

PN-AAM-982

ISN-29551

9365300/62

**IMPLEMENTING  
CAPACITY BUILDING  
IN JAMAICA:**

**FIELD EXPERIENCE IN  
HUMAN RESOURCE  
DEVELOPMENT**

**Field Report**

Prepared under AID contract 936-5300, "Organization and Administration of Integrated Rural Development."

George Honadle  
Thomas Armor  
Jerry VanSant  
Paul Crawford

Septembre 1980



Development Alternatives, Inc. 624 Ninth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE . . . . .	i
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
ELEMENTS OF CAPACITY . . . . .	1
THE ROLE OF CAPACITY-BUILDING IN IRDP . . . . .	3
STAFF SKILL DEVELOPMENT . . . . .	10
MANAGEMENT SKILLS WORKSHOPS . . . . .	10
RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	12
COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION BUILDING . . . . .	14
LOCAL LEADERS WORKSHOP . . . . .	14
STAFF WORKERS EXERCISES . . . . .	19
CONCLUSION . . . . .	25
IMMEDIATE ACTION STEPS . . . . .	25
INTERMEDIATE PROGRAMMING EXERCISE . . . . .	27
LONG-TERM STRATEGIES . . . . .	29

### ANNEXES:

- A. KELLITS MANAGEMENT SKILLS WORKSHOP  
DESCRIPTION
- B. CHRISTIANA MANAGEMENT SKILLS WORKSHOP  
DESCRIPTION
- C. CHRISTIANA DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKSHOP  
DESCRIPTION
- D. DECISION TREE USED IN WORKSHOPS

## LIST OF FIGURES

### Figure

1	Rapid Means of Improving Communications. . . .	13
2	Pindar's Development Commi tee's Mutual Support Issues . . . . .	16
3	Two Meetings Development Committee's Mutual Support Issues . . . . .	17
4	Project Staff Mutual Support Issues. . . . .	18
5	Independence of Development Committees . . . .	20
6	An Intermediate Point in Development Committee Evolution. . . . .	23

## PREFACE

This report focuses on one small part of the Human Resources Development activities of the Second Integrated Rural Development Project in Jamaica. The work occurred between May 12, 1980, and May 31, 1980. During the first two weeks of that period, Drs. George Honadle and Thomas Armor and Mr. Jerry VanSant conducted interviews and workshops. These activities focused on the problem-solving capabilities of IRDP staff and those village leaders who were officers of the project-related Development Committees. During the final week VanSant was back in the United States honoring a prior commitment while Honadle and Armor were joined by Mr. Paul Crawford, who assisted in the staging of the third workshop.

The activities reported here could not have occurred without the cooperation, support and active involvement of numerous people. Prior to the work trip, an exploratory visit was made by George Honadle and Dr. James Lowenthal of AID/DS/RAD. At that time, the assistance of Lowenthal and the support of Dr. Pat Peterson, the Rural Development Officer of USAID/Kingston, Mr. Dudley Reid, project director of the IRDP, and Mr. Roger Newburn, chief of party of the Pacific Consultants Technical Assistance Team, were invaluable.

During the work period, Messrs. Reid and Newburn were most supportive. Miss Levinia Hines, head of training for IRDP, contributed great time and effort to make the workshops a success, and Harvey Blustain of Cornell University contributed his time and valuable knowledge to the effort. Special mention must also be made of the active involvement and substantive contributions of two people -- Bernard F. Webber, of the IRDP staff, and Ryland Holmes, of the Pacific Consultants Team. They participated in the majority of workshop sessions and provided insights, knowledge and skills. Their active support contributed directly to the immediate effectiveness of the workshops and their determined emphasis on follow-through can be expected to play an important role in any longer-term success. Their valuable contributions are most gratefully acknowledged.

Although this report is written by four "visitors," it really belongs to the IRDP staff and the Development Committee officers. They generated most of the substance of the report -- we just organized it.

Additionally, the activity reported here should be seen as an integral part of the "family" approach to project

management promulgated by Mr. Reid. In such an approach, short-term consultants become part of an overall team that is also composed of project staff, villagers, and long-term technical assistance personnel. The glue holding this team together consists of an enthusiasm for learning and a commitment to development and to making the project work. We are honored to have been part of the team.

## INTRODUCTION TO CAPACITY-BUILDING

Rural development implies self-sustaining improvement in the lives of rural people. If this does not occur, projects cannot be considered successful. Unfortunately, success is not common.

Recent attention to this fact has stimulated interest in the development of human resources and group capabilities for generating benefits beyond the life of donor-assisted projects. This is called "capacity-building."

In this report, a capacity-building perspective is used to highlight selected aspects of human resource development in Jamaica's second Integrated Rural Development Project (IRDP). This section presents the elements of capacity and then it identifies the role of capacity-building in IRDP.

### Elements of Capacity

In general terms, capacity-building is improving the ability of people to deal with their problems. More specifically, capacity itself is the ability to:

- Anticipate and influence change;
- Make informed decisions;
- Attract and absorb resources; and

- Manage resources to achieve objectives.<sup>1/</sup>

To realize these capabilities, people form informal groups and formal organizations. The latter also allow capabilities to continue independently of the individuals who constitute the organization at any one period. Such organizations may be governmental, such as the IRDP, or they may be community-based, such as the IRDP-associated development committees.<sup>2/</sup>

The requirements of a capable organization include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Organizational skills, such as the ability to forge effective links with other organizations and to make it possible for local residents to participate in decisionmaking;
- Information for decisionmaking, and the ability to utilize those data;
- Staff or a stable membership; and
- Processes for solving problems and implementing decisions.<sup>3/</sup>

Thus, organizational capacity-building requires a focus on both administrative structures and management procedures as well as individual and group skills.

---

<sup>1/</sup> See Beth Walter Honadle, "A Capacity-Building Framework," paper prepared for the White House Task Force on capacity-building, U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA-ESCS-EDD, State and Local Government Program area, Washington, D.C. April 1980.

