DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 851 HE 002 789

TITLE	The Dynamics of Interinstitutional Cooperation in International Education: A Case Study of the Regional Council for International Education.
INSTITUTION	Institute of International Studies (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	OE-14160
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	75p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (no.1780-0812, $.40)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Foreign Relations; *Higher Education; *Intercultural Programs; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *International Education; *International Programs

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study was to increase understanding about the nature and processes of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education, particularly as related to international educational development, and to suggest guidelines for the improvement of cooperative endeavors. The study deals with 10 representative member institutions of the Regional Council for International Education (RCIE). Data were gathered by means of a questionnaire and a 3-member research team that visited each campus for extensive interviews with students, faculty, and administrative personnel. Two conditions are found to be most important on campus for successful participation in interinstitutional cooperation for international development: (1) support from the top administrative leadership, and (2) general receptivity among faculty. Three phases of RCIE operations are identified as the most important in assuring effectiveness: (1) adequate liaison between the campus and the central office; (2) greater involvement of campus personnel in the decisionmaking process; and (3) a broad-ranging communication and information dissemination program to assure that an adequate knowledge of the organization is available on campus. (Author/HS)

THE DYNAMICS OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

A CASE STUDY OF THE REGIONAL COUNCIL FOR INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

OE-X
HE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE / Office of Education OE-14160

OE-14160

THE DYNAMICS OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION:

A Case Study of the Regional Council for International Education

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Elliot L. Richardson, Secretary

Office of Education
S.P. Marland, Jr., Commissioner of Education

Institute of International Studies
Robert Leestma, Associate Commissioner for International Education

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. HE 214: 14160–71
U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1971

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price 40 cents
Stock Number 1780-0812

Foreword

In these times of growing interest in international education on the one hand and increasing financial constraints on the other, the significance of looking carefully at relevant experience in interinstitutional cooperation is readily apparent.

While interinstitutional cooperation is not new, neither is it especially common, nor are its dynamics yet very well understood. While in theory its potential is great—to eliminate unnecessary duplication, pool resources into more effective combinations, provide new and expanded services, etc.—in practice the benefits achieved often fall short of the initial promise. With the sharing of available resources clearly becoming more of an educational imperative, the need to understand the dynamics of interinstitutional cooperation has become increasingly important.

The decade of the 1960's was the period when the cooperative movement in higher education began to take root and spread. One of the most successful pioneering efforts was the Regional Council for International Education (RCIE), founded in 1959, and now made up of 31 colleges and universities in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia. (See list in appendix.) The member institutions vary greatly in size and kind.

As a case study of why and how one effective cooperative arrangement was established, developed successfully, and made to function, the Office of Education Institute of International Studies approached the Regional Council for International Education and asked it to undertake a self-study of the dynamics of its accumulated experience. RCIE was pleased at the challenge to review its experience for its own purposes, as well as for the benefit the findings might have for other institutions. The Council chose to proceed through an intensive look at a representative sample of ten of its member institutions.

RCIE was selected for several reasons. It has had sufficient experience and success to be worth examining critically for likely benefit to others. Thanks to its geographic spread and heterogeneous membership, it includes at least one example of almost every kind of higher education institution in America. Its focus is on international education. Its programs concentrate on the international dimensions of undergraduate education in smaller institutions, particularly in teacher education, a combination of increasing importance in the plans of the Institute of International Studies.

Further, the Regional Council represents an effective example of the

council form of interinstitutional cooperation, in contrast to the more common *consortium* form which has received more extensive attention in the existing literature. Among other characteristics, the council form is thought by its practitioners to be somewhat more responsive than other forms to ideas and initiatives from the faculty and students, a matter of considerable importance in higher education today.

RCIE was also blessed with both enlightened leadership and organizational stability over time. It has an excellent record in the effective use of external financial resources, but the more important fact by far is that its core program is internally self-sustaining RCIE is an example of a cooperative arrangement with sufficient inner strength to grow and improve independently of the lure and adhesive power of external grants. Finally, RCIE is developing a consultant capacity which can be useful outside its own ranks as well as within.

The RCIE case is thus a significant one to study. The answers, or cues to the answers, to the questions, *how and why does it work*, will be of interest and value to many. The RCIE experience is timely and relevant not only for international programs, but also for regional cooperation on other dimensions of higher education.

Within some real constraints of time and budget, this report presents an honest, searching effort to get at both the tangible and intangible aspects of what makes interinstitutional cooperation work in the case of the Regional Council for International Education. It reflects many of the variables in the complex set of human and institutional relationships that are involved, with particular emphasis on those factors which seem to be critically related to success. One of its strengths is the extent to which it is based upon interviews with students, faculty, and staff members at RCIE member institutions. It is not a systematic statistical study preoccupied with aspects that can be counted. Instead, it is a broader self assessment of what the council does, how it works and why, and of the process by which it has arrived at its present stage of development. The study is based primarily upon the perceptions of the participants on campus—it is a view from within and as such has a special value.

We are grateful to Dr. Shepherd L. Witman and all his colleagues and associates in the Regional Council for International Education for their willingness to undertake the study and share their experience with institutions elsewhere. The Office of Education is pleased to make the results of their effort available to a wider audience through this publication.

ROBERT LEESTMA
Associate Commissioner for International Education

Preface

Interinstitutional cooperation among colleges and universities is very new. It is the first major development affecting virtually all of higher education in America since the establishment of the Land-Grant colleges a century ago. And yet, as recently as 1960, it was little known as an educational form.

During this decade the concept has spread rapidly and has manifested itself in a variety of forms. Today there are literally hundreds of academic groupings, some even overlapping, which seek a variety of goals. Some appear to be doing well, some only moderately so, and some have already dissolved.

What are the dynamics of interinstitutional cooperation which make these differences? We do not have enough experience with this structure to reach firm conclusions based upon systematic observations and evaluations. There are still not enough benchmarks for success or failure or even agreement on what should constitute the priorities for the evaluation of the processes of cooperation. Moreover, these would undoubtedly differ in accordance with the specific shape, purposes, philosophies and personnel of the many different kinds of cooperatives which exist today.

Yet the process of searching out what makes for success or failure in cooperation among institutions of higher education must be continued. There is a rapidly increasing quantity of literature on the subject, yet only a beginning has been made in understanding what is, in fact, a vast and complex area of activity which invites approach from many different perspectives.

One of these approaches that used herein, is to examine the process by which a single cooperative association has developed over the years. The RCIE has welcomed being the subject of such an examination in order to aid in the sound evolution of the whole cooperative movement. We recognize, however, that this has caused us to go into extensive detail regarding the Regional Council itself and the development of international education. We hope this fact does not obscure for the reader the significance of the findings for interinstitutional cooperation as an educational structure.

We also recognize that we have not produced a rigorously designed and carried out piece of research. We did not intend to. This report is

based on the data uncovered by members of the project staff within the limitations placed upon them. It is heavily dependent on the perceptions of individuals rather than on objective data. To a significant degree the Council is a set of complex human and institutional relationships not easily amenable to quantification and precise analysis. The limited resources available to the project required further that its aims be modestly defined. It may therefore be useful to look upon this study as an essay on interinstitutional cooperation as embodied by the Regional Council rather than as an attempt to reach definitive explanations or conclusions.

We did realize that such a study would depend heavily on the principal staff members in the project and to them we are greatly indebted. The field research was the responsibility of Frank Bretz and Nelson Hoffman. At the time this study was made, Dr. Bretz was vice president for Academic Affairs at Capital University in Ohio and Dr. Hoffman was vice president for Academic Affairs at West Virginia Wesleyan College. Their full-time research assistant was Anne Spencer, who brought to her assignment several years of graduate study abroad at universities in Scotland and Uganda. The entire project was under the direction of David Hoopes, the vice president of the RCIE. Mr. Hoopes has had the responsibility for the editing of the final report.

They undertook an assignment which proved more difficult than any of us anticipated. They have nevertheless produced a report which we hope will contribute significantly to our general quest for better and more effective educational structures and our specific need to better understand interinstitutional cooperation.

The 10 institutions which cooperated with the project staff by opening their doors and giving their time to help bring the study to fruition, receive our wholehearted appreciation. While, as agreed upon at the outset, their anonymity in the context of the analysis has been carefully guarded, we do not hesitate to identify each one by name in praising the spirit with which they joined in. They were: Allegheny College, Bethany College, Fairmont State College, Findlay College, Kent State University, Otterbein College, Slippery Rock State College, Thiel College, West Virginia University, and Wittenberg University.

This study was made possible by a grant from the Institute of International Studies of the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Regional Council is most grateful for this assistance. It has particularly relished this opportunity to work with the Office of Education in a joint search for the most effective achievement of one of our common goals.

SHEPHERD L. WITMAN, President
Regional Council for International Education
February 10, 1971

Contents

Summary

Purpose and method.—The objective of the study was to increase understanding of the nature and processes of interinstitutional cooperation in higher education, particularly as related to international education development, and to suggest guidelines for the improvement of cooperative endeavors.

The study deals with only a single cooperative association—the Regional Council for International Education—selecting 10 representative member institutions for close examination. Data were gathered by a questionnaire and a research team consisting of two RCIE academic vice presidents and a research assistant. They visited each campus for extensive interviews with students, faculty, and administrative personnel. The history of the council and the operations of the central office and staff were also reviewed.

Findings.—A distinction can be made between a consortium and a council. The latter, of which the RCIE is a representative, is characterized by centralized program development and executive responsibility, heterogeneity of membership, the filtering up of ideas from a broad constituency, and a board of directors drawn from varying levels and positions in the membership and representing the council rather than their own institutions (as opposed to a board consisting of the member presidents).

The origin and initial aims of the Regional Council have played a major role in the development of its organizational pattern. Its size, heterogeneity of membership, and wide geographic spread have also been an important influence.

Certain critical factors within institutions which influence the development of both international education and the willingness to engage in interinstitutional cooperation are identified. These are: institutional support, faculty and student attitudes, the academic climate, and the ability to organize effectively to exploit opportunities.

The major phases of council operations are examined. These are: the decisionmaking process, the liaison system, the committee structure, and communications.

The council is seen as serving three functions: (1) stimulating international education on member campuses; (2) offering programs and services to them; (3) facilitating cooperation among them.

Conclusions and recommendations.—Two conditions are found to be most important on campus for successful participation in interinstitutional cooperation for international education development: (1) support from the top administrative leadership and (2) general receptivity among faculty.

Three phases of RCIE operations were identified as the most important in assuring effectiveness: (1) adequate liaison between the campus and the central office; (2) greater involvement of campus personnel in the decisionmaking process and effective structuring and use of the committee system; (3) a broad-ranging communication and information dissemination program to assure adequate knowledge of the organization is available on campus.

Ultimately the aim should be to create conditions which enable member personnel to identify with the council and see it as an integral part of their institutional life and themselves as part of a family of institutions able to act in concert for the benefit of each.

Methodology

It was originally intended that a research scholar would be assigned full-time responsibility for this project and that the study would include in some way all of the RCIE member institutions. Funds, however, were not available to support a project of those dimensions and the study was therefore restructured.

An effort, however, was made to retain the breadth of the study and to place principal stress on what was felt would be the source of the most relevant data: the interviews with personnel on campus. It was recognized that this would sacrifice some of the rigor and objectivity of standard research, but would hopefully provide a broader base for future work. Ten institutions were selected for study, each to be visited by project staff. These institutions, named in the order visited, were:

First five institutions
Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio
Fairmont State College, Fairmont, West Virginia
Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio
Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania
West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia

Second five institutions
Slippery Rock State College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania
Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio
Kent State University, Kent, Ohio
Thiel College, Greenville, Pennsylvania
Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia

It was felt that the study could be most effectively undertaken by personnel within the council who already had some familiarity with its operation and who would more readily be able to determine the best sources of data and to weigh their significance.

Those selected to conduct the research would have to be people of significant rank and reputation because in the conduct of interviews they would be dealing with areas of some degree of sensitivity. Two academic vice presidents from member institutions were selected. This staffing provided for a dual view of the institutions surveyed and the information gathered and also served to spread the work since they both continued to serve full-time in their capacities at their home institutions.

At the same time a full-time project assistant was needed to conduct background research, assist in project administration, and put together the collected data and materials for analysis.

Since the project depended heavily on detailed knowledge of the functioning of the Regional Council, which the research team could not be expected to have or devote time to acquiring, it was put under the direction of the RCIE vice president who has worked with the council since January, 1964.

The project staff established basic procedures as follows: the research team—that is, the two academic vice presidents—would make a joint visit to each of the 10 institutions for two successive days. They would interview faculty, staff, and students as widely as possible and attempt to meet not only with personnel involved in Regional Council affairs and international education programs but also, in order to provide a contrasting sampling of opinion, with personnel who had not been so involved. The research assistant was asked to set up the meetings, to visit campuses ahead of time to see that suitable preparations were made, and to interview foreign students—an area in which she had relevant experience.

It was decided that a representative cross-section of institutions should be surveyed, large and small, public and private, economically well-off and impecunious. Distributed more or less evenly among the three states represented in the Council, the group consisted of two large public universities, two state colleges, and a sampling of private colleges. It was felt, however, that the first five institutions should be selected and visited (during the fall of the year) before the second five were selected, in order to test selection criteria.

In order to enlist the support of the institutions selected, each president received a formal invitation to participate from the president of the Regional Council. Upon agreement, the dean of the institution was invited to a meeting in Pittsburgh to be briefed on the nature of the project and its procedures and what would be expected of the institutions. They were also asked to offer any suggestions they might have for working out the most effective procedures.

A number of the institutions responded with special interest, seeing this as an opportunity to provide added stimulus to their own ongoing institutional self-examination.

During the fall while the initial visits were taking place, the research assistant and the project director began developing the background information that would be needed in the project.

Each subject institution was asked to fill out an inventory of international education development over the past 10 years. This inventory did not provide useful sets of statistics and graphs but was extremely helpful to the project staff in providing the framework within which to view international education development on each campus as well as among the group as a whole.

Discussions were held with RCIE staff members, and documents in

the central office were studied. Research into international education and interinstitutional cooperation was undertaken.

On the basis of the experience with the first five schools the second five were selected. Changes in procedures and in numbers and positions of personnel interviewed were made as called for. The second five visits occurred in February and March.

The general pattern of each visit was as follows: the research team met first with the president, the dean, and the RCIE liaison representative. From there meetings with individuals and groups of faculty, administrative officers, and students were held. The investigators conferred with one another from time to time in order to compare general impressions and sharpen their insights. At the end of their visit they met again with the dean and/or liaison officer to offer their thanks and general comments on their experience and to clarify any issues which needed comment from a broader perspective. The researchers then submitted separate reports to the project director and research assistant who put these together to constitute the early drafts of this report.

At a final conference the project staff discussed the major issues that had come out of the study and advised the project director on the preparation of the final report.

