

PN-1114-408

ASSESSMENT OF THE THIRD  
AGRICULTURAL CAPITAL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT COURSE

62

by

Dr. Paul R. Kimmel

of

The National Academy of Sciences

001642

000173

5

March 1974

Prepared for the Office of International Training,  
The Agency for International Development, U.S.  
Department of State. The findings, conclusions,  
and interpretations contained are those of the  
author and not necessarily those of the Agency  
for International Development.

### Acknowledgements

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Ms. Ann Dammarell, Mr. Nat Farris, and Dr. Philip Sperling of AID/OIT for their helpful, professional advice and guidance. Thanks are also due to the USDA staff and instructors involved with the third Agricultural Capital Project Development course for their cooperation and suggestions. Their support and advice have contributed immeasurably to the relevance and completeness of this assessment.

Special gratitude is owed Mr. William Litwiller, the course co-ordinator; Ms. Janet Wilson, USDA/ERS evaluation specialist; and Dr. J. Price Gittinger of the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank, for their assistance in the development and implementation of this study. It is hoped they will benefit much from its results.

The quality of the assessment reflects the suggestions of all the individuals mentioned above, but, of course, they cannot be held responsible for any inadequacies which may exist in this report.

## C O N T E N T S

I.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND . . . . .	1
A.	The Program . . . . .	2
B.	The Staff . . . . .	4
C.	The Participants . . . . .	4
II.	EVALUATION METHODS USED . . . . .	8
III.	PARTICIPANT AND OBSERVER REACTIONS TO THE PROGRAM . . . . .	10
A.	Lectures and Lecturers . . . . .	10
B.	Discussions and Reviews . . . . .	12
C.	Case Studies and Tutorials . . . . .	14
D.	Audio-Visual Aids, Written Materials, and Homework . . . . .	15
E.	Course Coordination and Pace . . . . .	17
F.	The Field Trip . . . . .	19
G.	Facilities, Services and Outside Activities . . . . .	22
IV.	CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	25
A.	General Reactions . . . . .	25
B.	Course Objectives . . . . .	26
V.	RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	31

Appendix A : Course Outline and Schedule  
Appendix B : Weekly Evaluation Questionnaires  
Appendix C : Idiomatic Phrases Used by Lecturers

## PART I

### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

To help developing countries meet their need for skilled project evaluators, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) in cooperation with the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) has established a course in agricultural project analysis, design, and preparation as part of its training program for foreign agriculturists. Since its inception in 1972, this eight-week USDA course has been offered three times in Washington to participants from a variety of countries. Four-week versions of the course have been conducted in Turkey, Jordan, Guyana, and the Dominican Republic. This report provides an assessment of the third capital project course offered in Washington, D.C., between January 7th and March 1st, 1974.

The purpose of this report is to provide program planners and administrators with observations and suggestions from a disinterested observer that may assist them in conducting future capital project development courses. Through the generous cooperation of these administrators and planners, the observer was given full access to the faculty, staff, and participants involved in the third Washington Agricultural Capital Project Development course. This cooperation made it possible to assess the course's objectives, structure, and content; faculty and staff background and teaching techniques; interrelationships and characteristics of participants; and facilities and services provided in the course and during the field trip.

The AID/USDA course was first offered in 1972 in response to needs expressed by counterparts of the Department of Agriculture and AID personnel

in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The Agricultural Project course which had been developed by the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank was used as the model for the capital project course. Dr. J. Price Gittinger of the Economic Development Institute began their first course in project evaluation in April, 1963. The AID/USDA course uses Dr. Gittinger's book, Economic Analysis of Agricultural Projects, as its main text and has Dr. Gittinger as one of its speakers. In addition, several of the case studies used in the course and three other speakers came from the World Bank.

The purpose of the AID/USDA course is not only to help participants themselves to analyze agricultural projects more effectively. Many are also responsible for organizing and teaching similar courses in their home countries, as well as providing informal guidance to associates in efforts to improve project analysis procedures. It is important that participants have a general understanding of all the main elements involved in preparing, evaluating, and executing development projects. At the end of the course graduates should be able to help design project studies or to participate in the overall evaluations on which final decisions are based. This is not to imply that the participants are being trained as "decision-makers." They more often are advisors to decision-makers than decision-makers themselves. They should, however, be able to ask the right questions and provide leadership in arriving at sensible judgments.

#### A. The Program

The majority of the meetings of the third capital project course were held across the street from the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. Classes were held from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., four and a half days each

week with one afternoon free for other business. A nine-day field trip took place during the sixth and seventh week of the eight-week course. The nineteen participants were divided into four groups on the field trip to visit four different cooperatives in Southwestern Virginia. For the remainder of the program in Washington, D.C., and in Richmond, Virginia, (at the conclusion of the field trip) the participants met together.

In the course outline, given to all participants on the first day of the course (Appendix A), there is a listing of course content broken into four major categories. The first category is "Analysis and Methodology." These are lectures, discussions, and workshops held in Washington, D.C., presenting the techniques needed to do economic and financial analysis as well as to collect data. The second category is "Application of Project Analysis Techniques." This includes six case studies that were done in the Washington classroom, plus the field trip and project analysis in Southwestern Virginia and Richmond. The third category is "Economic and Public Administration" which covers eleven lectures given in Washington, D.C. The final category is entitled "General" and includes review sessions, course evaluations and graduation, field study reports and preparation, and travel. The estimated percent of time for each of these categories at the outset of the course was as follows: Analysis and Methodology, 30%; Application of Techniques, 38%; Economic and Public Administration, 16%; and General, 16%. The actual percentages allotted during the course were very close to those estimated. They were: Analysis and Methodology, 33%; Application of Techniques, 39%; Economic and Public Administration, 15%; and General, 13%. The formal classroom work and time spent in the field

on the project required approximately 36 working days during the eight-week course.

B. The Staff

There were 18 different professionals involved in the course in Washington, D.C., and on the field trip. Ten of these 18 were with the USDA, most of them with the Economic Research Service. The other eight came from AID, the University of Tennessee, the Department of Commerce, a private consulting firm in Pittsburgh, and from the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank. Six of the officials from the U.S. Department of Agriculture were involved in the development and planning of the program as well as its conduct and had responsibility for administrative and logistic problems as well as instruction. The USDA also provided a secretary-typist and an evaluation specialist. It should be mentioned that 10 of the 18 instructors took part in all three of the capital project courses conducted by the USDA in Washington, D.C. One other took part in two such courses, while still another had taken part in one course abroad prior to his participation in the Washington course.

C. The Participants

The Agricultural Capital Project Development course is budgeted and designed to accommodate 24 participants. Twenty-one participants were expected for the third course held in Washington, D.C., in 1974, but only 19 actually took part. Sixteen of these participants were regular AID trainees. One other was a U.S. AID local employee from Ethiopia, while the remaining two were Peace Corps volunteers being trained preparatory to their departure for Cameroon. Eleven of the AID trainees came to the U.S.

specifically to take part in the Agricultural Capital Project Development course. The other five took part in this course as part of longer U.S. training programs. Three of the AID trainees missed two or more days of the course as a result of arriving in Washington, D.C., after it had begun. No participant missed more than five days of the course for any reason, including illness or conflicting appointments, and most of the participants took part in all of the course activities.

The 16 AID trainees came from eight different countries. In only one of these eight countries is English the dominant language. Three of the trainees did not speak enough English to take part in the course without the help of an interpreter provided by AID. The interpreter was available for all sessions of the course both in Washington, D.C., and on the field trip. Eight of the 16 AID trainees stayed in Washington for all or part of a ninth week after the program had concluded to receive further instruction from the USDA in the teaching techniques necessary to conduct similar development courses in their home countries.

Fifteen of the 16 AID trainees were males. Nine were married and seven were single. Their average age was approximately 34 years. Five of the trainees were under 30 years of age, three were between 30 and 34, three were between 35 and 39, and five were between 40 and 49 years of age. The course participants were expected to be agriculturists at the B.A./B.S. level with only limited exposure to economics. One of the trainees had a high school degree, four had diplomas, seven had either B.A. or B.S. degrees, three had M.A. or M.S. degrees, and one had a Ph.D. Three of the participants held jobs in their home countries that were classified in the

categories of 3-A, 3-B, or 3-G, on their PIO/Ps. They were project supervisors, division chiefs, staff planners, management analysts, or other subordinates in line and staff functions.

It is interesting to note that while nearly a third of the AID trainees were under 30, the World Bank project analysis courses ordinarily do not accept candidates under 30 years of age. It is their belief that it is difficult to teach project analysis to people who are fresh from the University and whose interest and backgrounds are more theoretical. They believe that such trainees do not have the exposure to the wide range of projects necessary to development of sound judgment and political maturity that will enable them to benefit most from the courses. By way of contrast, the managers of the AID/USDA program feel that the participants' motivation is more important than their age and experience. Since most of the material is new it is important that the trainees have the desire and persistence to work on their assignments and keep up with the homework and field studies that are demanded of them during the capital project course. In any event, managers of the capital project course do not have the advantage of being able to select their participants as the managers of the World Bank's courses do.

The Agricultural Capital Project Development course allots approximately \$1,000 per participant for course expenses. This is in sharp contrast to the course taught by the Economic Development Institute of the World Bank which allocates approximately \$10,000 for each participant trained in Washington, D.C. The EDI course has two field trips rather than one, and one of these trips is usually taken to the Carribean. The World Bank program

usually lasts nine weeks. When it began it was a 13-week course, but program planners found that the quality of participants went up as they reduced the number of weeks to nine. They found that more senior people were able to leave their jobs for two months while they could not leave for three.

## PART II

### EVALUATION METHODS USED

The information on which this report is based was gathered by a variety of techniques, including observation, questionnaires, interviews, and informal conversations. The evaluator was present on 17 of the 40 days that the program was held (15 in Washington, D.C., and two in Richmond, Va.) for periods of one to eight hours. On these visits he spoke with nine of the 18 instructors in the program and nine of the 16 AID trainees. In addition, he made visits to AID/Washington, and the World Bank to talk with people involved in past and present programs. He also spoke with the USDA evaluation specialist on several occasions and other USDA officials who had knowledge of the course.

Eight questionnaires were prepared and administered by the USDA evaluation specialist. These questionnaires were usually administered for approximately 90 minutes on Friday afternoons. The questionnaires asked the participants to comment on both the speakers and their topics for the previous week. They also included: (1) questions on the sequence of the course materials and the rate at which they were presented; (2) the adequacy of time allotted for questions and discussion; (3) the availability and understandability of audio-visual techniques and written materials for each presentation; and (4) general questions on the level of instruction, its practicality, and suggestions for improving the presentations. When case studies were a part of the week's program the questions were somewhat different, although questions on time allotted and the quality of written materials were always included. For each item in the questionnaires, space

was provided for the participants to comment on their answers. Copies of the eight questionnaires with results are included in this report as Appendix B.

