

# **Government Needs and Shortages in Foreign Language and Regional Expertise and Knowledge**

*Signals, Facts, and Clues*

**Gail H. McGinn**

**March 31, 2014**

## **Introduction**

At Duke University in 2003, a precursor to this conference took place, considering *Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education: National Needs and Policy Implications*. At that time, Dr. Nancy Ruther presented a paper entitled “The International and Foreign Language Human Capital Challenge of the U.S. Federal Government,” discussing a topic similar to the one in this paper.

Prior to that conference, in January 2002, the General Accountability Office (GAO) issued a report on foreign language in the federal government entitled, “Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls.” This report documents efforts by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), the General Accountability Office and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to prompt federal agencies to engage in human capital and workforce planning. GAO notes that OMB went so far as to instruct agencies to address this in their budgets.

The important parts of the “human capital approach” were: development of strategic plans, conducting an inventory of the current workforce, ascertaining existing competencies and identifying needs, and making plans to meet those needs (GAO, 2002, pps. 31-34). Specifically, “OMB’s guidance stresses that agencies should seek to address shortages of skills by conducting a thorough workforce analysis.” (GAO, 2002, p. 22) The GAO examined four agencies:

Department of the Army, Department of State, the Federal Commerce Service, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. GAO noted that only the FBI seemed to employ a human capital management and workforce planning approach. GAO concluded:

*Without a specific strategic direction and a related action plan that effectively implements the strategies agencies intend to use to correct shortages in foreign language skills, it will be difficult for agencies to fill current and projected shortages. (GAO, 2002, p.26)*

GAO went on to recommend that agencies:

*...adopt a strategic, results oriented approach to human capital management and workforce planning. This approach should include setting a strategic direction, assess agency gaps in foreign language skills, developing a corrective plan of action, and monitoring implementation and success of this action plan. (GAO, 2002, p. 27)*

In this context, Dr. Ruther made a persuasive case for the need to improve foreign language and international expertise. For example, she noted the impact of globalization on federal missions, the introduction of the concept of “soft power”<sup>1</sup>, and the great number of Americans who speak a language other than English (25 million). Dr. Ruther also discussed the current state of the civil service, with a declining number of federal employees, growth of the use of contractors to supplement the governmental force and an impending “retirement bubble” as more federal employees reach retirement eligibility. Surely this confluence of issues argues for the human capital approach advocated by OPM and OMB, and her paper echoes the GAO in the need for this human capital approach. (Ruther, 2003)

Dr. Ruther notes that this approach had not been applied and that there was no systemic action to ascertain need and meet requirements. Dr. Ruther states, “If we measure what matters,

---

<sup>1</sup> Soft power is defined by the Oxford dictionaries as “A persuasive approach to international relations, typically involving the use of economic or cultural influence.”

then neither the full federal workforce or the government's AIFL needs have mattered to the federal government." (Ruther, 2003, p. 41)

In the decade that has since passed, one would hope that the need for foreign language and regional expertise would have become clearer, more quantifiable, and established as a human resource baseline for the purpose of recruiting and developing that expertise in our government. Indeed, as this paper will show, there was much activity around this issue and the foreign language issue overall in those ensuing years. Whether that activity has produced an answer to the question implied in the title of this paper remains to be seen.

Understanding government needs and shortages is not as easy as counting employees and competencies, determining gaps and filling them (if such data existed). In general, as my subtitle hints, there have been *signals* from major players in the Administration and the Congress that the need for foreign language and regional expertise and knowledge is critical. It is more difficult to pin down *facts*. Some data on the number of such jobs in the federal sector does exist. However, that data fails to answer the question of how many of those jobs there should be. *Clues* are more interesting to contemplate. Federal agencies have identified potential needs for foreign language and regional experts. There are requirements for federal agencies to provide service to those with Limited English Proficiency. A program allows agencies to reach out for assistance on an as needed basis. These clues indicate some examples of how the Government employs language and regional expertise and what the needs are.

This paper begins with a historical journey tracing the various activities, hearings, assessments and reviews taking place since 2003.

## Signals

In examining the federal government's need for foreign language and regional expertise, the past ten years have illustrated that the question goes beyond, "how many and what languages?" In considering the federal government's response, one needs to consider what the nation's leaders – Presidents, Secretaries of Agencies, and Members of Congress, say about the importance of foreign language and regional expertise. What are the lessons the nation has learned about these capabilities in an era of globalization, new threats, and increasing diversification in our nation? How are these thoughts communicated to a nation in words and actions? These are all valid questions to be considered in a discussion of government needs, and, indeed, the nation's needs. However, a further legitimate question is how the words used by our leaders translate into meaningful actions to improve the capability of the country.

In early 2004, the Department of Defense (DoD) embarked on a major initiative to change fundamentally the way foreign language was valued and used in the military. In February of 2005, DoD published a Defense Language Transformation Roadmap (DLTR) to this end. This Roadmap was envisioned as a series of activities and actions to be taken, the net result of which would be an enhancement to the Department's capability in language and area expertise. Importantly, in developing the Roadmap, four assumptions guided the authors:

*Conflict against enemies speaking less-commonly-taught languages and thus the need for foreign language capability will not abate. Robust foreign language and foreign area expertise are critical to sustaining coalitions, pursuing regional stability, and conducting multi-national missions especially in post-conflict and other than combat, security humanitarian, nation-building, and stability operations.*

*Changes in the international security environment and in the nature of threats to US national security have increased the range of potential conflict zones and expanded the number of likely coalition partners with whom US forces will work.*

*Establishing a new "global footprint" for DoD, and transitioning to a more expeditionary force, will bring increased requirements for language and regional knowledge to work with new coalition partners in a wide variety of activities, often with*

*little or no notice. This new approach to warfighting in the 21<sup>st</sup> century will require forces that have foreign language capabilities beyond those generally available in today's force.*

*Adversaries will attempt to manipulate the media and leverage sympathetic elements of the population and "opposition" politicians to divide international coalitions.  
(DLTR, 2005, p. 3)*

The Roadmap acknowledged a new "global" world and the need for language and regional expertise in order to be able to operate in that world. It expressed the need for an expanded level of foreign language expertise, both in the number of languages and in proficiency, to be able to succeed in new missions and with new partners.

The Roadmap established four broad goals for foreign language in the DoD. The first was to "Create Foundational Language and Regional Area Expertise." Its purpose was to ensure that the DoD had people in the force with language and regional area expertise who could be called upon as needed. The second goal was to "Create the Capacity to Surge." In a world with emerging threats, this goal was to ensure that the Department could respond to unanticipated language needs in unexpected parts of the world. The third goal was to "Establish a Cadre of Language Professionals possessing an Interagency Language Roundtable proficiency of 3/3/3 in reading/listening/speaking." In other words, DoD sought to have individuals with professional level competence in foreign language. This desire was amplified with the fourth goal that sought to enhance the Department's Foreign Area Officer program.<sup>2</sup>

The Department of Defense established an aggressive agenda to improve its capability. This agenda would touch many of the more than 3 million members of the active and reserve forces.