<sup>2/</sup> For an examination of community organizations independent of IRDP, see: Arthur A. Goldsmith and Harvey S. Blustain, Local Organization and Participation in Integrated Rural Development in Jamaica, Ithaca: Cornell University Rural Development Committee, 1980.

<sup>3/</sup> Honadle, op. cit., page 3.

When observing or assessing the capacity of an organization to undertake particular tasks, two dimensions should be examined. The first is organizational stock. That is, what resources does the organization control? For example, agricultural extension units with vehicles, well-trained staff, communication equipment and adequate materials and facilities are likely to be able to perform better than those units without these assets. The second thing to look for is organizational behavior. That is, what are people actually doing? This is important because high levels of stock do not automatically lead to high performance levels. In fact, a spit-and-polish Department of Agriculture, packed with highly paid Ph.Ds, may be very unlikely to deliver extension services to the most rural and most needy farmers.

Thus, effective capacity-building efforts must look beyond inventories of organizational stock to actual human behavior.<sup>4/</sup> This brief overview provides a lens for viewing the human resource development dimension of Jamaica's IRDP.

#### The Role of Capacity-Building in IRDP

The Jamaican Integrated Rural Development Project is a four-year project jointly financed by USAID and the Jamaican

---

<sup>4/</sup> See: George Honadle, "Managing institution building: An Action-Oriented Model Based on the Provincial Area Development Program in Indonesia," Development Alternative, Inc., Washington, D.C., November 1979, unpublished draft.

Government, involving a combined US \$26 million in loans, grants, technical assistance, and host-country investment.<sup>5/</sup> Approximately half of the project's expenditure is earmarked for erosion control activities. These include a soil conservation program requiring terracing, ditching, and pastureland treatment; reforestation of over 7,000 acres of project area and engineering works, including road construction and rehabilitation, stream control (waterway and check dam construction), and river control (embankment protection).

Credit and marketing components are included in the project plan. An agricultural extension program is expected to provide one extension agent for every 200 farmers. Improvements in housing and the provision of electricity and water are also included as part of an ongoing effort to increase rural infrastructure. Further, programs for home economics and the strengthening of local organizations are being added during the initial stages of implementation.

The IRDP focuses on two non-contiguous watersheds in the interior highlands of Jamaica. These watersheds, Two Meetings and Pindars River, contain approximately 4,000 small hillside farmers (averaging 2.9 hectares apiece). Though placing the

---

<sup>5/</sup> See: Agency for International Development, Jamaica -- Integrated Rural Development, project paper, September 1977.

project in non-adjacent watersheds increases the administrative difficulties, it nevertheless directly addresses the priority problems of two of the most important of Jamaica's 18 severely eroded watersheds.

In the context of the IRDP, capacity-building requires two basic emphases. The first is to train project staff in the skills necessary to carry out project functions and respond to the changing needs of the project's beneficiaries. Such skills involve not only the technical expertise necessary to implement the design, e.g., soil conservation and farming techniques, but also the management ability necessary to achieve these objectives.

Since beneficiary participation is one of the key elements in the success and continuity of an IRD project,<sup>6/</sup> a second need is to provide training to the beneficiaries themselves. This is necessary to help them to take advantage of the services offered, to develop their own capacity to identify problems and solutions, and to work cooperatively to implement the solutions generated.

Training of staff personnel can take several forms. One mechanism for training used in the IRDP has been the creation

---

<sup>6/</sup> Elliott Morss, John Hatch, Donald Mickelwait and Charles Sweet, Strategies for Small Farmer Development: An Empirical Study of Rural Development Projects, Boulder: Westview Press, 1976.

of counterpart relationships between host country nationals and long-term international technical assistance advisors. Also, project funds are earmarked for long-term training of project staff, both overseas and in-country, and short-term training workshops have been organized.

Much of this staff training concentrates on specific technical skills, such as soil conservation, agricultural extension, and agricultural economics (almost all of the approximately 40 man-years of training planned in the Project Paper has such a focus). Equally important, however, is the need for training to improve management and organizational skills. In part, this involves increasing the ability to work in teams, set realistic goals, measure progress, and resolve intergroup conflicts.

The initial effort to use a conference setting to explore objectives and build staff teamwork occurred in August 1979. At that time, the senior project staff met at Eltham -- away from the project site -- to hold a workshop. This exercise, which has since become known as the "Eltham Retreat," used small group exercises to build consensus and articulate objectives.<sup>7/</sup> In fact, this retreat for senior staff established the pattern of operation followed by the activities described in this report.

---

<sup>7/</sup> For more details, see Harvey Blustain's memo on the Eltham Report.

The second major capacity-building need in IRDP is to raise the abilities of the beneficiaries themselves. Agricultural projects often fail to achieve their goals because they do not adequately involve local people in the project's planning, implementation, management, and evaluation. In the absence of local participation, a development project will find it difficult to bring about the behavioral change necessary for its success. Moreover, development activities supported solely by government agencies and devoid of local participation and support will be unlikely to survive the termination of outside funds. According to Goldsmith and Blustain, local organizations serve several critical functions. These include:

- Facilitating communication between the beneficiaries and project personnel;
- Lessening beneficiary distrust and providing legitimacy to a project's activities;
- Providing a means of mobilizing popular support and cooperation among the beneficiaries; and
- Encouraging self-reliance.

In the IRDP, an awareness of the importance of local organizations to the success of the project has been increasing with experience. This has been an evolutionary process, beginning with the search for compatible existing organizations, such as the Jamaican Agricultural Society (JAS), and leading to the creation of the more project-oriented

Development Committees. Since the Development Committees are based in the JAS but strongly linked to the IRDP, their survival after the dissolution of the project is not certain. It is, therefore, very important that they become vital and effective organizations prior to that event. Thus, capacity-building within the Development Committees is extremely important.

