

XD-411-902-4
102 66139

**EVALUATION REVIEW OF U.S.A.I.D. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT (CA)
WITH THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
IN HIGHER EDUCATION (NAFEO), 1984-1988**

By

Mabel Smythe Haith, Ph.D.

April 1, 1988

11

EVALUATION REVIEW OF U.S.A.I.D. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT (CA)

WITH THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
IN HIGHER EDUCATION (NAFEO), 1984-1988

Executive Summary

by

Mabel Smythe Haith, Ph.D.

Findings:

1. **Awareness of services offered:** There is work to be done, since only half the HBCUs, a sixth of the missions, and a third of the A.I.D. Regional Bureaus responding claimed full, active awareness of the services available to them.
2. **Use of the CA to further the objectives of E.O. 12320 and the Gray Amendment:** Those who are aware of the services available find it easier and more efficient to use the NAFEO services; those who did not know or use the services expressed interest in learning more about them.
- 3a. **Efforts outside the CA:** Such efforts appear more frustrating than productive, and a third to a half of each group failed to respond to this question.
- 3b. **Significant differences between NAFEO and non-NAFEO.** HBCUs found NAFEO easier, quicker, and more productive, as did missions which had worked with NAFEO; few missions or bureaus had enough experience to judge, although they expressed interest in the CA.
4. **NAFEO Washington staff:** While 35 of the 46 HBCUs used the Washington staff, only six missions and none of the bureaus were really familiar with NAFEO. High praise came from both HBCUs and missions who were familiar. The possibility of using NAFEO to evaluate qualifications was welcomed by most respondents who answered.
5. **Publications: IRI and/or Fact Sheets:** Those who replied to the question testified to the usefulness of both; however, communication, updating, and delivery are significant problems which merit attention.
6. **Publications: Update:** Responses indicated that the Update was of greater interest to HBCUs than to missions, although some of the latter praised it and suggested that it offer more technical detail.
7. **NAFEO travel to missions:** Both sides testify to the growth of mutual understanding and respect through visits to missions, at which each learns from the other.
8. **Regional Workshops:** The concept aroused interest and suggestions from A.I.D. personnel, who saw in them an opportunity for exchanges of vital information and understanding.
9. **Services, problems, successes:** Better communication and more opportunities for interaction are needed—A.I.D. visits to campuses, HBCU visits to missions. Some concern was expressed that resources and staff were too restrained by the budget. A role to permit HBCU participation in the oversight provided by the A.I.D. PVO Advisory Committee was suggested.

Conclusions:

1. The Cooperative Agreement has made a worthwhile start and has greatly increased the interest of HBCUs in international economic development. A.I.D. missions are beginning to recognize the advantages HBCUs offer in the training of LDC citizens and the strength of many of their programs.
2. The difficulties of communication have multiplied the difficulty of the tasks ahead, but both sides recognize the value of working together and are working out ways of working together more efficiently.
3. Ways must be devised to bring the two cooperators--A.I.D. and NAFEO--together more easily and more often.
4. Oversight of the program needs more attention, both from NAFEO and individual HBCUs and from A.I.D. (bureaus, missions, and S&T/RUR).

Recommendations:

1. A clear, succinct statement of the Agreement, together with a directive to all officers to make use of the services provided should be communicated to all applicable missions. Administrative and budgetary arrangements should assure that this objective can be met; funding should be for a long enough period of time for the employment by NAFEO of enough suitably qualified professionals, and the budget should provide for the development of the cadre of officers within A.I.D. who are thoroughly conversant with both HBCUs and A.I.D., as well as committed to the success of the program.
2. A.I.D. officers should, as part of their initial training, be briefed about the program and the expectation that they will work on behalf of implementing its terms. The chief A.I.D. officer must be in charge of assuring that both newcomers and persons already on the staff are given help in understanding the program and the determination of A.I.D. that its objectives shall be carried out successfully. It will further require NAFEO to provide for regular consultations in Washington and site visits to overseas missions to plan with A.I.D. and its missions on the placement of trainees and to arrange consultations between A.I.D. and HBCU technical people for putting together other cooperative programs.
Project Manager)
visits to missions
3. Designation of a group of A.I.D. and NAFEO-HBCU representatives to serve on an oversight committee for the program.
Board
4. Employment of full-time editor/researcher for publications and reports made necessary by the increased activities and communications required.
NAFEO STAFF
5. A careful assessment of ways to bring more NAFEO members into active participation should be undertaken to determine priorities in allocating scarce resources.
What # is success?
6. NAFEO-HBCU representation on the A.I.D./PVO Advisory Committee would indicate clearly the importance of the program.
Chaired By Admin?

These are modest steps to take, but they can be recommended with confidence. The case for a solid thrust forward to close the communications gap between A.I.D. and the world of HBCUs needs no further proof; it can be done.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
The Questions and Findings	
1. Awareness of services; Evaluation of Their Quality	2
2. Use of Agreement to Further Objectives of E.O. 12320 and The Gray Amendment	3
3(a) Efforts Outside the Agreement: How Effective?	3
3(b) Significant Differences: NAFEO vs, Non-NAFEO	3
4. NAFEO Washington Staff	4
5. Publications: IRI or the Fact Sheets	5
6. Publications: NAFEO/A.I.D. Update	5
7. NAFEO Travel to A.I.D. Missions	5
8. Regional Workshops for Liaison Officers	6
9. Services; Problems, Deficiencies, Successes	7
Conclusions	8
Recommendations	12

EVALUATION REVIEW OF U.S.A.I.D. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT (CA)
WITH THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY
IN HIGHER EDUCATION (NAFEO), 1984-1988

