

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523  
**BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET**

FOR AID USE ONLY

*Satch # 22*

1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION  
A. PRIMARY  
Agriculture  
B. SECONDARY  
Development  
AE30-0000-0000

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE  
Pre-contract planning

3. AUTHOR(S)  
Roskelley, R.W.

4. DOCUMENT DATE  
1969

5. NUMBER OF PAGES  
16p.

6. ARC NUMBER  
ARC

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS  
Purdue Res.

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability)

9. ABSTRACT

10. CONTROL NUMBER  
PN-RAB-329

11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT

12. DESCRIPTORS  
Contractors  
Project planning  
Technical assistance

13. PROJECT NUMBER

14. CONTRACT NUMBER  
CSD-840 Res.

15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

**PRE-CONTRACT PLANNING**

By

**R. W. Roskelley**

**Utah State University**

**Logan, Utah**

One portion of the Final Report of the CIC-AID Rural Development Research Project, Contract No. AID/csd-840

## PRE-CONTRACT PLANNING

by R. W. Roskelley  
Utah State University

### PROLOGUE

During the time I was in Southeast Asia and the Middle East doing the field work on the CIC-AID Rural Development Research Project, I talked with many nationals in different countries. I visited with them under both official and informal situations. Dialogues were held with many Americans working in various capacities. Development programs of the U.S. AID organization and private foundations were discussed.

Soon after contracts started to accumulate, certain patterns began to emerge and accumulated evidence fell into such a pattern that conclusions seem to be warranted. One such conclusion was that the American image abroad is in a precarious position. There is abundant evidence of much good will, but too much of it is a "crossed fingers" variety. There is much sincere appreciation of our generosity in sharing our material wealth. But there are many reservations about our ability to be genuinely helpful in aiding them build the kinds of institutions that will be helpful in resolving their problems under their conditions.

These impressions and images of Americans held by persons of other nations have been formed during the last 15 years. They are an outgrowth of many American activities abroad, including foreign aid, that have not been as successful as might have been desired.

Many of the attempts of the representatives of the United States to help developing countries have been dominated by what might be called "technological determinism." The basic philosophy has been that if we export to the various developing countries our technology, somehow automatically, the rest will happen and the countries will pull themselves into the twentieth century. Too often our technological inputs have made but little impact because the related component elements were not given enough consideration. Frequently the human and cultural factors of institution building have been given little or ill-advised consideration.

If the United States presumes to have some of the professional resources to help develop programs to resolve world problems, the professional people of the United States must be doubly diligent in identifying and applying the great variety of variables which have not been utilized to date, yet are a critical prerequisite of success.

Some degree of success has been achieved by the American universities attempting to build institutions of higher learning in foreign lands. The world-wide study of agricultural university development programs abroad

turned up conspicuous amounts of evidence that in many places less-than-successful project operations prevailed. This conclusion was the consensus of each of four different investigators who made intensive analyses of from 13 to 15 projects in each of the four different parts of the world.

There were many factors which contributed to less-than-successful project accomplishments. Some of them were combinations of factors found in foreign cultures. Many others were obviously attributable to the demonstrated inability of the American university personnel and systems to do the right things at the right times and in the proper sequences. Much evidence was accumulated which suggested that ineffective pre-project planning caused many of the problems that were encountered.

#### WHAT THIS PAPER IS ALL ABOUT

In this paper an attempt will be made to present and interpret some of the lessons which have been learned about pre-contract planning during the last 15 years in building educational institutions in foreign countries. This report is based upon personal research experiences with the CIC-AID Rural Development Research Project during the last 2½ years. The information presented has been derived largely from six major sources:

