

THE EVOLUTION OF INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY UNDER TITLE XII:
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE BIFADEC AND THE
PROPOSED CENTER FOR UNIVERSITY COOPERATION IN DEVELOPMENT

by

William R. Miner

December 1990

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION
U.S. Agency for International Development
2201 C Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20523-0219

Contents

Executive Summary

Statutory Eligibility	1
Board Focusses Immediately On Eligibility	2
Eligibility A Major Concern Throughout The First Year	3
Board Wrestles With Several Rosters of Eligibility	6
Board Concentrates On The "Matching Up" Process	10
Utilization Issues Continue To Engage Board	12
Memoranda of Understanding Have Long Gestation Period	15
BIFAD Support Staff Uses Incentives Study Report	18
Special Attention Is Given To The "Matching" Process	20
Registry of Institutional Resources Struggles Into Operation	22
Three Lists Become One Directory	26
Conclusions and Implications	26
References	30

Attachments:

1. "Recommendations on Eligibility of Universities,"
BIFAD Staff paper, June 13, 1977
2. "Criteria and Procedure for Compiling the Roster
of Universities for Participation in Title XII
Programs, March 27, 1978 (revised July 1981)
3. "Report of Internal Staff Work Group on BIFAD
Recommendations for Improving University
Support of A.I.D. Programs." Presented to BIFAD
and A.I.D. at the fortieth meeting of the BIFAD,
December 5, 1980
4. The Roster of Eligible Universities
5. List of Memorandum of Understanding Agreements
6. Directory of Title XII Universities' Representatives
and Coordinators: A, B-1, and B-2 Lists,
Revised August 1990

Executive Summary

The Title XII amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended^{a/} is designed to increase the involvement and utilization of the U.S. land-grant, sea-grant and other universities in U.S. development assistance programs overseas. Entitled "Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger," the legislation provides the basis for determining the eligibility of institutions to participate in Title XII activities.

Specifically mentioned and "blanketed in" by the legislation are the land-grant colleges and universities (so designated under the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890) and sea-grant colleges (so designated under the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966).^{b/} Other colleges and universities are included which meet two criteria -- namely, "have demonstrable capacity in teaching, research, and extension activities in the agricultural sciences" and "can contribute effectively to the attainment of the objective of this title."^{c/} It is evident that the objective is the transfer and adaptation to developing country conditions of the so-called land-grant model of agricultural and rural development -- that is, research, education, and extension.

The Title XII legislation also requires the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD), the Presidentially-appointed body which is responsible for the implementation of this amendment, to develop and keep current a roster of universities which meet five criteria:

- (A) interested in exploring their potential for collaborative relationships with agricultural institutions, and with scientists working on significant programs designed to increase food production in developing countries,
- (B) having capacity in the agricultural sciences,
- (C) able to maintain an appropriate balance of teaching, research, and extension functions,
- (D) having capacity, experience, and commitment with respect to international agricultural efforts, and
- (E) able to contribute to solving the problems addressed by the title;...^{d/}

Consequently, the BIFAD and its Support Staff and subordinate units have been engaged regularly and heavily with the U.S. Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) and the U.S. university community and its associations in three related and often confusing exercises:

(1) enlisting the participation of the "statutorily eligible" land-grant and sea-grant institutions; (2) defining and making operational the "demonstrable capacity" and "can contribute effectively" legislative criteria for identifying other "eligible" universities; and (3) developing and keeping current a roster of universities meeting the five legislative criteria for being on the roster (see above).

This paper chronicles the BIFAD "eligibility" activities, which were numerous and constant during the first ten years of the Title XII program. It delineates the seriousness with which "eligibility" was addressed and, therefore, the time and effort which were devoted to carrying out those requirements of the legislation. The paper concludes with some implications for the new Board for International Food and Agricultural Development and Economic Cooperation (BIFADEC) and the proposed Center for University Cooperation in Development.

The Board sought early on a set of criteria to be used in measuring the required quality for and the purpose to be served by determining "eligibility."^{e/} The difficulty of establishing eligibility was recognized; nevertheless, the Board felt that the Board was "on the line with Title XII insofar as the performance of these institutions is concerned in these programs."^{f/} At the same time, it is also important to note that the BIFAD policy, as was set forth at the Board's second meeting in November 1976, has been "to encourage maximum involvement of both eligible and noneligible universities in achieving Title XII objectives."^{g/}

By the end of its first year of operation (September 1977), the Board had approved a provisional roster of 68 universities, including 46 "1862" and 9 "1890" land-grant universities, 1 sea-grant university, and 12 "other" universities "presumed" to be eligible.^{h/}

"Eligibility" took on even greater importance when it became one of the criteria for participation in the Strengthening Grants program in 1978.^{i/} By the end of the Board's second year (September 1978), it had received and approved recommendations on the "eligibility" of 131 institutions, and only 16 were denied eligibility of any kind.

Ultimately three "eligibility" lists were developed. They currently comprise BIFAD's Directory of Title XII Universities' Representatives and Coordinators as follows:

(1) "A" list of 84 institutions composed of 65 land-grant and sea-grant institutions -- 52 "1862", 12 "1890" and Tuskegee University, and 1 sea-grant -- and 19 "other" universities. This is the roster of eligible universities which meet the maximum criteria;

(2) "B-1" list of 20 institutions which meet the five eligibility criteria in the legislation, but not the additional criteria for roster status; and

(3) "B-2" list of 24 institutions in which a specific department, college, or institute (but not the entire institution) meets the five eligibility criteria.^{1/}

In addition to developing the Strengthening Grants program mentioned above, the Board has been involved actively in the creation and/or employment of mechanisms for making fuller use of the eligible Title XII institutions. Among them are: the "Statement of Principles for Effective Participation in International Development Activities" of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC); the Memorandum of Understanding agreements with 29 Title XII universities; the Collaborative Research Support program (CRSP); the Joint Enterprise Mode, Collaborative Assistance Mode, and the Technical Support to Missions Mode of contracting; the Joint Career Corps program; and the Registry of Institutional Resources (RIR).

The RIR, the establishment and maintenance of which are specified in the Title XII legislation, had a long and difficult gestation period. It was not until the meeting of the Board in June 1982 that the RIR was reported to be "updated, improved and computerized, and really...providing...a real asset..." although it was being managed on an ad hoc arrangement, more data had to be recorded, and computer retrieval programs had to be perfected.^{2/}

The RIR had become dormant by 1985. It contained 66 institutional profiles (Part A) and 786 subject areas of competence profiles (Part B) which reportedly rarely were used; 5,637 professional profiles (Part C), its main portion, the utilization of which was "lower than originally anticipated;" and 181 accomplishment reports (Part D) which were not used.^{3/}

A 1989 report of the General Accounting Office recommended that the BIFAD "place priority on developing a comprehensive and current registry of university resources to facilitate BIFAD's ability to match university capabilities with AID's (sic) needs."^{4/} Since then, a prototype two-page questionnaire has been developed and tested, using as a database information obtained from nearly 500 individuals involved in the seven CRSP programs. The data have been entered into a personal computer type of system, and it has been determined that the questionnaire and approach are doable. Board action is required before any further steps are taken.^{5/}

THE EVOLUTION OF INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY UNDER TITLE XII

Implications for the BIFADEC and the Proposed Center for University Cooperation in Development

Institutional eligibility has been of paramount importance from the inception of Title XII. It is defined in the legislation of December 1975 and, beginning with its first meeting in October 1976 and throughout most of the first ten years, it was a persistent and important and active consideration and agenda item of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD).

Statutory Eligibility

The legislative language is as follows:

(d) As used in this title, the term "universities" means those colleges or universities in each State, territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, now receiving, or which may hereafter receive, benefits under the Act of July 2, 1862 (known as the First Morrill Act), or the Act of August 30, 1890 (known as the Second Morrill Act), which are commonly known as "land-grant" universities; institutions now designated or which may hereafter be designated as sea-grant colleges under the Act of October 15, 1966 (known as the National Sea Grant College and Program Act), which are commonly known as sea-grant colleges; and other United States colleges and universities which --

- (1) have demonstrable capacity in teaching, research, and extension activities in the agricultural sciences; and
- (2) can contribute effectively to the attainment of the objective of this title.^{1/}

Board Focusses Immediately on Eligibility

At its inaugural meeting on October 19 and 20, 1976, the BIFAD recognized "statutory eligibility" as being for those institutions created by Congressional legislation in the form of the Morrill Acts of July 1862 and of August 1890 (land-grant institutions) and in the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of October 1966 (sea-grant institutions).

