

A7R  
378.06

A512f

698-210

file  
INTERAF - KRAUS

(19)

698-11-660-210

698-0062

done SK 10/13/74

REPORT ON THE  
EVALUATION OF AFGRAD AND INTERAF  
PROGRAMS

Overseas Liaison Committee  
American Council on Education

December 1974

A.I.D.  
Reference Center  
Room 1656 NS

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Evaluation of AFGRAD and INTERAF Programs .....	1
Background .....	1
Needs .....	3
Assumptions .....	11
Options .....	12
Postscript .....	18

### ANNEX 1

PROFILE: African Scholarship Program of American Universities (ASPAU) .....	20
--	----

### ANNEX 2

PROFILE: African Graduate Fellowship Program (AFGRAD) .....	23
--	----

### ANNEX 3

PROFILE: Inter-African Universities Scholarship Program (INTERAF) .....	26
Specialists Consulted .....	28
Selected Bibliography .....	30

## EVALUATION OF AFGRAD AND INTERAF PROGRAMS

### BACKGROUND

Most African nations have been independent for at least ten years. That decade has been a period of exploration and experimentation both for the leaders and for the millions of citizens. Development has commanded major attention, both in organization and implementation. Calls have gone out for technical assistance, and both multilateral and bilateral agencies have responded with help on a wide range of development problems.

One of the critical requirements for development, which surfaced early among the young African nations demanding entry into modernity, is that of highly trained indigenous professional manpower. Therefore, in addition to providing project-oriented participant training for such urgent needs, AID's Africa Bureau responded by providing special scholarship programs. Three such interrelated programs were established:

1. African Scholarship Program of American Universities (ASPAU); Annex 1 for details (started in 1961; U.S. based)
2. African Graduate Fellowship Program (AFGRAD); Annex 2 (started in 1963; U.S. based)
3. Inter-African Universities Scholarship Program (INTERAF); Annex 3 (started in 1967; Africa based)

The undergraduate ASPAU program is terminating at the close of FY 1975. Therefore, this study is directly concerned with AFGRAD and INTERAF.

In historical development, ASPAU was established in 1961, with support from representative American universities, to respond quickly to the urgent need for highly trained indigenous manpower in the newly independent African countries. This was a particularly dramatic operation because Africa had so few universities, yet needed immediately a wide range of quality institutions in which to educate her ablest young people. American higher education institutions in large numbers rose to meet this undergraduate challenge and have provided tuition-free, four-year scholarships. The AID/Africa Bureau deserves to be complimented for sponsoring this innovative scheme and American universities merit

applause for providing excellent educational opportunities for African scholars. In summary, nearly 1500 African students have completed their university education as planned under the ASPAU program, but to date less than 60% have returned to their home countries in Africa. Many are pursuing graduate programs and the repatriation rate should increase sharply within the next two to five years. In any case, ASPAU has shrunk as African university capacity has grown, supplemented by INTERAF, and will close out in 1975.

Overlapping and supplementing this development, AFGRAD was established in 1963 in response to the critical African needs for professional talent trained at the graduate level. This is a natural upward extension of the undergraduate ASPAU program. The urgency attached to AFGRAD was and continues to be even greater than that of ASPAU for two basic reasons: (1) advanced training is so essential for top-level technical and managerial leadership and (2) Africa had in the early 1960's and continues to have so few graduate and professional university programs in the priority fields of development. To date, the intake exceeds 900 students, the program completion rate is good, and the repatriation rate is high. *which fields?*

The third special scholarship program is INTERAF, which gradually became the African successor to the American ASPAU. This program was established in 1967 and utilizes African higher education institutions. The purpose of INTERAF, which is administered by the Association of African Universities (AAU), is to provide undergraduate training for Africans at African universities outside of their home countries, when subject-matter fields are not locally available. Actually, INTERAF is a natural evolutionary development in the institutional growth of Africa. In promoting the more effective utilization of African universities by Africans, it is making available at home a major portion of what ASPAU and other overseas undergraduate scholarship programs formerly provided. By 1973, more than 1000 African students had participated, with more than 700 currently engaged. As would be expected among the three programs,

INTERAF is the lowest in per-student costs and the highest in repatriation rate. By enhancing the supply of educated young African scholars, it also provides an igniter force for the growth of indigenous graduate programs critical for national development.

While this scholarship history was unfolding, the African world was changing dramatically, and in no way more than in education. Other donor nations were giving scholarship aid and continue to do so. The nature and extent of foreign technical assistance were changing. With so many fluid factors, AID understandably thought the time had come for an evaluation of the past and a projection into the future.

As a result, this study has come into being to evaluate the AFGRAD and INTERAF programs in the context of African manpower needs for development, with emphasis on critical problems affecting the masses of Africans. It is to reflect African needs for higher education. It is to concentrate on the 1975-80 period, although consideration must also extend into the 1980's (e.g., for completion of the pipeline flow of scholarship-holders).

