

DOCUMENT RESUME

05050 - [B0545471]

East-West Center: Progress and Problems. ID-78-11; B-154135.
February 15, 1978. 32 pp. + appendix (10 pp-).

Report to the Congress; by Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General.

Contact: International Div.

Budget Function: International Affairs: Foreign Information and
Exchange Activities (153).

Organization Concerned: Department of State; East-West Center,
Honolulu, HI; University of Hawaii.

Congressional Relevance: Congress; House Committee on
International Relations; Senate Committee on Foreign
Relations.

Authority: Mutual Security Act of 1960 (22 U.S.C. 2054).

The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, the East-West Center (EWC), was created in 1960 to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research. Located in Hawaii, the Center was originally established as part of the University of Hawaii, but since 1975 the Center has been under the management and control of a nonprofit public educational corporation. Findings/Conclusions: EWC has had difficulty in establishing a separate identity nationally and internationally, and the establishment of a separate corporation to manage and operate the Center has not resolved some questions concerning land, student enrollment, and future development. Better relations and understanding between people has resulted from knowledge and experience gained by Center participants. The Center enjoys a good reputation in Asian-Pacific countries and has been relatively successful in its efforts to raise funds from those governments. However, the Center has not yet attained full maturity as an educational institution. The Department of State has a legislative mandate to oversee the EWC, but to date it has not performed any qualitative evaluations of Center programs. Former Center participants suggest that the EWC could improve its cultural exchange efforts by: limiting repeat attendance by fellows, visiting researchers, and professional associates; scheduling professional associate activities at overseas locations; and increasing the length of time for professional associate activities. (RRS)

5471

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS



*BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES*

East-West Center -- Progress And Problems

The Mutual Security Act of 1960 directed the Secretary of State to provide for the establishment of an educational center in Hawaii. The Center was intended to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research. This report shows that the Center has been relatively successful in meeting its broad objectives relating to mutual understanding, but some of its practices are in need of improvement if the Center is to achieve complete program effectiveness.

The report assesses the strengths and weaknesses of Center programs and discusses the impact the Center has had on Asian-Pacific countries during its 17 years of existence. Suggestions are also offered for congressional consideration of a North-South Center.



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-154135

To the President of the Senate and the
Speaker of the House of Representatives

Growing interdependence among the nations of the world requires effective programs to promote mutual understanding between people across national boundaries. Successful "public diplomacy" programs facilitate the conduct of traditional diplomacy by increasing public awareness of the importance of international cooperation.

This report offers comments on ways to increase the effectiveness of one such program--the East-West Center in Honolulu, Hawaii. The Center seeks "to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific."

Our review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

Copies of this report are being sent to the Acting Director, Office of Management and Budget; the Secretary of State; the Director, United States Information Agency; and the President of the East-West Center.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Luther B. Stroh".

Comptroller General
of the United States

D I G E S T

The Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, or East-West Center, was created under the Mutual Security Act of 1960 (22 U.S.C. 2054) to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and the nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research.

The Center awards about 1,500 grants annually to persons to come to the Center for study, training, and research. Through fiscal year 1977 the Center has received about \$112 million in appropriations. Appropriations for fiscal year 1978 were \$12.2 million. This report assesses the strengths and weaknesses of Center programs and discusses the impact the Center has had on Asian-Pacific countries during the 17 years of its existence.

LACK OF LEGISLATIVE CLARITY
CREATED AMBIGUITY AND
CONTROVERSY IN MANAGEMENT,
OPERATION, AND CONTROL

The lack of congressional clarity in the Center's legislative history as to the type of educational institution desired and the extent of any relationship between the Center and University of Hawaii has resulted in ambiguity and controversy over management, operation, and control of the Center throughout most of its history. At the outset the Center was operated under a grant-in-aid agreement between the Department of State and the University of Hawaii Board of Regents.

Effective July 1, 1975, the Center was granted autonomy from the university by being put under the management and control of a nonprofit public educational corporation established by the State of Hawaii and independent of the university. With this action, the Center hoped to clearly establish its own separate identity. It now operates under the general direction of a Board of Governors with

international members which has authority over the Center through a grant-in-aid agreement executed between themselves and the Department of State.

The establishment of a separate corporation to manage and operate the Center has not resolved some questions concerning land, student enrollment, and the future development of the Center. (See pp. 7 to 12.)

CENTER EXCHANGE AND FUND-RAISING SUCCESSES

GAO found that better relations and understanding between peoples has resulted from knowledge and experience gained by Center participants. The Center is generally well known to those in the East who are interested in the subjects defined by the Center's problem-oriented institutes, and the Center enjoys a good reputation in Asian-Pacific countries. (See p. 14.)

The Center has also been relatively successful in its efforts to raise funds from Asian-Pacific governments. Since July 1, 1975, commitments amounting to \$679,000 have been received from 14 countries and promises of support have been received from several others. These recent fund-raising successes should result in even higher level interest by Asian and Pacific governments. Earnest fund-raising efforts in the private sector have only recently begun and it is too early to assess whether these efforts will prove successful. (See pp. 15 and 16.)

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM STRENGTH

The Center has not yet attained full maturity as an educational institution. To enhance the cultural interchange among EWC participants, the Center organized its problem-oriented institutes in 1970. Between 1970 and the present, several of the Center's individual institutes were unable to attain desired staffing strength. However, during that time all institutes, both strong and weak, involved participants in approximately the same

number. This does not detract from the concept that problem-oriented institutes can be an effective way to promote mutual understanding. To improve program quality and to eliminate certain deficiencies cited by former participants, others familiar with the Center, and current students, GAO recommends that the Secretary of State urge Center officials to concentrate on strengthening programs prior to involving a maximum number of participants. (See pp. 16 to 18.)

NEED FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION

The Department of State has a legislative mandate to oversee the Center. However, to date it has not performed nor had performed any qualitative evaluations of Center programs.

With incorporation, the Department of State has given the Center's Board of Governors responsibility for evaluation. The Board, in turn, has chartered an International Advisory Panel of experts to advise it on programmatic matters.

GAO believes the impact and effectiveness of the International Advisory Panel will be limited unless the Department of State and the Board clearly define what is expected of the panel. For example, GAO believes the length of time envisioned for the panel visits to the Center for evaluation purposes is inadequate. Accordingly, GAO recommends that the Secretary of State work with the Board of Governors to clearly define the responsibilities of the International Advisory Panel to insure that Center programs are adequately evaluated. (See. pp. 18 to 19.)

NEED TO IMPROVE CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

Former Center participants suggest that the Center could improve its cultural exchange efforts through its five problem-oriented institutes and at the same time increase its cost effectiveness by (1) limiting repeat attendance at the Center by fellows, visiting researchers, and professional associates,

(2) occasionally scheduling professional associate activities at overseas locations, and (3) increasing the length of time for professional associate activities. GAO believes all three suggestions have merit. (See pp. 19 and 20.)

The Department of State has interpreted the Center's authorizing legislation as requiring Center activities to be conducted "at the Center" and as only allowing for participants to be brought "to the Center." In order to satisfy the requirement, the Department has adopted the rule that each participant must spend at least 51 percent of his/her time at the East-West Center in Hawaii. However, this rule apparently does not resolve the problem. Accordingly, GAO recommends that the Secretary of State seek clarification of congressional intent in respect to scheduling activities at locations other than the Center. GAO also recommends that the Secretary of State urge the Center to reduce the number of repeat attendees at Center activities and consider lengthening the time for professional associate activities. (See. pp. 19 and 22.)

NEED TO REDEFINE THE STUDENT DEGREE PROGRAM

The Center has not been successful in integrating degree award students into the mainstream of Center research activities. Unsatisfactory project involvement has led to discontent among present students. Although students are required to be involved in Center project activities, almost 50 percent of those responding to a GAO questionnaire were either not involved in a project or labeled their involvement as not being meaningful. They cited several complaints.

GAO believes that most of the student complaints deserve attention and recommends that the Secretary of State urge the Center to take actions to improve the student-Center relationship. (See pp. 22 to 26.)

EXCESSIVE COST OF EDUCATION
PAYMENTS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

For the 1976-77 academic year, the Center paid the university an average of \$107 per credit hour for Center degree students attending the university. At the same time, university per-credit-hour graduate tuition rates for other than Center students were \$23 for resident students and \$58 for nonresident students.

