2020


Dan E. Davidson

Nadra Garas

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/rlj

Part of the Slavic Languages and Societies Commons

Recommended Citation
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70163/0036-0252.1035
Available at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/rlj/vol70/iss1/13

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Russian Language Journal by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

DAN E. DAVIDSON, NADRA GARAS

Abstract
Based on the American Councils-administered K-16 National Survey of Foreign Language Enrollments (2017), the present study examines emerging trends in enrollments and the availability of Russian language instruction at the state and national levels. K-12 and tertiary institutional data are examined in light of comparable information collected in 2007. The study found a continued close association between the geographical location of Russian K-12 offerings and the distribution of Russian-speaking households reported in the US Census. Nationally, Russian language enrollments increased by 20% between 2007 and 2016 among K-12 institutions to 14,876 with 31 states and the District of Columbia reporting state-level increases, 18 showing a decrease, and one state indicating no change. By comparison, higher education Russian enrollments declined by 20% over the same period to 21,353. Overall Russian ranks third among the less commonly taught languages at both the university and K-12 levels. The study also reports district-level and senior administrator responses regarding factors which inform decisions to offer Russian (and other languages), examples of innovative approaches to school-to-college articulation, and benefits noted from increasing access to advanced language and cultural training, as exemplified in the Russian Language Flagship.
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1. Introduction
The US educational system has never placed a strong emphasis on world languages in the way that other nations have prioritized the study of English and other major languages.¹ Even in the Cold War

¹ Compare, for example, the National Defense Education Act (Title VI) appropriations for 2017 totaling $22,743,107 for support of 100 National Area Resource Centers at an average award size of $227,431 and $2,746,768 for support of 16 Language Resource Centers with an average annual award of $171,673.
decades, the bulk of US investments in language and area studies flowed to area research rather than to language training; pre- and post-program proficiency testing, routinely required by government training institutions, was not practiced by most American area studies programs (Nugent and Slater 2016). And until the late 1970s, college and university faculty recruitment committees could not routinely assume that candidates for area studies positions, apart from foreign-born candidates, were necessarily accomplished speakers of the languages of the countries or regions in which they were specialized. Popular myths that English is sufficient for most international communication, that technology will soon obviate the very need for language-qualified personnel, or that undergraduate curricula cannot possibly be expected to meet the time and training demands of professional-level language acquisition are widespread in the US and other Anglophone nations to the present day (Commission on Language Learning 2017, vii–ix).

2. The Russian Flagship Program in the broader context of Russian study in the US

The Language Flagship Programs, like the Russian Flagship, are helping to increase awareness and to raise expectations of the role of language study at US universities and, increasingly, at the secondary schools from which those universities draw entering freshmen. Over its fifteen-year history, the Language Flagship has demonstrated that American students can and do indeed acquire professional-level competence in a critical language like Russian, reaching Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) Level 3 in speaking, reading, and listening (Common European Framework C1) by the time they graduate from college. Student (and parent) interest and the professional and academic opportunities that Flagship certification can bring are inspiring prospective students of diverse socioeconomic and educational backgrounds—traditional beginners, crossover students from other languages, heritage, dual immersion students, Reserve Officers’ Training Corps (ROTC) students, Russian Language Olympiada medalists and alumni of STARTALK and the National Security Language Initiative for Youth (NSLI-Y) immersion programs—to apply for those university programs that offer a pathway and financial support for continued study of the language and culture,
regardless of their prospective major fields or likely career trajectories. Such opportunities can be powerful motivators for students (and their families), for whom knowledge of a critical language can help open doors to a first-class university education and to careers as global professionals.

