks) of intensive classroom instruction, tutorials, and support activities, and that the curriculum be built around workplace activities and materials and include a strong technology component. A corps of mentors who are current federal agency employees could provide one-on-one mentoring for program participants. Finally, the experts recommended that CAL select partner universities with established intensive English programs and experience in the development and provision of courses in English for professional purposes.

The ESL assessment experts noted that government agencies rate language proficiency on the ILR scale, so assessment at program entry and program exit must be aligned with this scale. Language proficiency in both English and the heritage language must be assessed at entry. For heritage language testing, the experts suggested either the Defense Language Proficiency Test (from the Defense Language Institute) or the assessments used by the universities participating in the National Flagship Language Initiative. For English language testing, they noted that commercially available tests are not aligned with the ILR scale and do not have appropriate content. They therefore suggested the Defense Language Institute's English Language Proficiency Test, which is appropriate with respect to level and content and is aligned with the ILR scale. For assessment of progress during the program, the experts suggested diagnostic testing at the outset to identify strengths and needs and develop individual learning plans, and formative assessment to track progress and adjust the plans as needed. The experts suggested that the EHLS partner institutions of higher education would likely have diagnostic and formative assessment instruments and procedures in place that could be adapted for use in the EHLS program.

EHLS PROGRAM FEASIBILITY

On the basis of its research, CAL has determined that a first-year pilot of the EHLS program will be feasible under the following conditions:

- ❖ The program must develop a public presence that will enable it to recruit successfully within the target heritage communities.
- ❖ The program must take place at institutions of higher education that have established intensive English programs, experience in the development and provision of programs and courses in English for professional purposes, and connections with heritage communities in the area around them.
- ❖ The program must obtain access to assessment instruments that measure participants' language proficiency in relation to the ILR scale.

Pilot Program Proposal

CAL proposes to initiate the EHLS program with two institutions of higher education in the first pilot year. They will be selected on the basis of experience and connections with heritage language communities. For the first pilot year, one partner institution will enroll a cohort of heritage speakers of Arabic, and the other will enroll a cohort of heritage speakers of either Russian or Mandarin Chinese. The program will provide 720 hours (24 weeks) of instruction over a maximum of eight months and will combine classroom language instruction with tutorials, Web-based learning, and extracurricular activities. With assistance from NSEP, CAL will obtain work materials and tasks from federal agencies; CAL and NSEP will advise the partner institutions as they incorporate these materials into a curriculum that simulates a professional context in terms of materials, activities, and expectations while also addressing individual needs and developing metalinguistic awareness and language learning strategies. CAL and NSEP will work together to establish a mentoring program that pairs program participants with current federal personnel.

CAL, NSEP, and the institutions of higher education will develop a public presence (including a Web site) for the EHLS program that presents participation as a professional development opportunity. NSEP will help participants find positions to fulfill their service requirement.

The admission process will involve preliminary screening and English and heritage language assessment. During the program, assessment will include initial diagnostic testing and ongoing formative assessment. Assessment will enable CAL and its partners to evaluate the program while it is in progress. At exit, participants' English proficiency will be assessed using the same instruments used at entry, and instructors will generate a narrative description of each participant's skill levels. The formative and exit assessments will demonstrate the effectiveness of the first year pilot and identify aspects that require adjustment or improvement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	ii
A. Purpose of the Study	1
B. Data Collection and Analysis	3
1. <i>Military and Intelligence Agency Needs</i>	3
1.a. Language Needs.....	3
1.b. English Language Skills.....	4
1.c. Skills in Critical Languages	7
2. <i>Heritage Language Communities in the United States</i>	8
2.a. Arabic	9
2.b. Chinese.....	9
2.c. Korean	10
2.d. Persian.....	10
2.e. Russian	11
2.f. Additional Data	12
3. <i>English Language Learning at Advanced Levels</i>	14
3.a. Participant Needs and Class Makeup.....	14
3.b. Program Structure.....	15
3.c. Instruction and Materials	16
4. <i>Assessment</i>	17
4.a. Heritage Language Assessment	18
4.b. Entry and Exit Assessment.....	18
4.c. Progress Assessment.....	20
5. <i>Institutions of Higher Education</i>	20
C. Information, Issues, and Recommendations	22
1. <i>Participants and Recruiting</i>	22
1.a. Issues	23
1.b. Recommendations	23
2. <i>Overall Program Design/Structure</i>	24
2.a. Issues	25
2.b. Recommendations	25
3. <i>Curriculum and Materials</i>	26
3.a. Issues	26
3.b. Recommendations	27
4. <i>Assessment</i>	27
4.a. Issues	28
4.b. Recommendations	28
5. <i>Selection of Institutions of Higher Education and Management of Program</i>	29
5.a. Issues	30
5.b. Recommendations	30

D. Proposed Pilot Program.....	31
1. Program Structure.....	31
2. Curriculum.....	32
3. Recruitment and Admission Screening.....	33
3.a. Part 1—Initial Screening.....	33
3.b. Part 2—Listening and Reading Proficiency Assessment.....	34
3.c. Part 3—Speaking and Writing Proficiency Assessment.....	34
4. Exit Assessment.....	35
5. Participant Assessment and Program Evaluation.....	35
5.a. Entry Diagnostic Assessment.....	35
5.b. Formative Assessment.....	36
5.c. Program Evaluation.....	36
6. Program Management.....	37
6.a. Role of CAL.....	37
6.b. Role of Partner Institutions of Higher Education.....	37
6.c. Role of NSEP.....	38
6.d. Work Plan and Timeline.....	39
Appendix 1. Questionnaire for Defense and Intelligence Agencies.....	40
Appendix 2. Language Needs of Defense and Intelligence Agencies.....	52
Appendix 3. English Language Skills of Current Nonnative-English-Speaking Personnel.....	54
Appendix 4. Questions for Heritage Language Experts.....	57
Appendix 5. Foreign-Born Populations in the United States.....	58

A. Purpose of the Study

OBJECTIVES:

- ❖ To assess the need for the EHLS program within the U.S. defense and intelligence communities
- ❖ To identify existing pools of heritage language speakers who are U.S. citizens
- ❖ To define program and curriculum needs
- ❖ To identify needs and options for language proficiency assessment
- ❖ To identify institutions of higher education that could serve as partners for the pilot
- ❖ To develop a program management plan for the pilot

In order to carry out its mission effectively, the U.S. defense and intelligence community needs personnel who are proficient speakers of a number of critical languages. One source of such personnel is the communities of heritage language speakers in the United States. These communities contain U.S. citizens who are highly proficient in their native languages and are interested in working for the U.S. government, but lack the English language proficiency to carry out work-related duties effectively.

To address this situation, in 2004 the U.S. Congress amended subsection (a)(1) of section 802 of the David L. Boren National Security Education Act of 1991 (50 U.S.C. 1902) to include the provision of scholarships for heritage speakers of languages that are critical to U.S. security interests. The scholarships will enable these heritage speakers to pursue English language studies at institutions of higher education in the United States in order to increase their English proficiency to the professional level. Scholarships will be awarded only to students who are U.S. citizens and who agree to fulfill the federal service requirement specified for all scholarship recipients under the Boren Act.

In February 2005 the National Security Education Program (NSEP) asked the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) to conduct a feasibility study that would lead to the establishment of an English for Heritage Language Speakers (EHLS) scholarship program. The purpose of EHLS will be to implement the legislative requirements of the amendment cited above.

The feasibility study conducted by CAL had six objectives:

1. To assess the need for the EHLS program within the U.S. defense and intelligence communities and understand U.S. defense and intelligence community goals and expectations for the program.

To address this objective, CAL developed a survey questionnaire that was distributed by NSEP to senior language advisors at the various agencies. The survey asked respondents to list the languages critical to their agencies' work and to report on their observations

about the English and heritage language skill levels of agency employees. Results of the survey are reported in section B.1.

2. To identify existing pools of heritage language speakers who are U.S. citizens.
To address this objective, CAL consulted heritage language experts in Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Persian (Farsi/Dari), and Russian, and conducted Internet-based research on heritage communities in the United States. Results of this research are reported in section B.2.
3. To define program and curriculum needs for the EHLS program and outline possible structure(s) for a pilot.
To address this objective, CAL consulted experts in English as a second language instruction for adult learners at advanced levels of proficiency. Two ESL experts (Crandall and Meloni) served as key advisors to the study. In addition, individual and group consultations took place in the Washington area and at the annual Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages conference. Results of these consultations are reported in section B.3.
4. To identify needs and options for language proficiency assessment procedures.
To address this objective, CAL consulted an expert in adult language proficiency assessment and experts in English as a second language instruction for adult learners. These consultations enabled CAL to identify existing assessment instruments and evaluate the ability of each to meet the requirements of the EHLS program. Results of these consultations are reported in section B.4.
5. To identify institutions of higher education with expertise in English for professional purposes that would be interested in piloting the EHLS program.
To address this objective, CAL identified the metropolitan areas in the United States with the highest concentrations of speakers of the languages identified as critical in the federal agency survey (# 1 above) and then looked in those areas for institutions of higher education with intensive English programs that specifically offered courses or programs in English for professional purposes. Preliminary results of this research are reported in section B.5.
6. To develop a program management plan for the pilot program.
CAL's design for the structure and management of the pilot EHLS program draws on and responds to the needs and opportunities identified in the various phases of the feasibility study. Conclusions drawn from the results of the feasibility study are presented in section C, and the program management plan is set out in section D.

The feasibility study has enabled CAL to outline the general features of the program and identify issues that will require ongoing management and evaluation. CAL now proposes that it implement a pilot of the EHLS program with two institutions of higher education in order to evaluate its findings, revise them if necessary, and begin to address the issues that the study has identified.

B. Data Collection and Analysis

1. Military and Intelligence Agency Needs

- ❖ Arabic, Persian, Russian, Mandarin Chinese, Pashto, Urdu, and Korean were the critical languages most often cited by agency contacts
- ❖ Writing is the skill that most needs development among nonnative speakers of English who are currently on staff at federal agencies
- ❖ Translation, interpretation, informal conversation, formal presentations, and reading print and electronic media are the primary work-related purposes for which nonnative speakers of English who are currently on staff at federal agencies use English

To assess the need for the EHLS program, CAL developed a survey that was distributed by NSEP to 18 military and 10 nonmilitary intelligence agencies. As of April 25, CAL had received responses from 12 military and no nonmilitary agencies. See Appendix 1 for the full survey.

1.a. Language Needs

Respondents were asked to list in rank order the ten non-Western languages that were currently most critical to the agency's work. Table 1 lists the most commonly referenced languages. See Appendix 2 for a complete listing of the languages referenced and their rankings and frequency.