Introduction

The basic purposes of this evaluation include a need to know: (1) what changes, if any, should be made in the existing NAFEO/A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement in order to meet its objectives more effectively; (2) what changes need to be made to meet new and future demands of AID and/or NAFEO partners in the Agreement, and LDC institutions receiving AID assistance; and (3) whether NAFEO should be asked by A.I.D. to carry out additional tasks for HBCUs under an expanded agreement. Given the pre-examination of background material with regard to the purposes and history of the Cooperative Agreement, a careful examination of its experience as revealed by the replies to the questions submitted to all parties to the Agreement (overseas missions, HBCUs, A.I.D./Washington) highlighted the specific needs of each and provided diverse viewpoints from which to view the strengths and limitations of the program. The basic premise was that the Agreement would increase A.I.D.'s knowledge and understanding of the HBCUs and their potential for increasing the effectiveness of A.I.D. programs, and at the same time stimulate HBCU knowledge of the capacity to work with A.I.D. through its programs, thus increasing practical applications of agricultural, technical, research-oriented, and other activities on the campuses, which have historically been underserved by opportunities to be engaged in the rapidly expanding work in economic development which is so vital a part of our global interdependence today.

Nine questions (see Appendix A) were submitted to 75 A.I.D. missions and to 89 HBCUs for response. Six A.I.D. bureaus also responded to the questions.

Because the questions were phrased so as to elicit wide ranging individual responses, they are not easily tabulated. The opinions, enthusiasms and criticisms expressed, while useful and informative, are not always easily organized into neat categories; however, they express valuable insights into a program designed to attack a recently defined problem--the under use of an important sector of U.S. higher education in foreign assistance programs. The ground-breaking nature of the NAFEO/A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement, hereafter referred to as the CA, requires careful assessment of its basic assumptions, organization, procedures, and functioning as these elements relate to the success of its mission. It was therefore appropriate to use open-ended questions to ask for suggestions for improvement, to invite criticisms of its methods and assessment of its achievements. These may make for less tidy tables, but they provide considerable meat for analysis of a program which proposes to modify established ways of creating and organizing projects so as to make available to A.I.D. the resources, personnel, and commitment to economic development of the historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). The CA would at the same time foster interest in international careers in the member institutions, expanding opportunities for research contracts, for experiments in agricultural development, for consultancies in health and nutrition, for training functionaries from developing countries, as well as for numerous opportunities to direct student and faculty attention to the entire field of economic, environmental and educational development, interdisciplinary or specialized; in fact, it opens wider the door to the world of international relations and intercultural understanding.

It is obviously not easy to change ways of operating, and despite America's long experience with cultural pluralism, those who have had no experience with HBCUs do not know where they are, what they mean to the communities they serve, or what special advantages and opportunities they offer in foreign aid programs. Without this background, it is difficult to uncover and appreciate the special resources, human, geographic and

experiential, which give advantages to training at these institutions for personnel from developing countries. The CA purports to provide help in building the bridges between HBCUs and A.I.D. Ineffective operation can obviate the potential of a successful CA, as can poor communication, inept staff work or other errors and shortcomings. A.I.D., too, can hamper its own ability to grasp the benefits of the CA. Any source of interference with the successful achievement of the objectives of the CA is to be examined, just as it is essential to analyze the best-functioning aspects of the existing contract.

The Questions and Findings^{1, 2}

1. Are you and your colleagues aware of the services available under the NAFEO/A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement? Are they, in your view, effective and appropriate in linking HBCUs with USAID Mission program activities?

A.I.D. Bureau responses (six) tended to rely heavily on the missions for specific replies; only one, responded to the questions directly and in detail. One other response cited meetings with persons representing HBCUs, but indicated no connection with NAFEO or the Agreement. (See tables for percentage in each category). This result suggests that more general understanding of the Agreement and its purposes in the A.I.D. bureaucracy would be a significant step in increasing the effectiveness of the effort to acquaint A.I.D. with HBCU possibilities, personnel and opportunities. It would be instructive to determine what conditions were responsible for the singular responsiveness of the responsive bureaus.

Of the A.I.D. missions responding, 21, or 38.2 percent, had little or no awareness of the details of NAFEO or made little use of the Cooperative Agreement for serving their needs; although nine missions reported regular and sustained activities in cooperation with the CA, there was a lack of familiarity with the CA, despite expressing interest in the possibility that NAFEO would greatly facilitate their performance regarding Executive Order 12320 and the Gray Amendment. Those familiar with the publications from NAFEO tended to use them, and, in general, they wanted to learn "more of what they had been missing," to quote two of the comments. Only one expressed satisfaction with its ability to make use of HBCUs without NAFEO services. Two missions did not respond to the question. Interestingly enough, in spite of the disappointingly low level of mission awareness and activity reported in response to this question, a surprisingly large number of missions made positive suggestions to facilitate use of the CA.

The HBCUs responding were chiefly aware of the CA and its objectives; only five had little or no awareness, while 14 were generally aware and participating, with 23 very aware. A majority considered the NAFEO program beneficial; even those who had not made use of it themselves because of over-scheduling of staff or other problems, indicated that learning about participation in A.I.D. contracts was much easier and faster, if they used NAFEO information and contacts; they praised NAFEO publications and staff work in particular. It is clear that many missions and some HBCUs are not taking full advantage of the opportunity afforded by the CA.

¹ The division of HBCUs into A (early respondents) and B (late repliers) reflects a minor difference in the form of the questions which distinguished the two groups.

² Percentages, which were not referenced in the text, can be found in the tables.

2. Has your Mission used the NAFEO/A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement to further the objectives of Executive Order 12320 and the Gray Amendment? Please describe or summarize activities and achievements.

