

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL PROJECTS AND SITES

30 April 2005

I. Charge and Membership

In September 2004, a university-wide task force consisting of faculty and administrators was charged by Provost Steven E. Hyman to review University policies and practices concerning the creation, management, and coordination of international projects, including international sites, and to make recommendations that will enable the University to continue to expand its international activities in a thoughtful and careful way.

The Provost invited faculty representatives from the Business School, Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS), Kennedy School, Law School, Medical School, and School of Public Health to serve on the task force. Professor Jorge Domínguez was asked to chair the task force. Representatives from the Office of the General Counsel, Office of International Programs in the FAS, and Office of Risk Management and Audit Services were also invited to attend as *ex-officio* members of the task force.

II. Introduction

Harvard University is today a global university. Every year, thousands of foreign scholars come to Cambridge and Boston to study and to pursue careers in research and teaching. More faculty across the University are looking to develop intellectual capital in an international context. Increasingly, more students are choosing to spend time abroad.

In addition, Harvard derives great benefit from activities that are taking place outside of the country. Since the late 1990s, the number of international sites has increased, with the Business School taking the lead in creating several research centers around the world, the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies operating a university-wide center in Santiago, and researchers at the Medical School and School of Public Health setting up projects in many third world countries.

For the University to remain a global leader in teaching and research, it is essential that the University continue to engage internationally and to maintain a significant and vibrant presence outside of the United States. Harvard must continue to foster an international commitment to scholarly creativity, openness to new ideas, the recruitment of the best scholars wherever their country of origin, and advancements in the humanities, sciences, and associated disciplines in the professions. The opportunities for Harvard to engage internationally are practically limitless.

With benefits, of course, there are also risks attendant on Harvard's increasing presence abroad, some of which include:

- the physical safety of faculty and students who spend anywhere from a few days to an entire year in foreign countries;
- the protection of Harvard's name and identity;
- the compliance by Harvard and its agents with the laws, regulations, and customs of foreign jurisdictions;
- the management of operational logistics in remote locations; and
- adherence to the high standards of accountability that are established here in Cambridge and Boston.

Such risks are inevitable and should never discourage Harvard from seeking educational and research opportunities abroad, but they do indicate the need for better University-wide oversight and coordination of international activities.

Since 1997, the University has had in place a set of guidelines on establishing remote locations. The task force feels that it is important to affirm the principles that were explicated in those guidelines:

- clarity in the purpose and scope of international activities;
- adherence to Harvard's core academic purposes;
- rigorous oversight of such activities; and
- the need for cross-Faculty interests and concerns to be taken into account.

The task force also believes it important, given the University's ever-increasing international involvement, to suggest more specifically how international sites might be better managed in a university-wide context. The University and its Schools will benefit if they can leverage their resources more effectively, share information about and coordinate international activities, and minimize the exposure of the University's activities to unnecessary risk.

In the 1997 guidelines, responsibility for review of international projects was assigned to a subcommittee of Deans. Given the significant increase in international activity, the task force recommends that the international affairs tasks addressed in the guidelines be managed by the Provost with guidance and input from a standing committee that would be established under this document (see Section V). The Deans, singly or as a group, will continue to be consulted, and their input and advice sought, when activities are of a sufficiently unusual scope or nature to warrant their review or approval.

III. Strategic Considerations

Harvard's international projects, including sites, should enhance the educational and research activities of professors and students, but not substitute for proper endeavors that take place on the Boston and Cambridge campuses. The task force expects and encourages the Schools to continue to propose and develop new ideas for international activities in line with the University's academic mission and the mission of each School. It also recognizes that there will be substantial variation in the focus and nature of these

activities throughout the world, consistent with the diverse interests of the different Schools and of the faculty and students.

Specifically, the international activities of the University will advance one or more of the following aims:

- Seeking to ensure a worldwide leadership role for Harvard across all fields of knowledge;
- Facilitating the research of its faculty in any country in developing scholarship in the humanities, the social sciences, the sciences, and across the professions, and creating intellectual capital that is international in scope;
- Facilitating the study of a wide array of subjects, also in any country, by Harvard students from all the Schools of the University;
- Fostering the growth of a worldwide community of scholars and pertinent practitioners;
- Engaging the Harvard alumni, in appropriate ways, wherever they may reside.

We believe that the achievement of these goals will be enhanced through thorough reviews of the efficacy and success of the various engagements that the University has worldwide.

