

**GUIDELINES AND CRITERIA
FOR THE SELECTION
OF UNIVERSITY CONTRACTORS**

A REPORT FOR THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BY

CHESTER M. ALTER

The Academy For Educational Development

505 Symes Building

820 Sixteenth Street

Denver, Colorado 80202

April, 1967

Contract No. AID/csd-1099

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Samuel M. Brownell, Chairman

Professor of Urban Educational Administration, Yale University
Graduate School.
Formerly Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Michigan, and
United States Commissioner of Education.

Alvin C. Eurich, President

President, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.
Formerly President, State University of New York; Vice President,
Fund for the Advancement of Education; Executive Director, Ford
Foundation Education Program; Vice President and Acting Presi-
dent, Stanford University; Chairman of the Board, Stanford
Research Institute.

Sidney G. Tickton, Vice President and Treasurer

Staff Director for studies being conducted by the Academy for
Educational Development.
Formerly Program Associate, Ford Foundation; Manager of Technical
Services for Beardsley Ruml; Assistant Director of Research,
United States Treasury Department.

Joseph S. Iseman, Secretary

Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison (Attorneys
at Law, New York City).

Robert O. Anderson

Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Atlantic
Richfield Company; Trustee, University of Chicago, St. John's
College; Vice Chairman, Lovelace Foundation.

Gilbert Granet

President, Famous Artists Schools.

Robert V. Hansberger

President, Boise Cascade Corporation.

Fred Ludekens

Chairman of the Board, Famous Artists Schools; Director, Foote, Cone and Belding.

James A. McCain

President, Kansas State University.

John F. Merriam

Chairman of the Executive Committee, Northern Natural Gas Company; Chairman, Business Education Committee, Committee for Economic Development; Trustee, University of Chicago.

James E. O'Brien

Vice President and Director, Standard Oil Company of California.

The Academy for Educational Development is a nonprofit tax-exempt corporation serving schools, colleges, universities, government agencies, corporations, and other public and private organizations concerned with education, or desiring to develop educational plans for the future.

1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Phone: 212-265-5620

505 Symes Building
820 Sixteenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202
Phone: 303-244-9258

MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE ACADEMY'S
AID PROJECT

Initial Members of Committee

Frank Bowles

President, Fund for the Advancement of Education.
Formerly President, College Entrance Examination Board.

John S. Everton

Vice President, Education and World Affairs; Executive Director,
Overseas Educational Service.
Formerly United States Ambassador to Burma; Ford Foundation
representative in Burma; Associate Director, Ford Foundation
International Training and Research Program; President,
Kalamazoo College.

Lester W. Nelson

Educational Consultant.
Formerly Associate Program Director, Ford Foundation Education
Program; Treasurer and Associate Program Director, Fund for
the Advancement of Education; Secretary and Treasurer, Educa-
tional Facilities Laboratories; Past President, Middle States
Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

W. Homer Turner

Executive Director, United States Steel Foundation; Assistant
to the Vice President of Finance and Controller, United States
Steel Corporation.

F. Champion Ward

Vice President, Ford Foundation Division of Education and Research;
Trustee, Oberlin College.
Formerly Dean of the College and Professor of Humanities,
University of Chicago.

Alvin C. Eurich (Chairman)

Curtis H. Barker (Project Monitor)

University Relations Officer, Agency for International Development.

Subsequent Members of Committee

Chester M. Alter

Chancellor (on leave), University of Denver.
Formerly Dean, Graduate School, Boston University.

Richard D. Gatewood

Educational Consultant.

Formerly various positions in United States Foreign Service
up to Counselor of an Embassy.

David L. Mosconi

Head of the Division of Research, College of Business Administration,
University of Denver.

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10036

212 COLUMBUS 5-8525

March 31, 1967

Mr. William S. Gaud
Administrator
Agency for International Development
Department of State
Washington, D. C. 20523

Dear Mr. Gaud:

Contract number AID/csd-1099 dated December 22, 1965, authorized the Academy for Educational Development to conduct a study of university resources for use in the AID program. This study has now been completed, and this letter transmits our final report. It was prepared by Dr. Chester M. Alter, Chancellor (on leave) of the University of Denver.

During the course of the study, data were gathered and reports prepared on 108 universities, colleges, and higher education consortia. The day-to-day responsibility for this portion of the study was in the hands of Sidney G. Tickton, Vice President of the Academy. The field work was carried on and reports on the various institutions were prepared by a study team of college and university presidents, deans, and faculty members directed by Dr. David L. Mosconi, Head, Division of Research, College of Business Administration, University of Denver.

The contract provides that the inventory of information assembled during the course of this study including field reports and files of working materials be delivered to AID upon completion of the study. Because the inventory was voluminous, it is being sent directly to Mr. Curtis Barker, University Relations Officer, Agency for International Development, in whose office in Washington, D. C. it will be available for examination by your staff.

The completion of this study was possible only because of the cooperation of literally hundreds of college and university officials who provided the information we needed and stood ready to be helpful when called upon. We use this occasion to express our thanks to them.

We appreciate the opportunity of conducting this study for AID and look forward to discussing it with you and your associates at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Alvin C. Eurich

Alvin C. Eurich
President

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Tab</u>		<u>Page</u>
	Letter of Transmittal	
1	PREFACE	1
	<u>Part I - Criteria for Selection</u>	
	A. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF UNIVERSITY CONTRACTORS	
2	Introduction	11
3	Index to the Eight Gardner Criteria.	21
4	Criterion 1 - Extent of Resources.	23
5	Criterion 2 - Caliber of Faculty	41
6	Criterion 3 - Interdisciplinary Programs	53
7	Criterion 4 - Research Resources	68
8	Criterion 5 - Administration	78
9	Criterion 6 - Overseas Experience.	93
10	Criterion 7 - Quality of Personnel	103
11	Criterion 8 - Commitment.	113
12	B. MAJOR TYPES OF CONSORTIA, ASSOCIATIONS, AND OTHER INSTRUMENTALITIES DESIGNED FOR COOPERATIVE UNDERTAKINGS	
	Introduction	126
	Major Types of Consortia	132
13	C. IMPACT OF INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT ON THE UNIVERSITY.	149
	<u>Part II - The Inventory Study</u>	
14	A. INTRODUCTION	184
15	B. PROCEDURES AND METHODS	186
16	C. COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS	202
17	<u>Appendices</u>	
	A. Alphabetical List of Institutions Included in the Sample.	217
	B. Members of the Academy's Study Team.	222

Tables and Charts

Table 1.	Degree of expectancy of finding high caliber of faculty in relevant fields	52
Table 2.	Comparisons of foreign students and scholars and faculty members abroad at two similar universities .	153
Table 3.	United States faculty abroad by fields of interest .	155
Table 4.	United States students abroad by fields of interest .	156
Table 5.	Foreign students in the United States by fields of study	157
Table 6.	Foreign faculty and scholars visiting in the United States by fields of interest	158
Table 7.	Comparison of foreign students and total enrollment in AID-contract universities and colleges	160
Table 8.	Comparison of foreign students and total enrollment in non-AID-contract universities and colleges.	163
Table 9.	Comparison of visiting foreign scholars and total faculty in AID-contract universities and colleges .	168
Table 10.	Comparison of visiting foreign scholars and total faculty in non-AID-contract universities and colleges	171
Table 11.	Comparison of faculty abroad with total faculty in AID-contract universities and colleges	176
Table 12.	Comparison of faculty abroad with total faculty in non-AID-contract universities and colleges.	179
Table 13.	Comparison of 108 sample institutions with total United States institutions by category	194
Table 14.	United States universities with AID contracts as of September 30, 1966.	224
Table 15.	Number of universities and colleges with AID contracts, classified by categories	231
Table 16.	Summary of contacts made in securing data for sample of 108 organizations.	232
Chart A.	Institutions in the sample classified by type	237
Chart B.	Institutions in the sample classified by geographic areas.	239
Chart C.	Institutions in the sample classified by size (of enrollment).	241
Chart D.	Institutions in the sample classified by special characteristics.	244

PREFACE

Part I

The relationship between the United States government and the nation's colleges and universities is one which has a long history. It is interesting, therefore, to point out that this relationship has been developed without the Federal government itself establishing many Federal educational institutions. Howard University, an institution founded primarily for Negroes, and the military academies are about the only exceptions. With the great growth of the Federal government and concurrently the tremendous expansion of the higher education establishment under other auspices, both of these combined with the increasing demand for the services of scholars by all segments of our society, it is not surprising that this cooperative relationship between the government, its many agencies, and the universities has grown at a very rapid rate since the beginning of World War II.

In no area, with the possible exception of scientific research, has this growing relationship been more pronounced than in the area of international development. The need for, use of, and interest in government-university cooperation in this challenging undertaking has been amply demonstrated both by the Agency for International Development and its predecessor agencies

on the one hand and by a wide spectrum of educational institutions on the other. As of June 30, 1966, AID listed a total of 308 current contracts with 127 different universities or other academic institutions with total contract funds amounting to \$201,666,502. This is big business and, with an operation as large and as complex as this, it is not surprising that many managerial as well as philosophical problems have arisen. The peculiarities of overseas development have challenged some of the traditional methods and functions of the American university. Likewise, the limited mission of the Agency has required that some restrictions be placed on the latitude of actions preferred by the university.

There has been much written, conferences have been held, and dialogues have been engaged in on the subject of the problems and opportunities of university-AID relationships. Undoubtedly, the most significant publication on the subject has been AID and the Universities by John W. Gardner, which was published in a government report by the Agency and subsequently for public distribution by Education and World Affairs in 1964. This concise and thoughtful assessment of the relationship between the chief government agency responsible for our efforts in overseas development, the Agency for International Development, and the universities of the nation referred only briefly, although with great force, to the particular problem of the selection of university contractors for work overseas.

In December, 1965, the Academy for Educational Development entered into a contract with the Agency for International Development to develop and carry out a study designed to " . . . assist A.I.D. to implement the recommendations in the report to the Administrator entitled A.I.D. and the Universities by John W. Gardner, dated April 1964 . . . with specific regard for the recommendations on selection of contractors and the development and use of instrumentalities to serve multiple university efforts."

Section I-B of this contract gave the following specific statement of work:

"1. Within the framework of the Gardner Report, the Contractor will describe a set of detailed criteria and techniques for A.I.D. to use in selecting university contractors. The criteria will, among other things, identify the types of university resources which are relevant to A.I.D.'s needs and the factors which influence a university's ability to bring such resources to bear on A.I.D. tasks. Development of the criteria will start from the generalized questions stated in the portion of the Gardner Report entitled "Selection Criteria." The Contractor will detail these criteria.

"2. The Contractor will test these criteria and techniques on the several specific types of United States universities to be chosen by the Contractor. It is understood that the Contractor will be adding to, refining, and defining more precisely, the criteria and techniques while the studies of specific universities are being carried out, and each study of a university will specifically indicate in what way, if any, it is based on criteria or techniques that differ from those finally recommended to A.I.D. In choosing the universities to be studied, the Contractor will seek diversification in size, sponsorship (public, private, sectarian, nonsectarian), experience in international operations, experience with A.I.D. or predecessor agencies, geographic distribution in the United States, geographic and functional areas of overseas interest, and such other factors as may be relevant in obtaining a representative group with

sufficient diversity to test and illustrate the application of proper criteria and techniques. The group will include at least 100 universities, and no more than 125 universities, unless otherwise agreed upon by A.I.D. Consultants may be engaged for studies of specific universities, subject to appropriate safeguards against possible conflicts of interest, but responsibility for each study and for the correlation of the studies rests with the Contractor.

"3. Starting from the section of the Gardner Report entitled "Non-governmental Arrangements," the Contractor will describe in detail and recommend, with criteria for choice, what kinds of instrumentalities are needed, are practicable, and will most effectively serve to promote multiple-university efforts in A.I.D. programs.

"4. In performing the contract, the Contractor will assemble and analyze all available data, including information available within and outside A.I.D.; make visits and on the scene surveys, as appropriate; assess the relevant characteristics of each institution, with particular regard for the Gardner recommendations; and maintain a close working relationship with A.I.D.

"5. The Contractor will incorporate the results of its work in a final report, one separate and severable part of which will be the case studies of individual institutions, including the identification of resources relevant to the various A.I.D. needs.

"6. The Contractor will be prepared to update the data and conclusions as necessary and expand the sample for possible future extension of the study under supplementary funding if A.I.D. deems the same desirable and at its option requests the same in writing."

This study, together with separate reports on 108 institutions and with substantial documentary material relative to each institution in the sample, constitutes the final report called for by this contract.

Part I, Section A, of this report details, elaborates, and interprets each of Mr. Gardner's generalized selection criteria and applies each to

the various types of colleges and universities in the sample. Although every effort has been made to avoid any evaluation of individual institutions with respect to potential fulfillment of these criteria, it has become obvious that some of these standards are more likely to be met by some categories or types of institutions than by others. The reasons for such differences are cited in the study as the application of each criterion to each category of institution is elaborated. The various criteria have been tested by an analysis of the information gathered from the institutions in the sample (both those with and those without AID contracts) and by means of interviews. The knowledge and experience of the members of the Academy staff and the consultants who have served as members of the study team, as well as that of the Advisory Committee, have been influential and helpful in evaluating these criteria and thus the realism of their application.

In Section B of this report, the various kinds of instrumentalities designed to serve multiple-university efforts are categorized and described. Also a special set of criteria applicable to each of the various types of consortia, associations, etc., has been developed and tested. Although an effort has been made to minimize specific recommendations to AID, in the belief that the Agency is wise enough to develop its own proper procedures if it has sufficient facts available, included in this section are considerations which may be more

unusual than those in the section dealing with the traditional types of universities and colleges. The fact of the matter is, there is less experience to guide us in dealing with consortia than with individual institutions. Nevertheless, there is a potential for fruitful results which could stem from the efforts already made in marshalling the special resources of groups of institutions.

In Section C of Part I is presented an assessment of the probable impact of overseas development activity in the university. Although institutional impact is a most important objective for any university entering into an AID contract, it is difficult, if not impossible, to measure quantitatively. An effort has been made, however, to partially do this by a study of the number of foreign students, number of foreign scholars, and number of faculty members in overseas work. Comparisons of AID contract universities with otherwise similar noncontract universities have been made.

Although the results of this study should not be used to evaluate individual institutions, it would appear that the relationships cited have some significance in measuring impact and probably are useful in predetermining some factors contributing to that loosely defined quality called "commitment."

Part II

A major portion of this study has involved the gathering of relevant information from a sample of 108 colleges, universities, and other educational institutions. In choosing the institutions to be included in the sample, great diversification in size, sponsorship, experience in international operations, and geographic distribution was sought. Consultants interviewed representatives of many of these institutions and data and insights about them were collected. As a part of this over-all study, brief summaries of pertinent information on these institutions are submitted. Taken together, these 108 separately submitted reports constitute a readily-available inventory of information that might prove useful to AID when it is called upon to apply its criteria for the selection of a particular university for a possible overseas or other type of contract. Obviously, this inventory of reports is not complete, but it is an example of the kind of information that is available. Sometimes such information is difficult to obtain in individual cases, and it must be kept in mind that much of it rapidly becomes obsolete. However, it would not require a large staff to keep it up-to-date and to add to the inventory two or three times as many institutions as are included in the experimental sample used for this study.

These reports have been invaluable in the application and testing of the criteria and techniques for selection of contractors as

reported in Part I of this study. Charts and data pertaining to the survey of the sample institutions are included in the Appendices. The 108 reports on the individual institutions, together with files of materials and documents collected from the sample institutions, are transmitted separately for the further assistance of AID in the implementation of the recommendations in Mr. Gardner's report.

Although not a part of the scope or requirements of this study, many unsolicited comments and observations were gathered about AID-university relationships in particular and the role of universities in overseas development work in general. Believing that AID would not want these comments and observations lost, a number of them have been collected, sometimes paraphrased, and are included in Part II under the heading of "Comments and Observations." The Academy does not undertake to evaluate them, but merely transmits them. Although many of them have been heard repeatedly, some are obviously based on out-of-date information or on experiences gained from procedures and policies which have been modified in recent years.

It should be emphasized that these comments should not be interpreted as recommendations of the staff of the Academy, even if they are in the form of advice. They are ideas collected from a wide variety of sources and are submitted for review by AID.

Acknowledgements

The author was employed by the Academy for Educational Development as a consultant and assigned the responsibility for the writing and preparation of this final study. Although I gladly assume full responsibility to the Academy for its contents, its preparation would not have been possible without major assistance from many sources and many people.

To the University of Denver, which granted me a leave of absence as Chancellor for the Academic year 1966-1967, I am eternally grateful. Had this leave not been offered, I could not have undertaken this pleasant assignment.

The Academy officers and staff have provided all assistance and support that was needed. Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, President, and Mr. Sidney G. Tickton, Vice President and Treasurer, who served as Study Director, both have been constant sources of advice and guidance. Miss Nancy Berve, Coordinator of Reports, and Mrs. Robert B. Jones, secretary, have done the innumerable things that I could not possibly do and they have done them with complete graciousness and expertness.

Dr. David L. Mosconi, Head of the Division of Research in the University of Denver's College of Business Administration, served as Associate Study Director to coordinate the field work carried on by numerous consultants, and to him and them I extend my special thanks for the immense task of data collection, collation, and interpretation of the materials for the 108 institutions in the sample.

A special note of thanks is due Mr. Curtis Barker, University Relations Officer of the Agency for International Development, who has served as the contract monitor. Although he is in no way responsible for any views expressed in this report, he contributed in a most cooperative and helpful way to the author's understanding and appreciation of the significance of this study.

To all of these I express my appreciation and absolve them of any responsibility for the contents of the study.

Chester M. Alter

April 1967

PART I - CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

A. CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF UNIVERSITY CONTRACTORS

Introduction

Since the beginning of the huge buildup of university-government agency relationships shortly after World War II, perhaps no problem has been more frustrating than the proper selection of university contractors. Obviously this is a matter of concern to the contracting agency which has the responsibility not only of defining the project but also the responsibility for the selection of the contractor which is calculated to best perform under the contract. The agency here is confronted with a wide variety of alternatives and may well be subjected to a diversity of pressures from several sources.

By the same token the potential university contractors are under manifold pressures under the guise of internal desires or oppositions from individual faculty members, of taxpayer concern, of prestige-seeking forces, of traditional interests in all kinds of public affairs, and of a developing experience with government contracts.

The selection of a particular university for the awarding of a contract to perform a given mission, however, produces a kind of additional dilemma. On the one hand, it is not unreasonable to

expect the agency to want to contract with a university which it believes to be best qualified to perform with excellence; on the other hand, there is a general understanding that every kind of government-university relationship -- be it grant, contract, consultation, or what -- should be considered an opportunity for the government to undergird and enhance the strength of the university and hence the total strength of the nation's higher educational establishment. The reconciliation of these two avowed purposes, both of which have been implicitly and explicitly avowed by Congress, by the President of the United States, and by educational leaders, points up the desirability of the agency having well-understood criteria for the selection of contracting universities.

In dealing with this subject John W. Gardner wrote:*

"We have already made the point that A.I.D. should regard every contract as a means of strengthening the university as well as accomplishing a job abroad. So it must not only ask, 'Can this university do the job?' but, 'Are there particular advantages to the national interest in strengthening this university as a future resource?'"

This point of view has been fortified in more recent months by presidential statements as well as by Congressional actions. The enactment of the International Education Act as well as the language of Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966 both bear on this matter although there are clear distinctions between the specific objectives of these two pieces of legislation.

* A.I.D. and the Universities, page 21.

However, acceptance of both of these basic objectives might well be useful to the Agency for International Development in deciding between two potential university contractors (institutions A and B are both judged to be able to "do the job" but B would probably gain more than A in overall strength because A is already stronger than B; hence, university B possibly is awarded the contract). This does not become a real problem when it is faced from the beginning. There may be a dozen institutions that feel they are able to "do the job" and an analysis of the matter leads to the conclusion that probably at least a half a dozen of them are qualified. What criteria can then be used for selection? Shall the final selection bring about a further refinement of the question of which of the six can best "do the job" or of a determination of which of the six would profit most in terms of the development of its strength as a future national resource?

Assuming that in many cases AID contracts are a means of enhancing the strength of a university, we find ourselves asking the question "should (by the selection process) the strongest be made stronger and the weaker remain still adequate but less strong than the strongest, or should the contract be used to upgrade the total base of strength?" This is a policy question which every government agency must resolve for itself if it is not resolved in the national interest by higher authority.

One thing is certain, the dilemma is too important to be resolved by chance or by a series of chances, or by habit, or by a

limited knowledge of the total reservoir of potential contractors extending even to the fine structure of a wide variety of colleges and universities.

One of the purposes of this study is to "detail the generalized questions raised by John Gardner entitled "Selection Criteria."* This task has been undertaken with full cognizance of the warning given by Mr. Gardner as follows:**

"It has been suggested that we correct the deficiencies of recent selection procedures by establishing an orderly, systematic and explicit set of procedures and criteria. But we believe that any such attempt to formalize or explicitly define the selection procedure would tie the Agency hand and foot."

We subscribe to and have tried to adhere to this advice. But Mr. Gardner continued:

"The solution to the selection problem is to state certain general considerations (as we have above) and then to make certain that the people doing the selection are adequately equipped to do an intelligent job. This means, first of all, that they must be people who know the universities and know quality when they see it. The second requirement is that they have a thorough grasp of the nature of the job to be done overseas. The third requirement is that they have access to (or develop on their own) a comprehensive view of the total U. S. resources (university and other) to do the job. The fourth requirement is that there be instrumentalities (such as . . . university consortia) through which the resources of small institutions can be tapped."

It is within the framework of this advice and using the eight general considerations cited by Mr. Gardner that this study undertakes

* A.I.D. and the Universities, page 22-23.

** Ibid., page 23.

to be helpful to those in the Agency charged with the responsibility of selecting university contractors.

For each of the generalized criteria suggested by Mr. Gardner, some general elaborations and interpretations are included. Some, from a practical and operational point of view, are more realistic than others. The objective facts are applicable and available for some of his criteria, whereas for others the Agency will probably have to be content with subjective judgments. In the latter case, however, such judgments should be based on at least sophisticated and enlightened feelings of people who are well acquainted with the needs of the Agency and the detailed nature of the American educational system.

First, we have detailed Mr. Gardner's generalized questions by applying them to the various types of institutions and consortia. Second, we have tested many of the criteria through review of a vast amount of information and data as well as by means of personal interviews with knowledgeable people, always keeping in mind that in order to get pertinent and relevant answers prior to making a decision (such as selection of a contractor), the right and relevant questions must be asked. The right question to ask of one type of institution may be irrelevant in the case of another type.

For the purpose of this study we have used the nine rather obvious types or categories of institutions or organizations into

which the 108 examples in the sample were divided for the purpose of another part of this study (see page 189). (In Mr. Gardner's generalized questions he used the word "university" to include all kinds of higher education institutions -- universities, colleges, junior colleges, consortia, etc.)

For the purpose of detailing Mr. Gardner's generalized selection criteria and for the purpose of testing these against various types of institutions within the sample, we devised rather specific questions which could be asked of each university. These questions were not of equal significance with respect to either (a) the extent to which good answers were available for all institutions, or (b) their value in helping the Agency answer the crucial question of whether or not a specific institution would be a good place to consider for a development contract.

The questions, however, were helpful as a technique which any agency, not thoroughly knowledgeable about each of a long list of institutions, would find useful in building up an inventory of information about the probable resources and attitudes in individual institutions. The questions should be useful in giving a background of something more than purely subjective feelings about the potential usefulness of the various types of institutions for the meeting of AID's needs.

It is on the basis of our experience in this testing program, as well as from discussions with many experienced educators (both

faculty and administrators), that we have been able to arrive at the general comments following a statement of each of Mr. Gardner's eight generalized "Selection Criteria" applied to each of the nine categories or types of institutions. Many of the specific questions actually shed light on more than one criterion and are so listed. Although the applicability of the detailed questions to specific institutions are found in the university reports and files which are being submitted with this study, the following discussions can be considered something of a synthesis of reaction to this kind of approach.

The questions that are listed under each criteria are purely illustrative, and, as pointed out above, many of them are not likely to induce complete, accurate, or completely reliable responses when asked of a given institution. They do, however, constitute a technique that, when applied, provides a feeling about that institution as well as a basis for general conclusions on the probable resources which might well be found in each of the various types of institutions.

Specific Questions Which Might be Raised by AID
in Selecting a University Contractor

(Based on questions raised by Academy's representatives when they studied the various institutions in the sample)

1. What information on the various departments and schools in your institution do you have that might be helpful to the administrators of the AID program?
2. Can you provide AID with the names of department chairmen and faculty members who might be particularly helpful to the AID program?
3. Can you provide the number of graduate students in the particular departments and schools involved?
4. Can you provide the number of master's degrees awarded for the past five years?
5. Can you provide the number of doctoral degrees awarded for the past five years?
6. What information on the various departments and schools can you provide for the last five years showing the research and other important contracts and grants conducted by your institution?
7. Can you provide information for the last five years showing the research, consulting, government, and corporate activities in which key faculty members were involved?
8. For these same schools and departments can you provide a list of publications by the faculty for each of the past five years?
9. For these same schools and departments can you provide a list of overseas activities of the faculty for the past five years?
10. For these same schools and departments can you provide a list of honors received by the faculty for the past five years?
11. Can you provide a list of non-Western courses and programs offered by your institution?
12. Can you provide AID with the enrollment in each of these programs at the graduate level?

13. Can you provide information on special research institutes on campus?
14. Can you provide information on research activities in affiliated hospitals?
15. Can you provide information on off-campus research centers and laboratories?
16. What information can you provide on your institution's commitment to overseas development work?
17. Does your institution have a flexibility of operation which will make it possible to undertake new assignments, particularly off-campus and overseas?
18. Is your institution in a position to tailor programs to the needs of developing countries?
19. Could your institution release some of its best personnel to spend a year or two abroad?
20. How would the administration replace these persons or reassign their current duties?
21. What kinds of educational development activities have your institution carried on in recent years, both domestically and overseas?
22. Do you have any unique programs or have you made special contributions to the development of your local community?
23. Who in the institution has been responsible for these programs?
24. Are these programs still being carried on?
25. What interest does your institution have and to what extent has it participated in such activities as the Peace Corps?
26. What interest does your institution have and to what extent has it participated in such activities as the Job Corps?
27. What interest does your institution have and to what extent has it participated in other domestic programs involving the underprivileged?
28. Has your institution been involved in programs such as these in its own community or in nearby areas?

