



USAID | **SENEGAL**
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EVALUATION

Mid-Term Evaluation USAID/Senegal's Education and Research in Agriculture Project (USAID/ERA)

March 2014

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared independently by Chemonics International.

MID-TERM EVALUATION:

USAID/SENEGAL'S EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURE PROJECT (USAID/ERA)

March 21, 2014

Purchase Order No. AID-685-O-14-00013]

This evaluation took place in Dakar, St. Louis, Thies, and Ziguinchor between January 6, 2014 and March 21, 2014. The four-person evaluation team was led by Donald Brown, Senior Agricultural Specialist, and included Mohamadou Lamine Dia, Agricultural Education, Training and Research Specialist, Malamine Savané, Management and Policy Support Specialist and Ya Cor Ndione, Data Collection and Analysis Officer. The team was supported in the field by Aminata Ciss, Logistics and Administration Officer, and by Tamara Cogger, Chemonics PMU Associate. The evaluation was supported in Washington DC by a project management unit led by home office Director Joshua Kunin-Goldsmith. Demba Mbaye, Deputy Chief of Party USAID/ERA and Seynabou Top, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist USAID/ERA provided support to the team in scheduling meeting and gaining a deeper understanding of the Project. The team would like to thank Fatou Thiam, USAID/Senegal Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist and Ronit Gerard, USAID/Senegal Agricultural Officer for their support and guidance.

Cover photo: ERA Project, Assa Balayara, ERA Bourse d'Excellence scholarship recipient

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

CONTENTS

Acronyms..... 1

Executive Summary 1

Evaluation Purpose and Evaluation Questions..... 5

Project Background..... 7

Evaluation Methods and Limitations..... 9

Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations 12

Annexes 32

Annex I: Evaluation Statement of Work 34

Annex II: Evaluation Methods and Limitations..... 41

Annex III: Data Collection Instruments 45

Annex IV: Sources of Information 109

Annex V: Disclosure of Any Conflicts of Interest 113

ACRONYMS

AET	agriculture education and training
AETR	agricultural education, training, and research
AKIS	Agricultural Knowledge and Information System
ANCAR	Agence Nationale pour le Concile Agricole et Rurale
CAADP	Comprehensive Agricultural Development Program
CBAER	Capacity Building for Agricultural Education and Research Project
CIP	country investment plan
CNFTEFCPN	Centre Nationale de Formation des Techniciens des Eaux et Forêts, Chasse et des Parcs Nationaux
CNFTEIA	Centre National de Formation des Techniciens d'Elevage et des Industries Animales
EGO	Economic Growth Office
ENSA	Ecole Nationale Supérieure de l'Agriculture
ERA	Education and Research in Agriculture
FNRAA	Fonds National de Recherches Agricole et Agro-Alimentaires
FOG	fixed obligation grant
FTF	Feed the Future
FY	fiscal year
GRAAS	Groupe de Réflexion sur l'Agriculture au Sénégal
ICT	information and communications technology
ISFAR	Institut Supérieur de la Formation Agricole et Rural
ISRA	Institut Sénégalais pour la Recherche Agricole
ITA	Institut de Technologie Alimentaire
LTAEB	Lycée Technique Agricole Emile Badiane
MOU	memorandum of understanding
PMP	performance monitoring plan
PMU	project management unit
SOW	statement of work
UASZ	Université Asane Seck de Ziguinchor
UCAD	Université de Cheikh Diop de Dakar
UGB	Université de Gaston Berger
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
UT	Université de Thiès
VT	Virginia Tech

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to assess progress to date and identify improvements that will achieve the planned results of USAID's Education and Research in Agriculture (ERA) Project. Specifically, the evaluation team reviewed and assessed the adequacy of project components in the context of the Senegal Feed the Future (FTF) strategy, soundness of the project's approaches, quality of ERA's management, adequacy and efficiency of Virginia Tech's (VT) assistance delivery, beneficiary coverage and response, and overall potential of sustaining the project results beyond September 2015.

USAID/Senegal expects that the evaluation's findings and recommendations will highlight opportunities to maintain momentum, scale-up project activities according to the FTF strategy, create strategic project modifications aligned with budget realities, and guide the Ministry of Higher Education and USAID in future programming.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation team responded to a number of questions posed by USAID/Senegal in the evaluation's statement of work (SOW).

I. Project Management

- Q1. To what extent has the project been implemented effectively, including timely completion of project activities, effective use of project resources, reach of the target groups/beneficiaries, quality of partnerships and collaboration, and overall USAID/Senegal EGO goals?

II. Component 1: Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training

- Q2. To what extent has agricultural education and training been improved?
- Q3. Are the AET reforms being implemented relevant to stakeholders' priorities?

III. Component 2: Strengthening Applied Research and Outreach

- Q4. To what extent are applied research and outreach developed or strengthened and relevant to stakeholders' priorities?

IV. Component 3: Management and Policy Support

- Q5. To what extent has the project improved the AET institutions' management capacity and developed coordination mechanisms among them?
- Q6. What legal, regulatory, or administrative barriers are to be lifted for reforming management and administration systems of targeted AET institutions?

V. Crosscutting Questions

- Q7. To what extent has the project addressed gender issues?

- Q8. To what extent has the project addressed environmental compliance issues?
- Q9. To what extent has the project addressed ICT issues?
- Q10. What partnership mechanisms are most productive, efficient, effective, and sustainable for carrying out agricultural research to positively benefit resource-poor farmers and food security?
- Q11. What is the likelihood of sustaining project results after project closure?
- Q12. How relevant are project components and how realistic are project targets?
- Q13. Which R&D programs have contributed to changes in the policy or enabling environment?

PROJECT BACKGROUND

USAID/Senegal supports the Senegalese government's efforts to address constraints in the agricultural sector through the FTF strategy. This strategy is based on a development hypothesis that poverty and hunger can be sustainably reduced by transforming the national agriculture sector and nutritional status of the population, especially women and children, via focused and scaled investment priorities. In Senegal, FTF focuses on the following areas:

- Agriculture-driven economic growth in which productivity increases through a value-chain approach and promotion of sound land management
- Household behaviors that promote optimal nutrition
- Enhanced policy implementation
- Strengthened rural infrastructure and access to finance
- Increased human-resource capacity at health facilities and every level of the agricultural sector, including associated institutions.

Within the FTF strategic plan, ERA contributes to increased human-resource capacity by assisting Senegalese Agriculture Education, Training, and Research (AETR) Institutions. The purpose of the ERA Project is to develop human and institutional capacity for innovation in public and private sectors, leading to farming-system and value-chain-productivity improvements and production-system sustainability. The three project components are:

- Strengthening agriculture education and training
- Strengthening applied research and outreach
- Strengthening project management and policy support.

EVALUATION DESIGN, METHODS, AND LIMITATIONS

The evaluation team used diverse evaluation methods, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection to triangulate data. Methods included document review, in-depth interviews with key informants, focus groups, and surveys based on a Likert scale of informants and focus-group members. The evaluation team used these methods based on their appropriateness to questions and audience. For some questions, the team used several methods. Using a combination of methods improved the reliability of findings and our ability to evaluate results and make data-driven recommendations.

Although the evaluation team is confident that the data and findings in this report represent an accurate picture of stakeholder opinion, data collection is always subject to limitations depending on the methodology employed. Key informants can be biased by the interviewer, focus-group results are dependent on participants and moderators, and Likert scale-based surveys have potential limitations. The evaluation team recognized these limitations and has taken them into consideration in its analysis.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Evaluation findings are presented according to USAID/Senegal's questions.

Project management. The evaluation team looked at five elements related to project management. Findings included:

- In the initial project phase, 25 out of 33 key informant interviews and focus groups reported significant delays in funding project activities. These delays have decreased but are still viewed as an important issue by project stakeholders. The evaluation team identified three causes of perceived delays. Firstly, there were actual delays caused by initial start-up difficulties (due to limited staffing), internal political disruption during the presidential election, and a shortfall in obligated funding. Secondly, project stakeholders had unrealistic expectations of the project's goods and service delivery. These expectations were linked to institutions' assumptions that the rapid assessment and prioritization exercise represented an agreement for future delivery of goods and services. The ERA Project viewed these exercises as a planning activity and did not intend to fully provide the identified needs. However, this was never communicated to institutions. Thirdly, there was a dispute between ERA and the Fonds National de Recherches Agricole et Agro-Alimentaires (FNRAA) on implementing a new research funding mechanism, the fixed-obligation grant (FOG), resulting in research activity delays between one and two years.
- Most stakeholders believe that resources provided by the project were effective and valuable. However, they expressed a need for broader-based assistance to utilize the goods and services.
- Through activities with 12 AETR institutions, the project reached most of its targeted sector.
- Major communication issues hindered the project's partnerships and collaboration efforts. Communication issues were due to a number of related but distinct elements, including a lack of written formal agreements and work plans; informal communication protocols; unclear roles and responsibilities; lack of communication about the FNRAA partnership; unclear roles of the steering committee; and weak communication related to study tours and the Group de Réflexion sur l'Agriculture au Sénégal (GRAAS), which was established to encourage the practical use of ideas and concepts gained from study tours.
- Due to implementation delays, the project has yet to provide measurable contribution to USAID/Senegal's economic growth goals. Nevertheless, if the project's progress in curriculum and syllabus development, research organization and financing, and scholastic support for skilled Senegalese continues, then significant contributions could occur.

Performance of Component 1: Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training. ERA has established a foundation for systemic improvement of Senegal's agriculture education and training structure. The evaluation team found many examples of when the project served as a catalyst in bringing new ideas to Senegal's agricultural education structure; for example, 22 of 34 key informant interviews noted that the project had introduced new ideas and approaches to their institution. Survey results among 39 interviewees from educational institutions showed that more than half reported they strongly agreed (*tout à fait d'accord*) with the statement, "The project provided goods and services that are of critical importance to my institution."

Performance of Component 2: Strengthening Applied Research and Outreach. Funding delays and communication problems have limited the project's efforts to strengthen applied research and outreach.

Despite these issues, project actions to improve applied research and outreach systems are still considered relevant by stakeholders. Data from the survey of research institutions showed that half of the eight interviewees agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “The project provided goods and services that are of critical importance to my institution.”

Performance of Component 3: Management and Policy Support. Through equipment provision and training, the project has improved AET institutions’ capacity for management, but that capacity has not been widely applied. The evaluation team also found that ERA’s efforts to establish research activities have brought institutions together to work in a coordinated manner. Unfortunately, this coordination is informal and ad hoc. The team also noted that, as a coordinating mechanism, GRAAS is not functioning and is unlikely to do so. The evaluation team found no R&D programs contributing to policy change or enabling environment. Few legal and regulatory barriers exist to reform management and administration systems, but there is a possibility of administrative barriers based on the status quo and vested interests.

Crosscutting issues. The ERA Project has proactively supported gender equality, primarily through the Bourse d’Excellence scholarships. The project’s support of environmental and climate change mitigation research activities has had limited results to date. The project has successfully delivered ICT equipment to select institutions and actively supports e-learning. This has great potential but as yet limited results.

Partnership mechanisms. Beyond introducing the new FOG funding mechanism, which could serve as an important partnership tool, the project has facilitated limited formal partnership mechanisms for agricultural research. Through interviews, the evaluation team found willingness among research institutions to establish partnerships with the project and other institutions, provided that these partnerships are active, mutual, and respectful of Senegalese protocols and institutions.

Sustainability of project results. Most Senegalese AETR institutions interviewed by the evaluation team have taken steps to ensure maintenance and sustainability of project equipment. However, sustaining new concepts and approaches in agricultural education and research facilitated by the project will require continued support by implementing institutions.

Relevance of project components and realism of project targets. In general, the evaluation team found that project components were relevant to the project objectives. Future activities should focus on needs within the private and public sector for skilled human capacity to support pro-poor growth in the agriculture sector. A number of targets in the project’s PMP appear unrealistic, and the project is currently revising these targets with USAID.

Conclusion. The evaluation team thinks that the ERA Project has significant potential to achieve meaningful results in agriculture education and research in Senegal; however, problems with communication and administrative management have prevented the project from reaching its full potential. ERA will need to improve administrative management and communication with partners to achieve meaningful results.

I. EVALUATION PURPOSE AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to assess progress to date and identify improvements that will achieve the planned results of the ERA Project. The evaluation team reviewed and assessed adequacy of project components in the context of Senegal’s FTF strategy, soundness of the project’s approaches, quality of ERA’s management, adequacy and efficiency of VT’s assistance delivery, beneficiary coverage and response, and overall potential of sustaining project results beyond September 2015.

USAID/Senegal expects that the evaluation’s findings and recommendations will highlight opportunities to maintain momentum, scale-up project activities according to the FTF strategy, make strategic project modifications aligned with budget realities, and guide the Ministry of Higher Education and USAID in future programming.

After 30 months of implementation (September 2010 to June 2013), USAID/Senegal believes a comprehensive look at the ERA Project and its components will identify strengths and necessary adjustments to the project’s intervention approaches, nature of services, and efficiency of assistance delivered. The evaluation team was asked to gather a range of background information from USAID/Senegal staff, ERA staff, Ministry of Higher Education staff, AET staff, and beneficiaries to ensure that its findings, conclusions, and recommendations are based on an accurate understanding of the project and that multiple perspectives have been consulted. The evaluation report will be disseminated to all project stakeholders.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation team responded to questions from USAID/Senegal in the evaluation’s SOW in Annex I.

I. Project Management

- Q1. To what extent has the project been implemented effectively, including timely completion of project activities, effective use of project resources, reach of the target groups/beneficiaries, quality of partnerships and collaboration, and overall USAID/Senegal EGO goals?

II. Component 1: Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training

- Q2. To what extent has agricultural education and training been improved?
- Q3. Are the AET reforms being implemented relevant to stakeholders' priorities?

III. Component 2: Strengthening Applied Research and Outreach

- Q4. To what extent is applied research and outreach developed or strengthened and relevant to stakeholders' priorities?

IV. Component 3: Management and Policy Support

- Q5. To what extent has the project improved the AET institutions' management capacity and developed coordination mechanisms among them?
- Q6. What legal, regulatory, or administrative barriers are to be lifted for reforming management and administration systems of targeted AET institutions?

V. Crosscutting Questions

- Q7. To what extent has the project addressed gender issues?
- Q8. To what extent has the project addressed environmental compliance issues?
- Q9. To what extent has the project addressed ICT issues?
- Q10. What partnership mechanisms are most productive, efficient, effective, and sustainable for carrying out agricultural research to positively benefit resource-poor farmers and food security?
- Q11. What is the likelihood of sustaining project results after project closure?
- Q12. How relevant are project components and how realistic are project targets?
- Q13. Which R&D programs have contributed to changes in the policy or enabling environment?

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND

Constraints facing the agricultural sector in Senegal include poor infrastructure; limited access to land, water, and financial services; low basic education levels (especially among women) and antiquated university curricula; inadequate extension and advisory systems; marketing restrictions; and public subsidies that discourage diversification and innovation while encouraging inappropriate chemical and water use.

Senegal has taken actions to alleviate the constraints listed above. For instance, the government of Senegal signed the Comprehensive Agricultural Development Program (CAADP) compact, signaling a fundamental shift in national commitment to agricultural growth and development. The government's Accelerated Growth Strategy and Country Investment Plan (CIP) for Agriculture also demonstrate Senegal's commitment to reducing poverty and fighting hunger.

USAID/Senegal supports these efforts through the FTF strategy, which is based on a development hypothesis that poverty and hunger can be sustainably reduced by transforming the national agriculture sector and nutritional status of the population, especially women and children, via focused and scaled investment priorities. In Senegal, FTF focuses on the following areas:

- Agriculture-driven economic growth in which productivity increases through a value-chain approach and promotion of sound land management
- Household behaviors that promote optimal nutrition
- Enhanced policy implementation
- Strengthened rural infrastructure and access to finance
- Increased human-resource capacity at health facilities and each level of the agricultural sector, including associated institutions.

ERA will contribute to these development objectives and the overall results and targets of the FTF implementation plan by assisting AETR institutions. The fifth result is particularly important for Senegal's agricultural knowledge and information system (AKIS), which serves as the country's agricultural research, teaching, and extension system. This system must be modernized to effectively respond to challenges and opportunities that benefit producers, consumers, and a growing local agro-industry. A strong and dynamic AKIS is critical for addressing the challenges and opportunities in Senegal's agricultural sector.

ERA is helping to create an AKIS that recognizes Senegal's on-the-ground realities and the important role that Senegalese institutional leadership plays in molding the system over time. ERA will place AETR institutions at the center of the AKIS with strengthened and integrated teaching, research, and extension missions. This will demonstrate AETR institutions' direct involvement in project implementation and the win-win results of a strengthened, integrated, AETR system that educates personnel, conducts applied and adaptive research, and serves as a focal point for disseminating research results. Through the ERA Project, Senegal's AETR system will adjust and transform the AKIS, stimulating public and private sectors to work together as partners to shape Senegal's agricultural economy.

In sum, as part of the FTF strategic plan led by USAID/Senegal's Economic Growth Office (EGO), the purpose of ERA is to develop human and institutional capacity for continuous innovation in Senegal's

public and private sectors, leading to farming-system and value-chain-productivity improvements and production-system sustainability. The three components of the project are:

- Strengthening agricultural education and training
- Strengthening applied research and outreach
- Strengthening project management and policy support.

ERA's targeted AETR institutions in Senegal are:

- *Four universities with agricultural programs.* The University of Cheikh Anta Diop (UCAD); the University of Gaston Berger (UGB); the University of Thiès (UT), which includes two institutions of Ecole Nationale Supérieure de l'Agriculture (ENSA); Institut Supérieur de la Formation Agricole et Rural, (ISFAR); and the University Asane Seck of Ziguinchor (UASZ).
- *Three professional training centers.* The Center of Professional Training in Horticulture (CFPH) at Cambéréne, the Technical Training Center for Forestry and Water (CNFTEFCPN) at Ziguinchor, and the Technical Training Center for Livestock Raising and Industry in St. Louis (CNFTEIA).
- *One lycée with an agricultural focus.* The Lycée Technique Agricole Emile Badiane (LTAEB) in Bignona, Casamance.
- *Two research institutions.* The Institut Sénégalais de Recherches Agricoles (ISRA) and The Institut Technologie Alimentaire (ITA).

The ERA Project began under the name of the Capacity Building for Agricultural Education and Research project. Following a competitive bidding process, VT was awarded a contract to execute the \$28 million block grant for Senegal. After receiving its award, VT brought a consortium of five universities with their own specializations. Following startup and the establishment of a local program management office, the project was officially launched and renamed as the ERA Project on January 24, 2011.

3. EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

The evaluation team used a variety of evaluation methods, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection to triangulate data. Specifically, the evaluation methods included document review, in-depth interviews with key informants, focus groups, and surveys based on a Likert scale of informants and focus-group members. The evaluation team used these four methods based on their appropriateness to specific questions and the audience addressed. For some questions, the team used several methods. Using a combination of methods improved the reliability of the findings and the team's ability to evaluate results and make data-driven recommendations. Details on the evaluation questions and proposed methods to evaluate questions are located in Annex III, with a general description below.

Document review. During the first two weeks of the evaluation, each evaluation team member reviewed principal documents related to project execution. These documents included:

- Annual work plans: fiscal year (FY) 2010 to FY 2013
- Annual reports: FY 2010 to FY 2013
- The project monitoring plan (PMP) and its revisions
- The program description of the cooperative agreement
- Senegal's Multi-Year FTF Strategy: FY 2011 to FY 2015
- Senegal's Agriculture Country Investment Plan

Individual team members reviewed additional supplementary documents as appropriate. During initial in-country evaluation team meetings in Week 3, team members discussed initial reactions, questions, and clarifications about the reviewed documents to gain a mutual understanding before field work began. This knowledge helped the team to prepare key informant interview guides and focus-group guides.

Key informant interviews. In collaboration with USAID and ERA staff, the evaluation team selected individuals and technical working group (TWG) members as key informants for interviews. Key informants were selected based on their knowledge and influence on specific evaluation questions. In addition, our selection process ensured a diverse and representative range of project beneficiaries and participants. In Week 3, the evaluation team developed a key informant interview guide with core questions (see Annex III.2). Before interviews, team members reviewed interviewing techniques under the guidance of the evaluation team leader to ensure that they did not influence participant responses.

The evaluation team did not ask interviewees leading statements or questions. Each interview session began with an explanation of the session's purpose. Interviewees were asked to comment on four general areas: project management, relevance of project activities, sustainability of project activities, and internal (between their institution and ERA) and external (among AETR institutions) communication.

The evaluation team took detailed notes of key interviews and made an audio recording of each interview (after obtaining participant permission) for verification. These notes were assembled after each interview to quantify and analyze common themes. Common themes were defined as issues stated by participants in more than four interview sessions. The team developed a spreadsheet that listed common themes and the number of interview sessions in which these themes were noted. The spreadsheet is organized by themes and type of institution in which the interviews occurred (research,

university, and training centers) to evaluate institutional sources of issues. This data (Annex III.5) was used to define findings and create recommendations.