With few exceptions, students attending the university and other private and public institutions of higher learning under either Federal or private scholarships and grants are charged no more than nonresident tuition rates.

Under the agreements entered into on the date the corporation was established, the Center's Board of Governors agreed to make payments to the university which purportedly represent 50 percent of the university's total cost of education for Center degree students.

GAO recommends that the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Board of Governors, take action at an appropriate time to renegotiate education payments to the university that would be more in line with what others pay. This should be no later than the date the current agreements expire. For the 1976-77 academic year, the Center paid the university about \$554,000 in educational payments. About \$250,000 of this represents payments over and above nonresident tuition rates. (See ch. 4.)

SUGGESTIONS FOR CONGRESSIONAL
CONSIDERATION FOR A NORTH-SOUTH
CENTER

The better relations and understanding that have resulted from the knowledge and experience gained by Center participants should be a significant factor in the congressional consideration of an institution with objectives similar to the Center, but with a focus on the Western Hemisphere. Promoting better relations and understanding in nations of Latin America is just as important to the United States and those nations as it is in

Asian-Pacific countries. GAO believes that several lessons learned from the Center's experiences can benefit the development of a North-South Center focusing on the Western Hemisphere.

Essentially, GAO believes a North-South Center would benefit from a close proximity to university resources, but that the institution should remain clearly autonomous and free from university control. In addition, legislation establishing such an institution should define the specific type of institution and program direction intended. (See ch. 5.)

AGENCY COMMENTS

Officials of the Center and the State Department have provided us with oral comments which have been incorporated in this report where appropriate.

GAO's review was directed to the Center as a federally established institution. Accordingly, the University's position may not be completely shown in all sections of this report although conversations were held with University officials on specific issues.

C o n t e n t s

		<u>Page</u>
DIGEST		i
CHAPTER		
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Program activities	1
	Review of legislation	5
	Scope	5
	Agency comments	6
2	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EWC, UH, THE STATE OF HAWAII, AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT	7
	Federal perceptions and oversight of EWC	7
	Relationship with Board of Governors	8
	Relationship between EWC and UH	8
	Noninvolvement in foreign policy issues	10
	Perceived image problem	11
3	ACHIEVEMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	13
	Program successes	14
	Fund raising goals and successes	15
	Conclusion	16
	Assessment of program strength	16
	Conclusion and recommendation	17
	Need for external evaluation	18
	Conclusion and recommendations	19
	Need to improve cultural exchange activities	19
	Repeat attendees	20
	Conclusion	20
	Overseas activities	20
	Conclusion	21
	Length of activities	21
	Recommendation	22
	Need to redefine student degree program	22
	Shortcomings cited in project involvement	23

	Communications weaknesses exist at all levels	23
	Cultural activities need to be expanded	24
	Conclusion and recommendations	25
4	NEED TO REASSESS COST-OF-EDUCATION PAYMENTS TO UH	27
	Cost-of-education payments prior to incorporation	27
	Cost formula since incorporation	27
	Difference in tuition costs and EWC cost-of-education payments	28
	Rationale for cost-of-education method of payments	28
	Conclusions and recommendations	29
5	FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IF IT IS DECIDED TO ESTABLISH A NORTH-SOUTH CENTER	30
	Need for autonomy from any existing institution of higher learning	30
	Conclusion	31
	Need to clarify intended type of institution and program direction	31
	Conclusion	32
APPENDIX		
I	Profile of student questionnaire respondents and persons contacted overseas	33
II	Principal officials concerned with matters discussed in this report	42

ABBREVIATIONS

AID	Agency for International Development
CJ	Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs
DCAA	Defense Contract Audit Agency
EWC	Center for Cultural and Technical Inter- change Between East and West (or East-West Center)
GAO	General Accounting Office
IAP	International Advisory Panel
ICA	International Communication Agency
UH	University of Hawaii
USIA	United States Information Agency
USIS	United States Information Service

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Mutual Security Act of 1960 (22 U.S.C. 2054) directed the Secretary of State to provide for the establishment of an educational center in Hawaii to be known as the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West, or the East-West Center (EWC). EWC was established to promote better relations and understanding between the United States and nations of Asia and the Pacific through cooperative study, training, and research.

In October 1960, pursuant to the authorizing legislation, the Department of State entered into a grant-in-aid agreement with the University of Hawaii (UH) for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the new EWC. Organizationally, EWC remained under UH and the UH Board of Regents until July 1, 1975, when EWC was granted autonomy from UH by being put under the management and control of a nonprofit public educational corporation established by the State of Hawaii. Since that time it has operated under the general direction of a Board of Governors which includes international members.

EWC is housed in five buildings adjacent to the UH main campus. Land upon which EWC is located has been dedicated by UH for use by EWC in perpetuity for programs which carry out the purposes specified in EWC's authorizing legislation.

EWC awards about 1,500 grants annually to persons to study, train, and do research there.

The majority of EWC's funding comes from direct congressional appropriations channeled through the State Department. Through fiscal year 1977 the EWC has received \$112 million through the appropriation process. Appropriations for fiscal year 1978 were \$12.2 million. Other sources of funds include contracts and grants from various Federal agencies and private organizations and contributions from Asian and Pacific governments.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

EWC's program activities have drastically changed since 1960. Originally, EWC was organized into two major components, an International College and an International Training Facility. The International College provided

programs and services for degree students and research scholars while the International Training Facility administered short-term practical training courses.

A 1961 evaluation of EWC operations concluded that the International College should be disbanded and UH, exclusively, should formally educate students and grant degrees. Resultantly, EWC was organized into three administrative institutes--Institute for Student Interchange, Institute for Technical Interchange, and Institute of Advanced Projects.

The Institute for Student Interchange provided scholarships for study, mainly graduate, at UH. The Institute for Technical Interchange administered short-term, nondegree training courses in a number of practical areas covering such topics as rodent control and hotel management. The third institute, Advanced Projects, brought senior-level scholars and public administrators to EWC for research and writing.

A 1966 EWC-UH task force appointed to develop plans for the future suggested that EWC identify educational needs in Asia and the Pacific and devise programs to meet those needs. It suggested a program to utilize resources of all three institutes to solve identifiable problems. This suggestion resulted in a third major reorganization of EWC in 1970 into problem-oriented institutes in the fields of population, communication, culture learning, food, and technology and development. To insure a smooth transition and provide for flexibility and innovation, an open grants category was also established. EWC's move into the problem-oriented approach in program activities was helped by a \$3.7 million 5-year grant received from the Agency for International Development (AID) in 1968 for work in the population field and two grants totaling about \$1.5 million received from the same agency in 1970-71 for work in the communications field.

Today, EWC is divided into five problem-oriented institutes--population, communication, culture learning, resource systems (resulting from an Oct. 1, 1977, merger of the food and technology and development institutes), and environment and policy (newly established as of Oct. 1, 1977). Open grants still exist for students pursuing fields of study not specifically related to any of the problem-oriented institutes.

Each problem-oriented institute has an academic staff responsible for providing continuity to ongoing research, development, and exchange of knowledge and products. Each institute has focused on several project areas, and a series of different activities are generally ongoing within each.

Several different categories of awards are made to persons to come to EWC for study, training, and research. Grants available within each of these categories are summarized below.

<u>Awards</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Length of awards</u> (months)
Study:		
Graduate degree student	Enable qualified students to participate in EWC projects and concurrently work toward an advanced degree at UH.	17 to 24 (M.A.) 48 (Ph.D.)
Joint doctoral research intern	Enable Ph.D candidates from various universities to work on specific EWC projects relevant to their dissertations.	20 to 24
Professional:		
Professional associate	Attract mid- and upper-level managers to EWC for professional development training. Activities are specifically related to EWC projects.	1/4 to 12
Professional intern	Attract potential leaders for managerial experience or development activity through participation in specific EWC projects.	1 to 12

<u>Awards</u>	<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Length of awards</u> (months)
Research intern	Attract promising re- search workers for research training in specific EWC pro- jects.	1 to 12
Research:		
Visiting Re- search Assoc- iate	Attract outstanding international senior scholars and authori- ties to EWC for multi- year involvement in specific EWC projects.	24 to 36
Fellows	Attract outstanding post doctoral and mid- career scholars and authorities to EWC for involvement in specific EWC projects.	4 to 12

During the period July 1, 1971, through September 30, 1977, 8,077 participants received awards from EWC--1,699 study, 6,023 professional, and 355 research.