---

<sup>2</sup> Foreign Area Officers combine military skills with specific regional expertise, language competency, and political-military awareness to represent and advance U.S. interests in one of nine geographical areas: Latin America, Europe, South Asia, Eurasia, China, Middle East, and North Africa, Northeast Asia, Southeast Asia, and sub-Saharan Africa. (Junor, 2012, p. 10)

To meet its historic language needs, DoD runs its own language school, the Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, where it trains its own linguists to address part of the need. However, given the magnitude of the need as described in the Roadmap, and as its forces were engaged in conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, DoD realized that it had a greater need for language and regional expertise capability than previously envisioned.

DoD leaders also understood that the need for language and regional expertise capabilities would grow. Thus, they sought to invigorate language study and an understanding of the importance of language study in the nation to address this need. To these leaders, the rationale was clear – if the Department needed members with foreign language capability, its training job would be simplified if those entering the military already had studied a foreign language. Therefore, in June of 2004, the Department of Defense (DoD) in collaboration with the Center for Advanced Study of Language (CASL) at the University of Maryland convened the National Language Conference.

According to a Department of Defense News Release issued on June 18, 2004, this conference pulled together a vast audience representing “... leaders of federal and state government agencies and academia, as well as industry representatives, international language experts, and language researchers to discuss and lay the foundation for an initial strategic approach to meeting the nation’s language needs in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.” In all, over 300 attendees discussed the need for foreign language in the United States and actions that could be taken in all sectors to address this need. The findings of the National Language Conference were published as a White Paper, *A Call to Action for National Foreign Language Capabilities*. The White Paper notes:

*Despite the diverse backgrounds of the conference participants, by the end of the meeting there was a clear consensus that the demand for individuals with foreign language skills and cultural understanding far outweigh the supply and that the time to act is now. This resulting document is the Call to Action. (National Language Conference, 2005, p. 5)*

The White Paper included recommendations for the federal government, and an overarching recommendation for a National Foreign Language Coordination Council to be established to

*... identify crucial priorities, inform the nation's leaders of the seriousness of the foreign language gap, increase public awareness of the need for foreign language skills and career paths in business and in government, advocate maximum use of resources, coordinate cross-sector efforts, monitor the foreign language activities of all federal government departments and agencies, recommend needed national policies, and allocate designated resources to promising programs and initiatives at any level (federal, state, and local). (National Language Conference, 2005, p.3)*

Thus, the National Language Conference attendees sought to establish a mechanism to provide direction and oversight for the nation's efforts to improve the development and use of foreign language capability.

In May of 2005, Senator Daniel Akaka,<sup>3</sup> who would emerge as a continuing advocate of foreign language capability in the nation, introduced the National Foreign Language Coordination Act of 2005. This proposed legislation was built on the recommendations of the National Language Conference, and it called for the creation of a "National Language Director" and a "...National Foreign Language Coordination Council to develop and oversee the implementation of a foreign language strategy. ... and monitor the foreign language activities of the federal government." He specifically noted that such a council could be responsible for

---

<sup>3</sup> Senator Akaka was the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia.

“...integrating language training into career fields and increase the number of language professionals.” (Akaka, 2005, p.1) He also noted in the statement:

*America needs people who understand foreign cultures and who are fluent in locally-spoken languages. The stability and economic vitality of the United States and our national security depend on American citizens who are knowledgeable about the world. We need civil servants, including law enforcement officers, teachers, area experts, diplomats, and business people with the ability to communicate at an advanced level in the languages and understand the cultures of the people with whom they interact. (emphasis added) (Akaka, 2005, p. 2)*

Senator Akaka’s understanding of the needs of the federal government was clear. This was the first of a number of legislative attempts to establish such a council. Such legislation was never enacted. Senator Akaka also conducted a number of hearings on foreign language, particularly foreign language in the federal government.

In early 2005, the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of State sought the involvement of the Secretary of Defense in an effort to improve foreign language capability in the nation. (Rumsfeld, 2005) The effort later was expanded to include the Director of National Intelligence. After months of senior level planning, the final product was announced to the nation by then President George W. bush as the National Security Language Initiative (NSLI). NSLI was designed to: “Increase dramatically the number of U.S. residents learning, speaking, and teaching critical-need foreign languages.” (U.S. Department of Education, 2008, p. 1) The overarching emphasis was to build a base of citizens who had foreign language ability, from whom the federal government and the nation could recruit individuals to fill critical needs. NSLI efforts identified these needs with particular emphasis in 4 areas: building proficiency, concentration on critical languages, starting language learning early, and creating an on-call capability. The stated goals of NSLI were:

- Increase the number of U.S. residents studying critical-need languages and starting them at an earlier age.
- Increase the number of advanced-level speakers of foreign languages, with an emphasis on mastery of critical-need languages; and
- Increase the number of teachers of critical-need languages and providing resource for them. (U.S. Department of Education, 2008, p. 1)

NSLI was coordinated by the White House. In the NSLI design, each agency had designated responsibilities. In all, as identified in a fact Sheet published by the Department of State, \$114 million was sought in Fiscal Year 2007 for this effort. As evidence of the global approach to building language capability in the nation espoused by the participating agencies, some notable accomplishments of NSLI were:

STARTALK: An initiative undertaken by the Director of National Intelligence, STARTALK offers summer immersion experiences in critical languages to students across the United States. Thirty thousand students have enrolled in STARTALK programs in the last 6 years. Most students say that they continue studying their language after the program has concluded. (Brecht, 2014, p.11)

National Security Language Initiative for Youth (NSLI-y). NSLI-y is an initiative of the Department of State. It offers scholarships for high school students and recent graduates to study abroad, either for the summer or a full academic year, in the critical languages. These languages are listed on the NSLI-y website<sup>4</sup> as: Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Korean, Persian (Tajiki), Russian, and Turkish. For the 2013-14 program, 3285 applications were received for 626 positions. (Brecht, 2014, p. 12)

---

<sup>4</sup> [www.nsliforyouth.org](http://www.nsliforyouth.org)

Expansion of the National Flagship Program. The Language Flagship Program is sponsored by the Department of Defense through the National Security Education Program. The Department expanded its partnership with higher education to create additional proficient speakers of critical languages. In what a Defense official described as building a “Pipeline for the National Security Workforce” (Junor, 2012,p.7), these partnerships are designed to bring students to an Interagency Language Roundtable level three proficiency in any chosen field of study (students are not necessarily language majors). Flagship partnerships now exist with 26 programs at 22 universities in Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Korean, Persian, Portuguese, Russian, Swahili, Turkish, and Urdu. (National Security Education Program, 2013, p. 27)

