PN-ABZ-368

Policy Roundtable Series
Higher Education and Global Development

The Greying of Development Expertise: What's Needed and How Will the Next Generation Get Trained?

June 11, 1996

Sponsored by

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development

and

U.S. Agency for International Development
Cooperative Agreement PCE- 5055-A-00-2012-00

PN-ABZ-368

HIGHER EDUCATION AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT

POLICY ROUNDTABLE #3

The Greying of Development Expertise: What's Needed and How Will the Next Generation Get Trained?

June 11, 1996

Convened at the National Center for Higher Education
Washington, DC

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development

A program of the American Council on Education with
American Association of Community Colleges
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Association of American Universities
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

Sponsored with the U. S. Agency for International Development
Cooperative Agreement PCE-5055-A-00-2012-00
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research
Center for Human Capacity Development

B

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

Executive Summary

About the Roundtables

Assumptions about Future Development Cooperation

Skills and Experience in Future Demand

Sources of Needed Skills

Creating New Collaborative Structures

Priorities to Create an Action Agenda

Appendices

Agenda
List of Participants

C

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The third in a series of Policy Roundtables on Higher Education and Global Development was convened by the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO) with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) on June 11, 1996. The Roundtables focus on emerging, cross-sectoral issues and the changing circumstances of development cooperation as these may involve higher education. They aim to bring higher education expertise to bear on the identification of key and emerging development problems, strategic approaches for their amelioration, and effective models of partnership for development cooperation.

The first Roundtable concerned "The Look of Development Cooperation Ten Years Out: What New Roles for the State, Higher Education, Business and Industry, and the Community?" The second Roundtable built upon the first by addressing "Higher Education, the Corporate Sector, States and Communities: Forming New Partnerships for Economic Development." The third Roundtable, "The Greying of Development Expertise: What's Needed and How Will the Next Generation Get Trained?," sought to (i) predict the types of knowledge and skills needed for future development cooperation by U.S. higher education institutions and federal agencies; (ii) identify the skills and experience likely to be in future demand, and trends in how U.S. professionals are entering the international development arena; (iii) assess opportunities for the growth of expertise in international development cooperation; and (iv) identify implications for the future training of international development policy makers, planners and practitioners.

This meeting affirmed that the international work of U.S. universities, colleges and community colleges is complementary to national interests in development cooperation. The challenges are maintaining capacity on U.S. campuses to respond to global development needs of the future; gaining public understanding of, and commitment to, foreign assistance programs; and ensuring the availability of a cadre of men and women in government and in the American public at large who are committed to international engagement through education and development cooperation.

An evolution is occurring from development "assistance" to development "cooperation." There is increasing demand internationally for ideas and information about how to proceed on public issues. International organizations are shifting from providing answers toward providing information; from providing direct assistance toward providing lessons from useful experiences elsewhere. In developing countries there is more

interest in understanding the policy choices being faced in industrialized countries. Particularly valued are professional networks and other mechanisms for dialogue on development problems. Given this shift, it is increasingly important for specialists in the donor communities to be conversant with policy experiences and technical applications in their home countries.

Trends are toward greater international cooperation and more interdisciplinary activity. In universities, federal agencies, and multilateral development banks, the challenge lies in breaking out of traditional structures using new assumptions. Institutions can suffer from "technosclerosis" -- the hardening of disciplinary and sectoral walls. As funds get tighter, there may be a tendency to do more of the same thing more intensely, discouraging any move toward interdisciplinary team effort.

In terms of training development experts, no one can fully predict future requirements. At present, formal preparation in the field is gained primarily through masters degree-granting schools, such as those comprising the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA), or Ph.D. programs in specialized fields. Roundtable participants acknowledged the importance of technical expertise offered by the disciplines, described as U.S. higher education's comparative advantage. An effort is needed to balance technical skills with transferable skills (collaboration, policy analysis, intercultural communication, leadership) adaptable to a variety of contexts.

Graduates of programs in international fields are increasingly entering the "altruistic side" of the private sector; in banks, multinational corporations, and consulting firms as well as nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). Shrinking opportunities in international development careers through the federal government may eventually result in a decline in enrollment in international studies. The challenge for higher education and federal agencies is to keep the international development field strong; to continue to attract talented and dedicated people to help address important global issues. There should be a federal interest in helping some of the most able people develop the complex skills needed to enter the field.

Development specialists should be encouraged to move freely among disciplines and sectors to address problems; and across academia, public service and business. Since effective interdisciplinary work requires strong disciplinary background, it is important to invest in in-depth knowledge. Most participants agreed that a problem-focus is crucial for development cooperation in order to converge energies on finding solutions.

E

Policy Roundtable III: The Greying of Development Expertise

The critical core of development experts should be supplemented by others who have domestic experience that is in demand internationally. The question is how we can get people with substantive skills to apply them in developing countries. U.S. entrepreneurs, managers, scientists, analysts and communicators can serve in advisory capacities. A manager of an enterprise or education system in the U.S. could have a lot to offer to an overseas partner. There is likely to be a trend toward the engagement, for fixed terms, of those who may not have been trained in international development but who can contribute significantly on the basis of their domestic policy and operational experience.

Decreases in USAID collaborative funding with higher education have reduced higher education's engagement on development issues with USAID, and the number of graduate students and faculty who have built competencies in development fields through applied work on USAID initiatives. The proportion and nature of USAID resources going to higher education partners is significant, both for their impact on development objectives and for their impact on the sustainability of institutional collaboration and the training of the next cadre of development professionals.

There are a variety of models for fostering collaboration across higher education, USAID, business and industry, and community groups. The exchange of professionals from federal agencies, academia and NGOs can serve to broaden development expertise. "Development mentoring" can promote collaboration in applied research, and "public reviews" of development agenda could foster more objective and transparent evaluation of U.S. development assistance programs.

The following priorities were identified as key action areas to consider in defining an agenda for development cooperation.

1. Expand the Array of Partners Engaged in Global Development.

(a) International alliances of higher education institutions, industry, and local government are increasing. There may be utility in identifying innovative university-industry-local government partnerships which contribute to international development to determine opportunities for utilizing these to further U.S. development assistance interests. Consider whether development benefits -- of interest to the U.S. -- could derive from existing partnerships which function outside the purview of federal government. Consider what approaches, outside of traditional project modes, would enable such partnerships to serve development interests.

(b) Identify and compile models of effective collaboration (i) between the federal government and higher education, and (ii) within institutions. A repertoire of examples would enable the development

community to move toward better collaboration in program planning, design and implementation. The higher education community's relationship with the federal scientific community is one good example of effective dialogue, consultation, and collaboration. Several universities offer helpful examples of how cooperation can occur across departments.

(c) Build a database of international development linkages of U.S. higher education. Opportunities to access higher education resources are being lost because of lack of awareness of the extensive development initiatives of universities, colleges, and community colleges overseas. A compilation of higher education's global development initiatives could serve to inform federal agencies, other education institutions, business, and NGOs about resources and expertise which could be utilized.