### NEEDS

An assessment of need becomes of crucial importance. Unfortunately, there is no unanimity about such need, although we believe there is clearly a workable consensus within appropriate assumptions. We so conclude after (1) examination of extensive documentation (see bibliography) and (2) many interviews, encompassing consultants familiar with Africa in general and manpower needs in particular; representatives of the three major foundations (Ford, Rockefeller, Carnegie), the International Council for Educational Development, the African-American Institute, Practical Concepts, Inc., and the Overseas Liaison Committee of the American Council on Education; and education-oriented officials of the World Bank, the Department of State, and AID.

We conclude that:

1. there is a changing nature of the need for higher education for development which is worthy of special attention in new or on-going student-assistance programs;

*What is the nature of the change?*

2. such need will clearly extend through and beyond the 1975-80 period; and
3. AID support for such higher education is a suitable vehicle for achieving the objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973.

Need is examined here in three dimensions:

1. as seen in terms of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973
2. as seen by the African countries themselves (the LDCs)
3. as seen by foreign assistance specialists.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1973 specifically contemplates higher education needs. It emphasizes (1) development via (2) critical problems in (3) functional sectors benefiting the masses, including education and human resource development. As contemplated under the Act, a higher-education component is required as the apex and regenerative factor for the total education sector. Its contributions in leadership and technical capacity are essential in all the other named sectors, such as rural development, food production, health, planning, and public administration. The concerns of the Act are particularly acute in Africa. The emphasis is on the African and away from the expatriate. Therefore, Africans must have access to the requisite training for the managerial cadres and for the specialized professional positions, both of which are heavily dependent on university education as a means of entry. In addressing itself to "development" and "critical problems," the Act's operation through education puts a special dependence on the development orientation of American universities, especially the land-grant type, but all, including the private. The public-service, problem-solving orientation of American universities is a world-recognized resource which can be peculiarly responsive to the critical needs to which the Foreign Assistance Act specifically directs U.S. technical aid. In summary, it is difficult to see how the Act's clear intent would be aided by any diminution of the modest current efforts to develop the requisite African manpower and know-how through the universities in Africa and America. The question is not whether, but how.

How are the needs perceived by the Africans themselves? While the scope of this study did not provide for field work in Africa, direct appraisals were obtained from reports of African university Vice Chancellors, from annual reports on the scholarship programs (including reports from the Association of African Universities), and from a relevant and timely recent study which deals in depth with African perception of need for specialized manpower. The authors of the recent study have written as follows:

In a study of the Fulbright-Hays program in Africa conducted by the Overseas Liaison Committee for the Bureau for Educational and Cultural Affairs during 1973-74, interviews with approximately 100 African university administrators, faculty, and education ministry personnel in eleven countries indicated very clearly the continuing need for expatriate staffing over the next decade concurrently with ongoing local staff development. In Anglophone countries, the need is greatest in East Africa, although continued expansion of institutions of higher learning in the West will also exceed local capacity to provide necessary trained manpower. The strongly expressed interest of scholars and administrators in Francophone Africa in greatly increasing training opportunities in the U.S., especially in technical fields, represents a significant shift from earlier attitudes and one deserving particular consideration.

From the interviews and a review of a wide range of documents (see bibliography), providing both governmental and non-governmental channels to Africans and African countries, we learned that higher education needs as perceived in Africa arise from or include:

1. Localization requirements--in virtually all countries, despite considerable variance, and particularly in multiplier positions, as in the university and teacher-training institutions, management, and planning.
2. Growth--in the public and private sectors, best typified by the rapid development in Nigeria.
3. Shortfall in the trained human-resource capacity of African countries in comparison to their development needs, as graphically shown by the fact that 16 of the poorest 25 countries in the world are African, Asia has two and a half times as many scientific and technical personnel as Africa in relation to population, and the majority of African countries fall far short of expected progress toward the Second United Nations Development Decade goal

*Are personnel who have already been trained being used properly?*

for scientists and engineers in research and development work.

4. Underestimated needs in scientific-based agriculture, calling for greater specialization and for many new agri-related occupations.
5. Correction of Maldistribution of high-level manpower both geographically and in occupational fields.
6. Further university development--staff development including localization needs, plus the rounding out of evolving institutions (e.g., toward graduate education, new specialized faculties, or other attempted self-sufficiencies).
7. Increased professionalization of government services and growing dependence of both public and private sectors on managerial skills of university origin.

In addition to the articulation of these needs, African perception of critical on-going needs is apparent in feedback from AID missions in African countries and in requests from ministries, universities, and other employers. We do not see how anyone could conclude that high-level manpower needs of university origination are a thing of the past on the basis of the African countries' own perceptions and statements. If the standard is some kind of "effective demand" set against the Africans' "felt needs," the conclusion remains the same for this small number of scholarship-holders, who will be both highly qualified and development-related. On such a qualitative basis, in the view of the manpower experts consulted, effective demand exists.

