XD-AAB-568-A
ISN 67807

EXTERNAL INTERIM EVALUATION

PROGRAM SUPPORT GRANTS - JOINT MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

AGRICULTURE

Glenn O. Patterson

Clapp and Mayne, Inc.

December 14, 1989

EVALUATION

PSG/JMOU

CLAPP AND MAYNE, INC.: PSG/JMOU REPORT FINAL 12/14/89

TABLE OF CONTENTS

i. Executive Summary i

I. Project Identification 1

II. Introduction: Scope and Methodology of Evaluation 2

III. Background of the Project 3

IV. Objectives, Basic Structure and Operations of the Project 4

A. Goals, Objectives and Outputs 4
Table 1. Title XII Annual Business by AID, 1985-1989 7

B. Project Funding and Operations 8
Table 2. PSG/JMOU Grants by University, 1985 - 1989 9
Table 3. 1862 Institution Volume of Business and FTE Levels by Year 1986 - 1989 10
Table 4. 1890 Institution Volume of Business and FTE Levels by Year, 1986-1989 11
Table 5. Expenditure by University by Objective, 1988 13
Table 6. Expenditures by Activity - 1987-1988 Actual 14
Table 7. Expenditure of Funds by Activity - 1988-1989 Projected 15

V. Conclusions, Rationale, and Recommendations 16

A. Conclusions Related to Project Image and Perception 16

B. Conclusions Related to Project Goals, Purposes Objectives and Outputs 19

C. Conclusions Related to Project Partnerships 31

D. Conclusions Related to Project Funding, Management and Monitoring 33

VI. Other Issues 38

A. Efficiency, Sustainability, and Impact 38

B. Future Project Planning 40

VII. Summary of Recommendations 43

Annexes:

1. List of Persons Interviewed A - 1
2. JMOU Partnerships- Method of Review for Evaluation A - 3
3. Interview Instrument: Evaluation Issues A - 4
4. JMOU Areas of Concentration A - 8
5. Expenditures by University by Activity, 1987-1988 Actual
6. Scope of Work of Evaluation A - 12

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I. Introduction:

The Program Support Grant/Joint Memorandum of Understanding Project (PSG/JMOU) finances grants to 24 universities comprising 12 partnerships, each composed of one Morrill Act Land Grant University (1862 university) and one Historic Black College or University (HBCU or 1890 university). The project was authorized in 1986 at a level of $20 million and is scheduled to terminate in 1991. Program support grant matching dollar funds provided by the universities themselves have totalled approximately $8.4 million from 1986 through 1989.

II. Overall Achievement:

The PSG/JMOU Project has made a significant, though hard to measure, contribution in both the quantity and quality of U.S. universities' participation in international development activities and thus has improved the quality of AID assistance activities. However, it is increasingly clear that this project is not the most cost-effective mechanism for achieving that goal.

In addition, it has served to stimulate and broaden interest in international development issues in the universities and through the universities to private and public institutions within the states. Thus its principal long-term benefit to the U.S. may be indirect and unmeasurable.

The project suffers in its original design from the absence of feasible and quantifiable output targets. Project goals are expressed in terms of "strengthened capability", "broadened participation", "increased commitment" and "mobilized resources" and no benchmarks exist as to when such states have been reached. While the Joint Memorandum of Understanding does commit the universities to an "area of concentration", these areas are so broad as to encompass almost any likely activity. Furthermore, they are highly redundant. (Eight of the universities include "Rural Development" as one of their "areas of concentration"; another ten universities "concentrate" on "Crop and Animal Production"; half the universities "concentrate" on "Farming Systems" or on "Technology Transfer" or on "Institution Building".) Furthermore, the Joint Memorandum of Understanding commits the recipient institution to only one output subject to unequivocal quantifiable measurement - the number of person/years (or "Full Time Equivalents - FTEs") of service overseas related to AID activities.

This "output", however, is not within the total or even primary control of the universities themselves. It is dependent on both the magnitude of AID business in the relevant areas of

12

specialization and on the competition for that business from non-university suppliers. The output target has not been met in the case of the 1890 institutions, nor is it likely to be met in future years under the present project. In the case of the 1862 universities, the "target" was met even before the project was initiated calling into question the efficiency of the activity. The project appears increasingly inconsistent with specific AID needs as reflected in the agency's procurement practice. This leads to a growing feeling on the part of university faculty and administrators that they are "all dressed up with no place to go".

III. Project Image: A key obstacle to achieving the objectives of the project (and one related to the lack of measurable project goals) is the negative, even hostile image of the project which, according to interviews conducted, pervades AID outside of those directly involved in its administration.

Over the long term the widespread perception of the project as an "entitlement" related to campus rather than LDC concerns is to the disadvantage of AID, the universities, and the developing countries. It should be forthrightly addressed in the design of any follow-on activity.

Related to this is the view that the most important potential contribution of the universities, longer-term or post-contractual institutional linkage with LDC institutions, is not directly encouraged by this project.

IV. 1890 Universities:

Along with the HBCU Research Grants, this project has been a primary instrument in developing HBCU institutional and individual faculty interest, knowledge and competence in international development activities. This is attributable to the continuing "strengthening" component of the project (essential to the HBCUs), the formalized partnership with an 1862 institution already involved in overseas contracts, and the flexibility within the project on the use of funds.

While all 1890 institutions have received equal funding, increasingly clear profiles of strong and weak institutional performance are emerging: the former is characterized by a sense of a "marketing strategy" involving clear assessment of strengths and priorities, careful analysis of potential contract opportunities, channelling of resources to specific targets related to the marketing strategy, and vigorous pursuit of opportunities offered by partner institutions (both the JMOU partner and other potential partners). The "weak institutional performance profile" is characterized by little or no sense of a marketing strategy, unfocussed use of funds for disparate campus activities with little or no LDC involvement, and less than

vigorous pursuit of overseas opportunities with the JMOU partner university and with other potential partners. While widespread HBCU participation is desirable, AID should make provision over time to direct a greater share of its HBCU funding to those 1890 universities meeting the more "success-oriented" profile.

The success of the project in broadening the knowledge within the HBCUs of developing country problems and programs has not been matched by expanding HBCU participation in specific overseas activities in developing countries. Yet AID Regional Bureau and Mission personnel identify institutional needs overseas for which the experience and orientation of the HBCU seem well suited. AID should consider complementing its present grant program with an HBCU Institutional Linkage Grant program to relate HBCU capabilities more directly with clear LDC institutional needs.

V. 1862 universities:

The JMOU and its predecessor projects have made it possible to bring increased university talent, research efforts, and institutional involvement to bear on AID projects overseas. This has been achieved through highly flexible funding of add-on project activity, proposal preparation, transition costs of project personnel, activities aimed at expanded faculty participation and administration of international programs.

In accordance with AID intentions, funds available under the project are now being used primarily to "support" directly ongoing AID projects and to develop proposals in response to AID requests. (Two or three of the universities continue to use the funds more for institutional "strengthening" purposes than for support of overseas projects). In some cases activities financed appear to be legitimate contract costs which would be financed in the case of for-profit firms under an adequately allowed overhead.

The project-support activity undertaken, while highly valuable to the universities, is sometimes perceived as of marginal value by the Missions and Regional Bureaus. Furthermore, the longer-term institutional linkages which both universities and AID personnel agree to be highly desirable are only tangentially met through this project.

AID should consider initiating dialogue with the 1862 institutions to determine the possibility and desirability of AID's eventually financing the "real costs" of needed university services through the contract mechanism. This would imply adequate overhead allowance by AID to meet project-related costs now financed through the JMOU. It would also imply review (and in some cases modifications) in procedures for allocating overhead recoveries within the university system to permit essential

incentive to academic departments providing services. AID should then consider using funds thus freed from the JMOU for more output-oriented, demand-related Institutional Linkage grants with the 1862 institutions similar to those recommended above for the 1890 institutions.

VI. Partnerships:

Experience varies on the programmatic value to the university of the JMOU partnerships. In some cases the activities of one partner are not conducive to broad involvement by the other. In some cases, one or both of the partners are less active than would be desirable in pursuing joint activities.

Nevertheless, the partnerships as presently constituted have generated enormous good will and in many cases collaboration in programs far wider than those related to AID. The partnerships combine essential flexibility with continuity which have made them valued by virtually all participating universities. Flexibility exists to relate to any other institution as the opportunity arises. On the other hand a "primary partner" formalized through the JMOU encourages longer-term personal and institutional relationships which virtually all the participating universities value and which should be retained in any follow-on project.

They are not, however, a substitute for the opportunity of the HBCU to undertake meaningful work in the LDC's for which it is responsible and from which measurable outputs are expected.

VII. Project Funding, Management, and Monitoring:

This project is almost unique in AID in the sense that levels of funding under the project are set by formula related to factors external to the project itself and unrelated to activities proposed for financing. There is thus little or no flexibility on the part of AID management to respond to differences in university performance under the grant through differentiation in funding.

In marked contrast to its predecessor projects, the JMOU has benefitted in recent years by highly effective project management within AID. The achievements of the project are in no small part due to the increased structure and direction which has been provided by the project manager. The Annual Report and Forward Work Plan are sufficient but not burdensome monitoring tools. The ISTI contract has played a most important role in building a data base to permit more adequate project monitoring. Annual site visits have been most useful as have periodic workshops with the participating universities.

The principal weakness that hampers AID management of JMOU is the lack of measurable outputs in the project design. Project monitoring has taken the form almost exclusively of measuring uses of funds rather than results of expenditures. Even within the limitations of the present project design, greater information on project output should be collected and analyzed through the Annual Report. AID should require a clear description of outputs produced, e.g, number of person/months of faculty salary financed, number and nature of proposals prepared, etc. and clear indication of budgetary allocations made to them as part of the Annual Report.

VIII. Future Project Planning:

Taking into account the experience of this and predecessor projects, AID should give early consideration to a new project design effort which more directly and clearly links university resources to LDC activities with verifiable output goals and measurable accomplishments. Such an effort should:

- Focus more prominently on the widespread perception within AID and the universities of the importance of continuing non-contractual linkages between U.S. universities and developing country institutions.

- Within that context give special attention to the potential role of the HBCUs in long-term linkage with community-based institutions in the developing countries; this could be through an HBCU Institutional Linkage Program with similarities to the PVO Grant program.

- Maintain the flexible partnership approach under which a certain percentage of the funds available would be reserved for joint activities between 1862 and 1890 institutions.

- Aim at eventually financing the services to AID of the 1862 institutions (and most "resource mobilization" related to those services) through the contractual process (or individually tailored, output-related grant); these agreements would cover all "real costs" of services provided, leaving "strengthening elements" of the present grant programs for the benefit primarily of the 1890 institutions.

- Continue support of HBCU institutional development of viable "marketing strategies" (through flexible partnerships) for a determined period of time; after that time specific output-related activities in the developing countries would have to be undertaken to qualify for continued AID resources.

- Remove the "closed system" nature of the present project so that proposals by other eligible universities could be considered on their merits.

- Assume the likelihood of continuing AID procurement on an openly competitive basis and therefore encourage collaboration between the universities and the private sector.

If it appears that such a follow-on project is feasible, then encourage use of a portion of the remaining funds in the present project by universities for proposal preparation for the subsequent program.

