WASHINGTON
STATE
UNIVERSITY

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND THE U.S.

James B. Henson, Director
Jan C. Noel, Associate Director

INTERNATIONAL
PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE

OCCASIONAL PAPER

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND THE U.S.

James B. Henson, Director
Jan C. Noel, Associate Director

International Program Development Office
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164-1034

Occasional Paper #5

DEC. 1989

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF U.S. UNIVERSITIES AND PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES AND THE U.S.*

James B. Henson and Jan C. Noel
International Program Development Office
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

Summary

U.S. universities have and will likely continue to be participants in the delivery of U.S. development assistance. The focus, priorities, approaches, and organization of U.S. development assistance including participation by universities are being examined. This is occuring at the same time that the internationalization of universities is receiving a great deal of attention. Information presented in this paper indicates that participation in development assistance and internationalization of universities are related and can be synergistic with potential benefits for both the developing countries and the universities.

The internationalization of university programs is being emphasized because the incorporation of international content, materials, and perspectives are needed to strengthen the relevance of university programs in an increasingly inter-dependent world. In one survey of 159 universities, 98.1% indicated that global issues, problems and/or opportunities will be more important for the society they serve and ninety-nine percent (99%) indicated that the level of university international programs and activities will increase over the next 10-20 years.

*Supported in part by Washington State University; the Office of Technology Assessment, the U.S. Congress; and the U.S. Agency for International Development Contract No. DAN-1406-G-SS-9092. The content and opinions expressed are solely those of the authors.

A number of factors including faculty interest and commitment, supportive departmental environment, provision of resources and support by the central administration among others are very important in promoting and supporting internationalization. Universities indicated they had received a number of benefits from participation in development assistance with faculty experience and exposure being the benefit selected most frequently. Furthermore, universities indicated that faculty experience and exposure was the most important of a number of potential benefits they wished to achieve from participation in development assistance. It appears that professional related faculty experiences in a foreign setting promotes faculty interest in and commitment to internationalization and to participation in development assistance. Perception of actual and/or potential benefits from internationalization and from participation in development assistance will promote both and will encourage the commitment of university resources to them. "Internationalized" departments, colleges, and universities are more likely to preceive benefits from participation in development assistance and to be interested in establishing and maintaining long-term relationships with developing country institutions and their faculty and staffs.

U.S. universities represent significant and unique resources that can assist the developing countries. Needs, priorities, approaches and opportunities for the delivery of development assistance by the U.S. appear to match closely the capabilities of universities. The degree of internationalization of university programs and faculty, actual and perceived benefits to the universities, and the provision of resources and opportunities for participation will influence university contributions. Perhaps, universities should be more involved, not less. Approaches for university involvement should be carefully examined and structured to increase effectiveness taking into account lessons learned over the last decade. Investments in university participation in development assistance will benefit the developing countries, the U.S., and the universities and the clientele they serve. University participation should be viewed within a global, institutional context. Opportunities for dual benefits--benefits to the U.S. and the developing countries--have never been better.

INTRODUCTION

U.S. universities are inextricably involved in U.S. development assistance. Through their doors pass the planners and implementers of U.S. foreign policy. The foreign students they educate today are tomorrow's foreign leaders, colleagues, consumers and competitors. Universities generate, test and extend technologies and information in use world-wide. Thus, there can be no questions of whether or not universities have a role in development assistance, but rather whether that role is active or passive, strategic or by default.

The organization, priorities, and approaches for the delivery of development assistance by the U.S. Government are undergoing examination for potential change (BIFAD, 1988; Hamilton, L., 1988; Lele, U., 1988; Mellors, 1988; Mellors, 1989; Smuckler, R., Berg, R. and Gordon, D., 1988; and Woods, 1989). Related topics under discussion include who should participate and mechanisms for managing the participation of the multiple potential actors in U.S. development assistance efforts, what should be the focus of such activities and what are this country's comparative advantages in relation to other donors and developing country needs. A part of these discussions and deliberations is the role of universities in the delivery of development assistance by the U.S.

These discussions come at a time when the internationalization (globalization) of U.S. universities is receiving a great deal of attention (Groennings, S., 1987; Lambert, R., 1989; and Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c; Noel, J. and Henson, J., 1989). There are many who feel that the internationalization of U.S. education, especially higher education, is essential. Participation in development assistance activities has in the past and can continue to promote internationalization of university faculty and programs, which in turn will strengthen the ability of universities to participate in the delivery of development assistance. Investments in the internationalization of U.S. universities can have multiple, inter-related benefits to domestic programs and to assistance to the developing countries.

There are many indicators that development needs, opportunities, and environments are changing (BIFAD, 1988; Eicher, C., 1988; Koezuka, T, 1989; Lele, U., 1988; Mellors, 1988; Mellors, 1989; Pickering, D., 1987; Smuckler, R., Berg, R. and Gordon, D., 1988; Woods, 1989; Von der, Osten, 1987; and World Bank, 1987). The inter-relatedness of the world's social and economic systems is increasingly evident. The oil crisis; the October 1987, U.S. stock market crash with the ripple effects around the world; the debt status of the U.S. and many developing countries; the social and political upheavals in the Soviet Union and the Eastern Block countries; and the global nature of many environmental problems are examples. Some of the developing countries have progressed to become newly industrialized. Others are making some progress; while the economies of other countries, especially in Africa, remain stagnated or are still declining despite significant development assistant investments. Donors are examining strategies and approaches for assisting developing countries (BIFAD, 1988; Pickering, D., 1987; World Bank, 1987; and Koezuka, T., 1989). The U.S. can no longer claim to be the country which provides the most development assistance; Japan has replaced the U.S. for this role. Within the context of changing development assistance requirements and environments, an examination of the role, priorities, and approaches for development assistance make it opportune and perhaps essential to re-examine the role U.S. universities can play as participants in the delivery of development assistance.

This paper will: (1) examine the role of U.S. universities in development assistance in relation to implications for the developing countries, the U.S. and universities; (2) address university development assistance participation from the standpoint of the internationalization of the universities; and (3) consider mutual benefits to developing countries and to the U.S. from such internationalization. We suggest the degree of internationalization of the university will significantly influence the interest, commitment, and potential contributions of universities to development assistance. We propose that long-term relationships between universities and developing country institutions can result in mutual benefits for both and that the establishment and maintenance of long-term relationships will depend upon external funding sources, such as AID, as well as the mobilization and utilization of university resources. The latter will

depend upon the recognition of actual and potential benefits from participation by the universities and their programs. Participation in development assistance activities has in the past and can in the future influence internationalization of universities, which in turn can impact a broad spectrum of U.S. based programs and activities. Investment in the internationalization of U.S. higher education can pay dividends to the U.S. and to the developing countries.

