



Proj. 9310 868
PA 14-15-150
15N 11 14

EVALUATION WORKSHOP ON AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

by

JUDITH G. FENDER and D. WOODS THOMAS

Sponsored by

THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

and

THE COMMITTEE ON INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Contract AID/csd-2458

9/16/74 - 10/15/74

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Doc # 1056 NS

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS IN AGRICULTURE
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana

1-

EVALUATION

WORKSHOP ON AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE
AND UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

by

JUDITH G. FENDER and D. WOODS THOMAS

Preface

In the summer of 1969, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) and the Agency for International Development (AID) jointly sponsored a Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development. The two-week workshop (July 27 - August 8, 1969) was held at Purdue University under the auspices of Purdue's Division of International Programs in Agriculture.

The workshop was developed in response to recognition of the importance of institution building in economic development programs. This was one of the first steps toward the dissemination of information about the institution-building process to persons actively involved in programs designed to bring about change in educational, research and other institutions in the developing countries.

The principal objective of the workshop was one of examining the state of conceptual and empirical knowledge concerning the process of developing viable institutions capable of meeting educational, scientific and other needs of developing societies.

The workshop included participants from the U.S. academic community, the Agency for International Development, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation, and various agencies and institutions of the developing

nations. Leading educators and agricultural administrators from Brazil, Ethiopia, Ghana, India, Indonesia and Jordan participated.

The workshop on institution building was a unique educational endeavor. It stimulated a widespread interest in institution-building models and the practical principles of institution building as well as additional efforts to disseminate theoretical and empirical information about the institution-building process. The workshop group strongly recommended that additional seminars, workshops and conferences on these topics be conducted. It seemed desirable, therefore, to evaluate the usefulness of the workshop and the effectiveness of the manner in which it had been conducted. The results of this evaluation are presented below.

Methodology

In order to obtain essential evaluation data, a questionnaire was developed. The questionnaire^{1/} consisted of thirteen questions. These questions dealt with four issues:

1. Participants' general impressions of the workshop.
2. Evaluation of:
 - a. The workshop's effectiveness in increasing general understanding of the institution-building process.
 - b. Effectiveness of the approaches used to examine the institution-building process.
 - c. Effectiveness of techniques used in presenting workshop materials.
3. An evaluation of the usefulness to the participants of:
 - a. Knowledge gained.

^{1/} See Appendix A for an example of the questionnaire.

- b. Specific concepts of institution-building theory.
 - c. The hypothetical country problem "Escondido" as a means of examining institution-building models and concepts.
4. An appraisal of the subject matter presented and suggestions for improving future seminars and workshops.

In the summer of 1971 a questionnaire was mailed to each of the 64 participants. After an appropriate period, a duplicate questionnaire was sent to non-respondents. Forty-nine usable questionnaires were returned. Questionnaires completed by members of the workshop staff and by persons who attended the seminar for less than five days were excluded. Thirty-one non-staff participants attended the seminar five or more days; 22 (71 percent) returned questionnaires. Responses provided in these 22 questionnaires constituted the basis for this report (see Table I).

Table I. Questionnaires Mailed and Returned, Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development, Purdue University, July 27 - August 8, 1969.

Category	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent Returned	Number Included in Report
Staff Personnel	11	9	82	-
Non-Staff Participants Attending Less Than Five Days	22	18	82	-
U.S. Non-Staff Participants Attending Five Days or More	15	10	67	10
Foreign Non-Staff Participants Attending Five Days or More	16	12	75	12
Total	64	49	77	22

Fifty-five percent of the participants returning usable questionnaires were foreign nationals. Their comments about the workshop and indications of ways in which they have applied knowledge acquired about institution building constitute a valuable and interesting set of data. Equally, foreign participants brought to the conference a set of experiences and background quite different from those of the U.S. participants. It seemed appropriate, therefore, to compare responses of foreign participants with those of U.S. participants to determine the ways in which reactions to the workshop differed.

Workshop Evaluation

General Impression

The participants' general impressions of the Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development were most favorable. A majority of the respondents indicated that it had been a very useful and worthwhile educational experience. Several participants indicated that it provided an excellent firsthand exposure to the theoretical concepts and practical aspects of institution building. Participants also indicated that the workshop had provided numerous new ideas and concepts which are highly useful in their present work. The workshop was considered to have been well-organized and conducted with participants' time productively used. One participant indicated his general reaction was favorable but felt the workshop was oriented too heavily toward Far East country problems with little attention to Latin American problems.^{2/} There were few differences in the responses made by U.S. and foreign participants.

^{2/} A summary of specific participants' responses is presented in Appendix B.

Effectiveness

All respondents indicated the workshop was effective in increasing general understanding of the institution-building process (see Table II). Fifty-five percent indicated the seminar was very effective in this regard; 45 percent felt it was moderately effective. There were no major differences in responses by foreign and U.S. participants.

Table II. Effectiveness of Workshop in Increasing General Understanding of the Institution-Building Process, Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development, Purdue University, July 27 - August 8, 1969.*

Category	Very Effective		Moderately Effective		Slightly Effective		Not Effective		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Foreign Participants	7	58	5	42	-	-	-	-	12	100
U.S. Participants	5	50	5	50	-	-	-	-	10	100
All Participants	12	55	10	45	-	-	-	-	22	100

* Rankings provided in mid-1971.

Six approaches were used to present subject matter relevant to the institutional development process. Alternative approaches were used in order to ensure coverage of all aspects of institution building and to fully utilize the institution-building experiences of participants.

