

Tuesday, October 30, 2012

Performance management plan -- Keith Moore

Learn | Design | Train

Clara: Worthwhile to think about the indicators as applicable to only the leader award, or also to the associate awards.

Can you hold the core award responsible for affecting policy change?

MKB: 5 stages to indicators. Leader project will probably not get to stage 3, but the associate awards will.

Keith: Scoping assessments take a look at the supply of human capital by the AETs and the employment needs of the agriculture sector. We're looking for gaps.

Larry: (to Clara) Thinking about the potential buy ins and associate awards, all missions have to provide their FtF indicators to Washington, and their efforts have to contribute to those indicators. How can we convince the missions that associate awards will contribute to these indicators?

Clara: This will support their obligation to work with USAID Forward. They'll also have to appreciate that education institutions are going to staff all producer organizations. They're required to increase the percentage of direct grants they provide. They need to do something on the pipeline side.

USAID Forward indicators we could use? OCA Tool. Looks at every facet of organization.

Next steps: performance management plan due by December. Today, actually. But December should be fine.

Finance in innovATE – Zara Shortt

Establishing the subaward contract. In progress.

Post-award documents: budget, budget narrative, cost share budget, statement of work

^ detail provided about each

Search for culturally-sensitive logos

<http://www.mvula.co.za/>

<http://www.gatesfoundation.org/Pages/home.aspx>

<http://www.aet-africa.org/>

<http://www.meas-extension.org/>

<http://www.fordfoundation.org/>

<http://www.worldbank.org/>

http://www.fao.org/index_en.htm

<http://www.huairou.org/women-and-habitat-network-latin-america>

<http://theglobaljournal.net/article/view/585/>

<http://www.pih.org/>

<http://www.oxfam.org/>

<http://www.cabi.org>

<http://www.care.org/>

<http://www.brac.net/>

<http://www.mercycorps.org/>

Scoping Visits – Keith Moore

MKB: During scoping visits, find sub who would do the needs assessments/case studies/labor market survey.

Ed: important to establish good relationships with Missions and connections well before we go there. By the time we go, we should have a good idea of what they want. We should have an agenda already agreed upon. (At least for the first several days. The agenda should evolve as you're there.)

Keith: What is it on paper or electronically that we can send?
This will need to be developed.

Larry: Criteria for helping us choose. If there is already a high probability of getting a buy in from certain Missions, Missions with a high interest but that may not have the resources themselves to make the investment right now.

Clara: We really need to think about some selection criteria to ID the case study countries. Mission demand and resources to devote to this. Other opportunities. Ask

missions to submit one-page statement from the missions describing how this project could benefit them.

What about a country with many players vs. a country that only has one key player, or one heavy weight and other newer institutions?

Do you want to look at a post-conflict situation?

Geographic representation across Africa and other regions?

Tom Gill: Personal opinion, choose FTF country. Clearly aligns that we're looking at FTF. Extend towards strategic partner countries — South Africa, Brazil, India. Would it raise flags at USAID to do the initial scoping visit/case study in a non-FTF country?

Keith: In taking that first pilot country, we should probably target Africa, within the context of Africa.

MKB: We want to go where there is possibility of long-term funding for an associate award. But a new country, like Burma, would be fascinating. It's a new country, a post-conflict environment. Clara, do you think Burma would be a FTF country shortly?

Clara: That's the rumor I've heard. South Sudan is also in that category. The obstacle of working within these countries is that they don't yet have missions set up.

If a non-FTF country came with resources for associate awards, I would also consider that.

Keith: 2 issues on the table. What would be our pilot country?

Larry: Can we ask for a simple expression of interest from the Missions? An "Are you interested?" and then a phone call with the director or a PI to get a better sense of their needs, interest, and resources.

Clara: I think that's a great idea to follow up with a phone call. Whatever you can to make it easier for them is good.

Larry: I'd like to see us do at least one case study in a post-conflict country. I'd be willing to make a pitch for either Guatemala or Cambodia for that. They have ag officers who seem to be quite engaged.