In total, the evaluation team organized 27 key informant interviews. Sixteen of these interviews were with one person; the rest were with TWGs composed of up to 10 people. Interviews were conducted at 14 institutions. Two additional interviews with large private sector operators and one additional interview with a large state parastatal (SAED) also took place.

Focus groups. The evaluation team strategically used beneficiary focus groups to assess progress in delivering services and performance toward expected project results. Each focus group explored specific evaluation questions relating to participants' project roles. The evaluation team sought to select as representative a sample as possible (with approximately eight to 12 participants in each focus group) from a population that could speak knowledgeably about the topic. The evaluation team consulted with ERA project informants and concerned institutions for advice on who should participate.

Under the leadership of evaluation team leader, Ms. Ndione, the evaluation team developed focus-group discussion guides in Week 3 to ensure consistency within each target group. Two guides were prepared — one for students who had received Bourse d'Excellence scholarships from the project, and another for female food processors known as the Femmes Transformatrices. The guide included introduction and starting questions, general questions, and key topics for discussion (see Annex III.3). The team also reviewed focus-group moderation techniques and identified a lead focus group moderator for each session.

The team asked participants to sign a consent form at the start of each session to confirm that they were comfortable having the focus-group discussion recorded. In addition to recording the discussion, the team took notes to identify themes. Common themes raised in the focus-group discussion were differentiated from key informant common themes; although, in many cases, there were similar issues.

The evaluation team held nine focus-group sessions with four to 12 people at each session. The team organized focus-group sessions with students from six educational institutions and three user groups (two Femmes Transformatrices sessions and one millet producer group). From the key informant interviews and focus-group sessions, the evaluation team identified 20 common issues in at least four interviews or focus-group sessions.

Survey using a Likert scale. Finally, the evaluation team developed three surveys (Annex III.4) based on a Likert scale¹ for participants in informant interviews and focus groups. These surveys included a general survey, a special survey for student focus groups, and a special survey for Femmes Transformatrices. Surveys were administered to the 105 individuals who participated in interviews and focus groups at the end of their sessions. The survey is short and most respondents were able to complete it in approximately five minutes. There was a 100-percent completion rate. The survey was anonymous but each survey was numbered to designate the institution or organization at which the survey was taken. Survey documents were collected and Ms. NDione tabulated results on SPSS statistic software (Annex III.6). The team used the results to triangulate findings and recommendations.

¹ In a Likert scale-based survey, a general question is posed and statements related to this question (Likert items) are presented to the interviewee or focus-group participant. Participants are then asked to evaluate their views on these statements according to a five-point (or other odd number) scale that ranges from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.”

LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY USED

While the evaluation team is confident that the data and findings in this report represent an accurate picture of stakeholder opinion, data collection is subject to limitations depending on the methodology employed. Specific limitations of employed methods are discussed in this section.

Key informant interviews are open to potential bias from the informant. The tone and style of interviewers can make comparative data analysis difficult. As such, the methodology is not suitable for strictly quantitative data collection, although tendencies can be identified. Key informants were a mix of individuals (mostly heads of institutions or principal project focus points) and TWGs with more than one member, which makes drawing comparisons difficult; for example, drawing comparisons between an interview with one participant and one with six. The team used a standard guide for all informant interviews and gave a standard presentation on the interview purpose to all individual and TWG interview participants. The team analyzed interview data by reviewing written notes and audio recordings. These notes were in English and French, whereas the interviews were conducted in French; as such, potential misinterpretations could have occurred.

It should be noted that focus-group discussions are not tools to gather representative information of an entire community. Individuals within a focus group can sway the views of the group. Participants may also change their views in response to the focus-group moderator. The evaluation team did not have the ability to screen focus-group participants, and many participants were either self-selected or available at the time of the focus group. Focus-group data was collected by parsing notes and recordings for common issues and comments. Since the discussions were in French and the notes were written in English, a potential bias and error could have occurred.

Likert scale surveys are subject to limitations as well. Respondents have only five choices on their view of the given statements, and people often have more nuanced views. There is also a possibility that answers are influenced by previous questions. Likert scale surveys can also suffer from respondents who pick one side for most of their responses (i.e. all positive or all negative). Respondents may also seek to avoid “extreme” options and respond with more neutral positions than what they believe. The survey did not undergo extensive pre-testing due to time limitations. Language could also be an issue in some of the surveys (particularly with the Femmes Transformatrices) since the survey was written in French and some of the respondents may have had difficulty fully understanding its statements. Given its limited scale and lack of randomization, survey results can provide information on participants’ tendency in one direction or another but cannot provide precise data on target-group opinions.

4. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

I. Project Management

Q1. To what extent has the project been implemented effectively, including timely completion of project activities, effective use of project resources, reach of the target groups/beneficiaries, quality of partnerships and collaboration, and overall USAID/Senegal EGO goals?

Ia. Timeliness of Completion of Project Activities

Finding I. Early in the project, there were significant delays in funding activities — an issue that still negates project results.

The evaluation team discovered widespread concern among ERA stakeholders regarding delays in funding, delivery of equipment, and delivery of services. A total of 25 out of 33 relevant key informants noted that ERA delays in providing funds and/or equipment created significant delays in research and other programmatic activities. The “rapid assessment” and prioritization exercise of stakeholders’ needs in the initial part of the project created expectations that the project did not meet (see Section 4.a.iv). Most of the critical delays occurred in the initial project phase. Delays occurred in every project implementation area, including funding of scholarships, approval of research plans and funding, and delivery and installation of ICT equipment. While many stakeholders have been flexible and creative in working around these delays, the delays have still had negative impact on project results in several areas, particularly in research (see Section 4.c.i).

Key Informant Themes

ERA delays in providing funds and equipment has created significant delays in research/program activities.

— 25 out of 33 relevant key informant interviews and focus groups

ERA staff noted that several factors led to delays. For example, the project began with a limited staff of four operation-level members. One important task was to develop and test a procurement manual that met USAID and VT requirements; this took nearly one year, which delayed procurements.

In addition, a presidential election took place in Senegal during this period and project staff had difficulty identifying suppliers willing to serve their needs given the heightened risk in the country. Due to low disbursement rates, the project was obligated less than projected in its original authorization, resulting in fewer resources for delivering projects goods and services (see Exhibit I, next page). Finally, the *Fonds National de Recherches Agricoles et Agro-Alimentaires* (FNRAA) and VT took time to approve research proposals under a new funding formulation (FOG), which delayed funding for research.

Exhibit I. Cumulative Funding for the ERA Project

FY	Authorization	Sub-obligation	Balance	Percent
FY 2010 - 2011	\$5,600,000	\$4,680,000	-\$920,000	-16.4 %
FY 2010 - 2012	\$11,200,000	\$9,150,000	-\$2,050,000	- 18.3 %
FY 2010 - 2013	\$16,800,000	\$11,650,000	-\$5,150,000	- 30.7 %

During visits to educational and research institutions that worked with the project, the team heard several examples of funding delays and their impact on achieving project results. Funding delays for agricultural research activities had the most direct effect on project results (see Section 4.c.i). These delays have centered on the relationship between the project and Fonds national de Recherches Agricole et Agro-Alimentaires (FNRAA), the main organization within the Ministry of Agriculture that handles funding for public agricultural research activities. According to ERA project staff, working with FNRAA was not part of the original project plan but was strongly recommended by USAID as part of the USAID Forward Initiative to encourage use of local organizations. In response to USAID’s request, the project and FNRAA signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) on the use of FOG to fund research. Under the FOG mechanism, research proposals are developed with milestones and deliverables and payment for research is based on validated deliverables. This is different from traditional research funding in Senegal, in which 30 percent is advanced to the researcher for startup, with additional payments made throughout the research process.

Given this new approach, ERA leadership decided to create a year-long test to evaluate FNRAA’s ability to meet compliance standards required by USAID and VT. According to project staff, ERA and FNRAA were supposed to independently manage separate research activities during this time. The project established three stages in collaboration with FNRAA, providing training on USAID and VT accounting procedures under the FOG, creating a tender for research proposals, and choosing research projects to support the tender with ERA funding. Five research projects were accepted via the tender. FNRAA was to manage two projects and the project was to manage three. FNRAA was also meant to validate project deliverables according to FOG requirements; however, they were not fully trained and were unable to do so. When delays in research efforts became worrisome, ERA began to work with the researchers independently of FNRAA and directly funded some of their research activities. Funds were managed and disbursed to research institutions directly via VT upon request from ERA’s PMU in Dakar.

ERA staff believe that FNRAA did not understand the importance of the training on FOG and USAID and VT compliance requirements. It is ERA’s view that FNRAA believed their procedures were adequate. FNRAA’s views on this situation are unclear to the evaluation team, but both FNRAA and ERA have agreed that there was a dispute and misunderstanding related to this process. Neither USAID nor VT believed that the FNRAA’s system would produce adequate compliance. ERA feels that FNRAA suffers from a lack of human resources. This dispute has disrupted the funding and startup of most research activities by at least one year and has created a significant communication gap within the Senegalese agriculture research establishment on project activities (see Section 4.a.iv). Fortunately, FNRAA has now agreed to use a procedure proposed by ERA and trust issues between FNRAA and VT have been resolved. FNRAA and ERA have a new nine-month contract.

The consequences of this dispute and its subsequent delays in research funding are illustrated below:

- Research on sweet corn has lost two planting seasons; seeds purchased at the beginning of the research effort are now getting old and may have lower germination rates.
- Funds for research on drought-tolerant millet rice varieties were delayed by months. This drastically threw off the project due to millet’s specific growing season. Researchers received

funds after the rainy season had started, which prevented them from completing important construction work (such as building barriers to prevent salt water from entering research areas) and slowed down the research effort.

- The project's technical advisor from VT had to work with several research teams to revise their scopes to prioritize and scale down activities; for example, there is no longer time for activities like extension work on improved seeds.
- A research effort on irrigated rice lost an entire year of work. The initial research agreement was signed in July 2012 but the university conducting the research did not receive initial funding until July 2013 (just before the university closed for vacation). On September 15, 2013, they began their research activities but the delay had thrown off their work plan. In November 2013, the technical advisor from VT helped them to reprogram activities and they began to arrange subcontracts. This process was slowed down because the university had to work with ERA to secure additional approvals. They were finally able to start working with their subcontractors in January 2014.
- ERA funded a rain-fed rice research project; however, difficulties between FNRAA and ERA delayed implementation by one year. The activities were scheduled to start in 2012, but the research institution did not receive the first tranche of funding until July 2013 and the funds were insufficient.
- A research project to develop saline-resistant dry land crops on saline soils in Kaolack and Fatick was developed and submitted for funding in accordance with the FNRAA process, but the research institution was told that ERA was going to partly monitor the project with FNRAA. At the time of this report, the project has only been monitored by ERA. Research activities are constantly changing based on comments and requirements from VT, which has led to difficulties in planning. Late delivery of funds further complicated research efforts and the first plantings were lost because the millet was sowed in August (when it is normally sowed in May).

There were also critical delays in funding of the Bourse d'Excellence Scholarships. According to ERA staff, these delays were due to a slow selection of scholarship recipients by the training center and universities. It also took time to establish fund provision mechanisms for students. Some students reported a delay of nine months in the initial funding of their scholarships, while others indicated a delay of three to four months. Project staff believes the latter case is more accurate.

Finding 2. Although delivery of services and funds has improved, delays are still occurring.

Project stakeholders generally agree that the delivery time of project services and funds improved after the initial period. Nevertheless, some stakeholders are still waiting for scheduled goods and services that they expected from the project based on the early "rapid assessment" and prioritization of needs exercise for their institute. Several stakeholders have stated their concerns about these delays. Project staff explained that some of these expected items may never be delivered but most stakeholders are not fully aware of this. Poor communication between stakeholders and the project has compounded frustration on the part of stakeholders (see Section 4.a.iv).

Slow delivery of project goods and services is reflected in low project performance levels measured against PMP targets (see Exhibit II, next page). Although there are issues with the PMP and its targets (see Section 4.h), it is still clear that a number of the project's intended results have yet to be achieved.

Exhibit II. Performance on Targets (Cumulative FY11 to FY13)

Results	# of Targets	Exceeded (>110 % of target)	Met (>90 to 110% of target)	Not Achieved (<89% of target)	Unable to Assess Due to Lack of Data
Component 1: Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training	16	3	4	9	0
Component 2: Strengthening Applied Research and Outreach	8	5	1	2	0
Component 3: Management and Policy Support	14	1	0	8	5
TOTAL	38	9	5	19	5

Source: FY13 PMP Targets and Actual FY 11 – 13 (Annex III.7)

Comments on continued delays in delivery of project goods and services by project stakeholders and partners fall into several categories, including:

- Concerns about a lack of delivered goods and services based on an assumed agreement with the project after the rapid assessment
- Concerns about the need to finalize ICT equipment delivery and installation
- Concerns about continued late provision of scholarship funds

Lack of delivered goods and services based on an assumed agreement after the rapid assessment. Much of this concern derives from a communication issue between the project and its partners, which is discussed in detail below. But the concern also goes deeper. Many of the requested items concerned infrastructure, such as fencing, drip-irrigation systems, storage areas, classrooms, and rehabilitation of teaching farms, which have been specifically removed from project implementation. More troubling, the evaluation team discovered that select partners felt that there was a lack of respect from project members concerning the project’s commitments and agreements. This is a more fundamental relationship issue that the project will need to address in the future.

Finalizing ICT equipment delivery and installation. A large amount of computer and video conferencing equipment has been delivered to project partners and is currently being used. Nevertheless, there are some installations that are not yet fully functional because connections have not yet been made or there is remaining equipment to be delivered.

Scholarships. Some students commented that they still experience delays in receiving their scholarship funds. According to students, they expected funding on a trimester basis but often received their funds on a semester basis. They had to submit reports to receive the next tranche of their funds, but often experienced delays even after submitting. When students inquired about the delays, they were told that the project had to wait for other students to submit their reports before disbursing funds. These delays were typically one to two months. Such delays could cause students to miss an agricultural season.

Ib. Effective Use of Project Resources

Finding I. The equipment, vehicles, and scholarships provided by the project are valued by partners.

Although frustrated with the pace and process of implementing the ERA Project, an overwhelming majority of partners were appreciative of the equipment, vehicles, and scholarships provided. Universities and research institutes were particularly pleased with a scholarship that trained their staff in preparation for advance degrees in the United States. Equipment and vehicles were major additions to the technical training centers. An analysis of interview themes indicates the value of the equipment, vehicles, and scholarships provided by the project.

A survey document based on a Likert scale was given to individuals in key informant and focus groups. This survey supports the view that the equipment, vehicles, and scholarships were valuable and effectively used, although in a more nuanced way. A vast majority (42 out of 49, or <85 percent) of key informant respondents agreed to the statement, “The project provided equipment and services that were critically important to their institutions efforts.” Interestingly, less than half (22 out of 49, or >45 percent) did not agree with the statement, “Their institution would be worse off without the project’s support.” Nearly all of the students in focus groups (39 out of 42, or 92 percent) felt the scholarships were critical to supporting their education.

The evaluation team saw numerous examples of effective project resource use, particularly at lower-level institutions, such as training centers and the lycée. These institutions have extremely limited resources, so a new bus or a photocopy machine has enormous benefits for their institutions (see Section 4.d.i). Computers and other ICT equipment were generally put to good use. For universities and larger institutions, this equipment allowed them to upgrade from older and often obsolete equipment and to expand existing computer facilities to accommodate a larger number of students. In some institutions, the computer equipment was used for administrative support (tracking exam grades, for example) as well as student class work. A number of institutions provided additional training on computer equipment via computer-savvy students and faculty or local experts. Limited Internet access and connectivity is a problem for some non-urban-based institutions.

Buses and pick-ups were well-received. The vehicles allowed training centers and the lycée to conduct field visits and study tours without renting expensive vehicles. In most cases, the vehicles provided valuable support to other project-funded activities. In the one notable exception, the vehicle was too small to meet the needs of the receiving institution.

Stakeholders recognized that training activities were highly useful. Training on administrative work and research proposal writing, as well as more specific skill areas, such as e-learning and syllabus development, were cited as extremely valuable. Stakeholders also noted their satisfaction with their communication and relationship with VT and Tuskegee staff who worked with them training activities. This differs from the communication issues noted for the project as a whole (see Section 4.a.iv).

Key Informant Themes

Computers and lab equipment were useful and necessary.

- 19 out of 31 key informant interviews and focus groups

Key Informant Themes

Buses and pick-ups were useful and necessary.

- 11 out of 26 key informant interviews and focus groups

Key Informant Themes

The scholarship program was useful and necessary.

- 18 out of 27 key informant interviews and focus groups

Scholarships were also highly effective. Institutions with staff benefitting from scholarships for long-term training in the United States stressed the value of this training. In speaking with student recipients of the *Bourse d'Excellence*, the evaluation team was impressed with the breadth and innovativeness with which students used their scholarship fund to advance their learning and careers. Comments included:

- Scholarships provided access to computers, flash drives, professional clothes, and other important materials
- Funds enabled students to make the greatest use of their free time; for example, pursuing supplementary academic and research activities on the weekends
- Scholarships provided opportunity to apply practical skills; for example, one student conducted a vegetable farming research project
- Funds were used for research that enhanced students' academic levels and skill sets
- Scholarship resources opened doors for business, entrepreneurial activities, and development in Senegal, ultimately increasing food security
- Funds enabled students to participate in internships during their vacations
- Scholarships enabled several students to pursue advanced schooling when they otherwise would not have had the opportunity

Finding 2. The project's provision of goods and services did not always reflect recipients' priorities, resulting in sub-optimal use of project resources.

A number of stakeholders noted the need for broader-based assistance to fully utilize project goods and services. Approximately 20 out of 33 key informants cited this issue during interviews. The evaluation team discovered that project equipment was either not used or significantly under-used because critical supportive structures or services (from infrastructure to computer equipment) were not provided. In some cases, stakeholders found alternate means to acquire supportive structures and services through other sources, which compromised overall resource efficiency.

Concerns related to delivery and support of project resources were divided into three categories: the need to support infrastructure and other inputs to make resources useful, the issue of delivering standardized goods that did not necessarily reflect recipients' needs, and the need to address questions about the *Bourse d'Excellence* program structure. Each category is discussed in detail below.

Infrastructure or other resources that make project resources useful. A striking example of the need to support infrastructure and other inputs came from a university who asked the project not to deliver computer equipment because it had already received a shipment of computers from the World Bank. The project still delivered the computers, which prompted the university to request support in building infrastructure to house the additional equipment. The project refused the request and the university was obliged to find storage space for the unwanted computers.

Similar examples — from needing to build a fence to protect a research site to needing drip irrigation tubing for a water pump — arose during interviews and focus-group discussions. Many of these infrastructure requirements are related to teaching and research activities, such as rehabilitating a training farm for students or expanding classrooms to accommodate increased student enrollment. Stakeholders also cited a need for additional computer training, business development training, expanded Internet access, and incubation centers where entrepreneurial students could seek help to establish their own businesses.

Key Informant Themes

Although equipment is useful, our real needs are infrastructure and other critical support.

— 20 out of 33 key informant interviews and focus groups

Provision of goods that do not reflect institutions' needs. Stakeholders raised concerns about the rigidity of the project's package of delivered goods. Some stakeholders felt that the standardized package of goods and services did not consider their institutional needs. For example:

- The project provided a minibus with 14 seats when the stakeholder needed a bus with 40 seats
- On a study tour, a fluent English speaker had to take English courses along with other French-speaking colleagues
- Funding for a research activity was disbursed based on five arbitrary steps that did not correspond to the growing cycle of the research crop
- An institution that primarily works with fruits and vegetables was required to complete a training program on cereal production.

A few stakeholders also commented that ERA's priorities seemed to reflect those of USAID and not of Senegalese institutions.

The Bourse d'Excellence scholarship program. Despite widespread appreciation of the *Bourse d'Excellence* program, there were still concerns about the program's structure. These concerns were grouped into three categories: providing minor additional support to increase scholarship value, standardizing scholarships, and addressing scholarship funding levels. Each category is discussed in detail below.

Increasing scholarship value through additional, non-financial support. Student recipients and their faculty members noted that scholarships could benefit from additional support for recipients. Suggestions include:

- Establishing an online discussion group or social network to connect scholarship recipients (this was the most common suggestion)
- Supporting students after graduation to build their professional capacity and connect them to business opportunities and other projects
- Providing in-demand courses that are difficult to find in Senegal, such as statistics, research design, and business practices
- Connecting entrepreneurial-minded recipients to incubation centers to help them create their own businesses
- Changing the scholarship bank from the Société générale de banques au Sénégal to EcoBank to align it with the national scholarship program and to provide access to EcoBank's ATMs on campus

Scholarship standardization. In interviews and focus groups, stakeholders discussed the standardization of the Bourses d'Excellence scholarship program. Some argued for greater flexibility to adapt scholarships to individuals' specific needs. These stakeholders felt that current scholarships were not well-monitored and should be oriented to specific programs, degrees, and fields of study. Others argued in favor of the current standardized scholarship structure. In this structure, a separate and standard amount of funding is established for universities and training centers and all students within a given institution receive the same amount of funds. Those in favor of this structure argued that it makes the program easier to manage, and that a more flexible approach would surpass the capability of present staff. Stakeholders also noted that a standardized scholarship reduces potential conflict among scholarship recipients since they receive an identical amount of funding.

