

PD-ABM-463

98120

USAID/TANZANIA
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT
OF THE
SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE/
TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY LINKAGE PROJECT

Prepared by:

Dr. Anne M. Parrish, Creative Associates International, Inc.
Mr. Daniel Moshy

HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROJECT
(698-0463)

AID CONTRACT NO. AOT-0463-Q-00-3216-00, D.O. #4

submitted by:
AMEX International, Inc.

in collaboration with:
CREATIVE ASSOCIATES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Washington, D.C.
December 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. List of Acronyms	i
II. Executive Summary	1
III. Introduction of Evaluation Team Objectives	2
IV. Methodology	2
V. Impact Assessments of SUA-TU Linkage Project	3
A. DTP and Computer Training	3
B. WID Workshops and Gender-Sensitization	4
C. Other Linkage Project Local Short Courses/ Workshops	4
D. Faculty Enhancement, Exchange, Research, and Constraints	5
E. Impact of Linkage Project on Student Field Practicals	8
F. Perceived Constraints by SUA Faculty	9
VI. Impacts of Linkage Project on Smallholders, Extension Agents, and Other Regional People	9
VII. Constraints Identified by Smallholders	12
VIII. Recommendations of the Evaluation Team	13
A. Recommendations to Enhance Specific Areas of Future SUA-TU Cooperation	13
B. Recommendations to Enhance Beneficiary Impact .	15
C. Other Recommendations	16
IX. References Cited	17
X. Appendices	
A. Documents Reviewed	17
B. People Met/Interviewed	21
C. Copy of Leaflet Prepared for Dairy Goat Day	24

I. LIST OF ACRONYMS

DTP	Desktop Publishing
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FOA	Faculty of Agriculture
FOVM	Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
GNP	Gross National Product
GOT	Government of Tanzania
ICE	Institute of Continuing Education
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
NGO	Non-governmental organization
SUA	Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania
TU	Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, Alabama
USAID/T	United States Agency for International Development/Tanzania
WID	Women in Development

H

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The five-year USAID funded Sokoine University of Agriculture at Morogoro, Tanzania-Tuskegee University at Tuskegee, Alabama (SUA-TU) Linkage Project began 1 October 1990 and ended 30 September 1995. The linkage project was designed to enhance teaching and research capabilities of the SUA Institute of Continuing Education (ICE) and the SUA Faculty of Agriculture (FOA) in their response to farm-level needs of men and women. The project was initiated under a joint Memorandum of Understanding between SUA and TU, with SUA the designated beneficiary and TU as the grantee. The five-year project was funded at US\$2,385,754.

Based upon interviews, observations, and the reading of documents in the U.S. and Tanzania, the Evaluation Team recommends USAID/T continue their support of the linkage project. Had the linkage project begun with different SUA leadership and been more closely monitored by USAID/T, the results could have been more positive, additional short-term training of SUA faculty and staff could have been done, more smallholders would have benefitted, or would have benefitted through additional applied research and outreach programs (e.g., more training in animal traction). Much has been accomplished to improve teaching and out-reach programs at SUA during the past two years, however, and the Evaluation Team believes the limited project results will be sustainable if funds are available for additional and duplicate research and application and the smallholders will continue to be positively impacted by the time-limited transfer of knowledge. In spite of many project problems, the Evaluation Team has determined TU did impact SUA by providing assistance in developing a new applied problem-oriented curriculum and improved student practicals, developing approaches for problem-solving (e.g., applied research training, gender-sensitization), and disseminating innovations (e.g., outreach programs, DTP, and computer seminars). Extension personnel and smallholders were impacted by training programs and applied research activities (e.g., ox-weeders, carts, and dairy goat production), and six SUA personnel received advanced training in the U.S., which will in turn impact SUA students through improved teaching and enhanced computer facilities.

When different SUA personnel assumed their responsibilities two years ago, a leaflet was distributed to the FOA and seminars were held to explain project functions and opportunities. SUA proposals were submitted, approved, and applied research was

initiated. Later the FOVM was informed, but it was too late for them to productively participate. Because of the serious time constraints placed upon the researchers, the projects were by necessity designed to be accomplished in months instead of years and some would-be researchers did not submit proposals because of insufficient time. Once the SUA FOA became informed, the linkage project did begin to earnestly impact both the university and research recipients; research data have been collected and some have been incorporated into applied projects, student field practicals have improved, and project smallholders have benefitted from a labor-saving perspective because of the transfer of monetarily-free technologies.

III. INTRODUCTION OF EVALUATION TEAM OBJECTIVES

The following sections of this evaluation report will provide information by the Evaluation Team for the three evaluation objectives it was given: (1) to ascertain whether during the implementation of this linkage project the purpose of the Cooperative Agreement that sought to enable Tuskegee University to enhance the teaching and research capabilities of Sokoine University were met; (2) to provide an accurate picture of the success/failures in implementing the agreed Cooperative Agreement and; (3) to recommend specific areas of future SUA-TU cooperation that are within TU area of expertise and have large recipient impact (Scope of Work 1995:1).

IV. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation project began at TU. Participants interviewed included administrative personnel, research participants, seminar conductors, and other periphery personnel (see Appendix B). Each were asked to explain participation, contributions, problems, and benefits, and to make suggestions for improvements.

After the initial meeting at USAID/T in Dar es Salaam, the Evaluation Team went to SUA. Interviews were conducted with administrative personnel, FOA, non-FOA, non-participating FOA and other faculty (e.g., FOVM), scholarship recipients, and FOA students. Each were asked to describe participation (or lack thereof), contributions, problems, and benefits, and to make suggestions for improvements. Other noninvolved personnel (e.g., FAO, IrishAid, Ministry of Health, and Ministry of Agriculture) were interviewed to ascertain whether they were aware of the linkage project. Male and female produce and meat vendors were

interviewed to determine if they had noted a difference in the quality and quantity of produce over the 5-year period, what problems they had with locally-produced products, and from whom they purchased their goods (i.e., farmers, middlemen, or were themselves producers). Male and female smallholders and settled-out Maasai pastoralists were interviewed to determine whether or how they had been positively or negatively impacted over the same period.