2. Create Organizational Place -- and/or a new Structure -- Where Innovation Can Occur. One of the priorities raised again in this series of Roundtables is the need for some sort of organizational "safe space" to protect innovation and experimentation, especially in climates of declining resources.

3. Establish Flexible Systems and Programs for the Exchange of Expertise Applicable to Development Cooperation. Give consideration to devising flexible programs which create a more open system for the exchange of development expertise. In such a way, technical expertise could be brought from higher education, the corporate sector, and local government into USAID, and USAID officers could have stints with education, business, state and community groups to become aware of technical innovations and policy issues being dealt with in various quarters of American society.

4. Build Consensus for Longer-Range Cooperation on Global Development Problems. There is agreement on the increasing importance of longer-term, less prescriptive, more collaborative efforts to tackle key development problems. Consideration should be given to a strategy to build consensus for sustained attention to problems beyond the ever-changing political exigencies that put pressure on federal agencies. Serious thought is warranted on the utilization of the resources and skills from a wider range of possible contributors to development. Cooperation among government, the higher education community, business and industry, and community groups should be sought. The challenges are to clarify, first, what long-term development goals should be pursued regardless of shifting political pressures and country officers; second, what needs to be done to address them; and third, the critical development functions for each community and ways to collaborate with one another.

G

ABOUT THE ROUNDTABLES

This is the third in a series of Policy Roundtables on Higher Education and Global Development convened by the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO) and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). The Roundtables focus on emerging cross-sectoral issues and the changing circumstances of development cooperation as these may involve higher education. The purposes of the Policy Roundtables are to:

- Bring higher education expertise to bear on the identification of key and emerging development problems, strategic approaches for their amelioration, and effective models of partnership for development,

- Predict and describe the future of development cooperation to advance human, economic, and democratic development, and

- Promote the constructive engagement of thinkers from the higher education community and USAID on topics of common concern.

The Roundtables are helping define the content and process of future development cooperation, and the implicit agenda shared by higher education and USAID. The first Roundtable, "The Look of Development Cooperation Ten Years Out: What New Roles for the State, Higher Education, Business and Industry, and the Community?," concluded that today's development challenges are vastly different from those confronting USAID at its inception, and even those of a decade ago. The number of development partners both private and public, the complexity of issues, and the skills and needs of our development counterparts have changed.

The second Roundtable, "Higher Education, the Corporate Sector, States and Communities: Forming New Partnerships for Economic Development" focused on different types of partnerships. There was keen interest in the extent to which higher education -- from community colleges to research universities -- is engaged with the private sector and community groups in local, regional and international development efforts. Described as "a real eye opener" at USAID, the Roundtable pointed to the "coalitions of collaborating cultures" which are emerging from various higher education and industry networks.

The third Roundtable addressed "The Greying of Development Expertise: What's Needed and How Will the Next Generation

Get Trained?" It looked at the personnel part of these new modes of operation in order to determine the type of people required to face the challenges of global development in the future. Thirteen persons, representing a range of higher education institutions, disciplines, and development experience, joined with fourteen USAID officials for the all-day session on June 11, 1996, at the National Center for Higher Education at One Dupont Circle in Washington, DC.

The agenda of the third Roundtable was to:

- Predict the types of knowledge and skills needed for future development cooperation by U.S. higher education institutions and federal agencies,
- Identify the skills and experience likely to be in future demand,
- Assess opportunities for the growth of expertise in international development cooperation, and
- Identify policy implications for the future training of international policy makers, planners, and practitioners.

Participants agreed that it is in the fundamental self-interest of the U.S. to maintain a cadre of men and women in government and in the American public at large who are committed to international engagement through education and development cooperation. The higher education community, USAID, and their respective publics are challenged to determine ways to work together to keep international capacity and commitment on campus and in society. Roundtable members expressed the sentiment that to give up in the face of budget constraints and public doubt would be to shirk a major moral responsibility.

In a variety of ways the higher education community and USAID are focused on a set of collective issues. Academia and the official development community are "beleaguered allies." We need to identify creative and collaborative ways in which to work under similar pressures of shrinking budgets and uncertain public opinion. Maintaining international development capacity on U.S. campuses is difficult; gaining public understanding of, and commitment to, foreign assistance programs is a continuing struggle. We should try to get a clear sense of the challenges, the common problems we can address, and optimal approaches for working together on them.

The Roundtables have been instructive, first, in terms of what needs to be done; second, with whom we need to partner in the future; and third, approaches for pursuing the agenda. One of the significant outcomes of this meeting was the affirmation that the international work of U.S. universities, colleges and community colleges is

complementary to national interests in development assistance and global cooperation. Higher education participants expressed deep concern about maintaining the momentum for these initiatives, and remaining positioned internationally to respond to the global development needs of the future. Following the issuance of this third Roundtable report, an effort will be made to determine a collective course of action to address the priorities identified thus far.

Roundtable discussions have been candid, which has added to their value. This report seeks to provide a sense of the discussion without attributing specific comments to the persons who made them. Many statements in the report deserve greater elaboration than was possible during the Roundtable. The report includes such observations to reflect the range and spirit of the exchange.

The ALO and USAID hope this report will promote further debate and discussion about worthwhile ways to join the resources and expertise of the higher education community in support of the nation's, and the world's, interests in global development.

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT FUTURE DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION -- FUNCTIONS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND THE ROLE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

International Cooperation in the 21st Century

Some predict a declining role for humanitarian-based education assistance. Of 21 donor countries, 18 have reduced their spending in this area; only the Nordic countries and Japan have not. Within this context there is, instead, an increasing reliance on international education cooperation, through the exchange of information and policy approaches. Interest in the study of international and comparative education is increasing dramatically and, in the U.S., schools of international affairs and institutes for international development are booming. Such patterns reflect changes in a variety of sectors.

Regarding the future functions of international organizations, there are shifts from providing answers toward providing information; from providing direct assistance toward providing lessons from useful experiences elsewhere. The segmented institutional and bilateral functions of the international organizations and donor agencies are giving way to common concerns and programmatic cooperation involving relevant ministries, agencies, and counterpart institutions. There are more efforts to rely on the highly trained people in cooperating countries, many of whom have been educated in Europe and the U.S.

The evolution in approach from development "assistance" to development "cooperation" has led to an increase in demand internationally for ideas and information about how to proceed on pressing public issues. In developing countries, there is great interest now in understanding the policy choices that are being faced in "northern" countries, as well as the experience of other developing countries. Professional networks and other mechanisms for dialogue are particularly valued by developing country partners. Examples were given of partners abroad who indicate that what they want is not only money but technical exchange (such as an understanding of technological systems in water-scarce environments and the human organizations to support them).

Given this trend, there is concern that officials from the international and donor communities have been isolated from policy experiences and technical applications in their own countries. It is increasingly important for them to be more conversant with policy reforms at home. For this reason, one multilateral development bank is considering how to supplement its staff with

persons who, for example, have actually run school systems, managed cities and irrigation systems, and devised water usage policies.

