

900
P20
UNAR 12

Evolution of the Foundation's
University Development Program

November, 1972

Ralph K. Davidson

NOVEMBER 1972

EVOLUTION OF THE FOUNDATION'S UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(The following notes are based on internal memos, annual reviews, and reports to the Trustees)

1. The Challenge of the Developing Countries. The Foundation's University Development Program evolved from a very deep concern for the problems faced by the developing countries which had earlier significantly influenced the decision to initiate an "Expanded Program" financed out of capital. The discussions within the Foundation during the decade of the fifties emphasized most strongly that the ideas and aspirations generated in the course of democratic, national and economic revolutions in the Western tradition were producing explosive demands for far-reaching changes in other parts of the world. It was emphasized that in the West these changes came slowly and often painfully, over a period of three centuries: capital was accumulated; governments and other institutions were modified; the base of education was broadened; science and technology steadily opened a new horizon; and a body of social experience was built upon trial and error. It was clear that the underdeveloped countries were borrowing ideas and aspirations and had examples before them of more "advanced" countries; but they lacked capital, trained leadership and educated people, political stability, and understanding of how change was to be digested and used by their own cultures. Perhaps more than anything else they lacked time.

The gap that existed in the middle fifties between hope and reality was very great; expectations easily outran any reasonable prospect of satisfaction. Leaders in Asia, Africa, the Middle East and Latin America were asking themselves some very difficult questions: "How can we manage to do quickly what can only be done slowly? How can we bypass three centuries of development and achieve for ourselves, in our own time, a fair portion

of the economic and social advances which other countries are already enjoying? How can governments proceed at a realistic pace, and remain in power against those who would exploit the obvious gap between what we have and what we want?"

The discussions within the Foundation emphasized that although generalizations must yield to local variations, there seemed to be little doubt that great issues were at stake in the areas under discussion which would profoundly affect the "well-being of mankind." Among them: whether newly independent nations could erect a structure of government and public order under which peaceful development might proceed; whether public office could become a public trust, separate from private interest; whether these "new" societies would be able to understand and to draw upon their own history and culture and effectively marry new ideas with the best of their own traditions; whether they would be "open" societies, in the humanist tradition of the West, or closed by dogma or ideology; whether a steady progress could be made in raising the real standards of living for people living at the edge of survival; whether the distribution of slender resources among such vast needs could be accomplished by democratic process; whether some balance could be found between growing populations and available resources. As the discussions indicated at the time, this list could be expanded, but clearly these were issues of prime importance, not only to the underdeveloped countries, but to the world as a whole.

It seemed very clear at the time that the Foundation could indeed play a very critical and catalytic role in the bringing together of resources not just from The Rockefeller Foundation, but from many other

international agencies to assist in tackling the problem of development in the less developed countries. The Foundation program was expanded to include an emphasis on food production, concern with population questions, and it was further suggested that among those areas where the Foundation could be most effective would be in strengthening selected universities. As one memo pointed out, there was a tremendous need for educated and trained individuals within the less developed countries. It was argued that the programs of national governments, the United Nations, the United States Technical Assistance Program, and the sizable undertakings of the Ford Foundation, were tending to overstress the highly immediate needs of the underdeveloped countries and the necessities of the moment to the neglect of the more basic but less obvious foundations on which a country had to rest its capacity to improve the well-being of its people. The traditional policy of the Foundation had been to work for the long-run and to contribute to the well-being of mankind through an extension of knowledge in selected fields through the application of existing knowledge to certain practical problems, and through the training of leadership. It was further urged that the application of this policy on the part of the Foundation to the underdeveloped countries would lead to a concentrated program working with universities.

The discussion in the middle fifties emphasized that the primary responsibility of the universities was teaching and research and the extension of research results. The universities have the fundamental and basic role of educating the needed people and undertaking research of long-run importance. The Foundation's own experience, as well as that of

the General Education Board in the South, it was emphasized, tended to show that health, education, increased productivity and cultural enrichment moved together. What the Foundation could do was to foster research in the overseas areas concentrated on the more abiding problems that underlay day-to-day problems. This type of study could only emerge in universities or similar scholarly institutions. It was also urged that a special opportunity in the area of development was in the social sciences directed to the noneconomic - social and political - barriers to economic and social development.