In order to avoid duplication of these questionnaires and to prevent the participants from feeling that they were being over-assessed, this evaluator assisted the USDA evaluation specialist in preparing the questionnaires and added items of interest which otherwise would not have been included. Information was also obtained from reading some of the written materials provided to the participants, looking at exit interviews conducted by the Evaluation Branch of AID with six of the 16 AID trainees, and by talking with course coordinators in Washington, D.C., and Richmond, Virginia.

Although much of the information gathered, especially by the questionnaires, is of a quantitative nature, the analysis on which this report is based is primarily a more qualitative and judgmental one. This is done because of the one-time nature of the evaluation and the relatively small number of participants and instructors available for comparative purposes. There are at least three other evaluation reports available on earlier Agriculture Capital Project Development courses conducted in Washington, D.C., and abroad, written by the evaluation specialists at USDA in prior years. The interested reader may obtain more quantitative and detailed assessments by looking at the questionnaire results in Appendix B and referring to these previous USDA evaluations.

### PART III

#### PARTICIPANT AND OBSERVER REACTIONS TO THE PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

##### A. Lectures and Lecturers

In the final questionnaire administered on the last day of the course, participants were asked to rate 16 of the 18 lecture topics and 15 of the 18 people who took part in the Agricultural Capital Project Development course (see Appendix B). On nine of the 16 topics rated, either none of the participants or only one participant indicated that the topic "did not fit well" in the program. There were four other topics that 30% or more of the participants said did not "fit well" in the program. These topics included Resource Allocation Considerations and Project Design, Introduction to Foreign Survey Methods, Agriculture in Economic Development, and World Food: Looking Beyond the Food Crisis.<sup>2</sup> It is likely that the extent to which the participants felt the topics fit in the program was affected by the adequacy of the lecturer's presentation. The four speakers who gave the six talks that got the lowest ratings on fitting well in the program, were also responsible for five of the six lowest ratings for "effectiveness of presentation" in the weekly questionnaires.

The principal criticism that the participants made of most of the presentations was that "too little time" was spent on the topics. In half of the talks, 40% or more of the participants indicated that the amount of time was too little, while on only four of the 18 presentations did 75% or

---

<sup>1</sup>In this section, key reactions are underlined for review purposes.

<sup>2</sup>It should be noted that the two topics not included in this questionnaire (Farm Management Surveys and Land Reform) got even lower ratings in the weekly questionnaires on the item "the degree to which information will be useful to you in your work," than did any of the four topics mentioned above.

or more of the participants feel that the amount of time spent was just right. As one would expect, a significant minority of the participants also indicated that the rate at which subject matter was covered in the course was too fast. On the questionnaire at the end of the first week, half of the participants indicated that the subject matter was being covered too fast. On both the mid-program questionnaire and the final questionnaire, 38% of the participants rated the rate of the coverage of subject matter as being too fast. The principal reasons for this problem are that only one of the 16 AID participants had English as a first language, and many of the participants had not had a great deal of background in agricultural economics and financial analysis which were two of the main topics covered in the capital project course. Also, some of the speakers seemed to feel that they were under time pressures to complete their subject matter. As a result they did not speak as slowly and distinctly as they might have, they did not repeat important points, and they tended to use more slang and jargon than their audience could comprehend. In the 15 visits made by this observer to the program in Washington, D.C., many slang and idiomatic expressions were noticed. Some of the more often used of these expressions appear for reference purposes as Appendix C.

Despite these problems, the speakers on the whole were given fairly high ratings by the participants both on the effectiveness of their presentations and on the degree to which the information they presented would be useful to the participants in their work. The average rating for effectiveness for the 18 speakers was 3.9 on a 5 point scale, while the average rating for utility was 3.8. The speakers from the Economic Development Institute

of the World Bank more often got higher ratings on both these scales while speakers from the Economic Research Service of the USDA more often got lower ratings (see Appendix B).

The majority of the participants believed that they could handle the level of difficulty of the information being presented in the course. In the first questionnaire about two out of three of the participants said that with regard to their background and experience the information presented in the first week was about at the "right level." On the questionnaires given after the fourth week and at the end of the program, about four out of five participants felt that the level of information was about right for their technical background and experience. The participants who said that the level was not right usually indicated that the information presented was "too technical" in terms of their past experience.

#### B. Discussions and Reviews

On three of the USDA questionnaires participants were asked to rate the adequacy of the amount of time set aside for questions and encouragement of class participation. In all three cases, all of the participants indicated that the amount of time was either "very adequate" or "satisfactory." In addition, only three of the 16 AID participants felt that too little time was spent on class discussion when asked to rate this on their mid-program evaluation questionnaire. This high satisfaction with the amount of time allotted for class discussions does not necessarily indicate participant satisfaction with the utility of the discussions, however. When asked to rate the utility of various teaching techniques used during the second week of the program, participants rated both problem-solving workshops and

lectures higher than class discussions. Student recitation was rated slightly lower than class discussion for utility.

On the third week's questionnaire, participants were asked which of the review methods used in the seminar was most helpful. Eleven of the participants felt that the summary of main points by the instructor was most helpful, nine participants indicated that the problem exercises were most helpful, and four participants said that summary of main points by other participants was the most helpful review method used (participants were allowed more than one response on this item). On the mid-program questionnaire, participants were asked to rate review sessions, class discussion, and informal help sessions for their usefulness in clearing up problems. Both review sessions and class discussions got ratings of 3.9 on a 5 point scale, while the informal help sessions were rated at 4.3. In general, then, it appears that the participants found the informal help sessions most beneficial for improving understanding of subject matter followed by problem-solving workshops, lectures and summaries by instructors and classroom discussion. The least fruitful learning techniques were summary of main points by students and student reviews and recitations.

The primary problem in participants' review presentations and discussions is that many of the participants are not as well-prepared and as lucid in their presentations as are the program instructors. Even when the questions asked or the reviews made are well-organized, often the participants' difficulties in using the English language will make it very difficult for them to be understood by other participants for whom English is not the native language. Some participants were obviously embarrassed when called upon by

instructors to provide answers or to take part in reviews or role-playing exercises.

### C. Case Studies and Tutorials

As indicated above, participants rated informal help sessions and problem-solving workshops or case studies as the teaching techniques most effective in increasing their understanding. During the eight-week capital project course, there were seven major case studies and one scheduled informal help session. Half of the participants indicated on their questionnaires that too little time was devoted to the case study workshops, while about a third said that more time should have been allotted to informal help sessions. The problem -solving workshops got higher ratings than did the lectures both for effectiveness of presentation and relevance to the participants' home country situations. The average effectiveness rating for the seven workshops was 4.1 on a 5 point scale, while the average rating of relationship to problems in home countries was 4.0.

The seven projects described in the case studies are actual cases developed from materials used in the World Bank courses or by AID. In solving these cases, the participants were given a problem and an electronic hand calculator and expected to do some of the work on their own or with other participants outside the classroom. The participants principal criticism of the case studies was that they sometimes were not given specific enough feed-back on the mathematics involved in doing the financial and economic analyses. Many of the participants would have preferred to go through the solutions to the case studies a step at a time rather than being told that rounding error, and matters of assumption or value judgment made

it more important to look at the broader issues and not be concerned with the specific numerical solutions. Although such a step-by-step approach is probably not appropriate for every case study in the course (and should be reserved for informal help sessions with those who continue to need it), such an approach on a few of the earlier studies would probably have been helpful to all of the participants.

One tutorial session was scheduled for those who did not finish the second case study. They were invited to go to the office of the course coordinator on one of the open afternoons to work on a simpler case study. The coordinator felt that all but one of the participants who needed the additional assistance was at this help session, plus four of the participants whom he felt were not particularly in need of this additional assistance. It is this observer's opinion that more such scheduled sessions would be beneficial to all of the AID trainees. This would be especially true if the sessions could be used to work on case studies that are specifically developed to relate to the participants' own home country conditions and agricultural projects. Use of such tailored case studies should help to improve the course for the nine AID trainees who indicated in their third week's questionnaire that there was too much theoretical and not enough practical information presented in the seminar.

D. Audio-Visual Aids, Written Materials, and Homework

The participants generally were satisfied with the audio-visual aids and the written materials that were used in the capital project course. The principal problem was that not all lecturers had written materials or used audio-visual aids, and in some cases when written materials were

available they had not been translated into French, the only language of three of the 16 AID trainees. On at least two occasions, lecturers promised participants written materials that never came. On two other occasions, lecturers told this observer that they had written materials which were in French, but did not bring them because they had not been informed that there would be French-speaking participants in the group. None of the audio-visual aids was translated into French.

Although the audio-visual aids which were used were usually rated by the participants as being "satisfactory" or "very good," in this observer's opinion they were not always used as effectively as they might have been. Many more visual aids could have been incorporated into the program, as these often communicate much more effectively than words. During the 15 observations made by the evaluator only one film was seen (it was shown twice) and only one set of slides was projected. The major audio-visual aids used were the overhead projector, the blackboard, drawings and the felt marker board. In some instances, the numbers projected from transparencies were too small and too great in number to be easily seen and read during the time that they were on the screen. This was especially a problem for the French-speaking participants since the interpreter often did not have time to go through all the numbers in the time allotted. Whenever the transparency was a duplicate of written materials that participants already had, these problems were not as serious. However, when such written materials were not available or were not in French, it was disconcerting to the participants to be asked questions about numbers that they either could not see or found impossible to recall.

Apart from translation problems, the participants did not seem to have much difficulty in reading the written materials. They were especially pleased with the textbook used in the course (Gittinger's Economic Analysis of Agricultural Projects) and the Manual for Agricultural Capital Projects Analysis. However, when asked in the final questionnaire how much of the written material they were able to read and understand, nearly half of the participants gave ratings of either 2 or 3 on a 5 point scale. In looking at their comments following this rating it appears that the major problem was that they did not think they had enough time to do all of the readings during the eight-week course period. Several of the participants suggested that some of the written materials be sent to them in their home countries in advance of the course so that they would have sufficient opportunity to read and digest it. All of them indicated that they would be taking the written materials home with them for further use in both their work and any teaching they might do.

About half of the participants also felt that they did not have sufficient time to do the quality of work they wanted to on the homework assigned to them. As mentioned above, most of this homework was related to the case study problems. Those who mentioned this difficulty in their questionnaires felt particularly short of time during the first week or two of the course while they were still getting acclimated to living in Washington, D.C., and during the nine-day field trip when many activities were taking place.

E. Course Coordination and Pace

With the exception of the three topics that were moved to different time periods and three speakers who replaced others who were not available, the

Agricultural Capital Project Development course was kept closely on the schedule given to the participants on the first day of class, January 7th (see Appendix A). Some of the speakers who felt that they had more information to give than the time allotted would easily allow rushed and/or skipped material in order to meet time restraints. This resulted in many of the participants' belief that the program was moving too rapidly. In a few cases, speakers who did not have enough material to "fill up" the time scheduled would let participants go early or "fill in" with other comments and information than they had originally intended. Participants who finished the calculations ahead of other participants in the problem-solving workshops often felt they had to stay in the classroom until all of the participants had completed the case study. This dependence on the schedule also had the consequence of making the program appear to this observer as a rather disjointed set of presentations scheduled according to the availability of the lecturers.

