

*Problems of Cost
and Programming
of
Foreign Visitors
on the
American Campus*

by REUBEN LORENZ

A Report Prepared for
the Committee on Foreign Participant
Training Programs of the
Commission on Education and
International Affairs

COMMISSION ON
EDUCATION AND
INTERNATIONAL
AFFAIRS



American Council
on Education
Washington, D.C.
May 1961

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN PARTICIPANT
TRAINING PROGRAMS

Raleigh H. Fosbrink, Assistant to the Dean, School of
Agriculture, Purdue University, Chairman

H. W. Hannah, Associate Dean, School of Agriculture,
University of Illinois

Ray Kettler, Vice President for Finance,
University of California

John F. Meck, Vice President and Treasurer,
Dartmouth College

I - PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF STUDY

American institutions of higher education have for some time been concerned with the broad spectrum of rapidly expanding programs of international education, as sponsored both by public and private sources. During the past decade in particular, the commitment of these institutions to the implementation of such programs has become so considerable as to necessitate re-evaluation of principles and of operating methods and practices -- of principles, to clarify the responsibilities of higher education in this area of activity; of operating methods and practices, to assure maximum efficiency and to obviate unwarranted diversion of precious educational resources.

The Foreign Participant Training Program of the International Cooperation Administration is one of many enterprises in the international training field and one which depends upon institutional collaboration in training large numbers of foreign students, scholars, technicians, and administrators. For some time this program has exhibited special operational difficulties. One of these difficulties has been notably apparent in the "programming" of foreign nationals to American campuses (assignments, planning of schedules, language training, determination of courses, and the like) by ICA-Washington and by the institutions themselves. Another major difficulty is found in the criteria as well as the practices employed in reimbursement to the institutions of costs for services rendered.

In October 1958, the annual meeting of college contact officers at the United States Department of Agriculture recommended a thoroughgoing evaluation of the Participant Training Program, emphasizing the foregoing operational problems. Subsequently, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, which had received this recommendation, transmitted it for possible action to the American Council on Education in view of the range of agencies and programs involved both in participant training and other programs for foreign visitors. The Council's Commission on Education and International Affairs initiated the requested study, specifically limiting the scope of the investigation to the problems of programming and costing. In arriving at this decision the Commission visualized the ultimate formulation of recommendations designed to strengthen the whole process of programming foreign visitors and to place costing criteria and procedures on a realistic and equitable basis.

Accordingly, a special Committee on Foreign Participant Training Programs under the chairmanship of Raleigh H. Fosbrink, assistant to the dean of the School of Agriculture at Purdue University, was appointed to plan and direct the study. At its first meeting in May 1959 the Committee decided that the relationship of higher institutions to the participant training programs would require that the total situation be viewed in its myriad facets, but that only the programming and costing aspects would be given an intensive study. The Committee believed that an attempt should be made to secure funds to support a small-gauged project set in a larger context which would require a full-time project director for a period of six months. The American Council on Education subsequently received this financial support from the Ford Foundation. Reuben Lorenz, assistant business manager of the University of Wisconsin, was engaged to undertake a six-months' intensive study beginning in January 1960.

Meanwhile, the Committee had its second meeting in July 1959 at which it spent the first day in consultation with the International Cooperation Administration officials responsible for administration of the agency's Participant Training Program. There was a general exposition of the administrative organization of ICA's training apparatus, and representatives of the training divisions in agriculture, industrial resources, public services, labor, and public administration described in some detail the methods utilized in their respective areas. On the second day of the meetings, representatives of the Department of State's International Educational Exchange Service explained the procedures employed in the various exchange of persons programs. Both ICA and State were contacted again at a later date in order to obtain further understanding of their methodology in programming foreign visitors.

To obtain preliminary counsel and data, the Committee initiated a pilot study in which twelve institutions cooperated. This pilot study included small, medium, large, and very large private institutions and small and very large public institutions. Each of these institutions was visited by the study director who conferred with the personnel directly connected with the Participant Training Program. At the completion of this pilot study a questionnaire was prepared and distributed to over one hundred higher institutions which are the most active in this program. Completed questionnaires were received from 61 percent of these institutions. Six of these institutions, with an estimated total of 1500 foreign visitors in 1958-59, were visited in order to secure more detailed information than had been requested in the questionnaire.

The conclusions and recommendations found in this report are based on the results of the questionnaire, personal interviews with the concerned personnel of the respective institutions, conferences with the officials of the federal agencies administering these programs, and on such other information as the Committee was able to accumulate during its study of the ICA Participant Training Program and other programs that bring foreign visitors to our campuses.

II - PROGRAMMING THE FOREIGN VISITOR

The degree of success of any visit to the United States by a sponsored foreign national is dependent upon the programming of his time while in this country. Program specialists in the sponsoring agency must assume a great share of the responsibility in making certain that the visitor's objectives in this country are achieved with maximum benefit to him.

A successful program must include adequate orientation, an opportunity for the visitor to observe and confer in his professional field of interest, a wisely planned schedule for the visitor involved in a formal training project, some experiences to acquaint the visitor with the many different aspects of American life in small communities as well as large cities, and a terminal evaluation session that will provide the visitor with an analytical review of his experiences and give him an opportunity to engage in a frank exchange of ideas with his hosts and with other foreign visitors.

International Cooperation Administration

From the days of the Marshall Plan on through to the present time, training in the United States has been one element of the Mutual Security Program. The effort has normally been to make a quick but definite impact on the economy, therefore, the stress has been to select persons well qualified by position and technical background for a relatively short intensive training in the United States. The ICA program emphasizes Technical Exchange rather than Cultural Exchange, although at the same time the ICA type of training promotes international understanding, both cultural and technical. In efforts to make an early impact, ICA has followed the policy of generally limiting training programs in the United States to one year or less. It is also attempting to emphasize the means of solving problems and practical application (field or laboratory use) in preference to academic efforts as such.^{1/}

Degree programs are normally allowed for ICA participants only when a degree is needed to teach or to practice a profession in their home country. ICA programs operate in the fields of agriculture, education, health and sanitation, industry and mining, public administration, transportation, community development, and labor.

Method of Placement and Programming

Each of the various divisions of ICA has its own method for programming foreign participants. In some cases the programs are planned and

^{1/} From "Comments on Some Participant Training Problems," and internal office bulletin issued by ICA and dated October 10, 1957.

implemented entirely by ICA personnel, in other cases they may be planned and/or implemented by participating federal agencies or by non-governmental contractors. In all instances, ICA retains the final responsibility for insuring the effectiveness of the program. The development of training programs for participants sponsored by ICA is outlined in more detail in Appendix A of this report.

Department of State
(International Educational Exchange Service)

The various programs under the International Educational Exchange Service emphasize cultural exchange rather than technical exchange as in the ICA programs. State (IES) sponsors three exchange programs (other than student exchanges) which send foreign visitors to college and university campuses. These exchanges involve visiting lecturers and research scholars, elementary and secondary school teachers, and leaders and specialists in a variety of fields.

Method of Placement and Programming

Lecturers and Scholars - Approximately 500 persons a year, mostly Fulbright grantees, fall in the category of lecturers and research scholars. These scholars fit naturally into the teaching and research pattern of their host institution. They have few programming difficulties, since their university assignment is arranged well in advance of their arrival in the United States and they usually remain on campus for a semester or full academic year. Initial placement of lecturers and scholars as well as the supervision of their professional activities is handled by the Committee on Exchange of Persons of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, under contract with the Department of State.

Exchange teachers - Approximately 500 teachers also come to the U. S. under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright acts, but they are placed in their American training situations by the U. S. Office of Education, under contract with the State Department. About 150 of these teachers, exchanged on a "head for head" basis, remain in the United States a full year, during which they teach in elementary or secondary schools. The other 350 visit the U. S. for about six months and are considered to be a training group in teacher development. Their situation most closely approximates that of the ICA participants. They receive their training in three phases, spending two months at a teacher-training institution, two months observing classes of particular interest in a single school system, and one month visiting school systems in different parts of the United States. Arrangements for the teacher-training and observational periods are made by the Office of Education.

Leaders and specialists - These grants are awarded by the Department of State on the basis of nominations made by the American diplomatic missions from the number of grants allocated to each country. Most grantees travel singly, although there is a growing tendency to travel as teams or in groups. The length of a leader grant is from 30 to 90 days and that of a specialist grant is from 75 to 180 days, the purpose of the longer grant being to allow for a deeper professional experience.

During 1958-59 programming for 978 "non-academic" visitors in the leaders and specialists category was handled, with one exception, by various private organizations under contract to the Department of State. The American Council on Education, the Governmental Affairs Institute, and the Office of International Labor Affairs of the U. S. Department of Labor arranged the itineraries of the leaders, while most specialists were provided for by the National Social Welfare Assembly, the American Library Association, and the American Council on Education. Virtually all leaders and specialists visit at least one university campus during their travels in the United States.

Miscellaneous Federal Agencies

In addition to the International Cooperation Administration and International Educational Exchange Service there are other federal agencies which regularly request the cooperation of institutions of higher education in handling foreign visitors. Among these federal agencies are the Departments of Labor and Agriculture, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the United States Information Agency, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Many of the visitors sponsored by these agencies have definite ideas about what they want to do while in the United States. The respective agencies help them formalize their programs and request the desired institutions to cooperate in fulfilling the plans of the visitors. The contacts are usually between the agency and the president or a department head of a higher institution, but there are no formal lines of communication. Only in rare cases is there any financial reimbursement to the schools.

Private Agencies

There are many organizations other than the federal government that sponsor and program foreign visitors to this country. The foreign embassies as a group sponsor at least 4 percent of the total number. The various private foundations such as the Asian, Carnegie, Ford, Kellogg, Nuffield, and Rockefeller Foundations sponsor and finance approximately 4 percent of the foreign nationals visiting the United States schools. Some private industrial firms with overseas branches will request the cooperation of universities to help them train their employees. Non-profit organizations such as the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Inc. and the Institute of International Education rely on educational institutions to carry out their programs.

The programming procedures are similar in most instances. For example, sponsoring organizations may request the assistance of the U. S. Department of Agriculture in programming its visitors or it may do this for itself. When the organization does it, its program specialist reviews the preliminary program with the visitor, makes the necessary contacts for him, and relies upon the institutions to do the detailed programming for the period that the visitor is on their campuses. There is normally no formal line of communication between the sponsor and the institution, although the sponsor deals informally with the president of the institution or with an individual department head. With few exceptions there is no financial reimbursement to the universities involved.