Respondents indicated all the approaches were effective (see Table III). There appeared to be some tendency for approaches involving (a) presentation of institution-building models and concepts, (b) case

Table III. Effectiveness of Approaches Used to Present the Institution-Building Process, Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development, Purdue University, July 27 - August 8, 1969.*

Approaches	Very Effective		Moderately Effective		Slightly Effective		Not Effective		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Presentations of Institution-Building Models and Concepts	13	59	9	41	-	-	-	-	22	100
Case Studies of Institution-Building Projects	11	50	9	41	2	9	-	-	22	100
Technical Assistance Aspects of Institution Building	6	27	12	55	4	18	-	-	22	100
Hypothetical Country Problem (Escondido)	15	68	4	18	2	9	1	5	22	100
Issues Related to Institutional Development (Formal Discussions)	7	32	13	59	2	9	-	-	22	100
Exchange of Experiences with Other Participants	11	50	7	32	4	18	-	-	22	100

* Rankings provided in mid-1971.

studies of institution-building projects and (c) issues related to institutional development (formal discussions) to be ranked somewhat more effective than approaches involving (a) technical assistance aspects of institution-building projects, (b) exchange of experiences with other participants and (c) hypothetical country problem. Institution-building models and concepts tended to rank higher in this respect than other approaches.

Some variation existed among participant ratings of the effectiveness of these approaches. Foreign participants tended to rank case studies and the hypothetical country problem somewhat higher than did U.S. participants. U.S. participants tended to rank approaches involving technical assistance aspects of institution building and exchange of ideas and experiences with other participants slightly higher than did those from abroad. Considerable variation existed in U.S. participant ratings of the hypothetical country problem approach. Sixty percent felt it was very effective, 10 percent moderately effective and 30 percent slightly to not effective. U.S. participants directly involved in overseas institution-building projects tended to rate this approach somewhat lower in effectiveness than the remainder of this subgroup. Four pedagogic techniques were used in presenting workshop materials. Again, these variants were adopted in an effort to ensure maximum learning.

There existed considerable variation in the rankings of the degree of effectiveness of these several techniques (see Table IV). The panel presentation technique tended to rank slightly higher than other techniques. Thirty-two percent of the participants ranked it very effective; 59 percent moderately effective and 9 percent slightly effective.

Table IV. Effectiveness of Pedagogic Techniques Used to Present Workshop Materials, Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development, Purdue University, July 27 - August 8, 1969.*

Techniques	Very Effective		Moderately Effective		Slightly Effective		Not Effective		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Panel Presentations	7	32	13	59	2	9	-	-	22	100
Group Exercises Based on Hypothetical Country Problem	10	45	9	41	2	9	1	5	22	100
Small Group Discussions	10	45	10	45	1	5	1	5	22	100
Total Group Discussions	7	32	12	54	3	14	-	-	22	100

* Rankings provided in mid-1971.

There existed no great difference among rankings by foreign and U.S. participants.

Forty-five percent of the participants ranked the group exercises on hypothetical country problem and small group discussions as very effective. Forty-one percent ranked the group exercises as moderately effective, 9 percent ranked it slightly effective and 5 percent ranked it not effective. Whereas, 45 percent ranked small group discussions as moderately effective and 5 percent each ranked it slightly effective and not effective. The total group discussion technique was ranked very effective by 32 percent of the participants, moderately effective by 54 percent and slightly effective by the remaining 14 percent.

Foreign participants tended to consider group exercises and total group discussions as somewhat more effective than did U.S. participants. There was little difference among the rankings by foreign and U.S. participants of small group discussions.

The hypothetical country problem of "Escondido" was a special technique applied during the workshop to focus the attention of small work groups on analytical approaches to the solution of institution-building problems. Eighty-one percent of the respondents indicated it was a moderately to very useful technique. The remaining 19 percent ranked it as being only slightly useful. Foreign participants tended to rank this as a slightly more useful technique for examining institution-building models and concepts than did U.S. participants.

Fifty-seven percent of all the respondents indicated an adequate amount of time had been spent in discussing "Escondido." Twenty-nine percent felt less time should have been spent and 14 percent of the

respondents would have preferred additional discussion of the hypothetical country problem.

Participants indicated several ways in which such a technique might be used more effectively in teaching the principles of institution building. Some of the suggestions were as follows:^{3/}

1. Use actual case studies or take examples from agricultural universities now in process of development.
2. Tie the problem to a specific geographic area.
3. Improve coordination between small study groups in order to more fully understand the impact of each group's discussions on the institutional development process.

Knowledge gained through participation in the Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development was judged moderately to very useful in the present professional work of 86 percent of the respondents (see Table V). The remainder indicated it was slightly useful. The less favorable responses were made by respondents no longer directly involved

Table V. Usefulness of Knowledge Gained in Participants' Current Work, Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development, Purdue University, July 27 - August 8, 1969.*

Position	Very Useful		Moderately Useful		Slightly Useful		Not Useful		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Foreign Participants	5	42	6	50	1	8	-	-	12	100
U.S. Participants	4	40	4	40	2	20	-	-	10	100
All Participants	9	41	10	45	3	14	-	-	22	100

* Rankings provided in mid-1971.

^{3/} A summary of specific participants' responses is presented in Appendix B.

in institution-building work or unable to use the acquired knowledge in their present occupation. Foreign participants tended to rank the utility of acquired knowledge slightly higher than was the case with U.S. participants. Again, the responses reflect current positions and responsibilities of the participants.

Participants were asked to give examples of ways in which knowledge acquired at the workshop had been useful in their work. The responses were enlightening. Several participants indicated that the linkage concept made them aware of the importance of obtaining assistance and cooperation from the public and private agencies involved in the work of their institutions. For others, the institution-building model provided a conceptual framework within which to articulate ideas, approach problems and obtain an overall perspective on institution building.