1. An intensive study was made of 42 pre-contract survey reports made by representatives of American universities prior to the acceptance of a contract to help develop, for the most part, agricultural universities abroad.
2. Field work was conducted in eight different countries of Southeast Asia and the Middle East. This work involved 13 United States university contracts with 11 different universities or colleges. Ten of the contracts had been terminated before the study was conducted. An attempt was made to determine the extent to which effective or ineffective pre-contract planning had contributed to the successes and failures of project operations.
3. Extensive and intensive interviews were held with host country university personnel at each host institution and U.S. AID representatives when they were available. Interviews also were held with representatives of four United States universities who had been abroad as team members on university contracts.
4. Two institutions were studied intensively and nine others were studied in general terms to determine how well the characteristics, attributes, and behavior patterns of the "land grant" philosophy had been developed as an integral part of the host university. Attention was focused on the role which pre-project planning has played in institutional development.
5. Reports prepared by the American university personnel upon completion of their foreign tour of duty were examined to see if pre-contract planning was acknowledged by the professional persons as a meaningful force

in guiding project developments. All end-of-tour reports prepared by professional personnel representing American contractors were not available. Enough were available, however, to serve as a representative cross-section of the end-of-tour reports. Some were at AID offices in foreign countries, a few were in the files of the deans of the colleges of agriculture at host institutions, and a large number were on file at four "land grant" universities visited in the United States.

6. Contract termination reports were studied to see if any recognition was given to pre-contract planning as a factor that influenced project developments.

The questions, then, to be answered in this paper are:

1. What is the nature and extent of pre-contract planning as reflected from the different sources indicated above?
2. Were the pre-contract planning activities and reports done in accordance with the best information available in the behavioral science and educational fields?
3. How did the presence or absence of effective patterns of pre-contract planning influence the project operations, particularly their effectiveness?
4. What lessons have we learned?
5. In the light of these lessons, what are some likely new and meaningful patterns of pre-contract planning that might, if carried out, make a greater contribution to project effectiveness?

#### CONTENT OF THE PRE-PROJECT SURVEY REPORTS

An analysis of the pre-project survey reports revealed a number of significant things that have a bearing on pre-project implementation.

First, the pre-project survey reports were prepared and signed by representatives of American universities who, it was felt, would be involved later in project programs if implemented. The reconnaissance work preparatory to writing the reports usually involved two to eight persons representing the American university. In most cases the numbers were four or less.

Second, from the survey reports it is evident that the investigating team interviewed a significant number of key host country personnel who were working in governmental or university positions and were strategically interested in any university development programs that might be initiated.

Third, there is evidence that the members of the survey party traveled considerable distances and became reasonably well acquainted with the

agricultural problems of the country and the existing physical facilities for university development programs.

Fourth, in some cases the preliminary survey team went so far as to collect data and information about the physical features of educational systems in a given country which enabled them to make comparisons with minimal "land grant" standards.

Fifth, in a few cases this appraisal included materials available in the library, library floor space, etc. In part of the surveys, description was given of available experimental farm ground and the total research staff. In one or two cases, mention was made of available equipment.

Sixth, in most cases the lack of trained personnel was noted, but only in the broadest terms. The need for additional physical equipment and material that should be purchased to meet minimum requirements was often mentioned.

Seventh, most reports gave some consideration to the need for the revision of the curriculum, the improvement of teaching methods and research procedures in broad general terms. Seldom was there any further mention of these items of discussions about how they would or could be changed under the project implementation program.

Eighth, considerations or analyses of the many non-material features of institutional development were conspicuous by their absence. This meant that in the 10 to 40-page pre-project surveys, detailed consideration was given to the material bases that are needed for institutional operations. Seldom mentioned were any aspects of institutional features, developmental plans, proposals, or obstacles that would be involved in the institutional development.

As the pre-contract survey reports were read and re-read, I was forced to question the extent to which the project surveyors were acquainted with and understood, even in broad terms, the essential value systems, norms, definitions of situations, and the vast patterns of human relations which were to be developed or modified and changed in the proposed project operations dealing with the development of a "land grant" type institution. If this kind of understanding existed among the pre-project planners, why was so little consideration given to it in the preliminary planning phase as they were documented?

Again as I read the reports, the question arose: To what extent did the essential features of institutional change and develop norms, values and behavior patterns, as anticipated under a contract, become the basis of discussions and dialogues with host country nationals? Did the dialogues instead center largely on the development of a physical base that could become the material resource for implementing the anticipated institutional development at a later date.

Based upon the evidence submitted in the pre-contract survey reports available there were only three cases out of the 42 which suggested that any attention was given to the consideration of the more subtle aspects

of institutional development in the pre-contract planning activities, even in the three.