Table 1. Languages Most Commonly Listed by Agency Respondents

LANGUAGE	# TIMES LISTED	NOTES*
Arabic	9	Listed 9 times overall by seven respondents, including references to standard Arabic and its dialects. Ranked first by six respondents. Referenced twice by four respondents, as follows: Arabic first and Arabic Iraqi 2 nd , two respondents; Arabic Modern Standard first and Arabic dialects 2 nd , one respondent; Egyptian Arabic first and Gulf Arabic 2 nd , one respondent.
Chinese (Mandarin)	5	Ranked 2 nd , 3 rd , 8 th , 9 th , and 10 th .
Korean	4	Ranked 5 th by two respondents, 9 th by one, and 10 th by one.
Pashto	5	Ranked 3 rd by three respondents, 6 th by one, and 9 th by one.
Persian	10	Listed 10 times overall by six respondents, including references to Persian, Dari, and Farsi. Ranked 2 nd by one respondent and 3 rd by one. Referenced twice by four respondents, as follows: Dari 2 nd and Farsi 4 th , one respondent; Dari 4 th and Farsi 5 th , one respondent; Farsi 4 th and Dari 10 th , one respondent; Persian Dari 7 th and Persian Farsi 8 th , one respondent.
Russian	7	Two respondents ranked it first, one ranked it 3 rd , one ranked it 5 th , one ranked it 6 th , one ranked it 9 th , and one ranked it 18 th .
Urdu	5	Ranked 7 th by one respondent, 8 th by two, 10 th by one, and 12 th by one.

*Data do not include responses from nonmilitary intelligence agencies.

1.b. English Language Skills

Respondents indicated which communication skills in English were most important for nonnative-English-speaking personnel in that agency. Table 2 summarizes the responses.

Table 2. English Communication Skills Required by Agencies

SKILL	TIMES MARKED MOST IMPORTANT
Listening	2
Speaking	2
Reading	1
Writing	0
All skills	8

Respondents also rated the English language listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills of nonnative-English-speaking personnel. Three respondents indicated that all personnel were able to understand and respond appropriately to spoken and written English and communicate effectively in speaking and writing, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium. Two respondents provided no responses. Each of the remaining six respondents indicated that nonnative speakers were less proficient in writing than in listening and speaking. Responses are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. English Communication Skills of Current Nonnative-English-Speaking Personnel

SKILL	# CHECKS	RESPONSE
Listening	5	Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble understanding spoken English, but are able to ask questions to get clarification.
	1	Nonnative speakers often have difficulty understanding spoken English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
Speaking	5	Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble communicating in spoken English, but are able to clarify their meaning by repeating or rephrasing.
	1	Nonnative speakers often have difficulty communicating in spoken English; others often have difficulty understanding them.
Reading	3	Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble understanding written English, but are able to use resources to get clarification.
	2	Nonnative speakers often have difficulty understanding written English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
	1	Nonnative speakers do not need to understand written English to do their work.
Writing	4	Nonnative speakers often have difficulty communicating in written English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
	2	Nonnative speakers are not able to communicate in written English.

See Appendix 3 for a full listing of response options and frequency of selection.

Respondents indicated the activities and roles that nonnative-English-speaking personnel need to be able to perform. They placed the heaviest emphasis on translation and interpretation, formal and informal speaking, nontechnical reading, and report writing. A number of respondents also

referred to the need for understanding of military terminology and procedures. Tables 4 and 5 summarize the responses.

Table 4. Activities Required of Nonnative-English-Speaking Personnel

ACTIVITY	# CHECKS	COMMENTS
Correspondence	5	
Data/information analysis and synthesis	3	
Formal presentations	7	
Informal conversation	8	
Interpretation	8	
Interrogation	1	
Negotiation	1	
Reading newspapers, magazines, Web sites and Weblogs	7	
Report writing	6	
Technical/scientific reading	5	
Translation	8	
Other	1	write internal resume and performance plan

Table 5. Roles Required of Nonnative-English-Speaking Personnel

ROLE	# CHECKS	COMMENTS
Analyst	5	
Area specialist	6	
Attaché	0	
Content specialist	2	
Diplomat	0	
Interpreter	9	
Interrogator	3	
Negotiator	1	
Translator	8	
Other	3	language instructors (2); mil to mil liaison officers, unconventional warfare, civil affairs operations, psychological operations, direct action information officers, foreign internal defense, special reconnaissance, counterterrorism, counterproliferation of WMD, intelligence

Respondents also indicated which disciplinary or professional specializations were needed by nonnative-English-speaking personnel in the agency. As Table 6 demonstrates, responses varied widely but tended to emphasize content areas rather than professional specializations.

Table 6. Disciplines and Professional Specializations Needed by Nonnative-English-Speaking Personnel

DISCIPLINE/SPECIALIZATION	# CHECKS	COMMENTS
Agriculture and veterinary sciences	1	
Business/economics/trade	3	
Computer and information systems	4	
Engineering	3	
Humanities (history, literature, etc.)	3	
Law/legal services	1	
Medicine/medical research	0	
Public policy and urban planning	0	
Science (biology, chemistry, etc.)	4	
Social science (education, sociology, international affairs)	4	
No particular specialization necessary	0	
Other	7	military operations (2); foreign language instruction, interpretation, and translation; WMD (2); military and civil affairs; special ops operators; understanding of military terminology

Finally, respondents described the greatest issues their agency had experienced with the English language skills of nonnative-English-speaking personnel. Their responses were as follows:

- The complexities of joint military terms, acronyms, and concepts.
- Having appropriate security clearances.
- Nonnative-English-speaking personnel provided by foreign governments vary widely in capabilities. Improvements are needed in public speaking skills, writing, understanding English reports and processing that information for use in other products.
- For nonnative speakers of English, writing is usually their greatest weakness and may indirectly have an impact on career development as well as job performance.
- No major issues. Most personnel have Master's degree and English language skills are not an issue.
- They tend to have poor writing abilities.
- Due to the fact that our personnel are hired to perform language-specific functions that require a high level of proficiency in all areas, we have not experienced the kinds of problems that would be common under other circumstances.
- They require English language training in order to work effectively.
- Heritage speakers find it difficult to pass the Defense Language Proficiency Test (DLPT) with scores sufficiently high to qualify for Foreign Language Proficiency Pay since the DLPT was crafted for native American English speakers.
- Ability to write in English.

A number of these comments focus on the weak writing skills of nonnative-English-speaking personnel, and the activities marked most often in Table 4 include report writing. This information suggests that the EHLS program should emphasize the development of participants'

English writing proficiency. However, as Table 2 shows, respondents also indicated that writing was not a higher priority than listening, speaking, or reading. The explanation for this apparent contradiction may in part be that nonnative speakers of English are not assigned tasks that involve writing because their writing skills are weak, but they would be assigned such tasks if their writing skills were stronger.

1.c. Skills in Critical Languages

Respondents were asked to describe the language skills needed in the critical languages they had indicated. Four respondents provided no answers in this section. The remaining respondents provided answers for all languages as a group, rather than language by language, because the same responses were appropriate for all.

Respondents indicated which of the communication skills in the critical language were most important for personnel in their agency. Their responses are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7. Importance of Communication Skills in Critical Languages

SKILL	TIMES MARKED MOST IMPORTANT
Listening	4
Speaking	4
Reading	3
Writing	1
All skills	2

Respondents also characterized the critical language skills of personnel in their agencies who were heritage speakers of those languages. Three respondents indicated that “all native speakers have the language skills they need,” and four indicated that “some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas.”

Respondents listed the main types of activities carried out in their agencies. Their responses were the following:

- Unconventional warfare, civil affairs operations, psychological operations, direct action information officers, foreign internal defense, special reconnaissance, counterterrorism, counterproliferation of WMD, intelligence
- Live consecutive interpretation in a variety of situations in a hostile environment; translation of a wide variety of documents into English
- Russian: Mainly interpretation and language instruction, but also written translation
- Ukrainian and Azerbaijani: interpretation and translation
- HUMINT collectors must be able to listen and understand and speak well enough to elicit information. Analysts must be able to listen and read with full comprehension. Translators must be able to read and understand.
- Listening to and transcribing foreign language material and reporting on it in English; reading and translating foreign language material and reporting on it in English

- Intelligence analysis; data interpretation; listen to news sources; read news sources; read and translate source material
- Language instruction; interpretation and translation to and from English

Some respondents also provided additional comments:

- The mission doesn't really change with each different target language. But each job skill has a different set of requirements. Collection involves listening and speaking; analytical work mostly involves reading and understanding. Either way, the linguist must be able to write a report in English that effectively conveys the information.
- Heritage speakers usually have sufficient colloquial speaking skills in the language, but may have insufficient reading and writing skills.
- Taking heritage speakers to Level 3² in English and above will be problematic in that education levels will have to be taken into account.

2. Heritage Language Communities in the United States

- ❖ CAL consulted heritage language experts in Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Persian, and Russian
- ❖ The program will need to recruit heritage speakers who were educated at least through high school, and probably through college, in the heritage language
- ❖ A high proportion of heritage speakers who immigrated to the United States as adults have completed education at the postsecondary level and have professional-level heritage language skills
- ❖ The EHLS program would be of interest to heritage speakers who are U.S. citizens, particularly if it were presented as an opportunity for professional development

In order to determine where and how to find heritage speakers of the critical languages identified by the agencies, CAL consulted with professionals who have connections to heritage language communities in the United States. These heritage language experts commented on the educational backgrounds and heritage language skills of both those who had immigrated to the United States and those who had grown up in this country, as well as on heritage speakers' potential interest in the EHLS program.

² This refers to the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) scale. The ILR coordinates language instruction among U.S. government agencies. Its language proficiency scale describes what a person is able to do with language on a scale from 0 ("no proficiency") to 5 ("functionally native proficiency"). Listening, speaking, reading, writing, and translation are rated on separate scales. Level 2 is considered "general working proficiency," and Level 3 is considered "general professional proficiency."

All of the heritage language experts agreed on three main points:

- In order to find participants with the requisite proficiency levels in the heritage languages, the EHLS program will need to recruit heritage speakers who were educated at least through high school, and probably through college, in the heritage language. Heritage speakers who were born in the United States or who came to the United States as children will not have professional-level proficiency in the heritage language.
- A high proportion of heritage speakers who immigrated to the United States as adults have completed education at the postsecondary level and have professional-level heritage language skills.
- The EHLS program would be of interest to heritage speakers who are U.S. citizens, particularly if it were presented as an opportunity for professional development.

See Appendix 4 for a full list of the questions distributed to the heritage language experts.

2.a. Arabic

In addition to the community in Dearborn, MI, which is the largest, significant communities of Arabic speakers can be found throughout the country. Noted locations include Los Angeles, Chicago, New York City, San Diego, and several cities in Ohio.

The educational background of heritage speakers of Arabic who have immigrated to the United States varies, but over half are highly educated. Many are doctors, engineers, and computer specialists. The majority of those with university degrees have professional proficiency in Modern Standard Arabic (MSA). Their English language skills vary widely depending on their schooling.

Heritage speakers of Arabic who grew up in the United States have very low levels of Arabic as a general rule. Their Arabic is dialectal and they know little if any MSA.

The program would certainly be of interest to members of the community. A part-time program might be better because it would accommodate work schedules.

2.b. Chinese

Extensive Chinese communities exist in many cities throughout the United States. Communities are of two types: communities of professionals, whose residents have professional-level Chinese language proficiency, are largely middle class, and sponsor Chinese schools; and Chinatown communities, which have more diverse, working class populations. Communities of the first type can be found by locating Chinese schools. These schools are usually members of one of two associations: the National Council of Associations of Chinese Language Schools (NCACLS), whose members are primarily Taiwanese, and the Chinese School Association in the United States (CSAUS), whose members are primarily from mainland China. Since Tiananmen Square, the immigration pattern has shown more immigration from the mainland, and the latter association has been growing.

Because of U.S. immigration laws, most Chinese immigrants are professionals, and their spouses also are college graduates. They thus have professional-level proficiency in Chinese. Their English often has plateaued at the functional level they need to carry out their work responsibilities. Heritage speakers who have grown up in the United States have more limited Chinese language skills. Their use of Chinese is limited to certain domains of language use and certain registers.