For international organizations and multilateral development banks to fulfill their new roles, there will need to be shifts from the role of scientific "judge" to scientific "advisor," and from short-term investments based on north-south "medical models" (wherein expert teams from the "north" identify problems in the "south" and prescribe treatments) to collaboration on long-term program goals based on commonly determined problems and solutions.

Present Organizational Structures and Directions

Although trends for greater international cooperation suggest a movement toward more interdisciplinary activity, this is structurally difficult to achieve. In universities, federal agencies, and multilateral development banks, the challenge lies in breaking out of traditional power structures using new assumptions. Institutions suffer from "technosclerosis" -- the hardening of the disciplinary walls built around departments. As funds get tighter, the tendency may be to hunker down and do more of the same thing more intensely. In this atmosphere, departments will tend to become more cloistered, discouraging any move toward interdisciplinary team effort.

The general thrust of these comments is in accord with the discussions at previous Roundtables: the need to develop longer range goals, broader perspectives, and fresh ways of tackling problems.

Higher Education. The global challenges confronting the world today are not singular problems of particular disciplines or sectors. Contrary to the "division of labor" paradigm of social organization, which assumes that the most productive way to solve a problem is by allowing specialists to address its parts, today's problems require multidisciplinary approaches by teams. There can be diminishing returns to specialization.

Within higher education, such activities are encouraged, but faculty generally are rewarded toward tenure for their specialization in a discipline rather than for their involvement in interdisciplinary work. Unless higher education changes its reward structure, young faculty will continue to be reluctant to engage in complex problems of global development. These are fundamental problems. How should the power structures and rewards be redefined? How can this be accomplished?

Collaborative development work can be affected by funding. Many international development programs begin with a multidisciplinary focus, then funding is decreased and the comprehensive approach is

lost. There may be a tendency to support the core of a project, not recognizing that the core is unlikely to be successful without its other parts.

Budgetary restrictions as they relate to higher education institutions are changing how faculties are structured. Tulane University has reduced its staff by 10%, forcing the University to focus in new directions that are interdisciplinary. Cornell University has had to reduce its number of faculty lines in one College from 480 to 380, and defined the positions as "belonging" to the college rather than more narrowly to the department. The University is seeking to reorient faculty positions so that they may serve several departments. To the extent that university leaders can take open faculty lines and redistribute them centrally, they can instigate a cross-disciplinary focus. There are relevant lessons to be learned from this adverse funding climate.

Roundtable participants observed that unless an institution goes "all the way" in changing its reward structure, and the changes are clearly signaled by the leadership of the institution, a person seeking to innovate could commit "career suicide." Faculty, like others, may be resistant to change until they see that the alternatives are not personally threatening.

USAID. There is an incongruence between the importance of U.S. leadership in the world and the financial support allocated for U.S. development assistance. Nevertheless, recent pressures to balance the national budget will likely continue and cause major changes for USAID. As with higher education, the Agency is receiving less financial support and is being forced to consolidate.

There are three issues confronting USAID which touch on the discussion of human resource requirements for the development agenda. Each of these issues flows in one way or another from the current ambivalence on the part of the American people and their respective representatives toward continuing a strong public sector role in international development.

First is USAID's reduction in force. The Agency is reducing its workforce by about 10% by the end of this fiscal year. Within the Agency there have been discussions about the shape of USAID in the future and the skill areas that warrant protection. There has been a 28% reduction in USAID's Foreign Service education officers. Since those remaining will handle similar amounts of program funds, new means of managing these monies must be identified.

Second is the accelerated closing of overseas missions over the next five years. Sector programs in some countries will be terminated while others will continue without

USAID personnel. USAID will support full "sustainable development missions" in up to 30 countries (a decline from 43). The Agency will have "limited presence" in other countries, and also maintain the capacity to work in as many as ten "crisis areas" at any time. Maintaining long-term linkages with nations scheduled for USAID mission closing is a new challenge. The implications of these changes for USAID's partners, including the higher education community, need to be addressed.

Third, and relating to the trend toward a reduced USAID presence abroad, is the Agency's interest in the notions of "outsourcing" or "franchising" its activities. Moving the USAID development agenda to private sector partners and others is an option being discussed, particularly for countries where there may no longer be an official program but U.S. interests continue. For example, an NGO in the environmental field may be asked to take the lead in representing the U.S. in a country where environmental issues are of concern. A consortium of universities could take the lead in a country where science and technology capacity is of interest. There is an opportunity to explore innovative ideas about partnerships. People inside and outside USAID are working on this issue, and comments are welcomed by Agency staff.

Within the context of international development, it is important to note the increasing number of emergencies that exist in the world today; some 30 nations are experiencing "complex crises." It is impossible to pursue a development agenda without dealing with the crises that result from ethnic conflict, extreme poverty, and poor governance. For USAID, capacity to respond to crises must be enhanced, and capacity to pursue development objectives and plan for post-conflict transition amid the crises must be strengthened. It is important to increase focus on the root causes of instability to prevent the recurrence of crises. The challenge remains to ensure that the expertise required to manage crisis prevention programs is available for the next generation.

In response to the USAID position on reduced programs, the point was made that abundant evidence shows that very small programs can leverage other resources. It is important to judge programs on "net effect," and to get away from a mechanistic "input/output model" of assessing results. There is too much tendency to look at the effectiveness of USAID inputs only. We have to acknowledge, though we cannot begin to assess, the impact of other inputs to a country and the role these have on USAID contributions and vice versa. It would be a mistake to overlook the serendipitous effects which small USAID investments can have.

Skills and Experience in Future Demand

With regard to training development experts, there is much unchartered territory. No one can fully predict future requirements. At present, professional preparation in the field of international development is gained primarily through masters degree-granting schools, such as those comprising the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs (APSIA), or Ph.D. programs in specialized fields.

In 1988 there were 13 professional schools of international affairs in the U.S. Of the 7,000 applicants to the programs that year, fewer than 3,000 students were enrolled. In 1995/96 there are 16 such institutes and, of 13,000 applicants, 4,700 were admitted. Although APSIA schools compete with the country's business schools, enrollment in the latter has declined in recent years. There has been growing interest in the study of international finance, but not necessarily with a motivation to apply it to development.

The average age of admission to APSIA schools is 26. As compared to earlier years, today's students enter the programs with a wider variety of skills. They know economics, languages (particularly non-European languages), and are more internationally experienced. At the same time, they are as idealistic and pragmatic as they were 30 years ago. Almost every student wanting to enter the field of international development has prior work experience overseas and a demonstrated commitment to the field. These are signs of a healthy profession.

