

70940
Program
Review

December 12, 1975

Dear Jim:

We have just completed the December meeting of the Board of Trustees and I believe it was an extraordinarily successful one. Allan Barnes has sent you the report by Clark Kerr, chairman of the Trustee Committee for the Review of the EFD program. More recently, on December 3rd, he sent a memorandum to each one of you outlining our plans for the preparation of Volume II which will be presented to the Board of Trustees in December 1976. The subject is of such importance that I thought I would amplify some of the points made in Allan Barnes' memorandum of December 3rd as well as some of those in the Kerr Committee Report.

At the outset, I hope you will read the report of Clark Kerr's Committee very carefully. For this purpose, I'm enclosing another copy of the report. Let me take up the points in the Kerr Report as they are listed.

(1) The Trustees felt very strongly that our Volume I - EFD Review is "far too modest," and overall the Trustees believe that the Foundation has accomplished much with the UDP-EFD program over roughly the last 15 years.

(2) Several very important changes have occurred since the program was initiated in the 1950's; namely, "heightened attitudes of national pride and self-reliance, and a marked increase in funds for educational development." With regard to the latter, we commissioned a paper by H. M. Phillips of the OECD which presents an extensive analysis of the sources and amount of educational assistance, as well as its distribution geographically and by level of education, which covers the trends over the past decade or more. It was amazing to me that no single study had been done with the aim of coordinating the facts in the field of educational assistance and cooperation with the developing countries. In the absence of such a comprehensive review, it would seem to me very difficult for organizations such as our own to set priorities on the use of our finite resources. One and all believe that the Phillips review is invaluable and we plan to have it published and will send it to you just as soon as possible.

(3) The Trustees to a man felt very strongly that the RF should maintain its interest in higher education in the LDC's "despite the current disappointment and disaffection" with the accomplishments of universities. I share the Trustees' feeling that we have a reservoir of goodwill that

should not be lost, especially at those institutions where we have worked over the last 12 to 15 years. The strong suggestion was made that we should now treat the developed universities, e.g., University of the Philippines, University of Nairobi, University of Ibadan, Universidad del Valle, etc., as we do American universities - looking for disciplinary or interdisciplinary projects for which specific grant proposals would be submitted to the Foundation by these universities.

(4) The major deficiency of the historical review of the UDP-EFD program was its lack of detailed analysis and recommendations as to the future needs of educational institutions in the LDC's, and specifically, the objectives that The Rockefeller Foundation would pursue. In this context, the Trustees suggested that "increased attention be paid to areas of foundation interest and disciplines." An increased need for integrating knowledge and disciplines in approach to problem solving was stressed. Certainly the prime emphasis will most likely be on specific disciplines, but within this context, many disciplines should be brought to bear on given problems. For example, agricultural experts should broaden their interest and emphasis to include economics and nutrition and even demographic considerations; maternal and child health programs should broaden their purview to include greater emphasis on nutrition and population controls. In this context, we should all look at our existing programs within The Rockefeller Foundation and see where projects in the less-developed countries might fit with our domestic as well as international concerns: for example, there may be opportunities within the Quality of the Environment, Population and Health, Conflict in International Relations programs, to say nothing of the broadened use of the Arts and Humanities in an international context. Interdisciplinary efforts such as the Puebla or the Candelaria Project should be pursued but with much more vigorous attention to intellectualizing and recording the unfolding strategy of successful projects with built-in evaluation as the project begins. All too often we end up with a series of anecdotes and fragmented pieces of information which leave us without an extensive written report which might serve as a model for use in other countries.

It is felt to be especially important that the Foundation seek advice and suggestions as to future needs and opportunities in the universities of the less-developed countries where we have worked. For these purposes, Allan Barnes' memorandum has asked you to organize regional meetings which will be conducted with a minimal presence of RF staff. In assembling such a group of consultants it would probably be well to give them their charge in very general terms. We can point out that our resources are limited (to keep them from being expansive in their suggestions), but if we go into great detail about some of our program interests they might fall into the trap of telling us what they think we want to hear and not think creatively enough.

(5) This paragraph in the Kerr Report with its multiple recommendations is, I believe, clear. Again, the strong suggestion was made that we should treat the developed universities in the less-developed countries as we do American universities vis-a-vis specific programmatic grants with emphasis on our existing interests in our seven programs. Special emphasis

was put on the identification of key individuals with "creative ideas and potential for the improvement of higher education or the advancement of critical areas of research in teaching." Again, the Trustees stressed that we should use most of our funds for the support of creative individuals, a strategy we have used increasingly with the new fellowships in our domestic programs.

You should also be aware that The Rockefeller Foundation is planning to host a Bellagio III meeting on Education and Development here in New York in June 1976. This is designed specifically for the heads of the major international agencies who are interested in and provide major financial support for educational programs in the LDC's. The papers prepared for the second Bellagio Conference at the Villa Serbelloni in November 1973 were published under the title "Education and Development Reconsidered," edited by F. Champion Ward and published by Praeger Publishers, New York (1974). These papers and the plans for the June 1976 meeting should help us all in our own work. In addition, David Court edited a series of excellent essays on "Education, Society and Development - New Perspectives from Kenya," published by the Oxford University Press, Nairobi, 1974. And, of course, Jim Coleman, Gabriel Velazquez and Willoughby Lathem have written extensively on various aspects of education and university development in the less-developed countries. All of this gives us a fine background to complete our work for next December. Let me say also that if our report is of the quality I expect, it will most certainly have an influence on many major international agencies which have far more money and staff than we do!