This program would be of interest to members of the community if presented as a professional development opportunity. Cultural pride would be a significant factor to consider; heritage speakers of Chinese would need to know that they were able to honor their culture while participating in the program. Economic incentives alone would not be sufficient to induce them to participate.

2.c. Korean

According to the U.S. Census, the top ten states with Koreans are California, New York, New Jersey, Illinois, Washington, Texas, Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Georgia. Koreans in the United States are generally well educated because the majority of the immigrants who have arrived since the passage of the Immigration and Naturalization Act were educated, college-trained professionals from the urban class of Korean society. According to the 1990 Census, 55 percent of Korean Americans 25 years of age or over have had some college education and 80 percent have had at least a high school education: this compares with 45 and 75 percent respectively of all U.S. citizens in the same age category.

Despite their relatively high levels of education, many Korean-born immigrants have a weak command of the English language and so have difficulty finding jobs that match their education and professional training. For professional-level Korean language skills, the program would probably have to recruit first generation Korean immigrants. The vast majority of the Korean speakers who have been raised in the United States do not have adequate professional-level Korean language skills to do the kind of work the U.S. government needs; they would also have to be trained in advanced Korean.

This program would be of interest to many first generation, well-educated immigrants. A full-time program would have to compensate the individuals for pay lost by giving up their regular jobs.

2.d. Persian

The Persian-speaking community in the United States is very large in California and Texas. Persians also reside in significant numbers in many other states, including Virginia, Florida, and Illinois.

Persians who migrated to the United States before the Islamic revolution usually came from upper and middle class families that were able to support them. Most came to pursue their education, remained here, and helped bring their immediate and extended families to the United States. Many immigrant Persians became involved in building successful businesses and

establishing distinguished careers, especially as doctors and engineers, the two favorite professions of the culture. There is also a significant number of college professors of Persian origin.

The socioeconomic status of the Persian immigrants who migrated after the Islamic revolution is affected by different factors such as the extent of the support they receive from relatives and friends in the United States and from religious groups to which they belong. Persian minority religious groups value education highly and strive to take advantage of the opportunities for success in the United States.

The English language skills of Persians in the United States vary depending on educational level, profession, age, extent of stay in the United States, and the concentration of Persians in the community in which they live (in some areas in California, for instance, the immigrants need the Persian language to survive). Young Persian immigrants who do not speak any English when they move to the United States are generally able to communicate with near native proficiency within a few years. For older adults, the drive to better their living circumstances (home and appearances are generally important to Persians) often leads them to learn enough English to at least get a job.

Persians in general are very proud of their language. Most of those who currently live in the United States are literate. (They migrated for educational, political, or religious reasons). The level of the Persian language skills of the second generation, especially youth, depends to some degree on the community where they live and their involvement in that community. Generally speaking, Persians try to teach the language to their children, especially if both parents are Persian. In many cases children of Persian heritage can speak the language but can not read and write it. On the other hand, older parents who have come to the United States to join their children and who do not work or become involved in community activities outside the family and local Persian community rarely learn English.

2.e. Russian

The largest Russian-speaking communities in the United States are in New York City, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Washington DC/Baltimore, San Francisco, and Seattle. The educational background overall is very high; outside of New York, a high percentage have postsecondary education, and many have the equivalent of a master's degree or higher. Most thus have strong professional language proficiency in Russian.

The English language skills of this population are also strong. Rich Robin states, All Russian immigrants I have ever met (who were not retired) feel strongly that having come to the U.S., they are duty bound to learn English well. As a rule, Russians are big "U.S. English" supporters. They look down on immigrant populations who insist on other-language government services (ballots or driver's tests in foreign languages). Furthermore, Russians come from a historical culture where FL learning is revered to an extent unimaginable in this country. (This dates back several centuries.)

The Russian language proficiency of heritage speakers who grew up in the United States varies widely. However, many heritage Russian speakers who are now in college have advanced-level skills and could move to the superior level with appropriate Russian language training.

This program would probably be of most interest to younger arrivals (those in their 20s and 30s). The program will need to address cultural as well as linguistic issues, particularly the expectations and operating styles that characterize the American workplace.

2.f. Additional Data

CAL surveyed the information presented on the Modern Language Association's Language Map (available at www.mla.org) to identify areas with high densities of heritage-language-speaking populations. The purpose was to identify areas in which populations of speakers of Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, Korean, Persian, and Russian were all relatively high. The survey showed, not surprisingly, that the areas that met the stated criteria were New York City and Washington-Baltimore in the east, Chicago and Houston midcountry, and Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle in the west.

CAL also examined data from the 2000 U.S. Census on immigrant populations from countries where critical languages are spoken. The Census Bureau provides this data on a country basis rather than a language basis, so it does not correlate directly with the needs of this study. However, it does provide some relevant information regarding language use and language skill levels. The information is summarized in Tables 8, 9, and 10; see Appendix 5 for a complete data set.

Table 8. Citizenship and Education of Foreign-Born Populations in the United States (U.S. Census 2000)

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN	POPULATION			EDUCATION			
	TOTAL #	U.S. CITIZEN		BACHELOR'S		GRADUATE	
		#	%	#	%	#	%
Egypt	113,395	66,970	59	34,720	31	22,985	20
Iraq	88,890	45,600	51	10,745	12	6,935	8
Jordan	46,795	28,125	60	8,370	18	4,460	10
Lebanon	105,910	71,685	68	18,435	17	15,435	15
Syria	54,560	32,335	59	7,575	14	7,940	15
All Arabic-speaking*	493,215	273,020	55	94,975	19	67,080	14
China + Taiwan	1,518,650	788,910	52	278,425	18	329,965	22
Iran	283,225	171,880	61	67,305	24	60,320	21
Korea	864,125	447,170	52	193,635	22	94,965	11
Russia/USSR/FSU	1,216,320	556,250	46	886,885	73	218,450	18

* Includes Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria

Table 9. Language Self-Evaluation of Foreign-Born Populations in the United States (U.S. Census 2000; Population Aged 5 and Older)

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN	TOTAL IN U.S.**	USE LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH		SPEAK ENGLISH LESS THAN VERY WELL	
		#	%	#	%
Egypt	113,395	98,610	87	37,920	33
Iraq	88,890	83,595	94	44,610	50
Jordan	46,795	42,630	91	15,750	34
Lebanon	105,910	95,720	90	34,170	32
Syria	54,560	50,735	93	24,950	46
All Arabic-speaking*	493,215	441,905	90	183,810	37
China + Taiwan	1,518,650	1,410,275	93	929,800	61
Iran	283,225	260,260	92	112,230	40
Korea	864,125	718,855	83	492,400	57
Russia/USSR/FSU	1,216,320	1,086,805	89	666,875	55

* Includes Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria

** All ages

Table 10. Employment of Foreign-Born Populations in the United States (U.S. Census 2000; Population Aged 16 and Older)

COUNTRY OF ORIGIN	TOTAL IN U.S.**	PRIVATE SECTOR		GOVERNMENT SECTOR		SELF-EMPLOYED		NOT EMPLOYED	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Egypt	113,395	49,600	44	9,030	8	4,960	4	37,240	33
Iraq	88,890	37,320	42	3,315	4	3,685	4	33,560	38
Jordan	46,795	19,810	42	2,400	5	3,455	7	16,400	35
Lebanon	105,910	47,565	45	5,115	5	6,105	6	39,680	37
Syria	54,560	21,175	39	1,965	4	3,755	7	23,130	42
All Arabic-speaking*	493,215	208,640	42	25,710	5	24,520	5	179,225	36
China + Taiwan	1,518,650	688,515	45	99,950	7	47,695	3	548,965	36
Iran	283,225	127,510	45	17,440	6	19,135	7	101,010	36
Korea	864,125	330,475	38	39,225	5	66,360	8	309,830	36
Russia/USSR/FSU	1,216,320	432,780	36	51,770	4	34,790	3	476,445	39

* Includes Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Saudi Arabia, Syria

** All ages

3. English Language Learning at Advanced Levels

- ❖ English language learning for adults at high proficiency levels is not well researched with regard to either pedagogy or assessment
- ❖ Language instruction for learners at advanced levels needs to focus on vocabulary development, sociolinguistic considerations, and fossilized language errors
- ❖ Development of metalinguistic knowledge and explicit instruction on language learning strategies enables learners at advanced levels to become more linguistically sophisticated and thus to succeed as language learners
- ❖ Small cohorts of 10 participants from the same language background enable instruction to address individual needs and specific cross-language issues
- ❖ An intensive program of 720 hours of instruction can promote advancement from an ILR level 2 to an ILR level 3
- ❖ A curriculum that is built around professional-type activities and authentic workplace materials and includes a strong technology component can help learners develop both relevant language skills and awareness of the culture of the workplace

The knowledge base on language learning at advanced levels of proficiency is not robust. Therefore, CAL consulted with experts in postsecondary and adult English as a second language instruction regarding effective program structure, instructional approach(es), and overall curriculum and support for advanced-level English language learners. Two ESL experts (Crandall and Meloni) served as key advisors to the study. In addition, individual and group consultations took place in the Washington area and at the annual Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages conference.

These ESL experts responded to a series of questions about intensive versus nonintensive program types, issues in teaching listening/speaking and reading/writing at advanced levels, effective instructional materials, uses of technology, and uses of extracurricular activities such as tutorials and guest lectures. The experts were remarkably consistent in their observations and recommendations in these areas. In addition, their observations and suggestions agreed with those provided by the heritage language experts.

All of the ESL experts agreed that a fundamental issue for design of the program is that, because English language learning for adults at high proficiency levels is not well researched with regard to either pedagogy or assessment, program planning would need to rely on expertise in the field and formative evaluation of the program would be essential.

3.a. Participant Needs and Class Makeup

The ESL experts concurred with the observation of the heritage language experts that the likely candidates for the program would be immigrants with some degree of higher education in the heritage language. Accordingly, they recognized three areas that the program would need to address:

1. **Language:** Participants will have a fair grasp of English syntax and grammar, but will need to work on acquiring vocabulary (especially nuances of meaning) and developing sensitivity to shifts in register and other sociolinguistic considerations. Special attention will need to be given to fossilized language errors.
2. **Learning:** The program will need to develop participants' metalinguistic knowledge to enable them to recognize similarities and differences between their heritage languages and English (contrastive analysis). Development of metalinguistic knowledge and explicit instruction on language learning strategies will enable participants to become more linguistically sophisticated and thus to become successful language learners. It will also enable them to continue improving their language skills after completing the program to meet their professional needs.
3. **Culture:** The program will need to broaden participants' understanding of the expectations of the American workplace and help them recognize how those expectations differ from workplace expectations in their native countries. It will also need to help them understand the ways in which culture influences perception and thus can affect translation and interpretation.

The ESL experts were concerned that participant motivation would be high at the outset but diminish over time. In order to maintain motivation, they suggested implementing a mentoring program that would pair each participant with a working professional who could serve as a communication partner and advisor.

With respect to class size, the ESL experts recommended that class groups consist of approximately 20 participants drawn from the same language background. They recommended starting with 20 to allow for attrition. However, after further consideration and recognition that the program would include individual support in the form of mentoring, this number was reduced to 10 to 15. Class groups might include both NSEP scholarship recipients and non-scholarship participants recruited by the partner institutions of higher education. The ESL experts recommended drawing the initial participant cohorts from the same language background rather than mixed backgrounds because they felt this would allow the program to focus on a more limited range of learning needs while it is in the initial development stages.