Each of these were open-ended interviews regarding the involvement and success of the linkage program. For additional examples: smallholders were questioned about improvement in Extension service, problems, and interactions with SUA FOA students and personnel; administrative personnel were asked whether the linkage project had improved their program; 1-4 year FOA students were asked if positive instructional changes had been made; Extension workers were questioned on the type, change, and quality of training received during the past five years, what problems they had, and what additional training they needed; non-participating agency representatives were asked if they had noted changes in Extension work and farm-level improvement over the project period and; random males and females from all categories were questioned as to changes in gender issues.

A veterinarian familiar with the region and the inhabitants was hired to take the team to different project villages. During the interviews, male and female smallholders were individually and collectively interviewed. In addition to interviewing many farmers and the Extension workers for each village, Maasai elders were consulted, a Maasai livestock auction was visited, and sellers/buyers and the livestock Extension agent were interviewed.

The rationale was to use participant-observation and interviews with people from different levels of participation or non-participation in the project, starting at the top with SUA-TU personnel, working down to the ultimate recipients, and with noninvolved people who have been in the area throughout the duration of the project (e.g., FAO, vendors). Each of the interviews were used to cross-check information given by other informants. All literature obtained from TU and SUA was read and interview questions were in part, formatted from the material (see Appendix A). The research reports were used to help formulate conceptions of project impact and recommendations, and the current SUA course catalog was thoroughly read and planned changes were discussed with SUA-TU personnel.

V. IMPACT ASSESSMENTS OF SUA-TU LINKAGE PROJECT

This section will report whenever possible the impacts upon the enhancement of teaching and research at SUA by TU personnel and other populations. Because of the late start of the research projects (i.e., three years in some cases), most cannot be effectively evaluated because they are on-going, incomplete, or need to be replicated.

A. DTP and Computer Training

1. One SUA student was sent for an Associate Degree in Computer Science and also received instruction in electronic equipment repair.

2. DTP was introduced by TU and two DTP and computer workshops were conducted at SUA (1991 and 1994).

a. The DTP publications are of professional quality. Cost savings of in-house publishing are estimated to be 20% under the cost of off-site printing or preprinted materials.

3. DTP and the computer labs should be sustainable because of the U.S. technical training. Spare parts are available, but when exhausted, the program will not be sustainable without donor support.

4. ICE charges other departments a nominal fee. This money is used to cover costs and to off-set potential repair costs. Some faculty members either still believe DTP is only for ICE, or the publishing should be free of charge. It is suggested that ICE communicate with all faculty regarding the intended university-wide use of DTP and the fees.

B. WID Workshops and Gender-Sensitization

1. Part of the linkage project was to improve perceived problems with gender issues. Three WID workshops were held at SUA; one in 1991 conducted by TU faculty (Lyles 1991), the second in 1993 by a third-party (Engberg 1993), and a third in 1994 by a TU social worker.

2. Currently, WID courses are primarily taught in female-oriented FOA departments, but the newly developed SUA-TU curriculum will make gender-sensitive courses mandatory for all students in the first and second years.

3. The Evaluation Team was told a SUA women's group had been formed as a result of the WID workshops - Research Women in Agriculture (RESWA) to conduct activities.

4. From information obtained through interviews, the

WID courses have had positive results in increasing the value of the roles of women at the university and farm-level (e.g., 2 FOA females sent to the U.S. for advanced training, female and male FOA students sent to work with opposite-gender smallholders, female Extension worker trained in horticulture to work with male smallholders, male and female FOA members involved in research and training). During interviews, the Team was told these activities created a greater sensitivity towards all smallholders and both the workshops and applied work enhanced an appreciation for female input in farm labor, subsistence, and cash crop production. For example, females were chosen to demonstrate the effectiveness of ox-plows in one village. Additionally, under a separate donor program, eight female smallholders (no males) were taken to Vietnam in 1995 by SUA personnel to learn new technologies.

C. Other Linkage Project Local Short Courses/Workshops

- 1991 Problem-solving, Teaching and Research Workshop for SUA faculty.
- 1993 FOA Workshop on Research Priorities to the Year 2000 for SUA faculty, GOT staff, NGOs, bi-lateral agency representatives, and TU faculty.
- 1994 Project Planning Workshop for SUA-TU faculty.
- 1995 Development of Framework for Field Practical for SUA faculty, MOA staff, and students.

Interviewees stated these workshops were of value in identifying needs, but had the project begun on time, more could have been accomplished. As examples, the problem-solving workshop should have been extended to constraint identification and resolution, the FOA Workshop could have expanded into how to more effectively conduct multidisciplinary activities and resource sharing, and the latter two could have been divided with (1) the addition for methodology in identification of problems, constraints, and how to identify and conduct applied technology workshops and (2) enhancement of the field practicals to address smallholder needs.

D. Faculty Enhancement, Exchange, Research, and Constraints

1. Fifteen SUA faculty members travelled to TU for research, administrative purposes, and U.S. cultural orientation. Nineteen TU faculty members went to SUA

to conduct training, research and joint proposal writing, administrative duties, and outreach activities. Twelve SUA faculty or staff members were funded in order to attend conferences and workshops in nearby African countries. The latter allowed for the interchange of scientific knowledge in research and applied activities done by regional scientists attempting to solve similar problems. Relationships made through personal contact may enhance future exchange of research and recipient benefits.

2. Benefits of the exchanges included: TU faculty were made aware first-hand of problems of the SUA FOA and smallholders, which helped identify future research projects. SUA FOA received short-term training in computer use, bio-technology, U.S. Land Grant curriculum development, and gender sensitization.

a. These activities enhanced both faculties, however, the Evaluation Team questions the necessity of repeated trips by SUA and TU personnel, and those described as cultural "...visits to key historic sites,...and shopping for US commodities" (Progress Report April 1995:12).

