

**SECID**



The South-East Consortium for International Development

---

Technical Support to Mission  
AFR-0510-I-00-4007-00  
Work Order No. 22  
Burkina Faso

Scope of Work for the  
Long-Term Development Planning Team  
for the  
Institut Du Developpment Rural (IDR)  
of the  
University of Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

Submitted by:

Dr. Suchet Louis, Agricultural Research Administration  
Dr. Richard Hopkins, Education Policy and Planning

Contractor:

The South-East Consortium for International Development  
1612 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 704  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 429-1804

Contract No. AFR-0510-I-00-4007-00

The views expressed herein are the views of the Contractor and are not  
necessarily the views of A.I.D.

SCOPE OF WORK  
FOR THE  
LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT PLANNING TEAM  
FOR THE  
INSTITUT DU DEVELOPPEMENT RURAL (IDR)  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF OUAGADOUGOU  
BURKINA FASO

REPORT OF  
SECID TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TEAM  
TO  
USAID/BURKINA

Suchet L. Louis  
Agricultural Research  
Administration  
Tuskegee University  
Tuskegee, Alabama

Richard L. Hopkins  
Education Policy and  
Planning  
University of Maryland  
College Park, Maryland

November 15-30, 1986

## CONTENTS

### Introduction

- I. Development of the IDR and the Gampela site up to the present time.
  - A. Brief history.
  - B. Most significant gains of the AgHRD project.
    1. Participant training
    2. Gampela experiment station
  
- II. Present plans of the IDR for the development of the Gampela site.
  
- III. Major issues presently hindering development of IDR and the Gampela site.
  - A. Burkinabe teaching and research faculty
  - B. Recurrent costs
  - C. Development of a more applied curriculum
  
- IV. Suggested long-term planning process for the development of the Gampela site.
  - A. The purpose of long-term planning.

B. Phase 1: The setting of long-term goals and the suggestion of various alternative methods of attaining those goals.

1. Involvement of IDR, ministry, and research institute personnel in the planning process.

2. Exploration of various possible methods of attaining long-term goals (Included here are suggestions for possible eventual uses of the Gampela site).

C. Phase 2: The detailed planning and costing of the most promising alternative plans, allowing for choices and fallback positions as development proceeds.

D. Anticipated products of the planning process

1. The plan

2. Organizational changes and initiated activities

3. Personnel development

V. Suggested long-term planning team for the development of the Gampela site.

A. Organizations and team members involved.

- B. Suggested time line for the planning process and team member involvement.
- C. Outcomes: Written long-term plan and understanding of processes of the development and use of a long term plan by IDR and ministry personnel.
- D. Qualifications and job descriptions for expatriate consultants.

## Introduction

The Institut du Développement Rural (IDR) of the University of Ouagadougou is presently planning a move to the Gampèla site some 20 kilometers from Ouagadougou. Ouagadougou is the present site of this University, including the IDR. This rural site has begun to be developed as a research and teaching site for IDR for agricultural, livestock, and forestry research and teaching, with aid from USAID/Burkina. IDR is planning a complete move to the site to better integrate teaching, research, and rural development activities.

In Burkina Faso, as in many developing countries, much research and teaching is located in the University under the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, while most government rural development and extension activities are located in other ministries. In Burkina Faso the other relevant ministries are the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (forestry and water resources), and the Ministry of the Peasant Question (non-formal rural youth education). In addition, related research institutes (INERA, IRBET, IRSH) separate from the University are also located in the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. There is a desire to link research and teaching with rural development and extension work, but such linkages involve cooperation and coordination between at least these four ministries. The U.S. model of locating

agricultural extension in land grant universities has little hope of being copied any time soon in many developing countries, Burkina Faso included, however the U.S. mentality favoring, and the practices developed, linking research, extension, and education could be used as models to adapt to the multi-ministry situation. Such an adaptation would take much experimentation and effort, with dedicated involvement by Burkinabe at all levels in the various organizations involved.

In the IDR, the three Ministries, and the research institutes there appears to be great interest in developing such linkages by key leaders and personnel. The Gampela site, as somewhat virgin territory in terms of development and feelings of ownership, appears to be a highly promising location to develop such cooperative linkages as the site is developed. A long term plan for the development of this site by IDR in cooperation with other Ministries, research institutes, and perhaps PVO's or other organizations seems an ideal opportunity to experiment with and stimulate the development of key linkages between farmers, extension agents, researchers, teachers, and students in Burkina Faso. The potential benefit of the development of such linkages seems to warrant the effort required to explore ways to accomplish cooperation and coordination between several ministries, and appropriate cooperative long-term planning of the Gampela site at this time presents a promising opportunity to achieve this in some hopefully key and catalyzing ways.

In coming to this conclusion, this technical assistance team combined previous experience in the development of higher education and agriculture in developing countries, including the University of Ouagadougou and the IDR, with a series of site visits and discussions during the present two week period. Persons contacted included:

- (1) Clément Ouedraogo  
Rector, University of Ouagadougou
- (2) Nouhoussine Nacro  
Director of Public Relations, University of  
Ouagadougou
- (3) Sessouma Guillaume  
Director, IDR
- (4) Wedraogo François  
Director of Studies, IDR
- (5) Palo Pierre  
Farm Manager, Gampela site
- (6) Hebié Ditalamane, Diarra Boureima, and  
Kabré Alphonse  
Department Heads, IDR
- (7) Several faculty members, IDR
- (8) Benoit Ouedraogo  
General Secretary, Ministry of the Peasant  
Question
- (9) Kiemde Paul  
General Secretary, Ministry of Higher Education  
and Scientific Research

4-  
(10) Balma Didier

Head, Studies and Programs

Division, Ministry of Higher Education and  
Scientific Research

(11) Kambiré Jean-Martin

General Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture  
and Livestock

(12) Kambou Jean-Baptiste

General Secretary, Ministry of Environment  
and Tourism

(13) Ouali Firmin, Head of Programs, and Bosso N'Gueta  
(ISNAR) Technical Advisor

INERA, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific  
Research

This report proposes that a long term plan for the Gampela site be developed and that the planning process intimately and actively involve personnel from IDR, the Ministries, the research institutes, and other organizations as appropriate. It is suggested, therefore, that this proposal, or its revision subsequent to review by USAID, be translated into French and shared with IDR and the other ministries, institutes, and organizations involved for their further reaction, input, and consideration. It is essential that all parties have a sense of involvement in and commitment to all stages of the planning process proposed if it is to result in significantly increased cooperative linkages.

