JUN 0 1 2010

Dr. William Fischer
Portland State University
Foreign Languages and Literatures
P.O. Box 751 (ORSP)
Portland, OR 97207

REF: P017A100073

Dear Dr. Fischer,

We regret to inform you that your application to the FY 2010 Title VI International Research and Studies (IRS) program was not recommended for funding. Your proposal was reviewed by a panel of academic peer reviewers who evaluated all pertinent selection criteria.

We appreciate your interest in the IRS program and the time and effort spent in the preparation and submission of your application. Details on the evaluation of your application, including the scores and comments from the academic review panel, are enclosed. Please keep in mind that the Department of Education does not necessarily endorse all comments made by the reviewers.

If you would like further information concerning the competition, please write to Beth MacRae, Advanced Training and Research Team, 6th Floor, 1990 K Street, NW, Washington, D.C. 20006-8521 or by email beth.macrae@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

Samuel D. Eisen, Ph.D.
Team Leader
Advanced Training and Research Team
International Education Programs Service

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Portland State University (P017A100073)
Reader #1:   **********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1.Need for Project?	10	6
Significance		
1.Potential for use?	5	2
2.Related Materials?	10	8
3.Achieving Results?	10	8
4.Expected Contribution?	5	3
5.Plan of operation?	10	8
Quality of Project Personnel		
1.Quality of Personnel?	5	3
Significance		
1.Budget and Cost?	5	2
2.Evaluation Plan?	15	12
Adequacy of Resources		
1.Adequacy of Resources?	5	3
Significance		
1.Final Format Description?	5	3
2.Pretesting and Revisions?	15	12
Sub Total	100	70
Summary		
Summary		
1.Summary Comments	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Priority Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1.Priorities	5	5
Sub Total	5	5

Total　　　　105　　　　75

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - IRS/Materials - 1: 84.017A

Reader #1:   *********
Applicant: Portland State University (P017A100073)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.a) Is there a need for the proposed materials(s) in the educational area to be served?
  b) Are the (i) language(s); (ii) region or country; or, (iii) the issues or studies, for
  the study of which the materials are to be developed, of sufficient priority for, and of
  potential significance to the national interest to warrant support at this time?

  General:

  Need is justified. The significance of the program is limited to the institution, there
  is no clear indication how the program will have a national outreach.

Reader's Score: 6

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.a) Will the proposed materials have a good potential for being utilized by appropriate
  educational programs in other institutions in the United States?

  General:

  The proposed program could have the potential but there is no indication of how the final
  project will be shared with other institutions of higher education in the US, nor how
  others will know of its existence.

Reader's Score: 2

2.a) Have all the existing, similar materials (for the study of the language(s), region or
  country, or issue in question) been cited and accounted?
  b) Is there a critical commentary on the adequacy of such similar materials and is this
  commentary accurate? c) Will the proposed material(s) duplicate other materials already in
  existence or already in progress?

  General:

  Provides a comprehensive review of resources. It is difficult to ascertain the accuracy
  of the commentary (c) because the critique finds limitations in all existing resources
  including Rosetta Stone.

Reader's Score: 8

3.a) Are the objectives, which the proposed material(s) are to serve, clearly defined?
  b) Are the outlined methods and procedures for preparing the material(s) practicable and
  can they be expected to produce the anticipated results?

c) Does the application reflect a sufficient degree of knowledge in the pertinent areas to assure a successful completion of the project (e.g., for language materials: modern language pedagogy, modern linguistics theory; for area studies and related materials history, political and social structure, economics, etc.)?

General:

The objectives are clearly defined. Using an existing model of developing other languages, it seems feasible. The only issue might be the actual fit of European Language to an African Language.

Reader's Score: 8

4.a) Will the proposed materials contribute significantly to the strengthening, expanding, or improving instructional programs concerned with the language(s), area(s), or international studies in the United States?

General:

There is no indication of how this program will be disseminated to other programs (as explained in #2 above).