3. One benefit that should impact all recipients is the redevelopment of the SUA curriculum.

4. Listed below are the consensus of perceived benefits by SUA faculty.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <u>a.</u> Training and cooperative research at TU and at SUA | <u>f.</u> DTP, computer labs, A-V equipment, tents, vehicles allowed for research |
| <u>b.</u> Project allowed faculty to do applied research | <u>g.</u> Allowed to attend meetings and short-courses in nearby countries |
| <u>c.</u> Student field practicals have improved during past 2 years | <u>h.</u> Opportunities to publish |
| <u>d.</u> Scholarships for 6 SUA personnel | <u>i.</u> Funding for research |
| <u>e.</u> Faculty now aware more interaction with smallholders is important | <u>j.</u> Teaching skills improved |
| | <u>k.</u> Are learning multi-disciplinary approach |

5. Listed below are the consensus of perceived benefits by TU faculty.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <u>a.</u> Developed international contacts | <u>g.</u> Collaborative research |
| <u>b.</u> TU faculty able to visit farms | <u>h.</u> Was a 2-way learning process |
| <u>c.</u> Added global perspective to classes | <u>i.</u> Students become more involved in international issues |
| <u>d.</u> African Institute was in part a result of linkage project | <u>j.</u> Swahili now taught at TU |
| <u>e.</u> Opportunities to publish | <u>k.</u> Developed new technical skills |
| <u>f.</u> SUA FOA critiqued TU, made it a better university | <u>l.</u> Laboratory equipment |

6. Long-Term Training - Impacts and Constraints

a. Six SUA members were sent to the US for advanced degrees. The original program was changed by USAID/T because of time constraints. Degrees were to have been in Education Media/Communications, Women in Development, Agronomy, Farming Systems Research, Rural Farm Technology, and Home Economics. Instead the students are receiving:

MS in Family Studies/Pennsylvania State University

MS in Food and Nutrition/TU

MS in Education Media Studies/Florida State Univ.

MS in Food and Nutrition/TU

Ph.D in Crop Sciences/Cornell University

AS in Computer Science/John Patterson Technical College

b. Only two assessments can be made because only two students were available. The person with an AS in Computer Science is working at SUA and has taken charge of the ICE computer lab and university-wide computer and electronic repair. The other received a MS in nutrition and is now teaching. She stated she could not do her work or research without the U.S. training.

c. While all will enhance SUA, one of the two MS in Food and Nutrition should have been provided to another person (e.g., FOVM, Pest Management, Agriculture Engineering). This could have been rectified by more informative results of the Needs

Assessment Survey and closer monitoring by USAID/T.

7. SUA Curriculum Enhancement by TU Faculty and Staff

- a. TU and SUA jointly developed the field practical modules.
- b. Gender-sensitization is now part of student core training.
- c. Hands-on research opportunities for SUA faculty have enhanced their teaching because they can relate literature to practice.
- d. Training for DTP and computer use have been added, which has allowed for the limited publication of in-house course books and training materials.
- e. New curriculum has been developed that reflects the SUA-TU identified needs of students and the service community.

8. Audio-Visual Development

- a. The linkage project provided multimedia instruction at SUA. Equipment included video cameras, a video editing set, TV screen, and a video cassette recorder. The MOA Regional Extension Officer stated the A-V equipment had also been of benefit to them because they had co-produced training films for Extension agents.

9. Linkage Project Research Proposals

- a. Depending upon intent, proposals were selected by four different committees.
 - i. Applied Research Technical Team
 - ii. Field Crop Technical Team
 - iii. Continuing Education Technical Team
 - iv. Farmer Training Technical Team

The Evaluation Team believes these four committees are currently necessary because of the necessity for more multidisciplinary training. Members not cognizant in the value of other disciplines cannot effectively judge the worth of proposals submitted by other disciplines. In U.S. proposal submission, evaluators are still trained in the topical area; why should SUA be different?

b. Selection criteria included:

- i. must address issues from Needs Assessment survey

- ii. time-frame for completion
 - iii. must be applied-based proposal
 - iv. must be multidisciplinary
- c. Eighteen SUA or joint SUA-TU proposals were submitted; thirteen were approved. Some are completed, others in progress, and some not started because of time constraints. Of the proposals, one is not applicable to the guidelines. The project entitled "The Implications of Primary School Textbooks Towards Gender Bias in Socio-Cultural Development: The Case of Tanzania" was not multidisciplinary and the pragmatic benefits to smallholders and Extension agents are questionable.

SUA-Based Research Projects

1. Assessment of Termite Damage and Their Control in Morogoro Rural and Kilosa Districts.
2. Promotion of Soybean Utilization for Human Food in Morogoro Region. (not completed)
3. Extension of Draft Animal Utilization Through Promotion of Hire Service in Rural Tanzania.
4. Causes of Desertification and Loss of Biodiversity on the Uluguru Mountains.
5. Identification of Village Extension Workers Training Needs in Selected Villages of Morogoro Region.
6. A Study of Educational Media and Their Impact on Training and Extension. (not completed)
7. Development of Farmer-Oriented Publications for Use by Families Involved in Dairy Goat Production.
8. Pilot Studies on the Use of Lactoperoxidase System in Conjunction with Pasteurization to Enhance the Shelf Life of Milk Stored at Elevated Temperatures. (not completed)
9. Farmers Participation in Development Activities at Village Level - A Case Study of SUA-TU Linkage Project Villages.
10. Preliminary Investigations into the Control of New Castle Disease in Village Chickens. (not completed)
11. Womens' Indigenous Technical Knowledge and Its Effects on Agriculture and Livestock Production in Morogoro Region. (not completed)
12. An Epidemiological Survey for Major Diseases of Poultry in Morogoro Region. (not completed)

TU-Based Research Projects

Research activities include among others, soil

solarization, poultry genetics using blood samples from indigenous Tanzanian chickens, dairy goat research, establishment of trees for fuelwood and environmental protection, the collection of indigenous knowledge regarding trees, and the development of "A Manual for Monitoring and Evaluating Community Forest Efforts in Tanzania". The latter is in the printing process and the other research projects are on-going.

10. Impact of research - because of the lost-time problems, many projects were difficult or impossible to evaluate, however, some data were available because of smallholder, vendor, student, and Extension agent anecdotal feed-back. These will be discussed below.

E. Impact of Linkage Project on Student Field Practicals

1. Agricultural students spend five-week field practicals; nutrition students spend eight weeks. Sixteen male and female students were interviewed and they agreed the practicals had improved during the past two years. This evaluation was made by asking the students to describe field/university training before 1994 and to compare it to the current time. They stated their teaching of smallholders has been impacted through improved pre-field training, in-house DTP publications, and the use of project vehicles, tents, and cots.