## **I. Development of the IDR and the Gampela site up to the present time**

Background information on "Institut du Développement Rural" (IDR) is necessary to better understand the evolution of this institution of higher learning within the current changes which are taking place at the University of Ouagadougou.

### **A. Brief History**

Created in 1973, IDR, formerly Institut Supérieur Polytechnique (ISP), has trained to date 152 Engineers of Rural Development; in Agronomy (67), Livestock Production (53) and Forestry and Water Management (32). Initially ISP had no experimental farm, and no concurrent practical teaching was possible during the academic year. Prior to 1979, three (3) opportunities were offered to students to become in contact with the real agricultural world: "summer practicum", "field trips" and "memoire preparation". It was obvious that a remedy was direly needed to improve the quality of the graduates and to enhance their efficiency on the work sites. In 1977, USAID responded to a Government of Burkina Faso (GOB) request and the Agricultural Human Resources Development Project (AgHRD) was designed. The South-East Consortium for International Development (SECID) submitted a project paper to AID/Washington in December 1977. It took about one year before SECID was

granted the project implementation contract. In January 1979, SECID signed the contract with USAID. During 1979, two major events occurred in the history of IDR.

- (1) The arrival of the SECID technical assistance team and the opening of AgHRD activities at the University.
- (2) The creation of the "filière courte" at ISP for the training of the "Ingénieurs des Techniques du Développement Rural" ("ITDR").

To date, 154 ITDRs have been trained with 63 in agronomy, 47 in livestock production and 44 in forestry and water management. The creation of the "filière courte" degree (3 years) responded more to the need of offering an opportunity to and absorbing the "filière longue" (5 years) students who failed from the second to the third year-, than to the country's need for another intermediary or medium level Ag. technicians. Actually, the Agr. Extension Agents continued to receive their training for Agents Techniques (AT) and Conducteurs des Travaux (CT) at the Centre Agricole Polyvalent/Matourkou (CAP/M). As a result of the recent restructuration of IDR, the ITDR section of the Institute has been eliminated, leaving to CAP/Matourkou, the Forestry School of Denderesso, and the School of Veterinary Agents the responsibility of training the medium level technicians in their respective fields.

By 1980, all long-term SECID technical assistance team members at IDR were in place, and several major events took place before the end of 1981.

(a) The Gampela Experiment Station (GES) began to function as (1) a teaching site for all faculty in the three departments and (2) a research site for young Burkinabe faculty in full collaboration with SECID resident specialists.

(b) GES began to generate revenues which contributed significantly to the University's operating budget and indicated how it was possible for GES to become partly self-sufficient while meeting its initial goals, which were practical training and research.

(c) Selection and departure to the US of the first five long-term Burkinabe trainees.

(d) First changes in the IDR curriculum toward more applied teaching and introduction of Travaux Pratiques (TP) at GES.

(e) Introduction of an extension course with application at the village near GES.

(f) Mid-term Evaluation of the Project, in which positive results were noted, although some stumbling blocks or administrative "log-jams" at the University caused slow progress in implementing the project.

(g) Sudden change in the project leadership, which could have a negative impact on the work initiated, primarily in extension teaching and practices. However, the replacement by a Rural Sociologist-team leader helped soften the transition and, in fact, refocused the project after a few months of interim leadership insuring continued progress.

Construction at GES finally began in 1982. The lack of Burkinabè counterparts to SECID long-term experts created a real problem to the continuation of the work initiated at IDR campus and at Gampela station. The return of the first MS graduates (1982-83) did not overlap for the most part with the presence of the Technical Assistance Team in country. The log-jam in the selection process was in part responsible for this failure. The other reasons were the lack of interest in teaching positions by those trained when returned to Burkina from the US and the non-equivalency of US MS degrees to the 3rd cycle doctorate in the CAMES Universities, such as the University of Ouagadougou. These factors retarded the progress in training staff for IDR. The remaining scholarships were granted to the Ministries of Rural Development (MDR) and of

Environment and Tourism (MET); Seven (7) participants were sent to training from MDR, two (2) from MET, while eleven (11) were from IDR. The participants began returning to Burkina Faso in 1982, first the MS in animal science -- but after the long-term Animal Husbandry advisor had returned to the US.

From late 1981 to the end of Phase I, significant strides were made. Moreover, an extension to Phase I is currently being implemented.

a) All twenty (20) scholarships, established in the Grant Agreement, have been granted.

b) The first returnees to IDR have been successfully integrated into the faculty and their teaching and research performance has been recognized by their peers for their high quality.

c) Most administrative log-jams at the University have been broken, and all major construction at the Gampela Station has been completed and put into use. The financial reporting procedures and the state of project books were improved. More importantly, University accountants have received training from the Sahel Financial Management team, and USAID financial regulations have now been followed satisfactorily.

d) Changes in project management have occurred and contributed a great deal to significant progress. At USAID/Burkina, project responsibility was switched from Human Resources Office to Agricultural Development Office. The SECID Team Leader was replaced by a Rural Sociologist more eager to solve administrative problems and to solve commodity procurement. At the University of Ouagadougou, the Rector was replaced by another individual who offered more collaboration with SECID team leader than ever before.

e) In May 1984, the AgHRD project second and final evaluation took place. It was recognized that sound progress had been made in the form of US-trained Burkinabe faculty and the development of GES into a useful teaching and research site for the Institute. It was highly recommended that the institution building gains be consolidated by all means possible. Prior to the final evaluation report, the last team leader's trip report was strongly in favor of the extension of the project for the same reason.