The bureaus responding appeared, with one exception, not to be regularly in touch with NAFEO. The exception, appeared to have made good use of the CA to educate its missions as to how to utilize HBCUs. One other bureau detailed its contacts with HBCUs without mentioning NAFEO.

Nine missions reported using the CA to further the objectives of E.O. 12320 and the Gray Amendment; forty-one indicated that they had made little or no use of the CA; and nine failed to respond to the questions, citing garbled cable instructions in two cases. One using the CA cited a lack of success and two others declined to evaluate their limited experience.

Thirty-two of the HBCUs indicated having used the CA; two did not; three did not respond. Most of the respondents explained that doing so significantly strengthened applications, describing the CA route as "easier," "quicker," even "essential." Nine did not comment directly on this point.

- 3a. Has your Mission been able to work towards the objectives of Executive Order 12320 and the Gray Amendment without making direct use of NAFEO/A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement resources? Please describe or summarize activities and achievements.

The bureaus reported some success without the CA in one case. Two reported little or no success, one reported that although its missions only recently learned how to make HBCU placements, the CA "Provided much of the initial impetus to utilize HBCUs." Another reported that it "would welcome contacts with NAFEO to identify any additional HBCU expertise which could contribute to...programmatic goals." One discussed contacts with HBCUs without mentioning the CA. Two reported little or none.

Twenty-four missions reported some success without using the CA; nine reported little or none and 22 gave no reply.

Fifteen HBCUs reported contracts or grants obtained without CA involvement. Fourteen made no report or gave no relevant information. Twelve declared the CA a useful, even essential element in the process. One cited a grant received as an example of independence from the CA; another official noted that it had been developed as a direct result of a NAFEO/CA experience. Five noted a lack of success without the CA.

- 3b. If you have used both NAFEO and non-NAFEO means, do you note significant differences? Under particular circumstances, is one means more effective or easier than the other?

In response to this question, among all three groups of respondents, where both had been tried, working with NAFEO was found to be a more effective way to bring about the involvement of HBCUs in achieving A.I.D. objectives.

The Bureau which had worked with the CA made the point that establishing contact or exploring a new area or training, for example, is "best established through NAFEO"; once contact is made and placement of trainees decided, it is more efficient to work directly with the HBCU involved. The other bureaus gave no comment on this question.

Twelve missions found the NAFEO route more effective or easier; one favored finding its own HBCU contacts; fourteen gave no response; 28 gave non-substantive comments ("cable garbled," "N/A" "phasing out," "mission not involved in program development" or "no basis for judgment").

The 18 responding HBCUs (20 gave no reply to this question) declared the NAFEO route easier, quicker, more realistic and sensitive. Two cited the network of information and contacts as particularly valuable. None found the non-NAFEO route more desirable; this was true even of HBCUs with an established record of A.I.D. contracts behind them. Because HBCUs are often small and have tight budgets, they find it more difficult to keep up with RFPs and cultivate Washington contacts on an individual basis; NAFEO performs the coordinating function and is in effect the contact point with the network. As with the bureaus, HBCUs find NAFEO essential for making initial or preliminary contacts; once that is done, they continue to work directly with the contacts. Six cited using both NAFEO and other approaches without comparing them.

4. Has the NAFEO/Washington staff served your needs? How has it served you and what are your suggestions with respect to improving those services? Would you use NAFEO to make qualitative judgments among HBCUs, if that service were made a part of the CA?

No bureau replied directly to Question 4, and only two missions reported using the Washington staff of NAFEO. Twelve missions said they had not; four gave no response to the question. As to the possibility of their using NAFEO to provide judgments between and among HBCUs on the basis of qualifications, 21 missions would welcome them; two would not, and three expressed some reservations; 29 fell in the "no response" category.

The HBCUs responded with enthusiasm to the question; 23 A's and 12 B's had used the staff; three A's had not used the CA; seven A's and one B gave no report. Comments on the staff appeared in response to other questions as suggestions for improvement or additional services needed. Most comments were highly laudatory: "dedicated," "outstanding," "extremely responsive," "very supportive," "prompt" were typical. The Deputy Director, whose chief responsibility is the Cooperative Agreement, drew especially strong praise from eight respondents, being described by one as giving "unique services" and by others as "outstanding"; the Director of NAFEO was mentioned by three respondents as very helpful and supportive. An HBCU which has been especially active in the consortium noted the need for at least two more professionals to work under the Deputy Director, who is covering "too many" duties without adequate support; a second called for an editor to take charge of publications, seen by missions and HBCUs as vitally important to the success of CA; a third noted rapid turnover in the staff, except for the Director and Deputy Director. The inclusion of the Director in the comment suggests that the remark may refer to NAFEO as a whole, rather than the Cooperative Agreement staff in particular; however, it is true that the CA staff has been less than optimally stable. One bureau, too, noted that the Washington staff was "understaffed and spread too thin for the many demands made on them." (Pursuit of this point revealed that the staff has been smaller in recent months because of the difficulty of replacing departing staff in the last months of a contract which may or may not be renewed.)

HBCUs did not respond to the question regarding the use of NAFEO as an evaluator of qualifications. However, there were several suggestions for improvement: more technically trained staff for NAFEO (suggested by a mission respondent), more frequent visits to member campuses, more overseas familiarization visits (from both missions and HBCUs), more staff involvement (both missions and HBCUs).

5. Have you and your colleagues used or benefitted from the International Resources Inventory IRI or the Fact Sheets produced by NAFEO? If you have, please give examples. How might the IRI be modified better to meet your needs?

The bureaus, except one which found these publications very useful, did not reply to the question (except to note in two cases that they had not been received; this suggests a problem in distribution of mail). The responding one cited several contracts and placements growing out of their use.