IV. International Projects and Sites

The task force encourages individual faculty members to conduct research outside the United States. These recommendations are not intended to discourage the free inquiry and entrepreneurial spirit of faculty who wish to pursue international projects. Rather, they are intended to ensure that very large projects and projects of significant duration are conducted thoughtfully and safely and in a manner consistent with the University's administrative and academic standards.

To achieve these objectives, the task force recommends the following:

- All new proposals for the establishment of international multi-year projects that involve an annual project budget over \$1 million or one percent of a School's annual operating budget, whichever is larger, must be reviewed in advance by the Provost's Office.

International projects pertinent for these procedures involve multi-year commitments of Harvard schools, departments, or centers to engage Harvard professors or professional staff to teach, conduct research, or perform other professional services, for more than a brief visit, on a recurring basis somewhere outside the United States. The task force has suggested specific procedures that the Provost might choose to implement to review such projects. These are detailed in Appendix 1. It is expected that most proposals for international projects would be approved routinely. Some, however, might have to be examined more carefully by the Provost with the help of the faculty committee described below.

Federally-funded projects are already subject to approval under a process that involves the School and university levels. These new university procedures will henceforth be applied simultaneously with, and drawing upon, existing procedures in order not to lengthen the process of approval. The committee will coordinate with the Office for Sponsored Programs and focus its review on the overall relation of the proposed federally-funded project with the University's international activities in the context of the core mission of the University and its Schools.

- In addition, all new proposals for the establishment of international sites, regardless of the size of each site's annual budget, must be reviewed in advance by the Provost's Office.

International sites involve the physical presence of the University — or one of its schools, departments, or centers — outside the United States. This site employs University personnel at a physical space leased, rented, or purchased on behalf of the President and Fellows of Harvard College. The task force has also suggested several ways in which international sites might be conceived and designed. These are described in Appendix 2. In the next section, the task force also proposes a governance scheme to expedite the consideration and approval process for international sites.

- And finally, all proposals that bear the Harvard name must also be reviewed in advance by the Provost's Office, regardless of the size of their budgets, following the regulations in place for several years, which these recommendations leave unchanged.

V. Governance

The University has a long tradition of decentralized governance because it believes in the value of individual creativity and initiative. It is important that this tradition be respected so that new ideas continue to proliferate and take root. But as the University increasingly reaches beyond its boundaries and connects to the world, we must also coordinate our activities more effectively in order to harness shared strengths from different corners of the institution and to realize efficiencies wherever possible.

To better establish coordination and oversight of international projects (including sites, partnerships, and other such initiatives), while continuing to encourage faculty-driven efforts to expand Harvard's presence abroad, we recommend the following:

1. *The University should establish a standing committee on international projects, including sites, whose membership would be constituted by faculty from several of the Schools and appointed by the Provost in consultation with the Deans.*

This committee would develop a specific set of guidelines for establishing international sites and assess new proposals as the Schools propose them. It would compile the

accumulated case history of projects already approved. The committee would also be responsible for reviewing and monitoring proposals to enter into formal partnerships with foreign governments or institutions, or to engage in other international projects, according to the criteria already outlined.

In the same way Boston and Cambridge-based activities are monitored with regularity by the Visiting Committees or some other school-based mechanism, so too should ongoing international activities—no matter what form, be it a physical office or a local partnership—be reviewed periodically. The committee would provide guidance to the Provost and work with the Deans to review such continuing international activities.

Staff hired by, and faculty involved in, School-specific sites or projects would continue to report only to the Dean of their School.

2. *Each Dean in every School of the University should also establish a procedure to assess, monitor, and review international projects, including sites. This procedure should involve consultation with pertinent faculty. Each School will determine the scope of this procedure but the scope should be no narrower than it will be for the new Provost's standing committee. Schools are strongly encouraged to assess, monitor, and review as well projects smaller than those that the new university committee will consider, and inform the university committee of its disposition of those proposals. The university committee will work with the School to disseminate information about these smaller projects as well. Several Schools already have such a procedure, which would thus require no further change.*

The Provost may draw from the membership of these committees for appointments to the Provost's committee or from other faculty in consultation with the Dean of the School.