Of immediate concern to the Foundation at the time was how the Foundation could assist in helping to meet the needs of the less developed countries where a vast majority of the people of the world lived. A number of alternatives were put forward. It was urged that one of the most under-emphasized needs of the underdeveloped areas was for a vastly greater number of trained persons of all kinds; and, in view of the numbers required, it was argued that these could only be trained in the underdeveloped areas themselves. Furthermore, scarcely any of the developing countries had universities or institutions of higher learning equipped to train people in the numbers and to the level of proficiency needed. By far the biggest deficiency in the less developed countries seemed to be qualified faculty. Consequently, if the Foundation were to proceed in this direction, an appropriate initial step would appear to be to train the people who would train people. That is, staff development. Teaching and research and the extension of the results of the research were seen as proper university functions; furthermore they strengthen each other. The Foundation could

also assist by providing visiting staff who would get research started in the local environment by showing how it is done and actually participating in it. Furthermore, the Foundation might very well provide its own staff and, in addition, enable a few chosen universities to over-staff, so that regular university staff from American or other universities could participate for substantial periods of time (one or two years) in teaching and research programs overseas.

The discussion continued within the Foundation during the late fifties as the officers gathered more information and more experience in dealing with particular areas and departments of universities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Gradually a consensus developed that a program of concentrated support to a few universities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America would be a challenging opportunity to enable the Foundation to assist in meeting the complex problems of development in the so-called less developed countries.

The evolution of the University Development Program moved a step forward in 1960 with the presentation of a policy paper for discussion by the Foundation Trustees. It was suggested that a major cause of improvement of some institutions in Latin America, for example, lay in the continuing aid and encouragement provided by The Rockefeller Foundation through its several programs. The key to the success of the operating program of The Rockefeller Foundation had been its dynamic qualities. Every effort had been made to prevent them from becoming static or circumscribed, and the staff in the field and in New York had kept continuously alert to the possibilities of taking greater advantage of experience and progress for

increased human benefit. Intimately related to the operating activities of The Rockefeller Foundation have been those directed toward the training of individuals from a variety of scientific disciplines, and the support of carefully selected centers of research and education in universities, colleges and research institutions, both in the more highly developed countries of the world and in many of those nations considered to be underdeveloped. It was suggested that what was called for was the development of a new operating program, which would aim at the achievement of excellence on a university-wide basis in a few selected institutions in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. It was proposed that an interdisciplinary Foundation committee be established to review proposals and to make field visits to universities in the less developed countries.

The object of the new operating program would be to strengthen key educational and research programs of a university which would bring increasing benefits to the country concerned, as well as other countries within the region. The ultimate success of the program would depend upon the degree to which the several programs of The Rockefeller Foundation were able to collaborate in the creation of a pattern of excellence which would pervade the entire institution. It was further suggested that the goals of the institution could be achieved more quickly through direct and indirect assistance on a university-wide basis by a resident Rockefeller Foundation staff working in close association with the local personnel. It was visualized that this small nucleus of Rockefeller Foundation staff would become key faculty members in several sectors of the universities, such as medicine, economics, agriculture and possibly humanities. The group

would help to strengthen curricula, improve teaching and research facilities, and recommend selected students for postgraduate training. Ultimately, of course, the Foundation staff would be replaced by competent, well trained nationals, who by reason of their own abilities and association with Foundation staff members would be in a position to take full responsibility for further development of the university program. A major effort would be made to utilize local personnel and to train younger staff who would be expected to carry on in the years to come. Temporary specialists might be brought into the program for periods of a year or more, as the circumstances dictated. A most favorable response was received from the Trustees and Foundation officers were encouraged to develop a program to strengthen selected universities.

Additional steps were taken during 1961 and a policy statement prepared for Trustee consideration. This statement emphasized that, in seeking to exercise its mandate to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world, The Rockefeller Foundation had long held the philosophy that one of the most effective approaches to this goal was through assisting the development of increasing numbers of individuals qualified for important responsibilities within broad areas of their national interest. The statement went on to say that it was clearly evident that over many years educational centers have tended to be the principal training ground for the individuals who provide leadership in government, business, industry, education, the professions, and the humanities. Furthermore, the development of any country depends substantially on the degree to which it invests in the education and training of its youth.