The missions reported affirmatively in 23 cases (four declared it very useful), negatively in seven. Nine gave no report, and 16 noted that the publications in question had not been received. A suggestion was made that a section might be added to the Fact Sheet directory detailing each institution's "particular expertise and/or specialities in training and providing technical assistance..."

The HBCU responses were for the most part positive (25), with four negative replies. Ten did not reply to the question. Seven indicated that they had not received the publications in question; since responses came from the presidents' offices, it is possible that circulation on campus was at fault; the problem shows up in the missions as well.

6. Have you and your colleagues benefitted from the NAFEO/A.I.D. Update, a quarterly publication? If you have, please indicate how you have been served by it? How might these be modified to better meet your needs?

The relevant bureau response indicated that the Update "has not been particularly useful, largely because it has not been published on a timely basis. It would also be helpful if NAFEO provided more detail in its articles, including more background on country training needs and the advantages of HBCU placements." Four gave no response; one had not received update.

Mission responses were ten positive, five negative or neutral, 20 not received and 20 not responding. One suggested that Update may be more helpful to NAFEO members than to missions; and suggested that it might concentrate more on technical assistance and training for overseas projects.

HBCU responses were 31 positive, one negative responses; two not received; 12 failed to respond to the question. Some comments were highly enthusiastic: "excellent," "insightful," "extremely helpful," "informative," "sharing" were typical. A high value was placed on its service to the faculty; it was said to present useful models, inform the faculty, and publish faculty articles, thus serving as a stimulant for faculty activity in the field of overseas development. One respondent suggested that it needed a wider circle of readers.

7. Have you and your colleagues benefitted from the travel to USAID Missions of NAFEO-sponsored delegations of HBCU representatives? If you believe that you have benefitted, please illustrate specific examples. How might these be modified better to meet your needs?

The responsive bureau reported benefitting from travel by CA delegations; it suggested that

"...visits to missions by HBCU representatives should have a much longer lead-time (than this one had), and set definite objectives that they wish to achieve at each mission. Ample time should be provided for both LAC/DR personnel and NAFEO staff to explain to the mission the nature and purpose of the trip."

The other bureaus did not respond to the question.

Eleven missions reported that they had benefitted from traveling HBCU groups coming to learn at first hand about missions in the field (four reported not having had that experience, but favoring the concept); 33 had not had the experience, or it was not applicable to the missions concerned. Six gave no report. The general reaction to visits was that they provided an opportunity for officials of the countries visited to get acquainted with the HBCUs, the first step in establishing cooperative relationships. One mission cited a situation in which it took four trips to establish a relationship sufficiently strong to support a contract. Several indicated that they learned much more about HBCUs when representatives were present to answer questions and explain details. Another was impressed by the extent to which meetings with local officials established a sense of relationship which could thereafter be the basis for program planning. A mission in Africa learned that HBCU visitors could be received at the presidential level. A particularly desirable outcome was the growth in HBCU perceptions of what a mission is and does, so that later planning can build on mutual understanding of at least some of the problems and realities of overseas arrangements. One criticized a delegation of 16 as too large for maximum effectiveness... comment which reflected ignorance about the "delegation" which had AID LOs as participants in a Fulbright Group Study Abroad Activity using its agenda to get to know AID but was not an AID delegation.

Of the HBCUs, 22 reported having benefitted from overseas CA delegations; nine had not, but looked forward to doing so; one declared that the institution had "not particularly" benefitted; and 14 failed to answer the question or comment on the issue. The respondents considered the funding too meager for as much travel as would be desirable; obviously, not all institutions could be included in the stringent budget. Without first-hand experience, thorough understanding of the programs of economic development in the poorer countries is obviously harder to achieve.

8. Have you and your colleagues benefitted from participation in the Regional Workshops for Liaison Officers sponsored under the Agreement? If you have not, please suggest ways that workshops might be changed to meet your needs. For example, have you received or exchanged information about your needs and interests during these meetings? Have Missions asked Regional Bureau personnel to report during Workshops on Mission needs and interests?

As might have been expected, the lone full bureau response was positive; the bureau had been represented at a regional workshop in Washington, where it established direct contacts with the leadership of NAFEO, as well as with presidents and/or deans of a number of HBCUs. A suggestion came out of the experience:

"...(I)t would have been helpful to have had mission personnel present at the various seminars and conferences. Immediate feedback on mission needs, their assessment of training needs at HBCUs, and their judgment of the quality of HBCU training programs would have enhanced the dialogue in a number of the seminars. Perhaps NAFEO might consider sponsoring regional workshops in closer coordination with USAID Missions."

The other bureaus did not respond to the question.

Three missions reported having benefitted from Regional Workshops; 17 left the question blank; 24 replied "No" without elaborating; and nine said they had not been aware of such workshops. One reported not having been invited to any, but asked that such invitations have a long lead time, so that missions might plan to have someone present.

The HBCUs, on the other hand, reported wide participation; 34 had been represented at such workshops; two had not (one of these answered "not particularly," which could be judgment of the quality of the workshop or of the attendance). Eight gave no answer. Seven evaluated the workshops as "very informative," "valuable," "beneficial," "helpful," "useful"; three considered it an effective way to help colleges understand how economic development programs are developed; others extolled the free exchange of ideas, the international exposure, the information on A.I.D. priorities and the opportunity to develop consortial contacts and build networks. The general assessment seemed to be that here was a direct point of contact between the HBCUs, on the one hand, and A.I.D. mission and bureau people on the other. There was obviously great appreciation for the potential for networking and exchanging of views in such a gathering.

9. Are there other services not now covered by the Cooperative Agreement which you think would enhance the use of the HBCU community A.I.D. programs? Are there particular problems or deficiencies that need correction or particular successes that should be capitalized?