I. Project Identification

A. Project Title: Joint Memorandum of Understanding - Agriculture Program

B. Project Number: 936-5058

C. Project Officer: Gary W. Bittner

D. Project Authorization: Original - 3/14/86
Amendments -

E. Project Completion Date: Original - 12/31/91
Amendments -

F. Initial Fiscal Year: 1986
Final Fiscal Year: 1991

G. Total Funds Authorized: $20 million

H. Project Dates (Dates JMOUs Signed):

1.	a.	Alabama A&M	12/17/85
	b.	Kansas State	
2.	a.	U. of Arkansas PB	12/19/85
	b.	Auburn	
3.	a.	Florida A&M	3/3/86
	b.	North Carolina State	
4.	a.	Fort Valley State	1/5/86
	b.	Ohio State	
5.	a.	Lincoln	1/15/86
	b.	U. of Minnesota	
6.	a.	U. of Maryland ES	2/4/86
	b.	U. of Illinois U-C	
7.	a.	North Carolina A&T	10/4/84
	b.	Michigan State	
8.	a.	Prairie View A&M	1/30/86
	b.	Texas A&M	
9.	a.	Southern	3/3/86
	b.	Louisiana State	
10.	a.	Tennessee State	2/24/86
	b.	New Mexico State	
11.	a.	Tuskegee	3/27/84
	b.	Oregon State	
12.	a.	Virginia State	3/6/86
	b.	U. of Wisconsin	

I. Project Budget

Cumulative Obligations Through 9/30/88	9,266,000
Cumulative Expenditures Through 9/30/88	6,309,000
Pipeline as of 9/30/88	2,957,000
Planned FY89 Obligations	3,084,000
Matching Dollar Amount Provided by Universities, 1986 through 1989	8,434,436
Planned Future Year Project Obligations	4,650,000

18

II. Introduction

The JMOU/PSG Project authorization, signed in March, 1986, provided for interim evaluations to determine how effectively the project was meeting its objectives, and what, if any course corrections should be considered for the remaining years of the present project or for any possible follow-on project.

In July, 1989, AID signed a contract with the consulting firm Clapp and Mayne, Inc. to conduct the evaluation between July and September and to prepare recommendations for improving the project. This would be the subject for dialogue with the university community during the latter part of 1989. To lead the evaluation, Clapp and Mayne, Inc. chose Glenn O. Patterson, who had previously served with AID for over twenty years, including in positions as overseas Mission Director and as Deputy Assistant Administrator for Africa.

The evaluation was to look at the project from the point of view of the following: effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, state of the partnerships, comparison with other university programs, project incentives, and indicators of success; and then to make appropriate recommendations. (See Scope of Work in Annex 6.)

In carrying out the evaluation the following steps were undertaken:

1. Review and analysis of project data and background material including basic project documentation and the results of previous evaluations, workshops, conferences, etc.

2. Preparation and distribution of a paper of Evaluation Issues (attached as Annex 3) which formed the basis of interviews and analysis of project documentation.

3. Discussion with project-related personnel within AID and its contractors regarding their experience and views of project effectiveness and progress (List of persons interviewed is given in Annex 1).

4. Site visits to seven recipient institutions and discussion there with project administrators and participating faculty.

5. Extensive interviews of a similar nature with officials of those JMOU institutions not visited. These were carried out through conference calls arranged with seventeen institutions. Thus the evaluation involved extensive discussion with all of the twenty-four institutions participating in the project. (See Annex 2 for list of institutions visited and telephoned).

The evaluation was carried out during the ten-week period between July 10 and September 15, 1989.

III. Background of the Project

Recognizing the important role that U.S. land-grant universities could play in the fields of agriculture, rural development and institution-building overseas, AID determined in the early 1970's that a university grant program was needed to supplement the normal contract relationship between the universities and AID. The purpose was to develop within the university community a broadened interest in and capability for participating in assistance programs overseas. Under the 211d program, AID funds were provided to many universities to encourage greater institutional and faculty commitment to issues important to the less developed countries.

This support was continued in the late 1970's and early 1980's under Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act which envisioned a "partnership" between AID and the land-grant universities in "famine prevention and the freedom from hunger." It encouraged AID to "strengthen the capacities" of these universities to participate in U.S. assistance programs overseas. Approximately $26 million was provided by AID between 1979 and 1986 under the Title XII Strengthening Grants to some 57 universities. Uses of the funds included salary support for faculty, library development, graduate student research, overseas travel, curriculum development, seminars and workshops on development problems, and project administration.

These projects were highly popular with the universities, but sharply criticized by the AID Inspector General and General Accounting Office as being insufficiently focussed. While the projects were useful for broadening interest in international development issues in the universities, the actual uses of funds were often only peripherally related to specific AID objectives, priorities, and activities.

A successor project, the present PSG/JMOU project, was authorized in March,1986 as a grant project to 24 selected land-grant universities. Twelve partnerships were formed, each including an "1862 institution" and an "1890 institution". The 1862 institution were all major land grant universities that had participated extensively in AID programs with Title XII funding and with other funding. The 1890 institutions (also known as Historically Black Colleges and Universities or HBCUs) in most cases had little experience with AID programs. The purpose of these partnerships was to both "increase the involvement of the HBCU's in AID's agricultural program overseas" and to "improve the ability of Title XII universities to provide quality technical assistance" to the developing countries through AID in the area of agriculture, food production, and rural development.

In response to the criticism of the predecessor projects, guidelines were developed to focus the use of funds on direct support of AID activities and for joint activities involving the 1890 institutions.

IV. Objectives, Basic Structure, and Operations of the Project

This section provides a general summary of the objectives and operations of the JMOU project including basic project statistics.

A. Goals, Objectives and Outputs

The basic JMOU documents express the goals and objectives in two general terms - one related to HBCU strengthening and participation in AID programs, and the second related to "mobilizing support" from all participating universities for AID activities overseas. Areas of technical "concentration" were agreed upon among the partner institutions and AID. These are listed in Annex 4. The entire project was seen as a "partnership" between AID and the participating universities with "matching funds" coming from the universities' own resources.

The relative emphasis between the two goals differs among the basic project documents. In the initial Project Authorization in 1986, the objectives of the project were described as follows:

1. "increase involvement of the HBCUs in AID's program overseas";

2. "improve the ability of the HBCUs and other Title XII universities to provide quality technical assistance to LDCs and AID Missions in agriculture..."; and

3. "enhance overseas contract performance of paired institutions".

In the individual Joint Memoranda of Understanding (JMOUs) the priorities are expressed somewhat differently. Although the entire JMOU is written in a context of a partnership, the relative priority of the strengthening of the HBCU is unclear. The objectives are listed as follows:

1. "support current and foreseeable Title XII activities in order to enhance resources and capacity"; and

2. "otherwise mobilize professional and institutional resources...to participate in Title XII-related activities".

In AID's Guidelines for Annual Reporting issued in July, 1987, the general objectives of the previous documents were restated as five specific objectives:

1. Support of ongoing (Title XII) Contracts and Projects.

2. Support of Immediately Foreseeable Contracts and Projects. (At least 50% of the Program Support Grant was to apply to these first two objectives to meet the "agency's desire to have these funds used in ways that impact directly, as well as indirectly, on overall contract performance").

3. Support of Anticipated Contracts and Projects.

4. Support of Core Faculty.

5. Support of Joint Activities (to which no less than 20% of the PSG funds were to be applied).

Thus the relative priority of the two general objectives, the "increased involvement of the HBCUs in AID's...program overseas" and the enhanced impact on "contract performance" is somewhat clarified through the suggested allocation of funds. But clearly, both objectives are to be served by each partnership and each university.

The only specific measurable output required of the universities in the JMOU from the grant is the use of "best efforts" to provide a stated level of "Full Time Equivalents (FTEs)", i.e. person/years of regular university faculty employed in AID activities overseas through contract or grant with the institution (including, of course, subcontracts, work orders, and other similar mechanisms). The total for all 1862 institutions' participation was 385 FTEs in 5 years, i.e., 77 FTEs per year over the five year period or an average of 6.5 FTEs per 1862 university per year. The total for all 1890 institutions' participation was projected at 145 FTEs over the five year period; 29 FTEs per year or an average of 2.5 FTEs per 1890 university per year. A list of these FTE commitments by university is given in Annex 4.

Universities participating in the JMOU project were required to have "graduated" from the previous Title XII Strengthening Grant program. Partnerships between an 1862 institution and an 1890 institution were for the most part self-selected among those institutions AID had determined as eligible for the JMOU project.

The entire JMOU project was based upon AID's need for the increased participation of the universities in Title XII activities of the agency. Table 1 shows AID Title XII Annual Business by Year, a level which is declining.

22

Table 1. Title XII Annual Volume of Business with AID
1985-1988
($ millions)

		1985	1986	1987	1988
JMOU Universities:	1862	45.059	45.529	49.514	46.377
	1890	3.401	3.633	4.025	3.347
Non-JMOU Universities		63.881	69.128	61.000	49.001
Total Volume of Business		112.341	118.290	114.539	98.725

Source: AID: Summary of Title XII Universities Volume of Business with AID.

B. Project Funding and Operations

An authorization of $20 million was made for the life of the project through FY91. Cumulative obligations through FY89 are estimated at $12.3 million.

Pursuant to the JMOU and the follow-up Grant Agreement with each university, funds are provided yearly by AID to each university based on a formula using total "volume of business" of the school with AID under Title XII and the number of person/years supplied by the university from its regular staff for AID overseas activities ("Full Time Equivalents" or FTEs). In the case of the 1890 universities a minimum level of annual funding is set regardless of the formula referred to above. The total of all obligations through FY89 has been $12.3 million. The 1862 institutions have received approximately two-thirds of the total, with the 1890 institutions receiving approximately one-third of project funding. In 1989, grants were made to the 1862 institutions in a range from $87,750 to $242,200. Grants to the 1890 institutions were all identical at a level of $87,723. Table 2 lists PSG/JMOU funding by university. Tables 3 and 4 show the Volume of Business and FTE levels by university by year.

Table 2. PSG/JMOU Grants by University 1985-1989

University	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989
1.a. Alabama A&M	100,000	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. Kansas State	0	120,000	183,605	171,568	167,750
2.a. U. of Arkansas PB	126,320	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. Auburn	100,000	142,400	124,154	113,392	119,890
3.a. Florida A&M	30,000	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. North Carolina State	0	175,000	167,383	144,945	153,030
4.a. Fort Valley State	126,320	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. Ohio State	112,000	120,000	127,869	137,057	140,350
5.a. Lincoln	106,366	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. U. of Minnesota	200,000	194,712	180,284	196,218	205,660
6.a. U. of Maryland ES	0	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. U. of Illinois U-C	0	210,000	211,981	223,826	235,880
7.a. North Carolina A&T	62,123	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. Michigan State	300,000	243,000	242,200	235,659	226,130
8.a. Prairie View A&M	100,000	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. Texas A&M	254,507	240,666	152,731	143,959	153,030
9.a. Southern	0	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. Louisiana State	111,696	105,000	87,167	94,658	86,750
10.a. Tennessee State	65,547	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. New Mexico State	3,880	100,000	134,296	149,875	100,000
11.a. Tuskegee	112,371	104,000	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. Oregon State	0	220,000	242,200	238,616	315,880
12.a. Virginia State	63,730	0	90,000	88,742	87,723
b. U. of Wisconsin	0	193,000	150,784	169,595	222,230
Subtotal -					
a. 1890 Universities	892,777	1,144,000	1,080,000	1,064,904	1,052,676
b. 1862 Universities	1,082,083	2,063,778	2,004,654	2,019,368	2,126,580
TOTAL	1,974,860	3,207,778	3,084,654	3,084,272	3,179,256

Source: AID/ST/RUR Table.

Table 3. Volume of Business (in dollars) and Full Time Equivalents (in person-years) Reported by 1862 Institutions, 1985-1988

University	JMOU FTE	1985 FTE	1985 VOB	1986 FTE	1986 VOB	1987 FTE	1987 VOB	1988 FTE	1988 VOB
Auburn	7.00	6.67	1,016,765	7.85	1,049,319	8.29	1,321,089	7.46	2,073,382
U. of Illinois U-C	7.00	10.50	4,281,491	12.42	4,997,291	12.66	5,738,107	14.42	5,032,960
Kansas State	5.00	11.49	1,845,149	13.59	2,058,234	8.83	2,182,990	9.95	2,508,098
Louisiana State	5.00	6.60	1,257,638	5.37	661,696	5.86	1,052,797	4.94	1,878,544
Michigan State	7.00	14.75	5,241,229	13.82	4,562,088	11.02	4,743,326	12.60	5,479,598
U. of Minnesota	8.00	7.61	5,478,459	8.88	6,247,098	9.99	5,416,392	10.73	5,363,125
New Mexico State	6.00	9.46	3,457,782	9.02	2,824,433	5.98	2,764,797	6.25	2,018,558
North Carolina State	5.00	8.02	3,912,842	5.75	4.142,247	4.46	4,054,194	11.77	2,977,958
Ohio State	5.00	6.42	2,552,697	8.67	3,643,280	6.21	2,927,189	7.17	2,924,427
Oregon State	7.00	16.75	8,258,053	11.92	8,832,098	19.58	9,730,332	18.75	8,179,433
Texas A&M	8.00	3.71	4,494,242	7.02	3,970,895	7.79	4,095,565	7.52	3,572,949
U. of Wisconsin (Madison)	7.00	5.56	3,262,608	8.84	3,431,939	11.67	4,776,734	18.39	4,511,559
TOTAL	77.00	107.54	45,058,955	113.15	46,420,618	112.34	48,803,512	129.95	46,520,591

Source: ISTI Tables prepared for AID/ST/RUR.