f) After the March 1985 seminar on "Higher Education and Scientific Research at the Service of Development", the University of Ouagadougou was restructured.<sup>1</sup> As a result, ISP was divided into the Natural Sciences Institute (ISN) and the Rural Development Institute (IRD). The purpose

---

1. Decret No. 85-498/CNR/PRES/ESRS

of IDR is to respond to the new orientation of the University, which calls for the direct linkage between theoretical training and production. While IDR came from the Rural Development section of ISP, ISN resulted from the Biological Sciences section, which was opened in 1981 at ISP.

g) In December 1985, IDR carried out a self study. From the self study, several recommendations were made particularly on:

- (1) The elimination of the ITDR program
- (2) Pressing problems in the development of IDR, such as:

- a) the rapid development of GES and the accelerated transfer of the IDR campus from Ouagadougou to Gampela.

- b) the simplification of field trip procedures.

- c) the improvement of the shuttle between the Ouagadougou campus and GES.

- (3) The need for a more practical focus in teaching agriculture

- (4) The linkage between teaching, research and development (extension).

and (5) the more efficient use of IDR graduates.

It is also worth noting here the recommendation about an "interministèriel committee" (MESRS, MAE, MET and MQP), which will be responsible for defining, updating, and following-up the curriculum of IDR, and for monitoring the role and the contribution of the Institute in the rural development process.

In June 1986, the Amendment No. 4 to the project grant agreement was signed between USAID/Burkina and the GOB for the extension of Phase I. The PACD has been extended to March 31, 1988. A two-year extension is currently being implemented for the purpose of consolidating the gains of the first phase, enhancing the institution building process, and helping the University develop a long term plan for IDR.

**B. Most significant gains of the AgHRD project**

Although the gains obtained thus far may not yet be cost effective, they remain very significant in meeting the goals of the project.

**1) Participant Training**

The participant training output is significant. It markedly influences the nationalization of cadres at IDR. The following Table shows the positions occupied by the participants after they returned home.

NAME	DEGREE OBTAINED	POSITION OCCUPIED AT IDR	FURTHER STUDY PLANNED
1. Nianogo Aimé	MS Animal Science	Assistant	Ph.D student Univ. of Georgia
2. Yé Henri	MS Fisheries	Assistant	Ph.D student Duke University
3. Dicko Idrissa	MS Plant Pathology	Assistant	Ph.D student Univ. of Georgia
4. Sonda Constantin	MS Horticulture	-	Ph.D student Univ. of Georgia
5. Hébié Ditalamane	MS Agr. Economics	Assistant and Agronomy Dpt Head	
6. Diarra Boureima	MS Animal Nutrition	Assistant and Zootechny Dpt Head	
7. Palo Pierre	MS Poultry Science	Assistant and GES Farm Manager	
8. Kabré André	MS Fisheries	Assistant Water and Forest	
9. Somé Arsène	MS Entomology	Assistant Agronomy	
10. Kaboré Pascal	MS Agronomy	Not yet employed	

Thirty percent of the trainees occupy key positions at IDR and will be able to influence the curriculum development process and its implementation. The US Land-Grant system which permeates their training will certainly be very much understood at IDR and be offered as an example while the Institute is trying hard to link teaching and research with extension. This is viewed as a plus in attaining the project goals. The short-term participant training was also significant. Visits, short courses, seminars, research studies in US and in other third world nations profoundly marked the professional development of faculty and staff at IDR.

## (2) Gampela Experiment Station

The farm development infrastructure is in place and serves its dual purpose of practical teaching and research very well. Despite management and financial problems in the history of GES, activities are pretty much alive and under total Burkinabè management. Of course, there are problems which will be addressed later, however, it is working and the IDR, as well as other collaborative institutions are currently using the GES facilities. Students go twice a week to Gampela for farm practice. Graduating senior students use GES to develop their memoir research problems and to carry out their research projects. Faculty find excellent sites and adequate facilities for their own applied research.

**II. Present plans of the IDR for the development of the Gampela site**

The University of Ouagadougou has good reasons for dividing ISP into IDR and ISN and for planning to move IDR to Gampela. The physical presence of the entire institute (faculty, students, classrooms, laboratories, etc...) at the farm site will certainly have a positive impact on the integration of theoretical teaching into farm practices. The new graduate engineers will receive hands-on training which will open them more efficiently to the rural world and enable them to understand better the peasant's problems. Moreover, student farm practice will become less costly because they don't have to be transported twice a week. Faculty will have more opportunity to work on their research and will be more productive.

The IDR administration has a plan to move the Institute to Gampela, but it lacks the financial means. In the most recent Plan Quinquenal, 914 million FCFA are foreseen as the initial cost for the transfer. In the next five years, 700 million will be needed as follows (in million FCFA).

1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
202.5	100.6	154.8	153.0	89.1

According to the IDR Director, 85% of the funds necessary do not exist yet and must be sought. Although there is no money for this short-term planning, the IDR administration is confident that the campus transfer will take place according to the following plan.

**First Step:** By the academic year 1987-88, a first building of five classrooms, ten offices, and 3 laboratories (one per major) will be built. The students will take some courses at Gampela and will continue to be transported as required by their class schedule. A contract will be given to the University Food Service to bring food daily to Gampela and to serve food there, although without an adequate eating facility.

**Second Step:** At the end of 1988, a second building will be built, identical to the first. All courses will be offered at Gampela. Faculty, staff, and students will continue to be transported to and from Gampela.

**Third Step:** In 1989, a cafeteria with complete food service for 250 people will be built. All food will be prepared and served at Gampela.

**Fourth Step:** At the end of 1990, the dormitories for 250 people will be built, and in the 1991/92 academic year all students will be housed at Gampela. Faculty and staff will continue to be transported daily back and forth. Although no

plan is made to house faculty and staff at Gampela, it is not impossible for anyone concerned to find appropriate means to have a house built in the area. However, for social and family reasons, IDR is not considering faculty housing as an issue at present time.