3.b. Program Structure

Given the scenario that heritage language speakers would enter the EHLS program at a 2 or 2+ level on the Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) scale³ in English listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and would be expected to achieve a level 3 across all four modalities, the ESL experts did not agree on the number of hours that would be required for the program. They noted that the number of hours of instruction needed would depend on participants' heritage languages, educational backgrounds, and motivation. CAL's research on the use of the ILR scale

³ The Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) coordinates language instruction among U.S. government agencies. Its language proficiency scale describes what a person is able to do with language on a scale from 0 ("no proficiency") to 5 ("functionally native proficiency"). Listening, speaking, reading, writing, and translation are rated on separate scales. Level 2 is considered "general working proficiency," and Level 3 is considered "general professional proficiency."

across languages indicates that advancement by a whole level (for example, from level 2 to level 3) by an adult language learner requires an average of 720 hours of instruction (24 weeks at 30 hours per week)(see A. Omaggio Hadley, *Teaching Language in Context* [3rd ed.; Heinle & Heinle, 2001], pp. 21-27).

The ESL experts did agree that the program would need to be an intensive one in order to accomplish its goals. They noted that intensive reading and writing instruction, in particular, would be essential. An intensive program would allow learning to build on itself, whereas a nonintensive program would not provide the necessary level of reinforcement. The group cohesion that participants would experience in an intensive program would promote a positive learning environment. The experts also pointed out that the program would need to balance class time with extracurricular and individual work, to avoid learner burnout resulting from class time overload.

3.c. Instruction and Materials

The responses from federal agencies summarized in section 1.b. above indicate that instruction will need to focus on listening and speaking skills for both formal and informal purposes, reading of a variety of types of material, and writing. Development of vocabulary relevant to participants' professional goals and interests will also be essential. Activities will need to promote skill development in translation, interpretation, presentation making, and report writing as appropriate to GS 9-12 level jobs.

These observations were confirmed by presenters from federal agencies at the Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics (GURT, March 10-12, 2005). In addressing the conference theme, "Educating for Advanced Foreign Language Capacities," these presenters discussed the types of language training needed to produce effective interpreters, translators, and area specialists. They noted the following key points about the job requirements in their agencies:

- The jobs require an ILR level 3 or higher proficiency level across modalities.
- The jobs require three types of competence: linguistic/cultural, topic/domain, and research/analysis (that is, the ability to use language as a tool).
- The jobs require multidimensional language skills. People need to be able to identify the purpose for listening/speaking/reading/writing and adapt their strategies accordingly. They need to be able to combine skills so that they can provide a spoken or written synopsis, summary, or analysis in English after reading or listening to material in their first language.
- The jobs require a sophisticated understanding of interpretation and translation and an awareness of register. People need to be able to provide translation and interpretation that is accurate (grammatically and semantically), congruent (socioculturally and stylistically), and rapid. They must understand that oral transcribing and translation involve writing what is said rather than writing what one hears. They must have heuristic skills so that they can summarize and convey the gist.

The ESL experts agreed that instruction would need to use work-related content as the basis for a variety of learning activities: reading about a topic, listening to a presentation on it, talking about it, following up with research on the Internet, and writing about it. They stated that an intensive focus on writing would be essential, given their observations of the needs of advanced-level adult learners. They also noted that, since participants' job placements would not be known when they entered the program, instruction should include guidance on how to assess the needs of the workplace and continue to develop language skills accordingly.

Materials used in the program should be drawn from relevant professional contexts. They should include readings that present alternative viewpoints on a single topic and readings that embed different presuppositions in order to help participants develop the ability to recognize underlying assumptions and distinguish fact from opinion. They should also include models from different genres with analysis of the characteristic features of each genre or type.

The ESL experts emphasized the importance of using technology as a pivotal element of instruction. They noted that Internet-mediated activities such as chats, email, and Web-based learning would enable the program to give participants the hours of exposure necessary to reinforce their language skill development while creating and supporting individualized learning paths.

Both the ESL experts and the heritage language experts noted that, at advanced levels, adult language learners tend to have highly individualized plateauing, fossilization, and learning gap issues. They stressed the importance of using tutorials and individual learning plans to target instruction to individual needs and goals.

4. Assessment

- ❖ Assessment of language proficiency at entry and exit needs to be aligned with the ILR scale in order to ensure that program expectations are met
- ❖ Language proficiency in both English and the heritage language must be assessed at program entry
- ❖ Most commercially available tests of English language proficiency are not aligned with the ILR scale
- ❖ Diagnostic testing of English language skills at the beginning of the program will enable program participants and their instructors to develop individual learning plans, and formative assessment will enable participants to track their progress
- ❖ Partner institutions of higher education will likely have formative assessment instruments and procedures that can be adapted for use in the EHLS program

In order to develop an understanding of language proficiency assessment needs and possibilities, CAL consulted with senior testing associate Margaret Malone and with experts in English as a

second language instruction for adult learners at advanced levels of proficiency, and conducted Internet-based research on assessments currently in use in the public and private sectors. The background for the discussions and research was the need to assess language proficiency in relation to the ILR proficiency level descriptors. CAL needed to address four questions:

- How should the program assess heritage language proficiency—whether potential participants have the heritage language skills they need to succeed in the target positions?
- How should the program assess English language proficiency at entry—whether potential participants have the English language skills needed to succeed in the program?
- How should the program assess English language proficiency at exit—whether potential participants have the English language skills needed to succeed in the target positions?
- How should English language skills development be assessed during the program?

4.a. Heritage Language Assessment

The EHLS program will need to assess potential participants' proficiency in their heritage languages before admitting them to ensure that they have the skills they will need to carry out their work responsibilities effectively when they finish the program. Presenters from federal agencies at the Georgetown University Roundtable on Languages and Linguistics (GURT, March 10-12, 2005) noted that the tasks that typify work in their agencies require a proficiency level of ILR 3 across listening, speaking, and reading in languages other than English.

The assessment expert, Meg Malone, suggested that the program could use a self-assessment screening instrument such as that used by the Council of Europe's Language Passport for the first step in the application process. For final selection, further assessment using an Oral Proficiency Interview or a Simulated Oral Proficiency Interview might be used. Other assessments currently in development, such as a Web-based listening and reading assessment in Arabic and Russian, might also be available. In addition, the Arabic, Chinese, and Russian flagship institutions have a range of assessments in use that might be called upon, and the EHLS program might be able to use the Defense Language Proficiency Test.

4.b. Entry and Exit Assessment

Few tests of English as a second language assess proficiency effectively at the advanced level, particularly in the professional purposes context, and few are aligned with the ILR proficiency level descriptors. To identify candidates for use as entry and exit tests, CAL reviewed several possibilities:

- New Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL): The ESL experts concurred that the new TOEFL probably would not test proficiency at high enough levels, but might be useful as an initial screening instrument. The description on the TOEFL Web site indicates that the new TOEFL tests language use in ways that are appropriate for the EHLS program because it asks examinees to use a combination of modalities (listening and then writing, for example) to complete test tasks. However,

- its content is highly academic in orientation and does not reflect the types of material that EHLS participants would encounter in work contexts.
- **Test of Spoken English:** The Test of Spoken English is a 20-minute test with nine questions to which the examinee responds. The examinee is asked to tell a story based on a six-picture sequence and answer a related question; describe a graph and answer a related question; respond to two questions about ideas; and respond to three questions by taking the part of someone in a workplace situation. The examinee uses a test book while taking the test and may take notes in the book to prepare each response. The test is administered over the telephone (new version) and scored by trained raters. Meg Malone doubts that the Test of Spoken English can test effectively at ILR level 3 because its brevity precludes elicitation of the longer speech samples that indicate ability to use level 3-type abstract language.
 - **Test of Professional English:** This test has four sections, one each for listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In each section, test takers are asked to perform tasks representative of those typically encountered in the workplace or in everyday life. These include activities such as reading and writing work documents like letters, emails, and faxes, talking about office and social activities, and listening to announcements and discussions. The listening and reading questions are multiple choice and scored by machine. For the writing section, test takers write answers to questions on the answer sheet, and for the speaking section, test takers record their spoken responses. Trained language evaluators score the written and spoken responses. This test does not include activities that require the ability to understand and use level 3-type abstract language, and so probably would not test effectively at ILR level 3.
 - **Defense Language Institute (DLI) English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT):** The Defense Language Institute has designed the ELPT, which parallels the Defense Language Proficiency Tests used for other languages. The ELPT assesses listening and reading skills at ILR levels 1 through 3. There is also a tape-mediated speaking ELPT. Only two forms of the test are available, so it is used as an end-of-course proficiency test. DLI English Language Center teams have used the listening and reading ELPTs plus an Oral Proficiency Interview and a writing assessment to test military personnel in some NATO countries. Permission is necessary for outside organizations to use the ELPT.
 - **American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Oral Proficiency Interview:** Language Testing International uses the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview to assess English speaking proficiency. Performance is rated in relation to the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, which are aligned with the ILR scale.
 - **ACTFL Business Writing Test:** Language Testing International uses the ACTFL Business Writing Test to assess functional business writing ability. An examinee's performance on specific writing tasks is compared against the ILR writing proficiency guidelines. The test consists of five requests for a written response dealing with general business situations.

The ESL experts advised that the goal of entry testing in English should be to assure that participants are entering the program at an ILR level 2 to 2+ across the four modalities. For this

purpose, the experts agreed that the Language Passport self-assessment could be used with the initial application, and confirmation of skill levels could be obtained using the DLI ELPT (if available). An alternative would be to use the new TOEFL for listening and reading, the ACTFL Oral Proficiency Interview for speaking, and the ACTFL Business Writing Test for writing. These alternatives are not really optimal, however, because the TOEFL and the Business Writing Test do not have appropriate content and the TOEFL is not aligned with the ILR scale.

For exit testing, the goal will be to assure that participants have achieved at least an ILR level 3 across the four modalities and are prepared for the kinds of work that they will be asked to do in positions with government agencies. For this assessment, the ESL experts suggested using the DLI ELPT again, in combination with an individual written evaluation provided by program instructors.

4.c. Progress Assessment

The experts agreed that diagnostic testing would need to take place upon participants' admission to the program in order to identify their strengths and needs and begin to develop their learning plans. The ESL experts emphasized the importance of formative assessment at frequent intervals to give participants feedback on their progress. They suggested that this assessment should include video recording to allow participants to see and hear themselves as others see and hear them.

The experts suggested that the universities where the pilot program will take place would likely have formative assessment instruments and procedures in place and could apply these to the EHLS program.

5. Institutions of Higher Education

Partner institutions of higher education should meet four criteria:

- ❖ They should have established intensive English programs for nonnative speakers
- ❖ They should have experience in the development and provision of courses in English for professional purposes
- ❖ They should be located in areas with established heritage communities
- ❖ They should have existing relationships with the heritage communities in their areas

Given their observations about the rarity of advanced-level English for professional purposes programs in the United States and their recommendation that the EHLS program should be an intensive one, the ESL experts agreed that the participating institutions of higher education should have two characteristics:

- They should have established intensive English programs for nonnative speakers.
- They should have experience with developing and providing courses in English for professional purposes, as evidenced by their current course offerings.

The experts concurred that the latter criterion was especially important, given that the EHLS program will require the institutions of higher education to conduct a significant amount of development of instructional activities, materials, and assessment tools.