I. National and International Framework for International Education Development and Interinstitutional Cooperation

The Regional Council for International Education has been in existence for over a decade. The evolution of the form of cooperation embodied in the council is the focus of this study. It will be useful, however, to see the council in the context of the rapid and significant growth of international education and the interinstitutional cooperation in the United States as a whole, since the RCIE is an integral part of that movement. The framework of this development will be sketched only in the broadest strokes.

The contemporary orientation toward international education can be traced to the post World War II period when, as William Marvel, then President of Education and World Affairs, put it: "We have learned a bitter lesson during the war concerning our national ignorance of peoples, cultures and languages outside the Western European tradition." [1] Taking that lesson to heart, academicians, with foundation support, established the first area study programs (on the Soviet Union and Asia) and began to sound the alarm among their colleagues. At the same time, the world settled into the Cold War, "the war for men's minds" as it was called, with the United States and the Soviet Union jockeying for positions of influence around the world. Ignorance of the non-Western world was felt to be a major handicap. Cultural diplomacy, epitomized by the Fulbright program, also became a significant instrument of national policy and a major stimulus to international education. So too did academic involvement in foreign aid projects supported by the U.S. government. As the 1950's wore on, international education activity proliferated and received increased support from the Federal Government, especially in title IV of the National Defense Education Act which ultimately resulted in the establishment or expansion of 107 area study centers at American universities covering all of the world outside Western Europe.

At the same time that the Federal Government was encouraging a broader base of academic involvement in international affairs, the private foundations were also seeking to encourage greater awareness and con-

[1] "The University in World Affairs, an Introduction," William W. Marvel, in *The University Looks Abroad,* Education and World Affairs, 1965.

cern. In 1960 the Morrill Committee, financed by the Ford Foundation and known as the Committee on the University and World Affairs, published a landmark report on its findings. The Morrill Report (and later another report on the College and World Affairs which appeared in 1964) had a major impact on the academic community as it exposed the striking neglect of non-Western studies and other forms of international education in American academic institutions. Educators began to rally to the cause of international education in increasing numbers, and a growing interest was evident in new educational organizations to facilitate expansion in this field. The Regional Council had been founded in 1959. Other organizations, national and local, either came into existence or expanded their activity. As a direct outgrowth of the Morrill Report, Education and World Affairs was founded in 1962 with the financial support of the Ford Foundation. Its goal was to serve as a mechanism for stimulating and giving direction to efforts to improve international education in American schools, colleges, and universities.

In the 1960's area studies continued to expand and increasing numbers of foreign students came to study in the United States, while American students studying overseas multiplied even more rapidly. The establishment of the Peace Corps, while designed primarily as foreign aid, introduced international education as an incalculably significant experience into the lives of the legion of young volunteers who swarmed overseas. Scholars continued to ply among countries in increasing numbers. All this reached a climax in 1966 in the passage of the International Education Act.

But that year also appears to have been a turning point. The International Education Act was never funded. Then, in the late 1960's, a visible redirection of interest away from international education could be discerned. Attention shifted to the prolonged war in Vietnam and the rapidly deteriorating situation at home. Many foundations altered funding policies to place greater emphasis on domestic affairs and the public at large seemed to weary of "international commitments."

It is unlikely, however, that international education can conceivably be abandoned, although its focus may well change in the 1970's. If the upsurge of interest in international education in the past decade was to a significant degree dependent on Cold War politics, then the change in international political emphasis which appears to be occurring is likely to be paralleled by a change in educational emphasis. Indeed, there is already an increasing realization that the rapid pace of technological development in the modern world is forcing us to transcend the national and regional concepts which have dominated our thinking in international affairs. We need to develop a more encompassing global viewpoint which will enable us effectively to come to terms with such critical, worldwide

issues as population growth, distribution of scarce resources, pollution, and interethnic relations.[2] Thus, though the direction may vary, the interest in international matters is bound to continue.

Another very important development has occurred in higher education during these years. It is the result of an increasing awareness that new educational needs have placed demands on academic institutions which individual colleges and universities find difficult to meet. The scope of educational enterprise expanded so rapidly in the 1950's and 60's that more and more institutions found themselves unable to cope—unable to maintain their educational capabilities at a level expected and demanded by students and faculty. In addition, expenses soared while—especially in private institutions—adequate funding became harder to get. One response to these problems was interinstitutional cooperation—the pooling of efforts and sharing of resources.

The movement toward interinstitutional cooperation goes back some years. The formation of the cluster colleges at Claremont, California, about 40 years ago is generally recognized as the beginning. In 1929 the Atlanta University Center was founded, built upon the experiences of Spelman and Morehouse colleges which had been engaged in cooperative activity since 1921. Seventeen years later, in 1946, the University Center in Virginia was launched.

By the 1950's experimentation in cooperation was on the increase, especially among church-related colleges and institutions tied together with state systems. Interinstitutional cooperation on the scale to which it has now grown, however, is only a little over 10 years old. It was in 1958-59 that the Regional Council, The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (composed of the "big ten" universities and the University of Chicago) and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest came into existence. Since then there has been a steady expansion in the number of consortia. The Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) was formed in 1961 and the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education in 1962. It has been estimated that in the period between 1961 and 1966 interinstitutional cooperation increased 10 times.[3] There are now well over 60 consortia in existence and new ones are announced monthly.

Foundation support for cooperative endeavors has been relatively generous. It has been observed that "It is not always clear whether foundations provide the initiative or whether colleges propose an effort and then

[2] Steven Muller, "International Studies: Crisis and Opportunity," *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, Spring, 1970.

[3] Richard B. Lancaster, *Interdependency and Conflict in a Consortium for Cooperating in Higher Education*, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1969.

search out financial support; what is clear, however, is that behind most cooperative ventures a foundation is usually to be found." [4]

The Higher Education Act of 1965 gave the cooperative movement fresh support. Title III outlined a program for so-called "developing colleges." Under this provision $5 million was invested in cooperative programs in 1965-66. The Office of Education has articulated a policy of support for academic cooperation and has encouraged institutions to submit proposals for the funding of cooperative projects. In 1966, 84 cooperative programs were funded.

Cooperation in international education has constituted a major segment of the movement. Groups of colleges in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Minnesota—to mention only a few—have organized cooperative international programs. GLCA, while sponsoring cooperation on many fronts, has devoted a large portion of its efforts to international education. By 1966 there were approximately 150 instances of cooperation in international studies.[5] The National Council for Foreign Area Materials, established in 1967, became the first association of *associations* in this field. In 1968 it was succeeded by the National Council of Associations for International Studies, which represents over 400 colleges and universities.

These, then, are some of the significant steps in the development of the cooperative movement. What are the implications both for the study of this subject generally and for an analysis of the Regional Council? In spite of the relatively recent arrival of this phenomenon on the American scene, it is already a subject which is, as one observer phrased it, "necessarily massive and complex." [6] Another student of the cooperative movement has commented on the fact that, having grown as rapidly as it has, there is a need for stock-taking of what it represents. "Pressures for cooperation have come steadily but in an uncoordinated fashion. . . . The result is a maze of organizations with confusing labels. In short, there is a wealth of information which cries out for analysis." [7] He also observes that "the literature reflects a groping. We do not yet know how to label programs mainly because so little is known about what is taking place." [8]

It is in the context of this need for analysis and evaluation that the

---

[4] L. C. Howard, "Survey and Analysis of the Literature Related to Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education" in *Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education,* ed. Lawrence Howard (Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Institute on Human Relations, 1967, p. 122.

[5] Irwin Abrams, "Institutional Cooperation in International Studies," *Liberal Education,* March 1968.

[6] Raymond S. Moore, "Cooperation in Higher Education," in Howard, *op. cit.,* p. 304.

[7] Howard, *op. cit.,* p. 123.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 115.

Regional Council has undertaken this self-study of the dynamics of inter-institutional cooperation for international education. While recognizing that it is limited to a single organization and that many of its conclusions will be no more than hypotheses, it is hoped that this report of the study will be useful to others trying to examine the nature and meaning of the cooperative movement in higher education.

Lawrence Howard, in his excellent book, argues that in studying inter-institutional cooperation too much stress has been placed on the view from the top. "As a counterbalance to the present emphasis in literature on the chief executive officer's point of view, more clarity may come through descriptive monographs assessing the experience of participants in cooperative arrangements."[9] Perhaps this study, which is based heavily on data compiled from interviews with faculty, staff, and students at RCIE member institutions, will contribute to that counterbalance.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

II. The Regional Council for International Education

Forms of Cooperation

The research team and the staff members of this project began by examining the nature of interinstitutional cooperation and identifying for the purposes of the study what they felt to be two principal forms: the consortium and the council. It is important at the outset to clarify the distinction between the two forms, since some of their differences are fundamental. Also, this report will deal only with the council form.

A *consortium*, as most commonly found, consists of several colleges or universities with a board of directors composed of one representative from each member institution, normally the president.

These presidents meet at regular intervals to decide what policies or what programs shall be followed by the consortium. Basic decisionmaking takes place at the highest executive level both within the consortium *and* the member institution. Responsibility for the implementation of these policies is generally delegated to one of the member schools which acts as the agent for all members in that particular activity. Consortia tend to be composed of roughly similar types of institutions and are administratively decentralized. They are not dependent on a large staff and will normally have a small central office.

A *council*, on the other hand, is likely to be more heterogeneous in its membership, more centralized in its operations with a larger central staff. Implementation of policies and programs is usually delegated to a central agency rather than a member institution. Individual members are represented on committees and/or the board of directors. On these bodies they represent the council rather than their own institutions. The board is composed of a cross section of faculty and administrative officers. It makes decisions for the council but not for the institutions they each represent. Ideas and directives come from the member institutions via committees and individuals. The central office is expected to refine and crystallize these ideas into programs. Decisionmaking occurs at committee, staff, and board levels. Thus ideas may be generated at board or staff levels, or may be filtered up from the "grass roots" to be refined and implemented by the central administration. It can be seen, therefore, that whereas in a consortium policy is basically the result of action taken from the top, in a council ideas are more often processed up from line faculty and administrators on the individual campuses and in the central office.

This distinction is not intended to imply either that consortia do not provide means of wider discussion of policies and programs than takes place at board meetings, nor that associations of institutions cannot embody aspects of both forms of cooperation. It is a distinction made to assure that the Regional Council, the subject of this report, is not measured by inappropriate criteria.

The Regional Council for International Education is an example of the council form of cooperative association. It consists of over 30 colleges and universities in Ohio, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania with its central offices located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The members vary greatly in size and kind. Three are large universities, four are smaller universities. Seventeen are private liberal arts colleges, 14 are state or state-related institutions. Ten religious denominations are represented in member affiliations. Seven have only recently evolved from teacher education institutions. One, a charter member, is a 2-year institution (2-year colleges are no longer accepted for membership).

The 18-member board of directors is composed of presidents, deans, and faculty from the member institutions elected by representatives of the total membership at the council's annual conference. The central staff consists of 11 full-time persons in Pittsburgh, plus deans, staff, and faculty at centers in Switzerland and Italy.

Committees, task forces, advisory councils, and specialized conferences and meetings provide the source of ideas for the central staff and the board. The composition of these groups is dependent on the individual's ability to contribute, not on the need for representation from his institution, though wide participation is always sought.

The council exacts no requirements for membership other than academic accreditation. Programs and services are equally available to all members, but participation is voluntary. This means that the burden of deriving benefit from the council rests upon and within the individual institution.

Since decisions represent the collective thinking of the membership at many levels, the leadership within each institution bears a heavy responsibility to see that its interests and desires with respect to international education and cooperative activity are articulated and made known.

The commitment to cooperation within the context of a heterogeneous council form of association can be recognized as a demanding and almost inevitably difficult one to generate on an institution-wide basis. We shall see in this report how it has been sought by members of the Regional Council.

Objectives of the Council

The Regional Council for International Education was founded in 1959. It was a response to the newly identified need for colleges and uni-

versities to expand rapidly and radically the international dimension of education on their campuses. It recognized that this response could be made best within a collective framework, opening opportunities which would otherwise be closed to most of the members as individual institutions.

An early statement of its objectives defines the general purpose of all the council's programs as being "to expand the international component of the education offered by its member institutions as an effective means of assuring the alignment of liberal arts teaching with the realities of twentieth century society." The Regional Council has interpreted its functions to be threefold: to stimulate interest in international activities; to develop programs and services to assist in this effort; and to try to facilitate cooperation directed toward the achievement of greater international education activity within and among the member institutions.

Present Structure and Operations

As indicated above, the constituency of the Regional Council is extremely heterogeneous. Members range from the smallest with slightly under 800 students to the largest with roughly 31,000. Approximately two-thirds of the institutions have between 1,000 and 2,000 students. Some are located in large urban areas (Akron, Columbus, Pittsburgh) and others in small rural communities. They extend in a radius of roughly 300 miles of Pittsburgh, where the council has its headquarters at the University of Pittsburgh. Although the majority are undergraduate institutions, a third offer various types of graduate degrees, while the larger universities award a wide range of doctoral programs. Slightly more than half are on the semester system, the rest having three-term calendars. Many offer summer sessions and a few have a special interim session in the mid-winter. Thus, it is obvious that given the range of size, resources, location, organizational structures, and the like, their needs are, of necessity, quite different. Some have a diversity of overseas contacts and resources of their own while others depend entirely on the Regional Council for their international activities. How the varying needs of this group of institutions can be met within the framework of interinstitutional cooperation is a principal focus of this study.

The administrative structure of the council consists of a president, a board of directors, and a central staff. The president has major executive responsibilities. He is also chairman of the board and responsible to it. The board of directors, elected from the member institutions, is empowered both to make major decisions and to act in an advisory capacity, offering guidance in the development of programs and formulation of policy. It is composed of 18 faculty, deans, and presidents who serve in an individual capacity rather than as representatives of their institutions. The central staff responsibilities have been divided into three principal

areas with a director for each: faculty affairs, overseas affairs, and international student affairs. A vice president serves as the coordinator of council activities with special responsibility for financial and organizational management.

Operationally, the links between the member campuses and the central staff center around the RCIE liaison representative on each campus. The liaison is appointed by the president of the member institution for an unlimited term and is removable only by him. His role has been, to date, principally defined and described by the RCIE. He is responsible for the dissemination of information originating from the central office and the publicizing of Regional Council activities on his campus. He also serves as the bridge whereby information about developments at his institution become known to the administrative staff. This report will give special attention to the crucial role played by the liaison officer in council operations.[1]

Over the years, committees have been formed to act in an advisory capacity in the planning and implementation of activities. These reflect the main areas of council concern: faculty affairs, international student affairs, study abroad, teacher education, and the arts. Although the primary function of committees has been to aid in the development of programs, they have also been seen as serving an informational function, i.e., participation is intended to expand the knowledge and understanding of the council on campus and to spur international education and development. When special assistance has been needed in the formulation of policies regarding major issues, task forces and special advisory committees have been appointed. Task forces on area studies, centers abroad, faculty enrichment, and teacher education have provided the council with guidelines for action in these areas.

The Regional Council holds a number of meetings each year to provide opportunities for members to come together and exchange ideas. Among these meetings are an annual general conference, a conference of RCIE deans, special subregional conferences such as those on teacher education and study abroad. In addition special workshops have been held from time to time, e.g., library workshops on foreign area materials, a workshop for foreign student advisors, and three workshops on foreign student admissions.