*However, I see need more trained people.*

*Who? academics?*

Finally, in assessing manpower needs as seen by Africans, it is instructive to look at a nine-country study begun in 1965 under an AID contract, by Education and World Affairs<sup>1</sup>. It provides a benchmark of a decade ago regarding needs for specialized high-level manpower. From this study, one can see that the first generation problems

<sup>1</sup> Summary Report: Study of Manpower Needs, Educational Capabilities, and Overseas Study, Study Committee on Manpower Needs and Educational Capabilities in Africa, Education and World Affairs, New York, August 31, 1965.



of the 1960's, however well met, have turned into the even more intricate second generation problems, such as:

- a. The Africanization of undergraduate higher education for Africans studying in Africa; *elimination of expatriates? - not some Africanization of it - some is always*
- b. Sharper focus on key, strategically-placed, specialized personnel, *beneficial - i.e. 2/3 provide services directly, dependent* and on effective training to maximize development; and *?*
- c. the establishment of graduate programs in African universities, with interest in linkages into the international network of universities and research centers. *What? How?*

The views of foreign assistance scholars and practitioners were sought, although the method was neither exhaustive nor of the sampling type. Nevertheless, certain impressionistic conclusions, given below, are regarded as relevant.

Foundation representatives did not pursue the "effective demand" thesis. They articulated continuing African needs for university training both at home and in the U.S., and they generally opted for more flexibility and individual merit than AID personnel seem to favor, despite the recognition of need for development orientation and avoidance of the student's denationalization.

Views from the World Bank were similar. That organization is adding a full-time employee (former Vice President of Haile Sellassie I University in Ethiopia) to concentrate for the first time exclusively on the problems of higher education.

Spokesmen for the Office of International Training, AID, find no decline in academically- or degree-oriented training needs among African nations.

Professor Frederick Harbison, a Princeton University economist, says no African country has manpower information of sufficient coverage and reliability to serve as a guide for this study. Less ideal and more pragmatic instruments will have to be used, including country perceptions, indigenous planning projections, and requests for donor assistance. Given the few hundred students involved each year, the scholarship problem, like the development problem, is qualitative. The significance lies in key persons on

whose work others depend. For those who can build, lead, and work through organizations, the on-going need is unmistakable.

Professor John Hanson of Michigan State University, author of 15 country reports on English-speaking Africa's teacher needs for secondary education, includes in his summary report a section on the needed contribution of overseas education, particularly for "teacher educators." He reports remaining gaps in the teaching forces of all countries surveyed.

The three top officers of the African-American Institute expressed their view that African needs have shifted as to field and geography, and as to generality versus specificity of training, but university-based needs persist in virtually all African countries (even where most and longest aided) and literally (all) are in urgent need of planning-type personnel who can conceptualize problem-solving and manage the carry-through.

Finally, the practice of other countries and their technical assistance agencies are significant, particularly

- Britain and the Commonwealth, especially Canada
- France
- West Germany
- Netherlands
- Scandinavian countries
- USSR

All these countries offer scholarship and fellowship opportunities either at home or in Africa, or both. In fact, a few also contribute financially to INTERAF. Such programs are taken seriously and there is no apparent diminution in money or numbers. This includes British high-level, university-based programs which are more extensive than those of AID. In fact, the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Cooperation, which has a major education and training component worldwide, has announced a doubling of its financial effort (up to £ 3,000,000 next year). Canadian opportunities for African students are increasing also. In other words, the judgment in foreign assistance circles in other countries seems to be that the scholarship axis is still a viable, necessary, and undiminished relationship with most African nations.

*Do they provide funds  
to assist in planning?  
What's wrong?*

*BT WTS?*

THINK APPEARS TO US: ACADemics say Universities can use better trained people in more than 70 countries desirable

We conclude, therefore, on the basis of the goals of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, the needs implicit in requests from educational-manpower bodies in the African countries, and the judgments of technical assistance officers both from the U.S. and other donor countries, that sufficient need exists for continuation of AID-funded graduate scholarships for Africans through 1980. That need is most acute qualitatively and in the developmental fields. <sup>which?</sup> Comment will later follow on country differences, the changed nature of the needs, and the relative roles of U.S. and African universities in meeting them.

Evaluation of the need for an intra-Africa program like INTERAF calls for very different considerations. So long as some African countries have less-than-complete university offerings at home (e.g., in the professions), inter-country or overseas opportunities will be imperative at both undergraduate and graduate levels. It is clear that with the exception of Nigeria, and perhaps Ghana, such need will persist throughout sub-Saharan Africa beyond 1980. The question is whether Africans or Americans should provide, or somehow share, the finances in proper balance with other donors.