2. Gender issues did not appear to be an issue because male and female students were often assigned to opposite gender smallholders; none had negative experiences, but did relate positive ones. For example, one male worked with a female farmer and stated the experience was positive for not only them, but also for other smallholders because it helped to demonstrate the importance SUA is now giving to gender issues, including respect and higher status for the inputs of female labor and knowledge.

3. Until two years ago, students were sent on practicals without the knowledge of the Extension service. Since that time, the Regional Extension Office assigns a supervisor to the student. Students stated this was an improvement because they now had someone to help them in the field.

4. Nutrition students returning from field practicals are required to present seminars in their department.

5. An agri-business course has been added to the FOA curriculum because some graduates are now obtaining positions with large commercial farms and NGOs.

F. Perceived Constraints by SUA Faculty

1. Some SUA faculty not involved with the project are still unclear of the purpose. Leaflets describing DTP facilities and any additional funding that may be granted should be prepared for all faculty.

2. Others stated they were unable to submit proposals because of the limited time frame (i.e., Oct. 1993-Sept. 1995) and were disappointed because they believed their input and research would have been of value to the project and service community.

V. IMPACTS OF LINKAGE PROJECT ON SMALLHOLDERS, EXTENSION AGENTS, AND OTHER REGIONAL PEOPLE

A. Although most of the smallholders are subsistence farmers, some do produce a surplus and others plant cash crops including vegetables, sisal, and cotton. Through interviews with smallholders and vendors at the Morogoro market, it was learned the commodities are either sold to middlemen, or if the villages are close to Morogoro, the farmers sell directly to the vendors. As an example to improve vegetable sales, one outreach project provided capital and training for an one-acre horticulture demonstration project. The village Extension agent was trained by SUA-TU and she in turn trained five males conducting the work. Others have visited the plot but expressed a constraint in that they are unable to afford the inputs to duplicate the plot work. The information is, however, valuable: (1) the plot demonstrates that a profit can be made from improved vegetable production; (2) new techniques were learned and; (3) if cooperatives were initiated, farmers could benefit by a joint venture. Moreover, if more ox-carts (discussed below) are provided, produce could be directly taken to markets and therefore bypass middleman costs.

Because most of the inputs received by the smallholders were only in place for a maximum of one year, or had not yet been used, no effective assessments could be made other than labor, so therefore, almost all of the assessment data were anecdotal. This type of evaluation needs to be long-term because people were just learning how to use the inputs,

which could affect both yields and time, and weather data from only one year could skew results.

1. Estimates of smallholder literacy rates ranged from 50-80%, but Extension agents stated materials produced with DTP will be of value because literate smallholders can read to others. Because the DTP project is so new, no assessment can be made regarding impact. In part, this could have been assessed had the evaluation been done after the Dairy Goat Day and dissemination of DTP prepared literature.

2. The linkage project Needs Assessment Survey identified New Castle disease as a problem. Because of project problems during the first three years, the MOA Extension independently began vaccinations of village chickens. They extended their initiative beyond the project villages because the SUA-TU research would have only provided help for the 20 project villages. This has greatly helped smallholders because chickens not only provide protein, they are also a source of quick income.

3. A women's group in one village received ox-cart training and a SUA-TU ox-cart. They also now have a plow and stated their labor-intensive farming system has been improved. SUA-TU ox-carts have also been provided in other villages, but some have not received training, and in one, money was provided for lumber and SUA-TU personnel are to teach smallholders how to build carts. This is because it is less expensive to build carts on-site, they can be designed for specific needs, and the transfer of knowledge will become more sustainable because it can be duplicated both intra- and inter-village (i.e., farmer-to-farmer training). Before the introduction of carts (except in the Gairo region, which already had them), the functions of the carts were done by manual labor. The carts are used for many purposes; transport seeds, other inputs, ox-plows and weeders to the fields, crops to storage areas, goods to markets, and people to markets, medical facilities, and other places.

4. One village received an ox-weeder and one stated his maize yields had improved by 45% (note: this was not scientifically quantified). Without an ox-weeder, fields must be manually weeded three times per season.

The ox-weeder not only reduces the weeding times by one and saves labor, but does a better job of killing weeds and turning the soil, which increases moisture around the plants. With less weeds, the crops receive more nutrition and have less moisture competition. Because this is a new and on-going project, no qualitative data on yields were collected for either the previous or current crop years. Through multidisciplinary research, yield-loss assessments to pests could also be done at the same time. What is significant, however, is the lessor amount of labor expended per crop. This labor can now be used for other purposes (e.g., bringing more land into production).

5. Most (if not all) of the 20 project villages had male cattle that could be prepared and trained for animal traction. The reason they were not used is because no chains, weeders, plows, or carts were available. SUA-TU provided funding for pilot projects in some of the villages and the transfer of knowledge regarding their use is spreading (i.e., farmer-to-farmer and SUA-TU) and some villagers without oxen are now requesting monetary and technical help.

6. Ten smallholders were trained by SUA-TU on how to build stables for dairy goats and they in turn trained others (i.e., farmer-to-farmer). In conjunction with Heifer Project International, bucks will be provided to improve dairy breeds. Yields have not increased because the bucks have not been delivered and therefore, production has not improved. The benefits of the stables outweigh free-grazing because rations and breeding may be controlled and the environment will not be further degraded because of indiscriminate grazing. Smallholders stated they preferred goats to cattle because they are easier to handle, have fewer diseases, and are less labor-intensive because they consume less fodder.

7. SUA-TU has worked on three research projects in another village; sunflower production, draft animals, and horticulture. The smallholders stated the training has been very beneficial and there is a nearby oil processing facility, so a ready market is available for the sunflower seeds.

8. A Dairy Goat Day will be held in September for

interested smallholders. Total family training will be offered in order to neutralize gender issues and printed goat production literature in Swahili has been prepared. This outreach project compliments other current research (see IV.c.4, 6, 8, 11).

9. Some of the nomadic Maasai pastoralists are now settling-out because of pasture and water problems and have begun farming. SUA-TU has met with some and has provided training and chains for ox-carts. The ox-carts fulfill the same functions for the Maasai as for other smallholders.

10. The Kilosa District Livestock Development Officer and the District Crop Officer were aware SUA-TU were working in the area, but the time frame has been too short for them to make an evaluation of any outreach projects.