Reader's Score: 3

5.a) Does the design of the project show high quality?
b) Is the plan of management effective? Will it ensure proper and effective administration?
c) Is there a clear description of how the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the Section 605 International Research and Studies program?
d) Is the way in which the applicant plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve the project objectives appropriate and adequate?
e) To what extent will the applicant provide equal access treatment for persons, of racial and ethnic minorities, women, handicapped and the elderly?

General:

The program is well laid outâsince they are using an existing model âshellâ. Development of content is limited to one faculty who may be teaching the language/culture but has no educational background in teaching of languages (from the CV). Provides a limited description of how they will address equal access.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1.a) Is there evidence of professional competence to direct this project on the part of the project director or principal investigator?
b) Is there evidence of the qualifications of the other key personnel, if any, to participate in the project?
c) Is the amount of time that the key person(s) plan to commit to the project appropriate to the project's need?
d) To what extent does the applicant, as part of its non-discriminatory employment practices, encourage applications for employment from members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as members of ethnic minorities, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?

General:

PI has experience in use of technology and other languages, not including Swahili. The other member of the team has been teaching a Swahili course but has no education background in the content area (See CV). Graduate Assistant is identified as a native speaker of the Swahili language.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. a) Is the proposed budget adequate to support the proposed project activities?
   b) Are the costs reasonable in relation to the anticipated product (or objectives) of the project?

General:

Budget narrative is not clearly described.

Reader's Score: 2

2. a) Does the application include a plan for evaluating periodically the work accomplished under the project?
   b) Is there a realistic time schedule for accomplishing the work?

General:

The evaluation plan is well developed. They mention the use of two sets of rubrics, one to be developed by external evaluators who are not even identified in the proposal. There is mention that the program will be tested in courses â but there is no specific description of the course(s), when they are offered nor the estimated number of students taking the class (as per past enrollments).

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1. a) Does the applicant have adequate facilities to conduct the project?
   b) Are the equipment and supplies which the applicant plans to use adequate?

General:

They have a model âShellâ they have used. They plan to collect artifacts âon siteâ â is this in East Africa or in the US? It is not clearly described how these on-site resources (still pictures, video clips) etc will be collected, nor the resources needed to accomplish the tasks. Will the equipment be part of the budget or will they be using what is in the department? The budget was poorly described, hence difficult to know what the 15k for on-site collection of resources will cover.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.a) Are the contents and final form of the projected material(s) sufficiently well
  described?

   General:

   It is feasible given the past experiences with the other languages. They include a
   proposed template (prototype) of how the final product might look like.

Reader's Score: 3

2.a) Has sufficient provision been made for pre-testing the material(s) (with students
  and/or in the classroom) for possible revision before general dissemination or
  publication?

   General:

   Yes, but with no clear indication of which course it will be tested in. The PI uses the
   example of another large class of another language (German and Spanish). If as indicated,
   data will be collected, then they identify ways to use that to modify the technological
   aspects of the program as well as the content. Dissemination is not clearly articulated,
   but there is ample resources from the grant allocated to travel to conferences.

Reader's Score: 12

Summary - Summary

1. Please summarize the applicant's strengths and weaknesses.

   General:

   Generally, this was a well written proposal with a unique and tested system that has been
   used in development of computer based learning resources for other commonly taught
   languages (Spanish for example). There are gaps in the personnel, the budget is not
   clearly described and the overall fit of the model from one language to another is not
   articulated. There is no clear indication that the program, if developed can benefit
   others in the US.