In order to determine the eligibility of other institutions mentioned generically (i.e., those which "have demonstrated capacity...and can contribute effectively to the attainment of the objective of this title"^{2/}), the Board asked A.I.D. to prepare a background paper on criteria to be used in measuring the required quality of research, education, and extension of a U.S. institution to be eligible and the purpose to be served by the determination of 'eligibility.'^{3/} The Board asked A.I.D. to prepare also a paper on alternative definitions of Title XII activities, a narrow one and a broad one.^{4/}

Not waiting for the commissioned papers, the BIFAD declared at its second meeting in November that its policy "is to encourage maximum involvement of both eligible and noneligible universities in achieving the objectives of Title XII."^{5/} The BIFAD Support Staff had been established, and the Board asked it to prepare a survey instrument for distribution to universities, in order to obtain the information needed for establishing eligibility.^{6/}

The Board reviewed and suggested revisions to both the commissioned "scope and definition" paper and the survey questionnaire at its next meeting in December. The Board hoped to adopt the revised "scope and definition" paper at its January meeting.^{7/} Meanwhile, the revised questionnaire was to be tested on a small number of universities.

By the time of the Board's January meeting, a second "scope and definition" paper (in addition to the one reviewed at the December meeting) was presented to the Board. The paper was reviewed, revised and adopted by the Board as "an interim working document," which would be combined later with the earlier paper. The Board also reviewed, revised and accepted the paper on the "implications of eligibility" which it had asked A.I.D. to prepare.^{8/} (Copies of these papers are not available.)

At the January meeting, the BIFAD considered also two questionnaires, not one, to be used to obtain needed information from the universities. One questionnaire was for the "statutorily eligible" land- and sea-grant universities and the second one was for

"other agricultural universities." After further revisions requested by the Board, the questionnaires were to be reviewed again by the BIFAD, then by A.I.D. and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) before being pre-tested on a few institutions.^{2/}

Eligibility A Major Concern Throughout The First Year

The Board continued to meet monthly (except in August) during its first year and held a total of eleven meetings. Eligibility matters, now labelled "survey of university resources," remained a standard agenda item. In February, the Board authorized the BIFAD Support Staff to modify the questionnaires in accordance with the results of the pretesting -- the questionnaires had been sent to four land-grant and three "other" universities -- and to send them to the appropriate institutions. It was arranged for the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) to handle the mailing to the land- and sea-grant universities, while the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the erstwhile American Association of University Agricultural Administrators (AAUAA) jointly would mail to the "other" universities.^{10/}

The Board was disappointed that there was no progress report on the university survey at the March meeting.^{11/} A 50% return of survey questionnaires was reported at the April meeting of the Board, and the Board asked that an analytical report, including suggestions for establishing a roster of universities, be presented at its May meeting.^{12/} The establishment of a roster of universities was fulfilling one of the Board's specific responsibilities in the legislation as follows:

(c) The Board's duties shall include, but not necessarily be limited to -

(1) participating in the formulation of basic policy, procedures, and criteria for project proposal review, selection, and monitoring;

(2) developing and keeping current a roster of universities --

- (A) interested in exploring their potential for collaborative relationships with agricultural institutions, and with scientists working on significant programs designed to increase food production in developing countries,
- (B) having capacity in the agricultural sciences,
- (C) able to maintain an appropriate balance of teaching, research, and extension functions,
- (D) having capacity, experience, and commitment with respect to international agricultural efforts, and
- (E) able to contribute to solving the problems addressed by this title;...^{13/}

In a lengthy discussion of a document, "University Participation in Title XII Programs - General Guidelines and Procedures," there was consideration of whether to use the word "eligible" in listing universities to be involved. There were concerns about the capability, interest, and/or commitment of universities; the possible domination of larger, more experienced universities; the exclusion of smaller, less experienced universities; the limitations on competitive procurement; and the onus of making a final selection, among other things.^{14/}

A "very preliminary analysis" of the returned questionnaires was provided by the BIFAD Support Staff at the Board's May meeting. The Board, noting that the analysis "does not provide an adequate basis for establishing university eligibility," requested further analysis and a report at the June meeting.^{15/}

Meanwhile, the Board sought other means of identifying universities capable of undertaking Title XII activities. At the May meeting, the Board appointed two ad hoc committees in keeping with the Title XII legislation [sec. 298(d)(1) and (2), Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, December 1975, p. 81]:

- (d) The President may authorize the Board to create such subordinate units as may be necessary for the performance of its duties, including but not limited to the following:
 - (1) a Joint Research Committee to participate in the administration and development of the collaborative activities described in section 297(a)(3) of this title; and
 - (2) a Joint Committee on Country Programs which shall assist in the implementation of the bilateral activities described in sections 297(a)(2), 297(a)(4), and 297(a)(5).^{16/}

Among the duties of the Joint Research Committee (JRC) was "to recommend...up to ten research projects that should be approved by the Board at an early date, including which universities would be best equipped to undertake the activities proposed -- not limiting its considerations to eligible institutions, but it should be cognizant of collaborative research being limited to eligible universities."^{17/}

Instead of creating a Joint Committee on Country Programs as was suggested in the legislation, the Board chose to appoint a Joint Committee on Agricultural Development (JCAD), which, *inter alia*, was asked "to begin the process of recommending...a set of sector assessments and country development projects that should be approved by the Board at an early date, including which universities would be best equipped to undertake the activities proposed."^{18/}

The BIFAD took action on the question of institutional eligibility at its June meeting. Acting "on recommendations from the BIFAD Support Staff and the JCAD," which had analyzed information from 85 universities in response to the questionnaires (see attached "Recommendations on Eligibility of Universities"), the Board approved "a provisional roster of universities." The roster included "primarily land- and sea-grant universities automatically eligible under the law," and "12 universities other than these who were deemed to meet the eligibility requirements." The Board noted that "additional universities will be added to the roster as further information is obtained." The BIFAD Support Staff and the two *ad hoc* committees (JRC and JCAD) were "charged with a continuing study of university eligibility and the development of recommendations to the Board for possible additions to the roster." In order to carry out its responsibilities on eligibility, the JCAD proposed a Subcommittee on Eligible Institutions as one of its three subcommittees.^{19/}

Murray State University had been omitted inadvertently from the provisional roster (under the heading of "12 universities other than these who were deemed to meet the eligibility requirements"), so the Board approved that addition to the list of eligible universities at its July meeting.^{20/} At that meeting, the JCAD Chairman reported that "additional information is being sought concerning university qualifications," and he promised a report at the Board's September meeting. In September, the JCAD reported that a second university questionnaire was being developed "to determine more definitively areas of interest, depth of expertise and institutional commitment."^{21/}

The JCAD also proposed and the Board approved four institutions to be added to the roster of eligible universities: University of Arkansas, Louisiana State University, North Carolina State University and Virginia State College (now University).^{22/} Thus began in September 1977 a practice which continued until February 1982 -- namely, based on the recommendation of the JCAD, Board approval at every meeting of a few additions to the roster of eligible institutions.

By the end of its first year (September 1977), the BIFAD had approved a "provisional roster" of 68 universities, including 46 "1862" and 9 "1890" land-grant universities, 1 sea-grant university, and 12 "other" universities. However, except for statutory eligibility for the land- and sea-grant institutions and "presumed" eligibility for the twelve "other" institutions, the Board had yet to develop guidelines or criteria by which institutions could be certified as being "eligible."