Programs and Services

Most of the programs and services which the council provides can be divided according to the broad categories of staff responsibility outlined previously. They are described briefly in the following paragraphs.

[1] See ch. V.

Faculty

The major program for faculty is the Faculty Institute for International Studies. Established under a grant from the Ford Foundation in 1964, the Faculty Institute annually offers an academic-year seminar for faculty who are not specialists in international studies but who believe their teaching responsibilities need or can be enriched by an international dimension. In addition, a Scholar-in-Residence program has made possible the bringing to member campuses of foreign academicians to lecture, to assist in the development of curriculum, and to encourage international education development. Also a British-American exchange lectureship has offered an exchange of RCIE and British professors to lecture and interpret their respective cultures. On an informal basis the RCIE staff assists certain American faculty seeking overseas assignments.

Overseas

Overseas programs include opportunities for both students and faculty. The council has study centers in Basel, Switzerland, and Verona, Italy, for undergraduate study abroad.

With the exception of 1965, one or more overseas faculty seminars have been conducted by the council each summer since 1961. A special Presidential Study Mission to Western Europe was undertaken in 1970 and was the first in a projected series of such programs for RCIE member presidents.

International Students

Programs for foreign students studying in this country center around the intercultural communications workshop, which has been devised as an attempt to meet the need for more effective and meaningful dialog between American and foreign students. The council staff advises the membership on other foreign student matters such as admissions, orientation, English language instruction, campus programing, and advising. From 1964 to 1968, under a Ford Foundation grant, the council conducted an English language and orientation center for newly-arrived foreign students who had been accepted at member institutions. From time to time the council has also sponsored programs for foreign students and visitors under contracts from agencies such as the African-American Institute, the Institute of International Education, the Agency for International Development, the Departments of State and Agriculture, and the Office of Education.

A student exchange program with Argentina and a foreign student admissions service are in the early stages of development.

Other Activities

The council has sought to provide a number of services for its mem-

bers at both the faculty and student levels. For example, the opportunity for self-directed, independent study of "critical languages"[2] has been made available to students at several member institutions.

Cooperative relationships with institutions overseas have been established to provide new resources for the membership. The development of student and faculty exchange relationships with Makerere University in Uganda and the Netherlands Universities Foundation for International Cooperation (NUFFIC) in Holland are examples. The council also acts as a liaison for many of its members with national organizations concerned with aspects of international education, e.g., the Institute of International Education, the Council on International Educational Exchange, etc.

Finally, the council has fostered subregional cooperative programing among its members. Clusters of institutions have been encouraged in the joint use of the programs and services of the council. Visiting scholars have been shared in this way by groups of geographically proximate colleges.

Publications

The council has sought to develop and stimulate interest in international education through the communication of ideas via its own publications. These have taken a number of different forms. Flyers and brochures have been produced describing the various programs and services which the council provides. Reports have also been prepared summarizing the operation of these programs and activities. In addition to this descriptive information, the council has attempted to promote an exchange of ideas on topics related to international education. *Dimensions of International Education* is the name of a series of printed occasional papers designed to focus on specific issues, such as the study of world areas in undergraduate education. The Regional Council journal, *Vidya,* seeks to provide a scholarly forum for the discussion of matters of international interest and the publication of research stimulated by council activity. The council publishes a monthly newsletter during the academic year.

[2] Examples: Japanese, Chinese, Swahili, Arabic.

III. The Origin and Development of the Council

Establishing Organizational Patterns

If one is to explore the dynamics of an organization, he must know something of the evolution it has undergone to reach its current stage of development. It can be seen from the brief description in chapter I that the Regional Council was conceived and established in the midst of growing ferment among a number of alert educators, foundation officers, and government officials. These people sounded the alarm over the low state of international education in the American educational system and focused especially on higher education. It could only be natural, therefore, that those involved in this movement would see themselves somewhat as missionaries concerned with bringing the message to other educators and beginning the process of change which they saw necessary.

In this context, the Regional Council can be described as an organization which came into existence with a mission. This mission was to stimulate in liberal arts institutions in this region (1) a greater awareness of the importance of international education and of the potentials of pooling efforts and sharing resources, and (2) increased activity and broadened interest in international education.

The principal stimulus in organizing the council came from Shepherd L. Witman, a faculty member and administrative officer at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Witman became the first and, to date, the only president of the council.

The formation of the council followed two meetings, the first of which was called by Dr. Witman to consider ways in which institutions of higher learning in the tri-state region (Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia) could better cooperate with the Fulbright program. The second was an organizing conference.

Two important initial decisions were (1) that membership would be open only to academic institutions, thus excluding individual and non-academic organizational memberships, and (2) that only a token financial commitment would be asked of the members ($100 to $400, depending on size).

A board of directors, composed of faculty and deans with interests in international education, was selected. It is significant that no presidents were on the initial board of directors.

There was no paid staff. All the work was done by members of the

staff of the president and paid for by the headquarters institution. The primary activities of the council were organizational. Committees were appointed to explore the possibilities for cooperative action in faculty exchange, undergraduate study abroad, foreign student affairs, and faculty enrichment in international affairs.

Each institution was requested to appoint a liaison officer to serve as an RCIE contact person on each campus.

Certain characteristics of this early council activity are noteworthy.

The initial approach to prospective member institutions was, at the outset, through individuals on the member campuses. These individuals were selected, generally, not because of their position in the institution, but because of their interest in international education. Through them, the support of the presidents and/or deans of the institutions was sought. Thus the basic steps in the establishment of the council were (1) the seeking-out of individuals already interested in or committed to international education and (2) the translation of this contact into support and commitment from the top leadership (though in financial terms the commitment was a modest one).

During the period 1959-63 the RCIE president visited each member campus several times, conferring with presidents, vice presidents, and key deans. These visits were part of a conscious policy of keeping presidents informed about and identified with the council without making demands upon them which they could not meet. This policy has continued and has been expanded in recent years to include presidential membership on the board of directors.

It can be seen, however, that from the beginning there was no explicit, structurally built-in means for establishing a broad base of support for the council on campus. While one of the first steps of the RCIE president was to ask the member president to identify individuals he would like to have serve on RCIE committees, there was no requirement or, indeed, expectation, that these people would somehow form an organized nucleus for wider support.

Further, this pattern of operating through small numbers of individuals on each campus selected for their own personal commitment to international education and supported by the top administration was structurally institutionalized through the liaison system. Instead of expecting that an RCIE committee would be appointed at each institution, the president was asked to appoint a single "liaison representative" who would function as principal contact with the RCIE central office. He would be expected to attend the conferences held by the council, to publicize the RCIE on campus, and to serve as a channel, not simply for information about international education, the RCIE, and RCIE programs, but to a significant degree for the substantive impact of the council.

We can see in these early activities of the council the development of a basic pattern of operation: the identification of committed individuals and the drawing of these people off campuses to meetings, not only to plan RCIE programs and activities, but also to participate in substantive seminars and conferences. The expectation was that they as individuals would bring back to the institution the value of their experience and serve as catalysts for the development of international education on their campuses. This operational mode will be seen to characterize almost every phase of the development of the Regional Council.

There appear to be two fundamental reasons why the council developed as it did. The first lies in the principal objective of the council to carry to its membership a new awareness of the significance of international education and a new sense of the integral relationship of international education to liberal education as a whole. Behind this missionary aim is the more or less explicit assumption that, although the awareness existed in virtually all of the cooperating institutions, it was not yet deep enough or broad enough to achieve the major institutional commitment to international education necessary for the institution's best interest. It was the responsibility of the committed few to rally their colleagues and recruit them to the task of building the international dimension of education. Thus there was from the outset of the council an almost inevitable dependence for support on individuals selected for their commitment to international education (as opposed to dealing with people primarily according to their institutional roles: deans, department chairmen, admissions directors, etc.).

The second reason for the council's developing as it did lies in its minimal financial resources. It is understandable that major financial commitments could not be expected from the members since in most cases the president of the institution acquiesced in involvement in the council rather than initiating it.[1]

With these financial limitations, however, staff time was not available to develop at each institution an initial commitment broad enough to find a base among a group of faculty rather than in one or two individuals. Indeed, the hope was articulated early in the history of the council that *through its efforts* and over a period of time such a broad base of support for international education would be created.

The council is therefore not the creature of institutions which established it to serve a purpose already clearly defined and fully accepted institutionally. It is the inspiration of a few people looking ahead to the future imperatives of higher education in the United States.

---

[1] See pp. 20-21 for further discussion of financial questions.

Programs

The council moved in its early years to build its programs and its base of support in the membership block by block. And, in most cases, the programs manifest the characteristics identified above as inherent in the nature of the council.

To begin with, programs were developed and implemented in each of the three areas of principal concern: faculty, international students, and overseas.

Faculty.—The Faculty Institute for International Studies was the prime building block. Starting with 36 faculty participants in 1964-65, it now averages 90 each year. From 1964 to 1970 over 350 RCIE faculty have attended.[2] During the survey the one RCIE program most often mentioned and given highest priority for continuation was the Faculty Institute.

Attempts were made to enhance the impact of the institute on campus. In the original program each participating college received a library grant for the purchase of books related to the year's subject.[3] They were also encouraged to send more than one faculty participant, which most of them did. Efforts at systematically organizing the institutional impact of the program, on the other hand, have not met with marked success. Groups of alumni have been called together for meetings but no continuing program or activity resulted. The Faculty Institute is basically oriented toward the individual and it is through the individual alumni who have assumed broader responsibilities for international education on their campuses that the institute has brought home most effectively the significance of RCIE membership. In the perceptions of the participants, however, it is the personal benefits related to their teaching that were most often cited to the research team. These are discussed elsewhere in this report.[4]

The British-American Exchange Lectureship program followed the RCIE pattern.[5] The American faculty members who have gone abroad have each had a personal experience of great depth and to this day remain uniformly strong supporters both of the council and international education in general. The British lecturers who have come to this country each spring, often two in number, have delighted the members, even though time and money limitations encouraged their being programed on whirlwind tours of 20 or so schools for only brief visits.

Yet the program remained limited in its impact. There were no ad-

[2] A list of the subjects covered by the Faculty Institute is included in the appendix.

[3] With the termination of the Ford grant in 1969 this feature of the program ended.

[4] See ch. IV.

[5] The appendix includes a complete list of lecturers involved.

visory committees to be specifically concerned with Anglo-American educational relations; there were no conferences, seminars, or other program activities deliberately aimed at broadening the impact. The American faculty member was not expected to lecture or serve any specific function afterward, though in fact most of them have played significant roles in the RCIE as liaisons, committee chairmen, or board members. Rather, the individual and his personal development were the key elements.

In contrast the Scholar-in-Residence program has been aimed specifically at expanding the on-campus impact of the RCIE, especially in support of the faculty institutes and the increasing interest in area studies.[6]

Under this program foreign scholars have been brought to the RCIE annually for the entire academic year (including one curriculum consultant each year under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education).[7] Arrangements for these scholars have placed them for more time than the British lecturers on each campus. They have consulted on curriculum development as well as given lectures and engaged in other activities both formal and informal. They have also normally come from the world region which was the subject of the Faculty Institute the year before.

International students.—The Regional Council Center for International Students, which was conducted in the summers from 1964 to 1968, constituted a relatively major program spending $40,000 to $60,000 each summer and involving 80 to 125 students, staff, and faculty. The idea for creating the center grew out of several workshops on foreign student affairs held in the first years of the council's existence.

The center accomplished a number of very important things. Each summer it provided many newly arriving RCIE foreign students valuable orientation and English language training.[8] It served as a stimulus to the development of interest and expertise in foreign student affairs among RCIE faculty and staff who became involved in the center, and as a proving ground for new concepts in orientation, English language teaching, and intercultural communications. Perhaps most important, experience with the center demonstrated the critical importance of an effective admissions program—since orientation is of little value to students without the academic, financial, or linguistic ability to study in this country. The Foreign Student Admissions Service, inaugurated in 1969, can be seen in part as a direct outgrowth of the Orientation Center experience.

[6] The RCIE Conference of Deans in April 1968, gave special attention to area studies in undergraduate education.

[7] See appendix for a list of the scholars.

[8] Terminal questionnaires verified the fact that the large majority of students perceived the experience to be valuable.

At the same time, the center remained essentially peripheral to the mainstream of council development. It involved a limited number of RCIE students (40 to 70, the rest being assigned to it by the Institute of International Education under programs funded by the Department of State), and only a handful of RCIE faculty. It took place in a central location (four times in Pittsburgh and once in Akron) with no or only minimal relationship to the host campus. There was little followup with the students, no sense of identity among them with the council, and, for many, no real comprehension of the council as an institution. There were rarely many participants from a single campus and rarely was an effort made to build upon them any kind of special ongoing activity.

In terms of institutional impact, the center was perhaps most important in the involvement, limited though it was, of the foreign student advisers and admissions officers on campus who assisted by recruiting the students and by serving on the RCIE Orientation Center Committee. Efforts were also made to involve the foreign student advisers directly in the center, but with only partial success.

Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of the center and other conferences and activities related to foreign students was to project on to the campuses the idea that greater attention to foreign student affairs both as a service to the students and as a facet of the whole international education effort of the institution was needed.

With the exhaustion of the grant funds the program was phased out. The council decided to put its efforts into more basic programs, such as the Foreign Student Admissions Service. It was also felt that orientation could be more effectively and less expensively provided on individual campuses or among subgroups of institutions more geographically proximate.[9]

Overseas.—Every year since 1961, with two exceptions, the RCIE has conducted an overseas seminar for faculty.[10] Since 1966 they have been conducted outside of Western Europe in countries related to the Faculty Institute program of prior or subsequent years. While building on the Faculty Institute experience, they have been principally oriented toward the development of skills in the individual with responsibility left to him and his institution to make these effective on campus in the expansion of international education.

The Study Year Abroad program in Basel was established in 1965

[9] In addition it was about this time that the Ford Foundation withdrew much of its direct support for international education at the undergraduate level (particularly in the area of foreign student affairs).

[10] Once there was no seminar, once individual fellowships were given to faculty members to pursue their own study abroad or in the U.S., and on two occasions two seminars were conducted simultaneously. See appendix for a listing of the seminar sites and titles.

and enrolled 35 students in its first year. The committee which developed the program placed great stress on its academic quality and on its aim of providing overseas opportunities to students to whom such opportunities are not normally available (specifically those not fluent in a foreign language). Since 1965 over 200 students have attended. In the interviews with the research team, Basil alumni, with only a few exceptions, were enthusiastic about their experiences.

Of all the original RCIE programs, Basel prompted the greatest amount of direct on-campus publicity generated in the process of recruiting students. The research team discovered, however, that while more people have heard of Basel than any other RCIE program, it frequently became known, among students and faculty alike, without its identification with RCIE or as the *only* identification with RCIE: "The Regional Council? Oh yes, Basel." The implications of this for RCIE communications functions are discussed elsewhere.[11]

Some thought appears to have been given to the integration of the Basel experience into the students' overall academic program. History and political science majors have been especially encouraged to attend. Yet overall, Basel appears integral neither with the RCIE as a whole nor with on-campus activities.

