

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOPS
ON
MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING

Prepared for a
Washington Workshop
September 29, 1980

Organized by
Public Administration Service for
the Office of Rural Development and
Development Administration under
Contract AID/ta-C-1350

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOPS ON
MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
FOR PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Dominican Republic, September 12, 13, 1980
Liberia, September 17, 18, 1980

I. Introduction and Background

Under the Agriculture Sector Implementation Project (ASIP), carried out by Public Administration Service, PAS was asked to disseminate the experiences and lessons of the ASIP project and of four other management development and training projects supported by AID's Office of Rural Development and Development Administration (DS/RAD) in recent years.

In addition to the ASIP project, carried out in Egypt and Nepal in the period 1977 to 1980, the pilots included:

- The Economic/Rural Development Management Program (ERDM) carried out in Ghana. It's first cycle ran from 1977 to 1979; Cycle II will end in 1982.
- Two management training activities conducted under Indonesia's Provincial Area Development Programs:
 - a. Training of Trainers in Project Planning (July-August, 1979);
 - b. Project Monitoring Development, (April-May, 1980).
- The National Planning Project in Jamaica, (1976-1980).

During the summer of 1980, 20 AID missions were queried on their interest in hosting workshops that would share the lessons and possible applications of these 5 pilot activities. Expressions of interest in such workshops came from Thailand, the Philippines, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Liberia, Republic of Cameroon, and Senegal.

A cable to those seven missions on August 10, 1980, asked for confirmation of their interest and suggested dates for the workshop. The cable described workshop objectives to be:

"(a) Disseminate lessons and findings of ASIP and other AID-sponsored management development activities nearing

or having reached end of pilot/field research phase....
(b) Review application of this experience to present and anticipated mission requirements and priorities for support in strengthening management performance within mission projects and among national and sub-national institutions; and, (c) Obtain mission recommendations and priorities to guide AID/Washington in considering field service and support activities in public program and project management."

Of the seven missions, only the Dominican Republic and Liberia could accommodate the workshops before the end of the fiscal year.

A team, consisting of John P. Hannah of PAS; Thomas D. Murray, a consultant to the Office of Rural Development and Development Administration; and William J. Nagle, an independent consultant, prepared a manual for the workshops that includes summaries of the five pilot projects, a comparison of the issues addressed and approaches taken in the projects. The Appendices include many of the practical tools and methodologies used in the projects. Examples are the Project Identification and Planning Worksheets used in Indonesia; and the Project Profile Preparation Manual used in Jamaica and the list of 73 general management and skills training modules developed in Jamaica.

The team decided to prepare final agendas for the two workshops only after consultation with key figures in the AID missions and host country agencies and institutions.

In both the final in-country preparation and in the conduct of the workshops themselves there was strong stress on the opportunity the workshop presented for participants to examine the management training needs in the rural development and agriculture sectors of their respective countries and to come to some tentative conclusions on how best to address them.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

II. Dominican Republic

The workshop was held at the Instituto Superior de Agricultura (ISA) at its facility outside Santiago, a 2 1/2 hour drive from Santo Domingo. In preparing the agenda, the team drew on comments of staff of the AID Mission and officials of the Ministry of Agriculture. The final agenda was worked out in a day-long session with top staff at ISA. The extremely high level of interest in the workshop evidenced by ISA Director Norberto Quesada and his staff was directly related to ISA's own plans to create a Center for Management in Rural Development. AID is one of a number of donors from whom funds are being sought for the Center. Architectural designs for the Center, to be built on ISA grounds, have already been drawn. By the end of the workshop ISA had committed itself to a follow-up session involving the workshop participants that will go into greater depth on management problems and on strategies that can be designed to cope with them.

There were 35 participants the first day and 44 on the second day, including Minister of Agriculture Mejia.

Some other comments on the agenda: the participants were divided into three discussion groups that met for two hours the first day of the workshop and for one and a half hours the second day. While the presentations the first morning were in English, all the small group discussions and the plenary sessions that followed them were in Spanish.