The planning for the transfer of the IDR campus to Gampela is viewed as a short-term exercise. In fact it will begin to materialize when at least one third of the funds is secured in the form of grant or loans. To date it is unknown when the necessary funds will be available. Obtaining sufficient funding is becoming a top priority for the IDR leaders. No action has been taken toward long-term planning for IDR development and for the institutionalization of linkages between the institute and various relevant ministries and the national institute for agronomic research (INERA) or other research institutes.

### III. Major issues presently hindering development of IDR and the Gampela site

#### A. Burkinabe Teaching and Research Faculty

The "Burkinazation" of IDR faculty still remains an issue in spite of the recognized success of the AgHRDP participant training. The University of Ouagadougou wants to increase the number of its faculty at IDR. Significant strides have been made in the last 3 to 4 years to increase the number of

nationals in the faculty. Sixteen (16) out of twenty eight (28) faculty members are now Burkinabè. That is remarkable progress when compared to 2 or 3 in the technical areas at the time the project was being developed nine years ago. The following table illustrates the distribution of Burkinabè faculty in the three departments and shows where the level of effort needs be increased.

DEPARTMENTS	BURKINABE FACULTY	BURKINABE FACULTY TRAINED IN US	BURKINABE CURRENTLY IN TRAINING FOR	
			MS	Ph.D.
Agronomy	58.3	42.8	-	14.2
Livestock	60.0	50.0	-	16.6
Water & Forestry	66.6	50.0	-	18.3

From the above data, the progress is obvious. But the effort of training more Burkinabè should continue not only for the quantity but also for the quality. As far as the quantity is concerned, the University of Ouagadougou should revise the "Statut du Personnel" for their cadres so that the teaching positions will be more appealing. More advantages and more incentives undoubtedly will encourage more young graduates to seek employment at IDR. It appears that one of the major reasons for granting 50% of the AgHRD scholarship outside IDR was a lack interest in the teaching positions at IDR after obtaining the MS degree. When the such a condition was removed many Burkinabè applied who were anxious to get a higher

education. Unless the problems in appropriate employment at IDR caused by the present "Status du Personnel" are removed, the "Burkinazation" of IDR faculty may not be complete in a foreseeable future. It is worth mentioning that:

(1) of the returned participants:

a) 50% are currently working at other ministries (MET, MAE, ME).

b) 50% are holding positions at IDR

(2) of the participants currently on training

a) 37.5% will return to IDR

b) 62.5% will return to Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock.

From the above data, one may conclude that the project fund was not effectively used to solve the training of IDR faculty issue. But, the US graduates in other ministries will certainly help foster the linkages with IDR in the long-term plan.

As for the quality of faculty, one may argue that the MS degree is sufficient for a faculty member at IDR. That may be true if one considers only the academic level of teaching at

the present time. However, under the faculty rank and tenure policy of the University of Ouagadougou, which is caught between French-based CAMES stringent rules and the Burkinabè reality, it is not a fruitless expenditure to increase the number of Ph.D.s in IDR faculty vis-à-vis that of Doctorats d'Etat. In the long run, the payoff is certain and the implementation of a long-term development plan for the institute will have a better chance for success.

#### B. Recurrent Costs

The recurrent costs problem is an old issue. It continues to exist and to shake the foundation of the very institution building process that the AgHRD project is all about. When the Gampela Experiment Station was created, it was understood that donor agencies such as FAC and USAID would finance the construction, the farm implements, and the operating costs at the outset. But, no plan was made and agreed upon by the donors and the host country as to when and how GOB will assume the operating costs of GES. Mid-term and final evaluation of the project addressed this vital issue and suggested ways by which IDR can generate revenues to partly or totally assume the payment of recurrent costs. To date (1) all farm revenues go to the University general funds; (2) not all users of GES pay their fair share of farm facilities and labor; (3) no genuine effort has been made to gradually include part of GES operating cost into IDR basic budget; and (4) almost the

entire operating costs (except for one or two guards) come from AgHRD project extension funds. Although Burkina Faso is one of the poorest LDCs, time has come, after more than seven years of financial assistance to IDR, to wonder whether it is serious about making Gampela an essential part of the institution. One can only hope that with the new orientation of the University of Ouagadougou and the level of national effort under GOB policy of self-help, the issue of recurrent cost for Gampela will begin to receive an adequate solution. The transfer of IDR campus to Gampela can be seen as a new beginning to enhance the IDR effort in the right direction. Nevertheless, no long-term development should leave the recurrent cost issue unsolved.

### C. DEVELOPMENT OF A MORE APPLIED CURRICULUM

AT the outset, the IDR curriculum was developed on a theoretical basis without the inclusion of a laboratory for the courses in the technical fields. The reason given for the absence of technical laboratories in the curriculum was the non-existence of a farm attached to the Institute. When the SECID resident team began to use Gampela as a practicum site to link theoretical teaching to practices, other faculty members followed the example and, amazingly, faculty and students were very enthusiastic in getting their "hands dirty".

Although practicum became an integral part of the training, it was not systematically and clearly included in the official IDR technical curriculum. Furthermore, faculty contact time in their respective fields was not accounted for in their "Emploi de Temps", nor in the "field trips", nor in their "guidance time" for memoir supervision.

The 1985-86 curriculum is more specific for the first and second years, and not for the third and the fourth, as far as the number of hours of "Travaux Dirigés (TD)" and "Travaux Pratiques" (TP) are concerned. The following represents the schedule distribution in year I and II.

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>THEORETICAL COURSES</u>	<u>TD</u>	<u>TP</u>
I	46.1	19.7	34.2
II	53.6	17.6	28.8

The percentage of TD and/or TP is markedly reduced in the technical years as can be seen in more detail in the next table.