In 2006, the Presidents of 60 research universities joined the call for language capability. In January of that year, the Association of American Universities published a paper entitled *National Defense and Education and Innovation Initiative – Meeting America’s Economic and Security Challenges in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. The paper evoked the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and called for a comprehensive initiative to strengthen the nation’s capabilities in science and research, but also in foreign languages. The report notes:

*In the arena of national security, America and its allies face enemies – both hostile governments and a stateless enemy organized across geopolitical borders – that not only threaten us with traditional warfare but also seek the ability to undertake biological, chemical, and nuclear attacks.*

*The threat is rooted in ideological and cultural differences. Yet our nation lacks the level of language and cultural knowledge needed to confront successfully those who threaten us. (Association of American Universities, 2006, p. 7)*

Thus, the paper recommends a number of academic and federal government actions that should be taken to strengthen the United States’ position in research and innovation in science and technology and in foreign language expertise. Their paper notes the National Security

Language Initiative and recommends using it as a base to build greater language, area studies, and study abroad programs. (Association of American Universities, 2006, p.5)

On January 25, 2007, the Senate Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia held a hearing entitled, *Lost in Translation -- a Review of the Federal Government's Efforts to Develop a Foreign Language Strategy*. This hearing, chaired by Senator Akaka, was to examine, in his words, "What is the Federal Government's strategy for addressing the shortfall of Americans with foreign language proficiency?" (Senate hearing, 2007) The Government was represented by the Department of Defense, the Department of Education, and the National Virtual translation Center. The Government witnesses described current efforts to improve language capability, the implementation of the National Security Language Initiative, and problems with growing capability within the federal workforce.<sup>5</sup> This hearing again underscored the need to build a populace with language ability, to provide a source for recruiting to meet the needs of the federal government. Two pertinent quotes pertain, the first from Senator Akaka:

*The Federal Workforce Subcommittee has been looking at the Federal Government's ability to recruit and retain language-proficient individuals since the year 2000. For the last 6 years, I have tried along with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to encourage the Administration to address the government's foreign language needs.*

*It has become clear that while agencies can offer incentives for individuals with language skills to work for the Federal Government, it is increasingly more difficult to do so when there is a severe shortage of language skills in the American workforce. (Akaka, Senate Hearing, 2007)*

---

<sup>5</sup> These include time required to obtain a security clearance and instances where language is an additional duty, where, for example, you might need a truck driver who speaks Arabic. Arabic would not be part of the job description. The Defense witness describes the difference between a "position based" approach and an inventory of skills, where language would be available on demand for a mission.

The second quote is from the Defense witness, the Honorable Michael Dominguez, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness:

*But a very important point I wish to underscore today is the Defense Department cannot meet the full set of our national security needs solely through a strategy of teaching language to people after they have joined us.*

*We believe this country, which supplies us with the people that we need, needs to rededicate itself to the study of foreign languages so that people arrive in our workforce already equipped with those skills. (Senate hearing, 2007)*

Mr. Dominguez later says:

*So we are not going to stop screaming that this country has to take language seriously and we have to take language seriously because it is a critical skill now to success on the battlefield.*

Notably, at the end of the hearing, Senator Akaka states:

*I would also like to note for the record that the Department of Labor was invited to testify today but declined the invitation stating that the Department has not been active in reviewing the American workforce language needs or its own needs.*

In 2007, the National Research Council published International Education and Foreign Languages: Keys to Securing America's Future. This was a review of Title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs. This review also discusses matters related to federal programs, specifically in a section entitled "Addressing Unmet Needs in the Government." In particular, the review notes the problems that arise in trying to meet government needs, including security clearances, inadequate expression of need by government agencies, reduced size of government and reliance on contractors, and the difficulty of matching language skills to individual jobs. (National Research Council, 2007, pps. 121-126)

In November 2008, the House Armed Services Committee, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations completed an investigation of the DoD language program. The report made a compelling case for embedding language and regional expertise in the Armed Forces:

*It is difficult to predict the exact price tag for developing needed language and cultural capabilities. However, we do know what the cost to the military and the nation is if we continue to fail to greatly enhance these skills. The risk is more conflict and prolonged conflict, and the cost is more lives needlessly lost on all sides. (U.S. House of representatives, 2008 p. 54)*

The report also highlighted that DoD's efforts were tied to a larger nationwide effort, and it underscored DoD's position with regard to national language efforts and the ultimate impact of the lack of a robust program of foreign language study in our nation's schools, at all levels:

*... the Department finds itself involved in programs aimed at increasing the availability of foreign language study opportunities for both its personnel and members of the U.S. public. DOD's rationale is that if foreign language training becomes an integral part of the U.S. educational system, starting in kindergarten and continuing through advanced graduate work, the Department will have a greater and more sophisticated recruiting pool for service members, civilians, and contractors to meet expected national security challenges. (U.S. House of Representatives, 2008, p. 55)*

This view was underscored in testimony delivered by a Defense witness in 2012:

*The long-term solution must be a national one. In short, we recruit from a national pool of individuals who, for the most part, have little or no formal language training. We recognize that our schools cannot teach every language vital to U.S. national security, but we know that having a pool of individuals who have been exposed to a foreign language or had early language learning will greatly facilitate further language acquisition. A citizen (sic) possessing any language learning skills would greatly increase the Department's ability to fill language required positions with qualified individuals. (Junor, 2012, p. 4)*

Most recently, the University of Maryland Center for Advanced Study of Language hosted a gathering of foreign language interests in a "Languages for All" gathering and continued the discourse about language capability for the nation and the integration of language into the American educational system. A subsequent White Paper was issued that argues that the time has come for all to have the opportunity to learn a language and that such an opportunity is possible. The White Paper begins by echoing the recurring sentiments of the decade:

*A growing number of today's politicians, journalists, academicians, and business leaders cite the national benefits of a multilingual society, while more and more educators, psychologists, physicians, sociologists, and -- most importantly -- parents insist that a second language is of major benefit to the health and well-being of this nation's children. Yet, despite this rising chorus of testimony, our education system seems unable to find the will or the resources to effectively and efficiently make foreign language education an essential part of our children's preparation for life in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. (Brecht, 2014, p. 6)*

Consensus from experts in the field (expressed through the National Language Conference), leaders in the Administration (including the President), leaders in Academia and Members of Congress surely sent the signal that foreign language, and by extension regional expertise, were critical skills to be addressed by federal agencies. The essential lessons were that the world had changed; that the nation was not producing citizens with language capability, prompting assertive action by the national security community; and that, despite an overwhelming call from Language Conference participants and members of Congress for a federal leadership role, such a role was not forthcoming. However, the efforts arising during this time hopefully set the stage for the development of a national capability – numbers of people with these skills and necessary proficiencies – who could be recruited to the ranks of the armed forces and the federal government to meet future needs.