What follows are:

- The Agenda;
- The List of Participants;
- Management Problems Identified by the Participants;
- Strategies Devised to Address Problems on Which Participants Decided to Focus;
- Recommendations for Future Actions;
- Summaries of Evaluations by Participants of the Workshop;
- A general description of the Instituto Superior de Agricultura (ISA);
- Summary of Proposed Center for Management in Rural Development.

Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura
Agency for International Development
Instituto Superior de Agricultura

Workshop on Management Development and Training
for Program Planning and Implementation

September 12-13, 1980

P R O G R A M

Friday 12:

- 9:30 Registration
- 10:00 Opening and Welcome
- 10:15 Introduction to Seminar and Seminar Objectives
- 10:30 Context of Management Development and Training
- 10:45 Summary Review of Management Development and
Training Projects. Lessons of Experience from:
- | | |
|---------|-----------|
| Jamaica | Nepal |
| Ghana | Indonesia |
| Egypt | |
- 12:30 Lunch
- 1:30 Participants Views of Issues and Problems of Managing
Agriculture and Rural Development Programs and
Projects in the Dominican Republic.
- 3:15 Break
- 3:30 Plenary Session: Small Group Reports
- 5:00 End of First Day

Saturday 13:

- 8:30 Strategies and Approaches for Improving Program
and Project Management
- 10:00 Consideration of Present and Future Resources for
Management Development and Training
- 12:30 Closure
- 1:00 Lunch

**Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura
Agencia para el Desarrollo Internacional
Instituto Superior de Agricultura**

Seminario sobre Desarrollo Administrativo y Adiestramiento

para la Planificación y Ejecución de Programas

12 y 13 de septiembre, 1980

LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES

	<u>Nombre</u>	<u>Institución</u>	<u>Cargo</u>
1.	Lic. Sergio A. Grullón	SEA	Director Depto. Recursos Externos
2.	Ing. Santiago Tejada E.	SEA	Coordinador General del PPA
3.	Ing. Alejandro Tavares	SEA	Coordinador General PIDAGRO-III
4.	Ing. Samuel Encarnación	SEA	Director Depto. Planes, Programas y Proyectos
5.	Dr. Rubén D. Núñez	SEA	Director Depto. Informaciones, Estadísticas y Cómputos
6.	Lic. Joaquín Nolasco	SEA	Director Depto. Economía Agropecuaria
7.	Ing. Pedro Jiménez	SEA	Asist. Subsecretario IEC
8.	Ing. Fernando Badía	SEA	Director Depto. Extensión y Capacitación
9.	Ing. José Hernández Barrera	SEA	Director Depto. Semillas
	Ing. Augusto Núñez Sarita	SEA	Asist. Depto. Semillas
10.	Ing. Guillermo Villanueva	SEA	Director Depto. Investigaciones
11.	Ing. Víctor Vásquez	SEA	Asist. Técnico Depto. Tierras y Aguas
12.	Lic. Aristides Martínez	INESPRE	Gerente Financiero
13.	Ing. Tomás Hernández A.	BAGRICOLA	Administrador General
14.	Lic. Juan Núñez C.	ONAPLAN	División Agrícola
15.	Lic. Gabriel Guzmán	SEA	Coordinador Servicios Plan Sierra
16.	Ing. Manuel Isidor	Direc. Gen. Ganadería	
17.			Director Depto. Fomento Ganadero
18.	Lic. Jerry La Gra	IICA	Investigador
19.	Lic. Horacio Stagno	IICA	Economista
20.	Lic. Víctor Viñas	UNPHU	Director Depto. Economía Agrícola
21.	Ing. Rafael Romero	APEDI	Secretario Ejecutivo
22.	Ing. Emilio Martínez	AID	Asistente de Programas Agrícolas
23.	Sr. Thomas Murray	AID	Consultor
24.	Sr. John Hannah	AID	Consultor
25.	Sr. William Nagle	AID	Consultor
26.	Ing. Norberto Quezada	ISA	Director
27.	Ing. Isabel Ceara	ISA	Subdirectora Académica
28.	Ing. Fernando Fernández	ISA	Subdirector Administrativo
29.	Ing. Carlos Núñez	ISA	Subdirector de Investigaciones
30.	Lic. Hunt Hobbs	ISA	Encargado Depto. Agroempresas
31.	Ing. Angel Martínez	ISA	Profesor Agroempresas

PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED

(Dominican Republic)

1. Lack of training in administrative functions.
2. Regional offices do not work together.
3. Lack of personal and monetary incentives resulting in a lack of qualified personnel.
4. Administrative system lacks a global perspective.
5. The direct beneficiaries are not participating in the decision-making process.
6. Lack of any legal authority that would integrate the agricultural/livestock sectors with other agencies involved with agriculture.
7. No coordination at village level.
8. Lack of any coherence in the labor policies of development projects undertaken in the D.R.
9. No defined methodology for the transfer of technology.
10. Lack of financial/human resources to conduct social/economic research.
11. Lack of Sector and National communication (between Agriculture and Planning, between the agricultural agencies, between departments within institutions, between the Central Office of Agriculture and all regional offices.)
12. Lack of field follow-up, and a deficiency in program and project evaluation.
13. Priority given to project activity and not to the development goals (of the country).
14. Those responsible for financial resources have low management capacity.
15. System of distributing resources is inadequate.
16. Lack of knowledge concerning the administrative process in the Ministry of Agriculture.

STRATEGIES DEvised TO ADDRESS PROBLEMS
ON WHICH PARTICIPANTS DECIDED TO FOCUS

(Dominican Republic)

Problem: Administrative System lacks a comprehensive focus.

Strategy:

- Define the functions of all private sector institutions so that they correspond to the development policy.
- Bring about the legal integration of the Agriculture-Livestock Sector which will result in coordinated planning.
- Outline the positions and levels of responsibility as mechanisms for control and follow-up.
- Facilitate the functions of the agencies under the law.

Problem: Lack of Sector and National Communication.

Strategy:

- Set up training programs to strengthen the process of integration and communication among different levels of institutions at budget preparation time.
- Joint discussion on the measures, or an evaluation of the measures that have been carried out, in order to maintain an effective follow-up for the preparation of a joint program that will prevent problems of communication.
- Promote the legislation for the National Council of Agriculture and provide for evaluation of regional councils as a way of obviating administrative and communication problems among the different levels.

Problem: Lack of incentives.

Strategy:

- Create a merit system.
- Improve logistical support for development activities at the village level.

- Involve technicians in the decision-making process.
- Establish criteria for salary level of village workers.
- Improve the selection of personnel (both within and outside the institution).
- Set up orientation programs on the work areas the technicians will be assigned to.
- Establish a work group to design a personnel evaluation system.
- Design a training program.

Problem: Lack of training in Administrative functions.

Factors bearing on this:

- Public administration functions are not clearly defined, especially in terms of development plans.
- The amount of human resources, physical plants and funds available for training in this area are not known.
- No real knowledge about the "low administrative capacity."
- No uniformity in public administration due to different academic approaches.
- High mobility, due to disorganization in the public sector and in the carrying out of duties.

Strategy: Phase I

- Strengthen the present administration.
- Make available the resources necessary for training of personnel. (Personnel, facilities and money.)
- Adaptation in defining present jobs and moving personnel to match those jobs.

Phase II

- Develop plans to carry out strategies outlined in Phase I.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION

(Dominican Republic)

- Another seminar to delve deeper into all the problems identified.
- Set up a task force to design a planning and implementation system for projects and programs.
- Strengthen the responsibility for decision-making for all participants in the workshop.
- Continue in the future to prioritize problems.

