

Attachment I

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF TITLE XII PROGRAMS:
ANALYSIS OF MISSION RESPONSES

I. Introduction

In May 1986, the Administrator sent letters to all Mission Directors and to selected Title XII Universities which asked for candid answers to a set of ten key questions pertaining to the strengths and weaknesses of Title XII programs. Fifty-one missions (12 in the ANE Bureau, 15 in LAC and 24 in AFR) responded, most with very thoughtful and constructive comments.

This paper analyzes the responses from the USAID Missions and attempts (a) to summarize the most common themes addressed in the responses and (b) to highlight, through the use of direct quotations, some of the more insightful comments and suggestions contained in the responses. Significant differences in the responses from the three geographic regions are noted.

Methodology: Due to the relatively open-ended nature of the questions posed in the Administrator's letter, a formal statistical analysis of the responses is not possible (and never was anticipated). Also most of the ten questions posed included several sub-questions and very few missions and universities responded specifically to all questions and sub-questions. In some cases, a head count was possible and has been included in the analysis. However, even in these cases some degree of interpretive license is inevitable in categorizing responses in a meaningful way. To minimize the possibility of interpretive bias, each of

the regional bureau agriculture office chiefs and BIFAD were given copies of the draft analysis for review. Their comments are reflected in this final version.

II. AID Field Perceptions of Title XIIs

- #1. "In what areas are Title XII universities most effective, i.e., what in your judgment is their comparative advantage? Specifically, how do universities compare with private sector firms and other non-university entities with respect to (a) providing technical assistance, (b) institution building, (c) developing training and supporting research and technology transfer program, and (d) conducting sector and strategy analyses?"

Forty-one missions provided substantive responses to this question, but did not necessarily address all elements of this broad question. In addition, they often added significant caveats to their responses (e.g. universities had a comparative advantage for some types of policy/sector analyses but not for others).

- Education and training: All responses, save one, said universities had a comparative advantage in education and training. Title XII institutions are perceived to be strongest in university-to-university education activities (with the India Partnership model often cited) and in developing LDC secondary-level (certificate, diploma) training institutions. With their broad knowledge of U.S. training opportunities in U.S. universities, Title XIIs also have unique capacity in planning and implementing U.S. academic training programs, and are particularly adept at placing participants in appropriate training programs, sometimes waiving rigid admission standards.
- Research: Most responses indicated that Title XII institutions have excellent capabilities in agricultural research. One response said "Title XII universities

represent the major global resource of talent for technical activities focussed on science, research and institution building in Agriculture - a concept that has stood the test of time."

However, there were important caveats in some of the responses. About 1/3 of the African responses and 1/2 of the ANE responses rated IARCs higher or as high, especially when IARCs are already established in the geographical or climatic region. Title XIIs are felt to work best on commodity-specific research in structured, experiment station settings. They do less well in multidisciplinary research such as Farming System Research or in off-station research efforts, in part due to the compartmentalized organization of U.S. universities into academic disciplines. IARCs do better on applied research, related technology transfer and applied training activities but less well on building research institutions.

- Extension: Only a few responses discussed Title XII and extension programs, perhaps because AID is not focusing its agriculture sector efforts on building public sector extension systems. With the exception of 1/2 of the ANE responses, all of the responses gave Title XIIs high marks for extension programs with such comments as "many of the Land Grant extension concepts are very relevant and only the Title XII institutions have the experience and knowledge to adapt these concepts to the LDCs."

A few responses indicated Title XIIs were too wedded to the U.S. extension system and needed to be more flexible in designing and implementing extension systems appropriate to LDC needs. Also, the T&V (Training and

Visitation) extension system, now much in vogue, is not associated with Title XIIs in the minds of LDC agriculture specialists.

- Policy and Sector Analysis: 22 of 29 responses felt Title XIIs did not have a comparative advantage over other entities in Policy and Sector Analysis. LAC missions gave the universities proportionately higher marks. University strengths are perceived to be in data analysis and several responses noted that Title XIIs often do an excellent job in large-scale data gathering efforts and when sophisticated sampling techniques are needed. Private Sector firms and USDA are perceived to be more action-oriented, better able to translate analysis into strategy, and to "make suggestions that are 'actionable', that can be applied in a practical sense."

- Technology Transfer - 13 of 23 responses indicated that Title XII institutions had no unique capability in technology transfer activities but have about the same capacity as non-university entities or less. ANE ranked universities higher than the other regions. Title XIIs usually have the latest state-of-the-art technology, perhaps more so than others, but are felt to lack experience and originality in carrying out or communicating the actual transfer in LDC situations. One response stated that "technology transfer involves risk-taking and it may be that the element of risk-taking is more suited to the private sector."

Several missions cited examples of universities which have concentrated areas of technical expertise and have been very successful at transferring their knowledge in a wide variety of LDC settings; e.g. Kansas State in Grain Storage and Mississippi State in Seed Technology.