Table 4. Volume of Business (in dollars) and Full Time Equivalents (in person-years) Reported by 1890 Institutions, 1985-1988

University	JMOU FTE	1985 FTE	1985 VOB	1986 FTE	1986 VOB	1987 FTE	1987 VOB	1988 FTE	1988 VOB
U. of Arkansas (PB)	3.00	0.17	158,798	0.46	241,551	0.11	41,071	0.04	25,065
U. of Maryland (ES)	3.00	2.25	312,557	2.00	323,469	2.95	803,996	2.97	849,871
Alabama A&M Univ.	2.00	0.15	483,918	1.20	541,324	1.37	613,108	1.40	440,548
Southern	2.00	2.42	984,738	2.83	546,829	1.17	345,865	1.75	264,621
North Carolina A&T	3.00	0.58	231,121	1.25	411,739	1.25	439,811	0.42	410,147
Lincoln	2.00	1.42	208,131	1.79	257,608	1.33	227,500	1.21	278,342
Tennessee State	2.00	0.00	104,906	0.00	118,725	0.08	210,476	1.10	208,222
Florida A&M	2.00	0.00	113,689	2.00	186,169	1.85	363,349	1.64	86,771
Fort Valley State	2.00	1.00	92,450	1.11	192,315	0.75	92,187	0.17	48,071
Tuskegee	3.00	1.25	415,103	1.24	540,387	0.93	326,063	1.31	421,983
Prairie View A&M	2.00	N/R	89,400	N/R	110,382	N/R	222,715	0.24	141,566
Virginia State	3.00	3.08	205,904	4.75	162,169	2.42	339,328	2.10	171,379
TOTAL	29.00	12.32	3,400,715	18.63	3,632,667	14.21	4,025,469	14.35	3,346,587

Source: ISTI Tables prepared for AID/ST/RUR.

The JMOU and Grant Agreements signed by the universities have no specific requirements regarding use of the funds, except in terms of percentage of expenditure allocated according to the five objectives described earlier. The Guidelines to the Annual Report state that "there is no exhaustive list of categories of activities" which can be financed with the funds but that certain "commonly used and understood terminology has developed" over the years governing their use. These categories are as follows:

a. Language Training
b. Predeparture Orientation
c. Administration Orientation
d. Research Support
e. Graduate Student Support
f. Faculty Overseas Internships
g. Library Development
h. Women in Development
i. Seminars, Workshops, and Symposia
j. Publication Development
k. Salary Support - Administrative and Clerical
l. Basic Faculty Salary Support (salary support not included in other activities)
m. Post-contract Faculty Salary Support
n. Travel (other than expended under other categories)
o. Other

Tables of expenditures by objective and by activity are given in Tables 5, 6, and 7 below. Table 5 shows that in the case of both 1862 and 1890 universities over 50% of project expenditure is spent on ongoing AID projects, and both groups spend about 11% of funds on joint activities.

In Tables 6 and 7, there are more marked differences among the universities in expenditure patters. For example, the 1890 universities spend a far larger percentage of the grant (50.3%) on administrative staff salary support than the 1862 universities (12.5%). The 1862 universities use a larger percentage of funds (35.1%) than the 1890 universities (18.3%) for faculty research/ salary support.

Table 5. Actual Expenditures by University by Objective, 1988

	Support of Ongoing AID Projects		Immediately Foreseeable Activities		Possible Future Activities		Support of Core Faculty		Joint Programs	
	AMOUNT	%	AMOUNT	%	AMOUNT	%	AMOUNT	%	AMOUNT	
1862 Universities										
Auburn	217,638	82.8	1,656	0.6	15,557	5.9	5,968	2.3	22,052	8.4
U. of Illinois U-C	390,513	67.2	0	0.0	42,024	7.2	20,552	3.5	128,253	22.1
Kansas State	284,589	61.8	107,667	23.4	59,722	13.0	0	0.0	8,212	1.8
Louisiana State	33,689	19.5	48,823	28.2	50,263	29.1	40,218	23.2	(38,899)	(22.5)
Michigan State	341,879	53.0	114,878	17.8	118,854	18.4	0	0.0	69,245	10.7
U. of Minnesota	231,039	57.7	25,866	6.5	132,539	33.1	0	0.0	10,756	2.7
New Mexico State	25,369	10.7	91,948	38.6	77,456	32.5	43,338	18.2	(50,884)	(21.4)
North Carolina State	46,524	15.3	74,297	24.4	77,666	25.5	72,295	23.7	34,218	11.2
io State	172,723	50.8	75,133	22.1	21,819	6.4	940	0.3	69,284	20.4
Oregon State	295,807	64.2	32,702	7.1	16,364	3.6	0	0.0	116,035	25.2
Texas A&M	262,024	84.4	2,651	0.9	44,627	14.4	1,178	0.4	(62,876)	(20.3)
U. of Wisconsin (Mad)	215,275	56.7	17,334	4.6	95,248	25.1	12,339	3.2	39,573	10.4
SUBTOTAL	2,517,069	55.2	592,955	13.0	752,139	16.5	196,828	4.3	497,628	10.9
1890 Universities										
U. of Arkansas (PB)	10,549	8.0	53,823	40.9	15,701	11.9	29,206	22.2	22,280	16.9
U. of Maryland (ES)	53,738	40.7	16,320	12.4	28,269	21.4	11,101	8.4	22,635	17.1
Alabama A&M	62,960	56.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	48,029	43.3	(766)	0.1
Southern	59,575	66.4	8,446	9.3	12,170	13.4	10,892	12.0	(14,218)	(15.6)
North Carolina A&T	21,000	15.0	58,000	41.4	33,000	23.5	0	0.0	28,242	20.1
Lincoln	25,220	17.0	60,863	41.1	62,158	41.9	0	0.0	(21,756)	(14.7)
Tennessee State	15,459	20.7	12,093	16.2	10,593	14.2	11,098	14.8	25,593	34.2
Florida A&M	45,164	34.5	12,605	9.6	8,379	6.4	64,606	49.4	(74,662)	(57.1)
Fort Valley State	13,350	10.5	8,300	6.5	46,952	36.9	0	0.0	58,624	46.1
Tuskegee	175,138	66.7	0	0.0	45,331	17.3	42,285	16.1	(54,022)	(20.6)
Prairie View A&M	90,356	66.5	17,535	12.9	26,977	19.9	0	0.0	1,000	0.7
Virginia State	165,132	81.3	0	0.0	4,188	21.0	2,556	1.3	31,258	15.4
SUTOTAL	737,641	43.7	247,985	14.7	293,718	17.4	219,773	13.0	189,632	11.2
TOTAL	3,254,710	52.1	840,940	13.5	1,045,857	16.7	416,601	6.7	687,260	11.0

Source: ISTI Tables prepared for AID/ST/RUR.

Table 6. Expenditures by Activity, 1987 - 88 Actual

Activity	1862 Universities Avg. Expend.	1862 Universities % of Grant	1890 Universities Avg. Expend.	1890 Universities % of Grant
1. Language Training	19,317	6.3	5,008	3.6
2. Faculty/staff orientation	8,828	2.9	2,212	1.6
3. Faculty research/salary support	108,587	35.1	25,573	18.3
4. Graduate student support	24,692	8.0	1,843	1.3
5. Faculty overseas internship	23,456	7.6	662	0.5
6. Women in development	9,993	3.2	1,801	1.3
7. Seminars, w/shops, lib. dev.	31,968	10.3	6,652	4.7
8. Adm. staff salary support	38,677	12.5	70,506	50.3
9. Post-cont. fac. sal. support	4,269	1.4	4,106	2.9
10. Travel	13,565	4.4	15,580	11.1
11. Other	25,637	8.3	6,107	4.4
SUBTOTALS	308,989	100	140,050	100

Source: ISTI Tables prepared for AID/ST/RUR.

Table 7. Expenditures by Activity, 1988 - 89 Forward Work Plan

Activity	1862 Universities Avg. Expend.	1862 Universities % of Grant	1890 Universities Avg. Expend.	1890 Universities % of Grant
1. Language Training	26,186	5.9	12,182	6.4
2. Faculty/staff orientation	11,316	2.5	8,992	4.7
3. Faculty research/salary support	183,786	41.2	44,753	23.6
4. Graduate student support	19,446	4.4	5,038	2.7
5. Faculty overseas internship	32,531	7.3	15,157	8.0
6. Women in development	14,772	3.3	3,244	1.7
7. Seminars, w/shops, lib. dev.	39,833	8.9	11,405	6.0
8. Adm. staff salary support	43,640	9.8	55,522	29.3
9. Post-cont. fac. sal. support	26,426	5.9	900	0.5
10. Travel	26,493	5.9	22,545	11.9
11. Other	21,718	4.9	9,794	5.2
SUBTOTALS	446,147	100	189,532	100

Source: ISTI Tables prepared for AID/ST/RUR.

Monitoring of the JMOU project by each university is generally under the responsibility of the Director of International Programs or similar senior administrator of the university or within the College of Agriculture.

AID management is located in the Research and University Relations Office (RUR) of the Bureau of Science and Technology (S&T). That office is assisted by a management contract with the International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI), responsible for developing a data base for the project, analyzing project reporting and expenditure and generally assisting AID in project management. Monitoring is carried out through an Annual Report from each of the participating universities describing accomplishments under the project with accompanying financial reporting and a Forward Work Plan describing proposed activities over the coming year and related projected expenditures. Information is also given on the volume of business and FTE levels by university as a basis for calculating expected funding.

AID monitoring has also included an annual site visit to one university of each partnership at which representatives from the partner institution were also present.

V. Conclusions, Rationale and Recommendations

The following sections present the major conclusions of the evaluation, the rationale for those conclusions, and the operational recommendations that result. They are grouped according to the following categories:

- Conclusions Related to Project Image
- Conclusions Related to Project Goals, Purposes, Objectives, and Outputs
- Conclusions Related to Project Partnerships
- Conclusions Related to Project Funding, Management, and Monitoring
- Other Conclusions Related to Efficiency, Impact, and Sustainability

V.A. Conclusions Related to Project Image

Conclusion A1: The widespread perception of the project in AID as an "entitlement" directed to benefitting the university rather than to LDC needs is a significant obstacle to the achievement of project purpose. It should be addressed forthrightly by AID.

In reviewing the project with each of the participating parties - AID project management, the 1890 institutions, the 1862 universities, and the broader AID community - there are certain key differences in perception which are notable. The most damaging of these is the widespread and hostile view of the project within AID (outside of the office directly responsible for the project) as an unwarranted "entitlement" not subject to normal AID review and evaluation.

Personnel in the 1890 universities perceive the project as having been most useful in introducing faculty to the problems of the developing countries and to the process of participation in overseas work. Their association in a formal project with the more experienced 1862 institutions, and other 1890 institutions with which frequent interchange is facilitated, has been of major institutional value. On the other hand there is some feeling that too large a percentage of the resources available go to the already-strengthened and well-experienced 1862 universities and that too small a proportion of the funds going to the 1862 institutions is devoted to joint activities. More strongly, there is widespread frustration with the lack of concrete overseas activity available to them through AID. This is seen largely as a result of deficiencies in AID's procurement practices.

The view from the 1862 institutions is similar in the sense of the perceived usefulness of the JMOU project, but goes even farther. Many point out that far from an "entitlement", the present JMOU project is necessary to cover real costs to the universities of providing services to AID. Examples are given and frustration is expressed that this fact, coupled with the very significant matching grant from the universities toward AID activities should be more widely acknowledged within AID. As in the case of the 1890 institutions, there is increasing frustration with the reductions in AID business and the difficulty in maintaining faculty interest and commitment without tangible overseas activity.