While suggestions for improvement are scattered throughout the responses to other questions, Question 9 elicited a number of practical, imaginative and/or challenging ideas. With these have been collected suggestions scattered throughout the document in responses to various questions. Some ideas were presented by respondents who had had little or no experience with the CA and may therefore replicate existing plans or actions of which they have no knowledge.

The leading bureau suggestion is that HBCU and NAFEO presentations would benefit from more initiative and assertiveness. Positive ideas, presented with confidence and a clear sense of objectives and means to attain them, would pay off for both NAFEO and its component institutions. A more diffident or even apologetic manner is unlikely to get the attention good ideas deserve.

The missions offer several ideas of their own, designed to fit the major mission objective: getting to know the institutions and key people of the HBCUs. They would modify NAFEO publications to bring key data to the field: information about accreditation, descriptions of programs clearly relevant to A.I.D. projects and interests, information regarding new research or faculty with programs applicable to mission needs and objectives. Brief focused and targeted statements of programs with objectives and descriptions of plans for specific training programs and periodic accounts of groups using HBCU training services can give missions a feel for what happens on the campuses.

Participation by mission personnel in regional workshops can bring closer mission and campus, which can take advantage of the opportunity to communicate and understand each other's point of view, problems and ways of looking at the tasks at hand. Both will be interested in using overseas travel to educate, inform and promote relationships with overseas authorities and institutions.

Just as it is vital for NAFEO materials to be circulated through the missions and on the campuses, it is urgent that information from the missions and the bureaus be communicated widely on HBCU campuses. The more widely information is disseminated, the easier it will be to develop faculty, staff and student support for the programs being developed. A number of HBCU suggestions are related to the circulation of information and the importance of spreading wide the interest in and information regarding opportunities for economic development, with appropriate modes of participation spelled out clearly. Communication of what the missions need and want, as well as what and how HBCUs can deliver must get major attention. At present there is not yet enough solid information

available in readily communicated form, and too much of what is in the pipeline fails to reach its proper destinations in a timely fashion. The material is not reaching all who need it, leaving the impression that a lack of interest or willingness to work together interferes with the opportunity to serve and learn together.

Successes in establishing linkages with overseas universities, with research to resolve problems in agriculture or energy or housing, with obtaining grants to train persons in technology or health need to be highlighted. Establishment of consortia to do together what each alone is unable to accomplish deserves recognition and encouragement.

Growing achievement among a circle of academics who perceive international activity as an essential part of functioning in the modern world deserves support, whether it is Central State University's establishment of an International Center, Langston's meat goat research project or the education of South African students in administrative and technical career programs. The first four years of the CA have achieved enough so that the prevailing impression, even among those who have not known and used it, is that it should be continued (in the opinion of one HBCU respondent) for about ten years. Even missions which had not known of the CA expressed a desire to learn more, because they were uncertain how they might find the way to obey Executive Order 12320 and the Gray Amendment without some such program.

Conclusions:

The Cooperative Agreement was a bold idea, developed at a time when A.I.D. had been instructed to include HBCUs as contractors, using their personnel as consultants and specialists, their facilities for training--in short, include HBCUs as mainstream institutions had been used for decades. It was a logical move, but a challenging one. Neither HBCUs nor A.I.D. bureaus and missions were equipped to move easily from isolation and unfamiliarly. Many HBCUs had had little experience with economic development, nor did their leaders have extensive knowledge of government contracts with private or public agencies to achieve development aims. The world of the HBCU was as strange to A.I.D. officials as were the desertification programs of the Middle East and Northern Africa to the 1890 colleges; that is, a few knew something of them, but most of their associates did not.

→ The requirement that these two entities work together on common interests made for strange bedfellows. It is always easier to walk in an accustomed path; doing something different, without adequate role models to follow, was hard work. Understandably, materials and announcements failed to get to the proper persons intended to receive them. Three years later, a large number of missions and a few HBCUs were not informed about the Cooperative Agreement in any detail; yet a start had been made. In the meantime, those who decided that they could meet the requirements of Executive Order 12320 and the Gray Amendment discovered that the task of arranging everything without assistance made for a great amount of extra work, and respondents understood that despite their misgivings and uncertainties, they wanted to know more about the services available to them through the CA.

HBCUs who felt able to take care of themselves in much the same way came in time to value the services of a coordinating office in Washington which could collect information on RFPs, plan overseas visits to economic development sites, and advise them on what contacts to follow up in order to get information regarding their proposed projects.

There is clear evidence that the institutions and agencies which have committed themselves to work seriously with the Cooperative Agreement feel that they are well served. They have appointed Liaison Officers (LOs); they make use of the publications provided and declare themselves better informed regarding A.I.D. opportunities. They call

upon the NAFEO staff for advice and a variety of other services; they send representatives to regional conferences and/or request site visits. Some of them have had administrators or faculty members included in NAFEO training trips to developing countries, where they have participated in A.I.D. briefings and visited A.I.D. projects. Some have succeeded in obtaining grants from other federal agencies for overseas travel by faculty members; several have signed memoranda of understanding with universities in developing countries. Those which have been thus active have a growing number of faculty and administrative personnel who have overseas experience, interest and contacts, as well as ongoing commitments to development activities.

In analyzing the responses, as well as in talking with HBCU faculty members and administrators, one sees clearly that there is a relatively short history of experience in international AID projects for most HBCUs, in spite of a long history of educating students from Africa and the Caribbean and a somewhat shorter experience, perhaps, with faculty and students from still other parts of the world. There is evidence that the international background of some members of this college or university community may be considerably more substantial than is generally known. In a number of the institutions examined, there is no mechanism in place for automatically identifying alumni of Peace Corps, the Foreign Service, U.S.A.I.D., USIA, Crossroads Africa, Catholic Relief services, American Friends Service Committee, or other official or private agencies concerned with international projects in developing parts of the world; nor is there much formal recognition of overseas service in the armed forces.