This capacity-building may initially concentrate on local leadership and Development Committee officers, increasing their ability to identify and address local needs and mobilize local resources towards feasible solutions. Improving the effectiveness of such activities will increase the benefits perceived by farmers within the organization and, consequently, encourage their participation and support. Later, capacity-building among the general membership of the Development Committees could lead to more effective local control and direction, i.e., increased capability to generate resources, select officers, and guard their own interests. This should increase the value of the Development Committees in the eyes of local farmers and provide a firmer basis for them to operate during the project period and after the expiration of the IRDP.

In sum, capacity-building is necessary for the IRDP to succeed. In the short-run, this means that the project staff must obtain and use the skills necessary to marshal their

efforts and deliver services to local villagers. This includes the establishment of effective management procedures. Short-run efforts will also be influenced by the ability of Development Committees to provide the connection between staff actions and beneficiary involvement in implementation.

In the longer-run, this means that villagers must gain the individual skills and group capabilities necessary to carry on project initiatives and respond to evolving community needs. Only by following a strategy of building staff and beneficiary capacity, can the Jamaican IRDP overcome the many barriers to self-sustaining development.

#### STAFF SKILL DEVELOPMENT

During May of 1980, two three-day "Management Skills Workshops" were held for project staff.<sup>8/</sup> This section presents the approach taken to these workshops, the significance of this approach for capacity-building and some of the products generated by project staff during the exercises.

---

<sup>8/</sup> The first was held at the Pindars River Watershed office in Kellits on May 19-21. The second was conducted with the Two Meetings Watershed staff at the Christiana Potato Growers Cooperative Building in Christiana on May 26-28. For chronological descriptions of these activities, see Annexes A and B.

### Management Skills Workshops

The word "workshop" often describes a standardized package of lectures and exercises that is carried from place-to-place and performed time-after-time in approximately the same manner. For many reasons, this is not the approach used to build capacity in the IRDP. The weaknesses of a "canned" approach include the following:

- An assumption that standard solutions are available and that knowledge of those solutions will solve problems;
- A belief that increasing organizational stock through classroom training is adequate to improve organizational behavior; and
- A willingness to accept the data provided by outsiders as more useful for resolving implementation difficulties than the data held by those directly involved in the process.

Since the objective of the management skills workshops was to develop the ability of staff to solve their own problems, rather than to provide solutions to present situations, a standardized workshop approach was not used. Instead, an attempt was made to respond to staff definitions of issues and to structure an environment where mutual learning could occur. This was accomplished in the following way:

- One week prior to the workshops was spent interviewing staff and identifying issues and events that provided insights about implementation dynamics;

- The interview results were used to categorize issues<sup>9/</sup> that the workshop might address and to design the first day of the workshop;
- The morning of the first day was used to generate, from the participants, specific problems under each issue category; and
- These problems were then used as examples for the application of techniques and as a data base for selecting the skills to be addressed in the remainder of the workshop.

Thus, the exercises conducted at Kellits and Christiana were based on actual situations occurring during IRDP implementation, they involved project staff in the generation of plans for their own action, and they focused on raising the ability of project personnel to deal with new situations as they arise. Furthermore, although the visiting consultants provided some frameworks for confronting problems and processes for generating group initiatives, the workshops were -- in a very real sense -- self-designed by the participants. Since the most common activity was small-group sessions working on a product, the exercises were also largely self-conducted.

This overview of the workshop approach suggests that the effort was consistent with the idea of capacity-building as it was set forth in Section I. The remaining task of this section is to present some of the results of the management skills

---

<sup>9/</sup> The issue categories were: communication among project levels; the process used to plan project activities; the nature of subwatershed management teams; and the role of the development committees.

workshops and to discuss their implications for managing implementation and for future human resource development.

### Results and Implications

Project staff applied simple management techniques to actual implementation problems and generated some tentative solutions which they could carry out themselves. The evaluations of both workshops indicated both that the exercises were perceived as immediately useful and that demand exists for future extension of these activities.

This continuation has two dimensions: First, staff-generated remedies, such as those itemized in Figure 1, should be acted upon; second, the IRDP human resource development strategy should continue to include action-oriented, participative approaches to individual and group capacity-building.

Figure 1

Rapid Means of Improving Communications

- 1) More field visits from senior staff
- 2) Less reliance on formal reports for formal communication - more direct (one on one) contact
- 3) Development committee minutes (copy) to go directly to Mr. Webber's office
- 4) Rotating representative field officers at program staff (Mon. P.M.) meeting
- 5) Boxes for program components/people
- 6) Simplified version of meeting minutes for all staff
- 7) Staff newsletter
  - Timeliness - how often?
  - Contents - for whom/for what purpose?
- 8) People should make effort to understand others' roles
- 9) Fill existing staff vacancies with capable people
- 10) Delegate authority
- 11) Boxes for each subwatershed at springground and subwatershed offices
- 12) Drivers responsible for delivering contents of boxes
- 13) More use of written communication
- 14) Use notice boards
- 15) Central/project office staff attend watershed meetings (staff conferences)

## COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION BUILDING

During the first week of field work, the visiting consultants attended development committee meetings as part of the data collection exercise. In the second week, a one-day workshop was held with the presidents and secretaries of development committees. During the third week, the final morning of the second management skills workshop for project staff was focused on the present and future roles of development committees.

This section draws on the experiences noted above to present the community organization dimension of capacity-building in IRDP. First, the Development Committee Workshop is discussed and then staff perceptions of the appropriate direction for development committee evolution are identified.

Local Leaders Workshop

Capacity-building requires a two-way exchange of information and experience. To facilitate this exchange, Development Committee officers were brought together with IRDP staff to begin a process of developing mutual action plans and building shared experiences.<sup>10/</sup>

---

<sup>10/</sup> For a chronological description of the Workshop, see Annex C.

The morning was used to conduct a model meeting and then discuss ways to improve the use of time, to raise participation and to clarify communications during Development Committee meetings. The afternoon was spent generating and discussing ideas about how the IRDP, the Development Committees and the local communities might help each other. Some of the results of that exercise are displayed in Figures 2 - 4.