Motivation to continue language study beyond high school is a necessary but not sufficient condition for ensuring a student’s successful transition to the next level of language in college (Abbott 2005). Effective school-to-college articulation is another critical component for successful language learning careers, including for those of heritage or dual language immersion backgrounds. Over the past two decades, the American Councils Assessment Department has developed and administered on behalf of the American Council of Teachers of Russian (ACTR) the National Examination in World Languages: Russian (NEWL®-Russian, previously known as the Prototype AP Russian Examination). Now formally endorsed by the College Board to its 3000-plus member institutions for credit by examination and advanced placement, NEWL®-Russian is a four-skill, proficiency-based online examination, taken by approximately 500 graduating high school students of Russian annually (Bazarova, Lekic, and Marshall 2009). Among those graduates, a large majority each year score in the Intermediate Mid to Advanced proficiency ranges on the NEWL examination, typically qualifying them for placement into second- or third-year Russian courses as entering college freshmen.

The Russian Flagship Programs, including the seven domestic programs (see Eisen, in this issue) and the Overseas Flagship Program described in detail in the present volume, rely on best practices and the proven findings of current research in language and pedagogical science (Murphy et al. 2016). What is required of each student is a personal commitment to continue study of the language to the advanced levels and a readiness to devote a summer and a pre-graduation year to full-time study at an overseas university where that language is spoken, such as Al-Farabi Kazakh National University. What is required of the US domestic Flagship university, in turn, is a program of study for students to reach Advanced-level (ILR 2) proficiency in the language over the course of their undergraduate career. Related course work in history, literature, or other area studies is strongly encouraged but
cannot preclude the student’s concurrent academic work toward a major in another field. The overseas capstone year of the Flagship Program then proceeds within a linguistically and culturally acquisition-rich environment designed to bring the student to the Superior level (ILR 3) across all four communicative modes (see Abaeva, Akberdi, Pshenina, and Sansybaeva, in this volume), while direct-enrolling in an advanced content course, living with a local family, and pursuing an internship in the major field.

3. Who speaks Russian in the US? Where is Russian instruction available?

A 2016 American Academy of Arts and Sciences Commission on Language Learning report entitled *The State of Languages in the US: A Statistical Portrait* reports current Census information on the numbers of speakers of non-English languages residing in the US. Central among its findings is the fact that the overwhelming majority of adults who reported being able to speak a non-English language acquired that language at home. Perhaps not too surprising in light of the generally low investment levels in world language education, only 16.3% of US Census respondents claiming proficiency in a second language acquired the language at school. The study also confirms existing research on measured patterns of language attrition from first and second generation to the third generation of speakers, by which time only one in ten descendants reported any level of proficiency in their heritage language.

According to the most recent US Census Bureau Report (2013), about 0.3% of the US population five years of age and older reported speaking Russian in their households. This number (879,434) reflects an increase of 20% compared to 706,242 persons who spoke primarily Russian at home in 2000. Those who speak Russian at home represent 1.5% of the 20.6% segment of the US population (five years of age or over) who speak a language other than English at home.

---

2 Data and commentary from an earlier Russian language version of this study, which appeared in Но мы сохраним тебя, русский язык! Коллективная монография, посвящённая 90-летию академика Виталия Григорьевича Костомарова, Москва, Изд. «ФЛИНТА» 2019, 362–374 have been incorporated into sections 3 - 5 of the present study with the kind permission of Dr. Vladimir Karasik, Festschrift Editor.

Figure 1. K-12 students population enrolled in Russian classes
“The ACTR Nationwide Survey of Russian Language Instruction in US High Schools in 2009” previously observed the existence of a close relationship between the location of Russian language K-12 enrollments in the US and the distribution of Russian-speaking households reported in the US Census of 2000 (Davidson and Garas 2009). The present (2019) study reconfirms that finding and also reports on

2. the comparison of the 2014–2015 count of senior secondary Russian programs and corresponding Russian enrollments with those of other less commonly taught languages (LCTLs) by state and nationally;
3. state-level availability of Russian K-12 language classes in each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia in 2014–2015;

Figure 1 shows the number of elementary through high school students who are studying Russian at schools in each state. As was observed in the earlier study, those US states with higher numbers of students studying Russian such as New York, Texas, Ohio, New Jersey, California, and Pennsylvania are also the states with larger numbers of residents who speak Russian at home; however, the distribution of those enrollments have changed somewhat over the course of the intervening years.