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. For FY2010 International Research and Studies - Instructional Materials the competitive
  priority is:

   The development of specialized instructional or assessment materials focused on any of the
   following seventy-eight (78) languages selected from the U.S. Department of Education's
   list of Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs):

   Akan (Twi-Fante), Albanian, Amharic, Arabic (all dialects), Armenian, Azeri (Azerbaijani),
   Balochi, Bamanakan (Bamana, Bambara, Mandikan, Mandingo, Maninka, Dyula), Belarusian,

Bengali (Bangla), Berber (all languages), Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cebuano (Visayan), Chechen, Chinese (Cantonese), Chinese (Gan), Chinese (Mandarin), Chinese (Min), Chinese (Wu), Croatian, Dari, Dinka, Georgian, Gujarati, Hausa, Hebrew (Modern), Hindi, Igbo, Indonesian, Japanese, Javanese, Kannada, Kashmiri, Kazakh, Khmer (Cambodian), Kirghiz, Korean, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Kurdish (Sorani), Lao, Malay (Bahasa Melayu or Malaysian), Malayalam, Marathi, Mongolian, Nepali, Oromo, Panjabi, Pashto, Persian (Farsi), Polish, Portuguese (all varieties), Quechua, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala (Sinhalese), Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Telugu, Thai, Tibetan, Tigrigna, Turkish, Turkmen, Ukrainian, Urdu, Uyghur/Uigur, Uzbek, Vietnamese, Wolof, Xhosa, Yoruba, and Zulu.

General:

Swahili

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 3/16/10 12:41 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Portland State University (P017A100073)
Reader #2:   *********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project?	10	8
Significance		
1. Potential for use?	5	4
2. Related Materials?	10	8
3. Achieving Results?	10	9
4. Expected Contribution?	5	3
5. Plan of operation?	10	8
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Quality of Personnel?	5	3
Significance		
1. Budget and Cost?	5	3
2. Evaluation Plan?	15	13
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources?	5	4
Significance		
1. Final Format Description?	5	4
2. Pretesting and Revisions?	15	13
Sub Total	100	80
Summary		
Summary		
1. Summary Comments	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Priority Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Priorities	5	5
Sub Total	5	5

Technical Review Form

Reader #2:   **********
Applicant: Portland State University (P017A100073)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.a) Is there a need for the proposed materials(s) in the educational area to be served?
   b) Are the (i) language(s); (ii) region or country; or, (iii) the issues or studies, for
   the study of which the materials are to be developed, of sufficient priority for, and of
   potential significance to the national interest to warrant support at this time?

   General:
   He makes a very compelling case for the study of Swahili especially at novice to
   intermediate high levels.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.a) Will the proposed materials have a good potential for being utilized by appropriate
   educational programs in other institutions in the United States?

   General:
   He makes strong claims for this.

Reader's Score: 4

2.a) Have all the existing, similar materials (for the study of the language(s), region or
   country, or issue in question) been cited and accounted?
   b) Is there a critical commentary on the adequacy of such similar materials and is this
   commentary accurate? c) Will the proposed material(s) duplicate other materials already in
   existence or already in progress?

   General:
   This was one of the most thorough coverages of materials in all the proposals I was given
   to read.

Reader's Score: 8

3.a) Are the objectives, which the proposed material(s) are to serve, clearly defined?
   b) Are the outlined methods and procedures for preparing the material(s) practicable and
   can they be expected to produce the anticipated results?
   c) Does the application reflect a sufficient degree of knowledge in the pertinent areas to
   assure a successful completion of the project (e.g., for language materials: modern

language pedagogy, modern linguistics theory; for area studies and related materials history, political and social structure, economics, etc.)?

General:

Technically I think this a very comprehensive and defined product. The possible weakness is the Swahili background or lack of it in PI's c.v. The co investigator however is a native Swahili speaker.

Reader's Score: 9

4.a) Will the proposed materials contribute significantly to the strengthening, expanding, or improving instructional programs concerned with the language(s), area(s), or international studies in the United States?

General:

It has the potential to impact language and this world area's studies.

Reader's Score: 3

5.a) Does the design of the project show high quality?
  b) Is the plan of management effective? Will it ensure proper and effective administration?
  c) Is there a clear description of how the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the Section 605 International Research and Studies program?
  d) Is the way in which the applicant plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve the project objectives appropriate and adequate?
  e) To what extent will the applicant provide equal access treatment for persons, of racial and ethnic minorities, women, handicapped and the elderly?