- Institution Building: Most responses discussed Title XII capacity at institution building as a cross-cutting theme in the context of agriculture education, research and extension projects. 17 of 29 responses felt universities have a comparative advantage in institution building in general. Title XIIs were not thought to be appropriate for institution building efforts in a central Ministry of Agriculture (where USDA is seen to be the more natural counterpart organization) or for agricultural credit and cooperative institutions.

In sum, the responses said, yes, Title XIIs have shown that they can do an excellent job at building education and research institutions if (a) the Title XII has the commitment to do the job; and (b) the Title XII provides high quality long-term personnel who can work overseas effectively.

The commitment of a Title XII institution to a project was mentioned time and again in the responses as the key element in Title XII success at institution building. Commitment is reflected in the quality and timeliness of project backstopping, the influence and "clout" of the campus coordinator (especially to get key faculty released for overseas assignments, both long and short term), and the willingness of the university leadership to make international work attractive to faculty. Sometimes the university's commitment to overseas projects is perceived to be "heavily oriented towards what the project will do for the Title XII - overhead, theses, dissertations, post-doctoral research, experience for associate professors." Positive commitment was noted, for example, in the almost 20 year relationship that Iowa State and the University of Kentucky have had with Peru

and Indonesia respectively, and in Cornell's willingness to incorporate into their university budget, "international professorships," which focused specifically on overseas activities.

One very thoughtful letter questioned whether AID and BIFAD were being naive in hoping for such a commitment from today's universities. It stated in part "...there is no university where international agriculture is the main, or even a major focus. As a result, only a few mavericks manage to build a career in international work within the U.S. university system. Occasionally, these mavericks (e.g. Hugh Popenoe, Woods Thomas, Cotton Robinson) reach positions of authority and are able to influence university priorities to an extent; but the influence lasts only as long as the person. No single university has enough of these internationalists to take on an AID contract with its own staff - hence, the non-tenured faculty issue."

AID Missions feel success at institution building is also highly correlated with the quality of the long-term TA personnel which implementing agents can provide - a point obviously related to the issue of university commitment. Most responses said such other entities such as private sector firms and IARCs do better than Title XIIs at providing long-term overseas personnel. Universities are too often unable to provide senior scientists to work overseas and when they do, they stay only two years. As one response put it "the price may be too high to ask of an academic who is on the cutting edge of his profession." "From the point of view of the University department or school, releasing key faculty for overseas work is of marginal value to their academic reputation."

Private sector firms provide long-term personnel who generally have more prior overseas experience, and are more pragmatic and singularly focussed on achieving project goals, have better foreign language skills, are more culturally adaptable and stay longer. One response, reflecting the comments of several letters, stated "often university faculty, while excelling in disciplinary research as individuals, have difficulty in the advisory role, which requires communication skills, diplomacy, adaptability and patience in addition to technical research skills. These skills are oftentimes lacking in tenured faculty whose years of experience have been limited to the U.S. campus and to narrowly-defined, disciplinary research in the traditional experiment station setting."

AID Missions felt Title XIIIs did a better job providing short-term TA since universities have on hand "highly qualified experts in almost any field" and this expertise has usually been available, although not always at short notice.

#2. How important is tenured faculty to overall university performance in international agricultural development activities? Is staff turnover or the substitution of staff more or less of a problem with Title XII institutions than with comparable non-university contracts? And, conversely, to what degree are vacancies and/or the rapid turnover of A.I.D. technical and project management staff a serious impediment to the effective implementation of Title XII activities?"

There is no simple answer to this question and responses are decidedly mixed. 18 of 38 substantive responses to this question said tenure was very critical to project success, 12 said it was not at all or not very important and 8 said it was

somewhat or sometimes critical (i.e. for the Chief of Party). AFR responses were agnostic on the subject with responses equally divided. Some of the more common themes were:

- Tenure is critical for the Chief of Party (COP) and often for some other team members (e.g. to provide legitimacy for building in-country degree programs and commanding greater respect and cooperation from host country counterparts).
- Provision of tenured faculty is a mark of the university's commitment to a project. They are key to providing continuity for long-term efforts. The COP and campus project coordinator must be tenured and have the capacity to deal with department heads, Deans and other university officials on the basis of mutual professional respect in order to get the home office support needed.
- For all positions, tenure is less critical than quality. The experience of many missions is that universities too often offer tenured staff who are either at the very early or very late stages of their career and of little immediate use to their department - in essence, AID gets those that are expendable.
- Missions believe this is not surprising since most universities have not yet developed personnel policies to encourage their "best and brightest" mid-career faculty to work overseas. If such faculty cannot be placed overseas on a consistent basis, one response said, "Title XII is no different from your ordinary body shop."