The study program at EWC offers no courses, credits, grades, or degrees. All course work is done through and degrees are received from UH. Each problem-oriented institute, plus open grants, sets its own requirement for the amount of time students must devote to project activities. Generally, the requirements are not strictly enforced. Open grants candidates usually participate in local community activity projects.

The redirection of EWC's programs has also resulted in a decrease in degree student awards and a corresponding increase in professional associate awards. A comparison of participant distribution for academic years 1971 and 1977 illustrates this trend.

<u>Academic year</u>	<u>Total participants</u>	<u>Awards</u>		
		<u>Study</u>	<u>Professional associate</u>	<u>Research</u>
1971	1,255	615	562	78
1977	1,443	413	974	56

REVIEW OF LEGISLATION

Review of hearings, conference reports, and other documents pertaining to the legislative history of EWC show that the Congress did not specify, at the time EWC was created, a specific type of educational institution or the extent of any relationship between EWC and UH. This lack of clarity has resulted in ambiguity and controversy over the management, operation, and control of EWC throughout most of its history. These matters are discussed in more detail in chapter 2.

SCOPE

Our review was designed to evaluate EWC progress and accomplishments in accordance with the intent of authorizing legislation. We emphasized determining contributions made by EWC and evaluating whether its activities are unique in relation to other institutions.

The review was conducted primarily at EWC, Honolulu, Hawaii. We examined program documents and held interviews with officials of EWC, UH, and the Department of State, Washington, D.C. We also visited the countries of Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, and Thailand to ascertain the reputation and standing of EWC in Asia. Within these countries we met with officials in business, government, and academia who were former EWC students, were professional associate participants, or held positions of standing in subject fields in which EWC is performing research or professional associate training. We also met with the Department of State, United States Information Agency (USIA), and EWC country representatives in each of the five countries.

To ascertain the successes and shortcomings of EWC as perceived by current student participants, we sent a questionnaire to a random sample of students attending EWC at the time of our review. A profile of students

who responded to our questionnaire and persons interviewed overseas (including names and present positions) is included as appendix I.

AGENCY COMMENTS

Officials of EWC and officials of the State Department have provided us with oral comments which have been incorporated in this report where appropriate.

Our review was directed to EWC as a federally established institution. Accordingly, UH's position may not be completely shown in all sections of this report although conversations were held with UH officials on specific issues.

CHAPTER 2

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EWC, UH, THE STATE OF HAWAII, AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Since its inception in 1960, EWC's relationship with UH, the State of Hawaii, and the State Department has been unclear. EWC was part of UH. It was established by the Federal Government. Ambiguity and controversy over the management, operation, and control of EWC continued throughout most of its history. As a result, EWC has had difficulty in establishing a separate identity nationally or internationally.

EWC's identity crisis and imprecise relationship with the State and Federal Governments was somewhat clarified when it was established as a nonprofit, educational institution incorporated by the State of Hawaii on July 1, 1975. Through this action, EWC hoped to clearly establish its own identity apart from UH. However, the act of incorporation has not resolved some questions concerning land, student enrollment, and the future development of EWC.

FEDERAL PERCEPTIONS AND OVERSIGHT OF EWC

Pursuant to the authorizing legislation of 1960, the State Department entered into a grant-in-aid agreement with the Board of Regents of UH to establish, maintain, and operate EWC. Within the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU), the State Department's primary responsibilities centered on reviewing and coordinating all budgetary review processes involving congressional appropriations to EWC. In addition, State provided administrative and procedural guidance to EWC to clarify congressional intent and settle disputes between UH and EWC. The State Department maintained no actual operational or management control over EWC, although it established a National Review Board in 1965 ostensibly to represent the national interest and advise the State Department on EWC's programs and operations. As an advisory body, the National Review Board concentrated its primary efforts in defining the relationship between EWC and UH and the Federal Government, particularly the financial and structural relationships (i.e., buildings and land). The National Review Board

recommended and eventually laid the groundwork for the establishment of the corporation to manage EWC in 1975.

Relationship with Board of Governors

On the establishment of a separate corporation in 1975, the State Department entered into a new grant-in-aid agreement with the newly created Board of Governors of the new corporation. 1/ The basic intention of a separate corporation was

"(1) to place the Center, as a national educational institution, with international concerns, under broadly based autonomous governance; (2) to strengthen the Center's national and international institutional identity; (3) to strengthen its governance and to provide the basis for expanding its sources of funding in consonance with the congressional enabling legislation."

Under the new agreement, the Board of Governors is responsible for administration and operation of EWC. The State Department looks to the Board of Governors to assure that EWC's programs, policies, and procedures are consistent with Federal requirements.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EWC AND UH

The question of land and buildings continues to offer potential problems in EWC's relationship with UH and the State of Hawaii. These problems focus on the educational involvement of EWC degree students at UH and the future

1/Five members of the Board are appointed by the U.S. Secretary of State and five by the Governor of Hawaii. These appointed members elect five additional members from Asia and the Pacific area. Ex-officio members are the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs and the Governor of Hawaii. The President of the University of Hawaii is a nonvoting, ex-officio member.

direction and growth of EWC as an independent international institution. Some State of Hawaii and UH officials have expressed concern over the future development of EWC and its relationship to UH and the State.

In 1960 UH contributed 21 acres of land for use by EWC. Various formal agreements on the use of the 21 acres were made throughout the years, the most recent an agreement between the State Department and the Board of Regents signed in July 1975. Article VI of that agreement states:

"In the event that the purposes of the East-West Center are changed in substance so as to make them incompatible with the educational purposes of the University, or the Corporation or the Department undertakes any action relating to the programs or activities of the East-West Center that makes such programs or activities incompatible with the educational purposes of the University * * * then the commitment to make available in perpetuity land, buildings and fixtures for the purposes of the East-West Center and its programs in furtherance of the objectives set forth in the authorizing legislation shall be reviewed by the Department and the Board at the written request of either."

Although article VI is subject to broad interpretation, complete autonomy for EWC cannot occur as long as a potential disagreement over "incompatible educational purposes" can occur. EWC officials are aware that such a dispute could force the issue of EWC use of the 21 acres granted by UH. A potential fuse to such a dispute is EWC degree student enrollment at UH.

During fiscal year 1977, about 400 EWC students pursued graduate degrees at UH. EWC pays over \$500,000 to UH to cover the cost of education of these students. 1/ An agreement to supply a minimum number of students to UH

1/These costs are questioned in ch. 4.

through 1980 was reached at incorporation. EWC officials claim that there are no present plans to reduce or eliminate degree awards to attend UH. However, should funding be reduced at EWC, the student program would suffer. In addition, EWC officials have indicated a desire to increase joint doctoral internships, a move which might further reduce degree students who attend UH.

The UH reaction to cutting or eliminating EWC students is by no means certain. However, some UH and State of Hawaii officials have contended that without students, EWC would no longer be fulfilling its mandate. One Hawaii State legislator, a member of the Committee on Higher Education, expressed strong feelings that EWC get off State land if it discontinued sending students to UH.

In commenting orally on this report, State Department officials told us there was no legal difficulty with EWC's right to continued use of the 21 acres of land. They said that even if there was a complaint under article VI of the agreement quoted above, the only thing that may happen is the "review" called for in the article. They said that the view of the State Department is that, while the land is nominally in the title of the State, the Federal Government has perpetual-use rights constituting an incumbrance which continues as long as the land and buildings are used for EWC purposes within the meaning of the 1960 legislation.

NONINVOLVEMENT IN FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

EWC programs and policies, as mutually agreed upon between the State Department and EWC, are purposely steered away from political or foreign policy matters. State Department and EWC officials claim that, as an educational institution, EWC should not be involved in any manner in pursuing or advocating U.S. foreign policy interests. Section 4 of the State of Hawaii act to incorporate EWC states:

"The corporation shall be devoted to the educational purposes of this Act and shall not be used to conduct non-educational foreign policy goals of the United States * * *."

We saw no evidence that EWC was involved in any foreign policy matter other than the effort to promote better relations and understanding.

Perceived image problem

Concern has been expressed by EWC officials and the Board of Governors over the recent proposal to combine the functions of the State Department's Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs and USIA into a new agency to be known as the International Communication Agency (ICA). Specifically, they are fearful that a structural change might diminish the basic mission of EWC and impact on EWC's international image. EWC wants to maintain its image as an institution concerned with mutual problems of East and West, not as part of an agency to promote U.S. policies. EWC officials are fearful that ICA will be perceived by some Asian countries as the latter, and EWC wants to be autonomous from such perceptions, particularly in their recent efforts to solicit contributions from foreign countries. (See p. 15.)

