

Proceedings

**Agency for International Development
Forums on
University Development Linkages**

September 17, 1990, Rosslyn, VA

September 21, 1990, St. Louis, MO

September 24, 1990, San Diego, CA

Organized by A.I.D. Bureau for Science and Technology

**Facilitated and Documented by
International Science and Technology Institute**

James R. Stewart, Ph.D., Editor

Acknowledgements

The following people have made the University Linkage Forums possible:

Bradshaw Langmaid, Deputy Administrator for Research, A.I.D. Bureau for Science and Technology (S&T)

Lynn Pesson, Executive Director, A.I.D. Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD)

Curtis Jackson, Director, A.I.D. Office of Research and University Relations (RUR)

Ruth Frischer, A.I.D. Office of Research and University Relations (RUR)

Gary Bittner, A.I.D. Office of Research and University Relations (RUR)

Ed Ross, Project Administrator, International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI)

Colin Weir, Deputy Director, International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI)

Frederique Lambrakis, Project Associate, International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI)

Jim Carney, Facilitation Consultant, International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI)

Heather Sutherland, Facilitation Consultant, Spiral International

James Stewart, Documentation Consultant, Spiral International

Correspondence relating to this program should be sent to the attention of

Agency for International Development

Bureau for Science and Technology (S&T)

Director, Office of Research and University Relations (RUR)

Room 309 SA-18

Washington, DC 20523-1807

(703) 875-4005

FAX (703) 875-4394 and 875-5490

Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	1
Introduction	2
Purpose	2
Basic Rationale	2
Center for University Cooperation in Development	2
University Development Linkage Program	2
Underlying Considerations	3
Participant Response	3
Design of Forums	3
Results	4
Group A. Indicators of International Involvement by U.S. Colleges and Universities	4
Group B. LDC Institutional Involvement in Meeting Development Needs	5
Group C. Criteria for Evaluating Pre-proposals, Proposals and Sustainability	6
Group D. A.I.D. and College and University Funding Issues	8
Conclusions and Next Steps	11
Appendices	12
A. Agenda for the Day (sample)	13
B. Group Workshop Forms for Groups A, B, C and D	14
C. Reports to the Plenaries from each of the Groups	22
D. List of Handouts	33
E. List of Acronyms and Definitions	34
F. Answers to the Most Frequently Asked Questions	35
G. List of Participants	38

Executive Summary

Purpose

The A.I.D. Bureau for Science and Technology held a series of three forums across the United States, in September 1990, to obtain the participation of U.S. colleges and universities in the development of a proposed linkage program. This program would support direct ties of U.S. colleges and universities with institutions in less developed countries (LDCs), enabling these institutions to more effectively meet development needs of LDCs on a sustainable basis.

The three forums held in Washington, DC, St. Louis, MO, and San Diego, CA, were designed to obtain input from the participants to design the project and develop the request for proposals (RFP).

Participants

A total of 214 persons representing 164 U.S. colleges and universities attended. In addition, 30 representatives from A.I.D. attended one or more of the forums as resource persons.

Outcome

The desired outcome from the series of forums was achieved. Nearly all the representatives from a broad cross-section of U.S. colleges and universities reacted positively to the concept of a linkage program to help LDC institutions better serve the development needs of their countries. The participants accepted a competitive system of awarding \$100,000 matching grants. They endorsed a system of short pre-proposals, followed by full proposals reviewed by independent peer panels.

The participants had substantive, high quality input on all questions asked. A.I.D. received substantial information upon which to base the preparation of an RFP. Participants listed numerous indicators of internationalization for U.S. colleges and universities, providing the data for ranking these indicators in priority order within seven categories. Similarly, they produced many mechanisms to enable developing country institutions to define and plan linkages to help meet the needs of their countries, a total of 27 activities with priority rankings within five categories.

These two sets of data have been organized into 32 criteria for evaluating proposals, organized and ranked in five categories. To one key criterion, sustainability, they generated 24 creative suggestions to ensure continuation after A.I.D. funding for a project would end in five years.

Nearly all of the participants agreed that \$100,000 from A.I.D., matched by an equal or greater total contribution from the linked U.S. and LDC institutions, was a reasonable amount. However, many said that linkages involving HBCUs (historically black colleges and universities) with LDC institutions should only be required to match \$1 for every \$2 put in by A.I.D.

A majority thought that any one U.S. institution should be limited to one grant. However, they did say that if institutions entered into consortia, they still could receive up to \$100,000 per institution.

They could not agree on whether LDC institutions should be limited to any specific number of linkages, perhaps indicating that the potential of concentrating too many grants in one LDC is not a major problem, and it could be dealt with by having a wide geographical distribution of grants across the developing world.

A good majority of the participants felt that there should be no restrictions on the sources of matching funds and there should be no limit on including indirect costs in the match, up to the GAO negotiated level. They also agreed that all LDC contributions should be included.

All subgroups thought proposals should be ranked through an external peer review process, so long as there was broad representation on the panels.

Timetable

It is currently planned to have the University Linkage program operational before the end of September 1991.

Introduction

Purpose of the Forums

The A.I.D. Bureau for Science and Technology held a series of three forums across the United States, in September 1990, to gain the participation of U.S. colleges and universities in the development of a proposed linkage project. The project would support direct ties between U.S. colleges and universities and institutions in less developed countries (LDCs). These ties would support collaboration of U.S. and LDC institutions to more effectively meet the internationalization objectives of U.S. institutions as well as the development needs of LDCs.

Basic Rationale for Work with Colleges and Universities

Dr. Ronald W. Roskens, Administrator of A.I.D. has stated: "The U.S. college and university system is an extraordinary national asset which can be of significant benefit to the developing world if properly encouraged and focused. A.I.D. needs to take full advantage of the development-related resources available in the university community. Many U.S. universities have already concluded that they must internationalize their programs. This presents extraordinary opportunities for productive collaboration between A.I.D. and U.S. colleges and universities."

To implement these opportunities, Roskens created an Agency Center for University Cooperation in Development.

Center for University Cooperation in Development

Roskens: "The purpose of the Center for University Cooperation in Development will be to build, promote and strengthen mutually beneficial development cooperation and partnerships between A.I.D., U.S. public and private institutions of higher education that are engaged in education, research and public service programs relevant to the development needs of developing countries, and the institutions of higher education, research and extension in those developing countries."

"The Center will consolidate the existing Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) Support Staff and the Office of Research and University Relations (RUR) into a single organization in the Bureau for Science and Technology."

University Development Linkage Program

The purpose of this program is to support a cooperative, sustainable relationship involving U.S. colleges and universities with LDC research and education institutions, which will have a mutually beneficial effect on both institutions. The U.S. institutions will experience an expansion of their internationalization plans, especially in relation to the developing world. The LDC institutions will be strengthened and will be able to more effectively meet the development needs of their countries.

The program will be implemented through a series of projects partially funded by AID, based on proposals initiated by U.S. public and private colleges and universities in cooperation with LDC institutions.

Note: Although the program is called the "University" Linkage Program, it is open to all colleges and universities. Similarly, whenever the term "university" is used in this report, it means to refer to "colleges and universities."

Please also note that many definitions of terms and acronyms are found in Appendix E.

Underlying Considerations

The University Linkage concept has arisen from four considerations:

1. U.S. colleges and universities must become international institutions providing education, research and extension services relevant to global issues, and many are in the process already.
2. Developing countries' institutions of higher education and the societies they serve can be strengthened significantly through institutional collaboration with U.S. colleges and universities.
3. An A.I.D. program which encourages that collaborative process in developing countries can significantly advance the mission of A.I.D.
4. The program design must consider the needs and goals of both U.S. and LDC institutions. Both must share a commitment to the program's objectives and both must share in the benefits. Therefore the program must be designed in a collaborative manner and the results must be a partnership, if the commitment is to be sustainable.

Participant Response

Over 250 presidents of U.S. colleges and universities, representing a cross-section of four-year and graduate institutions, including current recipients of A.I.D. contracts, received an invitation to send a representative from their institution to one of the three forums.

A total of 214 persons representing 164 U.S. colleges and universities attended. In addition, 30 representatives from A.I.D. attended one or more of the forums as resource persons.

At the end of each forum, participants were asked to complete an evaluation. One of the questions was what would be the probability their university would submit a linkages proposal. The response was: 69% Very Likely, 30% Possible and 1% Not at All.

Design of Forums

The forums were designed with a combination of large and small groups to facilitate maximum input from the participants. (See the Agenda for the Day in Appendix A.) At registration, participants signed up for their choice of concurrent Group A or Group B in the morning and concurrent Group C or Group D in the afternoon. (See the Results section for a description of the Groups.) They also received a set of handouts, listed in Appendix D.

The day began with opening remarks by Bradshaw Langmaid, Deputy Administrator for Research, Bureau for Science and Technology (S&T), Lynn Pesson, Executive Director of Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD), Curtis Jackson, Director, A.I.D. Office of Research and University Relations, and Jim Carney, ISTI Facilitator.

The participants then went to their chosen Group A or B, where they received a brief introduction to the content and desired outcome for that group by Brad Langmaid or Curtis Jackson from A.I.D. Each person also received a form which listed the procedures to be followed and the questions to be answered. (See the Group Workshop Forms in Appendix B.)

Each table subgroup of 8 to 11 participants selected their own Chair to guide the group's discussion, a Rapporteur to write the group's discussion on a flipchart for reporting to the whole group, a Recorder to fill in the form for the subgroup and a Presenter to give the subgroup's report to the Group. After each subgroup had agreed on the answers to the questions on the form, and any other issues they wished to raise, they reported to the Group, where there was further discussion.

The representatives from each subgroup then met to prepare a consolidated report for that Group to a Plenary. These Plenary reports are presented in Appendix C. After each group's report, there was time for questions and discussion by all participants. Representatives of A.I.D. also responded with clarifications and comments. See Appendix F for answers to frequently asked questions.

Results

To generate the combined results of the three Forums, the report editor, James Stewart, first typed all subgroup reports just as they were received from the recorders. This formed a text database, on which he performed a content analysis.

He identified and listed all major suggestions, using as much as possible the categories suggested by the participants. He then calculated the number of times an idea was mentioned by the various subgroups. If an idea was indicated by the subgroup as higher priority, it was given more weight in the calculations.

The number of subgroups in a Group was dependent on the number of participants that signed up for that Group at registration. The counts were as follows:

Forum	Group A (U.S. institutions)	Group B (LDC institutions)	Group C (combined)	Group D (funding issues)
Washington, DC	5	4	4	4
St. Louis, MO	5	5	5	4
San Diego, CA	3	3	3	3
Total	13	12	12	11

The results of the workshops are reported in the order of the questions presented on the Group Workshop Forms (see Appendix B).

Group A. Indicators of International Involvement by U.S. Colleges and Universities

Objective: List and establish priorities of indicators for evaluating U.S. colleges and universities on their international involvement, creativity and commitment to internationalization. Internationalization of a college or university was defined as having an international orientation in its mission, policies and allocation of resources. It could involve everything from a basic policy commitment to strategic planning, staffing policies, organization, implementation, etc.

The following indicators were found as High (H), Medium (M) or Low (L) priority, based on an analysis of the subgroup reports. (All groups assumed that the discussion was concerning internationalization activities involving development efforts in LDCs.) (A few proposed indicators applying to capability for a specific linkage are included in the Group C results.)