The pattern of RCIE program development therefore seems clear. The council did not place its major stress on the rapid development of institution-wide commitment to the council and broad institutional impact of its programs. Instead it sought to create a wide range of programs reaching different segments of the campus population and placed its emphasis on the individual, drawing him off campus to participate in programs and benefits of which he would personally bring back to his institution. It was up to him and his institution to translate that experience into expanded commitment and increased international education activity.

The council of course did not wholly ignore the potentials of programs designed to affect institutional change directly—the curriculum consultants, the published recommendations of RCIE committees on policies related to faculty exchange, area studies, and study abroad; aspects of the Faculty Institute—these all had the intention of institutional impact. Nevertheless, the priority was given to the development and cultivation of individuals who would hopefully have the impact on the campus which would produce the changes necessary to the imperatives of international education development.

Organizational Development

Initial Imperatives and Policies

It is important to place this early organizational development of the

[11] See ch. V.

council within the framework of its initial financial and operational imperatives. Four appear to be most important.

1. *Financial.*—Funding, as has been mentioned, was set at a minimum in the beginning so as to encourage membership. The result was a lack of paid staff and a dependence on the headquarters institution in the early years.
2. *Size and geographic spread.*—From the very beginning, the council has been a large organization, spread over a wide geographic area and including large numbers of students and faculty (at present approximately 120,000 students and 7,000 faculty).
3. *Heterogeneity.*—The RCIE membership includes at least one representative of almost every kind of liberal arts institution, large and small, public and private, church-related and independent, that exists in the United States.
4. *Variation in commitment to and development of international education.*—The members of the council have not made a uniform commitment to international education. The degree of international education development on the campuses varies dramatically from campus to campus, as will be shown in the next chapter.

In the area of finances the council moved deliberately to develop several major long-range programs for which funds would be sought. These efforts came to fruition in the first of two financial turning points in RCIE history—the Ford Foundation grants for the Faculty Institute and the Orientation Center totalling $325,000 over a 4- (ultimately 5-) year period. This grant enabled the council both to initiate new programs and to begin the process of institutional and staff development on a solid foundation. One full-time professional staff member was hired and others worked on a part-time basis. Three years later another full-time staff member was hired as a number of smaller grants and contracts expanded program activity.

When these grants came to an end, however, other sources of support had to be found. During these years an important question had been debated within the council. Should it build its administrative and program structure on grants and contracts, on so-called "soft money," and thereby save the membership the burden of large-scale expenditures in support of the council? Or should it seek from the members solid financial commitments not subject to the whims of external funding agencies? The latter was decided upon.

Thus in 1968 came the next turning point when the council, after careful consultation with member presidents raised its annual fee to $2,500 per institution.

Two other policies have played an important role in the formation of the RCIE operational mode. One is that while occasional grants and contracts for special programs or pilot projects have been accepted which do somewhat limit member participation, funds from member fees and generally applicable program grants are used only for programs and services available equally to all members.

The second policy, that of changing equal fees to all members regard-

less of size, is even more significant because it has served to establish a norm for the relationships among the institutions. It was felt that while the council is very useful to large institutions (for whom the fee is less of a financial burden), it is especially valuable to the small. It was therefore deemed not only fair to charge small and large equally, but it helped assure that the energies of the council would not be inequitably consumed by larger contributors.

Basic Structure

The Regional Council is characterized by the centralization of administrative responsibilities.

The role of individual institutions in the administration of council affairs became a vital issue soon after the organization was established. As committees began to discuss concrete programs for which outside funding might be sought, the council had to decide how funded projects would be administered. There were two principal options: (1) to decentralize, asking member schools to serve as agent institutions in the administration of council programs (a common form of organization among consortia), or (2) to adminster the programs centrally. The latter was selected as potentially the most effective.

This decision led to the incorporation of the council in 1963, giving it the legal authority to receive grants and contracts and centrally develop and administer programs.[12]

The council was structured in a way parallel to the academic institutions of which it was composed. With a board, president, vice president, division directors, deans, and faculty, it embodies the basic elements of institutional life in the academic world.

The chief executive office, that of the president, became especially strong in the council. As a university president links the various schools and departments (which sometimes operate with surprising independence), the council president has linked the member institutions and their chief executive officers. The RCIE president represents the council to government, foundations and private educational organizations; develops relationships with other institutions in the U.S. and abroad; and chairs the board of directors and certain major projects and conferences. He

[12] In rejecting the agent institution concept of organization, the council was moving to avoid another problem—that of the potential domination of the council by a few large and/or vigorous institutions. This was recognized as particularly serious in relation to the headquarters institution. Given the financial dependence on the institution at which the council was headquartered, it is revealing to find that nowhere in research does there appear any sense of that institution dominating council affairs. The only comment related to the question of preferred status was an expression of the feeling that the council gave preferential consideration to the *independent liberal arts colleges*. There was little sense of the small institutions being dominated by the large.

oversees the budget and provides general operational supervision. He has thus been invested with broad authority, central responsibility and significant discretion in the achievement of interinstitutional cooperation. Given the fact that the council was operating without independently paid staff and through personal contact with individuals on widely distributed and diverse campuses—that is, given its basic limitations—it is probable that it could not have developed effectively without centralized authority. It is noteworthy that Lawrence Howard in his study mentioned previously describes the early cooperative associations (Claremont, Atlanta, and Virginia) as each having directors whose role approaches that of a president of the university.

Operations

The staff, which expanded naturally as program activities developed, works under the supervision of the president in administering current programs and developing new ones. They also work with the appropriate RCIE committees and have a great deal of direct contact with member institutions.

The RCIE committees merit special attention in this report, primarily because they were designed from the beginning to have a dual purpose. One of these purposes was to provide the advice and counsel normally expected of committees in academia. Like most such committees they have had an uneven record, some achieving a great deal and providing the members with significant personal satisfaction. Others have been of little value to anyone.

But RCIE committees have also been designed as a means of acquainting member personnel with the RCIE and getting them involved in its affairs. They have been seen both as an instrument of interinstitutional cooperation and a spur to international education.

The committees have been appointed from lists provided to the RCIE by member presidents and from among people identified in more informal ways. It has been the policy of the council to change each committee each year by adding one-third to one-half new members.

The implications of this policy are important and will be discussed elsewhere.[13] But it is clearly within the RCIE pattern of development to reach out to these individuals, draw them off campus to committee meetings and hope to send them back a little more strongly committed to international education and a little more ready to influence their institutions.

Another important issue in this study is the question of communication. As will be shown, the research team found that students and

[13] See ch. V.

faculty at member institutions suffered from lack of information about the council.

During its early years the council had necessarily to set its priorities rigidly. Precious staff time was allocated to that which seemed most substantive, principally the development and conduct of programs and communications designed to contribute to international education development and the acceptance of the concept of interinstitutional cooperaion. The result, in terms of information dissemination, was a heavy production of statements of philosophy, fat reports describing and evaluating programs, bibliographies, special studies and, in 1967, VIDYA, the RCIE journal.

For the day-to-day kind of communication capable of reaching a wide audience, the council depended almost entirely on the liaison (thus when the researchers visited the campuses they could detect a direct correlation between the effectiveness of the liaison and the degree to which the RCIE was known.) Yet even the information sent to the liaison was primarily program announcements and such communications made necessary by RCIE activities. It is especially significant, as will be shown later, that little information on the procedures and processes of council operations has gotten beyond the liaisons. Not until 1968 was a newsletter established to provide for a wider readership the kind of general view of the council necessary to grasping what is in fact a rather complex organization.

IV. International Education on the Member Campuses

Patterns of International Education Development

The variation in international education development among the institutions selected for this study is striking. Academic institutions are unique; each has its own special flavor or character which permeates all aspects of institutional life, including international education. In addition, systematic planning and development does not always characterize colleges and universities. Nevertheless, the data of this study clearly demonstrates that these 10 institutions, representative within the Regional Council and probably representative of 90 percent of the liberal arts institutions in the United States, have not been standing still for the last 10 years in the area of international education.

In every area where growth was statistically measured over the 10-year period, expansion is evident. This is especially true since 1966. For instance, in 1959-60 only one institution gave any assistance to foreign students or American students studying abroad (and this a single scholarship of $1,000 to a foreign student). By 1969-70 seven of the institutions were giving foreign student scholarships, four were offering assistantships to foreign students, and as many more were giving scholarships to American students to study abroad.

In 1959-60 only a few of the institutions had foreign faculty on campus—either for short-term visits or as full-time teachers. By the end of the decade all of them did. At the beginning of the decade few had international education or international student committees. By the end of the decade they all had one or both.

The increase in the number of American students going abroad is equally dramatic. The majority of the schools had no students going overseas to study in the early years of the decade. By 1969-70 the reverse was true and in many cases with striking increases in numbers (anywhere from 20 to 50 at several smaller institutions; 396 at one of the larger).

Similarly, the numbers of foreign students on campuses increased markedly at most of the institutions over the 10-year period.

Information gathered about international education development on the 10 campuses will be outlined only briefly here before going on to examine in more detail the factors which appear to influence such development. It should be reemphasized that this is a study of the Re-

gional Council and not a critique of the internationalization efforts of its members.

Curriculum.—Interestingly, changes in the curriculum over the last 10 years have not been as great as might have been expected. All the institutions surveyed offer the usual courses in European history: European languages (generally including Russian), international relations, plus world history and/or world cultures (sometimes called world civilization). New courses on non-European areas have been introduced, most often in history, politics, or comparative religion. Some have resulted from specialized training or experiences abroad, in a number of cases via the RCIE. Others resulted from the presence of a foreign faculty member or an American with special expertise teaching regularly-offered courses and being allowed to add a new course.[1]

In the smaller schools with limited resources these offerings are often not a permanent curricular commitment and disappear when the particular faculty member leaves.

Three of the institutions have initiated organized programs with an area focus outside of Western Europe. None of them claims to have a full-scale non-Western area *studies* program comparable to those at the major area study centers. They prefer the terms *area focus, area emphasis,* or *area concentration.* Normally, an area focus program enables students to put together courses taught in different departments but related to the world area in question. The study of a language of the area may or may not be possible or required. Most often the student will minor or receive a special certificate of study in the world area.

Study abroad.—It is in the opening-up of foreign study opportunities to students that we find the institutions surveyed advancing most rapidly. While two institutions have sent only a few students abroad, and these mainly to the RCIE Basel program, the others have been much more active.

Two-thirds of the institutions surveyed have developed undergraduate study abroad programs of their own. While Europe is the site of most of these, a few take place elsewhere, i.e., Japan, Mexico, and Iran. In length they vary from the mid-winter interim or a 6-week summer seminar to semester- and year-long programs. Three of the institutions are

[1] It may be significant that in the area of curriculum change, where development has been the slowest at the majority of the institutions surveyed, the RCIE has remained uninvolved—except to the degree that participation in council activities has indirectly affected curriculum. Until now the council has maintained this position to avoid any charge of internal interference in a matter traditionally the jealously guarded prerogative of faculties. The single important exception has been the council's publication "The Study of World Areas in Undergraduate Education," which reported the conclusions and recommendations of the 1968 Conference of Deans. A principal recommendation was that liberal arts colleges abjure *area studies* in favor of an *area focus* or *area emphasis.*

offering education students the opportunity to undertake internships or student teaching assignments overseas (in Africa and Latin America in addition to Europe) while others encourage independent study abroad, stressing flexibility rather than reliance on tightly programed experiences.

In addition to the usual number of foreign language majors, we see more and more students who are not majoring in languages going overseas for substantive study. This represents a significant shift in attitude away from more restrictive concepts of who is qualified to study abroad, and coincides in time with a parallel Regional Council policy formulated in 1964 and implemented in 1965 in its program in Basel.

Yet, in spite of this progress, there is still much room for active study-abroad development in the years ahead. While State and Federal Government scholarships and loans are being used increasingly by individuals to support study abroad, financial aid from the institutions is still small ($4,200 was the largest amount given by any one institution). Only one of the institutions provides organized study abroad, though a number have a single person who provides advice to students in this regard more or less informally.

Foreign students and scholars.—As indicated earlier, the increasing number of foreign students attending the institutions surveyed constitutes one of the most visible evidences of expansion in international education over the last decade. At the smaller colleges this is in part due to the increased number of scholarships offered in recent years. At the universities, the demand abroad for graduate and professional training in the United States can be identified as a major cause for the increase.

In response to this development, faculty committees on international students, international student clubs, and a variety of regular international and intercultural programs have come into existence. Full-time or part-time foreign student advisers have been appointed. Special counseling and orientation programs, usually quite modest, have been developed on most campuses.

Foreign scholars have also been appearing on campus in increasing numbers, sometimes as visitors, sometimes as immigrants or alien residents. At the smaller, more isolated colleges they still constitute something of a rarity, however. At these schools the RCIE Scholar-in-Residence program has been particularly welcome.

Cocurricular activity.—All of the institutions surveyed commit time and resources to cocurricular activities related to international affairs. The amount and emphasis generally correlates with the overall commitment of the institution to international education.

In this area more than any other, intangibles seem to determine quantity and quality. Inspired leadership (as provided by a lively visiting foreign scholar in one case) or a generally receptive climate often make all the difference. Exactly the same kind of program has been a

great success on some campuses and a complete failure on others. It was not the intent of this study to determine precisely why this is the case, and the research team did not develop extensive material on the subject. It nevertheless merits further study.

Factors Affecting International Education Development

There are many factors which limit the development of international education (and no doubt any needed educational change). A few of these which became most apparent during this study will be mentioned here.

Funding is probably the major one. All new educational programs must compete for increasingly scarce funds.

But as we have seen, curriculum is also slow to change, being processed as it is through curriculum committees which may feel that despite relatively minimal international offerings they had gone as far as necessary. In addition, students in many majors face course requirements which inhibit them from broadening their academic interests and in some cases virtually eliminate the possibility of studying abroad. Apathy and parochialism among students, faculty, and administrators can also be counted upon to raise barriers to the expansion of international education.

Among faculty, the pressure to complete doctorates and to publish within their own disciplines often limits the number willing and able to branch out into international subject areas.

This study has identified a number of critical aspects of institutional life which affect an institution's ability to overcome these limitations. Since they also play a significant role in determining the ability to profit from membershp in the Regional Council, they will be briefly described here. These aspects are: institutional support, faculty development, student attitudes, academic climate and institutional self-image, external impetus, and reorganization for international education.

Institutional Support

If one fact emerged clearly from this study it is that without support from administrative leadership, especially the president (but also the senior academic officer), little broad-scale development is likely to take place. Where a pervasive international awareness exists in an institution, a firm and active commitment to international education will normally be found at the top. Where honest commitment does not exist at the top, international education development is likely to be spotty at best. In the mobilization of resources and faculty support, the allocation of funds to new or different kinds of scholarships, and the opening up of new opportunities, top-level support was found to be essential.