In our report to the Congress, "Public Diplomacy in the Years Ahead--An Assessment of Proposals For Reorganization," May 5, 1977 (ID-77-21), we supported the proposal to merge the functions of educational and cultural exchange and USIA. We did so after reviewing such arguments as presented by EWC officials.

The Congress and the President were aware of these concerns when they considered the merger and took actions to implement it.

On October 12, 1977, the President submitted his reorganization plan to the Congress establishing the ICA to perform the functions of educational exchange and those of USIA. In his message transmitting the plan, the President stated that

"Several principles guided me in shaping this reorganization plan. Among the most important were: Maintaining the integrity of the educational and cultural exchange programs is imperative. To this end, the plan retains the Board of Foreign Scholarships, whose strong leadership has done so much to insure the high quality of the educational exchange program. In addition, I intend to nominate an Associate Director who will be responsible for the administration and supervision of educational and cultural functions consolidated in the new Agency. The responsibilities presently exercised by the

Department of State in relation to the Center for Technical and Cultural Interchange Between East and West, Inc., will be transferred to the new agency without alteration."

Precisely 3 weeks later, on November 2, 1977, the President transmitted to the Congress two amendments to his reorganization plan.

The first would add this sentence: "The Director shall insure that the scholarly integrity and nonpolitical character of educational and cultural exchange activities vested in the Director are maintained."

The second, in reference to the proposed seven-member, presidentially appointed United States Advisory Commission on International Communication, Cultural and Educational Affairs would add this sentence:

"The Commission's reports to the Congress shall include assessments of the degree to which the scholarly integrity and nonpolitical character of the educational and cultural exchange activities vested in the Director have been maintained, and assessments of the attitudes of foreign scholars and governments regarding such activities."

We believe the concerns expressed by EWC officials in respect to the impact of the reorganization proposal on the image of EWC are reasonable concerns. On the other hand, we believe that the actions taken to insure the integrity of the programs are adequate.

CHAPTER 3

ACHIEVEMENT OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Our review disclosed that EWC is succeeding in meeting its broad objectives of promoting better relations and increasing knowledge and understanding between the peoples of Asia, the Pacific, and the United States. This success was pointed out by an overwhelming consensus of persons familiar with EWC. Another indication of the favorable impact of EWC is the recent financial contribution of 14 countries. It is anticipated several others will make commitments during fiscal year 1978. These recent fund-raising successes should result in even higher level interest by Asian and Pacific governments.

EWC has not yet reached full maturity as an educational institution. We identified a number of areas which need improvement if EWC is to achieve complete program effectiveness and success. We believe that EWC needs to:

- Devote greater resources to strengthening institutes as the principal means to improve program quality and alleviate certain program deficiencies related to the EWC student program.
- Reassess the responsibilities of the International Advisory Panel (IAP), an EWC review body, to assure that EWC programs are adequately evaluated.
- Improve cultural exchange activities and increase cost effectiveness by (1) reducing repeated attendance at EWC by fellows, visiting researchers, and professional associate participants, (2) occasionally scheduling professional associate activities at overseas locations, and (3) lengthening professional associate activities.
- Involve its degree students more meaningfully in EWC project activities by (1) redefining the role of the degree student to clearly indicate expectations and intentions in EWC activities, (2) reexamining the responsibilities of EWC research associates as they relate to

student interactions, (3) improving the level of communication between institute staff and students, between institutes themselves, and between EWC and UH, (4) sponsoring more EWC-wide professional activities, and (5) involving students in the planning of activities they are expected to participate in including project activities.

These matters do not detract from the concept that problem-oriented institutes can be an effective way to promote mutual understanding.

To assist us in determining EWC successes and shortcomings, we interviewed former participants and others familiar with EWC in five Asian countries plus sent questionnaires to 108 current student grantees. Appendix I contains a profile of the students who responded to our questionnaire and of the persons interviewed overseas--including names and present positions. To date, EWC has not conducted a broad based impact evaluation. However, it is now in the process of designing such a study. The results are expected to be available sometime in 1978.

PROGRAM SUCCESSES

We found almost universal consensus among persons contacted that better relations and understanding between people of other countries has resulted from knowledge and experiences gained at EWC. In four of five Asian countries visited we found EWC is generally well known to those interested in the subjects defined by its problem-oriented institutes, and enjoys a good reputation. In the fifth country, Singapore, we found EWC is not as well known as in the other countries we visited. This may be due in part to the fact that Singapore does not share many of the problems common to her neighbors.

We also found that EWC is considered unique because of its Asia/Pacific focus, its cross-cultural approach to problem solving, and the experience of many cultures living and meeting together at one location. Asian participants have a good feeling toward Hawaii and the multi-cultural Hawaiian community which makes them feel comfortable and at ease in their surroundings. Students also cited the opportunity to obtain field study grants and to meet distinguished scholars and researchers from around the world as being a part of the unique experience.

In addition, most former participants advised us they maintain personal contact with EWC and/or with fellow participants from other countries.

Fund-raising goals and successes

Since the act of incorporation EWC has been attempting to obtain funds from foreign governments, and more recently efforts have been made in the private sector. 1/ In our opinion, EWC has been relatively successful in obtaining support from foreign governments. It is too early, however, to assess how successful it will be in the private sector.

Since July 1, 1975, commitments of contributions totaling \$679,000 have been received from 14 countries and promises of support have been received from several others. Of the amount committed, \$273,500 in cash has been received. The large number of contributing countries evidences the fact that EWC is looked upon favorably overseas. Some of the contributions were from the poorer countries of Asia and the Pacific, including Bangladesh (\$7,500), Nepal (\$5,000), and Tonga (\$4,000). The favorable impact of EWC was further amplified in comments made to us by government officials in Thailand. In that country, which has pledged \$200,000 to EWC since July 1, 1975, a meeting of officials and selected EWC alumni was held before an official funding commitment was given. We were advised that the consensus of those present at the meeting was that EWC has impacted favorably in the development of Thailand. Support was recommended and funding was approved. Cash in the amount of \$50,000 has been contributed.

In addition, during the same period in-kind and cash contributions, valued by EWC at \$660,000, were received from foreign government cooperating agencies, educational institutions, and individuals.

1/EWC contends that prior to the act of incorporation it could not accept outside funds in its own name because it was under UH control. As a result, EWC was unable to establish an international identity which precluded its ability to expand its funding base into private and international sectors.

Support was generally in the form of transportation, stipend sharing, and cooperating institution services.

EWC recognizes that foreign government support will probably never be sufficient to fund a substantial part of its operating costs. U.S.-appropriated-fund support totaled \$12.2 million for fiscal year 1978. EWC also recognizes that sizable private funding will not be forthcoming until it is considered a completely viable institution by others.

EWC's fund-raising goals are to increase percentages of outside funding from governments and private organizations and at the same time decrease the percentage of support from appropriations. This goal envisions continued increases in appropriated support.

Conclusion

We believe foreign government commitments received to date evidence EWC's support from countries with whom they are working. However, success from private organizations will depend upon the reputation EWC has or is able to establish within their fields. In any event, EWC will probably continue to rely primarily on appropriated-fund support.

ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM STRENGTH

EWC recognizes that two of their institutes, food, and technology and development, never attained the desired level or style of operation during their initial 7 years of problem orientation. As a result, EWC took action to combine their existing strengths into a new institute, resource systems, effective October 1, 1977. EWC perceived five main weaknesses in the two institutes which led to their reorganization.

- Neither had a sharp focus for their activities.
- Little intellectual output or new ideas were forthcoming.
- Neither institute had much success in engendering outside funds.
- Not many of the activities were designed and carried out to include Americans in the role

of learners alongside Asian and Pacific islanders, nor many Asian and Pacific islanders in the role of teachers.

--Activities were narrowed down to only a few countries and others were left out.

In addition to combining these two institutes, a new environment and policy institute was organized effective October 1, 1977. This institute is just now defining its project activities.

Center officials recognized that some of the other institutes were also not achieving desired results. In 1976 an intensive in-house programmatic review resulted in a redefinition of the population, communication, and culture learning programs. Some of the old activities were phased out and others were fit into redefined projects in an attempt to sharpen the focus of each project.