We suggest that both AID and universities must learn from past experiences in the delivery of and participation in development assistance and develop a new approach for the involvement of universities. Such involvement must build upon sustainability of relationships and the complementarity of programs and interests, mutual benefits, and the mobilization and availability of university and non-university resources. Fundamental to this approach is the recognition that international content, materials, activities, and understandings are and should be an integral part of everything that universities do.

UNIVERSITY ROLE AND PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

HISTORIC PERSPECTIVE

Beginning in the 1950's, universities entered into development assistance contracts with the Foreign Operations Administration, the International Cooperation Administration, and, since 1961, the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID). In 1960 the Committee on the University and World Affairs indicated that American universities could play a major role in world affairs including providing technical assistance to the developing countries (Burn, B., 1980).

From that time until the present, U.S. universities have been active participants in development assistance activities by the U.S. Government. The degree of participation was enhanced by the passage of Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1975 designed to foster collaborative relationships between American agricultural colleges and universities and

developing countries. Title XII called for the establishment of a Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) and supportive committees. This organization remains essentially intact today.

The Title XII legislation envisioned an expanding role for universities as they worked in partnership with AID in addressing the alleviation of poverty and world hunger. It provided for certain projects designated as Title XII projects to be "set-aside" and available only to the Title XII universities. It also promoted a closer relationship between the AID and universities for joint planning followed by implementation of development assistance projects by the planners--the collaborative assistance mode. During the years following the enactment of Title XII, universities were heavily involved in the implementation of technical assistance projects, reaching a peak in 1982. Since 1982, the number of new Title XII projects started each year has declined by more than one-half (GAO, 1989). Present projections indicate that by the end of fiscal year 1990, about 75% of the 142 on-going Title XII projects will have terminated. According to the General Accounting Office, (GAO, 1989) reasons for the decline include the decrease in USAID's agricultural development budget; fewer institution-building projects; new priorities adopted by Congress and the AID; and reluctance on the part of AID personnel to designate projects as Title XII. Joint ventures by universities with private firms, private voluntary organizations (PVOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and others have occurred. Universities have also successfully competed for development assistance contracts that are not agriculturally related and are not designated Title XII. Thus, university participation in Title XII is only one aspect of university assistance to developing countries and to the U.S. Government.

RATIONALE

The rationale for the participation of universities is multi-faceted. It is based in part upon the assumption that they have a ready available pool of well-trained and experienced faculty that can provide expertise needed by the developing countries and the U.S. Government. In terms of Title XII, the perceived domestic success and contributions of the

Land-Grant universities to U.S. development and the potential for such a model to contribute to agricultural and rural development in the developing countries was a dominant consideration. In a survey of 17 Title XII institutions, the universities perceive their comparative advantages for participation in development assistance to be in "... long-term projects that are concerned with educating students, conducting research, and developing institutions" (Miner, R., 1988: 3-4). Universities can provide technical assistance in a variety of disciplines and subject matter areas, can assist in building institutions and in developing training, research and technology transfer programs, and can provide institutional support and resources unavailable from any other source. One author states, "Capacity building (training, institution building, manpower development) is the comparative advantage of AID as a development assistance donor in the LDCs (the Indian Experience). U.S. universities should continue to play a major role in the effort" (Lele, U., 1989).

Many in AID agree with the above as the rationale for university participation, but indicate dissatisfaction with the commitment and performance of universities. The former apparently relates primarily to the provision of tenured faculty (Apple, J., Meiman, J. and Popenoi, H., 1987; Miner, W., 1988; GAO, 1989).

CURRENT TRENDS AND APPROACHES IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Strategies and approaches for development assistance by donors are being examined (BIFAD, 1988; Hamilton, L., 1988; Koezuka, T., 1989; World Bank, 1987). This is especially true in the U.S. where decreasing amounts of resources are available for development assistance; increasing earmarking occurs; development assistance expenditures are dominated by a few selected countries; the desires of PVOs, NGOs, and others to play a more active role are increasing; and dissatisfaction with the performance of AID is evident. Political input is being mobilized by many to address specific objectives and self-interests. Congress is questioning the organization and effectiveness of U.S. development assistance programs and AID's ability to effectively implement them (Hamilton, L., 1989). Legislation is being considered that could significantly alter AID and the process for providing development assistance

including the role of universities and Title XII. A number of conferences and publications have suggested alternative priorities and approaches for development assistance by the U.S. (BIFAD, 1988; Eicher, C., 1988; Mellors, J., 1988, 1989; Smuckler, R., Berg, R., and Gordon, D., 1988; Woods, A., 1989).

Some writers have suggested that the major thrust of U.S. development assistance activities should focus on cooperation, i.e. cooperative working relationships with developing countries that can result in mutual benefits over the long term (Smuckler, R., Berg, R., and Gordon, D., 1988). Urgent issues that need to be addressed include the Third World debt; the need for development of agriculture in Africa; the deteriorating global environment; the sustainability of natural resources; population; urban development; and others (Smuckler, R., Berg, R. and Gordon, D., 1988). A need for a re-organization of how the U.S. provides development assistance and a separation of development assistance from military assistance accounts have been suggested. Some writers emphasize the need for institutional development, especially in Africa (Eicher, C., 1988; Lele, U., 1988; Mellors, 1988, 1989; and Smuckler, R., Berg, R. and Gordon, D., 1988). Some state that long-term, well focused relationships between U.S. universities and developing country universities and other institutions can provide significant benefits to both and can assist in the establishment and sustainability of developing country institutions (Eicher, C., 1988; Mellors, J., 1988, 1989; Smuckler, R., Berg, R. and Gordon, D., 1988; Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989b).

UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION AND EFFECTIVENESS IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION

The U.S. General Accounting Office recently issued a report on "Issues Concerning U.S. University Participation in Foreign Aid" (GAO, 1989). The report indicates that after 1975, when the Title XII legislation was enacted, the number of new Title XII contracts and grants for technical assistance grew, peaked in 1982, and has declined since that time. The number of Title XII projects and contracts being implemented was 137 in 1982 and has

remained relatively stable (142 in 1989). The number and dollar value of new projects initiated annually has declined since 1982, and the level of active projects and the number of universities involved, though higher than in 1981, may significantly decline by the end of fiscal 1990 as the majority of active projects terminate. The number of new Title XII projects increased from about 14 in 1976 to 42 in 1982. Since reaching 42 new project starts, new starts have declined to a low of 14 in fiscal 1987 and an estimated 8 new projects in fiscal 1988. The dollar volume of Title XII technical assistance contracts and agreements also grew until 1982, but with a decreasing number of new projects, the volume has declined 74%. In 1981, over $227 million was awarded through Title XII projects, whereas in 1982, less than $50 million was awarded. The data indicates that almost 75% of the currently active projects (106) will terminate by the end of fiscal 1990. The information also indicates that the number of universities implementing Title XII projects will decline as the number of active projects decreases. In 1981, 55 universities were involved in Title XII projects. As of July 1988, 72 universities were participating in Title XII contracts or cooperative agreements. The GAO (1989) estimates that the number may drop to 35 universities after fiscal year 1990. These figures do not take into account university participation in non-Title XII set aside projects and contracts.

