

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY
PROJECT DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, AND EVALUATION WORKSHOPS:
AN INTEGRATED APPROACH TO MANAGING
AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS

Presented by:

International Development Management Center (IDMC)
University of Maryland

and

International Program Development Office (IPDO)
Washington State University

Report Prepared by:

Kenneth A. Smith, IDMC

May 1984

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Institutions involved in international development typically rely on a wide range of policy and program initiatives to induce improvements in agricultural and rural sectors around the world. Historically, these initiatives have emphasized the transfer of new or improved production technologies, i.e., procedures and equipment used to transform raw materials into finished goods and services. Managerial technologies, by which we mean the know-how required to mobilize, adapt and guide policy and program initiatives, are also vital to the development process. Unfortunately, managerial technologies frequently have been entirely overlooked or treated as exogenous to the development process. This has led the major international development agencies to pay increased attention to what they refer to as the "management gap."

Nowhere has this management gap been more evident than in the planning and implementation of agricultural and rural development policies, programs, and projects. In response, the issue of improving the management of the development process has begun to receive substantial attention from donor and host country agencies as well as from contracting institutions. As U.S. universities have begun to play greater roles in the planning and implementation of development efforts, particularly under the U.S. Agency for International Development's (AID) Title XII program, the ability of these universities to effectively manage development related activities has been identified as the area where strengthening would most quickly lead to improved development results. AID has awarded a strengthening grant to the Office of International Agriculture at Oregon State University for this very purpose.

This document presents an overview of one activity undertaken by Oregon State in an effort to improve its ability to manage agricultural and rural development projects. The workshops described herein were conducted as a joint effort between the Office of International Agriculture at OSU (OIA/OSU), the International Development Management Center at the University of Maryland (IDMC/UMCP), and the International Program Development Office at Washington State University (IPDO/WSU). Marcus Ingle and Kenneth Smith from IDMC, and Jan Noel from IPDO were the principle instructors. They were actively supported by Paul Kifer, Margaret Lewis, Carol Culler, and Martin Hellickson from OSU who served as group facilitators and helped with administrative support. Artie Kennedy, Carol Cahall, and Jan Bunting of IDMC, and Karen Engle of OIA/WSU assisted in preparing workshop materials and making logistical arrangements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. OBJECTIVES	2
III. WORKSHOP OVERVIEW	3
Workshop #1	4
Workshop #2	6
IV. EVALUATION	10
Workshop #1	10
Workshop #2	11
V. NEXT STEPS	12
VI. APPENDICES	14
A. Agenda: Workshop #1	15
B. List of Materials: Workshop #1	17
C. Agenda: Workshop #2	19
D. List of Materials: Workshop #2	21
E. Participants	22
F. Instructional Staff Biodata	23

I. INTRODUCTION

The Office of International Agriculture at Oregon State University (OIA/OSU) has recently received a strengthening grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID). This grant was awarded, in part, to prepare a core of university faculty for international assignments, and to assure that they are adequately supported by OSU. More specifically, one of five areas identified as deserving high priority for strengthening includes, "...creation of a cadre of faculty with training and experience in project design/evaluation/team leadership..."

The Office of International Agriculture is currently developing and implementing various programs to meet the objectives of the AID strengthening grant. OIA/OSU is giving high priority to upgrading the skills of a select number of the University's faculty in the areas of project design, implementation, and evaluation. After attending a Consortium for International Development (CID) Project Design and Analysis workshop in October 1983, Dr. Paul Kifer, Director of the Office of International Agriculture, determined that an expanded version of the CID workshop would be appropriate for OSU's strengthening effort. Dr. Kifer contacted one of the CID workshop facilitators, Dr. Marcus D. Ingle, about the possibility of assisting with the preparation and facilitation of the OIA/OSU workshops.

A pair of integrated project management workshops was proposed, and the purpose and scope of the workshops were negotiated (see OBJECTIVES below). The first workshop, entitled "Design and Analysis of AID-sponsored Agricultural and Rural Development Projects," was held in Newport, Oregon, from February 19 to 23, 1984. The second workshop, entitled "Implementation and Evaluation of AID-sponsored Agricultural and Rural Development Projects", was conducted from March 31 to April 5. Both workshops were attended full-time by thirty OSU faculty and administrators, twenty four of whom attended both sessions.