Clara: I just talked with Kimberly Lucas, the ag officer for Cambodia. They have a program called Harvest which includes a lot of focus on training and institutions.

Larry: Just got back from there. Bill Bradley is a real advocate of this kind of work. He's going to be there through 2017. The Harvest project has tied up all their FTF funding for the next 2 years, but they will start planning next year. It's a post-conflict country where all education was completely destroyed, so it would make for a very interesting case study.

Tom Gill: General logistics: Ed Rajotte is going to Bangladesh, India, and Nepal in early February for IPM work. Ricky will be out for MEAS work early February as well. If we wanted to do one of our case studies during that period, it would make sense to overlap.

Ed: look at this as a strategy where we have countries lined up with different strategies. We're not going to have countries with available funds right away. Keep people aware of what we're doing, keep track of what stage they are in.

Tom G: Also need to respond to Mission interest and desire. Right now, Bangladesh and Cambodia are both interested, and we have to choose one of the other. How do we handle this? Will their priorities shift during that time?

Keith: This conversation will be more fruitful when we have a list from Clara of interested Missions and can follow up with a phone call. Then we can make plans to do case studies back-to-back or use mixed teams.

Prakash: List would also include how much FTF allocation they have, and if AET is on the top of their priorities.

Keith: Mission interest and invitation would be indicative of that.

Sandra: Clara, are you talking to anyone in the Middle East? Such as Jordan and Tunisia?

Clara: thinking more like DRC or Nigeria.

Larry: We could do more scoping trips opportunistically (Ed and Rick's trip) if we could separate some of these items.

Ricky: Is there a push to make Burma a FTF country? What kind of funds will land there in a year or two? Will ag be a priority in that funding?

Clara: This is speculative, but #s I've heard for FY13 are around 3 – 4 million range. Administrator is heading out there in a couple weeks to launch signature program that includes ag, health.

MKB: I think we should talk about buy ins as well, as they may be very important in the short-term.

Prakash: I'm involved with the trilateral program with Cornell, and I know that recently Cornell was in Malawi. There's already some relationship or project talks with Cornell. Something like this may already be underway here. Something similar is also happening in Kenya--OSU.

Clara: I was thinking about those countries because innovATE is much broader than just universities. It includes the whole range of institutions—technical and vocational. It may be worthwhile to go back to places like Tanzania.

Keith: We've covered this pretty well, and we can't move forward until we hear who's volunteering. Maybe we should move forward to the next.

Tom H: Let's move on...

Global Learning Event – Kurt Richter

Kurt Richter (head), Larry Vaughan, Prakash from TU, Tom Gill from Penn State, ___ from UF

Scoping visit contact – Keith Moore

Keith Moore (head), Ntam from TU, Ed Rajotte from Penn State, ____ from UF

Web portal – Kurt Richter

Kurt Richter (head), Prakash from TU, Melanie Gilbert from Penn State, Becky Williams from UF

IDDL – Kurt Richter

Institute for Distributed and Distance Learning

The “Distributed” is very valuable in this case.

Clara: culture of distance learning at USAID: much available. Some instructor-led courses, some self-led.

Prakash: Glad to hear about the certificate you offer. Could someone not from VT, like myself, enroll?

Peter: because of the way it is structured, it would be most appropriate for Virginia Tech faculty, but we have stripped this of some of the Virginia Tech-specific elements so that we can offer it to a wider audience, at a distance. I would be willing to open it up to other people as long as they understand that we have just opened this node.

Prakash: There is not a lot of very specific online course that integrates all these elements—downloadable ppts—and combine that with online interaction with the students. My concern is the relevance of this in our project because all of our students will be in areas where connectivity will be a problem.

Peter: This may be a good way to train your mentors, or your connections.