The largest concentration of individuals who speak Russian at home is found in the state of New York (where 28% of the overall population speaks a language other than English at home). New York is also the state with the largest number of students studying Russian in schools (from kindergarten through high school).

Overall levels of student interest in learning Russian has persisted at schools in the 10 US states with higher Russian language enrollments over time. Arizona, Alaska, and Virginia have yielded their “top-ten” positions over the past decade to the District of Columbia, Michigan, and

---

4 Overall, only 19.7% of all US K-12 students were enrolled in a foreign language in the 2014–2015 school year, while 7.5% of university-level students were formally engaged in language study. Although higher education enrollments in foreign language have declined since 2009, school-level enrollments have grown, and Russian school enrollments have increased by 20% in absolute numbers over that same period.
North Carolina (Davidson and Garas 2009). The growth of enrollments in states such as North Carolina, Illinois, and the District of Columbia may also be associated with increased course offerings through the public school systems, as evidenced by increased programming for foreign languages, the emergence of dual language immersion instruction, and the addition of virtual class offerings that extend enrollment options for students beyond traditional courses at those institutions. Table 1 compares the K-12 Russian enrollment rankings of the top ten states in 2007–2008 and 2014–2015.

Table 1. States with the highest pre-K-12 enrollments in Russian language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing senior secondary program counts with enrollment numbers for all the LCTLs in the 2014–2015 academic year, one finds that Russian ranks third after Chinese and Arabic in both the number of schools offering the language and also the number of students enrolled. Figures 2 and 3 show the number of high schools and enrollment levels for the LCTCs.
Figure 2. High schools offering LCTLs

Figure 3. High school enrollments in LCTLs
By examining the geographical locations of high schools offering Russian, one finds no fewer than 148 senior secondary institutions offering the language across 41 states. Figure 4 shows the distribution of high schools with Russian across 50 states and the District of Columbia.

Figure 4. Distribution by state of schools offering Russian

Figure 5. Change in Russian language K-12 enrollment by state from 2007–2008 to 2014–2015
Table 2. Comparing K-12 and college-level enrollments by language in 2014–2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>K-12</th>
<th>2-/4-Year Colleges</th>
<th>K-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>26,044</td>
<td>32,864</td>
<td>58,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASL</td>
<td>130,410</td>
<td>106,936</td>
<td>237,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>227,087</td>
<td>60,070</td>
<td>287,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1,289,001</td>
<td>194,630</td>
<td>1,483,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>330,897</td>
<td>84,854</td>
<td>415,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>67,908</td>
<td>66,239</td>
<td>134,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>210,304</td>
<td>26,258</td>
<td>236,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>14,876</td>
<td>21,353</td>
<td>36,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7,363,124</td>
<td>781,640</td>
<td>8,144,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>4,941*</td>
<td>12,766</td>
<td>17,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>109*</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>4,748*</td>
<td>11,572</td>
<td>16,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>7,387*</td>
<td>11,901</td>
<td>19,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swahili</td>
<td>32*</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>2,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>4,449*</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>5,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>907,644</td>
<td>111,966</td>
<td>1,019,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,638,277</td>
<td>1,527,409</td>
<td>12,116,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimates derived from statistical modeling (see methodology section).

From the school year 2007–2008 to 2014–2015, the total elementary and high school enrollments in Russian increased from 12,389 to 14,876, a growth in absolute numbers of 20% over a seven-year period. During this
time, 31 states showed growth in enrollment, 18 states showed declining enrollment, and one state showed no change. Figure 5 shows the growth trend across the 50 states and the District of Columbia.