SUMMARIES OF EVALUATIONS BY
PARTICIPANTS OF THE WORKSHOP

(Dominican Republic)

- The seminar caused many high-level technicians to think about a subject that's received relatively little attention in the Dominican Republic.
- It helped define local management problems.
- It was particularly useful in providing a forum for the exchange of ideas and experiences.
- The most useful was learning about the management training that took place or is taking place, in Jamaica, Indonesia, Egypt and Ghana.
- The open participation of everyone can be very useful to all those interested in using this workshop method in their own offices. We all must act as development agents in our professional posts in order to come up with answers to very real problems.
- Favourable impression as it dealt with a subject that in the Dominican Republic is often forgotten, and that is Administration.
- Most interesting was the logical system of carrying out projects.
- Due to our work routine, we lose sight of how to deal with problems that affect us daily. The workshop allowed us opportunities to reflect on those problems.
- The workshop was very interesting; I received something of a shock as I never thought I could learn so much in a day and a half.
- Most interesting part was the problem identification and the existing possible solutions.
- The most interesting part was the group discussions about the administrative problems that affect the agricultural sector.
- In the plenary sessions we all came together to see the problems affecting us and this could be a point of departure for designing a management training program.
- It was totally different from what I was invited to expect. Nevertheless, I can frankly say that the workshop was extremely interesting and allowed an opportunity to hear and discuss problems that, due to the demands of our work, we don't usually have time for.

- Gave us an opportunity to consider alternative solutions to problems of development.
- Knowledge of various ways that programs of public administration were being carried out.
- The most interesting part for me was that it brought together people in responsible positions who, in one way or another, can do something about the problems identified.
- Well organized workshop that dealt with problems of management which although recognized, are not usually given necessary consideration.

CENTER FOR MANAGEMENT IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Instituto Superior de Agricultura proposes the establishment of a management training center to serve all institutions involved with agriculture in the Dominican Republic. The broad purpose of the center is to improve the management of both material and human resources in the agricultural sector, concentrating on those involved in the management of these resources. Its impact, through greater understanding and management at high levels, will be to improve the quality of life at the village level through increased agricultural production. A great number of qualified people (approximately 2,000 over the next four years) is seen as necessary to satisfy the immediate objectives of the Dominican government in overcoming the present food deficiencies.

Given the need for professional people in rural development and agriculture, the importance of management skills and the lack of training opportunities, the Center proposes the following four levels of instruction:

1. Symposiums for individuals and scholars working in the agricultural sector to analyze specific agriculture problems.
2. In-service training of short duration for agricultural administrators and program directors.
3. Medium duration courses for mid-level technicians with proven field experience.
4. Master's programs in Agriculture Economics and Administration.

The Center for Management in Rural Development, as it is tentatively called, will be housed as a permanent part of the Instituto Superior de Agricultura.

This proposal covers only the first five years of the program. Nevertheless, it is foreseen that the Center will provide essential services on a continuing basis once it is established.

L I B E R I A

III. Liberia

The team arrived on Monday, September 15, 1980, to make final plans for the workshop that was to begin on Wednesday, September 17, 1980.

A staff member of AID's Office of Rural Development and Agriculture in Liberia had sent invitations to the workshop, but no other preparations had been made. Much of the second day was spent in eliciting suggestions from key staff of the AID Mission, few of whom had been previously informed of the workshop. The most important finding came from two of the staff who had been significantly involved with the Ministry of Agriculture in writing a policy paper, released by the new government in June. It is titled, "Liberia's Agricultural Development: Policy and Organizational Structure." That policy paper, officially endorsed by the Head of State, provided a focal point for the first part of the workshop. The section of the paper on "Policy and Objectives for Agricultural Development" was distributed and discussed in the second hour of the workshop. By the end of the first morning, the participants began small group discussions on what they perceived as management obstacles to the implementation of the new policy. An afternoon plenary session on the results of the small group discussions was marked by vigorous debate. Late the first day and early the second, the team summarized the management training pilot projects. By that time, it was able to relate some of the experiences learned in the pilots to the problems actually on the minds of the participants. The approach taken in Liberia appeared to capture the attention of the participants earlier in the session by contrast to the Dominican Republic workshop where the material on the pilot efforts was shared before the participants had focused on their own management problems.

After the first introductory hour, the workshop moved from the AID's Mission conference room to the more informal and more comfortable common room of AID's new guest house, a quarter of a mile away. The setting appeared to provide an atmosphere for freer, more open discussion.

The wording of the invitations to the Liberia workshop and the fact that they were not signed by the AID Mission Director probably resulted in representation at somewhat lower levels than might otherwise had been the case. Nonetheless, those who did come evidenced a high level of interest and intelligent concern.