The situation in the world was one in which there were many new states coming into being with great rapidity. It was quite evident, the statement went on to say, that these new nations did not have available to them the span of time that was invested in the development of most of the great universities of the world. The Rockefeller Foundation was in a position to assist in the development of a few key institutions. Many of the newer countries in the world could not hope to develop immediately a system of universities such as exists in the industrialized nations. These nations must begin with one or a few institutions of higher education and develop these as rapidly as possible in terms of the needs and economic resources of their country. If assistance could be given rather broadly to selected institutions, it was argued that many dividends would accrue. Among these would be contributions to the body of knowledge which should be of tremendous value locally and elsewhere; the education of increasing numbers of qualified students who would later become leaders in the arts, sciences, professions, business, industry, and government; the training of faculty and administrators who would be available in response to the needs of other institutions with signal benefits to their development; and, ultimately, the creation of departments for graduate and postdoctoral education for those whose future responsibilities would require education at these levels. Together, these developments would insure continuing leadership with benefits for the entire educational system and for economic and social progress within the country or region.

The statement furthermore went on to say that all organizations interested in assisting the less developed countries had experienced the

severe limitations on accomplishment imposed by the paucity of adequate centers for higher education and research. Essentially all efforts directed toward improvement of public health, nutrition, demographic studies, economic growth, and cultural development must, of necessity, be supported to some degree by local university facilities and personnel. Greatest success, it was suggested, would require a strengthening of the educational environment of the university as a whole. The goal was developing the institutions that would assist in the social, economic and cultural development of a country and region. Sound university development would require, it was suggested, the establishment or strengthening of basic departments that reinforce one another and set standards for learning and research beyond their immediate boundaries. Thus, support for a single university, it was argued, may yield greater returns than if the same assistance was used in many different centers. In this concept, the Foundation's role, it was suggested, would be one directed toward helping the universities achieve their own aspirations in terms of national needs defined and directed by their own leadership.

The program of support to a few selected universities in Asia, Africa, and Latin America which was gradually evolving, was based on the premise that the major barriers to social and economic goals in much of the world lay in an inadequate transfer of knowledge, methods, and materials that were then available. Furthermore, fundamental to future progress were improvements in educational systems and facilities, and the prompt and direct application of knowledge to those problems most critical to the well-being of mankind. Furthermore, educational institutions within each country would have to accept the increasing responsibilities for the

education and training of needed personnel for the accumulation and application of knowledge for national benefit. As improvements were brought forward in the basic sciences, the professions, the humanities, and the social sciences, it was expected that the university would become an increasingly important resource of needed knowledge and personnel and an intellectual center of national significance in responding to national needs. Further, it was suggested that the Foundation would cooperate with a small number of universities, possibly six to nine, located in the less developed countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

The aim of the program would be to help create stable, progressive and quality programs which would contribute to national needs in scholarly and scientific areas. Included would be the training of educators, scientists, and scholars to meet the requirements for teachers at various levels throughout the country; the preparation of medical, legal, agricultural, and other professional personnel to serve public needs in private and official capacities and to carry on essential research directed to the economic, social, technologic, and cultural needs of the country. As guidance to the program it was indicated that universities selected for developmental support by the Foundation should be considered in terms of the role of the university in the attainment of national goals, and the potential of the university for regional or international contributions. In the implementation of the program the Foundation would assign a small corps of Foundation field staff to selected universities plus facilitating visiting professors from American and other universities for one-, two-, or three-year assignments.

2. Establishment of the University Development Program

In September, 1963, The Rockefeller Foundation trustees issued a statement - Plans for the Future - which included the University Development Program as one of five major program areas for the future. This statement was a culmination of the several years of discussion and program evaluation. The statement emphasized that the fundamental barrier to social and economic development throughout the world was the great lag in making available to all people the vast fund of knowledge which mankind had in its grasp. The statement also emphasized that the ultimate responsibility for citizen education lay within each nation. Meeting this responsibility would require increasing national investments in education at all levels, including universities and research centers responsible for the preparation of scholars, investigators, and professionals for posts of leadership. Rockefeller Foundation support would be aimed at strengthening the institutional patterns of education and research; sharing material and intellectual resources; training a growing body of qualified personnel, and speeding the direct application of knowledge for the well-being of society.

Further elaboration of the program and internal documents emphasized that the program would assist the university to provide education which would enable young people to learn to think objectively and clearly, to distinguish between fact and prejudice, to weigh evidence, and to understand more deeply their nation's history and culture and that of other civilizations. It was pointed out that education must be related to the needs of the people. It must touch the live problems and pressing

concerns of local society. Studies must be relevant to the questions that local people are required to answer. The education must also stress issues of enduring importance. It was said that the need was not only for individuals well trained in the specialized professions, but also for men who could make wise and sensible decisions in government and business. It was again proposed that the Foundation select from six to nine developing universities and aid them in ways which would help insure the continuing improvement of the total university function. The discussion argued for assistance to existing institutions rather than the creation of new ones and emphasized that program focus would be on helping institutions that would merit and attract support from other financial sources since the Foundation would, in time, reduce and terminate support at any one university and begin to assist others.