Important Point
Since information concerning the international indigenous backgrounds of the adult members of the college or university community is only haphazardly made available even to the administration, there is a tendency for the HBCU to underestimate its own background resources, even while perhaps overvaluing the international background of the faculty tourist whose trips to Europe or Africa or the Orient may have covered little time and provided less contact with the people of the countries visited. Recent avocational travel may sometimes be more highly valued than deeper and potentially valuable technical experiences with solving problems in circumstances which require special ingenuity and resourcefulness, simply because the latter may not be known widely in the university community.

A second difficulty is that the paucity of contacts with the Foreign Assistance Programs of our government leaves persons who may otherwise have been exposed to other cultures and countries poorly informed about U.S. Government mechanisms for devising programs for developmental change. Only the most experienced and sophisticated of HBCU leaders tend to have a well developed understanding of the mechanisms of government for making use of university personnel in development projects. Simply knowing the ropes eliminates much time-consuming effort, and experience with the planning, development and management of actual projects is accepted by the respondents as perhaps the best way to learn the process.

It is therefore in three areas--(1) building consciousness of existing strengths in international and intercultural activities; (2) developing contacts with both U.S. and overseas governments involved in cooperative efforts to achieve economic development and (3) planning projects--that the NAFEO/CA has put special emphasis. The mission evaluations note that their HBCU visitors arouse the interest and understanding of government officials being visited as to what HBCUs can offer in the way of projects, specific research interests, experts, ability to work with students whose education experiences may have been truncated or poorly balanced in some respects. When developing country officials learn of institutions whose agricultural or technical programs are combined with experience in teaching students whose families have never before encountered higher education, they realize that there are special advantages to exploring cooperative relationships with HBCUs in solving developmental problems.

Not all members of NAFEO have felt able to take advantage of the Cooperative Agreement. Those who have done so value the program and its appropriateness for the development of institutional programs today. Failure to make use of the opportunity was attributed to problems with personnel and budget; for example, in one of the smaller institutions, the departure of the appointed Liaison Officer for another HBCU took away, in effect, the institutional memory of the program and the established communication channels with the CA, which had to be reassigned and a new person familiarized with the program and its objectives. The more sophisticated HBCU assigned from the outset co-Liaison Officers to diminish the effects of this eventuality and to lessen the onus on the already fully employed LO. Six HBCU have used this option of assigning co-LOs. Since, in many HBCUs, the lone LO receives and distributes all communications and attends conferences and workshops associated with the program, a change of LO may require essentially beginning anew when a replacement is appointed.

A second impediment can be that in small institutions which typically have heavy teaching loads, the interest and energy required to launch a new endeavor may be exceedingly hard to come by, given existing priorities and commitments. There must be more than casual contact at conferences and through the mail, if more institutions are to be effective in the program.

Both impediments will be easier to handle as the knowledge of the potential of the CA grows, as it clearly has been doing, according to the responses. Still, there is a nagging inconsistency between the high praise given to the NAFEO staff in Washington for prompt and efficient service and the concern that the Deputy Director is overloaded and spread too thin. It is clear that more professional staff must be in place, if present standards are to be maintained.

NAFEO publications were cited as one reason why opportunities to develop AID contacts were more easily done through NAFEO than independently. The network of contacts, the access to organized information and the availability of advice as to questions which arise in the process, as well as the relatively easy path to consortium-building through NAFEO, provided a simpler, more effective path to fulfilling the objective of developing useful projects and getting them approved. One successful university declared that CA resources had been "indispensable"; a smaller college saw NAFEO as realistic and sensitive to the problems and concerns it had to take into account.

Since NAFEO had a variety of contacts with HBCUs, it was in a position to reinforce its work under the CA with other contacts. The Deputy Director, who is directly responsible for the program, takes advantage of all sorts of contacts with HBCUs to promote the objectives of the agreement. If people are present on other business, she points out an RFP or suggests that they write an article to share an insight or experience relevant to the CA. As a result of this and other ways of promoting the objectives of the CA, the NAFEO institutions are growing in their understanding of the program.

This is perhaps less true for the A.I.D. missions and bureau personnel. Some alumni of HBCUs are among them; however, they are valued in few missions as a source of understanding and information re HBCUs. Unless individuals are in close touch, their awareness of the present programs of their alma maters of ten to twenty (or more) years back may be limited. It is clear that there needs to be more expertise within A.I.D., with broad current knowledge of the HBCUs and ability to use the information and contacts in NAFEO to advantage. In addition, mission personnel should be given training to help them understand what strengths are available in the use of HBCUs, and how to capitalize on them. Many A.I.D. people do not realize that among the graduates of HBCUs are influential professional and political leaders in other countries: Japan's leading economic development

Not
!!

~~authority is a graduate of Morehouse;~~ the President of Malawi is an alumnus of Meharry Medical College, and Lincoln University claims at least three prime ministers and governors-general, not to mention other institutions which have produced dozens of cabinet ministers, university heads, and other professionals. The President of Sierra Leone welcomed a NAFEO group in 1987 at the behest of one of his ministers who had attended a NAFEO member institution.

There is emphasis here on public relations, because it is clear that there is considerable need for it, both between the cooperating agencies, which need to learn much more about how to use each other to advantage, and among the users of HBCU services abroad. Because many countries know the names of only a few widely known universities, they demand the same names, over and over. They encourage applicants to apply to Ivy League colleges or Michigan State, but not to North Carolina A. and T. University or Fort Valley, where it is common to educate students whose parents have had no experience with higher education and where there is long experience with the problems of small farmers in climates more compatible with those of many semitropical countries. But someone has to point out these advantages and others to those who do not know how to choose what may be in their best interests.