Scholarship funding levels. A number of faculty members, particularly at the training center and lycée level, questioned whether the scholarship program should decrease the funding amount given to individual students to enable more students to benefit. Scholarship recipients had mixed feelings. Several felt that it

would be better for more students to receive the *Bourse d'Excellence* scholarship, even if funding per recipient was reduced. Some said that they were called "*filis de ERA*," since they benefitted from the scholarship and no one else did. These students believed that if more students had scholarships, this would be less of a problem. Others suggested making the scholarship program more equitable by shortening the scholarship term and having more competitions.

Supporters of the present scholarship funding level and structure argued that scholarships are for excellence and that present scholarship levels are appropriate.

Ic. Reach of Target Groups and Beneficiaries

Finding. Through its activities with 12 institutions, the project reaches groups and beneficiaries in agricultural education and research, encompassing the majority of the targeted sector.

ERA has worked with a range of agricultural education and research institutions, from universities to *lycées*. The project has also reached students and faculty through scholarship provision. In addition, the project creates a better learning environment by providing students with needed equipment and vehicles.

In terms of results for target groups and beneficiaries, the project's reach has been limited. This is due to the long-term nature of the project's implementation goals, compounded by delays and poor communication. Over time, it is possible that the project's reach will expand and continue to grow.

Id. Quality of Partnerships and Collaboration

Finding. The project has a communication problem with a number of stakeholders, which hinders the quality of its partnerships and collaboration.

By all accounts, collaboration between the ERA Project and participating institutions began well. The project initially wanted to undertake a full diagnostic of each institution but later opted for a "rapid assessment" due to resource constraints. After the rapid assessment, the project conducted an exercise with each institution to produce a list of priority items. ERA insists that there was no intention of funding all of the items on the list. Nevertheless, no action plan (apart from the list) was established by ERA, and the institutions developed expectations based on that list. However, many of these expectations were not fulfilled and delayed funding limited the project's ability to deliver to stakeholders.

Key Informant Themes

Communication with ERA is a problem.

— 20 out of 27 key informant interviews and focus groups

To further confuse the situation, ERA sent engineer and architect design teams to study the infrastructural needs defined on each institution's priority list. This increased institutions' expectations of the project's deliverables. Construction never took place — perhaps due to budget shortfall or USAID's restriction on supporting infrastructure development. No rationale was ever communicated to institutions.

In addition to the prioritized list, ERA began to create a system of regional coordinators during the project's initial phase. The original idea was to divide the project by region, with one consortium partner leading each region (e.g., VT would manage Thies and Dakar while Tuskegee manages St. Louis). The first regional coordinator worked in St. Louis, but their management role was not successful. At some

point, VT decided to change the project's management structure from a regionally based structure to a thematically based structure, creating a central management unit in Dakar. Unfortunately, none of these changes were communicated to other implementing institutions. For example, a sign for the regional coordinator still hangs outside an office door in St. Louis, although the role no longer exists.

Thus, although the project had a strong start, it was unable to deliver what institutions expected (even if those expectations were unrealistic). A series of communication difficulties compounded the situation. During the 27 relevant key informant interviews, 20 interviewees mentioned that communication with the project was a problem; only seven indicated that it was not a problem.

Communication issues were multi-faceted with a number of related yet distinct elements, including a lack of written formal agreements and work plans; informal communication protocols; confusing roles and responsibilities, including those of the steering committee; and a lack of communication regarding the FNRAA partnership, study tours, and GRAAS.

Lack of written formal agreements and work plans. One notable issue in discussions with TWGs and researchers was a lack of formal project documents indicating what is to happen, when it is supposed to happen, and who is responsible. For example, the TWG did not have specific work plans to monitor the project's deliverables. Without a work plan, the TWG found it difficult to monitor or support the project and ended up acting as a clerk to support the PMU. In several cases, TWGs did not form because ERA only worked with them on an ad-hoc basis and staff availability was constantly changing.

Likewise, research activities lacked an agreed budget and timeline. Multi-partner research activities needed details on their partners, their individual role, and the amount of funds each partner would receive. Many researchers had written agreements through FNRAA, but it was unclear how those agreements linked to ERA's funds and technical mandates.

Informal communication protocols. Most project communication took place via informal phone calls and e-mails, which sometimes led to misunderstandings. The evaluation team learned that the project staff tended to bypass the normal protocol of communicating to a senior person at an institution (such as a director) about visits or other relevant issues. A number of individuals reported that this form of communication was non-professional and demonstrated a lack of understanding and respect for Senegalese institutions.

Confusing roles and responsibilities. Many project partners were confused about the roles, responsibilities, and relationship between VT and PMU staff in Dakar. They were confused about how decisions were made and how they were communicated. For example, professors or technicians from VT would arrive to work at institutions but would not report who they worked with or what they worked on.

Apart from PMU staff, no interview participants understood that project funds were held and managed by VT and disbursed by VT at the request of the PMU. Several members of the TWG stated that they saw funds arriving for their research activity from VT without knowing what it was to be used for or why. A senior member of an institution even asked whether the PMU was only a post-office box (*boite postale*) for VT or if they make their own decisions.

Poor communication on project objectives and methods. The evaluation team found little rationale to ERA's methods. While the majority of key informant survey respondents (30 out of 49) reported a strong understanding of the project, only two respondents (a head of a national research institution and a member of the agricultural *lycée*) were able to correctly state the project's objective. The project website is not clear and is primarily designed for a USAID or American audience rather than its

partners. This website (or perhaps a parallel website) could inform partners about how the project works and provide a platform for partners (such as scholarship recipients) to communicate about the project. A number of stakeholders expressed concern about access to information. The project installed information-based equipment in collaborating institutions, but this equipment has not yet been used to support project communication.

Lack of communication about the FNRAA partnership. The project initiated a new research funding approach through FNRAA; however, this approach experienced a number of issues and caused funding delays. Several researchers stated that they had signed formal research agreements with FNRAA but that they are now completely funded and monitored by ERA staff. Their formal agreement with FNRAA was never canceled. As such, the researchers feel compelled to respond to two authorities: FNRAA, under a formal agreement but with inactive budgets and work plans, and ERA, without a formal agreement but with active funding. Currently, it seems that the issues between FNRAA and ERA have been resolved, but few partners are yet aware of this.

Unclear steering committee role. The steering committee's role in project activities is unclear. Given the number of ministries involved with ERA, including higher education, agriculture, and livestock, as well as diverse levels of schools, from *lycée* to university, a global coordination unit is important. The evaluation team found several potential communication issues between the steering committee and project partners, including transferability of students from one level of educational institution to another. The steering committee could serve as an important source of "champions" of systemic reforms within agricultural education and research institutions (see Section 4.g). The steering committee could also play a critical role in correcting communication issues.

Weak communication regarding study tours and GRAAS. Study tours received mixed reviews from project stakeholders, possibly due to misunderstanding and poor communication regarding the study tour's purpose. The project's follow-up efforts for study tours via GRAAS mechanisms have had major management and communication issues. Most interviewees were aware of GRAAS but had differing views on who was responsible for GRAAS and whether it had positive results. Several senior interviewees stated that GRAAS was a duplication of existing Senegalese institutions. Many also felt that GRAAS had no formal or legal standing and that it was unlikely to have a significant impact on government policy or actions.

Ie. Contribution to Overall USAID/Senegal EGO Goals

Finding. The project has yet to provide measurable contribution to USAID/Senegal's economic growth goals. However, if the project's progress in curriculum and syllabus development, research management and financing, and scholastic support continue, significant contributions could occur.

The goal of USAID/Senegal's EGO, as stated in its FY 2011-2015 strategy, is to "sustainably reduce poverty and hunger, to improve equitable growth in the agricultural sector, and to improve nutritional status of the Senegalese people." The ERA Project contributes to this goal by "developing the human and institutional capacity for continuous innovation in the Senegalese public and private sectors, leading to farming system and value chain productivity improvements and production system sustainability."² The project aims to strengthen agricultural education and training, applied research, and outreach, as

² ERA Mid-term Evaluation Scope of Work

well as to provide project management and policy support. At this time, the project has provided limited contributions to USAID/Senegal's economic growth goals due to reasons noted above and the inherent difficulty of facilitating institutional change.

Nevertheless, there is evidence that institutional change is beginning to take place. If these changes are successful, the project can make a significant contribution to USAID/Senegal EGO goals.

II. Performance of Component I: Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training

Q2. To what extent has agricultural education and training been improved?

Finding. The project has established a foundation for systemic improvement of the national agricultural education and training structure.

The project seeks to improve the national agricultural education and training structure by:

- Providing targeted supply of equipment (primarily ICT equipment and vehicles)
- Providing scholarships for students and staff in education and training institutions
- Establishing systemic change in syllabus and curriculum development and management in education institutions
- Seeding new ideas in agriculture and training through study tours and faculty visit to the United States and other countries.

Equipment and scholarships provide near-term improvements in institutional educational and training environments. Establishing systemic improvement through new ideas and thinking and improved syllabus and curriculum development via self-assessment are also important steps in this process.

Stakeholders felt that ERA catalyzed new ideas and thinking. In the 2013 Presidential Decrees Relative to Higher Education and Research, the minister of higher education attributed this new thinking to ERA and its study tour participants. The vice proctor of UCAD credits ERA for universities' concept of a new *Institut Supérieur d'Agricole Durable et Entreprenariat*. Several heads of universities and training centers stated that wanted to establish incubation centers after seeing their success in study tours to Uganda. Some stakeholders believed the idea of creating the University of Thies to bring practical training and research into the university environment emerged from ERA.

Key Informant Themes

ERA has brought useful ideas and approaches to our institution.

— 22 out of 34 key informant interviews and focus groups

At the faculty level, stakeholders claimed that staff were more aware of the need for practical field work thanks to the *Centre de Application*. Even at the student level, new ideas were put into action due to ERA. In Ziguinchor, the evaluation team learned that students organized a *Federation National des Etudiants de Formation des Institutions Agricole* after an ERA workshop informing them of professional opportunities in the agricultural sector.

The project's aim to achieve fundamental systemic changes could have a profound effect on agricultural education in Senegal, which could then have positive impact on Senegal's agricultural sector and food security. The evaluation team observed that these institutional changes are beginning to occur.

Although small in scale and scattered among institutions, these achievements are creating a sense of optimism that institutional change could expand across the country. Examples of institutional changes include:

- Training on syllabus development and curriculum reform discussions are well advanced in educational institutions. At the *lycée*, training center, technical institutes, and UASZ, activities have expanded beyond training/discussion to implementation. At the training center, 19 out of 40 major courses have syllabi and are currently in the testing phase before they create the rest of the syllabi. The *lycée* claims to have syllabi for all of its courses. UASZ stated that it has made good progress on the syllabus effort. The director of a technical institute says syllabi introduction and curriculum reform has significantly improved the agricultural education system in Senegal. Students stated that course syllabi helps them to set expectations and effectively evaluate and monitor the course. Some faculty report that the syllabi helps them to better manage their time. However, participants noted significant challenges to gaining universal acceptance of new syllabi, particularly among *vacataires* or adjunct professors and teachers. At some institutions, nearly 90 percent of the teaching staff for specific courses may be *vacataires*. Many interviewees noted that *vacataires* would likely not support the addition of new syllabi as it could make them more accountable to students and control the materials they can present. Other interviewees felt that syllabus and curriculum reforms would be difficult at higher-level educational institutions due to more complex social-political-technical networks and power structures.
- Self-assessment processes are beginning to take hold in educational institutions. The evaluation team found that this reform was accepted and put into place among lower-level educational institutions. Project staff anticipate that higher-level agricultural education institutions will eventually accept this reform, creating a basis for certification and quality control.

Q3. Are the implemented AET reforms relevant to stakeholders' priorities?

Finding. The project's AET reforms are relevant to stakeholder's priorities.

From the minister of higher education to the director of the agricultural training *lycée*, the evaluation team discovered strong support for AET reforms initiated by ERA. Eleven out of the 17 key informant interviews from educational institutions (universities and training centers) praised curriculum and syllabus reforms. Survey results among 39 interviewees from educational institutions found that more than half (22 out of 39 interviewees, or 56 percent) strongly agreed (*tout à fait d'accord*) with the statement, "The project provided goods and services that are of critical importance to my institution." An additional one-third (13 out of 39 participants, or 33 percent) of interviewees agreed (*d'accord*) with the statement. Interestingly, about 38 percent (15 out of 39) of these interviewees did not agree with the statement, "My institution would be worse off without the assistance of the ERA Project." The evaluation team believes this discrepancy is due to delayed goods and services and communication issues.

III. Performance of Component 2: Strengthening Applied Research and Outreach

Q4. To what extent is applied research and outreach developed or strengthened and relevant to stakeholders' priorities?

Finding I. Funding delays and communication problems have limited the project's efforts to strengthen applied research and outreach.

Applied research and outreach is the weakest element of ERA. Of the project's five research efforts, only the drought-tolerant millet has made real progress (although at a small scale). Some research has only just begun or is seeking clarification and funding. Many research institutions have expressed

frustration working with the project. Stakeholders also had difficulty implementing the project's effort to establish multi-institutional research activities via FOG. Common themes include:

- Researchers noted a lack of formal agreements and work plans. Some researchers have detailed agreements for their research activities with FNRAA, but none have a similar agreement with ERA, even though ERA is funding and monitoring their research efforts.
- The FOG financing arrangement requires researchers to present deliverables for validation before funds are released for the next phase of their research. Bureaucratic delays within FNRAA, ERA's PMU, or VT (it was unclear who was causing the problem) resulted in funding delays. Since most research efforts are based on biological timing (planting, harvesting, etc.), these delays cause a loss of valuable research time. A researcher working on sweet corn indicated that she lost two years of research due to funding delays.
- Timing issues were apparent in other ways. Too often, the project works with one timeline while researchers work with another. Rainy seasons come and go, school schedules change, and administrators and staff are not always available. The result: delays and missed opportunities.
- Some researchers and observers commented that research efforts are too small-scale. For example, the only research effort indicating progress has produced a mere 600 kilograms of improved drought resistant millet seed.
- VT's role in technical advising and monitoring was a cause for concern. Interviewees stated that VT continually revised research efforts that researchers thought were already reviewed and approved. Several researchers felt that VT was merely monitoring them and not providing capacity building support. Some felt that VT had no confidence in their ability to manage and conduct research.

Finding 2. Despite implementation issues, project actions to improve applied research and outreach systems are still considered relevant by stakeholders.

Despite the issues noted above, the evaluation team identified strong levels of appreciation and support for the project's research reforms. FNRAA indicated that there was initially great skepticism about using FOG but they have since changed their mind. While FOG is initially more time-consuming, once it is in place it proves to be a more efficient way to fund research. This sentiment was echoed by research institutions. Half of the interviewees from research institutes (four out of eight) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "The project provided goods and services that are of critical importance to my institution." Similar to education institutions, more than one-third (three out of eight, or 37 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement, "My institution would be worse off without the assistance of the ERA Project." This discrepancy is likely due to delayed goods and services.

The research community agreed that the project's agricultural research was based on user needs. Out of six key informant interviews in research institutions, four participants agreed that the research was valuable and served the needs of its users. Multi-institutional research was also viewed favorably by most researchers. Though this idea is not new to researchers, the addition of universities into the research mix is new. Universities generally support the idea, as do traditional research institutions. Several researchers did note that such an arrangement requires a better organizational structure and stronger communication.

IV. Performance of Component 3: Management and Policy Support

Q5. To what extent has the project improved the AET institutions' management capacity and developed coordination mechanisms among them?

Finding 1. Through provision of equipment and training, the project has improved AET institutions' capacity for management, but this capacity has not yet been widely applied.

The evaluation team defined institutional management capacity by two factors: firstly, by functionality, which deals with management equipment and logistics. Secondly, by operations, which deals with management systems and processes. By delivering office and ICT equipment (such as photocopiers, printers, modems, and computers) to under-equipped institutions, many institutions now have a solid base for improved management. In terms of operations, some training programs and capacity building efforts have taken place, but it is difficult to identify significant improvements in institutional operations management. Although interviewees were aware of improved management mechanisms like FOG, there is little evidence that these mechanisms have been adopted in a significant way by research institutions. The evaluation team identified a reluctance to change among institutions and individuals — many preferred existing systems that they were comfortable using. In addition, some interviewees seemed to feel that new systems were being forced on local institutions by USAID.

Finding 2. In engaging multiple AETR institutions, the project has created an ad-hoc coordination mechanism.

The evaluation team found that ERA's multi-institutional research activities brought institutions together to work in a coordinated manner. Unfortunately, this coordination is informal and ad hoc. The evaluation team could not find any existing formal structures to support coordination. At the start of the project, staff expected to create a regional coordinating mechanism to manage activities. Although the project prepared an office and selected staff to support this mechanism, it was never created. And although occasional coordination and exchange opportunities among AETR institutions arose during meetings and workshops, there were case-by-case examples. Stakeholders gave a number of suggestions for coordination mechanisms. Many felt that institutions should lead coordination efforts but that ERA should facilitate and initiate connections, since the project has relationships with all institutions.

Finding 3. The GRAAS is not functioning and is unlikely to do so.

GRAAS was established to collect, distribute, and put new ideas (gained via study tours) into practice. According to project staff, there may be four GRAASs in total — one for each study tour that took place. The evaluation team found it difficult to gain a clear picture of GRAAS's location, structure, and accomplishments to date. Eight out of 22 relevant interviewees stated that GRAAS does not and will not work. These stakeholders felt that GRAAS is redundant and overlaps with mechanisms like *Système National pour le Recherche Agricole et Silvo-Pastoral (SNRAS)*. Stakeholders also noted that GRAAS is an informal organization and has no legal standing. This would make it extremely difficult for GRAAS to put forth ideas for government consideration.

Key Informant Themes

GRAAS will not work.

8 out of 22 relevant key informants interviews

Other interviewees spoke in favor of GRAAS. Their principal argument was that existing organizations are too rigid to consider new ideas and that only an independent voice like GRAAS could do so.

Q6. What legal, regulatory, or administrative barriers are to be lifted for reforming management and administrative systems of targeted AET institutions?

Finding. There are a limited number of significant legal and regulatory barriers to reforming management and administrative systems at targeted AET institutions. However, among larger and more established AET institutions, there are significant traditions and vested interests that can create administrative barriers to such reforms.

Senegal's AET institutions are expanding and developing under strong, progressive leadership. Nevertheless, management and administrative reforms have to contend with tradition and vested interests in maintaining the status quo. *Vacataires*, for example, have expressed concerns that reforms (such as syllabi development) may limit their present academic freedom and increase their workload. Such groups may present administrative barriers to reforms. This issue is prevalent at larger, more established AET institutions.

V. Crosscutting Questions

Q7. To what extent has the project addressed gender issues?

Finding. The project proactively supported gender equality, primarily through the Bourse d'Excellence scholarships.

The ERA Project has taken a proactive stance in supporting women and increasing their role in the agriculture sector. The project organized gender workshops to educate leaders on gender issues and to increase awareness of opportunities for women in agriculture. The *Bourse d'Excellence* scholarship program has been a major proponent of gender equality, allocating 70 percent of scholarships to women. The evaluation team held six focus-group discussions with scholarship recipients, ranging from university students to *lycée* students, and most of the recipients were highly qualified women.

The evaluation team asked faculty and students about the positive gender bias in the *Bourse d'Excellence*. Interviewees were aware of the bias. One faculty member agreed that most of the scholarships were for women but that they also happened to be the best students. One female recipient said that some boys are jealous, but it does not cause problems because the boys understood that they had won the scholarship based on merit. She also noted that since USAID/ERA (rather than the administration) selected scholarship recipients, students did not have issues with the selection.

Q8. To what extent has the project addressed environmental compliance issues?

Finding. The project's environmental and climate change mitigation research has had limited results to date.

The project chose research activities that would have a positive impact on environmental and climate change mitigation issues, such as drought-resistant millet, saline tolerant dry-land crops, and rain-fed rice production. Unfortunately, most of these activities have only just begun. The drought-resistant millet research activity is at an advanced stage and may achieve strong results within the life of the project. The other activities are more uncertain.

Q9. To what extent has the project addressed ICT issues?

Finding. The project has successfully delivered ICT equipment to select institutions and supported e-learning activities, which has great potential but has achieved limited results thus far.

The project has successfully delivered computers and other ICT equipment to institutions. Installation is mostly complete, although there are some concerns about connecting video conferencing centers. Some stakeholders requested additional training to support the use of new computer equipment.