In the final minutes of the workshop there emerged a consensus that the Liberian Institute for Public Administration (LIPA) would be an appropriate institution to follow up on the workshop. An official of LIPA agreed to call the workshop participants together to form a steering committee to plan further steps that might be taken. (It is not without irony that later the same evening, this individual was offered a high position with the Liberian Electric Company. His acceptance of the appointment leaves in doubt the intended follow through on the workshop.)

There follows:

- The Agenda;
- List of Participants;
- Policy and Objectives for Agricultural Development from New Policy Paper;
- Management Problems Identified by Participants as Obstacles to Implementation of New Policy;
- Strategies Suggested by Participants;
- Evaluations.

WORKSHOP ON MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING
FOR PROGRAM PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Monrovia, Liberia, September 17-18, 1980

P R O G R A M

September 17:

9:00-10:00 Introduction (AID Conference Room).
10:00-10:30 Move to AID Guest House for coffee and remainder of Workshop.
10:30 Review of Ministry of Agriculture Policy Paper.
11:00 Identifying Management Issues in Implementing New Policy: small group discussion.
12:00 Lunch.
1:30 Plenary session to discuss results of small group discussions.
3:00 Summary and lessons learned from Economic and Rural Development Project (Ghana).
3:45 Project Planning and Project Monitoring (Indonesia).
5:00 End of session.

September 18:

9:00 Project Monitoring (Indonesia).
9:45 National Planning Project (Jamaica).
10:30 Coffee break.
10:45 Agricultural Sector Implementation Project (Egypt and Nepal).
11:30 Summary of pilot activities and relevance to Liberia.
12:30 Lunch.

- 1:30 Participants discussion of Strategies to Meet Earlier Identified Issues.
- 2:30 Plenary Session.
- 3:45 Evaluation.
- 4:00 Closing.

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE LIBERIAN WORKSHOP

Yvonne Gardner	Ministry of Agriculture
David S. Morris	Forestry Development Authority
Sarah Sherman	Ministry of Planning and Eco. Affairs
Domity Akoi	Ministry of ADP
Francis Dennis	Liberian Bank for Dev. & Investment
Nathaniel Nemah	Agricultural & Coop. Development Bank
Samuel K. Pewu	Ministry of Agriculture
J. Willy Moore	Forestry Dev. Authority
A. Tubman	RPI
Catherine A. Thomas	Forestry Development Authority
Arthur Heagler	USAID/MOA
G. Henry Fomgah	Ministry of ADP
Lloyd Clement	ACDB
Austin Freeman	Liberia Institute of Public Adm.
John B. Vawar	Liberia Institute of Public Admin.
Gabriel D. Nmah	Partnership for Productivity/Lib.
Joseph G. Musah	Ministry of Agriculture
Richard Simunek	USAID
Mary Dennis	Ministry of Planning & Eco. Affairs
Harold Capener	Cuttington RDI Dir.
Bill Bolton	USAID/MOA

**REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE**

**LIBERIA'S AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT:
POLICY AND ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE**

MONROVIA, LIBERIA

JUNE, 1980

CHAPTER THREE

POLICY AND OBJECTIVES FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

An implicit mission of the Ministry of Agriculture is to further and support National Development through an effective agricultural development program. Basic policies in support of this mission are as follows:

- 1) The Ministry will pursue agricultural development within a framework that permits maximum effective coordination with other Agencies of Government relating to all facets of rural development.
- 2) The Ministry will seek active participation of all Liberian farm people in the development process. Development activities will not be confined to selected areas or selected groups of farmers.
- 3) Development programs will be designed to create conditions within which development can occur. Only the people can effect agricultural development; and the people can effect development only if they are provided the necessary incentive, motivation, knowledge, means, and support. The role of the Ministry will be to assist people to develop their resources and potentials.
- 4) The Ministry will promote equitable access to resources and means of production, and a corollary widespread dispersion of benefits from agricultural development.

The broad objective of the agricultural development activity of the Ministry of Agriculture, in support of National development objectives, is to expand Liberia's agricultural output until maximum economic and social benefits are gained for the total population, consistent with judicious use and prudent conservation of resources.