Other ways^{4/} in which the workshop had been useful included:

1. Creation of a greater concern with goals and strategy.
2. Catalyst for significant curriculum changes within a university.
3. Better identification of the needs of the institution and country.
4. Increased involvement of university administrators, AID and university students in a particular university's institution-building project.
5. Greater involvement of staff and host nationals in making decisions relevant to an institution-building project.
6. Application of the principles of "full acceptance" and "realism" in work with extension personnel so that educational programs become "our" programs instead of USAID's programs.

Institution-building models are constructed from several basic conceptual components. These tend to be integrated in a manner such that

^{4/} A summary of specific participants' responses is presented in Appendix B.

they jointly make up the overall model. These concepts were treated both individually and jointly in workshop situations and presentations. It seemed important, therefore, to obtain an evaluation of the relative usefulness of the several conceptual components of the institution-building model.

The several concepts constituting the institution-building model appear to have been useful to the participants in their present activities (see Table VI). Slight variation did exist in the responses. Ninety percent or more of the respondents considered the concepts of leadership, program, resources and linkages to be moderately to very useful in their present work. Seventy percent considered the doctrine concept moderately to very useful; 75 percent indicated the internal structure to be moderately to very useful. U.S. participants tended to rank the discussions pertaining to doctrine, internal structure and linkages as being somewhat more useful in their current work than did foreign participants. Foreign participants ranked the discussion of the resource concept more useful than did U.S. participants.

Participants were asked to give specific examples of ways in which they were able to use the various institution-building concepts in their work.^{5/} Examples of the uses of the linkage concept included:

1. Increased coordination of research between Departments of Animal Science and Agricultural Engineering.
2. Identification of common needs and ideas.
3. Establishment of contacts among the university, government agencies and agriculture industry.

The leadership concept has been employed to:

1. Introduce relevant ideas.

^{5/} A summary of specific participants' responses is presented in Appendix B.

Table VI. Relative Usefulness of Workshop Treatment of Various Institution-Building Concepts, Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development, Purdue University, July 27 - August 8, 1969.*

Concepts	Very Useful		Moderately Useful		Slightly Useful		Not Useful		Total**	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Leadership	11	52	10	48	-	-	-	-	21	100
Doctrine	4	20	10	50	5	25	1	5	20**	100
Program	6	29	13	62	2	9	-	-	21	100
Internal Structure	6	30	9	45	5	25	-	-	20**	100
Resources	4	19	16	76	1	5	-	-	21	100
Linkages	7	33	13	62	1	5	-	-	21	100

* Rankings provided in mid-1971.

** Variation in total number of responses due to non-response by individual no longer involved in institution-building activity and non-response by another attendee who did not attend two of the sessions.

2. Involve counterparts and host nationals in the institution's work.
3. Establish linkages with an institution's internal and external environment.

The concept of program is being used in:

1. Planning future development of the university based primarily on academic and program planning.
2. Preparing better programs.
3. Involving all participants in planning these programs.

The internal structure concept has been used to gain support and fix responsibility for recruiting with specific departments.

Subject Matter and Suggestions for Improvement

The subject matter of the workshop consisted of a "mix" of theoretical concepts and empirical information derived from experience. Fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated the "mix" to have been about right. Slightly over 40 percent felt that the "mix" would have been improved by a greater emphasis on applied materials. Only one participant indicated that additional theoretical materials should have been used.

Fifty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that sufficient opportunity had been given for discussion of the range of institution-building problems they had encountered in their work. Forty-one percent of the participants felt that certain institution-building problems had not been discussed adequately. Some 59 percent indicated they had encountered institution-building problems since the 1969 workshop which should be discussed at future workshops.

Among the topics indicated as not having received adequate attention at the workshop and institution-building problems encountered since 1969 were:^{6/}

1. Development of competent faculties to assume responsibility of university departments being developed in developing countries.
2. Campus planning and university and country development.
3. How to bring about internal structural changes in institutions with strongly established patterns of organization.
4. Discussion of the historical development of older universities in light of present concepts of institution building.
5. Discussion of the unity of purpose and understanding on the part of JSALD Mission technicians, administrators and contracting institutions.
6. How to obtain continuity of purpose and understanding from one "political generation to another."
7. The problem of placing tenured university staff members in overseas positions without creating program deficiencies at home or overstaffing without committing financial suicide if programs are terminated or positions deleted.
8. The possibility of coordinating technical assistance from various developed countries to a given developing country or region or a consortium approach to agricultural development assistance.
9. Financing and efficient allocation of limited resources.
10. Sociological and psychological aspects of country modernization.
11. Lack of leadership at key levels as a result of key persons being spread too thin or seeking personal gain through politics rather than a good program.

Respondents unanimously agreed that additional workshops similar to the Purdue effort should be held. The responses as to where these workshops should be held were quite varied. Participants supported the desirability of holding workshops abroad, in individual countries and

^{6/} A summary of specific participants' responses is presented in Appendix B.

contiguous regions or multi-country areas with similar development problems, as well as in the United States. There was also support for traveling seminars.

Participants were asked to indicate the optimum duration of future institution-building workshops. Responses ranged from four to thirty days. A majority indicated the optimum duration to be between six and ten days.

Participants were asked to indicate the types of professionals which, in their judgment, would benefit most from attending workshops on institution building. Responses were quite varied and included:^{7/}

1. Persons representing all functional levels of university and administration and research institute directors.
2. USAID officers, technical specialists, chiefs of party, campus coordinators and individual team members.
3. Governmental and educational leaders in developing countries.
4. Institution-building experts and program planners.
5. Representatives from foundations and bilateral and international development assistance organizations.

