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**IFLE MISSION**

*To meet the national need for expertise and competence in foreign languages and area or international studies*

**TITLIE VI Domestic International Programs:**

1. American Overseas Research Centers
2. Business and International Education
3. Centers for International Business Education
4. Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships
5. Institute for International Public Policy
6. International Research and Studies
7. Language Resource Centers
8. National Resource Centers
9. Technological Innovation and Cooperation for Foreign Information Access
10. Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language

**Overseas Fulbright-Hays programs:**

1. Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad
2. Faculty Research Abroad
3. Group Projects Abroad
4. Seminars Abroad Program and Special Bilateral Projects

**2013 Funding Opportunity**

**Anticipating 2014 Grant Competitions**

- CIBE – Business and International Education
- NRC - National Resource Centers
- FLAS - Foreign Language and Area Studies Fellowships
- IRS - International Research and Studies
- LRC - Language Resource Centers
- UISFL - Undergraduate International Studies and Foreign Language
- DDRA - Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad
- GPA ST - Group Projects Abroad
- SA - Seminars Abroad Program
Global Competencies

Global competencies are “21st century skills applied to the world.”

Global Competence Task Force, Asia Society, & Council of Chief State School Officers
Global Competency for ALL Students
International Strategy Goal 1

U.S. Diversity

Race/Ethnicity Study Abroad (2008):
- 82% White
- 4% Black
- 6% Latino
- 6% Asian American

40%-60% of U.S. undergraduates attend institutions where there are few international studies and study abroad opportunities.
International Benchmarking
International Strategy Goal 2

Percentage of Adults Age 25-34 with Postsecondary Education
(Associate Degree or Higher in U.S., per 2008 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau)

Chart 1: Percentage of Adults Age 25-34 with Tertiary Education
(Associate Degree or Higher in U.S., per 2008 Current Population Survey, U.S. Census Bureau)

OECD Education at a Glance 2010
Table A1.3a - Population with Tertiary Education 2008
“By 2020, America will once again have the highest proportion of college graduates in the world... So tonight I ask every American to commit to at least one year or more of higher education or career training... every American will need to get more than a high school diploma.”

President Obama’s Goal 2020

Goal

• 10 million more graduates from community colleges, four-year colleges and universities by 2020 (beyond 2+ million expected due to growth)

Goal

• Create and support opportunities for every American to complete one year or more of higher education or advanced training in his/her lifetime

Result

• “Best educated, most competitive workforce in the world”

Increase the U.S. College Degree Attainment Rate from 40 to 60%

ACCESS  QUALITY  COMPLETION
IFLE Strategic Goals

1. Meet President’s 2020 Goals and Improve the Quality of International Education

2. Improve Access to and Diversity in International Education

3. Increase in National Security and Global Competitiveness

International Affairs Office
International Strategy

- A world-class education and global competencies for all students;

- International benchmarking and applying lessons learned from other countries; and

- Education diplomacy and engagement with other countries.
Evidence-Based Grant Program Designs

Goal: More federal resources go to evidence-based practices

1. **Build Evidence**: Use strong evaluation designs to test and find effective practices

2. **Act on Evidence**: Increase the share of funds that support evidence-based practices
   - competitive grants to scale proven practices or validate practices with some evidentiary support; and
   - “pay for success” models where the Federal government pays for results after they are achieved.

3. **Assess Cost-effectiveness**: Once effective practices have been identified, programs should try to assess:
   - the relative impact of different programs on short and long-term outcomes;
   - the costs of program implementation at scale; and
   - the relative cost-effectiveness of alternative strategies.
Evidence-Based Grant Program Designs (cont.)

Goal: More federal resources go to evidence-based practices

4. **Disseminate Findings**: about what works and what does not to current and potential grantees

5. **Build grantee capacity and use grantee input**:
   - Use training, technical assistance, collateral materials, grantee learning networks, and information systems that help grantees implement effective programs.
   - Use grantee inputs to help program designers identify priority areas and hone initiatives over time.