These figures constitute an inventory of concerns in May 1980. Since the evolution of Development Committees is in an early phase, such an inventory may be useful for future comparisons with perceptions of issues and expressions of need. Both changes in Development Committee articulation of issues and either convergence or divergence of committee/project perspectives could provide signals about the direction of change.

The most important value of this exercise, however, is the actual initiation of a substantive dialogue between two important sets of actors in IRDP implementation. Moreover, one immediate result of the workshop was a consensus on the value of interaction among the officers of the different development committees. In fact, it is now planned to have quarterly meetings of all development committee chairmen in each watershed. Additionally, the precedent has been set -- the IRDP training program henceforth includes local organizations.

Figure 2

Pindar's Development Committee's Mutual Support Issues

	How We Can Support	What Support We Need
P R O J E C T	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Participate in the necessary programs</li> <li>2) Adhere to the advice of the project officers</li> <li>3) Identify projects for development; e.g., entombing of springs, repairing farm roads, erecting farm houses, and collecting stations, etc.</li> <li>4) Recommend to farmers to complete their farm plans, and increase production.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The sharing of the technical skills and expertise to develop the programs</li> <li>2) The cooperation of the project officers to enlighten the farmers</li> <li>3) Assistance with a bunch of illegible goings on and do try to make it fit in here</li> <li>4) The implementation of plans and the location of viable markets for products at remunerative prices.</li> </ol>
C O M M U N I T Y	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Encourage group action</li> <li>2) Encourage self-help, e.g., basic schools, playing fields, etc.</li> <li>3) Encourage adult education</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Direction for cooperatives</li> <li>2) Cooperation for implementation</li> <li>3) Aids for teaching and training days</li> </ol>

Figure 3

Two Meetings Development Committees Mutual Support Issues

	How We Can Support	What Support We Need
P R O J E C T	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Increase production</li> <li>2) Accepting changes in farming techniques</li> <li>3) Cooperation</li> <li>4) Communication</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Technical advice from officers</li> <li>2) Cooperation of officers</li> <li>3) Relevant educational material</li> <li>4) Tools and equipment</li> <li>5) Financial assistance</li> <li>6) Marketing and transportation</li> <li>7) Rural Sociology</li> <li>8) Agro-industries</li> </ol>
C O M M U N I T Y	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Rural infrastructure</li> <li>2) Reducing unemployment</li> <li>3) Improving standard of living</li> <li>4) Extending existing nurseries</li> <li>5) Veterinary services</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Medical and veterinary personnel</li> <li>2) Cooperation</li> <li>3) Communication</li> </ol>

Figure 4

Project Staff Mutual Support Issues

How We Can Support the Development Committees (D.C.)	How The Development Committees Can Support IRDP
1) Organize more training	1) Identify training needs
2) Attend meetings, and be punctual	2) Attend meetings, and be punctual
3) Supply educational materials	3) Provide adequate notice of meeting days
4) Provide technical assistance	4) Identify problems and needs
5) Streamline the communication process to expedite D. C. projects	5) Request special speakers one month in advance
6) Follow up on projects	6) Understand structure of IRDP
7) Identify and provide at cost sources of planting material, livestock, etc.	7) Follow up on projects
8) Provide transport for IRDP training	8) Assist credit officer in identifying credit-worthy people
9) Encourage and develop concept of self-reliance	9) Encourage and educate farmers in the IRDP
	10) Identify sources of planting material, livestock, etc.
	11) Do more self-help
	12) Assist in strengthening JAS branches

### Staff Workshop Exercises

Capacity-building is not just something that happens to the IRDP. Rather, it is a dimension of the work done by IRDP staff with local leaders. Thus, an important precondition to project capacity-building is the articulation of a strategy for doing it.

A strategy, in turn, requires a formulation of objectives, an assessment of the present situation and some understanding of the barriers to closing the gap between the desired conditions and present ones. Without a conscious strategy, capacity-building is less likely to occur.

One of the objectives consistently articulated by project staff is the self-reliance of the Development Committees. Furthermore, a commonly noted problem is the present lack of self-reliance.

To address this issue, IRDP staff conducted an analysis of the forces pushing toward self-reliance and those inhibiting it. The result of this "force field analysis" is displayed in Figure 5. This is useful because it provides an initial articulation of the problem and the identification of some items that staff could concentrate on changing.

However, this does not constitute a strategy. It neither suggests how to measure independence nor presents actions to be taken to promote independence. Additionally, it only

Figure 5

Independence of Development Committees

Force Field Analysis	
Driving Forces	Restraining Forces
<u>*Absence of other help</u> →	← <u>(Lack of resources)</u>
<u>{Community pride and spirit}</u> →	← <u>Lack of understanding of role*</u>
<u>National emphasis on self reliance</u> →	← <u>Poor participation</u>
	← <u>(Political divisions)</u>
<u>(National economic situation)</u> →	← <u>Lack of control of resources</u>
<u>Desire to control or own resources</u> →	← <u>Poor organization</u>
	← <u>Lack of information*</u>
<u>Ability to make their own decisions</u> →	← <u>Constant presence of officers*</u>
<u>*Ability to see limitations of project</u> →	← <u>Poor leadership</u>
	← <u>(Lack of dynamic leaders)</u>
<u>*Ability to see potential of the community</u> →	← <u>(Self-centered members)</u>
	← <u>(Unfulfilled promises by politicians)</u>
<u>Dynamic leaders</u> →	
<u>*Involvement at all levels of the community</u> →	← <u>(Accustomed to handouts)</u>
	← <u>Imposition of project goals on community</u>
<u>Competitive spirit</u> →	
<u>(Previous experience of group action)</u> →	← <u>{Protective activity in forming committees}</u>
	← <u>(Previous negative experience with government action)</u>

( ) Things we can't control.

{ } Things we may not be able to change.

\* Things we could concentrate on changing.

focuses on one general idea about the characteristics of an effective development committee -- self-reliance.