In 2014–2015, over 10.6 million school-age children (elementary through high school) were enrolled in the study of a foreign language in the US. The vast majority of these students were enrolled in Spanish classes, which, apart from English, is the most widely spoken language in the US. Approximately 1.5 million students are enrolled in foreign language courses at the university level, where Spanish also continues to be the most frequently studied world language. Examining these enrollments, we find proportionately higher enrollments in Russian among university students than at the elementary and secondary school levels.

Table 2 provides a comparison of K-12 and higher education enrollments for all world languages including American Sign Language.

6. Factors informing district decisions to offer Russian at K-12 levels
In the course of conducting the 2014–2015 enrollment survey, the researchers asked district officials and administrators to comment on the factors affecting their decisions to offer world language instruction in their systems, noting any innovative approaches they may have taken to support the LCTLs, such as Russian.

Respondents stressed that decisions by US schools to offer foreign language classes are informed by both demand and supply factors. Increased interest by parents and students can influence schools’ decisions to offer foreign languages and the choice of which languages to offer. On the supply side, schools struggle to offer foreign languages with a three- or four-year course sequence of instruction in order to ensure levels

---

5 The 31 states (and the District of Columbia) that experienced growth in K-12 enrollment were Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming. The 18 states that experienced decline in K-12 enrollment were Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin. There was no change in Louisiana.
of proficiency and cultural knowledge that will be useful for students at the next stages of their education or career. Shifting levels of enrollment from one year to the next can make it challenging for school administrators to secure the minimum number of student enrollments to start and maintain a language class and recruit teachers for each language. Administrators noted that until and unless the minimum number of students is enrolled, it is not a cost-effective proposition for schools or colleges to offer languages with low or highly fluctuating enrollments, particularly in an environment of scarce resources and increasing demands on available time in the curriculum for new class offerings.

Respondents also reported that with competing priorities within a limited-resource environment, institutional budgets must recognize academic priorities identified by districts (such as STEM) and governing boards, as well as those that are defined by federal and state requirements. Meeting prescribed standards in the subjects considered to be most important at the district, state or federal level rises in importance in the institutional decision-making process, both in terms of using available resources and in efforts to secure additional funds for subsequent years. These priorities often take precedence over foreign language learning, particularly in schools or states that have no specific foreign language policy or requirements.

District- and school-level survey respondents also commented that schools often struggle to find and retain qualified teachers, particularly teachers of the LCTLs, such as Russian. Lack of qualified teachers may lead to the cancellation of a specific language program or course (Commission on Language Learning 2017, ix). The development of the virtual high school is a model that, reportedly, has allowed schools to marshal available resources and give students a greater choice of subjects and courses offered, including foreign languages, while remaining financially viable and competitive in the education marketplace.

In another approach to bridging the resource gap, schools and colleges in some locations have elected to pool resources, providing language classes at a single area school or institution either during school time or after regular hours. In this model, schools are permitted to specialize in the teaching of one or two critical languages—Chinese,
Arabic, or Russian, for example—allowing students from surrounding institutions to travel to that school for language instruction.

Finally, as noted in the American Academy Commission Report, K-12 Russian and other world languages are now at the center of one of the most significant innovations affecting US education today: dual language immersion, which is estimated to have been incorporated into 2500–3000 programs across the nation as of this study. Among those states with notably active enrollments in foreign languages, Alaska, Arizona, Delaware, Georgia, Oregon, North Carolina, and Utah have implemented state-, district-, or school-level 50-50 dual language immersion programs at the K-5 and K-8 levels. Dual language instruction is often linked to local population demographics; Spanish, Chinese, French, Japanese, Russian, and Portuguese are the languages most frequently encountered (Fausset, Richard 2019). Dual language immersion programs may or may not be reflected in state-level foreign language enrollment reporting, given that courses taught in the partner language are treated as subject courses rather than foreign language courses (Steele et al. 2017; Burkhauser et al. 2016). The Utah bridge model for K-8 dual immersion to advanced placement and college-level study in the target language during the high school years is of particular relevance to the present discussion of school-to-college articulation and the preparation of US students at the advanced and professional levels of proficiency (Utah’s Advanced Language Bridge Program).

