2013

A survey of the U.S. Confucius Institutes: Opportunities and challenges in promoting Chinese language and culture education

Shuai Li
Georgia State University, sli12@gsu.edu

G. Richard Tucker
Carnegie Mellon University, grtucker@andrew.cmu.edu

A Survey of the U.S. Confucius Institutes:
Opportunities and Challenges in Promoting Chinese Language and Culture Education[1]

Shuai Li (郦帅)
Georgia State University

G. Richard Tucker
Carnegie Mellon University

Abstract: The Confucius Institute (CI) network is a key project in China's recent campaign to promote Chinese language and culture education internationally. This study focused on the CIs in the United States (U.S.) and investigated their effort to achieve this goal. The results of a survey questionnaire based on 24 U.S. CIs showed that these institutes primarily focused on Chinese language teaching, teacher education, academic and cultural events. Meanwhile, the areas of teaching material development, language assessment, Chinese program development and evaluation were underdeveloped. Qualitative interviews with four focal CIs further revealed that the CIs were able to adjust to their respective local environments and to involve the local community in their operations. They developed creative ways to cope with a shortage of qualified teachers, teaching methods, and teaching materials that has constrained the international promotion of Chinese language and culture. Localization is considered a key to success and sustainability of the CIs. Therefore, the current top-down CI evaluation performed by Hanban should be improved to better identify the CIs' achievements.
Key words: U.S. Confucius Institutes, International promotion of Chinese language

摘要：在世界范围内建立孔子学院是近年来中国实施汉语国际推广的重要方式。本文研究美国 24 所孔子学院在推广汉语和中国文化方面的所做的努力，以及在此过程中所面临的机遇和挑战。问卷调查结果显示，这 24 所孔子学院主要致力于汉语教学、教师培训、学术和文化活动，而教材研发、汉语考试推广及中文项目开发和评估仍有

1

待进一步发展。此外，我们也报告了对四所孔子学院所做的深度采访。采访结果表明这四所孔子学院能够较好地适应当地特定的环境和需求，也能够在运作过程中利用当地社区和资源，以富有创造性的方法来解决限制汉语国际推广的教师、教法、教材问题。因此，我们认为"本土化"是孔子学院取得成功和可持续发展的关键所在，而汉办目前的评估体系则需要加以改进以更客观地衡量孔子学院在不同方面所取得的成绩。
关键词：美国孔子学院、汉语国际推广

1. Background

Since 2004, the Confucius Institute (CI) network has rapidly expanded throughout the world. As a result, the CI network has attracted the attention of scholars from various disciplines, such as public diplomacy, language planning, and foreign language education. Meanwhile, the CI network's international expansion has also generated some controversies such as its impact on the academic freedom of host institutions, the quality of its educational programs, and its financial viability, etc. As a main task of the CI network is the global promotion of Chinese language and culture education, researchers have focused much on issues related to teacher education and textbook development (Chen & Yu, 2008; Jin, 2006; Xu, 2006; Xu & Zheng, 2011; Zhao & Huang, 2010). However, empirical research investigating CIs' effort in promoting Chinese language and culture education has been scarce. This study aims to fill this gap in the research literature and focuses on the U.S. CI network. By combining quantitative and qualitative research methods, we strive to understand the opportunities and challenges that the U.S. CIs face in promoting Chinese language and culture education.

1.1.   Hanban and the Confucius Institute (CI) Network

The Chinese language has gained international popularity with the increase of China's worldwide influence. It is estimated that approximately 30 million people study Chinese as a second language (Xu, 2006), and over 3,000 institutions of higher education offer Chinese courses (China Educational Newspaper, 2009, September 30). In response to this unprecedented need for Chinese language education, China has initiated its international campaign to promote Chinese language and culture education. The campaign is conducted by Hanban, also known as the Confucius Institute Headquarters (www.hanban.edu.cn). Founded in 1987, Hanban is affiliated with China's Ministry of Education. It sponsors a range of projects for international Chinese language and culture education (e.g., the *Chinese Bridge* Chinese Proficiency Contest, Chinese Proficiency Test or HSK, Business Chinese Test).The Confucius Institute (CI) network serves a critical role for Hanban to fulfill its mission.[2] The *Constitution and By-Laws of the Confucius Institute*, available on Hanban's website, states the mission of the CI network as dedicated:

"to satisfying the demands of people from different countries and regions in the world who learn the Chinese language, to enhancing understanding of the Chinese language and culture by these peoples, to strengthening educational and cultural exchange and cooperation between China and other countries, to deepening friendly relationships with other nations, to promoting the development of

---

[2] The fact that Hanban also named itself "the Confucius Institute Headquarters" in 2007 indicates the status of the CI network within Hanban.

2

multiculturalism, and to construct a harmonious world".

The CI network operates with two models: the Confucius Institute (CI) and the Confucius Classroom (CC). A CI is typically a collaborative entity between Hanban, a partner university in China, and a host university in the target country.[3] CIs' service areas are: teaching Chinese language, training and certifying local Chinese language teachers, administering Chinese proficiency tests, providing consultation services, and conducting language and cultural exchange.[4] While CIs usually provide a broad range of services, Confucius Classrooms (CCs) primarily cater to K-12 schools. A CC is a collaborative entity between Hanban, a partner school in China, and a host school in the target country. CCs can operate independently, although it is also common to find one or several CCs affiliated with a CI in the same region.

The CI network has developed rapidly since its formation in 2004.[5] By December 2011, 358 CIs and 500 CCs have been established in 105 countries or regions, with over 10,000 faculty and staff serving more than 500,000 learners (Hanban, 2011).[6] The CI network is expected to further develop into a comprehensive platform for cultural exchange. Recently, Hanban (2011) has identified five areas of focused development: (1) teacher education, (2) international Chinese textbook development, (3) Chinese proficiency test administration and development, (4) brand projects (e.g., *Chinese Bridge* Chinese Proficiency Contest, Confucius Institute Journal), and (5) a program for China studies research. Individual CIs are expected to become regional centers for Chinese language teaching, teacher training and accreditation, and Chinese proficiency test administration. The global CI network is expected to have established 500 CIs and 1,000 CCs by 2015 (Hanban, 2011).