Within the context of each workshop's scope and 4-day time period, an intense learning experience was designed and conducted that focused on the development of actual competencies needed by OSU personnel in designing, implementing, and evaluating development projects and programs. Using AID's Logical Framework as an organizing structure, a pragmatic set of generic principles, analytic techniques, and human processes for managing agricultural and rural development projects was introduced and applied.

The workshops were prepared and conducted jointly by the International Development Management Center at the University of Maryland College Park (IDMC/UMCP), the International Program Development Office at Washington State (IPDO/WSU), and the Office of International Agriculture at Oregon State (OIA/OSU). Marcus Ingle and Kenneth Smith of IDMC/UMCP, and Jan Noel of IPDO/WSU were the principal instructors (biographical data in Appendix F). They were actively supported by Paul Kifer, Margaret Lewis, Carol Culler, and Martin Hellickson of Oregon State, who served as group facilitators and provided administrative support for the entire program.

II. OBJECTIVES

The overall purpose of the two workshops was to strengthen selected OSU faculty members' understanding of AID's development policies and procedures, and to create a cadre of OSU faculty with the abilities and skills needed to successfully design, implement, and evaluate AID-sponsored agricultural and rural development projects.

Specific workshop objectives included the following:

- To help participants understand AID's policies and procedures relevant to agricultural and rural development project design, implementation, and evaluation, as these relate to OSU's international agriculture program;
- To help participants understand and learn how to apply basic design, implementation, and evaluation techniques, along with appropriate team processes, relevant to AID-sponsored agricultural and rural development projects;
- To help participants identify OSU project design, implementation, and evaluation policies and procedures in need of further strengthening following the workshop sessions, along with next steps for carrying out high priority improvements; and
- To increase the awareness of opportunities and activities within the OSU international agriculture program.

A secondary purpose was to expose a group of OSU faculty to principles and methods of planning and conducting effective training workshops and provide them with an opportunity to exercise these. It was with this purpose in mind that the four group facilitators were selected to work with the principal instructors. Their major responsibilities revolved around providing guidance to the small groups during group assignments and providing feedback to the groups regarding group processes. In addition, the facilitators assisted the instructors in reviewing each day's events, eliciting feedback from participants, and redesigning workshop sessions in response to the feedback.

III. WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

The two workshops presented a pragmatic set of generic principles, analytic techniques, and human processes for designing, implementing, and evaluating AID-sponsored agricultural and rural development projects in the context of developing countries. The conceptual centerpiece for the workshops was the Logical Framework, an integrated management approach that assists in clarifying project objectives in measurable terms, and systematically linking these objectives to the project's strategy, organizational structure, and resource requirements. The Logical Framework is central to AID's project system, and is also used extensively by other donor assistance agencies and developing countries. Related techniques and team process skills introduced as integral parts of the Logical Framework Approach included objective setting, feasibility analysis, responsibility charting, performance networking, team selection and orientation, resource allocation, consensus building, reporting and monitoring formats, and evaluation research (both formative and summative).

The workshops themselves were designed and conducted in accordance with several premises that were established to maximize the learning of the participants. These premises were as follows:

- The workshops should follow the principle of "structured flexibility." While pre-planned, the workshops should be facilitated in such a way as to be responsive to specific needs of the participants and to new issues and ideas that arose during the sessions;
- Differing positions, where based on facts and empirical evidence, should be openly discussed;
- Organized, formal, and informal interactions between participants all contribute to workshop objectives;
- Workshop participants are the key producers as well as consumers of workshop information. As a result, participatory dialogue is given priority over one-way didactic communication; and
- The workshops are another step--neither the first nor the last--of OSU's ongoing commitment to a strong and resilient international development program.

Both workshops focused on successful agricultural and rural development projects, viewed in the broader context of three fused management processes: design, implementation, and evaluation. These processes were presented as intricately related and complementary. Emphasis was given to examining the orchestration of these processes as a basic function of development management.

Finally, throughout both workshops, extensive use was made of case simulations, individual exercises, and project illustrations in order to facilitate the mastery of appropriate conceptual, technical, and interpersonal skills needed to successfully design, implement, and evaluate development projects.

Overview of Workshop #1:

The first workshop, entitled "Design and Analysis of AID-sponsored Agricultural and Rural Development Projects," began on Sunday evening, February 19, and continued through Thursday, February 23, 1984. The agenda and list of participants are given in Appendices A and E respectively. An overview of the workshop and the topics covered are presented below.

Sunday evening presented an opportunity for the workshop participants to become acquainted with one another and begin to gain an appreciation of the depth of experience represented by the entire group. In addition, the workshop was introduced against the backdrop of OSU's international development activities and purpose and intent of AID's strengthening grant.