## **Facts**

Having considered the many voices calling for improved national language capability, this paper now turns to consider what we know about how federal agencies are addressing their needs. In so doing, the paper will summarize findings in Congressional hearings, Government Accountability Office Reports, National Security Education Program postings, and other sources as available.

There are a number of sources that provide varying estimates of “foreign language” positions in the federal government. The Partnership for Public Service issued a paper using Fedscope 2009<sup>6</sup> listing the “Top Agencies for Foreign Languages.” The agencies listed are:

- Department of Homeland Security
- Department of Defense
- Broadcasting Board of Governors
- Department of Justice
- Department of Agriculture
- Department of Labor
- Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Smithsonian Institution

The total number of positions found in these agencies was 44,494, with the majority being in the Department of Homeland Security.

Most recently, the White Paper issued as a result of a recent forum, *Languages for All? The Anglophone Challenge*, cites the work of Ted Crump in 2001, in identifying 80 federal agencies with foreign language needs (Brecht, 2014, p. 9). The National Research Council’s Committee to review the title VI and Fulbright-Hays International Education Programs concluded in 2007, based upon a review of available sources, that 25,000 to 34,000 positions in the federal government require foreign language and that the range of positions requiring regional expertise and knowledge might be 19,000 to 44,000 (National Research Council, 2007, p. 48). Those numbers are probably low. We know, for example, that the Department of Defense alone has 37,000 military positions with a language requirement (Junor, 2012, p. 3) In addition, the numbers probably fail to account for those positions where language is not the dominant requirement. Instead language and regional expertise supplement the primary job, such as agricultural and trade development.

---

<sup>6</sup> Fedscope is an on-line tool developed by the Office of Personnel Management for analyzing federal workforce data.

With that in mind, let us turn to placements of National Security Education Program awardees. The Department of Defense manages the National Security Education Program, which provides scholarships and fellowships for students to study abroad.<sup>7</sup> Regions of the world where students are placed and languages to be studied are determined by surveying the needs of national security agencies and organizations. (National Security Education Program, 2013, p. 9) Students have a requirement to perform government service upon graduation. A look at the agencies who have hired these graduates provides insight into their use across the government.

The chart that follows<sup>8 9</sup> shows 42 government agencies who hired a total of 2,465 NSEP graduates into service. Not unexpectedly, most were hired by the Department of Defense and the Department of State, but other agencies with “double digit” (or more) hiring included the U.S. Agency for International Development, Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Treasury and the Department of Veterans Affairs, to name just a few. Clearly, language and regional expertise are valued in many facets of government. In all, the NSEP report states that as of 2012, 2,682 award recipients had either fulfilled or are in the process of fulfilling their service requirement (National Security Education Program, 2013, p. 7) NSEP is clearly filling a governmental demand for foreign language and regional expertise. It is clear also clear that the need for critical languages goes beyond the traditional national security agencies.

---

<sup>7</sup> These are known as Boren scholarships and fellowships.

<sup>8</sup> This chart is adapted from a more detailed display in the National Security Education Program Annual Report, which breaks out the elements of each Agency who hired the graduates.

<sup>9</sup> Dr. Ruther also used NSEP placements as an indicator in her 2003 paper.

Organization	Number of Placements
Broadcasting Board of Governors	6
Central Intelligence Agency	92
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe	3
Corporation for National and Community Service	3
Department of Agriculture	26
Department of Commerce	85
Department of Defense	833
Department of Education	4
Department of Energy	34
Department of Health and Human Services	41
Department of Homeland Security	118
Department of the Interior	15
Department of Justice	57
Department of Labor	4
Department of State	571
Department of Transportation	7
Department of Treasury	29
Department of Veterans Affairs	26
Environmental Protection Agency	18
Executive Office of the President	16
Federal Communications Commission	2
Federal Judiciary	23
Federal Reserve	7
Intelligence Community (Unspecified)	41
Inter-American Foundation	1
Millennium Challenge Corporation	8
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	24
National Science Foundation	10
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	4
Peace Corps	55
Securities and Exchange Commission	2
Small Business Administration	2
Smithsonian Institution	4
Social Security Administration	4
U.S. African Development Foundation	1
U.S. Agency for International Development	198
U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum	1
U.S. Congress	81
U.S. Institute of Peace	4
U.S. International Trade Commission	2
U.S. Postal Service	1
U.S. Trade and Development Agency	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,465</b>

Source: National Security Education Program, 2013

Using the NSEP placements as a basis, an interesting excursion was to look at the hiring opportunities posted for three of the non-traditional national security agencies to see how a need for language and regional expertise was expressed. The International Trade Administration (ITA) within the Department of Commerce shows 52 NSEP placements. Within its Commercial Service, the ITA discusses a need for Foreign Service Officers. On its website, the description of a Foreign Service Officer states: “Foreign Service Officers in the Commercial Service are typically assigned to foreign posts, such a United States embassies or consulates, to promote the export of U.S. goods and services, attract foreign investment into the United States and defend U.S. commercial interests abroad.” No language or regional expertise/knowledge is included in the requirements for the job.

On the other hand, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) within the Department of Health and Human Services hired 15 NSEP graduates. In advertising for on its website for positions such as Health Scientists, and Public Health Advisors, Epidemiologists, and Medical Officers who could be assigned to any of 64 countries, including Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh and Barbados, the CDC does include an Occupational Questionnaire in its application materials. That questionnaire asks whether the applicant can converse on public health issues in French, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, Russian or Arabic.

A large number of NSEP awardees (198) were hired by the U.S. Agency for International Development. In a blog posting, ([pathtopmf.com/how-to-compete-for-a-position-with-the-usaid-foreign-service](http://pathtopmf.com/how-to-compete-for-a-position-with-the-usaid-foreign-service), dated October 20, 2013), the Acting Chief of Foreign Service Personnel at USAID and colleagues described the foreign language requirement for USAID Foreign Service Officers. Foreign Service Officers are required to read and speak the language of their

assignment at a level three and they receive language training to achieve that level of proficiency. Foreign language ability is considered advantageous in the hiring process.

Federal agencies deal with the need for foreign language speakers differently in the hiring process. Thus, the value of foreign language capability and, indeed, regional expertise in some cases may be valued in the selection process, but may not to be an absolute requirement for application.

In a perfect world, foreign language and regional expertise would be so widespread that agencies could easily identify such expertise and relate it to positions and vacancies with a 100% perfect match. In the real world, this possibility doesn't exist (yet!) and agencies must often concentrate on filling vacancies with needed skills and abilities, dealing with the foreign language and regional expertise matter after hiring or using interpreter/translator workarounds.