1.2.   The 3T Challenges: Teachers, Teaching Methods, and Teaching Materials

Researchers have identified the 3T challenges that the CI network faces in promoting Chinese language and culture education, namely, the shortage of (1) qualified teachers, (2) appropriate teaching methods, and (3) suitable teaching materials (Chen & Yu, 2008; Jin, 2006; Xu, 2006; Zhao & Huang, 2010). The shortage of Chinese language teachers is manifested in quantity and quality. On the one hand, Hanban estimated that there were only about 40,000 qualified Chinese instructors for over 30 million overseas learners (Chen & Yu, 2008). On the other hand, Wan (2009) noted that Hanban instructors were reported to lack the necessary training for carrying out their work, such as inadequate knowledge about the local educational system and target students' learning styles, lack of intercultural communication skills and foreign language skills. Meanwhile, the local Chinese teachers in the target nations were found to fall short of subject knowledge in Chinese linguistics and Chinese pedagogy (Starr, 2009; Xu & Zheng, 2011). Concerning the shortage of appropriate teaching methods, it was re-

---

[3] There are exceptions to this prototype. The host institution for a CI can be a local public school system (e.g., the CI in Chicago partners with the Chicago Public Schools), or a public school system plus a university (e.g., the CI in Atlanta works with the Atlanta Public Schools and Emory University), or a local educational organization (e.g., the CI at China Institute).

[4] Some CIs have a specialty area in addition to the typical service areas mentioned here. For instance, the CI at Georgia State University has a business focus, the CI at SUNY - Binghamton specializes in Beijing Opera, the CI at University of Michigan focuses on music, and the CI at London South Bank University uniquely focuses on traditional Chinese medicine.

[5] The first two CIs were established in 2004 in Uzbekistan and South Korea. The first CC was founded in 2008 in Austria.

[6] The global CI network has organized and sponsored more than 10,000 cultural events with approximately 7.2 million participants. In 2011 alone, over 8,000 Hanban instructors were assigned to teach Chinese in more than 100 countries or regions, and over 5,000 overseas students were funded to study in China (CRI Online, 2011, December 13).

3

ported that the teaching methods adopted by Hanban teachers did not work well for learners in certain countries and cultures (Global Times, 2007, January 16; Starr. 2009, Xu & Zheng, 2011). The third challenge is a shortage of appropriate teaching materials. Hanban had originally planned to use the textbooks published in China. However, this strategy was soon met with resistance because many of these textbooks were developed with a one-size-fits-all mentality and did not take into account cultural and sociological differences across various nations (e.g., Du & Wang, 2008; Xu & Zheng, 2011; Yang, 2009).

In response to the 3T challenges, Hanban has implemented several measures. The first is to develop a series of standards as general guidelines for the international promotion of Chinese language and culture (Hanban, 2007, 2008a, 2008b). These include: the *Standards for Teachers of Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages*, the *Chinese Language Proficiency Scales for Speakers of Other Languages*, and the *International Curriculum for Chinese Education*.

Second, to address the shortage of qualified teachers and appropriate teaching methods, Hanban has worked on enhancing teacher training capacity both at home and abroad. For example, a new type of M.A. program in Teaching Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages was launched in 2007. According the China Academic Degrees and Graduate Development Center (website visited on April 22, 2012), 82 institutions of higher education in China have been accredited to offer this program, and approximately 6,000 students have been recruited since 2007. In order to train instructors fluent in foreign languages other than English, Hanban recruited 1,600 graduates from various universities in 2009. Half of them were trained in 26 targeted foreign languages, and the remaining half were assigned to teach Chinese abroad while learning the local language(s) (China News Service, 2009, November 12). Hanban has also sponsored training programs for in-service CI staff and teachers, pre-service Hanban teachers, and overseas in-service instructors. These programs recruited over 10,000 trainees in 2010 (Xu, 2011).

Third, Hanban has worked on localizing the supply of Chinese language instructors in order to develop a sustainable teacher force. For example, a scholarship program was launched in 2009 to support 1,000 foreign citizens annually to study in M.A. programs (in the area of Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language) in China. Another scholarship program was created for overseas in-service Chinese instructors to attend relevant academic programs in their home countries. Through collaborations with CIs' host institutions, the development of Chinese language teacher education programs in host countries has been added to the agenda for future development (Hanban, 2011).

Finally, in an effort to develop appropriate teaching materials, Hanban sponsored the publication of nine textbook series in 45 languages in 2010. Meanwhile, by 2010, 104 CIs from around the world had compiled or published 77 localized textbooks or textbook series (Liu, 2011). In addition to textbook development, technology has made it possible for online and multimedia learning platforms to be developed and used. These include the Confucius Institute Online (www.chinese.cn/en) and Radio Confucius Institutes in countries such as Japan, Russia, and Kenya (China News Service, 2009, November 12).

To summarize, the 3T challenges are seen as major issues that the CI network faces in fulfilling its mission. While Hanban has made strides in addressing these challenges, how these issues are dealt with at the level of individual CIs remains an interesting empirical question.

1.3.   The Confucius Institutes (CI) in the U.S.

The CI network in the U.S. has expanded rapidly since the first U.S. CI was founded at University of Maryland in 2004. As of April of 2012, 81 Confucius Institutes and 299 Confucius Classrooms have been established in 48 states (China News Service, 2012, April 13). The development of the U.S. CI network echoes the rapid increase in Chinese class enrollment in U.S. schools. At the tertiary level, the enrollment increased by 18% from 2006 to 2009 reaching 60,976 students (Furman, Goldberg & Lusin, 2010). According to an ACTFL (2010) survey, the enrollment in public schools at the K-12 level rose from 20,292 in academic year 2004-05 to 59,860 in academic year 2007-08. Meanwhile, the two major national Chinese school associations for heritage learners[7]each reported to teach approximately 100,000 students in their affiliated schools (websites visited on April, 222, 2012).

With nearly 400 CIs and CCs, the scale of the U.S. CI network is larger than any other national CI network in the world. In 2011, the U.S. CIs and CCs together offered 6,127 Chinese classes with a total enrollment approaching 160,000 students. They also organized or sponsored 2,800 cultural events with 1.47 million participants (China News Service, 2012, April 13). In contrast to the large quantity of news coverage of the U.S. CIs (Li & Dai, 2011), there has been little empirical research to understand the opportunities and challenges that they have faced in fulfilling their missions. Although a few scholars have reported the experience of individual CIs (e.g., X. Wu, 2011; Y. Wu & Ruan, 2010; Zhang, 2009), no study has attempted to examine the entire U.S. CI network. This study purports to be a step in that direction. It focuses on CIs (rather than CCs) for two reasons. First, CIs typically provide a broader range of services and target a wider audience than CCs. Second, compared with CCs, CIs have had a longer history of operation. Both considerations suggest that focusing on CIs is a reasonable choice as the first step to researching the U.S. CI network. The two research questions investigated in this study are:

RQ1: What do the U.S. CIs do to promote Chinese language and culture education?