The institutes EWC perceived as having had the most difficulty in attaining maturity were food, technology and development, and culture learning. Unlike the population and communication institutes, these institutes did not benefit from external funding from AID. These institutes were never able to attain staffing strength. However, we noted that all three of these institutes nevertheless continued to involve participants, both student and professional associate, at numerical levels equivalent to that of the stronger institutes. Current plans call for complete institute staffing and program maturation by 1980.

Conclusion and recommendation

EWC has not yet attained full maturity as an institution and is still striving to attain staffing strength. In the 7 years of problem orientation, EWC has attempted to maintain the number of participants at high levels even though some institutes were unable to attain staffing strengths. We believe this factor contributed to discontent registered by students (see pp. 22 to 26), and impacted on program quality.

We recommend that the Secretary of State urge EWC officials to concentrate on the development of fully viable programs prior to involving the maximum number of participants. As EWC progresses and gains strength,

program quality should increase and many of the existing problems perceived by students and others should diminish.

NEED FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION

Qualitative criticisms of EWC programs were heard from a number of persons we talked with in Asia. Comments were heard as follows:

--The quality of much of EWC research is not very high. (These opinions were based primarily upon review of EWC publications.)

--EWC should do a better job in identifying country needs prior to initiating research projects.

--EWC is conducting research, in some instances, in areas similar to those of regional and international organizations.

We found that EWC performs annual self-evaluations of their programs and program activities as part of their program planning review process. These evaluations look to, among other things, the relationship of the project to the institutes' problem focus, the mutual consequences between East and West of the substantive problem issues addressed, and adherence to the Asian-Pacific vs. American participant ratios. Periodic internal quantitative evaluations are also performed.

The State Department has a legislative mandate to oversee EWC. However, an external evaluation of the qualitative aspects of EWC programs has not been performed, except as relates to those institutes that performed work for AID. In EWC's early years, several studies were performed which looked mainly toward EWC's organizational structure.

With incorporation, the EWC Board of Governors is charged with responsibility for external evaluation of EWC programs. In January 1976, the Board, acting under section VI of the EWC incorporation act (State of Hawaii Act 82) chartered the IAP of international experts to evaluate EWC program quality content and impact and to advise the Board on programmatic matters. IAP will consist of between 7 and 11 members including 1 expert for each of the 5 institutes plus at least 2 generalists. Current plans call for each expert to visit an institute for about 1 week and submit an individual report to the Board. EWC officials told us that the initial reports of IAP should be completed in early

1978. However, as of the date of our review, the Board has not clearly defined what it expected from IAP and has not provided any detailed guidance on questions it wants answered.

We believe the impact and effectiveness of IAP may be limited unless the State Department and the Board of Governors take adequate measures to clearly define what is expected of IAP. For example, in both 1974 and 1975 a six-member international advisory committee composed of international experts spent 18 staff-days at EWC performing an evaluation of the EWC Communication Institute. The reports by the team of experts warned against "hasty assessments" in drawing conclusions on program effectiveness. In the 1974 report, the panel concluded that

"our understanding and knowledge of EWCI's programs and problems is incomplete and uncertain. We have had but little time to seek and receive a comprehensive overview of the institute's purposes and activities and even less for reflection and discussion for coming to a consensus about our several perceptions."

Conclusion and recommendations

We believe it is incumbent upon the State Department to insure that EWC programs are carefully assessed and reviewed to insure that programs are of high quality. Such assessments should address specific matters such as program accomplishments, significance and relative priority of program and research needs, quality and use of research products, and degree of interaction and coordination among EWC institutes and with outside institutions. We doubt that a single individual even with years of international experience and knowledge could effectively evaluate the complex programs of an institute in 1 week. This, however, is what is proposed for IAP.

Accordingly, we recommend that the Secretary of State work with the Board of Governors to clearly define the responsibilities of IAP to insure that adequate time and staffpower are devoted to effectively evaluate the quality and impact of programs conducted by each institute.

NEED TO IMPROVE CULTURAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

Although comments by persons in Asia whom we interviewed were generally favorable toward EWC, they did

suggest ways that EWC could improve in the cultural exchange areas. Three suggestions often heard as to how EWC could improve its cultural exchange efforts and at the same time be more cost effective are as follows:

- EWC should limit repeat attendance by visiting researchers, fellows, and professional associates.
- Professional associate activities should, upon occasion, be conducted at overseas locations.
- Many professional associate activities are too short to result in meaningful exchange or to be cost effective.

Repeat attendees

A number of persons advised us that there are too many repeat attendees at EWC programs and that more persons should be given the opportunity for exchange. A number of persons with whom we spoke told us they had attended EWC several times and one told us he had been there seven times.

We analyzed EWC participant statistics for the years 1976 and 1977 and found that 24 and 29 percent, respectively, of the visiting researchers, fellows, and professional associate participants were in fact repeat attendees. Many were identified who had been to EWC three or more times.

Conclusion

We recognize that some of EWC's activities require repeat attendance. For example, the same person may participate in both the research design and the later evaluation, both held at EWC. However, in many instances EWC is sponsoring the same persons to attend it again and again. Every time a repeat attendee comes to EWC, the opportunity for exchange is denied to one other person. Repeat attendances should be limited to the maximum practical extent.

Overseas activities

Many persons with whom we talked suggested that EWC conduct some of their short-term activities in neighboring

Asian/Pacific countries. This would permit people to learn from one another in closer proximity to their home countries, and at the same time, permit their American counterparts to experience Asian/Pacific cultures on a first-hand basis. In addition, regional activities would allow for broader participation by persons who might not ordinarily have the opportunity to travel to EWC. Depending upon the makeup of participants, a benefit would also result from a savings in transportation costs.

EWC officials agree with this suggestion but advised us that the State Department has interpreted EWC authorizing legislation as requiring EWC activities to be conducted "at the Center," and as only allowing for participants to be brought "to the Center."

In commenting on this report, State Department officials advised us that the Department, in order to satisfy the requirement, has adopted the rule that each participant must spend at least 51 percent of his time at EWC in Hawaii.

This rule, however, requires each participant to be brought to EWC.

Conclusion

We believe that the suggestion that EWC activities be conducted in Asian/Pacific countries in some few instances may have merit and might be especially appropriate in short-term activities. However, congressional intent needs to be clarified prior to considering such a change.

Length of activities

A common complaint from professional associate participants was that too many seminars and workshops last for only 1 to 2 weeks and that this is insufficient time for meaningful cultural interaction. They also felt activities of such short duration were not cost effective in view of the high cost of participant travel between Asia and Hawaii.

We analyzed Center project activities scheduled for the 1977-1978 school year and found that 54 percent of all planned activities are for 2 weeks or less in duration.

When the Culture Learning Institute is excluded, the percentage rises to about 70 percent.

Asians with whom we met suggested that seminars and workshops should last at least a month to permit lasting friendships to develop and to be cost effective.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Secretary of State urge EWC to take action to reduce the number of repeat attendees and consider lengthening workshops and seminars. However, in doing so, caution must be taken to insure that program quality is maintained. We also recommend that the Secretary of State seek clarification of congressional intent in respect to scheduling activities at locations other than EWC, particularly in respect to short-term activities, in order to determine whether, in a few appropriate instances, 100 percent of such activities can be conducted away from EWC.

NEED TO REDEFINE STUDENT DEGREE PROGRAM

In spite of EWC's overall success in promoting better relations and understanding between people, EWC students believe EWC is not reaching its potential and that exchange is taking a back seat to research. Students view themselves as serving two masters: UH, where they must meet degree requirements, and EWC, where they must meet project requirements. Since they obtain degrees from UH, they also have stronger allegiances there. Consequently, project involvement is the first to suffer. Further, student frustration is built up because of unsatisfactory project involvement, often stemming from the fact that EWC research associates have little for them to do that is considered meaningful. Research associates are required to design research projects and interact with students, fellows, and professionals in the various project phases. The multiplicity of duties may detract from the research associates' ability to relate to student needs.

Shortcomings cited in project involvement

Almost half of all EWC questionnaire respondents (excluding open grants) are either not involved in a project or label their involvement as not being meaningful. Students believe that they have not been integrated into the mainstream of EWC research work and that

they are not adequately involved in EWC or institute policy planning that impacts on the students. Many students feel there is a divergence of objectives between research associates and themselves and that research associates are insincere in their willingness to work with students. Further, 82 percent of all student respondents feel they are not treated as professionals or as equals with other participant types.