29. Does your institution include foreign students in its student body?
30. How many foreign students were on campus during each of the past five years?
31. From which countries do they originate?
32. What special activities does the institution engage in with respect to foreign students?
33. What does your institution do in order to better understand the needs of foreign students, and to overcome some of the problems they present?
34. What special resources or programs does your institution have that you think might be helpful to the AID program?
35. Does your institution have a museum, a library, and anthropological and archaeological specialties and interests?
36. What kind of adult education and extension services does your institution conduct?
37. What is the scope of these activities?
38. Are there special language programs and institutes on your campus?
39. Does your institution have a foreign study program such as junior year abroad or a foreign center?
40. Is your institution engaged in cooperative activities with other colleges and universities?
41. Is your institution engaged in cooperative activities with secondary schools?
42. If your institution is engaged in cooperative activities with other colleges, universities, or secondary schools, can you provide descriptive information which AID might find useful?
43. Can you provide printed or other descriptive material issued by the institution, such as catalogs, annual reports, presidents' reports, and press releases, which might be helpful in assessing the scope and the range of your institution's activities?
44. Can you provide printed or other descriptive material issued by the institution which would be helpful in explaining the aims and capacities of your institution to members of the staff directing and planning the AID program?

Index to
John Gardner's Generalized Selection Criteria

<u>Tab</u>		<u>Page</u>
4	1. Extent university has developed its resources	23
	1. Land-grant universities	24
	2. Other public universities and colleges.	26
	3. Public university branches.	28
	4. Large private universities.	29
	5. Liberal arts colleges	31
	6. Large engineering and science universities.	33
	7. Junior colleges	36
	8. Consortia of colleges and universities.	39
	9. Other higher education institutions	40
5	2. Caliber of faculty in key fields	41
	1. Land-grant universities	42
	2. Other public universities and colleges.	43
	3. Public university branches.	44
	4. Large private universities.	45
	5. Liberal arts colleges	46
	6. Large engineering and science universities.	47
	7. Junior colleges	48
	8. Consortia of colleges and universities.	50
	9. Other higher education institutions	51
6	3. Faculty inclination toward interdisciplinary work	53
	1. Land-grant universities	54
	2. Other public universities and colleges.	56
	3. Public university branches.	58
	4. Large private universities.	59
	5. Liberal arts colleges	61
	6. Large engineering and science universities.	63
	7. Junior colleges	65
	8. Consortia of colleges and universities.	66
	9. Other higher education institutions	67
7	4. Research resources in relevant fields	68
	1. Land-grant universities	69
	2. Other public universities and colleges.	70
	3. Public university branches.	71
	4. Large private universities.	72
	5. Liberal arts colleges	73
	6. Large engineering and science universities.	74
	7. Junior colleges	75
	8. Consortia of colleges and universities.	76
	9. Other higher education institutions	77

<u>Tab</u>		<u>Page</u>
8	5. Administrative ability to handle overseas work	78
	1. Land-grant universities	79
	2. Other public universities and colleges.	81
	3. Public university branches.	83
	4. Large private universities.	84
	5. Liberal arts colleges	86
	6. Large engineering and science universities.	88
	7. Junior colleges	89
	8. Consortia of colleges and universities.	90
	9. Other higher education institutions	92
9	6. Extent of earlier experiences in overseas work	93
	1. Land-grant universities	94
	2. Other public universities and colleges.	95
	3. Public university branches.	96
	4. Large private universities.	97
	5. Liberal arts colleges	98
	6. Large engineering and science universities.	99
	7. Junior colleges	100
	8. Consortia of colleges and universities.	101
	9. Other higher education institutions	102
10	7. Quality of personnel assigned to specific project	103
	1. Land-grant universities	104
	2. Other public universities and colleges.	105
	3. Public university branches.	106
	4. Large private universities.	107
	5. Liberal arts colleges	108
	6. Large engineering and science universities.	109
	7. Junior colleges	110
	8. Consortia of colleges and universities.	111
	9. Other higher education institutions	112
11	8. University's commitment to overseas development projects	113
	1. Land-grant universities	114
	2. Other public universities and colleges.	116
	3. Public university branches.	118
	4. Large private universities.	119
	5. Liberal arts colleges	120
	6. Large engineering and science universities.	121
	7. Junior colleges	122
	8. Consortia of colleges and universities.	123
	9. Other higher education institutions	125

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 1

"TO WHAT EXTENT HAS THE UNIVERSITY DEVELOPED ITS RESOURCES IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD GENERALLY --- FACULTY, CURRICULUM, RESEARCH, LIBRARY, INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS?"

Questions* which are particularly relevant to this criterion:

Since this is a rather general criterion, all of the 44 questions pertain in some measure to the determination of how well an institution has developed its resources.

* See page 18

(Extent of Resources)

Land-Grant Universities

This type of institution can be said to have developed its resources in the international field to a high degree and this has been done in most cases in a relatively short period of time. However, it should be noted that this rapid development in the land-grant university has not necessarily been of an across-the-board kind. For instance, the evidence would indicate that such institutions have strengthened their international interests in applied areas such as agriculture and engineering perhaps to a greater extent than they have in areas such as languages, anthropology, sociology, and the several cultural fields.

In a similar manner, in this type of institution perhaps more attention has been given to the operation, administration, management, and staffing of overseas development projects than in developing a planned way interdisciplinary area study programs at the undergraduate and graduate level or in the development of broadly-conceived curricula in, for instance, non-Western studies.

It appears that the annual dollar volume of overseas development work in some land-grant universities exceeds the total dollar volume of all research on their home campus. In the land-grant universities, development of resources of future importance in international

development generally has not been undertaken in certain professional areas. For instance, law, international relations, education, social work, and business administration are not usually as well developed in land-grant institutions as they are in other types of institutions. In engineering there appears to be a wide variation of stages of development within this types of institution.

(Extent of Resources)

Other Public Universities and Colleges

The general development of the public universities, in terms of this criterion, is at high level and reflects historically a longer period of interest in international affairs than has been the case with the land-grant institutions. They may be considered together with the latter type as constituting almost the full gamut of American higher education at the university level. To be sure, the public non-land-grant institutions generally have not been assigned certain fields of interest to the Agency such as agriculture, but, on the other hand, they generally have well-developed professional programs in medicine and law which may well be of future importance in international development. In terms of general resources such as arts and sciences and including engineering, out of which an interest in overseas work might be expected to flourish, these institutions are strong. Area study curricula, including non-Western cultural programs, are quite generally found. Language instruction, including many of those languages identified with less-developed nations, is common in the large public universities.

Faculties are large, diversified, and are oriented toward research and scholarship in many of the more prominent public institutions. The libraries of many of these institutions are among the better university libraries of the United States.

It should be pointed out that many of the large public universities have attracted large numbers of foreign students and visiting scholars and, particularly in more recent years, have found it possible to send more faculty members on a wide variety of overseas study and research assignments.

(Extent of Resources)

Public University Branches

It has been observed that this category of institutions, which is of rather recent origin, usually has not developed resources in the international field to the extent the parent universities have.* This is understandable because, in general, these branches have been established in large population centers primarily to meet the basic educational needs of the residents under the theory that it is cheaper to provide educational facilities where the people live than to transport students to a central-state university campus.

In many of the branch campuses, it is probable that the emphasis is on teaching and training rather than on research. In many, part-time and adult education is of major importance. Libraries in many of the branches are inferior to those in the parent university, although interlibrary mechanisms may be in operation. Team approaches and interdisciplinary curricula are less well developed than in the parent institution.

In some cases, the administrative relations between the parent and branch are unclear, both at the higher echelons and at the departmental level. Local autonomy and legal authority for entering into contracts vary from case to case.

* There are a few exceptions to this general statement.

(Extent of Resources)

Large Private Universities

With perhaps the exception of agriculture and, to a lesser extent, adult education, trade skills, or vocational training, the large private universities have generally (with some specific exceptions) had considerable experience with and interest in international fields. This is natural because they are not supported by the various states and therefore have considered themselves more nationally and internationally oriented. It should be pointed out that there is a wide variation between the representatives of this category of universities in terms of size, scope and emphasis of curricula, international interest, and their views of their own educational mission, as well as their source of control.

Many of the large private universities have traditionally had a substantial interest in foreign students and in the development of working relationships with foreign universities. Area studies programs, interdisciplinary curricula, and the development of cross-professional and disciplinary institutes are common in the large private universities. On many of these campuses, research, not only in the sciences and engineering but also in the basic and applied social sciences, is found to be a significant mission.

Some of the best qualified private universities, from the standpoint of this criterion, may tend to see direct service to the

government or to specific overseas undertakings as falling outside their own objectives.

Purely from the standpoint of this criterion alone, it can be said that many of the large private universities represent a fine resource for international development programs. However, the variation between the individual institutions within this category is so great and the needs of the Agency's projects are so specific that the possible matching of university to project becomes a problem requiring considerable understanding.

Nevertheless, this category of institutions represents a great store of potential usefulness simply from the point of view of extent of development of resources in the international field.

(Extent of Resources)

Liberal Arts Colleges

As a practical matter, the limited scope of purpose of this type of institution has had the effect of limiting their development of resources (particularly those needed by the Agency) in the international field. This is not to say that these colleges are not interested in international affairs. Many of them have developed strong interdisciplinary and intercultural area-study and non-Western studies programs at the undergraduate level. Their faculties may well include individuals who are most competent in applicable disciplines. Generally, however, they are oriented to undergraduate teaching. The depth of manpower in a given field is usually such that mobility of assignment would not be great, and research, particularly on broad interdisciplinary problems, is usually absent. The service mission of the liberal arts college is less well developed than in other types of educational institutions.

Libraries generally service the undergraduate teaching mission rather than any broader purpose. Many of the colleges have, for their size, a substantial foreign student population.

There is some indication that many of the better liberal arts colleges are beginning to feel the need of greater involvement in action programs including possibly international development. Many are establishing some kind of overseas branch operation or cooperative overseas study opportunities for their own students.

The lack of depth (in terms of numbers) of faculty in a given discipline, as mentioned above, is leading to an increasing interest among liberal arts colleges in the formation of cooperative inter-institutional associations, consortia, etc., for the purpose of reinforcing their strengths in fields of interest to the Agency.

(Extent of Resources)

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Although this category of institutions is not large, there are several examples which have developed substantial and important resources applicable to the Agency's needs. Many of these institutions are already involved in AID contracts and in other overseas development programs under other auspices.

Naturally, as the name of this type of institution implies, the scope of disciplines involved is more limited than in the case of other categories, but in several of the institutions their resources are more extensive than would be anticipated. For instance, there are cases of technological institutes which recently have developed strong interests and capabilities in management, administration, and economics. Furthermore, some have made substantial contributions to the application of these interests to overseas development.

The variation in size of these institutions leads to considerable disparity in their specific resources, both in terms of departmental depth and in terms of interdisciplinary scope and capability. It is found that, within this category, generally the most important resources will be the various branches of engineering. Particular attention is called to their experience in the application of this discipline to broad problems of industrial development. Usually

these institutions would have had less experience in small, grass roots, trade, or simple commercial or manufacturing development, but there are undoubtedly exceptions.

If concern for the development of overseas research centers is applicable, this category of American institutions could provide significant resources.

As a rule these institutions have not developed wide-scale programs that we have come to know as area studies, nor are highly developed non-Western cultural undertakings found in their curricula, either at the undergraduate or graduate level.

A remarkably high enrollment of foreign students, particularly at the graduate level, exists in this category of institutions reflecting a basic interest in what they have to offer other countries.

Because most of these institutions are private, they are expected to be less locally-oriented in their activities than would be the case if they were state-supported. On the other hand, a few of them have, sometimes through an almost autonomous division, developed strong technical and vocational programs designed to meet local manpower needs. This might well constitute a valuable resource useful to overseas development, notwithstanding the fact that these two objectives might seem incompatible.

The great disparity between the different representatives of this category of institutions, in terms of objectives, size, mode of operation, and even basic strength, leads to the conclusion that this criterion, although highly pertinent, would have to be applied to the individual institution rather than to the class on the whole in order to determine its true validity.

(Extent of Resources)

Junior Colleges

In view of the basic objectives, location, source of control and support, and in terms of scope of their mission (many junior colleges are actually called community colleges), these institutions are not expected to have developed many resources in the international field. Although this is generally true, it is possible that a given junior college or several of them combined would have certain kinds of resources that might be matched with AID's needs in specific specialized projects. In fact, they might have some resources and "know-how" which would be superior to any of the other types of institutions.

An agency or foundation would not go to the typical junior college if the project involved a high degree of sophisticated strength in any one of the usual substantive disciplines or professions. Teaching on the undergraduate level is their prime function. Research is usually not emphasized if carried on at all. Library facilities are developed to meet the college's teaching needs and, in most cases, would be rather inadequate for research support. Teaching loads are generally high relative to other types of institutions. Interdisciplinary programs or curricula which normally involve upper-class and graduate students are ordinarily not present in the junior college.

However, many junior and community colleges have had excellent experience in certain areas which might put them in the position of serving as an important resource in support of selected AID projects, provided of course that some of the other criteria are positive. Two possibilities are cited:

- . Trade school or vocational programs. Many of the junior or community colleges have developed strong trade, sub-professional, or vocational programs usually related to the specific manpower needs of their local community. This is a unique kind of educational or, more often, training operation with which, generally speaking, the other types of institutions have had relatively little experience. Although most junior colleges do not have staff or faculty members who have had a diversity of experience in international development, it is altogether likely that some really good teachers of the various trades and subprofessional skills (such as clerical, electronics, mechanics, etc.) could best be found in the junior college.

- . Administration of grass roots or locally oriented trade-skill or vocational institutions. The very nature of the mission of the junior or community college as it has developed in the United States (although they vary

widely in scope, structure, support, and control) has given rise to a substantial body of experienced administrators skilled in the organization, development, and management of this increasingly important type of educational institution. Here again the typical junior college administrator is not experienced in overseas development for the most part or in the application of his knowledge and experience to the overseas developing nation problem.

(Extent of Resources)

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Since consortia do not generally have faculties, curricula, libraries, etc., this criterion does not specifically apply. But the consortia do draw upon the resources of their component institutions. The major question is the extent to which these resources are made available to the consortium itself. There is a wide disparity among consortia in the degree of availability or usefulness of member resources. Geographic proximity of the members to each other, institutional interest in the joint undertaking, tightness and prestige of the consortium administration and management are all factors which may well determine the degree to which the resources of the components are marshalled in support of the needs of the consortium in relation to its mission.

For further material on consortia, see Part I, Section B.

(Extent of Resources)

Other Higher Education Institutions

The number of institutions in this category is so small and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 2

"WHAT IS THE CALIBER OF FACULTY IN KEY FIELDS? RELEVANT FIELDS WILL OF COURSE VARY WITH THE NATURE OF THE CONTRACT AND MAY INCLUDE -- AMONG OTHERS -- AGRICULTURE, ECONOMICS, PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, MEDICINE, NURSING, PUBLIC HEALTH, SOCIOLOGY, CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EDUCATION, AND ALL FIELDS OF ENGINEERING."

Note: See Table 1, page 52. The caliber of faculty (both in terms of quality and quantity) can be expected to vary widely among the various categories of institutions and from department to department within a single institution. This table represents a composite of the opinions of six educators regarding the strength of faculty generally found in relevant fields in each category of institutions.

The symbols H, L, and O indicate the degree of expectancy of finding a high caliber faculty in the various fields in each of the categories. For instance, one would expect to find high quality faculty in agriculture in the land-grant universities (hence the H designation), but there would be no expectancy of finding faculty strength in agriculture in the typical liberal arts college (hence the L designation). The symbol O is used to indicate those cases where, although the expectancy of high caliber faculty would not be great, there are occasional cases where it will be found. For example, a strong professional nursing program would not usually be found in a liberal arts college, but there are a few such colleges in which substantial strength appears, hence the symbol O is indicated.

Questions* which are particularly relevant to this criterion:

1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 21, 23, 38, 41, 42, 43

* See page 18

(Caliber of Faculty)

Land-Grant Universities

A high quality of faculty is normally found in this category of institutions, both in terms of the traditional standards used to measure quality and in terms of depth of backup strength (quantity). However, it must be remembered that this is a group of universities that traditionally have been assigned a somewhat limited educational mission. For instance, all of the land-grant institutions would be expected to have well-developed programs and faculties in agriculture, but few would have medical or dental schools. By the same token, the basic arts and sciences usually, but not in all cases, have been considered service courses in these institutions and the great strength in faculty that has been developed in some other categories of universities normally would not be found.

Therefore, this criterion becomes highly important when considering a particular land-grant institution for an Agency contract and the conclusions would be affected by the nature of the particular field or fields relevant to the specific project.

The degree of expectancy of finding high quality faculty in key fields generally of interest to the Agency in the land-grant institutions is summarized in Table 1 on page 52.

Other Public Universities and Colleges

Since this category of institutions includes both the large multipurpose and general state universities as well as the state colleges (the latter often being institutions which until recently were teacher colleges but are now rapidly expanding to include other fields, particularly arts and sciences), wide variation in caliber of faculty will be found in the fields relevant to international development projects. Most of these schools would not include agriculture and many would not include engineering. Many of our finest medical schools and schools of public health are found in this type of university. Many of these institutions (both universities and state colleges) have particularly fine programs and high caliber faculty in the field of education, including primary, secondary and higher education.

Here again the application of this criterion to this category of institutions has to be made on an individual basis, both with respect to the specific project and to the particular institution under consideration.

A summary of general expectations with respect to the relation of relevant key fields to this type of institution is found in Table 1 on page 52.

(Caliber of Faculty)

Public University Branches

There is a general feeling that the caliber of faculty, in most of the fields relevant to international development, would not be as high in university branches as that in their parent institutions. The evidence seems to confirm this feeling, although there are a few specific exceptions.

An important question to ask in considering a branch university is whether or not the branch is fully integrated with the parent at the departmental level or is the relationship primarily at the administrative level. This relationship seems to be particularly important in the application of this criterion. Generally the quality appears higher and certainly the potential depth of expertness would be greater in the cases where there is close integration (perhaps under one chairman) of faculty and curriculum at the departmental level.

Since most branches of the state universities are located in large population centers, their branches in terms of faculty and curricula could be expected to be more closely related to local community manpower needs. This fact in itself could give rise to the possibility in specific cases of finding high quality faculty in certain relevant fields.

The general expectation of high quality faculty in certain relevant fields is found in Table 1 on page 52.

(Caliber of Faculty)

Large Private Universities

The caliber of faculty in key fields will be found high in a large number of large private universities. This category of institutions, in most cases, will also provide high quality of faculty in substantial depth in many relevant areas. But by the same token this category will be void of some key fields. For instance, the broad field of agriculture is practically untouched in the private university with the possible exception of agricultural economics and certain scientific areas where applications are made to agricultural problems (for example, entomology):

There is usually great strength in the relevant basic arts and sciences and in many of the professions (law, medicine, engineering, public health [in perhaps fewer cases], education, and nursing).

Although great strength of faculty in key fields is often found in this category of institutions, many are more oriented toward undergraduate and graduate teaching, basic research, and scholarly rather than in service types of activity. There are, however, significant exceptions to this, and the trend appears to be towards more involvement of expert faculty members in this type of nonpublic institution in applied and project research, consultation with industry and government, and towards team approaches to problem solving.

The summary of general expectation of high quality faculty in certain key fields is found in Table 1 on page 52.

(Caliber of Faculty)

Liberal Arts Colleges

Since this category of institutions is highly limited in scope of interest, it is obvious that many areas applicable to international development would be missing entirely. This would include all the professions. Since the majority of these colleges are concerned with only undergraduate curricula and are relatively small, the depth of strength in the faculty would not be found very great. Excellent people, particularly in the arts and sciences, are, however, present on these campuses, and a high degree of interest in interdisciplinary approaches is found, as reflected in their curricula, and this applies specifically to area-studies programs and non-Western cultures and languages. Research and action programs related to the requirements of international studies generally are not well developed on the liberal arts college campus.

This criterion is difficult to apply to this category of institutions simply because their total interest and qualifications would not lead them into a potential for Agency contracts. The high quality of the faculties, however, is a resource which should not be overlooked when teams under different management auspices are being established.

A summary relating expected degree of excellence of faculty to specific relevant fields is found in Table 1 on page 52.

(Caliber of Faculty)

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

This criterion must be applied with care and discernment to this category of institutions because of the variations in the nature of their objectives and scope, and in the apparent variations in the general quality of faculty from institution to institution within the category.

High quality of faculty can be expected in many of the basic sciences and in certain branches of engineering, but here again there is a high degree of specificity. Few of these institutions would have high quality and depth in hydraulic engineering as applied to irrigation problems, but a small number would. Some of those that have great strength in this field might be weak in language capabilities or in other relevant and related fields.

Strong programs in agriculture, medicine, nursing, cultural anthropology, teacher education, and business administration usually would not be found in this category of institutions, although a few have developed strong management and industrial administration programs with the highest quality of faculty.

The degree of expectancy of high quality faculty in selected key fields of interest to the Agency in this category of institutions is found in Table 1 on page 52.

(Caliber of Faculty)

Junior Colleges

When an attempt is made to apply this general criterion to most junior colleges, it will be found that, by using solely the traditional academic standards, the response would be generally unfavorable. The doctoral degree is assumed to be important in describing faculty quality, and in most cases the percentage of doctorates on junior college faculties is lower than in several of the other categories. Ordinarily, in the relevant fields cited by Mr. Gardner, the quality of faculty in many junior colleges would not be considered high.

On the other hand, other fields may turn out to be most relevant to specific AID projects and in such cases there might very well be found a very high quality faculty. This would be particularly true in the fields of trade skills, subprofessional areas, and vocational education. Therefore, if the Agency were involved in a project calling for the development of instruction and training in fields such as industrial arts, metal working, carpentry, or sewing, it would undoubtedly discover a higher quality of faculty in certain junior colleges than it would in the typical university or liberal arts college.

By the same token, a high degree of interdisciplinary sophistication probably would not be found in the typical junior college.

Naturally there are individual exceptions on many junior college campuses, and these individuals might in some cases be a useful and effective resource.

For the purpose of marshalling enough over-all strength to warrant a total institutional contract, many junior colleges would be found lacking.

A summary relating expected degree of excellence of faculty to specific relevant fields can be found in Table 1 on page 52.

(Caliber of Faculty)

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Since the typical consortium or association does not have a faculty of its own, obviously this criterion does not apply to this category.

However, since the consortia do draw upon the member institutions, it is at least conceivable that the quality of faculty involved in a given project managed through a consortium might be very high. At least the potential for this kind of result would be present. The criterion should be applied in every case, however, because there is always the possibility of the opposite result occurring -- namely, the aggregation of less able and therefore most readily assigned faculty from several members of the consortia being allocated to the group for overseas assignment.

(Caliber of Faculty)

Other Higher Education Institutions

The number of institutions in this category is so small and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally.

TABLE 1

Degree of Expectancy of Finding High Caliber (Quality and Quantity) of Faculty
In Relevant Fields in Several Categories of Institutions

Code: High
Low
Occasional
(see note
page 41)

Relevant Fields (common examples)	Category of Institution								Other Higher Education Institutions
	Land-Grant Universities	Other Public Universities	Public University Branches	Large Private Universities	Liberal Arts Colleges	Large Engineering and Science Universities	Junior Colleges	Consortia of Colleges and Universities	
A. Agriculture	H	L	L	L	L	L	L		
B. Economics	H	H	O	H	O	O	L		
C. Public Admin- istration	O	H	L	H	L	L	L		
D. Medicine	L	H	L	H	L	L	L		
E. Nursing	O	H	O	O	O	L	O		
F. Public Health	O	O	L	O	L	L	L	NOT APPLICABLE	NOT APPLICABLE
G. Sociology	H	H	O	H	O	L	L		
H. Cultural Anthropology	O	H	O	H	O	L	L		
I. Business Administration	O	H	O	H	L	O	L		
J. Education	O	H	O	H	L	L	L		
K. Engineering	H	H	L	H	L	H	L		
L. Veterinary Medicine	H	L	L	L	L	L	L		
M. Trade Skills	O	L	O	L	L	L	H		
N. Adult Education	H	H	H	O	L	L	H		
O. Home Economics	H	O	L	L	L	L	O		
P. Law	L	H	L	H	L	L	L		
Q. Foreign Language	O	H	O	H	H	L	L		

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 3

"HAS THE FACULTY SHOWN ANY INCLINATION TOWARD THE KIND OF INTER-DISCIPLINARY WORK SO ESSENTIAL TO DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE? ARE THERE AREAS STUDY PROGRAMS OR INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH TEAMS?"

Questions* which are particularly relevant to this criterion:

1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21,
25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44

* See page 18

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Land-Grant Universities

Because of the traditional service mission of the land-grant colleges and universities, the use of the interdisciplinary approach to problem solving has been quite common in this type of institution.

It is noteworthy, however, that what might be called interdisciplinary work by the people in this type of institution would probably mean something entirely different from what the same expression would describe in, say, a private college or university. In the former, it might mean an irrigation engineer, a fertilizer chemist, a soil expert, and a farm economist, all attacking a problem of creating a viable and productive agricultural district in a developing country. In the latter, the same expression might mean a cultural anthropologist, a sociologist, a political scientist, two or three language scholars, and a historian combining to study the effect of modern methods of communication on the social and cultural behavior of a tribe or nation.

Area study curricula in the usual sense have not been widely developed in most of the land-grant institutions. More often interdisciplinary research teams are at work, although, as pointed out above, even in research such teams may be somewhat restricted in disciplinary scope. With the recent growth patterns of the land-grant institutions in many states and with the general tendency for

them to move more in the direction of becoming all-purpose universities, particularly building more strength in the basic sciences, the arts and humanities, and even in many cases the addition of new professional schools (for instance, business administration), an increase can be expected in the tendency to use interdisciplinary research teams and to develop broader area curricular programs.

This criterion needs to be applied to this category of institutions, but caution also is called for in its use as a measure of future contract success. The required interdisciplinary approach for a needed project may involve different areas and certainly different people than past team efforts have required, so experience may not be specifically applicable. The right attitude or general faculty and administration's feeling regarding this kind of work so necessary to development assistance would likely be found present in this category of institutions.