General:

He does not address equal access by the handicapped or elderly in the application. There is a generic statement of following the policy of the university.

Other than that the project (limited as it is to Intermediate High achievement is of very good quality.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1.a) Is there evidence of professional competence to direct this project on the part of the project director or principal investigator?
  b) Is there evidence of the qualifications of the other key personnel, if any, to participate in the project?
  c) Is the amount of time that the key person(s) plan to commit to the project appropriate to the project's need?
  d) To what extent does the applicant, as part of its non-discriminatory employment practices, encourage applications for employment from members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as members of ethnic minorities, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?

General:

See earlier comments on this, but in a less than ideal world I think the qualifications of the participants are adequate. I wish there had been more formal background in Swahili studies by the native informant/investigator.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.a) Is the proposed budget adequate to support the proposed project activities?
   b) Are the costs reasonable in relation to the anticipated product (or objectives) of the project?

   General:

   Yes. Some of the travel costs seems excessive however.

Reader's Score: 3

2.a) Does the application include a plan for evaluating periodically the work accomplished under the project?
   b) Is there a realistic time schedule for accomplishing the work?

   General:

   This is rather well done, but my question is why 4 evaluators are needed especially in the methodological aspect.

Reader's Score: 13

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1.a) Does the applicant have adequate facilities to conduct the project?
   b) Are the equipment and supplies which the applicant plans to use adequate?

   General:

   yes I think so, but more specifics would be better...

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.a) Are the contents and final form of the projected material(s) sufficiently well described?

General:

The contents and final form are adequately described.

Reader's Score: 4

2. a) Has sufficient provision been made for pre-testing the material(s) (with students
and/or in the classroom) for possible revision before general dissemination or
publication?

   General:

   The pre-testing I think if I read correctly will be done in the current Swahili
   offerings. I think also it will be tweaked accordingly during these classes and also with
   the input of the evaluators.

Reader's Score: 13

Summary - Summary

1. Please summarize the applicant's strengths and weaknesses.

   General:

   This is a very technically competent, professionally written, almost slick application.
   Of course the assumption that Swahili will easily fit into a German "shell" or a Spanish
   one remains to be proven, The lack of clear culture specific aspect is a consideration--
   not only culture but also Kultur. The credentials of the sole Swahili speaker are
   acceptable but he is not a Ph.D and he is evidently well prepared in social work, etc.

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1. For FY2010 International Research and Studies - Instructional Materials the competitive
   priority is:

   The development of specialized instructional or assessment materials focused on any of the
   following seventy-eight (78) languages selected from the U.S. Department of Education's
   list of Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs):

   Akan (Twi-Fante), Albanian, Amharic, Arabic (all dialects), Armenian, Azeri (Azerbaijani),
   Balochi, Bamanakan (Bamana, Bambara, Mandikan, Mandingo, Maninka, Dyula), Belarusian,
   Bengali (Bangla), Berber (all languages), Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cebuano (Visayan),
   Chechen, Chinese (Cantonese), Chinese (Gan), Chinese (Mandarin), Chinese (Min), Chinese
   (Wu), Croatian, Dari, Dinka, Georgian, Gujarati, Hausa, Hebrew (Modern), Hindi, Igbo,
   Indonesian, Japanese, Javanese, Kannada, Kashmiri, Kazakh, Khmer (Cambodian), Kirghiz,
   Korean, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Kurdish (Sorani), Lao, Malay (Bahasa Melayu or Malaysian),
   Malayalam, Marathi, Mongolian, Nepali, Oromo, Panjabi, Pashto, Persian (Farsi), Polish,
   Portuguese (all varieties), Quechua, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala (Sinhalese),
   Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Telugu, Thai, Tibetan, Tigrigna, Turkish, Turkmen,
   Ukrainian, Urdu, Uyghur/Uigur, Uzbek, Vietnamese, Wolof, Xhosa, Yoruba, and Zulu.