Respondents offered several suggestions relative to ways in which future workshops or seminars might be improved. Included among these were:^{7/}

1. Use case studies or country problems which show how application of institution-building principles have solved problems.
2. Consider holding workshops in developing countries and possibly do so on a regional basis thereby grouping countries with similar developmental problems.
3. Distribute workshop papers and materials well in advance so that participants have adequate time to study and prepare for workshop and possibly supply literature references pertaining to the theoretical aspects of institution building.

^{7/} A summary of specific participants' responses is presented in Appendix B.

4. Include more speakers from the developing countries on "Lessons from Experience in Institution Building in Developing Countries."
5. Concentrate on problems of one country at a time and include more of the "appropriate" people; that is, train USAID and host country personnel together.
6. Attempt to obtain more involvement and participation by delegates with less emphasis on lectures.
7. Institute a traveling workshop thereby allowing participants to visit and see the institution-building process and its adoption at work.

Summary and Conclusions

General impressions of the Workshop on Agricultural College and University Development were quite favorable. Participants indicated the workshop was a useful and valuable educational exercise which provided an excellent exposure to the theoretical concepts and practical aspects of institution building.

The workshop was an effective means of increasing participants' general understanding of the institution-building process. Likewise, the six approaches used in presenting subject matter relevant to the institutional development process were effective. The institution-building models and concepts approach tended to be among the more effective.

The four pedagogic techniques employed were effective. Considerable variation existed among participant evaluation of the relative effectiveness of these techniques. The panel presentation technique tended to be ranked as most effective. Foreign participants tended to consider group exercises and total group discussions to have been more effective techniques than did U.S. participants.

Eighty-one percent of the respondents considered the hypothetical country problem, "Escondido," moderately to very useful in examining institution-building models and concepts. It was suggested that this special technique would have been more useful had problems or case studies of actual countries been used. Foreign participants tended to consider this technique slightly more useful than did U.S. participants.

Knowledge gained at the workshop has been useful in the participants' professional work. Foreign participants tended to rank the utility of this acquired knowledge slightly higher than did U.S. participants. They also appear to have been able to apply it more directly in their work.

The several basic conceptual components of the institution-building model have been useful in the participants' current work. Participants identified a number of specific ways in which the linkage, leadership, program and internal structure concepts have been used.

Fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated the workshop contained about the right "mix" of theoretical and applied subject matter. There was some suggestion that any change in the "mix" in future educational endeavors should be in the direction of increased emphasis on applied materials.

Adequate opportunity to discuss the range of known institution-building problems appears to have been provided. However, some respondents identified certain problems which they felt were not adequately discussed. Other problems, encountered since the workshop, which should be discussed at future workshops were also identified. Included were such things as campus planning, effecting internal structural changes in established institutions, program deficiencies created in the home

institution by placing tenured staff in overseas positions and faculty development of universities in developing countries.

Workshop participants were unanimous in their judgment that additional workshops should be held. Interest was expressed in holding such workshops abroad as well as in the United States. An optimum duration of six to ten days was indicated. Respondents suggested that university administrators from the United States and abroad, USAID officers and others involved in technical assistance projects, government leaders in developing countries, and representatives from foundations and bilateral and multilateral development assistance organizations would benefit from this type of educational experience.

It appears that future workshops could benefit from application of institution-building principles to case studies or country problems, holding workshops abroad in individual countries or in groupings of countries with similar problems, use of more speakers from the developing countries to relate their experiences in institution building and increased involvement and participation by delegates.

The following set of conclusions appears warranted:

1. The workshop was effective and useful.
2. Knowledge gained about institution building is being used.
3. Additional workshops, both in the United States and abroad, would be useful and productive.
4. Future workshops could be improved as a result of experiences gained in this first endeavor.

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

SUMMER WORKSHOP ON AGRICULTURAL
COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY DEVELOPMENT

EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____

Organization: _____

Present Position: _____

1. Two years afterward, what is your general impression of the workshop?

2. How effective was the workshop in increasing your general understanding of the institution-building process? (Check one)

- 12 very effective
 10 moderately effective
 - slightly effective
 - not effective

3. In general, how effective was each approach used in the workshop to present the institution-building process? (Check one for each approach)

Approach	Very Effective	Moderately Effective	Slightly Effective	Not Effective
Presentations of Institution-Building Models and Concepts	13	9	-	-
Case Studies of Institution-Building Projects	11	9	2	-
Technical Assistance Aspects of Institution Building	6	12	4	-
Hypothetical Country Problem (Escondido)	15	4	2	1
Formal Discussions	7	13	2	-
Interaction with other Participants	11	7	4	-

4. How effective was each of the following techniques in presenting the workshop materials? (Check one for each technique)

Technique	Very Effective	Moderately Effective	Slightly Effective	Not Effective
Panel Presentations	7	13	2	-
Hypothetical Country Problem	10	9	2	1
Small Group Discussions	10	10	1	1
Total Group Discussions	7	12	3	-

5. How useful has the knowledge gained about the institution-building process been in your work? (Check one)

9 very useful
10 moderately useful
3 slightly useful
- not useful

- A. In what ways? For example, have you changed anything about the way you do your work as a result of things learned at the workshop?