6. **Support continuous program improvement**: Identify and recognize which interventions do not work and applying the lessons learned.
NRC Performance Measures

GPRA Measures
GPRA of 1993 - GPRA Modernization Act of 2010 requires federal agencies to develop and report to Congress measures that are:

- quantifiable annual and long-term
- ambitious, yet achievable targets from baseline data
- based on program regulations and goals

Project Specific Measures

- Include both quantitative & qualitative
- Support program goals
- Link directly to project’s goals and objectives
- Align with institutional goals
- Have clearly defined outcomes

PPSS – Policy/Planning Service:
- **Performance Measure**: Decrease subjectivity / Increase objectivity
- **Data Sources**: Increase data validity & reliability
- **Timeframe**: consistency and feasibility
- **Methodology**: consistency in data collection, analysis and reporting
NRC Performance Measures

- Objective-linked
- Responsibility-linked
- Organizationally acceptable
- Comprehensive
- Credible
- Compatible
- Comparable with other data (useful in making comparisons, for example, performance can be compared from period to period, with peers, with target groups, etc.)
- Easy to interpret

Additionally, we have to be able to demonstrate that NRC program and project performance is:

- Sustainable
- Reasonable
- Measurable
- Replicable
Developing Performance Measures
Formulate questions that are of interest to all stakeholders and audiences related to the NRC projects, and align questions with appropriate information gathering techniques.

1. Who/what will change?
2. When do you expect the change(s) to take place?
3. How much change is expected?
4. How will change be measured, recorded, or documented?

Planning Data Collection
1. What is the baseline?
2. What is the proposed target?
3. What measurable indicators show progress toward objective?

Preparing Data Analysis and Reporting
1. What are the benchmark indicators of results achieved?
2. How do we know if we meet the proposed objective?
3. What do collected data tell us?
# Performance Measure Form: PMF

## Project Goal Statement: 

### (Outcome/Impact)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures (Measurable Objectives) (S-T Outcome)</th>
<th>Major Activities (Input)</th>
<th>Data/Indicators (Output)</th>
<th>Data Source/Frequt</th>
<th>Base line</th>
<th>Actual/Target Y1</th>
<th>Actual/Target Y2</th>
<th>Actual/Target Y3</th>
<th>Actual/Target Y4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PMF for GPRA Measures, 1st Column will be pre-populated.
Factors to consider in developing measurable objectives to achieve comprehensive change or improvement.
Project Performance Measures

- **Student Outcomes**: advanced proficiency (knowledge/skills), degree completion, employability
- **Faculty Outcomes**: improved course curricula & delivery, published & disseminated new knowledge
- **Institutional Outcomes**: courses, certificate, degree programs, signed agreements/collaboration, sustainability

Other Research Study Questions:

- Why should my institution care about international education?
- Why should it be a priority in higher education or undergraduate program?
- What are my institution’s overarching goal and priorities?
- How can I align international education with them?
- How do I set up an evaluation to produce concrete data to show the values of international abroad education?

*Education Abroad & academic performance* (Kuh, 2009, McKeown 2010)
NRC Selection Criteria: Impact & Evaluation

- To what extent does the applicant provide an evaluation plan that is comprehensive and objective and that will produce quantifiable, outcome-measure-oriented data?

- To what extent do the Center's activities and training programs have a significant impact on the university, community, region, and the nation as shown through indices such as enrollments, graduate placement data, participation rates for events, and usage of center resources?

- To what extent does the applicant supply a clear description of how the applicant will provide equal access and treatment for eligible students and other participants who are members of groups that have been traditionally under-represented (such as members of racial or ethnic minority groups, women, persons with disabilities, and the elderly)?
NRC/FLAS Selection Criteria: Impact & Evaluation (cont.)

- To what extent have recent evaluations been used by the applicant to improve its program?

- To what degree do activities of the center address national needs, and generate information for and disseminate information to the public?