After a preliminary overview of the workshop on Monday morning, the concepts of project management were introduced to the participants, along with a set of generic management functions associated with successful development efforts. These functions served as the point of reference for introducing the tools and techniques related to project management during the rest of the workshop. The participants were also introduced to small group exercises and a process of sensitizing them to the things that make groups operate effectively was begun.

During the afternoon, AID's project design process was introduced, including the overall process of formulating development strategies, identifying projects, and assisting with the implementation and evaluation of development results. The Logical Framework was presented as AID's basic project design tool. In addition, the Team Planning Meeting methodology was introduced to the participants while communicating the importance of individual and team planning before a technical assistance team goes to the field for an assignment. In this context, the Kiboko Range Research Project case study was presented. This case provided the background for many of the examples and exercises during both workshops.

Tuesday initiated an elaboration of many of the concepts presented the day before. The morning began with an overview of AID's Project Identification Document (PID), the first formal document that identifies and summarizes a potential project in AID's system. This was followed by a series of presentations and small group exercises that focused on the Logical Framework, the centerpiece of the PID.

The first of these presentations covered the "vertical logic" of the Logical Framework; that is, the series of if-then hypotheses plus assumptions that are fundamental to project design. The second covered the determination of objectively verifiable indicators and means of verification necessary for measuring project progress, or "horizontal logic" as it is known. A third presentation discussed the concept of manageable interest; that is, what the project manager/implementation team is directly responsible for providing as a part of the project effort.

In response to these presentations, the participants worked in small groups to construct project design Logical Frameworks based on the Kiboko case

materials, and presented these designs back to the large group in a role play situation. These exercises ensured that the participants were familiar with the salient characteristics of a good AID project design, and knew how to use the Logical Framework approach for presenting their designs.

On Wednesday, the Project Paper was introduced. The Project Paper (PP) is AID's formal document for presenting a project design for approval as well as summarizing the background, scope, and purpose of the proposed project. The workshop participants were introduced to the objectives and major components of the PP and to the various types of analyses required, upon which AID bases project approval. These analyses include technical, financial, economic, social soundness, administrative, environmental, and energy. Small group exercises were used to introduce these analyses.

On Wednesday afternoon, the participants were given a "perception exercise" that introduced the notion of "filters" that all of us have, and how these can influence the way we perceive and deal with reality. In this context, the concept of Integrated Feasibility Analysis was introduced. Integrated Feasibility Analysis recognizes the interdependencies between the traditional types of analysis mentioned above, and incorporates these into a systematic, integrated approach to project analysis that varies in scope and nature depending upon the level of the means-end relationship being analyzed and the assumptions regarding external conditions that apply.

During the late afternoon, several special topics were presented in small group forums. These forums looked at the promises and threats of using microcomputers in project management situations; strategies for targeting, and getting benefits to, special groups of beneficiaries; and other important project design and analysis issues raised during the first several days of the workshop.

On Thursday, three major topics were introduced: implementation planning, contracting, and evaluation planning. Planning for implementation during the project design process addresses determining the types of actions necessary for putting into effect specific project elements (organizing, managing, staffing, contracting, purchasing, disbursing funds, etc.) and the actors responsible for carrying these out. Related issues include agreement between implementing actors on the goal and purpose of the project, clear articulation of the project strategy, and clear assignment of roles and responsibilities.

In the context of implementation planning, the various types of contracts AID gives for designing and implementing projects were discussed. Of specific interest were the standard and collaborative modes of university contracting. The collaborative mode is one in which a university is contracted to do a project design and then, after project approval, is given the contract for implementation without further competitive bidding. The discussion also showed how the Logical Framework translates into contract language; specifically, how inputs and outputs are written into a contract's scope of work.

Evaluation planning was presented in terms of setting up how a project's progress is to be measured, determining why the project is or is not realizing its goals, and establishing whether or not a project is still consistent with a host country's development needs. The evaluation plan

specifies the data to be monitored (including baseline data), how it is to be collected and analyzed, and how the findings will be used. It was demonstrated that the design Logical Framework contains the basic elements of the evaluation plan in the indicators and means of verification columns.

Late Thursday afternoon there was a summary and review session that included an evaluation of the first workshop and an assignment to be completed by the participants between the first and second workshops. The back-home assignment given the participants was, working alone or in small groups, to develop and elaborate a project design using the Logical Framework approach and including preliminary implementation and evaluation plans for a project in which they were interested. Eight back-home assignment topics were identified and agreed to by the participants.

