

PROJECT TITLE
 Grants to Strengthen (6) Universities' Competence in the Economics of Agricultural Development for the Less Developed Countries

6. PROJECT (4) 70 75	7. DATE LATEST PROP	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR 11/21/72
DURATION: (2) Jan FY 72 Ends FY 77			

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$
------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

c. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
University of Minnesota 122 (1)	AID/csd 2815
Iowa State University 124 (1)	AID/csd 2824
Cornell University 125 (1)	AID/csd 2823
Michigan State University 123 (1)	AID/csd 2826
Southern University 140 (1)	AID/csd 3414
Virginia State College 139 (1)	AID/csd 3415

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
USAID	AID/W	HOST		
		CM/COD	1. The Grant Officer will notify each Grantee of the issues and questions raised in this Management Review as referenced in the attached report. No meetings with Grantee representatives are required.	
		TA/AGR	2. The Agricultural Economics technical office will review the activities of this program with reference to the potential utilization of the capabilities being developed and develop an appropriate plan of action.	
		TA/AGR	3. The Agricultural Economics technical office will review activities of the Va State and SU Grants with reference to strengthening technical liaison for the purpose of building effective institutional capabilities and develop a plan for Agency support.	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

D. REPLACEMENT REQUIRES
 REVISOR OR NEW: PROP PIP PRO AG PIOT PIOC PIOP

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW
 10/17/73

PREPARED BY: TA/AGR, L. Fletcher 10/30/73
 REVIEWED BY: TA/RIG, J. K. McDermott

Report of In-House Management Review (10/17/73) of Six 211(d) Grants in
Agricultural Economics for Development:

University of Minnesota (csd 2815)
Iowa State University (csd 2824)
Cornell University (csd 2823)
Michigan State University (csd 2826)
Southern University (csd 3414)
Virginia State College (csd 3415)

Participants:

TA/RIG, J. K. McDermott, Chairman, W. C. Schaefer, Analyst
TA/AGR, Lehman Fletcher, Don Anderson, Wm. Schaefer, Liaison
CM/COD, Robert O'Brien, Carmine Gonzales, Grant Officer

Purpose of the Review: To make an Agency finding regarding adequate progress, the appropriateness of expenditures, and that activities undertaken or proposed have been or are consonant with the purpose and terms of the grant agreement.

Issues:

1. The first 4 of the above listed Institutional Grants made in June of 1970 were intended to develop and strengthen the competence of cooperating universities in the field of agricultural economics as it relates to the problems of developing countries, and to increase their ability and the ability of significant numbers of their staff to contribute to the solution of these problems. In this context each Grant Agreement contains provision for each University to nominate, and with A.I.D. designate, certain of its faculty to an International Agricultural Economics Panel. Further, the University would use its best efforts to make available to A.I.D. the services of Panel members during the life of the Grant to an agreed upon number of man-years which varies for each University. The status and plans for this "Talent Sharing" concept need review.

Each university (Minnesota, Iowa State, Cornell, and Michigan State) is requested to submit a report of the extent of specific talent-sharing activities in the terminology of the grant document (a) cumulatively for the 3-year period through the period of the present review (FY 71-FY 73) and (b) planned contributions for the 4th and 5th years of these grants.

2. Specific requests for information based on the review of each report follow by University:

Cornell University:

a. The item "Mission Payments (Research)" in Table I on page 40 requires clarification of the meaning of charges.

b. In Table II on page 41 the item of "Equipment, (Leases and Rentals)" requires a brief explanation of what is being rented with substantiating information.

c. Include the talent-sharing item.

Michigan State University:

a. Talent-sharing request.

b. Table IX-3 on page 56 includes Detail of Expenditures for Faculty Salaries which indicates that some long-time regular staff members are receiving grant funds. The philosophy of the 211(d) Institutional Grant has stressed the building of capability by the addition of staff rather than the replacement of currently funded positions. Please provide the rationale for this expenditure.

Iowa State University:

a. Talent-sharing request.

b. On 2/26/73 an amendment to AID/csd 2824 added \$400,000 to advance the state-of-the-art in sector analysis techniques for LDC agricultural development and the economic growth process. There is need for some reference in the annual report covering the activities, cost elements, and plans for this supplemental program.