The project has also provided training and support for e-learning activities. These activities are still in their beginning stages. As yet, no significant e-learning products have been produced. There is a great deal of interest in e-learning with the recent opening of the African Virtual University. This university offers licenses, masters, and doctorate degrees in a number of technical and practical fields. The evaluation team asked relevant interviewees if there were any plans to eventually link e-learning activities within agricultural education institutions to those of the African Virtual University. At this point, there appears to be no significant consideration of such an idea, but it remains a possibility.

Q10. What partnership mechanisms are most productive, efficient, effective, and sustainable for carrying out agricultural research to positively benefit resource-poor farmers and food security?

Finding 1. Apart from introducing the new FOG funding mechanism, which could serve as an important partnership tool, the project has facilitated limited formal partnership mechanisms for agricultural research.

Establishing a new funding mechanism like FOG can provide a basis for partners to carry out more effective agricultural research. The FOG is still in its testing stage and is not fully accepted in the research community. The evaluation team has examined FNRAA documents used to carry out research activities. These documents include partners' roles and budgets for research activities. Such documents could easily be merged with the FOG financing mechanism, but this has not yet been attempted. However, such an action seems within the possibility of the project's present operation.

Finding 2. The project has yet to establish productive, efficient, effective, and sustainable partnership mechanisms to carry out agricultural research.

During six key informant interviews with directors and TWGs in research institutes, interviewees expressed frustration with their partnership with ERA. These comments were not solicited.

Many of these comments reflect the communication difficulties explained in Section 4.a.vi and are not a true reflection of the attitude of project staff. Nevertheless, the comments provide a lesson on what will be necessary to establish productive, efficient, effective, and sustainable partnerships to support agricultural research in Senegal. Interviewees desired a truly proactive and mutual partnership with ERA that respected Senegalese protocols and institutions.

Despite frustration, interviewees were still interested in working with ERA. However, the evaluation team believes that this partnership has to be built on written formal agreements, work plans, and an active communication process.

Key Informant Themes

- ERA does not respect Senegalese protocol and/or institutions. (5 of 6 key informant interviews)
- The project is creating its own institutions rather than using existing ones. (4 of 6 key informant interviews)
- ERA follows its own priorities and not those of its partners. (4 of 6 key informant interviews)
- ERA does not respect its contracts and commitments. (4 of 6 key informant interviews)
- ERA appears not to be aware of what happens in Senegal. (3 of 6 key informant interviews)

Q11. What is the likelihood of sustaining project results after project closure?

Finding 1. Most Senegalese institutions have taken steps to ensure proper maintenance and sustainability of project equipment.

Nearly half of the interviewees in research and education institutions (22 out of 49, or 45 percent) strongly agreed with the statement, “My institution has the intention of continuing the activities started by the project after the end of the project.” Eighty percent (39 out of 49) either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement. More than 70 percent (35 out of 49) either strongly agreed or agreed with the statement, “My establishment is looking for funds to pay for the activities started by the project after the project ends.”

Several respondents indicated that they provide fuel for project vehicles out of their operating budget and maintain vehicles through their operating budget or special funds. At one training center, the director hired a local computer expert to maintain computers. Another university selected computer-savvy students to maintain the equipment.

Finding 2. The sustainability of new concepts and approaches for agricultural education and research requires continued support from implementing institutions.

Assure the sustainability of new approaches and concepts in agricultural education and research requires more than maintaining equipment and vehicles. Many new concepts and approaches are just emerging, and the project has only two years to find a means to assure their continuation. The evaluation team discussed this issue with a number of project stakeholders. Stakeholders suggested expanding capacity building activities, establishing public-private partnerships, and linking the project and its activities with other projects, such as the West Africa Agricultural Productivity Program. Interviewees agreed that several systemic changes would take time, such as professors developing syllabi for their courses, researchers and FNRAA working out the kinks in the FOG funding mechanism, and cooperative mechanisms expanding their research activities to encompass end-users.

Q12. How relevant are project components, and how realistic are project targets?

Finding 1. In general, project components are relevant to the project objectives. However, future activities should focus on more specific needs within the private and public sectors related to building skilled human capacity to support pro-poor growth in the agriculture sector.

The evaluation team looked at the three components of the project and concluded that they represent relevant elements needed to achieve the project’s objective of facilitating institutional change leading to increased human and institutional capacity in agricultural education, research, and outreach to support pro-poor agriculture development and improve nutrition in the country. Given project experience to date, Component 2 (strengthening applied research and outreach) appears the weakest component if its results are considered research output. However, the component’s intended result is the development of a stronger, more efficient research and outreach system rather than research output. Looking beyond the limited research results, the evaluation teams believes some real progress has been made in building such a system, although it has not always been smooth. New partners are working on research under a new and better funding mechanism.

One of the evaluation team's concerns is the project's orientation in its human capacity building efforts. The evaluation team met with two large private sector organizations that work with canned tomatoes products and rice in the Senegal River valley. The team also met with a director at SAED, the large parastatal that manages many of the irrigation schemes in the Senegal River Valley. All three organizations represent potential major employers for graduates of the educational institutions with which the project works. The meetings revealed that the major current need in the agricultural sector is for low- to mid-level practical technicians. There is also a need for a few more professional graduates. Graduates of the technical training centers and the agricultural *lycée* are in top demand. Demand for graduates of ENSA and ISFAR, who are also skilled, is lower. In many ways, these comments parallel the project's Human Capital Needs study, but in starker terms.

The other area of demand that needs to be considered is in the public sector — primarily regarding researchers. Many researchers are approaching retirement age and will need to be replaced. If the agriculture sector continues to receive funding, additional new researchers will need to be added to the system. Much of the project's most successful work is at the so-called lower-level training centers, where market demand seems to be strongest. Because of questionable market demand, future activities in developing human capacity to support agriculture should not focus on higher education, other than supporting more and better researchers.

Finding 2. A number of the targets in the project's PMP do not appear realistic.

In reviewing and updating results in the June 2013 revised PMP (Annex III.7), the evaluation team noted some inconsistencies and anomalies. ERA project staff indicated that they have corrected some of these and that they are setting more realistic targets.

Q13. Which R&D programs have contributed to policy change or an enabling environment?

Finding. The evaluation team could not identify a significant R&D program that had contributed to policy change or an enabling environment. Delays in project implementation have prevented most research efforts from contributing to policy changes. Significant institutional reforms in syllabus development, curriculum reform, and research implementation and funding will likely impact policy and create an enabling environment, but these are not R&D programs.

CONCLUSION

At mid-point in its implementation, the ERA Project presents a bit of an enigma. By many of its standard metrics, the project is not doing well. Significant delays in delivery of goods and services in the initial stages of the project led to poor progress in research activities. Important communication problems also exist between the project and the institutions it works with — particularly the research institutions. Both situations have caused frustration with the project among members of the Senegalese AET and research institutions. At the same time, the institutions see the ERA Project as highly relevant to Senegal's agriculture and education sectors. These partners appreciate ERA's support, recognize the importance of the project, and want it to succeed.

The ERA Project has significant potential to achieve meaningful results in agriculture education and research in Senegal; however, problems with communications and administrative management have it from reaching its full potential. ERA must improve administrative management and communications with partners to achieve meaningful results. The evaluation team believes the lack of any formal, written

agreements, memoranda of understanding, and work plans between the project and its institutional partners and stakeholders is a core reason for the communication problems mentioned above. After the rapid assessment and prioritization exercise, the project should have executed a written agreement with each institution listing what it would provide and when. If project events or funding change, the agreements should be modified to reflect current situations. Overwhelmed staff members might have seen preparation of these agreements as an arduous task while they worked to launch project. However such agreements would have avoided misunderstandings and unclear expectations that have caused frustration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For USAID/Senegal. During the remainder of the project, USAID should ensure that ERA finishes addressing issues that have hindered progress so far, maintains maximum flexibility in allocating remaining resources for partner priorities, and continues to support reform efforts for educational and research institutions.

In spite of past issues with management and communication, ERA provides a fundamental resource needed to achieve the Feed the Future objectives of reducing extreme poverty and increasing nutritional well-being in Senegal. This work focuses on training high-quality technicians through training centers and technical schools and researchers from universities. Additional resources and institutional change are needed to support the effort that is now getting underway.

The evaluation team thinks it will be difficult for the ERA Project to achieve all of its fixed results targets. However, the project has begun a systemic process that can have significant mid- to longer-term results in laying a foundation that enables Senegal to reach its Feed the Future objectives. When management and communication issues have been addressed, significant achievement as likely.

For the ERA Project. The project will need to establish active, mutual partnerships that respect standard Senegalese protocols and institutions. Ultimately, the evaluation team believes the sustainability of these new concepts and approaches will occur only when the institutions involved take full ownership of them. To encourage this level of acceptance and involvement, champions need to be identified to push them forward. Recommendations for the ERA Project include:

I. Improve communication and collaboration with partners

- Clarify and/or establish formal, written agreements, memoranda of understanding, and work plans between ERA and its institutional partners and stakeholders based on the availability of project resources and partners' priorities
 - Revisit or establish M&E plans with partners to ensure regular monitoring and evaluation of activities
- Develop formal communication protocols with each partner institution
 - Clarify reporting lines and project and partners' roles and responsibilities
 - Review agreements with partners and formalize or cancel them, as required

2. Capitalize on the collaboration ERA has initiated among AETR institutions

- Expand the steering committee to work more closely with partner institutions; consider including members from stakeholder institutions
- Empower the steering committee to serve as the official point of contact among institutions
- Revitalize the TWGs; facilitate exchanges among the TWGs of different institutions
- Consider formalizing partnerships among AETR institutions and facilitating official public-private partnerships
- Reconsider providing further resources to GRAAS program

3. Support the growth, reach, and sustainability of ERA activities by increasing focus on AETR institutions' collaboration with private sector institutions and other projects, such as WAAPP

- Identify champions who will advance ERA initiatives and activities
- Increase emphasis on private sector demands by:
 - Considering additional professional development support to scholarship recipients through internships and networking opportunities with private sector institutions, NGOs, and AET institutions
 - Creating a network to facilitate communication and coordination among other scholarship recipients
 - Increasing resource and training support to technical schools
 - Facilitating opportunities for university students to network with and enhance their professional development through private sector actors
 - Considering support to incubation centers

ANNEXES

ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK

**ANNEX II: EVALUATION METHODS AND
LIMITATIONS**

ANNEX III: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

ANNEX IV: SOURCES OF INFORMATION

**ANNEX V: DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF
INTEREST**

ANNEX I: EVALUATION STATEMENT OF WORK

Mid-Term Evaluation of USAID/Senegal's Capacity Building for Agricultural Education and Research (CBAER) Project Cooperative Agreement signed with Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

1. Purpose and use of the Evaluation

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to assess progress to date and identify improvements that will facilitate the attainment of planned results of the CBAER Project (aka USAID/Education and Research in agriculture (USAID/ERA)). Specifically, the Evaluation Team will review and assess the adequacy of the components stated in section II within the context of the Senegal FTF strategy, the soundness of the project's approaches, the quality of USAID/ERA overall management, the adequacy¹ and efficiency² of Virginia Tech's assistance delivery, the beneficiary coverage and response, and the overall chance of sustaining the project results beyond September 2015.

In addition to the evaluation findings, USAID/Senegal expects that good practices, lessons learned, and recommendations will provide ways to maintain momentum, scale-up the activities according to the FTF strategy, make the most suitable/strategic modifications in the project given realities of budget, and guide the Ministry of Higher Education and USAID in future programming.

After about 30 months of implementation (September 2010 — June 2013), a comprehensive look at these components will help to identify strengths and needed adjustments to the intervention approaches, nature of services, and efficiency with which assistance is delivered. The team conducting this evaluation will gather a wide range of background information from USAID/Senegal, USAID/ERA, Ministry of Higher Education, Agriculture Education and Training (AET) institutions staff, and beneficiaries to ensure that the findings, conclusions, and recommendations are based on an accurate understanding of the project and that multiple perspectives have been consulted to pave ways for utilization of the evaluation results. The evaluation report will be widely disseminated for the use of all stakeholders.

2. Context

The constraints facing the agricultural sector in Senegal include: poor infrastructure; limited access to land, water, and financial services; low basic education levels — especially among women - and antiquated university curricula; inadequate extension and advisory systems; marketing restrictions; and public subsidies that discourage diversification and innovation and encourage inappropriate use of chemicals and water.

¹ Adequacy is meant to assess relevance of the project's components. Are those the right mix?

² Efficiency is meant to ascertain whether the project is delivered in a timely and cost effective manner.

Senegal has taken actions to alleviate the constraints that are listed above. For instance, the Government of Senegal's (GOS) signing of the Comprehensive Agricultural Development Program (CAADP) compact signals a fundamental shift in the national commitment and policy toward agricultural growth and development. The GOS Accelerated Growth Strategy and the Country Investment Plan (CIP) for Agriculture also evidence the Senegal's commitment to reduce poverty and fight against hunger.

USAID/Senegal supports those efforts through the Feed the Future (FTF) strategy, which is based on the development hypothesis that poverty and hunger can be sustainably reduced through transforming the national agriculture sector and nutritional status of the Senegalese population, especially women and children, through focused and scaled investment priorities. In Senegal, FTF focuses on the following five areas:

1. Agriculture driven economic growth — productivity increases through a value chain approach and promotion of sound land management;
2. Household behaviors that promote optimal nutrition;
3. Enhanced policy implementation;
4. Strengthened rural infrastructure and access to finance;
5. Increased human resource capacity, both at health facilities and every level of the agricultural sector including associated institutions.

The fifth area above is well timely for the Senegal's agricultural knowledge and information system (AKIS) — its agricultural research, teaching, and extension system, which must be modernized and be made capable of responding to challenges and opportunities benefiting Senegalese producers, consumers, and the growing local agro-industry. A strong and dynamic AKIS is central to meeting the challenges and opportunities of Senegal's agricultural sector. USAID/ERA will contribute to these development objectives as well as to overall results and targets of the FTF implementation plan by assisting Senegalese Agriculture Education and Training (AET) institutions.

The AKIS that USAID/ERA is helping to create recognizes the on-the-ground realities of Senegal and the necessity of Senegalese institutional leadership in molding the ultimate form this system will take over time. USAID/ERA will place the agriculture education and training (AET) institutions at the center of the AKIS with strengthened and integrated teaching, research, and extension missions. The system approach will be to fully engage these institutions in USAID/ERA, demonstrating through their direct involvement in project implementation, the synergy and win-win result of a strengthened, integrated, AET system that will educate their personnel, conduct applied and adaptive research in partnership with them, and serve as a focal point for dissemination of research results. Through the USAID/ERA project, Senegal's AET system will adjust and transform the AKIS, stimulating the public and private sectors to work together as partners in shaping Senegal's national agricultural economy and future.

In sum, as part of the FTF initiative strategic plan led by USAID/Senegal's Economic Growth Office (EGO), the purpose of USAID/ERA project is to develop the human and institutional capacity for continuous innovation in the Senegalese public and private sectors, leading to

farming system and value chain productivity improvements and production system sustainability. The three components of the project are stated below:

1. Strengthening agriculture education and training;
2. Strengthening applied research and outreach; and
3. Project management and policy support.

For more details, see the USAID/ERA Project Results Framework in Annex A and a list of illustrative indicators in Annex B.

The table below provides a summary of the project

Project Name	Capacity Building for Agricultural Education and Research Project (CBAER) or USAID/ERA
Cooperative Agreement No	685-A-00-10-00194-00
Period of Agreement	September 1, 2010 — September 30, 2015
Funding	\$28,000,000
Implementing Organization	Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Agreement Officer Representative	Aminata Niane Badiane, USAID/Senegal's EGO Deputy Team Leader

The targeted agricultural education and training institutions in Senegal through the USAID/ERA project are:

- Four universities with agricultural programs: The University of Cheikh Anta Diop (UCAD), The University of Gaston Berger (UGB), The University of Thies, (UT) which includes two institutions of *Ecole Nationale Supérieure de l'Agriculture (ENSA)* and *Institut Supérieur de la Formation Agricole et Rural, (ISFAR)*, and The University of Ziguinchor (UZ).
- Three professional training centers: The Center of Professional Training in Horticulture (CFPH) at Camberene, The Technical Training Center for Forestry and Water (CNFTEFCPN) at Ziguinchor, and The Technical Training Center for Livestock Raising and Industry in St. Louis, (CNFTEIA).
- One Lycee with an agricultural focus: The Lycee Technique Agricole Emile Badiane (LTAEB) in Bignona, Casamance.
- Additionally, USAID/ERA works with the two research institutions of Senegal: The Institut Senegalais de Recherches Agricoles (ISRA) and The Institut Technologie Alimentaire (ITA).

3. Issues and Questions to be investigated

The Evaluation Team will investigate to what extent the implementing partner has contributed to USAID/Senegal/EGO cross-cutting IR: Increased Institutional and Human Resources Capacities. Specifically, the evaluation will measure achievements made through the three USAID/ERA

components listed in section II above, plus certain cross-cutting themes such as gender equity, climate change, educational bridging, governance, information and communication technology, and partnerships.

USAID/Senegal is interested in knowing about the adequacy of the components stated in section II within the context of the Senegal FTF strategy, the soundness of the project's approaches, the quality of USAID/ERA overall management, the adequacy and efficiency of Virginia Tech.'s assistance delivery, the beneficiary coverage and response, and the overall chance of sustaining the project results beyond September 2015. The evaluation team will also record good practices and lessons learned in addressing the three components and cross-cutting themes.

The Evaluation Team will answer the following questions related to cross-cutting themes and the three components of the project.

Cross-Cutting Questions:

- To what extent has the project been implemented effectively, including timely completion of project activities, effective use of project resources, reach of target groups/beneficiaries, quality of partnerships and collaboration, and contribution to overall USAID/Senegal EGO goals?
- How relevant are project components and how realistic are project targets?
- What's the likelihood of sustaining project results after project closure?
- To what extent has the project addressed gender and environmental compliance issues?
- What partnership mechanisms are most productive³, efficient, effective⁴ and sustainable⁵ for carrying out agricultural research to positively benefit resource-poor farmers and food security?
- Which R&D programs have contributed to changes in the policy or enabling environment?

Component I: Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training

- To what extent has agricultural education and training been improved?
- Are the AET reforms being implemented relevant to stakeholders' priorities?

Component 2: Strengthening Applied Research and Outreach

- To what extent are applied research and outreach developed or strengthened and relevant to stakeholders' priorities?

³ Productive is meant to assess if the project is producing or capable of producing the expected results

⁴ Effectiveness is meant to inform of the extent to which the project achieved its objectives

⁵ Sustainable

Component 3: Management and Policy Support

- To what extent has the project improved the AET institutions' management capacity and has developed coordination mechanisms among them?
- What legal, regulatory, or administrative barriers are to be lifted for reforming management and administration systems of targeted AET institutions?

4. Methodology

The project period to be reviewed ranges from September 2010 to June 2013.

4.1. Evaluation design

Since this is a performance evaluation, a non-experimental design seems to be more appropriate. The evaluation team shall propose its own methodology, however it is expected that the evaluation will be implemented through document review, key informant interviews, and focus group meetings.

We have annexed (Annex C) an illustrative evaluation design matrix. Offerors are requested to fill this matrix as much as they can; based on their proposed approach to this evaluation.

The Evaluation Team will develop the specific approach to evaluation methodology and analytical framework, a detailed sampling plan, and data collection tools (e.g. survey and interview questionnaires, discussion guide for focus groups, etc.). In developing the methodology, USAID/Senegal expects that the analysis will consider all Section III components, topics and issues to be investigated.

4.2. Data sources and collection methods

The Evaluation Team shall familiarize itself with USAID and project documentation. USAID/Senegal will ensure that all relevant documents are available to the Team prior to the field work. The documents will include, but will not be limited to:

- USAID/Senegal FTF strategy;
- Government of Senegal Agriculture Country Investment Plan;
- USAID/ERA agreement;
- USAID/ERA annual work plans, annual and quarterly reports;
- Performance Management Plan prepared by USAID/ERA;
- Sector action plans and reports;
- Training manuals;
- Field trip reports; and
- Other documents, as appropriate and/or required.

The Evaluation Team will review documentation provided by USAID/Senegal and USAID/ERA as well as other available information. The team will conduct in-depth interviews with beneficiaries and project staff, and analysis of project results.

The Evaluation Team will meet and interview representatives from USAID/Senegal, USAID/ERA, the Government of Senegal (Ministry of Higher Education), AET institutions, other donors, and other stakeholders in Dakar and in a sample of targeted localities.

4.3. Data analysis methods

The Evaluation Team should include approaches to data disaggregation and integrate gender in data analysis.

4.4. Limitations of the methodology

The Evaluation Team should include to the reports (draft and final) any methodological limitations to the evaluation.

