

179

PN-AAT-246

11/10/70

**REPORT
OF
AACRAO-AID CONFERENCE**

**"UNIVERSITY-GOVERNMENT COOPERATION
IN PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS FROM ABROAD"**

December 8 and 9, 1970
Sheraton Park Hotel
Washington, D. C.

Handwritten signature

SPONSORED BY:

**AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGIATE REGISTRARS
AND ADMISSIONS OFFICERS**

and

**U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAINING**

000246

004385
S

**REPORT
OF
AACRAO-AID CONFERENCE**
*"UNIVERSITY-GOVERNMENT COOPERATION
IN PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS FROM ABROAD:
AN ASSESSMENT BASED ON AN
AACRAO-AID STUDY"*

**December 8 and 9, 1970
Sheraton Park Hotel
Washington, D.C.**

Conference Chairman, CLYDE VROMAN

*Copies of this Conference Report and/or the AACRAO-AID Participant
Selection and Placement Study may be obtained free of charge from:*

*The American Association of Collegiate Registrars
and Admissions Officers
1 Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036*

CONTENTS

- 1. Preface**
- 2. First Plenary Session**
 - "Government-University Cooperation"—Lane Dwinell
 - "The United States Agency for International Development Participant Training Program"—Robert E. Matteson
- 3. Second Plenary Session**
 - "Background of the AACRAO-AID Study"—Clyde Vroman
 - "Highlights of the AACRAO-AID Study"—Lee Wilcox
- 4. Major Conclusions Reached in Work Groups**
 - Selection Processes in the Missions
 - Placement Processes in Washington
 - Admission and Academic Placement on U.S. Campuses
 - Performance and Experience on U.S. Campuses
- 5. Final Plenary Session**
 - "Perspectives on Conference Outcomes"
 - From the Viewpoint of AID—Arthur F. Byrnes
 - From the Viewpoint of the Study Committee—Albert G. Sims
- 6. Glossary of Terms and Acronyms**
- 7. Appendix A—Roster of Conferees**
- 8. Appendix B—Conference Program**

PREFACE

This Report summarizes the content and outcomes of a national invitational Conference held at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C., on December 8 and 9, 1970. The topic of the Conference was "University-Government Cooperation in Programs for Students from Abroad: An Assessment Based on an AACRAO-AID Study."

The Conference was arranged through the cooperative efforts of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers and the U.S. Agency for International Development, Office of International Training. The Conference was organized and conducted by the AACRAO-AID Study Committee listed below. Mr. Gayle C. Wilson prepared the manuscript for this Conference Report, assisted by Mr. Albert G. Sims.

The Conference purposes were:

- a) To present the Conference as an AID contribution to the International Education Year (1970);
- b) To encourage greater cooperation and improved practices between government and institutions of higher education.
- c) To present the Report of the AACRAO-AID Study of 1,142 AID participants, and
- d) To consider the implications of the Study for the overall field of foreign student selection and placement.

Conference members were carefully chosen to get a broad distribution of leaders recognized for their expertise and professional experience related to the purposes of the Conference. Invitations were extended to: University and college administrators; AID staff members and other government officials; representatives of educational associations, organizations and foundations; foreign student advisers; and AACRAO admissions officers, registrars, and academic credential analysts. The Conference roster is given in Appendix A.

The Conference program was organized especially to elicit reactions to the AACRAO-AID Participant Selection and Placement Study and to encourage the exchange of views and of information among Conference members with diverse backgrounds and professional competencies. It was a "working conference" aimed at reaching conclusions and making recommendations. The program of the Conference appears as Appendix B in this Report.

Clyde Vroman, Conference Chairman

AACRAO-AID Study Committee:

James R. Bower, University of Michigan
J. Douglas Conner, Executive Secretary, AACRAO
Ellsworth M. Gerritz, Kansas State University
Hattie Jarmon, Office of International Training, AID
Albert G. Sims, College Entrance Examination Board
Robert E. Tschan, Pennsylvania State University
Lee Wilcox, University of Wisconsin, Vice-Chairman
Clyde Vroman, University of Michigan, Chairman

FIRST PLENARY SESSION

The Conference was opened with an address by The Honorable Lane Dwinell, Assistant Administrator for Administration, Agency for International Development. Governor Dwinell represented Dr. John Hannah, Administrator of AID who was unexpectedly unable to be present at the opening session. The second speaker at the opening session was Mr. Robert E. Matteson, Director, Office of International Training, AID.

Abstract of Address by Governor Dwinell

I have long been interested in the complex—and these days sometimes highly stimulating—relations which exist between the academic world and the various levels of government. A good example of these relations is provided in the joint AACRAO-AID study which is the subject of this Conference.

The Study itself is an example of effective University-Government cooperation. From the outset both sides recognized that it would provide mutual benefits—that its purposes and its findings would serve a common interest. Hence it has been marked throughout by close coordination, careful planning, and thoroughness in execution.

It has been easy for us to work together because, as you all are aware, the Agency for International Development and this country's colleges and universities are old friends.

Today, some 130 colleges and universities are working on almost 300 contracts with the Agency to provide technical assistance to institutions overseas, to train foreign nationals on U.S. campuses, and to conduct research both here and overseas, as well as to provide special services for the Agency. In addition, AID's Office of International Training sends participants to more than 470 colleges, universities, or technical institutions. The 150,000th participant to receive training under the AID program recently arrived in the United States.

It is of utmost importance that our close partnership continue. Within the Agency, no office or bureau has fostered this partnership more actively than the Office of International Training. One might say that they had no choice; for in 1970 it would have been very difficult indeed to program almost 7,000 academic participants into some 470 educational institutions without a close working relationship with the academic community. The AACRAO-AID Study and this Conference attest to a productive partnership, mutually beneficial, and beneficial in particular to AID-sponsored foreign students.

Dr. Hannah expressed very succinctly his own feeling about participant training just a year ago when he told a training conference here in Washington that "training is the heart of technical assistance."

There is obviously wide agreement around the world that this is so. As all of you know, the United Nations has designated 1970 as International Education Year. The Study you have prepared, and this Conference, are important joint contributions by AACRAO and AID to this International Education Year.

The language of the Resolution passed by the United Nations General Assembly on December 17, 1968, recommended that we and other member nations

“. . . take stock of the situation with respect to the education and training in . . . [our] . . . countries and to plan and initiate or stimulate action and studies linked to the objectives and themes of the International Education Year in the context of their preparation for the Second United Nations Development Decade. . . .”