Some APSIA students are mid-career people who had good salaries, then became victims of industry "down-sizing." There are people with doctorates attending Cornell University to pursue the Master of Professional Studies in International Development. This flexible program provides an opportunity for those who have been part of the workforce for many years to increase their development expertise. Most APSIA schools require an internship and have good contacts with international organizations. Mid-career retooling is a growth industry. For many, retraining is not a luxury but a necessity. The "half life" of medical information, for example, is about 24-36 months. Academics and practitioners alike have to learn new applications in the field of international development.

To fulfill requirements for graduation, international service programs generally expect knowledge about a geographical area plus functional expertise in one or more fields such as business and economic development, environmental management, conflict resolution, the application of science

and technology to public problems, or international law and organization. Roundtable participants suggested other important areas for skill development in the future, such as emergency and disaster relief, and institutional management for countries in transition. While graduate programs are getting better at teaching theory, many think they need to improve their teaching of skills in problem-solving, program planning, and policy-making.

Some Roundtable participants noted that there must be an effort to balance technical skills with transferable skills -- those which are adaptable to a variety of contexts. Collaboration will be necessary for the engineer of the future, as well as other professionals. Key for achieving collaboration is understanding the multicultural, multiethnic aspects of policy dialogue and the problem-solving process. Nonetheless, the technical expertise of the disciplines gained through U.S. higher education is the nation's comparative advantage. We can never get away from that. A related observation: If international development agencies function only through a generalist mode, access to this advantage will be lacking.

The most effective international experts are those with leadership capabilities. How do we train people for leadership? The U.S. needs a critical number of development specialists to provide leadership and affect public opinion. Internationally skilled development experts have language, cross-cultural, and policy-making skills. The discipline-focused expertise provided by traditional Ph.D. programs should be maintained, but experience must be broadened to enable candidates to adapt to the fuller requirements of development. Such individuals need mentors who can teach them skills in cooperation and policy dialogue.

The most widespread international development training has been the U.S. Peace Corps. Over 160,000 Americans have served as Peace Corps volunteers, gaining many of the skills required of a development expert. They learn languages and other skills associated with their in-country presence. This source of training is one which should not be overlooked.

Many undergraduate institutions and programs require or encourage students to study or have internships overseas, and there is growing interest in developing country settings. Participants in these programs could become sources of greater advocacy for global development.

Japan and the Nordic countries invest in their young people by providing development training programs and internships. The Canadians offer small grants for graduate students and faculty to pursue development

topics abroad. USAID offers some internship opportunities, although fewer than in previous years. Such arrangements provide an attractive means of gaining experience if there is the responsibility and freedom to produce substantive work.

Currently USAID is not a good source for new career opportunities. Graduates of APSIA schools, who previously entered the public sector, are now gaining employment in "the altruistic side" of the private sector; in banks, multinational corporations, and consulting firms as well as NGOs. Graduates are no longer entering an organization with expectations of a life-time career.

As with APSIA graduates, Ph.D.s in international fields increasingly are entering the private sector. More and more entities are engaged in international development and commerce. Those with international skills are weaving in and out of academia. There is a need to better track international studies alumni in order to follow employment trends. Contact with the companies for whom they work will enable professional schools to adapt curricula to changing requirements.

Shrinking opportunities in international development careers through the federal government eventually may result in a decline in enrollment in international studies. As federal, or federally generated, employment opportunities dwindle, it is increasingly important that students enter this field for love, not money. The challenge is to continue to attract talented and dedicated people to the field to help address important global issues. Higher education and USAID must work together to help shape public opinion about development assistance. At the same time, it is necessary to avoid overstating the public sector opportunities available to candidates upon graduation. This is particularly true if the student is carrying most of the costs of his or her education, as is often the case at the graduate level.

It remains a real challenge to keep the international development field strong. We need capable students in this field because the skill demands are so complex. There should be a federal interest in helping some of the most talented people get their "foot in the door," so we will have more "world changers," not just "job fillers."

The critical core of development experts should be supplemented by others who have domestic experience that is in demand internationally. How can we get people with substantive skills to apply them in developing countries? U.S. entrepreneurs, managers, scientists, analysts and communicators can serve in advisory capacities. A manager of an enterprise or education system in the U.S. could have a lot to offer to an overseas partner. There is likely to be a trend toward the engagement, for fixed terms, of those

who may not have been trained in international development but who can contribute significantly on the basis of their domestic policy and operational experience.

SOURCES OF NEEDED SKILLS

Mobility across Sectors and Institutions

One challenge in mobilizing skills for global development lies in creating climates which allow development specialists to move freely among disciplines and sectors to address problems; and across academia, public service, and business. Most opportunities for faculty to serve in government are at the fellowship or post-tenure levels. Development specialists from academia who are seeking tenure find it more difficult to vary their career paths.

To enable greater mobility in addressing development tasks, work must be problem-focused, interdisciplinary, and client-oriented. A problem-focus is the organizing rationale for bringing disciplines to bear on solutions. Disciplines reward "discovery," but they also can serve application functions -- "horizontal" integrative roles in addressing problems. Many new discoveries are coming at the boundaries of disciplines; as in biophysics and biotechnology. As new information technologies let people tap into the knowledge of many disciplines, researchers are better able to move conceptually among them.

In problem-focused settings, the measure of success of an individual faculty member is judged not just by a department (which is discipline-based), but by an external team which is applying multiple disciplines to a problem. If the outcome is problem-solving, then judgments are made in a different way -- based not only on proficiency in a discipline but on achieving a solution.

Work that is client-oriented requires an understanding and respect for stakeholders' interests. Emphasis on development problems and clients redirects energies from the management of set tasks to the achievement of policy breakthroughs.

In-depth Knowledge

Some concerns were expressed by Roundtable participants with regard to interdisciplinary approaches. The breadth versus depth issue was debated. If one of the greatest strengths of U.S. higher education is its disciplines, interdisciplinary approaches can risk being superficial. Good interdisciplinary work requires strong disciplinary backgrounds. It is important to invest in in-depth knowledge and skills as a precursor to sound interdisciplinary work. As an African proverb states, "If you are cutting a path through the forest, it is the person behind you who knows if the path is straight or not."

The point was made that disciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches are not mutually exclusive. Some new dimensions should be added to the disciplinary approach and disciplinary expertise applied in new and more collaborative ways.

Senior faculty with international expertise lead institutions in development work, but there may be other faculty members with "hidden" international skills. One university surveyed faculty on their international expertise and found hundreds whose international skills had not been widely known. Colleges and universities can promote opportunities abroad for such faculty to build development expertise. Similarly, students are not experts about a country after a couple years of instruction; rather they have piecemeal knowledge about that country which can be honed through in-depth experience.

There is a lot of international work being undertaken, but it is not necessarily work which relates to international development. This presents a dilemma. Institutions want to use scarce resources for international development well, but also groom the next generation of development specialists. There are reasons for engaging disciplinary specialists (such as agronomists) and other professionals in development work abroad although they are not yet experienced in international applications of their specialities. In certain contexts such professionals can make valuable contributions abroad and, as a result of their experience, transmit a larger world view to their students.