Thorough review and oversight by the Schools will:

- Ensure that faculty proposals are first reviewed and subsequently monitored by those with closely related standards, interests, and concerns;
 - Facilitate and greatly expedite the process of review by the Provost's committee;
 - Provide scholarly and practical advice to proponents;
 - Permit scrutiny of smaller (budget below \$1 million per year or below one percent of annual budget, whichever is larger) multi-year projects and short-duration projects, should a School so decide; and
 - Sustain the University's traditions of decentralization.
3. *The University should establish a review and approval process for international sites that is swift and easy. We propose a two-step approval process to encourage the development of proposals for international sites while assuring that each proposal is coordinated, if necessary, with initiatives in other parts of the University and would be set up in an administratively sound manner. For examples of international sites, see Appendix 2.*

The first step should be simple. A Dean, Department Chair, or Center Director —upon the completion of the appropriate procedures within the pertinent School —would write a letter to the Provost, with copies to the standing committee and all the Deans of Faculties to explain the wish to establish a new site, request if necessary according to well-established policies the use of the Harvard name, briefly list the academic reasons to justify it and their relationship to the mission of the University and the School, identify the hoped-for date of opening, note the expected size of the staff and their activities, and propose procedures for oversight and periodic review. The committee, if appropriate, consults with the Deans of the Schools regarding their possible interest in joining the proposal and it is expected that in most cases it would quickly accept the proposal. At that moment, the Provost authorizes and endorses the proposal for a new international site and instructs the University General Counsel and the Office of Risk Management and Audit Services, and others as pertinent, to work with the proponents to formulate a detailed proposal for review during a second step. The committee will formulate a checklist of the academically and administratively salient issues to be included in a fully developed step-two proposal. The full proposal will return to the committee in due course for final approval, rejection, or modification. This second approval should in most instances be routine.

The committee will be most concerned with the proposal's consistency with the University's academic mission, evidence of academic need for the site and of good-faith efforts to engage with other Schools of the University, procedures for oversight and review, business plan, and compliance with legal requirements.

4. *The Provost's committee will also review other international projects that meet the criteria established in this report, considering the recommendations in Appendix 1 and upon the completion of the review by the proper committee in the School (see recommendation 2). In most cases, it is expected that such proposals would simply be approved and referred for information and discussion of administrative issues to the Office of the General Counsel, the Office of Risk Management and Audit Services, and the Provost's new administrative unit (see recommendation 5) for expedited implementation.*
5. *The University should create institutional capacity in the central administration to coordinate efforts between the Schools in establishing international sites.*

Such capacity would most logically fall under the Provost's oversight through the creation of an administrative unit with responsibility for the international affairs of the University. The task force expects that such a unit would make sure that information about existing or proposed international sites is shared throughout the University and that administrative functions relating to sites, including legal, finance, risk management, and human resources, are integrated for all international activities. This unit should include both faculty expertise and administrative support.

The task force expects that the Office of the Provost would work closely with Deans and faculty in the various Schools to develop and oversee a variety of University-wide

initiatives and policies regarding international projects, including sites, and other aspects of international engagement, and facilitate interfaculty coordination in the development of such endeavors.

The Office of the Provost would also continue to encourage and welcome faculty-driven efforts to diversify Harvard's presence in foreign countries. The Provost and designated staff, in consultation with the Deans, would assure that strong, well-developed proposals be promoted when the opportunity arises.

In addition to the necessary assessment, monitoring, and review tasks to be performed by the new unit in the Provost's office, the success of this initiative will rest on the will and capacity of these new officers of the university to promote international endeavors by Harvard Schools and professors and advocate on behalf of international projects of various types, including sites, facilitating and expediting their implementation. These new officers must make a serious commitment to act as well as trouble-shooters and problem-solvers, when appropriate, working jointly with the proponents of international projects to realize Harvard's full potential as a University.

Appendix 1: Procedures for the Approval of International Projects (other than sites)

In these instances, Deans of Schools follow well-established procedures to obtain permission, if necessary, regarding the use of the Harvard name. In addition, henceforth before launching a new large-scale multi-year international project budgeted at \$1 million per year or above, or in excess of one percent of a School's annual operating budget, whichever is larger, they file pertinent information with the Office of the General Counsel, the Office of Risk Management and Audit Services, and the Provost's committee on international projects (see Section V). It is expected that most proposals would be approved quickly, but either of the two Offices or the committee may request additional information or discussion if they deem it pertinent.

Professors engaged in projects of this magnitude and duration in another country, without formally using the Harvard name, will file in advance of implementation in the same manner as in the paragraph above, and having abided by the procedures established in each School. It is also expected that most of these proposals would be approved quickly, but there may be requests for additional information or discussion.

The Provost's committee will make available to all Deans of Schools summary information regarding projects throughout the University to facilitate voluntary coordination and cooperation between Deans and professors from various Faculties. The Provost's committee, in consultation with the appropriate Dean of School, and its counterpart committee, may also participate in the periodic review of such international projects, focusing on those aspects of the project that may affect the University as a whole.