7. K-12/K-16 enrollment survey methodology
In 2014–2015, American Councils and its partners launched a campaign to reach out to the language community to invite participation in The National K-16 Enrollment Survey. The purpose of the survey was to document enrollment in world languages, including Russian, in kindergarten through high schools in the US. American Councils launched its targeted data collection for states and high schools. This data collection method included reaching out to state departments of education and providing links to the online questionnaires to state

---

7 This study was sponsored by The National Security Education Program (NSEP) and conducted and published by American Councils for International Education in partnership with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL), and the Modern Language Association (MLA) and in collaboration with the National Council of State Supervisors for Languages (NCSSFL).
departments of education and high schools as well as hosting the link on the website of all partner organizations. American Councils created a website page for the enrollment survey to provide information for use by school principals, district administrators, and state foreign language supervisors—as well as other interested parties—regarding the purpose, sponsors, and partners in the present foreign language enrollment survey. This website page also provided links to the online questions for data collection and offered a mechanism for respondents from these agencies to upload data files in their preferred format. The state-by-state data collection was launched in collaboration with ACTFL, which reached out directly to its membership, inviting all members to promote the enrollment survey within their respective organizations and to submit relevant data on world language education. In addition, American Councils addressed 60 queries from individuals at the state and district levels, responding to questions, including those on timelines, and requests for assistance. Additionally, in response to requests from states, and to facilitate the process of identifying data elements needed, American Councils also shared a paper version of the questionnaire so that states could review all questions or requested data at once to expedite request process to their data processing departments. American Councils also offered the option of sending in a file to further help facilitate data submissions.

To support data collection and outreach in the language learning community, American Councils published an official press release through its newswire distribution service, PRWeb. The release was also featured on the American Councils website. The press release received 29,384 headline impressions and was delivered to 1,305 media outlets for distribution. American Councils continued to support its web presence by maintaining a landing page for the enrollment survey on its website in order to direct continuing traffic toward the survey and provide detail about the effort.

American Councils also conducted a separate high school direct census, reaching out to over 26,000 high schools across the US. American Councils and sending 56,000 mailings (invitation letters and reminder post cards) to schools to invite their participation in the high school census of US foreign language education. Data collection for high schools adopted a mixed-mode approach (telephone and Internet) in 50 states and the District of Columbia. The schools were initially contacted by mail
and were asked to complete the survey online. The non-respondents were then contacted by telephone and given an option to complete the survey either by telephone or on the Internet. Up to 10 attempts were made to contact the non-respondents.

American Councils statisticians developed a model for estimating enrollment for missing data using state-level data from the Census Bureau’s American Community Survey data: percent of households where languages other than English are spoken, percent of residents below the poverty line, percent of adults 25 years or older with an educational degree of Bachelor or higher, percent of residents who indicate their race as African-American, and percent of residents who indicate their ethnicity as Hispanic or Latino, delineated by the four regions of the US. Additional data sources included an indicator of state-level support for foreign language instruction, which was whether the state’s high school graduation requirements included foreign language instruction, either as a fixed requirement or as one of several possible credits that had to be accumulated toward high school graduation.

The presence or absence of such a foreign language requirement was coded from each state’s Education Department website. A regression model was developed with the dependent variable of interest as the proportion of students attending foreign language classes, modeling with generalized (fixed or mixed effects) linear models with a logistic link function and binomial sampling assumptions.

In addition to the data collection mechanisms noted above, the authors of the present study made use of data on Russian language programs and student enrollments available through activities of ACTR, including the annual high school Olympiada of Spoken Russian competitions and the secondary school essay contest, both of which typically attract well over 1,000 participants annually from throughout the US, and (2) aggregate data on participants in the annual NEWL-Russian.