6. How useful has each of the institution-building concepts been in your work? (Check one for each concept)

Concepts	Very Useful	Moderately Useful	Slightly Useful	Not Useful
Leadership	11	10	-	-
Doctrine	4	10	5	1
Program	6	13	2	-
Internal Structure	6	9	5	-
Resources	4	16	1	-
Linkages	7	13	1	-

76

- A. Please give examples of ways you have been able to use these specific concepts in your work. _____

7. Did you find the country problem of "Escondido" a useful technique for examining institution-building models and concepts? (Check one)

10 very useful
7 moderately useful
4 slightly useful
_____ not useful

- A. How much time should have been spent discussing "Escondido"? (Check one)

3 more time
6 less time
12 it was about right

- B. How might hypothetical country problems be used more effectively in teaching the principles of institution building? _____

8. Did the institution-building materials presented at the Purdue workshop contain about the right mix of theoretical and applied subject matter? (Check one)

12 Yes
1 No, needed more theory
9 No, needed more applications

9. Were there institutional development problems you anticipated discussing at the workshop but did not have the opportunity to do so?

13 No

8 Yes; if yes, what were they? _____

10. Have you encountered institutional development problems which should be included in future workshops of this type?

8 No

13 Yes; if yes, what were they? _____

11. How might future institution-building workshops of the Purdue type be improved? _____

12. Should additional workshops similar to the Purdue effort be held?

 No

22 Yes; if yes, please indicate:

A. Where should they be held?

 In the developing countries

 U.S.

 Traveling

 Other; please specify _____

B. Should they be organized to include participants from:

- 11 Contiguous regions
- 6 Individual countries
- 10 Multi-country
- Other; please specify _____

C. About how many days should such workshops last?

_____ Number of days

D. For what types of professionals in what kinds of institutions would such workshops be most useful? _____

13. Please indicate institution-building conferences in which you have participated since the Purdue workshop.

Workshop	Attended	Did Not Attend	Number of Days Attended
Purdue University Workshop July 27 - August 8, 1969	X		
Institution-Building and Technical Assistance Conference, Washington, D.C. December 4-5, 1969	1		
Bogor, Indonesia March 11-14, 1970	3		
FAO/Rome March 25-26, 1970	-		
Utah University, Logan, Utah August 17-21, 1970	1		
Asian Agricultural College and University Seminar, Thailand and India September 20 - October 5, 1970	3		
Other: Where: Date:	6		

14. Please indicate the nature of your experiences in technical assistance projects having institution-building objectives _____

15. Additional ideas and comments:

APPENDIX B

SELECTED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

SELECTED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS

Question 1: Participants' general impression of the workshop

1. The workshop has been a valuable experience to me in that it has given me an understanding of the process of institution building which is quite useful when one is working in a very young institution.
2. The workshop afforded an excellent first exposure to the institution building theory to the participants (most of them). For me it was a unique experience. Very timely, too, in the context of my work. The workshop was well organized. The content was substantial. The combination of theory and practice most optimum. I think it was a great success.
3. I feel the workshop was very well organized and conducted. It brought to focus many of the problems that hinder the institution building process. In many of my departmental activities I am often reminded of some of the basic ideas discussed in the workshop. All in all my impressions after two years are still very much positive.
4. The workshop "opened the way" to understand and know more about institution building.
5. Although I had been involved very much in building up an agricultural university from its very inception in one way or the other yet I had very little idea of any theoretical aspect of the institution building process. After attending the workshop at Purdue, I have got, for the first time, a clear idea of the theoretical aspects of the institution building process in which I have been involved as a practitioner. I am far clearer in my mind about the concepts of institution building and thereby the effectiveness with which I am able to discharge my present duties than was the case before attending this workshop. This has helped me to perform my duties with greater clarity and confidence. Further, to some extent, I have been able to disseminate this knowledge to other members of the faculty in this university and elsewhere through meetings and seminars held in connection with the development of agricultural universities in this country. My general impression about the workshop is that it was a very fruitful and educative experience.
6. It was one of the most useful workshops I have ever attended. It was a well-selected group attended by some very capable people with high intelligence.
7. Well organized, inspired more ideas.

8. My general impression was favorable, since the workshop enabled me to get acquainted with subjects which, in my country, have not yet been treated in the form of courses, seminars and the like.
9. Useful exercise and some knowledge gained from the workshop has been applicable in my work.
10. It was one of the finest I have ever attended, from the point of its utility and also dissemination of information on institution-building. This has been of help to me in improving the research program of my own organization and also sister institutions.
11. Valuable for the introduction it gave me to institution building concepts along the Esman model.
12. Favorable. Too oriented to Far East country problems and very little orientation to Latin America.
13. Helpful and worthwhile experience with many new ideas; many not so new but no way to apply most of them in my situation.
14. It was a good conference. Thought provoking and brought together the theorists as well as those involved in the practical aspects of institution building.
15. My general impression was that the workshop was well managed, kept the participants productively occupied. It effectively presented new ideas that were useful.
16. Very worthwhile to both U.S. participants and Nationals of the developing countries.
17. Excellent workshop involving all participants to a great degree. Very frank discussions between Americans and our overseas friends. The workshop was a credit to the fine cooperation between International Programs in Agriculture at Purdue and the Technical Departments.
18. Very good!! It gave me an opportunity to receive divergent views, not published, of the concept of institutional development.
19. The workshop was very good; it was useful. Concepts developed were valid, but unfortunately USAID dogma and bureaucracy prevented full use and application of concepts and principles. I believe I will be able to apply some of them in my present position.
20. It was a valuable, worthwhile experience. The general concept and guidelines for institution building have been valuable in my present work.

Question 5: Participants' use of knowledge acquired about the institution-building process in their current work.