- For many project TA positions, missions believe tenure is "irrelevant." "The right individual is more important than tenure." "Non-tenured faculty or TA hired off the street are often more experienced with overseas work and more effective than tenured faculty." "Insistence on tenure often leads to getting people not eager to take the risks associated with new professional challenges in difficult cultural and work environments."
- Title XIIs could provide better quality staff (tenured or not) through improved long-range planning and screening of candidates.
- Rapid turnover of Title XII staff appears to be a greater problem (a) in Africa and Latin America than in Asia and the Near East, and (b) for tenured rather than non-tenured personnel.

Except for tenured staff, the turnover problem is no different than for other non-university contractors.

Is the turnover of AID staff viewed as a problem by Missions?

- Except for Asia which claims its staff stays 4-5 years, the answer is generally "yes," although many missions feel the problem is being dealt with as the average tour of a USDH is getting longer. "Current promotional patterns encourage officers to be mobile, accepting new and greater responsibilities, not sustained efforts in the same portfolio of projects over a long period."
- Most feel this problem does not affect Title XII projects any differently than it affects other projects.

- FSNs often provide continuity as USDH project officers change but "FSNs are not always conversant with the wide range of AID management issues and concerns as are USDH."

#3. How have changes in A.I.D. and federal contracting modalities made accessing university resources more difficult? What suggestions do you have in this area?"

Most missions who responded to this question felt that recent changes in contracting regulations did not have an adverse affect on new mission projects. While these changes embodied in the new Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) strongly encourage open competition and require more justification for Title XII setasides, most missions felt the changes are in the field's interest. Clearly many missions are uncomfortable with Title XII setasides. From their point of view, if the universities have a comparative advantage in certain areas such as agriculture research, they feel the competitive "contract selection process will give the same result as a setaside with only a marginal addition of time." Most feel that increased competition between Title XII and private firms is healthy and will result in fewer Title XII projects that are inadequately staffed and managed. As one mission put it: "We strongly feel that universities can successfully compete with well prepared proposals and will, in the long run, fare far better than relying on preferred procurement arrangements."

A minority of respondents felt the tighter contracting regulations are inappropriate or being implemented too rigorously. For example, one said, "Universities have not been able to compete effectively with private firms for mission contracts ... they rarely win even when included in the competitive range...Universities rarely achieve the proficiency (at preparing competitive proposals) required by the process to

compete effectively." Another said, "waivers to restrict bidding to universities are being scrupulously studied and contested by AID contract officers...this appears in contrast to about 5 years ago when AID field personnel definitely felt there was Agency encouragement to use universities in certain types of projects."

Most missions, however, do feel that the new regulations negatively affect their ability to extend a university contract or award a Phase II contract to a university that successfully implemented Phase I. One stated, "Any contract extension over \$100,000 needs to be formally competed. This process can introduce personnel instability in a TA team and requires a significant amount of mission work and time. Previously we were able to advertise our intent to extend and amend a contract before executing a contract extension amendment, that seems to me a more reasonable approach." For Phase II projects "contracting regulations make it impossible to select the same university without full competition. This is costly and time consuming, especially in the light of AID and Title XII policy of providing long term (10-15 years) assistance to agriculture research and extension. The regulations should allow for the award of a medium term contract that can be extended for some longer period (say 20 years) if the contractor has proven to be successful in AID's judgment." Another said, "It appears to be more difficult to contract for new activities with universities currently or previously involved in a given country, causing a serious loss of expertise gained from previous activities. Allowing a heavier weight for previous in-country experience in the evaluation process could help overcome the problem."

In sum, most missions feel that full competition for new projects is beneficial to AID, but that greater flexibility is needed to obtain sole source waivers for contract extensions and Phase II projects.

4. Why has the Technical Support to Missions (TSM) contracting modality not been used as extensively as envisioned? Is this a useful tool and should it be retained? If your response is positive, do you have suggestions with respect to expanding the TSM concept?

Of the 40 missions responding:

- 7 said TSMs were very useful
- 18 said they were somewhat useful, had some problems but should be retained
- 6 said they were not at all useful or needed
- 9 indicated no experience with TSMs.

LAC missions had the most positive view of TSMs. All 11 who had experience with TSMs felt they were very useful (5) or somewhat useful (6). ANE was most negative with 3 of 8 missions with experience saying they were not useful or needed and the other 5 indicating they were "somewhat useful." 4 ANE missions or 1/3 of those responding said they had no experience with TSMs. AFR responses fell in the middle with most saying TSMs were somewhat useful.

Reasons why missions had not used TSMs extensively fell into three major categories:

(1) the most common reason was that private sector IQCs could provide better quality short term technical services across a broader spectrum of needs, faster and with minimal contractual difficulty. In essence most missions appeared to view TSMs as a university analog to IQCs which wasn't yet working as well as the tried and true IQCs. Very few mentioned the longer-term advantages that TSMs can provide of developing county-specific expertise in a particular university.

(2) Many missions, particularly in Africa, normally called on institutional contractors (often universities) already working on project implementation in-country to provide short-term services. These projects are apparently broad enough so that practically any short-term requirements in the agricultural sector can be provided conveniently through existing contract mechanisms. These missions see little need for a separate TSM mechanism.