Courses which include laboratory in the third and fourth years curricula of IDR:

Year	Major	Courses with Laboratory	Course without Laboratory
III	Common courses	0	100
	Agronomy	50	50
	Animal Husbandry	0	100
	Water and Forestry	28.5	71.5
IV	Common courses	0	100
	Agronomy	0	100
	Animal Husbandry	12.5	87.5
	Water and Forestry	33.3	66.7

Although the curricula for Years III and IV mention "TP" in the total "volume horaire" (VH), it is unclear how much of the V.H. should be allocated to the laboratory for each course. The lab is, in fact, left up to the teachers to program and, often, does not take place for various reasons. When the laboratory allocated time is not included in the curriculum, the lab becomes a casual exercise and often disappears. Moreover, the subject matter is too long and too inclusive in each option. A revised curriculum should, in the long-term planning, reduced course loads per major, and at the same time include lab time for each course in the official IDR curriculum and allow more time for field practicum at Gampela.

It will take time before the new system of teaching can be implemented with success due to the influence of the French educational system on Burkinabè higher ag. education. The long-term planning team should seriously consider the curriculum revision in its scope of work. The transfer of the IDR campus to Gampela will definitely improve the methodology of teaching agriculture and provide students with more opportunity for hands-on experience.

**IV. Suggested long-term planning process for the development of the Gampela site**

**A. The purpose of long-term planning**

By long-term planning we are thinking here of a time period of about 20 years. In relation to such a long-term period, five-year plans are relatively short-term.

Twenty year plans set out long-term goals and various long-term methods of achieving these goals. Such plans help guide five year plans by keeping long-term goals in mind so that each development is used to further in some small way these long-term goals. Long term goals are broad, but of basic importance. For the IDR, for example, they could be such things as (1) developing a closely coordinated and highly cooperative working relationship with such ministries as Agriculture and Livestock, Environment and Tourism, and the Peasant Question, and with related research institutes, in order to establish effective two-way linkages between farmers, extension workers, researchers, teachers, and students, and (2) developing curriculum and instruction that focuses on teaching thinking and problem solving skills rather than on teaching merely knowledge.

Long-term methods are alternative ways of realistically achieving these goals. In a twenty-year plan, one cannot set out only one path for getting to where one wants to go. One

sets out alternatives that could be followed depending on the choices and circumstances that develop along the way. Such alternative methods help guide 5-year plans by keeping alive various possibilities for achieving long-term goals as developments alter or undermine the first possibilities tried. This keeps the long-term evolutionary development from wandering off track by the pressures and problems encountered along the way.

Five-year plans, of course, organize annual plans and day-to-day operations into some kind of coherent pattern that works efficiently. However, an efficiently working organization guided by five year plans can lose sight of long term goals if those five-year plans are not guided by these goals.

B. Phase 1: The setting of long-term goals and the suggestion of various alternative methods of attaining those goals

1. Involvement of IDR, ministry, and research institute personnel in the planning process.

Long-term goals cannot be goals merely written down or understood solely by top leaders. Although top leaders should understand and support these goals, a critical mass of the personnel in the organizations involved needs to be dedicated to such long-term goals and to understand various ways of

achieving such goals if these goals are to be more than empty phases. It is the personnel that must step-by-step work to change organizational and individual activities and attitudes to achieve long-term basic changes.

This suggests that personnel of the organizations involved in achieving long-term goals need to be intimately involved in the defining of the nuances of meaning of the long-term goals (even though not, perhaps, in the basic goals themselves\*) and in the exploring and detailing of the various methods of achieving these goals. Such involvement in the planning process aims to strengthen a dedication to the goals and an understanding of the meaning of the goals and of possibilities for achieving these goals.

At the IDR, for example, a long-term goal could be the development of effective linkages between farmers, extension workers, researchers, teachers, and students, and those selected from the IDR, the research institutes, and the appropriate ministries to plan together the effective development of such linkages should be those who believe in and are excited by such a long-term goal.

---

\*A discussion among randomly selected personnel about what should be the basic long-term goals of an organization can easily lead to basic disagreement and increased resistance to

action in any direction. This can be a method of selecting leaders (the democratic process) of a political body or even of an organization, but once selected these leaders need to guide organizations toward long-term goals and inspire dedication to those goals and respect for the leadership's ability to facilitate those goals for action to take place.

Their job, then, is to explore just what kind of linkages would be "effective" and how such linkages could be established. One discussion about the meaning of "effective" linkages, for example, might be over how much IDR faculty should explain their research to extension workers and farmers (through training programs, for example) and how much extension workers and farmers are given an opportunity to complain to IDR researchers about the lack of applicability of current research to real farm situations (through workshops discussing the effectiveness of extension efforts, for example). Another discussion about the meaning of "effective" linkages might be over what kind of involvement by the various ministries in the development of the curriculum of IDR or in the use of the IDR training capabilities would be beneficial.

The involvement in defining the goals, then, is in defining various types of linkages and various meanings and measures of effectiveness, but not to argue over whether any linkages are desirable. Development is facilitated when participants in the planning process are selected who

wholeheartedly believe in this and who command the respect of their colleagues back in their respective organizations.

2. Exploration of various possible methods of attaining long-term goals

The planning team should first explore many various means of attaining long-term goals without detailing specific plans or costs. This opens many possible routes to follow as circumstances in the development process close off or undermine the first possibilities attempted. Detailing plans too early in the planning process limits the possibilities one later knows how to work toward, choking off development when the first obstacles are encountered. The planning process should result in various options available during the development process to circumvent these inevitable obstacles. Such options are more effectively discovered early in the planning process when minds are still open to exploration, rather than later when the necessity of constructing detailed plans for what are seen as the more promising options limits one's horizons and induces a commitment to specific options. All this does not mean, however, that there are not limits to the various options explored.

In this suggested long-term planning for the Gampela campus of IDR, for example, one central long-term goal could be effective linkages between farmers, extension workers, researchers, teachers, and students. The many different

possible linkages explored would be limited, for example, to those focused on alternative uses of the Gampela site. The planning team might explore, for example, different ways the various Ministries might become intimately involved in and committed to the activities at the Gampela campus, but this team would not explore the many ways farmers, extension workers, researchers, teachers, and students might be linked at other locations around the country.