1. I feel I gained considerable insight in how to approach problems relating to institutional development.
2. I am much more conscious of linkage groups. This influences many more decisions I now make. My basis for selection of leaders has been altered by facts learned in the conference. The Escondido exercise has made me much more conscious of the necessity of carefully weighing the merits of various alternatives.
3. In setting up goals to be achieved, in identifying the problems and difficulties involved in involving or obtaining the assistance of both private and public agencies (in establishing linkages), etc.
4. The knowledge and experience gained has become very handy in my day-to-day work of planning, promotion and evaluation of agricultural universities and colleges. I can now think more systematically on problems of institution building. The best use I have put this experience is in carrying out a joint assessment of the progress made by one agricultural university. Similar exercises with other institutions are in the offing.
5. Have tried to involve other staff members in the decision-making of expanding this department. The importance of linkages--with other departments, with other governmental units is given due consideration when the department makes broad plans. There is now an excellent working coordination between the Ministry of Agriculture and this department in doing agricultural research and extending research results to farmers.
6. As a result of attending this workshop, I have become very conscious of the fact that it is very important for this university to have very effective linkages, particularly the normative linkages. As a result, I have been instrumental in setting up a number of committees on which individuals of the organizations concerned with the agricultural development of the State are represented.
7. As a result of this conference I have improved the linkages of the university with many organizations. I made the directors of such organizations chairmen of the Committee on Agricultural Implements and Marketing. Thus a useful linkage was established between men who are actually working in the field and those doing research and teaching in the university.
8.
 - a. Involve host nationals more in planning.
 - b. Set up more international seminars on campus.
 - c. Inform the dean and technical department more on our programs.
 - d. Become better informed on consortiums and university contracts.

- e. Better understanding of AID/W thinking on contracts
 - f. Set up valuable workshop with AID/W and foreign nationals and IDB in connection with our new AID contract.
9. Tried to look at country needs more realistically. Concerned more with strategy than before. Also more cognizant about developing meaningful linkages between university and other institutions.
 10. Could have been very useful had AID administrators first been "educated." Have taught some of the principles and ideas to counterparts and have applied the principles of "full acceptance" and "realism" in my work with extension personnel. In this way, educational programs became "our" programs instead of USAID's programs.
 11. The university machinery, of which the Faculty of Agriculture is only a part, does not permit rapid changes. However, significant curriculum changes have been effected.
 12. It gave me a better perspective to study and plan for a new institution building project and especially for a pre-project planning workshop.
 13. Mainly in that the concepts I learned have provided a framework within which to articulate ideas that previously were intuitively held.
 14. Better identification of university and country needs. Planning. Assessment.
 15. I have been able to integrate research into resident instruction and extension education more effectively. Introduce interdisciplinary approach in research and coordinate the research program of my organization into similar institutions in the state, including similar research.
 16. Leadership - more delegation of responsibilities with more patience. Program planning - more total involvement.

Question 6: Participants' use of institution-building concepts in their current work.

1. I have found that in our international programs office it is absolutely essential to have support and in fact to fix responsibility for recruiting with specific departments. This gave us better people with back-up support from the department.
2. We have developed a system for planning future development of Agricultural Universities. It is based primarily on academic

21

and program planning first, followed by physical and financial planning. Such estimates are becoming very handy to win additional resources for institutions. Need to give attention to relationships with other organizations (linkages) is also now receiving deliberate attention. Internal structure and organization pattern are being refined.

3. I think of building and expanding my department as a process of many facets. Members of the department are encouraged and do actively participate in building the department. Strong linkages have been established with other departments that have common interest with this one.
4. The most noteworthy influence of the workshop has been an effort to build normative linkages of this institution. This has resulted in the involvement of a number of institutions with the working of this university. For example, we were able to interest an agriculture industry in the working of an agricultural department of the university. The result has been not only a very close relationship of these two institutions but also an industry has donated funds for research on the agricultural machinery suitable for this State. Similarly, we approached a number of industries connected with the development of agriculture. A number of smaller industries have come up with research fellowships for tackling some of the problems in which they are vitally interested. These are only a few examples to illustrate the point under consideration. Most of the organizations appreciate the keenness of this university to involve them in its programs and if properly tackled, apart from building close working relationships, it results in financial support to the university.
5. Leadership - Instead of doing things myself, I have more patience for waiting for counterpart leaders to act.
Linkages - I have placed more stress on formal agreements between complementary institutions when previously I would have felt that informal relationships might suffice.
6. Leadership - Introducing relevant ideas.
Program - preparing better programs.
Resources - Introducing more relevant programs.
Linkages - Identifying common ideas and needs.
7. Planning and projecting future program in my country.
Establishing linkages between University and Government Agencies.
Analyzing resource and manpower need for future agricultural development.
Advising on reorganization of services in university.
8. This institution was created more as a "brainchild" of USAID than as a product or "felt need" of the national government. As such,

linkages had never been established and there were other serious limitations in its operations. When the new contract was being negotiated, I tried to influence officials to take a new look at the different concepts: "doctrine," internal structures, etc., etc., and succeeded at least to some degree in this reorientation.

9. In preparing program for science and technology development in the country.
10. Utilized host nationals in setting up objectives. Program planning involving all participants.
11. Primarily in program planning. I hope that more specific use can be made of other concepts when I go to the field in 1972.
12. Linkages--coordinated research between departments, i.e., animal science and agricultural engineering. Program pre-planning implementation.
13. Since my return, I have been called to participate in meetings and seminars on institution building. As head of the research wing, I have been incorporating all useful recommendations in the system of the university. I have contributed articles on institution building.