RQ2: What are the opportunities and challenges that the U.S. CIs face in promoting Chinese language and culture education?

2. Method

This study consisted of a questionnaire survey and a series of qualitative interviews conducted during the Fall of 2009 and the Spring of 2010.

2.1. Questionnaire Survey

The survey questionnaire (Appendix A) consisted of questions for collecting basic information about the participating CIs (Question #1-6) as well as their focal service areas. Question #7 was designed to identify the focus areas of a CI in general categories. Questions #8a through #8g asked for more detailed information for each category.

The survey questionnaire was distributed to 53 U.S. CIs in September and October of 2009. Because Hanban had not released a complete list of CIs by the time of this study, multiple sources were

---

[7] The two associations are: the Chinese School Association in the United States (www.csaus.net), and the National Council of Associations of Chinese language Schools (www.ncacls.org).

consulted from January to September 2009 in order to ascertain the number of U.S. CIs. These sources included: Hanban's website for a partial list of CIs, Wikipedia (the entry named "Confucius Institute") for a partial list of CIs, Google search for news reports about U.S. CIs using Chinese and English key words such as "US Confucius Institute" and "美国孔子学院" ("U.S. Confucius Institute"), and the online journal *Confucius Institutes* maintained by Hanban. As a result, 55 U.S. CIs were identified by September 2009. Contact information was found for 53 CIs online, and the survey questionnaire was sent to these CIs' directors or coordinators via e-mails. During September and October of 2009, two rounds of e-mail reminders were sent out in one-week intervals to encourage participation. Twenty-four CIs completed the questionnaire. Another two CIs indicated that they had nothing to report because their programs had just started.

2.2. Qualitative Interviews

Qualitative interviews were conducted using a pre-developed protocol. The interview questions (Appendix B) were designed to gain three aspects of information for each CI: (1) current foci and decision-making process, (2) evaluations of current practices, and (3) future plans. Requests for interviews were made to the CIs that completed the survey questionnaire. Representatives from 11 CIs agreed to be interviewed. Due to scheduling issues, the interviews were conducted between November 2009 and April 2010 via telephone or face-to-face meetings. The interviews typically lasted for about 40-50 minutes. When permitted by the interviewee, audio recordings of the interviews were made and later transcribed for key information. When audio recording was not permitted, notes were taken for later analysis. The interviews were conducted in either English or Chinese, based on the choice of the interviewees.

3. Results

3.1. Results for Research Question One

RQ1 asked "What do the U.S. CIs do to promote Chinese language and culture education?" As Table 1 shows, the 24 CIs primarily focused on four areas: Chinese course offerings (23 CIs, 95.83%), teacher education (15 CIs, 62.50%), academic activities (17 CIs, 70.83%), and cultural events (20 CIs, 83.33%). Fewer CIs worked on pedagogical material development (4 CIs, 16.67%), language assessment (4 CIs, 16.67%), and program development and evaluation (6 CIs, 25.00%).

Among the 23 CIs that offered Chinese language and/or cultural courses, 17 (73.9%) targeted K-12 students, 16 (69.6%) targeted university students, and 13 (56.5%) targeted the general public. It was common for a CI to offer courses to multiple learner populations. For example, the CI at University of Texas - Dallas offered both for-credit courses to university students and non-credit courses to adult learners and Chinese adoptees and their (American) parents. The CI also organized Chinese cultural workshops for local technology companies. On the other hand, a CI may focus on a particular learner population. For example, the CI in Chicago partnered with the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and focused on CPS students.

As for teacher education, among the 15 CIs that offered this service, 12 (80.0 %) aimed at training K-12 teachers, seven (46.7 %) worked with teachers from Chinese schools (for heritage learners), and

four (26.7 %) offered teacher training at the college level. The trainees of the various teacher education programs were local in-service teachers and volunteer teachers sent by Hanban. A common format for teacher education was presenting workshops to address pedagogy-related topics. The CIs also used other methods of teacher education. For example, the CI at San Francisco State University organized demo-teaching tours for local schools; the CI at University of Texas - Dallas collaborated with the Texas Chinese Language Teachers' Association and hosted a *Startalk* teacher education program.

Table 1. Surveyed U.S. CIs and Focal Areas.[8]

	Name of CI	Year Est.	Focal Areas as of 2009						
			CO	TE	PM	LA	PDE	AA	CA
1	CI at U. of Maryland	2004	X	X	X	X		X	X
2	CI at U. of Iowa	2006	X	X	X		X	X	
3	CI at San Francisco State U.*	2006	X	X		X	X	X	X
4	CI at U. of Hawaii	2006	X	X	X			X	X
5	CI at China Institute *	2006		X				X	
6	CI at U. of Kansas*	2006	X						
7	CI in Chicago*	2006	X	X			X		X
8	CI at U. of Memphis	2007	X	X		X		X	X
9	CI at UCLA *	2007	X	X	X		X		X
10	CI at U. of Texas-Dallas *	2007	X					X	X
11	CI at Purdue U.*	2007	X	X				X	X
12	CI at IUPUI – Indianapolis	2007	X	X				X	X
13	CI at North Carolina State U	2007	X					X	X
14	CI at New Mexico State U.*	2007	X					X	
15	CI at U. of Utah	2007	X	X				X	X
16	CI at U. of Pittsburgh	2007	X					X	X
17	CI at Wayne State U.	2008	X	X		X	X	X	X
18	CI at U. of South Florida *	2008	X						X
19	CI at Texas A&M U.	2008	X	X				X	X
20	CI at San Diego State U. *	2008	X	X			X		X
21	CI in Atlanta *	2009	X					X	X
22	CI at U. of Montana	2009	X	X					X
23	CI at Presbyterian College	2009	X						X
24	CI at Alaska U. Anchorage	2009	X					X	X
	Total (N=24)		23	15	4	4	6	17	20

As previously mentioned, 17 CIs sponsored academic activities. Among the categories surveyed,

---

the most frequent were: organizing academic conferences (10 CIs, or 58.8 %), offering lectures (16 CIs, 94.1 %), and implementing exchange programs (14 CIs, or 82.3 %). In contrast, only a few CIs conducted research projects (3 CIs, or 17.6 %) or worked on sponsoring or founding professional organizations (5 CIs, or 29.4 %). The following presents two sample activities for the last two categories. The CI at San Diego State University carried out a research project to collect and develop materials for Chinese teacher education. The CI at Wayne State University founded the Chinese Language Association of Michigan, the first of its kind in the State of Michigan.

