

Ranfarts

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY'S
CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS
WITH OVERSEAS INSTITUTIONS

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to the Academic Council

May 10, 1966

Michigan State University's
Contractual Relations
With Overseas Institutions

I. The Charge to the Committee

At its meeting on December 7, 1965, the Academic Council discussed University policy defining the manner of involvement of Michigan State University with overseas institutions. A portion of the minutes of that meeting read as follows:

"The Academic Steering Committee thought it worthwhile to present the matter to the Council since there is an interest in the general policy defining the manner of involvement of this University with other institutions. The propriety of our cooperative relations with other universities is not in question. There is a need for a delimitation of the sphere of our responsibility wherever such relations are contracted. After some discussion by the President and others in which the contractual relations between this institution and others were described, it was moved: 'That upon the recommendation of the Committee on Committees, the President appoint an ad hoc committee which will take this matter under study.' The motion was approved."

President Hannah, on January 28, appointed a three-member ad hoc committee consisting of the undersigned with instructions "to prepare a report on Michigan State University's relationships with overseas universities."

II. The Committee's Definition of its Task

The Committee interpreted its charge to mean the following:

- A. It should develop policy recommendations which would help both to protect the interests of the University and to improve the quality of its overseas work.
- B. It should review both past and present policies and programs but its task was not to investigate the operation of any overseas project.
- C. While the charge to the Committee refers to the University's overseas relations both with "institutions" in general and "universities" in particular,

we interpreted this broadly to mean contractual relationships of an international character such as those described in the appendix of this report.

- D. The campus aspects of International Programs, such as the International Institutes and Centers and foreign student programs, are not included in the Committee's charge.

III. The Committee's Procedure

The Committee, in addition to working as a group, sought counsel among other interested faculty members in the development of this report. The following steps were taken to help the Committee understand the full implications of the problem and to develop constructive recommendations. The Committee:

- A. Met with the Steering Committee of the Academic Senate, a first time for preliminary discussions, and a second time to get reactions to a draft of the report.
- B. Circulated draft copies of the report among the thirty member International Programs Advisory Committee and asked for their comments and suggestions. Our original plan was to meet with this Committee. We regret that time did not permit.
- C. Passed copies of the draft among other interested colleagues for their reactions and suggestions.

The Committee appreciates the many suggestions it has received, but assumes full responsibility for the contents of this report.

IV. Background

The nature and extent of Michigan State University's commitments overseas are

generally known and need not be repeated here. A brief summary of current involvements, however, serves to underscore the importance of reviewing periodically the policies which guide one of the major enterprises of this University. The following is a cross-sectional view of our overseas projects as of April, 1966.

Our overseas projects are of two broad types, technical assistance and research. It is interesting and significant to note that during the last two years research projects have become a sizable component of our overseas program.

In the field of technical assistance we are currently engaged in nine projects with educational institutions overseas with annual budgets totaling \$2,304,000. The fields represented are Agriculture, Business Administration, Education, and Rural and Institutional Development. Fifty-seven professional contract people are working currently on these nine projects. Of these fifty-seven forty-six have faculty status at Michigan State University.

The University is currently involved in five overseas research projects with annual budgets totaling \$1,412,000. The areas of concern are Communication, Agricultural Economics, Agriculture, and Food Marketing. These research projects together have a staff of twenty-three persons of whom eleven have faculty status at Michigan State University. The relatively low University faculty participation in these research projects is explained by the fact that one is a Consortium project with three other universities which provide the majority of the staff.

A more detailed picture of our current overseas programs, both technical assistance and research, is found in the appendix of this report.

V. The Problem

Universities which undertake overseas programs are usually involved in

sensitive areas of human and governmental affairs. The very nature of overseas technical assistance and research programs imposes upon the participants both intellectual and professional responsibilities of a high order. Overseas programs by definition take place in a cross-cultural and cross-national setting; divergent views are in almost daily confrontation. Communication is frequently difficult. Intense feeling of personal and national pride are commonly involved.

Involved, too, are hard decisions, for overseas programs are conducted within a context of social, economic, and political change. Established procedures and rules of conduct for arriving at decisions frequently do not exist. The very concepts of development and institution building, with which our projects are concerned, require that people work in emerging rather than well defined situations. Experience is useful only as it can be employed to help plan and shape future development.

The University's success in such operations depends upon how well it makes a series of decisions which range along the course of a project from its inception, through its development and implementation, to final phase-out. These decisions suggest questions like the following:

A. Project Selection

1. Does the project fit into the major educational purposes of this University?
2. Will the University's efforts in the project strengthen the educational enterprise overseas?
3. Does the project require the kind of knowledge and experience which is represented in the faculty?
4. Can we staff the project from our own faculty? Do we have the other resources required to do the job?

5. What will be the likely contribution of the project toward strengthening campus teaching, research, and service?
6. Will the faculty have freedom to do research and to publish?
7. What is the nature of the commitment to the project of the host nationals and the funding agency?