Comment is now in order on the kind of need, particularly at the graduate level, and the changes therein. To say needs are sufficient to justify AID funding into the 1980's is not to say the situation is static. The kind of manpower need is changing and will change. These are the trends:

1. toward the qualitative side, particularly the graduate, professional and specialized;
2. toward filling the gaps in indigenous education and manpower development;
3. selection and training for genuinely critical needs identified in current employment situations or in urgent problems in national development amenable to university-based knowledge and skills;
4. toward the multiplier or leverage positions, such as managerial talent, planning officers, teacher-educators (the trainers of teachers), researchers, and university personnel;

5. toward refresher training, such as overseas for personnel educated exclusively in Africa and topping-up for strategic, established, securely-placed personnel with five or more years of service remaining;
6. toward relevance for employment or task, with the degree and academic experience subordinate thereto, although often the efficient means to such employment or task;
7. toward doing what can be done locally or in-country, rather than overseas.

In view of these trends and AID's predilections, a caveat is needed. In addition to the needs described above, although sometimes reachable through the same route, there is a need for the utilization of universities for more general objectives--for general education, for leadership, for the ability "to take command"; for the development of excellent, broad-gauged student's potential on his own terms in confidence that great, even if unpredictable, social usefulness will follow. While this need exists in the clear interest of both the U.S. and Africa, we quickly conclude that it is too untargeted, too "inefficient," and too long-term to be embraced by AID and its appropriate and preferred contribution among the totality of needs and donors.

Our scope of work called for us to address ourselves to country-specific needs, which we understand is interpreted to mean differential needs within Africa, and not country-by-country descriptions or prescriptions. It is clear that countries should be treated individually or by groups as LDCs on a spectrum, as contrasted with reliance on generalized "African needs." At one end of the spectrum is Nigeria, whose rapid development makes increasing demands on specialized manpower, both in number and kind. Nigeria now has the financial capacity to develop its needed higher education programs internally and to pay for its own scholarship programs overseas. However, Nigeria might benefit from advice in planning and implementing specially designed graduate programs unavailable at home but capable of long-range scheduling with American universities. Although this is not its direct responsibility, AID may desire to advise Nigeria in this matter as the

present scholarship aid comes to an end. At the other end of the spectrum, the 16 African countries listed by the United Nations as the least developed should have explicit priority access. For all countries, the appropriate strategy for determining country-specific needs, both in practical terms and in the spirit of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, is reliance on local determination through existing or established local mechanisms which combine educational and planning/development representation. It is through such local determination, rather than some prior listing, that country-specific needs must be derived.

#### ASSUMPTIONS

As we now attempt to formulate options for the future course of AFGRAD and INTERAF, we inevitably employ certain assumptions or concluding inferences. Since these are crucial, they should be set forth candidly here. Chief among them are these:

1. that reliable, current manpower data for Africa are not available by country or region to utilize as a base for the projection of need for highly trained specialized manpower for development.
2. that in the absence of such data, the most reliable guidelines will be found in the planning documents of the LDC and foreign donor agencies and in the counsel of the appropriate authorities in such countries and agencies.
3. that for long-term national development purposes, home-trained African specialized talent is usually preferred by LDCs and donor agencies, as opposed to expatriate talent.
4. that most African countries can move within a decade to a minimum self-sufficiency in regard to the availability of undergraduate higher education if effective inter-African student/staff exchange programs are accelerated. (Important exceptions include the special assistance required by the recently liberated Portuguese colonies, and the long continuing need for foreign undergraduate training for a few carefully selected African scholars in

highly specialized fields of science and technology related to development in priority areas.)

5. that the ability of African nations to finance the training of specialized manpower varies greatly and that these variations must be taken into account in an effective implementation of the AFGRAD and INTERAF programs.
6. that as a consequence of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973, with its emphasis on LDC involvement and the impact on the rural poor, the scholarship program base should shift to Africa as rapidly as capacity there will permit, with strengthening of the program management by Africans.

#### OPTIONS

In an effort to be of maximum assistance to the Africa Bureau of AID in its responsibility for making management decisions on the future of AFGRAD and INTERAF, options or alternate courses of action are set forth here, rather than a single recommended action. The importance of each program is recognized and the significance of the time frame for each is emphasized, although the interrelatedness of the two programs is always kept in mind.

Option I: Keep both AFGRAD and INTERAF programs on their present glide paths of termination, with a completion date of June 1979.

For AFGRAD this means that the final student selection will probably be in December 1975 and the final student intake will come in September 1976. The last students will leave the academic pipeline in June 1979.

For INTERAF the final student selection and entry will be in the academic year 1975-76 and the last students will leave the pipeline in 1978-79.

Comment: Only minor modifications can be introduced at this late date. The terminal date seems premature in view of the evidence of need stated in this report.