There is no evidence in any of the pre-contract surveys to indicate that any of the host country nationals, professional or otherwise, were given the privilege to concur or disagree with the material contained in the reports. This means that, for the most part, the pre-contract reports were largely unilateral. They represent the thinking of American personnel about what needed to be done in the different foreign situations. There is much evidence that host country professional personnel were included in preliminary discussions and undoubtedly had the opportunity to express opinions, but they were not afforded the opportunity to become joint authors of the reports.

I am not suggesting that there is no place for preliminary and exploratory investigations by one or another of the parties. The point under discussion and the material presented here are meant to raise basic questions, even suspicions, about the extent to which unilateral reports can become the effective base for project activities that by their very nature, if they are to be effective, must involve extensive and intensive bilateral dialogues and effective patterns of working relationships.

#### WHAT DID INTERVIEWS WITH HOST COUNTRY NATIONALS REVEAL ABOUT THEIR INVOLVEMENT IN PRE-PROJECT PLANNING?

At each of the host country institutions where I was involved in the study, individual interviews lasting 1½ to 2 hours were held with 10 to 25 people. At the seven colleges or universities there was not a single instance among all of the persons interviewed below the organizational level of dean (and sometimes not even a dean), that had been involved in pre-contract planning. Each interviewee reported that he was not involved in any of the pre-contract survey work that was done before the project was signed.

Much collected evidence clearly pointed out that many of the mediocre or non-accomplishments of project activities were caused partially by the failure to involve more people at the institutional levels in the preliminary planning process. Too often there was little or no understanding of what the end product would be like or how it should be achieved. The same observation could be made in reference to the lack of ministry personnel, legislative groups responsible for funding university activities, and representatives of the private sector. It is with these non-university personnel that effective and normative patterns of behavior could be developed to help ensure project success.

It was frequently mentioned by host country nationals on the university, ministry, and private sector levels that when project proposals were first started they were very happy at the prospects of help from America. They had a high regard for the United States and were extremely pleased that American universities should be interested enough in their welfare to

provide professional personnel and dollars to help build national institutions. But they had no clear insight of what these new institutions would be, what roles administrators should play, and how the new institutions would influence them and their countries.

This means that the only host country nationals that ever knew anything about the project or signed the project were some of those at the very top of the power structure. Those below merely heard that something was being talked about or was being contemplated. The question arises: How meaningfully could these lower echelon individuals participate in an activity about which they knew nothing before it was started and were not extended the opportunity to become involved in decision making during the formative stages?

The intensive review by the researcher of end-of-tour reports made by technicians and the contract termination reports provided very little insight about pre-contract planning. For the most part, no mention was made of the role that preliminary planning played in activities related to institutional developments.

#### THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THESE OMISSIONS

The real significance of these omissions or commissions in terms of later project development activities are best understood when viewed in the light of some basic social and psychological principles of human behavior. The following are illustrations:

The professional person at a host university cannot become enthusiastic about activities; he cannot dictate the resources at his command; he cannot contribute most intelligently to activities and he cannot encourage others to cooperate in doing those things that are anticipated if he has been denied the opportunity to decide what things are important, and how they need to be done. If there are myriads of questions in his mind about something that is being proposed or being carried out, he cannot tune in and enjoy the creative experience of developing new and meaningful activities involved in institution building. He will never understand how the things that are being attempted can help resolve the myriads of problems unless he becomes aware and articulate about the issues.

In the absence of the kinds of insights and understanding that can result from his playing an active role in pre-project planning, he becomes confused, oftentimes disillusioned. Under these or related conditions he will most likely develop attitudes of indifference to the things being attempted by the foreign national advisor. He tolerates what the latter does. Sometimes he develops hostility. For the most part, he politely awaits the day when the foreigner's tour of duty has been completed.

In summary, it may be said that each person that is or may become involved or identifies with a project operation, whether it be at a sponsoring institution or at any host country institution, should have the privilege of participating in dialogues that lead to a kind of under-

standing and result in final, meaningful decisions if he is to perform to his maximum capacity. This means that each should know what activities are anticipated; how they will be carried out; who will do what thing; when will things be done in terms of time sequence; what are his responsibilities, and how should they be done; what are the jobs of others and how are they related to him; what changes will be expected of him in terms of new skills, definitions of himself as a person, his relationships with students, other faculty members, the public, and time spent at work.