- To what extent do students matriculate into advanced language and area or international studies programs or related professional programs? (FLAS)

- What is the applicant’s record of placing students in post-graduate employment, education, or training in areas of national need and the applicant’s stated efforts to increase the number of such students that go into such placements? (FLAS)
Demonstrating the Impact of NRCs

- **Performance Measures**: Increase objectivity - Decrease subjectivity
- **Learning Outcomes**: Comparability across projects
  - **Data Sources**: data validity & reliability
  - **Timeframe**: consistency and feasibility
  - **Methodology**: consistency in data collection, analysis and reporting
Questions to Consider:

- In what way could we leverage the current expertise and experience of NRCs to help meet the Administration’s and national priorities? (Access/Diversity/College Completion)

- In which ways could NRCs refine and refocus their outreach activities to build intentional and systematic partnerships or programs with K-12, Community Colleges, or Business/Media and the general public that produce concrete results addressing ED’s priorities?

- How can NRCs partner with “Non-NRC institutions” to build their capacity to offer students in under-resourced institutions the language/international/area studies opportunities as those in the existing NRCs?

- Focus group interest: Kimoanh.nguyen-lam@ed.gov
  Cheryl.Gibbs@ed.gov
  Sylvia.Crowder@ed.gov
A Study of Four Federal Graduate Fellowship Programs – Education and Employment Outcomes

The Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) in the U.S. Department of Education (ED) sponsors four graduate fellowship programs:

- the Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad (DDRA) fellowship program, (258)
- the Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowship program, (3,405)
- the Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need (GAANN) fellowship program, (1,774)
- the Jacob K. Javits fellowship program (146)

This report describes the academic and employment outcomes as of 2006 of graduate students who received financial support through one of these four federal fellowship programs between 1997 and 1999. Despite their differences, however, all of these programs are intended to encourage academically talented students to become experts in fields important to the national interest.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development
Policy and Program Studies Service
2008
### Table A. Selected program characteristics and findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program characteristic</th>
<th>DDRA</th>
<th>FLAS</th>
<th>GAANN</th>
<th>Javits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal or Objective</td>
<td>To enable students to conduct research in other countries in modern languages and area studies</td>
<td>To develop expertise in modern foreign languages</td>
<td>To meet national needs for expertise in mathematics, natural sciences, computer science, and engineering</td>
<td>To enable students of superior ability in the arts, humanities, and social sciences to complete their terminal degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship survey response rate</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of fellowships with degrees completed by 2006</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral fellowships</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fellowships</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average years to degree completion</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral fellowships</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other fellowships</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent employed in job related to fellowship gained expertise since completing fellowship</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Reporting standards not met. (Too few cases for a reliable estimate.)

### Table 3. Percentage distribution of 1997–99 DDRA fellowships according to fellows’ field of study when received fellowship: 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Social sciences</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Area studies and international relations/affairs</th>
<th>Political science</th>
<th>Other professional fields</th>
<th>Anthropology</th>
<th>Other social science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Rounds to zero.

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Table 8. Percentage of 1997–99 DDRA fellowships in which fellows had worked for pay since their fellowship had ended, and among those, average number of jobs fellows held and percentage in which fellows began working at various intervals after fellowship completion: 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had worked for pay since fellowship</th>
<th>When first worked</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Worked in any part-time reported jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within year of completing fellowship</td>
<td>Within two to three years of completing fellowship</td>
<td>More than three years after completing fellowship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Had worked</td>
<td>Average support ended</td>
<td>Number of jobs held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether received other institution funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received no support from institution</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>‡</td>
<td>‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received less than what was provided through fellowship</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received same amount or more than what was provided through fellowship</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‡ Reporting standards not met. (Too few cases for a reliable estimate.)