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Other Public Universities and Colleges

This category of institutions has been in the forefront of the development of interdisciplinary programs, both from the standpoint of team research and in area studies curricula. For instance, the involvement of a university in the development of a Latin American area study program with substantial interinstitutional relationships with Central and South American institutions was first developed in a state university. Such cooperative programs have spread widely among this category of institutions, particularly with the state universities. The state colleges, being more limited in scope of interest, have not advanced as far in this kind of activity, but a number are making initial efforts in this direction.

This criterion should be applied in the consideration of an institution of this type and especially in view of the following observation. Although these institutions are generally large and diversified in their resources, evidence is developing that some may be so large that it has become necessary for the separate internal units (departments, divisions, schools, colleges, etc.) to become large enough themselves to gain autonomy and self-sufficiency, and in some cases to be rather noncommunicative with other units. A scholar in a departmental faculty of one hundred may find it possible, if not usual, to discover that all or most of his casual acquaintances, even daily luncheon companions, are all from his own department.

Similarly many of the academic disciplines are so broad that sub-specialties are developed to an extent that a specialist in economic theory who joins with an economic statistician on a project might say he was engaged in interdisciplinary research.

The comments regarding the application of this criterion to land-grant institutions are applicable also to this category of institutions.

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Public University Branches

It is safe to say that the interdisciplinary approach either in curriculum development or in team research has not been developed widely in the branch operations of most public universities. Naturally there may be a few exceptions. This general observation could be expected to be true because of the dominance of undergraduate and adult education programs in the branches, the fact that most of the branches are relatively recent on the educational scene, and the fact that most of them are directed primarily toward local community needs.

It is quite possible, however, that individual faculty members might be found on these campuses who are interested in, capable of, or are actually engaged in cooperative interdisciplinary team efforts.

One question that can be raised when considering a representative of this category of institutions is the extent to which it is integrated with its parent university, particularly at the departmental or academic faculty level.

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Large Private Universities

The faculty and administrative inclinations toward and patterns of interdisciplinary approaches to teaching and research in the large private universities appear to be more similar to those found in the large public universities than to those in the typical land-grant institutions. Area-studies programs and regional institutes (such as Far East, Southeast Asia, African, and Latin American) are often found in these universities. These programs and institutes in some cases involve undergraduate instruction as well as graduate instruction and research. A question arises, however, as to whether the interdisciplinary approach is really a pervading fact or is it a paper objective announced in principle but not strongly adhered to in practice? A great divergence will be found between different universities and sometimes great differences in the degree to which the approach is actually used in various areas of the same university. Some of the strongest and best developed area-study programs in the higher education establishment are found in the private universities, and some of these have now had several decades of experience, although the majority have developed their programs since World War II.

It has been observed that a greater prevalence of formally organized graduate schools of international relations (most of which are oriented toward political affairs and foreign policy) is

found in the private universities than in the public institutions. Although foreign policy and international political science is not an area in which the Agency would likely be primarily interested for the purpose of enhancing international development, it is obvious that the presence of such an undertaking on a campus might well be an indication of broad institutional interest in overseas studies. There is on campuses where international relations (in the traditional sense) is a well-developed operation a rather widespread flavor of international concern diffusing the whole institution.

The broad-based objectives of the recently-enacted International Education Act, calling for the development of centers of excellence in this field, may well focus a considerable amount of additional attention around the already functioning graduate schools of international studies. It may also encourage these schools, so often found in the private universities, to develop wider based attacks on problems involving more disciplines than have been usual.

Generally speaking, one would expect this criterion to be as well met in this category of institutions as in any other and better than in several.

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Liberal Arts Colleges

This criterion is particularly applicable to the typical liberal arts college, but in a way entirely different from its pertinence to the usual land-grant, public, or private university. Naturally as these colleges are primarily, if not solely (a few do offer some graduate work at the master's degree level in a few fields), restricted to undergraduate teaching with little interest in research, their interest or inclination is to apply the interdisciplinary approach to curricular matters. Team teaching has been developed on many of these campuses. This is perhaps due to what is said to be a "demand" on the part of the current generation of students, particularly students of the arts and sciences, that all their courses if not every lecture and every problem assigned be "relevant" to the great social problems of the day. This growing attitude of students is often shared by an increasing (or at least an increasingly vocal minority) number of faculty members.

This inclination toward a broader approach to learning has been manifested in a fairly large number of liberal arts colleges through their overseas center or junior year abroad programs. Dozens of relatively small colleges have established or acquired a foreign facility (most often in Western Europe) for housing groups of their students for a semester or year of study either under the guidance of their own assigned faculty members or in a foreign university.

Such programs do indicate a growing interest in the interdisciplinary approach as related to overseas culture although seldom are these located in or related to the underdeveloped or developing regions of primary interest to the Agency.

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Strange as it may seem, in view of the fact that the traditional image of this type of institution is one reflecting a high degree of specialization, there are several examples within the category where a well-developed philosophy of team research and interdisciplinary curricula exists. These examples of such unexpected inclinations are, however, likely to be more narrow than those found on general-purpose university campuses. For instance, at an institute well-developed teams might be actively engaged in a broad scope engineering project, but utilizing some basic scientists such as chemists, physicists, and mathematicians. The broad scope curricula commonly referred to as regional area studies (such as Far Eastern, African, or Latin American) involving language, politics, history, geography, anthropology, and sociology are not likely to be found here.

It is interesting to note that in several of this type of institution there are very recent trends toward affiliation, or actual merger in two very recent cases, of science and engineering institutions with other institutions with a broader base of programs to some extent for the purpose of making possible a greater degree of potential interdisciplinary work. Common involvement of this type of institution in consortia either for a single project or for a joint attack on several undertakings would also indicate a desire

on the part of their faculties to provide a wider base of potential interdisciplinary knowledge and expertness which can be brought to bear on the process of solving problems.

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Junior Colleges

Because of the dominant emphasis on lower division work (freshman and sophomore) in the arts and sciences with a second emphasis on trade skills and subprofessional areas, the faculties of most junior colleges have not shown a great inclination toward the kind of interdisciplinary work which Mr. Gardner deems "so essential to development assistance." Few junior colleges have developed what are considered significant area-study programs or interdisciplinary research teams. If, to be sure, such a criteria were deemed essential or even desirable for a specific development project overseas, it would not be profitable to explore the possibility of a junior college to handle the contract.

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

This criterion is not specifically applicable to consortia since it deals with the habitual or philosophical stance of an institutional faculty.

In the case of a single purpose ad hoc type of consortium, however, designed primarily to carry out an interdisciplinary kind of project, this criterion would be important. Putting a political scientist from one institution, an engineer from another, an agriculturist from a third, and a sociologist from a fourth into a consortium for the purpose of carrying out a development project abroad will not guarantee an interdisciplinary team approach to the problem at hand. Although the administrator of the contract may be cognizant of the need for a real interdisciplinary attack on the defined problem and each of the specialists may say he is so inclined, there is something rather novel and unpredictable about this kind of work which in the end, if great tact and care are not used, is likely to end up with four separate and unrelated thrusts.

(Interdisciplinary Programs)

Other Higher Education Institutions

The number of institutions in this category is so small and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 4

"WHAT ARE THE RESEARCH RESOURCES OF THE UNIVERSITY IN FIELDS RELEVANT TO DEVELOPMENT, AND PARTICULARLY IN THOSE FIELDS RELATING TO THE PROBLEM AT HAND?"

Questions* which are particularly relevant to this criterion:

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 21, 34, 35, 40,
42, 43, 44

*See page 18

Land-Grant Universities

It can be assumed for this type of university that a specific institution being considered for an overseas development project would have sufficient research resources in those fields relevant to the problem at hand; otherwise the particular university would not be interested in the project. It is safe to say that perhaps the greatest research strength of the land-grant universities now lies in the fields related to agriculture and engineering. However, these institutions have developed specialized strengths peculiar to their own states and regions and their strengths may not match the requirements of the specific overseas problem involved. For instance, research on the technology of irrigation or development of semiarid lands would not likely be found on the campus of an eastern land-grant college. Therefore, in the consideration of a specific university (particularly of the state land-grant type) for a specific project, it is not enough for the university to say, "We have a strong research program." This criterion, if it is important for a given project as it very often will be, therefore must be more specifically applied in the light of the problem at hand.

(Research Resources)

Other Public Universities and Colleges

In most cases the research resources of the large state universities can be assumed to be strong. This does not mean that they are strong or even adequate resources for support of the problems in all fields relevant to the specific projects of interest to the Agency. In most cases, the total research background of the state colleges included in this category is found to be less than in the public universities. Again there are exceptions particularly in certain fields. Teacher education might well be one of these exceptions.

It is entirely conceivable that for many projects a strong research resource might not be necessary for the contracting institutions. Nevertheless, a demonstrated history of research would be one of the indications of interest, especially if the scholars involved could see the possibility of a significant feedback from the overseas project which could be used to further their own research program.

Although this criterion is of great and general importance, it would appear that it could be applied to a given institution only after the specific project is well formulated.

Public University Branches

From the very history and nature of the public university branches it can be assumed that few of them have as yet developed strong research programs in fields of interest to the Agency. Again, it should be pointed out that in some cases where there is close curricular and departmental relationship between the branch and the parent or central institution, individual faculty members in the branch may actively engage in research projects as a part of the research undertaking of the parent department.

This criterion can be expected to come up with rather negative results when applied to this type of institution. Nevertheless, when such a resource is important to the problem at hand it would be a cogent question to ask.

(Research Resources)

Large Private Universities

In many of the large private universities the research programs are highly developed and often broad in scope. Naturally a wide disparity is found between institutions in this group with respect to fields of research emphasis. In general, there are many within this category where there has been a tendency toward theoretical or basic research rather than toward the more applied type. Whole areas of research interest and, therefore, research resources normally would be found missing in the private university (for instance, in agriculture).

Many of the private universities have substantially developed the team or interdisciplinary research approach, but again this is variable and might not be found on a given campus in fields of relevance to a specific overseas development project.

Although the fulfillment of this criterion would have a high degree of expectancy in this type of university, it should be necessary to apply it only in the light of the problem at hand.

Liberal Arts Colleges

Since research productivity is not an important objective of the liberal arts college, significant reservoirs of research resources in the fields usually relevant to overseas development ordinarily would not be found on these campuses. There might be a few exceptions, but they would be indeed few.

Certainly for any project where research experience (and particularly applied research or broad interdisciplinary team research) is a requirement of the problem at hand, it would be reasonable to assume that the liberal arts college would not be adequate to meet the need.

(Research Resources)

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Many of the institutions in this category have developed the highest level of research experience and will therefore be able to provide a strong resource under this criterion. Naturally, again, the criterion will have to be applied on an individual institutional basis in the light of the requirements of the problem or project at hand.

Generally, agricultural research would be found missing at these universities and institutes where both pure and applied research problems usually receive attention. Many are involved in consulting arrangements with government agencies and industry as well as in contract research projects. Necessary laboratory, library, and other research facilities are usually available at such institutions. Because of specialization, it would be necessary to be selective among this group when matching the requirements of the project at hand with the strength of the research resource at a given institution.

(Research Resources)

Junior Colleges

This general question, for all practical purposes, is not worth asking of the junior college. Research, as the word is commonly used in academic circles, is not prevalent in this type of institution nor do they see scholarly research as an important activity within their total mission.

Here again, if, in a special case, a study of some of the problems of the development or operation of junior or community college programs were needed in support of an Agency project, it is conceivable that one or two such institutions might be competent and interested. The problem of justifying the carrying on of research or otherwise involvement in an overseas mission at a locally-oriented and locally-supported institution is probably more critical with the typical junior college than with other types of institutions.

(Research Resources)

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Since a consortium of institutions would not be presumed to have any research resources of its own, the research capabilities which might be utilized could be only those of its members. In some cases, particularly with consortia made up of university-type components, this could be a source of great strength if these resources could in actuality be made available to the consortium. Often, however, geographic proximity to laboratories and research libraries is such a necessity that joint use of research facilities, either by faculty or by graduate students, does not turn out to be very feasible.

Although many institutions offering graduate work have worked out arrangements for cooperative use of specialized research equipment, it has been the usual experience that there are many complicating factors interfering with actual joint participation or joint use of facilities. A graduate student having a morning schedule of classes on one campus finds it difficult to go to another institution for his research work that afternoon. The same problem exists for faculty members.

If a strong and physically integrated research backup strength is an important factor in a specific AID project, it is reasonable to assume that contracting with a consortium might present serious difficulties. Here again, there are exceptions in specialized cases and the applicability of this criterion would have to be determined in the light of the requirements of the problem at hand.

(Research Resources)

Other Higher Education Institutions

The number of institutions in this category is so small and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 5

"HAS THE UNIVERSITY SET ITSELF UP ADMINISTRATIVELY TO HANDLE OVERSEAS PROJECTS? DO THESE ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS HAVE ADEQUATE ROOTS AT THE FACULTY AND DEPARTMENTAL LEVEL, ON THE ONE HAND, AND ADEQUATE TOP-LEVEL BACKING ON THE OTHER?"

Questions* which are particularly relevant to this criterion:

1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27, 39,
40, 41, 42, 43, 44

* See page 18

(Administration)

Land-Grant Universities

Most of the land-grant universities have become large enough to have developed administrative strength with sufficient depth and diversity to insure adequate managerial capability both in financial and academic affairs.

In some institutions (or states), there are certain legal restrictions which make it difficult for the institutions themselves to enter into contracts or to receive private grants for special purposes. Many of these institutions have therefore established separate corporations, usually called foundations or institutes, for receiving such funds and for operating and administering some of their contract services. Normally these separate corporate entities come under the same administrative control as the university, but commonly have their own board of trustees or directors. This administrative necessity may, in some of the public institutions, have arisen out of a wide variety of specific causes; for example, state auditing of state appropriated funds requiring special auditing procedures, state rules regarding year-end reserves, state travel regulations, and so forth.

Any outside agency, including a Federal agency, therefore must determine in the case of each specific institution whether it will be negotiating with the university or with a subsidiary organization and, if it is the latter situation, what complications may result.

Many institutions in this category have been involved in so many overseas contracts and programs which encourage both inside and outside relationships, that they have established separate administrative offices responsible for international programs with a director, dean, or even a vice president in charge. Although this kind of administrative control and direction may be highly desirable from a functional point of view, this arrangement does not always prove entirely satisfactory internally, particularly to the regular academic administrative officers and the faculties. The deans of some colleges within a number of universities have claimed that those in charge of international projects have either made contract commitments involving their faculty members without their knowledge or, in some cases, the liaison has been such that internal raiding has been charged. The desirability of such a functional administrative structure in the larger universities cannot be denied, but any agency considering placing a contract would be well advised to ascertain the quality of internal relationships with faculty, heads of departments, and deans as well as with the financial and business segment of the institutions.

(Administration)

Other Public Universities and Colleges

The application of this criterion to this category of institutions involves the same considerations as are cited under land-grant universities in the preceding section. Also the comments regarding the trend toward the establishment of special administrative offices for international programs and the internal problems this procedure sometimes presents are as applicable to the public universities and state colleges as to the land-grant institutions.

It should be pointed out that in many states the state universities and the land-grant institutions are probably more autonomous than are the state colleges. The usual structure is for both of the former to have separate boards of trustees or regents, although in some states the land-grant university falls under the jurisdiction of the State Board of Agriculture.. However, the state colleges, of which there may be several in any one state, often are under the control of the State Board of Education or some equivalent body. This is an outgrowth of the fact that many of these colleges have sprung from the older state normal schools and teachers' colleges.

Naturally, this criterion must be applied with appropriateness to each separate institution and in the light of the special requirements of each proposed project. It is not uncommon to find that the success or failure of an overseas contract depends upon the kind of

administration provided in the institution. This is often related to the smoothness of the internal liaison and relationships between those primarily in charge and those in the pertinent departments who may have other interests and obligations.

(Administration)

Public University Branches

The administrative structure of this type of institution varies widely from institution to institution and, in certain cases, may depart substantially from the structure of the parent university. Usually the pattern is simpler than in the parent and often a specific officer in the branch is subservient to his functional counterpart in the main university; in other cases he is autonomous.

The very history and nature of the branches indicate that they have not developed, to any great extent, special administrative offices responsible for overseas projects.

Although it would not be expected that many cases of overseas developmental programs or projects would be assigned to the typical public university branch, were such a project to be considered, the matter of administrative capability would be one of the criteria that should be carefully applied.

(Administration)

Large Private Universities

The administrative structure of most of the large private universities follows the usual pattern for American academic institutions. Many of these have become sufficiently involved in government grants and contracts, as well as with industrial research projects, to necessitate the establishment of administrative arms of the university responsible for such sponsored programs. In some cases these administrative units are highly autonomous, having the privilege of recruitment and employment of separate research directors and contract managers as well as research personnel without faculty rank or teaching responsibilities. In other cases such contract activities are highly integrated with the normal departments and divisions (both academic and nonacademic) of the university. Both approaches have worked well in different situations and in some instances both procedures are used on the same campus.

Where the interdisciplinary approach to a possible AID project is desirable or necessary, the personality and prestige of the internal coordinator or responsible administrator is critical both in terms of his relationship with the top administrators and with deans, departmental chairmen, and faculty scholars. The predetermination of how well this criterion will be met is one that must be undertaken for each institution and probably for each major contract, although past experience and a look at the general

structure already established can serve as indicators of administrative sophistication in an institution.

It should be observed that the private universities have a higher degree of flexibility and freedom than do the public institutions in terms of accounting and control procedures, personnel recruitment, travel arrangements, leaves of absence, and general contractual and administrative procedures. This is not to imply they are better in any way, but they are different in their structure and in their final source of fiduciary responsibility.

(Administration)

Liberal Arts Colleges

One of the critical problems most liberal arts colleges face in undertaking any new and large operational program is their usual lack in depth of administrative personnel. Their established organizational structure is more horizontal than vertical and general rather than specific for specialized functions, with each administrator responsible for several areas. The number of people reporting to one director, dean, or president is apt to be large with a consequent spread of kinds of responsibilities among the few administrators.

Since the liberal arts colleges have had little experience with overseas development programs, as a rule their administrative structures are not particularly well adapted for contract negotiation, fast recruiting of personnel, travel, following complex governmental regulations, or perhaps what to them would be novel accounting methods.

Administrative support as well as faculty and departmental cooperation would usually be present in principle, but it is questionable whether it would be effective in practice.

There is one fairly recent development which tenders some hope for improvement in future expectations when applying this criterion to this category of institutions. This is the increasing

trend toward the establishment of foreign study centers at which a portion of their students spend all or a part of one year -- usually the junior year. These operations vary considerably from college to college, but, in any case, the experience gained is surely adding to the breadth of administrative know-how and capabilities of those liberal arts colleges which are managing this kind of program. It should be pointed out, however, that most of these centers abroad are in well-developed countries and the kinds of administrative experience gained there might or might not be applicable to international development programs.

(Administration)

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Competent and extensive administrative patterns have already been established in many of the institutions within this category. Experience with industrial and government contracts, both for research and operation, often involving fast recruitment of personnel; with substantial foreign student enrollment; with fairly large budgets; and with experience in dealing with foreign visiting scholars has given to many institutions of this kind an opportunity to develop special administrators. These administrators are adept not only in handling special kinds of management problems, but they also have the ability to marshal the support of the top echelon of institutional administration as well as to have good liaison relationships with faculty members and departmental groups.

It would appear that high expectations could be had that this criterion would be adequately fulfilled in this type of institution. It is important enough, however, to warrant careful evaluation when a specific project is being considered for placement at a specific institution.

(Administration)

Junior Colleges

In the case of a vast majority, if not all, of the junior colleges the answer to this general question would be in the negative. A partial exception might be found in a very few institutions of this type, but this criterion can be assumed to be inapplicable.

(Administration)

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Although most consortia are cooperative entities with assigned representatives from their member institutions, it cannot be predicted in advance, from the administrative strength of the members, very much about the quality of administrative setup for the consortium. In several cases, none of the members have been able to release a strong administrator from their own staffs, which has made it necessary for the consortium to employ someone from the outside. Although often this has worked out well, it does create the possibility that the consortium administrator, particularly if the consortium is of the single-purpose type, will not be acquainted with the resources available in the member institutions. In such cases it is likely that the administration and operation of the consortium will not be well nourished by the faculties or even by the administrative officers of the component institutions. As a general observation, it can be said that most consortia are more closely related to the top administrators of their members than they are at the faculty or academic administrative levels.

There are cases where a great majority of faculty members, even in pertinent fields, do not know that their institution is a member of a consortium or association designed to carry on a program of great interest to them theoretically. The problem of internal communication within a modern complex university is probably

exceeded in magnitude only by that existing between universities even though they may be joined in a consortium.

This criterion is highly cogent with respect to this category of institutions, but must be applied in each specific case with wisdom and a discerning understanding of the potential problem.

(Administration)

Other Higher Education Institutions

The number of institutions in this category is so small and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 6

"HAS THE UNIVERSITY (OR THE PART OF THE UNIVERSITY MOST DIRECTLY INVOLVED IN THE CONTRACT) HAD RELEVANT EARLIER EXPERIENCE IN OVERSEAS WORK? HOW MUCH EXPERIENCE, AND WHAT WAS THE QUALITY OF ITS PERFORMANCE?"

Questions* which are particularly relevant to this criterion:

1, 2, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 34, 39, 40,
42, 43, 44

* See page 18

(Overseas Experience)

Land-Grant Universities

Most of the land-grant institutions of the nation have had relevant experience in overseas work. As a matter of fact, most of them have been or are currently directly involved in Agency contracts (see Table 15, page 231). A number have had foundation grants and it would appear that many faculty members (although probably a small percentage of the total) have had overseas assignments, either under their own institution's auspices or under support from other sources.

While no effort has been made in this study to evaluate the quality of performance of any institution relative to their prior or present operation of overseas projects, it is understandable that there would be substantial variation in this regard.

This criterion is still valid, but there is no alternative to applying it on an individual institutional basis when considering a specific university for a contract.

(Overseas Experience)

Other Public Universities and Colleges

Many public universities have had Agency contracts and those that have not are likely to have had other types of overseas projects under other auspices. This has been less true with the state college, although many of them have undertaken overseas projects particularly in the field of teacher education and other professional education fields.

It should be pointed out that since the scope of interest of the large public universities is ordinarily broader than that of the land-grant institutions, the kinds of overseas undertakings these institutions engaged in are likely to have been also of a broader type. Their degree of flexibility has provided them with a substantial experience in relevant kinds of development operations and studies.

Since no individual evaluations have been undertaken, it is not possible to comment on the quality of past performance.

(Overseas Experience)

Public University Branches

Relatively few of the branches of public universities have had direct responsibility for the operation of Agency contracts and it would appear safe to say that few have had any involvement in overseas development work. It is probable, however, that individual faculty and staff members in these branches have had some overseas experience.

The unique position of the faculties and the administrations in their relationships to their parent institutions, together with the usually more limited objectives of the branches, have combined to generate less experience in overseas affairs than might be expected from the size of the branches alone.

(Overseas Experience)

Large Private Universities

This category of institutions has had a wealth of past experience in relevant overseas work including Agency contracts for international development. A number of these private universities have been involved in some of the largest undertakings. On the other hand, certain of the better private universities, presumably because of their own policies or because of lack of contacts with the Agency, have never had an AID contract. Some of these, however, have had many programs related to international affairs and have demonstrated undoubted excellence in performance.

Again, in general, because these universities are broad-based in their curricular (except in agriculture) and research activities, their experience in international work has been more interdisciplinary and perhaps less applied than has been true with some of the other categories of institutions.

No effort has been made to appraise or evaluate the quality of performance of any of these individual institutions. This is a criterion which obviously would be applied on an individual basis when a university is being considered for a possible contract.

Liberal Arts Colleges

Very few of the institutions in this category have had any direct experience with the administration of AID contracts for overseas development. On this point, therefore, the criterion is generally inapplicable. However, many of them have had experience with other kinds of overseas or international programs which are relevant and constitute valuable resources as elaborated in other portions of this study. Among the pertinent experiences in which many of these colleges have been involved which may be mentioned are:

- . Operation of overseas branches or centers
- . Substantial numbers of students from abroad
- . Non-Western academic programs
- . Language programs (both traditional and unusual)
- . Visiting foreign scholars
- . Faculty leaves for overseas work
- . Memberships in consortia of various kinds

The quality of performance in such work will vary from college to college, but no effort has been made to evaluate the performance of the individual institutions. An evaluation of past performance in a college with respect to its experiences should be made at the time of consideration of placing a contract.

(Overseas Experience)

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

A substantial amount of prior and relevant experience has been developed in overseas work by many universities and institutes in this category. When an individual institution within this type is considered, the prior experience, however, most likely will be found to have been limited to rather specific and narrow scoped projects. From a management or administrative know-how point of view, such experience would be valuable in further undertakings.

No institutional evaluation of past experience, however, has been made.

(Overseas Experience)

Junior Colleges

This question will normally be answered in the negative for this type of institution. For instance, on September 30, 1966, there was only one junior college on AID's list of university contractors (see Table 15, page 231).

(Overseas Experience)

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Since consortia have been established both as single-purpose ad hoc organizations and as multi-purpose continuing cooperative entities, it should be determined for the purpose of applying this criterion which type of consortium is involved. If it is of the former type, perhaps set up for the sole purpose of administering a proposed specific contract, then obviously it most likely would not have had prior experience and could not have already demonstrated a high quality of performance.

On the other hand, the several member institutions and individual representatives possibly might have had experience in overseas work. If, therefore, the right kinds of institutions and people are put together as a consortium for the single purpose of handling an Agency contract, it could, as a matter of fact, marshal the finest experience possible.

In the continuing multi-purpose type of consortia, some have had overseas experience and it should be possible to evaluate their past performances. Since administrative personnel, as well as faculty members assigned to consortia projects from the respective member institutions, are usually subject to rotation back to their home bases, the personnel of the continuing consortia also changes fairly rapidly. For this reason this criterion must be repeatedly and continually applied.

(Overseas Experience)

Other Higher Education Institutions

The number of institutions in this category is so small and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 7

"WHAT IS THE QUALITY OF PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT?
HAS THE UNIVERSITY (AND ITS DEPARTMENTS) MADE IT POSSIBLE FOR
FACULTY MEMBERS TO PARTICIPATE WITHOUT SUFFERING IN TERMS OF CAREER
ADVANCEMENT?"