The heritage language experts recommended that the program be located in proximity to population centers with established heritage communities. They also noted that recruiting for the program would be facilitated if the partner institutions of higher education already had established links with the heritage communities in their areas, and they suggested that the institutions might want to open the program to heritage community members who met the language proficiency criteria for entry but were not NSEP scholarship recipients. CAL has begun to identify institutions that meet the criteria outlined by the heritage language and ESL experts.

C. Information, Issues, and Recommendations

The research portion of the feasibility study enabled CAL to identify relevant information about federal agency needs, program design possibilities, and heritage language speakers and their communities. It also allowed CAL to define a number of issues that the English for Heritage Language Speakers (EHLS) program will need to address in order to be successful. This section outlines CAL's recommendations for the design of a pilot program that will build on the information gained and address the issues raised. It covers the following topic areas:

1. Participants and recruiting
2. Overall program design and structure
3. Curriculum and materials
4. Assessment
5. Selection of partner institutions of higher education and management of program

The goal of the pilot program will be to obtain a broader and deeper understanding of the factors that contribute to overall EHLS program feasibility. The two greatest challenges in pilot program implementation will be recruitment and assessment. One challenge in recruiting arises from the fact that EHLS will be the first program to offer advanced-level English language instruction to professional adult populations with superior heritage language skills, so proven recruiting methods do not exist. Another recruiting challenge lies in the fact that program participants must be U.S. citizens and must be willing to fulfill the service requirement associated with receipt of an EHLS scholarship. The challenge in assessment stems from the lack of commercially available assessment instruments that test at appropriate levels of difficulty and are aligned with the ILR scale. The goal of the program is to enable participants to advance to ILR level 3, but its degree of success in achieving that goal will be difficult to evaluate if participants cannot be tested with instruments that are aligned with the ILR scale.

1. Participants and Recruiting

- ❖ For the first year, recruit one cohort of heritage speakers of Arabic and a second cohort of heritage speakers of either Russian or Mandarin Chinese
- ❖ Select institutions of higher education that are located in cities with high concentrations of heritage language speakers and have connections with the heritage communities
- ❖ Ensure that participants' language proficiency at entry is ILR 3 or better in the heritage language and ILR 2 or 2+ in English across listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- ❖ Present the program as a professional development opportunity for participants

As reported above, the agencies that responded to the survey identified the most critical languages (in rank order) as Arabic (including dialects), Persian (Farsi and Dari), Russian, Mandarin Chinese, Pashto, Urdu, and Korean. Significant numbers of heritage speakers of these languages live in urban areas in the United States, including New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago, Seattle, Houston, and Washington, DC. High percentages of the populations of Arabic, Persian, Russian, Mandarin Chinese, and Korean have postsecondary education in the heritage language, especially if they immigrated as adults.

The work that program participants will be doing to fulfill their government service requirement requires a proficiency level of Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) 3 or above in the heritage language. At level 3 and above, the ILR scale assumes that an individual possesses a significant repertoire of higher order and critical thinking skills and the ability to apply them in the heritage language. To meet the level 3 requirement, therefore, program participants will need to have received at least some of their higher education in the heritage language.

The goal of the EHLS program is to enable participants to achieve a level of ILR 3 or better in English across all four modalities (listening, speaking, reading, and writing). The ESL experts concur that participants will need to enter the program at ILR level 2 or 2+ in English in order to achieve this goal. The ESL experts also recommend that each participant cohort be drawn from a single heritage language background in the pilot phase of the program so that instruction can address the specific language learning strengths and needs related to that language background.

1.a. Issues

A number of issues must be addressed in order to recruit participant cohorts that meet the criteria described above.

- Participants are likely to be immigrants who came to the United States as adults. Many of them will have difficulty obtaining security clearances, which will limit their ability to fulfill the federal service requirement.
- Participants must be U.S. citizens, which means that they will have to have been in the United States for at least five years. This reduces the program's ability to recruit from an otherwise likely target population, current graduate students.
- Participants will be adult professionals, some with families, who may have difficulty participating in an intensive language program of six months to one year in length.
- Funding may not allow living stipends for program participants. This may prevent some otherwise qualified candidates from participating.
- Participants will have pride in their cultures and attachment to their countries, and will not want to participate in a program or hold a job that is perceived as detrimental to those cultures and countries.

1.b. Recommendations

To address the issues outlined above and maximize the pool of potential participants while attending to the stated language needs of federal agencies, CAL recommends the following:

- The program should recruit cohorts of participants with shared heritage language backgrounds, one of heritage Arabic speakers and the other of heritage speakers of either Mandarin Chinese or Russian.
- CAL should select partner institutions of higher education that are located in areas with high concentrations of heritage language speakers to enable participants to live at home while attending the program.
- The participant selection process should screen participants for both English and heritage language skills to ensure that they meet the criteria of an ILR level 2 in English and an ILR level 3 in the heritage language.
- The program should be presented as a professional development opportunity that will enable potential participants to succeed in higher level positions in the public or the private sector after they complete their service requirement.

2. Overall Program Design/Structure

- ❖ Select and work with partner institutions of higher education with expertise in English for professional purposes
- ❖ Ask partner institutions of higher education to draw on their expertise to design an intensive program that uses a variety of instructional techniques and media and develops linguistic, metalinguistic, and cultural competence
- ❖ Develop a cadre of current federal personnel who will serve as individual mentors for participants

The ESL experts outlined a number of key factors that would contribute to the quality of the program. They concurred that an intensive program would be more effective than a nonintensive one at promoting and reinforcing development of English language proficiency. They noted that, in addition to improving their language skills, program participants would benefit from participating in content courses in topic areas of interest and relevance to them, and that they would need to develop their knowledge of U.S. culture in general and the culture of the workplace in particular in order to succeed in their work after graduation. Finally, they pointed out that language learning is most successful when it is reinforced through a variety of activities that encourage learners to use the language in authentic communication situations.

CAL's research on language acquisition and language instruction at advanced levels revealed a lack of consensus on the specific programmatic factors that enable a language learner to progress from the equivalent of ILR level 2 to the equivalent of ILR level 3. However, study of the use of the ILR scale across languages indicates that advancement by a whole level (for example, from level 2 to level 3) by an adult language learner requires an average of 720 hours of instruction (24 weeks at 30 hours per week). In addition, CAL's research also found that many institutions of higher education, particularly those with intensive English programs, provide English for

professional purposes courses and programs, both as part of their regular program offerings and as contract programs.

2.a. Issues

The heritage language experts and the ESL experts raised three key challenges that the program would need to address.

- Participants will find an intensive language program stressful, especially if they have not previously been exposed to the expectations and requirements of higher education in the United States.
- Language learners at higher levels of proficiency have highly individual strengths and learning needs.
- Little research has been done in English for professional purposes at advanced (equivalent to ILR 2+ and beyond) levels of English proficiency.

2.b. Recommendations

To address the issues outlined above and maximize the program's likelihood of achieving the goal of bringing participants to an ILR level 3 across listening, speaking, reading, and writing, CAL recommends the following:

- CAL should select as its partners institutions of higher education that have intensive English programs with expertise in the development and provision of programs and courses in English for professional purposes, preferably at higher levels of proficiency.
- CAL should give the partner institutions general guidelines with regard to program length (24 weeks) and total contact hours (720) and let them propose a program structure that will address participants' need for reinforcement of language learning and individual tailoring of instruction by combining classroom work, language-supported content courses, individual and/or small-group tutorials, technology-based activities, and extracurricular activities.
- CAL should ask the partner institutions to describe their plans for including instruction in language learning strategies that can help participants succeed in the program and continue their language skill development after they graduate.
- CAL should ask the partner institutions to describe how they will provide advising for participants to help them stay with the program and understand what is expected of students in university-level classrooms in the United States.
- CAL and NSEP should work together to develop a cadre of current federal agency personnel who will serve as individual mentors to program participants and acquaint them with the culture of the U.S. workplace.

3. Curriculum and Materials

- ❖ Select partner institutions of higher education with expertise in the development of English for professional purposes curricula
- ❖ Combine task-based learning with broader skills development to promote alignment with the ILR level descriptors
- ❖ Build the curriculum around materials and tasks obtained from federal agencies and facilitate communication between curriculum developers and federal agency representatives

The EHLS program must have a workplace focus in order to enable participants to develop the skills they will need to carry out work-related tasks and activities. Curriculum development must therefore be done from an English-for-professional-purposes standpoint. This differs from an English-for-academic-purposes approach in that it identifies the functions and materials that characterize the workplace and builds instruction around those. In addition, the ESL experts and the heritage language experts noted that the curriculum would need to introduce participants to the culture and expectations of the U.S. workplace and introduce strategies for success on the job.

The curriculum will also need to be aligned with the descriptors for ILR levels 2, 2+, and 3. These descriptors articulate what a language speaker is able to do with the language in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, and they specifically reference cross-modality combinations such as reading about a topic and then speaking about it, a function that is professionally important.

Finally, as the ESL experts noted, the curriculum will need to include explicit reference to language learning strategies and contrastive analysis to give participants the metalinguistic awareness they need to succeed in the program and to continue to develop their English language skills after graduation.

3.a. Issues

In discussing curriculum development, the ESL experts noted two major issues.

- Little research or expertise currently exists in English for professional purposes at the advanced (ILR 2 to 2+) and superior (ILR 3 and beyond) levels, either with respect to curriculum format and content or with respect to time on task inside and outside of class.
- Little research or expertise currently exists with respect to aligning an advanced level English for professional purposes curriculum with the ILR descriptors.

3.b. Recommendations

To address the issues outlined above and maximize the program's likelihood of achieving the goal of bringing participants to an ILR level 3 across listening, speaking, reading, and writing, CAL recommends the following:

- The program should be based at institutions of higher education that have experience in the provision of instruction in English for professional purposes. Such institutions will have a knowledge base on which to build in developing and implementing a curriculum that is aligned with the ILR level descriptors.
- The curriculum should incorporate task-based learning, but should also take a more general approach in order to align with the ILR level descriptors and give participants the breadth of exposure they will need to deal with the variety of materials they will encounter in their jobs.
- CAL and NSEP should obtain sample materials and tasks from federal agencies and disseminate them to the participating institutions of higher education, and should facilitate communication between the institutions and agency representatives to ensure that the program curriculum uses authentic workplace situations and activities.

4. Assessment

- ❖ Assess English language proficiency at admission and exit using assessment instruments aligned with the ILR scale
- ❖ Assess heritage language proficiency at admission using assessment instruments aligned with the ILR scale
- ❖ Conduct diagnostic testing of English skills at the beginning of the program to enable development of individual learning plans
- ❖ Conduct formative assessment, including portfolio assessment, throughout the program to provide ongoing feedback to participants and enable CAL to evaluate the program

Assessment will need to involve entry and exit proficiency testing, diagnostic testing when participants begin the program, and formative assessment while the program is in progress. Assessments must rate applicants/participants in relation to the ILR proficiency scale. The cut point for heritage language proficiency at entry must be an ILR level 3 across listening, speaking, and reading; the heritage language experts agreed that substantial percentages of heritage language speakers have higher education in the heritage language and therefore would be able to meet this criterion.