1. Administrative Commitment

Mission Statement includes internationalization (good rhetoric, public statements)	H
Strategic Plans show specific timetables for near and long term efforts	H
Staff Policies (faculty hiring, promotion, tenure, incentives)	H
Administrative Structure (university-wide coordination office, high level, visible, real influence)	H
Trend toward enhancing pattern of internationalization	L
Continuous monitoring and evaluation process	L

2. Resource Commitment

Financial support to international programs/research (including faculty time, indirect costs)	H
Faculty commitment	H
Library (holdings, acquisition schedules, computerization)	M
Communications systems (Bitnet, teleconferencing, etc.)	M
Scholarships for international students	M
Travel opportunities for faculty, staff, students	L
Physical facilities	L

3. International Experience	
Faculty overseas experience, diversity, language competency	H
International grants and contracts (including collaboration with international institutions and organizations)	H
Faculty, staff and student exchanges	H
International students (number, diversity, percentage of student body, integration into campus)	M
U.S. students abroad	M
4. Academic Programs	
Majors, minors, concentrations, specializations, area studies (range, levels, enrollments)	H
Languages (diversity, levels, degree requirements, enrollments)	M
International topics integrated into general courses	M
English as a Second Language offerings	M
Interdisciplinary approach	M
International course requirements for general degree	L
Distance education	L
5. Community Linkages	
Relations with K-12 and post-secondary schools	M
Community programs (speaker services, international students in community, etc.)	M
Cooperation with businesses, PVOs and other organizations and consortia	M
Involvement in regional networks (eg. California intersegmental program)	L
Outreach programs	L
6. Human Resource Development	
Education and awareness programs for faculty, staff, alumni, Board of Trustees, etc.	M
Professional development activities for faculty and staff	L
Follow-up of international students and graduates to follow employment patterns upon return	L
7. Campus Culture	
Internationalization integrated into campus life (not isolated)	M
Public attitude of support and respect for international activities, interests, persons	L

Group B. LDC Institutional Involvement in Meeting Development Needs

Objective: Identify activities and mechanisms to enable developing country institutions to define and plan linkages which enable them to meet the needs of their society/community. This was done by looking at development needs broadly, including employment, health, economic growth, literacy, agriculture, etc., for developmentally relevant linkage projects in the following three categories: Education, Research and Outreach.

There was extensive discussion about the wide range of LDC development needs, including agriculture, health, business, etc., but the consensus was that the topics of the linkages need to be based on comprehensive needs assessments of the specific institutions and countries involved.

1. Comprehensive Planning Process	
Assessment of needs of LDC society (agricultural, health, economic, education, etc.)	H
Assessment of needs of institution (administration, education, research, outreach)	M
Development of near and long term plans and policies and their implementation	M
Continuous monitoring and evaluation, follow-up of graduates to identify job placement	M

2. Administrative Capacity	
Staff development, training, exchanges (policy analysis, management, fiscal skills)	H
Grantsmanship, connections with outside funding sources	M
Internal coordination among different parts of the university	L
3. Education Activities	
Faculty retooling, exchanges, workshops, conferences	H
Curriculum review, development and materials creation (interdisciplinary, practical)	H
Student exchanges	M
Libraries and information/communication technology	M
Graduate training, post-degree training (appropriate for LDC needs)	M
Education facilities	M
Language training (English and local languages)	L
Salary support (prevent the brain drain)	L
4. Research Activities	
Applied research (relevant to LDC needs)	H
Collaboration with researchers in U.S. and other LDCs and developed countries	H
Update research knowledge and methods (conference attendance, workshops, training programs)	M
Communications technology, development of databases, journals exchange	M
Cooperation with local business (R&D with and for private businesses)	M
Research facilities	M
5. Outreach Activities	
Linkages with local, regional and country governments, businesses, PVOs, advisory groups	H
Linkages with local schools	M
Training trainers and local leadership	M
Extension and demonstration programs to wider audiences (women, rural groups, etc.)	M
Communication technology	M
Materials production, both written and audiovisual	L

Group C. Criteria for Evaluating Pre-proposals, Proposals and Sustainability

Objective: Identify and prioritize criteria to be considered in evaluating pre-proposals and proposals for long-term sustainable development linkages, considering the indicators and activities developed in Morning Groups A and B.

Note that in the Washington, DC, session, the facilitators made no mention of pre-proposals, but the participants raised the suggestion as high priority. Consequently, pre-proposals were suggested explicitly in the St. Louis and San Diego meetings, and were endorsed by those participants.

1. Institutional Commitment to Internationalization	
Policy commitment (mission statement and strategic plan of U.S. institution)	H
Resource commitment (of U.S. institution)	M
2. Joint Planning Process	
Joint commitments of resources (specifically spelled out in an MOU)	H
Involvement of LDC institution in proposal preparation; demonstration of mutual goals, objectives and respect; meeting needs of both institutions	M
Mutual benefits to U.S. and LDC institutions	M

3. Institutional Capacity	
Adequate staff/administrative structure in both U.S. and LDC institutions	H
Experience: extending/building on existing strengths, facilities, subject expertise, area expertise, knowledge of language, culture, etc.	H
Experiences in linkages with LDCs, faculty working relationships, exchanges	M
Library holdings	L
4. Internationalization Impact	
Relative impact of the grant on the institutions (how much change will \$100,000 make in this institution?)	H
Potential impact on long term plans for internationalization activities in both institutions	M
Links among teaching, research and outreach	L
Impact of previous work, how it contributed to the curriculum	L
Impact on faculty, staff, students, community	L
5. Project Substance	
Significance - impacts, benefits, outcomes, (socio-economic value) both short and long term	H
Planned resources/budget appropriate (costs in line), matching funds available, committed in MOU by both institutions	H
Project personnel - experience, qualifications, significant time (50-100%) from key personnel	H
Sustainability*	H
Monitoring and evaluation procedures, regular process throughout the 5 years	H
Multi-lateral focus, multiple linkages, including private sector	M
Transferability, replication/generalization to other projects, countries, regions, expandability	M
Original, creative, non-duplicative, scholarly excellence	M
Focus on human resource development	M
Needs assessment, quality of assessment, degree of need	M
Feasibility of success, realistic timeframe	M
Statement of problem clear, scope appropriate (not too broad, so has chance of success)	M
Congruence with AID goals, objectives, country strategy	M
Leveraging capacity to create new constituencies, new niches, sustainability	M
Extent project fits into national or regional plans of development	L
Effective project management mechanisms	L
5. Project Substance (continued)	
Multi-disciplinary (broad view of development)	L
Appropriate mix of teaching, research and outreach	L

* Because of its importance, "sustainability" was the topic of a special workshop question, the results of which are given below.

Sustainability

Sustainability was defined as the ability of a project to continue effectively after A.I.D. funding ends in 5 years.

Objective: List steps U. S. colleges and universities and LDC institutions can undertake to ensure the sustainability of long-term linkages, including the involvement of other resources, such as multinational corporations, World Bank, indigenous private sector, etc.

The participants suggested that the best way to have sustainability is to have a good project, one that meets most of the criteria identified in C.

Other suggestions to aid sustainability of a project were:

- Building individual, institutional and community relationships over the 5 year grant period.
- Planning for early involvement of multiple outside funding sources, such as World Bank, foundations, etc.
- Forming collaborative projects with the private sector and NGOs
- Doing joint publishable research
- Incorporating the project into the strategic plans of institutions (projects at the core of the institutions' missions), so they will carry it on
- Including personnel development plans (HRD)
- Transferring technology
- Using alumni associations
- Leveraging and linking with other sources of funds, including other grants and contracts
- Involving both junior and senior faculty
- Ensuring information access via libraries, international societies, telecommunications, etc.
- Grantsmanship training
- Informal networking plus formal linkages
- Using the AID money to leverage donor support during the 5 years, then continue it
- Ensuring that outputs (benefits) are valued by stakeholders in both institutions
- Having adequate resources to produce sustainable benefits (time frame of 5 years may be too short)
- Conforming with long term development plans on both sides
- Having adequate long-term institutional capacity
- On-going research output (for U.S. universities, the capacity for research is a key outcome because this gains faculty support and interest)
- Good mix of research, training and practice
- Leveraging money for the LDC institution from other agencies in addition to AID, such as the private sector, foundations, and from other nations, ie. Japan, Holland, etc.
- Using a consortium approach
- Finding your niche of services and exploiting it as an institution
- Planning grants would help start out on a firm foundation

Group D. A.I.D. and College and University Funding Issues

Objective: Provide input to A.I.D. on issues for grant funding to help A.I.D. create a fair system for awarding development linkages grants to U.S. colleges and universities.

Size of Grant: Ten out of the eleven subgroups agreed that the proposed size of grants at \$100,000 provided a good balance between size of grants versus number of grants, given that only about \$5 million per year was projected to be available for the program. Some participants felt that \$100,000 was too small and that at least \$250,000 was needed to produce a quality product. Other participants felt that \$75,000 would be sufficient.

A. Multiple Grants to One U.S. University or LDC Institution

1. What restrictions, if any, should be placed on the number of grants to one U.S. university?

Citing a desire to have as many colleges and universities involved as possible, six subgroups said grants to a single institution should be limited to 1 grant, one subgroup said 2 grants, two subgroups said 3 grants, one said no limit, and one was undecided.

2. *Should we limit the number of linkages in which any one LDC institution can participate?*

Three subgroups said limit an LDC institution to 1 linkage, three said up to 2 linkages, three said no limit, one said no limitations needed because the number would be self-limiting by the capacity of the LDC institution, and one gave no answer. Those that suggested a limit of 1 linkage added that LDC institutions should be free to be included in as many submitted proposals as they desired, so they would not be penalized by picking the wrong U.S. institution.

B. Matching Requirements: Because leveraging additional resources is an important program criterion, and to further commitment, collaboration and sustainability, A.I.D. proposed that its funds be matched by at least the same amount from the combined resources of the U.S. and LDC institutions.

1. *What real expenditures and in-kind contributions should be considered as matching funds for U.S. universities?*

Eight subgroups said there should be no restrictions on matching by U.S. institutions. Several suggested that up-front proposal preparation costs should be counted as match. The ability to count preliminary expenditures (real investments), trips and other expenditures that can be accounted for, as part of matching would allow them to establish linkages. This is a particularly important issue for smaller institutions, that need to get credits wherever they can.

All but one of the groups said that a 1:1 matching rate would be satisfactory, except HBCUs need continuation of current matching rate of 1:2 (\$1 from HBCU is matched by \$2 from A.I.D.). One subgroup said all universities should start lower, perhaps 50% match required in the first year and work up to over 100% later, increasing the level of match required in subsequent years. Others did not agree with this approach.

2. *What limitations, if any, should be put on indirect cost contributions?*

Eight subgroups said there should be no arbitrary cap on indirect costs, the rate is decided in negotiation with the institution. One said there should be a cap of 50-100% on indirect cost rate (they couldn't agree). One said that no overhead should be allowed, only directly apportioned expenditures. One said that indirect costs should be limited to 75% of the university contribution and that 25% (\$25,000) should be required to be in cash expenditures.

3. *How should LDC institutions' contributions be counted?*

All subgroups agreed that all LDC institutions' contributions (salaries, equipment, etc.) should be counted toward the match, in U.S. dollar equivalents. Most said there should be no initial requirements of minimum or maximum percentages required from LDC institutions, but one felt that \$25,000 in matching contributions was reasonable to ask from an LDC institution.