To develop the strategy development process, the final morning of the Christiana staff workshop was devoted to identifying the present condition of Development Committees, articulating what they should be like at the end of the project and suggesting some ways to reach an intermediate point. This exercise focused on four development committee dimensions. They are:

- Membership;
- Resource Base;
- Functions; and
- Skills.

In the first phase of this exercise, the attitude of most Development Committee leaders was depicted as "dependency on IRDP." More specifically, the present situation along each dimension was depicted as follows:

- Membership: Older, male, wealthy landowners, JAS members, varies from place-to-place, not representative of their community;
- Resource Base: Dependency upon IRDP funds and skills, reluctant to use their own individual resources, no collective resources;
- Functions: Grousing (complaining), public relations assistance to project, identification of community needs, two-way communication, providing advise on IRDP fund use, helping farmers to organize themselves; and

- Skills: Some craft skills, traditional farming skills, limited management and organizational skills, highly skilled at begging, low membership skills, little ability to identify and act on their own needs (varies), some communication skills.

By the end of the project, however, the goal was to have the Development Committees looking very different from their present status. The ideal was to have them characterized by a heightened sense of community awareness and responsibility. More specifically, the objectives for each dimension were depicted as follows:

- Membership: Broad-based, revolving, separate from JAS;
- Resource Base: Drawn from other organizations, community contributions, financed from operations, organized with Treasury Committee;
- Functions: Seek solutions to community problems, become independent of government/foreign donor funds, provide information to the community, identify their own purposes and develop programs to achieve them; and
- Skills: Organization and management, leadership, financial management, technical (ag) education/communication, creativity and ability to respond to new ideas, ability to accurately identify community needs.

To help close the gap between the immediate reality and the long-term ideal, the project staff generated some indicators for intermediate objectives and some actions that could help to achieve the intermediate stage. These objectives and actions are displayed in Figure 6. This can be seen as a first

Figure 6

An Intermediate Point in Development Committee Evolution

DIMENSION	CHARACTERISTICS	HOW TO GET THERE
MEMBERSHIP	Turnover in membership, meetings consider fewer individual problems and more community ones; balanced membership.	Monitor meetings, integrate local extension staff into formation of committees; develop rules for revolving membership and interest group representation/geographical representation; increase numbers; include farmers without farm plans.
RESOURCE BASE	Fund raising activity beginning; begin to systematically identify their own resources; fewer demands on IRDP; non-IRDP funded activity occurring; 60/40 farmer IRDP participation in resources used.	Train/educate committees; NCLP committees to begin the activities.
FUNCTIONS	Accomplish community tasks with little help from project; committee passes technical information to farmers not directly contacted by IRDP.	Training in carrying out the tasks.
SKILLS	Organization and leadership; ability to select new members, takes less time to do things; fund raising.	Give them experience with guidelines; let them develop their own proposals for solving problems and identifying community needs instead of just individual ones; training; demonstrations; field days; fund raising assistance.

attempt by IRDP field staff to articulate their view of an appropriate Development Committee assistance strategy.<sup>11/</sup>

In May, then, a two-pronged approach to local organizational capacity was taken. First, direct action was taken to increase selected skills of local leaders. Second, staff attention was focused on the development of a strategy to continue to assist development committees. Although each prong occurred as a discrete activity, the artificiality of the division was apparent to many participants. Future efforts, then, should blend staff and beneficiary experiences into a mutual capacity-building endeavor.

---

<sup>11/</sup> Advisors, such as Goldsmith and Blustain, have called attention to Development Committee assistance but this is the first time, to our knowledge, that specific goals and means have been generated by field-level IRDP staff.

## CONCLUSION

This section looks to the future. It presents immediate, intermediate and strategic recommendations which emerge from participant perspectives and consultant observations.

### Immediate Action Steps

Each workshop produced a list of action steps that the project could implement with little or no resource commitment. In each workshop the items were developed through slightly different procedures. They are ordered and presented here under topical headings that might point toward implementation responsibility.

This first heading is Communications. This includes the following specific actions which should be taken to lessen problems arising from poor communication:

- Establish and utilize message boards at the various offices for general announcements;
- Utilize a technical/extension oriented newsletter for dissemination of information needed by field staff;
- Rely less on formal reports and more on one-to-one contact on important issues;
- Establish mail boxes at all offices and a regular mail distribution system;
- Prepare and distribute timely and simplified minutes of staff meetings;

- Review project newsletter for purpose and timeliness; and
- Use more systematic written communication.

The second set of immediate action recommendations emphasizes Information Systems. It includes:

- Reproduce farm plans before typing and return copy immediately to subwatershed office;
- Assemble cumulative data at subwatershed for baseline and forecasting purposes; and
- Assemble cumulative data at watershed for improved coordination within watershed and among subwatershed.

The third topic is Staffing. Suggested actions are:

- Fill senior extension officer vacancy at watershed level for coordination and information sharing; and
- Fill existing staff vacancies with capable people.

The fourth heading is Role Relations. This involves actions to:

- Clarify role of team leader regarding authority relations with other team members and role in enforcing policy;
- Eliminate distinction between agriculture extension and soil conservation officers at watershed and subwatershed levels;
- Increase senior staff visits to the field;

- Explain different roles within the projects; and,
- Have Central and Project office staff attend watershed meetings.

The next topic, Planning, contains only one suggested course of action:

- Develop "bottom-up" planning process for each watershed.

The final topic is Development Committees. The single recommendation here is to:

- Link up-front project resources to locally provided inputs on a reasonable basis.

These nineteen suggestions summarize the immediate action recommendations emerging from the workshops.

### Intermediate Programming Exercise

An opportunity to continue the process begun in August 1979 and strengthened in May 1980 presents itself in the Fall of 1980. This opportunity can be focused on two items. The first is the management issues identified for action in the workshops of May 1980. The second is the implementation plan required by the December 1979 evaluation.<sup>12/</sup>

---

<sup>12/</sup> See R. Curtis, J. Lowenthal and R. Castro, "Evaluation of Pindar River and Two Meetings Integrated Rural Development Project," USAID/Jamaica. January 1980.