Question 7: Participants' suggestions for using hypothetical country problems more effectively in future workshops

1. For Latin American people, examples should be relevant to that area.
2. I felt that the hypothetical country problem was very useful. It might be helpful to make an initial presentation, then have a panel point out weaknesses and follow up with another proposal to correct the deficiencies. That is to say to have more specific discussion on the recommendations made.
3. Certain assumptions and hypotheses should be clearly indicated to facilitate thinking and further planning. It should be split into two stages-- (1) demonstration in an abridged form (2) actual problem solving experience. There should be a critique to each exercise when finally presented. This would enable participants to appreciate the points that they left out or did not give due weightage to. This would give them the benefit of more experienced participants.
4. The hypothetical country problems could be formulated by taking some of the examples in the sphere of building up of the agricultural universities in this country as well as in some of the other developing countries. There are very varied situations in

33

which agricultural universities are being organized. In some of the situations, where a number of colleges of agriculture and veterinary medicine existed in a State, very complex organizational problems are arising and multi-location campuses are coming up. This may be the case in many countries. The hypothetical problems must include such situations so that the participants could be given the problems which are actually being confronted in some of the developing countries.

5. Pinpoint the participants to the geographic area described.
6. By letting trainees come up with their own hypothetical framework. In this way the group would usually have been dealing with "their" own problems since these would have been their projections. In that way the various "Escondidos" would have received greater interest, motivation and earnest effort.
7. A bit better coordination between groups would have been helpful. We used only a few concepts or principles per group and then did not "feel" the impact of each group's decision upon the whole. Some individuals did not cooperate with their groups but gave individual analysis and separate solutions.
8. My opinion is that real problems should be used rather than hypothetical, perhaps avoiding the real names of the countries. (mentioned three times)
9. Hypothetical country problems should be as realistic as possible and relate to the conditions of the particular country.
10. Giving concrete or living example of an institution would have been more useful than a hypothetical case of "Escondido."

Questions 9 and 10: Institutional development problems encountered by participants which merit additional discussion.

1. Time and space would not permit me to give details here. But each country's problems in building new institutions to serve developing agriculture or economy in general should have received more time and emphasis. There should have been, alternatively, a written account of these in advance followed by joint discussion later.
 2. Most of the problems anticipated by me came under discussion in the workshop. Some of the problems, however, like building up of a competent faculty, training of the faculties to be taken over by the universities being developed in the various developing countries and planning of campus, to my mind, should have received more attention.
- 34 -

3. The idea of doctrine.
4. Research administration.
Community/University interaction.
Training of the university high level administrators.
5. Historical examples, for example, some of the older universities, Oxford and European Universities are developed institutions. A dissection of their history of development would be extremely interesting if the present concepts were delineated in line with their development.
6. Unity of purpose and understanding on the part of the USAID Mission technicians, administrators and contracting institutions. Since the "tail" can't wag the "dog", more attention should be given to educating the dog so he'll know how to wag. There is an appalling lack of understanding on the part of some official administrators who have the last voice in institution building decisions.
7. University planning and country development.
8. A better exchange of information on the various projects--success and failures. Perhaps more emphasis on the individual's role and how he can be most effective, e.g., major teaching responsibilities vs. advisorship and assistance role.
9. How do you get continuity of purpose and understanding from one "political generation" to another, and how do you provide for uniform evaluative criteria?
10. A real problem is how to maintain majority of your overseas staff as regular members of campus departments without creating real program deficiencies at home. How can you overstaff without committing financial suicide if programs are terminated or positions deleted?
11. More on budgetary problems and efficient allocation of limited resources. (mentioned twice)
12. Possible ways to rapidly and timely bring about the adjustments in the (a) goals (b) programs of a developing institution.
How to make foreign technical assistance to developing institutions more dynamic.
13. How about coordinating technical assistance from different developed countries to a given developing country or region?
14. For most of the developing countries, where new institutions, like agricultural universities, are coming up, the administrative personnel concerned must have an exposure to the question of campus

planning and development in all its aspects vis-a-vis layout of the campus, architecture and planning of various types of buildings, landscaping, requirements of residential and recreational areas, etc. (mentioned twice)

15. Lack of leadership at key level due to:
 - a. Key person spread too thin.
 - b. Key person seeking personal gain through politics rather than a good program.
 - c. Lack of coordinated effort due to lack of leadership.
16. Loan contracts such as IDB and World Bank are very complex. Consortium approach to agricultural development.
17. The sociology of human approach.
Sociological and psychological aspect of country modernization.

Question 11: Participants' suggestions for improving future workshops.

1. Speakers from developing countries on "Lessons from Experience on Institution Building in Developing Countries."
2. Include more case studies - a good one and a poor one and then point out the reasons or use case studies that actually show how applications of IB principles have solved problems (four other respondents suggested using more case studies).
3. By reducing the philosophic content slightly and substituting more easily conceived material particularly examples for the benefit of participants for whom this may be the first exposure to theory of institution building.
4. They be held in developing countries. Group countries of similar problems (a region) participate in the workshop. Also include experiences from other countries such as Sweden who have participated in technical assistance (mentioned twice).
5. The notice given for a workshop should be quite ample and papers, etc., to be read in these workshops should be circulated well in time so that the participants can study them and come prepared. Since most of the participants will be only practitioners and not theoreticians, they should be advised to do some reading in the theory of institution building so that they come prepared for the theoretical aspect of the workshop. For this purpose, it will be a good idea to supply them some literature/references. I am making this suggestion out of my personal experience because some of the theoretical aspects were quite new to me and it took some time to really understand these aspects and grasp them.