Under Title XII, resources have been provided to universities for strengthening their capabilities to participate in development assistance. Fifty-seven universities were awarded Strengthening Grants. Later, some of these were converted to Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with 29 universities currently implementing MOUs (5 universities have single MOUs and 24 have joint MOUs). In addition, 8 universities have matching support grants (Bittner, G., 1989). All require the universities to match AID funds dollar for dollar with university funds. Thus, USAID resources have in the past and continue to be provided to U.S. universities to strengthen their ability to participate in development assistance in support of ongoing, foreseeable or anticipated projects. Universities provide resources (match) when they participate in some AID contracts and agreements with MOUs and CRSPs being examples.

EFFECTIVENESS OF UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION

Since the enactment of the Title XII legislation and the greater participation of U.S. universities, many opinions have been expressed concerning the effectiveness of university activities, but little data is available to support such opinions. These have ranged from very positive in support of university participation to very negative. Similar examinations of private firm participation and the effectiveness of the AID side of the partnership have apparently not occurred. There are varying opinions within AID as well as in the university community concerning effectiveness of university efforts. The GAO has issued two reports, one in 1981 and the other in 1989 related to university participation in development assistance as defined under Title XII. Also, in 1986 then Administrator McPherson initiated the collection of information from USAID missions and universities concerning the effectiveness of university participation. The responses (39 from missions and 17 from universities) were further examined by a small group of university representatives (Apple, L., Papenoe, H. and Meiman, J., 1987) and BIFAD staff (Miner, W., 1988) and reports prepared and disseminated. Generally, the concern of those in the AID focus on what is perceived to be a lack of commitment for the provision of high quality, tenure track faculty for long-term assignments and the failure of faculty to understand and effectively implement development assistance activities.

AID officials indicated that most universities are not willing or able to assign faculty to long-term overseas assignments, and faculty do not want to stay overseas for more than two years. Missions indicate that universities too often offer staff who are at either very early or late stages of their careers and who are, therefore, expendable. The university responses were generally that the quality of the person to meet the specific needs should be the primary consideration, not whether the person has tenure, and that AID procurement and administrative policies and practices, especially what are perceived to be conflicting contracting procedures, and personnel turnovers frustrate universities and the effective use of their available resources. Frequent priority changes and emphasis on short-term success rather than the development of long-term capacity also negatively impact the optimal utilization of universities. Universities also suggest that AID has not effectively utilized the range of available institutional resources.

They perceive one of the advantages of universities to be the existence of established, long-lasting institutions with a braod range of capabilities that are contributing significant amounts of their own resources to development assistance.

In the opinion of both the universities and the AID, the universities represent an important pool of expertise that, if appropriately oriented, committed and utilized, can contribute significantly to development assistance. One writer states "the major challenge is to blend the universities long-term time horizon with AID's comparatively short-term needs" (Miner, W., 1988: 17). Also, the degree of uncertainty regarding frequency and timing of faculty participation with resultant inability to plan and program faculty time and availability and the frustrations of dealing with the AID bureaucracy negatively influence university participation and has heightened university and AID tensions. After years of working together, there still seems to be a lack of agreement about how to most effectively utilize university capabilities.

Education and the development and operation of teaching, research, extension, and technology transfer programs are what U.S. universities do. They are uniquently qualified to assist developing country institutions which carry out these functions. Agriculture, while an important field for development, is but one of many in which universities can contribute. In the following sections it will be proposed that the universities' interest, commitment, and participation in development assistance will require new approaches that will build upon and contribute to the internationalization of universities and their programs. Emphasis should be on the establishment and implementation of long-term, mutually beneficial relationships between developing country universities and other research, teaching and technology transfer institutions and programs and U.S. universities in appropriate disciplinary and program areas. This will likely feature multiple, short-term visits by university faculty to developing countries and less long-term assignments as has been the case in years past. The widely differing AID and university agendas must be brought together and can be synergistic.

INTERNATIONALIZATION OF U.S. UNIVERSITIES

There appears to be a direct relationship between the degree of internationalization of universities and their interest and participation in development assistance. Participation in development assistance has and continues to impact in positive ways university program internationalization. This "benefit" from development assistance participation has frequently not been well recognized and quantified, and will be addressed in the following sections.

The need for internationalization of U.S. education has been recognized for years with much of the emphasis focused on "international education" mainly encompassing exchange programs, study abroad, foreign language training, foreign students' support, faculty and student exchanges, and related activities. Little attention has been focused on the role development assistance has and can play in the internationalization of higher education. In recent years, renewed emphasis is being placed on program internationalization by many universities. Results of a study currently underway by the authors on the "Internationalization of U.S. Universities--Why, What, and How" have supplied new data on the extent and nature of the internationalization of U.S. universities (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c). This study collected data from 159 universities and a number of case studies emphasizing strategic approaches to strengthen university programs by internationalization. This data, combined with other previous research, some conducted jointly with the International Development Management Center of the University of Maryland, and experiences in the planning, implementation and evaluation of technical assistance projects funded by AID and other donors will form the basis for the folloiwng discussions (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1988; Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989a,b,c; Noel, J. and Henson, J., 1989).

DEFINITION AND RATIONALE FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION

In this presentation, a general definition of internationalization will be used. It is the incorporation of international-related contents, materials, activities and understandings into the teaching, research, cooperative extension and public service functions of the university. The

definition assumes that appropriate international content, materials, activities and understandings should be an intrinsic part of all university programs.

The rationale for the internationalization of U.S. universities has been articulated by many and includes strengthening the relevance of university programs in an ever increasingly interdependent world (Groennings, S., 1987; Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1988; Henson, J. and Noel, 1989a,b,; Lambert, R., 1989; Smith, S., 1987; and Yates, 1984). The U.S. trade deficit and the competitiveness of U.S. products in the global market place have caught the attention of many in both the public and private sectors. It is estimated that 40% of American farm products are exported and nearly 75% of all American-made goods face foreign competition. Also, figures indicate the U.S. has been losing its market share in 8 of the 10 largest technology-intensive manufacturing industries. A number of studies have suggested that "our comparative advantage in the global economy is based upon innovative productivity, technical skills, and high levels of knowledge" (Groennings, S., 1987). The U.S. comparative advantage in world markets will be information and technology driven. These studies further point out that only 5% of Japanese technical literature is translated into English and during the 80's there have been 15 Japanese students studying in the U.S. for every U.S. student studying in Japan. As a further example of the swing in technology generation from the U.S. to other countries, it is now estimated that only 8% of the world's agricultural researchers are in the U.S. In 1987, of the 20 companies granted the largest number of U.S. patents, 9 were non-U.S. with 7 of the 9 being Japanese. Toshiba was granted the largest number of U.S. patents by any U.S. or non-U.S. company Thus, access to technology from around the world and its adaptation to U.S. needs and opportunities is an important consideration.