Developing Country Capability

There are growing cadres of people in developing countries with expertise comparable with that of their counterparts in industrialized nations. At a conference recently held in Louisiana of Latin American finance ministers, it was noted that two-thirds of the visitors were educated in U.S. institutions. Whom do we define as "we?" they asked.

We often forget the long-term impact of training nationals of other countries. About 25% of the students in APSIA programs come from overseas. When they return home, foreign students have a huge impact on their nation's development and serve as goodwill ambassadors for the U.S. In many cases, they are more sophisticated than their U.S. colleagues because they have knowledge of a broader segment of the world, and direct experience in addressing development problems. Higher education institutions and the Agency increasingly are cooperating with people who know what they want to attain, but need additional information and policy guidance to achieve their goals.

Information Technologies

New information technologies are changing the way all management, training, and research is done, as well as much international work. Just as USAID is more accessible because of electronic mail, so too are many development collaborators in the U.S. and other countries. Development cooperation will benefit from new information technologies which allow for speedy communication among many parties. Web sites are being established on the Internet for this purpose. Higher education has a vital role to serve in facilitating international professional networks that foster development.

Some of the greatest opportunities for higher education collaboration in development are with the middle-income countries, many of which have good internal technical resources. New information technology is improving 100% in 18-month periods, making information exchange and communications very cost-effective.

With regard to distance learning, USAID staff and other development specialists will have greater access to training courses. There are many opportunities for using computer-based approaches through the Internet. The 60 research universities of the Association of American Universities are exploring the development of computer-assisted courseware. USAID is not able to send its staff to universities in the traditional way for advanced study (and it is decreasing its sponsorship of overseas participants), so new models will be needed. One promising option lies in the greater availability of computer-assisted training materials, though not a substitute for a more contextual learning environment.

Who Defines the Problems

How a problem is defined, and who sets the development agenda, determine who has a stake in the problem's solution, and the kinds of skills sought to address it. Most participants agreed that a problem-focus is crucial for development cooperation in order to converge energies on finding solutions. The challenge is to define the development problem. One of the powerful forces limiting capacity to identify problems is the lack of conceptual integration of the disciplines. In a recent paper on crisis management, for example, it was noted that economists rarely considered educational needs, and education analysts seldom took note of economic planning.

Another limiting factor is the lack of collaboration across institutions. In the past, USAID and other donor agencies have missed opportunities to consult with those engaged in development outside the purview of their organizations. Who defines the problem is usually who has the interest and the money. Universities are donors, too,

investing of their own resources for development research and collaboration. The private sector may be considered a donor as business now procures substantial higher education expertise for research and training. Federal agencies need to view higher education and the private sector as partners in defining and addressing global development problems. Attention must also be given to global development issues that do not have financial constituencies -- like migration, for example.

Donor organizations need to ensure procedural mechanisms through which development partners can participate in defining the problems. This notion is embedded in our understandings about the future of development cooperation. Those engaged in development cooperation should agree, to some reasonable extent, on the processes for defining the problems, how the problems can be addressed, and what outcomes or solutions should be sought.

How can a federal development agency contend with the reality that priorities change both with technical advances and with the political moods of government? The macro-analysis of problems is important. As USAID moves to "outsource" responsibilities for development programs, it must increasingly take advantage of the perspectives, interests, and resources of its partners.

Donors sometimes have tended to define problems as though they were amenable to rapid technical solutions, to make it easier to demonstrate short-term accountability. Accountability and sustainability can be enemies. Pressures for accountability and quick results can thwart planning and implementing for the long-term. Universities also feel the pressure to emphasize the short-term benefits of federal support for research, because sponsoring agencies need to demonstrate results quickly. Demands for accountability may increase as funds diminish, and make tackling big development problems -- involving longer range human and institutional capacity building -- more difficult. As such there is a need to work with cooperating countries to maintain a focus on core development goals.

Leadership

Leaders in both higher education and USAID are being forced to redefine their mode of operating due to changing demands and funding constraints. In a more favorable funding environment, staff may be encouraged to move freely among disciplines and sectors to pursue important problems. Under today's constraints, the reaction may be to focus more intensely on specific tasks that are familiar, rather than to seek more collaborative ways of doing things. In such an atmosphere, federal agencies and university departments may tend to remain secluded. Similarly, within a federal agency

it may be as difficult to move across disciplines if career paths are narrowly defined within an organization.

Accountability can also work against interdisciplinary efforts. Unless there are visionary institutional leaders and "deans of interdisciplinarity," this will remain the case. At one university, a gift has enabled it to set up a funding source that is an alternative to federal projects; faculty and students can work on those problems judged most important rather than on what "request for proposal" happens to be out.

Allocating shrinking resources requires insightful leadership at the highest level. Within higher education, interdepartmental arrangements can be developed among, for example, economics, business, and the sciences to address global issues of food security. Such types of collaboration allow for qualitative change to occur in how resources are mobilized. One Roundtable participant, a university administrator, explained that he has been able to achieve goals at his university because he has moved resources from one area to another. This is "a contact sport" from which he bears the scars. A leader has to be catalytic and support faculty and staff who are innovative.

Federal Role and Market Demand

There is a juxtaposition of declining USAID resources and increasing student interest in development studies. Unlike some in Congress and the American public at large, students of international affairs are aware that in the rapidly internationalizing world, nations are becoming part of a global economy. During the 1950s - 1970s, financial assistance was available for graduate studies that prepared people for international development careers. This is not true today. Universities are faced with the option of supporting the same number of students at decreased levels of assistance or reducing the number of students who are supported. In some cases, as in the agriculture and engineering fields, graduate programs are wholly financed by private sector financing. The caution is, as an African proverb states, "If you have your hand in another man's pocket, you have to follow him wherever he goes."

There was discussion about the relationship between USAID's development budget and that portion implemented by higher education, currently in the 20% range. Some participants observed that this figure is much lower than it had once been, and means either that higher education is not delivering, or that USAID is abandoning its use of higher education. It was commented that, of the funds obligated to institutions of higher education in the last several years, a third has gone to institutions within 80 miles of Washington, D.C. It was suggested that more institutions of higher education located

throughout the U.S. become involved with USAID's programs in the future.

Decreases in USAID collaborative funding with higher education have reduced not only higher education's engagement on development issues with USAID, but also the number of graduate students and faculty who have built competencies in global development fields through applied work on USAID initiatives. The proportion and nature of USAID resources going to higher education partners is significant, both for their impact on development objectives and their impact on the sustainability of institutional collaboration and the training of the next cadre of development professionals.

There are several means other than government for raising revenue to support higher education's international development work. First, there are opportunities for U.S. higher education to bridge between domestic and international aspects of programs, and to raise funding that bring the two together. For example, some institutions involve domestic educational and agricultural interests and personnel in international collaborations which are of benefit at home and abroad. Second, the private sector is aggressively pursuing partnerships with institutions of higher learning to benefit from the international expertise they offer. Third, some development assistance may be provided on a reimbursable basis. Many countries are in a position to pay for the services they require. Already developing countries are approaching universities and community colleges directly, bypassing the federal government. Countries demand to become stronger partners in decision-making processes when they are paying for services rendered.