5. Illustrative tasks and timeframe

The tasks in this SOW will be implemented over a period of about 10 weeks (6 —working days per week), starting around October 2013. The schedule below is illustrative and will be discussed and revised as required:

- Literature review and development of evaluation methodology (2 weeks)
- Interviews and Field visits (3 weeks)
- Data Analysis and Draft evaluation report (3 weeks)
- One-day debriefing of findings at USAID/Senegal (1 working day)
- Final evaluation report (2 weeks)

TASKS	DATES/TIME FRAME
Literature Review	October
Meeting with USAID to discuss the evaluation SOW and finalize evaluation questions	October
Draft work plan, methodology and tools submitted to USAID/Senegal	October
USAID review of work plan, including data collection methods/ tools	October
Meeting with USAID/Senegal to (a) discuss the draft work plan; (b) review and confirm planned dates of submission of deliverables; and (c) brainstorm on key accomplishments, weaknesses, opportunities	October
Meetings with USAID/ERA to (a) review the information sources and contact list; (b) discuss appointment dates and times; and (c) brainstorm on key accomplishments, weaknesses, opportunities and	October
Final Work plan, methodology and tools Submitted for approval	October
Meetings with key informants: AET Institutions, GOS representatives (Ministry of Higher Education, Ministry of Agriculture, FNRAA, ISRA, DAPS, ITA), Private sector, producer organizations, other USAID implementing partners, etc.	October - November
Field travel and data collection	October - November
Drafting brief summary of key findings	November
Draft report submitted to USAID/Senegal	November
Debriefing for USAID/Senegal and Stakeholders	December
Full draft report submission	December
Feedback from USAID/Senegal and USAID/ERA	December
Revisions to Report and Submission of final report	December

6. Deliverables

The Evaluation Team shall deliver the following to the USAID/Senegal Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) for this contract:

1. A work plan including evaluation design, evaluation timeline, data collection methodology and tools;
2. A draft evaluation report in English;
3. A Power Point presentation to USAID/Senegal and the stakeholders about the findings, conclusions and recommendations ; and
4. A final evaluation report in English. The final evaluation report must meet the quality criteria specified in the Evaluation Policy. See following link for more information. <http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation/policy>.

The Evaluation Team shall propose its own evaluation report outline but it is expected that the main body (sections "Introduction" through "Lessons learned") of the final evaluation report will not exceed 50 pages. It is expected that the report will include the following sections:

1. Acknowledgement
2. Acronyms list
3. Executive Summary
4. Table of contents
5. Introduction
6. Background
7. Purpose and Methodology of the evaluation
8. Findings (according to issues in Section III)
9. Conclusions
10. Recommendations and strategic options
11. Lessons learned
12. Bibliography
13. Annexes (Statement of work, detailed description of the methodology, organizations and people contacted; and data collection tools, etc.)

ANNEX II: EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

The evaluation team used a variety of evaluation methods, combining both quantitative and qualitative data to allow for the triangulation of data. Specifically, the evaluation methods were 1) document review, 2) in-depth interviews with key informants, 3) focus groups, and 4) Likert scale survey questions for informants and focus group members. Using a combination of methods to answer key questions improved the reliability of the findings and also the ability of the team to evaluate the results and to make data-driven recommendations.

Each of the four methods was used according to its appropriateness to the particular question asked and audience addressed. For some questions, the team used several methods. Details of the evaluation questions and proposed methods used to evaluate these questions are presented in Annex III with a general description below:

Document review:

During the first two weeks of the evaluation each member of the evaluation team reviewed the principal documents related to the project's execution. These documents include:

- Annual work plan (FY 2010 – 2013),
- Annual reports (FY 2010 - FY 2013),
- The project monitoring plan (PMP) and its revisions,
- The program description of the cooperative agreement,
- Senegal's Multiyear FTF Strategy FY 2011 – FY 2015,
- The Government of Senegal Agriculture Country Investment Plan.

Individual team members reviewed additional supplementary documents as appropriate. During the initial in-country evaluation team meetings in week three of the evaluation, the team members discussed initial reactions, questions, and clarifications about the reviewed document to gain a mutual understanding of the documents before field work began. This knowledge was used by the team to prepare the key informant interview guides and focus group guides used for the field work.

Key Informant Interviews:

In collaboration with USAID and ERA project staff, the evaluation team selected individuals and technical working group (TWG) members as key informants for interviews. Selection of the individuals and TWGs was based upon their knowledge and/or influence related to the specific evaluation questions. In addition, selection was done to ensure a diverse and representative range of project beneficiaries and participants. During week three, the evaluation team developed a key informant interview guide with core questions (see Annex III). Before beginning the key informant interviews, the team members reviewed key informant interviewing techniques and the proper use of the interview guide under the guidance of the evaluation team leader so as not to influence participant responses.

The evaluation team took particular care not to give the interviewees leading statements or questions. Each interview session was started with an explanation to the interviewees of the purpose of the session. They were asked to comment on four general areas—management of the project, relevancy of project activities, sustainability of project activities after the project and communications both internal (between their institution and the project) and external (among the various AETR institutions)

The evaluation team took detailed notes of the key interviews and, with participant permission, made an audio recording of each interview for verification of those notes. These notes were assembled after each interview to quantify and analyze the key common themes that presented themselves across the interviews. Key common themes were defined as issues stated by participants in more than four interview sessions. The team developed a spreadsheet listing these common themes and the number of interview sessions where these themes were noted by the interviewees. The spreadsheet is broken down by not only themes but also the type of institution where the interviews occurred (research, university, training centers) to allow the team to evaluate institutional sources of particular issues. This data was used as part of the database for the evaluation team to define findings and create recommendations.

In total, the evaluation team undertook 27 key informant interviews. Sixteen of these interviews were with one person and the rest were with the TWGs that included up to 10 people. Interviews were held at 14 institutions with 2 additional interviews with large private sector operators and one at a large state parastatal (SAED) .

Focus Groups:

The evaluation team strategically used focus groups of beneficiaries to assess progress in delivering services and performance toward expected results of the project. Each focus group explored a specific evaluation questions related to the participants roles in the project. The evaluation team sought to select as representative a sample as possible of eight to 12 participants for each focus group, from a population with the ability to speak knowledgeably about the topic at hand. The evaluation team consulted with informants from the ERA project and concerned institutions for advice on the best people to participate in the focus group.

Under Ms Ndione's leadership, the evaluation team developed focus group discussion guides in week three to ensure consistency within each target group. Two separate guides were prepared—one for students who had received *Bourse d'Excellence* scholarships from the project, and the other for women food processors known as the *Femmes Transformatrice*. The guide included introduction and starting questions, general questions, and key topics to be discussed (see Annex XX). The team also reviewed techniques for moderating focus groups, and a lead focus group moderator was identified for each session.

As part of the consent form signed by the participants at the beginning of the session, the team requested the permission to use recording equipment to record the group discussion. Notes were also taken by the evaluation team. The exercise of identifying common issues as was done in the same manner as with the key informant interviews. The common issues raised in the focus group were differentiated from those of the key informant interviews although in many cases there were similar issues.

The evaluation team held 9 focus group sessions with 4 to twelve people at each session. Focus group sessions were held with students from 6 educational institutions and three user groups (two Femmes Transformatrice sessions and one millet producer group). From both the key informant interviews and the focus group sessions, the evaluation team identified 20 common issues noted in at least 4 interviews or focus group sessions.

Survey using a Likert scale:

Finally, the evaluation team developed three survey documents (Annex III) based on a Likert scale⁶ to be filled out by participants in both the key informant interviews and focus groups. The three surveys included a general survey, and a special survey document each for the student focus groups and for the Femmes Transformatrices. The appropriate survey was administered to all 105 individuals the evaluation team talked with in both interviews and focus groups.

The surveys were administered at the end the key informant interviews and the focus group sessions. The survey document is short and most respondents were able to complete the survey in a bit more than five minutes and there was a 100% completion rate. The survey was anonymous but each survey document was numbered to designate the institution or organization where the survey was taken. The survey documents were collected and Ms NDione tabulated the results on SPSS statistic software (Annex III). These results were used to triangulate the team's findings and recommendations.

LIMITATIONS OF THE METHODOLOGY EMPLOYED:

While the evaluation team is confident that the data and findings presented in this report represent an accurate picture of stakeholder opinion, all data collection is subject to limitations, depending on the methodology employed. The specific limitations of the methods employed are discussed in detail in this section.

Key informant interviews are open to potential bias from the informant. The tone and style of different interviewers can make comparative data analysis difficult. As such, the methodology is not suitable for strictly quantitative data collection although tendencies can be identified. The key informants were a mix of individuals (mostly heads of institutions or principal focus points of the project) and of technical working groups (TWG) which had more than one member, which also makes comparisons difficult (ie between an interview with one participant, and one with six). A standard guide was used in all of the key informant interviews and a standard presentation of the interview purpose was also given to all of the interviews both individual and TWG. Analysis of the data from the interviews was made by review of collected written notes and audio recordings of each interview. These notes were in both English and French while the interviews themselves were in French so potential misinterpretation could possibly occur.

Focus Groups are not tools to gather representative information of an entire community. Individuals within a focus group can sway the views of the group. The participants in the focus group may also bias their views in response to the moderator of the focus group session. The evaluation team did not have the ability to screen focus group participant and many of those who attended were self-selected or available at the time of the focus group. Data from the focus group was collected by parsing written notes and recordings for common issues and comments. Since the discussions were in French and the notes were in English a potential bias and error could occur.

Likert scale surveys are subject to some limitations as well. Respondents have only five choices on their view of the statements given, while people often have more nuanced views than these five choices. There is also the possibility that answers are influenced by previous questions. Likert scale surveys also

⁶ In a Likert scale based survey, a general question is posed and statements related to this question (Likert items) are presented to the interviewee or focus group participant. Participants are then asked to evaluate their views on these statements according to a five-point (or other odd number) scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree

can suffer from respondents taking one side or the other for most of their responses, i.e., all good or all bad. Respondents may also seek to avoid “extremes” options and respond with more neutral positions than they actually believe to be true. The survey employed did not undergo extensive pre-testing due to time limitations. In addition, language could be an issue in some of the surveys (particularly with the Femmes Transformatrices) as the survey document was in French and some of the respondents may have had difficulty in fully understanding the statements in the survey. Given the limited scale and lack of randomization, the results of the survey can only be used to provide information on tendency in one direction or another of the respondents and not precise data on target group opinions.

ANNEX III: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

- 1. Evaluation Design Matrix**
- 2. Key Informant Interview Guides**
- 3. Focus Group Discussion Guide**
- 4. Likert Scale-Based Survey**
- 5. Common Themes from Interviews and Focus Groups**
- 6. Tabulation of Survey Results**
- 7. FY 13 PMP Targets and Actual FY 11 – FY 13**

I. Evaluation Design Matrix

EVALUATION DESIGN MATRIX

(Questions highlighted in yellow are directly from RFQ)

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions	Illustrative Indicators	Data-Collection Methods	Data Source and Selection Criteria	Data Analysis Method
General Project Performance					
	1) How relevant are project components and how realistic are project targets?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Percent achievement of project targets Mapping project achievement to results framework 	Document Review	Annual Reports, PMP	Tabulation and discussion
			Key Informant Interview	USAID staff, GOS officials, senior AETR officials	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
			Likert-based Survey	USAID staff, GOS officials, senior AETR officials	Tabulation of responses
1) To what extent has the project been implemented effectively, including timely completion of project activities, effective use of project resources, reach of target groups/beneficiaries, quality of partnerships and collaboration, and contribution to overall USAID/Senegal EGO goals?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of spontaneous replications of project activities Adjusted AETR internal budgets and plans reflecting project results Percent of target beneficiaries expressing approval of project activities. 	Key Informant Interview	GOS officials, AETR officials and staff, selected farmers and private sector recipients	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
			Focus Group	<i>Femme Transformatrices</i>	Coding of notes and recordings to identify emerging themes
	2) What is the likelihood of sustaining project results after project closure?		Likert-based Survey	Interviewees and focus group members	Tabulation of responses

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions	Illustrative Indicators	Data-Collection Methods	Data Source and Selection Criteria	Data Analysis Method
	3) To what extent has the project addressed gender and environmental compliance issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number and quality of gender and environmental specific interventions Documented expansion of gender roles and responsibilities in AETR operations and programs 	Document Review	Annual Reports, gender studies	Tabulation and discussion
			Key Informant Interview	AETR officials and staff, selected farmers and private sector recipients	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
			Focus Group	<i>Femme Transformatrices</i> , women recipients of "Bourses d'Excellence"	Coding of notes and recordings to identify emerging themes
			Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees and focus group members	Tabulation of responses
Component 1: Strengthening Agricultural Education and Training					
1) To what extent has agricultural education and training been improved?	1) How has ERA activities contributed to increasing the relevance of AETR programs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of courses taught with approved syllabus Documented change in perception of AETR programs by private sector and farmers Number of graduates from AETR employed in their field Documented delivery and continue use of ICT and non-ICT equipment 	Document Review	Annual Reports, other studies	Tabulation and discussion
			Key Informant Interview	AETR officials and staff, selected farmers and private sector recipients	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
			Focus Group	Selected AETR faculty, selected student leaders	Coding of notes and recordings to identify emerging themes
			Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees and focus group members	Tabulation of responses
	2) Are AETR programs being implemented with greater strategic vision and coordination?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of institutions doing self-assessments Participation in GRAAS advisory group 	Key Informant Interview	AETR officials and staff	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
			Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees	Tabulation of responses

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions	Illustrative Indicators	Data-Collection Methods	Data Source and Selection Criteria	Data Analysis Method
2) Are the AETR reforms being implemented relevant to stakeholders' priorities?	1) What is the likelihood of sustaining project results after project closure?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented number/percent respondents indicate AETR reforms meet their needs. Number of reforms copied or expanded by AETR institutions themselves. Satisfaction of private sector, farmers, students, and faculty with AETR reforms. 	Key Informant Interview	AETR officials and staff and selected private sector recipients	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
			Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees	Tabulation of responses
Component 2: Strengthening Applied Research and Outreach					
1) To what extent are applied research and outreach developed or strengthened and relevant to stakeholders' priorities?	1) How well are research and outreach programs integrated with the value chains in Senegal – both public and private sector actors?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Researchers' satisfaction with FOG process and implementation. Number of farmers and private enterprises using new technologies relevant to project. 	Document Review	Annual Reports, research reports and other studies	Tabulation and discussion
			Key Informant Interview	Research institutes officials and staff, FNRAA officials, selected farmers and private sector individuals	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
			Focus Group	Research grant recipients	Coding of notes and recordings to identify emerging themes
			Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees and focus group members	Tabulation of responses

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions	Illustrative Indicators	Data-Collection Methods	Data Source and Selection Criteria	Data Analysis Method	
Component 3: Management and Policy Support						
1) To what extent has the project improved the AETR institutions' management capacity and has developed coordination mechanisms among them?	1) What partnership mechanisms are most productive, efficient, effective and sustainable for carrying out agricultural research to positively benefit resource-poor farmers and food security?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of institutions using curriculum mapping • Number and type of specific actions taken as result AKIS workshops and study tours. • Specific outcome from work of GRAAS advisory group. 	Document Review	Annual Reports, reports from GRAAS and other organizations	Tabulation and discussion	
			Key Informant Interviews	GOS officials, senior research institute officials	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings	
			Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees	Tabulation of responses	
	2) How sustainable are the AETR management and policy changes?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent of internalizing, via budgets and assigned personnel, by AETRs of management and policy changes. 	Document Review	Annual Reports	Tabulation and discussion
				Key Informant Interviews	GOS officials, senior AETR officials	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
				Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees	Tabulation of responses
2) What legal, regulatory, or administrative barriers are to be lifted for reforming management and administration systems of targeted AETR institutions?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identified barriers and status of reforms to remove 	Document Review	Annual Reports, other studies	Tabulation and discussion	
			Key Informant Interviews	GOS officials, senior AETR officials	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings	
			Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees	Tabulation of responses	

Evaluation Questions	Sub-Questions	Illustrative Indicators	Data-Collection Methods	Data Source and Selection Criteria	Data Analysis Method
<p>3) Which R&D programs have contributed to changes in the policy or enabling environment?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy change associated with specific R&D programs 	Document Review	Annual Reports, research and other studies	Tabulation and discussion
			Key Informant Interviews	GOS officials, senior research institute officials, AETR Officials	Guided interviews with tabulation of key issues and insights from notes and recordings
			Likert-based Survey	Selected Interviewees	Tabulation of responses

2. Key Informant Interview Guides

Guide d'entretien pour les responsables de master les directeurs d'études et staff

Connaissance et gestion du projet ERA

- 1) Quel est votre niveau de participation dans le processus de mise en œuvre des activités du projet ERA? comment s'est fait la répartition des rôles et responsabilités dans la réalisation des objectifs du projet.
- 2) Pensez-vous avoir une bonne connaissance des objectifs et activités du projet ERA ?
- 3) Comment jugez-vous la réalisation à temps des activités prévues (mise en place des équipements, formation ...)

Communication

- 1) Quels mécanismes de communications avez-vous développés avec le projet ERA
- 2) Quels mécanismes de communications avez-vous développés avec les instances de concertation mises en place (GRAAS, comité de pilotage, le groupe technique de travail, les comités régionaux...)

Durabilité/pérennité des activités du projet ERA

- 1) Est-ce dans votre planification future vous prenez en compte les activités développées avec le projet ERA ou comptez-vous les arrêter dès la fin du projet ERA?
- 2) Quelles sont les difficultés de suivi des étudiants bénéficiaires ?
- 3) Comment estimez-vous le niveau de retour des étudiants pour travailler au pays
- 4) Est-ce que les questions de changement climatique sont prises en charge dans le curricula et les syllabus ?

Pertinence des réformes mises en œuvre aux priorités des parties prenantes

- 1) Dans quelles mesures les activités du projet ERA sont intégrées dans le programme de l'institution? y a-t-il eu des avantages, des contraintes?
- 2) lesquelles de vos priorités n'ont pas été prise en compte ?

- 3) Comment jugez-vous les formations sur le processus de candidature à des appels d'offres, avez-vous soumissionné à des appels d'offre depuis? Les avez-vous gagnés? Pensez-vous qu'ERA y a contribué ? avez-vous soumissionnez en collaboration avec d'autres centre de recherches ? lesquels ?
- 4) Et les formations sur les capacités administratives et le renforcement de capacité concernant les compétences dans la mise en place de syllabus ? Pouvez-vous nous parlez de leur apport .
- 5) Vous avez bénéficié de cours à distance et de cours de courte durée sur les technologies pouvez-vous nous en parlé ?

Dans quelle mesure l'enseignement et la formation agricoles ont été améliorés avec le projet ERA ?

- 1) Comment et par qui les curricula/syllabus ont-ils été révisés ? améliorés ? qu'est ce qui a changé ? donnez-nous des exemples ?
 - Quels sont les nouveaux cours et nouveaux diplômes introduits avec la mise en œuvre du programme ERA?
 - Quelles sont les contraintes et les facteurs de blocage pour la révision complète des curricula/Syllabus ? Quels sont les obstacles juridiques, réglementaires ou administratifs qui doivent être levés pour la réforme des systèmes de gestion et d'administration des institutions ciblées
- 2) Comment les besoins en équipements et infrastructures pour la formation ont-ils évolués?
- 3) Quelle appréciation faites-vous de la formation des étudiants ?
 - Selon vous quels facteurs en sont la cause ?
 - Comment jugez-vous l'intégration des femmes dans les programmes (bourses, voyages d'étude) Comment les objectifs ont été fixés pour les femmes et pour les hommes i.e. y at-il eu une démarche volontariste orientée vers le genre ?
- 4) Quel est l'impact de l'introduction des investissements en équipements et infrastructures dans les formations ? Quel est le niveau d'utilisation des TIC dans les formations? Surtout par rapport au e-learning ?

- 5) Y a-t-il une adéquation entre la demande du secteur agricole et les curricula développés? comment les besoins de révisions, ont-ils été identifiés ? le contexte économique et social était-t- il pas favorable?
- 6) Y a-t-il des mesures d'accompagnement pour la recherche d'emploi et /ou stages des étudiants diplômés ?

Guide d'entretien pour les instituts de recherche

Connaissance et gestion du projet ERA

- 1) Quel est votre niveau de participation dans le processus de mise en œuvre des activités du projet ERA? comment s'est fait la répartition des rôles et responsabilités dans la réalisation des objectifs du projet ?
- 2) Pensez-vous avoir une bonne connaissance des objectifs et activités du projet ?
- 3) Comment jugez-vous la réalisation à temps des activités prévues (mise en place des équipements, formation de votre personnel, mise en place du groupe technique de travail, mise en place du groupe de réflexion sur l'agriculture et l'agro-industrie (GRAAS),

Communication

- 1) Quels mécanismes de communications avez-vous développés avec le projet ERA ? avec le FNRAA ?
- 2) Quels mécanismes de communications avez-vous développés avec les instances de concertation mises en place (GRAAS, comité de pilotage, le groupe technique de travail, les comités régionaux)

Durabilité/pérennité des activités du projet ERA

- 1) Est-ce dans votre planification future vous prenez en compte les activités développées avec le projet ERA ou comptez-vous les arrêter dès la fin du projet ERA?
- 2) Comment estimez-vous le niveau de collaboration avec le FNRAA avec les autres centres de recherche ? cela a-t-il été facilité par le projet ERA ?
- 3) Est-ce que les questions de changement climatique sont prises en charge dans les vos priorités de recherche ? En quoi le projet ERA y a contribué ?
- 4) Est-ce que les questions de genre sont prises en charge par les thématiques de recherche ? En quoi le projet ERA y a contribué ?
- 1) Les technologies ou pratiques créées grâce au projet ERA sont-elles durables selon vous?