Several of our large cities have international centers which are non-profit federations united to encourage contacts between America and foreign visitors. These centers try to promote person-to-person relationships through which the foreign visitors gain an insight into American ways and ideals and our citizens gain an insight into the visitors'. These centers assist all sponsoring organizations in enlarging their own contacts and by coordinating the local resources effectively and channeling visitors to those most appropriate to their interest. The centers will prepare detailed schedules or programs for international groups or individuals including visits to educational institutions, other professional contacts, sight-seeing, and home hospitality. They are of great assistance to the program specialists of the sponsoring organizations.

Host Institutions

There are two areas of international visitor programming at the institutional level that are normally separate and distinct from each other. The schools of agriculture of land-grant institutions have a procedure for agricultural participants which has been formalized to a considerable extent over the last decade. Other foreign visitors are processed in a much less formal manner.

Agricultural participants - Practically every land-grant institution has appointed a college-contact official responsible for coordination of short-term, non-contract foreign training programs in agriculture, home economics, forestry, veterinary science, and related fields. His office is normally a unit of the office of the dean of the college of agriculture; he has authority to represent the three functions of teaching, research, and extension. Most of the international visitors whose fields of interest fall within this area are programmed in Washington by the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture. The program specialists in the Foreign Agricultural Service work directly with the college contact officers. The normal procedure is for the institution to receive a proposed program from the Foreign Agricultural Service with copies of the biographical data and project implementation order and a request that the institution accept the visitor or group of visitors. The contact officer determines which departments in the school of agriculture are affected by the proposed program; these departments are contacted and asked to comment on the proposal and to determine if they can provide a worthwhile program for the visitor. A decision is also made at this time regarding the acceptance or rejection of the visitor, and Washington is notified accordingly. Only in rare cases are visitors rejected. There is a strong tendency for the host institution to accept the proposed program as final although the Foreign Agricultural Service welcomes suggested revisions.

Detailed programming for visitors to schools of agriculture varies at the institutional level depending upon the number and composition of the group of visitors. If it is a single visitor interested in one department there is normally no formal program; the department head will determine the program after conferring with the visitor. If there is a group of visitors whose interest will cross departmental lines the

college contact officer will normally prepare a detailed hour-by-hour program for the entire stay on the campus. Such a program will be arrived at and approved only after conferences with the academic staff directly concerned. Copies of this final program would be made available to the faculty and to each of the visitors.

The person preparing the program must take into consideration such factors as (1) the true objectives of the visitors and what the institution and community has to offer that will help fulfill these objectives, (2) proper housing, (3) transportation of visitors, (4) protocol conferences for high-level visitors, (5) luncheons, (6) placing visitors in seminars, (7) current conferences or meetings which might be of interest and value, (8) arranging meetings with faculty members who have been to the home country of the visitor, (9) possible meetings with students from his home country, (10) entertainment, and (11) home hospitality. After considering all these factors the programmer must prepare a final detailed schedule and still leave it sufficiently flexible that changes can be made after conferring with the visitors upon their arrival.

Other visitors - The procedures and organizational structures for processing international visitors in fields other than agriculture are more informal. At almost every institution the task of programming this type of visitor is assumed by various officials in addition to their regular duties. Top-ranking visitors are processed by the president's office - quite often by someone responsible for public relations; most of the other visitors are routed directly to the school or department involved where they are handled by the dean, the department head, or by one of their assistants. Normally no records are maintained concerning these visits, and no formal programs are prepared. The host has usually been alerted to the fact that someone is coming, but he does not prepare a program until the visitor arrives.

Several institutions that have large numbers of foreign visitors have established centers to act as host, provide escort service, and do most of the detailed programming. The University of California at Berkeley has its Bureau of International Relations, Stanford University has the Office of Foreign Visitors, and the University of Pittsburgh has the Office of Cultural and Educational Exchange. These organizations perform a function similar to that of the agricultural contact offices; they prepare the programs for the visitors, arrange for transportation, process other details of administrative nature, contact the academic departments concerned, and in general act as host for foreign visitors. This removes a considerable load from the academic and administrative staff who previously handled the visitors. Since the staff of these bureaus are full-time specialists in international problems they also can probably do a better job than the person who gives part of his time to processing a small number of visitors each year.

Programming Problems

There have been many policy, organizational, and program problems involved in the foreign participant program ever since its inception after World War II. Many of these have been solved, some are less

critical today but not yet solved, and others are receiving attention in hope of eventual solution. The International Cooperation Administration is now in the midst of reviewing the entire program with the hope that long-range improvements will result.

This listing of problem areas is not intended to be all-inclusive, but it is hoped that by bringing these particular problems out into the open satisfactory solutions perhaps can be achieved.

Defining the Role of the Educational Institution

Educational institutions are not sure as to their proper role in federally-sponsored programs in international education. The federal government has never made such a policy statement, nor have the colleges and universities taken a firm stand on what they think their role ought to be. Personnel of the U. S. Department of Agriculture have stated informally that land-grant colleges have a duty to cooperate to the fullest extent in the participant training program even at the cost of their teaching, research, and extension service. This attitude is not easy to accept when, in many cases, the total effect of the federal activities is not to help the universities carry out what they conceive to be their primary purpose but rather to involve them in the accomplishment of government policies determined without reference to the needs and goals of higher education.

As it submits its report to the Commission on Education and International Affairs, the Committee calls attention to two developments that may help clarify federal policy toward education in the international area. One of these is ICA's own study of the foreign participant training program. The other, and perhaps more far-reaching development, is the report which will be issued by the Ford Foundation's Committee on the University and World Affairs under the chairmanship of Dr. J. L. Morrill, president-emeritus of the University of Minnesota.

Personal Problems of the Visitor

Capability - Although there is continued improvement in the capabilities of the visitors, there are still instances in which a visitor is programmed at a level above or even below his comprehension. This makes communication difficult and creates frustration for both the host and the visitor. It is recognized that not all visitors can be experts in their field; but when they are not, the program specialist must take care in determining the level of the visitor's contacts while in this country.

Language barrier - The handicaps of language continue to be a major factor limiting the effectiveness of training. Special attention should be given to the visitor's knowledge of the scientific language in his field of work. Interpreters aid the situation in some cases, but this is never as satisfactory as direct communication. The American University's Language Center in Washington provides valuable refresher training in English, but some visitors are released too soon from these courses. The present language ability rating scale is unrealistic.

Orientation to the United States - A thorough orientation of visitors is most desirable in order to equip them for taking the best advantage of training. In addition to problems of living and traveling, they should also have some understanding of our history, our economy, and our social mores. The Washington International Center is of a great assistance in this area, but more work of this sort needs to be done.

There are frequent cases of financial problems which are embarrassing to the visitor and to his host. Misunderstanding of our social mores may defeat the purpose of the entire visit. Foreign visitors return as ambassadors of good will, and their visits should not be unnecessarily marred by such misunderstandings if we are to get the full advantage of their stay in the United States

Program committees in Washington need to spend even more time going over the program of a participant or group of participants so that they understand why they are programmed to the various locations, what they may expect to get out of each visit, and what the host institution may expect from the visitor.

Repetition during program - Perhaps the most often heard complaint of the visitor is that there was too much repetition in his program. A visitor will say that he went to three universities and saw the same things in all three places. This is a difficult problem to solve unless the program specialists of the sponsoring agency and the institutions know what is being offered at each location. Development of a complete but tentative program at each institution and circularization of this program to the sponsoring agency and to the other schools well in advance of the visitor's arrival is probably the only way this repetition can be avoided. The visitor wants to learn something new at each place he visits; he soon loses interest if the program follows too closely one previously offered to him.

Institutional Problems

Lack of advance notice - It takes time to prepare properly a program for a group of visitors spending several days or weeks on a campus. ICA in Washington requires six months' lead time between receipt of the documents concerning a participant and the call-for date. Normally ICA provides adequate notice of one to two months concerning the arrival of an agricultural trainee. However, about one visitor out of ten is still scheduled on a rush basis with ten days' or less advance notice. In areas other than agriculture, one to ten days is the rule rather than the exception. The academic personnel of our institutions are much more willing to accept a visitor if they have at least two weeks' notice. At that time their own programs are still flexible and they are willing to spend more time with the visitor; when there is advance notice of one or two days or only hours, in some cases, there is a feeling of imposition and neither the campus programmer nor the faculty member is happy. An attempt should be made to allow thirty days' lead

time and a minimum of two weeks' notice. There are certain to be exceptions in the case of "crash projects," but if the Washington program specialist will explain the situation to his contact in the institution he will no doubt receive complete cooperation. Nevertheless, these exceptions should remain exceptions and not become the rule.

Objectives of visit not defined - The training objectives of the participant are normally made available to the institution in advance of his arrival. This procedure breaks down, of course, when his arrival is announced with a telephone call. Generally speaking the statements of objectives provide adequate information for the campus programmer to plan a worthwhile stay at the institution. In some cases, however, the objectives are too broad. For instance, a visitor will be sent to a large university with a statement that "he is interested in business administration." This is so broad an area that little advance planning can be done. In other instances, fortunately few in number, the stated objectives are entirely different from the interests of the individual. This creates genuine program difficulties, since the institution must decide whether to follow the stated objectives in its programming or to accede to the wishes of the visitor. In either case, this visit to the United States is going to be far less successful than originally anticipated. The statement of objectives is the only basis the institutional programmer has for advance planning, and it is essential that the objectives of the visit be clearly and accurately defined.

Lack of academic interest - Some institutions believe that as many as fifty percent of their foreign visitors have no real academic interest in visiting an educational institution. Such visitors create frustration and a feeling of wastefulness on the part of faculty members acting as hosts. The lack of interchange of ideas results in an interview or conference which accomplishes nothing. This is not the situation when the visitor is a carefully selected trainee.

Colleges and universities expect to do a certain amount of good-will entertaining, but it appears that this could be accomplished equally well by an escorted tour not involving our leading researchers, teachers, or administrators. The program specialist has to determine the proper category in which each visitor should be placed and then acquaint the institution with his findings so that the visitor can be programmed accordingly at the institutional level.

Group vs. individual programs - Institutions receiving large numbers of visitors believe that they can be of the most service in this program through group training. An official of one institution stated, "We would like to have groups of visitors at our university who are interested in fields of study in which we can give them something of value. We would like to have them here long enough so that the program here can have some substance, and we would like complete freedom in programming them for this period. Otherwise we are not interested in the short term visitors."

Grouping of foreign visitors, rather than successive individual visits is encouraged by programmers for ICA and the Department of Agriculture. In 1958-59 there were 75 such groups. Group visits could be increased and could be applied to areas other than agriculture if program specialists were aware that special seminars and institutes are available or would be provided by the colleges and universities. In many cases small groups could be worked into regularly scheduled institutes with a minimum of effort for all parties. However, if this is to be accomplished the program specialists must be aware of what special institutes are available; this responsibility rests with the institutions themselves. For this reason the Committee has recommended the establishment of a central clearing house which would collect information about special institutes, seminars, and symposiums which are scheduled or which could be provided by institutions provided there were sufficient notice and enrollment. This information would be consolidated and disseminated to the various sponsoring agencies.