6. There was more emphasis on theoretical situations in this conference. This no doubt is important but papers which deal with practical problems would perhaps be just as useful. (mentioned twice)
7. Shorter duration; less investment in participant travel, more travel (proportional) for speakers--thus reaching a greater audience.
8. Shortening the workshop period (not more than one week).
More comprehensive papers.
Visual presentation of Institution Building model.
9. Concentrating them on the problems of one country at a time and including "all"--many more--of the appropriate people. USAID and host country personnel should be trained together and at the same time. This would concentrate the mix and permit the training to be conducted more nearly on a pragmatic and practical plane.
10. More involvement and participation by delegates and fewer lectures and teaching classes. (mentioned twice)
11. The discussions at the Purdue meet were just confined to the four walls of the universities. The participants should have been given an opportunity to visit places to see the institution building process and its adoption. The institution building process peculiar to each of the developing countries should also have been discussed.

Question 12: Participants' recommendations as to the type of professionals in various institutions who would benefit most from such workshops.

1. Government and educational leaders in developing countries. Members of bilateral and international development assistance organizations.
2. Agriculture and education, research, extension, administration--governmental.
3. Deans of agricultural colleges, directors of experiment stations, Food and Agriculture Officers of USAID Missions.
4. Professionals directly concerned with the development of innovative institutions to serve a specific sector of the economy in general.
5. These workshops will be useful to persons having administrative responsibilities in the institutions in which they are serving so that they can make an effective contribution in their respective spheres. To my mind, these workshops should include persons like vice chancellors of the universities, deans and directors and a few senior professors.

57

6. Both program directors and technical specialists, with these meeting separately for part of the workshop. The role and number of foreign institution nationals deserve further consideration, and perhaps amplification.
7. I feel they are especially important for those assuming Chief of Party assignments or others assuming broad roles of institutional development.
8. University participants, program planning, foundations, AID/W, IDB and World Bank.
9. Should include not only those engaged in institution building, but also administrators and others who either influence the institution building climate or may later replace those currently carrying the ball.
10. Experts in institution building, planners and programmers, managers, policy makers, including budget.
11. Chiefs of Party, campus coordinators and certain individual team members--both experienced and unexperienced.
12. Deans, directors and department heads, treasurers or finance officers, vice chancellors and presidents.
13. Such workshops will be useful practically to all institutions, more particularly to institutions which are in the process of development.

Question 15: Participants' additional ideas and comments.

1. The revision of USAID (IDC, IDI) will demand somewhat different in-country coordination since host countries will have considerably more responsibility and control of technical assistance, both money and advisors. Some emphasis should be placed on how a "lighter touch" can still be effective.
 2. Previous participants should be invited to various subsequent institution-building conferences to give them the opportunity to refresh their previous trainings as well as help them acquire additional information on this very important concept.
 3. I must say that the participation in the Purdue workshop was a memorable event in my professional career--moreso when I look back because to start with the exercise appeared a little dry to some, even boring. It, however, turned out to be exceedingly useful and most timely effort. I am sure all participants benefited the way I did. My grateful thanks to organizers, particularly for this follow-up action.
- 58

4. One of the long lasting and concrete contributions of technical assistance projects is in training local personnel who are competent enough to handle responsibilities taken care of by expatriates. Proper training of local personnel also enables an institution to emphasize and have more insight into local problems with the eyes of local people. I hope, as has been emphasized at the Purdue Workshop, the institution building process and concept will emphasize training even more.
5. One of the suggestions discussed at the workshop and at the various meetings and seminars has been the desirability of nominating teams of administrators to review the progress of institutions coming up in the various developing countries. The basic idea was that senior administrators from some of the institutions in the developing countries, which have progressed well, may be nominated to review the working of the institutions in these regions. It was thought that teams consisting of such administrators may be able to appreciate the problems of institution-building in the developing countries better than if the teams consisted of members only from developed countries. I think this is a good suggestion and needs to be implemented if a mechanism could be found to support such teams. This will not only help the institutions under review, but will also be a very educative experience for the members forming such a team.
6. Student unrest is now on an international scale. It is closely related to institution building and as such exchange of ideas on this problem could be useful.
7. Results of goals:
 1. Successful:
 - a. Recruited well-qualified native staff.
 - b. Increased student enrollment.
 - c. Offered graduate program at M.S. level (6 students).
 - d. Increased department budget threefold.
 - e. Improved teaching (visual aids); reduced "no show" lectures by the staff to minimum.
 - f. Introduced more practical application in classroom-- still held the theory.
 - g. Increased the reference library and textbooks.
 - h. Improved and increased laboratory equipment.
 2. Not successful
Unable to recruit all four persons to work as a team--resentment of some host members due to strong personality traits of some visitors.
 3. Not successful due to lack of:
 - a. funds
 - b. trained people
 - c. organizational structure
 - d. understanding of goals not uniform.
8. Institution building is one of the more important contributions USAID and other similar programs can make to international development.

39'

But to function effectively, both those who advise on institution building and those who implement these kinds of programs must understand basic philosophies, principles and concepts. These understandings are unlikely to be acquired unless they are carefully planned with the right people involved and participating. In far too many cases, the "tail" wags the "dog." Unfortunately, quite a number of institutions have come into being without proper commitment and understanding on the part of those responsible for them. How do we correct these mistakes?

9. Institution building idea is a new one, this idea should be further developed. This should be introduced as a course in colleges and universities. There should be a comprehensive research program on institution building. A number of case studies should be taken up in all countries with a view to develop institutions for efficient work. There should be annual evaluation of each institution--preferably internal and external evaluation every five years. I should like to participate, in any research and evaluation programs, if they are sponsored by the international agency like the one in question.