Comment: This appears to terminate scholarship support prematurely for many LDCs. Also, it is an untimely ending of the broader-based partnership support for the Association of African Universities.

Despite all efforts which can be made to secure maximum benefits under this option, the termination date will remain inconsistent with the findings of this report in regard to the intensity of need and current shortfall in high-level manpower requirements for African development.

Option II: Keep both AFGRAD and INTERAF programs as separate operations at the present intake levels, with a completion date of June 1984 (allowing a five-year planning period beyond Option I).

For AFGRAD this provides ample planning opportunity to apply the guidelines of (a) top-quality candidates, (b) leadership targeted in key development areas, (c) proper preparation, and (d) proper placement.

For INTERAF there is sufficient lead time for the establishment of promotion schemes wherein LDCs begin to build an appreciation and preference for African higher education for Africans. There is lead time to help AAU develop experience and stability, with enduring multi-agency support, as the administrative agency for the coordination of African higher education.

In view of the great AID investment already made in African universities and in other modes of African development, this option, in sharp contrast to Option I, would avoid what could be a costly error: "leaving the game at the half-time".

Option III: Wind down some fraction of AFGRAD (say two-thirds) by adding an equivalent graduate component to INTERAF, with retention of the AFGRAD remainder more specifically for monitored use in preparation of specialized talent for critical, development-related positions in Africa.

This option is based on the conviction that an American phase-out should be geared to the existence of adequate African graduate capacity. Its simplicity of phase-out/phase-in, with a transfer from the U.S. to Africa, is appealing. An essential feature of Option III is the long-term retention of a reduced U.S. university component for graduate education but with further attention to targeted employment-related needs, tailor-made student programs, monitoring of educational progress, and African repatriation. The emphasis is on the strategic or critical position (and the incumbent or intended incumbent), not on generalized graduate education for the individual's benefit. To make good on the targeting, this proposal contemplates the dropping of the tuition-waiver feature and the substitution of a cost-of-education allowance to the universities as a mode of leverage for AID's objectives. While this option would require AID funding to replace U.S. tuition waivers, the total cost to AID would be reduced because part of the program would be in Africa.

Option IV: Shift programs to Africa and African institutions by

1. phasing out AFGRAD
2. building up INTERAF with a graduate component
3. (with the further option of) making graduate appointments tenable either in Africa or in the U.S. as required by their specific employment relationships (with a fixed ratio between African and U.S. numbers, fluidity on the basis of experience, or scheduled phase-out for the U.S. component).



This option puts graduate education on a deliberately shared U.S.-African basis, with choice as to the "mix." It could and should have the same critical-position orientation contemplated in III. But above all else, it places the center of gravity in Africa. African mechanisms would decide on the utilization of U.S. university places, although an American-based intermediary might maintain the necessary host-university liaison. Expanded in-Africa services of the Association of African Universities would be particularly appropriate, with both direct and indirect benefits.

Looking back at all the options, combinations are obviously possible also. The use of intermediaries for administration of the program or programs--an evaluation which we regard as beyond our charge--is also a potential variable in the options. We can only say that we believe AID should contract for what it regards and can negotiate as the most effective means of program administration. We do observe that (1) we have encountered nothing to make an issue of possible changes in the present intermediaries; (2) intermediation through some mechanism familiar to, and with the confidence of, the U.S. university community is desirable; and (3) intermediation through the Association of African Universities has special advantages and multipliers: it builds an Africa-wide capacity which can be used for other purposes and will endure after aid ceases; it places confidence in Africans and other priorities; it can be the vehicle for eliciting African replacement funds; and it can reduce the American presence and cost required for administration in Africa.

From these options or some combination, the appropriate officials of the Africa Bureau of AID should be able to choose for the future. In so doing, we suggest that attention be given these considerations as part of a screening mechanism for testing each option:

1. A shift to Africa is desirable--for priority setting, student nomination, university facilities, central management, and assured repatriation--reserving American opportunities for filling out, topping up, or unique

specialization. An intermediate stage of control should soon be established, if possible, which involves both African and U.S. higher education association.

2. As basic criteria to guide AID in its investment in AFGRAD and INTERAF:

a. AID, in counsel with LDCs and appropriate intermediaries, should identify the academic fields of specialization within which scholarships will be offered.

b. Participating LDCs should be responsible for documenting their needs for training opportunities for specific types of specialized manpower directly related to national development plans and should specify where and how such talent will be used.

c. Each LDC annual scholarship quota should depend upon:

(a) strength of documentation designated in criterion b.

(b) availability of higher education opportunities within country and for region.

(c) ability of an LDC to pay for its own needs.

3. AID and American universities can and should cooperate as partners, but neither is amenable to quick change by the other; therefore, AID should for its particular purposes

a. go to the universities for what they can and will do best, under conditions which will maximize understanding and mutuality of interest;

b. reimburse universities for what AID wants, such as tailor-made programs, evaluations on AID's own terms, and conformity with the schedule for repatriation.