It is likely that this lack of program integration is primarily due to the low budget allotted to this program by AID. Because only \$1,000 per participant is available to the program planners in the USDA, they are forced to rely to a great extent on people in their Department to plan and conduct the course. However, none of these people, including the program secretary, was working full-time on this course for its entire eight-week period. There were not sufficient funds to provide for a full-time course administrator or coordinator. As a result, no one monitored all of the sessions and thus no one was able to provide the kind of summaries, tie-ins between points made in different lectures, and control of the pace of different presentations

that a full-time course coordinator might. Because the speakers for the most part had no advanced knowledge of the group members' backgrounds or of the information presented by other lecturers, they all started from basic assumption that no one knew anything about their topic. In some cases, this caused a great deal of redundance, while in others, points that could have been coordinated across topics were left to the participants to compare and contrast.

On the Monday morning of the second, third, fourth, and fifth weeks of the program, participants gave reviews of the topics covered in the previous week. Until the fourth Monday, there was little feed-back from the staff members on the reviews and participants were left to judge for themselves the extent to which they had clearly understood and integrated the materials they had heard during the previous sessions. If sufficient funds were available to provide for a full-time course coordinator and a full-time program administrator, it would be possible to both integrate the course content and solve the administrative and logistical problems associated with the capital project course. Having fewer staff members do more of the presentations and the case studies would also facilitate this kind of integration and provide the opportunity for more informal help sessions or tutorials for those trainees having greater difficulties.

F. The Field Trip

For nine days during the sixth and seventh weeks of the course, participants were in the field in Southwestern Virginia and with the Farm Home Administration in the state capital gathering data and writing reports about cooperatives. This field trip was designed to give the participants actual

experience in applying the concepts and methods they had learned during the first five and a half weeks of the course in Washington, D.C. It is interesting to note that although the field trip was the activity which required the most time and was the climax of the capital project course, only one participant listed it on the final questionnaire as an activity in the seminar that he found "most valuable" with respect to his job responsibilities at home. This one rating of "most valuable" was off-set by one other participant who rated it as "least valuable" in his final questionnaire. The participants' major dissatisfactions with the field trip, as listed in their post-field trip questionnaire (see Appendix B) were that they were assigned too much to do in the time available, and that the observation of the various activities in the field was too short. Some of the participants felt that enough time had been allotted for the field trip but that too much time was wasted during the first few days in the field and that many of the farmers and cooperative agents they visited were not adequately prepared to provide them the information they needed. They suggested that if the trip had been better organized and perhaps held at a different time of year or at different locations it would have been a better training experience. They found the observation of inappropriate or repetitious activities frustrating and time-consuming, detracting from more valuable training experiences.

Once again, some of these problems in organization and integration of the field trip can be attributed to the finances available to the program planners. Because of financial limitations and changes in the time at which this course was scheduled to begin, it was necessary for USDA to do most of

the preparatory logistics for this field trip in June of 1973. Had the course been held as scheduled (in the fall of 1973), this would have been a relatively feasible time lag from preparation to actual implementation. As it was, the delay of eight months between the planning and the implementation, plus Washington's birthday which fell on one of the days of the field trip, caused some missed appointments for the participants and made some of the appointments that were held much less fruitful than they might have been with more intensive advanced planning.

Another difficulty for some of the trainees on the field trip had to do with the composition and leadership of the groups into which they were placed. The 19 course participants were divided into four groups, three with five members and one with four members. Each of these groups was assigned one member of the USDA staff to be its coordinator. The four coordinators had different styles of relating to their groups, ranging from taking an active part in the data gathering and analysis to letting the group do its own work and structure its own activities. One of the coordinators left his group after four days in the field to return to Washington, D.C., and was replaced by another USDA staff member.

On the questionnaire ratings after the field trip, the four groups had very different reactions to their team experiences. One of the groups felt that in spite of the limited time and information available, they had accomplished a great deal by working as a group and had been highly effective. Another group felt just the opposite; that they had been very ineffective and that they did not work well as a group. The other two groups fell mid-way between these two extremes. The groups' ratings of their

effectiveness were directly correlated with their ratings of the usefulness of the help provided by the USDA staff in the field. The teams which had high regard for their effectiveness also felt that they had gotten useful help from their staff coordinator, while those who felt that they had been ineffective felt that their staff co-ordinator had not been as useful in providing help.

The USDA staff members had different philosophies about their role as group coordinators. One of the coordinators felt that the team members should be autonomous and should only use him as a resource. He mentioned that an earlier team coordinator had been criticized by program administrators of a previous capital project course for taking too active a role in the problem-solving activities. Another coordinator felt that he should work with the team members and give them feed-back on all phases of their data collection, analysis and reporting. He set the tasks for the group members and in some cases gave them suggestions on how to proceed. The reaction of the AID trainees was more positive toward this latter type of guidance than it was toward the more autonomous approach used by two of the group coordinators.

G. Facilities, Services, and Outside Activities

The participants were generally satisfied with the administrative arrangements provided by the USDA staff and field representatives for their Agr. cultural Capital Project Development course. They rated the seminar management and administrative services at 4.3 on a 5 point scale. Although this observer sometimes found the conference rooms to be noisy, warm, and smokey, they were not uncomfortable to the extreme, nor did they seriously

distract from program activities. The USDA provided one electronic hand calculator for every two participants to use in working on their case study homework and on the field trip problem, and also provided typing help in Richmond, Virginia, to enable the participants to have their final reports ready for distribution. The observer would suggest that if at all possible calculators be provided in future courses for each participant to make it easier for them to conduct their homework and to work independently when necessary on the field trip. If possible, it might also be wise to provide some dictation equipment to the trainees to use in preparing their field reports for typing.

Three major social activities were scheduled for the participants during the eight-week program. One of the USDA staff invited all the trainees to his home early in the program for a social evening. A trip was provided on a Wednesday afternoon to the Kennedy Center in Washington, D.C. And home hospitality was provided by farm families in the field when the participants were in Southwestern Virginia. On their final questionnaire, 78% of the participants indicated that they would like to have had more organized social activities in Washington, D.C. On their mid-program evaluation ratings 37% indicated that they would prefer to have more free time than was available. It might be well to schedule more activities and free time for participants even at the expense of increasing the length of the program. These activities could be related to course activities such as having social or business visits with officials in important financial and government institutions that the participants might wish to visit. These visits are especially important to those trainees who are here for only

this eight-week course in the United States.

The AID provided a very competent interpreter for the four French-speaking participants. This interpreter had worked at a previous capital project course and was familiar with the concepts and materials presented. She was present at all the activities in Washington, D.C., and accompanied one of the four groups throughout the field trip. As in most courses of this type there was some distraction caused by the simultaneous translations, and the usual delays when the French-speaking participants were asked either to answer or ask questions or make presentations. These delays and distractions could be reduced by having more sophisticated interpreting equipment (e.g., such as the U.N.) and by having the French-speaking trainees write their questions out in advance for the interpreter to read and having her give the answers back to them in written French, thus saving the extra class time required to listen to the French question or presentation and the French answer from the interpreter.

## PART IV

### CONCLUSIONS

#### A. General Reactions

Although most of the comments in the previous section are critical, it would be erroneous for the reader to assume that the Agricultural Capital Project Development course was a failure. At least two of the outside speakers and the majority of the USDA staff members believed that this group of AID trainees was the best that they had had in their three courses in Washington, D.C. Complimentary comments were made to this observer about the groups' receptivity, hard work, interesting comments, and lack of complaints about administrative and course arrangements.<sup>3</sup> The participants found at least nine of the eighteen lecture topics and speakers and five of the seven case studies to be both relevant and effective. When asked to rate the extent to which the field trip helped them apply the knowledge and skills they had acquired in the classroom, they gave an average rating of 4 on a 5 point scale.

To obtain a rough comparison of these trainees' satisfaction in relation to the satisfaction ratings expressed by AID trainees in general, the observer compared the group of 16 participants in the Agricultural Capital Project Development course with the total group of AID trainees who took exit interviews at the American University's Development Education

---

<sup>3</sup>It is interesting to note that the participants had very few comments or suggestions to be given to AID, even when this evaluator specifically asked for such on the last day of class. It is this observer's opinion that a majority of the trainees were not aware of AID's role in the program.

and Training Research Institute (DETRI) in fiscal year 1970.<sup>4</sup> When asked to rate their overall training program in the fourth week, the participants in the Agricultural Capital Project Development course gave an average rating of 5.7 on a 7 point scale. This is exactly the same average rating as given by 1700 AID trainees who rated their training programs at DETRI in fiscal 1970. The average overall rating of the field trip given by the 16 trainees was 5.1 on a 7 point scale. The average rating given by 600 members of observation training teams who were interviewed at DETRI in fiscal 1970 was 5.6 on a similar scale. In the questionnaire administered on the last day of the course, the USDA trainees were asked to rate the appropriateness of the course on three dimensions: (1) to their training and experience, (2) to their home country conditions, and (3) to their personal career plans. The average ratings on these three scales were 5.4, 5.2, and 5.5 respectively. The comparable ratings on the same scales given by the approximately 900 AID participants in special training programs who took exit interviews in fiscal 1970 were 5.9, 5.6, and 5.8. Thus, the reader can see that although the USDA trainees' ratings are somewhat lower, they are relatively comparable with those of AID trainees in general.

B. Course Objectives

The basic objectives of this course are to prepare technicians and administrators concerned with development projects in their countries to analyze these projects in terms of their economic and financial feasibility, and to evaluate their social and secondary benefits. The course is

---

<sup>4</sup>These comparisons should be treated cautiously because of the great difference in the size of the two groups of trainees.

designed to give the participants:

1. An appreciation of the role of the project within the overall development setting.
2. A methodology for analyzing the project and for comparing it with alternative projects.
3. A realization of the need for data-gathering from all sources including farmers, agricultural technicians, engineers, businessmen, and policy-makers.
4. An appreciation of the issues that must be considered in drawing together the components of the capital project and in making a project selection.

With regard to the basic course objectives, it is clear that the Agricultural Capital Project Development course has provided the participants with a basic level of competence in estimating costs, benefits, and rates of return from individual projects. They are all better able to analyze development projects in terms of their financial and economic feasibility, and their social and secondary benefits than they were when they began the course. With regard to the listed objectives, the picture is more mixed. Most of the participants do have some appreciation of the role of development projects within the overall development setting (objective 1). However, since the course did not utilize many examples, case studies or field trips to projects similar to those in the participants' home countries, the extent to which they can apply this appreciation to their own home countries' situations is yet to be determined.