(3) The pool of resources TSMs offer is too limited. A single university with a TSM cannot provide from its staff alone the broad range of services missions require but the TSM university is generally reluctant to look outside the university to hire talent like a body shop. University skills may also be thin. For example, if the experienced entomologist the mission wants is not available quickly (many missions mentioned teaching schedules as a major problem in getting timely assistance) many universities are unlikely to have available another entomologist knowledgeable to the particular country and/or problem. An established IQC with a roster of specialists would be able to deliver the needed services.

Several responses recommended that TSMs (or IQCs) be increasingly developed with university consortia. In fact, most of the TSMs mentioned positively in the responses (MUCIA - Eastern Caribbean; SECID - REDSO/WCA) are with consortia or with State-wide university systems such as SUNY, which utilize talent from the numerous universities in the system. These consortia apparently function as efficiently as IQCs. For example, REDSO/WCA stated that its TSM with SECID has "proven to be a very timely means of fielding professors from the entire field of agriculture, on short notice, to perform a variety of important tasks for REDSO's client posts."

Most missions felt TSMs were useful and should be retained; however a number cautioned that their positive recommendation was premised on the assumption that missions would maintain the freedom of choice in choosing among several modes (IQCs, PSCs, institutional contractors working in-country) for procuring technical services.

#5. What has been your experience with Title XII collaborative contracts? Should this procedure be used more extensively in the future? If so, why? If not, why not?

missions' experience with collaborative contracting has been quite diverse - with quite strong, almost ideological, feelings on the subject.

- 9 responses are quite positive. These missions have had very positive experience often citing all of the attributes AID and BIFAD hoped to see in the collaborative contract mode. As one Mission put it: "Title XII collaborative contracts are the only way to go. Not only does the modality assure that the implementing agent is in agreement with the design agent, it also promotes a stronger commitment on the part of the design team to prepare a project with realistic objectives and promotes a stronger commitment on the part of the university in gearing up its administrative support structure for project implementation. This in turn shortens the extraordinary time lag which normally occurs between the design/approval process and the bidding/contracting/implementation process."

Missions perceive that the collaborative contracting process leads to an increased commitment on the part of universities, a stronger long term TA team, stronger interinstitutional

relationships between the university and the host country institution, and better backstopping. Collaborative contracting may be most appropriate for agriculture education projects as these were most prominently mentioned as success stories.

Three missions felt the collaborative contracting mode should be expanded for use even when universities were not involved - for private sector or non-profit institutions.

Twelve responses felt the collaborative contracting approach worked well in certain limited circumstances and were more guarded in their praise.

Prerequisites for success seemed to be:

- USAID objectives must be clearly stated and correspond with university goals and objectives. This may be more difficult than in the past since PIDs are now shorter, less detailed documents. RFPs for PP design and eventual project implementation must be carefully thought through by the Mission prior to issuance.
- a majority of the university's PP design team will be made available for the long-term project implementation team.
- USAID and host country project objectives are consistent.

Eight responses gave the collaborative contracting approach poor marks and either said they would not use this mode or implied the same by saying nothing positive about collaborative contracting. Several missions disagreed with the basic concept, feeling that allowing a university to design its own project was a conflict of interest and resulted in projects designed

more in the interest of the university than the host country. Weakness in project design skills among university personnel was also commonly cited as a serious flaw in this approach.

There were some interesting variations in the responses. 10 of 13 AFR responses were very positive or indicated mixed experience. 5 of 11 ANE responses were strongly negative. No LAC responses were negative but several indicated no experience with the mode or demonstrated lack of knowledge about the concept - discussing their experience with CRSPs (Collaborative Research Support Programs) rather than with collaborative contracting.

#6. What has been your experience regarding Mission management of university contracts? From the Mission standpoint, have they required more and different management attention compared with non-university contracts? From the university standpoint, has such management been effective or excessive or directed toward the wrong issues? Are there distinctions in this regard between host country and direct university contracts?

Of 37 substantive mission responses to this question:

- 12 or almost 1/3 indicated that university contracts were more difficult to manage than non-university contracts.
- 3 indicated university contracts were easier to manage.
- 22 said there were no net differences in mission management requirements.

There were no significant regional differences in the responses.

Five missions discussed distinctions between host country and direct university contracts. Only two (both Asia missions) preferred host country contracts while the other three strongly favored direct AID contracts.

The most noted management problems associated with university contracts were the following:

(1) Universities tend to delegate less authority to their field-based Chief-of-Party than do private firms (for example, to sign contract amendments, change scopes of work, make in-country expenditures).

(2) Contract financial information is more difficult to obtain by the mission. Missions attribute this to (a) use of the Federal Reserve Letter of Credit payment mechanism for university contracts which provides "a paucity of financial details;" (b) less cost-consciousness on the part of universities than by profit-making private firms; (c) less university experience with AID financial regulations and requirements.