Some ideas the planning team might explore as possible ways of using the Gampela site to (1) make the IDR curriculum and instruction more applied, and (2) facilitate linkages between farmers, extension workers, researchers, teachers, and students are:

(1) Using the Gampela site to integrate teaching with field work in research and development in such a way that it teaches problem solving and creative thinking and not just the learning of knowledge and skills.

An applied educational curriculum does not mean just adding the learning of practical skills in the field to knowledge learned in the classroom. It means changing classroom teaching so that it focuses on problem solving and creative thinking, not just learning knowledge through memorization, and applying and expanding those creative problem solving skills by experimenting with

research and development activities in the field. The move to Gampela could hopefully help change teaching methods in this direction as part of the initial development of the site, rather than letting field work be added to the curriculum merely as the teaching of practical skills.

(2) Using the Gampela site to bring IDR students in contact with farmers and extension workers.

One way to invigorate the teaching of problem solving and the creative thinking this entails is to connect students more directly with farmers and extension workers, who have the problems that need to be solved. If IDR students are involved in workshops, conferences, and demonstration days with extension workers and farmers, they may see more clearly (1) the need for useful research and (2) the need for teaching and learning directly relevant to real problems of development.

(3) Using the Gampela site to provide advanced training for rural development leaders.

Government agencies, PVO's, and other organizations have a need for in-country trained rural development leaders. The move of IDR to the Gampela site could enable IDR to invite various ministeries and organizations to

collaborate on the development of programs to train rural development leaders where IDR may even be only one component in such training.

The Ministry of the Peasant Question (non-formal rural youth education), for example, has expressed an interest in collaborating with IDR to develop rural development leadership training for their top personnel that includes agricultural development but also community development, development of cooperatives, literacy training, health and nutrition improvement, and other areas.

(4) Using the Gampela site to assemble technical assistance teams for government and donor development projects.

Development projects could well use in-country technical assistance teams, which are not only much cheaper for the projects but also help develop in-country development leadership capacities. The Gampela site administration and facilities could be used to gather appropriate teams with members from IDR and other organizations.

This could also earn money for IDR, other organizations, and individual team members, keeping development money in country and providing a means of institutional self-support.

(5) Using the Gampela site to coordinate research funded by different institutes and organizations and to connect it with the needs and concerns of farmers and extension workers.

Already Gampela is used as a research site for research funded by various institutes and organizations. Development of the site could not only facilitate coordination between the research projects but also connections between researchers and both extension workers and farmers through workshops, conferences, visitation days, and other means, enabling researchers to hear the concerns and problems of extension workers and farmers directly. Such research projects could also be cooperative research projects with American universities and researchers, especially since such collaboration sometimes opens new possibilities for funding.

(6) Using the Gampela site to connect research and teaching.

Already research at the Gampela site has begun to connect students with research projects by both IDR faculty and other research institute personnel. Such connections, including students working on research projects and researchers sharing their research approaches and difficulties with students in class settings and at

research sites, could be enhanced by having both research and teaching located at Gampela. The presence of research at the Gampela site by other institutes and organizations could be used as a contact point to connect higher level students with research by these institutes and organizations in other parts of the country.

(7) Using the Gampela site to bring together development workers and researchers in IDR, social sciences, and other disciplines in the university to form rural development research teams.

If the Gampela site is used to bring other ministries, research institutes, PVO's, and organizations with more than agricultural interests in contact with IDR faculty, it can become a useful meeting place between these people and university faculty in other disciplines interested in rural development. Large scale, multi-faceted rural development research projects could in this way be facilitated.

(8) Planning for possible future cooperative efforts at Gampela involving ministries and organizations not included in this particular planning process.

One cooperative activity that the Gampela site might one day be used for, for example, could be research,

teaching, and extension programs to support development of agro-industry. Such efforts should probably include other ministries (such as commerce), other areas of the university (such as engineering, technology, and economics), and other organizations (such as business and industrial organizations). Planning for such possible future activities may involve at this time only tentative ideas and maybe designated plots of land for such possible development.

(9) Developing the Gampela site as a Center for Rural Development modeling university-ministry-farmer cooperation

Other ministries and organizations could be given plots of land to develop at Gampela, so that IDR would be only one of a multi-organizational Center for Rural Development. IDR could, perhaps, be the lead organization and the coordinator of inter-organizational activities at the Center and emanating from the Center. Variations on this idea could be explored, for example, different organizations developing different plots at Gampela, IDR developing some facilities for visitors and outside organization offices, or a project to develop a shared building or facility. This depends on the interests and desires of IDR, the different ministries, the research institutes, and the other organizations--and

on the possible sources of funding and the limits to funding. For example, simple shared facilities can serve temporarily until more developed facilities can be built.

The purpose of sharing facilities at Gampela, of course, would be to encourage active multi-organizational participation by fostering a feeling of belonging to the Gampela site in all participants. Organizations invited might be not only ministries, research institutes, and PVO's, for example, but also farmers' cooperatives and organizations. The physical proximity of personnel from many organizations collected at the Gampela site would, of course, make shared planning for conferences, seminars, demonstration or visitation days, workshops, training programs, curriculum development, extension programs, and research projects much easier.

(10) Using the Gampela site as a contact point with other African, international, and national organizations interested in rural development.

The Gampela site, especially if it becomes a national Center for Rural Development, can become a primary contact point for Burkina Faso with the many research and development organizations around the world involved in rural development problems. Eventually, for example, perhaps Gampela could be hooked into the international informational exchange systems.

C. Phase 2: The detailed planning and costing of the most promising alternative plans, allowing for choices and fallback positions as development proceeds.