All of the participants were exposed to the methodology called for by the second objective, and all learned some of it. However, when asked to rate how successful their groups were in calculating certain important effects of the cooperatives that they investigated on their field trip, the average participant ratings were 3.4 and 3.5 on a 5 point scale. These rather low ratings suggest that at least some of the participants did not feel that they were able to adequately estimate important parameters in the project that they worked on in Southwestern Virginia. The group coordinators also mentioned that some of the participants were not familiar with some of the basic principles of financial and economic analysis at the conclusion of the capital projects course.

It is likely that most of the participants are aware of the need (objective 3) as a result of their case study and field trip experiences in the course. However, the extent to which they know how to go about this data gathering is questionable. Most of the logistical aspects of setting up interviews with farmers and officials of farm cooperatives and obtaining records from the Farmers Home Administration were handled by the USDA staff. As a result, the participants have had very little experience in planning and organizing a data gathering project.

The fourth objective calls for the participants to have an appreciation of the issues inherent in decisions that might be made in drawing together the various components of the capital project. When asked the degree to which they developed an awareness of the importance of organizing data in project analysis and distinguishing relevant and irrelevant information through their case studies, the participants gave average ratings that

varied between 3.3 and 4.3 on 5 point scales in several of the questionnaires. Comments of some participants (such as those who talked with the AID evaluation specialists) and some of the lecturers in the program leads this observer to conclude that they are not all confident of their ability to draw together various components and select among them the important issues in making project selections. A comment made by George Baldwin in his article, "Teaching Project Analysis," Finance and Development Quarterly, No. 2, 1969, may help to explain the difficulty that arose for several participants with regard to this objective:

One of the problems in teaching project analysis is that people who are not previously familiar with some of the standard techniques of rate-of-return analysis tend to become so fascinated by these techniques and so proud of their ability to use them that they tend to give them more importance than they deserve. The experienced project analyst, already familiar with the various techniques normally employed, knows that the most important determinants of a project's estimated profitability are the assumptions made and the values put into the calculations. When one appreciates this fact, one realizes that the most useful analyzers of projects are not those who can dazzle their superiors with elegant techniques, but those who can raise sensible questions about the validity and completeness of the assumptions underlying the key calculations. (pp.4-5)

Because several of the trainees were not previously familiar with some of the standard techniques of economic and financial analysis, they did tend to concentrate on applying these to the projects they looked at in the classroom and in the field. For them to understand fully the larger picture will require more experience in their home countries and perhaps a later course in project implementation.

The real test of the understanding and information gained from this course can only be measured by follow-up of participants in their home countries. Unfortunately, there is no provision presently made for such in-country follow-up with the exception of some of the countries in which participants will be teaching the course to other economic and financial analysts upon their return. In some of these cases USDA staff members will be involved in assisting with the in-country courses. It is recommended that these officials make some attempt to formally evaluate the knowledge and skills of these trainees.

## PART V

### RECOMMENDATIONS

The following nine recommendations are related to the findings and conclusions cited above. They are intended to assist course planners and administrators in better reaching the objectives set for the Agricultural Capital Project Development course. Most of the recommendations were presented to the participants in the third capital project course in the final questionnaire (Appendix B). In all cases, at least half of these participants supported the recommendations. A few of the recommendations supplement or elaborate earlier suggestions made by the evaluation specialists from USDA in their reports on the first two Agricultural Capital Project Development courses in Washington, D.C. In these cases, the earlier recommendations are yet to be implemented.

1. Written materials should be available for all topics and case studies presented in the course and should be translated into all of the primary languages that the participants will be using during the course. The Manual for Agricultural Capital Project Analysis should be expanded to include more information and problem-solving activities on both financial analysis and economic analysis. The Manual plus the course text and some key articles should be sent to the participants in their home countries at least three weeks before they leave to come to Washington, D.C. All other written material should be handed out well in advance of its utilization in the course. There should be written notes in the major course languages for all presentations. There should be no necessity for participants to have to take notes during the course itself.

2. Some of the less relevant topics can be presented through written materials only or incorporated into other more appropriate presentations. Those lecturers who are not well organized should be encouraged to improve their presentations or be replaced. Those topics which might lend themselves to written presentations include Sector Analysis, Resource Allocation, and Credit. Those topics which might be incorporated into other presentations include the World Food Crisis, Employment Generation, Land Reform, and Agriculture in Economic Development.
3. All speakers should have outlines and notes for the other presentations and should confer if at all possible with each other on their teaching techniques and subject matter before each program begins. Each speaker should receive information on the participants' backgrounds, jobs, and project responsibilities before making their presentations. Presentations should be tailored as much as possible to the audience and coordinated with other parts of the program. Speakers should use examples and cases from the participants' home countries whenever feasible. Speakers must know in advance about the number of different languages which will be used in the course.
4. Speakers must be encouraged to talk slowly and distinctly, to repeat important points, to use simple words and concrete examples and to avoid slang and jargon. Those speakers who are dealing with economic and financial analysis, survey techniques, case studies, project planning and PERT must go most slowly and cover their material in greatest detail. When going through the solutions to case studies involving financial analysis, instructors should not omit steps in the mathematical calculations. Subtle

rhetoric, involved comparisons, elaborate illustrations, and U.S. humor are to be avoided. Speakers should use as many visual aids such as films, graphs, charts, diagrams, and slides as will fit into their topic area. These visual aids must be translated into as many languages as are being used in the course and should be large enough to be seen by everyone in the classroom.

5. Instructors must be especially careful when asking questions of participants or using participants in making presentations. If the participants are not well prepared and reasonably fluent in English, other participants will quickly lose interest in their comments. A "discussion leader" who merely asks for questions and then allows the most verbal participant to dominate the discussion is not facilitating learning. On the other hand, the absence of questions does not necessarily indicate that all participants have understood what has been said. The instructor who calls on participants without any knowledge of their background may embarrass them and negatively effect their learning. It is preferable to allow questions to come up spontaneously and in most cases to have these discussed by other participants. The course director should help the instructor in selecting the most appropriate participants to respond to questions. He should also encourage "individual" questions after the presentations are concluded so that all participants may be sure they know what has been discussed.

6. If possible, all participants should be fluent in the language in which the course is taught. If this is not possible, simultaneous translations through an interpreter removed from the main room (such as in the United Nations) is the next best alternative. Any other interpreting approach is

distracting. Whenever available, bi-lingual participants should be used to help explain technical ideas and concepts to fellow-countrymen whose language proficiency is not as good as theirs. Those who do not speak the language of instruction should write their questions out for the interpreter to read to the instructor. It may also be preferable to have the interpreter give a written answer back to the questioner in his native language.

7. The rooms in which the courses are conducted should have separate temperature, acoustical and ventilation controls if at all possible. The office and staff for the course should be located near to the classroom, but not so close that typing, phone calls, and other sounds can be heard. More calculators and dictation equipment should be available to the participants, especially on their field trips. If possible, the equipment should be similar to that available in the participants' home countries.
8. To teach the participants to produce the "best numbers" possible in project analysis without leaning too heavily and unqualifiedly upon them, a somewhat different sequence of course activities is proposed. During the first week of the course participants should be given simple case study problems (such as the pump problem) and individual help sessions to make sure that they are very clear on how to make a correct financial analysis. The second week could be devoted to bringing in those aspects of farm management which are relevant to financial analysis and going into somewhat more complicated case studies such as the Muda River Project and the Guyara Rice Project. Most of the work on these case studies should be done in class with assistance from the USDA staff.

The third week should be devoted to a field trip which focuses primarily on financial analysis. This trip should be to a location not too far from Washington, D.C., and should be highly structured and closely supervised. Participants should get a great deal of feedback on the work that they are doing in financial analysis and on their field trip reports presented at the end of this third week. The people in the field must be informed about who is coming, why they are coming, what information they will be requesting, and when they will arrive--in advance of their visit. It may be feasible to make this field trip a standardized one that is repeated each year so that the field personnel will have the necessary records and information in good order. These field personnel should be given feedback at the conclusion of the trip so they can improve their work in future years.

During the first part of the fourth week of the course the group should be given instruction in the use of PERT techniques, critical path analysis, and program planning. These techniques should be used by the participants in helping the program chairman to plan and organize the second field trip which will occur during the seventh week of the program. During the last part of the fourth week and most of the fifth week the substantive emphasis of the course should shift from financial analysis to economic analysis. The participants should be given simple problems and shown how to ask "the right questions" under changing sets of assumptions. It is possible that some of the same case studies used for financial analysis could be used in economic analysis with stress on the different perspectives that economic analysis demands. Instructors should emphasize the importance of the quality of this data, the assumptions made, sensitivity analysis, economic abstraction, project design, and the national picture involving such issues as employment, and land

reform. It is possible that this part of the course may take more than the two weeks allotted. This will be true if participants are having difficulties with the economic analysis or if they and the program chairman encounter logistical problems in setting up the second field trip. It may then be necessary to expand the course to a ninth week.

The sixth week (or seventh) should be used to prepare for and get to the field location. During this week the substantive emphasis should be on data gathering and survey research techniques. Participants should be trained in how to work in groups, how to gather and analyze data, how to write reports, and how to make presentations. If role playing or other empirical techniques are used, practice should be made as realistic and as close to the field situations as possible. If group members are divided into teams in any of these exercises, the coordinators who will be accompanying them on the field trip should stay with their teams in the classroom and give them individual help whenever necessary. There should be ample feedback on questionnaire construction and internal group dynamics. The co-ordinators may also help with some of the logistics of planning the field trip. However, they should give the participants as much autonomy as they feel they can handle in making arrangements with people in the field for data gathering and reporting. This kind of autonomy is critical to helping participants learn about the problems involved in planning and conducting a field survey.

The seventh (or eighth) week would be devoted to the major field trip. If there are different language groups in the program those with the same language must be put into separate groups. If all have a common language, nationalities and ability levels should be mixed in the groups. It may be

possible in some programs to group participants by their agricultural specialities. Interpreters should go along with those groups that are not fluent in English and can be involved in helping with the tasks in the field when qualified. Both interpreters and coordinators should see themselves as teachers and resource people, but not group leaders during the field trip. The groups should be allowed to structure their own tasks, their use of time and their presentations. Group members should be housed close together in the field for consultation purposes and convenience of transportation.

Groups may make field visits to different locations in the United States but all should have the same reporting deadline and location (Monday of the eighth or ninth week). Participants should be given ample feedback on their progress reports and their final reports, especially in regard to the economic analysis involved. Important USDA and/or World Bank officials should be present for final reports to raise real questions about the analyses the participants have made and the possibilities of project implementation. Such questions should give the participants some ideas about policy issues that they must consider when making similar reports in their home countries. The remainder of the last week can be devoted to individual meetings for participants who would like to make contact with important business or government officials in the Washington area. These meetings should be arranged well in advance, possibly even before the participants have left their home countries. Participants should also be encouraged and helped in taking part in scheduled social activities in the Washington area.