Unfortunately, the converse is not true; support from the top alone

will not make international education happen. It was found that even where a president was or appeared to be personally committed he might (1) fail to communicate this commitment effectively to the faculty and students, (2) function as a counterforce among his faculty by restricting their individual endeavors to expand their international interests and commitments, or (3) undermine his support by deliberately or inadvertently assigning international education low priority. Without specific encouragement to faculty and students, apathy and resistance to change more easily prevail.

Faculty Development

The faculty, too, must play a crucial role in the development of international education. The evidence of the study, however, indicates that institutional leadership has been slow to recognize this fact and has failed to support broad programs of faculty development.[2] A relatively pervasive commitment to international education among the faculty could be said to exist at only a small number of the institutions surveyed. In most cases in which it did not exist, there was a correlation between that fact and a low level of support for the establishment of policies and the allocation of funds to faculty development.

Except for language professors, international experience is generally not a significant consideration in appointing faculty, even though many colleges indicate it is desirable, especially if it relates to specific teaching responsibilities. Only one institution indicated that it is "increasingly weighed in favor of the candidate." Similarly, only one of the colleges surveyed has a definite policy of encouraging faculty to go abroad, including the offering of financial support. In this case, a small college reorganized its sabbatical program, made it compulsory, and allocated funds for special projects, giving particular encouragement to those focused overseas. At the other extreme, in at least one case faculty and administrative officers were outspoken in their unconcern with faculty experience abroad.

The academic dean often appears to play a particularly important and sometimes subtle role here. If he is personally supportive of international education he can develop his faculty in many ways which are not manifested in policy but which are equally, if not more, effective. By the

[2] In a survey of the development of non-Western area studies at private liberal arts colleges (a doctoral dissertation in preparation), Christopher Duffy has found that faculty development is an outstanding problem. Either the faculty is insufficient in these kinds of colleges or has insufficient training in non-Western studies. Mr. Duffy concludes that there is a clear need for greater faculty training in non-Western subject areas. He also believes that consortium efforts involving the sharing of institutional resources are the best means of improving faculty expertise with a minimal financial output. (From correspondence with Christopher G. Duffy, Office of International Programs, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois).

allocation of discretionary funds and personal encouragement (or pressure) he can create an atmosphere very conducive to the expansion of faculty experience and capabilities. The faculty development efforts of the RCIE have depended significantly on the willingness of the dean to identify, support (sometimes financially), and give recognition to faculty participants in RCIE programs.

Similarly, active and articulate faculty members can bring effective pressure to bear on the administration to support their interests.

In the end, of course, there is some degree of commitment to faculty development at all of the member institutions of the Regional Council, attested to by their very membership in the RCIE and by their support of faculty participation in the Faculty Institute and in overseas seminars. Concern with faculty can reasonably be said to be increasing at most of the institutions surveyed.

Student Attitudes

The research team did not survey student attitudes in great depth. Its most important observation was that student attitudes appear to follow closely attitudes among the faculty. Where interest and leadership in international education is high among faculty, *and where this has been manifest on campus and in the curriculum,* an interest and positive attitude toward international education among students are evident. Where that leadership is lacking, students tend to be uninterested or even negative.

Academic Climate and Institutional Self-image

In the process of visiting institutions the research team identified a very important aspect of institutional life which they called "academic climate." Academic climate is the general atmosphere on campus in which teaching, learning, and educational advancement take place. It is the sum total of the attitudes of administration, faculty, and students toward the educational endeavor to which they are jointly committed. While intangible, it pervades the institution and became evident very early in the interview schedule of the research team at each school. Although highly subjective, it is nonetheless significant and therefore ought not be overlooked.

Where the academic climate at an institution is dynamic and positive, support for international education is more likely to be generated. The institutions with the least interest in and commitment to international education appeared to be those saddled with more than their share of general dissatisfaction. Nor, it seems, does the climate for international education necessarily relate to the academic standing of the school or the qualifications of the faculty. Problems were found at institutions of recognized academic excellence as well as institutions still struggling to climb the academic ladder.[3]

Related to the academic climate is the issue of institutional self-image. At several institutions there is the sense that the point has not yet been reached where faculty and staff feel positive enough about themselves and their institution to have much of an outward thrust. This attitude may be expressed in various ways, one of them being that their students are "first generation" college, of whom not too much should be expected. An institution with a negative self-image may tend to hide behind its limitations—and to use them as an excuse for not doing more. Its faculty will tend to be defensive about the low level of international awareness on campus.

Interestingly, a strong sense of excellence and superiority also seem capable of functioning as limitations. They may create skepticism toward aid from an outside source and produce resistance to cooperation with other institutions—even in areas where the lone institution is incapable of operating.

External Impetus

In a number of cases impetus for development in international education had come from external sources. Association with a consortium based on church affiliation, involvement in a long-term overseas assistance project, a fortuitous overseas experience of an aggressive faculty member, a particularly effective visiting foreign scholar—each of these was found to have provided the stimulus to international education development.

The external stimulus, of course, which all the RCIE institutions share is membership in the council itself.

Reorganization for International Education

Those institutions which seem to have the most dynamic approach to international education programing are by and large the ones which have given attention to its organization. As the number and variety of activities have grown, it has become apparent to some institutions that the *ad hoc* development they have experienced needs centralized direction. Offices of international programs have been established or are projected at several of the colleges and universities surveyed. This kind of office is able to consolidate gains and add the thrust of centralized focus to scattered activities.

Other institutions, perhaps because they are less affluent, have responded to this need for more central direction by the establishment of multidisciplined international education committees. The effectiveness of these committees appears to depend on (1) the prestige and influence

[8] This "general atmosphere" appears to be especially important in determining an institution's receptivity to the concept of cooperation and ability to benefit from associations such as the Regional Council. See chapter VII.

of the faculty appointed to them, (2) the amount of administrative support given them, and (3) the clarity with which the goals are defined. Paradoxically, the presence on campus of a strong individual capable of embodying international education in his person will tend to weaken the committee.

Some institutions have established only international student committees. These have more limited aims and, thus, less authority. They often achieve wide impact, however, through the sponsoring of programs of high visibility, e.g., international weeks, prominent speakers, and the like.

The Place of the RCIE on Campus

The Role of the Council

For most of the members the council appears to serve one of two roles, either that of undergirding and supporting international education efforts already underway or as the principal source of stimulus and program activity in international education. Most commonly it is seen as playing a supporting role. It complements existing programs, opens new opportunities, provides outreach to other institutions, foreign or domestic, or simply adds increased impetus. Several of the institutions surveyed, however, depend almost wholly on the council for their international education activity. These tend to be the smaller, more impecunious colleges which find their options limited by lack of funds and experience.

Two interrelated problems were uncovered by the research team relative to the role played by the council.

One is that the rationale for being an RCIE member is not always widely understood. Indeed, membership is sometimes rejected. At institutions least active in the council—and occasionally at the active institutions as well—the research team encountered faculty and administrative officers who felt either that little resulted from RCIE membership or that membership was not needed, that the institution could do all that was necessary alone. In other words, at a number of institutions there were some who questioned, in many cases healthily, whether the RCIE had a significant role to play at all.

Second, the research team found that being a member and paying the $2,500 annual dues did not always mean that the institutional leadership was making a meaningful commitment to either the Regional Council or international education. The temptation to use membership in the RCIE as a private interest of the president was felt by the research team to be a real danger. The appropriateness of the council's serving such a role is open to question. The commitment of members to the council and its aims may merit periodic review by the Board of Directors.

Factors Affecting Participation

Why participation—in general and in specific programs and activities—has varied widely among the members has long been a subject of debate among those most closely associated with the council. To list the participation of some of the members of 10 years' standing would take less than a page while for others it would take five or 10 pages. The research team was not able to explore this subject in depth, but they did manage to identify certain factors which appear to affect participation.

As would be expected, the principal ones are the same that appear to have governed international education development in general. Particularly important is institutional support. Without support at the dean and presidential levels little can be expected, if only because the on-going commitment of resources (time, money, facilities) by the institutions has been a necessary part of involvement in the council. But faculty and student attitudes, the academic climate, the ability to organize effectively to exploit what the council offers are also important. Further, participation varies according to the role the council is seen to play and the commitment the institution makes to it. It will tend to be high where the commitment is strong and the role clearly defined, weak where they are not.

Other factors are:

Administrative and financial capability. If the institution is not willing or able to devote administrative energy or make the financial allocations (measured in time as well as dollars) necessary to exploit council opportunities effectively, then participation will suffer. In the case of study abroad, student financial limitations may affect participation significantly.

The special interest of an individual. A dean, liaison officer, or faculty member with a particular interest in one activity may influence participation in it beyond the level of participation in others.

Program duplication. A member-sponsored study-year-abroad program in one case and alternative sources of foreign scholars in another were found to limit participation in the RCIE.

Effectiveness of internal communication. If information about RCIE programs is not properly disseminated to potential clientele, participation will almost inevitably be affected.

Past experience. A major factor in participation in any program is feedback from past participants.

Policies. Pressure put on faculty to complete doctorates and institutional policies (defined or undefined), such as those restricting or discouraging students from studying abroad, limit participation.

The Impact of Participation

An assessment of the impact of participation in Regional Council programs can be divided into those for faculty and those for students.

Faculty.—Those faculty members who have participated in the Faculty Institute for International Studies, while voicing occasional specific criticisms, have an overwhelmingly favorable impression of it. Many felt that the continuation of the institute by the RCIE should receive top priority. Two principal values were identified as resulting from participation. The first is that it has provided the individual with a stimulus to his own intellectual growth. The second is that it has had a direct effect on curriculum and classroom teaching through the introduction of new materials and new courses.

A systematic study of how much infusion of new materials into someone's teaching results from a faculty enrichment program was not a part of this project. Testimony of the faculty, however, is that it has been large and it has not all taken place in the usual humanities and social science courses. One speech teacher, an alumnus of the Faculty Institute on the Middle East, now requires speeches on topics related to the Middle East in his speech communication courses. In a debate course, he regularly assigns Middle East problems as subjects. New courses have been established by faculty immediately after participation in the institute as well. An interesting example is a course in International Health Education introduced by a Faculty Institute alumnus who is a health education professor.

Some participants have felt that the value to their institution would be increased if a parallel, followup, or duplicate seminar could be held on individual campuses and thereby involve more people and increase the level of interest. Some have advocated the inclusion of student participants in the institutes. Many have recognized the value of the interdisciplinary and interinstitutional contacts stemming from the institute. Not only has there been a greater exchange of ideas among colleagues at the same institution and in the same discipline, but also an extensive interaction among people from different schools and different disciplines. Participation has brought about invitations to institute lecturers to visit other campuses.

Several institutions have allowed individual faculty members to repeat Faculty Institute participation several years in a row. Individual or institutional motives for this repetition were not clearly determined, though some of the repeaters teach survey or topic-oriented courses which deal with several world areas. (A few interviewees criticized the council and the institutions involved for allowing this repetition). At the same time it has also meant that fewer people have been reached and therefore the overall impact on the campus may be correspondingly less. Thus at several institutions the nucleus of those who have had exposure to directed area study remains small. On the other hand, these individuals tend to be the ones who most strongly support international activities there.

The same type of response has come from those who have participated in seminars abroad. The overseas experience is intensive. The alumni of the overseas seminars or other kinds of overseas experience tend to identify more thoroughly with, and remain more strongly attached to, the Regional Council. A number of articles, and at least one book, have been written and published as a direct result of these seminars, thus indicating a direct contribution to the professional advancement of some participants. In another case, faculty from two different schools instituted a course taught jointly and concurrently on the two campuses.

It was anticipated by many interviewees that the President's Study Mission to Europe, which took place after the research team had finished its visits, would have an especially strong impact on the membership by virtue of its involving the top decisionmakers. (As this writing, 10 months after the Study Mission, there is ample evidence that this expectation has been borne out.)

In the area of faculty exchange, that is, the British-American lectureship and the Scholar-in-Residence program, the data indicate that visiting scholars have the greatest impact on campuses that do not have easy access to other visiting scholars or their own foreign faculty. The crucial factor in deriving value from the scholars is the capacity of the institution to put him to use effectively while he is available. For example, at one college, if a scholar is on the campus for more than 5 days, a credit course is offered. In this way contact with students has been maximized. On another campus a single visiting scholar who has been in residence over a period of time has served as a major catalyst in focusing attention on international education. Through sheer force of personality this professor's influence has extended not only throughout the college community but into the town as well.

The impact of the visiting scholar thus appears to vary according to the personality of the scholar, the time he is on campus, and the effectiveness with which he is programed. He is likely to be effective if he is dynamic and assumes responsibilities for helping in the internationalization process, if he is on campus long enough, and if his services are used properly. Otherwise, the value of his visit will more often be limited to only a handful of people.

Students.—At the student level, information about the Regional Council is extremely limited. Even those who have participated in an RCIE program are sometimes unaware of its association with the council. Precisely what the council is and the nature of their college's relationship to it is known to only a few.

One of the principal arguments for having foreign students on campus is that it counteracts the parochialism found there. Yet it is questionable

whether that aim is being achieved. Foreign students, in particular, cite as a special problem their inability to have an effect upon their American fellow students. The intercultural communications workshop was created to attack that problem. But it is also specifically designed to be valuable to the foreign students who often express frustration at the difficulty they have in getting to know Americans.

Basel, of course, is the best known program among students. Its impact, however, is difficult to assess. While over 200 students have attended, on any campus at any given time, there are never more than a handful of alumni and these, in some cases, are outnumbered by students who have been abroad elsewhere. In addition, little systematic effort has been made to bring the experience of the Basel students back to their fellow students or to foster an expanded institutional impact. This is not uncommon; indeed, few study abroad programs have made any serious attempt to facilitate the effective feedback into the institution of the study abroad experience. Thus the value of Basel, like the value of most such programs, has by and large remained the private property of each individual attending, except in those relatively isolated cases where an outgoing and articulate student is able to communicate effectively the meaning of his year abroad.[4]

It is probably more in the simple existence of the program rather than in the feedback from participants that it achieves its institutional impact. The knowledge that Basel, and other study abroad opportunities, are *available* seemed to be significant to students interviewed by the research team, whether they had attended or not. Knowing that the institution and the faculty encourage study abroad, knowing that opportunities exist, and, perhaps, knowing those who had gone, appeared to be contributive to the fostering of a generally positive attitude toward international education. Where these elements were not present—even though some students might have been to Basel and elsewhere—the general impact appeared negligible.

The research team identified a marked need among those who had been abroad to identify more meaningfully with the international dimension of education on their campuses and to communicate their experiences to others. This untapped potential may be the key to expanding the impact of study abroad programs.