Pertinence des réformes mises en œuvre aux priorités des parties prenantes

- 1) Dans quelles mesures les activités du projet ERA sont intégrées dans le programme de l'institution? y a-t-il eu des avantages, des contraintes?
- 2) lesquelles de vos priorités n'ont pas été prise en compte ?
- 3) Comment jugez-vous les formations sur le processus de candidature à des appels d'offres, avez-vous soumissionné à des appels d'offre depuis? Les avez-vous gagnés? Pensez-vous que le projet ERA y a contribué ? avez-vous soumissionné en collaboration avec d'autres centre de recherches ?
- 4) Et les formations sur les capacités administratives et le renforcement de capacité concernant les compétences dans la mise en place de syllabus
- 5) Vous avez bénéficié de cours à distance et de cours de courtes durée sur les technologies pouvez-vous nous en parlé ?

Dans quelle mesure la recherche appliquée et la vulgarisation des résultats de recherche ont été améliorées ou renforcées grâce au projet ERA

- 1) Quelles nouvelles technologies/innovations avez-vous mises en œuvre dans le cadre du projet ERA? Et quelles utilisations en sont faites?
- 2) Est-ce que les programmes du projet ERA sur le renforcement de la recherche appliquée et la vulgarisation ont été bien adoptés par votre institution? Quels impacts sur la recherche et la vulgarisation agricole ?
- 2) Dans quelle mesure le projet a amélioré la capacité de gestion des institutions et a développé des mécanismes de coordination entre eux? Y a t- il eut des opportunités pour les partenaires d'augmenter d'améliorer leurs liens entre eux même et avec le secteur privé et avec les instituts de formations (ENSA, UCAD, ISFAR, et autres...)
- 3) Quels sont les obstacles juridiques, réglementaires ou administratifs qui doivent être levés pour la réforme des systèmes de recherches et de vulgarisation ? quels rôles le projet ERA pourrait-il jouer dans ce sens?

- 4) Comment jugez-vous l'intermédiation du FNRAA ?
- grâce à la formation reçue sur les procédures de soumission aux appels d'offres les subventions à la recherche ont-elles augmentées ?
 - Que pensez-vous de la procédure du FOG?
- 5) Que pensez-vous de la stratégie du projet ERA en matière de promotion de la recherche appliquée et de vulgarisation des résultats de recherche. Les projets mis en œuvre sont-ils répliquables et soutenables ?

Guide d'entretien pour le FNRAA

Connaissance et gestion du projet ERA

- 1) Quel est votre niveau de participation dans le processus de mise en œuvre des activités du projet ERA? comment s'est fait la répartition des rôles et responsabilités dans la réalisation des objectifs du projet.
- 2) Pensez-vous avoir une bonne connaissance des objectifs et activités du projet ?
- 3) Comment jugez-vous la réalisation à temps des activités prévues (financement de la recherche, formation des chercheurs, collaboration entre chercheurs, mise en place du groupe de réflexion sur l'agriculture et l'agro-industrie (GRAAS), utilisation des FOG...)

Communication

- 1) Quels mécanismes de communications avez-vous développés avec le projet ERA et avec les centres de recherches (ISRA, ITA)
- 2) Quels mécanismes de communications avez-vous développés avec les instances de concertation mises en place (GRAAS, comité de pilotage, le groupe technique de travail, les comités régionaux)

Durabilité/pérennité des activités du projet ERA

- 1) Est-ce dans votre planification future vous prenez en compte les activités développées avec le projet ERA ou comptez-vous les arrêter dès la fin du projet ERA?
- 2) Quelles sont les difficultés de suivi des centres de recherche bénéficiaires du FOG et autres financement de la recherche ?
- 3) Comment estimez-vous le niveau de collaboration entre les instituts que vous financez à travers le projet ERA ?
- 4) Est-ce que les questions de changement climatique sont prises en charge dans les priorités de la recherche donc dans vos sélections des projets à financer? Donner nous des exemples.
- 1) Est-ce que les questions de genre sont également prises en compte dans les thématiques de recherche ? Donnez-nous des exemples ?

Pertinence des réformes mises en œuvre aux priorités des parties prenantes

- 1) Dans quelles mesures les activités du projet ERA sont intégrées dans le programme du FNRAA? y a-t-il eu des avantages, des contraintes dans votre collaboration avec le projet ERA?
- 2) lesquelles de vos priorités n'ont pas été prise en compte ?
- 3) Comment jugez-vous les formations sur le processus de candidature à des appels d'offres ? est-ce que le niveau de soumission des centres de recherche a augmenté ? Pensez-vous qu'ERA y a contribué? et la soumission en collaboration avec d'autres centre de recherches le niveau a-t-il augmenté?

Dans quelle mesure le FNRAA a participé à la bonne mise en œuvre du projet ERA ?

- 4) Comment le FNRAA a aidé à la réalisation des objectifs du Feed the future ?
- 5) Que pensez-vous de la stratégie du projet ERA en matière de promotion de la recherche appliquée et de vulgarisation des résultats de recherche. Les projets mises en œuvres sont-ils répliquables et soutenables ?
- 6) Pouvez-vous nous parler des subventions offertes, des modalités de sélections des centres de recherches ?
- 7) Pensez-vous que la collaboration entre centre de recherche à augmenter avec le projet ERA?
- 8) Est-ce que effectivement les institutions de recherches (ISRA et ITA) ont gagné plus subventions après la formation reçue sur les procédures de soumission aux appels d'offre?
- 9) Que pensez-vous de la procédure du FOG?

3. Focus Group Discussion Guide

Focus groupe pour les étudiants

Questions introductives

Connaissances générales sur le programme de master

- 1) Pouvez-vous nous décrire de manière générale ce master et les cours dispensés ?
- 2) Quels étaient vos attentes en suivant ce cours de master ? qu'est-ce qu'un diplômé de ce cours devrait pouvoir acquérir en termes de connaissances et quels postes pourrait-il accéder selon vous ?

Contenu des cours et connaissances acquises

- 1) Pensez-vous que les cours que vous avez reçus sont conformes à vos attentes et à vos besoins en formations ? si oui comment ?
- 2) Comment les cours ont-ils améliorés vos connaissances en....
 - Pouvez-vous nous donner des exemples de connaissances acquises ?
 - Avez-vous eu l'impression d'avoir eu des cours interdisciplinaires (interplay of agriculture)? si oui pourquoi ? les aspects sur l'économie, la communication, la gestion et la communication ont-ils été pris en compte ?
- 3) Quelles sont selon vous les avantages d'avoir suivi ce cours de master en ?
- 4) Estimez-vous que le curriculum développé dans ce cours vous permet de connaître les contraintes de l'agriculture sénégalaise et pensez-vous que vous être assez outiller pour y faire face ? pourquoi ? Donner des exemples ?
- 5) Pensez-vous avoir compris les opportunités existant dans le secteur agriculture
- 6) S'il, y avait des choses en changer dans ce cours serait par rapport au contenu des syllabus ? ou aux professeurs? Pourquoi ?
- 7) A votre avis qu'est ce qui devrait être fait pour améliorer le programme du master en...les activités sociale, l'assistance administrative, la durée des cours, les services de soutien (bourses) les voyages d'études....,
- 8) Y a-t-il eu des promesses en termes de bourses ou de soutien ou d'insertion au début de ce cours ? ces promesse sont-elles étaient toutes réalisées.
- 9) Quelles interactions avec le personnel administratif et les professeurs avez-vous le plus apprécié? Quelles interactions avec le personnel administratif et les professeurs avez-vous le moins apprécié ? est-ce que les services pour les étudiants fournissent le soutien adéquat pour optimiser votre réussite ? Qu'est-ce que l'administration a bien fait selon vous dans ce programme de master ?

Perspectives et success stories

- 1) Pensez-vous pouvoir trouver rapidement un emploi après votre formation? Par quel moyen ?
- 2) Etes-vous bien orienté ou informé sur comment chercher des opportunités dans le secteur agricole, et bien outillé pour vous embarqué dans l'entrepreneuriat et l'auto emploi
- 3) Quels sont les problèmes relatifs au climat académique que voudriez-vous qu'on change pour les prochaine générations et qui pourrait améliorer la qualité de la formation?
- 4) avez-vous eu des opportunités de stages dans les organismes privés
- 5) Connaissez-vous des anciens qui ont réussi à s'insérer ? si oui dans quelle structure ?

4. Likert Scale Based Survey

Enquête pour l'Evaluation de Projet ERA

Principaux thèmes généraux :

Gestion de projet

J'ai une bonne compréhension du projet ERA et le travail qu'il accomplit.

Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout a fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Le projet ERA fait un bon travail en offrant un service à moi et mon institution

Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout a fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Pertinence des activités du Projet / Objectifs

Le projet ERA m'a donné (donné à mon établissement) des biens (fonds / services / formation / équipement) qui sont d'une importance cruciale

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Mon travail / institution serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Durabilité des activités du projet

Je (mon établissement) l'intention de poursuivre les activités initiées par le projet ERA après la fin du projet.

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Je (mon établissement) recherchent ou trouvé des fonds pour poursuivre les efforts énoncés par le projet ERA.

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Qualité de la communication / coordination / partenariats créés

Je (mon établissement) pu créer des liens plus étroits avec d'autres personnes et institutions qui soutiennent mon / notre travail à cause des activités du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

J'ai une meilleure compréhension de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel en raison du projet ERA.

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Spécifiques Secteurs thématiques :

Amélioration de l'éducation agricole / recherche agricole / sensibilisation – vulgarisations

La qualité du mon travail (travail de mon institution) peuvent faire s'est améliorée en raison des activités du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Je me sens mieux préparé pour répondre à mes objectifs personnels / institutionnel en raison des activités du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Il y a de forts liens entre les institutions de recherches (de formation) et le secteur privé

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Les capacités administratives et de recherche (de formation) ont fortement augmenté avec le programme ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Enquête de Project ERA (Etudiant)

Principaux thèmes généraux :

Gestion de projet

J'ai une bonne compréhension du projet ERA et le travail qu'il accomplit.

Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout a fait désaccord
(2)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Le projet ERA fait un bon travail en offrant un service à moi et mon institution

Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout a fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Pertinence des activités du Projet / Objectifs

Le projet ERA m'a donné (donné à mon établissement) des biens (fonds / services / formation / équipement) qui sont d'une importance cruciale

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Mon travail / institution serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Qualité de la communication / coordination

J'ai une meilleure compréhension de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel en raison du projet ERA.

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Spécifiques Secteurs thématiques :

Amélioration de l'éducation agricole

La qualité du mon travail peuvent faire s'est améliorée en raison des activités du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Je me sens mieux préparé pour répondre à mes objectifs personnels / institutionnel en raison des activités du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Les méthodes d'apprentissage ont été améliorées avec le programme ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

J'ai un bon connaissance des opportunités existantes dans le secteur agricole

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Enquête Project ERA (Les Femmes Transformatrice)

Principaux thèmes généraux :

Gestion de projet

J'ai une bonne compréhension du projet ERA et le travail qu'il accomplit.

Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout a fait désaccord
(3)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Le projet ERA fait un bon travail en offrant un service à moi et mon institution

Tout a fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout a fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Pertinence des activités du Projet / Objectifs

Le projet ERA m'a donné des biens (fonds / services / formation / équipement) qui sont d'une importance cruciale

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Mon travail serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Durabilité des activités du projet

Je l'intention de poursuivre les activités initiées par le projet ERA après la fin du projet.

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Je recherchent ou trouvé des fonds pour poursuivre les efforts énoncés par le projet ERA.

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Qualité de la communication / coordination / partenariats créés

Je pu créer des liens plus étroits avec d'autres personnes et institutions qui soutiennent mon / notre travail à cause des activités du projet ERA

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

J'ai une meilleure compréhension de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel en raison du projet ERA.

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Spécifiques Secteurs thématiques :

Pour les femmes transformatrices

Le programme ERA a amélioré mes connaissances en technologies de transformation

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

Le programme ERA a renforcé ma gestion organisationnelle

Tout à fait d'accord	D'accord	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Pas d'accord	Tout à fait désaccord
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

5. Common Themes from Interviews and Focus Groups

		1	2	3	4
		ERA delays in providing funds / equipment has created significant delays in research / program	Communication with ERA is a problem	Communication with ERA is not a problem	ERA does not respect Senegalese protocol and/or institutions
<i>Number:</i>		25	20	7	11
SC	1				
Research	1	x	x		x
	2	x	x		x
	3	x	x		x
	4	x	x		
	5	x	x		x
	6	x	x		x
Universities	1		x		
	2	x	x		
	3	x	x		x
	4		x		
	5	x		x	
	6	x		x	
	7	x		x	
	8		x		
	9	x	x		x
	10	x		x	
	11	x	x		x
	12	x	x		
	13	x	x		x
Training Centers	1	x	x		x
	2	x	x		
	3	x	x		
	4	x	x		
Focus	1			x	
	2	x	x		
	3	x		x	
	4				
	5				
	6	x		x	
	7				
	8				
Other	1	x			x
	2	x			
Relevant Interviews	34	30	30	25	

9

10

11

12

The TWG is not working well or at all	The computer and lab equipment was useful and needed	The buses and pick-ups were useful and needed	While equipment is good our real need is infrastructure and other critical support
---------------------------------------	--	---	--

<i>Number:</i>		7	19	11	22
SC	1				x
	1				
Research	2	x	x		x
	3				x
	4		x		
	5	x	x	x	
	6		x		x
	1		x	x	x
Universities	2				x
	3	x	x		x
	4	x		x	x
	5		x		
	6				
	7				
	8		x	x	
	9	x			x
	10		x	x	x
	11	x	x	x	x
	12				
	13	x	x	x	x
	Training Centers	1		x	
2			x	x	x
3			x	x	x
4			x	x	x
Focus	1				
	2				x
	3				
	4		x		
	5		x	x	x
	6				
	7		x		x
	8		x		x
Other	1				x
	2				x

Relevant Interviews	21	32	26	34
---------------------	----	----	----	----

13

14

15

16

		The scholarship program was useful and needed	The improvement of curriculum and syllabus is very useful	ERA has brought useful ideas and approaches to our institution	The study tours have little impact on improving Senegalese agricultural sector
--	--	---	---	--	--

Number:		18	11	22	4
SC	1	x		x	
Research	1			x	
	2	x		x	x
	3			x	
	4			x	
	5	x		x	x
	6	x			
Universities	1	x		x	
	2			x	
	3			x	
	4			x	
	5	x	x	x	
	6				
	7			x	
	8		x		
	9		x		x
	10	x	x	x	
	11	x	x	x	
	12		x	x	
	13	x	x	x	
Training Centers	1				x
	2	x	x	x	
	3	x	x	x	
	4	x	x	x	
Focus	1	x			
	2	x			
	3	x			
	4	x			
	5	x	x	x	
	6	x			
	7			x	
	8			x	
Other	1				
	2				

Relevant Interviews	28	24	34	22
---------------------	----	----	----	----

17

18

19

20

	GRAAS will not work	Universities need to focus on satisfying community needs is a good idea	Research should serve the needs of its users	ERA does not respect the time sensitivity of agricultural research
--	---------------------	---	--	--

<i>Number:</i>		8	10	8	5
SC	1				
Research	1	x		x	
	2	x		x	x
	3			x	x
	4	x		x	
	5	x	x	x	
	6				x
Universities	1	x	x		
	2		x	x	
	3				
	4	x			
	5				
	6				
	7				x
	8				
	9				
	10			x	x
	11		x		
	12	x	x		
	13		x		
Training Centers	1	x			
	2		x		
	3		x	x	
	4		x		
Focus	1				
	2				
	3				
	4				
	5		x		
	6				
	7				
	8				
Other	1				
	2				

Relevant Interviews	22	30	26	26
---------------------	----	----	----	----

6. Tabulation of Survey Results

Interprétation des enquêtes employant l'échelle de Likert

Gestions du projet

Position du personnel Institutions de recherche et de formation

Sur les 49 membres d'institutions de recherche et de formation 61, 6% estiment avoir une bonne compréhension du projet ERA du travail qu'il accomplit. (30,6% sont à fait d'accord et le même pourcentage est d'accord). Le personnel de l'université de Thiès et celui de Ziguinchor, le Lycée Technique Agricole de Ziguinchor de même que l'ANCAR estiment à 100% comprendre les objectifs du projet ERA.

Plus de la moitié des répondants pensent que le projet ERA à la capacité du d'offrir des services aux chercheurs, aux enseignants donc aux instituts de recherche et aux universités et écoles de formation, en effets ils sont 49% à être d'accord et 28,6% à être tout à fait d'accord

Une forte proportion des 49 membres d'institutions de recherche, d'universités, de centres de formation (71,5%) apprécient leur association avec le Projet ERA.

Position des étudiants

Sur 42 étudiants interrogés, 83, 3 % estiment avoir une bonne connaissance du projet ERA et du travail qu'il accomplit. 97, 7 % des étudiants pensent que la bourse offerte par le projet ERA est un bon service qui leur est rendu. Et les étudiants de l'université de Ziguinchor se distingue particulièrement, 91,7% d'entre eux sont tout à fait d'accord que les bourses du projet ERA sont un bon service pour eux et leur université. La totalité des étudiants apprécient leur collaboration avec le projet ERA.

Position des femmes transformatrices de Ziguinchor

Sur 14 femmes transformatrices interrogées, la totalité pensent avoir une bonne connaissance du projet ERA et du travail accomplit. 93 % des femmes productrices de Ziguinchor pensent que les services de formation offerts par le projet ERA ont été une bonne opportunité ; elles apprécient à l'unanimité leur association avec le projet ERA.

Pertinence des activités/ des objectifs du projet

Position du personnel Institutions de recherche et de formation

Les fonds mis à dispositions par le projet ERA pour des formations, des équipements ainsi que les biens et services sont d'une importance capitale pour institutions de recherches et de formation. En effet une grande majorités des répondants (85,8%) supportent cette hypothèse. Et parmi eux le staff de l'ISFAR et de l'UGB se distinguent dans ces institutions ils sont 100 % parmi les répondants à être parfaitement d'accord sur l'importance des fonds mis à disposition par le projet. Toutefois, 45 % des membres des institutions ne sont pas d'accord sur le fait que la situation de leurs institutions serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA.

Position des étudiants

92,8 % des étudiants interrogés pensent que les bourses offertes par le projet ERA sont d'une importance capitale. 59,5% d'entre eux pensent que leur situation serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA alors que 11,9% d'entre eux pensent le contraire. Le reste i.e les 28,6 % ne semble être ni d'accord ni en désaccord par rapport à cet hypothèse.

Position des femmes productrices de Ziguinchor

Les femmes productrices estiment à 64,3% que leur travail de production et de transformation de produits agricoles serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA , 28,6% pensent le contraire et 7,1% ne sont ni d'accord ni en désaccord par rapport au fait que l'assistance et les services du Projet ERA sont d'une grande utilité.

Durabilité des activités du projet

Position du personnel Institutions de recherche et de formation

Près de 80% du personnel des institutions interrogé estiment qu'ils vont continuer les activités initiées par le projet ERA. Seuls 6% d'entre eux pensent arrêter les activités qu'ils ont entreprises avec le support du projet ERA. Dans des structures comme l'UGB, l'ISFAR, l'ANCAR 100% des répondants pensent à la possibilité de maintenir dans leur programme les activités de recherche et de formation initiées par le projet

Par rapport à la possibilité de trouver des fonds pour continuer les activités du projet ERA 71, 5 % des répondants pensent que c'est faisable. En effet 18, 4% sont tout à fait d'accord et 53,1 % sont d'accord. D'un autre coté 18,4% d'entre ne sont ni d'accord ni en désaccord et 6,1% d'entre eux n'ont répondu.

Position des femmes productrice de Ziguinchor

La totalité des femmes productrices de Ziguinchor ont l'intention de poursuivre les activités initiées par le projet ERA et déclarent chercher ou avoir trouvé des fonds pour poursuivre les efforts amorcés par le projet.

Communication/ coordination/partenariats créés

Position du personnel Institutions de recherche et de formation

Concernant le renforcement des liens entre le personnel d'une même institution et entre des institutions différentes, un peu plus de la moitié des répondants (62, 2%) sont d'accord et 20,4 % y pensent que les liens entre institutions n'ont pas changé. Certaine coordination et projet partenariat sont antérieurs au projet ERA.

Selon seulement la moitié des répondants (51%), le projet ERA a permis une meilleure connaissance des activités entre collègues d'une même institution mais également entre chercheurs et universitaires de différentes institutions mais qui ont les mêmes centres d'intérêt. D'un autre coté, 22, 4% d'entre ont eu sont restés neutre par rapport à cet assertion Et, 22,5% ne

sont pas d'accord sur le fait d'une meilleure connaissance des activités des partenaires et des collègues.