Length of stay - Colleges and universities like to have the visitors on their campuses long enough so that they derive something of substance from their contacts. Some institutional officials believe that the participant trainee should spend periods of several weeks on each campus visited. The short-term visitor presents a different problem, since he normally has his own program well prepared before he arrives in this country and there is usually the job of eliminating a number of his requested tours so as to stay within the time limitation.

The visitor should be allowed to spend enough time in at least one location so that he can get the feel of the American way of life. If he is rushed from place to place for his entire stay he is apt to leave with his preconceived ideas of American life accentuated; these ideas often visualize us as a wealthy, irreligious, materialistic, fast-living nation. This impression must be avoided if bringing foreign visitors to the United States is to succeed in developing "part-time ambassadors" sympathetic to our way of life.

With respect to the long-term participant, there should be a definite understanding among all parties as to the exact length of his stay in this country. This should have been determined by the time he arrives so that the institution can schedule his courses accordingly.

Need for adequate transcripts - All international visitors who will be doing any course work at an institution of higher education should forward transcripts or other credentials describing their previous educational experience.^{2/} If they are to enroll in degree-granting courses these transcripts should be made available to the institutions several months in advance of the beginning of the semester. Even if they are to audit certain courses these transcripts should be made available to the institutions in advance of the registration period so that visitors can be placed in the proper courses. The sponsoring agency should expect no exceptions to be allowed by the universities regardless of the length of time elapsed since the visitor was previously enrolled in any academic institution.

^{2/} Two agencies actively concerned with the evaluation of foreign academic credentials are the Division of International Education of the U. S. Office of Education and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO).

Uneven distribution of visitors - Some institutions are expected to handle too many visitors, and other institutions would prefer to have more. Certain departments in specific institutions are overloaded, while other departments have no international visitors. These are real problems, and there is no easy solution. In many cases the objectives of the visitor can be accomplished only at certain institutions. For instance, the number of universities doing work in the raising of citrus fruits is very small. The visitor interested in this area must go to one of these few institutions and to the specific department within the school of agriculture. Many visitors have definite ideas about the schools they would like to visit, influenced by previous acquaintances, geographic location, school reputation, departmental offerings, etc.

There are small institutions which at present receive no foreign visitors and probably have no foreign students yet which would enjoy and would benefit by having some international visitors spend time on their campuses. It is only when the number of visitors is large and the frequency of visitors is almost continual that problems are created. At this point faculty members regard these visits as an imposition upon their primary duty of teaching and research. The time spent by a faculty member acting as host to a foreign visitor is seldom of value in achieving promotion within his field. On the contrary, it may rob him of the time he would be spending on research or writing. For this reason some of the junior members of the faculty are occasionally reluctant to spend day after day acting as host to groups of foreign visitors.

Federal agencies sponsoring visitors are striving to spread the load whenever possible, but program specialists must continue to explore new possible areas for handling their visitors. A local or regional organization of colleges and universities interested in international education and intercultural relationships can be of value to the program specialists in providing better geographic distribution of visitors. One such organization of about 25 institutions of higher education has been formed in the Pittsburgh area with its headquarters presently located in the Office of Cultural and Educational Exchange of the University of Pittsburgh.

Need for program evaluation - A complete program must include an evaluation of its effectiveness in accomplishing its objectives. Such an evaluation should be conducted in an informal atmosphere in which the visitor feels free to participate in a frank exchange of ideas. He should be encouraged to express his opinions about and reactions to the United States; this may reveal certain misconceptions that could be altered before the visitor returns to his home country. A seminar-type meeting sponsored by a college or university is probably the most revealing and most beneficial method of terminal evaluation.

Organizing Institutional Services to Foreign Visitors

The Committee on Foreign Participant Training Programs is of the opinion that as college and university administrators become more aware of the magnitude of foreign visitor programs, they will give serious

consideration to the need for a central office to receive and program visitors to the campus. Such an office should be high in the organizational structure of the institution, preferably under direct control of the president. This will lend authority and prestige to the office for foreign visitors in its dealings both with the staff of the institution as well as with the visitors. In some land-grant institutions an office for foreign visitors will exist in addition to the present agricultural contact office. It is the Committee's opinion there should be a close working relationship between the two offices and the agriculture office should keep the general office informed about visitors to the schools of agriculture.

The primary aim of this center would be to see that visits to the United States - not only the visits to the campus - are profitable. There are certain kinds of contacts where direct relationship may be the most efficient. Where this takes place, the center office should be informed.

For operational purposes this unit should (1) be provided with adequate staff and finances, (2) have financial arrangements which allow payments for transportation and purchase of meals for the visitors, (3) maintain a file of the faculty who have been abroad, (4) maintain a file of foreign academic people presently serving on the faculty, (5) maintain a working relationship with the foreign student advisor, (6) orient the academic community regarding the role of the university and its faculty in acting as host to foreign visitors, and (7) establish a faculty contact in each department or school depending on the wishes of the particular area (the dean may want an assistant or associate dean to handle the load in his school or he may want the visitor sent directly to the department involved). Once such a center is established on the campus it would be equipped to do on-campus and possibly off-campus programming of the foreign visitors. When the demand for these services is consistently high the institution should be given an opportunity to negotiate contracts with sponsoring agencies providing for guaranteed payment for its services.

III - COSTS OF FOREIGN PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAMS

Background

When the Technical Assistance or Technical Cooperation Program under the Economic Cooperation Administration was initiated in 1949, the land-grant colleges and universities were brought into the picture and cooperated most effectively. During the first two years of the program these institutions provided their assistance without cost to the federal government. In 1951, it was agreed by representatives of the land-grant colleges and universities and the two agencies then administering the foreign aid program - the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Technical Cooperation Administration - that out-of-pocket costs to the institutions should be met by ECA and TCA.

At a February 1951 meeting of the land-grant college contacts for the Technical Assistance Program the representatives were requested to work out some kind of arrangement for compensation for the out-of-pocket costs incurred in handling this program. It was stated that their estimated costs were from as low as \$9.00 per trainee-day to as high as \$25.00 per trainee-day. The representatives agreed that they should not expect ECA and TCA to pay them for the time of their institutions' scientists and specialists but that on a trial basis they should request a figure which would cover only actual out-of-pocket costs exclusive of the salaries of regular staff of the institution. Accordingly, these representatives asked that their institutions be compensated at the rate of \$2.50 per regular trainee. This amount was agreed to by the federal agencies and payments were begun effective July 1, 1951.

In 1952, the Committee on Financial Arrangements with Land Grant Colleges stressed the fact that any financial plan should be "simple to administer and uniform in rates of payment by all participating agencies." This committee recommended that uniform assistance be obtained from all agencies, both national and international, which refer agriculturalists and home economists to land-grant colleges.

In the November 12, 1952 report of the Joint U.S.D.A. Land-Grant College Committee on Agricultural Services to Foreign Areas, that committee suggested to the executive committee and the senate of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities the approval of this recommendation: "Since land-grant colleges are unable to use institutional funds appropriated by the states for defraying cost of out-of-country programs or on-campus costs involved in training the foreign nationals, financial grants will need to be large enough to cover all out-of-pocket and administrative expenditures by the colleges."

The Joint U.S.D.A. Land-Grant College Committee on Agricultural Services to Foreign Areas meeting in November 1953 made this recommendation: "The colleges point out that various institutions and agencies are carrying a substantial part of the cost of the trainee program through providing for consultation with staff members without reimbursement for such services

The 1954 meeting of college contact officers passed the following resolution:

"To: Foreign Operations Administrator.

Because of the increased cost that is occurring as the colleges are providing better and better training programs, and as we shall be dealing with individuals and groups that will require more time and attention than many of those in the past, the college contact officials therefore request Foreign Operations Administration to give careful consideration to this situation and if it can be done, to increase the per diem per visitor from two dollars and fifty cents (\$2.50), the present rate, to three dollars and fifty cents (\$3.50)."

This resolution was accepted by FOA and implemented in the next renewal of the agreements with the land-grant colleges and universities.

At a later date the per diem was raised to \$5.00 per visitor day. The present agreements also provide for reimbursement to cover costs of group leaders, special transportation, and books and training aids required for successfully servicing groups of trainees.

In summary, there has been a trend by land-grant colleges and universities to request greater reimbursement for their costs in this program. At the beginning they were willing to assume all costs; later, they requested reimbursement for estimated out-of-pocket costs; and in the last few years there have been strong feelings expressed that the federal government should pay all the costs. This study has attempted to determine the amount of these costs.

Types of Costs

In attempting to determine the overall cost to the institutions of the foreign visitor program it has been necessary to identify the costs that could be attributed directly and indirectly to this program. The most significant cost, of course, is the time which highly qualified staff must spend away from their research, teaching, and administrative duties. In addition to the direct consulting time, academic personnel must also prepare programs in advance of the arrival; in many cases, they are expected to attend luncheons and receptions and to perform escort services for the visitor while he is on the campus.

In our agricultural institutions there is normally an official contact officer responsible for preparation of the overall program; in other areas of the institution this duty is assumed by staff members acting in various capacities; in all cases it is necessary that someone perform this function if the visitor's stay is to be successful. Normally it is easier to measure the required time of the programmer than that of the other academic personnel. Some of the factors which must be considered in arriving at the proper allocation of time are advance correspondence and telephone calls, conferences to arrange programs before arrival, meeting the visitor at an airport or railroad depot, a period for proper orientation, escort service, evening and week-end entertaining, solving problems of the visitors, evaluation, and follow-up procedures.

The secretary in the program office is normally required to prepare multiple copies of the planned program, handle correspondence, maintain records required for billing and other purposes, and to process the mail of visitors.

Other direct costs which can be identified but which are not segregated for accounting purposes include telephone and telegraph charges (long distance calls are a common occurrence), postage, transportation costs (special transportation may be reimbursed but this leaves a considerable amount which must be absorbed by the college), meals for visitors (even though the visitor is usually on a per diem

basis it is customary for the host to buy the luncheon and often the dinner for the visitor), faculty per diem incurred while escorting the visitor on a field trip, and office supplies.

Indirect costs include use of conference rooms, use of library facilities, office and research space for long-term visitors, and administrative time in processing business papers.

Determining the Cost of Receiving a Foreign Visitor

The Committee on Foreign Participant Training Programs believes that it is possible to measure the cost to an institution of receiving a foreign visitor without resort to complex procedures. By keeping the method of cost determination simple, it should also be possible to develop a method of cost reimbursement that will be relatively easy to administer.