Large numbers of students have not yet been involved in workshops and only a few were interviewed. They were generally enthusiastic about the experience, but disappointed in the inability of the workshop to affect the atmosphere on their campuses. They feel that each school should have its own workshop (most workshops have drawn foreign students and sometimes Americans from a variety of campuses) so that

[4] For an RCIE student's view of this problem, see Charles Hammel, "A Student Abroad Returns: Problems and Suggestions." *Vidya 4*, (Spring 1970), pp. 29-34.

relationships established there might carry over into everyday campus affairs. Some foreign students, however, doubt whether it is possible under any circumstances to shake American students out of their normal parochial frame of mind. They feel that those who attend workshops are predisposed toward an international outlook anyway. As a resource for improving American-foreign student relations, the workshops have not involved enough students and institutions to assess their real potential. An exception to this is an institution at which the participation in a workshop resulted in the creation of an active international relations club, return visits to campus of the foreign students involved, and the regular sponsorship of one or two workshops annually.

The Regional Council Center for International Students was conducted in the summer for 5 years, 1964-1968, as an orientation and English language training program for foreign students. Of the few students interviewed who had participated, it seems that both the language instruction and the orientation experience, which gave them the chance to get their "American legs," were beneficial. However, the process of adjustment had in some degree to be repeated once they got to their own campuses. The more general impact of this program has already been discussed.[5]

One of the most interesting areas in which the council has had an influence is in fostering expanded interinstitutional cooperation directly between and among members. Officers at two of the institutions surveyed felt that involvement in the council has served as a prime stimulus in the development of such cooperation. In one case ongoing cooperation among several nearby institutions was increased, and in the other, the initial steps toward the formation of a new small-college consortium were taken. In two additional cases of interinstitutional cooperation the RCIE had influenced but not determined the course of developments.

What impact, as perceived by the membership, has the council had as a whole? In the majority of institutions surveyed, those who were familiar with the council felt it had played a major role in their international education development. In several of the institutions the general feeling was that the council has played a useful though not decisive role. In only two was the feeling widespread that the council had been of little value. In both these cases many recognized that the cause lay principally in the institution's failure to take advantage of what was offered. This latter point is important. No amount of effort on the part of anyone associated with the RCIE can bring the council to life on a member campus if there is not a corresponding effort among key staff and faculty at the institution.

[5] See ch. III.

V. Analysis of Council Operations

It is the aim of this section to examine the operations, functions, and programs of the council in the light of the foregoing descriptions. Here especially we will seek to discover the dynamics of the activities and relationships which determine what the council is today.

On-Campus Liaison

The liaison is intended to be the principal contact point for the council and a prime source of support.

The liaison system is a characteristic structural mode for the council and is at the heart of its operations. The effectiveness of the liaison and the degree to which a campus benefits from the RCIE are normally directly related. The liaison not only serves as a channel of communication, but also tends to become an embodiment of the RCIE on campus. This latter point is extremely important for it can be a two-edged sword. Other personnel on campus tend to identify the council with the liaison who in one case has become affectionately known as "Mr. RCIE." They look to him for information, guidance, and leadership relative to RCIE affairs and respond to the council to some degree according to his success or failure. In one extreme case, the liaison, who has since departed the institution, adopted the RCIE as his own private territory and was loath to share it with anyone else.

One of the important findings of the research team was that the effectiveness of the liaison operation depended significantly on its status and/or the status of the individual filling the position. When neither the individual nor the position has prestige on campus, the likelihood of significant institutional involvement in the council will be reduced, and other channels must be developed. This has happened at some institutions where the council has repeatedly approached the dean for decisions and actions which would normally be within the responsibilities of the liaison. The central staff may also respond by establishing relationships with a variety of individuals able to and interested in realizing the potentials of council membership. Of course, the problem may not be prestige at all, but simply a liaison who is not interested in the council and who neglects his responsibilities.

The *manner* in which the liaison functions on campus is also important to his effectiveness. In most cases encountered by the research team, the

liaison carries on an independent one-man operation, developing relationships, procedures, and channels of communication according to his own particular inclination and without significant formal organization.

An alternative mode has been instituted on a number of campuses. Here the RCIE liaison and RCIE activities are integrated into the operation of an international education committee (in one case an RCIE committee). This is both an enhancement of the role of the council (at least partially) and a step beyond its original orientation toward single individuals.

The Central Office

The findings of the research team indicate that few people within the council fully understand its overall structure—how the central office functions, or how the council is financed. Many are aware that there is a board of directors, a president, and staff members responsible for certain programs (with some of whom they have occasional contact), but there is uncertainty as to how they fit together and little awareness that the council is structured somewhat like their own institutions.

The central staff carry on the regular operations of the council and take major responsibility for the conduct of programs, program development, and institutional liaison within the areas over which they have supervision. They are thus both intimately involved in the evolution of the organization and closely and regularly in touch with key member personnel.

It is therefore understandable that, for people on campus, much of the identification of the council comes through the day-to-day contact with individual staff members. It was found by the research team that this personal contact with central staff significantly affects perceptions of the council among faculty and administrative officers in the membership, so that negative and positive responses to individual persons are often carried over in attitudes toward the council.

This inevitably places a heavy burden on the staff member. Not only must he do his job, he must be exceptionally sensitive and responsive to personnel on campus. In particular, he is called upon to reconcile the great variety of views he encounters with the philosophy on which RCIE programs and policies are ultimately based. This study revealed that where there is a failure in this task the council, not only the staff member, may appear among campus personnel to be inflexible and unresponsive.

The president especially tends to embody the council in the minds of the constituency. This identification is strengthened by the length of time the president has served and his direct involvement in the creation of the council. But we have already seen how the development of the council has stressed the role of individuals and how basic decisions have

focused authority on the central administration. The process of institutionalizing the council, for whatever reason, has been a slow one. Until it is elaborated more thoroughly as an institution, individuals and personalities are likely to play a major role in defining the nature of the organization.[1] Thus perceptions about the central staff, picked up by the research team in the interviews, tended to be projected upon the council as a whole.

One of these perceptions, found occasionally among faculty and administrators at the subpresidential level on the member campus was that the council was inflexible and unresponsive. It was felt that the council had become less innovative than some of its members in certain areas and insufficiently responsive to the needs and the expressed interests of the campuses. The council had become centralized, with too many decisions made at the staff level, little or no involvement of the membership, and too little information fed back to the campuses.

To understand the significance of this perception in terms of the dynamics of interinstitutional cooperation, it is necessary now to examine council operations in some detail.

The Decisionmaking Process

We have described how the centralized structure of the council came into existence. It is important to understand how it functions in operation. The process by which decisions are made is roughly described here.

Committees, conferences, task forces and advisory councils, or indeed individuals working alone with the central staff, generate ideas and propose plans of action and programs which then (normally) are crystallized in writing by a staff member for distribution to the advising group or individuals and for transmission to the RCIE president. He, in consultation with staff, decides which should be implemented immediately without further consideration, which need additional development and discussion through committees and conferences, which can be shelved according to previously established policy, and which should be taken to the board of directors for decision. The board of directors, in consultation with the president, sets general policies to guide his action and votes to approve or disapprove specific proposals, projects, and other matters put forward by the president.

It is not an uncommon mode of operation, particularly where the central staff is a small one. It is also not difficult to see it as a natural outgrowth of the council's organizational imperatives. Properly functioning, the system offers an effective means of developing and initiating

[1] All of which gives us reason to appreciate anew the oft-quoted wisdom of Emerson that an "institution is the lengthened shadow of a single individual."

programs. It also provides for significant member involvement in the process of determining the directions in which the council will move. But problems do arise in this process when those who are involved in it neither understand it clearly nor receive sufficient feedback about matters to which they have committed time and energy. For instance, the reports on RCIE committee meetings have too often been given verbally to the president rather than in writing—information which could then be distributed to and used by committee members involved in certain areas. Often, however, the verbal instructions arrive second or third hand and too late for effective accomplishment.

Faculty and administrators who have served on committees or have been otherwise close to the council operations have sometimes voiced concern and frustration at their inability to see what effects their contributions to the council were having. The failure to provide enough feedback to those engaged in the organizational development and decisionmaking process is bound to hinder involvement and commitment. But the issue is not simply one of feedback to committees on specific deliberations. The research team found a basic lack of knowledge among the members of how the council arrives at decisions.

There are thus two elements which need to be examined in more detail: the manner in which the committees function and the degree to which the communications system of the council feeds full information about its operations to the constituency.

The Committees

There are three important characteristics of RCIE committees. The first is that the committees have rarely been composed of homogeneous groups chosen solely for the academic discipline they represent or the position they hold at their institutions. The second is that the committees have been responsible for broad general areas (Faculty Affairs, International Student Affairs, etc.). The third is that the composition of the committees has changed radically each year in order that they might serve the purpose, mentioned earlier, of involving increasing numbers of individuals from member campuses in council affairs in order to expand knowledge of and commitment to the council as an organization.

Given these characteristics, what does the profile of an RCIE committee look like?

It is composed of approximately 15 people appointed by the RCIE president. No more than one member comes from any given school though they serve as individuals, not as representatives of their institutions. With some exceptions (i.e., Library, Arts) they come from a variety of disciplines and administrative posts, sometimes with special knowledge and expertise or with on-campus responsibilities related to the committee's area of concern. The committee meets once or twice a

year. Most of its members travel from 1 to 5 hours each way to attend. It meets for from 3 to 5 hours. Half of the members at the first (and often only) meeting in the fall are new to the committee and frequently almost wholly unfamiliar with the council.

It is small wonder that the data the research team gathered on the committee system indicated a great deal of uncertainty as to its function and value. In particular, there was little knowledge of what procedures governed the committees and how they fit into the overall structure of the council; nor was adequate information provided to committee members about the results of their work. As a matter of fact the RCIE committees have served primarily as sounding boards on which the staff could test ideas, policies, and procedures and get reviews of ongoing programs and policies. While their recommendations have never been binding, they have provided useful guidelines to the staff and have served as a stamp of approval for efforts to develop internal (within the membership) and external (funding agencies) sources of support for RCIE activities.

Thus the committees have been helpful even though not integral with RCIE operations. But the committees have had another function in addition to their advisory one, that of involving increasing numbers of people in council affairs.

From the staff point of view this second function has been an important one. Saddled with the council's intrinsic limitations in developing contact, interest, and support within the membership, the staff has found work with the committees, though frustrating at times, a valuable channel of communication—particularly in getting a sense of the nature of their constituency. Work with the committees has enabled the staff to become more broadly acquainted with member personnel than could otherwise have been possible and has helped them identify people with the skills and expertise essential to the proper functioning of council programs.

There is also evidence that useful acquaintanceships have developed among committee members from different campuses. These acquaintanceships have been reinforced and expanded at other RCIE meetings, and have contributed to the building of community and added to the effectiveness of programs.

Yet in the end, the committees have not served their primary advisory purpose to the degree required by the council. Alternative modes of meeting this need have therefore been developed.

Task forces are one of these. Composed of five to eight people selected for knowledge or experience in some particular area and designed to meet only once or at most twice and then disband, the task force is assigned one specific subject to consider and asked to come up with concrete recommendations for action. Task forces on Eastern European studies, area studies in undergraduate education, centers

abroad, teacher education, and faculty enrichment have each contributed crucially to council thinking.

Another advisory group is the Conference of RCIE Deans which has met annually since 1967 to consider subjects of major importance to the council. The deans are the first group of RCIE personnel to be formed according to position on campus and to be called together on a regular basis. The conference has focused the thinking of the deans on subjects of central importance to the council (area studies, faculty enrichment, the implications of this study).

Subregional conferences—five on study abroad and three on teacher education—have been held at different places within the region in order to expand the numbers of people involved in the discussion of council programs. In a sense these meetings have been a kind of extension of the committee system designed both to provide the council with thinking from the membership and the membership with information about the council. In addition the subregional meetings have constituted—from the perspective of the staff—an effort to bring the council closer to its constituency and to counteract in a small way the tendency of the council to draw individuals far away from their campuses in order to participate in council affairs.

Most recently the council has begun to experiment with the establishment of advisory councils as, to some degree, a direct substitute for the committees. These advisory councils are comparable to the task forces except that they may include more people and are expected to have a longer life—though not beyond the life of whatever programs result from their deliberations (if any). An advisory council on African and Afro-American Studies now exists. Others on Asian programs and student teaching abroad are in the process of formation.

Communication

The problem of communication is central to the discussion of any aspect of RCIE operations. It lies at the heart of the committee question: the committees, task forces, and special conferences are essentially channels of communication. They show the council wrestling with its basic problem of size and disparateness.

The research team found communications to be the issue raised most consistently on the campuses they visited. It is not hard to understand. As mentioned before, the RCIE embraces approximately 120,000 students and 7,000 faculty at over 30 institutions. It stretches through three States. Starting with no full-time staff, it consisted at the time of the study of only five principal staff officers. Following the basic operational pattern of the council, the communications function has been oriented primarily toward the development of support in individuals. Information given to them has been essentially of two kinds: first, general information

about the value of interinstitutional cooperation and the importance of international education development; second, information about the programs and services offered by the council.

We have seen that there was no systematic effort to establish an immediate broad base of support for the council;[2] likewise no general publicity or information program was undertaken. The council has stressed the dissemination of "substantive" information as opposed to publicity. Publicity was left to the individual institutions.

Thus, aside from program announcements provided often in limited quantities for restricted distribution, primary attention has been given to long and detailed reports of programs and conferences and to frequent statements of rationale. Reports on faculty seminars have occasionally included a liberal selection of the papers either delivered at or resulting from them. Several small research projects have been conducted under RCIE auspices and the staff has been encouraged to translate the experiences of the council and deliberations of its conferences and meetings into thoughtful reviews of aspects of international education as they relate to the RCIE. It was this latter effort that resulted in the inauguration of *The Dimensions of International Education* series mentioned earlier. The first title, "The Study of World Areas in Undergraduate Education," was published in 1969 and was the result of careful consideration of the subject by the assembled deans of the council.

This orientation toward the dissemination of substantive materials led to the establishment of *Vidya* in 1967. *Vidya* was intended to provide a forum for the discussion of international education, an outlet for research undertaken within the framework of Regional Council programs, and a means of communicating news about the activities of the council and the membership. It was published in the form of a scholarly journal. The research team made a deliberate effort to develop comments on and evaluations of *Vidya*, but found very few people on campus who were familiar with it to any degree. Among those who were, several questioned its quality and wondered if it were appropriate or necessary for the RCIE to publish it. They felt that an ample number of scholarly journals already existed.

The RCIE newsletter initiated in 1968-69 was given cursory attention by the central staff and its distribution was limited. Greater effort was put into it in 1969-70, one issue distributed to about 75 percent of the faculty in the membership. No consistent program of publicity beyond the simple announcement of activities to liaisons and interested individuals was undertaken until the latter part of the 1969-70 academic year, at which time the council began issuing news releases. Consequently the research team found the council unknown on some campuses.

[2] See ch. III.

Too few people knew about the council and its programs and about the concepts of international education and interinstitutional cooperation that lay behind the programs. Too much stress had been placed on flyers and mimeographed announcements sent in bulk to liaisons; and too little concern was given as to whether the liaisons could use them effectively on the campus, and whether supporting publicity efforts through other channels would be helpful. This heavy dependence on the liaison to do virtually all the publicizing and general communications work has left a void where the liaison has been unable to fulfill that role. Liaison officers voiced these concerns repeatedly to the research team.