In preparing the AACRAO-AID Participant Selection and Placement Study, you have fully responded to this recommendation from the United Nations. It is a great stride forward in the programming of AID-sponsored participants—and of all foreign students regardless of sponsorship or origin.

The working relationship between AACRAO and AID has been one of the best we have experienced with a private organization. The work you have done—the standards of performance on both sides—is of exceptionally high quality.

Abstract of Address by Mr. Matteson

The purpose of my remarks at this opening session of the AACRAO-AID Conference is to describe for many of you—who may not be well acquainted with it—the U.S. AID-sponsored Participant Training program.

“Participant training” means “training for national development.” The word “participant” is used to get away from the word “trainee,” and “student,” and to indicate that the program is one which is participated in by the foreign national and the foreign country, that it is a cooperative program, financed by both the United States and the other countries concerned.

It is a program to educate and train carefully-selected, qualified nationals from the developing countries. It is administered in Washington by the Office of International Training (OIT) of AID, together with 32 cooperating Federal agencies.

It is a kind of “world university”—with the administration being OIT and the participating Federal agencies; the students being the participants; and the faculty being the educators and trainers at the training facilities in the U.S. and in third countries abroad.

During each of the past several years, there have been from 13,000 to 15,000 AID-sponsored participants in training in the U.S. and in other countries. Going back to the beginning of the program in 1942, there have been 150,000 participants.

Most of these are younger people under 35 years of age. About 90% are male, and about 70% are married. About 50% of the participants are on academic programs at some 400 universities and colleges. Over half of these academic participants are on graduate programs.

In addition to the academic participants, about 25% of all participants are on "specialized programs," 15% are on "on-the-job" training, and 10% are on what is called "observation training." This last category usually involves higher level people—like industrial leaders, labor leaders, members of parliament—who cannot be away from their countries for very long and who learn by observing and by briefings as they move around to various parts of the United States.

In terms of the regions of the world from which they come, about one-third are from Latin America, 28% from East Asia and Viet Nam, 22% from the Near East-South Asia, and 20% from Africa.

The average length of stay is between six and nine months; the average cost is about \$3,000; and the so-called "brain drain" is less than 1%.

The objectives of this U.S. participant training program briefly stated are, first, the improvement in the technical and productive capabilities of participants through the acquisition of new technical knowledge and skills; second, the broadening of the outlook of participants through exposure to change and modernization; and third, a better understanding of the United States, its people and way of life. Inevitably, this last objective also leads to a better understanding by Americans of the developing countries through the varied contacts thousands of Americans have with these trainees from the developing countries.

In order that you better understand the participant training program, let me briefly describe the training process which a typical academic participant goes through.

1. The first step in the process is the formulation of an economic and social development program by the cooperating country, assisted by the USAID Mission. The position the participant holds is keyed to this program.
2. The next step is the selection of the participant by the officials of his government in consultation with the AID Mission. This is an extremely important step in the process. Leadership potential, educational qualifications, importance of his current position, English language competence, security, physical fitness, and the acceptance of an obligation to work in a job related to the economic and social development goals of his country after he returns home are prime requisites in the selection process.
3. A Project Implementation Order/Participant (PIO/P) is filled out. This includes a full description of the type and duration of training desired and the means of financing it. In the case of academic participants, it will often include the AID Mission recommendations on the academic institution to be attended, and it will almost always specify the level of education, and the major field of study to be pursued.
4. A "dossier" consisting of the PIO/P, which describes his program, bio data, transcripts of academic record (if he is an academic participant), and other documents is supposed to be sent to OIT in Washington.

5. In OIT, the dossier is assigned to a Development Training Specialist (DTS), until recently called a Program Development Officer. The DTS is in that geographic regional branch of OIT's Program Division from which region the participant will be coming. The DTS to whom the PIO/P is assigned will also have a functional specialty, for example, agriculture, public administration, or labor, corresponding to the student's field of study.
6. The DTS, after reviewing the dossier, decides whether to assign the programming function to a Program Officer in a participating federal agency (like the U.S. Department of Agriculture, for example) or whether to program the participant himself.
7. In either event, if the participant is to have academic training, the Academic Advisory Staff of OIT and the AACRAO credential analyst evaluate the participant's dossier and make recommendations to the DTS, or—if the PIO/P has been assigned to a participating federal agency—to its Program Officer, concerning the placement of the participant in a U.S. university or college.
8. Once these arrangements have been made, OIT sends the Mission what is called a "Call Forward" for the participant.
9. An extremely important part of the process then comes into play—the so-called "pre-departure orientation."
10. The next step in the life cycle of the participant is his reception at a Port of Entry in the United States. There are five Ports of Entry—New York, Miami, New Orleans, Honolulu, San Francisco—with small State Department staffs paid for by OIT and the Cultural Affairs Bureau of the State Department. The participant is helped through customs in these major ports of entry and assisted in his travel to Washington or directly to his training site.
11. In Washington, D.C., he is met by a volunteer from the Washington International Center and taken to his hotel. In most cases, the participant then takes part in a one-week orientation on the United States at the Washington International Center. During this week, the participant also reports to OIT for a briefing on administrative matters, meets his program officer (his DTS) and, if he is assigned to a participating agency, meets the officials there and gets a briefing on that agency.

If the participant is an academic participant, he may, at this point, if it is found necessary and time permits, be enrolled in a pre-academic workshop at Georgetown University or George Washington University. These workshops last two weeks and prepare the participant for U.S. university life by familiarizing him with U.S. classroom procedures, instruction methods, use of the university library, preparation of papers, and degree requirements. At this point, he may also be assigned to the American Language Institute of Georgetown University, if he is in need of additional English language training.

12. Once the participant leaves Washington and is at his academic institution, the key roles are played by the faculty adviser and the campus foreign student adviser. The AID Mission, foreign government, OIT, and participating agencies all depend in large part on the university advisers to keep them informed of the progress of the student, through the transmission of academic transcripts and through evaluation letters or reports on the participant's progress. While the participant is in training, the DTS has overall responsibility for his program. Because the participant is AID-sponsored, paid for out of AID money, AID is held accountable for a cost-effective program by the Congress, the Office of Management and Budget, and the General Accounting Office, and it is the DTS and the Program Division that become the focus of this responsibility.
13. Finally, in this participant training process, participants exiting through Washington are required to go through a fairly elaborate Exit Interview conducted under contract with the Development Education and Training Research Institute (DETTRI) of the American University. The feedback from these is used to improve the quality of the training and education programs.
14. Once the participant returns home, there is a follow-up program. He may continue to receive American professional journals. He may, in some countries, join a local participant alumni organization; he may receive a local participant journal; he will undoubtedly continue to have working contacts with American officials; and he may someday return again to the U.S. for refresher courses or an additional degree.