For purposes of simplicity it would be preferable, in the Committee's judgment, to establish one or two rates of reimbursement per visitor-day with a maximum rate for a group of a certain size and a maximum rate per visitor.

On a basis similar to the one proposed above, the Committee has, in this study, attempted to set forth actual cost figures in schedules 1-3 on pages 18 to 20. These schedules are based on estimates submitted by 70 institutions which acted as hosts to 11,303 recorded foreign visitors in 1958-59. It should be noted that a substantial number of foreign visitors came to campuses on an informal basis and that no record was made of these visits.

The estimated total costs per visitor man-day have been computed in schedules 1-3. Appendix B contains detailed information submitted by the 77 institutions participating in this study which bears upon the estimates of staff time and other direct and indirect costs incurred by institutions that act as hosts to foreign visitors. The following paragraph may also help explain some of the conclusions presented in schedules 1-3.

Different levels of cost - Costs per visitor-day will vary depending upon the size of the group and the length of stay. The most expensive type of visitor is the person who travels alone and spends less than a week on the campus. As shown in schedule 2 and appendix table B-8, the average cost for this type of visitor is \$58.88 per day. The least expensive type of visitor is the person who is one of a group of over five people and stays longer than a week. As shown in appendix table B-8, the average cost for such a visitor is \$8.27 per day. This is a large variance but since it seemed desirable to arrive at one per diem figure the various categories of visitors were weighted in arriving at a composite average; alternate rates were also computed. The weighting factors were based on the estimated number of visitors by category and the man-days spent by visitors to institutions during the month of April 1960. In order to avoid exceptional cases of high costs the Committee believes that it would be both practical and reasonable to put a ceiling on the total amount of per diem which can be claimed for any one group of visitors per day or for any one visitor for the length of his stay.

Converting hours to dollars - In order to arrive at any cost figure it is necessary to put a dollar value on the time spent by the members of the host institution's staff directly involved in making the visitor program successful. The Committee has used an academic year salary of \$9,130 as a base for the academic personnel and for the staff member performing the programming functions. According to the U. S. Office of Education, this is the mean salary for professors in undergraduate colleges of 4-year institutions for 9-10 months service for the academic year 1959-60.^{3/} It is recognized that this is a conservative figure when we consider that in some cases the president of the institution acts as host; in other cases, however, the function may be performed by an instructor with a salary of less than \$9,130.

An annual salary of \$3,600 has been used for the secretary; it was believed that this amount represents a reasonable national average. Vacations and paid holidays were considered in determining the proper hourly rate. Additional fringe benefits such as sick leave, retirement and social security contributions, insurance coverage, and sabbatical leave provisions were not considered as direct costs but were included in the indirect cost allocation of 20 percent of direct costs.

^{3/} Circular 614, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SCHEDULE 1

Estimated costs per visitor man-day
for all visitors - weighted on basis of man-days
(as reported for April 1960)

Academic staff

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	1.58	
Multiply by hourly rate		
(\$9,130 academic year salary, 40 hour week)	<u>\$6.917</u>	
Cost of academic staff time		\$10.93

Program specialist

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	.63	
Multiply by hourly rate		
(same as academic staff)	<u>\$6.917</u>	
Cost of program specialist		\$ 4.36

Secretary

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	.25	
Multiply by hourly rate		
(\$3,600 annual salary, 40 hour week, vacation and paid holidays 4 weeks)	<u>\$1,875</u>	
Cost of secretary		\$.47

Estimated direct costs for postage, telephone, transportation,
and meals

\$.75

Sub total		<u>\$16.51</u>
-----------	--	----------------

Indirect costs

(20% of direct costs - required to cover space utilization, additional fringe benefits to staff, administrative and other expenses)		<u>\$ 3.30</u>
---	--	----------------

Estimated total costs per visitor man-day		<u>\$19.81</u>
---	--	----------------

SCHEDULE 2

Estimated costs per visitor man-day
for a single visitor for period of one to seven days
(as reported for April 1960)

Academic staff

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	4.92	
Multiply by hourly rate	<u>\$6.917</u>	
Cost of academic staff time		\$34.03

Program specialist

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	1.54	
Multiply by hourly rate	<u>\$6.917</u>	
Cost of program specialist		\$10.65

Secretary

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	.54	
Multiply by hourly rate	<u>\$1.875</u>	
Cost of secretary		\$ 1.01

Estimated additional direct costs \$ 3.38

Sub total \$49.07

Indirect costs (20% of direct costs) \$ 9.81

Estimated total costs per visitor man-day \$58.88

SCHEDULE 3

Estimated costs per visitor man-day
for all visitors except single visitors
(as reported for April 1960)

Academic staff

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	1.02	
Multiply by hourly rate	<u>\$6.917</u>	
Cost of academic staff		\$7.06

Program specialist

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	.38	
Multiply by hourly rate	<u>\$6.917</u>	
Cost of program specialist		\$2.63

Secretary

Estimated hours required per visitor man-day	.23	
Multiply by hourly rate	<u>\$1.875</u>	
Cost of secretary		\$.43

Estimated additional direct costs		<u>\$.61</u>
-----------------------------------	--	---------------

Sub total		\$10.73
-----------	--	---------

<u>Indirect costs (20% of direct costs)</u>		<u>\$ 2.15</u>
---	--	----------------

Estimated total costs per visitor man-day		<u>\$12.88</u>
---	--	----------------

IV - FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The ICA Participant Training Program began as a "crash project" in 1949, at which time colleges and universities in a spirit of public responsibility accepted commitments which appeared to be short-term in nature. However, participant training and foreign visitor programs must now be recognized as long-range enterprises of increasing proportions. They impose both upon the federal government and upon institutions of higher education responsibilities for intelligent programming and equitable financing. Yet these responsibilities for programming and costs have never been sufficiently recognized or defined. Rather, the history has been one of partial and sporadic involvement of government and institutions with the government operating under administrative regulations on the one hand, and the institutions trying to solve their problems on a day-to-day basis instead of developing a long-term and well-planned program.

Findings of the Study

A. Programming

1. Foreign visitors are sent to campuses of colleges and universities in the United States by a variety of private organizations and by several agencies of the federal government including the International Cooperation Administration, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, and, to a lesser extent by the Departments of Labor, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare.

2. There are many variations in the procedures and policies for programming and scheduling foreign visitors to institutions of higher education. In many instances, a foreign national may have his entire visit scheduled by an agency which does not provide any part of his training or educational experience.

3. Educational institutions have much to offer in the form of educational experience and technical knowledge that is not available elsewhere. For this reason, educational institutions are willing to accept their fair share of the responsibility for training foreign visitors and to take an active part in programs for these visitors. However, the results of this study clearly indicate a need for more effective coordination in the programming and planning on individual campuses as well as at the national level to insure satisfactory contact on the part of foreign nationals with American institutions of higher education.

4. In addition to contact offices for visitors to the school of agriculture, a few institutions have established a central office for receiving and programming foreign nationals. Other institutions are still struggling with the problem of determining the proper place for this function within their organizational structure. At institutions where central offices for receiving foreign visitors have

been established, the offices are staffed with highly capable individuals sincerely interested in international education. Such central offices have been able to cope effectively with many of the normal problems that arise from having visitors on the campus. Also, they have alleviated much of the pressure placed upon busy administrators, researchers, and teachers.

B. Financing

1. American institutions of higher education, whether under public or private control, exist to serve the public welfare. However, during the conduct of this study the opinion was strongly expressed that it is neither reasonable nor just for government and private agencies to make increasing demands upon educational institutions for services that are costly in time and money without adequate reimbursement. Therefore, this study concentrated on the determination of costs involved and reimbursements made to educational institutions.

2. For participants in the fields of agriculture, home economics, veterinary science, and related subject matter, ICA reimburses educational institutions at the rate of \$5.00 per man-day; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reimburses the institutions at the rate of \$2.50 per man-day; in some cases, other organizations such as the European Productivity Agency and the foundations have also made reimbursement at the same rate as that paid by ICA. Various contractual arrangements have been negotiated for specific training services rendered by educational institutions. The fact remains that for significant numbers of foreign nationals who visit university campuses, there is no reimbursement to the institution for direct and indirect costs.

3. The most significant cost of the Participant Training Program to the educational institutions is the time which highly qualified academic personnel must spend away from their normal research, teaching, and administrative duties. Yet, at the same time, this cost is the most difficult to measure in terms of dollars.

4. Data collected in this study clearly indicate that the costs per visitor-day are considerably in excess of the present reimbursement rates of \$5.00 and \$2.50 per man-day. The data show the following costs for the month of April 1960:

Single visitor	1 to 7 days	\$58.88 per day
Single visitor	over 7 days	23.33 per day
Groups of 2 to 5	1 to 7 days	28.18 per man-day
Groups of 2 to 5	over 7 days	15.26 per man-day
Groups over 5	1 to 7 days	16.36 per man-day
Groups over 5	over 7 days	8.27 per man-day

Conclusions

Many factors affect the degree of success of a visit by a foreign national to the United States. Hence it is essential for each agency and each person involved in such a visit to strive for improvement in every phase of the program. The conclusions set forth below suggest some improvements in the working relationship between the sponsoring agencies for foreign participant and visitors programs, particularly the government, and the host institutions.

1. While the Committee recognizes that planning and administration of specific programs for foreign visitors is the responsibility of individual agencies, the Committee believes that there would be considerable advantage to colleges and universities as well as to the federal government if further steps could be taken to coordinate federally-sponsored foreign visitors programs with respect to policies and conditions of operation.

2. It would be desirable to have a clearing house of information on institutional programs of interest to foreign visitors. Such a clearing house would (a) compile current information on short courses, institutes, seminars, and symposiums that are offered or can be offered by institutions to foreign visitors and participant trainees, and (b) make available the above information to government and private agencies which are planning programs for foreign visitors. An agency such as the one recommended here could also provide information on school systems with special programs in elementary and secondary education that might be of interest to the foreign visitors.

3. Institutions of higher education should evaluate the services they now offer or are prepared to offer foreign visitors in terms of whether the individual institution can provide a meaningful and highly successful on-campus experience without disrupting its regular operations. Institutions which receive a substantial number of foreign visitors should consider the advisability of providing staff and facilities for coordinating all international educational programs.

4. Institutions which receive foreign visitors should be reimbursed by the agency sponsoring such visitors. This reimbursement should be fixed in an amount that covers the cost of academic staff time as well as the salaries and office expense of the staff needed to develop and carry out the on-campus program for the visitor. Such reimbursement should be based on the costs per visitor with due allowance for the difference in the cost of programming a single visitor and the cost of programming a group of visitors. In this connection, the cost data developed in this study, specifically those reflected in the table on p. 22 preceding, are regarded as an equitable basis for determining the proper rates for reimbursement to universities cooperating in participant training programs.