(3) Universities tend to be less flexible in responding to and resolving personnel problems and "non-routine problems." They also are often slower to take on the administrative duties associated with "setting up shop" at the start of a new project than more experienced private firms.

(4) Universities sometimes are less responsive to Mission and project needs which USAIDs attribute to the multiplicity of masters (university management, State legislatures, the host country and the USAID mission), which university contractors must serve.

(5) Finally, as discussed in Question #2, a critical factor is the quality and experience of the university Chief of Party and the quality of the campus backstop staff which carry most of the administrative and contract management burden. When universities have had a good deal of experience with AID projects and field an experienced, competent Chief-of-Party, they usually require much less Mission management.

#7. What are your expectations for future USAID-University contracts, from the Mission standpoint, given your particular agricultural development strategy, and from the University standpoint, given the priority accorded international programs in your University and the capacity to undertake future overseas activity?

Many responses to the question of future USAID-University contracts were quite vague, perhaps purposely so (several missions neglected to respond to this question). Of those who did respond clearly, 7 of 10 ANE missions indicated they expected to do less with Universities. All of the 7 AFR missions that gave clear responses said they would do the same level or more contracting with Universities. 3 of 7 LAC missions said they would do more; 3 said they would do less.

Several missions said they would prefer open competition for projects traditionally reserved for Universities. As one African Mission put it "there is definitely a trend to look beyond the universities for project implementation, even for those projects which traditionally would have been earmarked for the university route, i.e., research, extension and training.... There is equal lobbying from the PVO community, 8-A firms, small business and the private sector in general."

Two missions, El Salvador and Bolivia, said it was their impression that Universities were not interested in carrying out long-term projects in their countries.

The reasons for fewer future university contracts include (a) reduced number of new starts, and (b) increased focus on agribusiness and private sector-related agriculture projects.

A sense of the variety of responses may be gained from the following precis of a few randomly selected Mission responses.

Precis of Responses

El Salvador: Primarily needs short-term people. Universities have not shown interest in carrying out long-term projects in El Salvador in the past.

Egypt: Expects to continue present high level. Ag Credit project will be open to University participation.

Costa Rica: Shifting to private sector development projects; whether universities are used will depend on how much they can contribute to this.

Honduras: Hopes to get a long-term agriculture education project started.

The Philippines: Nationalism may necessitate more reliance on short-term university specialists.

Bangladesh: Hopes to renew an older Ag University institution-building effort. Would certainly seek Title XII assistance to design and implement.

ROCAP: Hopes to expand direct use of more Title XII Universities by host country and regional institutions.

Yemen: Overcommitted to Title XII projects, especially collaborative mode, but in the future will still have Title XII as principal effort.

Niger: Expects to concentrate largely on research; will insist on good quality, long-term personnel, regardless of time required; will pay for French language training.

Cameroon: Possible Title XII contracts for ag extension and ag policy analysis/economic planning projects.

Ecuador: No future Title XII contracts expected.

Burma: Would like universities to bid on upcoming crop production project. Not planning setaside.

Indonesia: No new initiative in ag/rural development sectors over next 2 years. Thus do not see a major new role for Title XII universities beyond what presently exists.

Zimbabwe: May want to involve university personnel in policy agenda and faculty of agriculture programs.

Eastern Caribbean: Will be phasing down, "expect to call on S&T centers of excellence."

Belize: No future Title XII contracts expected.

Nepal: Has had a high proportion of portfolio in university contracts; likely to decrease; is seeing more universities coming in as sub-contractors. Planning one setaside (Forestry Institute), 2 other projects on which universities can bid.

Sri Lanka: Will not be initiating any long-term research or educational institution-building projects, so no setasides; may be role for universities but on a competitive basis.

Pakistan: Fully expects to be involved with universities; feels that universities "can easily win their share of the awards with well prepared proposals."

Thailand: Sees future primarily in "obtaining individuals from various institutions on an as needed basis."

#8 How has the Washington BIFAD staff served your needs and what are your suggestions with respect to improving those services?

Thirty-two missions responded to this question with no significant regional differences:

- 13 indicated BIFAD had been very useful
- 9 said BIFAD had been somewhat useful or had mixed experience
- 2 said BIFAD was not useful to AID
- 8 said they had no contact or experience with BIFAD.

BIFAD staff was most commonly complimented for:

- facilitating decisions in the use of Title XII services
- facilitating the preparation of RFTPs and clarifying opposing views in contract negotiations
- knowing its institutions and having good access to decision-makers within them
- providing services when called upon.

Suggestions

A number of missions said they lacked familiarity with the personnel and services available from the Washington BIFAD office and how they were accessed. Others indicated their only contacts with BIFAD (except for its newsletter, in some cases) had been initiated by the Mission and encouraged more field visits by BIFAD staff (to identify potential Title XII projects and review ongoing projects). Clearly, despite its many years of existence, BIFAD can do more to publicize its services among AID field staff.