Immediate objectives are to create opportunities for Liberia's subsistence farmers to earn adequate incomes from farming, to make more productive use of Liberia's agricultural resources, and to increase agricultural output. Striving for food self-sufficiency within the limits of technical and economic feasibility will remain an objective. These objectives can be accomplished by furnishing farmers with technical information and supporting services which will permit them to make better use of Liberia's abundant land resources, and will at the same time greatly increase productivity of the resources that are used.

The primary thrust of the development effort is directed to the agricultural sector with major emphasis on the subsistence sub-sector. However, as Liberia's agricultural output increases, consumers will also benefit from more abundant and cheaper food supplies. Expanded incomes to Liberia's farm population will result in greatly increased demand for off-farm goods and services, thus stimulating employment and business activity in other sectors of the economy.

If the above objectives are accomplished, then additional benefits of providing a base for self-sustaining rural development and of contributing to a more equitable income

distribution, will automatically follow.

Accomplishment of the agricultural development objectives, then, would benefit all sectors of Liberian society and contribute significantly to National socio-economic development.

The Ministry of Agriculture intends to identify the potentials of the Nation's agricultural resources, together with opportunities for their development, and to create an organizational and institutional structure that will permit and encourage the needed development. The organizational and institutional structure must have the capability to: 1) implement, coordinate, and integrate the various development strategies; 2) perform routine functions, e.g., required regulatory activities; and 3) address, with appropriate policy decisions, continually emerging and changing problems and issues that impact on development, such as the pricing of agricultural commodities and inputs.

ISSUES IDENTIFIED AS OBSTACLES TO NEW POLICY

(Liberia)

- Fear of losing power at the center.
- Political interference.
- Lack of administrative capability.
- Lack of confidence in politicians.
- Logistical problems due to donor agency requirements.
- Non-involvement of local people in planning.
- Lack of communication between Ministries and Agencies resulting in policies not being properly implemented.
- No incentives for farmers to implement projects.
- Authorities lack credibility with farmers.
- Change from traditional farming methods to modern where farmers are not trained to use modern methods. Example--use of fertilizer.
- Authorities do not study traditional farming methods to determine if they are financially viable.
- Policy does not appear to recognize that people living in rural areas may make their living in activities other than farming, e.g., people in Cape Mount County who earn their livelihood through crafts and sewing.
- Lack of training in use/maintenance of agriculture equipment.

STRATEGIES SUGGESTED BY PARTICIPANTS

(Liberia)

1. Clearly defined policy for institutionalizing the structural arrangement.
2. Integration at regional level.
3. Development officer be selected without political influence.
4. Set up regional development committee of all central ministries.

EVALUATIONS BY PARTICIPANTS OF WORKSHOP

(Liberia)

- The most useful part of the workshop was the discussion of the Liberian case study on management issues/problems and strategies. Also the action training program in project planning and management.
- The most useful part of the workshop was the discussion of management issues with respect to project implementation.
- I think this experience sharing workshop was very useful. One is able to relate to what is happening elsewhere and draw certain lessons that can be useful in going through the problems they face day-to-day.
- The different training approaches utilized in the field tested projects in the four countries was very useful. The lesson learned from them was very rewarding. Many training institutions and agencies think that training is the panacea to all organizational problems. These cases illustrate clearly that training only becomes necessary when in fact the needs are identified.
- Informal style good. Attempt to begin with participant's perception of management issues produced getting our attention, interest, involvement, set the stage nicely for cross cultural comparative insight of cases. Distillation of principles, lessons, frames of refernece all worthwhile.
- Over all, I enjoyed the entire program or seminar especially the presentation of the materials. This kind of workshop should be conducted within the Ministries concerned because the information in the materials presented are definitely conducive to the Liberian problem.
- The most useful part was the case studies as we were able to know that most of the problems we have in Liberia are also found in other countries.
- In general the workshop was very informative and well organized. I appreciate the fact that we were involved in formulating management issues and identifying management problems that exist in our own situations before hearing of how other people are trying to solve theirs.
- Participants were able to exchange ideas which were found very useful to national development.