Summary

The cost to an educational institution which is host to a large number of short-term foreign visitors, foreign instructors and scholars, and enrolled foreign students is considerable. Such visitors require classroom space, office space, and the use of research facilities, all of which are in short supply. In addition, a considerable amount of time must be spent in counseling visitors with regard to their specific problems.

Private donors and state legislatures which are being asked for ever-increasing contributions to higher education may become reluctant to provide for the extra financial burden of special international educational programs in our colleges and universities. Since these programs are an important part of our national policy it would seem more appropriate to have a system of federal grants or contracts established with the cooperating institutions.

In the relatively short time that the ICA Foreign Participant Program has been in operation there has been a change of thinking from entire cost absorption by the colleges and universities to the belief that the total cost should be borne by the federal government. This belief is especially apparent among the institutions participating heavily in the program. At institutions where the number of foreign visitors is very low there is still a greater willingness for the institution to absorb the cost of receiving foreign visitors.

The Committee on Foreign Participant Training Programs has considered the possibility of federal legislation authorizing grants to educational institutions cooperating in government-sponsored foreign visitor programs. It is the Committee's opinion, in light of the information presently available, that it would be more desirable and equitable to reimburse educational institutions on an individual basis rather than to attempt to derive a satisfactory formula for grants generally applicable to all participating institutions. The data presented in this study should be sufficient to provide a basis for negotiating contracts between host institutions and the federal agencies that sponsor foreign visitors. Hopefully, a uniform rate of reimbursement could be established for federal sponsors as well as for non-federal agencies that sponsor foreign visitors to campuses. Such a uniform rate should reflect the cost factors set forth in this study.

In the case of institutions which receive a small number of foreign visitors, the sponsoring agency, whether federal or non-federal, might develop a simple procedure for reimbursing the institution on the basis of vouchers submitted by the institution and predetermined rates for services to individual visitors and groups of visitors. Again, these rates should reflect the cost factors set forth in this study.

The Committee is confident that when the facts of the matter have been made clear, federal sponsors of foreign visitors will be willing to negotiate with educational institutions for an equitable reimbursement of the cost of handling foreign visitors to these institutions. The Committee respectfully requests the Commission on Education and International Affairs and the staff of the American Council on Education to take such steps as are necessary to bring these findings to the attention of those agencies which operate foreign participant and visitor programs.

APPENDIX A

**Development of Training Programs for Foreign Participants
by International Cooperation Administration**

DEVELOPMENT OF TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR FOREIGN PARTICIPANTS SPONSORED BY
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION*

I. Agricultural Training Division of Office of Food and Agriculture (ICA)

In fiscal year 1958-59 there were 1,453 arrivals in the United States of ICA participants in agriculture. Most programs called for visits to about four colleges or universities. In addition, the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture programmed about 1,000 participants sponsored by other federal and non-federal agencies.

A. Functional Fields

1. Research, agricultural education, and extension
2. Land and water resources
3. Crop and livestock development
4. Agricultural economics, farm organization, and agricultural credit
5. Agricultural marketing and processing
6. Home economics and rural youth
7. Forestry
8. Fisheries
9. All other agriculture and natural resources

B. General Methods of Operation

1. Agricultural Training Division does not carry out participant training, as such, and only in very few instances are programs implemented directly from Agricultural Training Division.
2. The following participating agencies carry out the major portion of training requested through the Office of Food and Agriculture and Agricultural Training Division:

U. S. Department of Agriculture

Agricultural Marketing Service
Agricultural Research Service
Farmer Cooperative Service
Farmers Home Administration
Federal Extension Service
Foreign Agricultural Service
Forest Service
Office of Information
Rural Electrification Administration
Soil Conservation Service
Farm Credit Administration

U. S. Department of Interior

Fish and Wildlife Service
Geological Survey
Bureau of Reclamation
Bureau of Land Management

Schools of agriculture, agricultural organizations, and other institutions

* Adapted from information furnished by the International Cooperation Administration.

C. Development of Training Programs

1. Processing within Office of Food and Agriculture (ICA)

- a. Training requests received in Agricultural Training Division and referred to respective Agricultural Training Division Area Branches for review, comments, and acceptance or rejection.
- b. To Agricultural Programs Division of Office of Food for review and comment, checking to see if training requests are in line with program objectives as set forth in the Project Proposal and Approval
- c. To the technical advisor for that subject matter field in Agricultural Specialists Division of Office of Food for acceptance or rejection based on the subject matter nature of the training being requested and for comments regarding same
- d. To Chief of Agricultural Training Division for final approval and comments, then back to
- e. Agricultural Training Division Area Branch. If requests are approved they are transmitted, with suggested notes and comments gathered from above reviews to Foreign Agricultural Service.

2. Processing within Foreign Agricultural Service (USDA)

- a. Requests are assigned to a program specialist who, after review of Project Implementation Order - Participant objectives and comments, designates a "program committee," bringing in representatives from the other services of U. S. Department of Agriculture whose subject fields are encompassed by training requests and the ICA representative (technical advisor). This committee is responsible for the overall development of the program with the program specialist taking the lead in working out the detailed objectives and itinerary and making arrangements with the training institution(s) for doing their designated part. This is put in proposed form and
- b. Circulated to U. S. Operations Missions, for Mission, host country, and participant review and approval. This is supposed to be accomplished before the participant leaves his home country

Circulate to ICA-Washington for review and comment

Circulate to training institutions for their review, comments and acceptance

- c. After participant arrives at Foreign Agricultural Service the preliminary proposal is reviewed and discussed with the participant(s) before making a firm program which incorporates changes agreeable to the committee and in accord with the program objectives

3. Processing within Department of Interior (under 5 percent of Agricultural Training Division participants)

Procedures have been less formal than outlined above for U. S. Department of Agriculture, and vary somewhat among the four bureaus involved. However, an attempt is made to maintain the "committee approach," with wide review at each step, and to keep the Mission informed as fully as possible of advance plans.

4. Training Course Prospectuses

During recent years there have been increasing interest and participation in group courses in those subject areas where there are enough individual participant programs with similar training objectives. Office of Food (ICA) and Foreign Agricultural Service (USDA) have collaborated in developing course prospectuses which are circulated to the overseas Missions in an effort to encourage coordinated arrival times of people seeking training of similar nature. This also groups people in such a way that training institutions may make better use of teaching staff and facilities. In fiscal year 1958, 25 "prospectus groups" (multi-country) with 426 participants underwent training. During the same time 25 "country teams" from 11 different countries with 219 participants were on study programs. There were also 14 different, one-week communications seminars conducted at colleges involving 201 different participants. These figures show some results from efforts to provide group training.

II. Training and Technical Aids Division of Office of Industrial Resources (ICA)

There are approximately 2,000 participants processed by this division each year; about one-fourth of these, organized in groups of roughly ten each, will visit educational institutions. This means about fifty contacts each year with educational institutions. There is no set line of communication with the various institutions; the division may contact the public relations director, an individual professor, or the international department.

A. Functional Fields

1. Manufacturing, maintenance, and repair
2. Mining and quarrying
3. Transport, storage, and communication services
4. Commerce, banking, and insurance
5. Engineering and construction
6. Electricity, gas, and water
7. Business and professional services
8. Peaceful use of atomic energy

B. General Methods of Operations

1. Team projects are planned and implemented by Industrial Training Division (ICA)
2. Projects other than teams are planned and implemented by Industrial Training Division

3.. Programs are planned and/or implemented by participating U. S. government agencies

- a. Department of Commerce
- b. Department of Interior
- c. Department of Labor
- d. Federal Aviation Agency
- e. Federal Communications Commission
- f. U. S. Army, Corps of Engineers
- g. U. S. Coast Guard
- h. Atomic Energy Commission

4. Programs are planned and/or implemented by non-governmental contractors

C.. Development of Training Programs

1. When team projects are planned or implemented by Industrial Training Division

For groups spending ordinarily five or six weeks in the United States observing a specific area of industry, the project manager determines, with the assistance of information provided by the ICA Mission abroad, the training needs of the prospective participants and makes the necessary contacts with government agencies and appropriate plants or other industrial organizations. He arranges for the group to spend an agreed-upon period of time in stipulated training or observation within the organizations. For the period of stay within the United States the project manager has complete responsibility for the implementation of the program, technically and administratively. Usually he escorts the team throughout the entire observation and study program, making changes in the technical program or travel arrangements as required to meet satisfactorily the specified needs of the program.

Details of an administrative nature (payments to participants, travel arrangements, obtaining reimbursement for books purchased by the participants, etc.) are handled by the project manager. He is also responsible for: (1) providing adequate orientation of the participants upon their arrival; (2) aiding them in the event of program difficulties; (3) adjusting the program as needed to fulfill adequately the training request; and (4) in the event of illness or other personal difficulty, assisting the group in resolving the difficulties which might impair effectiveness or otherwise interfere with implementation of the training program.

2. When projects other than teams are planned and implemented by Industrial Training Division

Participants arriving individually in the United States for training for periods ranging from several weeks to a year or longer are handled similarly by Industrial Training Division project managers, but these trainees are, with rare exceptions, unescorted during the travel phases of their technical programs.

3. When projects are planned and/or implemented by participating government agencies

Participants arriving for long-term training and, occasionally, teams of participants are also programmed by other agencies of the U. S. government. Annual agreements between ICA and the respective agencies provide for the planning and/or implementation of training programs by the various agencies, depending on the technical field. In most cases the cooperating agency plans and implements the entire program, including administrative aspects, although close liaison is maintained with an ICA project manager who has overall responsibility for approval of the participant's program. Administrative details are covered by transfer of funds from ICA to the agency concerned, a specified amount being transferred for each specific training project.

Programs are sometimes implemented by cooperating government agencies, although part of the planning may be done by the ICA project manager. For such cases details are worked out between the project manager and the other agency, and funds are transferred appropriately for administrative expenses as well as for technical program costs.

4. When projects are planned and/or implemented by nongovernmental contractors

Industrial Training Division has contracts with a member of private organizations, largely management engineering firms, which plan and/or implement training programs on request. One such contract is financed on an annual basis. In addition, one-time project contracts are made with others. Generally, a contracting firm plans and implements the training program, maintaining liaison with the Industrial Training Division project manager who has final approval authority but on occasion the planning may be done jointly by Industrial Training Division and the contracting organization. For team projects which are contracted, the firm usually provides escort services and handles all administrative details.