Out of the many possible methods of attaining the long-term goals explored in the first phase of the planning, those alternatives that seem to hold the greatest promise are planned and costed in detail in the second phase of planning. The purpose is not to prematurely choose one "best" path, but to lay out detailed plans for several approaches, so that at the end of the planning process some of these approaches can be chosen for immediate development and others can be held for future development or for alternative approaches if the first attempts encounter difficulties. The hope is that the multiple approaches outlined will enable a flexible, adaptable approach to development and encourage a planning of such permanent fixtures as the physical plant that will take into account possible future developments and adaptations.

Detailed plans for various alternative activities and developments should include such analyses as:

- 1) Organizations and personnel involved in the development of the activity;

- 2) Administration and staff appropriate to the activity, including methods of institutionalizing the continued participation, cooperation, and coordination of the organizations and personnel involved;
- 3) Physical facilities, equipment, and supplies required for the activity, both the ideal set and the minimal set;
- 4) Maintenance and other recurrent costs required, and the source for permanent funding of such costs. (Note: These are critical costs that are often under-funded or not carefully planned in development projects);
- 5) The curriculum, research agenda, extension programs, workshops, conferences, or other activities involved, and the methods of determination and continual reformulation and improvement of these activities;
- 6) The inter-agency support systems needed (administrative support structure and personnel, policies, committees, etc);
- 7) An investigation and evaluation of the interest or willingness of organizations and personnel to participate;
- 8) A study of the financial requirements for all these activities, including alternative funding sources and alternative amounts to anticipate problems with funding.

These detailed plans for various selected activities should then be integrated into an overall plan analyzing relationships between the activities, priorities for the activities, and ways of integrating various activities and allowing for flexible development of them. In such an integrated plan the above eight items are again examples of those that should be considered. The result is a flexible plan that helps guide action over a period of many years, keeping constantly in mind the long-term goals and yet providing for changes in circumstances and in future choices or priorities.

**D) Anticipated products of the planning process**

The planning process has at least three possible important outcomes, only one of which is a written product the "Plan".

**(1) The plan**

The final plan includes a report of the various possibilities explored, the alternatives evaluated as having the greatest potential. the detailed selected alternative plans, the integrated overall plan allowing for flexible development, and an analysis of the institutional and financial support needed to realize various parts of the plan.

**2) Organizational changes and initiated activities**

Much of this must remain until the planning process is complete so that development does not proceed in unwanted directions before it is clear what those may be. However, all development activity does not stop during a planning process, and it is important to keep up the momentum of development. Some activities can be started or readjusted during the planning process as a result of the deliberations in that process, taking into account possible further adjustment later. Such readjustment is a continual process in institutional life in any case.

Some beginning joint activities, curriculum development, joint committees or working groups, new research projects, and coordination efforts can be initiated as the planning process proceeds. Planning and development continually take place side by side, each process testing and reinforcing the other. This long-term planning for the Gampela site should not stop development there, but both stimulate it and redirect it while the planning process is going on as well as after this particular planning is finished.

### 3) Personnel development

At least equally important to the plan itself is the development of the human resources involved in the planning process -- thus the importance of the inclusion of Burkinabe in this process. Active involvement in the planning process

should hopefully develop dedication to and knowledge of long-term goals and alternative methods of attaining those goals that will help personnel transcend day to day assignments and pressures. Moreover, attention to long-term goals that are central to the very soul of organizations, and hopefully to the people that work in them, should raise morale and excitement about the job to be done. And by no means least important, experience in planning attitudes and methodologies that emphasize the outlining of alternatives rather than the setting out of a single track, lock-step approach to development should foster a better mentality and ability to continue more effective planning for development.

These human resources effects are essential. It is doubtful that the plan can work effectively without them, yet it is possible that they can carry the benefits of the planning process into development results even if no one else reads the planning document. This depends, of course, on who is involved in the planning process. That is why it is important to have dedicated, capable, respected people in key positions in the appropriate institutions and organizations involved in the planning process.

V. Suggested long-term planning team for the development of the Gampela site.

A. Organizations and team members involved

1. Expatriate consultants (7)

- a. Co-team leader (Agriculturalist)
- b. Agricultural School Administration Specialist
- c. Curriculum Development Specialist
- d. Extension Administration Specialist
- e. Physical Plant Specialist
- f. Higher Education Policy and Planning Specialist
- g. Farm Management Specialist

2. Burkinabé planning team members (15)

a. IDR (5)

- (1) Co-team leader (1)
- (2) Agronomy Department Faculty (1)
- (3) Zootechny Department Faculty (1)
- (4) Water & Forestry Department Faculty (1)
- (5) Administration of IDR (1)

b. INS (2)

- (1) Faculty (1)
- (2) Administration (1)

- c. University of Ouagadougou (2)
  - (1) Rural sociologist or anthropologist (1)
  - (2) Agr. Economist or Specialist in Cooperatives (1)

c. Ministry of the Peasant Question (1)

e. Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (1)

f. Ministry of Environment and Tourism (1)

g. Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (3)

(1) INERA (1)

(2) IRSH (1)

(3) IRBET (1)

3. Back-up translator/interpreter (1)

B. Suggested time line for the planning process and team member involvement

1. Phase 1: The setting of long term goals and suggestion of various alternative methods of attaining goals (2 months).
  - a. Outside co-team leader (2 months, full time).
  - b. Personnel from IDR, University, ministries, and research institutes, (1 or 2 full days equivalent per week over 2 months).
  - c. Outside consultants, all except physical facilities specialist (2 or 3 week period at beginning or during 2 month period).
  - d. Translator/interpreter (at all times outside consultants are scheduled in-country).
  - e. USAID personnel (1 or 2 full days equivalent per week over 2 months).
  
2. Phase 2: Detailed planning and costing of alternatives (2 months).
  - a. Outside co-team leader (2 months, full time).

- b. Personnel from IDR, University, ministries, and research institutes (1 or 2 full days equivalent per week over 2 months).
  - c. Outside consultants:
    - (1) Physical facilities specialist (2 or 3 week period during 2-month period).
    - (2) All other outside consultants (asked back for 2 or 3 week period during 2 months if desired by planning team).
  - d. Translator/interpreter (at all times outside consultants are scheduled in country).
  - e. USAID personnel (1 or 2 full days equivalent per week over 2 months).
3. Writing and presentation of the long term plan to IDR, University, research institutes, ministries, and USAID (1 month).
- a. Outside co-team leader (1 month, full time).
  - b. Personnel from IDR, University, ministries, and research institutes (1 or 2 full days equivalent per week over 1 month).