MKB: When we try to program these activities internationally, one of the big problems is the cost difference between institutions. We'd like to see a marginal cost model adopted by Tech, rather than the average cost. I'm interested in your experience with this problem and with other universities. It can be a deal killer if we have to pay out-of-state tuition. There could be partnerships forming between institutions in the host countries and the partner universities.

Tom H: There's a need to train USAID Mission people, who are apparently used to online learning. We're also training faculty, faculty leaders, and administrators. The distributed method sounds like it would be great for this.

Peter: The workshops that we do that add up to the certificate program are a few hundred dollars at the most. University of Malawi example: took classes at a distance, came to get the pieces they needed, and then returned to their university to teach.

MKB: What about the other universities as far as distance learning internationally?

Tom G: Penn State has "World Campus" that has wide reach. All content is vetted by World Campus. Easiest to do things that are certificate based and does not require enrollment.

Peter: Penn State World Campus is actually considered a separate campus. It allows them to control tuition rates, salaries, etc.

Sandra: UF goes for the expensive professional courses, targeting high income countries. Grad cert programs are targeted toward extension agents around the state. We had a pilot project with USAID trying to do those graduate programs in developing countries. Faculty didn't know how to mentor, students have poor connectivity. We don't seem to be doing much where this is the case.

Ntam: TU is not very developed in this area.

Larry: Twice you mentioned K-12. These are areas we'll be working in . Gap seen in ERA project, children have to make career choices at 13 – 14 years old, picking a university path or vocational path. Maybe this could be valuable for providing information for those children at that level, to see what careers in agriculture mean in that particular country.

Peter: That's really important, that you can select modules in that field and that you can learn what it means to study in those fields. Those single units can be integrated into other curricula.

Ricky: This is being incorporated as MEAS develops its modules—you can pick and choose and create a program for a specific area.

Debrief:

Logistics worked out well.
But we need to control the weather better.

Feedback from group was very favorable.

MKB: It was really good to have our partners here. I'm sorry that more UF people couldn't make it out. There was a lot of discussion, and it was worthwhile.

Kurt: We have a real tiger by the tail here. This project is going to be a challenge. There's a lot of pieces. I don't think we have a clear, defined goal from USAID. That's good and bad. It's going to be hard to get started. Our strengths are definitely our partners. The assessment tools and case studies are going to be strong. The web portal has the potential to be a mess. There's really not a need for another web portal in the world unless we have a clear idea of our clientele—who's going to use this portal, and for what purpose. Until we answer this, we're taking a shot in the dark.

Larry: Look at the terminology and proposal again. Like the ability to provide training opportunities for USAID personnel. And then a database for training people. Those don't have to be part of a portal, but they have to be created and delivered somehow. We may be able to piggyback on something, like the MEAS project website.

Kurt: These are great ideas. But who's the client? What's the need? Ideas, but nothing concrete.

Jerzy: it's a dynamic process. Development, feedback, improvement. It has to be open ended to respond to demand changes. We should march toward responsibilities and ownership.

MKB: Peter had a good idea for a focus group. We should get a group together to talk about how a portal would be useful to better understand that.

Keith: I wouldn't limit that group to USAID-washington people. We need feedback from people who are thinking in the Mission level. They're on different agendas all the time, even though personnel circulate.

Tom H: First initial contact in these 5 countries should include focus group meeting at the mission to talk about the web portal. We're talking about something for them. We need their input, their buy in, for the portal. We'll have five countries before the Global

Learning Event. There's no need to develop a website when we don't know what format it is needed in. Let's build something that's useful. Let's not get into this too fast.

Kurt: can we use Agrilinks to conduct a survey among Mission personnel? (Melissa and Miriam have good contacts at Agrilinks.) We should take some time and make an effort to contact people in the field.

Tom: Scoping trips—chance to ground test with Mission staff?

MKB: We have to have some type of training database, course for Mission personnel? That is what we will need.

Larry: Those elements can be developed now.

Kurt: how are they going to use this? How will someone in a Mission use an ag training database?

Keith: I'm leery of a focus group, but if we can do that, it would be a huge benefit.