In summary, as you can see, the U.S. participant training program is a tremendous operational undertaking. It involves the administrative handling of 13,000 to 15,000 participants from 50-70 developing countries during the course of a year; it deals with hundreds of U.S. universities, colleges, industries, labor unions, cooperatives, and community groups throughout the country in working out training and educational programs; and it must handle all of this without upsetting the sensibilities of people from different cultures or their governments. At the same time it must try to satisfy U.S. private and public cooperating institutions, the Office of Management and Budget (Budget Bureau), and the General Accounting Office—to say nothing of the Congress of the United States and various other parts of the U.S. Government.

On the whole, OIT is gratified at the results of the Study. By and large, the AID-sponsored student seems to have fared very well. Still, there is plenty of room for improvement. We will take to heart the message of this Study and try to do even better in the selection and placement process.

I sincerely hope the result of all of this effort and study will be an improvement in the quality of the participant training program—and that thus it will help move us toward the more just and peaceful world we all seek.

SECOND PLENARY SESSION

The Second Plenary Session was devoted to highlights of the AACRAO-AID Study. The background of the Study was presented by Clyde Vroman, Chairman of the Study Committee and Director of Admissions, University of Michigan. Commentary on the findings of the Study was offered by Lee Wilcox, Vice Chairman of the Study Committee and Director of Admissions, University of Wisconsin.

Abstract of Remarks by Mr. Vroman

In the hope that the AACRAO-AID Study will be better understood and utilized at this Conference, I want to review briefly the background from which the Study emerges.

Professionalization in the selection, admission, and placement of foreign students in U.S. universities and colleges, as we know it today, has developed mainly during the past two decades. After World War II the U.S. assumed a new and substantial role in world leadership. We attempted to help both the developed and the developing countries. A major facet of those programs of assistance was the bringing of foreign students to the U.S. for education and training.

The serving of foreign students is a relatively new aspect of U.S. education. Prior to World War II only a small minority of our institutions of higher education were adequately prepared and staffed to select, place academically, and serve the needs of foreign students. In the early 1950's there was a dramatic increase in both the number and scope of associations and organizations whose purposes were totally, or partially, directed toward serving the various needs of foreign students. Examples are: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, African-American Institute, American Friends of the Middle East, State Department, Agency for International Development, Institute for International Education, National Association of Foreign Student Advisers, and the U.S. Office of Education. There was a groundswell of professionalism in the handling of foreign student matters.

Out of this period and movement came the Academic Advisory Staff of the Office of International Training, AID. The Director of OIT had seen the need to professionalize the process of bringing AID-sponsored participants to U.S. educational institutions. Miss Hattie Jarmon, an experienced university admissions officer and a member of AACRAO, headed the new Academic Advisory Staff. Miss Jarmon saw the unique opportunity for AID and AACRAO to work together in serving foreign students coming to the U.S. under AID sponsorship.

Accordingly, in June 1964 AID contracted with AACRAO to provide professional consultant services and academic credential analysts to improve the selection and admission of AID participants for study in U.S. academic institutions of higher education. This continuing contractual arrangement is called the "AACRAO-AID Project."

The first three years of activities and services under the Project made clear the need for a systematic study of background information on AID participants and a follow-up of their success in training programs in U.S. universities and colleges. In 1967, the Project organized the AACRAO-AID Study which forms the basis for this Conference.

Viewed historically then the Conference is one more major benchmark in the movement of the past two decades to serve foreign students who come to our U.S. institutions of higher education. Just as the past has reflected our efforts to professionalize our services, this Conference should point the way to increased excellence in our contributions to foreign students and to the objectives of international education.

Abstract of Remarks by Mr. Wilcox

I do not intend to report all of the findings of the Study. From the point of view of a practicing admissions officer, however, there are a number of results that seem of particular interest.

FOLKLORE

A sort of "folklore" has developed in the admissions community about AID practices and AID participants. A number of aspects of the folklore are examined empirically in the Study, and I would like to point out a few where the data permit us to classify them as fact or fiction.

Folklore #1: AID participants are poorly qualified academically. (This is sometimes expressed in terms of our bending standards for AID students in the name of better international understanding.)

Conclusion: AID participants seem well qualified.

Folklore #2: AID participants *may* finish their proposed program but they don't do very well.

Conclusion: The academic performance of AID participants is remarkably good, both qualitatively and quantitatively. This is especially remarkable considering the lack of academic criteria in the AID selection process.

Folklore #3: Credentials submitted for AID participants are often incomplete.

Conclusion: Fact. (In retrospect, we should have asked campus representatives about the timing as well as the completeness of the submission as late submissions are also a part of the folklore.)

Folklore #4: AID participants have poor English proficiency.

Conclusion: I interpret the Study data as partially confirming the folklore, but we don't know how it would compare with similar data on non-AID foreign students.

Folklore #5: ALIGU scores should be treated with suspicion. (The test is too easy, and security is bad.)

Conclusion: The study provided no evidence for this kind of concern about the value of ALIGU scores.

Folklore #6: AID matches the qualifications of the participant with the standards of the university.

Comment: It is very difficult to assess the extent of such matching because of the difficulty in measuring the participant's qualifications and especially in measuring the standards of the institution. *Prima facie* evidence of some matching is provided by the simple fact that all participants in the Study were admitted.

DISCREPANCIES

A second area I would like to comment upon has to do with discrepancies documented in the Study which would seem to be worrisome to AID. They are of two kinds—discrepancies in the perceptions of participants and in certain AID procedures.

Perceptions: Participants were asked upon arrival to indicate their field of study, their degree objective, and the level at which they expected to begin. Comparing their expectations with the program prescribed for them showed:

1. Over one third of the participants named fields of study different from the field called for in their program.
2. One fifth of the participants said they expected to earn a higher degree than was called for in their program.
3. One third of the participants pegged their starting level more than one year different from that determined by the credential analysts. Surprisingly participants tended to place themselves lower than did the analysts.

Other research has demonstrated that the participant's understanding of his program significantly affects his overall satisfaction. These findings, then, would seem to be of concern.

Procedures: Discrepancies were also noted in AID procedures related to English test score thresholds and to institutional placement recommendations. AID guidelines for English scores were not followed closely by Development Training Specialists in either bringing the participant to the U.S. or in the decision to place him in an English language institute versus directly on campus. Nor were exceptions to the guidelines limited to scores that were borderline. Not only were score thresholds not followed, in many cases the tests were apparently not given overseas. With respect to institutional placement recommendations, in two fifths of the cases the placement recommendation of the Mission was not followed. Placement recommendations made by the Academic Advisory Staff were not followed in three fifths of the cases.