Some A.I.D. respondents suggested that training in the use of HBCUs should be part of the initial five-weeks' training for new A.I.D. officers. Interaction with NAFEO staff and/or HBCU representatives at A.I.D. workshops, visits by A.I.D. personnel when they are in the U.S. (on consultation, home leave or otherwise) to HBCUs can build better relations between the two partners in this program and help HBCU personnel understand far better the problems, techniques, plans and prospects of working effectively together in the field. This would facilitate communication and enable each side to clear up inevitable misunderstandings or misperceptions about what is needed, how each perceives the other, and the like. It would also enable the NAFEO staff to ask questions about projects and mission needs and requirements--without such interaction communication is imprecise and cooperation more difficult. It is only in such interaction that the two partners can build the easy cooperative relationships so greatly needed on both sides so that confidence and respect can grow.

The need for interaction with embassies has been mentioned by one mission, which pointed out that a number of governments rely on their embassy personnel to advise them on the quality of educational institutions to which they are sending students. NAFEO reports consulting with a growing roster of embassies and of invitations to diplomats from developing countries to speak on HBCU campuses. Given additional personnel, more can be done in this area.

One more element of public relations: the need for help to those who must judge the quality of HBCU education suggests that the very helpful (according to these respondents familiar with them) publications include more evaluative material: accreditation, details of the kinds of training they have actually done with participants from developing countries, research. Such publications could be planned with the assistance of specialists familiar with both A.I.D. and HBCUs).

If persons competent in French and Spanish are encouraged to become involved in CA projects, there will be cause for celebration. Some missions have asked for help with francophone areas, particularly in training programs; the need for both French and Spanish competence is manifest and should be addressed. Opportunity clearly exists for HBCU action in the foreign language area.

In summary, both AID and NAFEO have made a start which demonstrates the usefulness of the CA; neither is satisfied with what has thus far been achieved, although both testify to the usefulness of the publications and the quality of the NAFEO staff work, where they have used either or both. Those acquainted with the CA and its potential recommend its continuance.

The major problems have been those of communication and limitation of the number of staff professionals in recent months. The Cooperative Agreement seems to be poised at takeoff, ready to fly. It seems clearly in the interest of both parties that its flight should be encouraged, carefully launched, sustained after takeoff, and continued as integral to the equitable and relevant programmatic services spearheaded by and through U.S.A.I.D.

Recommendations

1. A clear, succinct statement of the Agreement, together with a directive to all officers to make use of the services provided, should be communicated to all applicable missions. Administrative and budgetary arrangements should assure that this objective can be met; funding should be for a sufficiently long period of time for the employment by NAFEO of suitably qualified professionals, who are thoroughly conversant with both HBCUs and A.I.D., as well as committed to the success of the program. It should be made clear that performance evaluation will take into account their account their ability, using the resources of NAFEO, to achieve the aims of Executive Order 12320 and the Gray Amendment.
2. A.I.D. officers should, as part of their initial training, be briefed about the program and the expectation that they will work to implement its terms. The chief mission officer should be held responsible for assuring that both newcomers and persons already on the staff are given help in understanding the program and the determination of A.I.D. that its objectives shall be carried out successfully. NAFEO should be required to provide for regular consultations between A.I.D. and HBCU technical specialists in Washington and through visits by HBCU representatives to overseas missions to learn how they operate and to plan with A.I.D. on the placement of trainees and for other cooperative programs.
3. A carefully chosen group of A.I.D. and NAFEO-HBCU representatives should be designated to serve on an oversight committee for the program. Experienced A.I.D. officers who have attended HBCUs or served on their faculties may be particularly useful as interpreters of each to the other. Such a group could monitor progress in informing missions about the CA, in reaching the maximum number of HBCUs in addressing priorities when the budget cannot cover even all urgently needed activities.
4. The number of faculty Liaison Officers should be expanded in order to increase awareness of the program potential on HBCU campuses. Associate LOs should include all principal investigators, chief training officers or other grantees, all of whom need to know the broad possibilities of a coordinated program.
5. Systematic and uniform recognition of the international experience, linguistic competence, and relevant technical expertise of faculty and administration on HBCU campuses, updated periodically, should be made available to NAFEO/AID. The instrument used should be developed by NAFEO and the results summarized for the benefit of missions seeking information regarding such resources.

Director should be full time?

6. The NAFEO/CA staff should include, in addition to the Program Director, at least three other full-time professional staff members who can, in addition to the existing program:
 - a. Visit all active campuses
 - b. Produce and edit more frequent revisions of the IRI and other publications and reports.
 - c. Lead groups on more training visits to missions which offer prospects for cooperation, participant training contracts, etc.
 - d. Increase organization of consortia among HBCUs with common or reciprocal needs and possibilities.
 - e. Increase linkages with universities in LDCs.
 - f. Address participant placement issues and help with development of suitable programs.
7. NAFEO-HBCU representation on the PVO Advisory Committee of A.I.D. would indicate clearly the importance of the program.
8. Periodic meetings between NAFEO-HBCU and A.I.D. regional bureaus would greatly improve communication. Some problems could be discussed and resolved at this level; understanding would improve with more frequent airing of dilemmas and frustrations on both sides. A.I.D. officers might be assigned to HBCUs for varying periods of time, to interact with HBCU personnel.

These are modest steps to take, but they can be recommended with confidence. The case for a solid thrust forward to close the communications gap between A.I.D. and the world of HBCUs needs no further proof; it can be done.