Examination of the status of U.S. education, both K-12 and universities, indicates a lack of understanding and knowledge about world, especially non-western cultures, economies, political systems and environments. This is exemplified by the fact that only 1% of elementary school students in the U.S. are taught a foreign language and U.S. teenagers scored next to last when their knowledge of geography and other cultures were compared to similar groups from 9 other countries. Three of every five U.S. university graduates will work directly in

international trade or for a company that indirectly does so and the number is increasing. Environmental issues as exemplified by ozone layer depletion and "the greenhouse effect" are also promoting a need for global collaboration and understanding. Social and ethical questions and challenges are also evident with profound changes in the relationships of nations and political systems occurring rapidly.

STATUS OF INTERNATIONALIZATION

Several recent studies have been conducted or are in progress on the internationalization of U.S. universities (Groennings, S., 1987; Lambert, R., 1989; Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c). All of these indicate that most universities have recently or are currently undertaking some kind of activity to address the internationalization issue. These include examination and/or changes in curricula; changes in organizational structure; development of strategies and plans for internationalization; exploring methods for strengthening research programs by the incorporation of international thrusts or components; strengthening foreign language training; and others.

In one study on the internationalization of U.S. universities (Henson, J. B. and Noel, J. C., 1989c), data was collected from 159 primarily research universities (those that give a doctorate). The 159 universities classified themselves as follows: 57 public Land-Grant; 54 public non-Land-Grant; 38 private; and 10 Historic Black Colleges and Universities. All universities did not respond to all questions in the questionnaire which was sent directly to university presidents. The latter determined the representative(s) at his/her institution who provided the information. The following indicates the status of internationalization including participation in development assistance.

In the survey 98.1% of the university respondents indicated that global issues, problems and/or opportunities will be more important to the parts of society they serve over the next 10-20 years than at present. Ninety-nine percent indicated that the level of international programs and activities by their university will increase over the next 10-20 years. Only 1 university out

of 153 indicated that the level of international activities would stay the same or decrease. When asked to indicate the level of commitment their university had established for internationalization, 45% of the responders indicated very high or high degree of commitment, while 41% indicated moderate and 13% low and 1% no degree of commitment to internationalization. When asked whether the university had conducted any type of review, study or planning activities directed toward evaluating, strengthening or increasing the international content and dimensions of university programs, 79% indicated they had. Furthermore, when asked whether any recommendations for increasing or strengthening international activities had been implemented, 84% indicated implementation had occurred.

Most universities indicated they utilize university funds for internationalizing a broad spectrum of activities such as teaching, research, libraries, area studies, faculty travel grants, foreign student services, etc. while a majority also utilize federal and private foundation funds for international related teaching, research, and faculty travel grants. Private non-foundation donations are used for international related research activities by a slight majority of universities. Fifty-four percent (54%) of universities have separate identifiable budgets or sources of funds for international related activities, with 81% indicated procedures were in place for individual or groups of faculty to request funds. Forty-two percent (42%) of the responding universities indicated they utilize university resources to support participation in development assistance activities. It seems likely that a significant number of these universities participate in MOUs, Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs), or other AID related activities.

One author (Groennings, S, 1987) summarized his perceptions of the internationalization of universities in the northeastern states by stating, "Phenomenally, there is a change along the international dimension at every one of the institutions included in this study (of 40 universities), whether it be public or private, large or small. Viewed as a whole, this change is profound. The evidence strongly suggests that internationalization, which is based on a new understanding of what is relevant, is becoming one of the most powerful substantive development in the history of American higher education. Internationalization is so strong a

development that the closest parallel may be the scientific revolution. Each represents a permanent redirection of the intellectual framework and pervades virtually the full range of academic fields. Like the early scientific revolution, internationalization lacks orderly process or agreed-upon definition, yet is similarly moving along a massive front".

Our research findings (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c, Noel, J. and Henson, J., 1989) result in the following additional perceptions about international activities by universities:

- International is still viewed by many in the university community as something separate and distinct from domestic activities, i.e. not an integral part of all university programs;
- Many international activities are isolated and uncoordinated and are frequently not considered an integral part of students' academic programs;
- Development assistance activities are usually managed and administered separately from other international activities and usually are not coordinated with them;
- In some universities, and especially colleges of agriculture, international activities are generally considered to mean participation in development assistance which in turn means faculty serving long-term assignments overseas which negatively impact domestic programs;
- Activities associated with participation in development assistance are frequently thought <u>not</u> to be "intellectual" and not to be very relevant to U.S. based programs and activities; and
- Many universities lack a strategic approach and/or plan for internationalization which takes into account the various potential contributors to internationalization including participation in development assistance.

FACTORS INFLUENCING INTERNATIONALIZATION

A number of factors appear to be influencing the interest in and stimulating activities directed to the internationalization of universities. Each individual institution is unique and varies in terms of which of the factors given below or others are most important. These factors include, among others, the following:

- Economics and economic competitiveness and the role of universities in enhancing such competitiveness;
- Reports at the national, regional, and state levels which indicate a significant lack of knowledge about different countries, cultures, economic and political systems, and other international related topics by students (both university and K-12) and other citizens;
- The incorporation of international requirements into accreditation standards by college accreditation boards and organizations;
- Increased interest on the part of academic administrators, faculty, and students in internationalization;
- Interest in and/or demand by legislators, boards of regents, clientele groups and others for the incorporation of international-related materials, content, and activities into university programs to serve various clientele;
- Desire on the part of faculty and students to assist others less fortunate in the world (humanitarian concerns);
- Perceived need and priority for internationalization of disciplines and programs by faculty and administrators;
- Availability of non-university funds for internationalization (Title XII, Title VI, etc.); and
- Growing awareness of the global inter-relatedness of environmental, economic, population, food, ethical, political, and other topics directly relevant to individual U.S. citizens, states, and the nation and of the intellectual challenges and stimulations posed by them.

What to internationalize and how to carry out the internationalization processes are questions being asked by university administrators and other decision makers. Respondents in our study (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c) indicate that faculty, departments, funds and support by the central administration are very important in promoting and supporting internationalization. Faculty are especially important and determine the makeup of university curricula and other programs, conduct research, train students, provide expertise for development assistance, and interact with developing country colleagues and institutions.

