3860281-(28)

AID 1020-25 (10-70)

REPORT U-446

PB-AAD-099-D1

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO.	2. PAR FOR PERIOD:	3. COUNTRY	4. PAR SERIAL NO.
386-11-110-281.8	Jan.1, 1970 TO June 30, 71	India	FY 72-17 5p.

5. PROJECT TITLE

Agricultural Universities Development: Mahatma Phule Krishi Vidyapeeth (Maharashtra)

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 1967 Ends FY 1976	7. DATE LATEST PROP	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
	6/8/71	None	11/12/70

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: $790,000	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: $378,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: $ To be determined

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

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
Pennsylvania State University	AID/nesa-346

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

A. ACTION (X) USAID	AID/W	HOST	B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
x2		x1	1. Earlier selection and approval of participant nominees.	March 1972
x2		x1	2. Establishment of clearly defined policy on participant selections.	September 1972
		x	3. Selection of administrators and staff to fill existing vacancies and establishment of clear cut responsibilities of administrative staff and Department Heads.	September 1972
x2		x1	4. Clarification of guidelines of AUD Program with Maharashtra Government and University officials.	June 1972
x1	x2		5. Future PIO/Ts and contracts should be worded to include the purpose, outputs and conditions expected at the end of the project as stated in the logical framework.	June 30, 1972
x			6. The project manager will undertake a detailed review of his project reporting and information gathering system to assure that more adequate data are being collected over the next year to measure the project outputs and conditions expected at the end of the project stated in the logical framework.	June 30, 1972

D. REPLANNING REQUIRES REVISED OR NEW: [X] PROP [ ] PIP [ ] PRO AG [ ] PIO/T [ ] PIO/C [ ] PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW 2/10/72

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE	MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
Ronald H. Pollock	L. Paul Oechsli

AID 1020-25 (10-70) PAGE 2 PAR	PROJECT NO. 386-11-110-281.8	PAR FOR PERIOD: 1/1/70 TO 6/30/71	COUNTRY India	PAR SERIAL NO. FY 72-17

II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS

A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT — CONTRACTOR, PARTICIPATING AGENCY OR VOLUNTARY AGENCY	B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN — UNSATISFACTORY 1	2	SATISFACTORY 3	4	5	OUTSTANDING 6	7	C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X) — LOW 1	MEDIUM 2	3	4	HIGH 5
1. Pennsylvania State University				X							X	
2.												
3.												

Comment on key factors determining rating

The contractor has demonstrated keen interest in achieving results under very difficult conditions. There is sound evidence that development of the MPKV has been enhanced by the limited technical assistance provided.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING				X								X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Although MPKV has usually waited until near the deadline for selecting candidates, the quality of nominees has been generally good. The use to be made of the participants after their return will be a critical test but it is too early to assess this as the first participants start returning in August 1971.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
5. COMMODITIES				X					X			

Comment on key factors determing rating

Provision of commodities has been generally satisfactory.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
6. COOPERATING COUNTRY	a. PERSONNEL		X										X
	b. OTHER		X										X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Project leadership has not been as effective as desired. Forward planning of programs has been lacking. Key staff and administrative positions have not been filled. Administrative responsibilities have not been clearly defined. U.G.C. salary scales have not been implemented. Penn State advisors and consultants have not been utilized as effectively as they could be.

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
7. OTHER DONORS	N.A.												

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

II. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY TO DATE	CURRENT FY TO END	FY 72	FY 73	END OF PROJECT
1. Professional staff trained by USAID	PLANNED	18 1/	10		+10	+10	
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	10	10				
	REPLANNED						
2. Undergraduate students enrolled	PLANNED	-	2000	2000	2050	2100	2500
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	-	1929				
	REPLANNED			1900	1950	2000	2500
3. Post Graduate Students Enrolled - M.S.	PLANNED		95	-	100	?	?
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE		92				
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						

B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	COMMENT:
1. Degree Participants	Of the 18 Ph.D. degree participants in the U.S. only one was in major academic difficulty.
2. Buildings and Facilities	COMMENT: AID Architect reports that buildings under construction are well constructed and of functional type requiring little maintenance. Basic Science Building, Student Hostel and Faculty Housing to be completed by June 1972.
3.	COMMENT:

1/ 12 participants from MPKV + 6 participants from PKV.

AID 1020-25 (10-70) PAGE 4 PAR	PROJECT NO. 386-11-110-281.8	PAR FOR PERIOD: 1/1/70 to 6/30/71	COUNTRY India	PAR SERIAL NO. FY 72-17

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP? ☒ YES ☐ NO

Establishment and development of service-oriented State agricultural universities to the point where they have the capacity for planning and administering fully integrated programs in teaching, research and extension education.

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
1. Adequate physical plant.	Building construction progressing but slightly behind schedule established by MPKV officials.
2. Integrated extension, research and teaching program operating at department levels.	Too soon for measurement. Extension has not been transferred to MPKV.
3. Long Range Development Plan used as basis for program implementation.	A specific Long Range Plan has not been developed; ICAR estimates it will be completed in 1973.
4. Adequate financial support.	Sufficient to-date for Rahuri Buildings, additional funds needed at constituent colleges.
5. University staffed with adequately trained personnel.	Such staffing not attained. There is a large number of positions unfilled.
6. Curriculum relevant to student needs for employment.	Too soon for verification as no students graduated under Trimester System.
(Continued on Page 4A)	(Continued on Page 4A)

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

Continuing rapid growth in agricultural production in India.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

The MPKV has been in existence only four years which is not long enough for it to be identified with any significant contribution to the increase of food production in India or Maharashtra. As the University continues to improve its curriculum and provide better trained agricultural scientists and professional personnel, the extension education program of the State should improve significantly. Simultaneously the results of improved research projects will provide new information upon which food production may be increased. It is anticipated that the impact of the University will begin to show in 1973 or 1974.

PROJECT No.	PAR FOR PERIOD:	COUNTRY:	PAR SERIAL NO. FY 72-17
386-11-110-281.8	1/1/70 to 6/30/7.	India	

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions
7. Effective administrative performance.	A large number of administrative posts vacant or filled with Acting staff. Responsibility of administrative officers not clearly defined.
8. University responsive to needs of State.	Too soon to verify.
9. Functional professional linkages with other Indian and foreign agricultural institutions.	Apparently good linkage with ICAR but only limited linkages with foreign agricultural institutions.