All final reports should be reproduced and distributed to all participants on the final day of the program. This final day can also be used for course

evaluation and graduation ceremonies. As with the shorter field trip, feedback should be provided to all those people who have provided information and taken part in field activities so that if they are used again they may know how to proceed better. Whenever possible, the USDA program chairman should be involved with these field representatives on a face-to-face basis shortly before and after the trips occur.

9. To implement the program suggested above will require more full-time staff members and hence a greater budget. The present course is under-budgeted. Ideally, the Agricultural Capital Project Development course should be staffed by a full-time course director who is the substantive coordinator; a full-time program chairman to handle logistical and administrative problems; a full-time course secretary/librarian; a half-time evaluation specialist; and four or five members to conduct most of the instruction, work with individual participants in tutorial sessions and be the group coordinators on the two field trips. The remainder of the teaching and case studies could be conducted by approximately six outstanding speakers from other related agencies.

The course director can assist these instructors and improve the coherence of the program by cutting down on redundant information, pointing out relationships between points made in different presentations and summarizing important concepts on a regular basis. He can also assist in helping to group the participants for the field trips and suggesting to participants that they may benefit from individual help sessions. In the classroom he should make sure that everything is seen and heard by all participants which includes the visual aids and the repeating of questions and comments made by other participants. He should constantly keep the focus of the conversation or discussion on what

the participants do not know. When comments or instructions are being made that are not of interest to most participants he should curtail or re-focus these remarks. He should not be concerned as much with time as he should be with participant learning.

The USDA official in charge of the present course estimates that the cost for such a staff and program would be about \$32,000. This seems a relatively small increase in budget for what to this observer would be a significant improvement in meeting course objectives and facilitating participants' learning.

APPENDIX A

Course Outline and Schedule

AGRICULTURAL CAPITAL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT COURSE

Offered By

Economic Research Service  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

in cooperation with

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Washington, D.C.  
January 7 - March 1, 1974

I. COURSE OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the AID/USDA course in Agricultural Capital Project Development is to provide agricultural technicians from low-income countries with a basic level of competence in estimating costs, benefits,\* and rates of return from individual projects.

The rationale behind the course is derived from four inter-related propositions:

1. Investment--the increase in the stock of productive assets -- is an essential component of economic growth.
2. There is an urgent need by countries for an analytical basis for committing their own and externally supplied funds to specific development projects.

---

\* Where costs and benefits are broadly defined to include the equity and social issues arising in project execution.

3. The capital project\*\* -- the use to which the additional assets are put -- must be well designed for optimum balance between economic growth and other criteria. It must be thoroughly analyzed to show its ranking among alternative projects.
4. The supply of technicians competent to do project design and analysis is limited.

The course is designed to reach those middle level technicians whose day-to-day responsibility is to provide cost and return estimates for development projects. A functional grouping of course topics is presented in the following section, and a complete course outline is appended to this paper. The course is designed to give the participants:

1. An appreciation of the role of the project within the overall development setting.
2. A methodology for analyzing a project and for comparing similar projects.

---

\*\* Investment project is a more commonly used term than is capital project. Technically, the two are not synonyms: Investment refers to the creation or acquisition of assets, and capital refers to the assets themselves as factors of production. Clearly, the project has elements of both in that it involves the acquisition of assets and their use in producing goods and services. The term capital project will be used here because it places emphasis on the most important phase of the project, the use of resources to achieve the stated goals of the project.

Table 1.--Time distribution of course content, agricultural capital projects course, Washington, D.C., January 7-March 1, 1974

Topics on Analysis and methodology	Half-day sessions	Application of Project Analysis Techniques	Half-day sessions	Economic and Public Administration Topics	Half-day sessions	General	Half-day sessions
	(number)		(number)		(number)		(number)
Project Analysis (Economic Analysis)	6	Case Studies		World Food Crisis	1	Course Evaluation and Summary	1
Farm Management (Financial Analysis)	4	Irrigation (I)	4	Agriculture in Economic Development	1	Course Opening	1
Farm Survey Techniques (Data Collection)	4	Reclamation (II)	3	Projects in Agricultural Development	1	Renew Sessions	4
Project Management	3	Credit (III)	2	Planning	1	Field Study Preparation	1
Import Substitution	3	Marketing (IV)	3	Resource Allocation	1	Travel to Field	1
Livestock Herd Projections	2	Livestock (V, VI)	6	Analysis for the Agricultural Sector	1	Field Study Reports	2
		Project Management	1	Capital Projects and Employment Generation	1	Graduation	1
		Field Trip		Agricultural Credit	1		
		Farm Survey and Data Collection	4	Price Issues	1		
		On-site Project Analysis (Includes cooperation)	6	Policy Issues and Non-economic Criteria	1		
				Marketing Issues	1		
				Land Reform - Land Settlement	1		
<b>TOTALS</b>	<u>22</u>		<u>29</u>		<u>18</u>		<u>10</u>
<b>Percentage Distribution</b>	<b>30%</b>		<b>38%</b>		<b>18%</b>		<b>16%</b>

3. A realization of the need for data gathering from all sources: farmers, agricultural technicians, engineers, businessmen and policy makers.
4. An appreciation of the issues inherent in the decisions he must make in drawing together the components of the capital project and, to the extent possible, the social and equity issues which arise in project selection.

II. COURSE CONTENT

Table 1 shows the topics covered by the course and their distribution according to functional categories. Over 60 percent of the time focuses on topics of analysis and their application through case studies and field workshop experience. This is consistent with the type of clientele the course is intended to reach. Course participants are expected to be agriculturalists at the EA/BS level with only limited exposure to economics. The concentration on methodology and practical experience is designed to give them the tools required for their present responsibilities.

4/16

Course Outline and Schedule  
AGRICULTURAL CAPITAL PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
and  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Week One

Monday, January 7

Introduction

World Food: Looking Beyond The Food Crisis

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: Quentin M. West, Administrator  
Economic Research Service, USDA

An Overview of Project Analysis

1:30 p.m.

Speakers: David Brown - University of Tennessee  
William F. Litwiller - Economic  
Research Service, USDA

What is a project? What is project analysis?  
What is the role of project analysis in the develop-  
ment process? How is it done?

Tuesday, January 8

Project Analysis Methodology

9:00 a.m.

Speakers: David Brown  
William Litwiller

PART A

There will be six sessions on the methodology  
of project analysis. Topics include the time  
value of money, the opportunity cost of capital,  
the use of compounding and discounting, and the  
computation and use of benefit-cost ratios, net  
present value and internal rate of return.

Short homework exercises and classroom recitation will be used to firmly establish the various techniques of project analysis.

Project Analysis Methodology (Continued)

1:30 p.m. PART B

Speakers: David Brown  
William Litwiller

Wednesday, January 9

9:00 a.m. PART C

Project Analysis Methodology (Continued)

Speakers: David Brown  
William Litwiller

1:30 p.m.

Afternoon - OPEN

Thursday, January 10 x

9:00 a.m.

Project Analysis Methodology (Continued)

Speakers: David Brown  
William Litwiller

1:30 p.m. MOVE

Agriculture in Economic Development

Speaker: J. K. McDermott, Office of Research and Institutional Grants, AID, Department of State

Friday, January 11

9:00 a.m.

Project Analysis Methodology (Continued)

Speakers: David Brown  
William Litwiller

1:30 p.m.

Project Analysis Methodology (Continued)

Speaker: David Brown  
William Litwiller

Week Two

Monday, January 14 \*

9:00 a.m.

Review of Project Analysis Methodology

Speakers: David Brown  
William Litwiller

*Homework 1<sup>st</sup> hr + 1/2  
3 students give ans.  
Disc. Homework*

1:30 p.m.

Case Study I, "Muda River" Project

Speaker: David Brown

The Government of Malaysia requested a loan to help finance an irrigation project covering 261,500 acres in northwest Malaya. This loan request will be reviewed in this session.

Tuesday, January 15

9:00 a.m.

Muda River Case Study Workshop

Instructor: David Brown + USDA desk office for area

Workshops will be used to apply the various project analysis methodologies to the case study in order to gain a better understanding of their use and meaning.

1:30 p.m.

Muda River Case Study Workshop (Continued)

Instructor: David Brown

Wednesday, January 16

9:00 a.m.

Muda River Case Study Reports and Solutions

Speaker: David Brown

Participants will have an opportunity to present and discuss their solutions to the case study problem.

1:30 p.m.

Afternoon - OPEN

Thursday, January 17

Capital Projects in Agricultural Development

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: J. Price Gittinger, Economic Development  
Institute, IBRD

The relationship between investment and capital and the meaning of capital as a factor of production will be discussed.

The discussion will concentrate on the role of capital formation in economic development and the role of the project in capital formation. It will also cover capital as a vehicle for new technologies.

Resource Allocation Considerations in Project Design

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Roberta K. van Haeften, Economic  
Research Service, USDA

Projects require scarce resources. How these resources are allocated, both in terms of quantity and timing, depends on the design of the project.

Friday, January 18

9:00 a.m.

Policy Issues and Non-Economic Criteria

Speaker: Morris Miller, Economic Development  
Institute, IBRD

Discounted measures of project worth. are intended to demonstrate the contribution of each project to overall economic growth. They are the most commonly used criteria in project evaluation. Equity criteria are often equally important in setting project priorities. One of these, employment generation, will be discussed later in the course. This session is devoted to such criteria as income distribution, balanced regional development, self-sufficiency, saving and consumption, and social integration.

Many of these criteria are dependent upon project design and therefore must be "built into" the project. The analyst becomes responsible for considering factors such as minimum income levels, land tenure, type of ownership of marketing processes and pricing of agricultural commodities and irrigation water.

Role of Sector Analysis

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Roberta K. van Haeften

Sector analysis provides the framework within which investment projects are identified. What are the form and content of these analyses? What resources are required for carrying them out, what are the sources of assistance for their accomplishment, and how are the analyses used in development planning and project identification?

Week Three

Monday, January 21

9:00 a.m.

Review of Week Two - P's review speakers (in teams, over weekend)

Speaker: William Litwiller - FENDER 76 F-B

Population; Its Relationship to Employment and Investment

→ FAURS.

1:30 p.m.

Speakers: Frank A. Fender, Economic Research Service, USDA <sup>introduces</sup>  
NO [Richard A. Schroeder, Economic Research Service, USDA]

FRANK LAMMSON - SCRIBNER

Import Substitution

(going abroad, chg. schedule)

Fertilizer Plant in India

[3 to 4 PPs in prob., 1964 Report]

The relationship between population growth, employment and investment will be explored. The following points will be considered:

- a. Dimensions of the population problem
- b. Characteristics of employment problems in low-income countries.
- c. Different types of investment and their effect on employment.