11. The smallholders interviewed were receptive to training and wanted to learn effective technologies in order to improve their standards of living and labor-intensive farming system.

12. Other Smallholder Outreach Training Programs
1994 Extension Workers Communication Techniques,
conducted by the Technical Team for Continuing
Education.

1994 Dairy Goat Husbandry Practices Training,
conducted by SUA.

1994 Farmers Day Exhibitions, conducted by the
Technical Team for Farmers' Education.

1994 Indigenous Knowledge and Sustainable Agriculture
Workshop, conducted by the Technical Team on
Continuing Education.

1995 Ox-Weeding Training Course, conducted by the
Oxenization Extension and Training Services and OXETS
(an NGO).

1995 Horticultural Practices, conducted by SUA.

1995 Planned Dairy Goat Day in September, 1995
a. Had the linkage project begun on time, the
Evaluation Team believes more outreach training
programs would have been conducted and more people
could have benefitted. As may be seen by the
dates, all of the programs were done during the
last two years of the linkage project.

VII. CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED BY SMALLHOLDERS

A. Constraints identified included the slow implementation of outreach projects, the lack of stores to purchase inputs including pesticides, fertilizers, seeds, improved replacement roosters to prevent inbreeding, spare parts for ox equipment, and crop and storage pests. In one village there was an additional constraint. The project provided an ox-plow and selected one smallholder for its care. He thinks it was given to him and charges one goat per use. In one year's time, he has accumulated 59 goats, which have reproduced to a herd of about 80 animals. The ICE coordinator was informed of the situation and he stated he would become involved in a resolution.

B. SUA-TU has been involved in Extension agent training. These agents are not as effective as they should be, however, because many lack transportation and must walk long distances to reach villages, they need more technical training, there are no means of communication (i.e., telephones), and because they receive very low salaries, many subsidize their incomes by other means (e.g., own farms, various businesses). Because of the latter problem, they are frequently working on non-Extension money-making projects and some do not visit the villages often enough to assist the smallholders. This problem is compounded by two factors: they need more problem-solving training and a sufficient wage. One evaluator is himself a Tanzanian Extension agent and he concurred with the information collected.

a. Based upon personal experiences and discussions with East, West, South, and North Africanists, the problems faced by Tanzanian Extension agents are similar to others, as are the problems faced by the smallholders, especially monetary and the transfer of smallholder-identified appropriate technologies.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION TEAM

The following recommendations are based upon the Evaluation Team objectives as stated in the Introduction.

A. Recommendations to Enhance Specific Areas of Future SUA-TU Cooperation

1. Future Training Needs

a. Training is needed at SUA on how to collect and analyze qualitative data. Twenty regional

villages were selected for the study, which then became the locations for applied research. The Needs Assessment Study was used to develop the research agenda, but only identified the problems, not the constraints (i.e, restrictions in problem-solving). For example, smallholders were asked if animal dips were available, but if not, the constraints for were not identified (e.g., lack of money, pesticides, training, no knowledge of why dips were important?).

b. Two additional workshops are recommended. One should be on multidisciplinary research. This includes the collection of knowledge, resource utilization, and promotes understanding between social and natural scientists so that maximum cultural, monetary, and research results may be obtained (cf. 1.a example). Training could be through the establishment of Farming Systems Research/Extension (FSR/E) whereby multidisciplinary teams work together to identify smallholder-identified problems/constraints that could monetarily and feasibly be solved within the framework of SUA-TU expertise. Trainees should be everyone involved with applied research. If necessary, experts in FSR/E training could be obtained through the provisions of the MOU.

The second should be for FOA, Extension agents, and smallholders on how to form cooperatives. Except in Gairo, it is not traditional for regional smallholders to develop organizations; almost all work as individuals (male and female). Some emphatically expressed a desire for training in how to form cooperatives so they could combine resources to purchase inputs and market surpluses. One group had even written a proposal to submit to organizations to request training in cooperative formation. The MOA Regional Extension Officer concurred this training would be of great value and should be conducted. The Evaluation Team therefore believed this to be an indication that cooperatives would be compatible with GOT policy, plus these may help overcome the problems associated with changes in

GOT parastatal organizations. Because neither team member is a USAID employee, it is not known if cooperative training is policy; it is a recommendation.

SUA should be involved because they train some Extension workers, either as students or through ICE, and are the designated Tanzanian agricultural university. With TU (a cooperative training university), SUA should be the Tanzanian site for cooperative training. The Team recommends USAID/T support these endeavors.

2. Monetary Recommendations

a. There is a problem with money transfers from TU to SUA because TU issues checks from a bank in Montgomery, AL. Morogoro banks will not issue money until the checks clear and this takes up to 60 days. TU should use an international bank that can electronically transfer funds to a SUA account in Dar es Salaam.

b. International travel should be restricted to essential research and administrative personnel. Most communications could be accomplished via the fax machine. Money spent on unnecessary travel should be spent on applied and basic research, equipment, and outreach programs.

3. Future Collaborative Research

a. SUA should conduct applied research and topical areas should be discussed with Extension personnel and smallholders; the laboratory should be the farms. TU research should compliment SUA applied research and should be limited to pragmatic laboratory research. For example, while a key component in agricultural research, biotechnology is at this stage not appropriate because SUA FOA does not have trained personnel. Because the need is so great for immediate improvement at the farm-level, research should address smallholder-identified issues which can provide low-input technologies. For example, one FOA member has developed low-tech, low-input proto-types of household/village-level peanut and bean shellers and a palm oil press.

b. When asked about problems, most smallholders

identified pests, lack of fertilizers and follow-up help for projects. Identified constraints included lack of Extension pest control training, unavailability of inputs, and lack of money for inputs.

4. Enhancement of SUA Library Facilities

a. One of the main objectives of the linkage project was to enhance teaching and research at SUA, but no money was budgeted for improvement of the SUA library. Quality research and teaching are difficult without adequate resources, plus SUA has been designated as the Tanzanian National Library of Agriculture.

b. It is recommended that both SUA and TU faculties submit recommendations for appropriate periodicals and reference materials and the final purchase decisions be jointly made.

5. Future Funding

a. The Evaluation Team recommends continued funding so that on-going research may be completed or duplicated in certain situations (e.g., New Castle research, dairy goat management), or on applied research on small-holder-identified problems (e.g., pest management, low cost inputs).