University of Minnesota:

a. Talent-sharing request.

b. The "Preliminary Draft," dated July 1, 1973, received Oct. 15, 1973, (and labeled "Annual Report: 1972" on page 3) appears to be a report of total activities of the Economic Development Center. As such this submission is non-responsive to the Guidelines for Preparation of the Annual 211(d) Grant Report of June 13, 1972.

We request that the Grantee submit a brief supplemental report consistent with the A.I.D. format with respect to the following:

Summary first page: (Note, this page may be used by A.I.D. in various reporting procedures and should be an accurate summary statement.)

III. Accomplishments: This section can cross reference activities in the Economic Development Center Report as appropriate.

IV. Impact of Grant Supported Activities in Developing Institutional Capabilities: A focused statement is important.

V. Utilization of Institutional Resources in Development:
An interpretive statement on this subject is important.
Cross-references to the EDC report may be appropriate.
As an example, are any of the courses listed on pages 91-93 the result of activities funded under this grant?

VI. Next Year's Plan of Work and Anticipated Expenditures:
This section is particularly important for review purposes.

c. The supplemental materials in Tables I and II are acceptable. However, the vertical ruling following the column for "Salary and Fringe Benefits" on page 1 of Table I (a) and on pages 1 and 3 of Table I (b) appear to exclude these figures from the header A.I.D. 211(d) Grant Support. This should be corrected in the formal report.

Virginia State College; Petersburg, Virginia:

1. This first annual report on this Grant "To Improve Competence In Agricultural Economics and Economics to Analyze and Contribute to Resolving Problems of Low-Income Farm and Rural Non-Farm Units" is acceptable.

2. In the preparation of the 2nd and following annual reports continuing attention should be given to the Guidelines for Preparation of the Annual 211(d) Grant Report, dated June 13, 1972, for substance as well as format in reporting on Grant funded activities. Most of the materials in the Appendices to the current report need not be included unless a clear rationale is given for their relevance to the objectives of the grant.

Southern University, Baton Rouge, La.:

1. This first annual report on this Grant "To Improve Competence in Agricultural Economics and Economics to Analyze and Contribute to Resolving of Rural Un-Employment and Under-Employment" is acceptable. However, information on several questions is requested.

2. With reference to the 4 faculty members provided graduate stipends (page 4), please indicate the individuals, location of study, nature of course, and program.

3. A statement of cost elements in the "Teaching" item of Table I on page 19 is requested.

4. Clarify the reference on page 5 to the use of 211(d) funds for library resources and copy work with no corresponding reference to such expenditures in Table I on page 19.

5. References are made on pages 5, 9, 16, and 17 to 10 student scholarships with continuing support from 211(d) funds planned and 10 new undergraduate scholarships made available to entering freshmen. In view of the proposal statement for this grant on page 14 planning 4 or 5 new students on scholarship each year, cumulating to a total of about 20 at the end of the fifth year, what is the rationale for initiating and maintaining this doubled number of students on scholarship? How will SJ be able to plan for continuity of student support at the end of the grant?

6. Table I shows no "Non-211(d) Funding Amount." Does this mean that no estimates of University contributions for administrative, facilities, or consultations or other were available? While no information is requested at this time, the report for next year should contain some information and rationale on this subject.

7. The Plan of Work and Anticipated Expenditures on page 15-17 should be elaborated. What specific activities are planned?

Findings: The annual reports covered by this review are essentially acceptable. We are favorably impressed by the reports of complex activities, supportive interactions with other related programs, and growing capabilities being created in accordance with the objectives of the Grants. Certification of the acceptability of these reports will depend on the receipt of satisfactory answers to the issues and questions raised in this review. No meetings with the Grantee representatives are required.

Utilization: The TA/AGR Division of Agricultural Economics and Sector Planning will review the activities under this program of grants in terms of their individual and coordinated implications for utilization, and will consider substantive meetings or other activities as appropriate to current problems and the state-of-the-art.

Specific attention will be given by the Division of Agricultural Economics and Sector Planning to a program of planning and professional interaction with Virginia State and Southern University for the purpose of strengthening the effectiveness of grant supported activities in building institutional capability. We recognize that it is easy to "fritter away" funds on a variety of individually worth-while activities which may not have the benefit of forceful technical leadership and adequate institutional resources. Discussion has included proposed field visits with Grantee representatives, professional interactions with outstanding schools in the research field, sub-contracting work under supervision from the leading schools, graduate work-study service arrangements with TAB, and faculty rotational assignments among the Grantee school, graduate training, and TAB.

RESOLUTION

TARGET