Discussion of the JMOU project within AID (and outside the RUR Office of the Science and Technology Bureau) was unanimously and strongly negative, if not hostile. The project was termed an "entitlement" and a "political payoff" for which normal AID direction and analysis of project output and effectiveness could not be applied.

The project is seen as running counter to the institutional ethos in which AID officers are immersed and which usually involves the following elements:

- activities funded by AID should be justified based on eventual impact in the developing countries on high priority problems and opportunities for improvement;

- there should be measurable performance targets regarding effects on the LDCs;

- AID funding should be on the basis of funds for verifiable and quantifiable output products as well as proper management of funds;

- open competition for services is almost always best.

There was little awareness of (and great skepticism regarding) the difference between the JMOU project and the predecessor "strengthening" projects which had been strongly criticized by the Inspector General and the General Accounting Office. Regional Bureau and Mission representatives, when asked, stated no significant programmatic benefit or contribution to AID from JMOU. While most acknowledged the important contribution of the land-grant institutions in the agricultural and rural development activities of the agency (particularly in institution-building), they unanimously concluded that the resources of these universities should be brought to bear through the normal competitive bidding process and that the full cost of services provided should be paid for through the contracting mechanism (or if a specific AID need warranted, through a demand-driven, output-oriented grant agreement). There was some feeling that the most important and unique contribution that the U.S. university could make was in the form of a long-term institutional linkage with developing country institutions and that the JMOU project did not directly contribute to that effort.

There was more support for the goals of the JMOU project with respect to the 1890 institutions (in the case of those who were aware that such institutions were involved in the project). This was justified, not on the basis of AID need rigorously determined, but on other grounds of a domestic nature and the usefulness of possible future institutional linkages. There was strong support for continued "special assistance" to the HBCUs, although even here the strong preference was that such "assistance" be through work in the LDC's having an tangible and measurable output.

University representatives acknowledged the negative perception of the project within AID and stated that this sometimes constitutes a difficult obstacle to project implementation, especially securing Mission agreement of international travel. They also acknowledge that Mission and Regional Bureau "misunderstanding" of the project constitutes a factor in Mission resistance to add-on project elements in which the universities have a strong interest and to Title XII activities in general. They believe that over the long term Mission resistance is an important factor in the reduction of AID business going to the universities; this is particularly true

with increased delegation of authority to the field Missions in the project design, approval and implementation process.

Recommendations:

Recommendation A1: The JMOU project, in its present form, runs counter to AID institutional ethos, and should be brought to an orderly termination.

Recommendation A2: As discussed more fully later in this paper, the S&T Bureau should develop a follow-on project in which there is increased consensus within AID and with the universities on the nature and priority of project output as they relate to impact on the AID program abroad and the opportunities to benefit LDCs.

Recommendation A3: In the final years of the present project reporting and "information dissemination" should be based less exclusively on the "use of funds" and more extensively on actual products produced under the project as they relate to AID programs abroad and opportunities to benefit LDCs.

B. Conclusions Related to Project Goals, Objectives and Outputs

Overall Accomplishments

Conclusion B1: The PSG/JMOU project has made contributions in both the quantity and quality of U.S. universities' participation in international development activities and thus may have marginally improved the quality of AID assistance projects.

The PSG/JMOU, building on the interest and capabilities developed as a result of its predecessor projects (the 211d and the Strengthening Grant programs), has benefited AID programs in the following ways:

- direct supplementation of AID overseas contracts through project add-on activities initiated by the universities with the approval of the Missions, e.g. supplementary research activities, impact surveys not provided for in the basic contract, continuation of participant sponsorship when premature cutoff was mandated by contract termination, etc.

- financing pre-contract and post-contract salary costs of faculty assigned long-term to AID contracts; since such costs were often neither included in the contract nor possible from the university's own funds, failure to provide such funding would have resulted in at least some cases in the universities being unable to participate in the overseas work;

- expanding the supply of services potentially available to AID through direct funding of proposal preparation thus giving AID a wider choice of expertise upon which to draw in response to its RFPs and other requests for assistance;

- providing, along with the HBCU Research Grant program, the principal channel through which the 1890 institutions could be introduced to development assistance work;

- motivating universities to reform internal policies and procedures, e.g. faculty promotion policy, etc. to increase incentive for university talent to participate professionally in AID programs; related, is the application of universities' own resources in the form of matching funds (totalling some $8.4 million from 1986 through 1989) which would not have been forthcoming without the stimulation of the PSG/JMOU project;

- expanding faculty and department interest and involvement in development issues, e.g. through research support, travel opportunities, etc. Not only has this resulted in a greater supply of talent upon which AID can draw within the universities, but, perhaps more importantly has resulted in the initiation of long-term research interests and contacts in the developing countries on the part of individual faculty members which are subsequently maintained by professional interest totally independent of AID financing;

- significantly expanding, through the universities, the contact and outreach of professional and commercial groups , e.g. specific crop producer associations, livestock producers, extension services, etc. within the states and communities; these contacts are having an unmeasurable but nevertheless real impact stimulating increased participation of U.S. domestic groups in the international economy.

Conclusion B2: Most of the accomplishments of the JMOU Project and its contribution to AID's overseas programs meeting LDC needs are not measurable outputs. More important, the JMOU project is not achieving its stated objectives as efficiently as would be possible under a restructured project. (Section VI deals with the efficiency (cost-effectiveness) of the JMOU project for contributing to AID programs abroad and for meeting LDC needs.)

As stated above in the project description, the outputs of the project in its original design are expressed in unmeasurable terms, and no benchmarks exist as to when, if ever, project purpose has been achieved. The stated outputs of the project are "mobilized resources", "strengthened capability", "broadened participation" and "increased commitment". It is this element of intangible and unverifiable output which runs counter to the AID institutional ethos as applied, at least in theory, to virtually all of AID's other projects and programs. This is also an important source of resistance within the agency to full support of the JMOU project and other related activities.

The Joint Memorandum of Understanding commits the recipient university to only one output subject to unequivocal, quantifiable verification, namely the number of person/years (or "Full Time Equivalents" - FTEs) of professional service overseas related to AID activities. Other AID contracts are the source of the funds to pay for the FTEs. This "output", however, is not within the total or even primary control of the universities themselves. It is dependent on both the magnitude of AID business in the relevant fields of specialization, the size of the Title XII pool of funds, and on the competition for AID business from other universities and from non-university suppliers. The FTE output target has not been met (or even approached) in the case of the 1890 institutions which were to have been the primary beneficiaries of the project. The target was 29 FTEs for the twelve 1890 universities per year compared to 12.32 FTEs in FY85 before the JMOU project. The target seems worthy, but performance has not improved significantly -- i.e. 18.63 FTEs in FY86, 14.21 FTEs in FY87 and 14.35 FTEs in FY88. In the case of the 1862 institutions the targets were exceeded even before the project began, calling into question whether the project was necessary at all to achieve the very modest goals set in the JMOU (see Tables 3 and 4). The target was 77 FTEs for the twelve 1862 universities compared to 107.54 FTEs in FY85 <u>before</u> the JMOU project. Performance has improved over time to 113.15 FTEs (FY86), 112.34 FTEs (FY87), and 129.95 FTEs (FY88). Thus there appears to be an increasing inconsistency between the "resources mobilized" under the project and real programmatic needs of AID as reflected in its procurements from the JMOU institutions.

A related element in judgement of overall efficiency (cost-effectiveness) is the question of the priority of many of the "accomplishments"; AID Regional Bureau/Mission judgment differs increasingly from that of the universities. Some project support activities of high interest and priority to the universities is of low or marginal interest to the Missions. Insofar as agreement can be reached at the time of contract or grant signature on the priority of all activities related to a project financed by AID and provision of full funding of those activities through the contract mechanism, Mission - university dispute over priority can be minimized.

Finally, there is a whole range of activities for which funding is used under this project on which there is a wide consensus within AID that such activities are of no direct benefit to the developing countries or to AID; e.g. library development, clerical support to university offices, equipment and supplies for university activities, etc.

Conclusion B3: The decline of Title XII activity is likely to continue and the universities must adapt themselves to that situation. However, some modifications in AID procurement practice might also be warranted.

It is not possible to analyze the PSG/JMOU project without at the same time reviewing AID's procurement practice as it relates to the universities.

As was noted in the GAO report of April, 1989 on University Participation in AID programs there has been and continues to be a marked decline in Title XII activity and in the number of Title XII-type projects. That trend shows no sign of being reversed.

Rising to a peak in 1982, the number of new starts in Title XII-type projects has declined by more than one half each year. Furthermore, the GAO's analysis showed that by the end of 1990, about 75% of the 142 projects ongoing in 1989 will have terminated. To take the Latin America/Caribbean Region as an example, there is expected to be no new Title XII activity begun in 1989, and a representative of that Bureau foresaw no additional Title XII initiatives at all. At the same time, new activities with universities were expected to reach $60 million in 1989, all through open competition and almost all in joint activities with private firms. The decline of Title XII business, as has been noted elsewhere, is due to several factors:

- the decline of AID involvement in large institution-building activities;
- the decline in the 103 account for food, agriculture, and rural development and the earmarking of funds for other purposes within that account;
- the configuration of Mission programs with larger units of management involving increased private sector and marketing elements for which private sector contractors are often preferred; and
- the strong preference of AID managers and host country project leadership for fully open competition in procurement of services and strong resistance to "set-asides".

The result has been a sharp decline in the success rate of proposals prepared by the universities carried out under this project. This demoralizes faculty departments with funds that this project is supposed to "mobilize". The unsuccessful efforts repeatedly made to win AID contracts and the demoralization run counter to the objective of the JMOU project.

Expressed in economic terms, it seems increasingly that AID is using funds under this project to develop a supply which is not matched by effective demand. Put another way, a certain part (unmeasurable, but significant) of this project may be "mobilizing resources" for yesterday's needs rather than tomorrow's opportunities.

Procurement Practice: The trend noted above has been particularly devastating to the hopes of the 1890 institutions which had few previous overseas projects of their own. The reduction in the overseas contracts in relevant fields being undertaken by their partner institution also severely limits the opportunity for overseas experience of the 1890 faculty.

More important, though, is the general "exaggeration of requirements" in RFPs originating in the Missions. All universities note the "inflation" of requirements, particularly the number of years experience in country, in the region or overseas that are required in many Mission RFPs. Such requirements and inflated technical requirements unrelated to the real needs of the project serve to severely limit competition among potential suppliers. They involve the HBCU's in a Catch 22 situation of needing overseas experience to qualify for AID work, yet being unable to get that experience because of inflated RFP requirements. The problem is becoming more pronounced because of the increased decentralization of procurement in AID and greater host country involvement in that procurement -- involvement that is not necessarily matched with a knowledge of U.S. institutional and individual capabilities.

Some universities argue that the solution is to increase the use of a set-aside, but it seems likely that, even if it were feasible within government procurement regulations, that would only exacerbate the present disagreements between AID mission management and the university community. Far more promising is to find common ground in the identification of LDC needs which Missions regard as high priority and which universities, especially the HBCU's, have real resources to address. The HBCU Institutional Linkage Grant, discussed more fully below, seems to meet those criteria.

In summary, there is an increasing discrepancy between the resources "mobilized" under this project and the effective demand (as distinct from the developmental need) for those resources.

Recommendation B1: AID should attempt to bring supply more into line with effective demand by relying more completely on the contract process to "mobilize" and use the resources of the 1862 institutions.

Recommendation B2: AID should consider development of a program of Institutional Linkage Grants suitable to HBCU's to make fruitful use of university resources "mobilized" under the JMOU project by using them for development needs accepted by the AID Missions and Regional Bureaus.

Recommendation B3: AID should periodically review the realism of Mission issued RFP's to avoid gratuitous requirements that close out the 1890 universities and other potential bidders who could do the work abroad.

1890 Universities

Conclusion B4: The substantial contributions of the JMOU project to the institutional strengthening of the HBCU's has not been matched by hoped-for involvement in practical AID work overseas. A new mechanism should be considered.