4 P.M. - 6:30 Frank Kinisley

KIN NEL LEE

90

Tuesday, January 22

Case Study II, Bonikar Riceland Reclamation Project

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: ~~David Brown~~ Lyle P. Schertz

This project consists of a \$150,000 loan application for construction of a system of dikes, drainage canals and control gates to prevent flooding and to provide irrigation water. Policy and technical issues will be discussed before beginning work on the solution.

Bonikar Case Study

1:30 p.m.

Instructor: ~~David Brown~~ L.P.S.

Wednesday, January 23 \*

Bonikar Case Study - Reports and Solutions

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: ~~David Brown~~ L.P.S.

Participants will have an opportunity to present and discuss their solutions to the case study problem.

1:30 p.m.

Afternoon - OPEN *Kennedy Center(?)*  
~~Brown class~~

Thursday, January 24

Price Policy Considerations in Project Design

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: Lyle P. Schertz, Deputy Administrator  
Economic Research Service, USDA

The role of prices in guiding production, allocating resources among uses, and rationing products among consumers will be stressed. The discussion will also include the functions of prices in economic systems in which many prices are centrally controlled.

1:30 p.m.  
[DIRECTOR]  
TND. + COURSES DIVISION

MON, ~~C~~ Import Substitution POPULATION

Speaker: Frank <sup>FENDER</sup> Lamson-Scribner, Economic Development Institute, IBRD

Many countries have chronic foreign exchange problems. This discussion focuses on the reasons for and effects of import substitution projects. How these projects can be analyzed will be discussed.

Friday, January 25

Import Substitution Workshop

9:00 a.m.

Instructor: Frank Lamson-Scribner

Import Substitution Workshop Results

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Frank Lamson-Scribner

Results of the problems discussed in the workshop will be presented.

Week Four

Monday, January 28 x

Review of Week Three

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: William Litwiller

Introduction to Farm Survey Methods

1:30 p.m.

Speakers: David T. Mateyka, Economic Research Service, USDA  
NO Lyle P. Schertz *Bartering (Bob Evans)*

STIX

Project analysis is dependent upon a reasonable supply of production coefficients as well as costs and benefits. How to develop a questionnaire and conduct a farm interview so as to obtain this type of data are discussed. ROLE - PLAY

Tuesday, January 29

9:00 a.m.

Case Study III, Role of Credit in Development  
and Credit Case Study

Speaker: David T. Mateyka

Agricultural credit policy is more than just providing a pool of funds for farmers to use. Important decisions must be made regarding interest rates, collection policy, data control, the specific clientele to be served, technical assistance to farmers, and the institutions which are capable of reaching the clientele.

The case study project is a 2-1/2 year program to finance on-farm irrigation, land levelling, farm mechanization and technical assistance with a total cost of US \$45.0 million. The foreign exchange component is about US \$7.1 million.

Credit Case Study Workshop

Instructor: David T. Mateyka

1:30 p.m.

Wednesday, January 30 x

9:00 a.m.

Credit Case Study Solution

Speaker: David T. Mateyka

Participants will have an opportunity to present and discuss their solutions to the case study problems.

1:30 p.m.

Afternoon - OPEN - *Kennedy Center*

Thursday, January 31

Agricultural Marketing

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: Howard L. Steele, Economic Development Service, USDA

Agribusiness and the marketing function for both inputs and products provide the physical and financial linkages between the farm and industrial sectors of the economy. This session will focus on the relationship between technical and economic efficiency in the marketing and agribusiness functions and the success of any capital project in agriculture.

Case Study IV, Guyana Rice Marketing Project

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Frank A. Fender

The project consists of the construction of 5 modern rice storage centers and the establishment of a research station. The total cost is estimated at \$15.4 million with a foreign exchange component of US \$12.4 million.

Friday, February 1

9:00 a.m.

OK Marketing Case Study Workshop - FERTILIZER PLANT IN INDIA  
30A PR PROBLEM REPORT  
Instructor: Frank A. Fender

Marketing Case Study Solution

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Frank A. Fender LAMSON SCRIBNER No

Participants will have an opportunity to present and discuss their solutions to the case study problem.

Week Five

Monday, February 4

9:00 a.m.

Review of Week Four *Went very well - Reports of P<sub>3</sub>*

Speaker: William Litwiller

Land Reform and Land Settlement Issues

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Gene L. Wunderlich, Economic Research Service, USDA

Land reform and land settlement are seen as alternative measures for the relief of serious socio-economic problems in the developing countries. Their relationship to overall economic development will be stressed in this session. Given a useful definition of land reform, how do we identify a successful reform? What are the required conditions for success? In what sense, if any, is land settlement an acceptable substitute for land reform?

Tuesday, February 5

9:00 a.m.

Livestock Herd Projections Workshop

Instructor: Paul J. Hooker, National Marine Fisheries Services, Department of Commerce

The methodology of projecting herd sizes in the development process is conceptually not difficult, but it can be quite complex in its details. Errors often occur in the failure to distinguish between stocks (the herd) and flows (production, births, deaths, sales). Participants will

be taught to use a standard format for the year-by-year projection of herds divided into appropriate age/sex categories.

Solutions to Livestock Herd Projection Problems

1:30 a.m.

Speaker: Paul J. Hooker

Participants will have an opportunity to present and discuss their solutions.

Wednesday, February 6

Case Study V, Guyana Livestock Production Project

X 9:00 a.m.

Speaker: Paul J. Hooker

This proposed project includes the development of 27 beef cattle ranches and the provision of credit to these ranches. The planned investment under the project totals US \$7.1 million, with a foreign exchange component of US \$2.6 million.

1:30 p.m.

Afternoon - OPEN

Thursday, February 7

Guyana Livestock Production Case Study Workshop

X 9:00 a.m.

Instructor: Paul J. Hooker

Guyana Livestock Production Case Study Solution

X 1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Paul J. Hooker

Participants will have an opportunity to  
[<sup>No</sup> present and] discuss [their] solutions to the case  
study problem.

Friday, February 8

9:00 a.m.

Case Study VI, Ankole/Masaka Ranching Scheme

Speaker: Frank A. Fender - *Being to let Apichai present. No. a similar proj. in Tchad. Wood. org*

The Government of Uganda proposed to expand *Brits, know.* its cattle production capacity in an area being *in advance.* cleared of tsetse fly infestation. The total project cost is estimated at US \$1.9 million of which US \$650 thousand would be financed with a foreign exchange loan.

"Ankole/Masaka" Case Study Workshop

1:30 p.m.

Instructor: Frank A. Fender

Week Six

Monday, February 11

9:00 a.m.

"Ankole/Masaka" Case Study Solution

Speaker: Frank A. Fender

Participants will have an opportunity to present and discuss their solutions to the case study problem.

Farm Management I

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: William Litwiller

Farm management is a very important part of project analysis. If a project does not "go" at the farm level, it will not go at all. The importance of farm management and familiarity with its

analytical techniques will be stressed. The principles of budgeting and farm accounting will be emphasized.

Tuesday, February 12

9:00 a.m.

Farm Management II

Speaker: William Litwiller

1:30 p.m.

Farm Management Workshop

Instructor: William Litwiller

Will include exercises in farm management.

Wednesday, February 13

9:00 a.m.

Farm Management Surveys

Speaker: David T. Mateyka

This session will focus on what type of data is needed for project analyzed, how to obtain the data, and how to organize it. The differences between complete and partial budgeting and their uses will be stressed.

1:30 p.m.

Travel to Field Study site in Western Virginia

Thursday, February 14 - Field

Farm Management Surveys (Continued)

All Day

10-12

1-5

Instructor: David Mateyka

Participants will interview farmers, organize and analyze the data collected.

Friday, February 15 - Field

Morning

Measures of Efficiency in Farm Management

Speaker: William Litwiller

What are these measures? How are they calculated? What do they mean to project analysis? Are the same measures appropriate to both higher income and lower income countries?

Afternoon

Preparation for Field Study Exercises

Speaker: Robert W. Doan, Economic Research Service, USDA

The field study problems will be presented and discussed. The objectives of each study will be outlined and the participants divided into teams. Each team will analyze one of the field studies using as many of the analytical methods as are appropriate and prepare a final report.

Saturday, February 16

Morning

Preparation for Field Study Exercises (Continued)

Speaker: Robert W. Doan

Afternoon

Teams travel to respective field study sites.

Week Seven

Monday-Friday, February 18-22

Field Study Exercises

9:00 a.m.

The first two <sup>1/2</sup> days will be spent interviewing and collecting necessary data. The last three days will be used for doing the analyses and preparing the final report.

[

FRIDAY  
February 22

5:12 P.M.  
Return to Washington, D.C.

Week Eight

X Monday, February 25 X

Field Study Reports

All Day

Each team will present their final report on their field study project.

Tuesday, February 26

Project Management I

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: Robert B. Youker, PLANOLOG, Inc.

Three of the four sessions on project management will be used to familiarize the participants with modern management techniques. The fourth session will discuss the application of these management techniques to projects.

Project Management II

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Robert B. Youker

Wednesday, February 27

Project Management III

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: Robert B. Youker

Project Management IV

1:30 p.m.

Speaker: Robert B. Youker

Thursday, February 28

Agricultural Planning

9:00 a.m.

Speaker: Albert Waterson, The American University  
and IBRD

This session will focus on how to go about the planning of agricultural projects, reasons for unsatisfactory project implementation of projects and what can be done about unsatisfactory performance. An appreciation will be gained of how project design and analyses is an integral part of the planning process.

1:30 p.m.

Afternoon - OPEN

Friday, March 1 X

Course Review, Summary and Critique

9:00 a.m.

David Brown  
William Litwiller

1:30 p.m.