Lastly, 85 percent of all respondents cite research projects that are irrelevant to their interests as being a major or minor problem. Some cite the feeling that much of the research is not of a high quality. This latter feeling is shared by a number of former participants and other persons we interviewed. (See p. 18.)

Communications weaknesses exist at all levels

Another major problem perceived by students is the lack of communication and coordination between EWC and UH. Seventy-two percent of all respondents cited this as a problem. Terms such as a lack of communication, a lack of rapport, a cold war, etc., were used to describe the existing EWC-UH relationship. Students cite as evidence of the problems that exist between the two institutions the fact that UH will not grant any credit for EWC project work nor accept such work as a topic for their dissertation.

A situation which occurred during the fall 1977 school term illustrates the problem. The EWC Communication Institute planned for its new students a seminar designed to introduce them to the institute's research projects and help them develop research skills by providing instructions in research methodology. The institute approached UH departments having EWC Communication Institute students and UH agreed to grant academic credit for the seminar. However, the credits will be considered as overcredits and, as such, will not be accepted as a substitute for any UH course requirements, including research methods.

A UH-EWC Consultative Committee, which includes academic staff and administrators, provides a formal link between the two institutions. Nevertheless, a number of EWC staff members with whom we met agree with the students that more and better communications and cooperation are needed between the faculties of UH and EWC. Presently, 9 EWC staff persons have UH joint appointments and 12 have affiliate faculty status. Joint appointees teach at UH and perform research

at EWC. Their salaries are shared on a predetermined percentage basis. Affiliate faculty appointments are more informal but permit EWC staff to serve on graduate committees plus teach at UH. Outside of this, presently no formal EWC-UH ties exist at the faculty level. Also, there is presently no formal forum where the two staffs can meet and interchange. All staff contact is dependent upon individual initiative.

Students also perceive that a communications gap exists between themselves and research associates and themselves and the EWC administration. In fact, 80 percent of all respondents see this as a major or minor problem.

Communications between EWC institutes is also perceived as a problem, both by students and by a number of EWC research associates with whom we met. We were advised that no formal relationship exists between the institutes at the project planning stage and that little interchange occurs thereafter.

Population work performed by the Communication and Population Institutes during the period of about 1970 through 1977 illustrates this problem. The work, insofar as we could determine, was not closely integrated or discussed between the two staffs. In fact, we were advised one training module on demography developed by the Communication Institute was done by a consultant because the Population Institute chose not to be involved in this project.

Cultural activities need to be expanded

Student responses indicate that in their opinion much of EWC's success in meeting cultural exchange objectives is less attributable to activities planned and sponsored by EWC than the informal interaction in dormitory living, cooperative cooking, and other unplanned social activities.

Students suggest that visiting scholars be invited to meet and talk with participants and that EWC sponsor seminars and debates on topics relevant to world social, economic, and political activities. We noted that few professional activities outside of the institute projects are formally sponsored by EWC at the present time, but that EWC does in fact sponsor a multitude of social activities designed for students.

Conclusion and recommendations

We believe that most of the student complaints deserve attention. Student frustrations come from unsatisfactory project involvement and poor communication between EWC staff and students and between EWC and UH. We believe the students' lack of meaningful involvement in EWC project activities and the lack of communication and cooperation between EWC and UH are at the heart of the student problem.

EWC officials have suggested that a possible solution to the student concerns is to offer more joint doctoral intern awards. They contend that these type of awards do not require close ties with UH because joint doctoral interns have completed course work requirements prior to coming to EWC. In addition, they are actively involved in institute projects as part of their doctoral research requirements. We noted that this solution may not be feasible because of complications arising from current agreements between EWC and UH regarding minimum EWC student enrollment at UH, and use of UH land. (See ch. 2, p. 7.)

We recommend that the Secretary of State urge EWC to take actions to improve the student-EWC relationship. Among the matters to be considered are:

- redefining the role of EWC degree students to clearly state EWC expectations and intentions of student involvement in EWC projects;
- reexamining the role of EWC research associates who are now expected to design research projects plus interact with students, fellows, and professionals in the various project phases. Research associates may not have the time or ability to perform all of these tasks well;
- assessing ways to improve inter-institute communication and cooperation;
- encouraging and expanding communication and cooperation with UH to clearly define the role of EWC students in both institutions;
- sponsoring more EWC-wide professional activities; and

--involving students in the planning of activities they are expected to participate in, including project activities.

CHAPTER 4

NEED TO REASSESS COST-OF-EDUCATION PAYMENTS TO UH

EWC is currently paying the University of Hawaii a cost-of-education allowance for EWC students enrolled in UH courses. For the 1976-77 academic year, UH graduate tuition rates (per credit hour) were \$23 for resident students and \$58 for nonresident students. At the same time, EWC reimbursed UH at an average rate of \$107 per credit hour for courses taken by EWC degree students. From 1961 through 1977 EWC reimbursements to UH totaled over \$11.5 million. We believe the cost-of-education payments are excessive, and that EWC should be charged no more than standard tuition fees for students attending UH.

COST-OF-EDUCATION PAYMENTS PRIOR TO INCORPORATION

Prior to incorporation, EWC agreed to pay UH a cost-of-education payment in lieu of tuition for each EWC participant enrolled in credit courses. The cost of education included all general operating costs including both direct and indirect costs (e.g., instruction, maintenance on buildings, administration, and other services). EWC was charged based on a fixed amount per student. In 1971 EWC and UH negotiated a standard payment of \$698,000 per year for fiscal year 1972 through fiscal year 1975. In addition to the cost-of-education payment, EWC made separate payments for the costs of participant activity fees and summer session tuition costs. In fiscal year 1977, summer session costs were \$24,240.

COST FORMULA SINCE INCORPORATION

As a part of the incorporation agreement the EWC Board of Governors agreed to pay UH 50 percent of the total cost of education as calculated in the "per credit hour per course" formula. The agreement called for a one-time payment of \$415,000 in fiscal year 1976, and thereafter according to the formula. For the 1976-77 academic year, EWC paid an average of \$107 per credit hour, or a total of about \$554,000 in cost-of-education payments. About \$250,000 of this represents payments over and above nonresident tuition rates.

The method of calculating the costs involved in the formula has been questioned by EWC officials who on May 4, 1976, requested the State Department through the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) to audit the costs.

DIFFERENCE IN TUITION COSTS AND EWC COST-OF-EDUCATION PAYMENTS

In a March 31, 1976, audit report on cost-of-education payments to UH for the period July 1, 1973, through June 30, 1975, DCAA reported that the average costs per credit hour charged to an EWC student was \$117 while the average tuition cost per credit hour for a graduate student attending UH during the same period was \$16 for a resident and \$40 for a nonresident. For the 1976-77 academic year, the first year of the 50-percent cost-of-education formula, the average cost per credit hour for an EWC student was \$107 while the normal per-credit-hour tuition charge for a graduate course was \$23 for a resident and \$58 for a nonresident. UH has reciprocity agreements with virtually every Asian and Pacific country allowing foreign students to attend UH under resident tuition charges. Under standard tuition charges, at least two-thirds of EWC degree students would qualify under the lower cost resident tuition rate. The above analysis illustrates the excessive cost charged EWC even in relation to nonresident tuition charges.

We also noted that for the 1976-77 academic year, charges to EWC for UH courses ranged from under \$25 per credit hour to as high as \$705 per credit hour. EWC officials complain that high cost departments are influencing EWC advice to students on which courses they can take. In some cases, EWC students have had courses disallowed by EWC because of cost consciousness.

RATIONALE FOR COST-OF-EDUCATION METHOD OF PAYMENTS

The premise underlying the cost-of-education payments by EWC has been that taxpayers of the State of Hawaii should not shoulder the majority of financial burden for a national program. In addition, some UH officials contend that UH built up certain graduate programs, such as American studies, to support EWC needs. UH also provided other services such as library facilities. Further, a few federally funded grant programs include a cost-of-education allowance, so why not EWC?

While we recognize that EWC is a national institution which provides benefits to the Nation as well as to the State of Hawaii, we believe that the rationale for the cost-of-education formula is not justifiable.