Questions* which are particularly relevant to this criterion:

1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 39, 40,
42, 43, 44

* See page 18

(Quality of Personnel).

Land-Grant Universities

The pertinence of this criterion to the land-grant university could be judged only in relation to the needs of the specific AID project. However, the depth of faculty and administrative staff personnel in this type of institution, as most of them are large, is great enough that it is almost certain that a high quality of personnel would be assigned to a well-conceived project. Some of these institutions, however, are currently growing so fast in enrollment that there could be a tendency to want to keep the best faculty and staff members on campus.

The fact that land-grant institutions are more generally oriented to the service mission (for instance, extension programs and applied research) indicates that the probability of faculty members having their career progress (promotion, tenure, and salary) being prejudiced by overseas assignments is perhaps not as critical as in other types of institutions. These other institutions do not have service mission as a basic object and perhaps put more emphasis on research, teaching, and scholarly publication as a criterion for professional and career promotion.

(Quality of Personnel)

Other Public Universities and Colleges

The public (usually state but occasionally municipally supported) universities are large enough in most cases to make it possible to provide high quality personnel for an overseas project. The question, however, cannot be answered in a satisfactory manner until the proposed assignments to a specific project are suggested. It is also necessary to determine the degree of involvement of those who are proposed on paper for a project. The mere presence on the campus of a well-known expert in a field relevant to the project is not enough, even though he may have said he was greatly interested in the project. He may be so involved with other responsibilities that for all practical purposes he would be of little value to the project being undertaken.

In general, there is a high potential in this category for top quality personnel. The degree to which this criterion is likely to be fulfilled, however, is a matter which must be carefully evaluated in each case.

In the public universities and colleges, the departments are usually large enough to encourage substantial internal competitions for promotion in ranks and salary. When community service is not so institutionally dominant as an objective, it is not certain, without a look at the individual case, whether or not an overseas assignment might not result in the passing-over of an absent faculty member at the time of evaluation for promotion.

(Quality of Personnel)

Public University Branches

The quality of faculty, both in terms of the usual criteria of quality and in terms of depth of strength in a given field, ordinarily would not be found as high in the branches as in their parent institutions, particularly in the basic academic disciplines and certainly in most of the traditional professional areas. This is demonstrated by an examination of the ratio of doctorates to the total faculty in the branches as compared with the parent institution. There can, however, be a few exceptions to this general observation. There are public universities, for instance, that consider their medical arts and sciences programs (medicine, nursing; dentistry) as being separate branches of the parent campus. This could also be true in certain universities with such areas as adult education and curricula in trade skills and vocational education.

(Quality of Personnel)

Large Private Universities

As is true with other types of institutions, the application of this criterion necessarily has to be made on an individual project basis, but it is nonetheless important to raise the question in regard to a specific proposed project contract. Generally an adequate quality potential of personnel would be found in this category. As there is a higher degree of stability in size in this category of institutions, the possibility of rotation for overseas assignment may be greater than in other types of institutions which are rapidly growing and which need to utilize all their faculty and staff to meet local teaching demands.

The large private universities are usually old enough to have developed rather sophisticated promotion and tenure policies and, with the absence of political or even civil service type controls applying to them, they can be expected to exhibit somewhat more flexible personnel policies than can the public institutions. This would allow for easier mechanisms for handling overseas assignments without interfering with an individual's career development.

(Quality of Personnel)

Liberal Arts Colleges

The application of this criterion to this category of institutions is important in view of the fact that, in the majority of cases, the depth of backup strength in most disciplines would be expected to be less than with the large universities. This fact creates more difficulty internally in assigning faculty members to overseas work, particularly for extended periods of time.

Another problem is the usual lack of emphasis on the more applied areas relevant to many international development projects.

With respect to participation of individual faculty members or assignments without their suffering professionally in terms of promotion or tenure, this type of college usually has well-designed personnel policies which are well-known by the faculty and adhered to by the administration. In view of the smaller size of these institutions, with resulting greater personal relationships between faculty and administrative staff (deans and presidents), there is probably a lesser chance of a faculty member on leave being forgotten or passed over at the time of his salary and promotion evaluation. Nevertheless, when one of these institutions is being considered for a contract, this criterion should be applied because of the nature of this type of college. The assumptions of personnel policies and strengths that might be made in the case of larger universities might not be valid with the typical liberal arts college.

(Quality of Personnel)

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

This type of institution as a rule has had a great amount of experience working in close relationships with government agencies, business, and industry. For many years, faculty members have served as consultants either on leave for a year or two or on a continuing part-time basis. Because of this tradition of service, most of these scientific and engineering universities and institutes have well-developed policies which cover the problem described in this criterion. As a matter of fact, the professional and career advancement credit extended to a faculty member for overseas development work well might be enhanced in many cases rather than placed in an unfavorable light by evaluators.

In view of the degree of specialization often found in these institutions, the matter of quality of faculty assigned to a specific project might be found to be more crucial and questionable in fields outside the central theme of the project. Naturally, this problem would arise to a greater degree in those projects which are broadly interdisciplinary in scope.

Here again, although this criterion is important in the consideration of this as well as all other types of institutions, it would have to be applied in specific ways to the individual project after the requirements of the project are well defined.

(Quality of Personnel)

Junior Colleges

The pertinence of this question to the junior college only could be judged in relation to the needs of the specific AID project. However, were a junior college being considered for a contract, the importance of this criterion very well might be of controlling significance. This would be largely because the usual expectations of the typical junior college would lead to the conclusion that this criterion probably, or even usually, would not be met adequately. Because of the predominance of the teaching mission of the junior or community college, the flexibility of the total faculty in terms of mobility is perhaps less apparent than in other types of institutions.

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

The comments under criterion eight (see page 123) as applied to consortia are pertinent to this criterion. It should be emphasized, however, that the personnel assigned to a specific project contracted by the Agency to a consortium should be in theory of the highest quality since, in a way, they would be hand-picked for the specific undertaking from the faculties and administrative staffs of all the member institutions.

It can be assumed, however, that this happy situation might not be assured in every case. There is a feeling that sometimes institutions would like to farm out a few of their less-effective people to a consortium for the purpose of getting rid of them -- at least temporarily. Such a motive might, if carried far, result in a personnel cadre in a specific consortium project of far lower quality than would be expected from the average quality of the member institutions.

This criterion would therefore appear to be of very high importance in this category of institutions, but it is one that must be applied in a given case with great care and with a high degree of evaluative judgment.

(Quality of Personnel)

Other Higher Education Institutions

The number of institutions in this category is so small and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally.

Gardner's Selection Criterion, Number 8

"WHAT IS THE DEGREE OF THE UNIVERSITY'S COMMITMENT TO THE PROJECTS? THIS IS NOT MERELY A MATTER OF THE UNIVERSITY'S SAYING, 'WE'RE TERRIBLY INTERESTED.' ITS COMMITMENT CAN BE PARTLY MEASURED BY JUDGING THE EXTENT TO WHICH IT HAS ALREADY DEVELOPED ITS RESOURCES IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD GENERALLY AND IN THE FIELDS RELEVANT TO THE SPECIFIC CONTRACT. ITS FUTURE INTENTIONS SHOULD BE EXPLORED IN SOME DETAIL. WHAT WILL IT DO TO STRENGTHEN ITS RESOURCES FURTHER AS THE CONTRACT PROCEEDS? HOW DOES IT PLAN TO INTEGRATE THE OVERSEAS PROJECT WITH ITS HOME-BASE OPERATIONS? WHAT ARRANGEMENTS WILL IT MAKE TO INSURE FEEDBACK FROM THE FIELD EXPERIENCE INTO CURRICULUM AND RESEARCH ON THE CAMPUS?"

Questions* which are particularly relevant to this criterion:

Practically all of the questions cited give rise to responses which in total permit one to gather whether or not there is a real institutional commitment to overseas development work. This over-all assessment is probably of greater significance than would be any single response to question 16.

* See page 18

(Commitment)

Land-Grant Universities

When the history, original purpose, and sources of control and support of this category of institutions are examined, a commitment to overseas development projects, with all these projects imply, would not be expected to exist in the land-grant university. But if the actual involvement (commitment may be another matter), the total number, or the dollar value of Agency development contracts being managed by the land-grant institutions are used as a yardstick, it must be concluded that they are committed in a major way. To be sure, a substantial part of their overseas development work has been because of their strength in agricultural research, teaching, and service.

The commitment, as measured by affirmative and positive answers to questions bearing on this criterion as suggested by Mr. Gardner, would indicate that this rather extensive involvement has had a very significant impact on the institutions themselves. However, this observation will be found valid to varying degrees within the category of institutions and with a wide range of sometimes unexpected results.

In the literature published by these institutions, such as catalogs, sometimes there is a complete absence of any mention of commitment or even involvement in overseas contracts. There is

in some cases almost an apologetic attitude for their involvement: "We have been requested by the Federal government to contract for the operation of a program in . . ."

It is difficult to evaluate or measure the magnitude of the potential feedback into the curriculum and research programs of this category of institutions. As a matter of fact, when an intensive look is taken at the effect of overseas projects on a single institution; it may be difficult to isolate and describe any discreet effect on the specific or general mode of operation of that institution. Perhaps it is too early to observe the long-term internal effects. Some impact on research programs of local institutions is observable, although few curriculum changes have resulted from overseas projects. The land-grant institutions have undoubtedly strengthened the public interest in world affairs through their efforts.

In summary, after a number of years of involvement in international development projects, many of the institutions in this category are committed to this type of activity and they can be expected to broaden their horizons of interest to include more specific areas of interest, both relevant to their internal affairs as well as to the needs of the Agency.

(Commitment)

Other Public Universities and Colleges

The public universities and state colleges which make up this category cover a wide variety of institutions. Therefore, there is a great variation in their degree of commitment to overseas development work. In general, the state colleges, for reasons cited in other parts of this study, are not largely involved nor committed to this kind of assignment. The public universities, however, are thoroughly involved and may be assumed to be officially committed, although at the faculty level the interest is spotty and sometimes it may even be antagonistic. In a number of state universities having overseas programs, a definite trend can be observed toward curriculum changes (for instance, development of expanded foreign language programs), broadly-based area studies and research interests, and even an increased emphasis on international affairs (including foreign trade, foreign policy, and international education).

From the evidence and in view of the widening spectrum of the objectives of the large public universities, there should be an increasing commitment of these institutions to international development projects. They are, in most cases, improving their resources, and are already strong in many areas relevant to the total requirements of the Agency.

It should be pointed out, however, that while most of these universities are committed to the concept of world-wide interests --

and this is manifest in their expansion of curricula and research programs to include problems of national and international scope rather than just of local or state concern -- it is true that some have little interest in becoming involved in government agency, contract work of the development type. It is one thing to discover a thorough interest in international affairs on a given campus. It is quite another (and this requires careful investigation and judgment) to determine a solid and bona fide commitment to the management of development contracts.

It would be an interesting exercise to examine the requests for appropriations going from institutions to their legislative bodies as indicators of institutional commitment to overseas development work. This was not done with the Academy's sample institutions since such information would not have been available on anything like a complete or comparable basis.

(Commitment)

Public University Branches

The history of the branch operation of the large public universities, including the reasons for their establishment, their current objectives, their curricula, and the relationships with their parent universities, indicates that there is no substantial commitment to the idea of direct involvement in the management of overseas development projects. Where there is action at all in this regard, it occurs in the few cases where the chief administrative officer of the branch has a personal capability and interest in a particular project of interest to the Agency.

It would appear that when the more specific questions raised by Mr. Gardner under this criterion are applied to the typical branch university, the answers would add up to something less than a real and present commitment to overseas development projects.

This conclusion is more fully supported when an attempt is made, as has been done, to apply other criteria to this type of institution.

(Commitment)

Large Private Universities

What has been observed in regard to the application of this criterion to the large public university is generally applicable also to the large private university. One difference is that the latter type in most cases does not find itself in the position of justifying its interest in international affairs to a local controlling and supporting body such as a state legislature or a state board of regents. But for the same reason, some of the private universities have not developed their interest in or commitment to the service function to a higher degree. Hence, some are taking the position that they do not see, as a part of their total obligation or commitment, any place for their involvement in overseas contracts. This does not mean that they are not making contributions to the whole area of international development, but it may be in less formal ways that do not require AID contracts.

It appears that project research or project operation is a technique that many faculty members of private universities do not relish. To them, the strictures required are not acceptable.

Because of the wide variety of attitudes, policies, and modes of operation found in the large private universities, the assumption that all of them are committed to an involvement in overseas development projects would not be a valid one. Therefore, it is altogether necessary that this criterion be applied individually to each institution and with a specific project in mind.

(Commitment)

Liberal Arts Colleges

Although there is great interest on the campuses of liberal arts colleges in the general area of international affairs, there is little real commitment to an active involvement in overseas development programs. This is not surprising in view of the predominant commitment to undergraduate education in this type of institution. Action programs, operational involvement, research, and service activities generally are not a significant part of the basic objectives of the liberal arts colleges.

With possibly an exception or two, the conclusion must be reached that, for contract purposes, this category of institutions does not represent a significantly important source of potential interest or of resources. This does not preclude the possibility that there are on many of their faculties a few individuals who are interested, capable, and who might be available through assignment to consortia-managed contracts or attached to the overseas staff of another contractor. There probably would be a direct feedback from such field experience to their own campus, but this could be expected to be rather sparse and sporadic in terms of a major effect on the total campus attitude as reflected in curriculum or research.

(Commitment)

Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Because this category of institutions has had wide experience with government and industry sponsored research and consulting contracts, it is expected that they should have developed substantial commitments to international development projects. These commitments are reflected both in terms of what they feel will be the impact on their own programs (educational and research) and in terms of their motivation to serve the economic and social enrichment of all nations.

It is not difficult to see how such institutions have found that many international development projects fit directly into their own programs of industrial and technological development.

Many of these institutions have found that there has been a substantial feedback from their involvement in overseas operations. The manifestation of this effect, however, has been confined to perhaps narrower fields than would be the case with the broader purpose universities.

(Commitment)

Junior Colleges

The commitment of the junior and community colleges to overseas development appears to be more of a stated principle rather than an actual practice, judging from a general view of the very limited extent to which they have already established and developed resources and experience in the international field. Although individuals within these colleges have in some cases participated in international projects, particularly in the summer, this type of institution has not ordinarily seen participation in overseas projects as an institutional objective.

With the possible exception of the organization and operation of an overseas adult education, trade skill teaching, or subprofessional technical program, a typical AID project would most likely not have much feedback to the junior college, certainly not in the substantive disciplines or for the purpose of research studies.

A typical comment from junior college administrations is: "Yes, we are interested and there are many things we surely would be able to do, but frankly we are so new, are growing so fast, and we have so many things to do here that we just have not had time to develop overseas work." Such expressions are not at all exceptional and are without doubt logical and legitimate.

(Commitment)

Consortia of Colleges and Universities

Although this criterion is not applicable to consortia in the same way it is applicable to individual educational institutions, it is definitely not without importance or validity. In the case of the single-purpose type of consortium, established for the sole purpose of administering an overseas development contract, a commitment to this objective should be assumed. However, even here there should be an assurance that the commitment runs deeper than just the feeling on the part of the presidents of a group of similar institutions that they should be involved in an overseas contract or project -- perhaps just because they are available or because it would "look good."

The problem of feedback in terms of effect or impact on curricula or on research in the consortium's member institutions is even greater than it is when the individual institution has total and direct responsibility. There are cases where a member's real commitment to its consortium, let alone its commitment to the project of the consortium, can be questioned. This is particularly true of the multipurpose, any purpose, associations or consortia which have been established to "do all those things which the members cannot do alone."

The difficulties which consortia have encountered in the administration of joint undertakings notwithstanding, those organizations

with growing experience are proving to be a valuable resource in overseas development work. Some of them are showing a real commitment to getting the job done with skill and efficiency. Time will still have to prove how often they produce a real impact on their member institutions. They should, both from the view of the government and from the view of the institutions, do more than provide their members with an opportunity to be involved. Is the involvement likely to be of benefit to (a) the institution, (b) the government, and (c) the host country?

(Commitment)

Other Higher Education Institutions

The number of institutions in this category is so small and those that do fall outside one of the other eight categories are so diverse in objectives, scope, structure, and mode of operation, that we have not attempted to apply Mr. Gardner's generalized questions or criteria to this group of institutions. This is not to imply that the institutions which fall outside the categories listed have no potential usefulness to AID. The opposite would appear to be likely. It should be emphasized that, since the variability is so great in this category, the criteria would have to be applied to individual institutions rather than to this group generally.

B. MAJOR TYPES OF CONSORTIA, ASSOCIATIONS, AND OTHER
INSTRUMENTALITIES DESIGNED FOR COOPERATIVE UNDERTAKINGS

Introduction

One of the three specific assignments given to the Academy for Educational Development was stated in the contract as follows:

"Starting from the section of the Gardner Report entitled "Nongovernmental Arrangements," the Contractor will describe in detail and recommend, with criteria for choice, what kinds of instrumentalities are needed, are practicable, and will most effectively serve to promote multiple-university efforts in A.I.D. programs."

Mr. Gardner did not go far in his report in describing the various kinds of instrumentalities or structures now in existence for the purpose of securing a wide variety of kinds of interinstitutional cooperation. One paragraph of his, however, serves as an introduction to the problem:*

"We have listened carefully to both the enthusiasts and the skeptics on the university consortium. Both are convincing, and the evidence is not yet available that would prove one right and the other wrong. Clearly, the consortium can be made to work and work well. Whether it is a widely useful device remains to be seen. For the present, we would be wise not to confine ourselves to that fashionable idea but to reflect on the whole range of instrumentalities that universities have used or could use to accomplish their shared purposes -- from Brookhaven to the American Council on Education."

* A.I.D. and the Universities, page 41.

Although the American higher educational establishment is made up of a wide variety of kinds of components and although, in a sense, it is highly organized in terms of membership in many kinds of organizations,* it is true that the members of the establishment have not worked very hard at the matter of interinstitutional cooperation at the substantive or functional level. It is interesting to note that one of the oldest and most effective examples is the intercollegiate athletic conference. But here the prime purpose is the control of a competitive institutional enterprise rather than the strengthening of individual institutions in a cooperative problem-solving venture.

Today there are probably hundreds of examples of cooperative efforts. They go by many different names -- consortia, associations, institutes, councils, commissions, committees, boards, conferences, for instance. But we agree with Mr. Gardner that it still is unclear what are the best kinds of instrumentalities to serve specific functions such as overseas development work.

On the following pages, ten different kinds of instrumentalities or consortia are described, a few examples are noted, their strong and weak points are analyzed, and an indication is given of their likelihood of serving effectively in the promotion of multiple-university efforts in the AID program. Fourteen specific criteria or

* See Education Directory, Part 4, Education Associations, 1965-1966, United States Office of Education

questions are also listed that can be applied to each type of instrumentality or consortium in an effort to be helpful to the Agency as it considers its relationships with a broader base of university and college resources.

Major Types of Consortia, Associations, and Other
Instrumentalities for Cooperative Undertakings

1. Large associations with generally inclusive membership

Examples: American Council on Education
Association of American Colleges

2. Associations of like-minded institutions

Examples: Jesuit Educational Association
National Association of State Universities and
Land-Grant Colleges

3. Government-related organizations

Examples: Southern Regional Education Board
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

4. Single-purpose consortia

Examples: Associated Universities, Inc.
Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities

5. Multipurpose consortia

Examples: Associated Colleges of the Midwest
Associated Rocky Mountain Universities

6. Profit corporations

Examples: Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Westinghouse Learning Corporation

7. Nonprofit corporations, institutes, or associations

Examples: Academy for Educational Development
Educational Services Incorporated
Institute of International Education
Overseas Educational Service
The Rand Corporation
System Development Corporation

8. Central university associated with group of satellite colleges

Examples: University of Denver with Colorado College, Loretto Heights
College, Colorado Woman's College, and Regis College
Western Massachusetts Group

9. Professional associations

Examples: American Bar Association
American Medical Association

10. Scientific and cultural associations and societies

Examples: American Chemical Society
American Physical Society

Special Criteria Applicable to Consortia and
Other Cooperative Instrumentalities

1. What was the rationale or purpose for the original establishment of the consortium or association?
2. What is the nature of its component membership?
3. Does the instrumentality, as a body, have the support and interest of both the faculties and administration of its member institutions?
4. Is it an ad hoc single-purpose organization or has it been established to do anything or everything that no single member could do alone?
5. When was it organized?
6. Has the organization had any experience with operational or service contracts with any other agency?
7. What are the indications that it can assemble, from its member institutions or from other sources, an adequately expert and qualified technical staff for the purposes of the specific project?
8. Does the organization have capacities that a single member component does not have? If so, what capacities?
9. Is the organization properly incorporated as a legal body so that it may have contracting authority?
10. Does it have an administrative staff with managerial and accounting ability and authority?
11. Who has the decision-making authority, the organization or its members?
12. What is the extent and source of the organization's working capital?
13. Does it have a headquarters office?
14. What is the likelihood of feedback of values gained by the experience to individual member institutions?

Large Associations With Generally Inclusive Membership

This category of instrumentality available to the Agency for overseas development work and related activities is of the type represented by such organizations as the American Council on Education and the Association of American Colleges. These organizations, and there are few others of this type representing the colleges and universities of the United States, are large in terms of number of member institutions (there are over one thousand) and include most of the accredited institutions of the nation. They are in a strategic and accepted position of being able to "speak" for the American higher educational establishment -- that is, if any organization can. Their purposes are broad, and they are properly chartered and have contracting authority. One of these two specific organizations has a substantial and highly competent staff and both operate through commissions designed to give special attention to the various areas of interest to higher education.

When the various suggested criteria are applied to this kind of organization it becomes apparent that, although they are great sources of advice and intelligence of value to the Agency and have been used to a substantial degree, they ordinarily are not available for direct or primary operation of specific overseas development contracts. For special studies, evaluations, consultations, and planning purposes such associations can be and have already proven to be of assistance to the Agency.

One particular area in which these general purpose associations can be of great value to the Agency, as well as to all colleges and universities, is in serving as a medium of communication. Through their annual meetings (very fully attended by university presidents), their commissions, and more importantly, through their reports, newsletters, bulletins, and special documents which are widely read by university administrators, the work and needs of the Agency can be brought to the attention of the college and university community.

Associations of Like-Minded Institutions

Into this category of cooperative instrumentalities, a knowledge of which is useful to the Agency, is placed the non-all-inclusive but more specialized associations of colleges and universities so organized because of the special interests of their members. Such organizations may be national, regional, or state in geographic scope or they may be made up of departments, schools, or colleges having common professional interests. Similar types of institutions based on their sources of control or support have their own organizations.

The following are cited as examples of what is referred to as associations of like-minded institutions. There are many others. (See Education Directory, Part 4, Education Associations, annual publication of the United States Office of Education.)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
 American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business
 Association of American Law Schools
 Association of American Medical Colleges
 Association of State Colleges and Universities
 Association of Urban Universities

This category of associations includes only those in which the membership is institutional rather than individual. An example of two different types of associations would be the Association of American Veterinary Colleges on the one hand and the American Veterinary Medical Association on the other. Both of these types of organizations might well serve the needs of the Agency.

Most of the associations within this category have relatively small professional staffs, if any at all. Generally, but not always, these organizations of like-minded institutions are involved with standards and accreditation. Some make studies of concern to their own members and the majority publish newsletters if not more formal bulletins. The conducting of active programs or contract services is unusual in this group of associations. The problem of immediate decision-making can be a matter of importance and very difficult with this type of organization because of the geographic separation of the members and even of the members of the executive board. Concurrence rather than decision is the usual mode of operation.

It could be expected that little interest or strength would be found on the part of this type of instrumentality for the purpose of operating Agency contracts for overseas development. For advisory purposes, and also for the strengthening of communication between the Agency and the colleges and universities which are members of such associations, this category is a resource that could be of substantial potential value to the Agency. Many of these associations are concerned with precisely the areas and disciplines of greatest interest to the Agency in the over-all problem of international development.

Government-Related Organizations

A relatively new type of entity of increasing interest to the whole field of higher education is what is referred to as the "government-related" organization. Examples of this type are the "super boards," "coordinating councils," or "state commissions" (several other names are used) established by state legislatures to supervise, control, coordinate, or operate the total or at least a part of the public higher education in the state. This category should also include state systems such as the California State Colleges or the Board of Regents of the University of California, where there are in each case, in fact, several colleges or universities with separate campuses, faculties, and administration, under the jurisdiction of a single board.

Another type of government-related organization is the consortium or compact of states joined for the purpose of conducting or contracting for certain types of educational programs that some of its member states cannot adequately provide. In addition, such compact organizations are engaged in studies in the field of education which are of concern to the states. Examples of this type of interstate organization established by the governments of the states rather than by the educational institutions themselves are the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the Southern Regional Education Board.

A third example of cooperative organizations related to government is the Interstate Compact for Education, founded in 1966, which joins a large number of states in a nationwide effort to confront state educational problems on the national level. This organization is still in its formative stages.

It can be concluded from the rationale for the formation of such organizations that they would have no great interest in overseas development work in particular or international matters in general. However, and particularly in the case of the state systems, this may not always be true. An opposite example is the recent case of a state system of colleges contracting with the Agency for the education of a substantial number of college-age students from a Southeast Asian country. Here the system manages the contract, coordinates the program, and distributes the students for their education among the member colleges of the system. At least for the foreseeable future, the interstate compact groups cannot be expected to be significant resources for most kinds of overseas development projects. In special cases, however, they may prove to be an instrumentality useful to the Agency.

Single-Purpose Consortia

There have been a number of cases where it has been found advantageous to a government agency or to a group of colleges or universities to establish a single-purpose (or sometimes for related purposes) association or consortium with the objective of jointly conducting a specific undertaking which none of the members could do alone adequately.

Perhaps the first of such organizations on the educational scene were the state associations of private colleges established to provide for cooperative undertakings such as purchasing, library acquisitions, recruiting, joint faculty appointments, and lecture and concert tours. Through the discovery and development of such successful joint operations for special purposes, several government agencies have participated in the establishment of consortia for the purpose of operating research centers, overseas development and training projects, and other endeavors.