C. Maximum Funding Amount for a Single Grant: The proposed maximum grant for one U.S. college or university with one LDC institution is \$100,000 per year. *What approach does your group recommend for determining the maximum grant and why in these cases:*

(1) *Several U.S. universities with one LDC institution*

(2) *One U.S. university with several LDC institutions*

(3) *Several U.S. universities with several LDC institutions*

Eight subgroups agreed that consortia arrangements like these cases could be funded to a maximum of \$100,000 per U.S. university (no distinctions were made for the three cases). One subgroup said that all consortia should be limited to a maximum of \$75,000 per U.S. university. One subgroup suggested the maximum total for one consortium be \$250,000. One subgroup said that there should be no consortia at first, there should initially only be one-on-one linkages.

D. Peer review: A.I.D. is proposing that final selection of proposals be done by external peer review. *What suggestions do you have to make this review as fair and thorough as possible, e.g. how should an external peer review panel be designed, what are the skills needed, what representation is most appropriate, etc.?*

All subgroups thought that an independent agency should handle the peer review. Most said that A.I.D. could utilize an organization like NRC/BOSTID, so long as there was broad representation on the panels. One subgroup said the BOSTID system currently used is not adequate, suggesting the panels need to include representatives of LDCs. Others said panels should provide for participation by previous grantees, independent academic experts and representatives of the whole range of institutions, from large to small, especially including HBCUs when proposals from HBCUs are being reviewed. Peer review should include individuals representing like programs, eg. health experts reviewing health proposals.

Most subgroups felt that peer review could begin at the full proposal stage, but one felt it should begin with the pre-proposals.

E. Other Issues

Many subgroups added other comments:

1. It is a small program as far as funds go, but it has tremendous potential.
2. Early U.S.A.I.D. Mission involvement is essential. Universities should take an active role in briefing Missions. Review of pre-proposals will help Mission involvement. They need to feel that the Central Bureau is not bypassing them in the process. Mission stake will contribute to leveraging resources, add to legitimacy and will help free up other funding.
3. Other programs can be interested in buying into the linkage program, eg. SEED in Eastern Europe could buy in to a new program and enhance funds available. An Eastern Europe program could involve U.S. universities and this peer review process.
4. Have caution regarding evaluations of sustainability—need to ensure good survey instruments developed to determine questions of sustainability.
5. Other sources for leveraging could include Debt for Development, use of foreign currency.
6. It is important that A.I.D. actually fund the proposals at levels they requested rather than change budgets after submission, saying there are less funds available for same number of grants.
7. Have available Planning grants for up to 6 months to aid institutions without past grants.
8. Provide special consideration for universities that have had no previous grants.
9. Provide a minimum of 60 days between release of RFP and Pre-proposal deadline.
10. Minimize and simplify reporting requirements.
11. Have open communication of project and proposal information available during the proposal process, to facilitate collaboration and formation of consortia.
12. One subgroup suggested open information about existing connections, for example, our information on Haiti be available to other universities wanting to propose linkages. Setting up this kind of database could be one role of the new University Center in A.I.D.
13. Should emphasize the longevity of the linkage, greater than 5 or 10 years.
14. Use the pre-proposal system to aid U.S. institutions, that seek linkages, to find appropriate LDC institutions.
15. Require a clear statement of commitment from LDC institution as to its roles and responsibilities, including a narrative description of its understanding and the personnel and resources committed.
16. Use a process involving pre-proposals and proposals, to limit the time invested in an effort not likely to succeed.

Conclusions and Next Steps

Conclusions

The desired outcome from the series of forums was achieved. Nearly all 250 representatives from a broad cross-section of U.S. colleges and universities reacted positively to the concept of a linkage program to help LDC institutions better serve the development needs of their countries. The participants accepted a competitive system of awarding \$100,000 matching grants. They endorsed a system of short pre-proposals, followed by full proposals reviewed by independent peer panels.

The participants had substantive, high quality input on all questions asked. A.I.D. received substantial information upon which to base the preparation of an RFP. Participants listed numerous indicators of internationalization for U.S. colleges and universities, providing the data for ranking these indicators in priority order within seven categories. Similarly, they produced many mechanisms to enable developing country institutions to define and plan linkages to help meet the needs of their countries, which have yielded 27 activities with priority rankings within five categories.

These two sets of data have been organized into 32 criteria for evaluating proposals, organized and ranked in five categories. When one key criterion, sustainability, was given special attention, they generated 24 creative suggestions to ensure continuation after A.I.D. funding for that project ended in five years.

Nearly all of the participants agreed that \$100,000 from A.I.D., matched by an equal or greater total contribution from the U.S. and LDC institutions, was a reasonable amount. However, many said that linkages involving HBCUs (historically black colleges and universities) with LDC institutions should only be required to match \$1 for every \$2 put in by A.I.D.

A majority thought that any one U.S. institution should be limited to one grant. However, they did say that if institutions entered into consortia, they still could receive up to \$100,000 per institution.

They could not agree on whether LDC institutions should be limited to any specific number of linkages, perhaps indicating that the potential of concentrating too many grants in one LDC is not a major problem, and it could be aided by having a wide geographical distribution of grants across the developing world.

A good majority of the participants felt that there should be no restrictions on the sources of matching funds and there should be no limit on indirect costs, up to the GAO negotiated level. They also agreed that all quantifiable LDC contributions should be included.

All subgroups thought that an independent agency should handle the peer review. Most said that A.I.D. could utilize an organization like NRC/BOSTID, so long as there was broad representation on the panels. They also made over 15 other suggestions about how to implement the program.

Next Steps

In each session, Brad Langmaid announced that this summary report would be distributed by the end of October to all participants in the three forums. He invited anyone, whether they had attended a forum or not, to send in any comments or ideas.

He also outlined the following schedule as a goal he was working toward:

“In November, we will begin to write the RFP and hope to have it out on the street by February 15. If we allow 30 days for preparing pre-proposals, 30 days for reviewing them with the Missions, 60 days each for preparing and reviewing proposals, plus some time for grant negotiations, then a start up in very late FY 91 (September 1991) or early FY 92 is possible.”

Appendices

	Page
A. Agenda for the Day (sample)	13
B. Group Workshop Forms for Groups A, B, C and D	14
C. Reports to the Plenaries from each of the Groups	22
D. List of Handouts	33
E. List of Acronyms and Definitions	34
F. Answers to the Most Frequently Asked Questions	35
G. List of Participants	38

Appendix A. Agenda

A.I.D. Forum on University Development Linkages

Purpose: To obtain college and university suggestions for (1) the design of development linkages for developing country institutions with U.S. colleges and universities and (2) criteria for evaluation of proposals and linkage awards.

Expected Outcome: Established project design and evaluation criteria for linkage proposals.

8:30 - 9:30 am **Opening Remarks**

Bradshaw Langmaid, Deputy Administrator for Research, Bureau for Science and Technology (S&T)—Concept Overview

Lynn Pesson, Executive Director of Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD)—University Center Concept

Curtis Jackson, Director, Office of Research and University Relations—Details of the Linkage Project

Jim Carney, ISTI Facilitator—Agenda for the Day

9:30 - 11:30 am **Concurrent Groups**

Group A: Indicators of International Involvement

Outcome: Indicators for assessing U.S. colleges and universities on their , overall institutional commitment to internationalization.

Group B: LDC Institutional Involvement in Meeting Development Needs

Outcome: Activities and mechanisms to enable developing country institutions to define and plan linkages which enable them to meet the needs of their society/community.

9:45 - 10:30 Table subgroup brainstorming and prioritizing

10:30 - 11:30 Reports from subgroups and formation of consensus within groups A and B

11:30 - 12:30 pm **Plenary:** Groups A and B report on their priority recommendations

12:30 - 1:45 pm **Lunch**

1:45 - 3:30 pm **Concurrent Groups**

Group C: Criteria for Evaluating Pre-proposals, Proposals and Sustainability

Outcome: Criteria to be considered in evaluating pre-proposals and proposals for long-term sustainable development linkages, considering the indicators and activities developed in morning Groups A and B.

Group D: A.I.D. and College and University Funding Issues

Outcome: Information to help A.I.D. create a fair system for awarding development linkages grants to U.S. colleges and universities.

2:00 - 2:45 Table subgroup brainstorming and prioritizing

2:45 - 3:30 Reports from subgroups and formation of consensus within groups C and D

3:30 - 4:30 pm **Plenary:** Groups C and D report on their priority recommendations

4:30 - 5:00 pm **Closing Remarks/Conclusion—Bradshaw Langmaid**

Afternoon Group D: A.I.D. and College and University Funding Issues

Subgroup # _____ Chair _____ Rapporteur _____

Recorder: _____ (On the reverse, Recorder lists names in the Subgroup.)

Outcome: Information to help A.I.D. create a fair system for awarding development linkages grants to U.S. colleges and universities.

Introductions: Each person introduce themselves to the others in one minute or less, telling name, institution, interests/disciplines and background in international linkages.

Organization: Choose a Chair to guide the group's discussion to cover all points in the time announced by the Facilitator, a Rapporteur to write the group's discussion clearly on a flipchart for reporting to the whole group, a Recorder to fill in this form legibly for this Subgroup and turn in to the Facilitator.

Assignment: Provide input to A.I.D. on issues for grant funding.

A. Multiple Grants to One University or LDC Institution

1. The possibility exists, over the life of the linkage project, for one U.S. college or university to competitively obtain several distinct grants with several different LDC institutions. What restrictions, if any, should be placed on the number of grants to one U.S. university?

2. There is also the possibility for one LDC institution to be chosen by several U.S. colleges or universities for several different linkage relationships. Should we limit the number of distinct linkages in which any one LDC institution can participate? Explain your rationale.

B. Matching Requirements: A.I.D. is proposing, in order to expand the impact of the program and provide a maximum number of grants with limited funds, that funding from A.I.D. be limited to one-half or less of the funds required for the proposed activities.

What real expenditures and in-kind contributions should be considered as matching funds for U.S. universities? _____

What limitations, if any, should be put on indirect cost contributions? _____

How should LDC institutions' contributions be counted? _____

C. Maximum Funding Amount for a Single Grant: The proposed maximum grant for one U.S. college or university with one LDC institution is \$100,000 per year. What approaches does your group recommend for determining the maximum grant and why in these cases:

(1) Several U.S. universities with one LDC institution _____

(2) One U.S. university with several LDC institutions _____

(3) Several U.S. universities with several LDC institutions _____

D. Peer review: A.I.D. is proposing that final selection of proposals be done by external peer review. What suggestions do you have to make this review as fair and thorough as possible, e.g. how should an external peer review panel be designed, what are the skills needed, what representation is most appropriate, etc.? _____

E. Other Issues

Members of Subgroup: _____

At the end, choose a **Presenter** to give the report to the Group.

Appendix C. Plenary Reports from Each of the Groups

Group A: Indicators of International Involvement

September 17, 1990, Washington, DC,

Group A Report to Plenary:

We strongly urge that the task of writing the proposal be simple.

The 5 basic indicators our subgroup came up with (and were agreed to by the rest of the subgroups in our Group):

- 1 Commitment at all levels: Institution, faculty, students (35 points)
 - a Policies, such as tenure, promotion,
 - b Allocation of Resources (faculty time is a key indicator)
 - c Academic course and program offerings, student enrollment (indicates faculty and student commitment)
- 2 Administrative Structure: both a central international unit and dispersed units in the stronger international departments (25 points)
- 3 Strengths Relevant to the Proposal: include a mix of factors, such as library facilities, subject matter expertise, geographic experience, etc. (20 points)

The mix of those elements should be appropriate to the linkage you are considering
- 4 Experience in Relationships with LDCs: Overseas experience may be either by faculty or institution (10 points)
- 5 Trend or Pattern in Internationalization: how this proposal is consistent with trends of this university over the past 5 - 10 years (10 points)

Then I want to add:

- 6 Creativity, show that this is something new,
Leverage other resources
Finding your niche
- 7 Tell A.I.D. the need to remember flexibility in programming
U.S.A.I.D. Mission involvement is crucial
- 8 Match the outcomes proposed with the institution's ability to make it happen

Typical activities:

Focus on people, developing human resources, faculty sabbatical leaves, graduate students in both directions

Support for getting people together, preparing collaborative research, communications, conferences.

Fund raising (it costs time and money too)

Realism relative to the size of the grant

Both institutions benefitting from the linkage: feel it's important what the LDC school is doing for U.S.

Extent to which it has transformational impact on both LDC and U.S. institution.

We have anxiety that these indicators are not the consensus of the university community in the U.S.

September 21, 1990, St. Louis, MO

Group A Report to Plenary:

1 University Policy and Financial Commitment

Mission statement and strategic plan that incorporate statements on internationalization plans

Dedicated university research support

Indirect cost allocations relative to international work

Scholarships for international students

Scholarships for study abroad

- 2 Faculty
 - Self profile
 - Experience
 - Incentives in promotion and tenure policy (relative to international work)
 - Diversity (national and international)
 - Development opportunities
 - Overseas experience
- 3 Administrative Commitment and Support Structure
 - Does university wide office exist?
 - What is level of reporting
 - Public statements
- 4 Curriculum and Academic Programs
 - Requirements in General Education for the degree
 - Enrollment level in international courses
 - New course development efforts
 - Minors, concentrations, specializations, majors available
- 5 International Experience Levels
 - Study abroad
 - Exchanges, faculty and student
 - Cooperative agreements
 - Level of exchange activity
 - Collaboration with international organizations
 - International grants and contracts
- 6 International Student Experience
 - ESL programs
 - % and number of international students and scholars
 - Planned integrative activities that use international students to broaden the experience of the whole campus & community
 - Diversity of Student base, range of countries there
 - International teaching assistant training program
- 7 Private Sector Support and Linkages
 - Private sector contributions to international education
 - Public service links
 - Continuing education linking internationally
- 8 Foreign Language Offerings
 - Scope
 - Intensity level
 - Requirements for degree and admission
- 9 Efforts to Enhance or Grow Internationally
 - K-12 linkages and outreach
 - Speaker services
 - Cooperation with other universities and private voluntary organizations
 - New program starts
- 10 Library and Infrastructure
 - Holdings level
 - Electronic networks, such as Bitnet, technology for uplinks, downlinks
 - Computerization

September 24, 1990, San Diego, CA

Group A Report to Plenary

Priorities

- 1 Institutional Commitment -
 - a Mission Statement and Policy - university-wide mission statement as comprehensive as possible (explain why you are spending money overseas) and policy rationale
 - b Strategic Planning - done in all facets of the university, is it integrated with faculty, students and staff

Is there a track record at the institution (but not exclude those without extensive track records)

 - c Staffing - has there been a top administrative position filled, with someone with a wide range of knowledge and able to bring together faculty, students, staff
 - d Organization and Integrated Infrastructure
 - e Implementation
 - f Funding - from the legislature, plus external sources such as foundations
- 2 Human Resource Development
 - a Faculty - exchange programs, professional development activities, seen in hiring, promotion, and tenure practices
 - b Staff - foreign language competence, exchange opportunities for junior and senior staff even to level of secretaries, sensitivity to international students
 - c Students - how are international students recruited, is it seen as a positive activity, exchange programs, how are international students integrated into the institution and community, follow-up to see how employed when return to their home campuses
- 3 Program Development
 - a Program integration into campus life, or isolated
 - b Curriculum development process
 - c Distance education, eg. using satellite systems, etc.
 - d Library acquisitions
 - e Foreign language capabilities on campus
 - f Technical assistance, development cooperation, faculty exchanges, student
 - g Study abroad programs
 - h Exchanges at all levels
 - i International students on campus
- 4 Outreach, Networks, Linkages
 - a Intrastate networks (such as the intersegmental impact programs related to the master plan for the State of California encompassing elementary, secondary, community college, and University of California to address international aspects of education)
 - b Countries, institutional linkages
 - c Government networks
 - d Community networks, linking university with business,
 - e Consortia with institutions with similar areas of interest
 - f Regions, working with institutions in your region
 - g Public and private sectors working together for cooperation
- 5 Campus Culture (attitude toward internationalization)
 - a Reward system for faculty and staff for international activities
 - b Student life reflects a positive attitude, eg. diversity, multi-ethnic
 - c Community cooperation, attitude of support for international activities
- 6 Monitoring and Evaluation
Process to monitor institutional activities
Evaluation process integrated within the institution and other institutions

Group B. LDC Institutional Involvement in Meeting Development Needs September 17, 1990, Washington, DC,

Group B Report to Plenary:

We did not consense on priorities, came up with a list

Activities and mechanisms to define and plan linkages which enable LDC institutions to meet the needs of their society/community:

I Types of Institutions?

Universities

Government units, information ministries

PVOs

NGOs

Professional associations

II Institutional Development (we used this term to cover both "education" and "research categories, more inclusive of the broad range of LDC institutions that could be involved)

Administrative Capacity, needs assessment, internal linkages across disciplines and faculties, knowledge of funding sources and procedures (increase capacity to gain other resources), general skills

Professional Development, exchanges for faculty and students, international conferences, incentive structures for faculty, computer skills

Curriculum and Instructional Development, review, adaptation and creation of materials

Library Development

Better Relations between LDC institutions and government operating units (lessen isolation of institutions from the policy making bodies of the country) and the private sector

Brokering Non-university Resources, securing involvement of non-university people from U.S.

III Specific Topical Areas

Link research and education

Unit to unit linkages, eg. 2 schools of agriculture

Joint research and training centers

Collaborative research

Mentoring, advice for junior faculty, graduate students

Fellowships or mini-sabbaticals

Subjects

Agriculture

Environment

Population/Family Planning

Policy Analysis

Development Studies

Languages

IV Outreach

Information sources on graduates and faculty to overcome the job-skills mismatch, to meet the needs of the country

Policy analysis training

Small business development projects, get university beyond campus

Primary and secondary school ties, including updating teacher training

Public health training

Telecommunications, teleconferencing

Technology transfer

Extension, agriculture, engineering, business

V General Procedural Concerns

Establish a LDC advisory committee

Use blocked funds—leverage these monies in LDCs to supplement the AID money

Flexibility

Build on previous contacts and linkages to recognize previous work in match

Learn from the in-country experience of successful USIA university affiliation program, including contact persons

Get embassies and missions involved by identifying appropriate LDC institutions

Not be limited to just large US universities.

September 21, 1990, St. Louis, MO

Group B Report to Plenary:

First priority is overall needs assessment of the LDC institution and the LDCs themselves.

Education:

- 1 Faculty development, strengthen faculty of both US and LDC institutions
- 2 Making information technology available to LDC institution
- 3 Curriculum design
- 4 Student exchange both ways
- 5 Management structures
- 6 Planning and evaluation techniques

Research

- 1 Faculty Development
- 2 Collaborative research
- 3 Research agendas
- 4 Physical facilities, tools of research
- 5 Industry involvement, both US and LDC
- 6 Developing funding structures, sources and the grant writing, project design capabilities

Outreach

- 1 Training of local leadership
- 2 Intra-country and regional linkages, between institution and specific territories within their countries
- 3 Delivery systems development, extension is a model
- 4 Development of management systems for outreach
- 5 Linkages with LDC industry, NGOs, elementary and secondary school systems

Other

- 1 Harmonizing teaching, research and outreach activities of LDC institution.

September 24, 1990, San Diego, CA

Group B Report to Plenary:

We looked at the three areas from the point of view of the LDC institutions, but we first came up with Generic Approaches

- 1 Contributes to effective linkages with key institutions and stakeholders in the home country, including other universities, ministries, USAID, other potential donors, private sector institutions such as business, private universities
- 2 Reduces brain drain, attract and keep best human resources at the LDC institution
- 3 Assists in managing institutional resources at various levels, individual, unit, program, money, especially planning
- 4 Contribute to and look like success - builds constituency, makes my institution recognizably better, evaluation/monitoring

Education

- 1 Make education relevant, problem solving, locally relevant, not academic, used in local situation
- 2 Inputs needed
 - Human resource development
 - Access to information
 - Curriculum models
 - Acad management models and expertise
 - Facilities, supplies, teaching material
- 3 Networking and linkages with faculty abroad
- 4 Joint collaborative degrees with US and LDC institutions

Research

- 1 Make research relevant to local needs, based on assessment of local needs
- 2 Shared credit with LDC institution - publication, professional recognition for our work with US researchers, colleagues
- 3 Professional linkages, individual and institutional, graduate students
- 4 Access to data bases, IARCs, universities outside home country, professional networks
- 5 Research management improvements (planning, prioritization, assessment)
- 6 Develop and consolidate data bases on high priority problem areas
- 7 Access to research inputs, facilities, supplies, information, technology
- 8 Planning what we can and are willing to contribute, identify our strengths and resources as an LDC institution
- 9 Inter-disciplinary research, problem-solving orientation, something that our constituency can use

Outreach

- 1 Mission statement and strategic plan (who does/should do what), extension, outreach, technology transfer to my country
- 2 Understand what the US institution and its ties has to offer in this area (LDC institutions don't know the private business relations and capabilities of US institutions, other than agricultural extension)
- 3 Human resource development, training and development of staff
- 4 Ties to research and curriculum, reality checks
- 5 Utilize new communication technologies

In addition, we would like new arrangements for linking LDC institutions that are doing things well and could share from one country or continent to another, eg. from Latin America to Africa

Also, how to keep people in outreach activities

Group C: Criteria for Evaluating Linkage Proposals

September 17, 1990, Washington, DC,

Group C Report to Plenary:

We were concerned about open-endedness of our charge to identify criteria to screen proposals. We felt a lack of AID guidelines and lack of identified priorities.

We feel that priorities will vary from country to country, from region to region, among sectors (agriculture, health, etc.) and among activities (teaching, research, service).

We propose to bring key players together to identify priority items, US and LDC universities, AID, ministries of sectors involved, other external support agencies, such as World Health Organization, World Bank, etc.

We see a two stage process:

- 1 Short Pre-proposal, not involve much up-front costs
Screen with AID input from both Washington and missions to determine fit within priorities
2. Invite full proposal with major input from LDC universities
Submit these to peer review (with minor AID input)

Is it possible to make country mission statements available to those making proposals?

Peer Review: need to have agriculture experts review agriculture proposals, but need to have multi-disciplinary proposals reviewed by multi-disciplinary teams.

- Q Have LDC institution, US universities and Missions involved in the pre-proposals so that all three have agreed before the pre-proposal comes to AID DC
- Q I still have questions on the amount of effort required for start-up

We also have concerns for the process, need funding for US institutions to do this, is there funding available for LDC institutions?