The foregoing considerations raise a number of basic questions about the whole field of the pre-contract surveys or pre-contract planning:

1. What are the minimal ideas that should be considered and at what depth should they be considered in pre-contract planning?
2. Who should be involved?
3. How should it be done?
4. What is the minimum time required to plan the multiple bases that are essential for effective project operation if a contract is developed?

Not enough unequivocal evidence has been accumulated to warrant any final answers or conclusions to these questions. Perhaps there is no final answer. On the other hand, much accumulated evidence clearly suggests some tentative answers. These answers, though not final, could well become the bases for hypotheses that would embody the minimal features and activities of pre-project planning necessary to maximize the eventual project development activities.

The accumulated experience of the CIC-AID Research Project seems to warrant the following observations:

1. Evidence points out that pre-project surveys and preliminary planning to date have been far too limited and restricted in many areas.
2. If the activities of pre-project planning are to contribute most effectively to project development, far greater numbers of people at the sponsoring institution, the host university, related ministries, and private industry should become involved in pre-contract planning. The pre-project planning should provide an opportunity for some preliminary educational work necessary to lay a solid base for actual project developments.

There are many ways in which the minimal essentials of pre-project planning could be carried out. In the remainder of this paper an effort is made to describe an approach to pre-project planning that encompasses a number of principles that the research experience on this project suggest. Most certainly other approaches or modifications of these presented may be more meaningful than the one given.

## PRE-PROJECT PLANNING

Research experience suggests that pre-project planning is much more important than indicated by the attention traditionally given to it. This observation is based upon the axiom that unless people take the time to conceptualize, plan, and document the object they hope to create in a very specific fashion, much energy and resources likely will be wasted. It is also axiomatic that unless people have planned their goals in some detail it is very unlikely that they will succeed. If these observations are correct, and there is considerable evidence supporting them, it follows that pre-project planning is an activity that can ill-afford to be short changed. It is one of the key activities that needs to be developed as a prelude to the effective development of project operations.

As one reviews the preliminary survey reports, one is lead to conclude that they are actually partial feasibility studies made, for the most part, by Americans.

## ANOTHER KIND OF START

This situation could be remedied by another approach to pre-contract planning that would be consistant with the basic patterns of human relationships and educational growth discussed on pages 8 and 9 of this report. Evidence supports the idea of dividing the pre-project planning operations into two segments. These could be identified as Phase I--Feasibility Study and Phase II--Bilateral In-Depth Pre-Contract Planning Study.

If this dichotomy of pre-project planning were developed, the first phase could likely be carried out by a team of 12 to 15 people composed of representatives from the host country and personnel from the U.S. Aid organization. Membership on the committee from the host country university might include the Chancellor, the deans, and perhaps one or two representatives from departments within the university. At least one representative should be chosen from the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Finance, and perhaps other ministerial representatives. The United States' interests could be represented by the selection of the following persons in the AID organization: one person representing the Program office, one from the Education Division, and one each from Agriculture and Community Development. It might be advisable to include one or two Americans operating in the private sector of the host country economy if suitable persons are available.

This committee should be able to carry out its work in about 4 months or less. Since all of the above named persons on the committee are already on a payroll, only secretarial help and limited supplies would be required. They could well initiate and carry out the kind of preliminary feasibility study that is proposed.

The feasibility study, as conceived, could fill a number of basic needs. It would give representatives from the host country an opportunity to (1) participate in an exploratory educational venture, (2) participate more

meaningfully in the in-depth pre-contract survey, (3) understand some of the complexities involved in institution building, and (4) acquaint them in a general fashion with the magnitude and scope of the same. It also would collect valuable information that would be needed at later stages of institution building.

Great emphasis should not be placed upon identifying or analyzing items in great details. Instead, a program of inquiry and development should be generated from which a consensus could be reached on what to consider in more detail under phase II. It also might give a general enumeration of the country's needs and services the new institution might provide. It seems reasonable that the feasibility study also should develop a general definition and consensus about the prospective institution. Broad statements should be prepared concerning the procedures and problems of helping the university grow and extend its service. Attention should be given to ways of facilitating the host country's acceptance of the new and different educational philosophies.