The University Corporation for Atmospheric Research was established by a group of about 20 universities for the sole purpose of operating the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado. Brookhaven National Laboratory is managed by an association of eastern universities. The Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities, Inc., was established primarily for the single purpose to operate overseas development contracts or grants. There are other examples of this type of consortia.

When the special criteria suggested on page 131 are applied to this type of organization, the conclusion would be that it is a feasible and fruitful kind of approach which the Agency should find useful. Most of the technical requirements for a successful contract operation should be fulfilled. However, if one of the over-all purposes of AID's utilization of university and college resources is to develop the broad capabilities of these institutions, then a question might be raised as to what extent there would be a real impact on the individual member campus from such an arrangement. By the same token it would appear that, in the other direction, in some cases the only real involvement of the individual institutions in the consortium is administrative. Mr. Gardner observed that "If the multiuniversity sponsorship of Brookhaven were abolished tomorrow, it is doubtful that the operation would change significantly."* If this is likely to be the case for any proposed single-purpose consortium, about the only advantage of this approach is either to gain a kind of university prestige for the project or perhaps, in some cases, to gain the freedom from certain Federal government restrictions. Neither of these reasons are likely to generate any large amount of enthusiasm on the part of faculties in general.

* A.I.D. and the Universities, page 42.

Multipurpose Consortia

There has been a recent trend toward the formation of consortia of institutions, usually regionally based, with the primary but ill-defined purpose of "doing those things that no one of us can do alone." Some of these organizations have been organized as a result of local or regional pride with the hope the organization might be able to win for its region a large Federal installation which could add to the technical resources of the community. Others have grown as multipurpose consortia, in theory available to take on almost any kind of assignment, as a result of some particular or specific opportunity to engage in a cooperative undertaking.

It would appear as a result of testing the criteria on this type of consortia that they have several inherent weaknesses. In general they do not have wide support from their member institutions either administratively or from the faculty point of view. Sometimes they are felt to be competitive with some of their own members. Usually they are not well staffed and have little working capital which can be used for planning and for effective operation prior to receiving a contract. The typical pattern is to operate through committees made up of busy faculty members and administrative officers. These are drawn from the member institutions on a part-time basis, and most of them are more interested in promoting the interests of their own institutions or their personal research programs than they are in

giving real time and attention to the cooperative effort, particularly if the consortium is in the stage of "looking for something good to do."

The problem of proper and equitable assignment of overhead costs between different projects and activities being pursued at a given time seems to have given rise to conflicts with some sponsors. Division of overhead income between member institutions in consortia of this type has produced some internal differences of opinion.

In theory, this type of consortium has much to offer, and we may well see further developments of this kind, although it should be pointed out that, with perhaps a few exceptions, the single-purpose type of consortium offers AID considerable advantages over the multipurpose consortium for the successful operation of a contract for a specific overseas development project.

Profit Corporations

Although this type of organization does not directly involve colleges and universities as members, some of the profit research and development companies often do consider themselves closely related to specific educational institutions. Several companies, having been spin-offs from universities, are located nearby and commonly use faculty and graduate students as consultants and part-time employees. For these reasons this category of instrumentalities might be considered as a contracting entity for potential overseas development projects, as it has the ability to capture the resources of both large and small educational institutions for special kinds of overseas operations. It should be pointed out that this type of organization is not limited to the more usual scientific and engineering research fields. There are profit firms which are engaged solely in training programs, and undoubtedly some of these are quite expert in and have had much experience in programs such as trade skills and vocational training.

The following are examples of this broad type of profit organizations:

Arthur D. Little, Inc.
Falcon Research and Development Company
General Learning Corporation
J. G. White Engineering Corporation
Raytheon Corporation
Tipton and Kalmbach, Inc.
Westinghouse Learning Corporation

Nonprofit Corporations, Institutes, or Associations

Although this type of organization does not directly involve colleges and universities in terms of contract responsibilities, they do relate to the educational establishment in several important ways. Such corporations often draw a substantial proportion of their trustees or directors from both administrators and faculty of universities, and their administrative staffs are commonly recruited from the university community. The nonprofit firms are knowledgeable about where the experts in various fields are located and have had great success in recruiting personnel from educational institutions both for short-term and long-term assignments.

Many of these organizations have developed an image of great prestige, a factor which has enhanced their ability to recruit. Their use of consultants from the academic world has been quite substantial and has provided them with great strength. Although this technique does produce some problems on the campus occasionally, most educators would agree that the involvement of faculty members in activities sponsored by this kind of outside organization has had a beneficial result.

The nonprofit corporations vary widely in their fields of operation, purposes, and mode of operation. From the standpoint of corporate organization, decision-making power, staff, financial strength, recruiting ability, and in terms of most of our criteria,

this type of organization presents a favorable potential picture as a resource for AID's use.

The question might be raised of whether the increasing use of this kind of organization by many government agencies is likely to have adverse effects on the higher educational system of our nation. The problems faced in the area of international development, however, are so diverse in scope that it would appear that many of these problems will fall outside the framework of the long-term goals of the university. The utilization of the third-party nonprofit type of organization as a mechanism for meeting the needs of AID may prove to be not only a satisfactory solution to the Agency's problems, but in many cases also may serve as an indirect method of developing university resources in international affairs without compromising some of their own institutional values.

As examples of nonprofit corporations, associations, and institutes, the following are from a long list, many of which have already had experience in cooperating in many ways with AID and its predecessor agencies:

- Academy for Educational Development
- Battelle Memorial Institute
- Education and World Affairs
- Educational Services Incorporated
- Institute of International Education
- Overseas Educational Service
- The Rand Corporation
- System Development Corporation

Central University Associated with Group of Satellite Colleges

A natural outgrowth of the growing complexity of higher education, including the proliferation of curricula, the desire for greater research opportunities, and the pressure on educational institutions to provide a wide variety of services to the local, national, or world community, has been the developing experiment of cooperative programs involving a central complex university together with a group of neighboring liberal arts colleges. Although this type of consortium is still a fairly rare structure within the total higher education scene, there may be so many advantages to this kind of format that it may well be utilized to a far greater extent in the not too distant future. This kind of experiment is not unrelated, although different in form, to outright mergers of institutions (such as the recent Western Reserve University-Case Institute of Technology merger) and to the formation of cluster colleges as at Claremont, California.

Two examples are cited of the central university-satellite college type of consortium, both being in existence at the present time, which are counterparts of others being discussed:

- . The Western Massachusetts college-university group which includes the University of Massachusetts affiliated with Amherst, Mount Holyoke, and Smith Colleges.
- . The Colorado Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, which includes the University of Denver with

Loretto Heights, Regis, and Colorado Woman's Colleges,
all in Denver; and Colorado College in Colorado Springs.

This type of consortium would appear to provide resources available to AID which could meet most of the established criteria for potentially successful international development contracts. However, it should not be taken for granted that they automatically would be interested in taking on such an activity.

Professional Associations

Although the professional associations such as the American Bar Association and the American Medical Association are not educational institutions, they are included in this study because (a) they are vitally involved in many ways with the professional schools and colleges, and (b) their membership (usually individuals) is to a varying but often large degree made up of faculty members of colleges and universities.

Through committees and staff these associations typically are knowledgeable about and are in contact with the people and programs available in the universities. Although these professional associations could not be expected to be interested in managing an overseas development contract, they can be useful for advice, evaluation, and for recruiting purposes. This kind of association, through their publications and personal contacts, can often provide both prestige and effective channels of communication between a government agency and personnel in colleges and universities.

Scientific and Cultural Associations and Societies

The comments made in the preceding section, "Professional Associations," are applicable to the case of the scientific and cultural associations and societies such as the American Chemical Society, the American Council of Learned Societies, or the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. In view of the fact that such societies ordinarily are not likely to be interested in developing contractual relations with AID for the operation of overseas development projects, no attempt has been made to apply the usual criteria to them.

C. IMPACT OF INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT ON THE UNIVERSITY

There is a general agreement that if universities are to be properly involved in the nation's international development undertaking, there should be a resulting improvement of the university's strength in terms of resources and capabilities pertinent to its own objectives. As Mr. Gardner pointed out: ". . . in its overseas activities as well as at home, the university will function as a university and not merely as a pool of technical talent or an employment broker. It will remember that its unique role is not to apply present knowledge but to advance the state of knowledge, not only to supply experts today but to train the next generation of experts."^{*} But experts are now, and will continue to be, people -- individuals with knowledge, know-how, and motivation. Therefore, the question can well be asked: "Is the involvement of a university in overseas development work having an impact on its people, including students, faculty, and other constituents?"

Perhaps after years of involvement of American universities in international work including the operation of overseas development contracts, it is time for an assessment of the results. Much has been written and substantial statistical evidence has been gathered

* A.I.D. and the Universities, page 11.

pointing to positive results of such involvement of these institutions in many aspects of international activity. It is difficult to relate these results in any quantitative way to the specific matter of the impact of AID overseas contracts on universities.

If people are the important ingredient, and universities, in cooperation with government agencies, are the means, the premise that overseas contracts are strengthening the over-all capabilities of universities in international affairs can be tested, albeit inadequately.

In the course of this study, the following facts have been examined as related to each of the institutions constituting the sample:

- . Number of foreign students on campus
- . Percentage of foreign students to total enrollment
- . Number of faculty members spending all or part of current year abroad.
- . Percentage of faculty members abroad to total faculty
- . Number of foreign scholars visiting the university
- . Percentage of visiting foreign scholars to total faculty
- . Actual numerical change and percentage change in each of the above items between 1960-1961 and 1965-1966 at each of the 108 sample institutions.

The above data are shown in Tables 7 to 12, beginning on page 160. Great care should be taken in drawing any general conclusions from these data, and comparisons between contract and noncontract institutions within the sample of institutions included in this study may lead to false specific judgments. However, this kind of factual information about a specific institution, as generally related to a group of similar ones, can be useful in applying the criteria for the selection of potential institutions for contracts. Certainly this kind of information does answer the question of whether an institution is "committed" to international work and whether or not, as measured by these kinds of involvement, there is a chance for a major impact on the total work of the university.

For the purpose of illustration, let us consider two universities which might be considered similar in most ways. They are about the same size in terms of faculty and total enrollment, are both public in control and support, and are located in the same general geographic region. Many educators would place them, to the extent such comparisons can be properly made, at about the same level of quality. Institution "A" has held contracts with AID; institution "B" has not.

Table 2 on page 153 shows the data regarding foreign student enrollment (both absolute and relative to total enrollment), foreign scholars on campus (both absolute and relative to total faculty),

and university faculty members abroad (both absolute and relative to total faculty), in these two otherwise comparable universities, for both academic years 1960-1961 and 1965-1966.

TABLE 2

Comparison of Foreign Students and Scholars and Faculty
Members Abroad at Two Similar Universities

	University A	University B
1960-1961 Total enrollment	10,036	11,113
1965-1966 Total enrollment	13,565	16,335
Percentage increase in total enrollment	35.1%	47.0%
1960-1961 Foreign students on campus	247	187
1965-1966 Foreign students on campus	526	285
Percentage increase in foreign students	113.0%	52.4%
Percentage of foreign students to total student body, 1960-1961	2.5%	1.7%
Percentage of foreign students to total student body, 1965-1966	3.9%	1.7%
1960-1961 Total faculty	623	710
1965-1966 Total faculty	860	901
Percentage increase in size of faculty	38.0%	26.9%
1960-1961 Foreign scholars on campus	6	14
1965-1966 Foreign scholars on campus	77	21
Percentage increase in foreign scholars	1,183.3%	50.0%
Percentage of foreign scholars to total faculty, 1960-1961	1.0%	2.0%
Percentage of foreign scholars to total faculty, 1965-1966	9.0%	2.3%
1960-1961 Faculty abroad	11	7
1965-1966 Faculty abroad	31	15
Percentage increase in faculty abroad	181.8%	114.3%
Percentage of total faculty abroad, 1960-1961	1.8%	1.0%
Percentage of total faculty abroad, 1965-1966	3.6%	1.7%

University A has held AID contracts; university B has not.

This kind of comparison has been applied to a number of pairs of like institutions in the sample. This is dangerous, and one should not be quick to draw conclusions from the results. There are just too many variables in terms of traditions, objectives, stated or unstated purposes, structure, and the uncertainty of the reported data to warrant assumed validity of the picture. Also, causes and effects sometimes get mixed up.

Nevertheless, the comparison of the two institutions, "A" and "B" in Table 2, indicates a pattern that was not at all unusual in the tests that were run. It does appear that those institutions having AID contracts are receiving a higher percentage of foreign students than are the otherwise similar noncontract universities. Likewise, this observation would seem to hold with visiting foreign scholars on the campus and with the number and proportion of faculty members visiting overseas. It cannot be proved that this is directly the effect of contract involvement. It may be, however, a partially valid measure of what is too often vaguely referred to as "commitment." It is of interest to point out that this apparent relationship may result indirectly in a general stimulation of international interest on the campus. For instance, as a rule, there are far more United States faculty members traveling abroad from fields and disciplines of little or no formal interest to AID (for example, the humanities) than there are from fields thought to be of more

direct interest to the Agency (such as engineering). The following table indicates this point:

TABLE 3
United States Faculty Abroad By Fields of Interest

Field of Interest	Number of Faculty Abroad	Percentage of Total Faculty Abroad
Humanities	1,192	30.1%
Social Sciences	903	22.8%
Natural and Physical Sciences	777	19.7%
Education	315	8.0%
Agriculture	248	6.3%
Engineering	238	6.0%
Medical Sciences	171	4.3%
Business Administration	110	2.8%

Source: Open Doors 1966, Institute of International Education

A different ranking of the order of the fields of study attracting United States students for study abroad is found as shown in Table 4 on page 156.

TABLE 4

United States Students Abroad By Fields of Interest

Field of Interest	Number of Students Abroad	Percentage of Total Students Abroad
Humanities	8,204	45.1%
Social Sciences	3,234	17.8%
Medical Sciences	2,448	13.5%
Natural and Physical Sciences	1,118	6.1%
Business Administration	664	3.6%
Engineering	274	1.5%
Education	223	1.2%
Agriculture	57	0.3%

Source: Open Doors 1966, Institute of International Education

These data raise many questions in regard to impact. Mr. Gardner observed that ". . . professors going overseas will take graduate students with them, not only to work on the contract but to advance their graduate work through research and field experience."* This observation would appear to be a reasonable and desirable objective of the contracting universities and, to the extent it would enhance the future manpower resources of the nation,

* A.I.D. and the Universities, 1964, page 11.

should be in the interest to the Agency. However, when it is noted that in 1964-1965, 248 United States faculty members in agriculture were abroad, but only 57 American agricultural students were abroad, it can be questioned whether Mr. Gardner's suggestion is being implemented to a significant degree.

To complete the comparison, the relative interest in the various field and professions of foreign students studying in the United States in 1964-1965 is shown in the following table:

TABLE 5

Foreign Students in the United States by Fields of Study

Field of Study	Number of Foreign Students in the United States	Percentage of Total
Engineering	18,095	21.9%
Humanities	16,587	20.0%
Natural and Physical Sciences	14,560	17.6%
Social Sciences	12,300	14.9%
Business Administration	7,909	9.6%
Education	4,248	5.1%
Medical Sciences	4,150	5.0%
Agriculture	3,064	3.7%
Unknown or other	1,796	2.2%

Source: Open Doors 1966, Institute of International Education

In a similar way, the following table shows the fields of interest of foreign faculty members and scholars visiting in the United States in 1964-1965:

Table 6
Foreign Faculty and Scholars Visiting in the
United States by Fields of Interest

Field of Study	Number of Foreign Faculty and Scholars in the United States	Percentage of Total
Natural and Physical Sciences	4,383	47.5%
Medical Sciences	1,435	15.5%
Humanities	1,419	15.4%
Social Sciences	936	10.1%
Engineering	609	—6.6%
Agriculture	190	2.1%
Education	180	1.9%
Business Administration	81	.9%

Source: Open Doors 1966, Institute of International Education

It should be pointed out that the above statistics do not distinguish between students and faculty going to and from the well-developed countries and to and from the less well-developed, and it

is the latter group with which AID is interested. It would be of great interest to AID to have this kind of data available for the countries in which it is active. Such data was not gathered or analyzed for this study.

TABLE 7

Comparison of Number of Foreign Students and Total Enrollment
in Selected Universities and Colleges with AID Contracts*
1960-1961 and 1965-1966

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase In Foreign Student Enrollment 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	
Arizona, University of	13,508	209	1.5%	20,350	419	2.1%	100.5%
Auburn University	8,827	83	.9%	11,853	93	.8%	12.0%
Boston University	18,977	395	2.1%	20,821	401	1.9%	1.5%
California, University of (Berkeley campus only)	21,860	1,140	5.2%	26,834	2,575	9.6%	125.9%
Chicago, University of	9,006	363	4.0%	7,782	496	6.4%	36.6%
Colorado State College	4,568	13	.3%	6,576	40	.6%	207.7%
Colorado State University	6,131	85	1.4%	11,848	273	2.3%	221.2%
Columbia University	14,064	820	5.8%	17,345	2,169	12.5%	164.5%
Connecticut, University of	11,143	44	.4%	13,373	157	1.2%	256.8%
Eastern Michigan University	6,711	89	1.3%	10,188	97	1.0%	9.0%
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	3,318	7	.2%	3,588	3	.8%	-57.1%
Florida, University of	14,417	287	2.0%	16,874	501	3.0%	74.6%

* Institutions in this list are those that had AID contracts on September 30, 1966, and were included in the Academy's sample (see Table 14, page 224).

TABLE 7 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase In Foreign Student Enrollment 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	
Georgia, University of	9,605	74	.8%	12,500	133	1.1%	79.7%
Harvard University (includes figures for Radcliffe College)	13,204	803	6.1%	14,825	1,074	7.2%	33.7%
Idaho, University of	4,024	60	1.5%	5,961	76	1.3%	26.7%
Illinois, University of (Chicago campus only in sample; total figures for university used)	*30,796	935	3.0%	47,253	1,232	2.6%	31.8%
Iowa State University	9,726	225	2.3%	14,014	534	3.8%	137.3%
Kansas State University	7,797	166	2.1%	10,919	459	4.2%	176.5%
Kansas, University of	10,036	247	2.5%	13,565	526	3.9%	113.0%
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)	389	44	11.3%	650	116	17.8%	163.6%
Maine, University of	5,867	32	.5%	6,701	54	.8%	68.8%
Missouri, University of (Kansas City campus only)	3,515	26	.7%	6,775	49	.7%	88.5%
Montana State University	3,925	79	2.0%	5,901	163	2.8%	106.3%
New Mexico, University of	7,707	62	.8%	11,809	327	2.8%	427.4%
New York, State University of	**47,822	134	.3%	88,672	1,206	1.4%	800.0%
Northwestern University	15,530	115	.7%	16,472	294	1.8%	155.7%

* 1960 figures do not include the Chicago campus; 1965 figures do

** Does not include units joining the State University after 1960 (except Buffalo)

TABLE 7 (continued)

TABLE 7 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase In Foreign Student Enrollment 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	
Oklahoma State University	11,794	304	2.6%	15,079	550	3.6%	80.9%
Pittsburgh, University of	13,423	159	1.2%	17,796	348	2.0%	118.9%
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	5,482	44	.8%	5,586	110	2.0%	150.0%
Purdue University	19,152	486	2.5%	27,793	692	2.5%	42.4%
San Diego State College	11,757	57	.5%	16,880	188	1.1%	229.8%
San Francisco State College	16,976	123	.7%	15,328	355	2.3%	188.6%
Southern Illinois University	13,832	134	1.0%	24,502	459	1.9%	242.5%
Teachers College (Columbia University)	5,422	302	5.6%	5,514	311	5.6%	3.0%
Tennessee, University of	17,187	19	.1%	24,000	303	1.3%	1,494.7%
Utah State University	7,277	221	3.0%	7,793	513	6.6%	132.1%
Vanderbilt University	3,721	74	2.0%	4,750	103	2.2%	39.2%
Washington State University	7,311	150	2.1%	9,962	287	2.9%	91.3%
Wisconsin, University of (Milwaukee campus only in sample - total university figures used)	30,028	806	2.7%	44,220	1,495	3.4%	85.5%
Wyoming, University of	4,451	63	1.4%	6,351	119	1.9%	88.9%

TABLE 7 (continued)

TABLE 8

Comparison of Number of Foreign Students and Total Enrollment in
Selected Universities and Colleges Without AID Contracts*
1960-1961 and 1965-1966

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase In Foreign Student Enrollment to 1965-1966
	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	
American Institute for Foreign Trade	272	4	1.5%	356	16	4.5%	300.0%
Baldwin-Wallace College	2,355	19	.8%	**2,593	13	.5%	-31.6%
Barnard College	**1,425	24	1.7%	1,650	34	2.1%	41.7%
Bates College	860	3	.3%	891	9	1.0%	200.0%
Berea College	1,287	39	3.0%	1,399	32	2.3%	-17.9%
Bishop College	537	2	.4%	1,342	16	1.2%	700.0%
Bowdoin College	810	20	2.5%	891	22	2.5%	10.0%
Bronx Community College	465	0	--	6,648	32	.5%	--
California, University of (San Diego)	107	19	17.8%	1,395	105	7.5%	452.6%
California Western University	1,512	17	1.1%	2,000	26	1.3%	52.9%
Case Institute of Technology	2,340	89	3.8%	2,613	77	2.9%	-13.5%
Catholic University of America	4,359	210	4.8%	6,113	385	6.3%	83.3%

* Institutions in this list are those without AID contracts on September 30, 1966, and were included in the Academy's sample.

** Spring term figures; all others fall term figures

TABLE 8 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase In Foreign Student Enrollment 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	
Claremont Colleges - Claremont Graduate School	613	10	1.6%	1,024	54	5.3%	440.0%
Claremont Men's College	431	11	2.6%	650	7	1.1%	-36.4%
Harvey Mudd College	205	0	-	285	6	2.1%	-
Pitzer College (established in 1963)	-	-	-	348	9	2.6%	-
Pomona College	1,088	11	1.0%	1,166	20	1.7%	81.8%
Scripps College	281	4	1.4%	395	6	1.5%	50.0%
Colby College	1,177	14	1.2%	1,450	19	1.3%	35.7%
Colorado College	1,331	55	4.1%	1,478	8	.5%	-854.5%
Colorado, University of	17,903	180	1.0%	**22,799	322	1.4%	78.9%
Cuyahoga Community College (established in 1963)	-	-	-	9,900	0	-	-
Dallas, University of	554	6	1.1%	840	6	.7%	0
Denver, University of	5,941	136	2.3%	7,854	162	2.1%	19.1%
De Paul University	8,745	93	1.1%	9,758	211	2.2%	126.9%
Emory University	4,594	37	.8%	5,149	37	.7%	0
Fisk University	869	20	2.3%	1,026	13	1.3%	-35.0%
Florida Atlantic University (established in 1961)	-	-	-	3,000	6	.2%	-

** Spring term figures

TABLE 8 (continued)

TABLE 8 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase In Foreign Student Enrollment 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	
Florida Presbyterian College (first enrollment, fall, 1960)	150	0	-	761	5	.7%	-
Florida State University	9,019	85	.9%	13,000	149	1.1%	75.3%
Franklin and Marshall College	1,854	6	.3%	1,608	9	.6%	50.0%
George Peabody College for Teachers	1,617	96	5.9%	2,106	118	5.6%	22.9%
Georgia Institute of Technology	6,632	170	2.6%	7,300	286	3.9%	68.2%
Georgia State College	3,592	0	-	8,180	15	.2%	-
Hiram College	667	5	.7%	1,015	11	1.1%	120.0%
Howard University	5,175	591	11.4%	8,198	1,139	13.9%	92.7%
Illinois Institute of Technology	7,305	161	2.2%	8,133	473	5.8%	193.8%
Iowa, University of	11,113	187	1.7%	16,335	285	1.7%	52.4%
Kent State University	11,598	37	.3%	14,746	114	.8%	208.1%
Keuka College	443	5	1.1%	724	6	.8%	20.0%
Lake Forest College	1,297	12	.9%	1,281	18	1.4%	50.0%
Meredith College	694	4	.6%	850	2	.2%	-50.0%
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies (first full academic session in 1961)	-	-	-	152	3	2.0%	-

TABLE 8 (continued)

TABLE 8 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase In Foreign Student Enrollment 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	
New School for Social Research	**6,072	104	1.7%	10,100	112	1.1%	7.7%
New York, City University of (all components)	83,674	151	.2%	139,010	558	.4%	269.5%
*New York, State University of (Albany campus only)	3,343	8	.2%	5,808	64	1.1%	700.0%
North Dakota, University of	4,423	147	3.3%	6,088	333	5.5%	126.5%
Notre Dame, University of	6,467	139	2.1%	7,000	197	2.8%	41.7%
Portland State College	4,545	0	-	9,100	90	1.0%	-
Princeton University	3,904	204	5.2%	4,461	349	7.8%	71.1%
Regis College	1,021	0	-	1,056	7	.7%	-
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	4,569	208	4.6%	4,629	194	4.2%	-6.7%
St. Louis, Junior College District of (established in 1962)	-	-	-	6,932	0	-	-
San Diego City College	**4,184	33	.8%	**6,000	33	.6%	0
San Francisco, City College of	4,851	87	1.8%	10,800	81	.8%	-6.9%
Skidmore College	1,272	20	1.6%	1,426	12	.8%	-40.0%

* Full campus included in Table 7

** Spring term figures

TABLE 8 (continued)

TABLE 8 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase In Foreign Student Enrollment 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	Total Enrollment	Total Foreign Students Enrolled	Percentage Foreign Students To Total Enrollment	
Southern Methodist University	7,493	95	1.3%	6,373	73	1.1%	-23.2%
Springfield College	1,497	37	2.5%	1,965	32	1.6%	-13.5%
Spring Garden Institute	**1,050	3	.3%	365	6	1.6%	100.0%
Stetson University	1,944	6	.3%	2,046	23	1.1%	283.3%
Tufts University (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy only in sample)	4,283	69	1.6%	5,071	61	1.2%	-11.6%
Union College	2,670	0	-	1,317	18	1.4%	-
Wayne State University	21,352	359	1.7%	29,125	848	2.9%	136.2%
West Georgia College	847	2	.2%	2,257	6	.3%	200.0%

** Spring term figures

TABLE 8 (continued)

TABLE 9

Comparison of Visiting Foreign Scholars With Faculty Members of Selected
Colleges and Universities* With AID Contracts
1960-1961 and 1965-1966

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Foreign Scholars 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	
Arizona, University of	953	0	--	1,616	61	3.8%	--
Auburn University	548	0	--	1,024	13	1.3%	--
Boston University	1,902	0	--	2,675	78	2.9%	--
California, University of (Berkeley campus only)	1,073	19	1.8%	4,600	180	3.9%	847.4%
Chicago, University of	871	5	.6%	923	95	10.3%	1,800.0%
Colorado State College	247	0	--	332	1	.3%	--
Colorado State University	450	1	.2%	563	15	2.7%	140.0%
Columbia University	3,619	20	.6%	3,849	108	2.8%	440.0%
Connecticut, University of	1,133	8	.7%	1,710	16	.9%	100.0%
Eastern Michigan University	325	0	--	600	1	.2%	--
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	220	0	--	249	0	--	--

* Institutions in this list are those that had AID contracts on September 30, 1966, and were included in the Academy's sample.