Larry: part of a potential database that we mentioned in the proposal. Short-term training opportunities, and ones with online access that are openly available.

Jerzy: webinars are popping up everywhere.

Larry: even if we capture only what is in our university partners.

MKB: we have to come up with a protocol that our students will follow. We can put that on our to-do list.

Keith: we've got our list that outlines what the contents will be. There are certain basic things about a training opportunity that's there, that we can catalog easily.

MKB: We've got to hire some students. They'll be more creative in finding a way to structure it.

Keith: That's where we should be talking to Rick Rudd. Give them the chance to get involved.

Kellsey: Consider students working with IDDL if that's an option.

Jerzy: I don't have a feel of Tuskegee's depth of operation.

Tom: TU is only 3,000 students.

Kurt: They're involved in lots of other projects.

Keith: I've been in the field with NTam. He's perceptive. He understands what the issues are, and he has been useful in pulling together the next steps kind of plans.

Tom: keep Prakash in the conversation.

Larry: for a day and a half meeting, we covered a lot. But what we don't have is any progress in finalizing the workplan, which was one of our key objectives. What do we do next on that?

Keith: we got a lot of feedback around core. Hole around portal thing. We've sort of synthesized that we need to step back on that. On the rest, we've got a general consensus.

Larry: Involve one more time.

Keith: I've got notes for filling out these things. We need to go through the workplan, detail the tasks, resolve some issues about aligning these things with indicators, come up with more indicators, and circulate.

Larry: On tasks—let's look at training modules. In house? Partners? Resources?

MKB: Resources are mostly here for that.

Larry: Make sure that we're not just assigning stuff. One-on-one over phone, even.

Keith: We need to know the UF team.

Larry: Web portal discussions yesterday reflected our own differences of opinion within the office.

Kurt: Training modules. What do you have envisioned?

Larry: Focus groups helpful. First one—USAID's involvement in capacity building—a history. (Like Clara's presentation.)

Jerzy: Gary Alex warned against developing another land grant system.

MKB: the modules. John Thomas and USAID university. They have some kind of module.

Jerzy: the merit is in summarizing USAID _____. To promote collaboration.

Larry: We're supposed to deliver one hour of training. The second: an introduction to current AET projects, everything that AID is supported.

Keith: In doing this one, we'll have to show how we're distinctive.

Kellsey: can we talk about how we can connect with other projects too?

Keith: Yes, that's part of our distinction.

Larry: Maybe a module about developing communities of practice within the host country. How have people been successful doing that? Examples from ERA.

Keith: identifying the networks.

MKB: value of higher education or post-secondary education in ag.

Keith: Don't need.

Larry: but linking higher ed in ag to various sectors of employment. There might be surprising linkages that we can point out.

Kurt; maybe higher ed is not valuable in the vast majority of jobs

Keith: The AET in total – all the way from primary through university.

Larry: take all channels a student might go through in an educational system. Follow them.

MKB: break down in primary, secondary, and tertiary. There are USAID programs who have worked with the primary level. Get real world examples that USAID has supported elsewhere and discuss the impacts. Go through the systems one at a time.

Larry: that could be three modules. Use two countries as examples through 3 modules.

Jerzy: The concept alone that you can grow your plants in a school garden and incorporate it into the curriculum—maybe a school teacher module? I like this idea of Ghana because there is a very good urban horticulture program there.

Keith: Interesting discussion of video modules, but perhaps we're getting too detailed. We should develop these in another meeting.

MEC: Weak side of meeting is illustrated by the fact that it's not part of the conversation. Virginia Tech faculty weren't really integrated. They didn't know why they were there, they didn't know what to do in follow up.

Jerzy: The problem is they were mostly administrators. Maybe we could have a working group of faculty.

Tom: We're identifying the need as well as identifying their potential involvement in the project. For example, Peter staying in the meeting today. We wanted to see the involvement from across campus. It was too early for them to jump in.