SAMPLE

In generalizing the findings of the Study to other groups, such generalizations need to be tempered by our understanding of this particular sample. Five countries—Vietnam, Thailand, Brazil, Ethiopia and Indonesia—account for 60% of the sample, and Vietnam alone accounts for 30%. This is a concentration not found in other foreign student groups and probably won't be found in AID indefinitely. AID participants predominantly study in education, social sciences, and agriculture while foreign students in general are in engineering, humanities, and science. The basis for AID participants being here (joint government sponsorship, specific job upon return, etc.) is quite different from that of the typical foreign student and may result in motivational differences. Finances, while a serious problem for many foreign students, should not be a major concern of AID participants.

This AID sample is a very diverse group. A lesson to be drawn from this diversity is the difficulty it portends for ferreting out valid predictors of academic success. Tests are not likely to discriminate validly between people in a wide variety of cultures. Self ratings are not likely to mean the same thing across cultures. Diverse grading systems are difficult to amalgamate on a common scale. In other words, the predictive dice are loaded against us. Nevertheless, the Study did examine those kinds of predictors of academic success—tests, ratings, and demographic factors.

PREDICTION

The Study confirmed the lack of value of verbal ability tests in predicting the academic success of foreign students. The correlations with GPA were very low for both the SAT and the GRE. Furthermore, both groups performed quite well despite mean scores of less than 300 on each test. The validity of the verbal ability tests was not improved even when limited to participants with relatively high TOEFL scores. Thus it appears that verbal scores would not be useful in similar selection contexts.

Results with mathematics tests turned out quite differently. The correlation between SAT-Math and GPA (.55) was really startling. This is a higher relationship than usually found among U.S. students. The SAT-Math was a good predictor in the total group; it was still better when limited to students recently in school and/or enrolled in math-science curriculums. The relationship even held up among participants with relatively low TOEFL scores. It would seem that the SAT-M could be useful in competitive selection situations.

At the graduate level, the GRE-Quantitative was not at all useful in predicting success. Nothing else was either. Actually, graduate level performance is not very predictable for U.S. students because of the restricted range of grades given and the fact that skills important at the graduate level are not easy to test for.

English proficiency tests are not designed to predict academic performance and it is not really appropriate to use GPA as a criterion in validating these tests. There was a moderate relationship, nonetheless, between English scores and both quality and quantity of performance, at both the undergraduate and graduate level.

In trying to assess the validity of the participant's previous academic record in predicting success it would be ideal to use the indigenous grade average as the index of the quality of that record. We found this impossible to do because of the different systems of grading used in different countries or sometimes in different institutions in the same country. We therefore turned to ratings of the previous academic record as the next best alternative and used three sources—the participant, the credential analyst, and the receiving admissions officer.

The rating by the participant of his previous rank in class turned out to be not at all predictive of success. The AACRAO credential analyst's rating of the quality of the previous academic record was somewhat predictive of success for undergraduates but not for graduate students. As would be expected, the rating by the receiving admissions officer of the quality of the participant's previous academic record was the most predictive of success. The moral here is that professionals familiar with the educational background of the student *and* with the academic environment in which he will be placed can make reliable estimates of success.

Two demographic factors—age and number of years out of school—were found to be related to success. The younger participants and those most recently in school tended to perform better in the U.S.

These, then, were the highlights for me. The work groups which follow will give us all a chance to explore further both the details of the Study and the larger implications it may have.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS REACHED IN WORK GROUPS

Conferees were assigned to six work groups, each of which held four sequential meetings. Each group was asked to develop conclusions on these four topics:

1. Selection processes in the Missions.
2. Placement processes in Washington.
3. Admission and academic placement on U.S. campuses.
4. Performance and experience on U.S. campuses.

The group had no formal processes for reaching conclusions or making recommendations which would represent the consensus of all Conference members. The following ideas represent views common among the conferees, but they are not "Conference recommendations."

Selection Processes in the Missions

1. The AID Mission overseas should describe the objectives of the training desired for each participant on broader terms, making clear the function to be performed or the role to be played after completion of the overseas study. The PIO/P should, therefore, clarify the purpose of the training in relation to country needs so the U.S. university can better plan an appropriate academic program for the participant.
2. The basic competencies of participants should be assessed prior to beginning their programs of study and then be reassessed after the completion of their programs in an effort to evaluate, if possible, the effectiveness or impact of the program of study.
3. The whole matter of testing should be carefully scrutinized and every possible effort made to insure that test results are not misused. They should be considered in conjunction with all other information bearing on the student's aptitudes, abilities, and readiness to pursue a program of study or training.
4. The Study suggests that the inadequate English of many of the participants adds substantially to the cost of training. Procedures for "calling forward" participants for study in this country should assure that they have English ability to enable them to follow at least half-time academic studies on arrival in the U.S.
5. English training should be given in the home country. If the training in the home country is not possible, or not available, then it should be given at the American Language Institute at Georgetown University. Only in rare cases should all or most of the required training be delayed until the participant arrives on the U.S. university campus.
6. The Study recommendation for discontinuance of English waivers for India and Pakistan is strongly supported. It is also suggested that consideration be given to discontinuing waivers for participants from the Philippines.

Placement Processes in Washington

1. There was general consensus about the need for more consultation and communication among AID, the participating agencies, and the universities. It was

suggested that AID prepare a brochure outlining the nature of the objectives of the Agency and explaining how and why the candidates are selected. The brochure should also explain the limitations on participants' training and answer such questions as why participants cannot be encouraged to pursue an initial degree if a degree is not part of the PIO/P or why the participant cannot study for a second degree.

2. Greater emphasis should be placed on effective communications with the participant *before* he embarks on his program of study. It is essential that the participant be fully informed relative to all aspects of his training program and especially the educational goals and objectives which have been established.
3. In order to promote better understanding and more effective effort, AACRAO credential analysts should have a closer working relationship with the DTS's during the tours of the analysts in the Office of International Training.
4. A general preference was expressed by the DTS's for placing AID-sponsored students in relatively small U.S. institutions and ones not located in large cities if the desired training program can be provided. The number of U.S. institutions used for placement of AID participants should be expanded and the DTS's should look into the program offerings and facilities of many smaller institutions which are not now receiving AID-sponsored students.
5. Although at the time the Study was initiated, the Credential Analyst Worksheet (CAW) was not always used by AID-Washington and participating agencies, it was held in high regard. To facilitate its wider transmission as part of the dossier, educational institutions are urged to request it as indeed many are now doing. The university administrators stated that the CAW sheets had proven to be useful and should, therefore, be submitted to the campuses. At the same time, the group recognized that a number of factors other than academic credentials enter into the decision by AID for the appropriate placement of an academic participant.
6. The incidence of incomplete dossiers was noted in the Study Report. Numerous circumstances were cited to indicate why dossiers are incomplete. It was suggested that when an incomplete dossier is submitted to an institution it should include acknowledgement of the fact that some items are missing and indicate why.
7. The AACRAO-AID Project should define what credentials are necessary by country and/or area, and these minimum requirements for a complete dossier should be disseminated to the AID Missions and participating agencies.