Graduation Ceremony

APPENDIX B

Weekly Evaluation Questionnaires

*Dr. Kimmel*

FINAL EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE  
FOR

1974 AGRICULTURAL CAPITAL PROJECT ANALYSIS COURSE

January 7 - March 1

I. Content Breakdown for Eighth Week

A. Project Management I, II, III, IV, Tuesday, February 26 - Wednesday February 27  
Robert B. Youker, PLANOLOG, Inc.

CIRCLE ONE

	POOR					EXCELLENT					TOTAL	MEAN
	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	NO.	SCORE
(a) Effectiveness of presentation	(0)	(0)	(1)	(9)	(9)						19	4.42
(b) Adequacy of information received	(0)	(0)	(3)	(9)	(7)						19	4.21
(c) Organization of ideas	(0)	(0)	(0)	(8)	(11)						19	4.57
(d) Extent to which presentation provided new knowledge and understanding	(0)	(0)	(1)	(8)	(10)						19	4.47
(e) Degree to which information will be useful to you in your work	(0)	(0)	(2)	(7)	(10)						19	4.42
(f) The amount of time spent on this topic was												

No. of responses: 19

- 9 just right
- 9 too little
- 1 too much

(g) Written materials used with this presentation were

No. of responses: 19

- 14 very helpful
- 5 satisfactory
- 0 poor
- 0 there were none

(h) Problem Exercises

1. How well did problems teach you to apply ideas presented in the lectures?

<u>Not well at all</u>		<u>(Very well)</u>			<u>Total No.</u>	<u>Mean Score</u>
1	2	3	4	5		
(0)	(0)	(3)	(9)	(7)		
					19	4.21

No. of responses: 19

16 yes  
3 no

Give a reason for your answer:

-----  
The quality of the exposition, the information received and the organization of ideas were excellent.  
-----

-----  
There was too short a period of time to learn so many things.  
-----

-----  
Excellent lectures. Would have preferred to spend much more time on this subject of Mr. Youker.  
-----

-----  
The problems were in keeping with the data provided.  
-----

-----  
Although the presentation was given too fast, but I could follow it somewhat.  
-----

-----  
I did enjoy this course very much. I'm sorry that we did not spend more time in exploring each topic more deeply.  
-----

-----  
All of the topics are excellent. That is, I have approved all of it.  
-----

-----  
Could have been better if more had been done.  
-----

3. What other types of problems should have been included in this exercise?  
-----

-----  
More cases.  
-----

-----  
More agricultural related problems.  
-----

-----  
Problems closely related to agricultural projects.  
-----

-----  
It's not a matter of new topics but a problem of being more explicit.  
-----

-----  
More time. Should be give at the beginning of the course.  
-----

Comment on the instructor, presentation, or written materials:

- Well organized. Well presented. Written materials well prepared.  
Comment on timing: Better given before the trip or earlier.
- The method of on-going project analysis taught by Youker was excellent.
- Good - presentation was clear and concise.
- Excellent.
- Lecturer was well familiar with his subject and was very confident in his exposition.
- The presentation was given too fast. It seemed the time was very limited. It needed more time.
- Very good.
- Very well organized clear.
- This was a very well presented class.
- Excellent. Simple words used. Expert in his field. All in all very interesting.
- This subject should have come before the field trip.
- He was obviously a man of practice in his field, which infact is why the presentation was very satisfactory.
- He was quite good in explaining the system.
- Instructor was good. Film helped understanding. Written material was good too.

B. Agricultural Planning Thursday, February 28, 1974  
Albert Waterson, The American University and IBRD

	<u>CIRCLE ONE</u>					<u>TOTAL NO.</u>	<u>MEAN SCORE</u>
	<u>POOR</u>			<u>EXCELLENT</u>			
	1	2	3	4	5		
(a) Effectiveness of presentation	(0)	(0)	(0)	(10)	(7)	17	4.41
(b) Adequacy of information received	(0)	(0)	(1)	(11)	(5)	17	4.24
(c) Organization of ideas	(0)	(0)	(0)	(9)	(8)	17	4.47
(d) Extent to which presentation provided new knowledge and understanding	(0)	(0)	(2)	(11)	(4)	17	4.11
(e) Degree to which information will be useful to you in your work	(0)	(0)	(3)	(9)	(5)	17	4.11

(f) The amount of time spent on this topic was

No. of responses: 17

- 5 just right
- 12 too little
- 0 too much

(g) Written materials used with this presentation were

No. of responses: 17

- 12 very helpful
- 5 satisfactory
- 0 poor
- 0 there were none

Comment on the instructor, presentation, or written materials:

The presentation and written materials were perfect.

-----  
Excellent speaker, very condensed. His presentation was simple and understandable.

-----  
Good animated presentation.

-----  
Because of short time allowed for speaker, lecture was general. Would have enjoyed speaker.

-----  
Excellent instructor.

-----  
If the time was given a little bit longer for the presentation, it would give me more understanding to the problems which were common in my country.

-----  
Excellent.

-----  
Very good, clear and comprehensive.

-----  
Time allocated for this subject was too short.

-----  
Time is short. All in all enjoyed. Very capable person.

-----  
Good.

-----  
He is an excellent instructor, however we didn't have enough time to get all information we needed.

-----  
His personal experience makes his teaching very interesting.

-----  
Instructor was good but had very little time. Could have been useful if he had time to expound.

C. Do you think that these lectures should have come before the field trip?

No. of responses: 17

11 yes  
6 no

Should any topics be discussed after the field trip? If so, what?

I think not.

-----  
Yes, the results of the field trip reports.  
-----

Yes. (2 responses)

-----  
Yes, Some discussion of problems encountered on field trip should have taken place.  
-----

Review and feedback evaluation.  
-----

-----  
The lecture on network planning should have come earlier on.  
-----

-----  
The Project Management I, II, III, IV should have been given before the field trip.  
-----

No.

-----  
The CPM could have been presented before, but not necessarily the Waterston presentation.  
-----

-----  
No, we have to review all of the project analysis methods such as IRR B/C ratio. Each step to compute and analyze the project must be reviewed with own experiences. We have done in field trip.  
-----

No. (3 responses)

-----  
Yes, management.  
-----

-----  
Yes. Approaches of data collection should be done in detail and instructor should make sure participants know what they are going to do before field trip. Participants could present problems encountered and discussed by the various groups and possible solutions discussed by participants plus some help from instructors.  
-----

II. Eight Week Period Overall

A. How appropriate was this course for you in each of the following area?  
 (Circle one number on each of the scales below):

	a. To my Training and Experience	b. To My Home Country Conditions	c. To My Personnel Career Plans
The course was terrible, It could not have been more inappropriate.....	1 (1)	1 (0)	1 (0)
	2 (1)	2 (1)	2 (1)
	3 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)
	4 (1)	4 (3)	4 (3)
	5 (4)	5 (5)	5 (4)
	6 (5)	6 (7)	6 (5)
The course was perfect, it could not have been more appropriate.....	7 (5)	7 (1)	7 (5)
TOTAL :	17	17	18
MEAN SCORE:	5.41	5.18	5.50

Give reasons for your responses:

-----  
 This course for me was appropriate for my level of training and certain examples were well adapted to my country.  
 -----

-----  
 The planolog was out of sequence. Should have preceded field trip.  
 -----

-----  
 Exactly the type of training requested for my position in Peace Corps in Cameroon. I suppose that what I have learned will be directly applicable to my job there. At this time I have no career plans and can't evaluate how applicable.  
 -----

-----  
 The course was all right but the time was too short.  
 -----

The subjects given mostly new to me so that I could gain more knowledge from this course. The subjects given not all new for the people who have plenty of experience in agricultural planning. Everything depends on the policy of the government. Everybody maybe transferred to the office where he has a very different job than the previous one.

Some of the topics in the Economic and Financial analysis were not satisfactorily explained (especially on depreciation, intpretation of financial statements, loan repayment, etc.).

This course is very useful because it is very practical and really helps solve problems.

As a training exercise this is a very practical course.

The course applies to all because the problems which we have discussed are one way or another applicable. If I do not use it now, perhaps later.

This course will be more perfect if given more time for the field trip.

I think the course was just about right.

My work will be mostly agricultural surveys and project analysis.

The course was very good, but I feel it was very intensive. The beginning was discouraging as one did not get foundation into the basic concepts.

B. Listed below are the major speakers and their topics for this eight week course. Please check one box in column A to indicate whether or not you feel the speaker was organized in his presentation and one box in Column B to indicate whether or not his presentation fit in well with the rest of the program.

Speaker and Topic	Column A		Column B	
	Was well organized	Was not well organized	Did fit well in program	Did not fit well in program
1. <u>Quentin M. West</u> <u>World Food: Looking</u> <u>Beyond the Food Crisis</u>	13	2	11	5
	Total: 15		Total: 16	
2. <u>David Brown,</u> <u>Project Analysis</u> <u>Methodology</u>	16	3	16	1
	Total: 19		Total: 17	
3. <u>J. K. McDermott,</u> <u>Agriculture in Economic</u> <u>Development</u>	11 *1	4	9 *1	5
	Total: 16		Total: 15	

\* One participant gave McDermott a rating between the categories indicated on the chart

<u>Speaker and Topic</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>	
	Was well organized	Was not well organized	Did fit well in program	Did not fit well in program
4. <u>J. Price Gittinger, Capital Projects in Agricultural Development</u>	17	2	18	
Total: 19			Total: 18	
5. <u>Roberta K. van Haeften Resource Allocation Considerations in Project Design</u>	5	12	10	7
Total: 17			Total: 17	
6. <u>Robert K. van Haeften Role of Sector Analysis</u>	8	10	13	4
Total: 18			Total: 17	
7. <u>Morris Miller, Policy Issues and Non-Economic Criteria</u>	15	4	16	3
Total: 19			Total: 19	
8. <u>Frank A. Fender, Population; It's Relationship to Employment and Investment</u>	17	2	16	3
Total: 19			Total: 19	
9. <u>Lyle P. Schertz, Price Policy Considerations in Project Design</u>	16	2	18	
Total: 18			Total: 18	
10. <u>Frank Lamson-Scribner, Import Substitution</u>	19		19	
Total: 19			Total: 19	
11. <u>David T. Mateyka, Introduction to Farm Survey Methods</u>	6	13	12	7
Total: 19			Total: 19	
12. <u>Howard L. Steele Agricultural Marketing</u>	19		18	
Total: 19			Total: 19	
13. <u>Paul J. Hooker, Livestock Herd Projections</u>	16	3	18	1
Total: 19			Total: 19	

<u>Speaker and Topic</u>	<u>Column A</u>		<u>Column B</u>	
	Was well organized	Was not well organized	Did fit well in program	Did not fit well in program
14. <u>William F. Litwiller, Farm Management I &amp; II</u>	19		19	
	Total: 19		Total: 19	
15. <u>Robert B. Youker, Project Management</u>	19		18	1
	Total: 19		Total: 19	
16. <u>Albert Waterson, Agricultural Planning</u>	17		17	
	Total: 17		Total: 17	

Do you have any comments:

-----  
 After the presentations of Mrs. van Haeften which didn't really teach us much, the lessons of the other speakers were excellent.  
 -----

Numbers 15 and 16 should have been given before the field trip.  
 -----

Should give more time in agricultural planning and farm management.  
 -----

No. (5 responses)  
 -----

C. Taking into consideration your technical background and experience, how would you rate the information presented?

No. of responses: 19

15 about right  
 3 too technical  
 1 too general  
 0 too elementary

Explain your answer:

-----  
 There are details still not clear.  
 -----

Because it corresponds to my career plans.  
 -----

The technical part of course was very good, but certain parts were too general.  
 -----

Lots of new info received, but nothing was too technical.  
 -----

But would have liked more technical data.  
 -----

Well the things covered were usually done in a great hurry and I do not as much have a technical background.

Although I have only very little knowledge in agriculture economics, but it was not very difficult to follow the course.

But some were confusing.

I needed pre-study before coming here.

Although it is my first time to be exposed to Benefit Cost Ratio Calculations. I am fine with the other.

Some of the case studies presentations were too general and elementary.

Information was okay. Could have been better if presentations were simplified at beginning.