B. Recommendations to Enhance Beneficiary Impact

1. SUA Collaborative Research/Work with Other Agencies

a. SUA should work more closely with the MOA Extension Service and initiate or improve contacts with NGOs, the FAO, and other agencies working in the region. This may avoid duplicate research and outreach.

2. FOA Student Practicals

a. With TU involvement, Student Modules were prepared for field practicals. These modules are, however, too superficial and do not contain information regarding pest management, a major unprompted problem identified by smallholders, vendors, and FOVM during interviews.

b. SUA FOA should make every attempt to match student interests with their field practicals. Some students stated they had been placed with non-farm hosts and would have preferred to have

been with smallholders.

3. Smallholders

a. Smallholders do not understand logistical delays SUA must contend with and some were discouraged by the slowness of follow-up in farm-level projects. SUA personnel should explain potential delays, and when one occurs, they should contact the smallholders to explain (e.g., dairy-goat bucks discussed below).

b. There appears to be substantial farmer-to-farmer training (i.e., smallholders transferring technical knowledge between one another). SUA-TU outreach projects should facilitate this by helping smallholders with transportation and other expenses.

c. Smallholders stated the need for low-interest loans. According to the MOA Regional Extension Officer, FAO will soon initiate a program for this. It is recommended that SUA contact the locally-based FAO representatives to determine if outreach programs should be conducted. The two Morogoro Region FAO representatives have been working there for four years.

d. In part because of the short duration of the actual project work, none of the noninvolved agencies had noted any changes in the region during the project period.

d. Vendors also identified vegetable, grain, and legume pests as problems. They also stated they had not noted any commodity improvements during the project period.

4. Potential Future Training of SUA Students in the U.S.

a. If additional students are sent for advanced studies, they should be allowed sufficient time to overcome cultural and language shock before beginning their studies.

b. No one in the Rodent Control Program was included in the applied research or advanced degree program even though some smallholders reported rodent damage as high as 100%. Moreover, rodents are vectors for plague and other FOVM diseases, which are still serious problems. The FOVM

does not have anyone trained in rodent control (only ecology/biology and vector-borne diseases).

5. SUA and TU Faculties

a. All faculty at each university who have participated in the project should have a joint meeting at their university to share knowledge, problems, constraints, and ideas which could enhance future collaborative research and training.

C. Other Recommendations

1. USAID/T should have been more involved in the linkage project to have helped eliminate earlier problems. There should also have been more than two evaluations because the initial problems prior to the midterm evaluation could have identified and eliminated, which could have allowed for more applied research and outreach. It is therefore recommended that future SUA-TU collaborative work be more closely monitored and evaluated.

2. Because English is the language of instruction at SUA, documents and reports generated by TU serve as a covert method for improving language skills. It is recommended that all TU documents be thoroughly proof-read, sent through spell-check and GrammarCheck programs, and if necessary, proof-read by the English Department..

IX. REFERENCES CITED

Engberg, Lila E.

1993 Gender Issues in Intrahousehold Resource Allocation and Management. Report of a 10 Day Workshop Held at Sokoine University of Agriculture. Morogoro, Tanzania, July 17-31, 1993.

Lyles, Gladys J.

1991 Report on The Women in Development Workshop at Sokoine University of Agriculture.

Scope of Work for the External Evaluation of the Tuskegee-Sokoine University of Agriculture Linkage Project, October 1, 1990 to April 30, 1995. 1995. Washington, D.C.

Tuskegee University

1995 A Comprehensive Progress Report on The Tuskegee University Sokoine University of Agriculture Linkage Project Covering October 1990 to April 1995. Submitted to USAID. April 30, 1995.

APPENDIX A - DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Scope of Work for the External Evaluation of the Tuskegee-Sokoine University of Agriculture Linkage Project, October 1, 1990 to April 30, 1995. 1995. Washington, D.C.

USAID Tanzania

1992 Country Program Strategic Plan (CPSP) 1992 to 1997. Final.

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AT TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY

Ballard, Lynn E.

1992 SUA-TU Linkage Project Final Report on the Desktop Publishing Training Program. Sokoine University of Agriculture. Morogoro, Tanzania, August 9-September 3, 1991.

Caldwell, Sibyl J.

1994 SUA-TU Linkage Project Final Report on Desktop Publishing Training Program. Sokoine University of Agriculture. Morogoro, Tanzania, January 10-20, 1994.

Engberg, Lila E.

1993 Gender Issues in Intrahousehold Resource Allocation and Management. Report of a 10 Day Workshop Held at Sokoine University of Agriculture. Morogoro, Tanzania, July 17-31, 1993.

Faculty of Agriculture at Sokoine University of Agriculture

1994 Planning Workshop for the Development Programme of the Faculty of Agriculture held in Morogoro between 18-22 April 1994. Sponsored by The German Technical Co-operation - GTZ, Eschborn Germany and the French Food Aid Counterpart Fund Commission - Dar es Salaam.

Findley, H.J., V. Rutachokoziwa, and H.F. Mahoo

1993 Analysis of Farmers' Agricultural Problems and Training Needs in Selected Villages in Kilosa and Morogoro Rural Districts, Tanzania.

Kimbi, G.G., et al

1992 Report on Identification of SUA-TU Link Project Villages for Needs Assessment: A Preliminary Survey.

Kolison, Stephen H.

1995 Memo regarding visiting SUA faculty members. Table of Contents for A Manual for Monitoring and Evaluating Community Forestry Efforts in Tanzania.

Louis, Suchet L.