Admission and Academic Placement on U.S. Campuses

1. The campus administrators emphasized that just as there are no standard rules in the selection of participants in the Missions, there are no standard rules in university placements because of the variety of admission requirements.

The most recurrent and common problems were identified as (a) late submission of dossiers; (b) insufficient English proficiency; and (c) submission of incomplete dossiers.

2. Results of the Study relative to the usefulness of variables for prediction of academic success indicate that U.S. admission officers may need to take a second look at their academic and English proficiency requirements for selecting foreign students.
3. Every effort should be made by AID to meet application deadlines in the universities. On the other hand, admission officers at the universities should be as flexible as possible when there is important reason to extend such deadlines.
4. Educational institutions should undertake to refine their minimum English proficiency thresholds by major-field or discipline and by the country of origin of the participant on the basis of previous experience. They should share their experience with AID and others in the field of international education.
5. To the extent that specifications for the training program are made clear in the PIO/P, the U.S. institution receiving the AID participant should insofar as possible undertake to tailor the student's academic program to fit his and his country's special needs.
6. The findings of the Study indicate that the institutional admission officers' ratings of participants are the most predictive of success. This is so, presumably, because it is here that the most informed judgment can be made about the student in relation to the institution. Encouragement should be given the National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions to foster the expansion of credential evaluation and other support services that will enhance further the effectiveness of the institutional admissions office in the area of foreign student admissions.

Performance and Experience on U.S. Campuses

1. Where AID participants are concerned, the selection process operating on the basis of need for specific training rather than on previous academic achievement *per se* seems to be successful. High level of motivation, the security derived from having jobs to return to at the end of their training, the strength of supporting services, and the need to maintain "face" by succeeding in their academic work were pointed out as possible strong contributing factors in the *typically good academic performance* of the AID participants.
2. A "watered-down" degree is not in the best interest of either the foreign student or the institution. However, the fact that a foreign student may be given special attention should not be construed as lowering standards. The idea of tutorial help, adapting a thesis topic to the needs of a developing country, permitting the foreign student to register initially for a minimum number of hours, and similar considerations are in line with sound academic principles and should not be confused with double standards for students from abroad.

3. Representatives of AID expressed concern over the occasional tendency of faculty or the institution to encourage the student to seek further training, beyond that originally planned. The training of a particular participant is part of an overall country plan. The training specified has been carefully thought out and requested within the framework of the overall objective of the country plan. The faculty or administrators on a particular campus can actually delay and upset important arrangements when they encourage the participant to deviate from his planned study objectives.
4. Further study should be given to the matter of evaluating participant "expectations" compared to what actually happens insofar as the participant's program of study is concerned.
5. Continuous effort should be made pragmatically to ascertain, by level of study and by country, the most critical factors indicating performance potential of participants.
6. Attention should be paid to the facilities of the U.S. institution for counseling foreign students and assisting them in their social integration. Schools which have Area Studies programs relating to the country or region from which the participant comes may be more aware of the cultural background and the actual training needs of students from that geographical area. This is so especially if the faculty members handling such programs are persons who have personal experience in, and knowledge of, the area.
7. U.S. institutions should create more opportunities for AID participants to contribute to the education of U.S. students by providing opportunities to participants to lead seminar groups or give classroom presentations in appropriate situations.

General Observations

1. The type of dialogue which took place at this meeting should have transpired years ago. Many misunderstandings were clarified. There was a general spirit of cooperation and mutual concern for the participant.
2. The Study results might be further examined to determine whether or not there is a bias in the sample due to the large number of students from Vietnam and Thailand. This perhaps could be done by a reanalysis of the data already "banked."
3. A follow-up study on the participants after they have returned to the home country would be advisable. How well the participants apply and utilize the U.S. experience is important evidence in assessing the program.
4. There was basic agreement with the findings of the Study. There is much in the findings of the Study relevant to the generality of foreign students despite the special character of the program and its objectives.
5. Care should be taken in the interpretation of results or findings of the Study. Generalizations might be inappropriate because the participants in the sample may be such a special group that the findings are not generally applicable.

6. The Study Report as well as the Conference Report should be widely disseminated. They will be of importance to individuals working in the field of international education. Specifically the Study Report should be given to the general community of persons engaged in foreign student work.
7. The overall degree of cooperation and rapport between AID personnel and university personnel is quite good and a very commendable relationship has been developed. A foundation has been established upon which to build an even closer relationship and higher degree of cooperation. Further, there should be a continuation of research studies and conferences as a basic part of an "on-going" program in the field of international education. The AACRAO-AID relationship appears to be one of the finest instances of cooperation between the universities and a federal agency.

FINAL PLENARY SESSION

At the final Plenary Session of the Conference the Chairmen for the six work groups summarized the major conclusions reached in each group. Following these summaries, perspectives on the Study and the Conference were presented by Mr. Arthur F. Byrnes, Assistant Director for Training Support, Office of International Training, and by Mr. Albert G. Sims, Vice President, College Entrance Examination Board.

Abstract of Presentation by Mr. Byrnes

I have been asked to comment on outcomes of the Conference which are "indicators" of special importance to AID. The following have been identified as being especially significant:

If academic credentials are important to the universities, we should make greater effort to have them included in dossiers.

If the Academic Advisory Staff's professional recommendations are deemed to be useful, we should make greater effort to use them to effect participant placement.

We should work toward greater uniformity between and among AACRAO campus representatives and OIT's Academic Advisory Staff in the ratings of participants' previous records.

If academic credentials for analysis and placement and improved English language skill are considered essential for admission of AID participants, we must work toward applying these standards uniformly both in U.S. universities and in the government.

English language scores and AID standards should be maintained equally throughout U.S. institutions of higher learning and AID.

We must strive to use a greater range of the higher education resources throughout the United States.

Improved communications with the participants is indicated so their expectations, their countries' goals, and their actual training programs are in greater alignment than they are at present.