B. Project Development and Implementation

1. What are the main elements of the plan for developing the project?
2. What are the substantive requirements of the plan?
3. What steps are required to implement the plan?
4. How can faculty members who accept appointments to work overseas be oriented both to the work of the project and the University's purposes in foreign programs?
5. What kind of professional support on campus is required to help the project achieve its full potential abroad?
6. How can the overseas experience of faculty members best be fed back into the academic program on campus?

C. Phase-Out

1. After the project is finished are there possibilities for new and mutually profitable institution-to-institution relationships?
2. What does the experience of the project suggest for the future conduct of the University's overseas programs?
3. How can the experience of returning faculty members be used for their own professional profit and for the academic advantage of Michigan State University?

The University's long range success in these operations depends upon the wise resolution of questions like these. Obviously there are no single "right" answers. But there are some answers which are more "right" than others for a university of our character and purposes. It is our job to keep looking for them.

The problem, then, is to examine carefully (1) the assumptions and procedures for selecting the types of projects in which we shall work, (2) of developing the kinds of programs which are designed to do the job we want them to do, both abroad and on campus, and (3) to take the long view in working to extend the usefulness of the project after it has actually terminated.

VI. Policy Goals

Future policy considerations must emerge from the University's purposes and goals in overseas work. These have been stated at numerous times by many persons over the long course of the University's involvement in overseas activities. Broadly stated these goals include the following:

- A. To strengthen the educational enterprise overseas through the application of technical knowledge and the capabilities of this University.
- B. To expand existing knowledge about international and cross-cultural affairs through stimulation of faculty participation in consultation and research and student interest in problems related to these matters.
- C. To strengthen on-campus academic programs related to the developing areas of the world and to the development process.
- D. To strengthen campus programs designed to produce specialists who are capable of using their abilities in foreign settings in a productive manner.

VII. Policy Constraints

The institutional risks involved in working toward these goals are high. Any

educational institution involved in overseas work assumes a position both of high visibility and vulnerability. High also are the educational opportunities. In view of the considerations both of high risk and high opportunity what should be the constraints on our policy? We believe that the University's policy governing our contractual relations with overseas institutions should:

- A. Recognize that the risks of disruptive incident are built-in occupational hazards in the operation of overseas programs.
- B. Minimize such risks in every way possible.
- C. Provide for means of anticipating problems before they become critical.
- D. Provide for means of handling such problems if they become critical.

VIII. Policy Content

The following substantive considerations may prove helpful in assisting the University to maximize the educational opportunities and to minimize the risks involved in overseas programs. These considerations relate to all three phases of a project -- selection, development and implementation, and phase-out.

- A. The University, we recommend, should engage in projects which:
 - 1. Appear to have the greatest potential for contributing to the social, economic, and political development of the host country.
 - 2. Reflect clear faculty interest rooted in the professional schools, departments and/or area studies.
 - 3. Can be administered in such a manner that faculty interest and participation can be maintained or enhanced.
 - 4. Offer maximum opportunity for feed-back to campus in teaching, research, and service.

5. Provide professional opportunities overseas for faculty and graduate students beyond the normal requirements of rendering assistance.
 6. Offer possibilities for developing long-range relationships of mutual benefit both for the University and cooperating overseas institutions.
 7. Involve the building of new educational institutions or the revitalization of the old ones.
 8. Advance our support of the principle of free society and free inquiry.
- B. Conversely, we recommend that the University avoid projects which:
1. Compromise the principle of free society and free inquiry.
 2. Cannot be staffed largely from Michigan State University faculty.
 3. Require the University to work with non-educational or non-research type institutions.
 4. Are too sensitive or too close to power centers of government to afford the chance of doing successful work.
 5. Place faculty members in positions as final decision makers.

IX. Next Steps

A. We need to find a way to increase faculty contributions to the development of the University's overseas policy.

At the present International Programs has an advisory committee consisting of thirty members who are appointed by the Deans of the Colleges. This committee assists International Programs by reacting to a broad range of questions periodically presented to it.

We see value in establishing a standing faculty committee, in harmony

with present University rules, which is independent of overseas project operations and broadly representative of the faculty. The University's extensive commitments overseas, the large number of faculty involved, and the broad impact of foreign programs on this institution would seem to warrant the continuing attention of a standing faculty committee. The standing committee should pay particular attention to considerations designed to protect the University's interests, strengthen its international work both on campus and abroad, and reinforce the link between the faculty and International Programs.

B. International Programs should make provisions for appropriate orientation for faculty going overseas. Faculty members representing this University abroad are entitled to be familiar both with the University's aims and purposes in the international field and the program of the particular project on which they are to work. Included in such orientation might be some of the following: (1) statements regarding the University's overseas policy, (2) written information and documentation about the project, (3) advance visits to the project, (4) understandings related to the culture of the area, (5) language instruction as appropriate, and (6) information about the freedoms and constraints under which advisors work. In orientation programs the experience of faculty members who have served abroad is an invaluable resource and should be used wherever appropriate.