Table I: Awareness of Services Available and Their Quality Under the NAFEO/A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement

Respondent Group	Awareness								Total		Effectiveness, Appropriateness of Services							
	Little or None		General or Partial		Full, Active		No Response				Effective and Appropriate		Potentially Effective		Insufficient Experience to judge		No Direct Responses	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HBCUs: A	4	12.1	12	36.4	15	45.5	2	6.1	33	100.0	8	24.2	2	6.1	0	0.0	23	69.7
B	1	7.7	2	15.4	8	61.5	2	15.4	13	100.0	9	69.2	2	15.4	0	0.0	2	15.4
A.I.D. Missions	21	38.2	23	41.8	9	16.4	2	3.6	55	100.0	10	18.2	6	10.9	12	21.8	27	49.1
A.I.D. Bureaus	3	50.0	0	0.0	2	33.3	1	16.7	6	100.0	0	0.0	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3

Table 2: Use of the NAFEO/AID CA to Further the Objectives of Executive Order 12320 and the Gray Amendment

Respondent Group	Used		Did Not Use		No Relevant Reply		Other		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HBCUs: A	22	66.7	1	3.0	7	21	3	9.1	33	100.0
B	10	76.9	1	7.7	2	15.4	0	0.0	13	100.0
A.I.D. Missions	9	16.4	23	41.8	13	23.6	10	18.2	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	2	33.3	1	16.7	3	50.0	0	0.0	6	100.0

Table 3(a): Success in Working Toward the Objectives of E.O. 12320 and the Gray Amendment Without the CA

Respondent Group	Some Success Without CA		Little or No Success		No Response or non-Substantive Reply		TOTAL	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HBCUs: A*	4*	12.1	5	15.2	12	36.4	33	100.0
B	11*	84.6	0	0.0	2	15.4	13	100.0
A.I.D. Missions	24	43.6	9	16.4	22	40.0	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	1	16.7	2	33.3	3	50.0	6	100.0

*12 HBCU A's reported better success using the CA

Table 3(b): Relative Effectiveness of CA and Non-CA Approaches to E.O. 12320 and the Gray Amendment

Respondent Group	Greater Effectiveness						No Response		Other		Total	
	CA		Non-CA		No difference or Both							
	Number	Percent	number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HBCUs: A	16	48.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	51.5	0	0.0	33	100.0
B	2	15.4	0	0.0	6*	46.2	3	23.1	2	15.4	13	100.0
AID Missions	12	21.8	0	0.0	1	11.8	14	25.5	28 ⁺	50.9	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	83.3	0	0.0	6	100.0

*Answers did not indicate a choice of both, but simply reported that they had been helped by both U.S. Government agencies and NAFEO

+Sixteen reported that the issue was not applicable to the mission concerned; nine had too little experience to judge, two reported garbled cable

Table 4(a): Quality of the NAFEO Staff in Washington

Respondent Group	Use of NAFEO Staff Unaware				No Response or N/A		TOTAL	
	YES		Little or No Use					
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HBCUs: A	23	69.7	3	9.1	7	21.2	33	100.0
B	12	92.3	0	0.0	1	7.7	13	100.0
A.I.D. Missions	6	10.1	30	54.5	19	34.5	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	-	-	-	-	6	100.0	6	100.0

Table 4(b): Use of NAFEO to Make Qualitative Judgments among HBCUs

Responding Group	Would Use NAFEO		Have Some Reservations		Would Not Use NAFEO		No Response		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A.I.D. Missions	21	38.2	3	5.5	2	3.6	29	52.7	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	100.0	6	100.0

Table 5: I.R.I. and Fact Sheet Benefits

Respondent Group	Usefulness of I.R.I. & Fact Sheets								Total	
	Benefitted		Not Yet Used		No Response		Publication not Received, etc.			
	Number	Project	Number	Project	Number	Project	Number	Project	Number	Project
HBCUs: A	17	51.5	4	12.1	7	21.2	5	15.2	33	100.0
B	8	61.5	0	0.0	3	23.1	2	15.4	13	100.0
A.I.D. Missions	23	41.8	7	12.7	9	16.4	16	29.1	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	1	16.7	0	0	3	50.0	2	33.3	6	100.0

Table 6: UPDATE Benefits

Respondent Group	Usefulness or Update								Total	
	Benefitted		Little or No Use as Yet		No Response		Not Received or Other			
	Number	Project	Number	Project	Number	Project	Number	Project	Number	Project
HBCUs: A	21	63.6	0	0.0	10	30.3	2	6.1	33	100.0
B	10	76.9	1	7.7	2	15.4	0	0.0	13	100.0
A.I.D. Missions	10	18.2	5	9.1	20	36.4	20	36.4	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	0	0.0	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7	6	100.0

Table 7: Benefits of Travel to A.I.D. Missions

	Travel Benefits						Other		Total	
	Benefitted		Not Benefitted Up to this Time		No Response					
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HBCUs: A	20	60.6	4	12.1	8	24.2	1	3.0	33	100.0
B	2	15.4	5	38.5	6	46.2	0	0.0	13	100.0
A.I.D. Missions	11	20.0	33	60.0	6	10.9	5	9.1	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	1	16.7	0	0.0	5	83.3	0	0.0	6	100.0

Table 8: Benefits from Regional Workshops
for Liaison Officers

Respondent Group	Benefitted				Not Aware		No Response		Other		Total	
	YES		NO		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
HBCUs: A	24	72.7	1	3.0	0	0.0	7	21.2	1	3.0	33	100.0
B	10	76.9	1	7.7	0	0.0	2	15.4	0	0.0	13	100.0
A.I.D. Missions	3	5.5	24	43.6	9	16.4	17	30.9	2	3.6	55	100.0
A.I.D. Bureaus	1	16.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	83.3	0	0.0	6	100.0