1992 Trip Report No. P7 Report to the President on the Trip

- to Tanzania in Connection with Tuskegee-Sokoine Linkage Project. Project No. 621-0174. September 20-October 1, 1992.
- 1990 Report to the President on the Trip to Tanzania in Relation to Tuskegee-Sokoine Linkage Project. September 7-October 1, 1990.
- Lyles, Gladys J.
- 1991 Report on The Women in Development Workshop at Sokoine University of Agriculture.
- Prakash, C.S.
- 1994 Sweet potato biotechnology: Progress and Potential. Biotechnology and Development Monitor 18:18-19,22.
- 1992 First Draft of the Report and Recommendations of Dr. C.S. Prakash on His Trip to Sokoine University of Agriculture. May 13-21, 1992. n.d. Biotechnological Approaches to Sweetpotato Improvement at Tuskegee University.
- n.d. A Proposal for Biotechnology Cooperation between Tuskegee University and Sokoine University of Agriculture.
- Robnett, V. and T. Habtemariam
- 1991 Report on Problem-Based Approaches to Learning and Research Workshop.
- Siaway, Arthur T.
- 1993 A Progress Report on the TU-SUA Linkage Project for the July 22-August 22, 1993 Trip to Tanzania.
- 1991 A Report on the Trip by two Tuskegee University Teams to Sokoine University of Agriculture, Tanzania August 7-25, 1991. Presented to the Project Steering Committee on September 11, 1991.
- Siaway, Arthur, Suchet Louis, and H.O. Dihenga
- 1994 Building Development Management Capacity: The Tuskegee University-Sokoine University of Agriculture Experience.
- Smith, E., et al
- 1994 Nutritional Homeostasis and Effect of Comb Type. Poultry Science (in press).n.d. Typing EV genes in Tanzanian poultry. The Type and Distribution of Endogenous Viral Genes in Indigenous Chicken Populations in Tanzania.
- Sokoine University of Agriculture and Tuskegee University
- 1995 Capacity Building for the Development of Sustainable Agriculture Through Management of Natural Resources in Tanzania. A Project Proposal Submitted to U.S. Agency for International Development.
- 1991 Annual Report for year One (October 1,1990-September

30, 1991). The SUA/TU Link Project Submitted to the United States Agency for International Development. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

1991 Sokoine University of Agriculture-Tuskegee University Linkage to Enhance Teaching and Research Capabilities of U.S.A. Year Two Work Plan and Project Monitoring Plan Submitted to the United States Agency for International Development. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

1990 Sokoine University-Tuskegee University Linkage to Enhance Teaching and Research Capabilities of S.U.A. Year One work Plan and Project Monitoring Plan Submitted to the United States Agency for International Development. Dar es Salaam.n.d. Enhancing the Teaching and Applied Agricultural Research Capabilities of Sokoine University of Agriculture. Project Proposal Submitted to The United States Agency for International Development. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

Tuskegee University

1995 A Comprehensive Progress Report on The Tuskegee University Sokoine University of Agriculture Linkage Project Covering October 1990 to April 1995. Submitted to USAID.

1994 The Tuskegee University/Sokoine University of Agriculture Linkage Project.

1993 Progress Report of the Tuskegee University-Sokoine University of Agriculture Linkage Project Covering October 1, 1992 to December 31, 1992. Report No. 1.

1993 Progress Report on the Sokoine University of Agriculture-Tuskegee University Linkage Project Covering January 1, 1993 to March 31, 1993. Submitted to The United States Agency for International Development. Report No. 2.

1993 Progress Report on the Sokoine University of Agriculture-Tuskegee University Linkage Project Covering April 1, 1993 to September 30, 1993. Submitted to United States Agency for International Development. Report No. 3.

1992 Progress Report on the Sokoine University of Agriculture-Tuskegee University Linkage Project Covering October 1, 1991 to December 31, 1991. Submitted to United States Agency for International Development. Report No. 1.

1992 Progress Report on The Sokoine University of Agriculture-Tuskegee University Linkage Project Covering January 1, 1992 to June 30, 1992. Submitted to United States Agency for International Development. Report No. 2.

1992 Progress Report on The Sokoine University of

- Agriculture Tuskegee University Linkage Project Covering January 1, 1992 to September 30, 1992. Submitted to United States Agency for International Development. Report No. 2.
- 1991 Tuskegee-Sokoine University Linkage Project Report on Project Activities from September to December, 1990 to United States Agency for International Development. Washington, D.C.
- 1991 A Report on the Tuskegee-Sokoine University Linkage Program Activities from January, 1991 to April, 1991 to United States Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. Report No. 1.n.d. International Programs. United States of America Agency for International Development
- 1990 Cooperative Agreement No. 623-0000-A-00-0032-00, Tuskegee-Sokoine University Linkage Project No. 621-0174.
- DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AT SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE
- Bonsi, Conrad K.
- 1995 TU-SUA Linkage Project. A Report of Observations of Faculty of Agriculture's Field Practical Training Program. Tuskegee University: George Washington Carver Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Faculty of Agriculture, Sokoine University of Agriculture
- 1995 Zopp Workshop for Preparation of Framework for Development of New Field Practical Curriculum in the Faculty of Agriculture, Morogoro 4th-6th January, 1995. Sponsored by: SUA-TU Link Project.
- Four Pamphlets prepared by ICE for the Farmer Dairy Goat Day to be held in September 1995. Printed in Kiswahili with DTP.
- Hatibu, N., et al, Eds.
- 1994 Sustainable Agriculture and Conservation of the Environment. Proceedings of the Sokoine University of Agriculture Convocation 1st Workshop. Morogoro: Sokoine University of Agriculture.
- Mafu, S.T.A. and E.G. Rwambali
- 1993 A Report of Survey on Workshop Needs Assessment for Staff at Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Morogoro Tanzania. A Report Submitted to the Coordinator SUA/TU Linkage Project SUA, Morogoro.
- Makungu, P.J. and H.O.Dihenga
- 1995 Sources of Farm Power. Morogoro: Sokoine University of Agriculture. Makungu, P.J. and M. Ngetti, Eds.
- 1995 Training Modules for Field Practical Skills. Morogoro: Sokoine University of Agriculture.
- Sokoine University of Agriculture

1993/94/95 Sokoine University of Agriculture Prospectus.
Morogoro.

Tanzania Gender Networking Programme

1993 Gender Profile of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam: Tanzania
Gender Networking Programme.

Tarimo, A.J.P., D.F. Rutatora, and A.Z. Mattee, Eds.

1993 Sokoine University of Agriculture Morogoro. Towards
Developing a Programme of Research for the Faculty of
Agriculture to the Year 2000. Proceedings of the Faculty
of Agriculture Research Workshop held at the Institute
of Continuing Education, Sokoine University of Agriculture,
Tanzania 21st-23rd March, 1993.