As implementation of the program proceeded in the early 1960's, Foundation reports emphasized the criteria for selecting the universities to be included in the program: 1) there must be distinct strength in several disciplinary areas; 2) there must be a strong desire and will for improvement; 3) there must be substantial promise of increasing support from the country or area involved and from other international and private agencies. It was suggested that what was needed were universities that were vigorous, prepared to break with tradition, and determined to take major action to institute programs which met the realities of the total educational structure of the country, and to demonstrate that highest quality programs could be achieved while dedicated to meeting the needs of the community. It was further suggested that the Foundation concentrate within a university to strengthen fields of

key importance to a growing economy and the development of a modern society. The precise areas for support would vary from institution to institution, depending on national and regional needs. It was emphasized that attempts would be made to strengthen research and graduate training in disciplines having immediate and long-range importance to the development of the countries.

A theme running through the Foundation reports was the fact that historically strong universities were the principal source of scholarship, research, and trained leaders and therefore universities must be reckoned as a force without which progress is impossible. Universities in the less developed countries must be able to train the men and women needed to carry out the functions of government, to staff the professions, to manage commerce and industry, and must possess research resources and personnel capable of contributing to the theoretical and practical bases on which a viable society could be built. Foundation assistance would use the traditional Foundation tools of making grants in support of jointly determined activities and providing the services of staff for teaching, research, and administration, and assisting the organization and development of key departments and teaching and research programs. Emphasis was placed on the need for developing new curricula geared to national needs and more appropriate teaching materials incorporating both new ideas built on a nation's history and culture and information adapted from ongoing research, which, in turn, should focus on problems fundamental to the future of developing areas. It was emphasized that local scholars

capable of guiding local social, economic, and cultural development and conducting research on endemic problems must be developed. In view of the crucial nature of problems of economic development, social restructuring, and political change, it was essential that a university develop staff and support research attuned to urgent needs. However, research should emphasize the long-run solution of development problems rather than always responding to the immediate problems of next week.

The Foundation reports in the middle sixties emphasized the recurring themes that the Foundation would assist selected universities in developing their own resources for training professional people who could assume positions of leadership in private and public life. The Foundation would assist the institutions in the development of a corps of local scholars around which effective academic forces could be built. In order to achieve these goals, the Foundation would use its traditional tools of scholarship support, grants, providing field staff, and assisting in the appointment of visiting staff to develop key program areas. There was a continuing emphasis on support for teaching and research programs of importance to national development. It was suggested in a number of reports that the Foundation would emphasize support within the institutions for programs which address themselves to issues of critical importance, such as increasing food production, increasing the efficiency of economic planning, dealing with population problems, concern for the public health, incorporating new ideas with the national history and cultural identity.

In later reports it was suggested that one of the long-term goals was to enable nations to offer advanced degree programs for their own most gifted scholars, so that they would not have to rely on foreign training for their future professional, government and business leaders. Another of the long-term goals of its UD Program was the development of advanced training combined with research on pressing problems in the development of an indigenous problem solving capacity.

3. Five-year University Development Program Review

At the outset it was thought that at each university development center, assistance would be required for some ten to fifteen years in order to enable the Foundation to make its maximum contribution before gradually withdrawing and terminating support. At the end of the first five years of the Program and as a part of an overall five-year review of Foundation programs, it was believed appropriate to look again at the rationale, goals, and procedures of the University Development Program. The review began by recognizing the importance of the university in accelerating social change and national development. It stated that the University Development Program's major objective was to help create strong universities recognized as centers of excellence, largely staffed by indigenous scholars, and engaged in teaching and research relevant to national and regional needs. While the institutions should be centers of excellence, the meaning of excellence in both teaching and research should be in terms of commitment to national and regional needs. It was pointed out that while research and its application have played an important role in social and economic

development of the more advanced countries, the poorer countries have been slower to share in the benefits of the scientific and industrial revolution. The primary reasons for this gap were the absence of an adequate scientific base and the lack of sufficient numbers of trained people. The problems of social and economic development are enormously complex and knowledge on which to base action in the less developed countries was frequently not available. Therefore, the review suggested that indigenous problem-solving capacity was essential and that to attain this large numbers of specialists must be trained.