Once we have an understanding of the federal agencies that use language expertise to support their mission and hire people with that expertise, or train them, it will be useful to examine the words of some agencies that are most notable, or should be most notable, for quantifying their requirement and hiring accordingly. Specifically, in the last ten years, four agencies have been the subject of Congressional review (via hearings) or General Accountability Office studies. These are the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security.

In 2010, the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security were invited to testify before the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and

Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia at a hearing entitled “Closing the Language Gap: Improving the Federal Government’s Foreign Language Capability.”

The witness for the Department of Homeland Security described need in the following:

*DHS has a variety of foreign language needs: from providing emergency response services to persons with limited English proficiency, to leading investigations overseas, to interviewing foreign nationals on interdicted vessels. The Department’s mission touches many individuals in the United States who may lack English language skills and in addition has some 2,200 employees stationed abroad; as such, the ability to communicate effectively is a topic of vital importance to DHS. (Neal, 2010, p. 1)*

The testimony continues to say that at the time of the hearing there was no overall foreign language program. The various components of the Department analyze foreign language needs and work to meet them. Examples given included:

- U.S. Customs and Border Patrol require proficiency in languages (usually Spanish) and screen candidates for proficiency in, or ability to learn the language.
- Transportation Security Officers self-certify proficiency (language is considered a collateral duty).
- For those assigned abroad, when language is required those who have the necessary language skill are selected, or training is provided. (Neal, 2010, pp. 1-2)

The Department of Defense witness at that hearing described the many efforts the Department had undertaken to meet its language needs, including two innovative programs to recruit heritage language speakers. One of those programs, Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest was a pilot to recruit non-citizens with critical foreign language and culture skills.<sup>10</sup> The recruits received “expedited U.S. citizenship processing.” The program began in February 2009 and July 2010, the Army had

---

<sup>10</sup> The MAVNI program continues through 2014. See <http://www.defense.gov/news/mavni-fact-sheet.pdf>

recruited 792 members with critical language skills. (Weaver, 2010, p. 6) The other program created a new Military Occupational Specialty 09L which recruited native speakers as interpreters, focusing on the languages of Iraq and Afghanistan. The program started in 2003, and 1,000 individuals were recruited, trained, and sent to Iraq and Afghanistan. (Weaver, 2010, p.6.)

These two programs, initiated in a time of war to meet a language crisis, demonstrate the aggressive action the Department of Defense was taking to meet its immediate needs. These language skills were not available in the force or in the numbers required in the public from which the Department recruited.

This testimony also addressed the issue of quantifying demand for service members with foreign language and regional expertise. The witness states, “The current requirements system does not provide a clear demand signal for future foreign language needs so that our force providers can generate the capabilities we need.” (Weaver, 2010, p.7)

The Government Accountability Office (GAO) also testified at this hearing. Their testimony, entitled, “Foreign Language Capabilities -- Departments of Homeland Security, Defense, and State Could Better Assess Their Foreign Language Needs and Capabilities and Address Shortfalls.” In this testimony, the witness, David C. Maurer summarized the results of GAO reviews conducted from June 2009 to June 2010, focusing on these three agencies. The GAO witness reiterated the recommendations of the 2002 study referenced earlier – that agencies have strategic plans in place to address the need for foreign language and regional expertise and knowledge, conduct assessments

on need and capability, and use those assessments for purposes of building foreign language capability. Notably, the GAO found that DoD had an "... inventory of its language capabilities. In contrast, it did not have an inventory of its regional proficiency capabilities." The Department of Defense response to this finding was that "...measuring regional proficiency ... is more difficult than originally expected." (GAO, 2010, pp. 8-9)

The Department of Defense testified again before the same Subcommittee on May 21, 2012. Entitled, "A National Security Crisis: Foreign Language Capabilities in the Federal Government," DoD was joined at this hearing by representatives of the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, The Director of National Intelligence, the Globalization and Localization Association, and the Department of Education.

At this subsequent hearing , the DoD witness testified that DoD had 36,983 military positions that had a language requirements. In 2011, 81% of those positions were filled, but only 28% of the fills had language capability at the desired proficiency level. (Junor, 2012, p. 3) Junor points out that the need for language capability exists throughout the armed forces:

*The Department looks at language capabilities within three separate but overlapping groups: the General Purpose Forces, the Special Operations Forces, and Language Professionals, which included language analysts, translators, linguists, and Foreign Area Officers. Together, they span our Total Force. (Junor, 2012, p.3)*

Proficiency levels for these three groups vary, but clearly the DoD sees language as broadly needed for its operations.

Junor goes on to remark that of a force of 3.3 million people, 258,786 have some degree of language skill. The most reported language is Spanish. (Junor, 2012, p. 3)

Of special note within the DoD is the Foreign Area Officer program. The Department had 2,055 FAOs in 2012, up from 1,414 in 2006. In a February 5, 2014 posting from *Seapower Magazine Online*, Richard Burgess notes that the Department of the Navy recently announced that they are increasing the number of FAOs from 300 to 400 by 2019.

Also at the 2012 hearing, the State Department witness asserted the following with regard to the State Department mission:

*No matter where in the world they are serving, our employees must have the language skills to gather information, explain and advocate U.S. policies, establish and maintain our diplomatic platforms, build and maintain trust, and create relationships. (Thomas-Greenfield, 2012, p. 5)*

Testimony indicated that the Department had close to 4000 Language Designated Position. Seventy-four per cent of these positions were filled by individuals with full required proficiency, as opposed to 61% in 2009. The witness also described the issues involved in placing language qualified professionals in the correct positions. Occasions arise when an employee needs to leave a post early for personal or mission-related reasons, or when mission requirements demand a quick fill. The decision then is leave the post vacant while incumbents attend language training, or fill the position with someone with necessary skills, but not necessarily language proficiency.

A further issue for the State Department was the move to more difficult languages. The witness reported that positions had increased in the Near East, South Asia, and East Asia. From December 2002 to November 2011, Language Designated Positions increased by 46%, with the

greatest increases in Chinese and Arabic. These languages are also among the hardest languages to teach, requiring a long lead time prior to actual assignment. Pashto, Hindi, Urdu, and Farsi were also mentioned as areas of emphasis requiring lengthy training. The Department has a set of service and pay incentives to encourage the study of language.