Position des étudiants

Concernant l'Hypothèse d'une meilleure connaissance des activités des autres étudiants grâce au projet ERA 40,5% des étudiants ne sont ni d'accord ni en désaccord. Seuls 38,8 % d'entre eux supportent cette affirmation et les 21,4% restants ne sont pas du tout d'accord.

Position des femmes productrices

Concernant la création de liens et de partenariats avec d'autres institutions pouvant soutenir leurs activités 71,4% des femmes sont d'accord. En plus elles affirment avoir une meilleure compréhension de ce que les unes et les autres font dans le cadre de leurs activités.

Spécificités des secteurs thématiques

Position du personnel Institutions de recherche et de formation

Par rapport à l'amélioration de la qualité de l'éducation, de la recherche, de la sensibilisation et de la vulgarisation agricole 75, 5% du staff des institutions de recherche et de formation agricole estiment que c'est le cas. Plus 34, 7 % des répondants ne sont toutefois pas sûr que le projet ERA leur a permis de relever leurs défis personnels e professionnels.

Position des étudiants

97,6% des étudiants estiment que la qualité de leur étude s'est améliorée avec le projet ERA . et 90,5% d'entre eux estiment être mieux préparés pour affrontés leurs objectifs professionnels. En outre, 84, 7% des étudiants pensent que les méthodes d'apprentissage ont été améliorées avec le projet ERA. 82, 9% des étudiants interrogés déclarent connaître les opportunités existant dans le secteur agricole.

Position des femmes productrice de Ziguinchor

Les femmes transformatrices déclarent à l'unanimité avoir amélioré leurs connaissances en techniques de transformation et avoir renforcé leurs capacités de gestion organisationnelles

Tableau croisé J'ai une bonne compréhension du projet ERA et le travail qu'il accomplit

		* Catégorie du répondant														Total	
		Catégorie du répondant															
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)		
J'ai une bonne compréhension du projet ERA et le travail qu'il accomplit	Non réponse	Effectif	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	
		Pourcentage	33.3%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	6.1%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	5	1	1	0	15
		Pourcentage	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	25.0%	100.0%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	62.5%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%	30.6%
	D'accord	Effectif	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	4	15
		Pourcentage	33.3%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	12.5%	.0%	50.0%	66.7%	100.0%	30.6%	
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	11
		Pourcentage	.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	37.5%	37.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	22.4%	
Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	5	
	Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.2%		
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49		
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Tableau croisé Le projet ERA fait un bon travail en offrant un service à moi et mon institution

		* Catégorie du répondant														Total	
		Catégorie du répondant															
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)		
Le projet ERA fait un bon travail en offrant un service à moi et mon institution	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	2	14
		Pourcentage	33.3%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	75.0%	50.0%	16.7%	50.0%	28.6%
	D'accord	Effectif	2	0	2	1	1	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	5	2	24
		Pourcentage	66.7%	.0%	100.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	83.3%	50.0%	49.0%	
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	8
		Pourcentage	.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	62.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.3%	
Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.1%		
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49		
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Tableau croisé J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA

		* Catégorie du répondant														Total	
		Catégorie du répondant															
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)		
J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	4.1%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	1	14
		Pourcentage	66.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	62.5%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	28.6%
	D'accord	Effectif	1	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	4	2	2	1	2	3	21
		Pourcentage	33.3%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	25.0%	50.0%	33.3%	75.0%	42.9%	
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	6
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	37.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.2%	
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.2%	
Tout a fait désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	
	Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	4.1%	
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49		
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Tableau croisé Le projet ERA m'a donné (donné à mon établissement) des biens (fonds / services / formation / équipement) qui sont d'une importance cruciale

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total		
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)			
Le projet ERA m'a donné (donné à mon établissement) des biens (fonds / services / formation / équipement) qui sont d'une importance cruciale	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	1	0	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	1	7	1	4	2	2	26
		Pourcentage	33.3%	.0%	50.0%	75.0%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	12.5%	87.5%	50.0%	66.7%	50.0%	53.1%	53.1%	53.1%
	D'accord	Effectif	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	4	1	1	2	2	2	16	
		Pourcentage	66.7%	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	12.5%	50.0%	33.3%	50.0%	32.7%	32.7%	32.7%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2		
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.1%	4.1%	4.1%
Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3			
	Pourcentage	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.1%	6.1%	6.1%	
Tout a fait désaccord	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
	Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49			
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Tableau croisé Mon travail / institution serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total	
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)		
Mon travail / institution serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	7	
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	14.3%	14.3%
	D'accord	Effectif	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	10	
		Pourcentage	33.3%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	37.5%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	20.4%	20.4%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	8	
		Pourcentage	33.3%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	16.7%	25.0%	16.3%	16.3%
Pas d'accord	Effectif	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	6	2	1	2	1	18		
	Pourcentage	33.3%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	66.7%	50.0%	.0%	75.0%	25.0%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	36.7%	36.7%	
Tout a fait désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	4		
	Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	8.2%	8.2%	
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49		
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Tableau croisé Je (mon établissement) l'intention de poursuivre les activités initiées par le projet ERA après la fin du projet

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)	
Je (mon établissement) l'intention de poursuivre les activités initiées par le projet ERA après la fin du projet	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	2	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2	6	1	3	2	22
		Pourcentage	66.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	75.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	44.9%
	D'accord	Effectif	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	3	1	17
		Pourcentage	33.3%	.0%	50.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	62.5%	25.0%	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	34.7%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
		Pourcentage	.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	10.2%
Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	
	Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	4.1%	4.1%
Tout a fait désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	2.0%	2.0%
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49	
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Tableau croisé Je (mon établissement) de recherche a trouvé des fonds pour poursuivre les efforts énoncés par le projet ERA.

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total			
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)				
Je (mon établissement) de recherche a trouvé des fonds pour poursuivre les efforts énoncés par le projet ERA.	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.1%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	1	1	9
		Pourcentage	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	37.5%	.0%	16.7%	25.0%	.0%	18.4%	
	D'accord	Effectif	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	1	6	4	2	5	2	2	2	2	26
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%	66.7%	.0%	100.0%	75.0%	50.0%	100.0%	83.3%	50.0%	53.1%			
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	1	1	3	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%	.0%	12.5%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	18.4%			
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%			
Tout a fait désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
	Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.0%				
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49				
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				

Tableau croisé Je (mon établissement) pu créer des liens plus étroits avec d'autres personnes et institutions qui soutiennent mon / notre travail à cause des activités du projet ERA

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total			
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)				
Je (mon établissement) pu créer des liens plus étroits avec d'autres personnes et institutions qui soutiennent mon / notre travail à cause des activités du projet ERA	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.1%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	6
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	37.5%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	12.2%			
	D'accord	Effectif	3	0	0	3	2	3	1	1	2	4	2	1	3	25			
		Pourcentage	100.0%	.0%	.0%	75.0%	100.0%	100.0%	50.0%	100.0%	25.0%	50.0%	100.0%	16.7%	75.0%	51.0%			
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	6			
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	25.0%	12.2%			
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	7			
		Pourcentage	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	37.5%	12.5%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	14.3%			
Tout a fait désaccord	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3				
	Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	6.1%				
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49				
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				

Tableau croisé J'ai une meilleure compréhension de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel en raison du projet ERA.

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total			
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)				
J'ai une meilleure compréhension de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel en raison du projet ERA.	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.1%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	1	10			
		Pourcentage	33.3%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	33.3%	25.0%	20.4%			
	D'accord	Effectif	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2	3	1	2	1	15			
		Pourcentage	66.7%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	33.3%	.0%	100.0%	25.0%	37.5%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	30.6%			
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	1	3	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	1	2	11			
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	50.0%	75.0%	.0%	33.3%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	50.0%	22.4%			
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	9			
		Pourcentage	.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	12.5%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	18.4%			
Tout a fait désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2				
	Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	4.1%				
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49				
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%				

Tableau croisé La qualité du mon travail (travail de mon institution) peuvent faire s'est améliorée en raison des activités du projet ERA

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total		
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)			
La qualité du mon travail (travail de mon institution) peuvent faire s'est améliorée en raison des activités du projet ERA	Non réponse	Effectif	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		Pourcentage	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.1%
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2
		Pourcentage	33.3%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	50.0%	.0%	14.3%	
	D'accord	Effectif	2	0	1	3	1	2	1	1	4	7	1	5	2	5	2	30
		Pourcentage	66.7%	.0%	50.0%	75.0%	50.0%	66.7%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	87.5%	50.0%	83.3%	50.0%	61.2%		
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.1%		
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	7	
		Pourcentage	.0%	75.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	12.5%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	14.3%		
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49			
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%			

Tableau croisé Je me sens mieux préparé pour répondre à mes objectifs personnels / institutionnel en raison des activités du projet ERA

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total	
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)		
Je me sens mieux préparé pour répondre à mes objectifs personnels / institutionnel en raison des activités du projet ERA	Non réponse	Effectif	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	7
		Pourcentage	.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	14.3%	
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
		Pourcentage	33.3%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	6.1%		
	D'accord	Effectif	2	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	3	2	16	
		Pourcentage	66.7%	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	50.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	32.7%		
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	4	4	1	0	2	17	
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	75.0%	.0%	33.3%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	34.7%	
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	0	6	
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	12.2%	
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49		
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Tableau croisé Il ya de forts liens entre les institutions de recherche (de formation) et le secteur privé

* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Techniqu Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)	
Il ya de forts liens entre les institutions de recherche (de formation) et le secteur privé	Non réponse	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	21	
		Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	46.9%	
	D'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	0	0	3	
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	37.5%	62.5%	.0%	.0%	75.0%	24.5%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	8	
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	16.3%
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	12.5%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%	12.2%
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49	
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

Tableau croisé les capacités administratives et de recherche(formation) ont fortement augmenté avec le programme ERA
* Catégorie du répondant

			Catégorie du répondant													Total	
			UCAD	ITA	Université de Thiès	ENSA	ANCAR	ISFAR	ISRA	UGB	CNFTEIA	Université de Ziguinchor (TWG)	ISRA Ziguinchor	CNFTEFCPN	Lycée Technique Agricole Emile Badiane (TWG)		
les capacités administratives et de recherche(formation) ont fortement augmenté avec le programme ERA	Non réponse	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	20
		Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.0%	100.0%	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	44.9%	
	Tout a fait d'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	33.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	6.1%	
	D'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	4	2	3	3	15	
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	66.7%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	50.0%	100.0%	50.0%	75.0%	30.6%	
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	12.5%	37.5%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.2%	
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	0	5	
		Pourcentage	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%	.0%	10.2%	
Total	Effectif	3	4	2	4	2	3	2	1	8	8	2	6	4	49		
	Pourcentage	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%		

Tableau croisé J'ai une bonne compréhension du Projet ERA et du travail qu'il accomplit * Université /type de bourse

			Université /Formation					Total	
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor		Lycée Technique
J'ai une bonne compréhension du Projet ERA et du travail qu'il accomplit	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	3	2	5	0	3	1	14
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	33.3%	33.3%	71.4%	.0%	25.0%	25.0%	33.3%
	D'accord	Effectif	6	4	2	1	5	3	21
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	66.7%	66.7%	28.6%	25.0%	41.7%	75.0%	50.0%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	2	3	0	5
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	.0%	11.9%
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	8.3%	.0%	4.8%
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Le projet ERA fait un bon travail en offrant un service à moi et à mon institution * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse					Total	
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor		Lycée Technique
Le projet ERA fait un bon travail en offrant un service à moi et à mon institution	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	6	5	5	3	11	4	34
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	66.7%	83.3%	71.4%	75.0%	91.7%	100.0%	81.0%
	D'accord	Effectif	3	1	2	1	0	0	7
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	33.3%	16.7%	28.6%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	16.7%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	8.3%	.0%	2.4%
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse					Total	
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor		Lycée Technique
J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	6	6	5	1	9	3	30
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	66.7%	100.0%	71.4%	25.0%	75.0%	75.0%	71.4%
	D'accord	Effectif	3	0	2	3	3	1	12
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	33.3%	.0%	28.6%	75.0%	25.0%	25.0%	28.6%
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Le projet ERA m'a donné (donné à mon établissement) des biens (fonds / services/ formation/ équipement) qui sont d'une importance cruciale * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse						Total
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor	Lycée Technique	
Le projet ERA m'a donné (donné à mon établissement) des biens (fonds / services/ formation/ équipement) qui sont d'une importance cruciale	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	6	2	2	4	9	2	25
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	66.7%	33.3%	28.6%	100.0%	75.0%	50.0%	59.5%
	D'accord	Effectif	2	4	3	0	3	2	14
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	22.2%	66.7%	42.9%	.0%	25.0%	50.0%	33.3%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	11.1%	.0%	28.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.1%
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Mon travail/Institution serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse						Total
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor	Lycée Technique	
Mon travail/Institution serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	0	1	2	1	3	1	8
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	16.7%	28.6%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	19.0%
	D'accord	Effectif	5	1	4	0	6	1	17
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	55.6%	16.7%	57.1%	.0%	50.0%	25.0%	40.5%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	4	2	1	1	3	1	12
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	44.4%	33.3%	14.3%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	28.6%
Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	2	0	2	0	1	5	
	% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	33.3%	.0%	50.0%	.0%	25.0%	11.9%	
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé j'ai une meilleure compréhension de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel grace au projet ERA * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse						Total
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor	Lycée Technique	
j'ai une meilleure compréhension de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel grace au projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	0	2	1	0	1	2	6
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	33.3%	14.3%	.0%	8.3%	50.0%	14.3%
	D'accord	Effectif	4	1	0	1	2	2	10
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	44.4%	16.7%	.0%	25.0%	16.7%	50.0%	23.8%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	1	3	5	1	7	0	17
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	11.1%	50.0%	71.4%	25.0%	58.3%	.0%	40.5%
Pas d'accord	Effectif	4	0	1	2	2	0	9	
	% compris dans Université /type de bourse	44.4%	.0%	14.3%	50.0%	16.7%	.0%	21.4%	
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé La qualité de mon travail s'est améliorée grâce aux activités du projet ERA * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse						Total
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor	Lycée Technique	
La qualité de mon travail s'est améliorée grâce aux activités du projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	2	4	5	2	6	2	21
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	22.2%	66.7%	71.4%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%	50.0%
	D'accord	Effectif	7	2	2	1	6	2	20
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	77.8%	33.3%	28.6%	25.0%	50.0%	50.0%	47.6%
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	2.4%
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Je me sens mieux préparé pour répondre à mes objectifs personnels/institutionnels en raison des activités du projet ERA * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse						Total
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor	Lycée Technique	
Je me sens mieux préparé pour répondre à mes objectifs personnels/institutionnels en raison des activités du projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	4	2	2	1	8	3	20
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	44.4%	33.3%	28.6%	25.0%	66.7%	75.0%	47.6%
	D'accord	Effectif	4	4	3	2	4	1	18
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	44.4%	66.7%	42.9%	50.0%	33.3%	25.0%	42.9%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	1	0	2	0	0	0	3
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	11.1%	.0%	28.6%	.0%	.0%	.0%	7.1%
Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
	% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	.0%	.0%	25.0%	.0%	.0%	2.4%	
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Les méthodes d'apprentissage ont été améliorées avec le programme ERA * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse						Total
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor	Lycée Technique	
Les méthodes d'apprentissage ont été améliorées avec le programme ERA	Pas de réponse	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.4%
	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	2	2	2	2	9	3	20
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	22.2%	33.3%	28.6%	50.0%	75.0%	75.0%	47.6%
	D'accord	Effectif	7	2	3	1	3	0	16
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	77.8%	33.3%	42.9%	25.0%	25.0%	.0%	38.1%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	16.7%	14.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	4.8%
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	.0%	14.3%	25.0%	.0%	25.0%	7.1%
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé J'ai une bonne connaissance des opportunités existantes dans le secteur agricole * Université /type de bourse

			Université /type de bourse					Total	
			UCAD	ENSA	UGB	CNFTEFCPN	Université Assane Seck de Ziguinchor		Lycée Technique
J'ai une bonne connaissance des opportunités existantes dans le secteur agricole	Pas de réponse	Effectif	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	16.7%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.4%
	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	1	4	5	0	3	4	17
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	11.1%	66.7%	71.4%	.0%	25.0%	100.0%	40.5%
	D'accord	Effectif	7	1	0	2	8	0	18
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	77.8%	16.7%	.0%	50.0%	66.7%	.0%	42.9%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccord	Effectif	1	0	1	2	1	0	5
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	11.1%	.0%	14.3%	50.0%	8.3%	.0%	11.9%
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	.0%	.0%	14.3%	.0%	.0%	.0%	2.4%
Total		Effectif	9	6	7	4	12	4	42
		% compris dans Université /type de bourse	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé J'ai une bonne connaissance du projet ERA ET du travail qu'il accomplit * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djiyito	Jiribalut	
J'ai une bonne connaissance du projet ERA ET du travail qu'il accomplit	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Le projet ERA fit d'bon travail en m'offrant un service et à mon institution * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djiyito	Jiribalut	
Le projet ERA fit d'bon travail en m'offrant un service et à mon institution	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	7	2	9
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	28.6%	64.3%
	D'accord	Effectif	0	4	4
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	.0%	57.1%	28.6%
	tout à fait en désaccord	Effectif	0	1	1
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	.0%	14.3%	7.1%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djiyito	Jiribalut	
J'ai apprécié mon association avec le projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	6	6	12
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	85.7%	85.7%	85.7%
	D'accord	Effectif	1	1	2
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Le projet ERA m'a donné des biens (fonds / services/ formations/ équipements) qui sont d'une importance cruciale * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djyito	Jiribalut	
Le projet ERA m'a donné des biens (fonds / services/ formations/ équipements) qui sont d'une importance cruciale	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	3	5	8
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	42.9%	71.4%	57.1%
	D'accord	Effectif	4	2	6
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	57.1%	28.6%	42.9%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Mon travail serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djyito	Jiribalut	
Mon travail serait pire sans l'assistance du projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	2	4	6
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	28.6%	57.1%	42.9%
	D'accord	Effectif	0	3	3
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	.0%	42.9%	21.4%
	Ni en accord ni en désaccor	Effectif	1	0	1
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	14.3%	.0%	7.1%
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	4	0	4
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	57.1%	.0%	28.6%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé J'ai ERA l'intention de poursuivre les activités initiées par le projet ERA à la fin du projet * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djyito	Jiribalut	
J'ai ERA l'intention de poursuivre les activités initiées par le projet ERA à la fin du projet	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	4	7	11
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	57.1%	100.0%	78.6%
	D'accord	Effectif	3	0	3
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	42.9%	.0%	21.4%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé je recherche/j'ai trouvé des fonds pour poursuivre les activités énoncés par le projet ERA * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djyito	Jiribalut	
je recherche/j'ai trouvé des fonds pour poursuivre les activités énoncés par le projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	5	6	11
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	71.4%	85.7%	78.6%
	D'accord	Effectif	2	1	3
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	28.6%	14.3%	21.4%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé J'ai pu créer des liens plus étroits avec d'autres personnes et institutions qui soutiennent mon/notre travail grace aux activités du projet ERA * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djyito	Jiribalut	
J'ai pu créer des liens plus étroits avec d'autres personnes et institutions qui soutiennent mon/notre travail grace aux activités du projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	2	5	7
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	28.6%	71.4%	50.0%
	D'accord	Effectif	1	2	3
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	14.3%	28.6%	21.4%
	Pas d'accord	Effectif	4	0	4
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	57.1%	.0%	28.6%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé J'ai une meilleure connaissance de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel grace au projet ERA * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djyito	Jiribalut	
J'ai une meilleure connaissance de ce que mes collègues font au niveau professionnel grace au projet ERA	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	4	5	9
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	57.1%	71.4%	64.3%
	D'accord	Effectif	3	2	5
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	42.9%	28.6%	35.7%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé Le programme ERA a amélioré mes connaissances en technologie de transformation * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djyito	Jiribalut	
Le programme ERA a amélioré mes connaissances en technologie de transformation	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	5	4	9
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	71.4%	57.1%	64.3%
	D'accord	Effectif	2	3	5
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	28.6%	42.9%	35.7%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Tableau croisé le programme ERA a renforcé ma gestion organisationnelle * Femmes transformatrices

			Femmes transformatrices		Total
			Djyito	Jiribalut	
le programme ERA a renforcé ma gestion organisationnelle	Tout à fait d'accord	Effectif	6	5	11
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	85.7%	71.4%	78.6%
	D'accord	Effectif	1	2	3
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	14.3%	28.6%	21.4%
Total		Effectif	7	7	14
		% compris dans Femmes transformatrices	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