The increased involvement of the 1890 universities in AID activities overseas was emphasized in the Project Authorization as the primary objective to which the continued "strengthening" and "broadening" of institutional capacity and commitment on the part of the 1862 universities was clearly secondary. (This sense of priority was not carried through in the other project documents). In fact, that "involvement" as illustrated in Table 4 has not increased significantly in terms of FTEs; nor has there been any significant increase in terms of volume of business, after the expenditure of over $4 million through the JMOU project alone. Thus the benefits of the project to the 1890 institutions which are real have not been matched with tangible overseas work for the universities involving real programs in the developing countries for which they have direct responsibility.

In general the project has greatly expanded the knowledge, interest, and competence of the 1890 universities in international development activities in general and in AID operations in particular. While experience and degree of sophistication varied among the institutions at the beginning of the JMOU, the project has constituted a useful mechanism for some of the following changes:

- Increased knowledge of AID process of project design, approval, and implementation including proposal writing, budget preparation, evaluation techniques, and financial management.

- Through greater exposure to the developing country environment, greater knowledge of developing country needs, capabilities, resources, and cultural and socio-economic characteristics.

- Greater familiarity with other donor agencies and institutions involved in development activities, including other universities and consortia with which potential collaboration may be possible.

- Some specific overseas project experience primarily through the ongoing projects of the 1862 partner university.

Conclusion B5: Some 1890 institutions have developed a "strong performance profile" which is promising for future contribution to AID programs. Other 1890 institutions with a "weak performance profile" need additional guidance and assistance to use their JMOU funds productively.

All 1890 institutions can point to the qualitative progress noted above, but the effectiveness of the university's use of the JMOU funds differs among 1890 institutions. A "strong performance profile" and "weak performance profile" are increasingly apparent among the HBCU's.

The "strong performance profile" is characterized by:

- a growing sense of a "marketing strategy" involving an increasingly clear assessment of the institution's strengths and priorities;

- a careful analysis of potential contract opportunities;

- increasingly focussed use of funds (e.g. for travel, workshops, etc.) in conformity with the "marketing strategy"; and

- vigorous pursuit of opportunities offered by partner institutions (both JMOU partner and other potential partners), and, as importantly vigorous pursuit directly with developing country institutions themselves.

The alternative situation in which some institutions fall can be characterized as a "weak performance profile" and involves the following:

- little or no sense of a "marketing strategy", even potentially, and perception of the JMOU as essentially a deserved subsidy to the university;

- unfocussed use of funds for disparate campus activities with little or no LDC impact (e.g. hosting "dignitaries", building library, undirected travel, and disparate workshop attendance);

- use of the largest share of the funds for project administration and related clerical services and supplies;

- less than vigorous pursuit of overseas opportunities with the JMOU partner and with other potential partners.

While probably no institution would fit the second category completely, close to half seem to more nearly meet that profile than the first.

Recommendations:

Recommendation B4: AID project management, in collaboration with representatives of the 1890 institutions, to encourage "strong performance profiles" should refine the consensus about what constitutes a "success-oriented" JMOU pattern of activity. Examples of promising HBCU programs should be distributed and inter-university dialogue expanded.

Recommendation B5: Both 1890 and 1862 universities should be required to prepare a plan for "institutional development and marketing" with a strategy which will guide their use of funds under this project. (This is discussed more fully in a later section.)

Recommendation B6: HBCUs should have maximum flexibility in collaborating with each other to strengthen their "marketing strategy" and such use of funds should be considered eligible under the JMOU project, in addition to the use of funds to collaborate with the principal partner institution.

Recommendation B7: AID should increasingly (most likely in a follow-on project) direct funding to those 1890 institutions with a "strong performance profile" instead of continuing to fund all institutions equally regardless of performance and potential.

HBCU Institutional Linkage Grants

There is a very tangible unmet need identified by the Regional Bureaus and Mission Directors that HBCUs are well suited to fill, in spite of the fact that the present project is not resulting in as many overseas project opportunities as foreseen and as the 1890 institutions consider necessary to sustain faculty interest in the project. That need is one for long-term institutional linkage with institutions in developing countries,

particularly those serving rural and disadvantaged populations in improving productive skills. This is a role that has been filled by the 1890 institutions in their own states.

Long-term institution-building projects have declined within AID for many reasons, reasons that are unlikely to be reversed in the near future. Yet no greater development priority exists than increasing the productive capabilities of the mass of the population through relevant skills training and development of managerial capacity. Small, rural based, practical institutions with wide community outreach are essential, but in very short supply. It is precisely here that the HBCUs have excelled within their own states in the U.S.; the transfer of such experience could be invaluable to the LDCs. It could also be a key mechanism for providing the HBCU with increased opportunity for needed LDC experience. The non-contractual long-term institutional linkage between specific U.S. institutions, free of the day-to-day administrative involvement of the USAID, but in which clear outputs are expected has wide support within AID. It is the basis for the widespread acceptance and use of the PVO Grant mechanism. The very fact of long-term interest and involvement of a U.S. institution in a less structured relationship with an LDC institution, with mutual advantage to both in the continuous interchange, is widely accepted within AID. As in the case of the PVO Grant program, the sponsoring U.S. institution would have to prepare a responsible proposal with clear objectives and related budget for possible AID funding. Provision could be made that perhaps 10% - 20% of the funds be spent in procuring the services of an 1862 (or another 1890) university, thus preserving the partnership element of the present JMOU project. Naturally, participation in such a project, if one were developed, would in no way limit HBCU involvement and competition, as now for all the grants and contractual work with AID it could secure under the normal contracting process.

Recommendations:

Recommendation B8: AID RUR/S&T should open dialogue with the universities and with the rest of AID on the desirability and feasibility of establishing at a future date an HBCU Institutional Linkage Grant program. If such a program is feasible, HBCUs should be encouraged to use some of the funds under the present project to undertake travel and proposal design activities necessary for participation in that future project.

1862 Universities

Recommendation B5: The support of the 1862 institutions to ongoing and prospective AID projects both through the AID-provided funds and university Matching Funds continues to be

substantial. However, the JMOU mechanism is not the most cost-effective mechanism for achieving that goal.

The JMOU and its predecessor projects have made it possible to bring increased university talent, research efforts, and institutional commitment to bear on AID projects overseas. The major share of the achievements of the project listed at the beginning are in fact the contribution of the 1862 institutions. This has been achieved through highly flexible funding of add-on project activity and related research and other efforts on campus, proposal preparation, funding of transition costs of project personnel, activities aimed at expanded faculty participation in efforts related to developing country issues, and administration of international programs. Some of this expanded university interest has extended beyond the universities to commercial and professional groups in the U.S. to the benefit both of the U.S. and developing country institutions involved in the contacts.

Jn accordance with AID's intentions, funds available under the JMOU project are now being used primarily to "support" directly ongoing AID projects and to develop proposals in response to AID RFP's. In comparison to the HBCUs:

- a far larger percentage of funds are spent in support of ongoing AID projects;
- a far smaller percentage is spent on project administration;
- far more is spent on faculty research and salary support and overseas internships related to project activity.

In the case of a few of the 1862 institutions, however, the earlier pattern of the strengthening grant is maintained, contrary to AID's instructions: e.g. major library development, disparate workshops without focus or rationale. In some, there is a clear sense of the marketing strategy approach referred to above as a "strong performance profile" including policy changes within the university to promote a more entrepreneurial environment needed to do AID work.

The principal opposition to the JMOU project within AID is related to the 1862 institutions. It consists of essentially these ideas:

- The 1862 schools are highly sophisticated with 20 years or more of AID contracting experience and top-off grants in the form of 211d, strengthening grants and the JMOU; at what point, if ever, will they be sufficiently "strengthened" to do their overseas work

with AID through output-oriented contracts and possibly in some cases individualized grants, but related to a desirable, verifiable output?

- Admittedly AID may not be financing the real total costs of services of these universities including necessary transition costs of faculty serving on projects; likewise, overhead reimbursed by AID to the universities may not be sufficient to cover the real indirect costs which AID is forced to cover in the case of private firms or private universities, or even land-grant universities which do large amounts of contractual work with AID now without benefit of the JMOU grant.

- Admittedly, too, present university practices may be such that indirect cost recoveries to the faculty and department carrying out the contract are too low to provide continuing incentive, and furthermore such practices may not be easy to change in the short term.

- Nevertheless, services of 1862 universities in the JMOU project should be provided totally through contract, as are those of universities unrelated to the JMOU project, and those of private universities.

The views of the Mission Directors on university performance recently solicited by the Administrator confirms more recent discussions in at least one important respect: there is widespread feeling within AID, shared within the universities, that the need for post-contract (or non-contract) institutional linkage between the U.S. universities and LDC counterpart institutions is of immense importance and is not now being met. This has already been discussed under the section on 1890 universities above. Such a relationship, again with similarities to the PVO Grant program, could provide for longer-term interaction between 1862 institutions and LDC institutions without the day-to-day involvement of AID implied in the normal AID - contractor relationship. While it would be highly flexible, it would have verifiable and measurable outputs, and those outputs would primarily relate to conditions in and performance of an LDC institution rather than to changes on a U.S. campus.

Recommendations:

Recommendation B9: AID RUR/S&Ts should initiate dialogue with other involved offices in AID and with the 1862 institutions to determine the feasibility and desirability of AID financing the "real costs" of needed university services through the contract mechanism (or through individualized grant agreement with verifiable goals and measurable outputs). This would imply AID paying an adequate overhead allowance to meet project-related

45

costs now financed through the JMOU. It would also imply review (and in some cases modifications) in procedures within the university system for allocating overhead recoveries in a way that maintains incentive to academic departments providing services.

Recommendation B10: AID should then consider using funds thus freed from the JMOU for more output-oriented, demand-related Institutional Linkage grants with the 1862 institutions similar to those recommended above for the 1890 institutions.

C. Conclusions Related to JMOU Project Partnerships

Conclusion C1: The basic approach of a JMOU partnership between the 1862 and the 1890 institution has been beneficial for both parties and for AID. The combination of flexibility and continuity built into the partnership is the key to its success.

The origin of the individual partnerships under the project in many cases preceded the initiation of the project, although some were formed immediately prior to the project in anticipation of AID financing. While experience differs among the partnerships, in no case did any institution express the desire to dissolve the relationship and in the vast majority there was great optimism for increased cooperation in the future. It seems that the goodwill and evolving cooperative arrangements between the partners in many cases is becoming so strong that they will expand into other fields and continue regardless of AID's involvement. This must be regarded as one of the principal successes of the JMOU project.

The benefit to the 1890 institutions of the JMOU partnership is most obvious. At the beginning of the project many 1890 institutions had little experience in overseas assistance activities; the ongoing program of the 1862 university has in many cases provided a ready-made opportunity for increasing faculty overseas experience at the 1890 universities. Equally important, the partnership has vastly increased 1890 institutions' knowledge of practices and procedures related to overseas operations: proposal and budget preparation, contract negotiation, financial management, etc. Nevertheless, all of these experiences, however valuable, are no substitute for the practical involvement with developing country institutions in programs in which the HBCU is held accountable for success or failure.

While less obvious, the benefits of the JMOU partnership to the 1862 institutions are widely acknowledged by those institutions also. The faculty and institution support each other's efforts, and when these efforts are carefully orchestrated, they strengthen project proposals of the 1862 university and the capability to respond to needs for short-term

technical assistance. Training in some cases is more appropriate at the 1890 institution than at the 1862 institution. Joint participation in conferences and workshops, predeparture orientation, language training, exchange of scientists, preparation of joint promotional materials etc. has benefitted both institutions.

In the case of the least successful JMOU partnerships, one or more of the following factors contribute:

- The "overseas experience requirement" in the RFPs, which exaggerated the low volume of AID business going to the universities has already been discussed; there are many more unsuccessful joint proposals prepared as a result of this JMOU project than successful ones, probably on an order of five or six failures to one success, although data are not available in the Annual Reports as presently constituted).

- Ongoing activities of one partner, usually the 1862 university, may not be conducive to large-scale participation of the other institution; often they are in a field which is not a strong element in the other institution's "marketing strategy". (The resulting importance in increased flexibility for the 1890 institutions with respect to the rule that 50% of the JMOU funds must be spent in support of ongoing projects is discussed in the next section.)

- Frequent personnel changes and reorganizations at a few of the 1890 institutions have been cited as a deterrent to joint activities.