The workshop ended with two brief evaluation exercises; the first, a written exercise, was completed by the participants as individuals; the second was done in the large group. The results of the evaluation are presented in the following section (III. Evaluation).

Overview of Workshop #2

The second workshop, entitled "Implementation and Evaluation of AID-Sponsored Agricultural and Rural Development Projects," began on Sunday evening, April 1, and continued through Thursday, April 5, 1984. The agenda and list of participants are presented in Appendices C and E respectively.

The objective of the first session, on Sunday evening, was simply to introduce the new participants to the large group and allow all to become reacquainted. A "slogan" exercise was prepared to reintroduce the participants to one another and to the small group process. The slogan identified for the second workshop, as a result of this exercise, was "Think change because you will; but at least spend the money." A special tribute to Filbert, who got us started with the right attitude.

On Monday morning, the second workshop was overviewed and expectations for the session were established. In keeping with the principle of "structured flexibility," the second workshop was redesigned in light of the evaluation of the first. Specific redesign implications were as follows:

- Fewer topics were covered in greater depth;
- More attention was given to host country roles;
- Opportunity was provided for all participants to use each tool presented, rather than dividing the tools between groups of participants;
- More attention was given to "indicators", or measures of project progress;
- More examples from real and specific projects were provided;

- Small group tasks were made more explicit and more time was taken to review the team process of the groups;
- The format of the workshop materials (notebook, pre-workshop reading materials, etc.) was improved;
- Optional special topics were moved to the evening so as not to take time from the daily presentations; and
- The actual presentations were varied in format, instructors, and media.

Following this, the back-home project design assignments were presented by the participant work groups to the large group, and the presentations were critiqued. Presentations were made on the following topics:

- Sewage sludge effluent utilization program;
- Dairy development in Chile;
- Preparation of OSU faculty for overseas projects (2 presented);
- Administrative support for OSU overseas projects; and
- Media support for extension services and support unit in Tunisia.

These presentations led into a brief review of project design tools and procedures.

Monday afternoon the participants were introduced to the practical side of project implementation by means of group exercise. Put into work groups and given the task of implementing the Jama Integrated Community Housing Project, the participants operated within a context of formal and informal procedures to actually construct houses out of paper cards to meet the higher order objectives of the project. This exercise introduced the participants to the necessity of having clearly stated and agreed upon goals and objectives, clearly assigned and understood roles and responsibilities, and access to necessary contextual information for successfully implementing projects. The exercise also stressed the importance of mobilizing an appropriate implementation team and using good group processes for accomplishing objectives within time and resource constraints.

On Monday evening, several special topics were discussed at optional sessions. Paul Kifer led a discussion of activities and opportunities through the Office of International Agriculture at OSU, Marty Hellickson and Jan Noel provided an opportunity to refine the back-home assignment projects and take them on to the next steps, and Marcus Ingle conducted a review of project design concepts and tools, including the Logical Framework, for the new participants.

On Tuesday, the participants were given an overview of an eight-step model toward successful implementation. Referring to the Jama exercise of the previous day, the need for a systematic approach to implementation, supported by the judicious use of various management tools, was highlighted.

This overview was followed by a discussion of the various implementation actors and their roles during the project implementation process. Specifically, the host country, the donor agency, and the contractor were identified. The participants were divided into work groups, assigned the above roles, and given the task of viewing the project implementation process from their role group's perspective and identifying the functions their groups would provide during implementation. These role groups then served as the background for many of the subsequent group exercises.

Following the role exercise, the participants were introduced to performance networks and bar charts, two implementation planning tools useful for preparing detailed schedules that integrate procedural activities and project activities into a realistic time frame for project completion given available resources. These tools were presented in the context of the Jama exercise. Following the presentations, the participants, operating in their role groups, were assigned the task of creating and presenting bar charts for the Kiboko case.

Late in the afternoon, a brief presentation was made on the importance of administrative subroutines and procedures; routine and repetitive activities that are facilitated by establishing a standard procedure for carrying them out. Examples are recruiting staff, procuring commodities, and negotiating contracts. These may be "routinized" in the form of "nested networks", bar charts, and checklists.

On Tuesday evening, the topic of addressing gender roles for successful project implementation and targeting project benefits was introduced by means of a film and discussion. The film Andean Women was shown, and a discussion followed that focused on the need for good project designs, as well as successful implementation efforts, to take into consideration the social/cultural context of the project; the roles of men and women, young and old, etc.