A formal implementation plan document can be produced. More important, however, is the process used to develop the plan.

A plan might be developed over a two- to three-week period, including some "pre-work" collecting initial information and planning assumptions. The implementation plan would actually emerge from this activity. Some elements of such an activity might be:

- Identification and inclusion of appropriate key non-project people, such as:

Ministry of Agriculture  
Development Committee leaders  
USAID/Kingston  
AID/Washington  
Technical Assistance Team

- An interactive approach to formalizing implementation action steps; for example, a proposal by subwatersheds is reviewed, commented on and then altered, if necessary, before being made part of the implementation plan -- all within a few days and involving all relevant people.
- Critical interdependencies systematically identified and addressed;
- Realistic time frames developed and agreed to;
- Role expectations renegotiated between individuals and organizational units if necessary; and
- Staff members understanding of how their particular action steps will contribute to the overall implementation plan.

The first three recommendations of the December 1979 Evaluation (Project Orientation, Local Organizations, Management

Capability) are parallel to many of the issues and concerns raised in the May 1980 workshops. These data would provide the starting point for a systematic process of formulating action steps. This process would start with small organizational units and go through a series of interactions and reformulations of targets, times and responsibility. The plan would then have well-coordinated and sequenced sub-arts developed for and by the various operating units of the entire project.

### Long-Term Strategies

Capacity-building is a slow process. Although immediate tangible results sometimes are possible, the true test of capacity does not occur until after external resources are withdrawn. Moreover, capacity-building is not likely to result from a single involvement. Rather, a series of reinforcing sequential activities may be necessary.

With this in mind, two sets of general recommendations for longer-term strategies can be made. First, a continual stream of short-term assistance should be used to build staff skills. At six-month intervals throughout the project life, targeted skill development activities should occur. Sometimes they might be workshops, such as those held in May. At other times, they could be direct task involvement. Additionally, future efforts should not distinguish between staff and beneficiaries. Shared experiences, common tasks and mutual commitments can result from exercises with both participating.

Second, a pilot scheme should be established to provide an intense focus for building Development Committee capability. An appropriate level of effort would be to concentrate on two Development Committees in each watershed. At the end of one year, those committees could provide direct technical assistance to other development committees. Then, capacity-building in IRDP would be a true partnership among project staff and rural villagers.

These general suggestions must be turned into specific targets and timetables if they are to be implemented. The implementation planning exercise offers an opportunity to do this.

Both these recommendations and this report must be placed into the context of IRDP implementation -- they are neither a beginning nor an end. Rather, they constitute just one step in the learning process that is capacity-building.

**ANNEX A**

**KELLITS MANAGEMENT SKILLS WORKSHOP  
DESCRIPTION**

## ANNEX A

### KELLITS MANAGEMENT SKILLS WORKSHOP DESCRIPTION

This Annex provides a chronological description and brief overview of both the process and substance of the Staff Management Skills Workshop held at the Pindars River Watershed office in Kellits on May 19-21, 1980.

#### Day 1: Monday, May 19

The purpose of this day's activity was to break the ice, to get people interested and involved, and to generate some specific problems that could be used to illustrate the techniques to be introduced later.

Exercise A: The participants were broken into five groups by counting off. Each group generated a list of specific problems organized under four categories of concerns which emerged from the individual interviews conducted during the previous week. The lists were posted on the wall where they remained during the entire workshop. The topics were: Subwatershed Team; Planning; Communications; and Relationship Between Development Committee and Project. A list of the issues and problems is attached.

Exercise B: The "hollow squares" planning exercise was conducted. This emphasized the need for communication between planners and implementors. Three teams of planners developed instructions for three operating teams to assemble a puzzle. It was then assembled. The exercise was then discussed by the entire assemblage.

Day 2, Tuesday, May 20

This day was used to introduce some basic management tools that can be used to deal with some of the problems identified during Day 1. The emphasis was on things which could be done at the watershed and subwatershed levels.

Exercise A: To improve time management, a simple framework was introduced. This breaks time down into productive and non-productive use of time. By looking at a typical week, identifying how much time is used for different things, and seeing how time is wasted, suggestions can be made for better time use. This was a short lecture and handout.

Exercise B: A method called "force field analysis" was introduced using the example of the problem of developing greater self-reliance by Development Committees. The technique was presented to the entire group, which then broke into four small groups to use it.

Exercise C: The "Organizational Responsibility Chart" technique was introduced by using the example of entombment of a spring to illustrate it. First, a list was made of all activities required to entomb a spring. Next, a list was made of all actors involved in doing, supporting, approving, or needing to be informed of each activity. The activities were then listed down the side of the chart and the people were listed across the top. In each box -- where a task and an actor converged -- a letter was used to represent level of involvement. The letters were:

R = Responsibility for doing it;  
 A = Prior approval necessary;  
 S = Support required;  
 I = Should be informed.

This exercise was accomplished in the large group only. Circling each letter indicated completion.

Exercise D: A "Decision Tree" form was introduced using the problem of inadequate staff. The focus was on actions at the watershed and subwatershed levels. First, individuals used the form to identify alternative solutions, new problems and to choose a solution. Second, three groups of four sub-watersheds each met to choose a group solution and realize the value of group problem-solving. The Form is attached as Annex D.

Exercise E: An exercise on "Conducting Meetings and Discussing Watershed Issues" completed the day. The same three groups met again with one of the consultants running each meeting. An example of how to use a meeting was set by each consultant. The issues chosen by the three groups were Watershed Planning, Subwatershed Teams, and Information Flow Within The Watershed.

Day 3: Wednesday, May 21

This day focused on interactions among the three project levels of central office, watershed and subwatershed.

Exercise A: Using the entombment example, the idea of "PERT" scheduling was introduced to the whole group. Each activity was listed on a card, the cards were arrayed on a flip chart and the lines showing dependency were drawn. In addition to demonstrating the scheduling procedure, many issues of IRDP organizational relationships were raised.