Proposal criteria we agreed on:

- 1 Commitment by both US and LDC institutions
Project Specific
Shared Objectives
- 2 Structural strengths and capacity
Critical staff mass
Infrastructure (broadly defined) especially previous experience
3. Substantive merit
Focus on human resource development
Expand existing projects/relationships
Meet specific institutional needs
Breadth of university involvement
Distinctiveness, something new
Enhance internationalization of institutions
Planning for sustainability
4. Benefits beyond the 2 partners
Outreach, realistic plans
Inter-institutional linkages
Achieving AID priorities and LDC priorities
Benefits to institutions, including:
Increasing connections among faculty internationally
Improving teaching and research capacity]
Improved ability to seek future funding

September 21, 1990, St. Louis, MO

Group C Report to Plenary:

These are not in priority order, but the first 4 are the key priority. One group thought #10 highest priority

- 1 Needs assessment and articulation of goals (both tangible and intangible) that are clear and realistic
- 2 Measures of feasibility and cost effectiveness, (can it be done within time period?)
- 3 Partnership and mutuality of benefits and interests to both US and LDC institutions
- 4 Institutional capabilities to deliver, including plan, strategy, tactics, personnel, budget, measurable
- 5 Relevancy of objectives to the needs of the host country, LDC and US institutions

- 6 Sustainability, is result of all other things in place
- 7 Evaluation and monitoring and achievement of goals, objective determination procedures
- 8 Adequacy of resources, eg. technical, language, fiscal, faculty
- 9 Relationship to the internationalization plans of institution(s)
- 10 Leveraging capacity to create new constituencies, new niches, sustainability

Sustainability

- 1 Evidence of long-term commitment
- 2 Multiple donor involvement
3. Past track record of both institutions of sustainability of partners
- 4 Extent to which linkage develops personnel
- 5 Stability of respective institutions and administrative leaders (do a risk assessment)
- 6 Development of additional linkages within country and in region, a project worthy of emulation
- 7 Facilitation of mutual activities, faculty, students

All of these will have to be down to a single page of requirements

There are also other factors from small groups

September 24, 1990, San Diego, CA

Group C Report to Plenary:

One table began by challenging the premises of the University Center concept, asking if \$100,000 were adequate? Is it the most effective way to use the money? Or use it to make existing programs more sustainable? Are the criteria for institutional involvement appropriate for judging proposals of this nature or are these criteria good for \$1,000,000 grants? If we are creating a level playing field to broaden the base, we would not want the criteria of the morning Group A.

Assuming the University Center concept, this is our report:

A. Programmatic Substance

- 1 Socio-economic significance and impact
 - On the LDC institution itself
 - On the general population
 - On the economic capacity of that country
 - On the US institution
- 2 Non-duplicative, historical knowledge (not repeat other projects)
 - (This assumes an existing database of what has been done, where and with what success.)
- 3 Transferability to other institutions in the LDC and other countries -Diffusion of innovation, multiplier effect
- 4 Sustainability - look at both sustainability of a project and sustainability of a relationship with LDC
 - Proposal itself, both, cross-training in both LDC and US
 - Collaborative across institutions in US and LDC
 - Partnership with other sectors
 - Endowing essential elements, through a long term investment by both institutions
- 5 Breadth/Multi-disciplinary approach (would include the human dimensions)

- E Other issues
 - Early Mission involvement
 - Other AID program buy-ins, eg. Eastern Europe program could involve US universities and this peer review process
 - Survey Instruments are needed to provide adequate information on sustainability of programs
 - Other sources for leveraging could include Debt for Development, use of foreign currency

September 21, 1990, St. Louis, MO

Group D Report to Plenary:

A Multiple grants

- 1 1 university: maximum of \$100,000 per US university (except 1 group said 2 per university up to \$200,000)
- 2 1 award per LDC institution, in order to broaden the base of institutions involved
Later if more money available, could allow more

B Matching

- No limit to indirect costs at the audited level
- Include in-kind costs, housing, transportation, facilities
- Other, faculty and staff released time
- LDC include housing transportation, fees/tuition, etc.

C 1 Limited by number of US universities to \$100,000 per US university involved

- 2 \$100,000 per US university involved
- 3 \$100,000 per US university

D Peer review

Establish a pool of qualified reviewers with international experience, broad base of disciplines, institutions, geographic distribution

Phasing of reviewers:

- Pre-proposal - use interdisciplinary panel
- Proposal panel, based on the discipline of the grant
 - Rank order by discipline
- Awards arrayed by Region, Discipline, University type (include HBCU, state universities, land grant institutions)

Other Issues

- 1 At least 60 days between release of RFP and Pre-proposal deadline
- 2 Planning grants to aid institutions without past grants
We had questions about timing, amounts, scope of activity and how to fit in the process
- 3 Open information about existing connections, for example, our information on Haiti available to other universities wanting to propose linkages
- 4 Emphasis on the longevity of the linkage, greater than 5 or 10 years
- 5 Increasing the match required as the grant progresses, eg., yr 100 %, then 125% in yr 3
- 6 Pre-proposal, link US institutions that seek linkages with appropriate LDC institutions,

B Institutional Programmatic Strength

1 US institutions

- a Track record include parallel projects of the institution and faculty and other partners
- b Interest capability and commitment to the particular project
Faculty dedication to the project, US faculty spending 50 - 100% of their time on this particular project
Institution matching funds,
- c Capabilities as per Group A report

2 LDC institutions

- a Institutional capability and commitment (eg. International Institution for East-West Analysis, Vienna, insists on commitment of LDC institution)
- b Commitment to sustained implementation within the LDC
- c Fit of a project into the national and regional development plans of the country, already independently defined by an institution in the country
- d Appropriate extra-institutional links to private or public sectors, other institutions, and agencies as appropriate

C Proposal Mechanics

- 1 Budget appropriateness
- 2 Appropriate time frame
- 3 Effective project management
- 4 Evaluation and monitoring plan

**Group D. A.I.D. and College and University Funding Issues
September 17, 1990, Washington, DC,**

Group D Report to Plenary:

A Size of Grants

Recommend range from \$75 - 250,000. Some thought \$100,000 would not produce a quality product, so felt that \$250,000 needed. Others thought that \$75,000 would be OK, there was need to have more grants spread around

Build safeguard against concentration of grants in too few institutions, because a pattern of concentration shuts out newcomers.

Pattern of Institutional Linkages, case by case review, no hard and fast rules about pattern for linkages

Preference by some people for one-on-one links

B Multiple grants:

Limit proportion of funds to individual institutions, cap of \$500,000 over 5 year period per school.

Set aside funds for new grantees each cycle

C Matching, 50% is too stringent a requirement.

HBCU should only have max of 25% match required

Matching should reflect all inkind contributions from both US and LDC institutions

Matching should include up front proposal development costs

No arbitrary cap on indirect costs, decided in negotiation with institution

D Peer review, good agreement that it is good and begins at pre-proposal

In addition to NRC/NAS, include representatives of LDCs, AID missions, independent academic and previous grantees (not involved in funding proposals this year)

September 24, 1990, San Diego, CA

Group D Report to Plenary:

Systems for Making Awards

General points: New program should broaden participation in AID programs

We assumed \$100,000 maximum grant. However, we were unable to come to a consensus on a number of points, so we have just listed the alternatives:

A 1 Multiple grants to one US university: first priority be quality of proposal

Alternatives:

- a Eliminate multiple grants to one institution, unless funds left over
 - b No limits
 - c Up to 3 separate links at \$100,000 each
- 2 Limit multiple grants to LDC institutions to 2 because limits of absorptive capacity, concern LDC not able to handle more than one because of realities of LDC staff time (many hold 2 jobs)**

B Maximum funding amounts for:

1 Several US universities with 1 LDC institution: Alternatives:

- a Limit to 2 grants to the consortium
- b Limit to \$100,000

2 One US to several LDC institutions: Alternatives:

- a Limit to 3 links to any one US institution
- b No limit
- c Limit to \$100,000

3 Several US universities to several LDC institutions: Alternatives:

- a Limit to \$100,000
- b. Limit each US consortium up to \$300,000
- c. Limit each LDC consortium up to \$200,000

C Matching Requirements: Alternatives:

- a Include all documented direct support, such as housing, etc. for both US and LDC institutions
- b Consider requiring at least \$25,000 in cash from US institutions

Indirect costs alternatives

- a None
- b Up to negotiated GAO rate

D Peer review: Have broad representation of all types of schools likely to apply. Avoid conflicts of interest. Reviewers should know countries they are reviewing, have international program experience and some familiarity with AID procedures

Appendix D. List of Handouts

1. Project Concept Paper "U.S. University Development Linkages (936-5063)
(5-page paper prepared in August 1990 giving a preliminary explanation of the linkage concept)
2. A Center for University Cooperation in Development (July 30, 1990)
(3-page paper outlining the function and organization of the Center)
3. A.I.D. Mission Statement (September 1990)
(1-page statement of the mission and objectives of the Agency for International Development)
4. Foreign Aid Facts (August 1990)
(4-page booklet outlining the programs of A.I.D. in popular terms)
5. Provisional List of A.I.D. Countries (September 1990)
(1-page list of the 74 less developed countries in which A.I.D. currently works)
6. Position Announcement for Executive Director, Center for University Cooperation in Development
(2-page announcement of the position opening [closing date October 15])
7. Executive Summary, "Internationalizing U.S. Universities—A Time for Leadership,"
conference held June 5-7, 1990
(9-page summary of the conference)
8. Summary of University Responses to Questions Asked in RUR's Inquiry of January 1990
(4-page summary report of the survey)
9. Guidelines for Establishment of Linkages with Universities Abroad, North Carolina State University, December 1987
(5-page set of guidelines used by North Carolina State University, and can be considered for use by other universities)
10. List of Acronyms and Definitions
(A preliminary set of acronyms and definitions, superseded by Appendix E of this report)
11. List of pre-registrants to the forums
(This list has been superseded by the list of actual participants presented in Appendix G of this report)

Copies of the above materials may be obtained from:

Agency for International Development
Bureau for Science and Technology (S&T)
Director, Office of Research and University Relations (RUR)
Room 309 SA-18
Washington, DC 20523-1807
(703) 875-4005
FAX (703) 875-4394 and 875-5490

Appendix E. List of Acronyms and Definitions

Linkage - Linkage, in the sense used in this project, is defined as a direct operational and collaborative tie between a U.S. university(ies) and less developed country(ies), institution(s), arrived at through mutual agreement, providing mutual benefit, and requiring mutual investment of resources in specified activities.

Internationalization - In this presentation, internationalization will be defined as the incorporation of international contents, materials, activities, and understandings into the teaching, research, and public service functions of universities to enhance their relevance in an interdependent world.

Sustainability - Sustainability, in the sense of this project, is defined as the ability of a project to continue effectively after A.I.D. funding ends in five years.

Mission - Mission, in the context of this forum, is defined as a USAID office in a foreign country.

Less Developed Countries - Refers to a list established by the U.N. General Assembly in 1971 of those developing countries without significant economic growth, with very low per capita incomes, and with low literacy rates. This list, plus a later U.N. list of countries most seriously affected by the oil price increases of 1973-74, comprise the Fourth World.

Cooperative Agreement - A cooperative agreement is an assistance instrument in which substantial involvement is anticipated between A.I.D. and the recipient during performance of the proposed activity.

USAID - United States Agency for International Development

HBCU - Historically Black Colleges and Universities

LDC - Less Developed Countries

MOU - Memorandum of Understanding

JMOU - Joint Memorandum of Understanding

AID - Agency for International Development

SMOU - Single Memorandum of Understanding

NRC/BOSTID - National Research Council, Board on Science and Technology for International Development

NGO - Non-Governmental Organization

GAO - General Accounting Office

PVO - Private Voluntary Organization

Appendix F. Answers to Frequently Asked Questions at the A.I.D. Forums on University Development Linkages, September 1990

Internationalization

- Q It appears to me that developing international expertise within a university is at odds with approaches to help less developed countries.
- A Our assumption is that universities are committed to internationalizing, and through these grants, we can give that process a particular strength that will help the developing world.
- Q A university going toward internationalization could have no relation to AID's mandate?
- A No. Any university that is looking for a project for this program will have to touch on issues of A.I.D. relevance. The project must support the goals for A.I.D. established in the Foreign Assistance Act. However, we do not intend to induce any programs that are not consistent with your university mission.
- Q The benefits to the LDC institution may be more obvious. What are the benefits to American institutions?
- A We start from the premise that many U.S. universities are involved in Third World issues and development because it is important to the international character of their institutions. A.I.D. is trying to support a set of policy priorities that universities have decided to pursue in their own interests. International character of the institution supports sustainability. If the U.S. institution is only driven by getting additional funds, the program will not be sustainable.