On Wednesday morning, the discussion of the night before was continued and elaborated upon. A brief history of Women in Development as viewed by AID, up through the present, was presented. This was followed by a slide presentation on the Sudan, which clearly showed the integrated roles of both men and women in the agricultural production process. Gender Role Analysis, therefore, is understood to be focused on the need for a proper understanding of gender roles within the context of project design and implementation to ensure that the potential for project success is maximized. Based on this discussion, the participants were given a case study on the Arusha Planning and Village Development Project in Tanzania to review in the light of a series of questions that focused on the relationship between gender roles and successful project implementation.

On Wednesday afternoon, a presentation was made on authority issues during project implementation. The topic was focused on the roles and responsibilities of the various actors involved in implementation, including individuals such as the host country project manager and the contractor chief of party, as well as actor groups. The tool introduced for determining and agreeing on roles and responsibilities was the responsibility chart. The responsibility chart is useful not only for identifying the specific officer or individual accountable for an activity, but also for ensuring that all

members of the implementation team have a clear understanding of their responsibilities.

Late Wednesday afternoon, the participants were introduced more fully to the processes of monitoring and reporting project progress during implementation. The difference between observations/findings and conclusions, which was introduced during the Jama exercise, was reviewed. Emphasis was placed on the identification of important monitoring points, relevant data, and proper reporting procedures. These latter include the concepts of providing only the information that is needed to make necessary decisions, and providing this information to the right decisionmaker.

On Thursday morning, the process of planning and conducting project evaluations was discussed. Such issues as when to evaluate, who/what should be evaluated, and by whom, were addressed. Again, the delineation between findings and conclusions was mentioned, as a basis for making recommendations. The purpose of evaluation, it was agreed, is to review the implementation of a project to date, so as to arrive at recommendations for change that will make implementation more successful, and present these recommendations in a way that they are accepted and implemented by the parties involved.

A methodology for creating an evaluation plan was presented. The components of the plan included: 1) the important decisions to be made; 2) when the decisions are to be made; 3) the questions needing to be answered before the decision can be made; 4) the information necessary for answering these questions, i.e., indicators; and 5) the sources of this information. As an exercise, the participants were again divided into their role groups and asked to develop an evaluation plan for the Kiboko project.

On Thursday afternoon, the final day of the workshops, a "Next Steps" exercise was conducted. The participants were divided into groups according to their technical backgrounds and roles at OSU. These groups were asked to identify specific areas at OSU related to international development in need of strengthening, and prepare an initial implementation plan for carrying out a strengthening effort, using the design and implementation tools and techniques presented in the two workshops. This exercise was provided to allow the participants to apply their learning to specific areas of need at Oregon State in such a way that concrete suggestions for improvement/strengthening were derived and initial action steps identified. The exercise was very successful and the outputs are presented below under section V. NEXT STEPS.

Following the Next Steps exercise, the workshop was reviewed and summarized, evaluations were completed by the participants, and the group was dismissed. Evaluation results are presented below.

IV. EVALUATION

Workshop #1

Evaluation questions for the first workshop focussed on: the overall organization and management of the workshop; specific topics to be added, expanded, shortened or deleted; and the quality of instruction and materials.

Regarding the organization and management of the workshop, the evaluations were very positive, noting the need for better integration between members of the instruction team. The flexibility of the team in scheduling and ability to respond to specific requests was appreciated. A common concern, however, was the need for better clarification of work group assignments.

Regarding the specific sessions, the evaluations indicated that nearly all of the presentations were both needed for the overall subject of project design and analysis, and appreciated by the participants. While there was a consensus that more clarity was needed regarding the tasks of the small groups, there was a great discrepancy in the evaluations of the work group exercises overall. On the one hand, many felt that the exercises and group experiences were extremely helpful and positive, and should not be reduced. On the other hand, there were responses requesting less exercises and more didactic instruction.

Regarding specific topics, those presented were evaluated positively overall. The participants also identified additional topics they would have liked to see addressed. There was a desire to see more content regarding the role of politics in international development in general, and in project identification and design in specific. There was also interest in further elaboration on actor roles, including the roles of the host country, the donor agency, and the contractor team. Within the host country, there was interest expressed not only in the roles of project related authorities, but also in the roles of beneficiaries as distinguished by gender, age, social status, and the like. Finally, there was interest in the role of OSU's own Office of International Agriculture, and how it should go about motivating faculty members and other university personnel to get involved with and support international development activities.