III. Labor Training Division of Office of Labor Affairs (ICA)

A. **Functional Fields**

1. Trade union training

- a. Trade union administration and operations
- b. Labor-management relations, collective bargaining, grievance procedure
- c. Labor education techniques
- d. Trade union research and productivity
- e. Trade union cooperative
- f. Workers' housing

2. Labor ministry training
 - a. Employment services and manpower utilization
 - b. Apprenticeship and skills training
 - c. Industrial safety and health
 - d. Labor law administration
 - e. Labor standards
 - f. Labor statistics
 - g. Social security

B. General Methods of Operation

1. Implementation of training by participating agencies
 - a. Department of Labor
 - b. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
 - c. Housing and Home Finance Agency
2. Direct implementation by Labor Training Division
3. Implementation by contractors

C. Development of Training Programs

The Office of Labor Affairs has developed two sets of standards to be followed in developing labor training programs. The first, which is based on functional fields of activity, consists of promotional material sent to U. S. Operations Missions, describing the various sub-fields of activity in which labor training is available under ICA auspices. This information is used to acquaint the Missions in selecting the type of training best suited to the needs of the country.

The second set of standards is based on methods of implementation of training, and consists of six categories into which all forthcoming labor training projects will be fitted. These categories are as follows:

1. Observational study teams (10 weeks' or less duration)
2. Observational study plus three weeks' institutional training (teams of 10 weeks' or more duration)
3. Special institutional training combined with observational study (teams of several months' duration which require individually planned institutional progress)
4. National Institute of Labor Education university training programs
5. Programs for individual participants
6. Miscellaneous (mixed government-labor-industry teams, non-trade union teams, self-financed groups, etc.)

All of the foregoing except the #4 program (and, in one instance, the #3 program) are implemented entirely by participating agencies. Methods of developing programs for implementation by participating agencies and by other means are described below.

Programs Implemented Entirely by Participating Agencies

The development of the actual training program begins upon receipt of the Project Implementation Order-Participant and biographical data by ICA-Washington. The Project Implementation Order-Participant is reviewed by the project manager and the area labor advisor. This review determines appropriateness of training vis-à-vis the overall country situation, conformance with the approved country labor program, feasibility of implementation, selection of participating agency, and other related factors.

Upon completion of this review, the Project Implementation Order-Participant and biographical data are transmitted to one of the participating agencies, with a request for a proposed program and cost estimate. In the case of the Department of Labor, all Project Implementation Order-Participants and biographical data are sent to the Technical Cooperation Division, Office of International Labor Programs Division, or to one of the bureaus of the Department for action. In the case of other participating agencies, the documents are sent directly to the implementing office.

The participating agency then develops a tentative program, based on the training requested in the Project Implementation Order-Participant, the background and position of the participants, and the category (#1 through #6, afore-mentioned) into which the project falls. The participating agency contacts trade unions, industries, universities, state and local government offices, and other institutions and organizations throughout the country, arranging the appropriate program and itinerary for the participants. With few exceptions, all labor training programs are arranged to begin with special orientation at St. John's College, Annapolis, Maryland. This lasts from three days to two weeks, depending on the needs of the participants, and includes special orientation on the American labor movement as well as general orientation towards United States history, governmental, economic and cultural matters.

The #1 program consists of orientation for several days, followed by a series of visits to trade unions and other organizations, where the participants observe operations of offices and other installations, and meet with their American counterparts in the labor movement and with other American representatives of labor, government, and industry. The #2 program is similar to the #1 program with the addition of three weeks' institutional training. The #3 program contains institutional training developed by the participating agency and Labor Training Division on an ad hoc basis. Teams from France, Italy, Japan, and Ghana have participated in this program. The programs for individual participants (#5) often involve internship in trade union offices, government agencies, or industrial plants, combined with observational study and university training. Individual participants study a wider variety of subjects than do teams, and the programs for individuals are developed on an ad hoc basis.

The participating agency submits a tentative program and cost estimate which is reviewed by the project manager and area labor advisor. If approved, the U. S. Operations Mission is sent an outline of the program, and the prospective participants are notified of its contents. The participating agency often makes recommendations for changes in the duration of the training, or suggests a program that requires more funds than were provided for by the Mission. In such cases, ICA-Washington decides whether such changes should be made before notifying the overseas Mission.

Upon concurrence of ICA-Washington, the Mission, and the participating agency in the proposed program, necessary arrangements are made for team manager, interpreters, and others involved, and the participants are called forward. The program is discussed fully with the participants upon their arrival in the United States, and their suggestions for modification of the program are solicited. If participants are interested in changing any phase of their program, ICA and the participating agency develop a revised program. For participants undertaking training of three months or more, a "mid-term" planning session is often held, with representatives of ICA and participating agencies meeting with the participants to develop the latter phase of the program, based on results of the earlier phase.

Programs Implemented Partially by the Labor Training Division

The #3 program mentioned above sometimes contains specialized training given by the staff of the Labor Training Division. A team of Indonesians, for example, was engaged in a two-week workshop program conducted by a Labor Training Division staff member. The participants were instructed in workers' education techniques suitable for trade unions in under-developed countries, where funds and facilities for such activities are extremely limited. This workshop emphasized the preparation of simple and inexpensive audio-visual materials, and the use of skits and role-playing, aimed at trade union members who have had little formal education. This two-week course was known as "Operation Turn Back the Clock," since it was based on techniques and materials used in American trade unions twenty or more years ago.

Programs Implemented Partially by Contractors

The #4 program referred to earlier will be implemented by the National Institute of Labor Education, through a contract with ICA. This contract provides for the National Institute of Labor Education to arrange special labor education courses of about thirteen weeks' duration to be held at a university. The National Institute of Labor Education will select the university, recruit additional instructors where necessary, and prepare instructional material. Participants will be required to understand English and will be selected specifically for this program. The university course will be supplemented by observational study. It is quite possible that this latter phase of the program will be arranged by the Department of Labor.

The contract between ICA and the National Institute of Labor Education was signed in June 1959. Since participants to be trained under this program must be selected well in advance in order to gain a command of English, it will be late 1960 before the first #4 program is actually in operation.

IV. Technical Assistance Training Staff of Office of Public Services (ICA)

It is estimated that this unit will process approximately 2,200 participants during fiscal year 1959-60. Of this number about 1,000 will be in education and 400 in public health. About 85 percent of these will be enrolled in colleges and universities for the full term. The first quarter of 1959-60 required the processing of 34 percent more participants than for the previous year.

A. Functional Fields

1. Education
2. Public safety
3. Public health
4. Community services including social welfare
5. Communications media

B. General Methods of Operation

1. Direct implementation of training programs by project managers in the Technical Assistance Training Staff
2. Participating agencies
 - Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
 - Office of Education
 - Public Health Service
 - Social Security Administration
 - Department of Labor
 - Bureau of Labor Standards
 - Housing and Home Finance Agency
3. Contractors (examples)
 - International Association of Chiefs of Police
 - Universities and colleges
 - Ohio State University
 - Pennsylvania State University
 - New York State Teachers College at Geneseo

C. Development of Training Programs

1. For individual participants

- a. Applications are reviewed by project managers to determine training objectives. If training at a specific institution is desired by the Mission, arrangements are made with that institution. If no school is recommended, the project manager consults with substantive specialists within ICA or appropriate government or professional agencies or organizations to determine the best possible training within the limitations of time and funds allocated for the project. Attendance at conferences, conventions, workshops, and seminars are provided where feasible and appropriate.

- b. Program or training officers in the participating agencies review applications sent to them by the Technical Assistance Training Staff to determine whether training for the participant at a particular institution or with an organization has been recommended by the Mission. If it has, the training program is developed with the recommended institution or organization. If no particular institution or organization is recommended, the program officer is guided by the objectives stated in the Project Implementation Order. On the basis of his own professional background or in consultation with other specialists in his field, he arranges for academic study, practical visitation, or a combination of the two. Attendance at conferences, conventions, workshops, and seminars is provided wherever feasible and appropriate. As with programs developed by the Technical Assistance Training Staff, the programs of participating agencies are governed by limitations of time and funds. In some instances, extensions of training programs for individual participants are obtained for degree purposes.
- c. Training programs developed by contractors follow guidelines laid down by the Technical Assistance Training Staff in its contractual agreements with educational institutions or with private nonprofit organizations. In providing these guidelines, the Technical Assistance Training Staff is governed by the project objectives as furnished by the Mission (or Missions, if the project is multi-national). Although the contractor has considerable latitude in organizing and developing his program, final responsibility for the success of the program is retained by the Technical Assistance Training Staff.

2. For groups or teams

The procedures for developing programs for groups or teams, whether followed by the project managers of the Technical Assistance Training Staff or by training officers in participating agencies, are similar to those described in paragraphs 1(a) and (b) with respect to individual participants. For teams of participants escorts are provided by the Technical Assistance Training Staff and/or the participating agency. If the team members are not proficient in English, ICA provides interpreter services to the extent needed.

Programs for single or multi-national groups of participants are sometimes developed by contractors at the request of the Technical Assistance Training Staff. Agreements between ICA and the contractors may provide funds for coordinators, supporting administrative services, special instructional materials and techniques, and interpreter services. The responsibility for insuring attainment of the project objectives of these programs rests, as with other programs previously described, with the Technical Assistance Training Staff.

V. Public Administration Division of Office of Public Services (ICA)

A. Functional Fields

1. Accounting and auditing
2. Administrative management
3. Balance of international payments
4. Banking and finance
5. Budget administration
6. Business administration teacher training
7. Census and statistical procedures
8. Customs administration
9. Economic development
10. Local government administration
11. National income and gross national product
12. Organization and methods
13. Personnel management
14. Postal administration
15. Supply management
16. Tax policy and administration
17. Tax administration

Also, administrative management: short programs for high level officials

B. General Methods of Operation

As it has no counterpart agency for handling its training programs, the Training Branch of the Public Administration Division is responsible for planning and operating many of its own training programs. A descriptive program guide is developed for those programs which recur frequently and is sent to ICA Missions around the world.

Missions are not restricted to those programs listed in the program guide but many request other special programs for individuals or groups as needs arise in particular countries.

1. Training facilities

Three types of training available

a. Regular and special in-service university programs in administration

b. Practical on-site observation and consultation with public and private agencies. These are under the direction of the Training Branch and last typically from one to three weeks at each installation. In certain cases, depending upon the qualifications of the participant and his field of interest, longer-term placements can be programmed.

- c. Special workshops in public administration conducted by the Training Branch of the Public Administration Division, lasting from one to five months. These workshops focus on home country administrative problems and provide for full participation through participant working committees, project assignments, case studies based on experience abroad, and similar techniques. Some programs combine all three types of training.

2. Workshop Programs and Individual Programs

Workshop programs receive primary emphasis in the Public Administration Division training program. These group programs are usually composed of participants from a number of different countries. Group programs which include workshops conducted by the Training Branch, Public Administration Division, are usually limited to 20 participants to facilitate the kind of group participation and interchange which is essential for this type of training. The Training Branch considers that these programs provide the most effective utilization of the available staff and facilities.