4. Encouragement should be given U.S.-African interinstitutional cooperation in research projects of advanced African graduate students, such as faculty collaboration in thesis supervision, student residence in more than one university and country, or projects related to career and country of student origin (with the parallel use of supplementary service or work experience when more appropriate).
5. The tuition-waiver principle on the U.S. university side, combined with a targeted manpower-related goal on AID's side, is a confusion of concepts and is often counterproductive to AID objectives. The waiver principle, in which the university sees itself as adding to its pool of promising graduate material, should generally be reserved for programs based on individual merit, personal benefit, and adherence to conventional academic study--not for AID's more immediate and targeted purposes.
6. Instead of scattering widely among American universities (partly as a consequence of tuition waivers), AID should give further consideration to placing African students in a more manageable number of universities--manageable in efficiency, student program building, and ease of the intermediary's "keeping in touch," and more manageable through the creation of a critical mass of like-targeted students, or at least some continuity over time. A significant increase in the quality of the U.S. university contribution would almost certainly result from such concentrated attention, such utilization of faculty who know the country or countries represented, and such reliance on the cost-of-education payment which the private foundations have found effective.

7. Since the development of graduate studies in African universities is inevitable, their selective encouragement and use are desirable aid objectives.
8. Effective African management of INTERAF is critical, and appropriate incentives should be associated with AID's scholarship support.
9. The INTERAF undergraduate component should be supported increasingly by the African governments themselves, with generous lead time. It may be desirable, therefore, to arrange with the Association of African Universities for the generation of African support for intra-African exchanges, at least to achieve some significant degree of matching by the end of the 1975-80 period.

#### POSTSCRIPT

Another dimension of the problem should not be overlooked, as briefly alluded to earlier. One of the persistent tensions in AID-university relations is an understandable difference, and sometimes a polarity, in goal perception, on the continuum from what is narrowly called "training" to what is expansively called "education." This seeming mismatch was a fundamental problem in the ASPAU program. Nevertheless, AID as a mission-oriented agency is fully justified in targeting its resources. U.S. dollars are intended for "technical assistance." Public accountability is immediate. AID can do only a small fraction of the African manpower development job anyway. For all these reasons, this report (concentrates on scholarship options which are most fitting for AID. \*

It must be noted, however, that U.S. universities can contribute to African development needs beyond the options explored here. There is a significant place for a broader-based type of university scholarships, grounded on academic merit, open-ended as to objective, and reliant on the social benefits which derive from the greatest refinement of individual talents. Somewhere in the total pattern of U.S.-African

relations such opportunities should exist into the indefinite future. Their provision should be a challenge both to private philanthropy and to certain governmental funds. Our concern here is more limited--shorter-term objectives, development-related, and geared to the needs of manpower planning--and confined to what is appropriate for technical assistance through AID. We are here concerned with a part of the total--only a part among all international donors and only a part even for the U.S.

AID-university relations will be improved, and the education of African students thus benefited, to the extent that this distinction is recognized by all parties.

Eldon L. Johnson

Clifford S. Liddle

PROFILE

African Scholarship Program of American Universities (ASPAU)

This program was begun in 1961 to help meet African requirements for trained manpower by supporting the efforts of U.S. colleges and universities to provide undergraduate training for selected African students. Under this program, over 220 American institutions have provided tuition-free, four-year scholarships. The students' home country pays international travel costs and A.I.D. pays for their subsistence and other program expenses. The program is administered by the African-American Institute (AAI) which is responsible for selection and university placement, maintenance payments and other administrative arrangements.

Additional grants were awarded for undergraduate transfer candidates who fulfilled certain preconditions not applicable to the normal ASPAU program. The sub-project of the ASPAU program was entitled "African Transfer Student Awards" (ATSA).

The ASPAU (and ATSA) program is terminating at the end of FY 1975 with the graduation of the students still in U.S. universities. The Inter-African Universities Scholarship Program (INTERMAR) was developed to substitute for this program because of the increased capability of African institutions to meet undergraduate training needs.

ASPAU PROGRAM

Statistical Profile	Student Nos. (Cumulative Totals) 1961 - 6/30/74
Total Awards	1,594
Graduates	1,440
Withdrawals	146
% Program Completions	91%
% Repatriation	56.7%
Average Student Cost	(\$4,091) <sup>1/</sup>

Fields of Study

Engineering and Technical Sciences	523
Liberal Arts/Social Sciences	287
B. Admin./Econ./Govt.	234
Medicine/Paramedical/Related	198
Education/Teaching	131
Agric./Land Resources	126
Urban Studies	83
	12

Major Country Participants

Nigeria	378
Kenya	129
Cameroon	121
Uganda	112
Tanzania	109
Rhodesia	95
Zambia	93
Ethiopia	91
Ghana	72
Malawi	66
Zaire	65
(Others - See separate table)	263