- c. Outside consultants (it is anticipated that none would be required at this stage, however, it is possible that the planning team may want to invite back one or two for a couple of weeks).
- d. Translator/interpreter (only if any outside consultants return).
- e. USAID personnel (1 or 2 full days equivalent per week over 1 month).

**C. Outcomes of Planning Process**

Three outcomes of the planning process are anticipated:

1. A written plan.
2. Organizational changes and initiated activities.
3. Personnel development.

(See Section IV.D., Anticipated products of the planning process, for details).

The written plan would be shared and discussed by team members with IDR, the University, the research institutes, the ministries, USAID, and any appropriate the other organizations. The discussion would focus on the development and possible uses of the long-term plan. Enough copies of the plan, in both French and English as appropriate, should be made for widespread distribution to affected and interested institutions and personnel.

**D. Qualifications and job descriptions for expatriate consultants**

**1. Expatriate co-team leader (5 months, full time)**

**Qualifications**

Ph. D. in one of the agricultural or economics fields. Must have previous overseas experience, specifically related to the development of higher education institutions and research institutes in developing countries, preferably including Burkina Faso. Area of expertise should be in agricultural education, research, and/or extension administration. A working knowledge of French to at least the S3, R3 level is required.

**Job description**

Guiding the planning team cooperatively with the in-country co-team leader. However, the expatriate co-team leader will have the major responsibility for facilitating the planning process, organizing meetings, work plans, and outside consultancies, and for writing major planning documents, including the final plan.

2. Agricultural School Administration Specialist (3 months, perhaps in two visits)

Qualifications

Ph. D. in one of the agricultural fields. Five (5) to ten (10) years experience as an administrator, preferably at the Deanship level or as director of an agricultural experiment station in a land-grant university. Must have previous overseas experience and be particularly sensitive to the problems of developing countries and the inadequacies of LDC's universities. Must have participated as long-term advisor or short-term consultant in development projects, preferably in West Africa, and be cognizant of intricacies and politics of University bureaucracies which may influence development projects. A working knowledge of French to at least S<sub>2</sub>, R<sub>2</sub> is required.

Job description

The agricultural school administration specialist will work closely with the IDR Director, make a critical institutional analysis of IDR current administrative structure, develop several alternatives jointly with the Extension and the Curriculum Development Specialists and their Burkinabé counterparts of ways in which extension could be linked to teaching and research at Gampela, assist the team in designing

an original model which will be tested at Gampela, and be available to travel twice to Burkina Faso during the planning process, if required.

3. Curriculum development specialist (4-5 weeks, perhaps in 2 visits)

Qualifications

Ph. D. in one of the agricultural fields, or in rural sociology. Must have previous overseas experience specifically related to the development of problem solving and creative thinking curriculum and instruction in higher education institutions in developing countries. Knowledge of French is preferable, but not required.

Job description

Working with the planning team to explore possible ways of incorporating more teaching of problem solving and creative thinking in the evolving more applied agricultural curriculum and instruction of the IDR. Detailing of some alternative plans, especially if asked back for a second visit. A written summary report of suggestions, alternatives, and possible plans as appropriate, is required at the end of each visit.

4. Extension Specialist (4-5 weeks, perhaps in two visits)

Qualifications

M.S. in one of the agricultural fields. Must have overseas experience specifically at the farming systems research and extension. Must have served in extension in the US, preferably as director or assistant-director of Cooperative Extension Service in a land-grant university system. Must know institutional linkage possibilities between teaching, research, and extension. Knowledge of French is preferable but not required.

Job Description

Making contact with the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and of Question Paysanne. Must make a critical analysis of the extension activities in Burkina Faso. Working with the planning team and proposing various alternatives for linking extension to research and teaching at IDR. Preparing a detailed plan of alternatives in a written report to be incorporated in the long-term plan. Be available to travel twice to Burkina Faso if required.

5. Physical plant specialist (3-4 weeks, one visit, second phase of planning)

Qualifications

Must have previous overseas experience specifically related to the planning, design, and costing of physical plant facilities in developing countries, preferably including alternative low-cost designs. A knowledge of higher education, research, extension, and farm facilities is highly preferable. Knowledge of French is preferable, but not required.

Job Description

To work with the planning team to design and cost alternative plans for meeting the physical plant requirements for various activities developed out of the first phase planning. Written plans, analyses, and cost estimates would be required throughout the visit.

6. Higher education policy and planning specialist (2-6 weeks, in 1 to 3 visits)

Qualifications

Must have previous overseas experience specifically related to the development of higher education institutions and research institutes in developing countries, especially in

terms of creating a more problem solving focus aimed at rural development. Knowledge of French is preferable, but not required.

### Job description

Working with the planning team to explore possible ways of institutionalizing more creative problem solving of rural development issues, focusing on the integration of agricultural research, education, extension, and farm experience. Detailing of some alternative plans and integration of various alternatives into a final plan, if asked back for a second or third visit. A written summary report of suggestions, alternatives, possible plans, and proposals for integration, as appropriate, is required at the end of each visit.

7. Farm Management Specialist (4-5 weeks, perhaps in two visits)

### Qualifications

M.S. in one of the agricultural fields. Overseas experience is preferable but not required. Must have 5-10 year experience in farm management, preferably, in a land-grant university. A working knowledge of French at S2, R2 level is preferable but not required.

Job Description

Must take a critical look at the Gampela Experiment Station and suggest ways to improve the current farm management system. Must work with the planning team in developing the long-term plan for Gampela station, which will serve as a site for linking research and teaching to extension. Must write a report with recommendations for the long-term plan. Be available to travel twice to Burkina Faso during the planning process if required.