Both the president and dean of graduate studies at UH advised us that UH is not dependent upon EWC students. UH has over 4,000 graduate students, so the 400 EWC students have limited impact on most graduate departments. If EWC discontinued its student program, no UH departments would be eliminated. We found that none of the graduate programs have a majority of EWC students. In fact, during the 1975-76 academic year, the American studies program included 66 graduate students, of which only 13, or 20 percent, were EWC students.

We noted that except in a few instances, students attending UH under other Federal or private scholarships or grants, are charged tuition and fees with no cost-of-education allowance. Officials at the Office of Education told us that its grants include no payments to schools beyond normal tuition rates. We found that other scholarship programs sponsored by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, AID, Public Health Service, Ford Foundation, the Population Council, and many others do not pay a cost-of-education allowance.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We believe EWC should be charged no more than the standard tuition and fees for nonresident students. As shown earlier, this amount would still be above the normal tuition charge to foreign students and would compensate UH for related student services. By implementing the tuition method of payment, over \$250,000 could be saved annually, or alternatively, EWC could increase the amount of student grants. (The latter would minimize the financial drain on UH.)

Accordingly, we recommend that the Secretary of State, in conjunction with the Board of Governors, take action at such time as would be appropriate to renegotiate education payments to UH that would be more in line with what others pay. This should be no later than the date the current agreements expire.

CHAPTER 5

FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IF IT IS

DECIDED TO ESTABLISH A NORTH-SOUTH CENTER

Shortly after initiating our review of EWC, Congressman Dante B. Fascell, Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations, House Committee on International Relations, informed us that over the years there had been considerable interest expressed in establishing a North-South Center to serve the Americas. He said that the Subcommittee would appreciate information on EWC that would be helpful to considering a North-South Center, since it was likely that formal consideration of a proposal to establish such a center would occur early in 1978.

The better relations and understanding that have resulted from the knowledge and experience gained by EWC participants should be a significant factor in the congressional consideration of an institution with objectives similar to those of EWC, but with a focus on the Western Hemisphere. Promoting better relations and understanding in nations of Latin America is just as important to the United States and those nations as it is in Asia-Pacific countries.

As previously discussed in chapter 2, the lack of congressional clarity in EWC's legislative history as to the type of educational institution desired and the extent of any relationship between EWC and UH has resulted in ambiguity and controversy over EWC's management operation and control throughout most of its history. We believe clarification of these issues in any legislation aimed at creation of a North-South Center would benefit the direction of an institution created to promote better relations between western hemispheric nations.

Because of lessons learned at EWC, a North-South Center should have the potential to reach full institutional maturity and develop optimum strength programs more quickly than would otherwise be possible.

NEED FOR AUTONOMY FROM ANY EXISTING INSTITUTION OF HIGHER LEARNING

EWC was initially created as a part of UH and was operated under a grant-in-aid agreement between the State Department and the UH Board of Regents. EWC officials

advised us that at the outset the close relationship between EWC and UH was beneficial to EWC, but later impacted adversely on EWC's ability to develop and establish its own identity. On the plus side, the association with UH provided a background of campus activities for students, academic resources and a forum for intellectual interaction, assistance in obtaining acceptance from the academic community and foreign governments, and the donation of land upon which EWC buildings were built.

The close association, however, also created an identity crisis for EWC. Many recognized EWC as being merely an extension of UH. EWC had no separate identity as either a national or international institution. EWC officials advised that fund-raising efforts in the private and international sector were hampered because others saw their gifts as going to UH or the State Department. Also, there was no possibility of getting international participation in the governing of EWC because, by statute, members of the UH Board of Regents had to be residents of the State of Hawaii.

The 1975 incorporation agreement was intended to clarify the institutional identity of EWC, but instead represents only a partial resolution because EWC still sits on land owned by UH. Resolution of some of the student problems and the future direction of EWC still hinges partially on the issue of land.

Conclusion

We believe that a North-South Center would benefit from a close proximity to university resources. However, the institution should remain clearly autonomous and free from university control. Relationships between EWC and UH should be clearly defined and agreed to.

NEED TO CLARIFY INTENDED TYPE OF INSTITUTION AND PROGRAM DIRECTION

EWC's program direction has been in a state of transition almost from the beginning. At the outset it was even unclear as to what type of institution EWC should be--should EWC offer courses and grant credits or function in some other unspecified role? An early program change directed its resources away from being a college, but it was not until the 1970 program change that EWC went to its current problem orientation. While proceeding to problem orientation,

EWC maintained previous participant levels even though institutional staffing strengths had not yet been established. As EWC evolved, less emphasis has been placed on the number of students receiving EWC grants. Programmatic evolution has hindered EWC's efforts to reach full maturation and effectiveness.

Conclusion

We believe legislation introduced to create a North-South Center should clearly specify the type of institution desired. In addition, prior to establishing any such center, intended program direction should be clearly delineated.

PROFILE OF STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRERESPONDENTS AND PERSONS CONTACTED OVERSEASSTUDENTS

Students selected to receive questionnaires were randomly chosen from a listing of students in attendance at EWC during the latter part of August 1977. Recent grantees were excluded from our sample selection because they would not be adequately familiar with EWC programs and activities. Of 217 available students, 108 were sent questionnaires. Responses were received from 64 students (59 percent of our sample) representing 20 Asian and Pacific countries plus the United States. Student respondents were about equally split between those studying for their masters and doctorate degrees. One student was a joint doctoral intern and another was a candidate for a bachelors degree. Thirty-five percent of the respondents were over age 30 and 57 percent were between the ages of 25 and 30.

OVERSEAS CONTACTS

We visited Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, Taiwan, and Thailand and met with 69 persons having knowledge of EWC through the following types of contact.

	<u>Number</u>
Former degree student	18
Former professional associate participant	40
Former senior fellow	2
Other (note a)	<u>9</u>
Total	<u>69</u>

a/These persons had not attended EWC but had knowledge of its activities because of their position or standing in fields within which EWC is conducting research of professional development activities. For example, some of their staff members may have been involved in EWC activities.

Twenty-six of the persons contacted were academics, 30 were government employees or officials, and 13 were from the business world. We also met with State Department, USIS, Bi-National Commission, and EWC country representatives. Persons contacted were either recommended by EWC, the in-country USIS officials, or EWC country representatives. A complete

APPENDIX I

APPENDIX I

listing of the names and present positions of persons interviewed follows. Names generally appear in the order in which contacted.

JAPAN CONTACTS

- Mr. Clifton B. Forster, Public Affairs Officer, USIS
- Mr. Duane L. King, Deputy Cultural Exchanges Officer, USIS
- Mrs. Caroline A. Yang, Liaison Officer, U.S. Educational Commission, Japan
- Mrs. Ellen Mashiko, EWC Representative, Japan
- Mr. Masaaki Kasagi, Secretary-General and Director, International Affairs Department, Nihon Shimbun Kyokai
- Mr. Isao Amagi, Director-General, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science
- Mrs. Itsuko Kasai, Educational Counselor, U.S. Educational Commission, Japan
- Mr. Hiroshi Midzuno, Statistical Advisor, Bureau of Statistic, Office of the Prime Minister
- Dr. Yuji Kawaguchi, Staff Specialist, Maternal and Child Health Division, Children and Families Bureau, Ministry of Health and Welfare
- Dr. Toshio Kuroda, Professor of Demography, Nihon University
- Mr. Isao Sugiyama, Executive Secretary, Hosobunka Foundation
- Mrs. Haruko Watanabe, Director, HKW Video Workshop
- Mr. James M. Hester, Rector, U.N. University
- Mr. Akira Hoshino, Professor of Psychology, International Christian University
- Mr. Yasushi Mizoue, Specialist in Social Studies, Ministry of Education
- Miss Junko Watanabe, Specialist, Educational and Cultural Exchange Division, Science and International Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Education
- Mr. Masaru Ibuka, EWC Board of Governors, Honorary Chairman of the Board, Sony Corporation
- Dr. Nagai, Honorary Editorial Writer, Asahi Shimbun (former Minister of Education)

TAIWAN CONTACTS

- Mr. Roger Sullivan, Deputy Chief of Mission, American Embassy, Taiwan
- Mr. William Ayers, Public Affairs Officer, USIS
- Mr. Kao Yu-jen, Vice Minister of Interior Affairs
- Prof. Chang Fang-chieh, Director, English Research Institute, National Taiwan Normal Univ.
- Mr. Chang Hsien-sin, Instructor, English Department National Taiwan Normal Univ.
- Mr. C. C. Lee, Director, Bureau of Statistics, Executive Yuan
- Dr. Y. Y. Bao, Director of Bureau of International, Cultural and Education Relations, Ministry of Education
- Mr. Wei Hung-chang, Senior Specialist, Ministry of Education
- Mr. Cheng Wen-chang, Chief, Academic Research, Ministry of Education
- Mr. Raymond R. M. Tai, Director, Overseas Program, Government Information Office
- Mr. David Jung-chi Chung, Deputy Chief Reporter, United Daily News
- Mr. Hu Hung-chiu, Chief, Second Division, National Science Council
- Dr. Hsu Chia-shih, Dean, College of Arts, National Chengchi Univ.
- Mr. Chen Chao-lan, Professor, National Taiwan Univ.
- Dr. Kuang-kuo Huang, Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, National Taiwan Univ.
- Dr. Cheng-hung Liao, Chairman, Department of Agricultural Extension, National Taiwan Univ.

