It is a pleasure to comment on the outlook for international programs of home economics.

In reviewing comprehensive developments myself, earlier, and with conferees here this week, the following three considerations have seemed pertinent:

The Need for Commitment

First, it is evident that progress has been and will be achieved in direct and sure relationship to the sense of importance and commitment of the countries involved.

A sense of personal commitment is especially needed in programs of inter-cultural understanding -- and the sense of intelligent and knowing commitment far exceeds or is basic to the importance of monetary or special interest concerns. In home economics, which involves so many intangibles, a special kind of intense, informed interest is essential.

From some circles we have learned the definition of instant programs as -- "Add money and stir."

It is true that in many undertakings the process of adding money and stirring can produce some good and beneficial results. Thoughts and aspirations combined with available resources make this possible. However, as we have learned from many of our speakers this week, international programs basically require deeply cultivated understandings.

The sense of commitment in international programs in home economics must stem from belief on the part of participating countries in the significant contribution which such programs may make to economic development and social progress, a belief held not only by the academic circles of such countries but also in their business and governmental circles. (Most frequently this involves continuing commitment through many changes of personnel, including changes of students, faculty, and governmental administrations.)

*Dr. Odland is dean, College of Home Economics, University of Tennessee.
This area was discussed in our last conference. However, perhaps there is much more which can be undertaken toward knowledgeable understanding of the contributions of home economics programs to economic development and social progress. This week Mr. Stucky, Miss Mackinnon, Dr. Holtzclaw, Miss Drinker and Dr. Heft have provided special incentives to us for this.

The development of knowledgeable commitment has been the starting point for many of our more successful programs (as exemplified by the late Dr. Lydia Roberts in the home economics program in Puerto Rico). Perhaps this is the primary area for strengthening foundations for continuing and developing programs.

The Need for Cooperation and Coordination

Secondly, our outlook for international home economics programs is completely dependent on continued and intensified cooperation and coordination in our undertakings.

Our 1963 conference was held in response to the evident need for cooperative planning and development. This, our 1965 conference, has reaffirmed our convictions. All of us are critically aware of the fact that we in home economics, perhaps as much as in any other field, need to use all of our resources wisely and well, on a defined priority basis. This can best be accomplished through cooperative planning and development. Fortunately, as our experiences increase and our outlook for the future becomes more realistic, we can predict with better success how we might provide together for the judicious use of resources. We are profiting from such concern in long-range planning for home economics programs of research, teaching, extension as supported by individuals, state and government agencies, and private foundations in this country. The benefit of such long-range planning in international programs is increasingly evident. Much can be accomplished in home economics in conferences such as this and in contingent planning and action.

In home economics we have or will have specifically, the guidelines of our 1963 and 1965 conferences -- and, the increasing involvement in coordination by our professional, academic and governmental home economics agencies and organizations.

---

1 William G. Stucky -- who is educational leader, Center for Agricultural and Economic Development -- in floor discussion made the point that the acceptance of international home economics programs will be directly related to the extent to which such programs are linked up to the solution of overriding national problems. He said this is particularly true in nations with scarce resources.

2 See paper of C. Frances MacKinnon, "Developing Economic Programs Abroad -- Latin America," on pages 125-30 of this report.

3 See paper of Katherine Holtzclaw, "The Status of Home Economics Programs in the Agency for International Development," on pages 209-14 of this report.

4 Gertrude R. Drinker -- who is program specialist, Foreign Training Division, International Agricultural Development Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture--participated in a panel discussion on internationalizing home economics programs in the U.S. See pages 179-185 of this report for a summary of the panel.

5 See paper of David Heft, "Influences of Latin American Education Affecting International cooperation in university Curriculum Development, on page 85 of this report.
The international program of work of the American Home Economics Association, which has just been reviewed by the association in Atlantic City, encourages cooperative planning.

Also, in special conferences such as this, we see the result of cooperative planning among and between all sponsoring groups for international programs.

The International Rural Development Office, under the capable direction of Dr. Elton L. Johnson, has done much to promote coordination among the member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and between these and the various governmental and private agencies and foundations. In fact, it was through Dr. Johnson's office that much was developed in the planning of this conference. I should mention also the excellent informative international newsletter developed by Dr. Johnson.

We have been particularly fortunate to have had summarized for us, during this conference, the increasing coordination of programs of governmental agencies. A very special effort is being made to include home economics in many programs--and as an example I would like to mention, most recently, the Eleventh Conference on Foreign Agricultural Training Affairs sponsored by the new International Agricultural Development Service, in which Miss Drinker has played a prominent role. Proceedings of this meeting will be available soon. Also, I would like to mention the recent report you have received from the Joint Committee on Education for Government Services of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Tremendous strides have been made by this committee and its member institutions and agencies in developing not only policies but also the mechanics for cooperative international programs.

The Need for Judicious Use of Resources.

As the third item, which is, in fact, contingent on cooperative planning, our outlook for the future depends upon the judicious use of our resources with, again, flexible list of priorities. For example, each of us at this conference is concerned with the problem of personnel and the extent to which appropriate personnel can be shared in international program planning. We have considered at length the kinds of persons needed, the experienced personnel available, and the ways in which appropriate personnel might be recruited and prepared for undertakings in other countries. We do have under way in this country some significant plans whereby needs of developing countries for personnel from this country may be met on a cooperative basis by business, academic institutions, and government agencies. Our outlook for expanding numbers of experienced home economists for higher educational programs in this country is not propitious. Our conference has indicated a strong consensus for a brighter outlook for international programs when the programs emphasize graduate training for those who would return to the developing countries to expand home economics training programs there. We have known this; now we seem to really be considering "working ourselves out of business" in the planning stages of our programs.
There is apparently no bias against women in the home country -- or in the United States in the selection of students from other countries for higher education study programs abroad. In a country where only 10 to 20 per cent of the women are in programs of higher education, we would expect many who come to this country to study to be of the "governing elite" in their native countries. However, through the training and commitment of the "governing elite," perhaps initially effective programs may be developed in native countries which may then have support for reaching more and larger segments of the population.

It would seem that with a favorable commitment on the part of this and developing countries to the importance of home economics and its contribution to economic development and social progress, the need for personnel can in times ahead be met primarily through the developing or "newly independent" country.

Resources may be primarily concerned with people, but also some minimal requirements of facilities and equipment need definition. For effective training programs in this country some items of equipment and materials are necessary. However, we now recognize that for maximum effectiveness in the developing country, perhaps facilities, materials and equipment are best defined and developed by those most closely involved in and native to the developing program. Advice and counsel can be helpful. However, as indicated by many here, those most directly involved in the long-range program promotion are perhaps in the best position to know what is essential in an individual program. Dr. Holtzclaw eloquently emphasized this earlier at this conference.

We have learned that with equipment as with curricula and reference materials, there is no comprehensive "check-off" list. The same is true of research, as was discussed in detail here earlier. Our outlook depends on professional commitment and aspirations of those who have the long-range vision and continuing responsibilities for developing programs in their respective countries.

In considering the outlook for the future, our program was planned to cover problems and potentialities. It is apparent that these may involve to an increasing extent: (1) a sense of commitment by academic, business, and governmental institutions and agencies to the significant contribution of home economics programs in the economic development and social progress of the country; (2) cooperative and coordination of all undertakings and programs with recognition and development of mutual interests, (3) the judicious recognition and intelligent development of ever-increasing resources. And, I cannot help but add (from our personal experiences detailed in the first 1963 conference report and University of Tennessee International Program report, and in behalf of many comments here) -- (4) perspective, persistence, patience, and realistic, constructive optimism!