General:

Swahili
Yes

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 3/15/10 6:35 PM

Technical Review Coversheet

Applicant: Portland State University (P017A100073)
Reader #3:   *********

	Points Possible	Points Scored
Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Need for Project		
1. Need for Project?	10	8
Significance		
1. Potential for use?	5	3
2. Related Materials?	10	9
3. Achieving Results?	10	9
4. Expected Contribution?	5	3
5. Plan of operation?	10	7
Quality of Project Personnel		
1. Quality of Personnel?	5	3
Significance		
1. Budget and Cost?	5	3
2. Evaluation Plan?	15	12
Adequacy of Resources		
1. Adequacy of Resources?	5	4
Significance		
1. Final Format Description?	5	3
2. Pretesting and Revisions?	15	13
Sub Total	100	77
Summary		
Summary		
1. Summary Comments	0	0
Sub Total	0	0
Priority Questions		
Selection Criteria		
Significance		
1. Priorities	5	5
Sub Total	5	5

Total   105   82

Technical Review Form

Panel #1 - IRS/Materials - 1: 84.017A

Reader #3:   **********
Applicant: Portland State University (P017A100073)

Questions

Selection Criteria - Need for Project

1.a) Is there a need for the proposed materials(s) in the educational area to be served?
   b) Are the (i) language(s); (ii) region or country; or, (iii) the issues or studies, for
   the study of which the materials are to be developed, of sufficient priority for, and of
   potential significance to the national interest to warrant support at this time?

   General:

   Although with some minor typos and errors, the need of the materials is well described.

Reader's Score: 8

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.a) Will the proposed materials have a good potential for being utilized by appropriate
   educational programs in other institutions in the United States?

   General:

   The proposal has the potential of being utilized by other programs, but more detailed are
   needed. The applicant's description is short.

Reader's Score: 3

2.a) Have all the existing, similar materials (for the study of the language(s), region or
   country, or issue in question) been cited and accounted?
   b) Is there a critical commentary on the adequacy of such similar materials and is this
   commentary accurate? c) Will the proposed material(s) duplicate other materials already in
   existence or already in progress?

   General:

   The review of the existing materials is appropriate.

Reader's Score: 9

3.a) Are the objectives, which the proposed material(s) are to serve, clearly defined?
   b) Are the outlined methods and procedures for preparing the material(s) practicable and
   can they be expected to produce the anticipated results?
   c) Does the application reflect a sufficient degree of knowledge in the pertinent areas to
   assure a successful completion of the project (e.g., for language materials: modern
   language pedagogy, modern linguistics theory; for area studies and related materials

history, political and social structure, economics, etc.)?

General:

The objectives and proposed materials are well described and the methods and procedures are appropriate. However, one wonders why the resources could not be equally made available through streaming videos using new advances in digital technology.

Reader's Score: 9

4.a) Will the proposed materials contribute significantly to the strengthening, expanding, or improving instructional programs concerned with the language(s), area(s), or international studies in the United States?

General:

The envisioned materials could be used as a template by others to develop instructional materials. However, the specific likely impacts of the materials could have been provided in this section.

Reader's Score: 3

5.a) Does the design of the project show high quality?
b) Is the plan of management effective? Will it ensure proper and effective administration?
c) Is there a clear description of how the objectives of the project relate to the purpose of the Section 605 International Research and Studies program?
d) Is the way in which the applicant plans to use its resources and personnel to achieve the project objectives appropriate and adequate?
e) To what extent will the applicant provide equal access treatment for persons, of racial and ethnic minorities, women, handicapped and the elderly?

General:

The discussion on the plan of management and some activities are appropriate, but the quality of the design could have been improved.