The following have been determined to be important for the promotion of university internationalization:

1. The gaining of international experiences, exposure, and foreign language capabilities by faculty, especially professionally challenging experiences in a foreign setting;
2. Departmental environments that promote and support the understanding of and participation in international activities by faculty and the internationalization of programs;
3. Provision of resources for international related activities;
4. Central administrations and university environments that recognize and are supportive of international activities, materials, content, and understandings as intrinsic components of university programs and activities and of faculty participation;
5. Development and implementation of strategies, procedures, and plans that explicitly incorporate internationalization into the university planning and resource allocation processes;
6. Organization of the university that promotes internationalization, provides input about internationalization into university decision-making processes, and emphasizes university-wide participation;
7. Functional and operational procedures that promote and reward international-

related activities by faculty, departments, and colleges; and

8. The provision of long-term leadership for internationalization at a reasonable high administrative level.

When asked to indicate the importance of a number of potential factors to assist in establishing, strengthening, and/or operating international activities on university campuses, the following percentages of respondents indicated the given factor is very important as opposed to somewhat important, somewhat unimportant, very unimportant, and don't know. The number of respondents varied from 156 to 159. Only those factors selected as very important by 50% or more of the respondents are given below:

• Faculty interest and support	94%
• Funds	93%
• Support of central administration	91%
• Departmental support	74%
• Faculty incentives and rewards	67%
• Department chair support	66%
• Strategic plan	60%
• Departmental incentives and rewards	56%

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERNATIONALIZATION AND PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

There appears to be a direct synergistic relationship between the level of university internationalization and participation in development assistance by the universities (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c; Noel, J. and Henson, J., 1989). As indicated in the previous section, faculty experience and exposure, especially the conduct of a professional activity in a foreign country context, is an important factor in influencing the interest and international orientation of faculty. This was also emphasized in a study of Perez and Rogers (1984) which determined that the most important factors influencing faculty interest in participating in short-

and long-term development assistance activities were previous overseas experience and capabilities in a second language.

In one study on internationalization of universities (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c), 77 of the 154 responding universities (50%) indicated that their universities had in the past or were currently implementing development assistance projects. Although the data has not yet been sufficiently analyzed to determine the type of universities participating, it seems likely that the number will be dominated by land-grant universities and those that have received AID strengthening grant and MOU funding. When asked to indicate the dollar volume of business from development assistance participation for 1987-1988, 47.4% indicated $1 million or less, 11.5% between $1-2 million, and 28.2% indicated a dollar volume of business of more than $2 million. When asked whether donor funded development assistance activities were administered separately from study abroad, student exchanges, and other "international education" activities, 102 of 155 (65.8%) responding universities indicated that they were administered separately. In most land-grant universities, development assistance and related Title XII activities are administered in colleges of agriculture and involve other colleges minimally (Henson, J. B. and Noel, J. C., 1989c). Also, when respondents to our survey were asked to indicate the level of priority placed on participation in donor funded development assistance by the upper administration and by departments and faculty, 73 of 158 (46.2%) indicated a moderate to high priority by administrators and 48 of 155 (37.5%) indicate a moderate to high priority by departments and faculty.

When asked to rank which of 9 possible benefits from participation in donor funded development assistance had been realized by their university as a result of participation in development assistance, the following were listed by the indicated percentages of 74-82 universities responding:

- Faculty experience and exposure 89.0%
- Assistance to developing countries 87.7%
- Information useful to teaching 86.4%

- Information useful to research 84.0%
- Source of foreign students 82.1%
- Increased source of funds 76.5%
- Student experience and exposure 74.1%
- Information applicable to public service 59.7%
- Information useful to cooperative extension 51.0%

When asked to rank the first, second, and third most important benefits their university wishes to achieve from its participation in donor funded development assistance from the list given above, responding universities ranked them as given in Table 1. As indicated in Table 1, the selection of the first, second, and third most important benefit by 75-78 responding universities varied greatly with faculty experience and exposure selected most frequently as the first (35.5%) and as the second (29.9%) most important benefit. Information useful to research was selected by the largest number of universities (21.3%) as the third most important benefit. Assistance to the developing countries was selected by a relatively large number of universities compared to other benefits (Table 1). Information useful to public service was selected by only two universities and information useful to cooperative extension was not selected by any university. That the responding universities selected faculty experience and exposure most frequently as the first and second most important is evidence of the emphasis placed on this benefit by universities, which was substantiated by personal interviews during the conduct of case studies. Sixty-four (64) responding universities indicated their university had provided a mean of 14.27 permanent faculty to serve on donor funded development assistance projects during the last year. Records from the Office of Research and University Relations of the Bureau of Science and Technology of AID indicate the 29 universities with MOUs with AID have provided an average of 192 full-time faculty equivalents each of the last five years (Bittner, G., 1989).

Example benefits from long-term relationships for universities and for developing country instituitons have been indicated (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989b) and are summarized below.

Table 1. Ranking of Benefits Universities Wish to Receive from Participation in Development Assistance Activities

	First Most Important (78 Responses)	Second Most Important (77 Responses)	Third Most Important (75 Responses)
Faculty Experience and Exposure	38.5%* (30)**	29.9% (23)	10.7% (8)
Assistance to Developing Countries	16.7% (13)	13.0% (10)	18.7% (14)
Information Useful to Teaching	7.7% (6)	22.1% (17)	9.3% (7)
Information Useful to Research	16.7% (13)	11.7% (9)	21.3% (16)
Source of Foreign Students	2.6% (2)	1.3% (1)	6.7% (5)
Increase Source of Funds	11.0% (9)	11.7% (9)	13.3% (10)
Student Experience and Exposure	6.4% (5)	7.8% (6)	16.0% (12)
Information Applicable to Public Service	0.0% (0)	2.6% (2)	2.7% (2)
Information Useful to Coop. Ext.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)
Other	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.3% (1)

* Percentage of respondents
**Number of respondents

For the developing country institutions:

1. Assistance for developing and strengthening institutional programs and human resources;
2. Promote relationships between institutions and individuals that stimulate interest and long-term commitment and promote sustainability;
3. Provide opportunities for training and professional enhancement for faculty and staff;
4. Serve as a source of information, technology, and access to equipment and expertise and facilities that might not otherwise be readily available and provide access to a broad spectrum of institutional resources and capabilities resident in the U.S. universities;
5. Assist in creating a "critical mass" of scientists and disciplinary expertise that might be lacking, at least in the early evolutionary stages of an institution;
6. Provide scientific stimulation and encouragement as colleagues and peers;
7. Assist in developing strategies, approaches, plans, and provide models for institutional development, strengthening and/or change in response to changing conditions internal and external to the institution;
8. Carry out collaborative research, teaching and other activities;
9. Provide potential source of additional resources; and
10. Assist the developing country institutions to develop and maintain political support.