Exercise B: A matrix was used to depict the flow and use of information on farm plans. This was done with the entire assemblage to identify how the system works and to suggest ways to improve data use among all levels.

Exercise C: The assemblage was broken into groups representing the three project levels and "Other." The "Mutual Support Sharing" exercise required each group to relate itself to each other group by identifying actions they could take to support

the others as well as actions the others might take to assist them. For each thing asked, however, it was required that something be offered. The group outputs were posted on the wall and everyone examined all suggested actions. Discussion followed.

Exercise D: The entire workshop was summarized by emphasizing the range of skills examined and the fact that all participants are managers. The workshop was then evaluated by each individual, focusing on the most and least useful exercises and suggestions for improvement or future action. Each participant also received handouts on "Roberts' Rules of Order," "Active Listening," and "Managing Change."

**ANNEX B**

**CHRISTIANA MANAGEMENT SKILLS WORKSHOP  
DESCRIPTION**

## ANNEX B

### CHRISTIANA MANAGEMENT SKILLS WORKSHOP DESCRIPTION

This Annex provides a chronological description and brief overview of both the process and substance of the Staff Management Skills Workshop held at the Christiana Potato Growers Cooperative Building in Christiana on May 26 - 28, 1980.

#### Day 1: Monday, May 26

Exercise A: Five groups generated lists of specific problems organized under four categories of issues. The categories were: Subwatershed Team; Planning; Communication; and Relationship Between Development Committee and Project. The lists were posted on the wall and used to supply exercise examples during the workshop.

Exercise B: The "Hollow Squares" planning exercise was conducted in the same manner as it was used in the Kellits Workshop.

#### Day 2: Tuesday, May 27

Exercise A: Force Field Analysis was used to break out elements of the problem of developing greater self-reliance among Development Committees. Small groups developed analyses which were combined into a group output that was posted.

Exercise B: The Time Management exercise was used. Participants broke their time use into productive and non-productive activities. This was a presentation, brief exercise and assignment for each participant's own use.

**Exercise C:** The Decision Tree Form was used to focus on problems related to alternative solutions of the lack of adequate transportation. Two groups of subwatershed officers and a central office staff group produced solutions which were presented to the entire group.

**Exercise D:** The Organizational Responsibility chart technique was used to examine the actors and activities involved in entombing a spring. This was done in the large group.

**Exercise E:** PERT/CPM scheduling was introduced as an added way of analyzing the spring entombment process. After a brief introduction, the activities identified in the ORC exercise were displayed through time and the sequential/simultaneous scheduling possibilities were noted. This occurred in the large group.

**Exercise F:** In preparation for Senior Staff participation on Friday, three groups identified issues related to the management of the project and formulated specific questions for different officials or units. These issues and questions were used by the consultant team in preparing the next day's agenda but they were not discussed beyond the groups that prepared them.

**Day 3: Wednesday, May 28**

**Exercise A:** This group exercise examined the present, end-of-project ideal, and intermediate stages of Development Committee evolution along the dimensions of: Membership, Resource Base, Functions, Skills, and Attitudes. This began thinking toward a manageable, measurable strategy for supporting D. C. evolution. The three groups also focused on strategies for moving from the present stage to the intermediate one.

**Exercise B:** Participants were asked to recommend specific steps that could be readily implemented to facilitate the flow of management information throughout the project. These simplified action

steps (e.g., use of announcement boards) were listed and forwarded to the Project Administrative Officer's desk.

Exercise C: The "Mutual Support Sharing" exercise required each project level to relate itself to each other level by identifying actions they could take to support the others, as well as actions the others might take to assist them. For each thing asked, however, it was required that something be offered.

**ANNEX C**

**CHRISTIANA DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKSHOP  
DESCRIPTION**

## ANNEX C

### CHRISTIANA DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE WORKSHOP DESCRIPTION

This Annex provides a chronological description and brief overview of both the process and substance of the Management Skills Workshop for Development Committee officers held at the Christiana Potato Growers Cooperative Building on May 22, 1980.

The purpose of the workshop was to facilitate communication among Development Committee leaders and between those leaders and project staff. At the same time, through modeling exercises, techniques of meeting leadership and effecting group discussion were illustrated.

Exercise A: A model meeting exercise was introduced and conducted by B. S. Weber. A chairman and secretary were selected and the meeting conducted in accordance with a prepared agenda. Analytical comments were made in the course of the model meeting by Mr. Weber and Mr. Holmes.

At the end of the meeting, small group discussions were held to consider the meeting process, the most important things that can be accomplished at Development Committee meetings, and the most difficult parts of meetings. The whole group reassembled to hear reports from the small groups and to discuss how to overcome the identified difficulties.

The exercise was summarized by a brief presentation on the distinction between efficiency and effectiveness in organizations.

Exercise B: To consider how the Development Committees and project can mutually support each other more effectively, the participants were divided into

three groups: Pindars Watershed Development Committee officers, Two Meetings Watershed Development Committee officers, and Project Staff. The committee officers groups considered the following questions:

- How can we support the project?
- How can we support our community?
- What support do we need from the project; and
- What support do we need from our community/

Project staff considered these questions:

- How can we support the Development Committees?;
- What support do we need from the Development Committees?

Ideas were written down and posted for general review. Discussion followed to clarify and identify special follow-up possibilities. A "Goldfish Bowl" technique was used in which seven persons carried on the discussion, surrounded by the rest as observers. In this technique, any observer may enter the circle by displacing someone not involved in the conversation. This method was used as one example for coping with orderly discussion in large groups.

Among several ideas expressed, the following specific recommendations emerged:

- Development Committee chairmen within each watershed should meet quarterly with watershed officers and appropriate project staff to discuss issues of mutual interest. This was agreed to by project management.

- Development Committees will assume responsibility for delivery of their meeting minutes directly to the Project Officer, as well as through subwatershed officers. This was agreed to by Project Management.
- The Project should provide veterinary services to balance and complement the emphasis on animal husbandry credits. This was to be reviewed immediately at the Project Management level.