Consideration should be given to preparation of a general statement concerning the nature and the extent of change in the operational philosophies, functions, procedures, and physical resources as they are related to: (1) teaching; (2) research; (3) agricultural extension; (4) administration; (5) student services; (6) sources of funds from federal government; (7) funding programs from non-governmental sources; (8) how the university can identify itself with needs and the interests of people and other institutions; (9) building needs; (10) equipment needs; (11) library needs; and (12) other resource material needs.

This study might also explore, in a preliminary fashion, something about the number and needs of trainees from the host institutions, including governmental agencies, that should be sent to foreign countries for training. Attention should be given to programs that would most meaningfully utilize the trainees when they return from study abroad. General estimates could be made of American personnel needs, the disciplines involved, and also the total man-months that are needed on foreign assignments and on the home campus.

Some considerations and broad recommendations should be made concerning operational policies of the contract with reference to the following items: Who determines how project funds are expended? Who selects trainees? Who determines where they go? What do they study? Where do they fit upon their return home?

Preliminary consideration should be given to responsibilities and authorities under the contract of: (1) the host government officials, (2) host university officials, (3) U.S. AID personnel in the host country, (4) U.S. AID in Washington, (5) representatives of the American university in the field, and (6) the responsibilities of university officials on the home campus in America with reference to the provisions, plans, and developmental programs.

The feasibility study could include the preparation of a brief statement of the major problems that would likely be encountered in the process

of attempting to develop a land-grant type institution in a foreign country. This might include a brief description and analysis of the general cultural, economic, political, administrative, legal, educational, and other variables that may impede or facilitate institution building. Some discussion could be given as to ways and means of circumventing or reducing the negative impacts.

It should be understood and made clear in the beginning that the material prepared by a general committee or a series of smaller committees working on the feasibility study, as outlined above, would not be final nor binding to later activities. Instead, the proposals would constitute a broad general definition of the task to be accomplished and problems that may be encountered or need to be resolved to facilitate maximum project development. The proposals would be subjected to very careful scrutiny by the participants of the in-depth pre-contract planning program as outlined below. The feasibility study might suggest the names of a number of universities that would qualify to meet the basic contract requirements.

In summary, the feasibility study should do a number of things:

1. It should initiate the processes of helping people of different countries and cultures learn how to work together.
2. It should provide the beginning of a fine educational experience in which groups from two different cultures could explore the steps and work out the kind of an institution they think they want to develop.
3. It should help them discover the modifications and changes necessary to adapt the American model of a "land grant" university to meet the basic needs of a given group of people in a given culture at a given time.
4. The study might well point out various difficulties that might be encountered and suggest measures to avoid future problems.

#### PHASE II BILATERAL IN-DEPTH PRE-CONTRACT PLANNING

If, after the completion of the feasibility study as outlined above, there is a sufficient degree of mutual understanding, good will, and enthusiasm, steps should be taken to initiate phase II.

#### HOW PHASE II DIFFERS FROM PHASE I

The second phase of pre-contract planning differs from the first phase in several respects. Following is a brief summary of some of the more important differences.

Distinguishing characteristics  
of Phase I

Distinguishing characteristics  
of Phase II

- 
- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>1. It is conducted exclusively in the host country.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <p>1. Most of the broad planning exercises are done in the host country, but a very important part is also done at the sponsoring institution.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <p>2. The time span should not exceed 3 or 4 months.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | <p>2. It may last as long as 1 year. The length of time will be determined largely by the ability of the American team to plan and work with host country nationals in creating the kinds of understanding that are necessary for project implementation. Certainly the fields of understanding are sufficiently great to warrant the use of at least 1 year in this activity. One university dean that was interviewed said, "One hour spent learning to understand what needs to be done and how it should be done will save from 5 to 10 hours later on and he will be assured that the right thing is being done."</p> |
| <p>3. Persons involved would be limited to about 7 or 8 host country nationals and 3 or 4 representatives of the U.S. AID organization.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                          | <p>3. Large numbers of host country nationals from the university, from governmental institutions and from the private sector would be involved. This phase also would involve as many of the representatives from the sponsoring institution as may participate in the project activities carried on under the institution building program.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <p>4. In phase I, the activity is primarily one of an exploratory nature. It is carried out in order to examine the potentials of institutional development in the country and identify significant features that should be considered for future study before final recommendations are made for the initiation of the project.</p> | <p>4. The second phase of investigation uses the information developed during the first phase, but explores each area much more deeply and completely. All aspects of the proposed institution building activities are spelled out. In a sense, the end product of this exercise should be a set of blueprints, specifications, procedures, and areas of responsibility for project operations.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