Organizing and sponsoring cultural activities is another typical service area of the 24 CIs. Thirteen CIs (54.2 %) organized summer camps for learning and/or experiencing Chinese language and culture. Seventeen CIs (70.8 %) organized various cultural events (e.g., Chinese New Year Celebration, and *Chinese Bridge* Chinese Proficiency Contest).

In contrast to the four typical categories of CI activities, only a few of the 24 CIs engaged in pedagogical material development (4 CIs, or 16.7 %), language assessment (4 CIs, or 16.7 %), and program development and evaluation (6 CIs, or 25.0 %). An example of instructional material development was the UCLA CI's effort to create a Chinese curriculum based on the foreign language education standards recently adopted by the California State Board of Education. Concerning language assessment, the CIs were involved in hosting, organizing, and promoting the HSK test (a standardized Chinese proficiency test developed in China). In terms of program development and evaluation, an example was the San Diego State University CI's involvement in developing the Chinese language programs for two local elementary schools.

In summary, course offering, teacher education, academic activities, and cultural events were the four major channels used by the 24 CIs to promote Chinese language and culture education. Fewer CIs worked on pedagogical material development, Chinese program development/evaluation, and language assessment implementation.

3.2.   Results for Research Question Two

RQ2 asked "What are the opportunities and challenges that the U.S. CIs face in promoting Chinese language and culture education?" To answer this question, we report the experience of four representative CIs here. These CIs were chosen because they reflect the variations among the interviewed CIs regarding focal service areas, geographic location, and opportunities and challenges that they have faced. Each case is described for its focal areas, means of evaluation, and major issues in operation.

Confucius Institute A (CI-A). Founded in 2006 in a large city, CI-A focused on K-12 Chinese teaching and teacher professional development. These two areas were chosen by the CI because its partner, a local public school system, was interested in promoting Chinese teaching at the K-12 level. From 2006 to 2010, the CI helped increase the number of schools offering Chinese classes from three to 43, serving over 12,000 students. The CI did not directly teach Chinese; instead, it worked on recommending qualified Chinese language teachers to partner schools and offering information about teacher certification. With Hanban's support, the CI also provided free Chinese textbooks to local schools. In addition, the CI offered workshops catering to in-service teachers, addressing topics such as pedagogy, instructional materials (e.g., technology use, textbooks), and student recruitment. According to the CI director, these activities effectively addressed the 3T challenges.

With a primary focus on increasing the number of Chinese classes within the local public school

system, the CI's effort in evaluating the quality and progress of Chinese classes lagged behind. The dominant means of evaluation at the time of the interview was class observations conducted by the CI staff. Although the CI would have liked to implement standardized Chinese language assessments, a difficulty was that schools varied in curricula, textbooks, and amount of Chinese language instruction. Consequently, according to the director, school-based assessment would continue to be the primary means of tracking students' progress. Nevertheless, CI-A was planning to design and implement a uniform Chinese curriculum and assessment tools for its partner schools.

Confucius Institute B (CI-B). CI-B was established in 2007 in a small college town with a primary focus on K-12 Chinese teaching. According to CI-B's director, it was a "very easy" decision to focus on K-12 Chinese instruction: after contacting local community leaders, the CI identified a gap between the local need for K-12 Chinese education and the local school's inability to meet the need due to financial constraints. Hence, CI-B's support in providing Hanban teachers was greatly welcomed by the schools. By the time of the interview, the CI had partnered with one high school and three K-5 schools with over 1,900 students taking Chinese courses.

The CI relied on feedback from local stakeholders to evaluate its current practices. The CI staff organized regular meetings with liaisons of the local public schools. Class observations were also conducted to evaluate the performance of individual teachers. In addition, the CI submitted annual reports to Hanban. However, according to the CI director, the reports were more for accounting purposes (e.g., budget, number of students, teachers, and participants of cultural events) than for evaluation.

Having received quite a few requests from local schools asking for Chinese teaching support, the CI planned to expand its language teaching programs. The main challenge was to recruit enough staff and teachers to meet the growing need. By the time of the interview, there was only one full-time staff member, and the other two were professors from the CI's host university who volunteered to work for the CI on a part-time basis. As for the 10 language instructors, nine came from China and one from the State Department through the Teacher of Critical Languages program. Recruiting qualified instructors from the local area was not easy because the CI is located in a small college town. Hence, ensuring a steady and sufficient supply of qualified teachers and staff members to keep up with the CI's development was a major challenge for CI-B.

Confucius Institute C (CI-C). CI-C started to operate in 2008 in a medium-sized city with a focus on Chinese language and culture education on the host university's campus. The CI faculty constituted the backbone of the host university's Chinese program and they offered nine undergraduate and graduate courses. Interestingly, the CI did not reach out to local K-12 schools despite considerable perceived local need for Chinese language teaching. The CI also did not offer non-credit courses to the general public, although it did organize cultural events for the local community.

As the interview revealed, the CI's nearly exclusive focus on the university campus was a topic of contention between the CI and its host university. The university expected the CI to assume major teaching responsibilities on campus and put restrictions on its community outreach effort. While the CI acknowledged the importance of meeting the need on campus, it also considered itself to be a service provider that should go beyond the university campus to serve the local community. The CI director mentioned the lack of freedom to implement projects that the CI deemed as important to fulfilling its mission. Meanwhile, there was also a concern on campus that the CI was competing with certain academic units for students and resources. As a result, the CI received "suggestions" about what courses to offer and other specific requirements.

9

As it turned out, the CI's U.S. director had resigned six months prior and a search for a replacement was underway. Hence, the tension between CI-C and the host university most likely resulted from a lack of coordination between the two parties. Nevertheless, managing a smooth cooperative relationship between CI-C and its host university seemed to be a major challenge for the CI's endeavor.

Confucius Institute D (CI-D). CI-D was established in 2007 in a large city. The CI initially experienced a brief period of uncertainty, trying to figure out its role in the host university and in the local community. With the rationale of building on what was already in place in the local area, the CI reached out to work with leaders of an influential local organization enthusiastic in promoting Chinese education in K-12 schools. The local community leaders set up a Mandarin School Committee to work with the Mayor's Office and the school board to strategize about how to start Mandarin programs. In this process, the CI helped put together an advisory board to develop the "Mandarin, Spanish and other languages in school" initiative, which states that every child in a school district has the right to learn a language besides the language spoken in their home. After the school board passed the initiative in 2008, CI-D started to work with local schools to offer Chinese courses.

It soon became apparent to CI-D that recruiting qualified teachers would be a challenge. Before CI-D was founded, the local schools reported unsatisfactory experience with Hanban instructors due to the instructors' lack of training or experience in teaching young learners. There were also changes in the Union Rule that made it financially difficult for local schools to continue to hire Hanban instructors. Therefore, CI-D decided to recruit and train teachers from the local area. It turned to university students in credential programs and doctoral students in applied linguistics. About 10 students were recruited as teaching scholars. These students had background in Chinese and were interested in pursuing a career in teaching Chinese. The teaching scholars were assigned to teach in the local schools. In return, they received scholarships from the CI. Meanwhile, in return for the scholarships, university faculty agreed to supervise the performance of the teaching scholars, and the local schools agreed to offer professional development sessions for them.

The CI also worked on implementing the state standards for foreign language education. At the time of the interview, the CI was recruiting teachers to develop the first year's curriculum and lesson plans based on the *World Language Content Standards* adopted by the State Board of Education in 2010. The goal was to publish a standards-based handbook for local teachers.

Interestingly, one major issue that the CI faced was how to work with Hanban to better evaluate its achievement. From the CI's perspective, it had focused on constructing and maintaining a network by utilizing local resources to serve the CI's mission and to sustain its operation. From Hanban's perspective, as perceived by the CI director, this kind of partnership made it difficult to evaluate the CI's achievements. One comment that the CI received from Hanban was: "You don't do programs by yourself, you partner with other institutions". When the CI was asked to report its work in numbers (i.e., number of students taught, number of teachers trained, number of participants at cultural events), it felt some difficulty in doing so, because the CI was only one part of a local network working together. The difference between the CI and Hanban regarding how to evaluate the CI's achievement was captured in the director's remark: "We don't have any students, but everybody knows our Confucius Institute". As it turned out, the CI was under the leadership of a U.S. director and there was no co-director from China. This could have caused difficulty in reaching agreement over how to evaluate the CI's work.

4. Discussion

RQ1 examined what the 24 U.S. CIs did to promote Chinese language and culture education. The results showed that the CIs primarily worked on offering Chinese courses, teacher education, organizing and sponsoring academic and cultural activities. Regarding Chinese course offerings and teacher education, a noticeable trend was an emphasis on the K-12 level. Although 22 of the 24 CIs were hosted at universities, 17 reached out to local K-12 schools for Chinese teaching. Likewise, among the 15 CIs that provided teacher education, most worked with K-12 schools and Chinese schools.

Three factors may have jointly contributed to this K-12 focus. First, compared with universities, K-12 schools need more academic support for Chinese course offering. Chinese language education has been an academic subject in U.S. higher education for decades, yet the history of teaching Chinese in K-12 schools is short, starting with the Dodge Foundation's "China Initiative" in 1982. Hence, while many universities have full-fledged Chinese programs with well-developed curricula and well-trained faculty, these are usually not available to K-12 schools. CIs have been welcomed by K-12 schools because they can provide teachers and curriculum support at no cost. Second, Chinese language education at the K-12 level can target a larger student population than at the tertiary level. As previously mentioned, approximately 200,000 students are enrolled in (weekend) Chinese schools and about 60,000 attend Chinese classes in public schools. Meanwhile, the enrollment in university Chinese classes was around 60,000 in 2009. Finally, Hanban has recently placed more emphasis on the CI network's community outreach effort. This is reflected in the theme of the 2009 World Confucius Institute Conference "Confucius Institute and Community Service". At the conference, Ms. Yandong Liu, State Councilor and President of the Council of the Confucius Institute Headquarters, asked CIs to support the establishment of Confucius Classrooms in primary and secondary schools (Xinhua News Net, 2009, December 11). This recent Hanban policy may have influenced the CIs' decision to focus on K-12 schools.

Concerning the CIs' effort in teacher education, the most common format turned out to be workshops. While workshops can enable focused discussion of a selection of topics for in-service instructors, systematic training of future teachers through certification programs remains an underdeveloped area. Clearly, a steady flow of qualified local teachers is needed to sustain Chinese language teaching in the long run. In fact, Hanban (2011) has asked CIs to collaborate with host universities to develop programs for teacher education; it also plans to increase the support of "Confucius Institute Scholarship" for training local teachers. Hence, recruiting and training candidate teachers for the future seems to be a logical step for CIs to take in the next phase of development.

Besides course offering and teacher education, only a few CIs worked on pedagogical material development, language assessment administration, and program development or assessment. This is perhaps not surprising since these "less focused areas" typically necessitate a strong and sustained research base that is usually not available to many newly established CIs. Hanban (2011) has recently identified Chinese language assessment and China studies research programs as key areas of development for the CI network. The effect of this new strategic plan will need to be investigated empirically in the future.

RQ2 investigated the opportunities and challenges that the U.S. CIs faced in promoting Chinese language and culture education. Our findings indicated that K-12 Chinese education held great potential for future development. The CIs were also found to have adopted localized strategies to promote

Chinese teaching at the K-12 level. For example, CI-B taught Chinese courses for local schools because it was not easy to recruit and train local teachers. In contrast, CI-A and CI-D did not directly teach for local schools because teachers were available in the local area. The two CIs thus played a supportive role by recruiting and training local teachers to support Chinese education.

While Chinese language teaching at the K-12 level constitutes an opportunity for development, it may also put more pressure on the localization of qualified Chinese teachers, which is already a challenge for at least some CIs. Our results showed that the reasons behind and by making effort to standardize Chinese education. These examples showed that the CIs were able to adjust to their respective environments and to develop the perceived shortage of qualified teachers varied among the four CIs. For CI-B, it was because the enrollment growth seemed to outpace the development of the CI's capacity to provide teachers with supporting staff. For CI-D, it was due to the unsatisfactory experience of using Hanban teachers. These findings support previous literature on the 3T issues (e.g., Chen & Yu, 2008; Jin, 2006; Xu, 2006; Zhao & Huang, 2010) by providing an additional piece of evidence from the U.S. CIs. On the other hand, the shortage of qualified teachers also motivated some CIs to find creative ways to address this challenge. For instance, CI-D managed to involve local communities, K-12 schools, and institutions of higher education as stakeholders to develop a model for teacher education. Because the candidate teachers were recruited from the local area, and because the responsibility for educating and supervising the instructors was shared among multiple parties, this model has much promise of strong sustainability.

In addition to the K-12 level, our findings suggest that much can be done at the university level, especially in institutions without full-fledged Chinese programs. For example, CI-C served as the backbone of its host university's Chinese program and offered a range of graduate and undergraduate courses. Although there was tension between the CI and some academic units on campus, that was likely due to the temporary vacancy of a U.S. director which led to the lack of coordination and communication between the CI and the host university.[9]

The above discussions point to the importance of communicating with local schools, institutions, and communities to gain their support for CIs' operation in terms of decision-making, action(s) implementation, and performance evaluation. As our findings showed, involving partner institutions or local communities enabled a smooth decision-making process. CI-A and CI-B are good examples here: both decided to focus on K-12 Chinese education after consulting the local communities and partner institutions. In contrast, it was probably the lack of effective communication between CI-C and its host university that led to the temporary disagreement over whether the CI should reach out to local K-12 schools.

When it comes to carrying out activities/projects for promoting Chinese language and culture education, our results again showed the importance of gaining local support. For example, the key to the success of CI-D's teacher education model is to construct and maintain a collaborative partnership with the local institutions. Similarly, it was likely the close working relationship with local schools that contributed to the rapid development in Chinese teaching for CI-A and CI-B. Meanwhile, the notion "local support" should be interpreted broadly to encompass any relevant policy movement at the state level. For example, it was the state-level supportive environment for K-12 foreign language (i.e.,

---

[9] The 2010-2011 annual report of CI-C showed that it was able to reach out to local K-12 schools (e.g., successful application of a Confucius Classroom, partnering with the State Department of Education to conduct a statewide survey of public schools with Chinese programs, sponsoring a workshop for local K-12 teachers).

passing the *World Language Content Standards*) that motivated CI-D to work on developing standards-based curriculum and instructional materials. Because this effort on the part of CI-D was based on a statewide educational policy, it is likely to be endorsed by local schools and organizations.

Finally, our findings suggest that local support is an indispensible component for evaluating CIs' projects. All focal CIs mentioned the various ways of collecting feedback (e.g., exit questionnaire, informal communication, and course evaluation) from their stakeholders to improve their performance. A particular example is CI-D's teacher education model, in which the supervision and evaluation of the candidate teachers' performance were largely conducted by local university faculty (rather than by the CI staff). Hence, the continuous support from the faculty is a key to the quality and sustainability of the model.

In contrast to the CIs' effort in involving the local community to evaluate its projects, the current top-down evaluation performed by Hanban does not seem to consider CIs' partners to the fullest extent. The major format of this top-down evaluation is the annual report form in which CIs delineate their *framework* (i.e., missions and general strategies), *impact* (i.e., statistics regarding language and cultural programs, community engagement, technology use), *visibility* (i.e., means to publicize the CI), *sustainability* (i.e., statistics about infrastructure, human resources, operational models and management, finance, future plans, strategic partnership), and their *concerns and suggestions*. A complementary measure of this top-down CI evaluation is on-site visits made by Hanban evaluation delegations once every few years. The on-site visits typically involve members of the local community by means of school visits, class observations, and meetings with host institution(s). In theory, these two ways of evaluation should provide a comprehensive means for evaluating each CI's performance. In practice, however, Hanban seems to value statistics (e.g., number of students taught, teachers trained, and event participants) more than other aspects (such as strategic partnership development). The problem with this approach is the imposition of a somewhat simplistic assessment framework on individual CIs whose missions can best be fulfilled by implementing localized strategies (for promoting Chinese language and culture education). The dissatisfaction of CI-D's director regarding how Hanban assessed its achievement is an example. Therefore, how to develop an evaluation protocol that balances quantitative and qualitative factors is a pressing issue that needs to be addressed by Hanban and the CI network. Y. Wu, (2011) recently proposed a new CI evaluation framework consisting of a set of quantitative and qualitative measures, and more exploration and experimentation in this direction is needed.

To a broad extent, this brings us to the issue of the CI network's sustainability within the context of Hanban's (2011) ambitious plan to establish 500 CIs and 1,000 CCs by 2015. Given the considerable regional differences (e.g., actual need in Chinese language and cultural education, availability of local resources) and the possible limitation in Hanban's capacity (e.g., financial, human resources) in supporting the fast-growing CI network, localization would be an advisable strategy to sustain the CI network and its development. Localization as a guiding principle would mean to involve the local community in a series of operational procedures: identifying focal service areas, implementing projects, and evaluating achievements. The ideal scenario would be for each CI to serve as a regional pivot, connecting and utilizing regional resources to meet local needs. In fact, our results showed that the four U.S. CIs were making effort in this direction, although their effort in involving local partners was not necessarily and adequately recognized by Hanban. This mismatch between local practice on the part of individual CIs and higher-level evaluation performed by Hanban might cause some problems in sustaining the CI network's future development.

13

5. Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Research

This study showed that the 24 U.S. CIs offered a range of programs that contributed to Chinese language and cultural education, particularly in the areas of language teaching, teacher education, and academic and cultural events. Among these areas, K-12 Chinese teaching and teacher education hold great promise for future development. On the other hand, teaching material development, language assessment, program development and evaluation were areas that need to be further developed. Our interview results further revealed that the four CIs were situated in unique environments and that they generally took a "localization" strategy to involve local communities in decision-making, program implementation, and performance evaluation. In so doing, the four CIs were able to develop creative strategies to cope with some of the 3T challenges. While localization is the key to the success of the CI's operations, its importance has yet to be fully recognized in Hanban's current top-down evaluation system. It is our suggestion that the achievement of individual CIs should not be evaluated solely based on Hanban's standards. Rather, a more comprehensive evaluation system involving various stakeholders, CI collaborators, and recipients of CI services should be developed and implemented.