If the analysis of credentials is vital, we must work to make greater use of the data in placement of AID participants. For example, 11 of our DTS's said that participating agencies with whom they work used the CAW for placement and an equal number (11) said they did not.

We seem to need greater precision in establishing English language standards for AID participants.

We should review AID policy for justifying waiving English testing.

AID might consider using the SAT Math test in some way to improve the selection process.

The folklore existing in some quarters that AID participants were less able to perform than other students was exploded by the Study. AID participants performed better in U.S. universities than other foreign students and better than the average U.S. student. And this despite the fact that they were older, had been out of school a longer period of time and were not selected primarily because of their scholastic ability.

University officials now have a better understanding of the complex university selection and placement process which occurs among the host-country government, the USAID, AID/W and the U.S. institution of higher education. They also more fully comprehend some of the difficulties encountered in coordinating these elements in an education and training program.

The Conference gave 200 attendees from all over the U.S. a better understanding of the AID participant training program.

Abstract of Presentation by Mr. Sims

I have been asked to contribute a perspective on our Conference in this last session. It is too soon for true perspectives to emerge, but I have some distinct impressions.

Whatever the Study may be as a piece of research, it has been a *process* that has already yielded substantial benefits. This meeting caps interaction over the past three years during which both AID and the universities have come to know each other better while improving their working relationships.

AID participant trainees are not typical of foreign students and so generalizations from the Study must be made with caution. Yet we are largely without evaluative information about foreign students and the Study Report will be read widely for its insights and cues.

We all have these days been seized with the crises in education domestically—particularly the problems of providing opportunities in higher education for the minorities and the poor. I find this report especially heartening to those of us with hope for extending such opportunities and providing real equality in access to education.

Behold the AID participant trainee as he appears in the study—

- not selected on grounds of academic proficiency or promise;
- older than the typical undergraduate or graduate student and further in years away from formal education, a demonstrable handicap;
- with English language competence apparently less than that of the typical foreign student and far less than that of the native student;
- and with academic aptitude scores so depressed that he would not be in the range of competition at selective colleges and universities if he were a native student.

But he has done his job in academe and done it well. What accounts for the quality of his performance? The inferences to be made are obvious. If we are prepared to give students an explicit goal or prospect in the society, and

if we will invest the money and effort to orient and help them, then the chances of their success academically are good *despite* unfavorable test predictors and other conventional indices of prospects for success.

This is a lesson we could take to heart as we search for means to deal with the minority and the poor. The question is not whether we can open such meaningful opportunities for them, but rather how much we want to do it.

I earnestly hope the Study will be read in this light as well as for what it has to say to all of us concerned with international education.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ACRONYMS

AACRAO	American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers
AACRAO-AID Project	An AID contract with AACRAO to provide professional consultant services and academic credential analysts to improve the selection and admission of AID participants for study in U.S. academic institutions of higher education.
AAS or AAS/W	Academic Advisory Staff, Office of International Training, AID
AID	Agency for International Development. Department of State
AID/OIT	AID, Office of International Training
ALI/GU	American Language Institute, Georgetown University—provides English language training and materials development, including tests, for AID-sponsored participants (students) and grantees of CU (Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State)
BIO-DATA	Participant Biographical Data form
Call Forward	Authority for the Mission to send a participant to the U.S. for his training program
CAW	CredentiaL Analyst Worksheet. A special form used by AACRAO and AAS professional credential analysts to record the factual and qualitative data and judgments about a participant's educational background and preparation related to his proposed academic training program in the U.S.
DETRI	Development Education and Training Research Institute of the American University
Dossier	Participant's file of documents, including academic record, used in placing him in his training program in the U.S.
DTS	Development Training Specialist
GPA	Grade-point average
GRE	Graduate Record Examination
Mission	AID representatives overseas
National Liaison Committee	National Liaison Committee on Foreign Student Admissions. A committee composed of representatives from five national organizations concerned with foreign student admissions—The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, The College Entrance Examination Board, The Council of Graduate Schools, The Institute of International Education, and The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs

OIT	Office of International Training, AID
Participant	A foreign national selected jointly by Mission and host country personnel for training connected with the AID-assisted development program in his country.
PIO/P	Project Implementation Order/Participants
SAT	Scholastic Aptitude Test, provided by the College Entrance Examination Board
Study	The AACRAO-AID Participant Selection and Placement Study of 1,142 AID Participants
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language, provided by the College Entrance Examination Board and Educational Testing Service
USAID	AID Mission overseas

APPENDIX A

ROSTER OF CONFEREES

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Adams, Harold A.	Director of Admissions	University of Washington
Alatis, James	Associate Dean	School of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University
Anthony, Edward M.	Chairman, Department of Linguistics	University of Pittsburgh
Armitage, Richard	Provost and Dean of Faculties	University of Missouri-Kansas City
Aronson, John E.	Director of Admissions	University of Nebraska
Asch, Rose-Marie	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Barendsen, Robert D.	Comparative Education Specialist	U.S. Office of Education
Baron, Marvin	Associate Foreign Student Adviser	University of California-Berkeley
Bebb, E. Kent	Chief, Training Administration Branch	Bureau of Reclamation U.S. Department of Interior
Belk, Samuel E., III	Chief, University and Community Relations Branch	OIT/AID
Bens, Allis R.	Director	American Language Institute San Francisco State College
Benson, August G.	Foreign Student Adviser	Michigan State University
Bich, Nguyen Ngoc	Director, Information and Cultural Affairs	Embassy of Vietnam
Bigelow, Alfred B.	Education Planning Specialist	OIT/AID
Black, Dorothy H.	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Bomberger, Dorothy	Training Adviser	U.S. Census Bureau
Bower, James R.	Associate Director of Admissions	University of Michigan

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Bridgers, Furman A.	Director, International Education Services and Foreign Student Affairs	University of Maryland
Briggs, Channing M.	Dean of Admissions and Records	Portland State University
Brothers, Viola E.	Development Training Specialist	OIT/ AID
Bryson, George D.	Chief, Contract Participant Branch	OIT/ AID
Buck, Violet	Administrative Assistant	University of Connecticut
Burke, Gerald M.	Assistant Dean Graduate School	New Mexico State University
Burks, Julia M.	Deputy Chief, English Teaching Division	U.S. Information Agency
Butler, Ronald C.	Registrar	North Carolina State University
Byrnes, Arthur F.	Assistant Director for Training Support	OIT/ AID
Camden, J. E.	Education Planning Specialist	OIT/ AID
Carpenter, John A.	Director, Center for International Education	University of Southern California
Clark, Roberta	Program Specialist	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Clary, Albert L.	Registrar	Louisiana State University
Clubine, Eugene L.	Coordinator, Office of Foreign Students	Iowa State University
Conner, J. Douglas	Executive Secretary	AACRAO
Constance, Clifford L.	Registrar Emeritus	University of Oregon
Cumbie, Calvin A.	Registrar	Texas Christian University
Darden, M. Elizabeth	Program Director	U.S. Public Health Service