Regarding the instruction and materials, the evaluations were again mostly positive. The instructors were given good marks, though it was observed that a greater sense of teamwork was needed. The energy level of team was viewed as high and their attitude positive. It was noted that the junior members of the team would benefit from more experience in presenting the material. The team approach and varied presentation styles were appreciated, however. There were many positive suggestions regarding the workshop materials. These focussed on better organization of the notebooks, documentation of material in the form of handouts, and use of various presentation media.

Overall, the first session was given a very positive evaluation. The material was viewed as important and beneficial, and the instruction as very good. As always, there was room for improvement.

Workshop #2

Evaluation questions for the second workshop focused on three areas: overall evaluation of the organization, management, and presentation of the workshop; how well the objectives of the workshop were met; and to what extent the workshops will result in improvements in OSU's ability to participate in AID projects, and improvements to those projects themselves.

There was a consensus that the organization, management, and presentation of the second workshop was improved over that of the first. The instruction team was seen as working together more smoothly, the presentations more varied, the depth with which topics were covered more appropriate, and the exercise assignments more clear. The redesign effort for the second workshop, based on the evaluation of the first, was seen as successfully implemented. In addition, the high level of interaction on the part of the participants contributed to the positive evaluation.

There was also a consensus that all three of the stated objectives of the workshops were reached to a degree. The first objective, to gain an understanding of AID's policies and procedures relevant to agricultural and rural development project design, analysis, implementation, and evaluation, in the context of OSU's international agricultural program, was seen as successfully addressed to a great extent. The second objective was to understand and learn how to apply basic project design, analysis, implementation, and evaluation tools and techniques, along with appropriate team processes, relevant to AID-sponsored agricultural and rural development projects. This objective was also seen as being achieved to a measurable degree, though there is an evident need for further learning and practice. The third objective was to improve awareness of opportunities and activities within the OSU international agricultural program. While this objective was not as successfully addressed as the two previous, there was a consensus that a start had been made.

In all cases, the evaluations revealed that there was positive movement toward achieving the objectives of the workshops. It was also observed that there is more to learn, a need for practice with the tools and techniques, and a need for follow up to maintain the level of learning and the interest and commitment built by the workshops. Harking back to the operating premises for the workshops, the evaluations supported the premise that these workshops need to be only "...another step--neither the first nor the last--of OSU's ongoing commitment to a strong and resilient international development program."

Finally, there was a strong feeling that these two workshops have contributed to OSU's ability to participate effectively in AID-sponsored agricultural and rural development projects. Whether or not this will contribute to the success of AID projects remains to be seen, though the potential is there.

V. NEXT STEPS

The Next Steps exercise conducted on Thursday, April 5, was designed to provide an opportunity for the workshop participants to identify areas related to international development work in need of improvement or strengthening at OSU, both to practice learned skills related to project planning and implementation, and to identify specific steps that can be taken by the University to strengthen and enlarge its role in international development work.

Dr. Kifer introduced the exercise against the background of a new International Council having been set up at OSU, its first meeting having been held earlier on Thursday. The outputs of the exercise were to be presented to the University's Dean and Associate Deans on Tuesday, April 10. The specific assignment was to: list up to five international development areas at OSU that need strengthening; rank these areas by priority based on feasibility, cost, and impact; select the two highest priority areas; and develop a simple implementation plan for addressing them. The implementation plan should include a statement of purpose and desired outputs, specific activities to be undertaken and a suggested schedule, and identification of who should have responsibility for, who should support, and who should participate in the effort.

As a result of the exercise, many areas for activity were identified. These areas, as synthesized by Dr. Kifer and presented by him at the meeting of April 10, are as follows:

1. Plan for activities and expenditures related to the Memorandum of Understanding, including establishing the areas of cooperation with Tuskegee;
2. Develop an International Activities information program designed to improve understanding of and commitment to international activities on the part of faculty, administrators, and citizens of Oregon. One means of doing this would be the establishment of an Information Forum;
3. Define and develop areas of specialization on which OSU should concentrate. Areas of expertise, including ability to work in a team mode, should be identified within the faculty. Specialization areas should include back-up support for project development, and project evaluation;
4. Increase faculty participation in international development activities by means of training, creating and publicizing incentives, career opportunities, etc.;
5. Build a program of international training activities, utilizing foreign students where possible, that would include language training, further workshops on project design/implementation/evaluation, cultural sensitivity, communication skills. Predeparture orientations should be included in this program;

6. Expand OSU's capacity to manage and support international development programs not only through developing faculty and staff expertise, but also by establishing administrative procedures (travel regulations, purchasing procedures, etc.) that support such activities;
7. Formalize Department support by the Office of International Agriculture;
8. Coordinate the support of Administrative and Department units; and
9. Address the need for centralized coordination of international activities.