In an attempt to understand the U.S. CIs' effort in promoting Chinese language and culture education, this study is limited in several ways, and future research is needed to deepen our understanding. First, the sample size for the questionnaire survey was small in spite of our effort to encourage broad participation. Future research will need to recruit more CIs in order to gain a fuller picture of the U.S. CI network. Second, we focused only on CIs in this study. However, since K-12 Chinese education and teacher education represent a promising area of CIs' development, future research will need to examine the operations of CCs as well. Third, as the U.S. CI network has developed greatly since the study was carried out, it would be interesting to adopt a longitudinal perspective by revisiting the focal CIs to learn about their latest development. Finally, this study mainly focused on the perspectives of the U.S. CIs regarding the opportunities and challenges in fulfilling their missions. It would be meaningful to gain the perspectives of the CI collaborators and the recipients of the CI's services (e.g., local community, K-16 schools) in order to obtain a full understanding of the impact of the CI network.

References

American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). (2010). *Foreign Language Enrollments in K-12 Public Schools: Are Students Prepared for a Global Society?* Available: http://www.actfl.org/files/ReportSummary2011.pdf.

Chen, J., & Yu, P. (2008). Retrospection and prospect of the development of the Confucius Institutes. *International Chinese Language Teaching & Learning*, *3*, 25-32. (陈敬、于鹏 (2008). 孔子学院发展的回顾与展望。《国际汉语教学动态与研究》，第 3 辑，25-32 页。).

China Educational Newspaper. (2009, September 30). International promotion of Chinese language and culture, p.4 (中国教育报. (2009 年 9 月 30 日). 中国文化大规模走出国门。第 4 版。).

China News Service. (2009, November, 12). Curtain rose for the 4th Confucius Institute Conference: collecting thoughts for multidimensional development. (中国新闻网 (11/12/2009) 第四届孔子学院大会开幕，集思广益探多元发展。). Available:

http://www.chinanews.com.cn/hwjy/news/2009/12-11/2014151.shtml.

China News Service. (2012, April 13). Chinese language continues its popularity in the U.S.: On the National Chinese Conference (中国新闻网 (2012 年 4 月 13 日) 美国汉语热持续"高烧"全美中文大会盛况空前). Available: http://www.chinanews.com/hwjy/2012/04-13/3817285.shtml.

CRI Online (2011, December 13). The Confucius Institute network plans to expand its service area for Chinese language education. (国际在线 (2011 年 12 月 13 日). 孔子学院将扩大服务领域拓展汉语教学广度和深度). Available: http://gb.cri.cn/27824/2011/12/13/5951s3474250.htm.

Du, F., & Wang, S. (2008). Development of Chinese teaching, the problems and countermeasures in Egypt. *International Chinese Language Teaching & Learning*, *1*, 72-78. (杜芳、王松岩 (2008). 埃及汉语教学发展概况、存在的问题及对策。《国际汉语教学动态与研究》第 1 辑，72-78 页。)

Furman, N., Goldberg, D., & Lusin, N. (2010). Enrollments in languages other than English in United States institutions of higher education, Fall 2009. Available: http://www.mla.org/2009_enrollmentsurvey.

Global Times. (2007, January 16). Germany *Daily News* said Confucius Institutes encounter crisis, p. 6. (环球时报 (2007 年 1 月 16 日). 德国《每日新闻报》载文称：孔子学院遭遇危机。第 6 版。).

Hanban (2007). *Standards for Teachers of Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. (汉办 (2007). 《国际汉语教师标准》。北京：外语教学与研究出版社。)

Hanban (2008a). *Chinese Language Proficiency Scales for Speakers of Other Languages.* Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. (汉办 (2008a).《国际汉语能力标准》。北京：外语教学与研究出版社。)

Hanban (2008b). *International Curriculum for Chinese Education*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press. (汉办 (2008b). 《国际汉语教学通用课程大纲》。北京：外语教学与研究出版社。)

Hanban. (2011, December). Recommendations on Confucius Institute development and planning (Draft). Document presented at the 6th Confucius Institute Conference. Beijing, China.

Jin, L. (2006). The state and disciplinary strategies for the global promotion of Chinese language. *Journal of East China Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)*, *38*, 97-103. (金立鑫 (2006).试论汉语国际推广的国家策略和学科策略。《华东师范大学学报（哲学社会科学版）》，第 38 卷，97-103 页。).

Li, K., & Dai, C. (2011). Report of the U.S. public opinion of the Confucius Institute. *World Politics*, 7, 76-93. (李开盛、戴长征 (2011). 孔子学院在美国的舆论环境评估。《世界政治》，2011 年第 7 期，76-93 页。).

Liu, Y. (2011). Working together towards the sustainable development of Confucius Institutes. Keynote speech delivered at the 5th Confucius Institute Conference. *Confucius Institute*, *12*, 26-35. (刘延东 (2011). 携手促进孔子学院可持续发展——在第五届孔子学院大会上的主旨演讲。《孔子学院》，第 12 期，26-35 页。).

Starr, D. (2009). Chinese language education in Europe: The Confucius Institutes. *European Journal of Education*, *44*, 65-82.

15

Wan. X. (2009). Confucius Institutes and the localization of overseas Chinese language teachers. *Journal of Yunnan Normal University (Edition on Chinese as a Foreign Language Teaching and Research)*, *1*, 27-31. (宛新政 (2009). 孔子学院与海外汉语师资的本土化建设。《云南师范大学学报（对外汉语教学与研究版）》，2009 年第 1 期，27-31 页。).

Wu, X. (2011). The rise of China's public image: The effects of Chinese language and culture education by Confucius Institutes – A survey based at the Confucius Institutes at University of Massachusetts Boston and at Bryant University. *Diplomacy Review*, *1*, 89-102. (吴晓萍(2011). 中国形象的提升：来自孔子学院教学的启示——基于麻省大学波士顿分校和布莱恩特大学孔子学院问卷的实证分析。《外交评论》，2011 年第 1 期，89-102 页。).

Wu, Y. (2011). On the index system of Confucius Institute assessment. *Educational Research*, *8*, 30-34. (吴应辉 (2011). 孔子学院评估指标体系研究。《教育研究》， 2011 年第 8 期，30-34 页。).

