

EA

PD-AAA-431-A1

Library
498-208

309.2

Memorandum

W 494

Internal Distribution

DATE: November 11, 1971

FROM : SA/IR/RD, Robert *Keenan*, SEADAG Liaison Officer

SUBJECT: Evaluation of SEADAG, Phase I: Administrative Review
498-0208

Attached for your information is the final report of AID's Evaluation of SEADAG, Phase I: Administrative Review. Phase II will be a substantive "Spring Review" type evaluation in late spring or early summer of 1972 and will analyze some of the fundamental issues involved in AID-academic relations, the value of SEADAG in this context, the impact of SEADAG on AID planning, and the SEADAG program under the new agreement

Phase I evaluation recommends that "AID should fund the second year of the two year SEADAG agreement at a level to support the expanded programs developed under the first year of the new agreement." Accordingly, the Supporting Assistance Bureau has agreed to provide \$722,000 toward the 1971-72 SEADAG program. This program includes approximately 24 seminars of which about eight will be held in Asia.

The evaluation identifies the following areas where AID performance should be improved: procedures for AID Mission participation; procedures for submitting seminar topics to SEADAG; procedures for selecting AID participants; and seminar reporting. We will be working with many of you or your staff to formulate the revised procedures. The evaluation recommends that SEADAG try to secure the following four improvements in the seminars: the relating of seminars to the results of recent research; the use by panel chairmen of multi-disciplinary approach whenever practicable; the distribution of seminar papers sufficiently in advance of the meeting in order for academic and AID officials to have time to come to the meeting fully prepared; and rapporteur arrangements to assure that high-quality and useful seminar reports will be prepared on a timely basis.

Thank you for your contributions or your staff's contributions to the evaluation during the past two months.

Attachment:
a/s

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1656 NS



Distribution:

Kenneth Rabin, SA/IR/RD
Henry Gruppe, SA/IR/RD
Robert Johnson, SA/IR/TECH
Edgar Owens, SA/IR/TECH
William Williams, SA/IR/TECH
Edward Schiffman, SA/IR/TECH
Francis LeBeau, SA/IR/TECH
David Mutchler, SA/IR/TECH
Alex Shakow, EAD/I
Victor Morgan, SA/IR/LT
Jack Kent, SA/IR/LT/T
Harold Levin, SA/IR/LT/L
Solomon Silver, SA/IR/C
Cleo Shook, EAD/KPA
Chester Bell, EAD/KPA/K
Frank Correll, EAD/KPA/P
Charles Fossum, SA/VN/ND
Donald Goodwin, SA/VN/ND
Charles Breecher, SA/IR/DP
James Cudney, SA/IR/DP
Adolph Bennett, SA/IR/PROC
Herbert Morris, GC/EA
Samuel Butterfield, AA/TA
Christina Schoux, TA/PM
Curtis Barker, TA/RUR
William Miner, TA/UDS
Glenn Schweitzer, TA/OST
Arthur Coutu, TA/AGF
Madison Broadnax, TA/AGF
William Siffin, TA/DA
John Hilliard, TA/EHR
Martin Forman, TA/N
R. T. Ravenholt, TA/POP
Princeton Lyman, AFR/TECH
Robert Muscat, PPC/PDA
George Marotta, PPC/RC

A.I.D. Evaluation of SEADAG
Phase I: Administrative Review

I. Summary and Recommendation:

Overall SEADAG performance during the past year justifies a continuation of the SEADAG Agreement. The findings of the evaluation show that SEADAG has improved considerably the planning, implementation and administration of SEADAG activities since the inception of the new Agreement, October 1, 1970. A.I.D. officials now consider the planning for seminars satisfactory, the new SEADAG secretariat competent to execute its functions effectively, and the division of research funds into separate SEADAG and A.I.D.-controlled research programs satisfactory to both parties. Some problems remain. The major one is the quality of A.I.D. participation in SEADAG seminars. While there was some excellent A.I.D. participation in all seminars and planning sessions held this past year, in general, it has not yet reached a sufficiently high level for all A.I.D. participants. The usual complaint voiced by both A.I.D. action officers and academics is that A.I.D. staff tend to observe rather than participate as active contributors in seminars. The evaluation suggests courses of action which should help minimize these complaints.

Recommendation: A.I.D. should fund the second year of the two year SEADAG agreement at a level to support the expanded programs developed under the first year of the new agreement.

II. Introduction:

A new agreement was signed with SEADAG effective October 1, 1970. The scope of work of that agreement, together with its general provisions, provides a liberalized approach to the SEADAG process of A.I.D.-academic relations, and one which was felt would allow for greater dialogue with A.I.D.

The new agreement was accompanied by new leadership in SEADAG. Prior to the signing of the agreement, the Honorable Phillips Talbot former Assistant Secretary of State and Ambassador to Greece, became President of the Asia Society. John Quinn, and later Guy Lee, were replaced by Charles McVicker (Executive Secretary, SEADAG); and a new Controller was hired by the Asia Society after the agreement came into effect.

Under this agreement (Article III B), A.I.D., together with SEADAG, is obligated to evaluate the SEADAG program before funding for the

second year of the two-year contract, which expires September 30, 1972, can be approved. After discussions both internally in A.I.D. and with the Asia Society, it was mutually concluded that an administratively-oriented review would be appropriate for the first twelve months' experience of SEADAG under the new agreement. This would be followed by a substantive "Spring Review" type evaluation of SEADAG in late spring or early summer of 1972 which would analyze some of the fundamental issues involved in A.I.D.-academic relations, the value of SEADAG in this context, the impact of SEADAG on A.I.D. planning, and the SEADAG program under the new agreement.

Not enough time has elapsed since the inception of the new agreement to conduct such a basic evaluation of this type now. What this phase of the evaluation attempts to do is to gauge the progress made during the past 12 months in implementing the new agreement; pinpoint problems that either continue from previous years or are products of the new agreement; and find ways to improve SEADAG, and the A.I.D. role in it, in its second year of operation under the new agreement. The evaluation, thus, deals primarily with the experiences of A.I.D. officials under the new agreement and with the new management of SEADAG. Experiences under the earlier agreement have already been evaluated during the spring of 1969.

III. Methodology:

Questionnaires were sent to all A.I.D. action officers for SEADAG panels, the principal participants in SEADAG seminars from various offices of the Technical Assistance Bureau, the Asian country desks, and to the Missions. (See Annex 1) The questions were grouped under the following headings:

- A. Seminars
- B. Research
- C. SEADAG Secretariat
- D. A.I.D. participation

The questions were designed to elicit information on three aspects of SEADAG:

1. the results (of seminars, research, etc.)
2. the process (of dialogue, including mutuality of education for A.I.D. and the academicians, Asians, etc.)
3. the management (by SEADAG, A.I.D., including action officers, project management, etc.)

All addressees were given copies of the Chairman's Report on SEADAG 1970-1971, the new scope of work in the SEADAG agreement, a list of SEADAG seminars held during the period January 1, 1970-June 30, 1971 and of

the papers presented at these meetings, a list of participants in SEADAG planning meetings and seminars during the same period, and a list of all SEADAG research grants and their status of completion.

The questionnaire, while extensive, was not considered exhaustive but rather a preliminary step to screen the views of over 30 A.I.D./W officials and over 20 Mission officials, whose exposure to SEADAG varied from many years to perhaps less than a year.

The replies varied in depth, but nearly half the replies contained insights into problems and issues which called for personal interviews. Where possible, within the constraints of time and personnel, such interviews were held to determine the commonality of complaints, achievements, etc.

Generally, the replies to the questionnaire provide the analysis which enables us to conclude that SEADAG should be continued for the second year of the agreement and funded at a level commensurate with its improved program focus and managerial capability.

IV. Old Problems and the New Agreement:

While both A.I.D. and the academics have in the past severely criticized SEADAG, one must remember that these criticisms stemmed from two fundamentally different viewpoints: A.I.D. felt that the SEADAG program should operate efficiently like an ideal A.I.D. project; the academics felt that SEADAG should be a source of public funds to permit academics to organize research projects and seminars which would enable them to "advise and counsel A.I.D. officials on development in Southeast Asia." A.I.D. viewed SEADAG's deficiencies principally as:

1. An inefficient Secretariat.
2. Inadequate procedures for planning of seminars.
3. Inadequate logistic support of seminars.
4. Lack of relevance or significance of many seminars and research projects to development and/or A.I.D. interests.
5. Little Asian involvement in seminars and in research projects.
6. Papers not prepared on time and seminar minutes poor, late and inaccurate.

The academics saw many of the same problems but stressed:

1. SEADAG appeared principally a tool of A.I.D. which wanted seminar topics determined by A.I.D.
2. The criteria for selection of research projects seemed arbitrary and subject to A.I.D.'s interests and not to academic quality.
3. Inadequate logistic support of seminars.
4. Lack of senior A.I.D. officials in seminars and very uneven A.I.D. participation.
5. SEADAG membership was irrelevant since there were inadequate academic standards.

Major changes incorporated in the revised agreement to overcome these problems included:

1. Granting of near autonomy to SEADAG in operating its programs; A.I.D. can communicate its interests to SEADAG but SEADAG does not have to have A.I.D. approval to carry out seminars and research except for field research, and then only subject to careful Ambassadorial review.

2. Division of research funds into two programs: one under the exclusive control of SEADAG except for the Ambassadorial veto; the other under the exclusive control of A.I.D. and related directly to development concerns determined by Host Governments and the A.I.D. Missions.

3. The dropping of SEADAG membership replaced by participation based on willingness to assume an active and continuing professional role in SEADAG plus possession of special knowledge and/or competence in Southeast Asia development.

4. Agreement that at least one third of the seminars will be A.I.D. program oriented seminars.

5. Increased Asian participation in both the planning and conduct of seminars.

6. Emphasis on careful pre-seminar planning.

7. Upgrading the secretariat to carry out the "planning, organizational leadership and administrative functions necessary for the successful conduct of meetings"; the previous agreement called only for a central secretariat "through which meetings of groups and committees could be convened, managed, recorded and funded. . . ."

V. Phase I Evaluation Findings:

A. Seminars

1. The secretariat has placed heavy emphasis on careful planning for seminars and during the past year sponsored 14 planning sessions (and 14 actual seminars). Six action officers indicated their panels have benefitted from this stronger planning, 2 anticipate benefits in 1971-72 and only 2 saw no evidence of strengthened planning. While the Executive Secretary had to operate with a program principally organized by his predecessor, he has raised the level of A.I.D. interest in the seminar program through the use of planning sessions. Action officers often have indicated that the planning sessions which include about 7 participants are sometimes as informative and useful as the seminars themselves.

2. Under the new seminar procedures, panel chairmen are selected to run a series of two to three seminars within a 12 month period, focusing on a common topic with each seminar treating a special aspect of it. This concept of a series of seminars on a common topic has been received well by both the academics and A.I.D., reintroducing in a majority of panels the concept of a dialogue over time between academics and A.I.D. officials on development issues of interest to both. Most action officers indicated that the seminar topics were relevant to A.I.D.

and one third of the seminars are A.I.D. program-related. Some action officers, however, pointed out that while the topics may be related to A.I.D. interests, the treatment of the topics in the seminars sometimes makes the seminars much less useful to A.I.D. than had been expected.

3. The principal value of the SEADAG seminar to A.I.D. officials is the process of the seminar. For some this means principally the introduction of new faces interested in development in a particular country; to others it means the opportunity to examine an issue from a multi-disciplinary perspective. The value of the seminar to A.I.D. is seriously hampered by the late preparation of discussion papers and the often poor, late and inaccurate seminar minutes. The lateness of papers often results in sterile seminar discussions since neither A.I.D. nor academic participants have had a chance to examine the papers with their colleagues or even to think about them themselves. Inadequate seminar reporting, however, is both a fault of SEADAG as well as of A.I.D.: most action officers, for example, want analytical reports of the seminars yet fail to prepare their own versions in order to share key points of the seminar process with the rest of the Agency.

4. SEADAG has shifted from a predominantly research to a predominantly seminar program. This means that the principal payoff of SEADAG to the Missions has shifted from research to the seminar process. Up to this time, the Missions have benefited only sporadically from SEADAG seminars. The holding of one seminar per panel in Asia now gives the Missions opportunities to participate in the seminars although procedures for their effective participation have not yet been worked out. Six Missions and the Office of Regional Economic Development can suddenly populate a seminar above the desired 20 even 25 maximum number of participants. Panel chairmen also may not know the Mission personnel and therefore may not know whom to invite except representatives from technical offices.

B. Research

1. The division of the research funds into two separate programs is considered satisfactory by both A.I.D. and the academics although the latter would like to see an increase in SEADAG research funds. The East Asia Research program under A.I.D.'s control has been well received by the Missions, and A.I.D. has proceeded to make the program even more responsive to the Missions' needs by transferring the management of the program to the field. The A.I.D. program also eliminates one of the Mission's earlier objections that not enough SEADAG research was undertaken jointly with Asian scholars. In view of the increasing numbers of highly qualified Asian experts staffing Asian institutions, A.I.D.'s research program emphasizes support for research proposals submitted by Asians or jointly with Asians, thus helping to increase the contributions of these institutions to the development of their countries. The acerbic academic criticism of 1970 over SEADAG research was absent during this year due to the elimination of the A.I.D. veto (except for political sensitivity) and the adoption of

selection criteria which met generally acceptable academic standards. ISAC (Interuniversity Southeast Asia Committee of the Association for Asian Studies) selected two members to participate in the SEADAG research screening committee after a close vote, whereas in 1970 ISAC was more bitterly opposed to the SEADAG research program.

2. There was strong agreement that the seminar process usually has its most effective impact on A.I.D. when the seminar focuses on new ideas supported by recent field research. It was hoped that SEADAG would strengthen the ties between SEADAG seminars and new research during 1971-72. SEADAG has several alternative ways to do this. SEADAG can select panel chairmen on the basis that they incorporate new research into the seminars. SEADAG can encourage panel chairmen to devote part of their seminars to examine and recommend improvements in the research design of approved SEADAG and A.I.D. East Asia research projects or to evaluate completed research projects. SEADAG can organize ad hoc seminars to present and evaluate for A.I.D. the significant findings of selected completed SEADAG and A.I.D. East Asia research. Relating seminars to completed research would be greatly appreciated by A.I.D., especially in view of the large number of final research reports due within the next 12 months.

C. SEADAG Secretariat

1. The SEADAG Secretariat is considered competent to handle its administrative functions. Logistic support for the seminars is satisfactory though the timing of seminar papers and the preparation of seminar reports, responsibilities shared with panel chairmen, are unsatisfactory. Communications between SEADAG and A.I.D. action officers are satisfactory.

2. The Secretariat is considered competent to provide the leadership to organize and run a seminar program of 10 panels holding a maximum 2 to 3 seminars a year (including one seminar in Asia) with one or two planning sessions per panel. Most action officers recognize that a great deal of the Executive Secretary's time is spent trying to locate new panel chairmen who can run seminars well and on topics of interest to A.I.D. Several A.I.D. action officers as well as several panel chairmen have complained that the secretariat has overstepped its prerogatives by selecting new panel chairmen without the concurrence of the academics already participating in the panel or the A.I.D. action officer. While these complaints are important, they are indicators that the secretariat is action-oriented and is trying to cut unnecessary lag time between successive panel chairmen when the incumbent and the A.I.D. action officer cannot agree on new seminar topics and potential chairmen. In some cases there may have been too great haste on the part of the secretariat, but this may also have resulted from the feeling of being pressured by A.I.D. to perform. Overall, the secretariat's improved control over the operations of the seminar program has greatly improved the reputation of the secretariat in A.I.D.'s eyes but simultaneously raised objections from academics who resent SEADAG's tighter procedures.

3. The Secretariat also has introduced procedures to help chairmen run their seminars more effectively. The secretariat, for instance, tries to limit the size of seminars to 20 participants (excluding observers) which appears to be in the neighborhood of the maximum number for an effective exchange among all the participants. The secretariat tries to keep the number of major papers presented at the seminar to 6 or below since this is generally the maximum number which can be discussed thoroughly in a two day seminar if the papers are indeed worthy of such discussions. The secretariat tries with varying success to persuade the seminar chairmen to invite participants with different backgrounds to assure multi-disciplinary discussion of development issues. Additionally, the secretariat encourages meaningful Asian participation by budgeting up to 5 round trips for Asians to come to seminars in the States as well as holding one seminar per panel in Asia with only 5 U.S. scholars budgeted to attend each.

D. A.I.D. Participation

1. A number of action officers admitted that they have felt A.I.D. participation was poor, corroborating what academics have often complained about. The usual complaint is that A.I.D. staff tend to observe rather than participate as active contributors in seminars. This faulty (i.e., overly passive) role perception may stem from a number of factors: lack of preparation for meetings (although this may be due in some cases to late delivery of seminar papers); over-identification with a narrow, work-defined interest; too much preoccupation with maintaining a "low profile" vis-à-vis academics (too low a profile vis-à-vis Asians as well: at one Asian seminar, for instance, Mission participants were asked to reserve any comments for coffee breaks and the final session in order to maintain a low profile during the seminar.); the fact that too little is required of A.I.D. participants in terms of "formal" contributions, including preparation of seminar papers. It may also stem from uncertainty about SEADAG's purpose and what they're supposed to do at seminars.

2. In general, neither SEADAG nor A.I.D. has a systematic way of selecting A.I.D. participants or planning seminars to attract the interest of A.I.D. officials other than those directly interested in the topic. Action officers in some cases have indicated they have no control over A.I.D. participation and were vague about who did. The bulk of A.I.D. participation tends to come from the technical offices with the generalists, program officers, and decision makers left out; certainly, the desks feel left out. Additionally, while action officers look for a multidisciplinary approach on the part of the academics, they overlook the value of having an analogous mix on the A.I.D. side.

3. Even if appropriate procedures for selecting A.I.D. participants are formulated, they may have marginal effect on improving A.I.D. participation and the seminar process itself unless there are sufficient travel funds to send 4 or 5 A.I.D. participants to each of the seminars. When only 1 - 2 A.I.D. participants appear at a seminar of 20 or more participants, the seminar usually turns into a discussion among the academics rather than developing into a dialogue between A.I.D. participants and the academics.

E. SEADAG Membership

Dropping the concept of SEADAG membership made little difference substantively to A.I.D. since no standards were applied to membership except interest in SEADAG. The concept of SEADAG membership still lingers in the minds of many academics as well as in the minds of many A.I.D. officials because the name SEADAG implies membership. Some academics still think of SEADAG as an advisory body to A.I.D. though this concept never worked out in practice.

F. Impact on A.I.D. Planning

Unfortunately, there is no pattern indicating that SEADAG activities are tending on the whole to have more of an identifiable impact on A.I.D. planning. One can select a number of important seminars, research reports, or seminar papers or a few ideas picked up from SEADAG meetings to support SEADAG "successes" but their frequency is no more this past year than in earlier years. Among these are:

1. The 1970-71 series of Mekong seminars on resettlement may lead to the Asian participants submitting through the Mekong Committee a major resettlement planning project for A.I.D. funding.
2. Dr. Theodore Smith's research on "Indonesian Bureaucratic Capacity and the New Five-Year Plan" was published in Indonesian newspapers and used by several officers of the Government of Indonesia.
3. USAID/Djakarta and the Indonesia Desk have used the research of Dr. Bruce Glassburner on "Pricing of Agricultural Surplus Food Commodities in Indonesia: Rationale and Economic Effects."
4. The Thai National Institute for Development Administration has made Dr. Ladd Thomas' research on "Designing a Plan for Resettlement of Those People Who Will Lose Their Land as A Result of the Pa Mong Project" required reading in one of their courses.
5. The Office of Science and Technology in the Technical Assistance Bureau has credited the SEADAG and East Asia Research programs as precedents for their proposed NSF and mini-grant programs.
6. The discussions at a recent Indonesia seminar on Non-Economic Factors in Indonesian Development led to Gadjah Mada University submitting a research proposal, which was funded by the East Asia Research Program, on "The Impacts of Government Subsidy Upon the Villages in Java and Bali."

VI. Priority Areas for Improvement:

A. A.I.D. Participation

The next quantum jump in increasing the utility of SEADAG seminars to A.I.D. lies in improving A.I.D. participation. A.I.D. should consider the SEADAG secretariat as a resource and systematically take advantage of the opportunities provided by this resource. Following are specific actions which could be taken:

1. Selection of U.S. Government Participants: As a general rule the U.S. Government should be allowed about 25% of the participant slots, which means 5 people in a seminar of 20, whether the seminar is in Washington, D.C., New York City, San Francisco, or Bangkok. (For seminars of the same size held in the United States, a desirable allocation of the remaining slots might be 5 Asian participants from overseas and 10 participants located in the United States. For seminars held in Asia, a desirable allocation of the non-U.S. Government slots might be 10 Asian participants living overseas and 5 non-Asian participants.)

The A.I.D. action officer should be able to negotiate with the panel chairman the selection of U.S. Government participants and add or subtract names in order to keep a multi-disciplinary mix of U.S. Government participants. The action officer should be given the responsibility of screening out U.S. Government officials who in his judgment will not contribute to the seminar even if this means only 2 or 3 U.S. Government participants joining the seminar. Offices who feel they should be represented but whose representatives would not contribute to the seminar can be included as observers as long as the observers do not exceed the number of U.S. Government participants.

2. Travel Funds: The Supporting Assistance Bureau and the Office of East Asia Development Programs should be willing to send on an average 3 participants to SEADAG seminars and 2 participants to seminar planning sessions held in the United States. The Bureau already is paying through the SEADAG agreement about \$9,000 direct seminar costs for each seminar, excluding secretariat costs and Asia Society overhead. On an average basis, the travel costs for three A.I.D. participants attending one SEADAG seminar in the United States would total about \$400. It would seem reasonable to spend this small amount of funds for the Bureau and EADP to take full advantage of the seminar and develop a dialogue between A.I.D. and academic participants on issues of interest to A.I.D. One to 2 additional participants can be expected to attend from other bureaus, such as the Technical Assistance Bureau and PPC, for an average of 4-5 A.I.D. participants per seminar.

The Bureau and the Office of East Asia Development should be willing to send one participant to each SEADAG seminar held in Asia if the field trip to attend the seminar can be combined with other official business for which the participant would travel to Asia. The principal A.I.D. participation in these seminars should come from A.I.D. Missions.

3. Seminar Topics: Last year the SEADAG Liaison Officer canvassed the action officers and desks for seminar topics of interest to them. On the whole, the list was interesting but not useful because most of these topics were not thought out well in terms of academic interest, program interest and appropriateness for handling in the context of a SEADAG seminar. The SEADAG Liaison Officer, in conjunction with the SEADAG Secretariat, should draft a short but comprehensive format for A.I.D.'s use in proposing seminar topics; such a format would underscore for SEADAG A.I.D.'s willingness to give serious support to each topic and be helpful to the Secretariat when conveying A.I.D.'s suggestions to academics for their support or constructive alternatives.

4. Reporting: The action officer or another A.I.D. participant with the appropriate knowledge should be designated to prepare an analytical report (for general problem seminars) which would share the SEADAG process with the rest of the Agency. The report should evaluate the credentials of the academics for the benefit of the Missions in particular, should analyze the discussions in terms of what A.I.D. is doing or thinking about doing, and should try to elicit Mission comments to get them involved in the seminars before the Asian seminar takes place.

5. Procedures for Mission Participation: The action officers should try to involve the Missions in the seminar program as fully as possible. Beginning several months before SEADAG begins to recruit new chairmen for the panels, the action officers should canvass their Mission counterparts for ideas and topics which the Missions would like to see developed in SEADAG seminars, and come to agreement on those topics and ideas which should be submitted to SEADAG in the format discussed above. Direct correspondence between SEADAG and the Missions should be encouraged to facilitate the development of a seminar series where SEADAG decides to pursue a topic proposed by the Missions. Otherwise, it is suggested that SEADAG continue to correspond primarily with A.I.D. Washington. The action officers should encourage in the planning for the Asian seminars the involvement of Mission Directors, Deputy Mission Directors and Program Officers as well as the action officers' technical counterparts.

B. SEADAG Management

It is recommended that the secretariat try to secure the following four improvements in the seminars: distribution of seminar papers sufficiently in advance of the meeting in order for academic and A.I.D. officials to have time to come to the meeting fully prepared; rapporteur arrangements to assure that high-quality and useful seminar reports will be prepared on a timely basis; use by panel chairmen of the multi-disciplinary approach whenever practicable; and relating of seminars to the results of recent research.

C. A.I.D. - SEADAG Relations

The selection of topics or panel chairmen will remain a point of tension between A.I.D. and SEADAG; it is the nature of the relationship that makes this inevitable. However, this tension can be minimized by a greater understanding on the part of A.I.D. officials of SEADAG's role and limits of SEADAG's responsiveness to A.I.D.'s immediate interests. A.I.D. must accept the fact that we are competing with the academics for SEADAG's attention and that the level of A.I.D. performance in SEADAG seminars is perhaps the greatest asset we have in persuading SEADAG of the merits of our suggestions.

SA/IR/RD
10/29/71

The questions related to SEADAG can be divided into three categories: 1) the results (of seminars, research, etc.); 2) the process (of dialogue, mutuality of education for AID and the academics, Asians, etc.); 3) the management by SEADAG, AID, including action officers, project management, etc.). You may wish to consider dealing with the following questions in these terms or specifically in terms of the format posed below. In any case, our purpose is to provide an opportunity to improve the program during the second year of its operation, if the evaluation indicates that continuation is appropriate. We pose the questions below to give you an idea of the range of issues we hope you will cover, but please do not feel bound by this format. We would like to have whatever comments you care to make on these or other issues.

A. The Seminars

1. What evidence have you seen of stronger seminar planning, particularly longterm planning? Was there more direct communication with the Asians in the planning of Seminars? Were seminar subjects relevant to A.I.D.
2. Has there been a greater continuity in the flow of ideas from seminar to seminar within the panel? If so, did you find it useful or repetitive?
3. Was the timing of the seminars well planned in terms of preparation and distribution of papers, notification of participants, scheduling of meetings so as to coincide with or benefit from other meetings, etc.?

4. How would you characterize the quality of seminar participants? Was there an interdisciplinary mix of American academicians? Were there sufficient Asians at appropriate meetings? Were they from the academic or policy positions most appropriate for the subject matter and anticipated results? Were the A.I.D. participants articulate and qualified? If seminars were held in Asia, did Asian attendees have at least equal, if not greater, opportunity to participate than U.S. nationals -- or did the latter tend to dominate?

5. Were the papers presented at seminars germane to A.I.D. interests? Were they of publishable quality? Did they provide new data for useful planning of future programs? What was the title of the best seminar paper you came across during the past year? What made it so good?

6. Were the minutes of the meetings helpful? Were they analytical or reportorial? Which kind is most useful to you? Were they issued in a timely manner?

7. In what ways was the process of seminars useful to you in terms of enhancement of your capability or that of other A.I.D. representatives? Do you believe that they were useful to the field? If so, through what mechanism did it increase the total knowledge about a particular problem? (Reports of meeting? Action officers comments? Attendance at meetings? Others?).

8. What type of seminar are you finding most useful: panel meetings or

special purpose, ad hoc meetings? Would you like to see more of the latter? Why? Why not?

9. If you participated in a SEADAG seminar held on Asian soil during the last 10 months, please describe the advantages and disadvantages you feel it held, vs., seminars you've attended in the U.S. To whom do you feel most benefits accrue when a meeting is held in Asia? When held in the U.S.?

10. What kind of effect do you think the multidisciplinary representation by both A.I.D. and the academicians had upon A.I.D. personnel at the meetings? On academic personnel? If only 1 or 2 disciplines were represented in each panel, what effect do you think this might have?

11. What type of follow up did, or should, A.I.D. or SEADAG make in spreading the views presented at seminars both in AID/W and in the field?

12. Do you know of any specific instances where SEADAG seminar papers, reports, or discussion/ ^{were} ⁱⁿ included/ the process of A.I.D. Programming? A.I.D. Project? Host government or academic institution programs or projects or planning? If so, please describe them.

b. Research

1. Do you feel that the SEADAG Research Program (as distinguished from the East Asia Research Program) chose appropriate research topics in accordance with the scope of work of the agreement?

2. Do you feel the reporting by research grantees has been adequate in areas of your concern? The interim reports? The final reports?
3. How are research results distributed? In the field? In Washington?
4. Does, or should, the research relate to panel programs and priorities? How closely?
5. Do you know of specific instances where A.I.D. has used the reports of SEADAG research in programming, or program planning? In clarifying program issues? Do you know instances where Asian governments and institutions have done the same? American institutions?

C. SEADAG Secretariat

1. Do you feel that the management of the panels by the SEADAG Secretariat has been adequate?
2. What problems still need to be attacked? What do you feel are the strengths of the new management?
3. What is the maximum number of seminars both planning and substantive that you feel the SEADAG Secretariat can handle within your panel?

D. A.I.D. Participants

Do you feel that A.I.D. participation in the seminar process has been

has been adequate? (a) helping to plan meetings, select participants, select agenda; (b) preparation of papers; (c) attendance at and contributions during seminar meetings and (d) follow-up activity, especially dissemination in AID/W and to the fields of new ideas or new data. From the East Asia Bureau? From the Vietnam Bureau? From the other Bureaus? How might it be strengthened? What problems internal to A.I.D. do you feel affect the SEADAG process, and how might they be eliminated?