

June 29, 1977

3p.

REGISTERED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner
 President
 Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Subject: Grant No. AID/TA-G-1113

Dear Dr. Wiesner:

This Agency is currently conducting a comprehensive review of all current Grants and Contracts including the subject Grant. Reports and site visit summaries of progress toward achieving the goals of the cited Grant have been evaluated. As a result of this review the Agency believes that the goals envisioned when the Grant was executed will not be achieved under the Grant. We therefore find it necessary to consider "Termination" of the Grant.

In consonance with the Grant provision entitled "Termination", consultation is required to discuss the ramifications of such an action. It is therefore suggested that you contact Mr. Curtis Farrar, Assistant Administrator for Technical Assistance, telephone 202-932-8614 to establish a mutually agreeable time for this consultation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert J. C'Brien
 Chief
 Central Operations Division
 Office of Contract Management

Clearances:

AA/LEG;JLewis	<u>9/7</u>	dtd	<u>6/30</u>	25207
GC/CS;Perkins	<u>20</u>	dtd	<u>6/30</u>	
AA/TA;CBarker	<u>6/73</u>	dtd	<u>6/30</u>	
TA/N;LRudel	<u>2/3</u>	dtd		
AA/TA;CFarrar	<u>CF</u>	dtd	<u>6/30</u>	

CM/COD/ITA; R110
 RDoufette; etr; 6-29-77

Memorandum
File

A. L. ...

June 6, 1977

ACTION MEMORANDUM FOR THE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR-DESIGNATE

THRU: ES

FROM: AA/TA, Curtis Farrar

Problem: Whether or not to terminate prematurely a 211(d) Grant in the field of Nutrition to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Discussion: As the attached review form and memoranda from Lou Rudel illustrate the MIT grant has not produced anything like what we wanted from it. The authorities there are promising to do better, but they have done that before. It seems clear that whatever action we take, the result will not be the kind of freestanding capability at MIT that we hoped to produce.

The arguments against termination are mainly that it is a lot of trouble for relatively little gain. There may be approximately \$200,000 left in the grant. We should probably want to leave some of this in order not to be unfair to the graduate students who have set their courses of study on the basis of expectations of financial support from the grant. And MIT will certainly not take a termination for cause lying down.

Alternatives would be to define a clear set of actions that we think should be taken by a deadline, say the end of September, and terminate then only if those actions have not been taken; or to request an objective outside evaluation which would be due shortly in any case.

Recommendation: It is my recommendation that we proceed to termination, but lend a willing ear to hardship arguments for the coming academic year, but not beyond, in the case of graduate students who do not have time to make other arrangements.

- Approve termination 200
- Prefer one more warning _____
- Prefer outside evaluation _____
- Other _____

(FYI: Jim Levinson was the Director of the MIT center under the Grant for its first two years. He has been head of the Office of Nutrition in TAB temporarily in the absence of Martin Forman on study leave. He has, of course, not participated in the review of this project by AID. Levinson was never replaced at MIT by another full time Director.)

Attachments: Draft Review Form
Two Memoranda on MIT by Rudel

Clearance: TA/N:LRudel

AMS
SW

AA/TA:CFarrar:jb:6/6/77

9310160 ⑥

PD-AAC-609



November 18, 1976

Dr. Kevin Scrimshaw, Director
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
International Nutrition Planning Program
20A-222, 18 Vassar Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Dear Dr. Scrimshaw:

While reviewing the work plan for years 3 and 4 of the INP 211(d) grant which came out of the review sessions held at the beginning of this year, I noted the discussion on pages 11 and 12 dealing with the development of expanded programs for students interested in nutrition policy careers. I note that an M.A. program was to have been set up within the Nutrition Department and that a similar program was to be developed for the Political Science Department to begin in the 1977-78 academic year. I also note that a non-departmental masters program in Nutrition Planning was to have been explored by the Advisory Committee last summer and was to be offered by September 1978.

Would you kindly let me know the status of these particular efforts and your proposed time schedule for their implementation.

It would also be helpful if you would let me know the status of the two research activities supported directly by the 211(d) grant which were to be completed early in year 3. The first is a model of malnutrition causality; the second is a historical analysis of fish protein concentrate.

Sincerely,

Ludwig Rudel
Associate Director
Office of Nutrition
Technical Assistance Bureau

MIT Inputs Into Pakistan Project

2p.

I. Full Time Advisor:

Lynch - Affiliation with MIT only through project

II. Short Term Consultants:A. Faculty

L. Taylor	-	4 weeks	
Skolnikoff	-	4 days	(on other business)
Scrimshaw	-	8 days	(half on other business)
Levinson	-	5 days	
Rha	-	<u>5 days</u>	(despite considerable pressure from MIT Food Sciences faculty that she not participate)
		50 days	

B. Non-Faculty

Rogers	-	8 months	(Brandeis U. Ph.D. candidate)
Gilbert	-	6 months	(U. of Hawaii graduate, no affiliation with MIT)
McCarthy	-	2 months	(Faculty, Northeastern University; Research Associate, MIT; MIT Masters degree in economics; denied admission to MIT Ph.D. program in economics)
Levinson	-	2 months	
Kazmi	-	6 weeks	(Dropped from MIT Ph.D. program in economics. Dept. advised against participation in Pakistan project)
Y. Taylor	-	1 week	(Ph.D. from MIT. No present affiliation)
Rutman	-	<u>1 week</u>	(No affiliation with MIT)

600 days

III. On-Campus Activity

- Dept. of Political Science - no involvement
- Dept. of Economics - Taylor and McCarthy modeling exercise
- Dept. of Nutrition - No involvement

June 30, 1977 2P

MEMORANDUM

TO: TA/N, Lu Rudel

FROM: AA/TA, Curt Barker *CHB*

SUBJECT: Contemplated Termination of MIT Institutional Grant

I understand that the decision has been made to proceed toward the early termination of AID/TA-G-1113, Section 211(d) grant to MIT. There are several factors which should be considered in preparing for the consultation with MIT as called for in the Grant Agreement prior to termination.

On the basis of the current file, I assume that the rationale for termination, not yet spelled out in detail, is based on our judgment that the probability that MIT can achieve the objectives of the grant is too low to warrant continuation. (An alternative rationale could conceivably be as follows: The objectives of the grant, as originally written and as subsequently refined by reality, are no longer of sufficiently high priority to the needs of the LDCs to warrant continued support.)

If the assumed rationale is the one to be used, and if your two memos (of February and May) are to be the basis of this rationale, I would make the following points:

- (1) The Grant Agreement will be the baseline against which performance and output will be judged, point by point.
- (2) The skills, knowledge, courses, programs, etc., expected to be established/strengthened under the grant cannot be expected to be operational until later in the five-year grant period.
- (3) You state in one of your memos that graduate student research is not closely related to the research needs of operating agencies. The legislative history and underlying concepts of Section 211(d) indicate that it is not supposed to be. We have the Contract Research Program

to respond to operational research needs. The rationale for Section 211(d) research is to build the necessary knowledge and data base for a more complete understanding and command of the defined problem area. This point was established in the Agency's response to a GAO Report on University Institutional Grants, dated May 5, 1976.

(4) You also make the point that the MIT research tends to be uni-disciplinary. On page 13 of the Grant Agreement, the Grantee describes alternative ways of achieving a multi-disciplinary result, but clearly opts for the alternative of emphasizing disciplinary training for solid grounding, coupled with subsequent broader exposure to other relevant disciplines. It is safe to say that there is no general consensus on the best way to achieve a multidisciplinary approach, but we did accept MIT's option by signing the Grant Agreement.

(5) A great deal of weight is put on the failure to handle the participants from Morocco and Bolivia properly. This is indeed a serious problem and symptomatic of significant shortcomings on the part of MIT. However, it must be kept in mind that the participant training program is not part of the grant activity. Regarding the especially-designed courses to be developed under the grant particularly for these participants, it is quite possible that at the end of the second year of the grant, they were not yet operational.

(6) Finally, we must be prepared to address the obvious point that will undoubtedly be made by MIT: Even if all expectations are not met (they seldom are), there are many significant gains already, and there will be many more, all of which will most likely be lost to AID with an early termination. We must establish that this loss will be compensated for by the very small amount of funds remaining after all existing commitments to faculty salaries and graduate student stipends are met.

cc: AA/TA, Curt Farrar
AA/TA, Erven J. Long