- In some cases, there is resistance on the part of host country personnel and to a lesser extent Mission personnel to accept large-scale involvement of the 1890 institution or to use that institution for training.

- In some cases, there is passivity on the part of the 1890 institution so that all initiative must be generated by the 1862 institution; this relates to those institutions with the "weak performance profile", lacking a sense of "marketing strategy" as discussed earlier.

- In some other cases, there was a lack of active pursuit at the beginning of the JMOU project on the part of 1862 universities in involving their partners in ongoing activities; virtually all 1862 universities seem to be attempting now to involve their partners in new proposals.

- There is limited faculty depth in some of the 1890 institutions, so that making a person available for a full-time assignment overseas (or even short-term work) is far more burdensome than for an 1862 institution; salary differentials overseas between 1890 faculty and 1862 faculty has also been cited as a managerial difficulty.

With all of these difficulties, however, the partnership mechanism must be regarded as one of the major successes of the JMOU project, primarily because it is so regarded by most of the universities. This success is attributable to an effective combination of flexibility and continuity. Flexibility exists to work with any other institution as the opportunity arises in pursuing overseas business. This is increasingly important to the 1890 institutions in developing joint activities among themselves. On the other hand, the existence of a "primary partner" formalized through the JMOU encourages longer-term personal and institutional relationships which are increasingly valued by the participating universities.

Recommendations:

Recommendation C1: The partnership arrangement between 1862 and 1890 institutions with its combination of flexibility and continuity should continue to be strengthened under the JMOU project and encouraged in follow-on activities.

Recommendation C2: Great flexibility should be allowed the 1890 institutions to use funds for joint activities, in combination with eligible institutions other than its primary partner. This applies particularly to encouraging greater cooperation and "marketing" by groups of 1890 institutions.

D. Conclusions Related to Project Funding, Management and Monitoring

Project Funding

Conclusions:

Conclusion D1: This project differs from most AID activities in the sense that levels of funding under the project are set by formula related to factors external to the project itself. It is not related to the quantity and quality of the activities proposed for financing. There is thus little or no flexibility on the part of AID management to foster better university performance under the grant through changes in funding.

Conclusion D2: If AID funding decreases, it will be preferable to reduce the number of recipient institutions than to

sliver and slice available funds even more with equally distributed, across-the-board cuts. At some point the administrative burden is greater than the benefit and that point is being approached in some cases.

Conclusion D3: Conclusion: Funding by formula eliminates the need for value judgments on the part of AID management, but there is no substitute over time for making funding decisions that take into consideration institutional performance under the grant.

Funding levels for each university under the JMOU are given in Table 2 above. As explained there, the levels are determined in the case of the 1862 institutions on the basis of FTEs and volume of AID business. In the case of the 1890 institutions, a minimum level is set, this year at $87,723 per institution, which is provided to all universities regardless of performance.

The use of the formula was initiated to avoid some of the criticism of the JMOU predecessor projects where use of funds in some cases had little or no relationship to AID business, real or potential. By relating funding levels in the case of the 1862 institutions to volume of business and FTEs, funding was directed to those most successful in winning AID business. Also by requiring that no less than 50% of the funds be spent in "support" of ongoing and immediately foreseeable AID projects, it was hoped that the entire JMOU project would be more directly supportive of the normal AID program. That result has largely been achieved by the 1862 universities (with 1 or 2 notable exceptions in which funds are still used for "strengthening purposes"). The real issue remains as stated in the beginning of this paper: the priority and value of those "support" activities and whether or not some of them should be included in the AID Mission-funded project contracts. Strong differences in Regional Bureau and university perspectives remain on this point.

The requirement for the 1890 universities to spend 50% of the funds in support of ongoing and immediately foreseeable projects, while well intentioned, may not always be in the best interests of the project. In most cases the projects of the 1862 partner offer useful opportunity for increasing the overseas experience of faculty of the 1890 institution, but not always. In some cases the particular active overseas project of the partner is in an area which is not the strong point of the 1890 institution and one which would not be in a sensible "marketing strategy" for the 1890 university. In such cases, a strong case could be made for using funds for a first priority "marketing" or proposal- development purpose rather than a low priority add-on to an existing project. The danger, however, is that once opening the door to exceptions, funds will be used increasingly for administration and clerical support, already excessive in the 1890 universities. Nevertheless, additional flexibility should be

considered but only within the context of an articulated "institutional development and marketing strategy" set forth by the university.

The five categories of objectives to which funds are to be related are somewhat ambiguous and by no means mutually exclusive. (They are: support of ongoing projects, immediately foreseeable projects, anticipated projects, core faculty, and joint activities). Some simplification should be considered, perhaps by compressing them into three categories: support of ongoing projects or signed contracts, support of anticipated projects and contracts, and joint activities. (This last category, as now would combine add and non-add items).

Use of funds is highly flexible, and for this reason there are almost no cases of AID's disallowing an expenditure even though some are peripheral to support of ongoing or potential AID activities. (AID does on occasion refuse permission for international travel if such travel seems inappropriate.) The value of continuity suggests retaining the present categories of expenditure, but it would be helpful to some institutions (and for improving the evaluation capability of the project in general) for AID to provide through illustration what it considers the most useful pattern of activity in each of the expenditure categories (language training, etc.). Some flexibility must be retained but increasingly in relation to an articulated institutional development and marketing strategy.

Recommendations:

Recommendation D1: Recommendation: In any follow-on project funding levels should at least in part reflect the programmatic use of the funds within the project itself. It should not be totally set by external formula.

Recommendation D2: While retaining the general requirement that 50% of the funds be spent on ongoing activities, AID should allow on an exceptional basis use of funds for other purposes justified within the context of a well-articulated institutional development and of a marketing strategy approved by AID.

Recommendation D3: Further AID guidance should be given on: a) the necessity of each university preparing a plan with an institutional development and marketing strategy which will generally guide their use of the funds, and b) illustrations of what AID would consider higher priority and lower priority expenditure pattern in the categories of expenditures.

The Annual Report and Forward Work Plan

Conclusion D4: The Annual Report and Forward Work Plan are adequate mechanisms for project monitoring of expenditures and activities. However, they do not adequately orient attention to achievements and contribution to LDC programs.

The principal mechanism for monitoring project progress is through the Annual Report and Forward Work Plan required of each recipient university once a year. It consists primarily of an Executive Summary, a Report of Accomplishments, a Forward Work Plan, and Grant Funding Data.

In September, 1987, RUR issued a new set of guidelines for the Annual Report. This was a most useful standardization of what had previously been haphazard reporting at best. For the most part these guidelines have been well accepted by the universities, and the reporting requirements under the project are considered reasonable by both the universities and AID.

The quality of the reporting varies widely among the universities. The relationship between the particular activities described and the accompanying budget tables is often unclear. There is often no discernable institutional strategy which guides use of the funds under the grant. Furthermore, the organization and presentation of the report suffer from the ambiguity described above in the various "objectives" of the project.

As referred to earlier, the JMOU project has been monitored principally on the basis of the profile of expenditures, and the Annual Report contributes to that weakness. Under each category of expenditure (e.g. language training, faculty salary support, etc.) a quantitative statement of the product produced (e.g. how many trained in languages for how long with what results, number of project proposals prepared and their successfulness, etc.) are needed to make any judgment of the efficiency in the use of the funds by the universities.

Recommendations:

Recommendation D4: The JMOU Annual Report and JMOU Forward Work Plan are important and can be made to be adequate mechanisms for project monitoring and should be continued.

Recommendation D5: The Guidelines should be supplemented to: a) emphasize the importance of project strategy, guiding rationale, and multi-year goal rather than a list of disparate activities; b) provide quantitative reporting on major project outputs; c) relate clearly the funding proposed to activities completed or planned.

Recommendation D6: One or more examples of exceptionally well-prepared JMOU Annual Reports and accompanying budget

material (e.g. that from the University of Illinois) should be distributed to all universities as a model.

Recommendation D7: In the absence of an adequate report and Forward Work Plan and accompanying funding materials, the JMOU grant should be held up until the university has complied with the guidelines.

University and AID Management

At the university level, administration is usually in the hands of the Director of International Programs. The existence of a committee to oversee use of funds may or may not exist. They are more prevalent at the 1862 universities than at the 1890 institutions where determination on the use of funds seems to remain more concentrated. No major complaints were expressed at the university levels related to the mechanisms for management there, although it would be useful to include a brief description of that process in the Annual Report.

The universities widely praised the present project management in AID RUR/S&T with bringing greater structure and discipline to the JMOU project. A collegial and thoroughly professional atmosphere and good relations between the RUR project manager and the university community seems to exist. This has been an important asset in achieving the results of the project. Within AID, management by RUR of predecessor projects was widely criticized.

The contract with ISTI has enabled the project to develop a data base for project monitoring of expenditures and activities and has been most useful in helping AID analyze and respond in a timely way to Annual Reports, travel requests etc. Thus a share of the credit given by the universities to present AID management of expenditures must also be given to ISTI.

The new emphasis on developing verifiable outputs and relating JMOU activities to AID and LDC needs is different from ISTI's work on monitoring expenditures. RUR may wish to amend the ISTI contracts to expand the information base on program outputs.

The site reviews, first on the campus of one of the partner institutions and then the other, have been useful for project communication and monitoring. Visits have been made by the project officer, an ISTI officer, and a BIFAD officer. They are well-prepared and resulting reports for the most part are informative. One exception must be noted: the reports of the BIFAD representative appeared uniquely un-analytical; they were almost unfailingly laudatory of every university activity. These site review visits have been followed up by a letter from the

project officer which has accurately reflected findings from the reviews and which have been useful to the universities.

Recommendations:

Recommendation D8: Project Management should consider the possibility of involving Regional Bureau/Mission representation and university personnel themselves in periodic project monitoring activities such as site visits.

VI. Other Issues

A. Efficiency, Sustainability, and Impact

Efficiency

The projected cost of the JMOU project is $20 million from AID funds plus matching resources ($8.4 million through 1989) from the 24 participating universities.

The difficulty of measuring efficiency in the absence of quantifiable output targets has been fully discussed. The project has most certainly "mobilized resources", "broadened participation", "increased commitment" etc. of the university community to participate in AID activities overseas. Through the partnership element it has been particularly useful in stimulating the interest and potential participation of the 1890 institutions. In the case of both the 1890 institutions and the 1862 institutions the element of flexibility in this project has been essential in stimulating the degree of interest it has generated within the university and through the university to commercial and professional groups within the states. (Much of the faculty and community involvement this project has generated cannot be accomplished through the contract mechanism, since the flexibility on the part of the recipients to decide the most important uses of the funds for their own institutions greatly increases their sense of participation and proprietorship.)

Nevertheless, that great flexibility, the source of the project's greatest value to the universities, is likewise the source of its greatest difficulty, the lack of support of AID mission and Regional Bureau personnel. By retaining that flexibility in a follow-on project but tying the efforts more clearly and directly to activities in the developing countries that are valued by AID, (e.g. through the Institutional Linkage Grants), the efficiency might be considerably enhanced.

Sustainability

"Sustainability" in AID usage refers to the dynamic built into the project design enabling the goals of the project to continue to be met when AID financing is no longer forthcoming.

Some of that dynamic has already been referred to: faculty research efforts stimulated by this project which will continue for some time regardless of AID; contacts in the LDCs made by the universities and institutions within the states which now have a dynamic of their own apart from AID; some strong partnerships between the 1862 and 1890 universities which may be expanded to fields other than international development and will continue regardless of AID.

By and large, however, sustainability will continue to depend on AID resources, and the volume of Title XII business is declining inexorably. Already there appears to be some retrenchment as faculty once involved in the international projects are now changing direction because of lack of contract opportunity with AID funds. The clear impression is that AID is "mobilizing" more resources with JMOU grants than it is likely to use through present contract mechanisms.

Another element related to sustainability concerns the "closed" nature of the present project. As presently structured, the JMOU project is a closed system. To have been eligible to participate, the university had to have "graduated" from the prior Strengthening Grant project, a project which no longer exists. Thus other universities, either 1862 or 1890, which through AID contracts perform Title XII-type work, are not eligible for participation in the JMOU grant, and no provision is made either for re-opening entry or for phase-out of presently funded institutions regardless of the quality of their use of the funds and the potential value of their institutions for AID programs in LDCs.