** Spring term

TABLE 9 (continued)

Institution	1960 -1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Foreign Scholars 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	
Florida, University of	1,002	0	--	1,400	48	3.4%	--
Georgia, University of	557	1	.2%	1,000	10	1.0%	900.0%
Harvard University (including Radcliffe College)	4,844	11	.2%	4,598	640	13.9%	5,718.2%
Idaho, University of	275	16	5.8%	464	16	3.4%	0
Illinois, University of (all campuses; Chicago Circle campus only in sample)	2,265	38	1.7%	6,749	186	2.8%	389.5%
Iowa State University	808	22	2.7%	1,144	83	7.3%	277.3%
Kansas State University	464	8	1.7%	824	23	2.8%	187.5%
Kansas, University of	623	6	1.0%	860	77	9.0%	1,183.3%
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)	42	0	--	54	2	3.7%	--
Maine, University of	301	3	1.0%	590	4	.7%	33.3%
Missouri, University of (Kansas City campus only)	354	0	--	489	1	.2%	--
Montana State University	322	0	--	479	5	1.0%	--
New Mexico, University of	365	1	.3%	564	20	3.5%	1,900.0%
New York, State University of (all campuses)	4,528	50	1.1%	5,836	215	3.7%	330.0%

** Spring term

TABLE 9 (continued)

TABLE 9 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Foreign Scholars 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	
Northwestern University	1,925	20	1.0%	2,245	75	3.3%	275.0%
Oklahoma State University	792	0	--	812	14	1.7%	--
Pittsburgh, University of	872	45	5.2%	1,212	121	10.0%	168.9%
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	420	3	.7%	475	0	--	--
Purdue University	1,162	19	1.6%	1,915	137	7.2%	621.1%
San Diego State College	604	0	--	1,091	2	.2%	--
San Francisco State College	635	0	--	1,075	0	--	--
Southern Illinois University	761	26	3.4%	1,855	29	1.6%	11.5%
Teachers College (Columbia University)	350	1	.3%	337	3	.9%	200.0%
Tennessee, University of	1,368	3	.2%	2,252	36	1.6%	1,100.0%
Utah State University	320	1	.3%	371	13	3.5%	1,200.0%
Vanderbilt University	738	2	.3%	964	69	7.2%	3,350.0%
Washington State University	489	12	2.5%	642	36	5.6%	200.0%
Wisconsin, University of (Milwaukee campus only)	459	0	--	715	28	3.9%	--
Wyoming, University of	320	0	--	600	9	1.5%	--

** Spring term

TABLE 9 (continued)

TABLE 10

Comparison of Visiting Foreign Scholars With Faculty Members of
Selected Colleges and Universities Without AID Contracts*
1960-1961 and 1965-1966

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Foreign Scholars 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	
American Institute for Foreign Trade	25	0	--	35	10	28.6%	--
Baldwin-Wallace College	126	0	--	149	0	--	--
Barnard College	188	2	1.1%	180	1	.6%	-50.0%
Bates College	56	0	--	60	1	1.7%	--
Berea College	112	0	--	114	1	.9%	--
Bishop College	26	2	7.7%	77	7	9.1%	250.0%
Bowdoin College	86	2	2.3%	85	1	1.2%	-50.0%
Bronx Community College	164	0	--	193	1	.5%	--
California, University of (San Diego)	+	0	--	190	120	63.2%	--
California Western University	120	0	--	105	0	--	--
Case Institute of Technology	191	0	--	877	22	2.5%	--

* Institutions in this list are those without AID contracts on September 30, 1966, and were included in the Academy's sample.

** Spring term

+ Not available

TABLE 10 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Foreign Scholars 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	
Catholic University of America	523	0	--	752	39	5.2%	--
Claremont Colleges - Claremont Graduate School	125	0	--	162	6	3.7%	--
Claremont Men's College	51	0	--	68	0	--	--
Harvey Mudd College	+	0	--	48	0	--	--
Pitzer College (established in 1963)	--	--	--	*42	0	--	--
Pomona College	111	1	.9%	107	3	2.8%	200.0%
Scripps College	35	0	--	45	0	--	--
Colby College	111	0	--	95	5	5.3%	--
Colorado College	104	0	--	151	1	.7%	--
Colorado, University of	516	5	1.0%	1,761	59	3.4%	1,080.0%
Cuyahoga Community College (established in 1963)	--	--	--	369	0	--	--
Dallas, University of	49	0	--	63	0	--	--
Denver, University of	340	0	--	523	2	.4%	--
De Paul University	324	0	--	527	0	--	--
Emory University	418	9	2.2%	1,351	22	1.6%	144.4%
Fisk University	58	0	--	88	5	5.7%	--

* Fall, 1965

** Spring term

+ Not available

TABLE 10 (continued)

TABLE 10 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Foreign Scholars 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	
Florida Atlantic University (established in 1961)	--	--	--	*197	0	--	--
Florida Presbyterian College	22	0	--	55	0	--	--
Florida State University	700	15	2.1%	748	43	5.7%	186.7%
Franklin and Marshall College	105	0	--	132	1	.8%	--
George Peabody College for Teachers	130	0	--	145	0	--	--
Georgia Institute of Technology	464	2	.4%	480	12	2.5%	500.0%
Georgia State College	197	0	--	325	5	1.5%	--
Hiram College	51	0	--	76	0	--	--
Howard University	660	21	3.2%	920	61	6.6%	190.5%
Illinois Institute of Technology	449	0	--	593	15	2.5%	--
Iowa, University of	710	14	2.0%	901	21	2.3%	50.0%
Kent State University	405	0	--	716	0	--	--
Keuka College	48	1	2.1%	60	0	--	--
Lake Forest College	60	0	--	88	1	1.1%	--

* Fall, 1965

** Spring term

TABLE 10 (continued)

TABLE 10 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Foreign Scholars 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	
Meredith College	51	0	--	65	0	--	--
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies (first full academic session in 1961)	--	--	--	*29	1	3.4%	--
New School for Social Research	288	0	--	350	1	.3%	--
New York, City University of	5,055	3	.06%	6,673	42	.6%	1,300.0%
New York, State University of (Albany campus only)	157	1	.6%	408	1	.2%	0
North Dakota, University of	200	0	--	335	4	1.2%	--
Notre Dame, University of	483	10	2.1%	523	0	--	--
Portland State College	242	1	.4%	800	21	2.6%	2,000.0%
Princeton University	552	15	2.7%	853	29	3.4%	93.3%
Regis College	76	0	--	89	0	--	--
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	533	0	--	602	17	2.8%	--
St. Louis, Junior College District of (established in 1962)	--	--	--	*261	0	--	--

* Fall, 1965

** Spring term

TABLE 10 (continued)

TABLE 10 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Foreign Scholars 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Foreign Scholars	Percentage Foreign Scholars To Total Faculty	
San Diego City College	150	1	.7%	300	0	--	--
San Francisco, City College of	262	0	--	310	0	--	--
Skidmore College	120	0	--	123	5	4.1%	--
Southern Methodist University	341	0	--	470	2	.4%	--
Springfield College	69	0	--	110	1	.9%	--
Spring Garden Institute	47	0	--	*31	0	--	--
Stetson University	124	0	--	153	0	--	--
Tufts University	570	2	.4%	585	43	7.4%	2,050.0%
Union College	275	1	.4%	152	0	--	--
Wayne State University	840	29	3.5%	2,655	54	2.0%	86.2%
West Georgia College	41	0	--	107	0	--	--

** Spring term
* Fall, 1965

TABLE 10 (continued)

TABLE 11

Comparison of Faculty Members Abroad With Total Faculty of
Selected Colleges and Universities With AID Contracts*
1960-1961 and 1965-1966

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Faculty Members Abroad 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	
Arizona, University of	953	12	1.3%	1,616	28	1.7%	133.3%
Auburn University	548	0	--	1,024	2	.2%	--
Boston University	1,902	2	.1%	2,675	25	.9%	1,150.0%
California, University of (Berkeley campus only)	1,073	80	7.5%	4,600	+	--	--
Chicago, University of	871	11	1.3%	923	53	5.7%	381.8%
Colorado State College	247	0	--	332	0	--	--
Colorado State University	450	1	.2%	563	39	6.9%	3,800.0%
Columbia University	3,619	25	.7%	3,849	46	1.2%	84.0%
Connecticut, University of	1,133	7	.6%	1,710	7	.4%	0
Eastern Michigan University	325	4	1.2%	600	7	1.2%	75.0%

* Institutions in this list are those that had AID contracts on September 30, 1966, and were included in the Academy's sample.

** Spring term

+ Not available

TABLE 11 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Faculty Members Abroad 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	220	0	--	249	0	--	--
Florida, University of	1,002	0	--	1,400	24	1.7%	--
Georgia, University of	557	5	.9%	1,000	1	.1%	-80.0%
Harvard University (including Radcliffe College)	4,844	26	.5%	4,598	21	.5%	-19.2%
Idaho, University of	275	0	--	464	3	.6%	--
Illinois, University of (all campuses)	2,265	34	1.5%	6,749	79	1.2%	132.4%
Iowa State University	808	7	.9%	1,144	28	2.4%	300.0%
Kansas State University	464	11	2.4%	824	25	3.0%	127.3%
Kansas, University of	623	11	1.8%	860	31	3.6%	181.8%
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)	42	0	--	54	0	--	--
Maine, University of	301	3	1.0%	594	2	.3%	-33.3%
Missouri, University of (Kansas City campus only)	354	3	.8%	489	0	--	--
Montana State University	322	2	.6%	479	5	1.0%	150.0%
New Mexico, University of	365	2	.5%	564	0	--	--
New York, State University of (all campuses)	4,528	38	.8%	5,836	103	1.8%	171.1%

** Spring term

TABLE 11 (continued)

TABLE 11 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Faculty Members Abroad 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	
Northwestern University	1,925	12	.6%	2,245	25	1.1%	108.3%
Oklahoma State University	792	0	--	812	19	2.3%	--
Pittsburgh, University of	872	33	3.8%	1,212	45	3.7%	36.4%
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	420	2	.5%	475	0	--	--
Purdue University	1,162	6	.5%	1,915	74	3.9%	1,133.3%
San Diego State College	604	0	--	1,091	15	1.4%	--
San Francisco State College	635	7	1.1%	1,075	26	2.4%	271.4%
Southern Illinois University	761	4	.5%	1,855	12	.6%	200.0%
Teachers College (Columbia University)	350	12	3.4%	337	21	6.2%	75.0%
Tennessee, University of	1,368	25	1.8%	2,252	9	.4%	-177.8%
Utah State University	320	14	4.4%	371	12	3.2%	-14.3%
Vanderbilt University	738	7	.9%	964	17	1.8%	142.9%
Washington State University	489	8	1.6%	642	0	--	--
Wisconsin, University of (Milwaukee campus only)	459	0	--	715	9	1.3%	--
Wyoming, University of	320	8	2.5%	600	9	1.5%	12.5%

** Spring term

TABLE 11 (continued)

TABLE 12

Comparison Of Faculty Members Abroad With Total Faculty Of
Selected Colleges And Universities Without AID Contracts*
1960-1961 and 1965-1966

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Faculty Members Abroad 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	
American Institute for Foreign Trade	25	0	--	35	0	--	--
Baldwin-Wallace College	126	2	1.6%	149	4	2.7%	100.0%
Barnard College	188	3	1.6%	180	6	3.3%	100.0%
Bates College	56	2	3.6%	60	0	--	--
Berea College	112	2	1.8%	114	2	1.8%	0
Bishop College	26	0	--	77	0	--	--
Bowdoin College	86	3	3.5%	85	5	5.9%	66.7%
Bronx Community College	164	0	--	193	3	1.6%	--
California, University of (San Diego)	+	0	--	190	5	2.6%	--
California Western University	120	2	1.7%	105	4	3.8%	100.0%

* Institutions in this list are those without AID contracts on September 30, 1966, and were included in the Academy's sample.

** Spring term

+ Not available

TABLE 12 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Faculty Members Abroad 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	
Case Institute of Technology	191	5	2.6%	877	6	.7%	20.0%
Catholic University of America	523	0	--	752	5	.7%	--
Claremont Colleges - Claremont Graduate School	125	0	--	162	5	3.1%	--
Claremont Men's College	51	0	--	68	2	2.9%	--
Harvey Mudd College	+	0	--	48	3	6.3%	--
Pitzer College (established in 1963)	--	--	--	*42	0	--	--
Pomona College	111	4	3.6%	107	3	2.8%	-25.0%
Scripps College	35	3	8.6%	45	1	2.2%	-66.7%
Colby College	111	0	--	95	5	5.3%	--
Colorado College	104	0	--	151	3	2.0%	--
Colorado, University of	516	7	1.4%	1,761	34	1.9%	385.7%
Cuyahoga Community College (established in 1963)	--	--	--	369	0	--	--
Dallas, University of	49	0	--	63	1	1.6%	--
Denver, University of	340	3	.9%	523	6	1.1%	100.0%
De Paul University	324	0	--	527	3	.6%	--

* Fall, 1965

** Spring term

+ Not available

TABLE 12 (continued)

TABLE 12 (continued)

Institution	1960 -1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Faculty Members Abroad 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	
Emory University	418	1	.2%	1,351	3	.2%	200.0%
Fisk University	58	0	--	88	2	2.3%	--
Florida Atlantic University (established in 1961)	--	--	--	*197	0	--	--
Florida Presbyterian College	22	0	--	55	1	1.8%	--
Florida State University	700	0	--	748	5	.7%	--
Franklin and Marshall College	105	4	3.8%	132	5	3.8%	25.0%
George Peabody College for Teachers	130	0	--	145	0	--	--
Georgia Institute of Technology	464	3	.6%	480	9	1.9%	200.0%
Georgia State College	197	0	--	325	2	.6%	--
Hiram College	51	2	3.9%	76	4	5.3%	100.0%
Howard University	660	3	.5%	920	3	.3%	0
Illinois Institute of Technology	449	3	.7%	593	3	.5%	0
Iowa, University of	710	7	1.0%	901	15	1.7%	114.3%

* Fall, 1965

** Spring term

TABLE 12 (continued)

TABLE 12 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Faculty Members Abroad 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	
Kent State University	405	4	1.0%	716	2	.3%	-50.0%
Keuka College	48	0	--	60	0	--	--
Lake Forest College	60	0	--	88	3	3.4%	--
Meredith College	51	0	--	65	0	--	--
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies (first full session in 1961)	--	--	--	*29	1	3.4%	--
New School for Social Research	288	1	.3%	350	6	1.7%	500.0%
New York, City University of	5,055	27	.5%	6,673	38	.6%	40.7%
New York, State University of (Albany campus only)	157	3	1.9%	408	2	.5%	-33.3%
North Dakota, University of	200	0	--	335	2	.6%	--
Notre Dame, University of	483	10	2.1%	523	0	--	--
Portland State College	242	6	2.5%	800	9	1.1%	50.0%
Princeton University	552	13	2.4%	853	15	1.8%	15.4%
Regis College	76	0	--	89	0	--	--

* Fall, 1965

** Spring term

TABLE 12 (continued)

TABLE 12 (continued)

Institution	1960 - 1961			1965 - 1966			Percentage Increase Of Faculty Members Abroad 1960-1961 to 1965-1966
	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	**Total Faculty	Total Faculty Abroad	Percentage Faculty Abroad To Total Faculty	
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	533	3	.6%	602	0	--	--
St. Louis, Junior College District of (established in 1962)	--	--	--	*261	0	--	--
San Diego City College	150	1	.7%	300	0	--	--
San Francisco, City College of	262	0	--	310	0	--	--
Skidmore College	120	1	.8%	123	2	1.6%	100.0%
Southern Methodist University	341	0	--	470	3	.6%	--
Springfield College	69	0	--	110	2	1.8%	--
Spring Garden Institute	47	0	--	*31	0	--	--
Stetson University	124	1	.8%	153	1	.7%	0
Tufts University	510	2	.4%	585	10	1.7%	400.0%
Union College	275	4	1.5%	152	1	.7%	-75.0%
Wayne State University	840	14	1.7%	2,655	19	.7%	35.7%
West Georgia College	41	0	--	107	1	.9%	--

Sources: World Almanac, 1962 and 1967
Tables: Open Doors 1961, 1966 - Institute of International Education
7-12: 1965-1966 College Facts Chart, National Beta Club

* Fall, 1965
** Spring term

TABLE 12 (continued)

PART II - THE INVENTORY STUDY

A. INTRODUCTION

Paragraph 2 of Section I-B of the contract (see the Preface, page 3) called for the collection of data and information from at least 100 universities with a wide diversification in size, sponsorship (public, private, sectarian, nonsectarian), experience in international operations, experience with AID or predecessor agencies, geographic distribution in the United States, and geographic and functional areas of overseas interest.

The Academy's Advisory Committee, composed largely of persons who were then or formerly had been officials of private foundations, began with a list of 250 universities, colleges, and higher education consortia. This list was then screened down to a group of 150 institutions that appeared to provide a proper distribution and diversification. Finally, a group of 108 institutions and consortia was selected as the sample for the inventory study. The total sample was then subdivided into nine categories by type. These categories served the purpose of the required testing of criteria as applied to types of institutions as described in Section A of Part I of this study.

For the purpose of assembling information regarding the resources of each institution, consultants were given assignments to gather

the data. Visits were made and separate reports prepared on each institution in the sample.

The individual reports on each institution constitute the results of the inventory which in turn is a major portion of this over-all study. These reports are submitted separately to the contract monitor in the Agency for International Development.

A discussion follows (Part II, Section B) of the procedures used in the inventory study, a description of the sample and of the sampling process, comments on the visits to the campuses by the consultants, the study team, and the classification of the institutions in the sample.

Finally, included in this study is a section entitled "Comments and Observations" (Part II, Section C). Without evaluation by the Academy, these are included for whatever use AID may wish to make of them. They come from many sources and cover many rather specific areas of AID-university relationships.

B. PROCEDURES AND METHODS

The inventory study started with a meeting of the Advisory Committee (listed in the front of this study), a group of persons who were then or formerly had been officials of private foundations. At this meeting was discussed a list of 250 universities, colleges, and higher education consortia for possible inclusion in the sample. This list was then screened down to 150 institutions based on the comments at the meeting and further preliminary investigations. These showed that at most higher education institutions the capacity for overseas development activity and the resources that can be allocated to such activities are relatively specialized. Therefore, the sample had to be designed to bring out the most that could be learned about each particular specialization.

The screening was directed toward the development of a list which would include (a) various types of institutions; (b) institutions distributed widely geographically in order to take account of sectional differences, if any, in the variety of higher education resources; (c) both large and small institutions; (d) institutions with and without AID contracts; and (e) institutions known to have strong management, substantial administrative flexibility, wide range of program, unique activities, or extraordinary interests.

Categories

The study team first established a number of preliminary categories to be used in stratifying a sample of universities and colleges to be contacted as follows:

1. Land-grant universities
2. State universities which are not land-grant institutions but are members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
3. Public universities which are not members of the association, including former teachers colleges which have now become multi-purpose colleges and universities
4. Large private universities, mainly residential (over 3,000 full-time students with 50 per cent or more living on campus)
5. Large private universities, mainly commuter (over 3,000 full-time students of which more than half commute)
6. Liberal arts colleges, mainly residential, with more than 1,000 students
7. Large teachers colleges
8. Engineering and science universities, colleges, and institutes with more than 1,000 students
9. Liberal arts colleges with fewer than 1,000 students
10. Large junior colleges (more than 3,000 students)
11. University branches
12. Other higher education institutions
13. Consortia and groups of universities and colleges

During the early part of the study it became clear that these classifications were unwieldy and could be simplified. It was found, for example, that as far as overseas development activities among state universities were concerned, the non-land-grant institutions which were members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges were similar in their operation and function to those which were not members. The reasons for membership were historical and were not of any real significance to the study.

There was also no clear distinction as to the point at which a university became "mainly commuter." Although the percentage of commuter students varies from year to year, the resources of the institutions involved, their capacities, research activities, and particularly their overseas development interests are influenced by a wide variety of factors not related to the resident or commuter characteristics of either the students or the faculty members.

It was also found that all small universities and colleges would have serious difficulties in releasing any personnel for off-campus activities and it was not informative, therefore, to classify liberal arts colleges by the size of the student body as had previously been planned.

With those considerations in mind, the classification of institutions studied was consolidated into nine categories as follows:

1. Land-grant universities (see Note A)
2. Other public universities and colleges (see Note B)
3. Public university branches (see Note C)
4. Large private universities (see Note D)
5. Liberal arts colleges (see Note E)
6. Large engineering and science universities and institutes (see Note F)
7. Junior colleges (see Note G)
8. Consortia of colleges and universities (see Note H)
9. Other higher education institutions (see Note I)

The rationale for this final classification of institutions, the significant differences between the categories, and the normal characteristics of institutions with each category, becomes obvious from a review of Part I, Section A of this study.

A list of the institutions and consortia in the sample divided into the preceding nine categories is shown in Chart A, page 237.

Notes on Institutions in the Sample Included in the Various Categories

A. Universities included in this group are those classified by the Office of Education as being land-grant colleges and universities.

B. Included in this classification are state universities that are not land-grant institutions. Some are of recent origin; others

have many years experience. One has a relatively small enrollment because of its geographic location while the others are quite large. In the past some of the state colleges were teacher education institutions primarily. They are now emerging as institutions with a broad range of educational offerings. Several state colleges are included in the sample -- most of these are located in urban areas. One is of very recent origin and is concentrating on junior and senior programs but will soon be involved in graduate work.

C. Information was secured from six branches of public universities. All are located in urban areas. One is a newly-created institution, while another was created by the state taking over a city university.

D. The institutions included in this category are widely scattered geographically. Most are located in urban environments. One is now state-related, but our data cover a period when it was a private institution.

E. This category includes 25 institutions classed as liberal arts colleges. Although four use the word university in their titles, their true function is that of a liberal arts college. Included are a number of women's and men's colleges, predominately Negro colleges, and church-related institutions. Most of the colleges have less than 1,500 students enrolled and are widely scattered geographically.

F. Five engineering and science universities or institutes which are geographically separated are included in this category: Two are private and three are state institutions.

G. Five junior and community colleges and one junior college district are included in this group. Five are public institutions, while one is a private college which began conferring degrees only recently.

H. In this category are six consortia and a private nonprofit organization which has been coordinating several colleges as a consortium under AID contracts. The study of these organizations was directed at the group organization as a potential resource for AID. Some reference to the members was essential in some cases so that a better report might result.

I. In this category are four institutions which did not seem to fit directly into the other categories. Three are private, while one is a state-chartered institution.

The Sample

Within these nine categories the study team then proceeded to select institutions which were on the list discussed with the Academy's Advisory Committee with a view to satisfying the needs of each category, and selecting institutions that could be reached easily from a series of central geographic points and from which the members of the field team could operate. It was found that the budget limitations on travel could be met by confining a large part of the sample to the

larger cities and their far-out as well as their close-in suburbs. The far-out suburbs included many institutions in nonurban locations -- an adequate number at least to give a rounded sample. By selecting members of the field team from universities and colleges in cities in 12 different parts of the country, a wide range of coverage was achieved without extensive air travel. This took on added importance during the course of the study because of the large number of return visits to various institutions that had to be made.

During the course of the study, members of the study team contacted, on campus or in off-campus meetings, representatives of 118 higher education institutions and consortia. Only 101 of these are included in the reports submitted to AID. Of the other seventeen, four made some data available, but the information was inadequate for a report. The others, after continued contact, did not furnish any data. The budget limited the amount of time and number of field contacts that could be made. These restrictions had been anticipated and the study was designed so that this limitation on depth was negligible.

An additional 19 institutions or organizations were contacted by mail. Seven are included in the sample of 108 reports where no direct campus or off-campus contact was made. Of the other twelve contacted by mail, in four cases a direct declination on data submission was received from the president or academic vice president. Of the remaining eight, the data promised were never received or were inadequate for a complete report.

We believe the sample is so representative of higher education in the country that the adding of other institutions to increase the size of the sample would not have changed our findings and conclusions. Nevertheless, future investigations might be desirable for the purpose of (1) increasing the inventory of information; (2) updating the data in the file which obviously become obsolete with the passage of time; or (3) assessing the effect of changes in personnel, the establishment of new programs, and changes in an institution's commitment to or capacity for overseas development activities.

During the course of the study, the sample was tested and slightly amended in order to give greater weight to:

- . Including "representative" institutions. The sample was not balanced statistically, however, with respect to the precise number of institutions included in each category or the number of students in institutions in each category, because these factors were not critical to the study.
- . Bringing to the surface resources and capabilities for overseas development activities not previously utilized by AID. Both institutions with AID contracts and institutions without AID contracts or with an insignificant contract total in relation to the institution's capabilities and resources were examined.

When the sample had been completed, the 108 institutions for which reports are submitted represented proportions of the groups of which they were in part as shown in Table 13 on page 194.