NOTE: Questions regarding their employment instructed fellows not to report on research or teaching jobs that they did in conjunction with their work toward the degree if was supported by the fellowship. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Table 9. Percentage of 1997–99 DDRA fellowships in which fellows had worked in at least one job in which they used the expertise they had gained through the fellowship since it had ended; among those, average number of related jobs held; percentage distribution according to when first related job began; and average number of years spent in such jobs: 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had worked in job involving expertise gained from fellowship</th>
<th>Average number of related jobs held since fellowship support ended</th>
<th>When first worked in related job</th>
<th>Average number of years spent in job where used expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within a year of completing fellowship</td>
<td>Within two to three years of completing fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Questions regarding their employment instructed fellows not to report on research or teaching jobs that they did in conjunction with their work toward the degree that was supported by the fellowship. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Figure 5. Of 1997–99 DDRA fellowships in which fellows had worked in at least one job in which they used the expertise gained through their fellowship, percentage in which fellows had worked in various sectors in any of these jobs: 2006

‡ Reporting standards not met. (Too few cases for a reliable estimate.)

Table 14. Percentage distributions of 1997–99 FLAS fellowships according to fellows’ gender and race/ethnicity: 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black or African-American</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Multiple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First-professional degree</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program type</td>
<td>Graduate field of study</td>
<td>Language</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>American and European</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other history</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other humanities</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional fields</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area studies and international relations/affairs</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political science and government</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other social science</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>#</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Rounds to zero.
NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
Figure 6. Percentage distribution of 1997–99 FLAS fellowships according to geographic region of origin for first language studied with support of the FLAS fellowship: 2006

NOTE: Some fellowships involved the study of multiple languages. This figure includes data on the first language reported for each fellowship. See Appendix A for languages included in each geographic region. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.


Foreign language programs that are eligible for National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART) grants.

a Critical language programs that are eligible for National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART) grants.
Figure 9. Percentage distribution of 1997–99 FLAS fellowships by fellows’ degree completion status in 2006, and percentage distribution of 1992–93 bachelor’s degree recipients’ graduate degree completion status in 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed 80%</td>
<td>Completed 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still enrolled 14%</td>
<td>Still enrolled 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropped out 6%</td>
<td>Dropped out 6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.
SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, Survey of Graduate Fellowship Programs, 2006; National Center for Education Statistics, 1993/03 Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study (B&B:93/03).
Table 23. Percentage of 1997–99 FLAS fellowships in which fellows had worked for pay since their fellowship had ended, and among those, average number of jobs fellows held and percentage in which fellows began working at various intervals after fellowship completion: 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had worked for pay since fellowship support ended</th>
<th>Average number of jobs held</th>
<th>When first worked</th>
<th>Within two years of completing fellowship</th>
<th>More than three years after completing fellowship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within two years of completing fellowship</td>
<td>More than three years after completing fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program type</th>
<th>Had worked for pay since fellowship support ended</th>
<th>Average number of jobs held</th>
<th>Within two years of completing fellowship</th>
<th>More than three years after completing fellowship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-professional degree</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate field of study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate field of study</th>
<th>Had worked for pay since fellowship support ended</th>
<th>Average number of jobs held</th>
<th>Within two years of completing fellowship</th>
<th>More than three years after completing fellowship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American and European</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other history</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other humanities</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional fields</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area studies and international relations/affairs</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political science and government</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other social science</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Questions regarding their employment instructed fellows not to report on research or teaching jobs that they did in conjunction with their work toward the degree that was supported by the fellowship.

Table 24. Percentage of 1997–99 FLAS fellowships in which fellows had worked in at least one job in which they used the expertise they had gained through the fellowship since it had ended; among those, average number of related jobs held; percentage distribution according to when first related job began; and average number of years spent in such jobs: 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Had worked in job involving expertise gained from fellowship since fellowship support ended</th>
<th>When first worked in related job</th>
<th>Average number of years in job where used expertise</th>
<th>Degree completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within a year of completing fellowship</td>
<td>Within two to three years of completing fellowship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree completion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete, still pursuing</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not complete, no longer pursuing</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Questions regarding their employment instructed fellows not to report on research or teaching jobs that they did in conjunction with their work toward the degree they were supported by the fellowship. Detail may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Figure 11. Of 1997–99 FLAS fellowships in which fellows had worked in at least one job in which they used the expertise gained through their fellowship, percentage in which fellows had worked in various sectors in any of these jobs: 2006