Board Wrestles With Several Rosters of Eligibility

Therefore, at the beginning of its second year of operation (in October 1977), the Board discussed having guidelines or criteria by which institutions could be certified as being eligible, the number of institutions desiring this certification, how noneligible institutions could get involved in Title XII, and what guidelines to use when noneligible institutions were part of a consortium. Although it recognized the difficulty of establishing eligibility criteria, the Board concluded that it "is on the line with Title XII insofar as the performance of these institutions is concerned in these programs." Consequently, the JCAD was asked to "make the first cut at it" even though "the Board itself is going to have to make some difficult decisions and provide some guidance."^{23/}

Meanwhile, the JCAD recommended and the Board approved the University of California at Davis, Tennessee State University, and Alcorn A&M College (now University) for the roster of eligible universities.^{24/}

The Board decided that, except for institutions that were automatically eligible (*i.e.*, land- and sea-grant institutions), there would be "no further additions to the roster until the criteria that are being developed by JCAD have been reviewed and approved by the Board." In making that decision, the Board tried to clarify the distinction between "the roster" and "the list of eligible institutions." The roster was created from the list of eligible institutions, because the criteria for being on the roster

were stiffer. However, pending the JCAD's guidance on eligibility criteria, the Board made no decision on whether there should be only two lists -- that is, roster and eligibility -- or also a third list -- that is, "non-eligible institutions that have something specific to offer."^{25/}

The BIFAD Support Staff and two consultants worked on developing criteria for eligibility and the roster and on procedures for the participation of noneligible universities. A "Status Report on Development of Criteria for University Title XII Eligibility" was made at the January 1978 meeting of the Board. It included a framework entitled "Registry of Resources" which was intended to be "inclusive of all the...institutions that...should be participating in Title XII activities." The report contained sections on the privileges and responsibilities of each of six classes of institutions; procedures for obtaining and evaluating information for placing institutions on the roster; and procedures for expanding the data base on each institution for use "in the matching up process of institutions with the tasks to be undertaken." A written report, vetted by the JCAD, was promised for the Board's February meeting.^{26/}

At this (January 1978) meeting of the Board, confusion continued between the meaning of "eligible" and "on the roster." It was explained that the "1890" land-grant institutions were eligible in the same manner as the "1862" land-grant institutions. Some of the "1890s" had failed to respond to an earlier questionnaire and, therefore, were omitted from the earlier list of eligible institutions -- namely, Kentucky State University, Delaware State University, South Carolina State University, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, University of Maryland at Eastern Shore, and Langston University. Meanwhile, there had been replies from all but two of them.^{27/}

The JCAD presented a rough draft of a report on university eligibility criteria to the BIFAD on February 27. Section 1 contained the purpose of a registry of institutions. Section 2 included six classes of participants and criteria for membership in each class -- namely, eligible universities, roster universities, consortia, multicampus university systems, federal agencies, and other institutions (other universities, international agencies and centers, foundations, private businesses, and private and voluntary organizations -- and 13 factors or criteria for distinguishing between "eligibility" and "roster" status. Following a lengthy discussion, the Board asked the JCAD to consider the report further.^{28/}

At its meeting in March, the Board reviewed and discussed a more detailed fifth draft of the report on criteria (see copy attached). An A.I.D. lawyer clarified that the Title XII legislation required A.I.D. to determine eligibility in collaboration with the BIFAD. The BIFAD's task was to develop and keep a roster of eligible institutions.^{29/}

There was some urgency for the Board to take action on this report at this meeting. Eligibility was related to the Strengthening Grants program, and the Board also had before it a draft document on proposed strengthening grants to universities. With actual and planned revisions to several sections in both documents, the Board approved the eligibility and strengthening grants documents. The following revisions and clarifications of the roster/eligibility paper are instructive, in terms of the kinds of concerns which apparently had to be addressed:

1. The inclusion of a specific statement that A.I.D. will seek BIFAD counsel and advice in the determination of eligibility.
2. The Board has full responsibility for the determination of roster institutions.
3. Any university or college not currently on the roster can make an application.
4. The original questionnaires are to be added as appendices to the document.
5. An institution that has gone through the full appeal process is not eligible to submit for reconsideration for at least a year.
6. Examples of how non-roster institutions may participate are to be added as a footnote.^{30/}

Up to this time, the Board already had placed 72 institutions on a "provisional roster." The JCAD's "work group on eligibility and roster issues" (earlier referred to as the Subcommittee on Eligible Institutions) followed the procedures set forth in the eligibility report, used the criteria and score sheets and reviewed the applications of 54 institutions. It noted that additional applications were pending. The JCAD made five recommendations which the Board approved at its meeting on May 25, 1978, as follows:

(1) Include 3 eligible universities on the roster -- i.e., University of California at Berkeley, University of California at Riverside, and the University of Tennessee;

(2) Include 14 universities on the eligible list and in the Registry of Institutional Resources (RIR). More information is needed for them to be considered for the roster. They are: University of Miami (Florida), University of Kansas at Lawrence, University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, University of Colorado at Boulder, Arkansas State University, Illinois State University, College of the Virgin Islands, University of Nevada at Reno, University of Wyoming, Texas A-I University (site visit required), Delaware State College, Langston University, Tennessee State University (Editor's note: The Board already had approved it for provisional roster status at its meeting on October 11, 1977. See page 6.), and South Carolina State College;

(3) Include 12 institutions on the eligible list and in the Registry of Institutional Resources, but not on the roster as follows: University of Wisconsin at Platteville, West Texas State University, California State University at Chico, Western Carolina University, Arizona State University, Tufts University, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Stephen F. Austin State University, Western Illinois University, Northeast Louisiana University, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, and University of Maryland at Eastern Shore;

(4) Include 10 institutions in the Registry of Institutional Resources as follows: Fort Hays State University (agronomy and range management), Humboldt State University (forestry, fisheries and wild life), Boyce Thompson Institute (plant sciences), Southwest Missouri State University (horticulture), Northern Arizona University (forestry and watershed management), Howard University (human nutrition), Morehead State University (adult education), Angelo State University (range management), University of Wisconsin at Stevens Point (fisheries, soil, water and wild life), Northwest Missouri State University (small farming systems). Northwest Missouri State University would be considered for the eligibility list if more information was provided; and

(5) Exclude 15 institutions from all lists, including the Registry of Institutional Resources, as follows: Middle Tennessee State University, Panhandle (Oklahoma) University, Eastern Kentucky University, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, University of Arkansas at Monticello, Northwestern (Louisiana) State University, Missouri Western State College, Southwest Texas State University,

Tarleton (Texas) State University, Southeastern Louisiana University, Northern Michigan University, Tennessee Technological University, Southeastern Arkansas University, Arkansas Tech University, and Western Michigan University. The Board asked the JCAD to study further the applications of Arkansas Tech and Tennessee Technological Universities.^{31/}

The following clarification was made of the three lists: Only "eligible" institutions could be placed on the "roster." Not all "eligible" institutions were in the Registry of Institutional Resources. Moreover, there were some institutions in the Registry that were neither on the "roster" nor were "eligible" institutions.^{32/}

A joint A.I.D.-BIFAD formal announcement of these actions was planned, and the BIFAD Chairman was to send a letter to each institution.^{33/}

When the Board met again in September 1978, it approved the JCAD recommendations for the University of Nevada at Reno to be on the roster and in the Registry, Kentucky State University as an eligible institution, but not in the Registry, and the State University of New York at Alfred and at Cobleskill in the Registry. The University of North Carolina at Charlotte was denied approval for any list.^{34/}

By the end of its second year of operation, therefore, the Board had received and approved recommendations on the "eligibility" of 131 institutions: 76 for the roster (and, by definition, eligible), 14 eligible and in the Registry of Institutional Resources (with the possibility that additional information would permit them to move to roster status), 12 eligible and in the Registry, 1 eligible and not in the Registry, 12 in the Registry, and 16 institutions denied places on any of the lists.

Board Concentrates on the "Matching Up" Process

While the Board continued to deal with the approval of institutions for the various lists, the focus of its "eligibility" activities during the third year of operation was on the more effective utilization of the institutions on those lists in A.I.D. programming.

The JCAD reported to the Board that one of its priority agenda items was that "we simply have to get at the problem of establishing a more effective registry of resources" (February 22, 1979)^{35/} and "the means of really utilizing the information better" (March 29, 1979).^{36/} In June, the Board had a lengthy and inconclusive discussion about how and

when the various rosters were used to respond to queries for expertise and other assistance -- that is, the "matching up" process.^{37/}

While there was not total agreement on what the "matching up" process was, some felt that it was viable and that the current registry of resources was not completely adequate. (It was noted that there was a joint A.I.D.-BIFAD effort underway to upgrade and perfect the Registry of Institutional Resources, thereby providing computer-based access to the desired information.^{38/}) Among the considerations were the following:

How early in the project planning and designing process and in what kinds of project planning and design should Title XII universities be involved?

How feasible would it be to have Title XII universities so involved?

Could the universities respond to short-term, last-minute requests for technical assistance? How quickly?

Could an "early warning system" be developed for such matters?

How could there be developed an inventory of selected professional and technical people with relevant capabilities and easy access to them without a cumbersome and unwieldy roster or system? While an institutional roster probably would have to be updated every two years, a personnel roster would have to be updated annually, at least. Moreover, there were pros and cons to relating personnel to institutions.

Could overseas experience be provided to university personnel, who otherwise were professionally or technically competent?

In what ways could the danger of the BIFAD Support Staff becoming the "pickle in the middle" in the "matching up" process be avoided?^{39/}

At the next (July) meeting of the BIFAD, the JCAD reported that it had formed a new work group on accessing institutional and professional resources for A.I.D., and had charged the group with three activities: improve the Registry of Institutional Resources, develop a professional pool of individuals of competence and international experience and devise acceptable ways of accessing that pool by A.I.D., and incorporate them with the experimental program ideas that were approved by the BIFAD and A.I.D.^{40/} By September, the JCAD reported that a work group on training nearly had completed "a sort of sourcebook

of programs...available to (field) missions...one volume on the degree programs and a separate volume on nondegree programs." The volumes also contained how many foreign nationals, by country of origin and by academic field, were being trained.^{41/}

Meanwhile, during the third year of operations, the Board approved the following JCAD recommendations on "eligibility:"

Placing the University of California (no further designation was provided) and the University of Wisconsin at Stoughton in the Registry of Institutional Resources;⁴²

Moving the University of Kansas at Lawrence from the "Other Universities and Institutions on the Registry of Resources" list to the list of "Eligible Universities not on the Roster;"^{43/}

Keeping Angelo State University in the group of "Other Universities and Institutions on the Registry of Resources;"^{44/} and

Adding Tennessee Technological University to the "Other Universities and Institutions on the Registry of Resources."^{45/}

Utilization Issues Continue to Engage Board

The BIFAD Chairman called the Board's meeting of October 25, 1979, which marked the beginning of its fourth year of operations, "a sort of transitional meeting." Introducing an agenda item, "BIFAD Perspectives on Title XII, Implementation and Programmatic Issues," he cited the development of the Registry of Institutional Resources as evidence of significant progress.^{46/} At the same time, he said that "one of the things that is going to need constant watching is the whole question of how do we improve the registry of institutional resources."^{47/} He conjectured that "we probably...during the coming year need to perhaps look at the question of reviewing that registry and roster, gather data once again, perhaps in a way that will be even more useful for the development...assistance process, to identify more precisely what some of the capabilities are of those institutions...We think that a great deal more can be done in this area to improve the speed and flexibility with which we in the academic community can respond."^{48/}

Shortly thereafter, the BIFAD and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) sponsored a half-day seminar in Washington, D.C., for Title XII officers on "Problems Restricting More Effective University Involvement in A.I.D. Country Programs." The seminar was led jointly by the JCAD and A.I.D.'s Technical Program Committee for Agriculture.

Three sets of recommendations for improving Title XII university involvement in A.I.D. programs were contained in a BIFAD report discussed by the Board at its meeting on June 26, 1980. They dealt with Title XII universities as an aggregation, national associations as they relate to these institutions, and A.I.D.

The recommendations for the individual Title XII universities were to: (1) set up an intrauniversity task force to examine the university's involvement in international programs; (2) modify the Strengthening Grants program to conform to the findings of the university task force; (3) modify the appointment, promotion, tenure, and merit pay policies and procedures to consider adequately professional efforts in international agriculture; and (4) cultivate and develop local support for international programs and studies.

The recommendations for the national associations, AASCU and NASULGC were to: (1) increase and improve national representation for international agricultural programs; and (2) develop mechanisms and procedures to assist member universities to implement NASULGC's "Statement of Principles."

The recommendations for A.I.D. were to: (1) develop reciprocal agreements with individual Title XII universities for long-term support of A.I.D.'s development assistance program; (2) set up a joint committee (A.I.D., NASULGC, BIFAD, USDA, and AASCU) to make specific recommendations for #1 above and report to the September 25 BIFAD meeting; and (3) lengthen the authorizing, contracting, and funding periods for Title XII sector programs and projects.

Following consideration of these recommendations, the Board decided to have a joint BIFAD-A.I.D. staff committee work further on the matter.^{49/}

The BIFAD Chairman wanted the report distributed to the Title XII community. Consequently, it was published by the BIFAD in October 1980 as "Toward More Effective Involvement of Title XII Universities in International Agricultural Development," BIFAD Staff Report No. 1, 63 pages.

Meanwhile, the A.I.D. Administrator appointed an A.I.D.-BIFAD staff work group to: (1) review the recommendations of the staff report to determine their general usefulness and viability for recommendations for implementation; (2) recommend needed refinements or minor modifications of the recommendations to make them actionable; (3) determine and recommend the proper offices for developing mechanisms to implement specific recommendations; and (4) recommend arrangements for additional staff work to permit A.I.D.-BIFAD consideration of recommendations not presently actionable.^{50/}

The report of the A.I.D.-BIFAD internal staff work group on the BIFAD recommendations for improving university support of A.I.D. programs was presented to the BIFAD at its meeting on December 5, 1980 (see copy attached).^{51/} The report endorsed or concurred in all four recommendations for individual Title XII universities, except that little modification was needed in the Strengthening Grants program and, therefore, that the withdrawal of these grants was not contemplated.^{52/}

The report did not comment on the recommendations for AASCU and NASULGC. As for the recommendations for A.I.D., the existence of the work group was evidence that one recommendation had been carried out. The report suggested specific clarification of Handbook guidance and appropriate cable guidance to field missions on flexibility in the lengthening, authorizing, contracting, and funding periods.^{53/}

A large portion of the report dealt with a proposed Memorandum of Agreement between A.I.D. and each statutorily eligible Title XII university, in lieu of the earlier recommended reciprocal agreement. Five of the six specific recommendations in the report were concerned with the development and implementation of this Memorandum of Agreement, including a proposed timetable that would result in the signing of the first one of these agreements by July 1, 1981.^{54/}

The other specific recommendation was for A.I.D. to fund an independent study of incentives for individual and university-wide involvement in development assistance activities. The study was to be completed by June 30, 1981.^{55/}

At this December 5, 1980, Board meeting, the JCAD announced that, with the help of the Technical Program Committee for Agriculture, it would sponsor a series of three two-day regional workshops in January and February 1981 in Nashville, Tennessee, College Park, Maryland,

and Pomona, California. Among other things, the workshops were expected to "expose to the University Community the new questionnaire that the RIR -- Registry of Institutional Resources -- is sending out to the universities...(T)his is the instrument that we expect will again greatly improve and upgrade the information that we have on Title 12 (sic) institutions..."^{56/}

During its meetings in 1981, the Board heard reports on all three matters -- i.e., the proposed Memorandum of Agreement, the incentives study, and the results of the RIR questionnaire. However, the Board reached closure on none of these matters until 1982.

Memoranda of Understanding Have Long Gestation Period

Meanwhile, the BIFAD Chairman and the A.I.D. Administrator issued a joint memorandum on May 28, 1981, reaffirming the continuing relationship between A.I.D. and the universities and their commitment to carrying out fully the mandate of Title XII. A.I.D. Administrator Peter McPherson made clear his desire and goal of having long-term mutual agreements between A.I.D. and "most universities that on a regular basis do work with A.I.D."^{57/} When the target date of July 1981 had passed without a signed Memorandum of Agreement, many people became concerned. At the Board's September meeting, a formal presentation to A.I.D. was promised by October and to the Board by December.^{58/} Administrator McPherson expressed his impatience with the lack of sufficient progress on developing what had come to be called a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) when he addressed the annual meeting of NASULGC in November 1981. He indicated his desire for "up to five" MOUs between A.I.D. and the universities as soon as possible. He also discussed several other ways of involving universities in A.I.D. business -- namely, the Joint Enterprise Mode of contracting, host country contracting, and the Joint Career Corps.^{59/}

One week later, A.I.D.'s Senior Assistant Administrator for Science and Technology established an internal workgroup within A.I.D. to "develop our negotiating strategy on memoranda of understanding, including the selection of the universities and the establishment of negotiating teams and schedules."^{60/} When the Board heard a progress report at its meeting of December 3, 1981, the members questioned the peer evaluation and review process and the proposed "magical number of five" MOUs. The explanation given was that a pilot effort was desired by December 31, in order to get some answers and to provide a basis for expanding the effort.^{61/}

At its meeting in April 1982, the Board learned that three universities -- the University of Florida, Purdue University, and Colorado State University -- had been selected for a pilot exercise of developing and negotiating MOUs with a completion target date of June.^{62/} The Board did approve a draft MOU "in principle as an acceptable framework of the MOUs" at its meeting on June 24, 1982^{63/}, and was pleased with the announcement at its September meeting that the signing of the first MOU would take place with Colorado State University on October 4, 1982.^{64/} Shortly thereafter, on October 26, 1982, the second MOU was signed with the University of Florida.

The report on the "process, progress and prospects" of the MOU, which was presented to the Board at its meeting on March 31, 1983, noted that those involved in developing this mechanism "went through a very exhausting process...to try and select (sic) universities for the very important first phase, the pilot exercise."^{65/}

Following the selection of three universities for the pilot exercise (see above), questions arose about the "identification of a core staff of university professionals to be utilized overseas in A.I.D. programs."^{66/} Reduced A.I.D. funding levels had made it difficult for A.I.D. and the universities to express their intent for A.I.D. to use and for the universities to have available a core staff for A.I.D.'s overseas program requirements. This prompted the identification of one more criterion for use in selecting additional MOU candidates -- namely, 10 long-term person-years per year for each university. This criterion was used in the negotiation of two additional MOU universities: Utah State University and Washington State University.^{67/}

It was clarified that the MOU "reflected a much more mature kind of relationship with A.I.D." and that the MOU replaced the Strengthening Grants program as "an acknowledgment that the university...has really graduated to the MOU mode."^{68/}

A new idea was introduced with this report -- that is, to conceptualize and negotiate joint MOUs. The notion was to start with only two universities -- that is, pairing a larger university with a smaller and/or historically black university. The joint MOUs were expected to be "a lot more specific regionally and topically."^{69/}

The Board asked for "a greater degree of visibility to what the specific criteria are"^{70/} and once again (see supra, page 15) expressed concern about the selection evaluation process and how equitable it was.^{71/} It was concerned also with institutions that were not "graduating from strengthening grants to MOUs," whether there was a

dollar or number ceiling regarding MOUs, and the allocation of available funds between the strengthening grants programs and the MOUs.^{72/} It was recognized that there were legitimate concerns which must be worked on jointly by the BIFAD and A.I.D.^{73/}

On April 15, 1983, just two weeks following this Board meeting, the A.I.D. Administrator announced a five-point special program for historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) as the Agency's response to Presidential Executive Order 12320 and the President's follow-up memorandum of September 22, 1982. Among the five points was the following:

- Third, I have directed that there be developed several Joint Memoranda of Understanding which involve more than one institution...Under the new program, MOU relationships will be joint undertakings involving universities with greater international development experience and one or more of the smaller and Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This makes it possible for an Historically Black College or University to participate in MOUs, even if the school has a modest depth in numbers of professionals in relevant subject fields...It is my intention to closely review the possibility of an Historically Black College or University to be a partner in each MOU that is signed in the next 18 months.^{74/}

Three more MOUs were signed during 1983 with Purdue University on April 27, 1983, Utah State University on June 27, 1983, and Washington State University on November 25, 1983.

The details of the proposed JMOUs were developed by a Joint A.I.D.-BIFAD Task Force whose report was approved by the Board at its meeting on June 7, 1984. The specifications in that report had grown partly out of the negotiation of the first JMOU, which actually had been signed a week earlier (on June 1) with Oregon State University and Tuskegee University.^{75/} The twelfth and last agricultural JMOU was signed in July 1986 with the University of Minnesota and Lincoln University (Missouri).

So it was that 29 "statutorily eligible Title XII universities" (see list attached) signed Memoranda of Understanding with A.I.D. and have been recipients of related program support grants. (Note: There are also four JMOUs in health which are not included in the foregoing: Columbia University and Meharry Medical College; Johns Hopkins University and Drew University of Medicine and Science; University of North Carolina and Howard University; and Tulane University and Morehouse School of Medicine.)

BIFAD Support Staff Uses Incentives Study Report

The design and management of an independent study of incentives for increased participation of qualified Title XII faculty and staff members and institutions in A.I.D. programs overseas were assigned to A.I.D.'s Office of Management Planning and Analysis.^{76/} The study was one of the approved recommendations of the joint A.I.D.-BIFAD internal staff work group on university relations (see supra, page 13), and was to be completed by June 30, 1981.^{77/}

The firm, Management Analysis Center, Inc., was selected in April 1981 to carry out the study, following the authorization of funds in March. The study team made a report to the BIFAD at its May 28th meeting of the results of the pre-study interviews with six universities (University of Florida, Purdue University, University of Maryland at College Park, South Dakota State University, Virginia State University, and University of Wisconsin at River Falls).^{78/} It was not until September 1981 that the contractor finally was permitted to make a wider survey, owing to clearance of the survey by the Office of Management and Budget as a condition precedent.

The Board heard a final report at its meeting on March 25, 1982. There were 1,156 faculty respondents from 17 universities out of 4,000 questionnaires sent to 18 Title XII universities. A total of 43 university administrators responded out of the 79 Title XII institutions on BIFAD's "A" list surveyed. During the Board's lengthy discussion of the findings, there were many questions about the content of the survey instrument, who was interviewed, and the interpretation of the findings. Only a portion of the results was presented, given the time constraints, and it was indicated that a full, final report was due in mid-April.^{79/}

It was not until its meeting of June 2, 1983, that the Board considered again the incentives study, then nearly two years after the study originally was to have been completed.^{80/} The BIFAD Support Staff meanwhile had urged A.I.D. not to accept the report, because it was felt that the interpretations therein were not in keeping with the university community's feelings on some items. However, the document was used to focus discussion at Title XII regional seminars in January and February 1983 from which, it was felt, sounder reactions were elicited. As a result, the BIFAD Support Staff prepared a set of recommendations on the incentives study for Board consideration.^{81/}

The staff paper noted the progress made already on eight of the problem areas which the study identified:

- (1) A.I.D. commitment to longer-term funding: the Memorandum of Understanding was a move toward long-term commitment;
- (2) Involvement of small and less-experienced universities: the Joint Enterprise Mode of contracting was a step in that direction;
- (3) Increased faculty involvement in project planning: the increasing use of the Collaborative Assistance Mode of contracting was involving faculty earlier;
- (4) Dearth of orientation information: BIFAD's proposed program of pre-departure orientation for Title XII university personnel on A.I.D. overseas contracts was designed to meet this need;
- (5) Better dissemination of information to university faculty: BIFAD's Title XII regional seminars were to be used, as well as the upgrading of the newsletter, BIFAD BRIEFS;
- (6) Perquisites overseas equivalent to those of A.I.D. employees: Actions were taken by A.I.D. to improve access to post privileges, especially commissaries and medical units, for contractor employees;
- (7) Attracting younger faculty overseas: the new Joint Career Corps program would provide complementarity between university and A.I.D. work; and
- (8) Identifying "leadership quality" faculty for A.I.D. projects: BIFAD's Registry of Institutional Resources was a positive step to help track former university faculty and staff participants in A.I.D. projects.^{82/}

Three problems still required special attention: involving younger faculty, attracting quality university teams for "tough nut" projects, and responding to university criticism of the "matching" process.

Regarding involving younger faculty members and in addition to the new Joint Career Corps mentioned above, the BIFAD Staff recommended the following:

- (1) a self-study and review of Title XII university policies and procedures, using the self-monitoring guide drafted for elaborating NASULGC's 1979 "Statement of Principles for Effective Participation in International Development Activities;"

(2) a program item for discussion by the Association of U.S. University Directors of International Programs and at Title XII regional seminars and for coverage in the BIFAD BRIEFS;

(3) assessment of the current Strengthening Grants program for opportunities given to younger faculty members; and

(4) selection criteria for and language in future MOUs and other agreements encouraging the involvement of younger faculty members.^{83/}

In order to attract quality university teams for "tough nut" projects, the BIFAD Staff recommended the following:

(1) A.I.D. should consider foreign language training as a factor in estimating project costs and implementation time;

(2) A.I.D. and the BIFAD should continue efforts to inform potential university contractors of recent changes in tax laws which serve as incentives for overseas service;

(3) A.I.D. regional bureaus should develop "needs profiles" as early warning signals to the universities about possible "tough nut" project opportunities;

(4) the BIFAD Staff should continue to provide advance notice of "tough nut" projects for potential bidders; and

(5) "tough nut" projects should be a consideration in selecting MOU participants and in negotiating the language of the agreement.^{84/}

The Board accepted the BIFAD Staff report and approved its recommendations.^{85/}

Special Attention Is Given To The "Matching" Process

The third problem requiring special attention from the findings of the earlier incentives study report by the Management Analysis Center, Inc., was university criticism of the "matching" process. Subsequently, in his address to the NASULGC annual meeting in November 1982, A.I.D. Administrator Peter McPherson expressed his belief that the matching process used in bringing universities into relationship with the Agency should be reviewed. Thereafter, he appointed two A.I.D. Assistant Administrators and the Executive Director of the BIFAD Support Staff to undertake the review.^{86/}

A draft report on the matching process was presented to the Board at its meeting on June 2, 1983. The report revealed the following:

- (1) Not too many universities competed for each project;
- (2) There were bids on "hard nut" projects;
- (3) The competitive procurement process was working, enhanced by newer contracting procedures;
- (4) There had been an increase in the involvement of small and less experienced universities;
- (5) There needed to be more feedback to universities on the weaknesses of their proposals;
- (6) The 60-day time requirement for responding to requests could not be lengthened further; and
- (7) The universities were woefully lacking in foreign language, especially French, capability and in using the Strengthening and Matching Grants programs accordingly.^{87/}

The Board asked that further work be done on the subject and on the report.^{88/}

A final report was presented to and approved by the Board at its meeting on December 2, 1983, while recognizing that the planned further vetting of the report might require some minor changes.^{89/} Two fundamental questions were addressed in the report: equity for smaller and less experienced universities and the efficiency of the matching process.^{90/} The report contained the following conclusions and recommendations:

- (1) The establishment of a competitive process with some sort of preassessment and providing for more business to minority institutions;
- (2) The better knowledge and use of the various contracting mechanisms, including joint efforts, by institutions;
- (3) The laying to rest of myths about large numbers of competitors per project and about the lack of response to so-called "tough nut" projects;
- (4) The use by A.I.D. contracting officials of a "source listing" of institutions from the BIFAD Staff;
- (5) The proposal for a national workshop to help universities prepare better project proposals (using the 50 identified common weaknesses in technical proposals) and to provide feedback to universities on the reasons for unsuccessful competition;

- (6) The improvement of Requests for Technical Proposals (RFTPs);
- (7) The recognition that delays in receiving mail from USAIDs cut into the 60-day period for preparing proposals;
- (8) The development of reasonable expectations as to language competency;
- (9) The use of the NASULGC basic principles by universities; and
- (10) The development of internships for faculty members in A.I.D.^{21/}

Registry of Institutional Resources Struggles Into Operation

For some time during the early months of the BIFAD, questions about "eligibility" always were confused with questions concerning the development and maintenance of a roster or registry of institutional resources (see pages 4 and 7, supra). When the confusion continued over the distinction between "the roster" and "the list of eligible institutions," the BIFAD Staff and two consultants worked on developing criteria for eligibility and the roster and on the procedures for the participation of noneligible universities.^{23/} That report (in January 1978) included, inter alia, a framework entitled, "Registry of Resources" which was intended to be "inclusive of all the...institutions that...should be participating in Title XII activities." (See supra, pages 7 and 8.)^{24/} Subsequently, a JCAD "work group on eligibility and roster issues" explored the matter and presented a report, the fifth draft of which the Board finally (in March 1978) accepted with actual and planned revisions (page 8, supra).^{25/}

The JCAD work group followed the procedures, applied the criteria, and used the score sheets set forth in the eligibility report in reviewing the applications of 54 institutions, then made five recommendations which the Board approved in May 1978 (see pages 8 and 9, supra).^{26/} That action by the Board apparently overcame the longstanding confusion by establishing essentially three categories: universities on the roster which by definition had to be eligible and had to meet additional criteria, eligible universities, and universities in the Registry of Institutional Resources (pages 8-10, supra).

At the beginning of the Board's fourth year of operation in October 1979, the BIFAD Chairman conjectured that "a great deal more can be done in this area [of making the Registry of Institutional Resources more effective in identifying more precisely the capabilities of Title XII institutions] to improve the speed and flexibility with which we in the academic community can respond (page 12, supra).^{97/}

Efforts to improve the Registry of Institutional Resources continued. The Board learned at its meeting in December 1980 that, among other things on the agenda of a series of three regional workshops the JCAD and A.I.D.'s Technical Program Committee for Agriculture would sponsor in January and February 1981, there was the plan to "expose to the University Community the new questionnaire that the RIR -- The Registry of Institutional Resources -- is sending out to the universities...(T)his is the instrument that we expect will again greatly improve and upgrade the information that we have on Title 12 (sic) institutions..."^{98/} At the Board's September 1981 meeting, it was announced that the main institutional profiles for the RIR had been received from about 25% of the universities, there had been a flood of data from individual faculty and staff members, and there also had been some solvable computer systems problems.^{99/}

The JCAD continued to work on the effectiveness of the RIR. In its final report to the Board on June 24, 1982 (after revision of the BIFAD charter had resulted in, inter alia, the combining of the JCAD and the JRC into the Joint Committee on Agricultural Research and Development or JCARD), the JCAD cited the following among its accomplishments:

The Registry of Institutional Resources is updated, improved and computerized, and really is providing a real asset in terms of our matching funds.^{100/}

Among the "issues that still remain on the agenda...to pass onto the new JCARD" was the following:

The Registry of Institutional Resources is being managed on an ad hoc (sic) arrangement until all collected data are recorded and computer retrieval programs are perfected. The continued operation and updating of the RIR must be provided for, either in BIFAD or in A.I.D.^{101/}

The RIR was a computerized information system which was tied in to A.I.D.'s mainframe computer, and used INQUIRE, a reportedly sophisticated data base.^{102/} It was composed of four parts/profiles: (A) institutional, (B) subject (matter) area of competence, (C) professional (individual), and (D) institutional accomplishment report.^{103/} This

four-part questionnaire was not received favorably by the university community. In addition to the detailed information requested and the time required to complete the profiles, there were objections over and questions about the confidentiality of some of the information, the propriety with which it would be used and shared, and the control over data access when the RIR was tied in to A.I.D.'s main computer. Consequently, parts A, B, and D were not always completed with care and often were returned reluctantly.^{104/}

The June 2, 1983, meeting of the Board was a tour de force. The agenda included substantive consideration of A.I.D. policy on the use of historically black colleges and universities, the BIFAD Staff follow-up report on the incentives study which had been prepared by Management Analysis Center, Inc. (pages 18ff., supra), and a draft report on the matching process (pages 20ff., supra).^{105/} During the discussion of the latter report, two of A.I.D.'s regional bureaus reported on their unsuccessful attempts to use the RIR system and criticized the system for failing to meet their needs.^{106/} A year later, in July 1984, the Board approved the application and processing procedures for an MOU which included, inter alia, the following: "2. Appropriate information to the Registry of Institutional Resources (RIR) must precede any proposal for an MOU."^{107/} Apparently the BIFAD Staff still was struggling to get needed information from the Title XII institutions for making the RIR effective.

There is no further mention of the RIR in the transcripts of Board meetings. By the time the BIFAD Support Staff had moved to temporary offices for seven months and then returned to the main building of the Department of State in 1985, the RIR was dormant. A report in 1985 by an A.I.D. information specialist indicated that the utilization of the 66 institutional profiles (Part A) and of the 786 subject areas of competence profiles (Part B) was "rare." The utilization of the 5,637 professional profiles (Part C), the main portion of the RIR, was "lower than originally anticipated." The 181 institutional accomplishment reports (Part D) were "not used."^{108/}

The limited use of the RIR was corroborated by the former BIFAD Staff member, who had been responsible for the RIR system. In an interview in February 1986, she said that there were three principal users of RIR: the regional bureaus (primarily the Bureau for Africa), university people, and international agencies and consulting firms. The regional bureaus tended to focus on the "top ten" universities (those which historically had the most business with A.I.D.) in looking for expertise. They wanted to know who had done what as a way of

gaining comparative information. The university types did not know who was "out there" and, therefore, had to go to RIR when they "got a piece of the action." International agencies, international agricultural research centers, indefinite quantity contractors, and consulting firms shopped the RIR for people with experience to help them fulfill their contractual and other obligations. Depending on the number of new program initiatives at any given time, the former staff member estimated that there were about five or six inquiries of RIR per month.^{109/}

Meanwhile, further reorganization and retrenchment efforts in A.I.D. during 1985 resulted in a reduction in the BIFAD Support Staff, including a loss of personnel responsible for the RIR. The computer terminal was disconnected and removed later. There were some discussions in 1986 about reviving and revising the RIR, but no further action was taken.

In 1988 and 1989, the General Accounting Office (GAO) reviewed the efforts of A.I.D. and the BIFAD to implement the Title XII legislation. One of the recommendations in the GAO report of April 1989 was that, in fulfilling the requirements of the Title XII legislation, the BIFAD should "place priority on developing a comprehensive and current registry of university resources to facilitate BIFAD's ability to match university capabilities with A.I.D.'s needs."^{110/} This prompted the BIFAD to begin the redesign of the RIR with a view to having a simple, in-house personnel computer type of system.

A prototype questionnaire has been developed and tested, using as the database information from the nearly 500 individuals involved in the seven Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs).¹¹¹ There is a two-page survey form for the CRSP Professional Directory. The first page contains name and address, CRSP position, degree and specialization, years of professional experience, language proficiency, and professional international experience. Check marks and brief one-word, two-word answers are required. On the second page is a list of CRSP professional fields of activities requiring the identification by check marks of relevant primary and secondary specializations. This is quite a departure from the earlier four-part questionnaire which the universities resented and resisted.

The data have been entered into a personal computer type of system, and it has been determined that this type of questionnaire and approach is doable. The next steps require Board determination of the universe of institutions to be included, additional equipment, and more personnel.^{112/}

Three Lists Become One Directory

The RIR is dormant. A prototype of a new individual or professional registry has been tested successfully and remains to be used on an expanded basis.

From the accumulation of approved actions on "eligibility" over the years, three lists or types of institutions have been developed including 128 institutions (see the attachments). The premier (A) list or roster is composed of 84 institutions. Included are 65 land-grant and sea-grant institutions -- 52 "1862", 12 "1890" and Tuskegee University, and 1 sea-grant -- and 19 "other" universities who meet the "eligibility" and additional criteria.^{113/} Four university consortia also are included on the A list -- namely, the Consortium for International Development (CID), Mid-America International Agricultural Consortium (MIAC), Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA), and South East Consortium for International Development (SECID).

A second (B-1) list of 20 institutions contains those which meet the five statutory "eligibility" criteria. The third (B-2) list of 24 institutions includes those in which a specific department, college, or institute (but not the entire institution) meets the "eligibility" requirement.

These three lists comprise the Directory of Title XII Universities' Representatives and Coordinators. In practice and for most purposes, the BIFAD Support Staff has treated them as one list for the past three or four years.

Conclusions and Implications

Eligibility is written into the Title XII legislation, which includes also criteria for determining eligibility. There is also the requirement for developing and maintaining a roster of eligible institutions. Another dimension was added when the BIFAD adopted early on a policy of inclusivity -- that is, of involving as many universities as possible in carrying out the purpose of Title XII. A policy of "y'all come," when real opportunities and resources are finite, requires some basis for selection. Thus, the dilemma between encouraging participation and ensuring quality, a dilemma with which the Board has wrestled.

The Board took seriously its responsibility, in tandem with A.I.D., for determining the eligibility of institutions to participate in Title XII activities. Beyond the legal requirement, the Board recognized that the reputation of the BIFAD and of the universities was at stake in the resulting performance of the chosen institutions. Quality had to be assured as much as possible. At the same time, inclusivity was to be promoted.

A related and exclusive responsibility of the Board added to the difficulty of dealing with eligibility. The legislation requires the BIFAD to develop and maintain a roster of eligible institutions. In addition to frequent confusion over the two related responsibilities, there have been the problems over scope. There have been questions of how much and of what kinds of data to collect; what kind of systems to use to store and manipulate the data and keep the information current; and, most especially, who would have access to the data and for what purposes. In addition to Freedom of Information Act considerations, there were concerns about privileged information, institutional competitiveness, and personnel raiding, among others.

The university community also took seriously the matter of eligibility and were involved early and heavily in the development, application, and monitoring of the criteria. Individual members of the university community, as well as representatives of their associations, participated in work groups, task forces, and special panels, and were prominent members of BIFAD's joint BIFAD-A.I.D. committees on agricultural development and research. Members of the university community also have been vital members of the BIFAD Support Staff from its inception. The nature and depth of involvement by universities and their associations have been essential elements in the definition and application of eligibility.

Eligibility never has been seen as an end in itself, but as being an important first step towards the better and fuller utilization of the resources of Title XII universities in A.I.D. programming. Eligibility is related to the sufficiency of a university's resources, in terms of their quality and quantity, as well as the institutional commitment of resources for implementing Title XII. Eligibility is related also to the efficient accessibility of those resources and their efficacious utilization. Of course, the Board's statutory responsibility for keeping a roster of eligible universities is linked inextricably to matters of gaining access to and utilizing university resources. The Board has had to be concerned with both input and output. It recognized immediately that eligibility is related closely to its responsibility for the quality of the performance of Title XII universities in A.I.D. programming.

Experience has shown that eligibility is much more difficult "in practice" than it is "in concept." The Board wrestled with its many dimensions and ultimately concluded that, for the purposes of Title XII, there would be three categories of eligibility -- namely, those institutions with a statutory basis and resources sufficient to meet the most rigorous criteria; institutions able to meet minimum criteria; and parts of institutions able to meet minimum criteria. Enroute to these conclusions, the Board had to deal with questions of peer review and evaluation, size of institution, special treatment for some institutions, exclusivity and inclusivity factors, and budgetary constraints. External factors, such as changing foreign aid program priorities, fluctuating foreign policy requirements, transforming circumstances in developing countries, and varying domestic political pressures also were influential.

The recent transformation of the BIFAD into the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development and Economic Cooperation (BIFADEC) and the inclusion of more than agriculture and rural development in its purview complicate the matter of eligibility and the development and maintenance of a roster or registry of resources. The complications are compounded further by the proposed merger of the BIFADEC and the A.I.D. Office of Research and University Relations to create a new Center for University Cooperation in Development. The Center expects to take advantage of and use more fully the considerable development-related resources in the university community and the universities' increasing efforts to internationalize their programs and campuses. This means broadening the scope well beyond the Title XII universities.

Unless and until the foreign aid legislation is modified, however, eligibility will continue to be a legal requirement for participation in Title XII activities. With the inclusion of other disciplines and subject matter areas, in addition to those related to agriculture and rural development which have been the "traditional" focus of the Board, the challenges are how to fulfill the eligibility requirements and how to develop and maintain a roster of eligible universities.

Determining eligibility requires a judgment and that opens a proverbial Pandora's box. Despite the complexity of the process and serious questions about the fairness of peer reviews, how criteria were applied, who did the evaluations and how, nevertheless, the BIFAD and the Title XII community insisted on keeping "in house" the determination of eligibility. For those who were involved and remember, the possibility of having this determination made externally (e.g., by the National Academy of Sciences) might be welcome. On the other hand, the university community might prefer to continue an "in house" process and the involvement that it entails.

Beyond who makes the judgment of eligibility and the process by which it is done, there are the criteria on which that judgment is based. Will there be criteria in addition to those in the legislation? Who will make that determination and how? The university community participated heavily in this activity in the early years of the Title XII program. Interpreting the level of institutional commitment, determining the critical mass and essential mixture of resources, and assessing the balance between and among available fulltime-parttime, tenured-nontenured, known-unknown, and experienced-inexperienced faculty-staff members for core support and field assignments are some of the measurements to be made and for which criteria will be required.

The matter of a roster of eligible institutions for Title XII food and agricultural and related activities remains for the BIFADEC. A decision is needed on whether to adopt the simplified system which has been tested recently on the CRSP data. If that system is approved, then additional personnel, equipment, and other resources will be needed to develop and maintain it.

Of course, the Center for University Cooperation in Development is expected to be more than the sum of its merged parts. What of Center activities other than those of Title XII? How separate will the two sets of activities be? On what basis will the university community be invited and encouraged to participate in these other activities? How will they qualify? Who will make the determination? Will there be minimum and other levels of requirements of institutional commitment, resource capacity and availability, and other essentials of substantive participation? What kind of registry of resources, if any, will be needed? These are some of the considerations as the Center determines what institutions will help design, develop, implement, monitor and evaluate its program and activities.