Eligibility

- Q What if a new college or university wants to come in?
- A Internationalization can be started with a policy decision.
- Q Then past track record has no bearing on a proposal?
- A Success is always important, but we are looking for a review process that takes into account the benefits of established programs as well as new entrants with the right policies, but no program record. My particular concern is to make the playing field as level as possible. We want to recognize institutions with a lot of experience as well as those who are beginning to implement an internationalization policy. This will be difficult to transform into award criteria.
- Q Is the list of LDCs final or will Eastern Europe be considered?
- A The list is governed by a range of legal and political issues and changes periodically. A decision has not yet been made on whether funds designated for Eastern Europe will be made available for this program. The RFA will be clear in that respect.
- Q What about linkages with international agricultural research centers?
- A No, we hadn't thought about that, but perhaps you could include them in a buy-in process. LDC institutions could include research institutions.
- Q Is there a minimum level of capacity both in the LDC and U.S. institutions that makes a linkage worthwhile? For example, are there some LDC institutions that cannot benefit from a linkage, do they need more technical assistance?
- A This is not a technical assistance program and does not substitute for bilateral A.I.D. technical assistance and institution building activities. For institutions in early stages of development a more traditional institution building contract is probably more appropriate.
- Q Any thoughts to helping international education using the debts that U.S. forgave?
- A Debt for development could be a very attractive element of a linkage program.

- Q Does definition of LDC institutions include government ministries?
- A We use the term institution in a broad sense to capture the diversity of educational and research institutions in the developing world, but it does **not** include ministries.
- Q Is A.I.D. presenting this program as too broad? For example, proposals for increasing language potential, as compared to health programs, require a different expertise in evaluating. So I believe A.I.D. will set its own priorities later. You should say now the priorities that A.I.D. will fund.
- A We do not want to impose limits on the discussion or on your creativity. The Foreign Assistance Act sets the broad policy areas; then there are A.I.D. policies and the Administrator has recently issued an Agency mission statement, and finally there are country development strategy statements. A.I.D. seeks linkages that are closest to its strategy, but we want to have programs that are sustainable because of your commitment to them, therefore the programs must be close to your university's strategy also.
- I believe that outreach is crucial, and that linkages that strengthen that direction will be most important. The Agency bottom line is developmental relevance. We're looking for institutions to "teach people how to fish, not provide them with fish," linkages that will enable LDC institutions to help solve the problems in their societies.

- Q Are funds not available for small institutions?
- A Everyone is eligible.
- Q Are those universities who have JMOUs eligible?
- A They would not be eligible while receiving a JMOU grant. If their JMOU ends they could participate in the new program. While the JMOU is active, they could apply for a linkage grant, but the grant would not start until the JMOU ended.
- Q Can we use PSG funds to get ready for the linkage?
- A Yes, you could apply for a linkage grant, and then have it go into effect when the PSG ends.
- Q Length of funding?
- A Five years for each linkage.

Proposals and Pre-proposals

- Q If we establish linkages, I would want a two-stage RFP process. First explore contacts with an LDC institution and then prepare a proposal.
- A I would agree with this approach. There will be a page limit on both pre-proposals and proposals.
- Q Are you considering joint proposals from U.S. and LDC institutions?
- A All proposals are joint; they need to be worked out with the LDC institution. We are looking for something like a memorandum of agreement between the two institutions. I would love a system where LDC institutions could also bid. We haven't solved how to do that yet, so for the present the U.S. institution will receive the grant and in that sense is the lead institution.
- Q How will a two-stage proposal process work?
- A The pre-proposal would be a description of an idea with little budget detail. If it looked good, we would invite the institution to submit a full proposal. Pre-proposal review allows you to tell some institutions they're way off the mark. You can say, "Don't waste more time and effort." We need to take into account that new institutions have up-front costs for developing a full proposal. The intent of a pre-proposal arrangement is to accomplish the minimal screening of proposals, to reduce the cost to you of writing proposals that are unlikely to be competitive. It will be a minimal screening as we expect a very competitive proposal stage.

Q What will be the U.S.A.I.D. mission involvement?

A Pre-proposals and proposals will be reviewed by the missions. They will be asked if this linkage is in the U.S. national interest and whether it will be helpful to the development process in that country. They also can give their opinions as to its strengths and weaknesses, and these comments will be considered in the review process.

Q Management entity for a consortium?

A One university must be designated as the lead institution for a consortium proposal and it will be responsible for funds management.

Matching

Q If matching is defined so it includes the wide range of activities that an university is doing to internationalize its program, then matching is not a problem.

A Remember your match includes the total contributions of both U.S. and LDC institutions. We are prepared to define matching very broadly, including time, effort, money, equipment, etc. I expect the in-kind contribution of resources will be more than the cash. You may include the imputed money value of the activities you are doing in linkages, and for internationalization. The capacity of a proposal to leverage additional resources into the linkage will be an important part of the review criteria.

Q On matching, when one university submits several proposals, it can't double count the match?

A That is correct. Each match must relate to a single proposal.

Q Could U.S. institutions submit more than one proposal?

A Yes. That would be our inclination at this time. However, there would be a limit on the number of linkage grants one university could receive as lead university. We do not plan to place a limit on the number of times a university can participate as a member of a consortium.

General

Q Once you have an established University Center with 30-50 projects, you should facilitate networking among projects.

A I agree, that is clearly our goal. We want to play that networking role.

Q Time frame for the process?

A Our intent is to get the conference proceedings out to you before the end of October.

In November, we will begin to write the RFP and hope to have it out on the street by February 15. If we allow 30 days for preparing pre-proposals, 30 days for reviewing them with the Missions, 60 days each for preparing and reviewing proposals, plus some time for grant negotiations, then a start up in very late FY 91 (September 1991) or early FY 92 is possible.

We are faced with likelihood of many more good proposals in the first year than we could fund. We will consider using second year funds to start some of them. We would like to fund some new proposals every year.

Q Are there other means for university input into this process?

A We do not plan any more workshops but would welcome any written comments you may wish to send us.

Appendix G. List of Participants

Dr. J. Lawrence Apple
Director, International Programs
North Carolina State University
Box 7112
Raleigh, NC 27695

Dr. Steven Arnold
Director
International Development Program
The American University
School of International Service
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Anderson Hall, Lower Level - South
Washington, DC 20016-8066

Mr. Russel Backus
Agriculture Development Officer
Agency for International Development
Office of Technical Resources
Bureau for Africa
1515 Wilson Boulevard, Room 310
Arlington, VA 22209

Dr. David Berndt
Associate Director of
Sponsored Programs
Boston University
25 Buick Street
Boston, MA 02215

Dr. Robert E. Black
Chairman, Department of
International Health
Johns Hopkins University
School of Hygiene & Public Health
615 North Wolfe Street
Baltimore, MD 21205

Dr. Steven A. Blodgett
Director of Recruitment and Liaison
Council for International Exchange
of Scholars
3007 Tilden Street, N.W. #M-500
Washington, DC 20008

Dr. Reynold Bloom
Associate Provost
State University of New York - Albany
State University Plaza, T-800
Albany, NY 12246

Dr. Elizabeth W. Brabbles
Department Chair
Howard University
2400 6th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20059

Dr. Gwendolyn E. Braxton
Assistant Academic Vice President
for Instructional Support
Delaware State College
1200 N. Dupont Highway
Dover, DE 19901

Dr. Frank Busta
Professor and Head
Food Science and Nutrition
University of Minnesota
1334 Eckles Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55108

Dr. Craig Calhoun
Director of International Programs
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3130

Dr. C. Stuart Callison
Deputy Executive Director
BIFAD/S, A.I.D.
Room 600 SA-2, Department of State
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Tom W. Carroll
Director & Professor
Center for Advanced Study of
International Development
Michigan State University
306 Berkey Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1111

Dr. Winfrey Clarke
Director
International Agriculture Programs
Virginia State University
Box W
Petersburg, VA 23803

Dr. Toni Cleveland
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
State University of New York - Morrisville
Route 20
Morrisville, NY 13408

Mr. Sheldon W. Cole
Deputy Director
National Association for Equal
Opportunity in Higher Education
400 - 12th Street, NE
Washington, DC 20002

Dr. Hemalata Dandekar
Associate Vice President for Research
The University of Michigan
4056 Fleming Administration Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1340

Dr. Jonathan Davidson
Director, Washington Office
University of South Carolina
919 18th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dr. Lawrence P. Donnelley
Associate Provost
International Programs
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19716

Dr. Margaret Fahs
Director
Debt for Development Coalition
1707 L Street, Suite 1020
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dr. Jorge J. Fernandez
Advisor to the President
for International Affairs
University of Puerto Rico
General Post Office 4984
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936

Dr. John Frechione
Associate Director
Center for Latin American Studies
University of Pittsburgh
4E04 Forbes Quadrangle
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Joyce Garth
Financial Officer
Graduate School of Public &
International Affairs
University of Pittsburgh/IMDI
3J03 Forbes Quadrangle
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Howard L. Gauthier
Vice Provost, International Affairs
The Ohio State University
190 N. Oval Mall
Columbus, OH 43220

Dr. Glenn W. Geelhoed
Professor of Surgery, Director
International Health & Development
George Washington University
2150 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20052

Dr. Peter Hackett
Dean, International Studies
University of Virginia
206 Minor Hall
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Dr. Ricardo Hahn
Associate Professor
Department of Family Medicine
University of Tennessee, Memphis
1121 Union Avenue
Memphis, TN 38104

Dr. David O. Hansen
Associate Dean
Ohio State University
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1099

Dr. Wilmer M. Harper
Professor/Coordinator
International Agriculture
New Mexico State University
Department of Agriculture Economics
Box 3169
Las Cruces, NM 88047

Dr. Grace E. Harris
Vice Provost for Continuing
Studies & Public Service
Virginia Commonwealth University
827 W. Franklin Street
Box 2523
Richmond, VA 23284-2041

Dr. Maurice P. Hartley
Associate Dean for Academic
& Special Programs
Rutgers University/Cook College
P.O. Box 231
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

Ms. Gail A. Hochhauser
Director, AID/AASCU Linkages Program
American Association of State Colleges
and Universities
One Dupont Circle, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-1192

Dr. C. Dennis Ignasias
Director of International Programs,
Associate Dean
Graduate Studies & Research
University of Maryland Eastern Shore
Graduate Studies & Research Office
Princess Anne, MD 21853

Dr. Shaik Ismail
Director, World Capitals Program
The American University
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Anderson Hall, Lower Level - South
Washington, DC 20016-8066

Dr. J. Dean Jansma
Associate Dean, International Programs
Pennsylvania State University
240 Agricultural Administration
University Park, PA 16802

Dr. Kerri-Ann Jones
Science and Technology Advisor
Agency for International Development
Office of Technical Resources
Bureau for Asia and Near East
320 21st Street, NW, - 4440 NS
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Douglas L. Keene
Coordinator
International Health Network
1701 K Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20006

Dr. Charles C. Kidd
Dean
Florida A&M University
Room 301 Foote-Hilmyer
Administration Center
Tallahassee, FL 32312