Individually tailored programs requested by a Mission will continue to be provided to the extent that Training Branch facilities and other available resources permit. Shorter-term and longer-term programs can be planned for teams or individual participants with special needs or specialized interests.

The Training Branch is also responsible for training programs in the fields of census and statistical procedure, national income and gross national product, balance of payments, customs, taxes, and tariffs. When programs are received in these fields they are submitted to other federal agencies for more detailed planning and implementation. These programs represent a small percentage of the total.

The Training Branch also utilizes educational facilities in the execution of its training programs. For example, participants may be sent to Harvard University either for a special international program in taxation or for the development of teachers of business administration. Simple arrangements are made with these universities whereby tuition costs are paid regularly. In certain instances special contractual arrangements are made for the development of special programs tailored to the needs of participants in public administration. In other instances, an open-end contract is arranged with the institution, as in the case of the American University, Georgetown University, and George Washington University, whereby special in-service courses have been developed to meet the overseas requirements of the participants in the ICA program. Another use of the open-end contract is for a participant who may require some additional in-service training to supplement his regular work program in the United States.

C. Development of Training Programs

Training programs for participants are developed primarily upon the basis of a request from a Mission which describes the specific needs of training. Since Mission requests frequently are neither sufficiently comprehensive nor intensive in defining the best training for an individual participant, the Training Branch has developed a system of individual and continuous consultation by professional advisors experienced in the fields of public administration. These advisors (public administration specialists) are responsible for assisting the participant and clarifying the participant's needs. The advisor is responsible for preparing the participant's training programs based on an understanding of the major administrative problems of the participant's country, detailed knowledge of the participant's duties and responsibilities, and familiarity with the best possible training experiences available to the participant. Similar procedures are followed in the development of programs by participating agencies such as those mentioned above. Special workshop programs are developed in selected areas of public administration such as personnel, budgeting, and procurement. The concept behind the workshop is that training in public administration is valuable only if it can be put into practice in the home country situation. These workshops focus sharply on developing the skills, abilities, and knowledge to solve administrative problems at home.

APPENDIX B

**Detailed Statistics of Foreign Visitors to
Higher Educational Institutions**

DETAILED STATISTICS OF FOREIGN VISITORS TO
HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The statistical data contained in Appendix B were compiled from information obtained from questionnaires sent to 106 colleges and universities, from which 59 replies were received. The questionnaire was supplemented by personal interviews with the personnel directly connected with the program at 18 institutions. The institutions contacted in the survey acted as host to 99.4 percent of the agricultural participants programmed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, Foreign Agricultural Service, to land-grant colleges and universities in the continental United States. These institutions also acted as host to a high percentage of the leaders and specialists programmed by the American Council on Education.

The type and completeness of records concerning fiscal year 1958-59 varied considerably among the institutions. The data were used whenever they could be made a part of one of the following tables, but in a number of cases, the records were not sufficient to give us all the desired breakdowns. This accounts for the different total number of visitors reported for 1958-59 in the tables.

The questionnaire also requested data for the month of April 1960. This information was compiled currently, since the questionnaires were circulated just prior to the beginning of the month.

To summarize, the statistical data were accumulated from the available records of 10,361 visits of foreign nationals to American campuses for the fiscal year 1958-59 and 1,322 visits for April 1960. The data are set out in tables as follows:

Table

- B-1 Length of Stay and Size of Group
- B-2 Sponsoring Agencies
- B-3 Area of Origin
- B-4 Field of Interest
- B-5 Average Estimated Hours of Staff Time per Visitor Man-day
- B-6 Estimated Total Staff Hours per Visitor Man-day
- B-7 Average of Estimated Direct Costs per Visitor Man-day
- B-8 Average Dollar Costs per Visitor Man-day

TABLE B-1 -- FOREIGN VISITORS BY
LENGTH OF STAY AND SIZE OF GROUP

Length of stay	Size of group	1958-59		April 1960	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
One to seven days	1 person	2,517	30.8	316	20.7
One to seven days	Groups of 2-5	1,088	13.4	239	15.6
One to seven days	Groups of more than 5	<u>2,211</u>	<u>27.1</u>	<u>699</u>	<u>45.7</u>
Total visitors, one to seven days		5,816	71.3	1,254	82.0
Over seven days	1 person	988	12.1	91	5.9
Over seven days	Groups of 2-5	354	4.3	21	1.4
Over seven days	Groups of more than 5	<u>1,004</u>	<u>12.3</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>10.7</u>
Total visitors, over seven days		2,346	28.7	276	18.0
Total, all visitors		<u>8,162</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,530</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE B-1a -- FOREIGN VISITORS BY
SIZE OF GROUP

Arrivals by number in group	1958-59		April 1960	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1 person	3,505	42.9	407	26.6
Groups of 2-5	1,442	17.7	260	17.0
Groups of more than 5	<u>3,215</u>	<u>39.4</u>	<u>863</u>	<u>56.4</u>
Total	<u>8,162</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,530</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE B-2 -- FOREIGN VISITORS BY
SPONSORING AGENCIES

Sponsoring Agency	1958-59		April 1960	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
International Cooperation Administration	3,238	38.0	604	39.5
Department of State (general)	116	1.4	82	5.4
International Educ. Exchange Service	15	.2	57	3.7
via American Council on Education	781	9.2	78	5.1
via Governmental Affairs Institute	430	5.0	44	2.9
Department of Health, Education and Welfare	43	.5	28	1.8
Other federal agencies	<u>451</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>2.2</u>
Total federal agencies	5,074	59.6	927	60.6
European Productivity Agency	117	1.4	38	2.5
Consulates	382	4.5	62	4.1
Foundations	406	4.8	59	3.9
Institute of International Education	169	2.0	11	.7
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships	21	.2	3	.2
Industry	12	.1	16	1.0
United Nations (Incl. FAO)	54	.6	7	.4
Marketing Association			80	5.2
Other non-federal sponsors	1,479	17.3	271	17.7
Self sponsored	<u>811</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>3.7</u>
Total	8,525	100.0	1,530	100.0

TABLE B-3 -- FOREIGN VISITORS BY
AREA OF ORIGIN

Area	1958-59		April 1960	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Europe	2,560	30.7	465	30.4
Africa	486	5.8	143	9.3
Near East	659	7.9	100	6.5
South Asia	1,118	13.4	122	8.0
Far East	1,448	17.4	154	10.1
Latin America	1,419	17.0	389	25.4
Australia and New Zealand	171	2.0	55	3.6
Canada	15	.2	9	.6
Other	<u>466</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>6.1</u>
Total	<u>8,342</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,530</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE B-4 -- FOREIGN VISITORS BY
FIELD OF INTEREST

Field of interest	1958-59		April 1960	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture	4,046	48.2	638	41.7
Education	2,079	24.8	328	21.4
Engineering (Technical Aids)	613	7.3	239	15.6
Labor	158	1.9	5	.3
Communications	88	1.1	19	1.2
Health	148	1.8	59	3.9
Public Administration	608	7.2	146	9.6
Other	<u>650</u>	<u>7.7</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>6.3</u>
Total	<u>8,390</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1,530</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE B-5 -- AVERAGE ESTIMATED HOURS OF STAFF TIME PER VISITOR MAN-DAY

Number in group	Length of stay	Staff time in hours 1958-59				Staff time in hours April 1960			
		Secretary	Programmer	Academic staff	Total	Secretary	Programmer	Academic staff	Total
1 person	1 - 7 days	1.66	2.99	4.83	9.48	.54	1.54	4.92	7.00
Groups of 2-5	1 - 7 days	.70	1.44	2.93	5.07	.36	.96	1.89	3.21
Groups of more than 5	1 - 7 days	.97	1.32	2.62	4.91	.27	.40	1.42	2.09
1 person	Over 7 days	1.33	2.10	6.43	9.86	.20	.93	1.80	2.93
Groups of 2-5	Over 7 days	1.00	1.73	4.15	6.88	.14	.15	1.63	1.92
Groups of more than 5	Over 7 days	.74	1.17	2.85	4.76	.19	.30	.60	1.09

TABLE B-6. — ESTIMATED TOTAL STAFF HOURS PER VISITOR MAN-DAY

Number in group	Length of stay	1958-59 by institution				April 1960 by institution			
		High	Low	Median	Average	High	Low	Median	Average
1 person	1 - 7 days	16.0	3.0	8.50	9.48	13.7	1.53	7.59	7.00
Groups 2-5	1 - 7 days	13.0	2.0	6.10	5.07	8.25	.94	2.56	3.21
Groups of more than 5	1 - 7 days	13.5	.57	4.56	4.91	5.77	.14	1.36	2.09
1 person	Over 7 days	16.0	.80	7.5	9.86	6.53	.36	2.39	2.93
Groups of 2-5	Over 7 days	13.0	2.2	7.5	6.88	2.77	1.42	1.60	1.92
Groups of more than 5	Over 7 days	13.5	.5	3.0	4.76	3.76	.40	1.02	1.09

TABLE B-7 -- AVERAGE OF ESTIMATED DIRECT COSTS PER VISITOR MAN-DAY, APRIL 1960
(other than staff salaries)

Number in group	Length of stay	Cost
1 person	1 - 7 days	\$3.38
Groups of 2-5	1 - 7 days	3.09
Groups of more than 5	1 - 7 days	.53
1 person	Over 7 days	.18
Groups of 2-5	Over 7 days	.15
Groups of more than 5	Over 7 days	.31
Average direct cost		.75

TABLE B-8 -- AVERAGE COST PER VISITOR MAN-DAY
BY SIZE OF GROUP AND LENGTH OF STAY

	Stay of 1 - 7 days			Stay of more than 7 days		
	Single visitor	Group of 2-5	Group of more than 5	Single visitor	Group of 2-5	Group of more than 5
1958-59						
Number of visitors	2,517	1,088	2,211	988	354	1,004
Staff salaries	\$57.20	\$31.54	\$29.07	\$61.49	\$42.55	\$29.20
Indirect costs	<u>11.44</u>	<u>6.31</u>	<u>5.81</u>	<u>12.30</u>	<u>8.51</u>	<u>5.84</u>
Total average cost per visitor	\$68.64	\$37.85	\$34.88	\$73.79	\$51.06	\$35.04
April 1960						
Number of visitors	316	239	699	91	21	164
Visitor man-days	721	455	1,628	2,048	350	2,656
Staff salaries	\$45.69	\$20.39	\$13.10	\$19.26	\$12.57	\$ 6.58
Other direct costs	3.38	3.09	.53	.18	.15	.31
Indirect costs	<u>9.81</u>	<u>4.70</u>	<u>2.73</u>	<u>3.89</u>	<u>2.54</u>	<u>1.38</u>
Total average cost per visitor	\$58.88	\$28.18	\$16.36	\$23.33	\$15.26	\$ 8.27

APPENDIX C

Questionnaire with Attached Letter and Reporting Guides

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
FOREIGN PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

The American Council on Education, through its Commission on Education and International Affairs and other cognizant bodies, has for some time been concerned with the broad spectrum of rapidly expanding programs of international education, as sponsored both by public and private sources.