A rather general perception was that BIFAD spent "too much time touting Title XII" and trying to forcefeed missions with Title XII institutions and too little time assisting universities in improving performance - which should lead to more contracts based on merit. BIFAD was encouraged to "assist universities in improving skills in developing proposals, negotiating contracts and improving contract management" - three areas of major weaknesses often cited in responses to earlier questions. BIFAD should "assume a somewhat tougher professional relationship with Title XII institutions ...and be more than a recruitment office for Title XII institutions."

Other suggestions included:

- evaluate the characteristics of successful Title XII projects to determine why they have succeeded
- encourage universities to improve personnel policies and procedures to remove disincentives to key staff working on long-term overseas assignments
- ensure a better "fit" of Title XII institutions to the job at hand and develop common expectations between the USAID Mission and the university.

- assume greater responsibility over an invigorated JCC program
- allow greater Mission participation in the selection of Title XII institutions and their personnel.

#9 What has been your experience with university consortia, multi-university contracts or single university contracts? Is one mode preferable, and if so, why?

Twenty-five missions provided substantive responses to this question. Given its very open nature there is no meaningful way to aggregate the responses statistically, however, some key mission perceptions emerge very clearly.

Single University Contracts:

- are easiest to manage and tend to engender greater university commitment to success. A single university tends to be more flexible in tailoring services to a specific program than a consortium;
- are generally appropriate for smaller, less complex projects;
- are usually carried out by the larger universities (with contracting expertise, a greater pool of tenured faculty which can be devoted to overseas programs, etc.).

University Consortia Contracts:

- offer smaller schools a chance to participate in overseas development;
- are essential for large and complex projects due to the need for a broader resource base to draw upon (ex., for French speakers):

- are more costly due to additional management layering;
- lack the desired university commitment ("are simply administered by a contracts office without any real sense of [university] involvement") and less effective in the long-term objective of building university capacity;
- need strong central management and "unity of command" to override conflicting interests among the participating universities, avoid turf battles and adjudicate effectively among the university when necessary;
- may be inherently more difficult to manage because of differing personnel and procurement policies among the universities. On the other hand, consortia management can build up and apply expertise on AID contracting and other regulations more readily than a multiplicity of single universities;
- seem to be improving their performance as inter-institutional differences are ironed out through experience and the need for strong leadership by a lead university is recognized.

Multi-University Contracts:

Most responses did not differentiate between consortia and multi-university contracts. Those that did focused on the need for clear lines of authority and responsibility among prime and sub-contractors. The trend for universities to work jointly with private firms was viewed very positively especially when the private firm was responsible for contract management and the universities could focus on the technical elements of the scope of work.

#10. In summary, based on your experience, what is it you feel that universities do best and how do you feel AID should make maximum effectiveness of these strengths?

Answers to this question largely reiterated points made earlier in the Mission responses, although some Mission Directors provided quite thoughtful summary statements or made more sweeping suggestions which were not felt to be appropriate in addressing the earlier questions ad seriatum.

Commonly stated comments were:

- U.S. universities are an important and sometimes unique resource that have played and should continue to play a very important role in U.S. efforts to encourage agricultural development in the 3rd World.
- However, universities, like all institutions, must adapt to a changing development environment, must be responsive to modifications in AID and host country development strategies and priorities, must shore up their operational weaknesses, and must increasingly compete with (or collaborate with) non-university entities who provide similar services.
- Universities have not resolved the conundrum of how to encourage their best tenured staff to take long-term overseas assignments in the face of competing career interests and institutional requirements.
- AID should explore ways to facilitate university involvement overseas through longer-term contract commitments, and innovative funding mechanisms to maintain full-time international program staff at universities.

- AID must assist the universities in overcoming their managerial and administrative shortcomings.

Some of the more unique field recommendations should also be noted.

- Establish an Institute of International Agriculture (to which universities could affiliate) with a tenuring system for individuals who want to pursue a career in international agriculture. The Institute might also administer the CRSPs and be contracting entity for bilateral projects. [Swaziland]
- Select universities, with BIFAD support, should create a separate track for their personnel who desire to pursue careers overseas. These personnel (who would not be considered for tenure) would be totally relieved of teaching, research and other university requirements for tenured faculty and should be graded and rewarded solely on their performance in aiding projects reach their objectives (the University of Arizona at Tucson is apparently trying a version of this). [Lesotho]
- "Limit the definition of Title XII projects to the University teaching/faculty development type... more in keeping with the present day role of the land grant universities in the States." [Swaziland]
- "Discussions could be initiated between the Agency and Title XII institutions with the objective of coordinating country specific studies with graduate degree programs. Such a program would strengthen the Agency/Title XII association, allow U.S. universities to broaden their

areas of concentration beyond state or regional interests and provide an economic source of highly trained technical assistance to missions and host countries." [Thailand]