MEC: For instance Bill Carstensen felt that he was not included what was going on. We want faculty from the beginning. Sense that OIRED hogs project and doesn't enjoy faculty.

Tom: Important thing is to follow up. I quizzed Bill at lunch—he has four faculty who could be involved right away.

Larry: follow up is key thing. It's how we can go right or wrong. But we shouldn't raise people's expectations and then dash them when we can't involve them. If we could keep engaged with them for the next month or two, explain the core project and opportunity, maybe establish core group or working group with wide membership to generate ideas.

Tom: this is a new OIRED—trying to get faculty involved from across campus. People did not want to work with OIRED, they don't want any part of it. So we get dept heads, associate deans at the table when we have more information and ways to involve them.

Maybe on scoping missions, we could involve one other person from Virginia Tech.

Jerzy: a lot of new faculty are being hired, and some of them already have international links. Capturing them when they are in the beginning stages of their employment is key.

Tom: some of the faculty knew what was going on, and was glad to be invited.

Keith: But we have to manage expectations. It takes a long time before the payoffs. It has to be a slow encouragement. A thank you for coming at the end of this week.

Jerzy: Interviewing for new horticulture faculty. Knows the capacity of some already. Capture them right on arrival.

Tom: Bob rattled off 3 or 4 faculty we could contact from CNRE.

Kurt: We really need to talk with Rick Rudd and ag extension. Maybe even grad students. They would at least benefit from this exposure.

MKB: Y1, we have a spot for a post doc, students, and consultants. There are opportunities, not just within Tech but more generally, to engage experts in different areas. Use for global learning event? Commission guest studies from an area? We have that flexibility.

Jerzy: meeting with ag extension grad students.

Tom: Coffee/tea, short seminar, and ask if they're interested.

Jerzy: We can go to them through a seminar series.

MKB: We have a Sudanese student.

Kellsey: money in budget for honorarium for the Global Learning Event

Keith: Can we use some of that honorarium \$ for a written paper? Not just a presentation, but a written document? Something as an indicator.

Jerzy: good idea, has broader coverage.

Tom: mirrors question: Oh, is there a report about that? There should be something from it.

Keith: there's a lot written and already out there. We have to can the latest.

Jerzy: contact journal and have a special issue towards the end of the grant.

MKB: ag extension journal? The Journal of Ag Education and Extension. Opportunity for a session?

Tom: a lot of synergies came up. Peter Doolittle sitting next to me yesterday. Head of CIDER. Asked if I was involved in the next conference. Peter wanted us to be involved in that project.

Larry: that's what I'd like the Global Learning Event to become over the next 5 years.

Tom: this event is practically doubling in size every year—they had 1,000 participants last year, and they come from all over.

MKB: this is one reason IPM is so successful with associate awards.

Larry: our partners didn't necessarily leave with a to-do list.

Keith: I have marching orders! But I need to do homework first.

Larry: what if each institution submitted the workplan for the tasks they're going to do?

Keith: next year. This year we need to have an integrated program.

MKB: we want to edit the document that Clara proposed sending out to the Missions. We should personalize the invitations to those Missions that have already expressed interest. We also want to mention buy-ins as opposed to just associate awards. Buy ins are easier to do, they're smaller amounts, etc.

MEC: we need to choose criteria for selecting the focus countries, or at least find which ones we have to choose from.

Jerzy: in Liberia and west Africa, they're looking up to Ghana and Nigeria.

Keith: until we know who the real characters are, we can't make a final decision. Ghana seems probable right now.

MKB: and new countries are opening up right now.

TO DO:

- Review email (distribute)
- Sub groups – set up
 - Global Learning Event
 - Web portal
 - Scoping trips – Jerzy added

- Thank yous – Tom
- Make presentations available – Scholar—Keith—Kellsey to give presentations
- Work plan – Keith getting group together to brainstorm through details
- Web portal stuff – Kellsey will email, provide contact info for follow up
- Group meeting in a week – Wednesday 11/7 at 9am, OIRED library