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Donovan, James A.	Secretariat to U.S. Advisory Commission for International and Cultural Affairs	U.S. Department of State
Doyle, Barbara A.	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Dremuk, Richard	Associate Director of Graduate and Foreign Admission	University of Illinois
Drescher, Marcine	Foreign Student Evaluator	University of Wisconsin-Madison
Dwiannell, Lane	Assistant Administrator for Administration	AID
Dyresen, Dyre	Director of Admissions and Records	Andrews University
Eastman, Sue	Secretary	The Asia Foundation
Ellis, Wade	Associate Dean Graduate School	University of Michigan and Association of Graduate Schools
Elsen, William J.	Policy Planning Officer	OIT/AID
Fischelis, Robert L.	Fellowship Officer	Rockefeller Foundation
Fish, Cynthia	Undergraduate Admissions Adviser	Cornell University
Fisher, Claudine E.	Associate Director of Admissions and Records	Colorado State University
Fraser, Stewart E.	Director International Center	George Peabody College for Teachers
Freund, Larry	Education Editor	Voice of America
Frey, James S.	Director, Foreign Student Services	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Fulcher, Robert C.	Program Specialist	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Gerritz, E. M.	Dean of Admissions and Records	Kansas State University

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Giordano, Anthony B.	Dean of Graduate Studies	Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Griff, Ernest R.	Director of Admissions	Michigan Technological University
Grindle, Bryce	Foreign Student Adviser	University of Maine
Grissom, John W.	Chief, Counseling Branch	OIT/AID
Haas, George James	Assistant Director of Admissions	Indiana University
Hagberg, Gordon	Regional Director Washington Office	Institute of International Education
Halasz, Sari C.	Administrative Services Officer, Graduate Admissions Office	University of California-Los Angeles
Halladay, Lloyd I.	Lecturer-Coordinator	English Language Institute- University of Michigan
Hall, Harvey	Registrar	Stanford University
Harris, David P.	Director	American Language Institute Georgetown University
Hattendorf, John C.	Director of Admissions	University of Cincinnati
Haviland, R. Michael	Campus Coordinator Uganda Project	University of Massachusetts
Hawkins, Esther L.	Academic Program Adviser	C.U./Department of State
Hefling, Robert J.	Director, Graduate and International Student Admissions	University of Colorado
Hein, Andrew J.	Assistant Dean Graduate School	University of Minnesota
Hendamidjaja, Hendarsin	Assistant Educational and Cultural Attache	Embassy of Indonesia
Higbee, Homer	Assistant Dean International Studies	Michigan State University
Houlihan, Marita T.	Director, Non- Sponsored Foreign Student Programs	C.U./Department of State

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Hudson, Harold A.	Participant Orientation Coordinator	OIT/ AID
Huganir, George	Dean, Graduate School	Temple University
Irvin, Thomas C.	Assistant Director for Program	OIT/ AID
Jache, Ruth V.	Associate in Admis- sions and Supervisor of International Student Admissions	Columbia University, Teachers College
Jacobson, Robert	Assistant Editor	Chronicle of Higher Education
Jameson, Sanford	Associate for Inter- national Education	College Entrance Examination Board
Jarmon, Hattie	Chief, Academic Advisory Staff	OIT/ AID
Jenkins, Hugh	Executive Director	National Association for Foreign Student Affairs
Johnson, James C.	Assistant Director for Administration	OIT/ AID
Jones, David P.	Chief, Education Division Vietnam Bureau	AID
Kersting, Edwin J.	Dean and Director College of Agricul- ture and Natural Resources	University of Connecticut
Kimbel, Cathy Rodgers	Staff Assistant	OIT/ AID
Landry, Robert W.	Deputy Assistant Director for Program	OIT/ AID
Laney, Frederick J.	Program Specialist	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Levine, Richard	Vice President	Educational Testing Service
Lippmann, John F.	Assistant Director for Policy Planning and Evaluation	OIT/ AID
Longmire, B. Jean	Instructor	American Language Institute Georgetown University

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
MacGregor, J. C.	Director of Admissions and Registrar	University of New Mexico
Mahn, Robert E.	Assistant to the President and Secretary of the University	Ohio University
Malcom, Donald J.	Program Director TOEFL	Educational Testing Service
Malone, Charles E.	Director of Admissions	University of Tulsa and National Association of College Admissions Counselors
Matteson, Robert E.	Director	OIT/AID
Matthewson, Douglas E.	Director, Admissions and Records and International Affairs	Miami-Dade Junior College and American Association of Junior Colleges
Mayer, William Fred	Dean, School of Public Health	University of North Carolina
McDaniel, Leah J.	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
McIntosh, Charles W.	Chief, Technical Assistance Training Section	U.S. Office of Education
McLaughlin, Martin M.	Deputy Director	OIT/AID
Mekeel, Arthur J.	Policy Planning Officer	OIT/AID
Mestenhauser, Joseph A.	Associate Director Office of the Adviser to Foreign Students	University of Minnesota
Mogannam, E. Theodore	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Moss, Lois M.	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Najjum, Nelson N.	Acting Chief East Asia/Vietnam Branch	OIT/AID
Neuberger, L. Mark	Dean of Admissions and Records	Utah State University
Nixon, Norton D.	Associate Director of Admissions	University of Utah

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Norland, Milton A.	Deputy Director Foreign Training Division	U.S. Department of Agriculture
O'Bannon, George W.	Assistant Director Office of Cultural and Educational Exchange	University of Pittsburgh
O'Brien, Thomas J.	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Oliver, Donald L.	Dean of Admissions and Records	Boston University
Oliver, Eugene E.	Director, University Office of School and College Relations	University of Illinois
Page, J. Boyd	President	Council of Graduate Schools
Painter, Jean	Staff Assistant	OIT/AID
Palmer, Leslie A.	Assistant Director	American Language Institute Georgetown University
Parker, William A.	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Parrish, James B.	Director of Admissions	University of Florida
Patrick, William S.	Dean of Admissions and Registrar	Georgia State University
Philpott, Gladys	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Pillet, J. V.	Chief, Fellowships	Pan American Health Organization
Platon, Luthgarda R.	Assistant Director International Student Center	New York University
Podol, Richard L.	Deputy Chief Offices of Resources and Systems	AID
Pramualratana, Fong	Education Counselor	Royal Thailand Embassy
Prosser, Ann	Administrative Assistant	AACRAO

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Putman, Ivan	Program Officer Foreign Faculty and Student Programs	State University of New York- Albany
Rehm, D. H.	Participating Agency Staff	AID
Ringer, James H.	Associate Dean Student Adminis- trative Services	Indiana State University
Roberts, Herbert C.	Chief, Orientation Branch	OIT/AID
Ruth, Joseph Y.	Director of Admissions	George Washington University
Schaler, Otto	Chief, Multi-Regional Branch	OIT/AID
Schenck, Ethel A.	Assistant Director of Admissions	University of Wisconsin- Madison
Schwarz, Paul A.	Executive Vice President	American Institute for Research
Sepmeyer, Inez H.	Administrative Services Officer Office of Under- graduate Admissions	University of California-Los Angeles
Shampain, Judith	Evaluation Officer	OIT/AID
Sheehan, Geraldine	Special Assistant	U.S. Department of State
Shields, Robert L.	Chief, Latin American Regional Branch	OIT/AID
Shocmaker, Francis	Director, International Programs and Services	Columbia University, Teachers College
Silberman, Eleanor S.	Development Training Specialist	OIT/AID
Sims, Albert G.	Vice President	College Entrance Examination Board
Sjogren, Cliff	Assistant Director of Admissions	University of Michigan
Sojourner, Wilmer A.	Dean of Admissions and Registration	Howard University
Sosronegoro, Herqutanto	Educational and Cultural Attache	Embassy of Indonesia

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Soulides, Elaine C.	Special Assistant to the Assistant Director for Program	OIT/ AID
Sperling, Philip	Senior Evaluation Officer	OIT/ AID
Spreckelmeyer, Mary Ann	Assistant Director Non-Sponsored Foreign Student Programs Staff	C.U./Department of State
Springwater, Ronald E.	Director Division of Education	African-American Institute
Starnes, Mary Elizabeth	Development Training Specialist	OIT/ AID
Stone, Russell	Program Officer Vietnam Bureau	AID
Storey, Ruth T.	Supervisor Foreign Graduate Admissions	Stanford University
Strain, William H.	Director of Admissions	Indiana University
Sweeney, Leo J.	Director of Admissions and Registrar	University of Missouri-Kansas City
Temmer, Harold E.	Registrar and Admissions Officer	University of California-San Diego
Tschan, Robert E.	Assistant Dean Graduate School	Pennsylvania State University
Utley, David G.	Director-International House and Adviser to Foreign Visitors	University of Chicago
Vickery, Kenneth N.	Dean of Admissions and Registration	Clemson University
Vroman, Clyde	Director of Admissions	University of Michigan
Wagner, Elmer	Registrar and Admissions Officer	University of California-Davis
Walker, John	Associate Program Officer	State University of New York-Albany
Weldon, William S.	Assistant to the Dean Graduate School	University of Michigan

Name	Title	Institution and/or Agency
Whithead, Richard H.	University Registrar	University of Florida
Wilcox, Lee	Director of Admissions	University of Wisconsin- Madison
Williams, William M.	Chief Education Division East Asia/Technical Services	AID
Wilson, Gayle C.	Executive Associate Director of Admissions	University of Michigan
Wilson, Theodore J.	Chief Africa/Near East- South Asia Branch	OIT/AID
Windsor, David L.	Registrar and Director of Admissions	University of Arizona
Woolston, Wayne C.	Registrar	University of Montana
Young, Howard W.	Education Writer	U.S. Information Agency

APPENDIX B
CONFERENCE PROGRAM

Tuesday, December 8

9:00 a.m. REGISTRATION, Lobby Sheraton Park Hotel

9:00 a.m. FIRST PLENARY SESSION

Park

Ballroom

West

Chairman, Clyde Vroman, Director of Admissions, University of Michigan

a) Address, "Government and University Cooperation," John A. Hannah, Administrator, A.I.D.

b) Address, "The A.I.D. Participant Training Program," Robert E. Matteson, Director, Office of International Training, A.I.D.

10:30 a.m. Intermission

10:50 a.m. SECOND PLENARY SESSION

Park

Ballroom

West

Presentation, "Highlights of the AACRAO-AID Study."

a) "Background of the Study," Clyde Vroman

b) "Summary and Commentary on the Study," Lee Wilcox, Director of Admissions, University of Wisconsin

12:15 p.m. LUNCH PERIOD. No Conference luncheon is scheduled.

1:30 p.m. WORK GROUPS (First Session)

Conference members have been assigned to the six work groups, each of which will hold four sequential meetings. In each group there will be persons representative of all the major interest groups attending the Conference. Group assignments are indicated by Roman numerals on the registration badges. Everyone is expected to go to the assigned group and to remain with it throughout its four sessions. This is imperative for the success of the sharing and learning processes planned for this basic aspect of the program. Work sessions will cover all aspects of the AACRAO-AID Study, with particular reference to the following four major topics:

a) The AID participant (foreign student) selection processes in the Missions.

b) The participant placement processes in Washington, D.C.

c) Participant admission and academic placement on U.S. campuses.

- d) Evaluation of participant performance and experience on U.S. campuses.

The first two work sessions will emphasize (1) the sharing of information on the AID participant selection and placement processes, and (2) the analysis of the Study Report. The last two work sessions will apply the findings of the Study and the results of the group discussions toward conclusions and recommendations for the improvement of the selection and placement of AID academic participants in U.S. universities and colleges. These outcomes will be reported to the Conference members at the final plenary session.

3:15 p.m. Intermission

3:45 p.m. MEETINGS OF THE SIX WORK GROUPS (continued)

Wednesday, December 9

9:00 a.m. MEETINGS OF THE SIX WORK GROUPS (continued)

10:30 a.m. Intermission

10:50 a.m. FINAL MEETINGS OF THE SIX WORK GROUPS

12:00 Noon LUNCH PERIOD. No Conference luncheon is scheduled.

1:50 p.m. FINAL PLENARY SESSION

Delaware

Suite

Chairman, Miss Hattie Jarmon, Chief, Academic Advisory Staff, Office of International Training, AID

a) "Presentations of Work-Group Conclusions and Recommendations"

b) "Perspectives on Conference Outcomes"

1) Arthur F. Byrnes, Assistant Director, Training Support Division, Office of International Training, AID

2) Albert G. Sims, Vice-President, College Entrance Examination Board

3:30 p.m. ADJOURNMENT