5. The purpose of the exploratory study is to determine whether the project, as originally suggested, is a risk.
6. Estimated costs--\$1,000 for secretarial help.
5. The purpose at this level is to determine whether the project still seems feasible after intensive and extensive analysis and exploration of all ramifications have been considered.
6. Estimated costs--\$100,000
  - a. Expenses for three host country nationals to visit United States.
  - b. Salaries and expenses for three representatives of the sponsoring university in a foreign country for 8 months to 1 year.
  - c. Secretarial help.

In this activity it is anticipated and deemed necessary that the in-depth pre-contract planning should be developed, spelled out, and clearly understood and documented by: (1) all personnel responsible for project operations in the host university, (2) the host government, (3) the offices of strategic host private institutions, (4) AID/host country, (5) AID/Washington, and by (6) all personnel of the cooperating American institution that may become involved in any part of the project development.

A very broad list of topics should come under consideration. Included should be those items listed by Blaise and Esman in their discussion of the Dimensions of the Institution Building Framework.<sup>1</sup> These involve the institutional variables of leadership, doctrine, program, and internal structures. They include the enabling, the functional, the normative, and the diffused linkages and a variety of transaction dimensions.

Considerable attention should also be given to the material base of institutional development posed in the Liming report.<sup>2</sup> Attention might well be given to anticipated ways and means of measuring progress in Institutional Maturity by such techniques as posed by Roskelley and Rigney.<sup>3</sup> It seems self-evident that much consideration should be given in the early stages of planning to anticipated Strategy Patterns from the beginning to the end as developed by Rigney and McDermott.<sup>4</sup> In the early planning, attention could well be given to possible patterns and plans of inter-university relationships after the formal contract operations have been terminated.

In a real sense, there is much evidence which suggests that unless the kinds of understanding and agreements suggested above can be developed by the representatives of each country in the planning processes, there is little chance they can be realized through project implementation later on.

## METHODS OF PROCEDURE

The following proposals are suggested as a means of maximizing the proposed planning steps. It is presumed that representatives of the American university selected to participate in the phase II part of the program have reviewed and accepted the details in the report prepared in the feasibility study. Furthermore, it is assumed that the university is sufficiently interested in the prospects of developing a contract to appoint a project supervisor to work as their representative on project activities for a period of from 4 to 5 years if a contract is developed. Such an individual should have not only a high degree of technical competence in a chosen academic field but also should have academic insights and understandings in the broad field of institution building. He should be able to relate himself in a warm understanding fashion to persons in foreign cultures.

MAKING THE LEADERSHIP POSITION AT THE  
SPONSORING UNIVERSITY ACADEMICALLY ATTRACTIVE

The recommendations on how the supervisor could spend his time made by Baldwin and his associates in their report on the exploratory study on Indonesia have many merits. They suggest that during the first year he should spend most of his time in the host country. During the last 4 years he should spend half of each year at the host university supervising, guiding, and helping direct institutional developmental programs. The other half of his time he would spend at his own university. Three months of the time at the home university would be devoted to backstopping the activities of the project in the field. During the other 3 months, he would identify himself with his own research projects, graduate students, and similar academic activities to keep in touch with his academic interests at the university.

Under the program outlined above, the field service of the U.S. project director at the host institution would be broken into two periods of 3 months each. There would be an interval of about 3 months between trips to the field. The procedures outlined above could have considerable flexibility according to the needs of contract operations.

This is only one of many possible approaches to the solution of a problem that needs to be resolved; namely, develop a pattern of work that will make it possible to attract high quality leadership to a project over long periods of time and not penalize the person professionally.