The ESL experts concurred that the cut point for English proficiency at entry would need to be an ILR level 2 across listening, speaking, reading, and writing in order for participants to be able

to achieve an ILR level 3 across all four modalities at program exit. The ESL experts also noted that language learners at higher levels have individual strengths and needs, and that those individual characteristics would need to be identified and appropriate learning plans developed through participant assessment. Finally, the experts agreed that participants' English language proficiency would need to be assessed at program exit to determine whether they had achieved an ILR level 3 in English in listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

4.a. Issues

The major issues identified by CAL and the ESL experts all focus on the lack of appropriate assessment instruments.

- Commercially available assessments that test proficiency in English for professional purposes do not extend to the advanced level, and commercially available assessments that extend to advanced levels (such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language and its associated speaking and writing tests) focus solely on academic English.
- Two commercially available ESL assessments (the Oral Proficiency Interview and the Business Writing Test, both from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages) are scored in a way that correlates with the ILR proficiency level descriptors. However, the content of the Business Writing Test is business-oriented and thus covers only part of the range of potential speaking and writing communication situations.
- The Defense Language Institute (DLI) English Language Proficiency Test (ELPT) tests English for professional purposes and tests at the target levels, but is not commercially available.

4.b. Recommendations

In order to conduct assessment that will enable CAL to admit program participants who have a high likelihood of succeeding, and in order to evaluate the EHLS program to determine whether and to what extent it is achieving its goals, CAL recommends the following:

- Potential participants' English language proficiency should be assessed when they apply to the program. CAL and NSEP should explore the possibility of using the DLI ELPT, the only existing assessment instrument that is appropriate in content and aligned with the ILR scale.
- Potential participants' heritage language proficiency should be assessed when they apply to the program. CAL and NSEP should work with the Defense Language Institute and with institutions participating in the National Flagship Language Initiative for Arabic, Chinese, and Russian to identify effective ways of assessing potential participants' proficiency in their heritage languages in relation to the ILR scale.
- CAL and the institutions of higher education should work together to develop diagnostic assessments based on the institutions' existing assessment instruments and procedures. The diagnostic assessments would be administered to program participants at entry and would provide the basis for development of individual learning plans.
- CAL and its partner institutions of higher education should work together to develop formative assessment mechanisms based on the institutions' existing formative

assessments. The formative assessment mechanisms should include portfolio assessment, which can be used with any type of program content at any level and which provides a measure of what learners know and are able to do that can be compared with the skills and abilities focus of the ILR level descriptors.

- CAL should assess program participants' English language skills at program exit using the same assessment instruments used for program admission, plus a written narrative evaluation provided by the staff of the institution of higher education.

5. Selection of Institutions of Higher Education and Management of Program

- ❖ The program must take place at institutions of higher education
- ❖ Institutions of higher education that have intensive English programs in place will be able to draw on existing resources to develop and provide the program
- ❖ Selection criteria should include location and connections with heritage language communities
- ❖ The budget for the pilot program will allow for the selection of two institutions of higher education
- ❖ CAL will need to collaborate closely with the partner institutions in program development and evaluation; program management will need to balance guidance from CAL with partner institutions' autonomy
- ❖ A program advisory board will provide valuable advice throughout the formative evaluation process

The authorizing legislation requires that the program take place at institutions of higher education. The ESL advisors suggested that CAL select institutions that have intensive English programs already in place and therefore have the resources to develop and implement a quality pilot program in a fairly short period of time. The advisors also suggested that CAL select partner institutions that are located in urban areas with significant populations of heritage language speakers and that have established connections with those heritage communities. This will facilitate participant recruitment.

Until CAL selects the partner institutions of higher education, the dollar amount required for each participant's scholarship will not be known. However, it appears likely that the total amount budgeted for the pilot program will support the provision of scholarships for a maximum of 20 participants each year, that is, 10 scholars at each of two institutions of higher education. CAL will encourage the institutions to demonstrate ways of controlling costs so that more participants can be served.

5.a. Issues

The ESL experts raised one main issue with respect to program management. They observed that the ability of the institutions of higher education to develop the program in ways that they see fit, building on their existing strengths and resources, would need to be balanced with CAL's provision of guidance and direction. The experts agreed that an effective way to address this issue would be to approach the pilot as a partnership in which CAL and the institutions collaborate in evaluating the factors that make this previously untested type of program successful.

5.b. Recommendations

In order to select institutions of higher education that will be effective partners in the development and piloting of the EHLS program, CAL recommends the following:

- CAL should investigate potential partner institutions in several metropolitan areas, with the intention of selecting two institutions as partners for the first year of the pilot program.
- CAL should plan to conduct site visits and joint meetings to promote collaborative development of program format, curriculum, assessment procedures, and program evaluation plans.
- CAL should continue its research on application and admission procedures for program participants to determine how best to approach these.
- CAL should form a program advisory board composed of government agency representatives, heritage language experts, ESL experts, and assessment experts. The function of the advisory board will be to provide feedback and suggestions for adjustments to the program as the results of formative evaluation are gathered.

D. Proposed Pilot Program

CAL proposes to initiate the EHLS program with two institutions of higher education in the first pilot year (July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006). CAL will select the institutions on the basis of their connections with local heritage communities and their experience with the development and provision of advanced-level programs and courses for English for professional purposes. The pilot program will be a cooperative educational and research effort that will enable CAL and its partner institutions of higher education to develop a deeper understanding of the factors that contribute to success in high-level English language learning.

For the first pilot year, CAL will select two institutions of higher education that are based in metropolitan areas with substantial heritage-language-speaking populations and that have established connections with those populations. One institution of higher education will enroll a cohort of heritage speakers of Arabic, and the other will enroll a cohort of heritage speakers of either Russian or Mandarin Chinese. This will allow the institutions to target instruction to the specific strengths and needs of learners from a single background.

1. Program Structure

- ❖ Pilot the program at two institutions of higher education; select institutions that have connections with heritage communities
- ❖ Recruit a cohort of heritage speakers of Arabic for one institution, and a cohort of heritage speakers of Russian or Mandarin Chinese for the other
- ❖ Provide 720 hours (24 weeks) of instruction over a maximum of eight months
- ❖ Combine classroom language instruction and content courses with tutorials, Web-based learning, and extracurricular activities
- ❖ Establish a mentoring program that pairs program participants with current federal personnel

CAL will ask each participating institution of higher education to propose an intensive program that totals 720 hours of instruction, consisting of 30 contact hours per week for 24 weeks distributed over a maximum of eight months. Contact hours should include the following components:

- Group language and culture instruction
- Language-supported content courses
- Individual and/or small group tutorials
- Technology-based activities, including language lab and Web-based activities
- Interaction with mentors in federal agencies

Program proposals should also include descriptions of the following:

- How the program will conduct initial diagnostic testing and use it to develop individual learning plans for participants.
- How the program will conduct formative assessment that is linked to the individual learning plans and provides continuous feedback on progress to each participant. Formative assessment may include the use of portfolios and videotaping.
- How the program will provide advising services to participants to help them address issues relating to program participation.
- What types of extracurricular activities the program might include.

CAL will work with the partner institutions of higher education to help them develop and implement the program structure they have proposed. CAL will provide suggestions and resources, and will facilitate (with assistance from NSEP) the establishment of a mentoring program that pairs program participants with current federal agency personnel.

2. Curriculum

- ❖ Develop a curriculum that simulates a professional context in materials, activities, and expectations
- ❖ Include instruction in metalinguistic awareness and language learning strategies
- ❖ Provide support for participants as they attend content courses in areas of interest
- ❖ Use tutorials to address individual areas of need
- ❖ Use technology to broaden and deepen participants' language learning experience

CAL will ask each participating institution of higher education to propose a curriculum for the program that covers the following content:

- Linguistic competence: Vocabulary (including terminology relevant to the federal workplace), cross-modality skills, register, pronunciation, and stress and intonation
- Discourse competence: The structure of oral presentations, reports, and work-related reading materials
- Sociolinguistic competence: Knowledge of the conventions of language use based in U.S. culture and the culture of the workplace; awareness of and ability to use the appropriate register
- Strategic competence: Language learning strategies, metalinguistic awareness, and contrastive analysis
- Content courses: Pre- and/or post-class discussion groups to cover language and content of courses in fields of interest to participants, such as social science, business and economics, international relations, humanities, and science

Teaching methodology should include the following:

- A statement of learning goals for each activity
- Authentic activities and materials, such as role plays and simulations, interviews, oral presentations, summarizing, report writing, email communication, informal conversation, technical reading, and newspaper/online reading
- Small-group or individual tutorials in areas of need
- Technology components such as video, Web-based learning, chats and bulletin boards, email, Web research, and instant messaging

CAL will work with the partner institutions of higher education to help them develop and implement their proposed curricula. CAL will provide suggestions and resources, and will facilitate (with assistance from NSEP) the acquisition of authentic materials from federal agencies for use in the program.

3. Recruitment and Admission Screening

- ❖ Use a Language Passport-type self-assessment for initial screening in both English and the heritage language
- ❖ Use English language assessments from the Defense Language Institute, which are aligned with the ILR scale, for admission screening
- ❖ Use heritage language assessments from the Defense Language Institute and/or the flagship language programs for admission screening

CAL will assess whether to conduct recruitment and admission screening in house or subcontract all or part of this work to a management firm that has experience with educational development programs, and develop a plan for advertising the program in conjunction with NSEP and the partner institutions of higher education. The admission process will have four parts.

3.a. Part 1—Initial Screening

Interested persons will complete an application that includes the following elements:

- A biographical information form similar to the one used for the Language Passport; the form will identify possible security risk factors and elicit data on how the applicant learned about the program and why the applicant is interested in it
- A heritage language skill self-assessment based on the Language Passport self-assessment grid; the self-assessment will also ask about level of education in the heritage language and how the person maintains heritage language skills
- An English language skill self-assessment based on the Language Passport self-assessment grid; the self-assessment will also ask about the applicant's English language learning history

3.b. Part 2—Listening and Reading Proficiency Assessment

Applicants who pass the initial screening step will then be tested for their English listening and reading proficiency. Applicants must be rated at an ILR level 2 or above in English in all four skills in order to enter the EHLS program; testing listening and reading proficiency first will enable the admission process to screen out those applicants who do not meet this criterion in these skills before the more expensive speaking and writing assessments are administered.

The English listening and reading assessment instruments should be aligned with the ILR level descriptors and will ideally be the Defense Language Institute's English Language Proficiency Test (DLI ELPT). CAL will work with DLI to determine whether and how the ELPT can be used for the EHLS program. If use of the ELPT is not possible, the alternative would be the listening and reading sections of the new Test of English as a Foreign Language; however, this test is less than satisfactory because it tests for academic rather than professional skills and because it is not aligned with to the ILR scale.

At this stage, applicants will also be tested for their listening and reading proficiency in the heritage language. Applicants must be rated at an ILR level 3 or above in the heritage language in all four skills in order to enter the EHLS program; as with the English assessments, testing listening and reading proficiency first will enable the admission process to screen out those applicants who do not meet this criterion in these skills before the more expensive speaking and writing assessments are administered.

The heritage language listening and reading assessment instruments should be aligned with the ILR level descriptors. With NSEP assistance, CAL will work with the flagship programs and the Defense Language Institute to identify and obtain appropriate assessment instruments.