<sup>1/</sup> Includes: Program Cost per Student - \$2,647  
Admin. Cost per Student - 1,444

\$4,091

ASPAU

COUNTRY DISTRIBUTION

ASPAU Country Participants  
(continued from ASPAU Profile)

Country	Cumulative 1961 - 6/1974
Ivory Coast	35
Morocco	25
Senegal	22
Sierra Leone	19
Malagasy Republic	19
Seychelles	16
Somalia	15
Togo	13
Liberia	13
Dahomey	12
Swaziland	12
Botswana	11
Gambia	11
Tunisia	10
Lesotho	7
Chad	6
Mali	5
Niger	5
Upper Volta	4
Congo (Brazzaville)	2
Gabon	<u>1</u>
	1,594



AFGRAD PROGRAM

<u>Statistical Profile</u>	<u>FY 1974</u>	<u>Student Nos. (Cumulative Totals) 3/1/63 - 6/30/74</u>
Total Awards	130	913
Graduates	-	558
Withdrawals/Terminations	-	42
Repatriation	77 (90.6%)	545 (90.2%)
Average Student Cost	(\$5,148) <sup>1/</sup>	-

Major Fields of Study

Economic and Bus. Admin.	33	157
Engineering	24	142
Science (Physical and Life)	9	140
Agriculture	21	88
Education	10	68
Administrative Professions	3	63
Mathematics	7	56
Medical Related <sup>2/</sup>	9	77

Country Participation

Nigeria	18	183
Ghana	21	148
Ethiopia	17	145
Kenya	6	69
Uganda	7	58
Cameroon	8	46
Zaire	4	32
Tanzania	2	32
Ivory Coast	5	25
Others (See Table III)		

<sup>1/</sup> Includes program cost per student	\$3,723
administration cost per student	<u>1,425</u>
	\$5,148

<sup>2/</sup> Of the 32 countries some have participated more consistently than others.

AFGRAD

COUNTRY DISTRIBUTION

AFGRAD Country Participants  
(continued from AFGRAD Profile)

<u>Country</u>	<u>FY 1974</u>	<u>Cumulative 3/63 - 6/74</u>
Liberia	8	20
Zambia	4	20
Sierra Leone	3	19
Senegal	3	19
Sudan	5	15
Malawi	3	15
Tunisia	4	12
Morocco	-	8
Swaziland	4	7
Lesotho	2	6
Mali	1	5
Togo	2	5
Madagascar	-	4
Rhodesia	-	4
Botswana	2	3
Somalia	-	3
Upper Volta	1	3
Dahomey	-	2
Burundi	-	1
Chad	-	1
Mauritius	-	1
Mozambique	-	1
Niger	-	1
	<u>130</u>	<u>913</u>

PROFILE

Inter-African Universities Scholarship Program (INTERAF); Project Number 698-11-660-210; Grant AID/afr-608 with Association of African Universities (AAU)

The purpose of this project is to provide undergraduate, diploma and certificate training for Africans at African universities outside their home countries through a grant to the AAU.

Because of the increased capability of African universities to assume a larger role in training Africans at the undergraduate level, training under this program has been progressively substituted for that provided in the U.S. under the African Scholarship Program of American Universities (ASPAU). This project seeks to encourage the maximum use of the existing facilities, minimize the costly duplication of facilities by African universities, and reduce the need for African governments to send students overseas.

Between 1967 and 1971, the African-American Institute (AAI) administered this program; first under a direct contract with A.I.D., then under a subcontract with the AAU who received a grant directly from A.I.D. Commencing July 1, 1971, the AAU assumed major responsibility for the administration and guidance of the INTERAF program. Participation of other donors is being actively sought by the AAU, and a number of countries now contribute varying amounts of money to support this program.

Since the inception of this program in 1967 through June 30, 1973, approximately 1,044 students from more than 33 countries have studied under the INTERAF program. Currently, there are about 765 students in the program at an average student cost of \$1,900 yearly.

INTERAF PROGRAM

INTERAF Student Enrollment by University  
1974/75

Countries Participating

University

1. Botswana
2. Cameroon
3. Chad
4. Dahomey
5. Ethiopia
6. Gambia
7. Ghana
8. Guinea
9. Kenya
10. Lesotho
11. Liberia
12. Malawi
13. Mali
14. Mauritius
15. Morocco
16. Niger
17. Nigeria
18. O.A.U.
19. Rhodesia
20. Rwanda
21. Senegal
22. Sierra Leone
23. Somalia
24. Sudan
25. Swaziland
26. Tanzania
27. Togo
28. Tunisia
29. Uganda
30. Upper Volta
31. Zaire
32. Zambia