TABLE 13

Comparison of 108 Sample Institutions With Total
United States Institutions by Category

Classification	Total Number	Number in Sample	Percentage in Sample
All United States universities and colleges, fall 1965	(a) 2,184	108	5%
All public universities and colleges, fall 1965	(a) 800	48	6%
Universities and colleges that could possibly allocate resources to overseas development activities	(b) 450	75	17%
Consortia, consortia operators, and state and city systems that could possibly allocate resources to or manage overseas development projects	(b) 100	10	10%
Universities with 10,000 students or more	(b) 135	31	23%
Universities and colleges with AID contracts on December 31, 1965	(c) 126	41	33%
Universities and colleges receiving grants under Ford Foundation's Special Program in Education through September 30, 1965	(d) 70	16*	23%
Land-grant universities and colleges, 1964	(e) 68	19	28%
Predominately Negro institutions, fall 1965	(a) 1 105	5	5%

* excludes two Negro colleges which
received special grants in 1964.

- (a) Source: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1966. Tables 91, 100.
- (b) Our estimate
- (c) Source: Department of State, Agency for International Development, Contract Services Division, AID-Financed University Contracts, December 31, 1965.
- (d) Source: Ford Foundation's Annual Report 1965
- (e) Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1966, Table 196, p. 139.

The Visits

In accordance with the agreement with AID's Washington office, the study team made all initial contacts with universities, colleges, and consortia through the office of the institution's chief executive. Members of the team visited mostly with persons on campus to whom they were referred by the chief executive -- usually an academic vice president, a dean, director of overseas education and development activities, and faculty members most interested in overseas work. In no case did the team do any unannounced visiting, investigation, or evaluation of existing projects. The assignment was data assembly and resource identification and the consultations were limited accordingly.

In many cases it was necessary to make two or more trips to the sample institutions in order to obtain the data requested or to see the key people. In practically all cases a substantial amount of telephone and mail follow-up was required. Many university and college officials were glad to talk to the study team, were receptive to the requests for information and statistical data, and eager to be of assistance. However, they were too busy, frankly, with day-to-day administrative matters to be able to provide the information desired in accordance with needs or the timetable of the study. As a result, the amount of persistent follow-up required was far beyond that expected in the original study plan, and the plan was amended

to allow for all that was necessary. Nevertheless, despite the best efforts, there were 17 institutions to which campus visits were made, but from which inadequate data and material were obtained largely because key personnel lacked the time to do the work. Therefore, other institutions were substituted for those from whom reports were not received, and the size of the sample was reduced from the original maximum goal of 125 institutions to the final 108. Although the smaller sample did not impair the study's effectiveness, the nonrespondents did involve expenditures of time and travel from which there were no results. The cost of visits to nonrespondents was minimized by not paying honoraria to consultants for these visits.

In many cases, as already noted, the time required for campus visits was substantially greater than anticipated, resulting in much of the material being submitted in raw or unprocessed form, to be edited, checked, rewritten, or put into final form by the Academy's staff.

The members of the study team were careful to tell all college and university personnel contacted for this study that because the institution was included in the sample, it was in no better or worse position with regard to possible future contracts with AID. Moreover, mention was made especially that the study team was not evaluating an institution's activities -- either with respect to past contracts or as candidates for future contracts. It is believed that most of

the persons from whom the study team obtained information or discussed the assignment were aware of the position of the contractor. It is always possible, however, that at some institutions disclaimers of the member of the team were received with a degree of skepticism. Nevertheless, during the course of the study, there were no instances in which a college or university official said he believed that a member of the study team had implied anything beyond the precise limits of the Academy's assignment.

The Study Team

The study team was composed of college and university presidents, deans, and faculty members, many of whom had worked with the Academy on previous assignments. The team was under the immediate direction of Dr. David L. Mosconi, Head, Division of Research, College of Business Administration, University of Denver, who made numerous visits to campuses himself and reviewed and supervised the editing of every report received. The team was distributed geographically across the country as indicated earlier in this study in order to minimize travel.

One objective in selecting the team was to assemble knowledgeable and dependable people who knew the college and university field, but who were not specifically experts in AID programs, overseas development programs, or international education activities. There

had to be a balance between the necessity of obtaining the information and data needed to complete the assignment, and avoiding the implication that the team members were so expert in the overseas development field that they must be evaluating past or present AID assignments or making recommendations about the desirability of future AID contracts.

Member of the study team relayed numerous comments made to them on their visits which were personal or confidential and not included in their reports. Some of these comments have been paraphrased and are included in various parts of the final study and particularly in the section titled "Comments and Observations," (see page 202).

Study team members reported that frequently it was quite impossible to make a depth analysis of resources in one visit or through a series of short visits. The team felt that AID should send representatives to campuses of institutions of all types regularly so as to develop ability to immediately assess resources and capacities whenever the need arose.

The study team reported that at nearly every institution visited, top executives agreed readily that AID should have information of the type sought in this study before the Agency either planned or implemented the various parts of its program. The practical problem was how to make the information available without a backbreaking volume of work.

Some of the material assembled for the Academy had not been collected previously at many institutions. Some administrators found the data extremely interesting and can be expected to obtain similar data regularly. The answers to the questions asked provided insights that were not obtainable earlier. As this became clear, 33 reports by members of the study team were sent back to the institutions for their review and comment. Detailed answers and suggested corrections, brief letters of approval, or telephone calls indicating acceptability were received. In each case the reports have been modified accordingly before final submission to AID. Most corrections were ones of fact or represented cases when more up-to-date information was made available for the report.

One special point: as indicated earlier, the members of the study team were instructed to stay precisely within the limits of the assignment. They did not look into many other matters which might have been useful to this study, but which might also have stirred up concern about the possible objectives of the visits and reports.

Kinds of Information Assembled

The Academy asked each institution to provide the kind of information that should be assembled in AID's files for study prior to the negotiating of overseas development contracts. Although the questions as paraphrased on page 18 of this study were used as the basis for data gathering, additional information that was immediately

available was also submitted by some institutions. The result was that the field team obtained a wide variety of types of documents, reports, and statistical data for the file. In some cases, no doubt there is more information than is actually required, information not directly relevant to the questions asked, information not likely to be directly useful to AID at the present time, or information that could be put together in a more readily accessible form.

The institutions were asked to direct their assembly of information to the following fields of interest:

- . Economics, including marketing and commerce
- . Public administration
- . Political science
- . Law
- . Business administration
- . Engineering
- . Agriculture
- . Education and educational systems, including vocational education
- . Public health, medicine, pharmacology, and nursing
- . Sociology and anthropology
- . Communications, including audio-visual and political-socio networks and structure
- . Natural resources, including science and engineering
- . Behavioral sciences, including learning theory and motivation

- . Journalism
- . Foreign area studies (such as the National Defense Education Act foreign area programs)

Many institutions felt that they wanted to submit a great deal of information beyond these fields, in view of the possible development of new interests of AID and of other government agencies, particularly if the budget permits the funding of new overseas educational programs under the provisions of the International Education Act of 1966. This additional information has been accepted and has been included in the file of all the information received.

The nature of the study did not make it possible to derive data from each institution that would be directly comparable with other institutions in the sample. Also the accuracy of data from some institutions in the sample is of much higher order than others.

C. COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

In this section is presented a compendium of comments and observations gathered from a wide variety of sources during the conduct of this study. Although some are worded in the form of recommendations, they are submitted merely for review and consideration by AID rather than as recommendations by the Academy for Educational Development. Some are undoubtedly valid, some are feasible and even desirable, and some may be the result of out-of-date information and therefore are no longer pertinent.

With respect to the information available

1. The volume of information available at universities and colleges that could be useful to AID is overwhelming. It rolls off printing presses, spins out of computers, accumulates in file cabinets and libraries, and is assembled and duplicated for government reports and newspaper stories. It piles up in countless offices, frequently in multiple copies. The information, however, is largely in the form of raw data or is incorporated in special-purpose reports, and has to be processed to be useful.
2. The practical problem is how to dig through this goldmine of material, analyze, refine, and process it, and then extract that critical fraction of information essential to both the univer-

sities and AID. This procedure is a real task for every institution, time-consuming, frequently onerous, and accomplishment is usually possible only by assigning to it the most knowledgeable (and usually the busiest) men on campus.

3. No one has really solved the information problem. Educational administrators readily say they haven't time enough or energy enough to read all the reports or study all the data available to them. They acknowledge the fact that they have to make some policy decisions without all the critical background data. On the other hand, they do not like to see or to recommend that a government agency such as AID follow this practice. Many agree that AID should have a file of relevant and critical information that provides a comprehensive background for all members of the group of universities or colleges from which the selection of a contract or grant recipient must be made. The file would have to be organized, written, collated, and culled, and should cover a broad range of matters, but it also has to contain pinpointed material as needed. It is essential as the basis for prudent decisions by government personnel.

With respect to an inventory of information like that assembled by the Academy for AID

1. Well-trained and capable people are required to maintain up-to-date records as extensive as those in the proposed file, to analyze

the data, to put key information into a computer or other data-processing system, and to summarize the pertinent information for contracting officers. The cost of such a staff may run to as much as \$100,000 a year. A government agency can surely afford to spend this fraction out of \$150 to \$200 million in outstanding contracts in order to have ready access to a wide variety of essential background information.

2. Much of the information assembled and submitted with this report was available at the universities and colleges visited. It just had not been brought together previously.
3. Some university and college administrators found useful management data for their own institutions in the Academy's checklist of information requested for the reports, and they used the Academy's request (and AID's need) as an opportunity to compile the information for their own purposes.
4. Officials of other institutions, while recognizing the value of the requested data to themselves and to the government, were distressed by the cost of these and other constant demands for descriptive and statistical information and the burden they put on top officials. They felt that the magnitude of the information-assembly job was such that they could not afford the requisite allocation of time and staff.

5. A small group of institutions said they could not interfere with their own activities in order to meet the government's need for information. They took the position that if the government needed the information and its assembly was costly, the government should pay the cost.
6. After the information was assembled, many administrators found the data extremely revealing. They just had not known what resources for overseas development activities were available at their institution, how vast these resources actually were, or the extent of their institution's recent accomplishments.
7. Despite the clerical work involved, it is practical for institutions of higher education to assemble a file of detailed information on their resources and capabilities for overseas development activities for AID's Washington office. The process is probably not nearly as costly as some administrators claim. Moreover, once the file had been assembled, it could be kept up-to-date rather easily with the key materials placed in a computer or other data-processing system for quick retrieval and study by AID.
8. The year-to-year changes in personnel, programs, and emphasis in many institutions are so great that last year's information on resources for overseas development activities may be obsolete. This means new information is required every year or even more often.

With respect to the resources available for overseas development activities

1. The resources of American universities and colleges for overseas development activities are impressive in amount, quality, range, and diversity. It is probable that at least 450 to 500 institutions have resources for overseas development that could be useful to AID in a wide variety of fields -- from economics to public health, from agriculture to engineering, from geography to education. They draw on faculty and administrators with a broad array of skills, training, background, and experience.
2. The extensiveness of these rich resources does not imply that they are now or will be easily available to AID or any outside agency. In most colleges and universities, the best resources are already committed (in many cases overcommitted) to the development of their own educational programs, the needs of increasing enrollment, and the planning for new construction of facilities and reoriented academic objectives.
3. All types of colleges and universities, both large and small, have resources that might be useful to AID. The institutions are located in every part of the country, and there are no geographic limitations or advantages that stand out. However, institutions with 150 or fewer faculty members and key administrators are usually too small to mount off-campus programs

effectively. The predominately Negro colleges, women's colleges, and most of the smaller liberal-arts colleges visited for the study were all in this situation. Leaders of these smaller institutions say that the loss of a few key people for even relatively short periods could impair developments on campus or overseas programs for their own students. Ordinarily, they would turn down new assignments abroad, even though the opportunities were extremely attractive. However, the smaller institutions might be members of a consortium, or there might be special circumstances or arrangements which would make an overseas development assignment practical.

4. In some colleges and universities there are resources potentially useful to AID that are now dormant or undercommitted to overseas work. To be effective they would have to be developed, organized, and cultivated by AID or by some foundation or other agency. A number of these institutions are relatively uninformed about AID needs or about how to apply their resources to meet them. They are unlikely to take the initiative in making contact with AID or any other government agency.
5. There are many universities whose commitment to overseas development work is so great that they will assign people to overseas assignments regardless of the resulting burden on other elements of the institution. In such cases of overcommitment there is always the danger of insufficient follow-through.

6. Many strong institutions with extensive resources, large research programs, and widespread off-campus activities are eager to undertake or increase overseas development work, provided it does not interfere with their central goals and objectives. They feel constrained to protect their resources against contracts or research that might alter an institution's essential character, or adversely affect the responsibility it owes to its constituency. (Some observers believe that commitments to the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, and the Atomic Energy Commission, for example, have already damaged certain institutions.)
7. The widest range of resources of potential use to AID are naturally found in the large comprehensive universities which have a diversity of graduate activities and highly developed professional schools. While AID has concentrated its attention on such universities, there are still a number of them that are not in the AID program and many whose resources exceed those so far tapped by AID.
8. Many institutions with what seems a limited program also have useful resources for overseas development -- for example, those with a high concentration in teacher education or technical training. Some of these institutions are far ahead of the broad-based universities in their specialties, such as preparing

students for elementary education. Some could be most effective in training foreign students on their campuses.

With respect to the interest in overseas development activities or the program of the Agency for International Development

1. Most institutions with resources of potential use to AID express the desire to help the United States government if their assistance is really essential. Their questions are: how? when? and under what circumstances?
2. Despite their willingness to be helpful, most colleges and universities feel no particular obligation to seek out AID contracts or to offer their services to government agencies in general. Institutions with either small AID contracts or none at all (or, in most cases, any other government contracts) display a good deal of naivete as to the actual commitment required of them to perform an overseas contract. The term "institutional commitment" is used very loosely by both administrators and faculty. In some institutions it is reinforced by an overseas office on the campus and many faculty members assigned or available for overseas development work. In other institutions the commitment consists mainly of good intentions.
3. Many colleges and universities with resources potentially useful to AID point out that their first responsibility is to their own

students and to research which is closely related to the faculty's teaching or professional interests. However, AID could recruit such institutions because of the challenge of overseas projects, their encouragement of academic growth and broadened horizons for administrators and faculty members, and their increase of local or regional prestige. Many institutions also recognize that an active program in overseas development attracts talented new faculty members.

4. Many universities and colleges with resources that could be useful to AID noted that (a) neither AID nor its predecessor agencies ever approached them or examined their resources, (b) AID circulates no information on its overseas development needs, and (c) the general feeling is that most universities and colleges not now in the AID program would be wasting their time and efforts if they sought AID assignments.
5. The presidents and other administrators of many institutions believe their faculties could greatly benefit from serious participation in the nation's overseas development program, and campus interest in the field has increased greatly in recent years. However, some of these institutions lack the know-how, time, manpower, or even the initiative to develop a full-scale overseas development program.

6. Some institutions have AID contracts primarily because of the interest and drive of a handful of people on campus. As overseas programs have increased, these institutions have established offices or centers to handle them, sometimes with the help of grants from the Ford Foundation and other foundations. Further grants, particularly when funds become available under the International Education Act of 1966, can stimulate an effective program of overseas development at many institutions.
7. There are institutions where AID contracts or other overseas development activities are still the concern of only a very few people. If these key people should leave, or if their own personal or professional situations should change, the resources of the institution are much less likely to be available for AID projects or any other outside contracts.
8. A number of institutions said that some of their faculty members might participate in a project or a contract operated by another college or university, but that they themselves would not or could not take the lead in such activities.
9. A few institutions with resources that could be useful to AID said they did not want to get entangled in foreign operations. However, if AID needed their resources for critical overseas work, they would make their resources available.

With respect to certain reservations about AID contracts raised by a number of universities and colleges

1. Conflicting objectives

University administrators frequently said that the divergence between AID's objectives and those of the college or university interferes with the development of contracts that are mutually beneficial. AID needs contractors to carry out effectively those overseas assignments which the Agency determines should be carried on. The universities, these administrators say, wish to determine their own priorities and procedures in building up their educational programs and allocating their personnel. They cannot allow outside objectives to interfere.

2. Competing claims on personnel

There is also concern about allowing an institution's key people, both at top level and in middle management, to become too deeply involved in AID or any other off-campus activity. The best academic and administrative talent in large universities is so involved with current teaching and research, that diversion today will impair an institution's quality and well-being tomorrow and the years ahead. This concern limits the willingness of many institutions to take on new assignments, or even to continue or expand existing commitments..

3. Raiding

Some universities feel that AID treats their faculties as a pool of highly trained manpower to be raided at will, thereby interfering with an institution's development.

4. Incompatibility of contract work

Many universities and colleges consider AID activities as contract work, which they do not consider part of their function.

5. Difficulties with AID contracts and contracting officers

It is sometimes said that AID administrators and AID contracts are difficult to work with and that AID contracting officers are hard bargainers. (Some of the comments heard may be out of date in view of the new AID-university contract, but past impressions linger.) The red tape entailed in negotiating an AID contract is so great that many institutions with useful resources do not actively seek an AID assignment.

6. Government contracts now noncompetitive

Government agencies (including AID) are rapidly becoming non-competitive in today's market. Some university administrators, as well as faculty members in a wide variety of fields, regularly command \$150 to \$300 a day as consultants. They also receive travel allowances and other fringe benefits that are better than those the government provides. The regulations are frequently

less onerous, and there may be bonus arrangements when the assignment involves special hardships.

7. Not best type of assignment

An AID assignment may not be the best type of assignment for many faculty members. A teacher who is a highly qualified and sophisticated specialist in an important narrowly-defined field may be neither a diplomat nor a linguist, and may not be a good United States representative abroad despite his top reputation at home.

8. Overhead

AID's manner of calculating overhead is still a stumbling block, particularly as to inclusions and exclusions. While present procedures are no doubt better than they were a few years ago (and improvement is, in all probability, limited by the government's General Accounting Office regulations), they still seem to be a major irritant to college and university officials. This problem discourages top administrators from seeking government contracts, reduces their interest (and thus their leadership) in any AID projects undertaken, causes them to avoid responsibility for overseas operations, and finally, if committed by their institutions, makes them reluctant to assign the best people to AID projects.

9. Long-term faculty contracts versus short-term AID contracts

Some university officials hesitate to enter into long-term commitments with faculty, in order to make sure they are available to

handle AID contracts that run only a few years, or because AID's budget may be cut back or cancelled in mid-stream. It can be argued, of course, that few institutions run the risk of hiring excessive faculty in view of the nationwide expansion in college enrollment.

10. Dubious educational value

Potential feedback into the classroom from AID projects is frequently small because of the specialized background of many university people engaged in overseas development. For example, if AID uses a medical school professor to work on a public health problem overseas, there is little chance of his experiences feeding back into his university's undergraduate liberal arts classrooms.

With respect to the organization and structure of universities and colleges in relation to AID activities

1. Many universities and colleges are not organized to manage contracts successfully. Frequently they do not assign responsibility for the follow-through so essential to contract and project success, or they place it in the hands of an understaffed or uninterested faculty member. These institutions may well have the technical and professional capacity to carry out AID contracts, but they do not know how to mobilize and administer the necessary resources.

2. AID does not have a field staff to pay constant visits to universities and colleges all over the country, describing AID's needs and program, and seeking good people and useful ideas. This lack of staff prevents AID from finding useful people who are available for overseas development assignments.
3. Many universities and colleges that have the resources for overseas development programs but no contracts at present, lack people with the imagination required to work out plans for good projects (although they might be able to carry out projects once they are launched).
4. Many potentially useful universities and colleges lack information about AID's needs and about their own relevant resources. At many institutions, there is a pervasive lack of communication and information at the highest levels of authority and responsibility.

APPENDIX A

Alphabetical List of Institutions Included in Sample

1. American Institute for Foreign Trade (Arizona)
2. Arizona, University of
3. Associated Colleges of the Midwest (Illinois)
4. Associated Rocky Mountain Universities, Inc. (Utah)
5. Auburn University (Alabama)
6. Baldwin-Wallace College (Ohio)
7. Barnard College (New York)
8. Bates College (Maine)
9. Berea College (Kentucky)
10. Bishop College (Texas)
11. Boston University (Massachusetts)
12. Bowdoin College (Maine)
13. Bronx Community College (New York)
14. California, University of (Berkeley)
15. California, University of (San Diego)
16. California Western University
17. Case Institute of Technology (Ohio)
18. Catholic University of America (Washington, D. C.)
19. Chicago, University of (Illinois)
20. Claremont Colleges (California)

APPENDIX A
(continued)

21. Colby College (Maine)
22. Colorado College
23. Colorado State College
24. Colorado State University
25. Colorado, University of
26. Columbia University (New York)
27. Committee on Institutional Cooperation (Indiana)
28. Connecticut, University of
29. Cuyahoga Community College (Ohio)
30. Dallas, University of (Texas)
31. Denver, University of (Colorado)
32. De Paul University (Illinois)
33. Eastern Michigan University
34. Educational Services Incorporated (Massachusetts)
35. Emory University (Georgia)
36. Fisk University (Tennessee)
37. Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
38. Florida Atlantic University
39. Florida Presbyterian College
40. Florida State University
41. Florida, University of
42. Franklin and Marshall College (Pennsylvania)
43. George Peabody College for Teachers (Tennessee)
44. Georgia Institute of Technology

APPENDIX A
(continued)

45. Georgia State College
46. Georgia, University of
47. Georgia, University System of
48. Graduate Research Center of the Southwest (Texas)
49. Great Lakes Colleges Association (Michigan)
50. Harvard University (Massachusetts)
51. Hiram College (Ohio)
52. Howard University (Washington, D. C.)
53. Idaho, University of
54. Illinois Institute of Technology
55. Illinois, University of (Chicago Circle Campus)
56. Iowa State University
57. Iowa, University of
58. Kansas State University
59. Kansas, University of
60. Kent State University (Ohio)
61. Keuka College (New York)
62. Lake Forest College (Illinois)
63. Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)
64. Maine, University of
65. Meredith College (North Carolina)
66. Missouri, University of, at Kansas City
67. Montana State University
68. Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies (California)

APPENDIX A
(continued)

69. New Mexico, University of
70. New School for Social Research (New York)
71. New York, City University of
72. New York, State University of, at Albany
73. New York, State University of (all campuses)
74. North Dakota, University of
75. Northwestern University (Illinois)
76. Notre Dame, University of (Indiana)
77. Oklahoma State University
78. Pittsburgh, University of
79. Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn (New York)
80. Portland State College (Oregon)
81. Princeton University (New Jersey)
82. Purdue University (Indiana)
83. Regis College (Colorado)
84. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (New York)
85. St. Louis, Junior College District of (Missouri)
86. San Diego City College (California)
87. San Diego State College (California)
88. San Francisco, City College of (California)
89. San Francisco State College (California)
90. Skidmore College (New York)
91. Southern Illinois University
92. Southern Methodist University (Texas)

APPENDIX A
(continued)

93. Southern Regional Education Board (Georgia)
94. Springfield College (Massachusetts)
95. Spring Garden Institute (Pennsylvania)
96. Stetson University (Florida)
97. Teachers College (Columbia University, New York)
98. Tennessee, University of
99. Tufts University (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Massachusetts)
100. Union College (New York)
101. Utah State University
102. Vanderbilt University (Tennessee)
103. Washington State University
104. Wayne State University (Michigan)
105. West Georgia College
106. Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (Colorado)
107. Wisconsin, University of (Milwaukee)
108. Wyoming, University of

APPENDIX B

Members of the Academy's AID Study Team

Robert Z. Aliber

Director, Program of International Studies, Graduate School
of Business, University of Chicago.

Joseph Allen

Consultant to the Duke Endowment and various colleges and
universities.

Formerly Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Duke Endowment;
Administrator, Alfred P. Sloan National Scholarship Program.

John Barden

Assistant to the Provost, Case Institute of Technology.

Dewey F. Barich

President, Detroit Institute of Technology.

Formerly Manager, Educational Affairs, Ford Motor Company.

Anna Jo Behrens

Lecturer in Economics, San Diego State College.

Formerly Assistant Staff Director, Committee on Higher Education
in New York State; Senior Economist, United States Treasury
Department.

John E. Binnion

Director of the Graduate Program in Business Education, Texas
Technological College.

Ralph E. Binnion

Director of Admissions, Southern Methodist University.

Corwin E. Bjonerud

Professor of Education, San Francisco State College.

Formerly Director, San Francisco State College Teacher
Education Project in Liberia.

Frederick deW. Bolman

Director of Special Programs, Esso Education Foundation.

Formerly President, Franklin and Marshall College.

Murray M. Davidson

Management Consultant, Ernst and Ernst.

APPENDIX B
(continued)

- G. Wayne Glick
President, Keuka College.
Formerly Dean, Franklin and Marshall College.
- E. Bruce Heilman
President, Meredith College.
Formerly Vice President for Administration, George Peabody College for Teachers.
- Millard F. Long
Associate Professor of Business Economics, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Chicago.
- Arthur W. Mason, Jr.
Dean, College of Business Administration, University of Denver.
Formerly Director of the Doctoral Program, Graduate School of Business Administration, Washington University.
- W. Hugh McEniry, Jr.
Dean, Stetson University.
- Rexford G. Moon, Jr.
Director of Studies, Academy for Educational Development.
Formerly Director, College Scholarship Service of the College Entrance Examination Board.
- David L. Mosconi
Head of the Division of Research, College of Business Administration, University of Denver.
- Judith Murphy
Senior Program Associate, Academy for Educational Development.
- Anthony E. Seidl
Associate Professor of Education, University of San Francisco.
- Sidney G. Tickton
Vice President, Academy for Educational Development.