3.c. Part 3—Speaking and Writing Proficiency Assessment

At this stage, applicants who have achieved a score of ILR level 2 or better on the English listening and reading assessments will be tested for their English speaking and writing proficiency. The speaking and writing assessment instruments should be aligned with the ILR level descriptors and will ideally be either the ELPT tape-mediated format or the Oral Proficiency Interview as used by DLI staff for speaking, and the writing sample as used by DLI staff. CAL will work with DLI to determine whether and how these instruments can be used for the EHLS program. Alternatives would be the Oral Proficiency Interview from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages for speaking, and the Business Writing Test from the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages for writing. These assessments are aligned with the ILR scale, but the Business Writing Test is not fully appropriate for this use because of its content.

Applicants who have achieved a score of ILR level 3 or better on the heritage language listening and reading assessments will be tested for their heritage language speaking proficiency at this stage. The speaking assessment instrument should be aligned with the ILR level descriptors.

With NSEP assistance, CAL will work with the flagship programs and the DLI to identify and obtain appropriate assessment instruments.

4. Exit Assessment

- ❖ Use English language assessments from the Defense Language Institute and an instructor-generated narrative for exit assessment

Upon completion of the program, each participant will be assessed for English proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The goal is to achieve an ILR rating of 3 or higher across all four modalities. Exit assessment will include testing that uses the same instruments that were used for the entry screening and an instructor-generated narrative that describes the participant's strengths and areas for development.

5. Participant Assessment and Program Evaluation

- ❖ Use diagnostic assessment at the beginning of the program to help each participant develop an individual learning plan
- ❖ Use portfolio development for formative assessment that provides ongoing feedback and enables each participant to measure progress in relation to the individual learning plan
- ❖ Evaluate the ways in which the program is achieving its goal of bringing participants to an ILR level 3 across listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English, and the aspects that require adjustment or improvement

Participant assessment during the period of the program will serve two purposes: It will enable participants to develop individual learning plans and monitor their progress in relation to those plans, and it will provide essential information for CAL and the institutions of higher education to use in evaluating the program overall. For example, the assessment results will indicate not only how many participants reach or exceed the expected outcome of an ILR level 3 across all modalities, but also the background characteristics of those who do, in addition to the features of the program that produce successful results.

5.a. Entry Diagnostic Assessment

CAL will work with the partner institutions to develop diagnostic assessments that build on the institutions' existing instruments and provide a profile of each participant's English language

strengths and needs across all four modalities. The diagnostics will test what participants know and are able to do with language so that they reflect the skills and abilities that are outlined in the ILR descriptors. With the assistance of program instructors, participants will use the results of the diagnostic assessments to develop individual plans for strengthening their English language skills.

5.b. Formative Assessment

Each program participant will build a portfolio of study products, individual and group projects, and other documents that provides ongoing feedback and a profile of progress in relation to the individual learning plan. In addition, in consultation with CAL, the institutions of higher education may elect to conduct point-in-time testing at designated points during the program. The significance of the results of all formative assessment should be transparent so that this process helps program participants take control of and evaluate their own learning. Advisors and instructors at each institution should help participants use formative assessment to identify their individual strengths and areas of need, set new learning objectives, and revise their individual learning plans to reflect those new objectives. The usefulness of the various approaches to formative assessment will be analyzed for purposes of program evaluation and improvement.

5.c. Program Evaluation

The goal of the EHLS program is to enable participants whose English skills are at the ILR 2 to 2+ level to increase their skills to an ILR level 3 across all four modalities. The purpose of program evaluation is to determine in what ways the program is achieving this goal, and how, and in what ways it is falling short, and why.

Participants' formative assessments will be an essential part of program evaluation. In addition, CAL will conduct site visits at each institution of higher education at several points during the program, and the project directors from each institution will come to CAL for two joint meetings. CAL will ask both program participants and program instructors to provide written evaluations of the program at the midpoint and at the end.

If possible, CAL will also track program participants for two years after they graduate from the program to determine what they feel made them successful as they went on into government service and in what areas they wish they had learned more.

6. Program Management

- ❖ CAL will oversee the program and coordinate the work of the partner institutions of higher education
- ❖ The institutions of higher education will contribute their expertise to program development and conduct the program
- ❖ NSEP will serve as liaison to government agencies and manage participants' placements in connection with the service requirement

6.a. Role of CAL

CAL will serve as the overall coordinator of the EHLS program, providing oversight for all aspects of program development, curriculum and assessment development, participant admission, and program evaluation. CAL's responsibilities will include the following:

- Select partner institutions of higher education
- Advertise and recruit for the program
- Design and develop program website
- Coordinate screening and selection of scholars
- Provide authentic workplace materials to the partner institutions
- Collaborate with the institutions on program design, curriculum development, development of diagnostic and formative assessments, use of technology
- Coordinate development of mentor program
- Coordinate meetings with the partner institutions
- Conduct on-site evaluation
- Conduct overall program evaluation, collect feedback from advisory board, and provide annual report to NSEP
- Serve as liaison between NSEP and the institutions of higher education
- Disseminate program findings

6.b. Role of Partner Institutions of Higher Education

The institutions of higher education will partner with CAL in program development and will provide instruction and support services. The responsibilities of the partner institutions will include the following:

- Advertise and recruit for the program
- Participate in selecting scholars
- Design and administer diagnostic entry test battery in collaboration with CAL
- Design program and develop curriculum in collaboration with CAL
- Coordinate content course offerings with other university departments
- Arrange small group and individual tutorials

- Conduct periodic formative testing
- Arrange extracurricular activities: guest lecturers, field trips
- Set up mentoring relationships with federal agency personnel in collaboration with NSEP and CAL
- Develop and coordinate technology component, including online activities, in collaboration with CAL
- Participate in program planning and coordination meetings with CAL and NSEP
- Provide periodic reports, including results of formative assessment, participant feedback on program and specific activities, instructor feedback on curriculum and activities

6.c. Role of NSEP

NSEP will serve as the program's liaison to government agencies. NSEP responsibilities will include the following:

- Facilitate acquisition of authentic materials
- Advise on needs of government agencies
- Identify contacts in agencies who can provide general information about job requirements
- Advise on government regulations with respect to the scholarship program
- Manage the federal service requirement and assist program participants with the job search and application process

6.d. Work Plan and Timeline

(Assumes a July 1 start date.)

DATE	ACTIVITY/MILESTONE	RESPONSIBLE
May-June 2005	Conduct further research on potential IHE partners, possible recruitment firm, proficiency testing	CAL, NSEP
	Begin Web site development	CAL
	Develop RFP for IHEs	CAL
YEAR 1 (July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006)		
July 1	Release RFP for two partner IHEs	CAL
August 1	IHE partner candidates submit proposals	IHEs
August 15	Announce decision on IHE partners	CAL, NSEP
September 1	Make scholarship applications available (print and Web); begin scholarship applicant recruiting	CAL, IHEs
November 1	Deadline for initial scholarship applications	Applicants
November 15	Deadline for completion of proficiency testing	Applicants, CAL
Week of December 5	Final selection of scholars	CAL, IHEs, NSEP
January-August	Conduct program	IHEs, CAL
	Identify and initiate discussion with potential additional IHE partners	CAL
	Conduct summative evaluation of first year of program	CAL, IHEs, NSEP
YEAR 2 (July 1, 2006-June 30, 2007)		
July 1	Release RFP for third partner IHE	CAL
August 1	New IHE partner candidates submit proposals	IHE
August 15	Make decision on new IHE partner	CAL, NSEP
September 1	Make scholarship applications available (print and Web); begin scholarship applicant recruiting	CAL, IHEs
November 1	Deadline for initial scholarship applications	Applicants
November 15	Deadline for completion of proficiency testing	Applicants, CAL
Week of December 4	Final selection of scholars	CAL, IHEs, NSEP
January-August	Conduct program	IHEs, CAL

IHE = Institution of Higher Education

Appendix 1. Questionnaire for Defense and Intelligence Agencies

English for Heritage Language Speakers Scholarship Program

SURVEY FOR DEFENSE AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES

Name: _____

Title/Position: _____

Agency/Dep't: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

_____ I am willing to respond to follow-up questions.
Please contact me via _____ phone _____ email _____ either

_____ Please contact the following individual for follow-up questions.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

1. Language Needs

Your responses to questions 1a—1b will inform program recruitment.

1. a. Please list in rank order the ten languages (other than English and western European languages) that are currently most critical to the work of your agency or department. For each language, indicate in the second column whether your agency currently employs speakers of that language, and indicate in the third column whether or not your agency needs additional personnel who speak that language. If specific varieties of one or more languages are key (for example, Chinese—Mandarin), please list the relevant varieties in the Comments section.

<u>Language</u>	<u>Currently Employ</u> <u>Speakers</u>		<u>Need Additional</u> <u>Speakers</u>	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No
_____	Yes	No	Yes	No

1.b. Comments:

2. English Language Skills

Your responses to questions 2a—2g will inform program design and curriculum.

2.a. For personnel who work in your agency or department, which communication skills *in English* are most important?

— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

2.b. What are the greatest issues your department has experienced with the English language skills of nonnative-English-speaking personnel?

2.c. How would you describe the English language skills of the nonnative speakers of English who currently work in your department or agency? If the skill levels differ by language background, please indicate that in the comments section.

Listening

- ___ Nonnative speakers are able to understand and respond appropriately to all spoken English, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium.
- ___ Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble understanding spoken English, but are able to ask questions to get clarification.
- ___ Nonnative speakers often have difficulty understanding spoken English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
- ___ Nonnative speakers understand almost no spoken English.
- ___ Nonnative speakers do not need to understand spoken English to do their work.

Speaking

- Nonnative speakers are able to communicate effectively and appropriately in English, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium.
- Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble communicating in spoken English, but are able to clarify their meaning by repeating or rephrasing.
- Nonnative speakers often have difficulty communicating in spoken English; others often have difficulty understanding them.
- Nonnative speakers are almost completely unable to speak English.
- Nonnative speakers do not need to use spoken English to do their work.

Reading

- Nonnative speakers are able to understand and respond appropriately to all written English, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium.
- Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble understanding written English, but are able to use resources to get clarification.
- Nonnative speakers often have difficulty understanding written English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
- Nonnative speakers understand almost no written English.
- Nonnative speakers do not need to understand written English to do their work.

Writing

- Nonnative speakers are able to communicate effectively and appropriately in written English, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium.
- Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble communicating in written English, but are able to express their ideas effectively.
- Nonnative speakers often have difficulty communicating in written English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
- Nonnative speakers are not able to communicate in written English.
- Nonnative speakers do not need to communicate in written English to do their work.

2.d. What kinds of activities do nonnative-English-speaking personnel in your agency need to do in English? Please check all that apply.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Translation | <input type="checkbox"/> Negotiation | <input type="checkbox"/> Interpretation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Formal presentations | <input type="checkbox"/> Interrogation | <input type="checkbox"/> Informal conversation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Report writing | <input type="checkbox"/> Correspondence | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Data/information analysis and synthesis | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Technical/scientific reading | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reading newspapers, magazines, websites and weblogs | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ | | |

2.e. What disciplinary or professional specializations do nonnative-English-speaking personnel in your agency need to have? Please check all that apply.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and veterinary sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> Business/economics/trade |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Computer and information systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public policy and urban planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Law/legal services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Science (biology, chemistry, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Medicine/medical research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Humanities (history, literature, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> No particular specialization necessary |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social science (education, sociology, international affairs) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ | |

2.f. What types of roles do or would nonnative-English-speaking personnel play in your department or agency? Please check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Translators | <input type="checkbox"/> Diplomats | <input type="checkbox"/> Attaches |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Interpreters | <input type="checkbox"/> Interrogators | <input type="checkbox"/> Analysts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Area specialists | <input type="checkbox"/> Content Specialists | <input type="checkbox"/> Negotiators |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) _____ | | |

2.g. Comments

3. Key Language Skills

Your responses to questions 3a—3d will inform program recruitment and program design.