## STEPS TO IMPLEMENT PHASE II

Following the selection of the project director to represent the sponsoring university, he should travel to the host country campus as soon as the necessary clearances have been obtained. There he could identify and relate himself to the personnel of the university and the U.S. AID organization in order to acquire a more comprehensive understanding of the details and implications spelled out in the feasibility study.

Following the stay of 4 to 6 weeks in the host country, during which he has acquainted himself thoroughly with the contents of the feasibility study, the representative of the sponsoring institution should return to his home campus and share his insight and understanding with representatives of the sponsoring institution who are potential staff members in the host country. He should also plan for a meaningful and educational visit of the committee of three from the host university.

To set the stage for maximum educational growth as a prerequisite to insightful planning, the three persons that are appointed and designated as leaders of the pre-contract planning committee should travel to the campus of the sponsoring institution to spend time and learn about the values, the norms, the philosophies, and the operational precedures of the Land Grant model as outlined on page 12. Another purpose of their visit should be to help them become better prepared to participate in the in-depth pre-project planning program at their own institution. While they are visiting the campus at the sponsoring institution, a series of seminars and conferences should be held. Dialogues should be developed with respective deans, department heads, and staff members. Representatives of the sponsoring institution should be certain, that as a result of the dialogues, seminars, consultations, and field trips, the visiting members of the committee from the host university acquire a clear understanding of the essential features of a land grant institution and ways and means by which such could be developed in their own country. The representatives of the host institution could spend as much as 3 to 4 months at the sponsoring institution.

A part of the total seminar and dialogue process should involve the flow of information from the representative of the host to those representing the sponsoring institution. In this flow, the prespective cooperating staff members should become well acquainted with the essential features of the host institution as it exists at present.

Following its 3 to 4-months stay in the United States, the host university committee could return home and make preparations for a reciprocal visit by representatives of the sponsoring institution. About 1 month after the committee has returned and has been able to make preparation for the intensive pre-project planning activity on a broad scale, a committee of three from the sponsoring institution should spend 6 to 8 months in the country finalizing the pre-project activities and preparing the final report. Members of this committee would include the project director and two other persons who have: (1) demonstrated their technical competence, (2) acquired an insight into the institution building processes, (3) have completed appraisals of other institutions, and (4) are able to relate to other people in other cultures.

Attention needs to be given to the question of in-service training programs for personnel from the sponsoring institution who may accept foreign assignments at the host institution. By the same token, plans need to be made for in-service training programs designed to help host institutional staff members who have been to America for study to become more effective staff participants in the project activities. It would be hoped that at the close of the pre-project planning phases, a spirit

of mutual trust, confidence, and understanding would have been developed by the representatives of the two countries.

In addition, a series of blueprints should have been developed and approved by representatives of all institutions involved. These blueprints should spell out in some detail the ultimate goals, the steps necessary to achieve these goals, and the roles and responsibilities of different persons involved in the developmental process. When these things are achieved, then, and only then, does it seem likely that the maximum success of the new institution will be assured.

#### References:

1. Esman, M. J. and Blaise, H. C. Institution Building Research: The Guiding Concepts. (Mimeograph) Graduate School of Public and International Affairs. University of Pittsburgh, 1965.
2. Liming, O. M. Agricultural Universities: Comprehensive Analysis and Targets to Self-Development Competency in Various Subjects. 8 pages, New Delhi, India, April 20, 1966.
3. Roskelley, R. W. and Rigney, J. A. Measuring Institutional Maturity in the Development of Indigenous Agricultural Universities. Utah State University, Logan, Utah, 1968.
4. Rigney, J. A. and McDermott, J. K. Role of Technical Personnel in the Technical Assistance-Institution Building Process. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina, 1968.

If an agricultural university is to develop most effectively and make maximum contributions to a developing nation, it should become a functional part of a national plan for change in the agricultural sector of the country. A fine paper dealing with the topic is entitled A Developing Planning Model for Technological Change in Agriculture by Joseph B. Goodwin, Melvin G. Blase and Dale Colyer. University of Missouri. One portion of the Final Report of the CIC-AID Rural Development Research Project, Contract No. AID/csd-840.