Benefits to U.S. universities and their faculties are similar and include as examples the following:

1. Opportunities for professional and personal faculty experiences and development;
2. Source of extra-mural funds;
3. Conduct of collaborative research and other activities that provide access to germplasm, predators, agents, field conditions, environments, materials and

technologies not available in the U.S. and useful to U.S. based programs and activities;

4. Participation in student exchanges and internships and in faculty exchanges;
5. Provision of opportunities to enhance experiences and understandings about non-western cultures, economies, environments and political systems;
6. Promote potential market development and understandings about multiple economic and other parameters related to marketing and economic competitiveness;
7. Access to a variety of information and data useful to clientele and programs; and
8. Promotion and support of internationalization of university programs.

As a part of our study (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c), we have conducted case studies in which deans or associate deans of colleges were interviewed to obtain information about a number of topics including impact from participation in AID funded development assistance on their colleges. A total of 58 Deans or Associate Deans from a spectrum of disciplines (agriculture, engineering, business, arts and humanities, science, communications, and others) have been interviewed. The following are subjective impressions gained from these interviews related to impact of development assistance participation on the internationalization of college programs. The responses indicated that participation in development assistance by colleges have influenced faculty and college programs, sometimes to a significant degree. Faculty experiences gained by such participation have resulted in heightened faculty interest and understandings about other countries, cultures, and professional related topics and promoted the incorporation of international materials into courses, reorientation of research and strengthened faculty support for foreign student training and other changes. In some cases when contract activities declined or ceased with associated decline in faculty opportunities for foreign experience and exposure and the number of faculty with international experiences in a given college declined due to resignation, retirements, and other influences, the impetus for the incorporation of international content and material into programs decreased. One college representative indicated that the administration and faculty of his

College had recognized the above impact on college programs from development assistance participation and responded by initiating a vigorous effect to obtain opportunities for faculty to serve overseas on development and other projects to gain faculty experience at "someone else's expense". These observations suggest the internationalization process at this stage of its evolution at many universities is dynamic and iterative, is faculty dependent and requires continued stimulation and support. That participation in development assistance by faculty can play an important role was strongly suggested. However, there were colleges that had participated in donor-funded development assistance activities that seemed to have benefitted minimally with little impact on college programs. It is also evident from these and other observations that an explicit plan or approach to capture and utilize faculty experiences to further internationalize programs is worthwhile (Noel, J. and Henson, J., 1989).

As indicated previously, one of the criticisms of universities by AID is the inability to provide tenure track faculty to serve on short- and long-term overseas assignments. Factors influencing the willingness of faculty members in college of agriculture to accept international assignment were studied previously by Perez and Rogers (1984). This study of 886 faculty indicated that two of the most important predicators of willingness to serve overseas were previous overseas experience and capability in a foreign language. Utilizing the data developed by Perez and Rogers (1984) and other research conducted at Washington State University, Henson (1984) described constraints and potential approaches for enhancing faculty participating in international overseas projects. It was suggested that previous overseas experience by faculty and a supportive departmental environment and chairperson were important promoters of faculty interest and potential participation. Similarly, previous overseas experience by faculty promotes university internationalization. The data in Table 1 indicates that the responders to the questionnaire in our study rank faculty experience and exposure as one of the most important benefits and expectations from development assistance participation. All of these suggest that university efforts to promote internationalization of programs and participation in development assistance should emphasize the gaining of overseas foreign experience by faculty. Other factors are also important.

An important factor which influences both university internationalization and participation in development assistance is the realization of actual and/or perceived benefits by universities and their colleges, departments and faculty. The more internationalized a university becomes, the more benefits are perceived from participation in development assistance and other international related activities. This results in a greater likelihood of interest, commitment, rewards and support for international related efforts. The degree of internationalization will influence interest and participation in development assistance, which in turn promotes internationalization. The realization of actual and/or potential benefits can also significantly influence the mobilization and utilization of university resources to further enhance participation in development assistance and in internationalization of the university. Perceived benefits realized from development assistance participation and those benefits universities wish to achieve from participation in development assistance were given above. At the present time we are conducting studies to identify and quantify benefits to faculty and programs from development assistance participation.

It has been suggested that U.S. development assistance activities should emphasize a more collaborative relationship with developing countries stressing benefits (Smuckler, R., Berg, R. and Gordon, D., 1988). The success of the CRSPs have been cited as examples of such collaborative activities. It seems likely that until explicit benefits are recognized from participation in development assistance, that universities will only minimally commit their own resources to these endeavors. The establishment of mutually beneficial, long-term institution-to-institution relationships based upon collegial, faculty interactions in appropriate disciplinary and program areas can assist the developing countries. That such an approach emphasizing institutional development and strengthening should be a focus of U.S. development assistance strategy has been indicated by authors and donors (BIFAD, 1988; Eicher, C., Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1986; Lele, U., 1988; Mellors, J., 1988, 1989; Smuckler, R., Berg, R. and Gordon, D., 1988; Woods, Al., 1989; World Bank, 1987). This suggests that <u>universities should be more and not less involved in the delivery of U.S. development assistance</u>.

How to most effectively mobilize and utilize the spectrum of university capabilities is a challenge. Experiences gained over the last decade should assist in defining appropriate approaches and procedures. The universities have in the past and can in the future significantly contribute to the progress of development in the developing countries. In so doing, the universities and the public they serve will also gain.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ENHANCING UNIVERSITY PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

Examination of the literature, the studies indicated previously in this paper and experience of the authors and others lead us to draw the following conclusions and suggest some recommendations regarding university participation in development assistance and university relationships with AID or its replacement organization.

CONCLUSIONS

• U.S. universities represent very significant and unique resources that have in the past and can continue to assist the developing countries. University strengths are primarily in institution development and in training, research, and technology transfer programs, which also represent areas of need for developing countries in Africa and elsewhere (Eicher, C., 1988; Mellors, J. W., 1988; Smucker, R. N., Berg, R. J. and Gordon, R. F., 1988; Lele, U., 1988). Some have indicated these same areas represent the comparative advantages of AID as a development assistance donor (Lele, U., 1988). According to the records of the Bureau of Science and Technology/Research and University Relations of AID, the 29 universities that currently have MOUs with AID have provided an average of 192 full time fauclty equivalents for each of the last 5 years (1984-1988). In terms of number of faculty, the number would be considerably higher since an estimated one-quarter to one-third of the total equivalents are represented by short-term assignments.

• Little data is available on the impact of university participation in development assistance on developing countries. In some instances, the impact appears to have been significant, especially in institutional development activities. Data available is mostly in the form of individual project evaluations which frequently are short-term in perspective, do not address impact parameters, and are of limited value in determining the long-term impact of university participation on developing countries. There are a number of examples of long-term relationships between universities and developing country institutions that have been quite successful.