Appendix 2: Types of International Sites

The Schools of the University display wide variation in their interest in, and capacity to develop international sites. Participation in such developments should be voluntary. The task force envisages several variants, any of which should be acceptable.

These approaches have in common our hope to preserve individual initiative for professors and Schools and facilitate entrepreneurship and flexibility while providing for a modicum of coordination. Faculty-driven initiatives should proceed unfettered, but within an administrative structure that makes sense for the University as a whole.

A. Single-School International Site

A School of the University would propose, establish, and operate its own international site. The School's Dean would appoint the executive director who would report to this Dean. The School would decide how much physical space it wants, which activities it would sponsor, what would be its budget exposure and business plan, allocate its own resources, and hire and fire personnel. No services would be provided to any other School. The School would follow the procedures for formal approval recommended in Section V of this report.

In addition, once a year the site's executive director would report to the Provost's committee on international projects and sites regarding its principal activities, indicating whatever possibilities may exist, if any, for coordination or cooperation with other Harvard Schools and professors.

B. Modular Approach

Another approach to the establishment and operation of international sites is modular. Each international site would have two or more modules. Each interested School would propose, establish, and operate its own module within an international site. Each Dean would appoint the executive director of the module who would report to that Dean. Each School would decide how much physical space it wants, which activities it would sponsor, and what would be its budget exposure and business plan. Each module's executive director would allocate its own resources. No module need provide services to a School other than its sponsor.

Each international site would have a director for the site as a whole who would report to the Office of the Provost. In most cases, the site's director would also serve as executive director of one of the modules; the fractional allocation of time and compensation would be worked out case by case. The site's director would be the university's representative before all national and sub-national authorities where the site is located and be responsible for, and manage, all formal relations between the university and other public or private institutions in the host country. The site's director would also oversee compliance with the laws and regulations of the host country and the United States on

behalf of the site and all modules. The director would also manage human relations, information technology, real estate, and space allocation for the modules in the site.

C. Integrated Approach

A third approach to the establishment and operation of international sites is to create an interfaculty site that serves all Schools of the University. Proposals may emerge from regional research centers, from the Deans of the Schools working with and through the Office of the Provost, or from the President or Provost directly. The interfaculty site would devise procedures to serve professors and students from any School in the University. The proposing unit would nominate a director who is jointly appointed by, and responsible to, the proponent and the Provost, and who would decide how much physical space is needed, which activities the site would sponsor, and what would be its budget exposure and business plan.

The director would also be the university's representative before all national and sub-national authorities where the site is located and be responsible for, and manage, all formal relations between the university and other public or private institutions in the host country. The director would also oversee the site's compliance with the laws and regulations of the host country and the United States. The director would also manage human relations, information technology, real estate, and space allocation in the site.

D. Hybrid Approach

A hybrid approach would combine the modular and integrated approaches. One School may decide that the level of service that it wishes to provide to its faculty or students would greatly exceed what the integrated approach can accomplish. Other Schools, however, may be satisfied with the level of service that an integrated approach can provide. Cost may be a consideration: the first School may have more resources than the others. We see no problem in thinking about an international site that has two modules. One is created and responds to just one School. The other module exemplifies the integrated approach. The process of establishment, appointment of site director, review, etc. would be akin to the modular approach in this case for the site as a whole, but to the integrated approach for that part of the site that operates on this basis.

Appendix 3: Task Force Membership

Jorge I. Domínguez (*Chair*)

Clarence Dillon Professor of International Affairs
Director, Weatherhead Center for International Affairs

William P. Alford

Henry L. Stimson Professor of Law
Vice Dean, Graduate Program and International Legal Studies
Director, East Asian Legal Studies

David Bloom

Clarence James Gamble Professor of Economics and Demography
Chair, Department of Population and International Health

John H. Coatsworth

Monroe Gutman Professor of Latin American Affairs
Director, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies

Jane Edwards (*ex officio*)

Director, Office of International Programs in the FAS

Deloris Pettis-Donaldson (*ex officio*)

Director, Risk Management and Audit Services

Gregory Poppe (*ex officio*)

University Attorney
Office of the General Counsel

John A. Quelch

Lincoln Filene Professor of Business Administration
Senior Associate Dean for International Development

Dani Rodrik

Rafiq Hariri Professor of International Political Economy
Chair, Master in Public Administration in International Development Program