Now let me go on to Allan Barnes' memo of December 3rd. I'd like to make the following points and reinforce what Allan has said:

(1) Our approaches for the future will involve one discipline or several disciplines. We should relate our efforts to the seven existing program interests, which are, in addition to EFD, Conflict in International Relations; Quality of the Environment; Population and Health; Conquest of Hunger; Arts, Humanities, and Contemporary Values; and Equal Opportunity. Particular attention should be given in your review to anticipating the major problems in the less-developed countries a decade hence, and then tailoring the development of disciplines or interdisciplinary work in the less-developed countries to those needs. In this context, the priorities and thoughts of the leaders from the less-developed countries should take precedence over what we may think, and your regional meeting should provide much valuable grist for our mill.

(2) In addition, in your meetings of roughly 20 people, there should not only be a good age and occupational distribution, but there most certainly should be an emphasis on representation by women as well as men. Bear in mind that women have as much to do with agriculture in many less-developed countries as men do! On top of this, they have a lot more to do with the expansion of the population!

(3) Bill Young will work closely with Willoughby Lathem, Harry Oshima, Al Nyberg and Professor Delehanty in organizing and conducting the review in the Asian region. Gabriel Velazquez will work with his fine staff at

Bahia and include Farzam Arbab and his ideas and interesting projects in Colombia. I'm sure that Jim Coleman will work closely with Len Miller and David Court in Africa.

As relates to the Table of Contents, the Introduction will also include the full Kerr Report and a pertinent, succinct review of the literature as well as a summarization of the Phillips Report on the present trends in educational assistance in the less-developed countries. The New York staff is reviewing, discipline by discipline, its plans for the future and this will be available by the end of March at the very latest. You all will report on the regional meetings with a full list of participants and their titles. Precise examples will be necessary both from the New York staff as well as the field and should include specific disciplines or multidisciplinary studies as well as areas of studies - for example, the environment, population and health, nutrition and agriculture, conflict in international relations, and so on.

It is most important that the organization of the new functions and responsibilities of the EFD Committee be clearly understood by everyone in the New York office and in the field. It seems to me to be a relatively simple idea and one that makes abundant good sense, but the responsibility must be spelled out carefully as regards the process of exploration in conjunction with the field staff, the mechanism of coordination, and finally the mechanism of evaluation.

Allan Barnes' list of common questions is fine, but here again I would like to amplify some of his thoughts as you work them over and tell us what you think of them:

(1) Certainly, individual disciplines are to be pursued but the Trustees also stressed areas of interest, such as might include objectives within the Conflict in International Relations Program, Population and Health, Conquest of Hunger, etc. Such areas of interest as the environment or the whole subject of post-harvest losses might be considered. Again, we should include in our Volume II much more emphasis on new opportunities and concepts. More attention should be paid to the interface, for example, between agricultural production and nutrition. For all these purposes, I'm enclosing an up-to-date summary of the objectives within each one of our domestic and international programs so that you can be thinking in the full context of all the programs and their objectives.

(2) Not only "what kinds of disciplinary and interdisciplinary efforts do you envisage," but how do you look at the whole of replicability of models and how might we build into such projects a record of the steps taken, as well as ongoing evaluation? Here again with reference to question #4 in Allan's memo, we should include the question of environmental issues, international affairs with reference to monetary problems, conflict, and so on. In his question #5, I believe we should support individual departments or disciplines where appropriate as well as interdisciplinary institutes, but here again, I'm anxious to know what you all think.

I hope you will forgive me for the length of this letter, but the new directions that the EFD program takes will be determined this coming

year for approval of our Trustees. Clearly, you are in the very best position to formulate the new directions and then to implement them. I just wanted to add my note of encouragement as well as to stress the vital importance of the whole undertaking this coming year. Conceptually, I believe that for the foreseeable future, the most unique contributions of The Rockefeller Foundation will lie in the field of international affairs, with specific reference to economic and educational development, agriculture and aquaculture, population and health problems, and conflict reduction. I think our history and the quality of our present staff has prepared us uniquely for this task. Also, I think in time we will see the interdependence of all our programs as they are currently structured. And, as our money power becomes less and less important, our entrepreneurial function and the influence we can exert on massive funds and important international agencies becomes central to us all. For this purpose, I am enclosing a copy of the President's Review which I hope you will read as carefully as you do the Kerr Committee Report.

Finally, hoping that you are not exhausted by reading this, I do wish you all a wonderful Christmas with your families. I have nothing but admiration for what you have done to date and we all look with great hope to the future, with specific reference to 1976!

Sincerely yours,

John H. Knowles, M.D.

Dr. James S. Coleman
Kinshasa, Zaire Mail

JHK:hw
Enclosures