The witness did note that applicants for Foreign Service with language proficiencies can receive “preference points” for hiring. (Thomas-Greenfield, 2012, pp. 1-4)

And, again, echoing the common refrain of national security agencies, Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield returns to the national theme:

*To address increasingly complex national security challenges, the State Department must have robust foreign language capabilities. Therefore, we strongly encourage young people to study languages earlier in life, starting in middle and high school and continuing into college. (Thomas-Greenfield, 2012, p. 4)*

The Federal Bureau of Investigation witness reported that there had been increasing demand for translation services. Their Language Services Section manages the agency’s 1400 linguists. Of that number, 600 are Language Analysts and 800 are contractors. Since 9/11/2001 the FBI added 800 new contract linguists and 100 new Language Analysts. The FBI adopted a “workforce planning model” which guides their recruitment to those languages with a “shortfall or anticipated need.” They also use their contract linguists as a pool from which to hire Language Analysts, hiring about 40 a year from that pool. Like the Department of Defense, the FBI has identified existing employees with language skills who can be called on if needed. This pool of 2, 000 receives Foreign Language Incentive Pay. (FBI, 2012, pp.2-3) The FBI identified their top language needs as Arabic (Yemeni), Chinese, Farsi, Pashto, and Somali.

Testimony identified some issues with accessing foreign language speakers into their workforce. Among them are the need to pass language tests, polygraph tests, and background investigations; the fact that many of the qualified are not U.S. citizens, and the competition with other federal agencies for a limited number of language speakers. (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2012, pp. 3-4)

The following table highlights some of the findings described above:

**WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND REGIONAL EXPERTISE IN SELECTED FEDERAL AGENCIES BASED UPON HEARING TESTIMONY?**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>FINDINGS FROM 2010, 2012 HEARINGS<sup>11</sup></b>
Department of State	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close to 4000 Language Designated Positions (LDPs)</li> <li>• 74% filled by fully-language-qualified staff</li> <li>• Dec 2002 – Nov 2011 LDPs increased by 46%</li> <li>• Greatest increase: Chinese and Arabic</li> </ul>
Federal Bureau of Investigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1400 Linguists: 600 Language Analysts; 800 contractors</li> <li>• Over 2000 employees receive incentive pay for language (pool to draw from)</li> </ul>
Department of Defense	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 36,983 military positions have a language requirement.</li> <li>• 81% filled in 2011 – only 28% at required proficiency level</li> <li>• Foreign Area Officers increased since 2006 from 1414 to 2055</li> <li>• 258,786 individuals report language skills</li> </ul>
Department of Homeland Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the time, no Departmental foreign language program, components determine language needs.<sup>12</sup></li> <li>• Customs and Border Protection require foreign language – must be proficient or demonstrate potential to learn language.</li> <li>• Transportation Safety Official – language is a collateral duty – employees self-certify.</li> </ul>

<sup>11</sup> Because of the hearing dates, consider these findings as representing a point in time, for illustration.

<sup>12</sup> The Department of Homeland Security did publish a Language Access Plan addressing support for those with Limited English Proficiency in 2011.

There does not appear to be a coherent and consistent picture of federal agencies' need for individuals to fill positions where foreign language is a primary skill to be desired or an absolute prerequisite for hiring and assignment. It would be easier to train and educate in the required languages in preparation for eventual hiring if this were the case. However, federal agencies need for foreign language and regional expertise and knowledge appears to be more nuanced than a strict headcount against identified positions and appears to be far greater than the identified positions would indicate.

### **Clues**

While not providing sought after numbers of employees filling designated spaces, there are hints as to what agencies need and how they are providing for foreign language and regional expertise needs. For those who might be tempted to say that federal agencies don't care about meeting foreign language requirements, there are some sources of information that counter that sentiment. The Secretary of Education is required by law (Section 601)(c)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) to consult with other federal agencies regarding areas of national need for foreign language and regional expertise.

What follows are excerpts from the latest 2013 report prepared by the Department of Education.<sup>13</sup>

Seventy-eight priority languages (not commonly taught) and the regions of the world were identified by the Secretary of Education. They are attached at Appendix A. The list is remarkable both for the number of languages and for individual languages identified, ranging from Akhan (Twi-Fante) to Zulu.

---

<sup>13</sup> The entire report and reports of prior years are available at the Department of Education website at this address: <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ope/iegps/languageneeds.html>

More illuminating, for our purposes, are the statements included in the report from the individual agencies. The following statements from selected agencies are excerpted from the report:

1. U.S. Department of Agriculture: USDA ranks the following world regions as most vital to the future of U.S. Agriculture: Western Hemisphere (Canada, Caribbean, Central/South America), East Asia, Southeast Asia and the Pacific Islands, and the Middle East. The Department also notes that although Spanish is commonly taught, broad understanding of Spanish and western Hemispheric cultures are critical to the success of U.S. agriculture.
2. U.S. Department of Commerce: The Department of Commerce also notes that “in addition to urgent needs ... proficiency in the following languages is desirable”: French, Indonesian, Turkish, German. Commerce ranks the following world regions or countries as area of importance: Asia, with specific focus on China, Korea and Vietnam; Middle East; Latin America, with specific focus on Brazil; Europe with specific focus on Eastern Europe and Russia; South East Asia, with specific focus on India.
3. U.S. Department of Defense: Recommends the development of more language and regional study programs for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, Central Asia, and the Middle East.
4. U.S. Department of Transportation: Recommends the following regions/countries/languages as important to furthering U.S. international transportation interest: South America: Brazil (Portuguese); Asia: China (Mandarin); Middle East: Iraq/Afghanistan/UAE, Kuwait (Arabic/ Kurdish/ Oman/ Pashto/Dari)

The thoughtful lists and comments provided by these and other agencies may lead to the conclusion that the need for foreign language and regional/cultural knowledge is acknowledged

and, as we discovered earlier, may be considered in some hiring decisions even if such knowledge is not the primary job requirement.

With that as background, let us turn to other clues about federal government needs as they play out in real life.

### Limited English Proficiency

On August 22, 2000, President Bill Clinton signed Executive Order 13166, “Improving Access to services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency.” The purpose of the Executive Order was to “...improve access to federally conducted and federally assisted programs and activities for persons who, as a result of national origin, are limited in their English proficiency....” The Order required federal agencies to develop and implement plans to provide program and services to those with limited English proficiency, whether provided by the agency itself, or by a recipient (such as a contractor or grantee) who provides services and programs on behalf of the federal government. This Executive Order has its basis in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibits discrimination based on national origin and requires “meaningful access” for those with Limited English Proficiency. The agency lead for the Executive Order is the Federal Coordination and Compliance Section (FCS) of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.<sup>14</sup>

Included on the LEP website are “Frequently Asked Questions.” One of these questions describes the analysis that agencies are to conduct in creating their implementation plans:

*The basic tenets of the order require agencies to ascertain the non-English language needs of those they serve, and plan to provide interpretation as necessary and translation of vital documents. Recipients and federal agencies are required to take reasonable steps to ensure meaningful access to their programs and activities by LEP*

---

<sup>14</sup> These documents and an overall discussion of the Limited English Proficiency program can be found at the government’s website: <http://www.lep.gov/>

*persons. While designed to be a flexible and fact-dependent standard, the starting point is an individualized assessment that balances the following four factors:*