The Workshop was concluded with the suggestion that the following task be added to the agenda of each Development Committee at a future meeting:

- List five (5) of the most pressing needs identified in your community and prepare a plan setting out how your committee would deal with two (2) of these.

Handouts dealing with Communication, Group Effectiveness, Leadership, and Parliamentary Procedure were given to each participant.

Response to the day's activities by the participants was of high quality and enthusiasm. Although time was not taken for written comment or evaluation, the view of the training consultants is that the Project should continue to include Development Committee leaders in its training strategies.

**ANNEX D**

**DECISION TREE USED IN WORKSHOPS**

OTHER DOCUMENTS AVAILABLE FROM THE IRD PROJECT

I. FIELD REPORTS

1. Rural Development Strategies in Thailand: A Review of the Organization and Administration of Rural Development for AID, by Donald R. Mickelwait, Charles A. Murray, and Alan Roth (June 1979).
2. Organizing and Managing Technical Assistance: Lessons from the Maasai Range Management Project, by George Honadle with Richard McGarr (October 1979).
3. Management Assistance to LCADP Transportation Logistics: Observations and Recommendations, by David W. Miller (October 1979).
4. Community Based Integrated Rural Development (CBIRD) in the Special Territory of Aceh, Indonesia, by Jerry VanSant with Peter F. Weisel (October 1979).
5. Honduras Small Farmer Technologies: A Review of the Organization and Administration of Rural Development for USAID, by Richard L. Smith, Donald R. Jackson and John F. Hallen, with George Honadle and Robert af Klinteberg (October 1979). Also in Spanish.
6. Addressing Problems of Middle Level Management: A Workshop Held at the Lofa County Agricultural Development Project, by Thomas H. Armor (October 1979).
7. Coordination and Implementation at Bula-Minalabac: An Example of the Structure and Process of Integrated Rural Development, by James A. Carney, Jr., George H. Honadle and Thomas H. Armor (March 1980)
8. An Information System for the Rural Area Development - Rapti Zone Project, by David D. Gow (May 1980).
9. Implementing Capacity-Building In Jamaica: Field Experience in Human Resource Development, by George Honadle, Thomas H. Armor, Jerry VanSant and Paul Crawford (September 1980).
10. Supporting Field Management: Implementation Assistance to the LCADP in Liberia, by George Honadle and Thomas H. Armor (October 1980).
11. Institutional Options for the Mandara Area Development Project, by A.H. Barclay, Jr. and Gary Ellerts (October 1980).
12. Supporting Capacity Building in the Indonesia Provincial Development Program, by Jerry VanSant, Sofian Effendy, Mochtar Buchori, Gary Hansen, and George Honadle (February 1981).

13. Management Support to the Jamaica Ministry of Agriculture Second Integrated Rural Development Project, by Jerry VanSant, Thomas Armor, Robert Dodd, and Beth Jackson (April 1981).

14. The Abyei Rural Development Project: An Assessment of Action Research in Practice, by Gene M. Owens, A.H. Barclay, Jr., Edwin G. Charle, and Donald S. Humpal (May 1981).

15. The Botswana Rural Sector Grant: An Assessment After One Year, by Roger J. Poulin and others (November 1981).

16. Planning for the Communal First Development Areas in Botswana: A Framework, by A.H. Barclay, Jr. (November 1981).

17. Differing Agendas: The Politics of IRD Project Design in Panama, by David Gow, John Bishop, Edwin Charle, Robert Hudgens, Joseph Recinos, and Humberto Rojas (July 1981).

18. Institutional Analysis and Design for Ecuador's Rural Development Secretariat, by Donald R. Jackson with Alex Barril (October 1981).

## II. STATE-OF-THE-ART PAPERS

Integrated Rural Development: Making It Work?, by George Honadle, Elliott R. Morss, Jerry VanSant and David D. Gow (July 1980). (a preliminary state-of-the-art paper.)

Integrated Rural Development: Making It Work?, executive summary, by George Honadle, Elliott R. Morss, Jerry VanSant, and David D. Gow (July 1980).

Executive summary available in French and Spanish:

Developpement Rural Integre: Le Faire Reussir?, Sommaire Executif (July 1980).

Desarrollo Rural Integrado: Puede Tener Exito?, Resumen Ejecutivo (July 1980).

## III. RESEARCH NOTES

1. Integrated Rural Development: Nine Critical Implementation Problems, by Elliott R. Morss and David D. Gow (February 1981).

2. Implementation Problems in Integrated Rural Development: A Review of 21 USAID Projects, by Paul Crawford (June 1981).

IV. WORKING PAPERS

- #1. Rapid Reconnaissance Approaches To Organizational Analysis for Development Administration, by George Honadle (December 1979).
- #2. Integrated Rural Development in Botswana: The Village Area Development Programme, 1972-1978, by Hugh Snyder (December 1979)
- #3. Technical Assistance for IRD: A Management Team Strategy, by Donald R. Mickelwait (September 1980).
- #4. Technical Assistance for IRD: A Field Team Perspective, by Jerry Silverman (forthcoming)
- #5. Technical Assistance for IRD: A Counterpart's Perspective, by Soesiladi (June 1981).
- #6. Using Organization Development in Integrated Rural Development, by Thomas H. Armor (June 1981).
- #7. IRD in Colombia: Making It Work, by Donald R. Jackson, Paul Crawford, Humberto Rojas, and David D. Gow (June 1981).
- #8. Fishing for Sustainability: The role of Capacity Building in Development Administration, by George Honadle (June 1981).
- #9. Beyond the Rhetoric of Rural Development Participation: How Can It Be Done?, by David D. Gow and Jerry VanSant (June 1981).
- #10. Building Capacity for Decentralization in Egypt: Some Perspectives, edited by Tjip Walker (October 1981).
- #11. Water User Associations: A Capacity Building Approach to Organization and Management Issues, by Gene Owens and George Honadle (forthcoming).