But it was among students that the research team found the most thorough ignorance of the council. Many had heard of Basel, but only a few could identify it as a Regional Council program and even fewer had an understanding of what the council was—its aims and the commitment to international education which it represented for their institution. The research team even found a number of students who had been to Basel yet who had only the haziest notion of what the RCIE was. A similar lack of comprehension was found among those who had been involved in RCIE foreign student programs, such as the orientation center or the intercultural workshops. There was little knowledge of the council beyond the program in which they had participated. Thus to many people on campus, faculty as well as students, the RCIE means a single, isolated program. It has not jelled as an institutional association with a broad range of opportunities or as a general symbol of commitment to international education.

In the end the failure to augment itself to the wide audience which is its ultimate constituency can be attributed directly to the basic operational and organizational characteristics of the council plus the decision to devote maximum energies to what was felt to be the substance of its mission. This forced the council to place heavy dependence on close contact with presidents, deans, and committed supporters, and on liaisons and committee members who could be rallied to the cause. The creation of an effective communications network was thus destined to move slowly.

VI. Functions of the Council

Like any other organization, the Regional Council for International Education has certain definable functions. These are: (1) to stimulate interest, activity, and ideas in the area of international education within the member institutions; (2) to offer the member institutions programs and services which will expand the international dimension of education on their campuses; (3) to facilitate cooperation which enables the members to realize their aims in international education.

Stimulus.—The means by which the council acts as a stimulus have been discussed. They include committee meetings and conferences of various kinds, the distribution of publications, and staff visits to campus. The very fact of membership in and commitment to the council, as well as participation in specific programs, can be seen as a stimulus to general international education development. In the member institutions it is a symbol of presidential commitment, even if the commitment goes no further than paying the dues.

Institutional response to this stimulus varies. It may be a passing one. The institution pays its dues; and then waits to receive programs and services and to be told what to do to further international education on its campus. In such cases the impact of the council has been relatively small and international education as such not highly developed.

On campuses which have developed their own impetus toward international education, the council is seen as having little effect in this regard. These institutions may feel that their contributions to the other members of the council are greater than their benefits.

At most of the institutions surveyed, however, the council is a 2-way street offering them the opportunity both to give and to receive. In their attempt to develop international education the institutions find the stimulus of council membership valuable both in generating new activity and undergirding and supporting self-initiated efforts.

Programs and services.—Most of those interviewed felt, however, that the principal function of the Regional Council is to provide programs and services. These are the *raison d'être* for membership, the product for which membership fees are paid. In general the membership is satisfied with this arrangement and feels the council has fulfilled its end of the bargain. But this view of the council—as a set of ready-made programs and services which can be plugged into by the membership as the interest or need arises—places it external to its members. Yet there is an ex-

pressed desire that the council become more integral with its members institutions, especially by bringing RCIE programs to campus for greater involvement and impact.

In its program function the council can be seen as a kind of center for resource sharing. Member institutions put dues, interest, time, and funds (over and above the dues) into a common pool—the Regional Council for International Education. Out of the council each institution takes, according to its interest, the stimulation necessary for the development of its own international education activities and specific programs and services offered by the council. Thus by contributing to a common pool or center the member institutions are able to derive benefits, selected according to their own interests, which would not otherwise be as accessible or as adequately geared to their needs.

Facilitation.—Yet the council is also expected to serve as a facilitator of cooperation among its members, as a bridge for cooperation so that resources and ideas may be shared directly. This is a role the council is only beginning to play. Its ability to do so may depend on whether among its members a sense of interdependency is already felt or has first to be created. It appears that many individuals do not in fact understand the Regional Council to be a form of interinstitutional cooperation. This may be to some extent a failure to understand or respond to the concept of cooperation, because of the newness of the idea in higher education and the sheer size of the effort needed to communicate that fact.

Thus, while the central staff and many of the council's strongest supporters believe that direct interinstitutional cooperation can be facilitated among members, the demand for it is still relatively small and sustained effort is not directed toward its accomplishment.

VII. Conclusion

We shall try to state in this conclusion the principal significance of the findings of the study as seen by the project staff. It includes, inevitably, recommendations specifically aimed at the RCIE and suggestions applicable to other academic cooperatives. The staff recognizes that the Regional Council itself must create the machinery to examine the findings and translate them into action. The recommendations should therefore be seen as useful guidelines and not as an infringement on the responsibilities of the officers and constituency on the organization.

Clearly above all else two principal factors appear that determine the degree to which interinstitutional cooperation for international education development can be effective on a campus. The first is the support of top administrative leadership, specifically the president and the principal academic officer (vice president or dean). While their support does not always assure success, without it little can be expected to happen. The second is the general receptivity to cooperation and international education among campus personnel, especially the faculty.

The question of receptivity cannot be stressed enough in relation to the ability of the institution to profit from interinstitutional cooperation. Where this receptivity (or capacity to identify with the RCIE) has been strongest the impact of the council has been the most extensive, and international education development has proceeded rapidly. Where there has been a general lack of receptivity international education has suffered.

In the development and conduct of programs the Regional Council, according to the testimony of those interviewed for this study, has performed satisfactorily. It therefore may be concluded that the selection and realization of its substantive goals has been effective and needs little further commentary.

In contrast, in the organization of its relationships with its members, unmet needs have been identified. Three areas emerge as the most critical: (1) effective liaison; (2) expanded involvement of constituents; and (3) adequate communication and information dissemination.

Effective liaison.—Council staff has worked well with the presidents and deans, but has given insufficient attention to the proper use of the liaison system and thereby reduced its effectiveness, especially in maintaining contact with its broader constituency.

Since the liaison tends, as we have seen, to become an embodiment of the council, he should of necessity be more than a mere functionary.

To call him, as has been done, a "channel of communication" is inappropriate and, in fact, counterproductive.

The research team often found that liaisons felt themselves to be essentially paper-pushers, unable to represent the council effectively or to have a significant personal influence on the course of international education development on campus. Because the liaison has a central role, serious attention needs to be directed toward changing this self-image. He should in fact, not just in title, "represent" the council on campus. The liaison who sees his role as that of a paper-pusher will have trouble being fully effective. More likely, he may, consciously or unconsciously, reject his responsibilities.

In the course of their interviews, the research team identified certain qualities which ideally should be expected in a liaison officer:

1. *Personal qualities.* He must be an energetic person, willing and able to put time and effort into the work of the council. He must be committed to international education and understand what that commitment means.

2. *Relations on campus.* He must be respected by his colleagues and be able to get their ear when necessary. He must also be able to get tangible support from the administration, including adequate financial backing and reduction in his teaching load to accomplish his mission.

3. *Relations with RCIE.* He must work at understanding the operations of the council, he forceful in presenting his institution's needs and interests to the central RCIE office, and insist on receiving from the RCIE staff everything he needs to do an effective job.

There appears to have been a tendency for the central staff to depend entirely on the institution for initiative in assuring that the liaison is properly established on campus. It may be that this should properly be a joint effort of RCIE and the member institution. The central office must recognize the significance of the liaison. The liaison needs comprehensive guidelines, special orientation, and the investment of major responsibilities.

The liaison would function most effectively as a part of a committee or some other structure on campus which is responsible—perhaps along with other things—for relations with the RCIE. This situation prevails on a number of the campuses surveyed and was found to be effective. The liaison should also serve as a reverse channel to the council to provide both general and specific responses to programs, policies, and actions. Such a process would constitute a healthy reciprocal relationship between the campus and the central staff and would ultimately provide for a strengthened decisionmaking process and an enhancement of status and capabilities of the liaison.

Finally, a principal shortcoming of the liaison system—not attributable to issues treated above—is the difficulty the liaisons have in effectively reaching students in any numbers. It was felt by many of those interviewed that the RCIE needed direct contact with the students, and the appointment of student liaisons was recommended.

Expanded involvement of the constituency.—A cooperative association must increasingly involve its constituency in the substantive planning and development of its programs and keep it informed of the results which it contributes. The committee system and its relation to the decisionmaking process within the council are particularly important in this regard.

We have seen how the committees have served partially as a source of ideas and recommendations regarding the development and conduct of programs, and partially as a mode of communication—a method of creating greater awareness of, involvement in, and commitment to the council among the member personnel, and a source of general information about the constituency for the central staff.

The committees have also served as a manifestation of cooperation reinforcing the cooperative image of the council and, in the long run, fostering within the overall context of the council the development of interpersonal and interinstitutional relations among those who have worked together on the committees.

Yet it is the conclusion of this report that the aims of the committee system have been contradictory and have limited the capability of the committees to achieve either aim satisfactorily. The committees were expected to advise. Yet little attention was given to continuity of membership or if their members had the necessary knowledge or expertise. They were expected to increase involvement, and yet committee members received inadequate orientation to the council and to their responsibilities on the committee. They were given only erratic feedback on their efforts. The emergence of the task forces, advisory councils, the Deans' Conference, and the subregional meetings as alternatives seems to confirm this analysis.

Any organizational structure with diverse or conflicting goals is almost bound to be subject to these problems. It would seem wiser for the council to concentrate its efforts in developing greater awareness of and commitment to the council through other means and allow the committees to develop the specialized effectiveness they need as agents of program development and as part of the initial stages of the decisionmaking process.

Further, to be effective certain other general requirements should be met:

1. A clear description of the functions and operating procedures of the committee should be communicated to committee members. General statements of committee goals and policies have been provided in writing, but more is needed.
2. Committee members must be kept informed step-by-step as developments follow from their deliberations.
3. Whatever the precise authority of the committee, there must be dynamic interaction between the committee members and the central staff responsible for day-to-day operations.

All this is not to deny the importance of the communications function previously assigned to the committees. But communication must now be pursued in other ways.

Adequate communication and information dissemination.—Efforts in this area have evolved slowly. While appropriate stress was placed in the beginning on the development of substantive programs, it has become increasingly clear, particularly since 1966, that an organization such as the Regional Council cannot possibly function effectively without a large-scale, highly systematic effort to communicate basic information about itself widely among the membership.

There is always the risk of imbalance when allocating priorities between substantive programing and information dissemination. An overemphasis on programing risks misunderstanding among the actual or potential clientele. Overemphasis on communication risks superficiality and exaggeration.

On the campuses they visited, the research team encountered far too many people who, even though they knew of the council and in many instances had been involved in its activities, still had only a vague or partial understanding of what it was, how it functioned, and what their institution's relationship or commitment to it was. Many of the liaisons cited the failure of the central office to support them adequately in their efforts to convey to their colleagues the necessary information to overcome this misunderstanding.

What is needed is a conceptual framework, a general view of the council, within which those who have had contact with it can place their experience. Communication theorists tell us that the communication of such a general view is difficult at best. In an organization such as the council it becomes an overwhelming task. Yet without it the value of the experiences of those who participate in the programs and administrative affairs of the council will be diminished.

Likewise, the failure to maintain a communications link with these individuals over a period of time will tend to dissipate their capacity or inclination to serve as a force for the expansion of the council's adherents and for the realization of the council's, their own, and their institution's aims in international education.

Participants should have adequate information prior to, during, and after their involvement with the council. In addition to dissemination through liaisons and directly to participants, a greater variety of channels of communication are called for. A student liaison would be one. A general news and information program is another. More frequent visits to campuses by staff is another.[1] In short, the council, because of the

[1] Over and over in the interviews, staff visits to campus were mentioned to the research team as an effective means of spreading information about the RCIE. We have noted how the RCIE has tended to be identified, in some cases almost solely, through contact with the staff.

kind of institution it is, needs a highly developed internal communications system if continued progress is going to be made in developing cooperation among such distant and disparate components. Any organization of this kind must give early attention to that internal communications system, otherwise no matter what it does there is danger of atrophy occuring at the furthest points in the operation.

Other conclusions.—One question that appeared in different forms from time to time during the study was whether or not the kind of indirect member relationships which are embodied in the RCIE are truly "interinstitutional cooperation." It is probable that the question is a semantic one. The fact is that the institutions have come together in a joint venture, their representatives do sit down together to share ideas, and they do develop activities in which they jointly engage. These activities do not, however, create the kind of identification with the council which is needed in a cooperative association if it is to continue to remain viable.

General receptivity and the ability to identify with the RCIE on the part of member personnel have been shown to be critical to its success. For only in this process of identification can institutions be more effectively encouraged to work out solutions to their own problems in cooperation with their colleagues, i.e., other members of the RCIE family.

Effective liaison, expanded involvement, better communication are all means of stimulating this identification. But to bring it to fruition the council must be more active in playing a facilitative role in bringing about cooperation between or among its members—a role it has only recently begun to develop.

It may be that the ability to assume a facilitative role is an advanced stage of evolution for a cooperative association with a heterogeneous membership. It takes a long time to create in the diverse members a sense of common purpose. Within the council, direct cooperation has normally been among like institutions. Indeed, what cooperation has occurred among differing kinds of institutions has resulted from council initiative or intervention. Yet this kind of lateral cooperation has been rare. It is the hypothesis of this report that it can be expected to increase as the council grows in complexity and sophistication as an organization.

While the organizational philosophy of those who create a cooperative institution is important to the ultimate form it takes, students of the subject would also do well to examine the imperatives placed upon it by the circumstances of its establishment and early development, the nature of its constituency, and the initial goals it set or had to set for itself. A cooperative endeavor must organize not only logically, but also according to these imperatives.

From the outset the founders of the Regional Council were especially sensitive to the need for flexibility and a pragmatic approach. The first board of directors deliberately postponed writing bylaws in order to give the organization time to jell and take direction so that the bylaws would be as precisely geared to its real operational needs as possible. While this initial flexibility produced a centralized structure which has been perceived by some as having become less flexible over time, it clearly served the needs of the association which has grown up under it.

In its early years the council needed careful guidance by dedicated leadership. Yet it did not have the operating funds nor the broad commitment from the institutions which would assure that this need could be met. Further, the Regional Council did not come into existence with a powerful impetus behind it. It had to develop its own dynamic. Indeed, its purpose, to a significant degree, was to overcome resistance to the very thing it felt needed to be accomplishd in higher education.

This made the council a force for innovation and the development of new approaches to education and of new activities on and off campus. Its centralized structure gave it the ability to stimulate innovative thinking, translate it rapidly into programs, and implement these programs from the central office. Institutional unanimity is not required for action, nor is universal participation, and there is no necessity of finding an agent institution to carry the administrative burden.

It is hard to see how the council could have survived without strong leadership wielding decisive authority during the formative years. There was no other source of leadership than among those responsible for generating the organization and no sensible alternative to geographic and organizational centralization.

At the same time the question of inflexibility is a serious one. As an organization with strong leadership ages, a decline in flexibility and innovativeness is probably inevitable. It is then the responsibility of both the leadership and the constituency to see that an inflow of new ideas is maintained and that these ideas are given every opportunity to come to fruition in the form of policies and programs. Responsiveness to the constituency has therefore become critical. In this light the importance of the liaison function, the committees, and the reciprocal flow of information is evident.