Increasingly universities and colleges are able to leverage funds from USAID and other government sources through partnerships with the private sector. The question was raised as to what it takes for the private sector to invest in a program. Higher education participants said that the key ingredients are capable partners and an agenda that the university and its industry partners develop together.

American Public Constituency

Against their best interest, the higher education community and USAID have failed to create a common constituency for global development cooperation. This has hurt the Agency in the federal funding wars. The U.S. development assistance program needs greater credibility among taxpayers. Some U.S. states are proving effective at constituency building for international cooperation, through their partnerships with colleges, universities, and local business.

Support for traditionally defined development is getting smaller, yet public awareness of international influences is growing. There is

a need to increase the American public's understanding of global development issues and Congressional awareness of development cooperation's results at home and abroad. (For example, 43 of the top 50 nations which purchase food from the U.S. once received U.S. food aid.)

USAID needs more effective outreach beyond Washington, D.C., to raise public awareness, elicit opinion, and create a constituency with the Agency. Although the American public is becoming more internationally oriented through education programs and the workplace, few faculty at some higher education institutions know about USAID; many students don't know of USAID at all. The Agency's Lessons without Borders Program, which is found on various Internet list serves, is not widely known. USAID should host more regional "town meetings" in conjunction with education institutions. One of the best ways to build a constituency is to engage more groups in development cooperation by providing seed money for their ideas, activities and linkages.

With the reduction of USAID field presence, there are risks and opportunities. Many believe that the most successful types of development projects are small-scale and community-based. Given reduced numbers of USAID personnel, there may be a temptation to give larger awards for fewer projects. Ways should be found to facilitate development collaboration by more partners. For example, higher education institutions in developing countries have important roles to serve in fostering local development, and these institutions can be aided through partnerships with U.S. institutions.

In the past decade USAID has procured a larger share of its work from consulting firms. These companies can offer a level of flexibility and quick response which higher education institutions and NGOs may be less able to provide. Because of its mission and institutional resources, higher education offers long-term continuity and a commitment to capacity building which firms and NGOs rarely can provide. With close ties with legislators and a large segment of the American public, higher education institutions have enormous opportunity to increase the visibility and concern for international development among Congressional leaders, the corporate sector, and voters.

Creating New Collaborative Structures

Several means were mentioned for instigating more collaboration among USAID, the higher education community and their partners in business, industry, and local government.

Endowments and trusts

In terms of private sector involvement in development, one model for collaboration is offered by Cornell University which received a private gift amounting to $7.5 million for a five-year period to work on sustainable agricultural and rural development. The University is using the unrestricted money to enable faculty to propose collaborations which are open-ended and jointly planned with higher education institutions, USAID partners, NGOs and local entities in nine countries. Faculty time is contributed. Accountability for results is not sought in the first few years of the programs (when one can only evaluate the process), but rather over five or ten years. These initiatives are cost-effective; the University figures that it implements a program for $200,000 that USAID might need $1 million to implement. Flexibility and leveraging make the funds more productive when the pressure to spend resources by the end of the fiscal year is removed. The role for USAID in this type of arrangement could be to attract additional monies based on an agenda that host development partners have identified as important.

CRSP model

The USAID-supported Collaborative Research Support Projects (CRSPs) are dynamic examples of multidisciplinary programs focused on agriculture and food security goals, which bring together domestic and international interests. They produce long-term results and have means to look at interim progress. Through these programs faculty are able to work in the international arena. The most renowned American scientists in certain fields are able to become internationally engaged and contribute in ways they had not imagined previously. It is important to look at how the CRSP model, which employs cost-sharing, can be used for cooperation between USAID and higher education on other global development problems. Efforts should document thoroughly the outcomes of these programs to ensure that the Agency has the evidence to support them.

Network of applied research and training centers

The research and training collaboration that helped create the "Green Revolution" in agriculture in Asia offers a model for building a consortium of university centers of applied research and training. Such a consortium would link together electronically host country and U.S. institutions -- like "a virtual CIAT" (International Center for Tropical Agriculture). Virtual networks could also provide prototypes of new information technology and materials for development. A variation on this theme is to reach out to the technically trained foreign alumni of U.S. higher education, and further "legitimize" and make use of their skills on development problems. It merits considering

how to link these people with one another and with their U.S. counterparts to effect collaboration.

Public reviews

One suggestion called for more objective and transparent monitoring and evaluation of U.S. development assistance programs. This could occur through a type of "social audit function" in which international development specialists from higher education, the corporate sector, and foundations would review development plans and priorities, make them more transparent and consensually derived.

Development mentoring

One recommendation was to expand the joint Peace Corps and USAID internship and training programs, and seek opportunities with higher education institutions. Another suggestion was for a development mentoring program which could promote collaboration in applied research. For example, two young professionals -- one from the U.S. and one from the cooperating country -- would form a team to work on a development problem in the host country. Faculty advisors of the students could supervise the activity. A USAID practitioner could be involved. There might be modest USAID support for travel and materials. It is likely that the U.S. higher education institution would bear some of the funding costs, since the alliance would benefit the institution. Another effort could be the short-term exchange of U.S. and developing country students. The U.S. student would be guided by a particular host-country faculty member and pursue a development task rather than attend classes. These partnerships could be supported by USAID, the higher education institutions, and NGOs. It would be important to ensure that participants serve as resources in the future.

Campus internships for USAID staff

Visiting scholars from USAID could teach or otherwise participate in academic and community outreach programs on U.S. campuses. The cost to USAID in terms of level of support to the staff member would be determined by the Agency. These types of exchanges are easily arranged, and would be of great benefit to USAID staff in terms of acquainting themselves with changes in American higher education and new opportunities for cooperation with business and local government. USAID staff could also enhance their skills in particular areas through such a program.

USAID internships for higher education faculty and young scientists

Since the Joint Career Corps Program was initiated in the early 1980s, the program has placed about 30 university faculty in tours with USAID, and about 12 USAID officers at universities. The program has had little use in recent years. Consideration should be given to reviving the program as a means of

providing USAID with senior scientific, technical, and policy expertise relevant to its programs; giving USAID officers opportunities to teach and know higher education operations; and providing campuses with opportunities to increase ties with USAID.

USAID actively participates in the AAAS Fellows Program (currently there are 14 Fellows in the Environment Center alone). Most of the Fellows are recent Ph.D. recipients in the sciences but not necessarily affiliated with a higher education institution. The intention is to offer Fellows an opportunity to apply their knowledge to the field of international development.

Faculty development internships with NGOs

These programs and internships would involve junior faculty who want to develop expertise in international development by enabling them to work with the NGO community. This would serve as a means of enlarging the pool of experienced faculty needed to engage in development cooperation with NGOs, and enable the higher education institutions to consider areas for possible collaboration. Individuals who can bridge the perspectives of government, higher education, business, and NGOs, in the interest of global development, have vital roles to play.

UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) - and similar assignments

To enable faculty to contribute to development overseas, FAO offers assignments within the organization. As part of the arrangement, FAO pays around $2,500 per month in per diem to the faculty member, and the higher education institution pays his or her salary and benefits. The U.S. Department of Agriculture also funds two-year associate professional officer positions at the FAO headquarters in Rome. Many agencies offer internships for junior professionals. The U.S. funds junior professional officer positions with the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), including two years in a developing country.

State-supported international development initiatives with higher education

The University System of Georgia, which consists of 34 institutions, aims as a system to become more international. Throughout the state of Georgia, area councils have been established which sponsor study abroad programs. Through these state-supported exchange mechanisms, 20 to 30 junior faculty have received Chancellor Awards to pursue work in China, England and South Africa. The University System of Georgia is also involved in a Carpathian - U.S. higher education initiative which pairs universities in five former Soviet states with partner

institutions in the southeastern U.S. (with the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development, in cooperation with USAID). This project assists the Carpathian region universities to develop their public service role in order to engage the institutions in regional economic development. In addition, Valdosta State University serves as a regional center through which U.S. faculty are facilitating the development of an American Studies Program in northern Russia. Through this program American political scientists are assisting the people of that region to rewrite their legal code. By way of the Internet, the University System of Georgia is working on environmental projects in Belize and Hungary. This cost-effective means of collaborating will have a tremendous impact on future development efforts.

Public-private international partnerships

As described in the second Policy Roundtable of this series, training programs are provided by the Maricopa Community Colleges in Arizona to government and business and industry professionals from Chengdu, China. This low-cost model relies on the mostly pro-bono contributions of the City of Phoenix and area businesses such as Motorola. This partnership serves to illustrate how resources are being leveraged from the private and public sectors and higher education for global development cooperation. Such sets of collaborative relationships -- for joint problem definition, design, and application -- can be as broad as our imaginations.

Higher education institutions are working with state agencies, city and country agencies, and professional associations to foster local development. Such collaborations can be drawn upon for development cooperation in international settings. In the environment arena for example, USAID is working with the Council of State Governments, the National Association of State Development Agencies, the American Consulting Engineers Council, and the Air and Waste Management Association. Extending these alliances to include higher education institutions can mobilize considerable expertise for development.

PRIORITIES TO CREATE AN ACTION AGENDA

Roundtable participants suggested the following as key policy arenas to consider in defining an action agenda for development cooperation.

I. *Expand the Array of Partners Engaged in Global Development*

a. ***Draw on university-industry-local government partnerships.*** Identify innovative university-industry-local government partnerships which contribute to international development to determine opportunities for utilizing these to further U.S. development assistance interests. Consider whether development benefits -- of interest to the U.S. -- could derive from existing partnerships which function outside the purview of federal government. Consider what approaches, outside of traditional project modes, would enable such partnerships to serve development interests.

b. ***Identify and compile models of effective collaboration (i) between the federal government and higher education, and (ii) within institutions.*** A repertoire of examples would enable the development community to move toward better collaboration in program planning, design and implementation. The higher education community's relationship with the federal scientific community is one good example of effective dialogue, consultation, and collaboration. Several universities offer helpful examples of how cooperation can occur across departments.

c. ***Build a database of international development linkages of U.S. higher education.*** Opportunities to access higher education resources are being lost because of lack of awareness of the extensive development initiatives of universities, colleges, and community colleges overseas. A compilation of higher education's global development initiatives could serve to inform federal agencies, other education institutions, business, and NGOs about resources and expertise which could be tapped.

II. ***Create Organizational Place -- and/or a new Structure -- Where Innovation Can Occur.*** One of the priorities raised again in this series of Roundtables is the need for some sort of organizational "safe space" to protect innovation and experimentation, especially in climates of declining resources.

III. ***Establish Flexible Systems and Programs for the Exchange of Expertise Applicable to Development Cooperation.*** Consideration should be given to devising flexible programs which create a more open system for the exchange of development expertise. In such a way, technical expertise could be brought from higher education, the corporate sector, and local government into USAID, and USAID officers could have stints with education, business, state and community groups to become aware of technical innovations and policy issues being dealt with in various quarters of American society.

There is agreement on the increasing importance of longer-term, less prescriptive, more collaborative efforts to tackle key development problems. Consideration should be given to developing a strategy to build consensus for sustained attention to problems beyond the ever-changing political exigencies that put pressure on federal agencies. Serious thought is warranted on the utilization of the resources and skills from a wider range of possible contributors to development. Cooperation among government, the higher education community, business and industry, and community groups should be sought.

IV. ***Build Consensus for Longer-Range Cooperation on Global Development Problems.*** A mutually agreed upon policy agenda is required for the future. The higher education community and USAID need to develop a process for serious evaluation of the recommendations raised in the reports of these Roundtables. This process may begin by higher education and USAID caucusing their respective communities to determine their responses, then reconvening formally with proposals in mind to identify areas of agreement in principle.

The challenges are to clarify, first, what long-term development goals should be pursued regardless of shifting political pressures and country officers; second, what needs to be done to address them; and third, the critical development functions for each community and ways to collaborate with one another.

APPENDICES

ASSOCIATION LIAISON OFFICE
FOR UNIVERSITY COOPERATION IN DEVELOPMENT

American Council on Education
American Association of Community Colleges
American Association of State Colleges and Universities
Association of American Universities
National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges

AGENDA

HIGHER EDUCATION AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT:
Policy Roundtable #3

June 11, 1996

The Greying of Development Expertise: What's Needed and How Will the Next Generation Get Trained?

Sponsored with the U.S. Agency for International Development

National Center for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, DC
Suite 610 (AACTE)

8:30 a.m. **Coffee,** pastries. Meet participants.

8:45 a.m. **Introductions and Welcome**

John C. Vaughn, Roundtable Moderator
Executive Officer
Association of American Universities

Higher education associations' welcome and expectations

C. Peter Magrath
President
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

USAID welcome and expectations

Ann Van Dusen
Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

ADDRESSING FIVE CORE ISSUES --

I. Assumptions about Future Development Cooperation and Functions of International Organizations

What are the assumptions which will shape federal, non-federal and multinational assistance five years out? What are the global challenges and opportunities that the next cadres of development and international professionals, "north" and "south," are apt to face?

Participants will have available the Reports of Policy Roundtables 1 and 2, and material of Stephen P. Heyneman on his view of assumptions from the perspective of the World Bank. Kelly C. Kammerer, USAID, has been invited to offer thoughts on assumptions he sees influencing the shape of international assistance in the future.

Discussion:
Do Roundtable members perceive these assumptions as valid? What key assumptions may be missing? What are the implications of these assumptions for development cooperation? ...For the roles of bilateral and multilateral development assistance organizations (e.g., with respect to agenda setting or facilitation; donor-led dynamics or collaboration)?