D. The rate at which subject matter was covered in this seminar was

No. of responses: 17

10 just right  
\*6 1/2 too fast  
1/2 too slow

Give a reason for your answer:

Some wasted time.

Many important problems were not treated fully because of too little time.

Some items covered too fast. Some too slow. We literally raced through Farm Management.

Some subjects too briefly. Some too extensively.

Some lectures were too fast in that they were chasing time.

Some presentations were very good, but others were boring.

Some just right, some too fast, some too slow.

Some too fast. CPM Waterston. Others about right.

But I felt somewhat I was gaining more and more at the later part of the course.

I think some general topics take too much time. Whereas for practical exercises there less time.

A course like this which is technical and difficult cannot be covered at this speed. It will be profitable if more time is given in the future.

\*Split score. The participant comment was, "Some items covered too fast, some too slow." We

Too many things were done in a few hours and before one was familiar with certain concepts new concepts were being introduced. However, there was a link between concepts.

E. How much of the written material handed out were you able to read and understand

(NONE)				(ALL OF IT)	TOTAL NO.	MEAN SCORE
1	2	3	4	5		
(0)	(1)	(71/2)	(71/2)	(3)		
					19	3.26

Which written documents have been or will be of most value to you?

Gittinger's book is one that covers most of the basic principles. The case study materials are practical and problem solving cases. The manual is a very important paper as a background to be used.

Apart from that which was not translated into French, I didn't have any difficulty understanding the problems.

Yang, Gittinger and the outline.

Not enough time to read everything. Gro-more Manual and Farm Management I, II & III were most helpful as well as Gittinger's book.

IRR materials. J. Price Gittinger's book and Agricultural Capital Projects.

Price Gittinger, Dr. Brown, Lamson Schribner Mr. Litwiller, and Dr. Waterston.

The Manuel (A,B,C,D,E,), The Gittinger's Book, Farm Management, I,II, & IV.

Gro-more Example.

The Course Manual. Farm Management, I,II, III. Livestock Herd Projection (Hooker ), and PLANOLOG.

Pert, Planning, Farm Survey and Land Reform.

Financial Analysis Methodology.

The Case Studies.

Most of that which I have read particularly the Manual.

F. With respect to your job responsibilities at home, which topics and activities in this seminar have you found

(a) Most valuable (please list and give a reason for your response)

-----  
The inter-relationships of economic/financial analysis and the on-farm-analitical problems.  
-----

-----  
Financial and Economic Analysis, IRR Calculations, Cost-Benefit Analysis.  
-----

-----  
Gittinger, Miller, Fender, Schertz, Lamson-Schribner, McDermott, Mateyka  
Litwiller, Youker, Waterston.  
-----

-----  
Litwiller, Farm Management; Price Policies, Schertz; Brown, IRR;  
Youker, PERT/CPM; Lamson-Schribner, Mateyka, Sampling and Survey  
Methods.  
-----

-----  
Field trip showed us how to analyze a project from start to finish.  
-----

-----  
Quantitative analytical tools and CPM.  
-----

-----  
IFR Herd Projection. There were useful as I will be meaningfully  
involved in project analysis.  
-----

-----  
Agricultural Planning. Financial and Economic Analysis and Import  
Substitution.  
-----

-----  
Project Analysis Methodology. Capital Projects in Economic Development.  
Farm Management, I, II and Import Substitution.  
-----

-----  
For me everything is important. I don't see anything less valuable.  
Maybe the population presentation.  
-----

-----  
Gro-more example which gave me basic information on the calculation of  
IRR. It was critically needed for my job responsibility in my country.  
-----

-----  
Project Analysis, Cost Analysis, Planning Implementation. I have  
to teach these things at the college.  
-----

-----  
PERT (could make use of it). Planning and Land Reform.  
-----

-----  
Project Management. (Robert B. Youker). This will help me to do my  
job practically.  
-----

-----  
Agricultural Planning. Project Analysis Methodology.  
-----

-----  
Financial Analysis.  
-----

-----  
Project Analysis Methodology. Capital Project in Agricultural Development,  
Policy Issues and Non-Economic Criteria, Price Policy consideration.  
Import Substitution, Farm Survey Methods, Agricultural Marketing.  
Livestock Herd Projections. Farm Management, Agricultural Planning.  
-----

-----  
Project Analysis Methods, Project Management, Import Substitution,  
Agricultural Marketing and Farm Management.  
-----

## (b) Least valuable:

The trip is very important, but not satisfactorily done, and not evaluated afterward, which one is still unclear.

Sector Analysis, Population.

Mrs. van Haeften.

PERT/CPM

McDermott's ramblings.

I have things listed as not fitting into course on previous page.

Populations Studies.

World Populations.

World Food. Population.

Farm Surveys. Calculation of Benefit - Cost Ratio

Policy issues and non-economic criteria. The instructor seemed to over emphasize the non-economic factors.

World Food.

Introduction to farm survey. Policy issues and non-economic criteria. Population, it's relationship to employment, etc.; could have been useful if well presented.

G. How many weeks do you think would be an ideal length for this Agricultural Capital Project Course? (This course is now 8 weeks long)

Responses:	No. of Responses
12 weeks	6
10 weeks	6
9 weeks	2
8-10 weeks	1
8 weeks	3
7 or less	0

- H. What other information or topics should have been presented in this course to provide you with the skills and knowledge necessary for project analysis?

-----  
 Topics concerning the problems from the points of view from loan giving institutions (experiences).  
 -----

-----  
 We did not speak enough about economic and financial control of projects.  
 -----

-----  
 Include another field trip early in the course. The first one being highly structured and highly supervised.  
 -----

-----  
 More on project management. More detail on non-income factors to evaluate some way to consider them.  
 -----

-----  
 The procedures on how lending organizations such as World Bank handle projects financed by it. The procedures of how to secure loans from those organization.  
 -----

-----  
 Accounting principles and foreign aid.  
 -----

-----  
 Pre-orientation is needed for the basic information on the terminology and theory most frequently used in the course.  
 -----

-----  
 Organization and administration aspect since it ties up with project analysis.  
 -----

-----  
 Most of the subject presented seemed to have been too divided into subsectors. We couldn't recognize relationship between each subjects because too many instructors presented their ideas without any regarding his portion in over-all training plan.  
 -----

-----  
 Should have some topics concerning fisheries and cooperatives in the course.  
 -----

-----  
 Dealing with particular problems in countries represented in detail.  
 -----

- I. Participants have sometimes had difficulties in the U.S. which interfered with their training programs. Listed below are some of these difficulties. Indicate by marking one box in each row how much each of these difficulties interfered with your learning in this course.\*

<u>DIFFICULTIES</u>	<u>NEVER INTERFERED</u>	<u>SOMETIMES INTERFERED</u>	<u>OFTEN INTERFERED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
(a) Cold weather	4	8	3	15
(b) Bad food	11	5	0	16
(c) Lack of sleep	5	7	4	16
(d) Feeling homesick, lonely	9	4	3	16
(e) Being ill	12	3	1	16
(f) Bad housing conditions	10	3	2	15
(g) Discrimination by Americans	15	1	0	16
(h) Lack of money	10	3	2	15
(i) Bad transportation facilities	6	9	0	15
(j) Lack of English language	6	10	0	16

3 participants did not complete this part indicating that it was either "not relevant" or "not applicable"

<u>DIFFICULTIES</u>	<u>NEVER INTERFERED</u>	<u>SOMETIMES INTERFERED</u>	<u>OFTEN INTERFERED</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
(k) Lack of calculators o other supplies	11	5	0	16
(l) Uncomfortable, noisy conference rooms	12	3	0	15

Other difficulties you had : No responses

J. Indicate which of the following recommendations about this training program would be most helpful in improving future Agriculture Capital Project Courses.

<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>Would Not Help</u>	<u>Would Help Somewhat</u>	<u>Would Help a Great Deal</u>	<u>Total</u>
(a) Have written notes for all the lectures	1	6	9	16
(b) Eliminate Monday review sessions	8	7	2	17
(c) Eliminate some lecture topics	5	11	2	18
(d) Eliminate some lecturers	4	8	6	18
(e) Have more case studies	4	6	8	18
(f) Have simpler case studies	4	5	6	15
(g) Have the field trip earlier	9	5	3	17
(h) Make the field trip longer	5	7	6	18
(i) Have two field trips	10	4	3	17
(j) Make sure farmers, co-ops and the FHA are ready for your field visit.	1	4	13	18
(k) Have more <u>special</u> teaching sessions	3	9	5	17
(l) Have the course in one language only	6	5	5	16
(m) Send readings and manual to participants <u>before</u> the course begins	1	10	7	18
(n) Use more films and other visual aids	3	10	5	18
(o) Have less homework	8	9	1	18
(p) Have more organized social activities for participants in Washington	4	9	5	18

Other difficulties you had: No responses

K. Arrangements and Recommendations for your Training Program  
(not applicable to Peace Corps participants)

1. Please indicate by marking one box in each row, when each of the subjects listed below was first clearly explained to you.

<u>Subject</u>	<u>In Home Country</u>	<u>In Washington D.C.</u>	<u>Never Clearly Explained</u>	<u>Total</u>
(a) The objectives of your training program	7	8	1	16
(b) The details of your training program; the plan	4	12	0	16
(c) A.I.D. administrative regulations for participants	7	8	1	16
(d) Aspects of culture and daily life in the U.S.	8	7	0	15
(e) Money allowances from A.I.D.	4	12	0	16
(f) Travel arrangements	10	7	0	17

2. How adequate was your personal participation in the development of your training program from its planning to its completion?

No. of responses: 15

- 10 adequate
- 5 somewhat inadequate
- 0 very inadequate

Give a reason for your answer:

Well, I was not personally involved in the planning of the course.

I did most of the arrangement myself.

It was adequate in view of my job experience in my home country and it added a great deal of information for myself.

I was not given enough time.

Everything was planned before I came to the course but everything went just fine.

3. What would you have changed in your program?

-----  
I would have spent much more time on the field trip especially in  
drawing the samples.  
-----

-----  
Have some more time for personal work or reading.  
-----

-----  
I feel somewhat, I can perform my job better when I return to my country.  
-----

-----  
Would like to have all questionnaires approved by the course staff before  
the field trip. As I have seen the groups prepare their questionnaire  
during the trip.  
-----

-----  
Perhaps, give it a longer time.  
-----

APPENDIX C

Idiomatic Phrases Used by Lecturers

APPENDIX C

Idiomatic Phrases Used by Lecturers

Beat a dead horse  
Can of worms  
Change in Pace  
Common Sense  
Do your thing  
Down the road  
Drop in the bucket  
Good deal  
Goofing up  
In the ballpark  
In the hole  
Jiggle-jiggle  
Kidding around  
Know-how  
Lock, stock and barrel  
Nail it down  
On the ball  
Rusty dusty  
Saving grace  
Screw up  
Seat of the pants  
Shoot for  
Short cut  
Start from scratch  
Switch gears