- "Even though assistance to agricultural higher education is currently out of fashion, it would be useful to thoroughly evaluate A.I.D.'s historic experience in developing and improving LDC agricultural education, especially through formal linkages with U.S. universities. These programs have been characterized as trickle down with slow impact. In retrospect there is reason to believe that agricultural higher education programs have formed the basis for sustained agricultural growth and in the long run have been essential for the success of many LDCs now emerging from food deficit problems. If this observation holds, AID is missing an opportunity to assist in sustained agricultural growth in many countries. Re-establishing agricultural higher education as an important element of AID's development strategy would provide the natural opportunity for linking Title XII university programs with USAID programs. Universities have a clear competitive advantage in the area of LDC university development. They have done an excellent job in the past and can be expected to do so in the future." [Egypt]

CLEARANCE:

ANE/TR/ARD:Purves/Rice (draft)

LAC/DR/RD:Joslyn (draft)

AFR/TR/ARD:Prussner (Draft)

BIFAD:R.W.Kleis (subs)

ATTACHMENT II

Summary of University Responses on Strengths and Weaknesses of Title XII Programs After Ten Years of Experience

The Administrators letter of May 30 soliciting comments went to 35 involved Title XII Universities. The most common responses within the ten categories of queries are summarized in the following paragraphs.

1. Areas where Universities are most effective? (Comparative advantage)
 - Title XII Universities are inherently strongest in institution building, human resource development (both formal and informal education), research and technology dissemination and interlinkages thereof.
 - Universities offer large pools of expertise, institutional continuity, prestige, objectivity, versatility and support resources such as libraries, linguistics, scientific facilities and organizational linkages as compared to private sector firms.
 - While not claiming unique capabilities in program management, they do consider the notion of lack of management expertise and effectiveness to be invalid. Indeed there were citations of private firm common recruitment of not only technical expertise but management talent from Universities.
 - Universities recognized private sector capability and competitiveness in responding to short term staffing needs, staffing establishment positions, policy and sector analyses, non-institutional development project management, and some forms of technical assistance.
 - Considerable acceptance of the appropriateness of greater use of "blended capabilities" or joint undertakings between universities and private firms for projects needing the best of both. Clear identity of a principle contractor and accountable entity is important.
2. How important is involvement of tenured faculty?
 - Very important for project leadership and a majority of team; to provide experience, commitment, institutional loyalty and continuity of relationships and

accountability. (Tenured - most commonly considered as permanent affiliation or "tenure line" whether yet on tenure or not)

- There is general perception that university faculty promotion and tenure policies and/or procedures reflect strong disincentives to long term overseas assignments.
- Recognition that the senior faculty experience pool will continue to decline unless junior and new individuals with interest but without experience are blended into project staffing.
- There are needs for recruiting special staffing capabilities from outside or from sister universities; to bring the most appropriate capabilities to the project.
- Universities attitudes generally are to engage projects that fit their institutional character, faculty expertise, long term interest and the enhancement of institutional function.
- Increased continuity of staffing is regarded as important in Title XII projects as well as for private firms and AID. It is not regarded as a unique problem to universities.
- Contracting entity (university) knows staff best and has project performance responsibility and therefore should not be second guessed on staffing by Host Country or AID Officers. Citations were provided of staff selection of "off-the street" or lesser qualified than primary nominees of contracting university.

3. Effects of contracting modalities changes?

- Concern that AID seems to have lost sight of the rationale of Title XII and for using the Standard University Contract or the Collaborative Assistance Mode Contract in an over reaction to private sector firms lobbying efforts.
- Perceived bias against Title XII procurement set-aside for projects clearly fitting criteria for such.
- Shift of contracting authority to Missions cause problems of communication, understanding, processing

13

time and use of appropriate mode. Mission officers often have inadequate, outdated or otherwise wrong understandings of Title XII and universities involved.

- The generally agreed desirability of long term institutional commitment and relationships is denied by "full and open competition" of universities competing with private firms which lack the structural capability for such. Re-competing second and third phases of a multi-phase project is also inconsistent with voiced encouragement of long term commitment, continuity of staffing and sustained relationships.
- The pillar of private sector development in LDCs appears to have been skewed toward U.S. private sector involvement; and then to private consulting entities without any internal expertise pool. Commonly, such "firms" recruit almost totally from universities or "off the street" without the question of permanent staff being raised. The involvement of AID annuitants is commonly cited.
- Suggestions:
 - Urge Mission Directors (and/or ADOs, RDOs) to spend 2-5 days on an involved university campus.
 - Seek mechanisms of improved communication with Mission officers.
 - Promote University/Private firm collaboration when appropriate to project needs.
 - Clarify meaning of Private Enterprise pillar within agency units.
 - Restore the favor and usage of SU and CAM Contracts with Missions leadership and Bureaus.
 - Implement mechanisms of continuity of successful contractors in phased projects.
 - A program to place AID personnel for two to four weeks at several different universities. (A professional development program).