TABLE 14

United States Universities with AID Contracts
As of September 30, 1966
(In order of dollar amounts of contracts)

Rank	Institution	In Sample	Technical Assistance Abroad		Training, Research, and Technical Services		Total AID Contracts in Dollars
			Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	
1	Teachers College (Columbia University)	Yes	6	\$20,052,531	1	Open	\$20,052,531
2	Educational Services Incorporated	Yes	2	11,677,601	2	\$3,570,938	15,248,539
3	Kentucky, University of	No	2	12,185,045	2	30,892	12,215,937
4	Michigan State University	No	4	8,905,422	7	2,425,325	11,330,747
5	Oklahoma State University	Yes	2	11,037,746	1	Open	11,037,746
6	Texas A and M University	No	4	8,660,228	1	Open	8,660,228
7	Wyoming, University of	Yes	2	8,089,487	1	Open	8,089,487
8	Wisconsin, University of	*Yes	4	3,108,040	8	3,965,218	7,073,258
9	Ohio State University	No	7	5,314,986	6	774,014	6,089,000
10	Colorado State University	Yes	4	6,079,252	1	Open	6,079,252
11	California, University of	**Yes	7	5,504,627	4	343,708	5,848,335
12	Illinois, University of	***Yes	4	5,374,521	3	465,278	5,839,799
13	Ohio University	No	3	5,425,371	1	Open	5,425,371
14	Washington State University	Yes	1	5,416,039	1	Open	5,416,039
15	North Carolina State University	No	1	4,057,180	3	1,016,300	5,073,480

* Milwaukee branch in sample
** Berkeley and San Diego campuses in sample
*** Chicago Circle Campus in sample

TABLE 14 (continued)

Rank	Institution	In Sample	Technical Assistance Abroad		Training, Research, and Technical Services		Total AID Contracts in Dollars
			Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	
16	Nebraska, University of	No	2	\$3,981,000	2	\$370,152	\$4,351,152
17	Pittsburgh, University of	Yes	3	3,791,511	4	348,630	4,140,141
18	Purdue University	Yes	1	3,864,298	1	Open	3,864,298
19	Harvard University	Yes	2	2,407,473	4	1,227,533	3,635,006
20	Iowa State University	Yes	*2	3,402,560	1	Open	3,402,560
21	Southern California, University of	No	2	3,161,560	0		3,161,560
22	Indiana University	No	3	3,091,348	1	25,252	3,116,600
23	Kansas State University	Yes	2	3,025,016	1	Open	3,025,016
24	Southern Illinois University	Yes	4	2,932,223	1	Open	2,932,223
25	West Virginia University	No	5	2,844,226	1	Open	2,844,226
26	San Francisco State College	Yes	1	2,615,058	0		2,615,058
27	Hawaii, University of	No	1	1,442,156	4	1,154,248	2,596,404
28	Cornell University	No	2	1,969,061	4	590,968	2,560,029
29	William Hood Dunwoody Industrial Institute	No	2	2,212,532	1	Open	2,212,532
30	Houston, University of	No	3	2,161,858	0		2,161,858
31	Western Michigan University	No	1	1,678,353	0		1,678,353
32	St. Louis University	No	2	1,677,750	0		1,677,750
33	Pennsylvania, University of	No	1	1,328,594	1	250,000	1,578,594

* Includes one joint contract with the University of Iowa

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Rank	Institution	In Sample	Technical Assistance Abroad		Training, Research, and Technical Services		Total AID Contracts in Dollars
			Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	
34	Johns Hopkins University	No	0		3	\$1,566,638	\$1,566,638
35	Yale University	No	0		1	1,513,730	1,513,730
36	Colorado State College	Yes	1	\$1,501,080	0		1,501,080
37	Syracuse University	No	3	1,456,568	1	22,000	1,478,568
38	California State Colleges	No	2	1,162,000	3	293,337	1,455,337
39	Massachusetts, University of	No	2	1,431,800	1	Open	1,431,800
40	Michigan, University of	No	2	1,317,723	2	53,100	1,370,823
41	Eastern Michigan University	Yes	1	1,351,444	0		1,351,444
42	Hampton Institute	No	1	1,324,500	0		1,324,500
43	Tuskegee Institute	No	1	1,253,329	1	Open	1,253,329
44	Arizona, University of	Yes	1	1,216,000	1	Open	1,216,000
45	Mississippi State University	No	2	665,146	3	538,575	1,203,721
46	San Diego State College	Yes	2	1,146,000	0		1,146,000
47	Stanford University	No	1	1,143,283	0		1,143,283
48	New York University	No	1	835,000	1	149,096	984,096
49	New York, State University of	Yes	3	920,461	2	46,200	966,661
50	North Carolina, University of	No	1	168,000	2	738,984	906,984
51	Utah State University	Yes	2	795,000	1	Open	795,000

TABLE 14 (continued)

TABLE 14 (continued)

Rank	Institution	In Sample	Technical Assistance Abroad		Training, Research, and Technical Services		Total AID Contracts in Dollars
			Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	
52	Missouri, University of	*Yes	2	\$789,143	1	Open	\$789,143
53	Chicago, University of	Yes	1	746,109	0		746,109
54	Utah, University of	No	1	740,000	0		740,000
55	Florida, University of	Yes	2	443,300	2	\$179,111	622,411
56	Loyola University (Louisiana)	No	0		1	603,704	603,704
57	Bucknell University	No	1	565,868	0		565,868
58	Northwestern University	Yes	1	525,000	0		525,000
59	Oregon State University	No	0		1	478,415	478,415
60	Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities	No	1	465,645	0		465,645
61	Tennessee, University of	Yes	1	450,594	1	Open	450,594
62	New Mexico State University	No	1	406,000	1	Open	406,000
63	California State College at Los Angeles	No	1	400,000	0		400,000
64	Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	Yes	1	300,000	0		300,000
65	Boston University	Yes	0		2	298,053	298,053
66	Connecticut, University of	Yes	1	286,000	1	Open	286,000
67	Vanderbilt University	Yes	1	285,921	0		285,921
68	Bryant College	No	1	259,705	0		259,705

* Kansas City campus in sample

TABLE 14 (continued)

TABLE 14 (continued)

Rank	Institution	In Sample	Technical Assistance Abroad		Training, Research, and Technical Services		Total AID Contracts in Dollars
			Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	
69	Minnesota, University of	No	1	\$10,600	5	\$246,136	\$256,736
70	Brandeis University	No	0		1	250,594	250,594
71	Albany Medical College (Union University)	No	2	236,858	0		236,858
72	Kansas, University of	Yes	1	212,000	0		212,000
73	Colorado School of Mines	No	1	209,000	0		209,000
74	Georgetown University	No	0		3	195,980	195,980
75	Williams College	No	0		2	182,519	182,519
76	Columbia University	Yes	0		1	166,950	166,950
77	New Mexico, University of	Yes	1	165,751	0		165,751
78	Northeastern University	No	0		1	163,300	163,300
79	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	No	0		2	158,307	158,307
80	Medical College of Virginia	No	0		1	130,200	130,200
81	Pennsylvania State University	No	2	120,341	1	Open	120,341
82	California State Polytechnic College	No	1	73,132	0		73,132
83	South Florida, University of	No	0		1	65,129	65,129
84	American University	No	0		2	50,000	50,000
85	Akron, University of	No	0		1	43,720	43,720
86	San Jose State College	No	1	18,584	0		18,584
87	Virginia, University of	No	1	15,000	0		15,000

TABLE 14 (continued)

TABLE 14 (continued)

Rank	Institution	In Sample	Technical Assistance Abroad		Training, Research, and Technical Services		Total AID Contracts in Dollars
			Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	
88	George Washington University	No	0		2	\$15,000	\$15,000
89	St. Michael's College	No	0		1	13,020	13,020
90	Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College	No				Open	Open
91	Arkansas, University of	No				Open	Open
92	Auburn University	Yes				Open	Open
93	Clemson University	No				Open	Open
94	Delaware State College	No				Open	Open
95	Delaware, University of	No				Open	Open
96	Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	Yes				Open	Open
97	Fort Valley State College	No				Open	Open
98	Georgia, University of	Yes				Open	Open
99	Idaho, University of	Yes				Open	Open
100	Kentucky State College	No				Open	Open
101	Langston University	No				Open	Open
102	Lincoln University (Missouri)	No				Open	Open
103	Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)	Yes				Open	Open
104	Louisiana State University	No				Open	Open
105	Maine, University of	Yes				Open	Open

TABLE 14 (continued)

TABLE 14 (Continued)

Rank	Institution	In Sample	Technical Assistance Abroad		Training, Research, and Technical Service		Total AID Contracts in Dollars
			Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	Number of Contracts	Total Contract Dollars	
106	Maryland State College	No				Open	Open
107	Maryland, University of	No				Open	Open
108	Montana State University	Yes				Open	Open
109	Nevada, University of	No				Open	Open
110	New Hampshire, University of	No				Open	Open
111	North Carolina, Agricultural and Technical College of	No				Open	Open
112	North Dakota State University	No				Open	Open
113	Point Park Junior College	No				Open	Open
114	Rhode Island, University of	No				Open	Open
115	Rutgers University	No				Open	Open
116	Sacramento State College	No				Open	Open
117	South Dakota State University	No				Open	Open
118	Southern University	No				Open	Open
119	Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial University	No				Open	Open
120	Texas, University of	No				Open	Open
121	Vermont, University of	No				Open	Open
122	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	No				Open	Open
123	Virginia State College	No				Open	Open
124	Washington, University of	No				Open	Open
125	Western Illinois University	No				Open	Open
							<u>\$218,606,792</u>

TABLE 14 (continued)

TABLE 15

Number of Universities and Colleges with AID Contracts, and
Amount of These Contracts, Classified by Categories Used
in the Study by the Academy for Educational Development

September 30, 1966

Category	Number of Institutions with AID Contracts			Amount of AID Contracts
	Dollar Amount Shown	No Dollar Amount	Total	
A. Land-Grant Universities	32	29	61	\$123,611,461
B. Other Public Universities and Colleges	24	5	29	28,700,308
C. Public University Branches*				
D. Large Private Universities	23	0	23	44,798,376
E. Liberal Arts Colleges	5	1	6	3,033,073
F. Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes	1	0	1	300,000
G. Junior Colleges	0	1	1	-
H. Consortia of Colleges and Universities	2	0	2	15,714,184
I. Other Higher Education Institutions	<u>2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2,449,390</u>
TOTAL	89	36	125	\$218,606,792

*Public university branches are included under their parent institutions
in categories A and B.

TABLE 16

Summary of Contacts Made in Securing Data for
Sample of 108 Organizations

Institution	Total*	Number of Persons Contacted	
		Mail and Telephone	Personal
American Institute for Foreign Trade	2	1	2
Arizona, University of	5	5	3
Associated Colleges of the Midwest	2	1	2
Associated Rocky Mountain Universities	2	2	2
Auburn University	4	2	4
Baldwin-Wallace College	2	2	2
Barnard College	2	2	2
Bates College	2	2	2
Berea College	4	4	2
Bishop College	3	3	3
Boston University	4	4	1
Bowdoin College	2	2	2
Bronx Community College	2	2	2
California, University of (Berkeley)	2	2	2
California, University of (San Diego)	11	11	3
California Western University	2	2	2
Case Institute of Technology	3	3	2
Catholic University of America	6	6	3
Chicago, University of	5	2	5
Claremont Colleges	2	2	-
Colby College	2	2	2

* Column one indicates the total number of persons contacted and is not mail and telephone plus personal visits, as some individuals were contacted in each way. Duplications of mail, telephone, and personal contacts are not indicated.

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

Institution	Total*	Number of Persons Contacted	
		Mail and Telephone	Personal
Colorado College	4	4	3
Colorado State College	2	2	2
Colorado State University	2	2	2
Colorado, University of	2	2	2
Columbia University	5	5	2
Committee on Institutional Cooperation	3	3	2
Connecticut, University of	2	2	2
Cuyahoga Community College	3	3	2
Dallas, University of	3	3	3
Denver, University of	4	4	4
DePaul University	7	7	3
Eastern Michigan University	2	2	1
Educational Services Incorporated	3	3	-
Emory University	2	2	1
Fisk University	5	5	3
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	9	9	3
Florida Atlantic University	8	8	3
Florida Presbyterian College	6	6	3
Florida State University	10	10	3
Florida, University of	10	10	3
Franklin and Marshall College	3	3	3

* Column one indicates the total number of persons contacted and is not mail and telephone plus personal visits, as some individuals were contacted in each way. Duplications of mail, telephone, and personal contacts are not indicated.

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

Institution	Total*	Number of Persons Contacted	
		Mail and Telephone	Personal
George Peabody College for Teachers	6	6	6
Georgia Institute of Technology	2	2	1
Georgia State College	3	3	2
Georgia, University of	2	2	1
Georgia, University System of	2	2	2
Graduate Research Center of the Southwest	2	2	2
Great Lakes Colleges Association	21	21	2
Harvard University	13	13	2
Hiram College	2	2	-
Howard University	10	10	4
Idaho, University of	2	2	2
Illinois Institute of Technology	2	2	2
Illinois, University of (Chicago Circle Campus)	2	2	2
Iowa State University	6	6	5
Iowa, University of	2	2	1
Kansas State University	2	2	1
Kansas, University of	2	2	1
Kent State University	2	2	2
Keuka College	1	1	1
Lake Forest College	3	3	3
Lincoln University (Pennsylvania)	3	3	2
Maine, University of	1	1	1

* Column one indicates the total number of persons contacted and is not mail and telephone plus personal visits, as some individuals were contacted in each way. Duplications of mail, telephone, and personal contacts are not indicated.

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

Institution	Total*	Number of Persons Contacted	
		Mail and Telephone	Personal
Meredith College	1	1	1
Missouri, University of at Kansas City	2	2	1
Montana State University	2	2	-
Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies	2	2	2
New Mexico, University of	2	2	1
New School for Social Research	6	6	3
New York, City University of	2	2	2
New York, State University of at Albany	1	1	1
New York, State University of (all campuses)	6	6	3
North Dakota, University of	1	1	1
Northwestern University	2	2	1
Notre Dame, University of	3	3	3
Oklahoma State University	2	2	1
Pittsburgh, University of	2	2	-
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	3	3	1
Portland State College	2	2	-
Princeton University	5	5	2
Purdue University	4	4	2
Regis College	2	2	1
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	2	2	2
St. Louis, Junior College District of	1	1	1
San Diego City College	2	2	2

* Column one indicates the total number of persons contacted and is not mail and telephone plus personal visits, as some individuals were contacted in each way. Duplications of mail, telephone and personal contacts are not indicated.

TABLE 16 (CONTINUED)

Institution	Total*	Number of Persons Contacted	
		Mail and Telephone	Personal
San Diego State College	4	4	2
San Francisco, City College of	3	3	3
San Francisco State College	2	2	2
Skidmore College	2	2	2
Southern Illinois University	4	4	2
Southern Methodist University	4	4	2
Southern Regional Education Board	2	2	1
Springfield College	5	5	1
Spring Garden Institute	1	1	1
Stetson University	7	7	3
Teachers College (Columbia University)	3	3	2
Tennessee, University of	4	4	4
Tufts University (Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy)	3	3	1
Union College	2	2	2
Utah State University	2	2	1
Vanderbilt University	4	4	2
Washington State University	2	2	1
Wayne State University	2	2	2
West Georgia College	1	1	1
Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education	2	2	2
Wisconsin, University of (Milwaukee)	2	2	2
Wyoming, University of	3	3	3

* Column one indicates the total number of persons contacted and is not mail and telephone plus personal visits, as some individuals were contacted in each way. Duplications of mail, telephone and personal contacts are not indicated.

CHART A

Institutions in the Sample Classified by Type

<p>A. <u>Land-Grant Universities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *University of Arizona *Auburn University *Colorado State University *University of Connecticut *Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University *University of Florida *University of Georgia *University of Idaho *Iowa State University *Kansas State University *University of Maine *Montana State University *Oklahoma State University *Purdue University *University of Tennessee *Utah State University *Washington State University *University of Wyoming <p>B. <u>Other Public Universities and Colleges</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Colorado State College University of Colorado *Eastern Michigan University Florida Atlantic University Florida State University Georgia State College University System of Georgia University of Iowa *University of Kansas Kent State University *University of New Mexico City University of New York *State University of New York 	<p>B. <u>Other Public Universities and Colleges (continued)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> University of North Dakota Portland State College *San Diego State College *San Francisco State College *Southern Illinois University Wayne State University West Georgia College <p>C. <u>Public University Branches</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> University of California (Berkeley)+ University of California (San Diego)+ *University of Illinois (Chicago Circle Campus)+ *University of Missouri at Kansas City+ State University of New York at Albany *University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee)+ <p>D. <u>Large Private Universities</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Boston University Catholic University of America *University of Chicago *Columbia University University of Denver De Paul University Emory University *Harvard University Howard University *Northwestern University University of Notre Dame
--	--

* Universities and colleges marked with an asterisk had AID technical assistance abroad and/or training, research, or technical assistance contracts as of September 30, 1966.

+ Also land-grant institutions

CHART A (continued)

Institutions in the Sample Classified by Type

D. Large Private Universities
(continued)

*University of Pittsburgh
 Princeton University
 Southern Methodist University
 *Teachers College (Columbia University)
 Tufts University
 *Vanderbilt University

E. Liberal Arts Colleges

Baldwin-Wallace College
 Barnard College
 Bates College
 Berea College
 Bishop College
 Bowdoin College
 California Western University
 Claremont Colleges
 Colby College
 Colorado College
 University of Dallas
 Fisk University
 Florida Presbyterian College
 Franklin and Marshall College
 George Peabody College for Teachers
 Hiram College
 Keuka College
 Lake Forest College
 *Lincoln University
 Meredith College
 Regis College
 Skidmore College
 Springfield College
 Stetson University
 Union College

F. Large Engineering and Science Universities and Institutes

Case Institute of Technology
 Georgia Institute of Technology
 Illinois Institute of Technology
 *Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

G. Junior and Community Colleges

Bronx Community College
 City College of San Francisco
 Cuyahoga Community College
 Junior College District of St. Louis
 San Diego City College
 Spring Garden Institute

H. Consortia, and Operators of Consortia, of Colleges and Universities

Associated Colleges of the Midwest
 Associated Rocky Mountain Universities
 Committee on Institutional Cooperation
 *Educational Services Incorporated
 Great Lakes Colleges Association
 Southern Regional Education Board
 Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

I. Other Higher Education Institutions

American Institute for Foreign Trade
 Graduate Research Center of the Southwest
 Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies
 New School for Social Research

* Universities and colleges marked with an asterisk had AID technical assistance abroad and/or training, research, or technical assistance contracts as of September 30, 1966.

CHART B

Institutions in the Sample Classified by Geographic Areas

A. Northeastern States

(Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts
New Hampshire, New Jersey, New
York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island,
and Vermont)

Barnard College
Bates College
Boston University
Bowdoin College
Bronx Community College
Colby College
Columbia University
University of Connecticut
Educational Services Incorporated
Franklin and Marshall College
Harvard University
Keuka College
Lincoln University
University of Maine
New School for Social Research
City University of New York
State University of New York at
Albany
State University of New York
University of Pittsburgh
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn
Princeton University
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Skidmore College
Spring Garden Institute
Springfield College
Teachers College (Columbia
University)
Tufts University (Fletcher School)
Union College

Total - 28

B. North Central States

(Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas,
Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri,
Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio,
South Dakota, and Wisconsin)

Associated Colleges of the Midwest
Baldwin-Wallace College

B. North Central States (continued)

Case Institute of Technology
University of Chicago
Committee on Institutional
Cooperation
Cuyahoga Community College
De Paul University
Eastern Michigan University
Great Lakes Colleges Association
Hiram College
University of Illinois (Chicago
Circle Campus)
Illinois Institute of Technology
Iowa State University
University of Iowa
Kansas State University
University of Kansas
Kent State University
Lake Forest College
University of Missouri at Kansas
City
University of North Dakota
Northwestern University
University of Notre Dame
Purdue University
Junior College District of
St. Louis
Southern Illinois University
Wayne State University
University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee)

Total - 27

C. Southern States and District
of Columbia

(Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware,
District of Columbia, Florida,
Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana,
Maryland, Mississippi, North
Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina,
Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and
West Virginia)

Auburn University
Bishop College
Berea College

CHART B (continued)

Institutions in the Sample Classified by Geographic Areas

C. Southern States and District of Columbia (continued)

Catholic University of America
 University of Dallas
 Emory University
 Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
 Florida Atlantic University
 Florida Presbyterian College
 Florida State University
 University of Florida
 George Peabody College for Teachers
 Georgia Institute of Technology
 Georgia State College
 University of Georgia
 University System of Georgia
 Graduate Research Center of the Southwest
 Howard University
 Meredith College
 Oklahoma State University
 Southern Methodist University
 Southern Regional Education Board
 Stetson University
 University of Tennessee
 Vanderbilt University
 West Georgia College

Total - 27

D. Mountain and Western States
 (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming)

American Institute for Foreign Trade
 University of Arizona
 Associated Rocky Mountain Universities
 University of California (Berkeley)
 University of California (San Diego)
 California Western University

D. Mountain and Western States (continued)

Claremont Colleges
 Colorado College
 Colorado State College
 Colorado State University
 University of Colorado
 University of Denver
 University of Idaho
 Montana State University
 Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies
 Portland State College
 Regis College
 University of New Mexico
 San Diego City College
 San Diego State College
 City College of San Francisco
 San Francisco State College
 Utah State University
 Washington State University
 Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education
 University of Wyoming

Total - 26

CHART C

Enrollment October 1, 1966
 Institutions in the Sample Classified by Size

<p>A. <u>More than 15,000 students</u></p> <p>University of Arizona (21,407) Boston University (21,099) University of California (Berkeley, 27,000) University of Colorado (15,681) Columbia University (17,382) University of Florida (18,039) Iowa State University (15,183) University of Iowa (17,755) Kent State University (16,500) Northwestern University (17,169) Oklahoma State University (19,072) University of Pittsburgh (19,394) Purdue University (21,407) San Diego State College (17,800) San Francisco State College (18,500) Southern Illinois University (25,753) University of Tennessee (26,813) Wayne State University (30,832)</p> <p>Total - 18</p>	<p>B. <u>10,000 - 15,000 students (continued)</u></p> <p>City College of San Francisco (11,475) Washington State University (10,622) University of Wisconsin (Milwaukee, 14,176)</p> <p>Total - 16</p>
<p>B. <u>10,000 - 15,000 students</u></p> <p>Auburn University (12,334) Colorado State University (12,701) University of Connecticut (13,387) Cuyahoga Community College (10,620) Eastern Michigan University (13,000) Florida State University (14,319) University of Georgia (14,000) Harvard University (14,986) University of Illinois (Chicago Circle Campus, 10,921) Kansas State University (11,285) University of Kansas (14,605) University of New Mexico (12,568) New School for Social Research (10,200)</p>	<p>C. <u>5,000 - 10,000 students</u></p> <p>Bronx Community College (7,049) Case Institute of Technology (5,170) Catholic University of America (6,642) University of Chicago (8,359) Colorado State College (7,512) University of Denver (8,173) De Paul University (8,416) Emory University (5,360) Georgia Institute of Technology (7,349) Georgia State College (8,892) Howard University (9,000) University of Idaho (5,969) Illinois Institute of Technology (8,249) University of Maine (6,325) University of Missouri at Kansas City (7,891) Montana State University (6,299) State University of New York at Albany (7,094) University of North Dakota (6,390) University of Notre Dame (7,425) Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn (5,600) Portland State College (8,494) Junior College District of St. Louis (8,087)</p>

Source: College Facts Chart 1966-1967, National Beta Club

CHART C (continued)

Enrollment October 1, 1966
Institutions in the Sample Classified by Size

<p>C. <u>5,000 - 10,000 students</u> (continued)</p> <p>Southern Methodist University (7,013) Teachers College (Columbia University, 5,633) Utah State University (8,000) Vanderbilt University (5,334) University of Wyoming (6,653)</p> <p>Total - 27</p>	<p>E. <u>1,000 - 2,000 students</u> (continued)</p> <p>Colorado College (1,517) Fisk University (1,135) Franklin and Marshall College (1,600) Hiram College (1,058) Lake Forest College (1,290) Regis College (1,400) Skidmore College (1,545) Stetson University (1,760) Union College (1,384)</p> <p>Total - 13</p>
<p>D. <u>2,000 - 5,000 students</u></p> <p>Baldwin-Wallace College (2,131) California Western University (2,283) University of California (San Diego, 2,248) Claremont Colleges (4,100) Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (3,482) Florida Atlantic University (3,434) George Peabody College for Teachers (2,000) Princeton University (4,675) Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (4,768) San Diego City College (3,700) Springfield College (2,093) Tufts University (4,837) West Georgia College (2,750)</p> <p>Total - 13</p>	<p>F. <u>500 - 1,000 students</u></p> <p>Bates College (930) Bowdoin College (911) University of Dallas (948) Florida Presbyterian College (810) Keuka College (744) Lincoln University (805) Meredith College (931)</p> <p>Total - 7</p>
<p>E. <u>1,000 - 2,000 students</u></p> <p>Barnard College (1,800) Berea College (1,461) Bishop College (1,314) Colby College (1,435)</p>	<p>G. <u>Under 500 students</u></p> <p>American Institute for Foreign Trade (401) Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies (207) Spring Garden Institute (380)</p> <p>Total - 3</p>

Source: College Facts Chart 1966-1967, National Beta Club

CHART C (continued)

The following institutions in the 108 sample are not included in Chart C:

Associated Colleges of the Midwest
Associated Rocky Mountain Universities
Committee on Institutional Cooperation
Educational Services Incorporated
University System of Georgia
Graduate Research Center of the Southwest
Great Lakes Colleges Association
City University of New York
State University of New York
Southern Regional Education Board
Western Interstate Commission
for Higher Education

Total - 11

CHART D

Institutions in the Sample Classified by Special Characteristics

<p>A. <u>Predominately Negro Institutions</u></p> <p>Bishop College Fisk University Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University Howard University Lincoln University</p> <p>B. <u>Women's Colleges</u></p> <p>Barnard College Keuka College Meredith College Skidmore College</p> <p>C. <u>Men's Colleges</u></p> <p>Bowdoin College Franklin and Marshall College University of Notre Dame Princeton University Regis College Union College</p> <p>D. <u>Predominately Roman Catholic Institutions</u></p> <p>Catholic University of America University of Dallas De Paul University University of Notre Dame Regis College</p> <p>E. <u>Institutions Related to Other Churches</u></p> <p>Baldwin-Wallace College (Methodist) Bishop College (Baptist)</p>	<p>F. <u>Institutions Related to Other Churches</u></p> <p>Boston University (Methodist) California Western University (Methodist) University of Denver (Methodist) Emory University (Methodist) Florida Presbyterian College Franklin and Marshall College (United Church of Christ) Hiram College (Disciples of Christ) Keuka College (Baptist) Lake Forest College (Presbyterian) Meredith College (Baptist) Southern Methodist University Stetson University (Baptist)</p> <p>F. <u>Institutions Included in Ford Foundation Special Program in Education</u></p> <p>Barnard College Berea College *Bishop College Bowdoin College University of Chicago Claremont Colleges Colby Colleges Colorado College Columbia University University of Denver Emory University *Fisk University Franklin and Marshall College Lake Forest College University of Notre Dame Stetson University Teachers College (Columbia University) Vanderbilt University</p>
---	---

* 1964 grants to selected Negro colleges