- Dr. Hsueh-yi Lu
 Senator (Legislator) and Chairman
 Committee on Economic Affairs (55th Session)
 Committee on Procedures (59th Session)
 Legislative Yuan (National Senate)
 Professor
 National Taiwan Univ.
 Charter President
 Rotary Club of Taoyuan West
 Secretary-General
 Chinese Institute of Public Opinion
- Dr. Chien-chung Yin, Associate Professor and Chairman,
 Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, National
 Taiwan Univ.
- Mr. Tse-Tseng Huang, Deputy Director, Bureau of Statistics,
 Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics,
 Executive Yuan
- Mr. David T. Y. Lu, Senior Statistician, Bureau of Statistics,
 Directorate General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics,
 Executive Yuan
- Mr. Yuh-Hsiung Hsiang, Chief, 1st Division, Bureau of
 Statistics, Directorate-General of Budgets, Accounts, and
 Statistics, Executive Yuan
- Mr. Tze-Hwa Fan, Division Chief of Population Statistics
 and Census Division, Population Department, Ministry of
 the Interior
- Dr. Wu Jing-jyi, Executive Director, U.S. Educational
 Foundation in China; Adjunct Professor, National Chengchi
 Univ.
- Mrs. Loretta L. T. Huang, Associate Professor, National
 Chengchi Univ.; Country Representative, East-West Center,
 U.S. Educational Foundation, Republic of China
- Dr. Chen Chi, Professor of History, National Chung-Hsing Univ.
- Mr. Chang-Yan Kuo, Director of Research Section, Chinese
 Classical Music Assn.; Professor of Music, Graduate Division,
 College of Chinese Culture; Chairman, Music Section, Taipei
 Normal Junior College
- Dr. Ping-Shi Yu, M.D., The Children's Health Hospital
 Editorial Board of ACTA Paediatrica Sinica

Mr. C. T. Huang, Senior Vice President, Investment Dept.,
China Investment and Trust Co.

Mr. Frank L. Hung, President, Harvard Management Service, Inc.

SINGAPORE CONTACTS

Mr. Edward C. Ingraham, Deputy Chief of Mission, American Embassy, Singapore

Mr. Thomas Spooner, Cultural Affairs Officer, USIS

Mr. Larry Seah, Exchange Officer, USIS

Mr. Seh Chang Kwang, Secretary, Public Service Commission

Miss Chow Miew Boey, Assistant Secretary, Public Service Commission

Mr. Patrick Chia, Hotel Development Manager, Singapore Airlines

Mrs. Tai Yu-Lin, Director, Regional Language Centre

Mr. John Ang, Lecturer, Social Work Department, University of Singapore

Dr. Peter Chen, Head, Sociology Department, University of Singapore

Dr. Wan Fook Kee, Chairman, Singapore Family Planning and Population Board, Ministry of Health

Mr. Muhammed Bin Jaafar, Chief, Malay Language, Ministry of Education

Mrs. Lim Beng Choo, Chief, Chinese Language, Ministry of Education

MALAYSIA CONTACTS

- Mr. Robert H. Miller, U.S. Ambassador, American Embassy,
Malaysia
- Mr. William C. Dawson, Assistant Cultural Affairs Officer,
USIS
- Ms. Zakiah Hanum, Deputy Director, National Archives
- Ms. Leong Thong Peng, Women's Editor, New Straits Times
- Dr. Jose Furtado, Head, Zoology Department, University
of Malaya
- Mr. Mano Maniam, Executive Secretary, Malaysian American
Commission on Educational Exchange
- Dr. Abdul Maulud Yusof, President, East-West Center Alumni
Association
- Mr. Encik Ahmad bin Yusof, Secretary, East-West Center
Alumni Association
- Dr. Mohd Noor Adbullah, Director-General, Rubber Industry
Smallholders Development Authority (RISDA)
- Mr. John Middleton, Consultant, Asian Center for Development
Administration
- Mr. J. S. Henry, Senior Education Officer, Teachers Training
Division, Ministry of Education
- Mr. Ramesh Chander, Director, Department of Statistics
- Mr. Encik Sulaiman Hashim, Acting Director, INTAN, National
Institute of Public Administration
- Mr. Encik Othman Yeop Abdullah, Deputy Director, INTAN,
National Institute of Public Administration
- Dr. Chong Kwong Yuan, Economic Advisor, Rubber Industry
Smallholders Development Authority (RISDA)

THAILAND CONTACTS

- Mr. James McGinley, Public Affairs Officer, USIS
- Mr. Bart Nelson Stephens, Cultural Affairs Officer, USIS
- Mrs. JoAnne Hankins, EWC Program Representative, Thailand
- Mr. Peter Geithner, Representative, The Ford Foundation
- Dr. Arb Nakajud, Vice-Rector, Kasetsart University
- Dr. Snit Smuckarn, Assistant Professor, National Institute of Development Administration (NIDA)
- Mr. Apichart Chamrathrithirong, Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University
- Mr. Sumitr Hemasathol, Reporter, Bangkok Post
- Mrs. Anuri Wanglee, Director, National Statistical Office
- Dr. Samporn Saengchai, Senior Lecturer, NIDA; Consultant, Department of the Interior
- Dr. Wichit Srisa-an, Deputy Undersecretary, Office of State Universities
- Dr. Nippon Debalaya, Director, Institute of Population Studies
- Dr. Suraphol Sudhara, Professor, Dept. of Marine Science Chulalongkorn University
- Dr. Bumroongsook Siha-Umphai, Dean, Faculty of Communication Arts, Chulalongkorn University
- Professor Vipha Muttamara, Department of Vocational Education, Ministry of Education
- Dr. Kovit Worapipatana, Deputy Secretary-General, Department of Educational Techniques, Ministry of Education
- Dr. Suntaree Komin, Assistant Professor, NIDA

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS CONCERNED WITH
MATTERS DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

	<u>Tenure of office</u>	
	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
<u>DEPARTMENT OF STATE</u>		
SECRETARY OF STATE:		
Cyrus R. Vance	Jan. 1977	Present
Henry A. Kissinger	Sept. 1973	Jan. 1977
William P. Rogers	Jan. 1969	Sept. 1973
Dean Rusk	Jan. 1961	Jan. 1969
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS:		
William K. Hitchcock (acting)	Aug. 1977	Present
Joseph D. Duffey	Apr. 1977	Aug. 1977
William K. Hitchcock (acting)	Jan. 1977	Apr. 1977
John Richardson, Jr.	July 1969	Jan. 1977
Edward D. Re	Feb. 1968	Jan. 1969
Charles Frankel	Sept. 1965	Dec. 1967
Harry C. McPherson, Jr.	Aug. 1964	Aug. 1965
Lucius D. Battle	June 1962	Aug. 1964
Philip H. Coombs	Mar. 1961	June 1962
<u>CENTER FOR CULTURAL AND TECHNICAL INTERCHANGE BETWEEN EAST AND WEST</u>		
PRESIDENT (note a):		
Everett Kleinjans	Aug. 1968	Present
Howard P. Jones	July 1965	Aug. 1968
Thomas H. Hamilton (acting)	Jan. 1964	July 1965
Alexander Spoehr	Jan. 1962	Jan. 1964
Murray Turnbull (interim Director and acting Chancellor)	Dec. 1959	Jan. 1962

a/Title was Chancellor from inception to July 1975.