Reader's Score: 7

Selection Criteria - Quality of Project Personnel

1.a) Is there evidence of professional competence to direct this project on the part of the project director or principal investigator?
b) Is there evidence of the qualifications of the other key personnel, if any, to participate in the project?
c) Is the amount of time that the key person(s) plan to commit to the project appropriate to the project's need?
d) To what extent does the applicant, as part of its non-discriminatory employment practices, encourage applications for employment from members of groups that have been traditionally underrepresented, such as members of ethnic minorities, women, handicapped persons, and the elderly?

General:

The qualification and expertise of the PI is excellent. However, the expertise of the Kiswahili expert in African language instruction, African linguistics or material development is not well established.

Reader's Score: 3

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.a) Is the proposed budget adequate to support the proposed project activities?
 b) Are the costs reasonable in relation to the anticipated product (or objectives) of the project?

General:

The proposed budget is reasonable. However, more details are needed on the how the Kiswahili language specialist and other team members will be appropriately remunerated.

Reader's Score: 3

2.a) Does the application include a plan for evaluating periodically the work accomplished under the project?
 b) Is there a realistic time schedule for accomplishing the work?

General:

The evaluation plan is appropriate. However, it could have been more developed. Colleagues teaching other languages at the applicant's institution could have been involved to strengthen the proposal.

Reader's Score: 12

Selection Criteria - Adequacy of Resources

1.a) Does the applicant have adequate facilities to conduct the project?
 b) Are the equipment and supplies which the applicant plans to use adequate?

General:

There are good facilities at the applicant's institution, but more details could be provided.

Reader's Score: 4

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.a) Are the contents and final form of the projected material(s) sufficiently well described?

General:

More details of projected materials as well as their method of distribution could have been provided. The applicant demonstrates no evidence of established network or contact with African language professionals.

Reader's Score: 3

2.a) Has sufficient provision been made for pre-testing the material(s) (with students and/or in the classroom) for possible revision before general dissemination or publication?

General:

Some provisions have been made for pre-testing the materials, but could have been extended to few other schools outside the applicant's own institution.

Reader's Score: 13

Summary - Summary

1.Please summarize the applicant's strengths and weaknesses.

General:

The strength of the proposal lies in its proposed use of technology to develop Kiswahili instructional materials based upon the ACTFL guidelines. The project would have been strengthened by involving a well-established Kiswahili language professional.

Reader's Score: 0

Priority Questions

Selection Criteria - Significance

1.For FY2010 International Research and Studies - Instructional Materials the competitive priority is:

The development of specialized instructional or assessment materials focused on any of the following seventy-eight (78) languages selected from the U.S. Department of Education's list of Less Commonly Taught Languages (LCTLs):

Akan (Twi-Fante), Albanian, Amharic, Arabic (all dialects), Armenian, Azeri (Azerbaijani), Balochi, Bamanakan (Bamana, Bambara, Mandikan, Mandingo, Maninka, Dyula), Belarusian, Bengali (Bangla), Berber (all languages), Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cebuano (Visayan), Chechen, Chinese (Cantonese), Chinese (Gan), Chinese (Mandarin), Chinese (Min), Chinese (Wu), Croatian, Dari, Dinka, Georgian, Gujarati, Hausa, Hebrew (Modern), Hindi, Igbo, Indonesian, Japanese, Javanese, Kannada, Kashmiri, Kazakh, Khmer (Cambodian), Kirghiz, Korean, Kurdish (Kurmanji), Kurdish (Sorani), Lao, Malay (Bahasa Melayu or Malaysian), Malayalam, Marathi, Mongolian, Nepali, Oromo, Panjabi, Pashto, Persian (Farsi), Polish, Portuguese (all varieties), Quechua, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Sinhala (Sinhalese), Somali, Swahili, Tagalog, Tajik, Tamil, Telugu, Thai, Tibetan, Tigrigna, Turkish, Turkmen, Ukrainian, Urdu, Uyghur/Uigur, Uzbek, Vietnamese, Wolof, Xhosa, Yoruba, and Zulu.

General:

Kiswahii is part of the 78 languages.

Reader's Score: 5

Status: Submitted
Last Updated: 3/12/10 3:19 PM