*1) The number or proportion of LEP persons eligible to be served or likely to be encountered by the program or grantee;*

*2) the frequency with which LEP individuals come in contact with the program;*

*3) the nature and importance of the program, activity, or service provided by the program to people's lives; and*

*4) the resources available to the grantee/recipient or agency, and costs. As indicated above, the intent of this guidance is to find a balance that ensures meaningful access by LEP persons to critical services while not imposing undue burdens on small business, or small nonprofits*

On February 17, 2011, Attorney General Eric Holder issued renewed guidance for this directive including, significantly, guidance for agencies to consider in their hiring processes the need for the job to have language capability to facilitate the agencies plans. He writes: “When considering hiring criteria, assess the extent to which non-English language proficiency would be necessary for particular positions or to fulfill your agency’s mission.” (Holder, 2011, p.2)

Agency plans for implementing this Executive Order are available on the LEP website. Implementation has been uneven, and it appears from that site that many major agencies report that plans are still under development. However, a review of the existing plans reveals many commonalities. The Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Homeland Security do indeed speak to the need to consider language capability in the hiring process for some jobs. All agencies either have or plan to survey and use other methodologies to determine what languages might be important. The most commonly cited language of concern is Spanish, but other languages factor in as well. For example, the Federal Emergency Management Administration writes:

*....FEMA has identified priority languages in coordination with State and local governments. The language most frequently encountered is Spanish, which falls in Category A, followed by the languages in Category B: Arabic, Cambodian, Chinese, Haitian-Creole, French, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Russian, Tagalog, Urdu, and Vietnamese, and Category C: Greek, Polish, Thai, Portuguese, and American Sign Language. FEMA is guided by this and its local assessments of the LEP populations in planning for language services it will provide. (Department of Homeland Security, 2011, p. App.-9)*

Plans include the determination of those in the workforce who might be bi-lingual and circumstances under which those employees would provide interpretation services.<sup>15</sup> Other interpretation sources include contractors and telephonic services. The identification and translation of vital documents is also common, as articulated in the guidance.

The Coast Guard plan provided a clear picture of the part language plays in their activities:

*Some examples of circumstances in which the Coast Guard might encounter speakers of these languages include:*

- Units conducting drug interdiction, migrant interdiction, search and rescue, and other missions in the Gulf of Mexico, Caribbean Sea, and waters off the southwest United States routinely encounter Spanish speakers.*
- Following Hurricane Katrina, the Coast Guard activated a Reservist to serve as an interpreter during meetings with Vietnamese vessel owners, alleviating concerns about safety issues, vessel recovery, and hazardous materials remediation.*
- During the visit of the Coast Guard cutter CGC DALLAS to Georgia, Ukraine, and Bulgaria, members of the Coast Guard Auxiliary Interpreter Corps deployed to act as certified Russian/Ukrainian interpreters. As of 2010, the Coast Guard Auxiliary has also provided linguistic support to the following cutters: ACUSHNET, ALERT, ALEX HALEY, CHASE, AQUIDNECK, BOUTWELL, DALLAS, DEPENDABLE, JARVIS, HAMILTON, MADRONA, MUNRO, SPENCER, STORIS, and MOHAWK.*
- The First Coast Guard District Command Center in Boston, Massachusetts directed search and rescue efforts to assist a Portuguese fishing vessel off the coast of New England.*
- The North Pacific Coast Guard Forum held a multi-mission Exercise in Honolulu, Hawaii to focus on international oil spill response. During the exercise, members of*

---

<sup>15</sup> All plans are careful to require vetting of current employees to verify proficiency.

*the Coast Guard Auxiliary served as Korean, Russian, Japanese, and Chinese interpreters. (Department of Homeland Security, 2011, App.-30)*

Clearly, as this program gets more robustly implemented in all federal agencies, the need for interpretation and translation services should grow, as may interest in hiring bi-lingual employees for agency jobs.

### National Language Service Corps

As noted earlier, one of the innovations assigned to the Department of Defense as a part of the National Security Language Initiative was the creation of a Civilian Linguist Reserve Corps. This was envisioned to be a corps of Americans with language and regional capability who could be available “on-call” to respond to language needs of all federal agencies. The program was funded in 2007 and the Department was to recruit 1000 members in ten languages by 2010. The Corps began as a pilot program.

Today that corps has become the National Language Service Corps, with over 4500 members and capability in over 290 languages (National Security Education Program, 2013, p. 41). Members of the Corps are appointed as temporary federal employees on intermittent work schedules. Their work is cost-reimbursable by the employing agency. (National Security Education Program, 2013, p. 42)

To date, most of the work of the Corps appears to be Defense-related. There were eight Defense activations in 2012, and twelve more were projected for 2013. There are also a number of agencies outside Defense that have employed the Corps. These include the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Akan/Twi), U.S. Department of Labor (Wage and Hour Division) (Lao), Department of Justice, Washington INTERPOL (Spanish, French). Agencies that have

expressed interest in using the NLSC include the Peace Corps (French), Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Spanish and as many as 7 additional languages), Department of Homeland Security (Various- for U.S. population support), and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Various – for U.S. population support). (NSEP Report, 2012, pp. 64-69) Other specific examples described on the National Language Service Corps blog (nlscorps.blogspot) include:

- Activation for the Centers for Disease Control to assist with a pandemic influenza exercise and with content on non-English web pages.
- Activation with the U.S. Coast Guard to provide interpretation in support of a U.S. Coast Guard cutter participating in maritime security and safety exchanges off the coast of Africa.
- Activation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency to work on a disaster contingency plan and a National Level Emergency exercise.

In addition to DoD and agency operational support, there appears to be a clear connection between the NLSC capabilities and the agencies' plans to support those with Limited English Proficiency.

Clearly, federal agencies do care about and require foreign language and regional/cultural expertise, as indicated by their responses to the Department of Education, their requirement to establish plans to support those with Limited English Proficiency, and the expanding use of the National Language Service Corps. Again, the list of languages and areas of interest in the world is long, and it will probably never be possible to fill positions specifically for all language and regional contingencies.

## **Conclusion**

Understanding the federal government's need for foreign language and regional expertise and knowledge is more complicated than looking at job vacancies or numbers of positions within agencies that are "language designated." Such a look provides a narrow look at the totality of the need, which spreads across agencies and organizations of the federal government. It overlooks the positions that have such requirements, but for which the first requirement is another kind of expertise, such as a medical degree or scientific degree. It also overlooks the need for unanticipated "on call" requirements, such as a response to Hurricane Katrina or the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. In many cases, federal agencies, including but not limited to those responsible for national security, don't know where the next crisis where materialize and therefore planning for such crises is neither feasible nor cost effective. The panoply of agencies hiring NSEP awardees shows the overall appetite that agencies have for these skills.