The review went on to warn that a university must not be an end in itself. It must be an institution responsive to needs of society - a powerful force in social and economic development, engaged in the kind of teaching and research required for the transition from traditional to modern ways of life. The greatness of a university did not, it was suggested, derive from its physical plant, gross numbers of faculty and students, and the presence of one or two strong departments, or a few outstanding scientists - but rather from complementary strength across interrelated disciplines that reinforced and drew support from one another. Out of this kind of creative interchange evolves an outstanding institution.

When the University Development Program was adopted as a major area of concentration, the Foundation selected a few institutions which it anticipated would have the potential of serving national and regional needs - institutions having an identifiable strength in several disciplines, the determination toward progress, sound academic and administrative

leadership, and substantial promise of increasing support from both the country or area served and other international sources.

A fundamental step in the development of a university is the formation of a corps of well-trained capable local scholars. The Foundation used its regular scholarship and fellowship program, plus support for other training activities, to assist the various universities in their staff development. It was suggested that, as departments became stronger with the return of indigenous staff, local graduate programs could be established so that a country would no longer need to depend on training its most advanced scholars at foreign institutions. Appropriate research programs would of course, be associated with developing graduate teaching programs.

In carrying forward these activities, it was felt essential that Rockefeller Foundation staff would be resident on the various campuses for long-term assignments to provide continuity to the overall program, but the long-term staff would need to be supplemented by scholars on one- or two-year assignments drawn from a variety of universities. The Foundation would also provide support for specific research projects, laboratory equipment, experimental farm development, improving teaching material, curriculum revision, language and reading laboratories where needed, library development, and additional support for scholarships for graduate study at local universities. The precise combination of support would depend upon the judgement of the Foundation's staff, working on a day-by-day basis with their colleagues at the particular university. Major emphasis was placed on strengthening teaching programs, the writing of study materials, and, in some cases, the publication of a series of books

based on local research and bringing together material on fundamental problems of the developing countries. It was agreed that agricultural, medical, social, and economic research focusing on essential needs would both provide essential knowledge for the development of graduate teaching and assist in the development of action programs.

The Foundation's experience in the first five years of its University Development Program emphasized certain basic principles, and the review went on to enumerate the following:

1) Persons who have key roles in determining the development of the university must have strong motivation and commitment to progress and change. Essential changes in most centers include "administrative organization; strengthening of faculties; greater emphasis on teaching and research on community, national and regional needs; increased co-operation among faculties in curriculum development, teaching, and research; faculty recruitment and promotion based on merit; and improvement of salaries and employment practices to attract and retain the best scientists, scholars and administrators."

2) There must be prospects for increasing financial support from the state and national governments, the private sector, and international sources. The Foundation sources can only provide limited, critical support to serve as a catalyst to the total development of the university.

3) People are more important than dollars in assistance efforts. Regular Foundation staff, assigned to key roles for extended and indeterminant periods, are essential for progress toward the overall goals.

4) University development is a long process; at least a decade is required to develop a mature scholar from a university graduate. Changing basic attitudes and implanting new concepts and procedures will take at least as long or longer.

5) Each program must follow well-defined plans tailored to the university's needs and opportunities and adjusted to developments as the program proceeds. Foundation emphasis is on units, such as agriculture, economics, medicine, that are most directly relevant to the country's needs, with support to the other social and natural sciences, the arts and humanities, provided as needed for a balanced academic development.

6) A timetable for development is different for each university and continuing reassessment is essential. In these terms, it was also suggested that, as centers of excellence emerged at the universities the Foundation was assisting, possibilities would be explored for developing networks of cooperating institutions, utilizing those centers as sources of visiting faculty and as graduate training centers for staff members of other universities in the region.

The five-year review went on to suggest that comprehensive assistance to one or two additional universities would be considered when Foundation staff and resources were freed by developments at the institutions being assisted at that time. The Foundation would remain vigilant to the needs and opportunities for shifting emphasis and to the appropriate time to terminate the UD Program at each institution. It was suggested that the timetable was different for each UD Center, but that the yardstick was the same for all - the creation of a strong,

indigenous university, with a critical mass of highly qualified scholars able to carry forward their own program to meet local, national, and regional needs.