• Limited information available indicates the AID-university partnership envisioned in Title XII has developed severe stresses on the part of both parties. Some in AID are of the opinion that universities are not committed since they have not always provided experienced, well qualified, tenured faculty in needed disciplines within the time frame required by AID programs. Universities on the other hand are of the opinion that AID's procurement procedures, bureaucracy, short-term time horizons, unrealistic time frames and lack of understanding of universities prevent the optimal utilization of university capabilities. Universities appear to be increasingly frustrated by having to deal with a bewildering morass of AID bureaucracy which appears to penalize, not promote, university participation and the use of university resources in any focussed, long-term manner. A simplistic view of the basic differences between AID and the universities is their agendas and time frames are different. Universities traditionally have focused on domestic related activities and generally view these activities with a relatively long planning and implementation time frame, especially for faculty. University faculty have permanetnt full-time jobs and are not "on the street" actively seeking positions or they would not be faculty. This is in contrast to so called consulting firms which hire the majority of their staff "off the street" or tap the university faculty pool for temporary consulting services. One must also appreciate that some universities have performed well on some projects, while others have performed poorly on some projects. In the authors' experience the same is equally true for private consulting firms, PVOs, NGOs, and others involved in development assistance as well as the agency itself, but no comparative studies have been done.

• The status of university internationalization or globalization has and will perhaps even more in the future influence their interest, commitment, and effectiveness for participation in development assistance. The interest and commitment of universities are driven by real and perceived benefits to the universities, their programs and faculty. Universities that are globally oriented, outward-looking, and that promote and support the international character of the university as an integral part of the university programs are more likely to perceive benefits. The extent that relationships between developing country institutions and their scientists and faculty, and U.S. universities their faculty and programs benefit universities will greatly influence the mobilization and utilization of university resources in support of the relationships. The establishment and support of long-term, mutually beneficial relationships between developing country universities and other research, training and technology transfer institutions and U.S. universities will benefit both and can assist in the strengthening and sustainability of developing country institutions (Henson, J., and Noel, J., 1989b).

• University participation in development assistance has generally not been integrated into the university mainstream. Our study (Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c) indicates that development assistance activities are conducted in isolation from most other "international education" programs on 66% of the university campuses. That development assistance activities are generally not a part of academic programs per se is also evident. How to more effectively incorporate development assistance activities into academic programs remains unclear, but appears to be important to address.

• Participation in development assistance has had a significant and positive impact on the internationalization of some colleges in some universities, which in turn has influenced interest, commitment, and participation in development assistance. This represents dual benefits, benefits to the developing countries and benefits to the universities. Such dual benefits and the internationalization of universities have received little attention by researchers, donors or universities. Investment by the U.S. Government in U.S. universities by a variety

of programs such as Title XII, Title VI, and others in our view have had significant, but frequently unrecognized benefits, especially the broad impact of Title XII.

• Faculty international experience and exposure are key factors for the internationalization of universities and for participation in development assistance. That one of the primary expected benefits from university participation in development assistance is faculty experience and exposure is indicated by our studies on the internationalization of universities (Henson, J. and Noel, J. 1988; Henson, J. and Noel, J., 1989c).

• Faculty participation in development assistance activities has had negative connotations for some universities, and some colleges, especially colleges of agriculture. In the view of some, international means faculty serving long-term assignments overseas on short notice, which in turn negatively impacts domestic programs. In some instances, agricultural clientele commodity groups feel threatened by university efforts to assist in strengthening the capabilities of potential competitors in the developing countries. For many in the university community, international still connotates something separate and distinct from domestic programs with international not considered an integral and appropriate part of all university activities. This perception is changing and will likely continue to change as indicated by 98.1% of university responders in our study indicating that global issues will become more important to the clientele they serve over the next 10-20 years and 99.3% indicating that international related activities of their universities will increase over the next 10-20 years.

• The focus and organization of development assistance by the U.S. will likely change within the intermediate-term and should incorporate and perhaps even emphasize the capabilities and comparative advantages of the U.S. universities (Lele, U., 1989).

• In order to capitalize on university potentials for assisting the developing countries, development assistance activities by the U.S. must focus on the things universities do best within long-term time frames and emphasize mutual benefits. These are directly in line with the need for re-orientation of AID's development assistance priorities. Development assistance

activities must be viewed as being one component of inter-related multiple components positively impacting universities and their programs within a total university context of internationalization.

• It is further suggested that investments in universities under the aegis of Title XII have had benefits beyond the provision of university faculty for and the management and implementation of development assistance projects. It is not possible to accurately estimate the benefits from such investments, but they are likely considerable. There have also been negative impacts, primarily resulting from the emphasis on faculty serving long-term on development assistance projects with inadequate time frames and resources to deal with these demands.

RECOMMENDATIONS

• The focus and priorities of development assistance by the U.S. be changed generally as suggested by several authors to emphasize: agriculture; health; population; environmental issues including sustainable management and use of natural resources; urban development; and institution and capacity development. Taken into account should be the status of developing country institutions, absorptive capacity in terms of resource inputs, and needs and opportunities in both the short- and long-term (Eicher, 1988).

• University participation and contributions be emphasized and encouraged based upon long-term, mutually beneficial relationships between universities and their faculties and developing country institutions and their faculties and staffs. Suggested needs and opportunities for re-orienting development assistance priorities have emphasized areas and activities for which universities have comparative advantages. Mechanisms for selecting universities for participation and for monitoring, and evaluating university performance and impact need to be identified. Emphasis should be placed on real commitment and performance and on the integration of development assistance participation as one component of multicomponent international activities by universities. University international activities -

study abroad, area studies, foreign language training, development assistance and others should all be a part of and contribute to academic programs.

• Mechanisms and approaches for the most effective use of university capabilities and the relationships of university capabilities with those of other U.S. organizations (PVOs, NGOs, and private sector) for the delivery of development assistance by the U.S. should be critically examined and more effective mechanisms and approaches developed. These should be based upon the changing development assistance and university environments. A unique opportunity appears to exist because of an increasing awareness and need for an international emphasis across a broad spectrum of U.S. education, business and government.

• Some long-term funding needs to be provided universities based upon real commitment and effectiveness of participation in development assistance. Such should be within a university environment that emphasizes internationalization of university programs and activities. This can have broad ranging benefits including and synergetic with development assistance. Commitment and use of university resources and mechanisms for accountability of university performance should be required. As an example, it has been suggested that university adherence to "the Basic Principals for College and University Involvement in International Development Activities (National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, 1983) be one measure of commitment to development assistance activities (GAO, 1989). We suggest these principals are good, but do not go far enough. Such an approach or approaches can also utilize federal resources to leverage the availability and use of university resources to assist in achieving U.S. development goals.