In some cases agencies "hedge their bets." DoD sought to create a "strategic stronghold" of experts by surveying the force and determining where expertise lay, even if not required in their current jobs. It has augmented this capability through the Military Accessions Vital to the National Interest, as discussed earlier. The FBI has apparently taken a similar tack, as have other agencies in their planning to support those with Limited English Proficiency. In other cases, and it seems increasingly, agencies rely on the National Language Service Corps for these missions, or employ contractors who can be deployed quickly.

But the best "hedge" for federal agencies is a citizenry with a background in languages and, hopefully, by extension, regional expertise and knowledge. That is why, over the past ten years there has been a multi-agency and Congressional call for more exposure and education of

Americans in foreign language. Why else would the State Department devote significant resources to NSLI-y? Why would the National Security Agency commit to its very successful STARTALK program? Why would the Department of Defense undertake its Flagship programs?

It is true that there is a need for people who have mastered the Less Commonly Taught, critical, or strategic languages – themes that have resonated in the past ten years. But there is also a need for students who are exposed to any language study at an early age, laying the foundation for the further acquisition of language and regional skills at later dates, since some agencies teach language to those hired for other skills.

The only conclusion is that while agencies should aggressively apply a human capital management model to identifying and meeting needs for individuals to fill “language designated positions,” there is a continuing need for the nation as a whole to embrace and fulfill the need for education in foreign language and regional expertise and knowledge. This is important, not just for the needs of the federal government, but to secure our overall place in the world.

## APPENDIX A

The Following Languages Were Identified by the Secretary of Education:

- Akhan (Twi-Fante)
- Albanian
- Amharic
- Arabic (all dialects)
- Armenian
- Azeri (Azerbaijani)
- Balochi
- Bamanakan (Bamana, Bambara, Mandikan, Mandingo, Maninka, Dyula)
- Belarusian
- Bengali (Bangla)
- Berber (all languages)
- Bosnian
- Bulgarian
- Burmese
- Cebuano (Visayan)
- Chechen
- Chinese, Cantonese
- Chinese, Gan
- Chinese, Mandarin
- Chinese, Min
- Chinese, Wu
- Croatian
- Dari
- Dinka
- Georgian
- Gujarati
- Hausa
- Hebrew, Modern
- Hindi
- Igbo
- Indonesian
- Japanese
- Javanese
- Kannada
- Kashmiri
- Kazakh
- Khmer (Cambodian)
- Kirghiz
- Korean
- Kurdish – Kurmanji

- Kurdish – Sorani
- Lao
- Malay (Bahasa Melayu or Malaysian)
- Malayalam
- Marathi
- Mongolian
- Nepali
- Oromo
- Panjabi
- Pashto
- Persian (Farsi)
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Quechua
- Romanian
- Russian
- Serbian
- Sinhala (Sinhalese)
- Somali
- Swahili
- Tagalog
- Tajik
- Tamil
- Telugu
- Thai
- Tibetan
- Tigrigna
- Turkish
- Turkmen
- Ukrainian
- Urdu
- Uyghur/Uigur
- Uzbek
- Vietnamese
- Wolof
- Xhosa
- Yoruba
- Zulu

The following regions of the world were identified:

- Africa
- Central Asia/Inner Asia
- East Asia
- Middle East
- South Asia
- Southeast Asia and the Pacific Islands
- Russia/East Europe
- Western Hemisphere (Canada, Caribbean, Central/South America)

## REFERENCES

Akaka, Daniel K. “Closing the Language Gap: Improving the Federal Government’s Foreign Language Capability.” Statement before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia. United State Senate. July 29, 2010

Akaka, Daniel K. “Introduction of the National Foreign Language Coordination Act of 2005.” Washington D.C. May 19, 2005

Association of American Universities. “*National Defense Education and Innovation Initiative: Meeting America’s Economic and Security Challenges in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.*” January 2006

Brecht, Richard (with Martha Abbott, Dan E. Davidson, William P. Rivers, Robert Slater, Amy Weinberg, and Anandini Yoganathan). *Languages for all? The Anglophone Challenge.* University of Maryland. February 2014

Defense Language Transformation Roadmap, Washington D.C. February 2005

Federal Bureau of Investigation, “A National Security Crisis: Foreign Language Capabilities in the Federal Government.” Statement before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia. United State Senate. May 21, 2012

General Accountability Office. *Foreign Languages: Human Capital Approach Needed to Correct Staffing and Proficiency Shortfalls.* GAO-02-375. Washington D.C. January 2002

General Accountability Office. *Foreign Language Capabilities – Departments of Homeland Security, Defense, and State Department Could Better Assess Their Foreign Language Needs and Capabilities and Address Shortfalls.* Statement of David C. Maurer, Director Homeland Security and Justice Issues. GAO-10-715T. Washington, D.C. July 29, 2010

Holder, Eric. “Federal Government’s Renewed Commitment to Language Access Obligations Under Executive Order 13166.” Office of the Attorney General. Washington D.C. February 17, 2011.

Junor, Laura J. “A National Security Crisis: Foreign Language Capabilities in the Federal Government.” Statement before the Statement before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia. United State Senate. May 21, 2012

\_\_\_\_\_. “Lost in Translation: A Review of the Federal Government’s Efforts to Develop a Foreign Language Strategy.” Hearing Proceedings of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia. Senate Hearing 110-84. Washington D.C. January 25, 2007

The National Language Conference. *A Call to Action for National Foreign Language Capabilities*. Washington D.C. February 1, 2005

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

National Security Education Program. *2013 Annual Report*. Arlington, VA. February 21, 2014

Neal, Jeffrey R. Testimony before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia. United State Senate. June 17, 2010

Partnership for Public Service. "Foreign Language Jobs in the Federal Government." Undated

Rumsfeld, Donald. "Language Initiative between State, Defense and Education" Secretary's "Snowflake". February 16, 2005 See <http://library.rumsfeld.com>

Ruther, Nancy L. "The International and Foreign Language Human Capital Challenge of the U.S. Federal Government." Paper presented at a Duke University Conference, *Global Challenges and U.S. Higher Education: National Needs and Policy Implications*. January 23-25, 2003

Thomas-Greenfield, Linda. "A National Security Crisis: Foreign Language Capabilities in the Federal Government." Statement before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia. United State Senate. May 21, 2012

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education. *Enhancing Foreign Language Proficiency in the United States: Preliminary Results of the National Security Language Initiative*. Washington D.C. 2008

U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS). *Language Access Plan*. February 28, 2011

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Oversight & Investigations. *Building Language Skills and Cultural Competencies in the Military: DoD's Challenge in Today's Educational Environment*. Committee Print 110-12. Washington D.C. November 2008.

Weaver, Nancy. "Closing the Language Gap: Improving the Federal Government's Foreign Language Capabilities." Statement before the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia. United State Senate. July 29, 2010