4. Focus on More Sharply Defined Goals

As the officers gained more experience in the implementation of the UD Program during the sixties, Foundation reports reflected a more focused and sharper emphasis on the Program's overall goals, while continuing to emphasize the need for achievement of national goals. They suggested that admission to universities needed to be related to national and regional needs and that local institutions needed to develop more practical, career-oriented curricula, to provide education and research relevant to national social and economic goals, and to end their reliance on foreign educational institutions for advanced training. There was a shift in emphasis from the transfer of knowledge to the essential need for the discovery and application of knowledge in order to respond to urgent social and economic needs of developing nations. It was clear that within the developing countries, the demand was for institutions engaged in the kind of teaching and research required for the transition from traditional to modern ways of life, and the enlargement of opportunities for human welfare. Through education geared to national needs, while striving simultaneously for excellence, national leaders are formed; through research a university comes to grips with problems of national and regional concern and imparts relevance to the teaching of highly motivated teacher/scholars.

It was pointed out that until recently, many countries continued to rely on foreign training for leaders and scholars and often on expatriate staff for the universities. The development of leadership and knowledge took top priority in the Foundation's programs; the emphasis was on training for indigenous scientists, technicians, and humanists, and on the creation of a scientific base from which to attack the complex problems of social and economic development. It was emphasized that existing knowledge had to be adapted to local situations and problem-oriented research undertaken on questions for which the developed world had no answers - in areas such as crop and animal disease, public health needs, and economic growth patterns. It emphasized most strongly that the transfer of knowledge was not adequate; many of the complex problems of development could not be answered with existing knowledge. The universities in the less developed countries had to create new teaching patterns and research capacity to answer the questions and deal with the problems of development. This was true in the area of technology, economics, health, agriculture - in all fields.

The Foundation would continue to use its traditional tools, with continuity assured by the long-term assignment of RF staff members to each of the University Development Centers to work closely with the universities leadership and faculty members in defining needs and then draw plans for development. Scholarships would be provided for advanced training abroad, where essential, but there would be continual pressure to develop post-graduate programs within the local university. There would be an increasing shift to support of projects geared to local and national needs that emphasized both research and the training of the indigenous staff. The

ultimate goal at each of the institutions was to make the UD Program unnecessary at that particular center, and to terminate Foundation support when the institution had achieved its goal.

5. Whither Bound?

Reports at the beginning of the seventies suggested that the Foundation's UD Program was entering a new phase in which it would increasingly stress postgraduate teaching and research; creation of university-wide, interdisciplinary programs; and cooperation with nonuniversity agencies, such as the International Agricultural Institutes, government ministries, and other international agencies. It was suggested that ultimately this trend might lead to the establishment of cooperative networks across broad geographical regions, in which the universities and their affiliates would link efforts with Foundation and other international programs concerned with the conquest of hunger, population stabilization, delivery of health care, preservation of the environment, and allied fields.

After eight years of collaborative efforts under the UD Program, a recent annual report stated that if The Rockefeller Foundation could be said to have a single preeminent interest historically, it was the development of institutions to train professional people, scientists and scholars in the applied disciplines, who, in turn, would train succeeding generations of students, advance the state of knowledge in their fields, and respond to their country's needs. The report went on to say that it was the Foundation's faith that knowledge is a first step towards realizing man's potential, that man himself is ultimately a rational creature. Small wonder then, that the Foundation saw its particular role in the third world as revolving around

the development or strengthening of existing centers of learning. The report went on to suggest that a great university can be a prime mover in the transition from traditional to modern ways of life; but this transition presents enormously complex problems, whose solution requires many different kinds of trained people. If the university is to fulfill its potential as a force for constructive change, it must have the will and the ability to build professional competence in key disciplines and to furnish a scientific and scholarly base for relevant problem solving. A decade is scarcely long enough to assess what a university has fully absorbed in its continuing life, let alone what contributions its faculty and graduates are likely to make in the years ahead. Then too, the university's usefulness today depends a great deal on the policies and levels of awareness of political leadership. Above all, it must be kept in mind that the purpose of university development is to build universities that can contribute to a variety of national goals and adapt to changing needs. As one looks at the development of the past several years, it is clear that a great deal remains to be done. The universities need to carry forward a deeper and more searching study of development and underdevelopment in order to make the greatest contribution to national needs. The universities must push more vigorously in creating new teaching material; training their own staff; taking full account of new knowledge; adapting received knowledge; incorporating new ideas into the history and culture of their societies; developing the scholarly and scientific competence to create the technologies appropriate to their social and economic development; and educating and training the individuals needed in the broad society. This is a difficult challenge, and yet, if met, can make a most significant contribution in the various countries and regions.

Ralph K. Davidson