The S&T Bureau has justified this restrictiveness on the basis that AID needs no other institutions in addition to those presently involved in the project for its assistance purposes. S&T emphasized that the JMOU project is to meet AID's needs, not necessarily those of the universities. While that may very well be the case (indeed there may already be more institutions participating in the project than AID "needs" to do its present work), the continued absence of competitive opportunity for other institutions leaves AID on a less secure ground than would otherwise be the case.

Impact

The direct impact of the project on the LDCs has been marginal at best and unmeasurable. On the other hand the impact within the 1890 institutions in terms of providing a window to the world of development assistance has been considerable.

Likewise, the impact on the 1862 institutions in stimulating faculty research and interest in participating in LDC assistance projects has been significant. These have generally been discussed elsewhere, and by the nature of the project are largely unmeasurable.

B. Future Project Planning

Goals, guidelines, procedures, funding parameters, etc. should not be lightly changed and certainly not for marginal additional benefit, since there are 24 separate universities involved in the present project. The familiarity with the present JMOU project and its operations is an important element in maintaining its achievements. However, dialogues should be initiated now with the universities on a future project which would meet the changing needs of AID as well as meet the aspirations of the universities and continue to make their services widely available in the developing countries. One promising approach for making fruitful use of the 1862 and 1890 institutions follows.

Taking into account the experience of JMOU and predecessor projects, AID should give early consideration to a new project design effort (fully involving the universities) which more directly and clearly links university resources to LDC activities with verifiable output goals and measurable accomplishments. Such an effort should:

- Focus more prominently on the widespread perception within AID and the universities of the importance of continuing non-contractual linkages between U.S. universities and developing country institutions.

- Within that context give special attention to the potential role of the HBCUs in long-term linkage with community-based institutions in the developing countries; this could be through an HBCU Institutional Linkage Program with similarities to the PVO Grant program. That program would be characterized by:

  a) submission of a concrete proposal to AID (agreed to by both the US institution and its LDC counterpart) for consideration involving specific goals and outputs to be achieved in an LDC context;

  b) presentation of a life-of-project budget related to the activities to be undertaken;

  c) multi-year commitment on the part of AID;

d) grantee flexibility to respond to changing opportunities and obstacles in meeting project objectives; and

e) evaluation of grantee performance on the basis of results achieved in an LDC context.

Strongly encourage the continuation of the flexible partnership project under which a certain percentage of the funds available would be reserved for joint activities between 1862 and 1890 institutions.

Aim at eventually financing the services to AID of the 1862 institutions (and most "resource mobilization" related to those services) through the contractual process (or individually tailored, output-related grants); these agreements would cover all "real costs" of services provided, leaving "strengthening elements" of the present grant projects for the benefit primarily of the 1890 institutions.

Continue support of HBCU institutional development of viable "marketing strategies" (through flexible partnerships) for a determined period of time; after that time specific output-related activities in the developing countries would have to have been undertaken to qualify for continued AID resources.

Remove the "closed system" nature of the JMOU project, so that proposals by other eligible universities could be considered on their merits.

Assume that AID procurement will continue to encourage an openly competitive basis and therefore encourage collaboration between the universities and the private sector.

If it appears that such a follow-on project is feasible, then encourage use of a portion of the remaining funds for the present project by universities for preparing themselves and their accounting systems as well as proposal preparation for the subsequent AID-funded project for universities serving in LDCs.

VII. Summary of Recommendations

A. General Thrust of the Recommendations

1. The JMOU project should be terminated as scheduled in the project authorization.

2. Immediate discussion should begin on a follow-on project which:

   a. has verifiable and measurable output targets and is directly related to benefit in the LDCs;

   b. focuses primarily on the 1890 institutions and combines "strengthening" elements with practical overseas work through a grant project such as an HBCU Institutional Linkage Grant;

   c. fosters the eventual funding of 1862 university services to AID programs through contracts (or in exceptional cases through an individualized output-related grant);

   d. considers a limited number of Institutional Linkage Grants also open to 1862 institutions; and

   e. preserves the elements of flexibility and continuity of the partnership arrangement of the JMOU project by reserving a portion of the funding for joint 1862-1890 activities.

B. Detailed Recommendations

1. The present JMOU project, with only minor modifications described below, should be continued in its present form until its scheduled termination.

2. During the next year, the S&T Bureau should lead a dialogue on a follow-on activity in which there is more full consensus among the universities and major decision makers of AID on what the universities can do that will be perceived positively by AID with verifiable measures of contribution to AID programs abroad and valuable contributions to high priority LDC problems.

3. Immediately, RUR should shift from its present almost exclusive reliance on expenditure patterns

to assess university programs and should supplement that monitoring information with reporting on tangible project output by university and in summary.

4. RUR should initiate discussions with AID Contracting Officers and the Regional Bureaus regarding the complaints of exaggerated experience requirements and other technical requirements of Mission-issued RFPs.

5. RUR should attempt to bring the supply of university resources "mobilized" into line with demand by helping universities to get adequate overhead allowances on their contracts and free JMOU resources going to the 1862 universities.

6. RUR should open dialogue with the 1890 universities on the desirability and feasibility of establishing an HBCU Institutional Linkage Grant program. RUR should support a "joint feasibility analysis" to develop the concept. If such a project is feasible, funds under the present JMOU project should be permitted to be flexibly applied by the HBCU to develop proposals for presentation to AID.

7. RUR project management, in collaboration with representatives of the 1890 universities, should refine the consensus on what constitutes a "strong performance profile" of expenditures, management behaviors and outputs. A definable "marketing strategy" should be part of that profile.

8. HBCUs should have maximum flexibility to use project funds to collaborate with each other to strengthen their "marketing strategy" in addition to the use of funds to collaborate with the principal partner institution.

9. RUR should reward those 1890 institutions meeting the "strong performance profile" through increased funding to the extent it is feasible (most likely in a follow-on project).

10. RUR should initiate dialogue now with the 1862 institutions to determine the feasibility and desirability for AID to finance the "real costs" of needed university services through the contract mechanism (or through individualized grant agreement with verifiable goals and measurable outputs). This would imply adequate overhead

allowance by AID to meet project-related costs now financed through the JMOU. It would also imply review (and in some cases modifications) in procedures within the university system for allocating overhead recoveries in a way that maintains incentive to academic departments providing services.

11. RUR should consider using funds freed by AID paying adequate overhead allowances (Recommendation 10 above) for funding output-oriented, demand-related Institutional Linkage Grants similar to those recommended for the 1890 universities (Recommendation 8).

12. The partnership arrangement between 1862 and 1890 institutions with its present combination of flexibility and continuity should continue to be encouraged under the JMOU project and a similar provision made in follow-on activities.

13. In any follow-on project, or even in any continuation of the present JMOU beyond its present termination date, funding levels should at least in part reflect the effectiveness of use of the funds within the project itself. It should not be set totally by external formula.

14. While retaining the general requirement that 50% of the funds be spent on supporting ongoing activities, AID should allow the 1890 universities on an exception basis to use funds for other purposes related to a well-articulated institutional development and marketing strategy.

15. Further AID guidance should be developed in consultation with the recipient universities on the following: a) the articulation and inclusion in the Annual Report of an institutional development and marketing strategy which will generally guide the individual university's use of the funds; and b) illustrations by AID of higher priority and lower priority expenditure patterns for the 1890 and 1862 university groups.

16. The Annual Report and Forward Work Plan are important and adequate mechanisms for project monitoring of expenditures and should be continued with more attention to verifiable outputs from the JMOU funded activities.

17. The present Guidelines should be supplemented to: a) emphasize the importance of project strategy, guiding rationale and multi-year goal rather than only a list of disparate activities; b) provide quantitative reporting on major project outputs; c) relate clearly the funding proposed to activities underway or planned; and d) link these activities to AID programs or other contributions to LDC needs.

18. One or more examples of exceptionally well-prepared Annual Reports should be distributed to all universities as a model.

19. RUR Project Management should invite Regional Bureau/Mission representation and university personnel themselves to participate in periodic project monitoring activities such as site visits.

20. Future project planning, in collaboration with the universities and the Regional Bureaus, should be initiated according to the guiding principles outlined in Section VI.B. of this paper.

Annex 1. List of Persons Interviewed

AID - Bureau of Science and Technology
- David Bathrick
- Nyle Brady
- Gary W. Bittner
- William Furtick
- Curtis Jackson
- Brad Langmaid
- Loren Schullze
- Douglas Sheldon
- Garland Standard

AID - Bureau for Latin America/Caribbean
- Galle Rozell

AID - Bureau for Africa
- Lance Jepson (not available)

AID - Bureau for Latin America/Caribbean
- James Lowenthal

AID - Contracts Office
- Jay Bergman
- Kathryn Cunningham

AID - Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination
- Arnold Baker

BIFAD
- Eloise Carter
- Duane Everrett
- Lynn Pesson

ISTI
- Freeman Pollard
- Edward Ross
- Collin Weir

OTHERS
- Clarence C. Gray

Annex 1. List of Persons Interviewed (continued)

Alabama A & M	Okuna Okezie
U. of Arkansas - Pine Bluff	Mazo Price
	Dennis Balogu
	Carol Engle
	Komalam Jairaj
Auburn	Mason Marvel
	Brian Duncan
	Dr. Parks
Florida A & M	Charles Kidd

Fort Valley State College	Rupert Seals
U. of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign	James Kirkwood
Kansas State	J. Nickolaides
	Vernon Larson
Lincoln	Jim Jorns
Louisiana State	Ikbal Choudhury
	Rouse Caffey
U. of Maryland - Eastern Shore	Lakshman Velupillai
	Dennis Ignasias
Michigan State	Robert Dotson
U. of Minnesota	Paul Roberts
New Mexico State	Delane Welsch
	Harold Matteson
	Donald Dwyer
	Leroy Dougherty
North Carolina A & T	Diana Sprig
	Richard Robbins
North Carolina State	Robbin Henning
	Lawrence Apple
	Douglass Gross
	Larry Tombaugh
Ohio State	Wayne Corbett
Oregon State	David Hansen
Prairie View A & M	Edwin Price
Southern University	Freddie Richards
	Gus Ridgel
Tennessee State	Rose Glee
Texas A & M	Sam Comer
	James Goodwin
	Richard Frederiksen
Tuskegee	George Teetes
	Suchet Louis
	Eugene Adams
	Sherman Jones
	William Lester
Virginia State	Winfrey Slarke
	Michael Joshua
	Donald Price
U. of Wisconsin	Ken Shapiro

Annex 2. JMOU Partnerships: Method of Interview for Evaluation

1.	North Carolina State University	Site Visit
	Florida A & M University	Conference Call
2.	New Mexico State University	Conference Call
	Tennessee State University	Conference Call
3.	Louisiana State University	Conference Call
	Southern University (Baton Rouge)	Conference Call
4.	University of Minnesota	Conference Call
	Lincoln University	Conference Call
5.	University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign)	Conference Call
	University of Maryland (Eastern Shore)	Site Visit
6.	Michigan State University	Conference Call
	North Carolina A & T	Site Visit
7.	Ohio State University	Conference Call
	Fort Valley State College (Georgia)	Conference Call
8.	Oregon State University	Conference Call
	Tuskegee University (Alabama)	Conference Call
9.	University of Wisconsin	Conference Call
	Virginia State University	Site Visit
10.	Kansas State University	Conference Call
	Alabama A & M University	Conference Call
11.	Auburn University (Alabama)	Site Visit
	University of Arkansas (Pine Bluff)	Conference Call
12.	Texas A & M University	Site Visit
	Prairie View A & M University (Texas)	Site Visit

Annex 3. Interview Instrument: Evaluation Issues in the PSG/JMOU Project

Discussions with AID, university, and other officials related to the project will cover some or all of the following issues as appropriate with the official being interviewed:

I. Issues related to Basic Project Objectives

There is considerable variation in the description of the objectives of the JMOU activity. In the initial project authorization it is described primarily in terms of "increasing involvement of the HBCU's in AID's agricultural program overseas" and to improve the quality of that involvement. In the JMOU's it is described as supporting "current and foreseeable Title XII related activity" and to "otherwise mobilize professional and institutional resources" to participate in Title XII-related activities.