REFERENCES

Executive Summary (pp. iii-v)

- a Part I, Chapter 2, Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2220 a.-e., Sec. 312 of Public Law 94-161 (89 Stat. 849), "Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger," pp. 77-83.
- b Ibid., Sec. 296(d), p. 79.
- c Ibid., Sec. 296(d)(1)(2), p. 79.
- d Ibid., Sec. 298(c)(2), p. 81.
- e Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD), Approved summary of the minutes of the meeting, October 19-20, 1976, pp. 152 and 156.
- f BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, October 11, 1977, pp. 105-106.
- g BIFAD, Approved summary of the minutes of the meeting, November 22, 1976, p. 166.
- h Ibid., June 13, 1977, p. 223; July 11, 1977, pp. 232 and 235; and September 12, 1977, pp. 242-243.
- i BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, March 23, 1978, pp. 27-45 and 136-143. See also "Criteria and Procedure for Compiling the Roster of Universities for Participation in Title XII Programs," March 27, 1978, revised July 1981, 28 p.
- j BIFAD, Directory of Title XII Universities' Representatives and Coordinators, revised August 1990.
- k BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 24, 1982, pp. 95 and 97.
- l From a meeting with James Lindahl, AID/SER/IRM/WPS, on April 15, 1986. Lindahl quoted from a study of RIR which he had done in 1985.
- m U.S. General Accounting Office, "Foreign Aid: Issues Concerning U.S. University Participation," April 1989, p. 32.
- n Interview with BIFAD Staff member, Randall Hoffmann.

Statutory Eligibility (p. 1)

- 1 Part I, Chapter 2, Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2220 a.-e., Sec. 312 of Public Law 94-161 (89 Stat. 849), "Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger," Sec. 296(d), p. 78.

Board Focusses Immediately on Eligibility (pp. 2-3)

- 2 Ibid.
- 3 BIFAD, Approved summary of the minutes of the meeting, October 19 and 20, 1976, p. 156.
- 4 Ibid., p. 153.
- 5 Ibid., November 22, 1976, p. 166.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Ibid., December 22, 1976, p. 172.
- 8 Ibid., January 10-11, 1977, p. 179.
- 9 Ibid.

Eligibility A Major Concern Throughout The First Year (pp. 3-6)

- 10 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, February 14-15, 1977, pp. 166-170.
- 11 BIFAD, Approved summary of the minutes of the meeting, March 14, 1977, pp. 201-202.
- 12 Ibid., April 11, 1977, pp. 209-210.
- 13 Title XII legislation, Sec. 298(c)(2), p. 81.
- 14 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, May 5, 1977, pp. 16-111.
- 15 Ibid., May 7, 1977, pp. 40-50.
- 16 Title XII legislation, Sec. 298(d)(1) and (2), p. 81.
- 17 BIFAD, Approved summary of the minutes of the meeting, May 7, 1977, pp. 217-218.
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 13, 1977, pp. 223-224.
- 20 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, July 11, 1977, p. 28.
- 21 BIFAD, Approved summary of the minutes of the meeting, September 12, 1977, pp. 242-243.

22 Ibid.

Board Wrestles With Several Rosters Of Eligibility (pp. 6-9)

23 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, October 11, 1977, pp. 97-111.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

26 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, January 28, 1978, pp. 88-91.

27 Ibid., pp. 91-93.

28 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, February 27, 1978, pp. 99-129.

29 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, March 23, 1978, pp. 137-141.

30 Ibid., pp. 27-45 and 136-143.

31 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, May 25, 1978, pp. 6-15.

32 Ibid.

33 Ibid., pp. 13-15.

34 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, September 28, 1978, pp. 15-18.

Board Concentrates On The "Matching Up" Process (pp. 11-12)

35 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, February 22, 1979, p. 73.

36 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, March 29, 1979, p. 145.

37 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 5, 1979, pp. 93-110.

38 Ibid., pp. 97-99.

39 Ibid., pp. 93-110.

40 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, July 26, 1979, pp. 41-42.

41 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, September 27, 1979, pp. 113-114.

42 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, October 26, 1978, p. 72.

43 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 5, 1979, pp. 93-94.

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid.

Utilization Issues Continue To Engage Board (pp. 12-15)

46 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, October 25, 1979, pp. 62-64.

47 Ibid., p. 66.

48 Ibid., p. 67.

49 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 26, 1980, pp. 16-57.

50 Ibid.

51 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, December 5, 1980, pp. 10-20.

52 BIFAD, "Report of Internal Staff Work Group on BIFAD Recommendations for Improving University Support of AID Programs." Presented to BIFAD and AID and the fortieth meeting of the BIFAD, December 5, 1980, 22 p.

53 Ibid., pp. 8-12.

54 Ibid., pp. 13-18 and 19-22.

55 Ibid., pp. 18-19.

56 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, December 5, 1980, p. 96.

Memoranda Of Understanding Have Long Gestation Period (pp. 15-17)

57 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, May 28, 1981, pp. 21-25.

58 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, September 24, 1981, pp. 108-113.

59 Agency for International Development (A.I.D), Remarks by A.I.D. Administrator M. Peter McPherson before the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), November 10, 1981. Unpublished manuscript, 26 p.

- 60 A.I.D., Memorandum from A.I.D. Senior Assistant Administrator for Science and Technology, November 17, 1981.
- 61 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, December 3, 1981, pp. 66-102.
- 62 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, April 22, 1983, p. 38.
- 63 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 24, 1982, pp. 61-89.
- 64 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, September 25, 1982, p. 102.
- 65 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, March 31, 1983, p. 9.
- 66 Ibid., p. 10.
- 67 Ibid., p. 11.
- 68 Ibid., p. 17. Three types of MOUs had been specified by the Joint A.I.D.-BIFAD Task Force: Type I - manpower-specific with a single university; Type II - general, no specific manpower commitments with a single university; and Type III - joint, manpower-specific involving a large experienced university and a smaller institution. No Type II MOUs were negotiated. See further, "Report of a Committee of the Joint A.I.D.-BIFAD Task Force on MOUs to the Board," July 19, 1984, 7 p.
- 69 Ibid., pp. 12 and 20.
- 70 Ibid., p. 22.
- 71 Ibid., p. 23.
- 72 Ibid., p. 24.
- 73 Ibid., pp. 25-30.
- 74 A.I.D., Remarks of A.I.D. Administrator M. Peter McPherson to the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, Washington, D.C., April 15, 1983, p. 5. See also BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 2, 1983, pp. 102-114.
- 75 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 7, 1984, pp. 9-32.

BIFAD Support Staff Uses Incentives Study Report (pp. 18-20)

- 76 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, May 28, 1981, pp. 54-55.
- 77 BIFAD, "Report of Internal Staff Work Group on BIFAD Recommendations for Improving University Support of AID Programs." Presented to BIFAD and AID and the fortieth meeting of the BIFAD, December 5, 1980, pp. 18-19.
- 78 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, May 28, 1981, pp. 55-81.
- 79 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, March 25, 1982, pp. 55-70.
- 80 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 2, 1983, pp. 115-131.
- 81 BIFAD, "BIFAD Staff Recommendations on Incentives Study," April 28, 1983, 7 p.
- 82 Ibid., pp. 2-4.
- 83 Ibid., pp. 4-5.
- 84 Ibid., pp. 5-6.
- 85 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 2, 1983, p. 131.

Special Attention Is Given To The "Matching" Process (pp. 20-22)

- 86 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, June 2, 1983, p. 78.
- 87 Ibid., pp. 78-88.
- 88 Ibid., pp. 88-101.
- 89 BIFAD, Transcript of meeting, December 2, 1983, pp. 15 and 41.
- 90 Ibid., p. 16.
- 91 Ibid., pp. 16-41.

- 109 Interview with Michelle Rucker, February 1986.
- 110 U.S. General Accounting Office, "Foreign Aid: Issues Concerning U.S. University Participation," April 1989, p. 32.
- 111 Interview with Randall Hoffmann, BIFAD Staff member, who is responsible for BIFAD's information systems.
- 112 Ibid.

Three Lists Become One Directory (p. 26)

- 113 BIFAD, "Criteria and Procedure for Compiling the Roster of Universities for Participation in Title XII Programs," March 27, 1978, revised July 1981, 28 p.