7. FY-13 PMP Targets and Actual FY-11 to FY-13

USAID/ERA Table FY13 PMP Targets and Actuals FY 11 – FY13

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
1	1,1	Number of graduates at the License, Masters, and Doctorate levels (USAID/ERA Outcome Indicator).	License	M	434	230	310	0	292	0	262	268	30%	An assessment survey completed by ERA in FY 2011 provided number of actual students in the pipeline at partner AETRs. As a result, the Targets were revised in order to be adjusted with the institutions Records
				F	90	137	85	0	152	0	243	268		
			Masters	M	81	94	66	4	66	0	75	81		
				F	12	52	18	2	41	0	75	81		
			Doctorate	M	27	9	28	0	28	0	24	24		
				F	5	8	15	0	18	0	24	24		
			<i>Total</i>		649	530	523	6	597	0	703	746		
1	1.1	Number of graduates at the Diploma and technical certificate levels (USAID/ERA Outcome Indicator).	Diploma	M	250	265	300	16	337	33	356	375	42%	
				F	65	62	200	4	187	10	206	225		
			Technical Certificate	M	355	341	150	93	187	58	206	225		
				F	90	87	150	28	187	28	206	225		
			<i>Total</i>		760	755	800	141	898	127	974	1050		

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
1	1,1	Number of AETR supported to develop syllabus/curriculum			0	0	0	0	2	6	5	3	300%	New Indicator added in order to highlight activities implemented during the curricula revision which is a long process
1	1,1	Number of curricula revisions completed with detailed course outlines	Total	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	5	10	0%	Curricula revision is a long process. The project cannot achieve numbers of revised curricula previously planned
1	1.1	Number of graduates from AETRs obtaining employment in their field. (5)	Total	0	TBD	0	400	120	450	88	530	560	24%	Targets revised according to the institutions Records and to the assessment study conducted by the project focused on this item

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
1	1.1	Number of AETR members trained	Administration, Finance or M&E		0	27	20	18	25	5	30	20	111%	This indicator is disaggregated by training to take into account all activities implemented in training area
			International program exchange research, consulting networking		0	0	14	0	35	27	60	0	55%	
			Strategic documents implementation		0	0	0	0	6	9	8	10	150%	
1	1.2	Number of individuals who have received USG supported long-term agriculture sector productivity or food security training at the local level (FtF Output Indicator 4.5.2-6) (7)	Male	0	753	57	10	0	15	75	30	30	14%	Targets previously planned were cumulated year after year. The numbers were revised to take into account the project interventions for this item which will be accounted starting the FY13 with the Scholarship Program
			Female	0	750	10	5	0	10	80	20	20		
			Total	0	1503	67	15	0	25	155	50	50		

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
1	1.2	Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agriculture sector productivity or food security training at the local level (FtF Output Indicator 4.5.2-7) (8)	Male	0	1250	323	753	73	50	133	100	25	20%	Targets previously planned were accumulated. The numbers came from proposal. These were adjusted according to the reality on the ground. Revised targets are not cumulated
			Female	0	1250	47	750	140	150	106	250	125		
			Total	0	2500	370	1503	213	200	248	350	150		
1	1.2	Number of AETRs provided with	improved ICT infrastructure and equipment (USAID/ERA Output Indicator)	0	1	1	12	12	12	11	12	0	96%	Indicator disaggregated by the project to highlight improvement in equipment and infrastructure. Targets revised according to field reality.
1	1.2		Improved non-ICT infrastructure and equipment (USAID/ERA Output Indicator).	0	4	0	7	7	1	4	1	1	92%	
1	1.2		Laboratory equipment		1	0	3	4	4	3	4	0	88%	

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
1	1.2		special tools and equipment for advanced research		0	0	3	4	5	3	10	0	88%	
1	1.2	Number of AETRs conducting distance and distributed learning programs through ICT infrastructure (USAID/ERA Output Indicator)	Total		1	0	3	0	5	7	10	10	78%	
1	1.3	Number of higher education partnerships between international institutions and host country higher education institutions that address regional, national, and local development needs (USAID/State Standard Indicator)		0	4	6	10	1	2	4	3	2	69%	Those targets were revised to reflect on the ground reality. This is because it is a very long process to develop partnerships with international institutions and host country higher education.

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
2	2.1	Number of new technologies or management practices under research as a result of USG assistance (FtF Output Indicator 4.5.2-39)	Millet	0	1	0	1	2	1	6	0	0	156%	Target changed according to the research program implementation plan.
			Maize	0	1	0	3	1	2	1	2	2		
			Rice	0	1	0	1	2	0	3	0	0		
			Aquaculture	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1		
			Climate Change	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	1	1		
			Other aspects of food security and economic growth	0	0	0	2	0	1	3	1	1		
			Total	0	3	0	10	6	5	22	5	5		
2	2.1	Number of new technologies or management under field testing as a result of USG assistance (FtF Output Indicator 4.5.2-39) (19)	Millet	0	1		1	0	1	9	1	1	106%	
			Maize	0	0		2	0	4	0	4	4		
			Rice	0	0		0	0	2	3	2	2		
			Aquaculture		0		1	0	1	0	0			
			Other aspects of food security and economic growth	0	1		1	0	2	2	2	2		
			Climate Change	0	0		1	0	0	5	1	1		
Total	0	2		6	0	10	19	10	10					

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
2	2.1	Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance (FtF Output Indicator 4.5.2-39) (20)	Millet	0	0		0	0	1	3	1	1	130%	
			Maize	0	0		2	0	1	3	4	4		
			Rice	0	0		1	0	2	3	1	1		
			Aquaculture	0	0		1	0	0	0	1	1		
			Climate Change	0	0		0	0	0	2	1	1		
			Other aspects of food security and economic growth	0	0		1	0	1	2	2	2		
			Total	0	0		5	0	5	13	10	10		
2	2.1	Number of farmers who have applied new technologies or management practices developed by institutions supported by USAID/ERA as a result of USG assistance (16)		0	50	0	200	100	150	192	250	100	73%	New Indicator added in FY12 as per the Revised FtF HandBook

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
2	2.1	Number of private enterprises, producer organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) that applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance (FtF Outcome Indicator 4.5.2--28) (17)	Private enterprises	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	6	154%	
			Producer organizations	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	6		
			Water users associations	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0		
			Women's groups	0	0	0	20	25	30	50	40	0		Items added according to the October 2011 FTF Handbook
			Trade and business associations	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	6		Items added according to the FTF Handbook
			Community based organizations	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	1	0		
			Total	0	2	0	25	25	38	75	51	18		
2	2.1	6. Number of private enterprises, producer organizations, water users associations, women's group	Private enterprise	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3	3	154%	Items added according to the FTF Handbook
			Producer organizations	0	1	0	3	3	2	10	4	4		
			Water users associations	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1		
			Women's groups	0	0	0	30	25	40	50	50	0		

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
		trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance (FtF Output Indicator 4.5.2-11) (21)	Trade and business associations	0	0	0	3	0	5	3	7	0	124%	
			Community-based Organizations	0	1	0	2	0	3	30	4	4		
			Total	0	2	0	40	30	53	88	69	12		
2	2.2	Number of partnerships developed to deliver training services to local farmers and the private sector (22)	Total	0	2	0	5	1	10	4	12	0	29%	
2	2.2	Number of short courses delivered in response to stakeholder demand (23)	Total	0	4	0	1	3	2	39	3	0	600%	Targets revised according to reality on the ground.

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
3	3.1	Number of AETR institutions using databases tracking student academic records, performance and post-graduate occupations (29)	Total	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	8	0%		
3	3.1	Number of AET institutions using accounting software to manage program finances and to generate reports (30)	Total	0	1	0	2	2	4	0	8	10	29%	
3	3.1	Number of students participating in private sector internships (32)	Male	0	0	0	5	0	20	14	40	60	70%	
			Female	0	0	0	5	0	20	21	40	60		
			Total	0	0	0	10	0	40	35	80	120		
3	3.1	Number of private sector participants in international study tours (33)	Male	0	0	0	4	4	7	2	10	0	67%	Targets revised according to the experience realized in this area and also according to the project capacity
			Female	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	0		
			Total	0	0	0	5	5	10	5	15	0		

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
3	3.1	Number of private sector/AETR joint training programs (35)	Total	0	0	0	5	5	20	6	30	0	44%	Revised to account for the long process to create such programs. Assessment for this is ongoing.
3	3.1	Number Private sectors partners identified for partnership development with AETR institutions	Total		0	0	0	0	0	10	10	10	?	New indicators added in FY13 PMP Revision to highlight activities implementing during the process of developing partnership between the Private Sector and USAID/ERA AETR institutions
3	3.1	Number of Private Sector partners note of interest for having partnership with AETR institutions	Total		0		0		0	5	8	8	?	New indicators added in the FY13 PMP Revision to highlight different steps made by the project to have GDA

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments	
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15			
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T			
3	3.1	Number of Private Sector/university research collaborations	Total		0		0		0	0		5	5	?	agreements
3	3.1	Number of GDA partners identified	Total		0				0	7		10	10	?	
3	3.1	Number of GDA partners note of interest	Total	0	0	0	1	0	0	2		0	0	200%	GDA agreements implementation is a long process.
3	3.2	Number of institutions with improved Management Information Systems, as a result of USG Assistance. (USAID/State Standard Indicator) (25)	Total	0	4	0	6	12	11	0		11	11	57%	
3	3.2	Number of AET institutions using database (26)	Total	0	0	0	0	0	5	0		8	8	0%	
3	3.2	Number of "bureaux d'insertion" using database to assist students as a student support	Total	0	0	0	0	0	3	0		9	5	0%	Revised because many of AETR partners do not have "Bureaux d'insertion" or personnel in

Obj.	Results	INDICATOR	Disaggregate	BASE	Fiscal Years								% Cumulative Performance on targets FY 11 - 13 $\frac{(b+d+f)}{(a+c+e)}$	Comments
					FY 11		FY 12		FY13		14	15		
					T (a)	A (b)	T (c)	A (d)	T (e)	A (f)	T	T		
		service (28)												charge of this item.
3	3.2	Number of cross component study tours		0	1	2	1	1	3		2	0	?	

ANNEX IV: SOURCES OF INFORMATION

1. List of Persons Interviewed

2. Bibliography of Documents Reviewed

**Mid-term Performance Evaluation: USAID/Senegal ERA
Contact List**

Date Contacted	Name	Title	Institution
8-Jan-14	Michael Bertelsen	Executive Director	Office of International Research, Education, and Development, Virginia Tech
21-Jan-14	Fatou Thiem	M&E Specialist	USAID/Senegal
21-Jan-14	Ronit Gerard	Agriculture Officer	USAID/Senegal
22-Jan-14	Demba F Mbaye	Acting COP	USAID/ERA Project
22-Jan-14	Seynabou Top	M&E Specialist	USAID/ERA Project
22-Jan-14	Ndeye Falone Seck	PPP Officer	USAID/ERA Project
22-Jan-14	Alioune Gueye	Admin Team Leader	USAID/ERA Project
22-Jan-14	Nd. Naty Bocoum	Director Special Programs	USAID/ERA Project
22-Jan-14	Keith Moore	Director Performance Assessments	USAID/ERA Project
28-Jan-14	Alioune Fall	Directeur General	ISRA
28-Jan-14	Yaoude Faye	Agent Comptable Particulier	ISRA
28-Jan-14	Seydi M. M. Toure	Responsable Informatique	ISRA
28-Jan-14	Samba Sall	Scientific Coordinator	FNRAA
29-Jan-14	Kandioura Noba	Deputy Provost/focal point	UCAD
30-Jan-14	Ababacar Ndoye	Directeur General	ITA
30-Jan-14	M. Sr. Ndiaya Cisse	DCFMA	ITA
30-Jan-14	Beye Cheikh	Point Focal/Recherche	ITA
30-Jan-14	Ndeye Doumouya	Directeur des Relations Extérieures	ITA
30-Jan-14	Abdoulaye Mbaye	Point Focal	ITA
30-Jan-14	Djibril Traore	Ancien CST	ITA
30-Jan-14	Mamadou Salif Sow	Ingénieur/atelier céréale	ITA
30-Jan-14	Nefissatoure Diop Ndiauge	Chef de projet, Chef atelier fruit et légumes	ITA
3-Feb-14	Mary Teuw Niane	Ministre	Ministère de l'enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche
3-Feb-14	Nouhou Diaby	Conseiller Technique	Ministère de l'enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche
3-Feb-14	Baydallaye Kane	Recteur	Université de Thies
3-Feb-14	Samba Aron Ndione	Responsable Coopération	Université de Thies
3-Feb-14	Tala Gueye	Responsable Recherches	Université de Thies
3-Feb-14	Abdoulaye Dieng	Directeur	ENSA
3-Feb-14	Abdou Magib Diagne	Chef des Services Administratifs	ENSA
4-Feb-14	Mamadou Thiam Diop	Directeur des Etudes	ENSA
4-Feb-14	Saliou Ndiaye	Professor, Coordinator of ERA millet research project	ENSA
4-Feb-14	Moustapha M. Thioune	Expert en Evaluation de Projet	ENSA
5-Feb-14	Bineta Mbengue Dieye	Directrice de Zone	ANCAR

5-Feb-14	Mouhameth Camara	Directeur	ISFAR
5-Feb-14	Ibrahima Fall	Comptable	ISFAR
5-Feb-14	Sadibou Sow	Professor - TWG	ISFAR
7-Feb-14	Amadou Bal	Professor and Researcher	Université Gaston Berger
7-Feb-14	Oumar Sow	Director	SAED
8-Feb-14	Ibrahima Sall	Directeur General	CNT (Coumba Nor Thiam)
8-Feb-14	Ablaiye Dienge	PCA	Comite Interprofessionnelle de la Tomate
10-Feb-14	Pepe Sher Diop	Director	CNFTEIA
10-Feb-14	Fatou Ka Sow	Instructor/ERA Activities Coordinator	CNFTEIA
10-Feb-14	Mamour Syll	Directeur des Etudes	CNFTEIA
10-Feb-14	Alioune Diouf	Professor - TWG	CNFTEIA
10-Feb-14	Sacoura Diop	Professor - TWG	CNFTEIA
10-Feb-14	Ahmed Ndiaye	Professor - TWG	CNFTEIA
10-Feb-14	Ousmane Guiy	Professor - TWG	CNFTEIA
10-Feb-14	Gapa Daonda Gueye	Professor - TWG	CNFTEIA
13-Feb-14	Saliou Djiba	Director	ISRA Djibelor
13-Feb-14	Michel Gomis	Chef des Services Administratifs	ISRA Djibelor
13-Feb-14	Simion Bassene	Coordinator, ERA Research Project	ISRA Djibelor
13-Feb-14	Dasyira Nanrice	Researcher	ISRA Djibelor
13-Feb-14	Daouda Ngom	Professor/ERA Point Focal	UASZ
13-Feb-14	Ngor Ndour	Professor - TWG	UASZ
13-Feb-14	Dioung Kobor	Vice-Rector - TWG	UASZ
13-Feb-14	Doudon Gueye	SIS - TWG	UASZ
13-Feb-14	Melyan Mendy	Professor - TWG	UASZ
13-Feb-14	Ndiouma Ndour	Professor - TWG	UASZ
13-Feb-14	Tiduabe Sane	Professor - TWG	UASZ
14-Feb-14	Moussa Cisse	Director	CNFTEFCPN
14-Feb-14	Gomes Ousmane	Professor - TWG	CNFTEFCPN
14-Feb-14	Bacary Amara Badji	Professor - TWG	CNFTEFCPN
14-Feb-14	Omar Fall Niang	Professor - TWG	CNFTEFCPN
14-Feb-14	Nfally Coly	Professor - TWG	CNFTEFCPN
14-Feb-14	Molaore Savane	Professor - TWG	CNFTEFCPN
14-Feb-14	Fatou Atchikiti	Presidente, GIE Jiribalut	Femmes Transformatrices
15-Feb-14	Ibou Diedhiou	Director	LTAEB
15-Feb-14	Ababacar Beye	Instructor - TWG	LTAEB
15-Feb-14	Alle Sow	Instructor - TWG	LTAEB
15-Feb-14	Ibou Diedhiou	Instructor - TWG	LTAEB

Note: This list does not include the 42 student scholarship recipients under the Bourse de l'Excellence program that participated in focus groups or the 13 female processors that participated in focus groups.

Bibliography

Boris Bravo-Ureta, A. Maas, I. Diouf, A. Ndoye, Agricultural Education, Research and Extension: An Analysis of Human Capital Needs in Senegal, ERA Project, March 18, 2012.

Collecting Primary Data: A Guide for Project Monitoring and Evaluation Practitioners, Chemonics International, August 2008.

Décisions Présidentielles Relative à l'Enseignement Supérieur et à la Recherche, Ministre de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche, 2013.

Feed the Future, Senegal FY 2011-2015 Multi-Year Strategy, USAID/Senegal, February 22, 2011.

Note conceptuelle : Création d'un Institut Supérieur d'Agriculture à l'Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar (Sénégal), Faculté des Science et Techniques UCAD, April 2013.

Program Description: Virginia Tech Cooperative Agreement No. 685-A-00-10-00194-00 Pages 18 - 59, USAID/Senegal.

Programme National d'Investissement Agricole (PNIA): Plan d'Investissement 2011- 2015, Ministre de l'Agriculture République du Sénégal

USADI/ERA Annual Report: FY 2010. Virginia Tech, September 2011.

USAID/ERA Annual Report: FY 2011, Virginia Tech, November 2011.

USAID/ERA Annual Report: Year 3 – FY 2013, Virginia Tech, December 2013.

USAID/ERA Annual Work Plan Revised, Virginia Tech, June 21, 2013

USAID/ERA Annual Work Plan Year 2 (2012) Revised, Virginia Tech, October 17 2011

USAID/ERA FY 2012 Annual Report, Virginia Tech, October 2012.

USAID/ERA FY 2013 Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), Virginia Tech, May 2013.

USAID/ERA Table comparing FY11 PMP and FY13 PMP, USAID/Senegal.

ANNEX V: DISCLOSURE OF ANY CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Name	Donald Brown
Title	Team Leader
Organization	Chemonics International Inc.
Evaluation Position?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team Leader <input type="checkbox"/> Team member
Evaluation Award Number <i>(contract or other instrument)</i>	PO No. AID-685-0-14-00013
USAID Project(s) Evaluated <i>(Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)</i>	USAID/ERA Mid-Term Performance Evaluation
I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts: <i>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</i> 1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation. 3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project. 4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation.	

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

Signature	
Date	18 March 2014

Name	Ya Cor Ndione
Title	Data Collection and Analysis Officer
Organization	Chemonics International
Evaluation Position?	D Team Leader Team member
Evaluation Award Number <i>(contract or other instrument)</i>	PO# AID-685-0-14-00013
USAID Project(s) Evaluated <i>(Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)</i>	Midterm Performance Evaluation of the USAID/Senegal Education and Research in Agriculture (ERA) Project
I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.	D Yes – No
If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts: <i>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation. 3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project. 4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation. 	

I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.

Signature	
Date	<u>19 - 02 - 2014</u>

Name	Malamine Savane
Title	Management and Policy Support Specialist
Organization	Chemonics International
Evaluation Position?	<input type="radio"/> Team Leader <input checked="" type="radio"/> Team member
Evaluation Award Number <i>(contract or other instrument)</i>	PO# AID-685-0-14-00013
USAID Project(s) Evaluated <i>(Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)</i>	Midterm Performance Evaluation of the USAID/Senegal Education and Research in Agriculture (ERA) Project
I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
<p>If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts:</p> <p><i>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</i> <i>2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation.</i> <i>3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project.</i> <i>4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</i> <i>5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated.</i> <i>6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation.</i> 	
<p>I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.</p>	
Signature	
Date	19-08-2014

Name	Mohamadou Lamine Dia
Title	Agricultural Education, Training and Research Specialist
Organization	Chemonics International
Evaluation Position?	<input type="checkbox"/> Team Leader <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Team member
Evaluation Award Number <i>(contract or other instrument)</i>	PO# AID-685-0-14-00013
USAID Project(s) Evaluated <i>(Include project name(s), implementer name(s) and award number(s), if applicable)</i>	Midterm Performance Evaluation of the USAID/Senegal Education and Research in Agriculture (ERA) Project
I have real or potential conflicts of interest to disclose.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<p>If yes answered above, I disclose the following facts:</p> <p><i>Real or potential conflicts of interest may include, but are not limited to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Close family member who is an employee of the USAID operating unit managing the project(s) being evaluated or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 2. Financial interest that is direct, or is significant though indirect, in the implementing organization(s) whose projects are being evaluated or in the outcome of the evaluation. 3. Current or previous direct or significant though indirect experience with the project(s) being evaluated, including involvement in the project design or previous iterations of the project. 4. Current or previous work experience or seeking employment with the USAID operating unit managing the evaluation or the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 5. Current or previous work experience with an organization that may be seen as an industry competitor with the implementing organization(s) whose project(s) are being evaluated. 6. Preconceived ideas toward individuals, groups, organizations, or objectives of the particular projects and organizations being evaluated that could bias the evaluation. 	
<p>I certify (1) that I have completed this disclosure form fully and to the best of my ability and (2) that I will update this disclosure form promptly if relevant circumstances change. If I gain access to proprietary information of other companies, then I agree to protect their information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary and refrain from using the information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished.</p>	
Signature	
Date	19 Mars 2014

U.S. Agency for International Development
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523