In summary, the above list of areas for strengthening indicates that there is both an interest in continuing the international activities of OSU and improving the University's performance in this field by developing areas of expertise and by building appropriate support structures. As only one step in OSU's ongoing process of building a strong and resilient international development program, it appears that the Project Design, Implementation, and Evaluation Workshops have been successful in helping to identify some of the next steps.

VI. APPENDICES

A.	Agenda: Workshop #1	15
B.	List of Materials: Workshop #1	17
C.	Agenda: Workshop #2	19
D.	List of Materials: Workshop #2	21
E.	Participants	22
F.	Instructional Staff Biodata	23

APPENDIX A

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURE
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

"DESIGN AND ANALYSIS OF AID-SPONSORED
AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS"

February 19-23, 1984

-- Workshop Agenda --

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 19

Evening (7:30) Opening and Introductions

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 20

Morning Overview and Expectations
Development Projects and Management

Afternoon AID's Project Design Process
Selecting and Preparing Teams

Evening Independent Assignments

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 21

Morning Project Identification Exercise

Afternoon Logical Framework for Project Design
Workgroup Presentations

Evening Independent Reading

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 22

Morning Project Paper Exercise: Finalizing the Project Design

Afternoon Perception Exercises
Integrated Feasibility Analyses
Special Issues

Evening Group Assignments

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23

Morning

Implementation and Contracting Considerations
Evaluation Planning

Afternoon

Next Steps Planning Exercise and Assignments
Review and Summary of Workshop #1
Closing

APPENDIX B

CONTENTS OF WORKBOOK - WORKSHOP #1

Introduction

1. Workshop Overview
2. Learning Objectives
3. Workshop Agenda
4. List of Participants
5. Instructor Biodata
6. Workbook Contents

Day 1

1. PROJECT MANAGEMENT: BRIEF REVIEW OF DEFINITIONS
11 PAGES
2. A MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO PROJECT DESIGN
7 PAGES

Day 2

1. THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK
35 pages
2. A COMMON PROJECT DEVELOPMENT FRAME OF REFERENCE
A Question Approach to Eliciting a Project Design
5 pages (2 are numbered Attachments I and II)

Day 3

1. A MANAGEMENT APPROACH TO FEASIBILITY STUDY 9 PAGES
2. PROJECT ANALYSIS: TOWARDS AN INTEGRATED METHODOLOGY
8 pages
3. MICROCOMPUTERS AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATIONS: MANAGEMENT APPLICATIONS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES 28 Pages
4. REACHING THE POOR THROUGH DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: AN OVERVIEW OF STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES 17 Pages

Day 4

1. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE LOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND CONTRACTS
4 Pages
2. NIM Chapter 500
Appendix A
State 080589 of 24 Mar 83 2 pages
Subj: PP Implementation Plans
3. ELEMENTS OF AN EVALUATION PLAN -- 1 page

Appendices

1. Project Assistance (Handbook 3)
approx. 96 pages (Chapters 1, 2, 3, 9, table of contents (TC),
and Preface)
2. Chapter: 00
Section: GLOSSARY
Transmittal: USAID Order 83-04 9 pages
3. Glossary of Project Management Systems (PMS) Terms 5 pages

APPENDIX C

OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURE
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

"IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF AID-SPONSORED
AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS"

April 1-5, 1984

-- Workshop Agenda --

SUNDAY, APRIL 1

Evening (7:30) Opening and Small Group Introductions

MONDAY, APRIL 2

Morning Overview and Expectations
OSU Project Presentations
Review of Project Design Tools and Procedures

Afternoon Jama Project Implementation Exercise

Evening Independent Reading
Special Topics

TUESDAY, APRIL 3

Morning Introduction to Implementation Start-up
Implementation Planning Tools and Techniques

Afternoon Project Scheduling Workgroups
Administrative Routines and Procedures

Evening WID Film and Discussion

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 4

Morning Gender Role Analysis and Case Application

Afternoon Authority Issues and Responsibility Charting
Monitoring and Reporting

Evening Group Assignments

THURSDAY, APRIL 5

Morning

OSU Project Presentations
Evaluation Planning and Conduct

Afternoon

OSU Next Steps Planning Exercise
Review and Summary of Workshop
Closing by 4 p.m.