• Faculty international development, experience and exposure, and internationalization of departments be supported by both the development assistance organizations and university resources. Emphasis on the internationalization of faculty will stimulate their interest and availability to participate in development assistance activities and will influence the internationalization of university programs.

• All of the above take into account the current and likely future realities in terms of needs and opportunities for development assistance and U.S. university participation. Both developing country needs and U.S. universities are changing and will likely change even more over the next several years. Participation in development assistance activities can be a significant component of internationalization.

REFERENCES

Apple, J. L., Popenoe, H., and Meiman, J. 1987. The USAID/University Partnership. Issues Identified by USAID Mission Directors that Reflect Upon University Performance and that Universities Must Address. Washington, D.C.

Bittner, G. 1989. Personal communications.

Board for International Food and Agricultural Development. 1988. Toward a Partnership in World Agriculture for the 1990's: A Symposium. Washington, D.C. Agency for International Development: 1-7.

Burn, B. 1980. The Role of American Universities in Development Assistance. Washington, D.C. Expanding the International Dimension of Higher Education. Jassey-Bass Publishers: 98-106.

Eicher, C. K. 1989. Sustainable Institutions for African Agricultural Development. The Hague, Netherlands. International Service for National Agricultural Research Working Paper No. 19.

Groennings, S. 1987. The Impact of Economic Globalization on Higher Education. Boston, Mass. New England Board of Higher Education: 2.

Hamilton, L. 1988. The U.S. Political and Economic Development Environment for Foreign Assistance in the 1990's. In Development Partnership in World Agriculture for the 1990's: A Symposium. Washington, D.C. Occasional Paper No. 13., Board for International Food and Agricultural Development.

Henson, J. B. 1984. Faculty Participation in International Overseas Projects--Constraints and Potential Approaches. Pullman, Washington. Proceedings, American Society of University Directors of International Agricultural Programs: 112-125.

Henson, J. B. and Noel, J. C. 1988. Internationalizing U.S. Universities and Colleges of Agriculture. Rosemont, IL, Proceedings, Council of North Central Administrative Heads of Agriculture: 15-28.

Henson, J. B. and Noel, J. C. 1989a. Faculty and the International Agricultural Education Curriculum for the Year 2005: International Agricultural Educational Curriculum for 2005: In press.

Henson, J. B. and Noel, J. C. 1989b. Internationalizing the University: Issues for Sustainability of Developing Country Agricultural and Rural Development Institutions. In Preparation.

Henson, J. B. and Noel, J. C. 1989c. "Internationalizing Universities-Why, What and How". Unpublished data of national study.

Koezuka, T. 1989. Commentary: Reinterpreting Old Formulas for Agricultural Development and AID. Washington, D.C. International Food Policy Research Institute Report. Vol. 11, No. 3: 1,4.

Lambert, R. D., 1989. International Studies and the Undergraduate: A Special Report. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education.

Lele, U. 1988. Agricultural Growth, Domestic Policies, External Environment and Assistance to Africa--Lessons of a Quarter Century. Development Partnerships in World Agriculture for the 1990's: A Symposium, Washington, D.C., Board for International Food and Agricultural Development: 130.

Mellors, J. W. 1988. Food and Agricultural Development Needs for the 1990's. In Development Partnership in World Agriculture in the 1990's: A Symposium, Washington, D.C. Board for International Food and Agricultural Development: 31-42.

Mellors, J. W. 1989. Agricultural Development in the Third World: The Food, Poverty, and Trade Nexus. Ames, Iowa. Choices. First Quarter. American Agricultural Economics Association: 4-8.

Miner, W. R. 1988. A Study of the Responses of Title XII Universities to AID Administrators' 1986 Survey of Performance of Title XII Institutions. Washington D.C. Board for International Food and Agricultural Development.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. 1983. Basic Principals for College and University Involvement in International Development Activities. Washington, D.C.

Noel, J. C. and Henson, J. B. 1989. Personal observations.

Perez, R. and Rogers, L. 1984. Factors Influencing Northwest Colleges of Agriculture Faculty Members Willingness to Accept International Assignments. Pullman, Washington. International Program Development Office Occasional Paper No. 1. Washington State University.

Pickering, D. C. 1987. Strengthening Agricultural Research in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Proposed Strategy. Washington, D.C. African Agricultural Research and Technology Development. D. Pickering, ed. The World Bank: 67-101.

Smith, S. 1987. Internationalizing the University. Pullman, Washington. International Program Development Occasional paper No. 3., Washington State University.

Smuckler, R. H., Berg, R. J., and Gordon, D. F. 1988. New Challenges, New Opportunities - U.S. Cooperation for International Growth and Development in the 1990s. East Lansing, Michigan. Center for Advanced Study of International Development, Michigan State University.

U.S. Agency for International Development. 1987. Continuing Linkages Between U.S. and Developing Country Institutions. Washington, D.C. Cable 297272.

U.S. Agency for International Development. 1985. Plan for Supporting Agricultural Research and Faculties of Agriculture in Africa. Washington, D.C.

Von der Osten, A. 1987. A Comment on the Strategy Proposal by the World Bank. Washington, D.C. African Agricultural Research and Technology Development. D. Pickering, ed. The World Bank: 110-115.

Woods, A. 1989. The Future of U.S. Foreign Assistance. Urbana, Il. International Agriculture Newsletter No. 135. University of Illinois: 1-3.

World Bank. 1987. Guidelines for Strengthening National Agricultural Research Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa. Washington, D.C. and the Hague, Netherlands. Special Program for African Agricultural Research: 12-15.

Yates, A. C. 1984. A Special Challenge to the Modern University. International Program Development Office Occasional Paper #2. Pullman, Washington. Washington State University.

Occasional Papers are published by the Washington State University International Program Development Office as a service to those interested in international development. Single copies of each paper are available free of charge from the address listed on the inside back cover. For additional copies, or more information about the series, contact the office at (509) 335-2541 or FAX (509) 335-2982.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT OFFICE OCCASIONAL PAPERS:

#1. "Factors Influencing Pacific Northwest College of Agriculture Faculty Members' Willingness to Accept International Assignments" by Robert Perez and LeRoy Rogers. April 1984.

#2. "A Special Challenge to the Modern University" by Albert Yates. July, 1984.

#3. "Using International Programs to Enhance Departmental Excellence" by Thadis W. Box. June, 1985.

#4. "Internationalizing the University" by Samuel Smith. November, 1987.

#5. "The Internationalizing of U.S. Universities and Participation in Development Assistance: Implications for the Developing Countries and the U.S." by James B. Henson and Jan C. Noel, December 1989.

For additional copies of this report, contact: International Program Development Office
French Administration Building, Room 338
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164-1034
(509) 335-2541