It should be clear by now that interinstitutional cooperation is still a cumbersome educational instrument. That it exists is testimony to the intensity of the need which the institutions engaged in it feel. It must therefore be looked at in the context of that need.

The character of the Regional Council has emerged from the matrix of forces which brought it into existence. It can be seen as one way for interinstitutional cooperation to develop. Leadership seeks a constituency from a cross-section of roles and ranks within the institutions

and from this "grass roots" builds a program for the membership as a whole. Support and commitment is sought from the top leadership, and broad participation is invited though not insisted upon. Administrative and program responsibility is centralized, delegated to the source of council leadership, that is, the president and board.

But, admittedly, this is only the beginning.

The strength of the council has lain in the dedication of the few individuals who have carried the burden of council affairs and brought its message to their campuses and their colleagues. A strong network of direct attachments centered in Pittsburgh and radiating outward has developed. A much more elaborate and complex set of relationships and attachments must develop in the future, however, if the organization is to continue to grow and be viable.

It may be hypothesized that this is a basic dynamic in the development of interinstitutional cooperation: a group of institutions through the highly developed commitment of a limited number of individuals may come together and hold together for a significant period of time during which many programmatic and organizational achievements are made. Nevertheless, as it moves on to more sophisticated developments, the nurturing of a broader base of support and a more elaborate and involving set of organizational relationships is required.

With this in mind it is suggested that a broad-based program of long-range planning may be an important next step in the development of the council. The evidence of this study indicates that the council has evolved as an effective instrument of its diverse constituency without yet bringing that constituency together to plan systematically the future course of the organization.

The test of interinstitutional cooperation must be the degree to which it opens to institutions—staff, faculty, and students—opportunities which would not otherwise be available and strengthens the educational program of each through their joint endeavors.

This report cannot but conclude that the RCIE has met that test adequately and has established a firm foundation on which to build a true community of institutions working with one another to widen the horizons of American higher education.

A Select Bibliography

ABRAMS, IRWIN. "Inter-institutional Cooperation in International Studies," *Liberal Education*. March 1968.

BURNETT, HOWARD J., editor. *Inter-institutional Cooperation in Higher Education*. Corning, New York. College Center of the Finger Lakes, 1969.

HAMMEL, CHARLES. "A Student Abroad Returns: Problems and Suggestions," *Vidya*. Journal of the Regional Council for International Education. Volume 4, Spring 1970.

HOWARD, LAWRENCE C., editor. *Inter-institutional Cooperation in Higher Education*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Institute on Human Relations, 1967.

LANCASTER, RICHARD B. *Interdependency and Conflict in Higher Education*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), 1969.

MCCOY, PRESSLEY C. "The Forms of Inter-institutional Cooperation," *Liberal Education*, March 1968.

MORRILL, J. L. *The University and World Affairs*. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1960.

MULLER, STEVEN. "International Studies: Crisis and Opportunity," *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, spring 1970.

NASON, JOHN W. *The College and World Affairs*. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1964.

Non-Western Studies in the Liberal Arts College. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1964.

University Looks Abroad, The. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1965.

WELLS, HERMAN B. "International Education: The Present Decade," *Vidya*, Journal of the Regional Council for International Education. Volume 4, spring 1970

WITMAN, SHEPHERD L. "Cooperation for International Education," *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*, fall 1965.

——— *Inter-institutional Cooperation and International Education*. Occasional Report No. 8. New York: Education and World Affairs, 1969.

APPENDIX: Additional Data on the RCIE

RCIE MEMBER INSTITUTIONS 1969-70

Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania
Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea, Ohio
Bethany College, Bethany, West Virginia
California State College, California, Pennsylvania
Capital University, Columbus, Ohio
Chatham College, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Clarion State College, Clarion, Pennsylvania
Concord College, Athens, West Virginia
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, West Virginia
Denison University, Granville, Ohio
Fairmont State College, Fairmont, West Virginia
Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio
Glenville State College, Glenville, West Virginia
Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, Pennsylvania
Kent State University, Kent, Ohio
Malone College, Canton, Ohio
Marshall University, Huntington, West Virginia
Ohio Dominican College, Columbus, Ohio
Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio
Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio
Potomac State College, Keyser, West Virginia
Salem College, Salem, West Virginia
Slippery Rock State College, Slippery Rock, Pennsylvania
Thiel College, Greenville, Pennsylvania
The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio
The University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia
Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio
Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 1969-70

J. Sam Biedler (1969-72)
Professor of Education, Kent State University
Louis F. Brakeman (1969-72)
Professor and Chairman, Department of Government
Denison University
Ralph W. Cordier (1966-72)
Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Oscar G. Darlington (1966-72)
Professor of History, Ohio Northern University
James Gemmell (1968-71)
President, Clarion State College
Gordon E. Hermanson (1968-71)
President, Davis and Elkins College
Eugene Hotchkiss (1969-72)
Executive Dean, Chatham College
Wendell G. Johnson (1968-71)
Professor of Mathematics, Hiram College
Lauren A. King (1968-71)
Vice President for Academic Development, Malone College
John H. Laubach (1964-70)
Professor of History and Government, Otterbein College
William J. McBride (1969-72)
Dean of the College, Findlay College
George F. Moore (1967-70)
Professor and Chairman, Division of Social Sciences, Concord College
Ernest J. Nesius (1965-71)
Vice President for Off-Campus Education, West Virginia University
Richard W. Solberg (1967-70)
Academic Dean, Thiel College
Sister M. Suzanne, OP (1969-72)
President, Ohio Dominican College
A. Mervin Tyson (1969-72)
Vice President for Academic Affairs, Marshall University
Shepherd L. Witman (1964-70)
Director, Office of Cultural and Educational Exchange
University of Pittsburgh
Graydon W. Yaple (1965-71)
Vice President for Academic Affairs, Wilmington College

OFFICERS AND STAFF 1969-70

Officers
President, Shepherd L. Witman

Secretary, Wendell G. Johnson
Treasurer, George F. Moore

Staff

Vice President, David S. Hoopes
Director of Faculty Affairs, Helen S. Wood
Director of Overseas Affairs, William J. Koenig
Director of International Student Affairs, G. Stephen Ryer

Overseas Staff

European-American Study Center, Basel, Switzerland
Dean, Charles O'Brien
Centro Internationale di Studi, Verona, Italy
Dean, Charles S. Russell

RCIE COMMITTEES (1964-65)

Committee on the Arts
Faculty Exchange
Faculty Institute
International Education Foundation
Library Resources
Overseas Projects and Governmental Relations
Publications
Regional Council Center for International Students (Orientation Center)
Sixth Annual Conference Planning Committee
Study Year Abroad
Committee on the Teaching of International Relations

RCIE COMMITTEES (1969-70)

Committee on the Arts
Eleventh Annual Conference
Faculty Affairs
International Student Affairs
Study Abroad
Teacher Education
VIDYA Editorial Board

FINANCES

The annual financial resources of the Regional Council for International Education are currently in excess of $250,000. They are derived from membership dues, tuition, and external sources, including government contracts, foundation grants, and fees for services rendered.

OVERSEAS SUMMER FACULTY SEMINARS

1961 Education as an Expression of its Cultural Environment. Netherlands

1962 American and Dutch Educational Values and Emerging Africa. Netherlands.
1963 Youth and its Search for Identity in Modern Democracy. Denmark.
1964 Self-Realization and Work in Free Society. Wales.
1966 Trends in American and Yugoslav Education. Yugoslavia.
1967 Development of Modern China. Taiwan.
Faculty Institute Seminar: (untitled). Mexico.
1968 Cultural and Intellectual Dimensions of the Development of Modern China. Taiwan.
Faculty Institute Seminar: Contemporary Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia.
1969 Middle East (individual fellowships)
1970 Social and Economic Development of East Africa. Uganda.

BRITISH-AMERICAN EXCHANGE LECTURESHIP

1964—Topic: Educational Systems
Dr. James Gemmell, President, Clarion State College
Mr. Ainslie Howard Ensor, Principal, Newland Park Training College for Teachers
1965—Topic: Political Systems
Dr. George Moore, Chairman, Division of Social Sciences, Concord College
Mr. Kenneth Lindsay, Former Member of Parliament and Civil Lord of the Admiralty
Professor Arthur Newell, Holder of John Winant Lecture-Fellowship
1966—Topic: Economic Structure of Present Society
Dr. Barrie Richardson, Head, Department of Economics, Bethany College
Mr. Peter Coffey, Lecturer in Economics, Loughborough University of Technology
Dr. Kathleen Ollerenshaw, Member, National Advisory Council for Education Council for National Academic Awards
1967—Topic: Patterns of Social Order
Dr. Paul Gustafson, Professor of Sociology, Hiram College
Miss Nancy Seear, Reader in Personnel Management, London School of Economics
Reverend D. R. Thomas, Lecturer in Biblical Studies, University College, Aberystwyth, Wales
1968—Topic: State of the Arts
Dr. William MacLeod, Chairman, Department of Philosophy, Baldwin-Wallace College
Mrs. Elizabeth Deighton, Art Consultant
Mrs. Estelle Serpell, Tutor, University of London, Department of Extra-Mural Studies

1969—Topic: Challenges Facing Education Today
Dr. Albert Gray, Professor of Economics, Baldwin-Wallace College
Mr. J. T. E. Brennan, Tutor in Secondary Education, Cambridge Institute of Education

FACULTY INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

1964-65—Asia
1965-66—Africa
1966-67—Latin America
1967-68—Eastern Europe and The Soviet Union
1968-69—The Middle East
1969-70—The Cultural and Intellectual Framework of Chinese and Indian Life
1970-71—The Black Experience—Africa/America

REGIONAL COUNCIL CENTER FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS (ORIENTATION CENTER)

Programs were held at:
University of Pittsburgh—1964, 1965
Chatham College—1966, 1967
University of Akron—1968

SCHOLARS-IN-RESIDENCE

1966-67; Tetsuro Sasaki; Education; Tohoku University, Japan.

1967-68; Donald M'Timkulu; Sociology; Ministry of Education, Zambia.

1968-69; Jorge Betancur, S. J.; Dean, School of Social Sciences; Javeriana, Colombia.

Parimal Das; Psychology; Diocesan and Scottish Church, India.

Lambertus Palar; Former Ambassador to United Nations; Indonesia.

Shau-lam Wong; Sociology and Social Work; Chinese University of Hong Kong.

1969-70; Parimal Das, Petar Mandic; Education; University of Sarajevo, Yugoslavia

1970-71; Lambertus Palar, Parimal Das, Sillaty Dabo; Modern Languages; Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone.

Michael Wei; Journalism; Chinese University of Hong Kong.

CONTRACT PROGRAMS FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS AND TRAINEES

African Leadership Workshop—1964, 1965
Development Fellowship Program—1966, 1967, 1968.
International Teacher Development Program—Italian Educators—1965, 1967, 1969

Summer Leadership Institute for African Women (annually)—1963-1967
Mid-Winter Leadership Program (annually)—1965-1970

INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIONS WORKSHOPS

The Council has conducted approximately 30 workshops for foreign and American students at member institutions as well as for mature foreign training program participants and American faculty. These programs have taken place predominantly in Pittsburgh, though a number have been sponsored by Fairmont State College in West Virginia and Denison University in Ohio. In almost all cases participants from a number of different institutions have been involved. Workshops have also been included as integral parts of the Regional Council Center for International Students and the Mid-Winter Leadership Program.

MAJOR CONFERENCES

Annual Conferences 1959-70
Workshop I: Admission of Foreign Students—1963
Workshop II: Admission of Foreign Students—1965
Area Studies: Conference of Deans—1968
Library Workshop on Foreign Area Materials—1968
Study Abroad: Subregional Conferences—1968-69
Faculty Enrichment: Conference of Deans—1969
Teacher Education: Subregional Conferences—1969-70

REGIONAL COUNCIL PUBLICATIONS: 1959-1970

Reports to Member Institutions

Report of Activities (annually) 1963-68
Report to Member Colleges and Universities 1967
Guide to the Coming Year 1968-69

Reports on RCIE Programs

Faculty Institute for International Studies
Report on the Asian Studies Program 1964-65
Report on the African Studies Program 1965-66
Report on the Latin American Studies Program 1966-67

Regional Council Center for International Students (Orientation Center)
Report on the Regional Council Center for International Students (annually) 1964-68

Faculty Seminars Abroad
Education as an Expression of its Cultural Environment. Report of First International Seminar, The Hague. 1961.

American and Dutch Educational Values and Emerging Africa. Report of Second International Seminar, The Hague. 1962.

Youth and Its Search for Identity in Modern Society. Report of Third International Seminar, Denmark. 1963.

Self-Realization and Work in a Free Society. Report of Fourth International Seminar, Wales. 1964.

American Discussion Papers. Report of Seminar on Current Trends in Yugoslavian and American Education, Yugoslavia. 1966.

Yugoslavia Discussion Papers. Report of Seminar on Current Trends in Yugoslavian and American Education, Yugoslavia. 1966.

The Development of Modern China. Report of Seminar in Taiwan, 1967.

The Cultural and Intellectual Dimensions of the Development of Modern China. Report of Second Faculty Seminar in Taiwan. 1968.

Social and Economic Development of East Africa. Report of Seminar in Uganda. 1970.

Other Programs

African Leadership Workshop, 1964.

International Teacher Development Program. Reports on the Seminar for Italian Educators, 1965, 1967, 1969.

Periodicals

RCIE Newsletter 1968—

VIDYA: Journal of the Regional Council for International Education

VIDYA 1—1967

VIDYA 2—1968

VIDYA 3—1969

VIDYA 4—1970

COMMUNIQUE—Newsletter of Intercultural Communications Programs 1970—

Dimension Series

The Study of World Areas in Undergraduate Education. Dimensions of International Education No. 1. 1969.

Western Europe and the United States: Toward New Trans-Atlantic Educational Relationships. A Report of the Regional Council Presidents Study Mission to Western Europe. Dimensions of International Education No. 2. 1970.

Aspects of American Culture Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective. Dimensions of International Education No. 3. 1971.

Bibliographies

General Bibliography on Asia. 1964.

Select Bibliographies of Recent Books on the History, Politics, and Sociology of the Continent:

Africa. 1965.
Latin America. 1966.
Eastern Europe. 1967.
The Middle East and North Africa. 1968.

Flyers and Brochures

Handbook for Students from Abroad. 1966.
Recommended Policy Governing Faculty Overseas Activities for RCIE Member Institutions. 1966.
The Regional Council for International Education. 1966.
Overseas Catalogue. 1970.
Regional Council Study Year Abroad. 1970-72.
Ten Year Report—1970.

Special Studies (mimeographed)

Study of the American School in Tangier and a Proposal for American Education in Morocco. 1965.
The Adjustment of Foreign Students, A Pilot Study. Morris I. Berkowitz. 1965.
Culture and Communication in Intercultural Relations. David S. Hoopes and Gary L. Althen. 1969.
Human Relations Training and Foreign Students. Gary L. Althen. 1969.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1971 O—437-742