3.a. For each of the key languages you listed in question 1, indicate which communication skills *in that language* are most important for personnel in your department or agency.

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

Language: _____
— listening ___ speaking ___ reading ___ writing ___ all skills

3.b. For each of the key languages listed above, do the native speakers of that language who are currently employed in your agency or department have the skills *in that language* that they need to do their work effectively?

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

- All native speakers have the language skills they need
- Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas
- No native speakers have the language skills they need
- No native speakers work in this department

Language: _____

___ All native speakers have the language skills they need

___ Some native speakers have insufficient skills in some or all areas

___ No native speakers have the language skills they need

___ No native speakers work in this department

3.c. For each of the key languages named, list the main types of activities that are carried out in that language in your department (for example, listening to news broadcasts, reading briefing materials, talking on the telephone).

Language: _____

Activities:

Language: _____

Activities:

Language: _____

Activities:

Language: _____

Activities:

3.d. Comments:

Appendix 2. Language Needs of Defense and Intelligence Agencies

Respondents were asked to list in rank order the ten non-Western languages that were currently most critical to the agency's work.

LANGUAGE	RANK ON LIST (# OF AGENCIES GIVING THAT RANKING)	TOTAL TIMES LISTED
Arabic	1 (4), 2(1)	5
Arabic dialects	2 (1)	1
Arabic - Egyptian	1 (1)	1
Arabic - Gulf	2 (1)	1
Arabic - Iraqi	2 (1)	1
Arabic total		9
Azeri	3 (1)	1
Bahasa Indonesia	3 (1), 7 (1)	2
Bengali	16 (1)	1
Burmese	20 (1)	1
Chavacano	5 (1)	1
Chinese - Fukienese	13 (1)	1
Chinese - Mandarin	2 (1), 3 (1), 8 (1), 9 (1), 10 (1)	5
French (Africa)	4 (1), 6 (1)	2
Georgian	9 (1)	1
Hindi	4 (1), 19 (1)	2
Japanese	6 (1), 17 (1)	2
Korean	5 (2), 9 (1), 10 (1)	4
Kurdish	5 (1)	1
Lao/Cambodian	15 (1)	1
Magindanaon	7 (1)	1
Malay	14 (1)	1
Pashto	3 (3), 6 (1), 9 (1)	5
Persian	2 (1), 3 (1)	2
Persian - Dari	2 (1), 4 (1), 7 (1), 10 (1)	4
Persian - Farsi	4 (2), 5 (1), 8 (1)	4
Persian Total		10
Russian	1 (2), 3 (1), 5 (1), 6 (1), 9 (1), 18 (1)	7
Serbian-Croatian	7 (1)	1
Somali	9 (1)	1
Spanish	4 (1)	1
Tagalog	8 (1), 10 (1)	2
Tausug	4 (1)	1
Thai	11 (1)	1
Turkish	6 (1), 10 (1)	2
Ukrainian	2 (1)	1

LANGUAGE	RANK ON LIST (# OF AGENCIES GIVING THAT RANKING)	TOTAL TIMES LISTED
Urdu	7 (1), 8 (2), 10 (1), 12 (1)	5
Uzbek	7 (1), 8 (1)	2
Vietnamese	21 (1)	1
Yakan	6 (1)	1

Notes: One respondent listed 21 languages. One respondent included Spanish in the list, and two included French. One respondent stated, “We have no language skill requirements and currently don’t employ language speakers.” One respondent entered “N/A” in the response space.

Appendix 3. English Language Skills of Current Nonnative-English-Speaking Personnel

This section asked respondents to report on the English language skills of current personnel. One respondent indicated “not observed” for questions c and d. One respondent did not provide any answers to question e. One respondent did not provide any answers in this section.

c. How would you describe the English language skills of the nonnative speakers of English who currently work in your department or agency? If the skill levels differ by language background, please indicate that in the comments section.

Listening

- 3 Nonnative speakers are able to understand and respond appropriately to all spoken English, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium.
- 5 Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble understanding spoken English, but are able to ask questions to get clarification.
- 1 Nonnative speakers often have difficulty understanding spoken English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
- Nonnative speakers understand almost no spoken English.
- Nonnative speakers do not need to understand spoken English to do their work.

Speaking

- 3 Nonnative speakers are able to communicate effectively and appropriately in English, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium.
- 5 Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble communicating in spoken English, but are able to clarify their meaning by repeating or rephrasing.
- 1 Nonnative speakers often have difficulty communicating in spoken English; others often have difficulty understanding them.
- Nonnative speakers are almost completely unable to speak English.
- Nonnative speakers do not need to use spoken English to do their work.

Reading

- 3 Nonnative speakers are able to understand and respond appropriately to all written English, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium.
- 3 Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble understanding written English, but are able to use resources to get clarification.
- 2 Nonnative speakers often have difficulty understanding written English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
- Nonnative speakers understand almost no written English.
- 1 Nonnative speakers do not need to understand written English to do their work.

Writing

- 3 Nonnative speakers are able to communicate effectively and appropriately in written English, regardless of topic, context, or communication medium.
- Nonnative speakers occasionally have trouble communicating in written English, but are able to express their ideas effectively.
- 4 Nonnative speakers often have difficulty communicating in written English; this reduces their ability to do their work effectively.
- 2 Nonnative speakers are not able to communicate in written English.
- Nonnative speakers do not need to communicate in written English to do their work.

d. What kinds of activities do nonnative-English-speaking personnel in your agency need to do in English? Please check all that apply.

- 8 Translation 1 Negotiation 8 Interpretation
- 7 Formal presentations 1 Interrogation 8 Informal conversation
- 6 Report writing 5 Correspondence
- 3 Data/information analysis and synthesis
- 5 Technical/scientific reading
- 7 Reading newspapers, magazines, websites and weblogs
- 1 Other (please specify): write internal resume and performance plan

e. What disciplinary or professional specializations do nonnative-English-speaking personnel in your agency need to have? Please check all that apply.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> _1_ Agriculture and veterinary sciences | <input type="checkbox"/> _3_ Business/economics/trade |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _4_ Computer and information systems | <input type="checkbox"/> _3_ Engineering |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _0_ Public policy and urban planning | <input type="checkbox"/> _1_ Law/legal services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _4_ Science (biology, chemistry, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> _0_ Medicine/medical research |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _3_ Humanities (history, literature, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> _0_ No particular specialization necessary |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _4_ Social science (education, sociology, international affairs) | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _7_ Other (please specify): military operations (2); foreign language instruction, interpretation, and translation; WMD (2); military and civil affairs; special ops operators; understanding of military terminology | |

f. What types of roles do or would nonnative-English-speaking personnel play in your department or agency? Please check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> _8_ Translators | <input type="checkbox"/> _0_ Diplomats | <input type="checkbox"/> _0_ Attaches |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _9_ Interpreters | <input type="checkbox"/> _3_ Interrogators | <input type="checkbox"/> _5_ Analysts |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _6_ Area specialists | <input type="checkbox"/> _2_ Content Specialists | <input type="checkbox"/> _1_ Negotiators |
| <input type="checkbox"/> _3_ Other (please specify): language instructors (2); mil to mil liaison officers, unconventional warfare, civil affairs operations, psychological operations, direct action information officers, foreign internal defense, special reconnaissance, counterterrorism, counterproliferation of WMD, intelligence | | |

Appendix 4. Questions for Heritage Language Experts

1. Where in the United States do heritage language communities exist, and how large are they?
2. In general, what is the educational background of heritage language speakers who immigrated to the United States? What proportion of that population has professional-level heritage language skills?
3. In general, how strong are the English language skills of the heritage speakers described in question 2?
4. In general, how strong are the heritage language skills of heritage speakers who grew up in the United States? What proportion of that population has professional-level heritage language skills?
5. Would the program described here be of interest to heritage speakers who are citizens of the United States?
6. Would the program be more attractive as a full-time program of study or a part-time one?

Appendix 5. Foreign-Born Populations in the United States

FOREIGN-BORN POPULATIONS IN THE U.S.													
From Census 2000 data													
Country of Origin	POPULATION			EDUCATION			LANGUAGE - Population 5 and up			EMPLOYMENT - Population 16 and over			
	Total Popula-tion	Citizen	Non-citizen	Over age 25	Bache-lor's degree	Grad-uate school	English only	Other than English	Speak English less than very well	Private sector	Gov't sector	Self em-ployed	Not em-ployed
Egypt	113,395	66,970	46,425	96,660	34,720	22,985	13,360	98,610	37,920	49,600	9,030	4,960	37,240
Iraq	89,890	45,600	44,295	72,250	10,745	6,935	5,370	83,595	44,610	37,320	3,315	3,685	33,560
Jordan	46,795	28,125	18,665	39,145	8,370	4,460	3,520	42,630	15,750	19,810	2,400	3,455	16,400
Kuwait	20,365	7,250	13,115	12,565	4,295	2,435	2,125	17,910	4,645	8,120	910	565	7,745
Lebanon	105,910	71,685	34,225	92,685	18,435	15,435	9,660	95,720	34,170	47,565	5,115	6,105	39,680
Libya	5,365	3,375	1,985	4,625	1,265	860	1,180	4,175	1,300	2,570	450	245	1,665
Morocco	34,680	13,645	21,035	29,670	6,650	4,030	4,540	29,825	12,625	17,925	1,725	1,565	10,770
Oman	1,170	230	940	400	105	125	125	985	300	250	85	10	510
Saudi Arabia	21,085	3,805	17,280	8,875	2,815	1,875	1,835	17,720	7,540	4,305	715	175	8,525
Syria	54,560	32,335	22,225	47,665	7,575	7,940	3,600	50,735	24,950	21,175	1,965	3,755	23,130
China	1,192,435	595,870	596,565	1,009,435	199,875	231,160	66,220	1,105,210	753,040	532,210	78,320	35,740	434,030
China+Taiwan	1,518,650	788,910	729,745	1,275,750	278,425	329,965	86,130	1,410,275	929,800	688,515	99,950	47,695	548,965
Korea	864,125	447,170	416,955	676,640	193,635	94,965	131,265	718,855	492,400	330,475	39,225	66,360	309,830
Russia	340,175	154,825	185,350	244,065	58,285	67,895	35,885	291,045	169,030	121,365	14,650	9,495	128,635
USSR	37,335	22,935	14,400	31,065	8,825	10,415	2,340	34,965	20,045	17,670	2,430	1,325	12,540
FSU	838,810	378,490	460,320	611,755	141,215	140,140	57,920	760,795	477,800	293,745	34,690	23,970	335,270
Kyrgyzstan	2,375	260	2,120	1,170	275	230	115	2,195	1,670	735	130	60	685
Kazakhstan	9,155	1,480	7,675	5,445	1,325	1,285	340	8,420	5,520	3,195	350	265	2,950
Afghanistan	45,195	25,980	19,215	34,595	6,315	3,855	2,210	42,780	21,480	18,655	1,835	1,845	18,010
Iran	283,225	171,880	111,345	250,785	67,305	60,320	22,340	260,260	112,320	127,510	17,440	19,135	101,010