APPENDIX D

CONTENTS OF WORKBOOK - WORKSHOP #2

Introduction

1. Objectives and topics
2. Workshop Agenda
3. List of Participants
4. Instructional Staff

Day 1

Lessons in Development Project Management
8 pages

Day 2

Planning for successful project implementation
1 page

DAY 3

DAY 4

Women in Development: Bibliography
15 pages

DAY 5

1. Type III Evaluations: Consultation and Consensus
6 pages
2. Evaluation Planning: Concepts and Steps
12 pages
3. Conducting an AID - Sponsored Evaluation
4 pages
4. Presentation of Evaluation Results
17 pages

APPENDIX E

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

<u>Participant</u>	<u>Department*</u>
<u>Both Sessions</u>	
Tom Bedell	Rangeland Resources
Garvin Crabtree	Horticulture
Carol Culler	Women in Development/Rural Development
Kent Daniels	Office of International Agriculture
E. A. Elgasim	Animal Science
Norman Goetze	Extension/Crop Science
Martin Hellickson	Agricultural Engineering
Barbara Isely	Sociology
Bruce Johnson	Agricultural Communications
Paul Kifer	Office of International Agriculture
Roger Kraynick	Rural Development
Charles Langford	Sociology
Margaret Lewis	Rural Development
J. Ronald Miner	Agricultural Engineering
William Mansour	Horticulture
Arsalan Mazaheri	Soil Science
James Moore	Agricultural Engineering
Kenneth Rowe	Statistics
William Sandine	Microbiology
Gerald Simonson	Soil Science
Alvin Smith	Veterinary Medicine
Lloyd Swanson	Animal Science
Maxine Thompson	Horticulture
John Young	Anthropology
<u>First Session Only</u>	
Te May Ching	Crop Science
Patricia Harris	Tuskegee Institute
Harold Kerr	Extension
Margaret Thomas	Women in Development
V. Van Volk	Soil Science
Philip D. Whanger	Agricultural Chemistry
<u>Second Session Only</u>	
Floyd Bolton	Crop Science
Frank Conklin	Office of International Agriculture
Richard Cuenca	Agricultural Engineering
Thomas Doerge	Soil Science
LeMoyné Hogan	Washington State University (Sudan)
Steven Sharrow	Rangeland Resources

*At Oregon State University unless otherwise specified.

APPENDIX F

PROJECT DESIGN WORKSHOP

Instructional Staff

MARCUS D. INGLE, Ph.D.

Dr. Ingle is an international management specialist. His experience encompasses project design, implementation, and evaluation work in more than fifteen Asia, Latin American, and African countries. He has directed and conducted numerous management training programs and workshops for university and both private and public sector staff in developing countries and the United States. He has also headed up or served as a team member on numerous consultancies and research and development efforts, as a government official (with both AID and USDA), a private consultant, and a university staff member. Dr. Ingle is currently the coordinator of the International Development Management Center at the University of Maryland. He has a Ph.D. in Social Science from Syracuse University and a Master's of Public Administration from the University of Washington.

JANET C. NOEL, DVM

Dr. Noel is a Doctor of Veterinary Medicine who has integrated her specialty with an interest in agricultural and institutional development and training in developing countries. She has worked and travelled extensively in Africa and Asia. Dr. Noel's experience encompasses project planning and administration as well as clinical veterinary medicine and veterinary research. She has served as Associate Project Director of the Western Sudan Agricultural Development and Western Sudan Agricultural Research Projects, and has participated in numerous project design, implementation, and evaluation training exercises. Dr. Noel received her DVM from Washington State University and is currently the Project Coordinator of the International Program Development Office at Washington State.

KENNETH A. SMITH, MPIA

Mr. Smith has had extensive training in development planning and administration and has specialized in project planning, implementation, and information systems. Mr. Smith was instrumental in the establishment of the International Development Management Center at the University of Maryland and now serves both as the Center's Administrative Officer and as a Research Assistant. In the latter capacity, he is currently managing a research effort into the impacts of using microcomputer technology for development management. As a consultant to the Development Project Management Center of USDA, he has prepared a manual on Project Monitoring and Implementation Systems for USAID sponsored projects in Thailand. Mr. Smith received his MPIA from the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh.