

9310123001501

9310230

60-AL-678-
Report Symbol U-447 D1

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

1. PROJECT TITLE Agriculture and Economic Development 211 (d) Michigan State University			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-11-140-123	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/AGR/ESP
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) Terminal 7p	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 70	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 76	C. Final Input Delivery FY N/A	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ _____ B. U.S. \$ 744,890	
			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) June 1970 To (month/yr.) September 1976 Date of Evaluation Review July 13, 1978	

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIC, which will present detailed reports.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>Project terminated in September 1976 and no further action is contemplated to extend grant or have a follow on project.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Batch # 17</p> <p>185I/052</p> <p>3501</p>		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

John C. Day
Dr. John C. Day, DS/AGR/ESP

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: *Leon T. Hesser*

Typed Name: DS/AGR, Leon Hesser

Date: 8/15/78

976-M
8/15/78

13. SUMMARY

The 211(d) grant received by Michigan State University (MSU) was originally funded for a five-year period, from June 1970 to June 1975. It was later extended through September 1976 with additional funding. The purposes of the grant were twofold: to expand the university's competence in agricultural economics related to LDC's and to develop MSU's capacity in research, training, consulting, and technical assistance that AID, LDC's, and other donors could draw upon.

Progress under the grant was greatest in areas of most consistency with university-related functions, such as graduate training, staff development, and research. Difficulties were encountered in fulfilling commitments which required the university to go beyond its normal sphere of activities. This was particularly true of two objectives: cooperation with other grantees and talent sharing (i.e., technical assistance to AID). It should be noted that these deficiencies were characteristic of 211(d) grants in agricultural economics at that time and were not peculiar to MSU. Also, these weaknesses were due, in part, to inadequacies in AID's leadership of the program. Grant activities were strengthened when AID assumed a more active role after 1973.

The purposes of the grant were met in part; MSU's capability in LDC agricultural economics seems to be enhanced. The task remains to identify means of sustaining this capability and of enabling AID, LDC's, and other donors to use it.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

As noted in the 1975 PAR, the grant did not specify levels of performance which MSU was expected to achieve. The lack of objective indicators of goal attainment made a final evaluation difficult. The lack of specificity in the project outputs contributed to poor communication between MSU and AID in the early stages of the project.

This evaluation is based on analysis of the project design reflected in the Grant Project Statement, final annual report (for 1975-76), and related correspondence. The final annual report was sent to AID by MSU on June 14, 1978.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS/VALIDITY OF ASSUMPTIONS

Changes occurred, not in the actual operating conditions of the project, but in both parties' perceptions of the purposes and assumptions that determined their relationship. AID placed considerable emphasis on the technical assistance aspects of MSU's talent-sharing role. AID's assumption was that sufficient commitment to international development work by the MSU faculty core group would result in the fulfillment of AID staffing

needs, particularly at AID/W. In contrast, MSU's view of talent-sharing was oriented toward faculty development and experience in LDC's. These are not incompatible views, but the project designers overlooked a factor that severely hampered progress toward AID's hopes for talent-sharing: the MSU core group's existing commitments to teaching, research, extension, and on-going contract and consulting activities limited their availability to AID. Thus, the faculty members were unable or unwilling to forego other obligations in order to meet AID's goals for utilization of MSU capability in international agricultural economics.

Efforts were made to eliminate this weakness, but the lags in identification and response severely limited the usefulness of the project to AID. Unfortunately, satisfactory talent-sharing arrangements only seemed to emerge in the final year of the 211(d) grant. (See "Outputs".)

16. and 17. SUMMARY OF OUTPUTS AND INPUTS (from 1975-76 annual report)

Major successes in meeting grant objectives occurred in the areas of faculty development, graduate training, and research by faculty and students. MSU developed numerous linkages with LDC's, especially in Africa, which was an area of particular interest to AID. Other outputs during the six-year grant period include:

- development of a core staff of 15 faculty members specializing in international development work (an addition of one position)
- increases in annual enrollment of graduate students from less than 100 to more than 125
- increased enrollment of graduate students from LDC's to 50% of the total, with a shift toward more students from African countries
- 85 advanced degrees awarded to students interested in international development
- 50 students received research support from 211(d) funds
- 211(d) financing of LDC field research for faculty and students
- development of at least five specialized graduate courses related to LDC topics
- development of four research programs
 - The African Rural Development Network
 - Agricultural Sector Analysis and Simulation Project
 - Rural Agriculture Program Management
 - Agricultural Marketing Organization in Latin America
- numerous publications, conference papers, dissertations, theses, etc.

Weaknesses of the project centered on two objectives:

- 1) talent-sharing with AID
- 2) involvement in joint undertaking with other grantees.

AID must bear a considerable amount of responsibility for insufficient achievement of the joint undertakings objective. MSU ~~stated~~ the need for coordination and joint planning among 211(d) recipients in its 1972 Report (p. 4), but there was no known response from AID at that time. Eventually, efforts toward this objective declined in significance. The objective of promoting cooperation among the various 211(d) grantees, including MSU, was not a complete failure. Faculty exchanges and joint seminars occurred, especially in later years of the grant.

A "Special Evaluation of AID 211(d) Grants to Improve Capability in Agricultural Economics Related to LDC's," in December 1973, clearly identified the failure of talent-sharing agreements to provide the agricultural economists needed by AID. Unlike the disinterested attitude it displayed toward joint undertakings by 211(d) grantees, AID gave a more aggressive response to the shortfalls in talent-sharing and utilization which characterized the 211(d) grants.

The April 1975 "Proposal for Extension of 211(d) Grant" (p. 6) states that of the 10 man-years of service MSU agreed to under the talent-sharing agreement, only four man years were provided (MSU had, however, performed services through other contracts with AID and LDC's). In its 1975-76 Report (p. 2), MSU states that it provided 87 man-weeks of short-term and 13 man-years of long-term assistance to AID, foreign governments, and foundation projects in LDC's. Although this shows evidence that MSU was making some effort in the direction of providing talent-sharing, it is doubtful that AID ever realized the amounts or types of technical assistance that were originally intended by the grant. MSU tended to consider much of its activities in LDC's as talent-sharing, even when these activities were outside the narrower definition used by AID.

The institutional constraints on MSU's ability to meet AID's needs (mentioned earlier in this evaluation) and AID's inadequate response to the problem, prevented the Agency from realizing many direct benefits from the project. The fact that AID's needs went unmet does not mean that MSU's new capabilities were wasted. MSU was directing its attention toward a variety of development-related efforts included in the grant. Although MSU agreed to the terms of the project, objectives and purposes incorporated in the grant may not have been appropriate; either in terms of MSU's ability to provide talent-sharing outputs or AID's ability to provide leadership inputs.

The grant was extended from its original date of conclusion (June 30, 1975) to September 30, 1976. There was additional funding of \$100,000. Actual expenditures in 1975-76 were \$156,271. Accumulated expenditures for 1970-1976 were \$744,890 of a total grant of \$745,000.

The purposes for the grant extension to September 1976 were the following:

- completion of research on agricultural development topics by graduate students,
- completion of research by faculty members with direct utilization foreseen for AID or other assistance agencies,
- salary support for faculty members available to AID on a short-term basis.

In the light of MSU's 1975-76 annual report, it appears that the grant extension served the interests of MSU in developing its department (Purpose I of the original grant), but that AID's staffing needs were still not realized to the extent hoped for (Purpose II) over the six-year course of the grant.

18. PURPOSE

The purposes of the grant were to:

I) "Strengthen and expand competence in agricultural economics related to problems in LDC's."

II) "Strengthen and develop institutional capacity in research, training, consulting, and technical assistance that AID, LDC's, and other donors can draw upon for expert advice and assistance related to problems in international agricultural development."

MSU made progress toward improving its competence and capacity in dealing with agricultural economic issues (See "Outputs"). The shortfalls in the project centered on the ability to marshal this new talent and to utilize the capabilities of MSU staff and students in a way that met MSU's commitments to AID's immediate needs for expertise. There was a difference in interpretation of the commitment between AID and MSU on talent-sharing (c.f., attachment "B" of "Comprehensive Review of 211(d) Grants in Agricultural Economics, "March 24, 1975, which deals with the controversy over "utilization"). Other constraints to accomplishing Purpose II were obligations that competed for the time of MSU personnel and lack of leadership by AID early in the project.

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

The "Program or Sector Goal" row is blank in the logical framework of the project design summary. The goals and subgoals of the project are elusive, which may account for some of the divergence in expectations of AID and 211(d) grantees. Narratives in various project documents indicate that the project was designed in response to rising demand for specialists capable of improving performance in LDC agricultural sectors, with resulting promotion of overall economic and social development.

In this context, project outcomes emerge beyond the range of designated project outputs. Considerable problems were met in realizing AID's immediate needs for expertise in agricultural economics, but MSU did make numerous contributions toward long run international development efforts (See "Outputs"). The background of experience obtained by students and faculty, and the educational opportunities made possible by the grant (especially in the light of MSU's recruitment efforts in LDC's) are major assets of the program.

20. BENEFICIARIES

Given MSU's strong commitment to development, it is likely that LDC's will benefit from the 211(d) grant in ways that go well beyond the objectives and time constraints of this project. The fact that it was difficult to establish effective utilization of grant-developed capacity does not preclude the possibility that MSU faculty and the professionals produced by its degree program will be utilized in LDC's. In particular, LDC graduates of MSU's program who were recruited under the grant are likely to make significant development contributions.

Since no provision was made to sustain the core group of faculty at MSU, future utilization of their talents by LDC's and AID may be restricted.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

No unplanned effects were identified.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

1) The MSU personnel's commitments hampered their ability to meet AID's needs for specialists. Faculty members may not have the flexibility of schedules or desire to fulfill AID's needs for agricultural economists.

2) The grant was most successful in enhancing MSU's capability to perform in university-type tasks.

3) AID did not follow through on its leadership obligations. MSU could not be expected to ensure that AID's needs were met (i.e., AID must look after its own interests).

4) Objective means of verification and evaluation of progress were needed to prevent misinterpretation of project goals, purposes, outputs, and inputs.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

I. There is a need for reconsideration of the appropriateness of talent-sharing and AID's expectations of utilizing university capabilities to meet the Agency's need for specialists. A compromise must be reached between AID and university perceptions of commitments entailed by talent-sharing and utilization arrangements. AID must recognize and assert its leadership role. Grant commitments should be specified in more detail.

II. Initial project plans should have anticipated the eventual need to sustain the capacity developed at MSU. Alternative funding for programs, salaries, and expenses will be difficult to obtain when the 211(d) grant expires. If funding cannot be found, the efforts of the core group may be redirected, precluding opportunities for future utilization of the capacity developed using 211(d) funds.