During the past decade in particular, the commitment of American higher education to the implementation of such programs has become so considerable as to necessitate re-evaluation of principles and of operating methods and practices: of principle, to clarify the responsibilities of higher education in this area of activity vis-a-vis its "primary," on-campus responsibilities; of operating methods and practices, to assure maximum efficiency and to obviate unwarranted diversion of precious educational resources.

The Participant Training Program, one of many enterprises in the international training field, and one which depends upon institutional collaboration in training large numbers of foreign students, scholars, technicians and administrators each year, has for some time exhibited special operational difficulties. These weaknesses have particularly marked the "programming" of foreign nationals to American campuses (assignments, planning of schedules, determination of courses, and the like) both at the hands of Washington and the institutions themselves, and the criteria as well as practices employed in reimbursement of costs for the services rendered.

In October 1958, the annual meeting of college contact officers at the Department of Agriculture recommended a thoroughgoing evaluation of the Participant Training Program, emphasizing the foregoing operational problems. Subsequently, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, which had received this recommendation, transmitted it for possible action to the Council in view of the range of agencies and programs covered in participant training. The Council's Commission on Education and International Affairs has initiated the requested study, specifically limiting the scope of the investigation to the problems of programming and costing. In arriving at this decision, the Commission visualized the ultimate formulation of recommendations designed to strengthen the whole programming process and to place costing criteria and procedures on a realistic and equitable basis.

Accordingly, a special committee was appointed to plan and direct the study and the committee has now completed a pilot study covering a small group of institutions. At this time the scope of the study is being broadened to include more than one hundred major educational institutions who program a majority of the foreign visitors to American campuses.

A wide sample of statistical data must be obtained in order to insure serious consideration of the committee's final recommendations by the various federal and private agencies. The committee hopes that it will be possible for your institution to assist in this study by supplying the requested information. We are asking that you will please forward this material to the appropriate individuals for completion and return to this office.

Sincerely yours,

Reuben Lorenz
Study Director

Reuben Lorenz
American Council on Education
435 North Park Street
Madison 6, Wisconsin

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

STUDY OF THE FOREIGN PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

Definition of Terms and Reporting Guides

- Foreign Visitors - All foreign nationals spending any time on the campus, excluding only the students enrolled in regularly scheduled academic courses.
- Date - This entire study is to be completed prior to July 1, 1960; we are therefore requesting that Schedule II be returned as soon as possible and that Schedule I be returned immediately after April 30, 1960.
- Copies to be Filed - Return one copy to this office; it is not necessary that it be typewritten. If there were no visitors during April 1960, please return form indicating this fact. If the visitor program is decentralized separate schedules may be filed by each office.
- Schedule I - Schedule I covers only the month of April, 1960. Include all foreign visitors on the campus during this one month; include those who were programmed prior to April 1 but were on the campus during April; exclude those who were programmed during April but are to arrive at a later date. The sample Schedule I indicates the type of information desired under each of the headings. The hours of staff time required may vary considerably depending on the type of individual visitor, size of group, field of interest, etc. These figures will have to be estimates but we ask that they be made carefully because it may have a direct effect on the amount of cost reimbursement approved by agencies such as the International Cooperation Administration.
- Schedule II - This schedule covers the 1958-59 fiscal year or some other convenient recent 12-month period. Our pilot study has indicated that in many cases little or no information is available in this area. We are asking that you will complete as much of this form as can be done from your records. In all cases we would like to have you make an estimate, based on past experience, of the staff time required per visitor-man day. Please return this form as soon as completed.

If you have any particular problems in the area of foreign visitors or have any suggestions for improving the present procedures, we would appreciate receiving these comments along with Schedules I and II.

If you have any questions regarding the completion of these forms, please call Reuben Lorenz, Madison, Wisconsin, ALpine 5-3311, extension 5003, or write Reuben Lorenz, American Council on Education, 435 North Park Street, Madison, Wisconsin.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

**FOREIGN VISITORS
During April, 1960**

No. of Visitors in Group	Days on Campus	Sponsor	Area of Origin	Field of Interest	Out of Pocket Costs Incurred	Hours of Staff Time Required		
						Secretary	Programmer	Academic Staff

Use Actual Number	Number of Days Not Days of the Month	Such as: Amer. Council on Education Int. Coop. Admin. Govt. Aff. Inst. Dept. of Labor China Medical Bd. Rockefeller Fndn.	Europe Africa Near East South Asia Far East Latin America Other	Agriculture Education Engineering Labor Trans- portation Health Public Adm. Other	Include Trans- portation, Meals, Entertain- ment, etc.	Include time spent in advance programming as well as time spent with visitor while on the campus.
-------------------------	---	--	--	---	---	---

Examples

1	6	ICA	Africa	Agriculture	4.50	1	6	18
8	2	Dept. of Labor	Europe	Labor	21.00	2	6	8

FOREIGN VISITORS
July 1, 1958 to June 30, 1959

Period beginning _____ and ending _____

A. Total Number of Visitors _____

B. Length of Stay and Size of Group

	Number	Estimated Hours of Staff Time Required Per Visitor-Man Day		
		Secretary	Programmer	Academic Staff
One to Seven Days - One Person	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Visitors in Groups of 2-5	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Visitors in Groups over 5	_____	_____	_____	_____
Over Seven Days - One Person	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Visitors in Groups of 2-5	_____	_____	_____	_____
- Visitors in Groups over 5	_____	_____	_____	_____
Total (will equal A above)	_____	_____	_____	_____

C. Sponsoring Agency	Number
International Coop. Admin.	_____
Governmental Affairs Inst. (State)	_____
Amer. Council on Educ. (State)	_____
European Productivity Agency	_____
Housing and Home Finance	_____
Consulates	_____
Foundations	_____
Institute of International Educ.	_____
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship	_____
Other	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
Total (will equal A above)	_____

D. Area of Origin	Number
Europe	_____
Africa	_____
Near East	_____
South Asia	_____
Far East	_____
Latin America	_____
Other	_____
Total (will equal A above)	_____

E. Field of Interest	Number
Agriculture	_____
Education	_____
Engineering	_____
Labor	_____
Transportation	_____
Health	_____
Public Admin.	_____
Other	_____
Total (will equal A above)	_____

APPENDIX D

D-1 Replies Received from Questionnaire Sent to Institutions

D-2 Institutions Contacted by Personal Visit from the Study Director

Replies Received from Questionnaire Sent to Institutions

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Response</u>	
	<u>April 1960</u>	<u>1958-59</u>
Auburn University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Antioch College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Arizona State Collge - Flagstaff	-	-
Arizona State College - Tempe	-	-
Arizona, University of	-	Schedule II
Arkansas, University of	-	Schedule II
Ball State Teachers College (Indiana)	Schedule I	Schedule II
Berea College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Boston University	-	-
Brigham Young University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Bryn Mawr College	-	-
Buffalo, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
California Institute of Technology	-	-
California State Polytechnic College	Schedule I	Schedule II
California, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Carnegie Institute of Technology	Schedule I	Schedule II
Chicago, University of	Schedule I	Summary
Cincinnati, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
City College of New York	Schedule I	Schedule II
Clemson Agricultural College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Colorado College	No information available	
Colorado State University	Schedule I	-
Colorado, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Columbia University	No information available	
Connecticut, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Cornell University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Delaware, University of	-	-
Denver, University of	-	-
Dillard University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Duke University	Schedule I	No information available
Florida, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Fresno (California) State College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Georgia, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Harvard University	-	-
Houston, University of	-	-
Idaho, University of	Schedule I	-
Illinois, University of	Schedule I	-
Indiana University	-	-
Iowa State University of Science and Technology	Schedule I	Schedule II
Iowa, State University of	-	-

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Response</u>	
	<u>April 1960</u>	<u>1958-59</u>
Johns Hopkins University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Kansas State Teachers College at Emporia	Schedule I	Schedule II*
Kansas State University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Kansas, University of	-	-
Kentucky, University of	-	-
Louisiana State University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Maine, University of	Schedule I	Letter
Maryland, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Schedule I	Schedule II
Massachusetts, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Miami, University of	-	-
Michigan, University of	-	-
Michigan State University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Minnesota, University of	-	-
Mississippi State University	-	-
Missouri, University of	-	-
Montana State College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Nebraska, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
New Mexico State University	Schedule I	Schedule II
New Mexico, University of	-	-
New York State Teachers College, Geneseo	Schedule I	Schedule II
New York University	Schedule I	Schedule II
North Carolina Agricultural and Technology College	-	Schedule II
North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering	Schedule I	Schedule II
North Carolina, University of	Schedule I	-
Northwestern University	-	-
Notre Dame, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Oberlin College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Occidental College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Ohio State University	-	-
Oklahoma State University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Oklahoma, University of	-	-
Oregon State College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Pennsylvania State University	-	-
Pittsburgh, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Pomona College	-	-
Princeton University	-	-
Purdue University	-	-
Reed College	Schedule I	Schedule II
Rochester, University of	-	-

*Data received after tables were completed.

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Response</u>	
	<u>April 1960</u>	<u>1958-59</u>
Rutgers University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Seattle, University of	Summary Letter	
Scripps College	Schedule I	Schedule II*
Southern California, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Southern Methodist University	-	-
Stanford University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Syracuse, University of	-	Schedule II
Temple University	Schedule I	Schedule II*
Tennessee, University of	Information not available	
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College	Schedule I	Schedule II*
Texas, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Tuskegee Institute	-	Schedule II
Utah State University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Utah, University of	Schedule I	-
Vanderbilt University	-	-
Virginia Polytechnic Institute	Schedule I	Schedule II
Virginia, University of	-	-
Washington University (St.Louis, Mo.)	-	-
Washington State University	Schedule I	Schedule II
Washington, University of	-	-
Wayne State University	-	-
West Virginia, University of	Schedule I	-
Wisconsin, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Wyoming, University of	Schedule I	Schedule II
Xavier University of New Orleans	-	-
Yale University	Schedule I	Schedule II

*Data received after tables were completed.

Institutions Contacted by Personal Visit from the Study Director

Institution

American University
California, University of (Berkeley)
California, University of (Davis)
Columbia University
Columbia University-Teachers College
Cornell University

Georgetown University
Illinois, University of
Lafayette College
Michigan State University
New York University

Pennsylvania, University of
Pittsburgh, University of
Purdue University
Stanford University
Tulane University

Tuskegee Institute
Wisconsin, University of