Apart from Russian language programs conducted as part of the US formal educational system, Russian language study occupies a place in US home schooling; in Saturday schools organized by Russian Orthodox churches; in monasteries and Scouting programs; in privately funded day care and early childhood education programs; and in charter, private, and Russian Embassy schools serving heritage and other Russian-speaking populations in the US. The present study, unfortunately, only
addresses Russian enrollments that are a part of the formal US educational system. However, the 2009 ACTR survey does provide data on public, independent, and heritage Russian schooling in the US at the senior secondary level (Davidson and Garas 2009).

8. Conclusions
Any assessment of the current state of foreign language education in the US should consider both K-12 and higher education language enrollment trends, with an understanding that the realities on the ground are, not surprisingly, invariably more complex than the top-line figures reported here might suggest. As noted above, investments in Russian (and in all K-12 language education) vary greatly from one state to another, with the larger enrollments and more extensive offerings generally coinciding with concentrations of Russian-speaking communities of US residents. By contrast, enrollments at the higher education level are more likely to reflect state-, federal-, and institutional-level investments and commitments to the study of language and international studies.

As is evident from the present study, the level of demand for a foreign language in a largely decentralized educational system like that of the US informs what language a K-12 school would decide to offer and how the school would offer it. Schools can restructure or modify course offerings to meet student interest. Parent and student interest in a particular language is often informed by the cultural heritage of the parents or family but also increasingly by the perceived utility of the study of that language. With the growing awareness of the need to develop 21st century skills and to be more competitive in an increasingly globalized economy, parents and students, and, in some cases, businesses and nonprofit organizations, may elect to partner with public schools to enrich or to expand language offerings beyond Spanish and English (Commission on Language Learning 2017, 20–21).

The 2017 report of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences Commission on Language Learning, America’s Languages: Investing in Language Education for the 21st Century, has presented a broad-ranging and well-documented view of the US’s current language needs, what language capacities and resources are now in place, and how US needs are likely to change in the years to come. Foremost among the commission’s recommendations is the call for “a national strategy to
broaden access to language education for every student in the United States as preparation for life and work in the global 21st century,” which will include “opportunities for students to travel and experience other cultures [and] immerse themselves in languages as they are used in everyday interactions and across all segments of society” (26-27).

The view of Russian from the K-16 perspective reveals patterns in the formal study of Russian not previously observed and deserving of further attention in the future. Higher education enrollments in Russian over the period of 2009–2016 declined by more than 20% (excluding summer institutes and some study abroad programs), while K-12 enrollments in Russian over the same period increased by just over 20% (excluding summer institutes and study abroad programs) (Looney and Lusin 2018).8

Moreover, enrollment declines across programs in US higher education are by no means uniform. Russian university-level enrollments were observed to hold steady or to increase at those institutions which have invested in the support of faculties and programs, established Flagship Programs and Title VI Centers, and/or encouraged student participation in federally funded programs for overseas study such as the Boren Awards, the Critical Language Scholarship Program, Fulbright-Hays scholarships, and the Fulbright US Scholar Programs. Institutions with Russian Flagship Programs have invested in advanced level instruction, including overseas study, and expanded access to their curricula for students of all majors and backgrounds. Most have not only maintained enrollment at all levels, as a result, but in many cases have grown them considerably.

The American Academy Commission Report recommends that US schools accord the study of world languages the same status in the core curriculum of US education as that of English, mathematics, and science. The elevation of world languages to the status of core curriculum will require considerable expansion and reimagining of existing program designs, as well as of new modes for the delivery of instruction. The present study, and indeed the present volume of papers, provides some early indications of how that core status for languages might eventually take root.

8 The 2018 report provides the most recent update of US Russian higher education enrollments as of 2016: 20,353.
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