II. What Skills and Experience will be in Demand for Future Development Cooperation?

Will the emphasis be on technical specialization in a discipline, or on expertise on thematic problems (e.g., international environmental policy; conflict resolution; international relations in science and technology; international economics and business; poverty alleviation)? How important will multidisciplinary skills be? What types of experiences will be most relevant? What skills and experience will be needed most?

Deans of schools of international affairs note that demand for their programs is booming. Lewis Goodman has examined the nature of this growth and offers perspectives. In a different vein, Norman Uphoff suggests that the cohort of professionals entering the international development arena through some disciplinary tracks is becoming more "international," though not necessarily more "developmental."

Discussion:
Are there common skill denominators for successful work in development assistance? How are these similar to, and different from, skill denominators for work in international affairs more generally? Will there be international development cooperation roles for domestic entrepreneurs, managers, scientists, analysts, and communicators? How important will it be to have a continuity of development experience -- topical? geographical?

12:00 Working lunch - Suite 710

12:45 Resume

III. Where will Individuals with the Needed Skills Come From?

What will have to be done to attract individuals to prepare for, and to enter careers and shorter term service in international development cooperation? Is supply a problem? In what regard? What will it take to ensure the capacity to mobilize and sustain development expertise? Once the individuals with expertise are attracted to development cooperation, what are the best ways to sustain their commitment and expertise?

Seth Spaulding has examined changing dynamics in the preparation and engagement of international education professionals. Edna McBreen has questioned the issue of responsibility (federal? higher education?) for the preparation of development professionals.

Discussion:
What will be the effects of diminishing "career" opportunities in the field of international development? How will young people be attracted to study and work in development cooperation, particularly as federal employment opportunities (e.g., in USAID, USIA, USDA international service) decrease? How can the expertise of U.S.- trained cooperating country individuals be harnessed for development? Are there individuals not trained in international development cooperation whose skills need to be tapped?

IV. What New Collaborative Structures are called for among USAID, the Higher Education Community and their Partners in Business and Industry and Local Government?

What changes may be necessary to plan and implement better approaches to preparing, recruiting, and sustaining expertise for development cooperation?

How can we construct a more porous system for getting needed expertise (e.g., across federal agencies, higher education, business and industry, and ngos)?

William Bertrand holds that new structures are needed to promote opportunities for development cooperation among different institutional actors and sectors. Peter Koehn argues the importance of providing opportunities for valuable overseas experience for young professionals. Tracy Harrington and David Cordell speak of mechanisms for enhancing the growing role of the states and community colleges in development cooperation.

Discussion:
What good models of federal/higher education/business and industry cooperation exist? What new models may be called for? What types of relationships and training for development cooperation are most effective? How are financial resources a constraint and not a constraint? In what ways can new ideas, new relationships, new motivations drive greater productivity in development cooperation?

V. What key Policy Issues and Priorities should Inform a Future Action Agenda?

What are the main policy areas to consider in defining an action agenda for development cooperation? ...For shaping new opportunities for engaging an array of professionals and their institutions in development cooperation? What are the principal priorities from the day's discussions?

Discussion:
How do we reflect on the issues raised in the three Policy Roundtables? How do we develop a process for serious evaluation of the recommendations raised in the reports of the Roundtables? What is the next conversation that should take place to further cooperation between the higher education community and USAID?

4:00 Adjourn

6/10/96

PARTICIPANT LIST - HIGHER EDUCATION

HIGHER EDUCATION AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT:
Policy Roundtable #3

June 11, 1996

The Greying of Development Expertise: What's Needed and How Will the Next Generation Get Trained?

National Center for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, DC
Suite 610

Steven Arnold, Professor and Director, International Development Division, American University

William E. Bertrand, Senior Vice President, Institutional Planning and Innovation, Tulane University

David Cordell, Dean, International Education, Edmonds Community College

Louis W. Goodman, Professor and Dean, School of International Service, American University

Tracy Harrington, Director, Office of International Programs, Valdosta State University

Kay King, Executive Director, Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs

Peter H. Koehn, Director, Office of International Programs, The University of Montana

C. Peter Magrath, President, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

Edna L. McBreen, Assistant Provost, West Virginia University

Seth Spaulding, Director, Institute for International Studies in Education, University of Pittsburgh

Norman Uphoff, Director, Cornell International Institute for Food, Agriculture and Development, Cornell University

John C. Vaughn, Executive Officer, Association of American Universities

Staff Liaison:
Joan M. Claffey, Director, Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development

FINAL PARTICIPANT LIST - USAID

HIGHER EDUCATION AND GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT:
Policy Roundtable #3

June 11, 1996

The Greying of Development Expertise: What's Needed and How Will the Next Generation Get Trained?

National Center for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, NW, Washington, DC
Suite 610

John L. Anderson, Multisector Advisor, Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis, Bureau for Asia and the Near East

Alan B. Batchelder, Economist, Center for Economic Growth, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

Frances E. Carr, Senior Research Advisor, Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination

Kelly C. Kammerer, Counselor, Office of the Administrator

Hiram G. Larew III, Science/Technology Specialist, Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination

Robert S. McClusky, Education Development Specialist, Office of Higher Education and Training Support, Center for Human Capacity Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

William R. Miner, Senior Information Officer, Center for Human Capacity Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

Margaret Neuse, Deputy Director, Office of Population, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

Muneera Salem-Murdock, Principal Analyst, Office of Women in Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

George Taylor, Regional Coordinator - Asia and the Near East, Environment Center, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

Ann Van Dusen, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

Emily Vargas-Baron, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Center for Human Capacity Development, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research

Carolyn Weiskirch, Senior Policy Advisor, Office for Non-traditional Assistance and Special Issues, Humanitarian Response Team, Bureau for Policy and Programs Coordination

Dennis Wendel, Chief, Office of Human Resources, Project and Management Training Branch, Bureau for Management

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development

The Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO), established in 1992, coordinates the efforts of the nation's six major higher education associations to build their partnership with USAID and to help their member institutions plan and implement development programs with colleges and universities abroad. Uniquely situated to broaden and deepen the involvement of the American higher education community in partnerships for global development, ALO serves to mobilize the community's resources toward this end.

For more information or for additional copies of this report you may contact ALO staff through:

Association Liaison Office
Suite 700
One Dupont Circle NW
Washington DC 20036

Telephone: 202 857-1827
Fax: 202 296-5819
Internet: alo@aascu.nche.edu

U.S. Agency for International Development

Since 1961, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) has been charged with implementing programs which further American self-interest and demonstrate American humanitarian concern. Spending less than one half of one percent of the federal budget, USAID works in four interrelated areas crucial to achieving U.S. foreign policy objectives: improving health and population conditions; promoting economic growth; protecting the environment; and supporting democracy. In addition, USAID's assistance to victims of famine and other natural and man-made disasters saves thousands of lives every year.

To learn more about USAID and its programs, visit their web site at:

http://gopher.info.usaid.gov