A final word from the Committee. We were appointed in January and began our work prior to recent events, charged with helping to develop policy considerations which can strengthen and guide this University in its overseas work in the years

ahead. The past is instructive. We hope its lessons are reflected in this report. The future is where we shall work. We trust that our recommendations have relevance for what is to come.

Respectfully submitted,

The Committee:

Ralph H. Smuckler

John P. Henderson

Cole S. Brembeck

APPENDIX

Michigan State University International

Projects as of April, 1966.

MSU INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS AS OF APRIL, 1966¹

Contract Project	Counterpart Host Institute	Dates of (a) Origin and (b) Expected Finish	Purpose of Project	Field(s) of Effort	Sponsoring Agency and Annual Budget	Number of Contract Staff in Field	Number of Contract Staff of MSU Faculty Status
<u>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS</u>							
1. Argentina	College of Agriculture of University of Mar del Plata	(a)February 1, 1965 (b)About 6 years	Assist in developing new agricultural college at Balcarce	Agriculture	AID \$144,000	1 plus 1 short term staff	1 plus 1 short term staff
2. Brazil	Getulio Vargas Foundation; U of Rio Grande do Sul; U of Bahia	(a)October 1, 1958 (b)August 1966	Assist in establishing first school in Brazil of business	Business Administration	AID \$200,000	3	2
3. Central America, (Assn. of American Schools)	Bi-National and U.S. sponsored Central American Schools	(a)July 1, 1960 (b)Indefinite	Develop teacher education, educational research	Education	Dept. of State \$25,000	2 short term staff	2 short term staff
4. Nigeria (Peace Corps Masters in Education)	Nigeria	(a)April 14, 1965 (b)January 1968	Train Peace Corps Volunteers for O/Seas teaching and MSU M.A. in Education	Education	AID \$110,000	1	1

continued...

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS

5. Nigeria	University of Nigeria	(a)March 18, 1960 (b)About 1970	Develop new University	General University	AID \$1, 113, 000	30 plus 2 short term staff	22 plus 1 short term staff
6. Pakistan	Academies for Rural Development, Peshawar and Comilla	(a)June 1957 (b)About 1968	Assistance for Pakistan sponsored rural develop- ment program	Rural Development	Ford Foundation \$196, 000	4	3
7. Ryukyus	University of Ryukyus	(a)October 16, 1951 (b)Indefinite	Assist in University total development	General University	Dept. of Army \$140, 000	4	4
8. Thailand	Thai Ministry of Edu- cation and National Education Council	(a)July 24, 1964 (b)August 1968	Study and assist national education planning	Education, Research	AID \$208, 000	4 plus 1 short term staff	4 plus 1 short term staff
9. Turkey	Four Turkish Academies of Economics & Business Ankara, Istanbul, Izmir, and Eskishehir	(a)February 27, 1964 (b)June 1968	Assist and strengthening Turkish academies in business administration	Business Administration	AID \$168, 000	4	4
Total					\$2, 304, 000		

RESEARCH PROJECTSMSU International Projects as of April, 1966,¹ continued...

1. Communication, (Diffusion Research)	Univ. of Minas Gerais, Brazil; Nat'l Inst. Comm., Development, India; EDI Nigeria	(a)December 10, 1964 (b)January 1968	Study diffusion and adop- tion of innovations in rural developing societies	Communication	AID \$250,000	8	4
2. Europe, (EEC Countries)	Univ. of Gottingen	(a)June 4, 1965 (b)March 15, 1967	Study EEC Agriculture and its implications regarding future U.S. imports.	Agricultural Economics	Dept. of Agriculture \$84,000	3	3
3. Latin America, (Comparative Study in Food Marketing)	Puerto Rico and Argentina	(a)April 15, 1965 (b)About 2 years	Study L. A. food marketing systems	Food Marketing	AID \$264,000	2 plus 1 short term staff	2 plus 1 short term staff
4. Latin America, (Food Marketing)	Latin America Generally	(a)March 1, 1966 (b)March 1968	Establish National Market Development Planning Center for L. A.	Food Marketing	AID \$199,000	0	0
5. Nigeria (Rural Development) ²	Various Nigerian universities and gov't institutions	(a)April 1, 1965 (b)August 1968	Study Nigeria's agricultural development (Consortium)	Agriculture	AID \$615,000	9 short term staff	1 short term staff
					\$1,412,000		

1. Data accurate for April, 1966, only since staff changes occur monthly.

2. MSU is headquarters for consortium research project. Other institutions include Kansas State University, Colorado State University and University of Wisconsin -- plus coordination with Department of Agriculture, Department of Interior and Research Triangle Institute in North Carolina.