Wu, Y. & Ruan, G. (2010). A survey on the Chinese cultural understanding among American youth: A case from the Confucius Institutes in the Pittsburgh area. Academic Exchange, 10, 201-205. (吴瑛、阮桂君 (2010). 中国文化在美国青少年中的传播效果调查——以匹兹堡地区孔子学院为例。《学术交流》，2010 年第 10 期，201-205 页。).

Xinhua News Net. (2009, December 11). Liu Yandong addressed the 4th Confucius Institute Conference: Promoting humanitarian exchange between China and the world with quality Confucius Institutes. (新华网 (2009 年 12 月 11 日). 刘延东在出席第四届孔子学院大会时强调：办好孔子学院，推进中外人文交流与合作。)
Available: http://news.xinhuanet.com/politics/2009-12/11/content_12633190.htm.

Xu, L. (2006). It is a great good thing to accelerate the international promotion of Chinese language. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 8-12. (许琳 (2006). 汉语加快走向世界是件大好事。《语言文字应用》，2006 年 6 月，8-12 页。)

Xu, L. (2011). Report on the 2010 work and 2011 plan of the Confucius Institute Headquarters. *Confucius Institute*, *12*, 14-21. (许琳 (2011). 关于2010年孔子学院总部工作总结和2011年计划的汇报。《孔子学院》，第 12 期，14-21 页。)

Xu, L. & Zheng, S. (2011). Popularizing Chinese in Africa: Status quo, problems and solutions. *West Asia and Africa*, *3*, 42-46. (徐丽华、郑崧 (2011). 非洲汉语推广的现状、问题及应对策略。《西亚非洲》，2011 年第 3 期，42-46 页。).

Yang, R. R. (2009). A tentative exploration of the development of Chinese language education in overseas nations. Global Education Outlook, 10, 86-90. (杨蓉蓉 (2009). 海外在校汉语教育发展趋势初探。《全球教育展望》，2009 年第 10 期，86-90 页。).

Zhang, Z. (2009). A field report on the Confucius Institute at University of Maryland. *World Educational Information*, *3*, 81-85. (张治国 (2009). 美国马里兰大学孔子学院田野调查。《世界教育信息》，2009 年第 3 期，81-85 页。).

Zhao, H., & Huang, J. (2010). China's policy of Chinese as a foreign language and the use of overseas Confucius Institutes. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice*, *9*, 127-142.

Appendix A
Survey Questionnaire

1. Name of your CI: _____.
2. Date of foundation of your CI: _____ (documents signed) _____ (in operation).
3. Partner University (in China): _____.
4. The geographical service area of your CI covers: _____.
5. The current status of your CI is:
A. In planning stage
B. Documents signed
C. In operation

6. Which of the following statement best describes your CI?
A. A CI that <u>directly</u> provides services to promote Chinese language and culture (e.g., A CI that offers Chinese language courses; or a CI that develops pedagogical materials, etc.)
B. A supportive CI that <u>primarily</u> focuses on community outreach (e.g., A CI that doesn't offer Chinese language courses by itself, but helps local schools in their course offerings, etc.).
C. Others (Please briefly describe) _____

7. How do you describe the current focus (or foci) of your CI? (Choose all that apply)
A. Chinese language teaching (i.e., course offering)
B. Chinese language teacher education
C. Chinese language pedagogical material development
D. Chinese language assessment
E. Chinese program development and evaluation (e.g., bi-lingual education programs)
F. Other academic activities (e.g., research, symposium, lecture series, professional organizations, etc.)
G. Cultural activities (e.g., summer camp, Chinese New Year, etc.)
H. Others (Please briefly describe) _____

8a. If you chose A in question 7, please indicate the focal population of your CI. (Choose all that apply)
A. K-12 students
B. University/college level students
C. Local community (e.g., general public, companies, organizations)
D. Others (Please briefly describe) _____

8b. If you chose B in question 7, please indicate the focal population of your CI. (Choose all that apply)
A. K-12 Chinese language teachers
B. Weekend Chinese school teachers (for heritage learners)
C. Tertiary level Chinese language teachers
D. Others (Please briefly describe) _____

17

8c. If you chose C in question 7, please indicate the specific areas that your CI focuses on: (Choose all that apply)
A. Curricula
B. Textbooks and other classroom materials
C. Computer-assisted language learning programs
D. Others (Please briefly describe) _____

8d. If you chose D in question 7, please indicate the specific areas that your CI focuses on: (Choose all that apply)
A. K-12 level assessment
B. Tertiary level assessment
C. Administering assessment
D. Others (Please briefly describe) _____

8e. If you chose E in question 7, please indicate the programs that your CI has been involved in:

8f. If you chose F in question 7, please indicate the specific areas that your CI focuses on: (Choose all that apply)
A. Conducting research
B. Organizing academic conferences
C. Offering academic lecture series
D. Sponsoring and/or founding professional organizations
E. Sponsoring and/or organizing exchanges programs (e.g., study abroad in general, service learning, cultural exchange, etc.)
F. Others (Please briefly describe) _____

8g. If you chose G in question 7, please indicate the specific types of activities that your CI focuses on: (Choose all that apply)
A. Summer camp
B. Various Chinese cultural events (e.g., Chinese festival celebration)
C. Others (Please briefly describe) _____

Appendix B
Interview Questions

Current practice & decision making
1. What are the current foci of your CI (e.g., Chinese language teaching, teacher education, pedagogical materials development)? Please provide one or two typical examples for each focal area.
2. How does your CI decide to focus on these areas? More specifically:
    2a. In what way do you see the needs for your CI to focus on this area(s)? Was there any need analysis before deciding your CI's current foci?
    2b. What roles do Hanban, the host university, the partner University, and the local communi-

18

ty/government play in the decision making process?

Evaluation of current practice

3. For each of the focal areas you mentioned above, how does your CI evaluate the achievements? More specifically:

    3a. Is there any means of internal assessment? (i.e., assessment carried by your CI)

    3b. Is there any means of external assessment? (e.g., peer review, and/or assessment by Hanban, evaluations by host university and/or partner university)

    3c. Does your CI collect feedback from the stake holders? (i.e., those to whom the CI provides services)

4. Considering the current foci of your CI, what are the opportunities and challenges you have experienced or will expect to emerge?

Future development

5. Does your CI have explicit long-term goals (mission)? What are the goals?
6. What steps will your CI take to realize these goals (tactics)?
7. How does your CI plan to evaluate your future achievement?