APPENDIX B - PEOPLE MET/INTERVIEWED

PEOPLE MET IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

7 July Mr. Lowell Phillips, Division Director, Creative
Associates International, Inc.
7 July Ms. Derry Velardi, Senior Associate, Creative
Associates International, Inc.
7 July Ms. Lorraine Denakpo, Project Manager, AMEX
International, Inc.

PEOPLE INTERVIEWED AT TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY

10 July Dr. Arthur T. Siaway, Coordinator SUA-TU Linkage
Project
10 July Dr. Suchet L. Louis, Associate Provost and
Director of International Programs
10 July Dr. Eloise Carter, Associate Director of
International Programs
10 July Dr. Gladys Lyles, Sociologist
10 July Dr. C.S. Prakash, Associate Professor, Plant
Molecular and Cellular Genetics
11 July Dr. Edward Smith, Assistant Professor, Bio-
Technology
11 July Dr. Ralph Noble, Assistant Professor, Animal
Sciences
11 July Dr. Henry Findlay, Assistant Professor,
Vocational Training
12 July Ms. Sibyl Caldwell, Information Technician
12 July Dr. Robert Zabawa, Associate Professor of
Anthropology
12 July Dr. Steven Kolison, Associate Professor of
Forestry

- 12 July Dr. William Lester, Provost, Vice-President
of Academic Affairs
- 12 July Dr. Walter Hill, Dean of the College of
Agriculture, Director of the Carter Research
Experiment Station

PEOPLE MET AT USAID/TANZANIA

- 17 July Dr. Daniel Ngowi, Economist
- 17 July Dr. Anne Fleuret, Impact Assessment Advisor
- 17 July Dr. Diana Putman, Deputy Project Development
Officer
- 17 July Mr. Kristos Minga, Training Officer
- 17 July Ms. Hedwiga Mbuya, Program Assistant

PEOPLE INTERVIEWED AT SOKOINE UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE
MOROGORO, TANZANIA AND FROM THE MOROGORO REGION

- 17 July Representative of IrishAID from the Gairo area
- 18 July Dr. H.O. Dihenga, Coordinator of SUA-TU Linkage
Program
- 18 July Mr. Amon Mattee, Head of Agriculture Extension,
Associate Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture
- 18 July Dr. N.T.A. Bangu, Dean of the Faculty of
Agriculture
- 18 July Dr. Peter Msolla, Deputy Vice-Chancellor
- 19 July Dr. R. Wambura, Team Leader, Extension and
Farmer Training Team, Farmers Participation
Research
- 19 July Mr. E. Mafipa, SUA student sent to John
Patterson College in the US. Two year technical
degree program in computer science
- 19 July Mr. Theobald Moshisa, SUA student sent to Tuskegee
University for MS in Food and Nutrition Science
- 19 July Dr. R.L. Kurwijila, Head of Animal Science and
Production
- 19 July Dr. J. Matovelo, Senior Lecturer of Veterinary
Pathology, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
- 19 July J.B. Rugemalila, MD, Ph.D. Director of Research
and Training for the National Institute for
Medical Research.
- 20 July Ms. Dorothy Machunda, SUA student sent to
Tuskegee University for MS in Food and Nutrition
Science
- 20 July Dr. K. Mtebe, Head of Food Science and Technology
Department, Member of SUA Steering Committee
- 20 July Dr. R. Machangu, Senior Lecturer, Project Leader

of Rodent Research

20 July Dr. B.S. Kilonzo, Professor of Rodent Research Project

20 July Dr. Abood, Senior Lecturer, Department of Animal Sciences

20 July Mr. S. Mafu, Lecturer in Basic Sciences Unit

20 July 16 undergraduate students from the Department of Agriculture

20 July Dr. Faustin P. Lekule, Chairman, Foundation for Sustainable Rural Development

21 July Mr. J. Msaky, Senior Lecturer, Department of Soil Sciences

21 July Dr. F.T. Magayane, Lecturer, Department of Agriculture Education and Extension

21 July Dr. L.A. Mtenga, Professor in the Department of Animal Sciences, Member of SUA Steering Committee

21 July Mr. Ezra Lazaro, Lecturer, Department of Agriculture Engineering and Land Planning

21 July Three employees of FAO. Two have worked in Morogoro for 4 years in animal health and nutrition, plus 1 who came to evaluate a FAO/SUA project

22 July Numerous vendors and a butcher from the Morogoro main market (both male and female vendors and those who pay for stalls and outside squatters)

22 July Villagers and three Extension Agents from Mgeda, Morogoro Region

24 July Abdul Hayghaimo, D.V.M., Regional Subject Matter Specialist, Ministry of Agriculture

24 July Ms. Imelda Ishuza, District Extension Officer, Morogoro District

24 July Villagers and Extension Agent of Wami Luhindo Village, Morogoro District

24 July Villagers and Extension Agent of Magole Village, Kilosa District

24 July Maasai herders and MOA Livestock Extension agent at the Kilosa District livestock market day

24 July Mr. Muhaluma, Division Extension Agent, Morogoro District

24 July Villagers and Extension Agent of Mvomero Village, Morogoro District

24 July Villagers and Extension Agent of Msufini Village, Morogoro District

24 July Maasai Tribal Elder

25 July Dr. Tesha, District Livestock Development Officer,
Kilosa District

25 July Mr. M.P. Mseke, District Crop Officer, Kilosa
District

25 July Villagers, village Extension Agent, and Division
Extension Agent of Mvumi Village, Kilosa District

25 July Villagers and Extension Agent of Magubike Village,
Kilosa District

25 July Extension Agent of Gairo Village, Kilosa District

25 July Villagers and Extension Agent of Ngaluda Village,
Kilosa District

26 July Ms. E. Shayo, Regional Extension Officer, Morogoro
Region and Kilosa District

26 July Dr. H.O. Dihenga, Mr. Amon Mattee, and Dr. Abdul
Hayghaimo

27 July Dr. Sizya Lugeye, Director of the Institute of
Continuing Education, Chair of Steering Committee
and the Monitoring and Evaluation Team

27 July Dr. V. Rutachokozibwa, Senior Lecturer, Extension
Education, Member of the Applied Research
Committee

PEOPLE MET AT USAID/TANZANIA

31 July Evaluation Team briefing of USAID/T personnel