Dr. James I. Kirkwood
Director of International Programs
Fort Valley State College
P.O. Box 5413
Fort Valley, GA 31030-3298

Dr. Donald T. Lauria
Professor, Director International
Public Health Program
University of North Carolina
School of Public Health, CB #8060
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-8060

Dr. Peter J. Levin
Dean
College of Public Health
University of South Florida
13301 Bruce B. Downs Boulevard
Tampa FL 33612

Dr. Shelby Lewis
Associate Vice President
Research and Sponsored Programs
Clark Atlanta University
International Center
223 James P. Brawley Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30314

Dr. Harold Matteson
Assistant Vice President
New Mexico State University
Center for International Programs
Box 3456
Las Cruces, NM 88005

Dr. John K. Mayo
Director
Center for International Studies
Florida State University
LS1 - 204 Dodd Hall
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Dr. Edna L. McBreen
Director
Office of International Programs
West Virginia University
2112 Agriculture Sciences Building
Morgantown, WV 26506

Dr. John W. McCall III
Assistant Professor
Department of Family Medicine
University of Tennessee at Memphis
College of Medicine
899 Madison Avenue, Suite 850-M
Memphis, TN 38103

Dr. Donald E. McCreight
Professor
University of Rhode Island
126 Woodward
Kingston, RI 02881

Dr. George M. Higgs
Interim Vice President
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05401

Dr. Willie Mendes
Deputy Chief of Mission
Embassy of Sri Lanka
2148 Wyoming Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008

Dr. Richard H. Merritt
Professor
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

Dr. Robert M. Miller
Dean
University of Rhode Island
College of Resource Development
Woodward Hall
Kingston, RI 02887

Dr. William R. Miner
Chief, Institutional and
Human Resources Division
Board for International Food
and Agricultural Development
515 22nd Street, N.W., Room 600 - SA2
Washington, DC 20006-4250

Dr. Russell E. Morgan
President
National Council for International Health
1701 K Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20006

Dr. Henry Nieves
Director, International Programs
University of Puerto Rico
Mayaguez, PR 00708

Dr. E. Aban Oddoye
Director, International Center
for Health Sciences
Meharry Medical College
1005 D.B. Todd Boulevard
Nashville, TN 37208

Dr. Funso Oluyan
Program Officer
National Association for Equal
Opportunity in Higher Education
400 12th Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

Dr. Keith Osterhage
Director, Research Services
The American University
Office of Research Services
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016-8066

Dr. Jiryis S. Oweis
Chief, Country Programs
Board for International Food and
Agricultural Development
505 22nd Street, N.W., Room 600-SA2
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Anne C. Perry
Associate Professor of
International Business
The American University
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Doug E. Peterson
AAAS Fellow
Agency for International Development
Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean
2111 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007

Dr. Evangelos A. Petropoulos
Professor of Physiology/Director
Institute of International Health,
Michigan State University
A-327 East Fee Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824-1316

Dr. Sheila Polakoff
Director, Health Sciences Programs
George Washington University
2100 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037

Dr. Hugh Poponoe
Director, International Program
University of Florida
3028 McCarthy Hall
Gainesville, FL 32611

Dr. John Ragland
BIFAD Visiting Scientist
Board for International Food and
Agricultural Development
505 22nd Street, N.W., Room 600-SA2
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Samuel S. Rea
Director, Office of Education
Agency for International Development
SA-18
Washington, DC 20523-1807

Dr. Carla Ricci
Associate Provost
Tufts University
Office of Government Resources
Medford, MA 02155

Dr. Richard Riegelman
Director, MPH Program
George Washington University
2150 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Dr. Richard Robbins
Director, International
Agriculture Program
North Carolina A&T State University
145 Carver Hall
Greensboro, NC 27411

Dr. H. Paul Roberts
Program Coordinator
Michigan State University
324 Agriculture Hall
East Lansing, MI 48824

Dr. Mary Hill Rojas
Acting Director
Office of International Development
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
1060 Litton Reaves Hall Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24060

Dr. Gary Russell
Human Resource Development Officer
Agency for International Development
Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean
Main State, Room 2239
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Nancy L. Ruther
Associate Director, YCIAS
Yale Center for International
and Area Studies
85 Trumbull Street, Box 13A
New Haven, CT 06850

Dr. Eugene E. Ryan
Director, Center for
International Programs
East Carolina University
Brewster A-102
Greenville, NC 27858

Dr. William M. Sangster
Dean, College of Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332

Dr. Ray Schaub
International Director
World College
Eastern Michigan University
307 Goodison Hall
Ypsilanti, MI 48197

Dr. Susan Schram
International Affairs
National Association of State Universities
and Land-Grant Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Suite 710
Washington, DC 20036-1191

Dr. R. Grant Seals
Director, International Programs
Florida A&M University
Box 338, Room 301 Foote-Hilyer
Tallahassee, FL 32307-1887

Dr. James D. Sheppard
Health Officer
Agency for International Development
Bureau for Africa
Washington, DC 20523-1807

Dr. James A. Sherburne
Director, International Programs
University of Maine
204 Clapp Greenhouse
Orono, ME 04469

Dr. Darl E. Snyder
Associate Vice President &
Director of International Development
University of Georgia
111 Candler Hall
Athens, GA 30605

Dr. Donald E. Stone
Professor/Executive Director
Duke University O.T.S.
P.O. Box DM Duke Station
Durham, NC 27705

Dr. Walter W. Sullivan
Vice President
Morehouse School of Medicine
720 Westview Drive, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30310

Dr. John R. Swallow
Development Officer
Agency for International Development
Room 4440, ANE/TR/ARD
Washington, DC 20523-0053

Dr. John W. Thomas
Professor
Harvard University
Institute for International Development
One Eliot Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Elba Velasco
Child Survival Fellow
Agency for International Development
Office of Development Resources
Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean
Main State, Room 2247
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Richard Vengroff
Dean of International Affairs
University of Connecticut
Box U-182
Division of International Affairs
Storrs, CT 06208

Dr. William A. Ward
Professor/Director of
International Programs
Clemson University
101 Barre Hall
Clemson, SC 29634

Dr. James H. Weaver
Professor of Economics
The American University
4400 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Anderson Hall, Lower Level-South
Washington, DC 20016

Dr. Collin C. Weir
Deputy Director/Agricultural
Specialist
International Science &
Technology Institute, Inc.
1601 N. Kent Street, Suite 918
Arlington, VA 22209

Dr. Dennis Weller
Agriculture Development Officer
Agency for International Development
Bureau for Asia and Near East, Room 4440
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Delane E. Welsch
Assistant Dean & Director/
International Agriculture Programs
University of Minnesota
1420 Eckles Avenue, Room 293
St. Paul, MN 55108

Dr. Myron Winick
President
University of Health Sciences
Chicago Medical School
3333 Greenbay Road
North Chicago, IL 60064

Dr. Larry Zuidema
Acting Director, International
Agriculture Program
Cornell University
Box 14, Kennedy Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Kent T. Adair
Dean, School of Forestry
Stephen F. Austin State University
Box 6109 SFA Station
Nacogdoches, TX 75962

Dr. W. Merle Alexander
Professor and Director
Institute of University Studies
Baylor University
P.O. Box 7266
Waco, TX 76798-7266

Dr. C. Stuart Callison
Deputy Executive Director
BIFAD/S, A.L.D.
600 SA-2, Department of State
Washington, DC 20523

Dr. Ray Carpenter
Director
International Agriculture Programs
University of Wyoming
P.O. Box 3345, University Station
Laramie, WY 82071

Dr. George C. Christensen
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Alaska Statewide System
202 Butrovich Building
Fairbanks, AL 99775

Patrick T. Dowling, MD, MPH
Chairman, Department of
Family Medicine
Harbor-UCLA Medical Center
1001 W. Carson #F
Torrance, CA 90502

Dr. Hillary S. Egna
Director Pond Dynamics/
Aquaculture CRSP
Oregon State University
Office of International Research & Development
Shell Hall 400
Covallia, OR 97331-1641

Dr. Lawrence Feinberg
Executive Director for
International Programs
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

Dr. Gerald W. Fry
Director, International Studies
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Dr. C. Jane Geddes
Assistant Dean
UCSD/International Relations &
Pacific Studies
9500 Gilman Drive
La Jolla, CA 92093-0519

Dr. Ernest H. Gilmour
Vice President for Academic Affairs
and Provost
Eastern Washington University
Cheney, WA 99004

Dr. James T. Goodwin
Coordinator of International
Agriculture Programs
Texas A & M University
Room 340, H. C. Bell Building
College Station, TX 77802-2477

Mr. Carl H. Gotsch
Professor, Food Research
Stanford University
Food Research Institute
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Susan Hagadorn
Director, Program Development
Western Consortium for Public Health
2001 Addison Street, Suite 200
Berkeley, California 94704

Dr. Anthony E. Hall
Professor
University of California, Riverside
Department of Botany and Plant Sciences
Riverside, California 92521

Dr. J. B. Henson
Director
International Program Division
Washington State University
French Administration Building, Room 328
Pullman, WA 99164-1034

Dr. Robert Jackson
Director, Center for
International Studies
California State University, Chico
Chico, CA 95929-0770

Dr. Shannon Janes
Assistant Vice President
University of Texas at Austin
Box 7699
Austin, TX 78113

Dr. Bartell Jensen
Vice President, Research
Utah State University
1635 N. 1515 East
Logan, UT 84321

Dr. Dixon C. Johnson
Executive Director, International
Students & Overseas Study Programs
USC
300 STU
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0899

Dr. James Jonish
Professor of Economics/Deputy
Director, International Center
Texas Tech University
I CASALS
Lubbock, TX 79409

Dr. R. D. Koob
Vice President, Academic Affairs
Cal Poly - San Luis Obispo
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Dr. Harry Kreisler
Assistant Director
Institute of International Studies
University of California, Berkeley
215 Moses Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. Kenneth A. Laurence
Director, International Trade
and Development
University of Idaho
216 Morrill Hall
Moscow, ID 83843

Dr. Kooros M. Mahmoudi
Associate Professor and Chair
Sociology Department
Northern Arizona University
Box 15300
Flagstaff, AZ 86011

Dr. V. A. Metcalf
International Programs
Arizona State University
124 Moeur Building
Tempe, AZ 85287-4105

Dr. Joe W. Neal
President & CEO
Texas International Education Consortium
P.O. Box 7667
Austin, TX 78713-7667

Dr. Jan C. Noel
Acting Director
International Development Cooperation
Washington State University
French Administration Building, Room 328
Pullman, WA 99164-1034

Dr. Michael Norvelle
Director
International Agriculture Programs
University of Arizona
210 Nugent Building
Tucson, AZ 85721

Dr. Larry Palmer
Assistant to the President
University of Texas at El Paso
El Paso, TX 79968

Dr. Larry L. Pilcher
Director, Public Affairs
UCLA
10833 Le Conte Avenue /16-035 CHS
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Freddie L. Richards
Professor/Director
Prairie View A&M University
P.O. Box 2834
Prairie View, TX 77446

Dr. A. Rivera-Batiz
Assistant Professor
UCSA
IR/PS University of California-San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Brenda Robinson
State University Dean
International Education
California State University
Chancellor's Office
400 Holden Shore
Long Beach, CA 90802

Dr. Royce Shaw
Director
Office of International Programs
California State University, Sacramento
6000 J Street
Sacramento, CA 95819-6402

Dr. Harold J. Simon
Professor of International
Health Policy
UCSD
M-022
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Gerald Slavin
Director, International Programs
and Studies
University of New Mexico
2111 Mesa Vista
Albuquerque, NM 87131

Dr. Oscar Soria
Executive Director
CUIDES - Interamerican University Counsel
for Socio-Economic Development
P.O. Box 1-440
Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico 44100

Dr. David A. Sprecher
Provost
University of California
at Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Pamela A. Stephenson
Vice President
Texas International Education Consortium
P.O. Box 7667
Austin, TX 78713-7667

Dr. James J. Sullivan
Director, Sea Grants
University of California
A-032 Sea Grant
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Joseph Szyliowicz
Professor
University of Denver
Graovase School of International Studies
Denver, CO 80208

Dr. Otto W. Tetzlaff
Professor
Angelo State University
San Angelo, TX 76909

Dr. Lee Thomas
Director
International Programs & Services
University of Nevada, Reno
130 Mackay Science
Reno, NV 89557

Dr. Lloyd D. Vincent
President
Angelo State University
P.O. Box 11007
San Angelo, TX 76909

Dr. Barbara D. Webster
Associate Vice Chancellor, Research
University of California, Davis
Mrak Hall
Davis, CA 95616

Dr. William A. Welsh
Director of International
Programs
University of Arizona
Nugent Building 209
Tucson, AZ 85721

Dr. Morris D. Whitaker
Director, International Programs
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322-9500

Dr. Gene L. Woodruff
Graduate Dean/Vice Provost
University of Washington
201 Administrative Ab-10
Seattle, WA 98195

Dr. David Yount
Vice President for Research
and Graduate Education
University of Hawaii
2444 Dole Street
Honolulu, HI 96822

Dr. William S. Abbott
Director of International Programs
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078

Dr. M. Francis Abraham
Director of International Studies
Grambling State University
P.O. Box AF
Grambling, LA 71245

Dr. Jean S. Aigner
Executive Dean
International Affairs
University of Nebraska System
& University of Nebraska-Lincoln
1237 R Street
Lincoln, NE 68588-0221

Dr. Gregory F. Aleia
Dean, Graduate Studies
Illinois State University
310 Hovey Hall
Normal, IL 61761

Dr. Larry D. Allen
Dean
College of Life Science
Louisiana Tech University
P.O. Box 10198 T.S.
Ruston, LA 71272

Dr. Jose O. Alvarez
Professor and Director
Division of International Health
University of Alabama at Birmingham
303 Tidwell Hall, University Station
Birmingham, AL 35294

Dr. Thomas Billing
Coordinating Director
International Agriculture Training Program
University of Missouri at Columbia
College of Agriculture
223 Gentry Hall
Columbia, MO 05281

Dr. Lynn Bridwell
Assistant to President
Southwest Missouri State University
901 South National
Springfield, MO 65804

Dr. Ronald A. Brown
Associate Vice President
Agriculture, Forestry & Veterinary
Medicine
Mississippi State University
P.O. Box 6342
Mississippi State, MS 39762

Dr. H. Rouse Caffey
Chancellor
Louisiana State University Agricultural Center
P.O. Drawer 25203
Baton Rouge, LA 70894

Dr. C. Stuart Callison
Executive Director
BIFAD/S
Agency for International Development
Room 600, SA-2, Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20523

Dr. Gerald E. Carlson
Chairman
Department of Agriculture
WIN
405 Knoblanck
Macomb, IL 62907

Dr. Michelle Carpenter
Research Associate
Fort Hays State University
600 Park Street
Hays, KS 67601

Dr. Eloise Carter
Associate Director, Office
of International Programs
Tuskegee University
Kresge Center, Room 219
Tuskegee, AL 36088

Dr. Jeffrey Chin
Vice Provost
University of Missouri
Jesse 116
Columbia, MO 65211

Dr. Ikbal R. Chowdhury
Director of International Programs
Lincoln University of Missouri
202 New Memorial Hall
Jefferson, City, MO 65101

Dr. Sammy Comer
Coordinator, International Agricultural
Program
Tennessee State University
P. O. Box 723
Nashville, TN 37209-1561

Dr. Harold R. Crawford
Associate Dean/Director
International Agriculture Programs
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

Dr. Carolyn A. Cross
Assistant Vice Chancellor
The University of Kansas
226 Strong Hall
Lawrence, KS 66045-2904

Dr. Manfred J. Czesla
Director, Office of
International Affairs
University of Illinois at Chicago
921 West Van Buren Street
Chicago, IL 60607

Dr. Billie R. DeWalt
Professor of Anthropology
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40502-0024

Dr. Michael R. Dingerson
Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean
Graduate School
University of Mississippi
University, MS 38677-1844

Dr. Samuel Donald
Director of Agriculture
Alcorn State University
P.O. Box 690
Lorman, MS 39096

Dr. John Eisterhold
Dean, International
Programs/Admissions
University of Tennessee, Martin
144 Gooch Hall
Martin, TN 38237

Dr. Gaston A. Fernandez
Director, Office of
International Studies
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN 47809

Dr. V. Flanigan
Professor, Mechanical Engineering
University Missouri Rolla
Route 5, Box 629
Rolla, MO 65401

Dr. Felix Gagliano
Vice Provost
International Programs
Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701

Dr. Richard L. Guthrie
Associate Dean
International Agriculture
Auburn University
College of Agriculture
103 Comer Hall
Auburn, AL 36849-5401

Dr. John Heyl
Director
Center for International Programs
University of Missouri-Columbia
208 Lowry Hall
Columbia, MO 65202

Dr. David Hilderbrand
Director
International Programs
South Dakota State University
221 Administrative Building
Brookings, SD 57007

Dr. Robert Hovde
Coordinator
International Development
Illinois State University
105 McCormick Hall
Normal, IL 61761

Dr. Robert W. Hunt
Professor
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

Dr. Arthur Klatt
Assistant Dean - International Programs
in Agriculture
Oklahoma State University
139 Agriculture Hall
Stillwater, OK 74078

Dr. Charles B. Klasek
Executive Assistant to the President
Southern Illinois University
at Carbondale
Anthony Hall 218
Carbondale, IL 62901

Dr. Donald M. Knox
Director
School of Applied Behavioral Sciences
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

Dr. Sandra S. Kramer
Special Assistant to the Dean
Tulane School of Public Health
& Tropical Medicine
1430 Tulane Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70112

Dr. Margriet Lacy
Associate Vice President for Instruction/
Director of International Activities
North Dakota State University
Old Main 103
Fargo, ND 58105-5014

Dr. Vernon C. Larson
Assistant Provost/Director
International Programs
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KS 66502

Dr. Robert Leestamper
Assistant Vice President of
Academic Affairs
University of Northern Iowa
Barber Hall 132
Cedar Falls, IA 52242

Dr. Jack Ling
Director, International Communication
Enhancement Center, SPHTM
Tulane University
1430 Tulane Avenue
New Orleans, LA 70112

Dr. Ally Mack
Coordinator
Mississippi Consortium
for International Development
Jackson State University
P.O. Box 17103
Jackson, MS 39217

Dr. Robert W. Mack
Professor of Biology
Jackson State University
1400 J.R. Lynch Street
Jackson, MS 39217

Dr. Mary Martin
Dean of Graduate School
Middle Tennessee State University
CART
Murfreesboro, TN 37132

Dr. H. F. Massey
Associate Dean, International Programs
University of Kentucky
College of Agriculture
324 Agriculture Science Building N
Lexington, KY 40546-0091

Dr. JoAnn McCarthy
Director
Office of International Studies and Programs
Illinois State University
105 McCormick Hall
Normal, IL 61761

Dr. Lawrence E. McKibbin
Director
Office of International Programs
University of Oklahoma
Norman, OK 73019

Dr. James Meiman
Director
International Programs
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523

Dr. John Miller
Associate Dean, Academic Affairs
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
2801 S. University
Little Rock, AR 72204

Dr. C. W. Minkel
Associate Vice Chancellor and Dean,
Graduate School
University of Tennessee
404 Andy Holt Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0140

Dr. E. Philip Morgan
Director, International
Development Institute
Indiana University
201 N. Indiana Avenue
Bloomington, IN 47405

Dr. Edward H. Moseley
Director, Capstone International
Program Center
The University of Alabama
Box 870254
Tuscaloosa, AL 35487

Dr. Thomas Moss
Dean
Graduate Studies and Research
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, OH 44106

Dr. Allen Myers
Special Assistant to the Provost
Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701

Dr. Thomas Nicastro
Bureau for Asia Near East
Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523-1807

Dr. Ralph W. Nicholas
Dean and Director
Center for International Studies
University of Chicago
5828 S. University Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637

Dr. Myra Norman
Director
Research and Grants
Southwest Missouri State University
One University Plaza
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

Dr. Robert Orr
Coordinator
International Agriculture Programs
University of Tennessee
320 Morgan Hall
Knoxville, TN 37901-1071

Dr. James D. Quisenberry
Director, International Programs
and Services
Southern Illinois University
at Carbondale
910 South Forest
Carbondale, IL 62901

Dr. Wendell G. Rayburn
President
Lincoln University
601 Jackson
Jefferson City, MO 65101

Dr. Hazell Reed
Vice Chancellor
International Affairs
University of Arkansas - Pine Bluff
P.O. Box 82
Pine Bluff, AR 71602

Dr. Charles L. Rhyherd
Associate Director
International Programs
Purdue University
West Lafayette, IN 47907

Dr. Mossie J. Richmond, Jr.
Vice President for Student Affairs
Arkansas State University
P.O. Box 119
State University, AR 72467

Dr. William L. Richter
Head, Political Science Department and
Chair, International Activities Council
Kansas State University
Manhattan, KA 66506

Dr. James H. Sangster
Director, Institute for
International Affairs
Central State University
Wilberforce, OH 45384

Dr. John W. Santas
Associate Director
International Agriculture
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign
113 Mumford Hall
1301 W. Gregory Drive
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Rudolph W. Schulz
Dean
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242

Dr. Robert A. Sedlak
Assistant Vice Chancellor
University of Wisconsin - Stout
Administration Building
Menomonie, WI 54751

Dr. Kenneth Shapiro
Associate Dean, International Agriculture
University of Wisconsin-Madison
240 Agriculture Hall
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. James W. Shuford
Dean
School of Agriculture
Alabama A&M University
P.O. Box 202
Normal, AL 35762

Dr. Arvarh E. Strickland
Associate Vice President
Academic Affairs
University of Missouri System
309 University Hall
Columbia, MO 65211

Dr. Marvin C. Swanson
Director, International Studies
Southeast Missouri State University
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

Dr. Danny E. Terry
Associate Professor of
Agricultural Economics
Central Missouri State University
Grinstead 133
Warrensburg, MO 64093

Dr. Clayton Thomas
Associate Dean, Graduate School
Illinois State University
310 Hovey Hall
Normal, IL 61761

Dr. James Tweedy
Dean
Southern Illinois University
College of Agriculture
Carbondale, IL 62901

Dr. Joan Wadlow
Provost
University of Oklahoma
Evans Hall
Norman, OK 73069

Dr. Thomas Westing
Associate Dean, Director
International Agriculture Programs
University of Arkansas
300 Hotz Hall
Fayetteville, AR 72701

Dr. Keith Whigham
Interim Director, International Affairs
Iowa State University
45 Kildee Hall
Ames, IA 50010

Dr. H.P. Whiteside, Jr.
Assistant Director
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Sparkman Center, 315 Tidwell
Birmingham, AL 35294

Dr. Handy Williamson, Jr.
Department Head
Agricultural Economics
University of Tennessee
12108 East Ashton Court
Knoxville, TN 37922