Abidjan	23
A.B.U.	30
Ain Shams	-
A.U.C.	-
Benin-Lome	36
Cairo	-
Cameroon	53
Cape Coast	15
C.E.S. - Niamey	8
Cuttington	7
Dahomey	-
Dakar	102
Dar es Salaam	23
E.N.I. - Bamako	6
F.B.C.	26
H.S.I.U. - Addis	31
Ibadan	8
I F E	25
Khartoum	8
Lagos	39
Legon-Accra	18
Liberia	6
Makerere	14
Malawi	8
Mohammed V.	20
Nairobi	30
Njala	16
Nsukka	8
Tunis	23
U.B.L.S.	105
U.S.T. - Kumasi	16
Zaire	37
Zambia	24

TOTAL

765

SPECIALISTS CONSULTED

THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE

William R. Cotter, President  
Walter C. Carrington, Vice-President  
Ronald E. Springwater, Director of Education and Program Budgeting

THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION

Stephen H. Stackpole, Director, Commonwealth Program  
Patrick Murphy

THE FORD FOUNDATION

Elinor H. Barber, Program Officer, International Division

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION

Joseph E. Black, Director, Social Sciences  
Ralph K. Davidson, Deputy Director, Social Sciences  
Joseph R. Bookmyer, Fellowship Associate

THE UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, NEW YORK

Abebe Ambatchew, Bureau for African Affairs

THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (ICED)

Kenneth W. Thompson, Director of Program on Higher Education  
for Development

THE WORLD BANK

Duncan Ballantine, Director, Education Department  
Mulugeta Wodajo, Advisor, Higher Education

PRACTICAL CONCEPTS INCORPORATED

Leon J. Rosenberg, President  
Molly Hageboeck, Consultant  
Members of PCI Study Team for Evaluation of ASPAU, AFGRAD and  
INTERAF: "Impact on Regional Scholarship Programs on Manpower  
Needs in Africa"- November 1973.

SPECIALISTS CONSULTED (continued)

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AFRICA BUREAU

Dennis Conroy, Director, Office of African Regional Affairs  
Frank Moore, Chief, Policy Planning and Analysis Division, AFR/DP  
Arthur Howard, Consultant  
Alvis Hardie, Education Advisor  
George Jespersen, Project Manager

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAINING (OIT)

Philip Sperling, Evaluation  
Milton Carr  
Ruth Rossiter  
Thomas Weir

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS (CU)

Gilbert Anderson, Office of Policy and Plans  
James Wachob, Office of African Programs  
Marjorie Rodgers, Office of African Programs

OVERSEAS LIAISON COMMITTEE, AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

Consultants:

Karl Bigelow, Professor Emeritus, Teachers College,  
Columbia University

Cleveland Dennard, President, Washington Technical Institute  
Washington, D.C.

Carl K. Eicher, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Michigan  
State University, and Chairman of OLC

John Hanson, Professor of International Education and African  
Studies, Michigan State University

Frederick Harbison, Professor of Economics and Public Affairs,  
Princeton University

Arthur Lewis, Chairman, Department of Curriculum and Instruction  
University of Florida

John S. McNown, Professor of Civil Engineering, University of  
Kansas

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. African-American Institute. Annual Reports, African Graduate Fellowship Program (AFGRAD).
2. African-American Institute. Annual Reports, African Scholarship Program of American Universities (ASPAU).
3. African-American Institute. Annual Reports, Inter-African Universities Scholarship Program (INTERAF).
4. Association of African Universities. Annual Reports, Inter-African Universities Scholarship Program (INTERAF).
5. Association of African Universities. The Constitution.
6. Association of African Universities. The Student Handbook.
7. Hanson, John W., and Crozier, D.J.S. Report on the Supply of Secondary Level Teachers in Africa: Shifting the Locus and Focus to Africa. East Lansing, Michigan: Board of Trustees, Michigan State University, 1974.
8. Education and World Affairs. Summary Report: Study of Manpower Needs, Educational Capabilities, and Overseas Study. By Study Committee on Manpower Needs and Educational Capabilities in Africa. New York: August 1965.
9. The United Nations. The Second United Nations Development Decade, Trends and Policies in the First Two Years. New York: 1974
10. UNESCO. Statistical Yearbooks.
11. Practical Concepts Inc. Evaluation of ASPAU, AFGRAD and INTERAF: Impact of Regional Scholarship Programs on Manpower Needs in Africa. Washington, D.C.: November 1973.

12. Agency for International Development. FY 1976 Field Budget Submissions for:

- a. Africa Regional
- b. East Africa Regional
- c. Southern Africa
- d. Ethiopia
- e. Ghana
- f. Kenya
- g. Liberia
- h. Morocco
- i. Nigeria
- j. Tunisia
- k. Zaire

13. Agency for International Development. FY 1974 and FY 1975 Africa Programs. Submissions to the Congress.

14. Agency for International Development. Development Assistance Plans for Ethiopia and Kenya. 1974.