4. Why TSMs not more used?

- Universities (few) involved have favorable experiences; other universities generally interested.

- Missions have in some cases indicated lack of familiarity with this mechanism (a communications need); in other instances Missions have indicated a desire for broader field to draw on (this tends to assume the appearance of an "old boys club").
- Universities might well assume a more pro-active role in developing Mission interest.
- Longer term contract and planning horizon would increase effectiveness.

5. Collaborative Assistance Contracts experience and usage recommendations?

- unanimous agreement that concept is good, should be more used and should be cast in long planning horizon of ten years or more for institution building projects.
- The concept of involvement in planning and design by the subsequent implementing contractor has much logic, efficiency, and appeal to more senior stronger faculty.
- This mode appears to be diminishing in usage contrary to expressed support. In some instances it has reverted to Standard Contract mode pattern after initial implementation contract and even been re-competed in subsequent phases contrary to the CAM concept. This latter appears to result from "procurement process inflexibility."

6. Experience regarding Mission management of contracts?

- Experiences varied and quite favorable --- recognizing staffing squeeze and project loads.
- General concern for AID staffing turnover and shifts of concepts; levels of understanding and commitment to ongoing contracts objectives.
- Some Missions tend to: (1) focus on short term results, (2) display commitment to process mechanics, losing sight of basic goal and (3) exercise excessive micro-management and technical judgements including personnel selection.
- Universities desire a partnership relationship in which the University and USAID sustain communication on

project execution and each functions to further commonly perceived objectives.

- University experiences of Host Country contracts are less positive and suggest greatly complicated management relationships without offsetting advantages. USAIDs do not recognize a significantly different role for HCCs, further adding to the complications for the contractor. (eg sequential bureaucratic time delays in processes even when all three parties are in accord.)

7. Expectations for future USAID/University contracts?

- All respondents have had strengthening grants and have or anticipate program support grants for enhanced program support capability.
- More extensively involved universities project a sustained level of AID contract activity; less extensively involved universities project an expanded involvement.
- Most universities seek geographic focus and involvements matched to their general technical strength. They visualize more collaborative participation as projects become fewer and larger.
- Longer term contracts and post contract association mechanisms are desired.
- The universities have developed a much increased experience base, administrative commitment, faculty interest and integration of global dimension into institutional missions and policies.

8. BIFAD Staff functions?

A. Broad appreciation of roles served for:

- Information dissemination.
- Orchestration of Title XII institutional involvement.
- Workshops, special studies, reports, publications.
- Development of Title XII mechanisms.
- Interface with AID for Title XII community.
- Access assistance, etc.
- Development education efforts.
- Performance enhancement assistance.

B. Suggestions or problems (most by one or two respondents)

- University administrators orientation.
- Assignment preparation workshops for faculty (expand).
- Pooling and dissemination of project experiences.
- Orchestrate groupings of universities for specific large undertakings.
- Politicized procurement process.
- More and earlier pending project advisories.
- Establish a joint Title XII, private sector advisory group.
- Increased credibility with universities through higher percentage of IPA staff.

9. Experience with Consortia, Multi-University or single-University contracting?

- All respondents are associated with consortia of varying types and sizes. All are positive in their experience and/or anticipated usage.
- Most feel consortia mode will be appropriate for increasing percentage of (larger) projects. Most suggest need for flexibility to form special ad hoc aggregations for some special nature projects. All "standing" consortia have this flexibility.
- Consortia offer (1) enlarged pool of resources (2) greater staffing flexibility (3) broadened portfolio of projects and service opportunities (4) more efficient and effective proposal development, evaluation, management experience, "intelligence gathering," and mutual support and (5) participation opportunities for smaller, less experienced institutions.
- There are preferences for single institution contracting for small projects of good fit to institutional character and expertise.
- Object to AID exclusion of consortia from some contracts.
- Important to clearly define administrative responsibility and roles in consortia contracts with special role of lead University on behalf of the Consortium (including the post contract linkage and association).

32

10. Summary of Title XII University strengths and utilization suggestions

A. Commonly stated (unanimous) judgements of university strengths are:

- Institution building (broader than education).
- Human resource development, technology generation and technology transfer.
- Continuity and permanence.
- History of interfacing with Private Sector.
- Campus support mechanisms.
- Broad pool of expertise.

B. Suggestions for more effective usage

- Involvement in needs assessment and planning (pre-contract stage).
- Longer term projects and planning horizons.
- Sustained funding mechanisms for institutional planning and support.
- Overcome AID mis-perceptions of universities; eg U.S. Land-Grant structure translocation concept (long since passed) and academic image based upon old and perhaps non-Land Grant undergraduate experience.
- Develop mechanism or format of collaboration between Universities and Private firms.
- Reaffirm and strengthen Title XII partnership concept and the special mechanisms (CRSPs, TSMs, JCCs, MOUs PGSSs, Collaborative Assistance mode, etc.).

BIFAD:RWKleis:bls:9/8/86:#5435A

31