A. How important, from the point of view of AID's mandate, do you believe it to be for these institutions to be "mobilized" outside of the normal contracting for specific services? Would the priority differ between the HBCU's ("1890 institutions") and the earlier land-grant colleges ("1862 institutions")?

B. To be eligible for this project, institutions already had to have received previous "strengthening grants". Is there any foreseeable limit to how much "strengthening" or "mobilization" is enough? Does the eligibility requirement increase the competitiveness of the already strong institutions and discourage the participation of institutions newer to the international development field?

C. Of the five operating objectives of the project (used for all Forward Work Plans and Annual Reports), four relate to "supporting" ongoing, "immediately foreseeable", and "anticipated" AID contracts and to the "core faculty" and staff related to those contracts. The fifth objective, "support of joint activities", requires the application of no less than 20% of the applicable funds.

How do expenditures under the first four objectives differ from those under the SMOU's? Since a basic rationale of the project is the achievement of the fifth objective, would there be any advantage in separating this out as the basis of the JMOU, leaving the rest to the traditional SMOU's? If, in fact, the encouraging of joint activities with the HBCU's is the major unique objective of this project, could that better be served through any other mechanism (e.g. through direct grants to the HBCU's enabling them to buy partnership services wherever they chose)?

D. The project is now limited largely to activities related to agriculture and rural development, yet AID may wish to increasingly use U.S. educational institutions in other fields, e.g. environment, small business programs, non-agricultural skills training, etc. Should the project be broadened beyond the present Title XII and should the eligibility of U.S. educational institutions be broadened? How much?

E. Are there any other issues related to the basic design and rationale of the project you believe are particularly important aspects to be preserved, or alternatively others which should be re-examined?

II. Issues Related to Project Operations

The individual JMOU's describe the use to be made of the funds to be provided only in the most general terms (e.g "supporting Title XII activities" and "otherwise mobilizing...resources" for Title XII activities). AID's Guidelines for Annual Reporting states that some "commonly used and understood terminology has developed" through the years to govern the categories of uses of the funds: language training, predeparture orientation, etc.

A. To what extent are the eligible and priority uses of the funds "commonly understood" among the recipient institutions and among AID project personnel? Would greater specificity on priority and eligible uses of the funds in the JMOU or in a subsequent "Implementation Letter" or guideline be useful, or would it limit excessively the university partners in the project?

B. The formula used for determining the amount of the grant to each institution each year is based on a combination of volume of Title XII business being undertaken and the number of "Full Time Equivalents" (i.e. person/years of work) overseas provided to AID by the institution from its regular staff. Does this formula adequately serve the objectives of the project, of AID, of the 1890 institutions, and of the 1862 institutions? What modifications should be made, if any, and why?

C. To what extent are do activities undertaken under this project reflect a serious partnership between the 1890 institution and the 1862 institution? Does this "partnership" in any way go beyond the AID agreement? Should it? How is this "partnership" perceived by each, and what modifications, if any, would be desireable from the point of view of the recipient institutions?

D. What other obstacles do the recipient institutions face (e.g. policy changes within the university) to meeting the objectives of the project? Are there other feasible ways in which

AID can be helpful, including non-financial changes in procedures?

E. Are there any other modifications in the basic operations of the project or in the specific allocation and uses of the funds which you believe would improve the project's effectiveness?

III. Reporting, Monitoring, and Evaluating Progress

Basic implementation of the project centers around the Annual Report. In this document recipient institutions provide a Forward Work Plan in which they describe their proposed use of the funds and a report of the previous year's accomplishments, including related budgetary material.

A. Does the Annual Report including the Forward Work Plan and report of previously funded activities constitute an adequate mechanism for overall project management and the periodic release of funds? Are any modifications in those reports and the guidelines related to those reports needed? Are the supplementary reports and procedures related to them (e.g. international travel, core faculty support, etc.) adequate (or excessive) for management needs on the part of both the universities and AID? Are any modifications needed in the guidelines related to such reports?

B. The evaluation plan consists of Annual site visits supplemented by interim outside evaluations like the present one being undertaken. What do the universities believe are acceptable indicators of when an institution or department is adequately "mobilized" or "strengthened"? And what constitutes inadequate progress in "mobilizing resources" or "support to Title XII activities"? What are the principal factors that contribute to each of these situations? Are more precise quantitative or qualitative evaluation tools needed or desireable?

C. What specific overseas work of a Title XII nature are you now undertaking or prepared to undertake which would not have been possible without this project? Or in what specific ways has the quality of your in-country work with AID improved as a result of this project?

D. Are reports, reviews and evaluations presently available adequately used by AID managers and the universities themselves for improved project management?

IV. Issues related to AID Management and Administration

Management and administration of this project involves several offices and organizations: AID's Bureau of Science and Technology/RUR Office, BIFAD, AID Regional Bureaus, PPC, the Contracts Office, overseas Missions, and AID's contactor for some aspects of implementation, ISTI.

A. Is the cost and structure of the administration of this project reasonably related to the magnitude and nature of the project? Should any modifications be considered for improved efficiency?

B. From the point or view of the recipient institutions, what is their view of the clarity and responsiveness of AID management to their concerns and interests? Likewise AID's view of the management of the projects within the universities?

C. What is the perception of this project in the broader AID community, especially with overseas Missions? And outside AID? Is that perception accurate? What modifications, if any, are suggested, in dissemination of information about this project?

Annex 4. JMOU Technical Areas of Concentration

University	FTE Commit.	Fields
1. a. Alabama A & M	2	Food Service
b. Kansas State	5	Farming Systems Research/ Extension
c. both		Post Harvest Technology in Cereals Institution Building Crop Production Rural Planning and Development
2. a. Southern	2	Tropical Crop Vegetable Production Small Animal Production
b. Louisiana State	5	Food & Cereal Crop Technologies Agricultural Research Mgmt.
c. both		Farming Systems Rural Development Women in Development
3. a. Fort Valley State	2	Small Family Farm Programs Small Ruminants
b. Ohio State	5	Renewable Natural Resources Mgmt. Agricultural Finance Biotechnology
c. both		Crop and Livestock Systems Soil Erosion Control Oilseed Production Animal Health/Veterinary Preventive Medicine Human Nutrition

4. a. Tennessee State	2	Rainfed Crop and Small Animal Production by Limited Resource Production Units
b. New Mexico State	6	Arid Land Range Mgmt. Crop Production Under Irrigated and Dryland Conditions
c. both		Farming Systems Research and Extension Crop and Livestock Production in Fragile Environments Rural Development and Decisionmaking for Limited Resource Farmers Institution Building and Technology Transfer
5. a. Tuskegee b. Oregon State	} 10	Agricultural Crop and Livestock Production Small Farming Systems Rural Community Development Animal Health Care Institutional Development Nutrition and Health Care Delivery Systems
6. a. Lincoln	2	Human Nutrition Small Family Farm Programs
b. U. of Minnesota	8	Environmental Management in Less Favored Natural Resource Areas Food and Agricultural Policy
c. both		Crop and Animal Production in Less Favored Natural Resource Areas
7. a. Virginia State	3	Agricultural Credit and Rural Financial Markets Farming Systems Rural Development
b. U. of Wisconsin	7	Agricultural/Natural Resource Interaction Agricultural Extension and Information Systems
c. both		Plant and Animal Production

		Agricultural and Rural Development Policy Analysis
8. a. North Carolina A & T b. Michigan State	} 10	Farming systems Research Agricultural Economics Institution Building Natural Resources Alternatives to Farm Employment Human Nutrition and Health Agricultural Research Mgmt. Agricultural Engineering
9. a. Florida A & M	2	Human Nutrition Microcomputer Applications to Project Mgmt. Environmental and Water Quality
b. North Carolina State c. both	5	Improved Soil Management in the Humid Tropics Agricultural Policy Institutional Development Integrated Crop Production Technology Transfer to Limited Resource Farmers Animal Production Agribusiness Management
10.a. Prairie View State	2	Agribusiness
b. Texas A & M c. both	8	Crop Production Irrigation and Water Management Agricultural Policy Agroforestry Range Science Farming Systems Agricultural Technology Transfer Animal Production
11.a. U. Of Arkansas PB	3	Farming Systems Research and Extension
b. Auburn	7	Forestry and Agroforestry Farming Systems and Natural Resources Research and Extension Inland Fisheries

c. both		Natural Resource Management Technologies Aquaculture
12.a. U. of Maryland ES	3	Crop Production in Semi-Arid and Arid Zones
b. U. of Illinois U-C	7	Agricultural Technology Transfer Agricultural Policy Analysis Natural and Renewable Resource Mgmt. and Utilization
c. both		Food Legumes and other Edible Oilseeds Farming Systems Research
Subtotal FTEs of 1890 Universities		29*
1862 Universities		77
TOTAL		106

* assuming 3 each of the 10 FTEs for Tuskegee and North Carolina A & T.

Annex VI. Scope of Work of Evaluation

A. The Contractor shall be responsible for evaluating the overall program for the Agriculture JMOUs. In doing so, the Contractor shall perform the following activities:

1. Review the following JMOU baseline documents:

   a. JMOU agreements
   b. Guidelines for Annual Reporting
   c. Instructions for Requesting Travel Clearance
   d. Guidelines for Reporting Full-Time Equivalents/Volume of Business (FTE/VOB)
   e. JMOU Monitoring files
   f. Individual University Files
   g. JMOU General File
   h. JMOU Project Authorization
   i. JMOU Workshop File

2. Survey of JMOU Universities

   Determine the data which the Universities perceive as important in evaluating the JMOU program (other data not presently available in RUR).

   Synthesize such data into major categories.

   Request synthesized data from all 24 universities as part of the information for evaluating the JMOU project.

3. Interview AID Personnel

   Develop an interview instrument (based on the scope of this evaluation) for acquiring information from AID personnel.

   Interview the following people as a part of the information for evaluating the JMOU project:

Curtis Jackson	Brad Langmaid
Gary Bittner	Jay Bergman
David Bathrick	Kathryn Cunningham
Steve Wingert	Douglas Sheldon
Lance Jepson	William Furtick

Jim Lowenthal
Duane Everett
Eloise Carter
Lynn Pesson
Garland Standrod
Arnold Baker
Collin Weir

4. Evaluate the JMOU Project:

a. Effectiveness. Is the project achieving satisfactory progress toward its stated JMOU Project objectives? Should the objectives be changed?

b. Efficiency. Are the effects of the project being produced at an acceptable cost compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same objectives? Can university resources be utilized more efficiently and rapidly through other funding mechanisms?

c. Impact. What positive and negative effects are resulting from the project? Are there important lessons learned? Is there evidence of US/LDC partnerships?

d. Sustainability. Are the effects of the project likely to become sustainable development impacts -- that is, will they continue after AID funding has stopped? Have the universities fostered other long-term agreements among partners and developing countries, regional agriculture centers, etc.?

e. Analyze Partnerships. Analyze each partnership and justify partnerships which are thriving, evolving, and troubled. What are the key factors that promote and inhibit JMOU partnerships? Given the political nature of this project, what alternatives would be realistic for troubled partnerships?

f. Comparison. If data are available, compare the efficiency of this JMOU program versus universities which have international programs but received no federal support. Washington State University is conducting such a study.

g. Project Incentives. Is the current FTE/VOB formula equitable and realistic, and does it offer an incentive to achieve the current JMOU objectives? Should the formula and JMOU objective and incentives be adjusted or modified?

h. Indicators to Success. What are the long-term goals this project should strive to achieve? What long-term indicators would be meaningful to the host country institutions, AID field missions, Congress, others?

i. Recommendations. Should the JMOU project be extended for three or five years? Should it be modified to current AID concerns (i.e., sustainability, maintaining and enhancing natural resources)? Justify the recommendations.

5. Conduct University Assessments

a. Visit four universities with their JMOU partners attending. Choice of the four universities to be visited is to be made in consultation with and approval of the AID Project Officer specified in Block 5 of the cover page of this Delivery Order.

b. Develop an assessment survey based on the scope of this evaluation for acquiring additional university information. For example, what are the benefits of the JMOU project to various departments, research, teaching extension? What are the benefits to the community, county and state? Are there any lessons learned from the JMOU partnership?