

THE INITIAL PLANNING PHASE AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT

January to April 2008

REPORT ON ACTIVITY ONE

Strengthening of University Capacity for Promoting, Facilitating and Teaching Rural Innovation

ACP-EU Co-operation Programme In Higher Education (EDULINK)

May 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	<i>Introduction</i>	3
2	<i>Results/outputs Achieved</i>	3
3	<i>Issues</i>	6
4.	<i>Annexes</i>	7
	<i>Annex 1: Sucapri Inception Workshop</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>Annex 2: Amendment Of Detailed Description Of Sucapri Activities</i>	<i>23</i>
	<i>Annex 3: Status Reports From Sucapri Partner And Associate Institutions</i>	<i>33</i>
	<i>Annex 4: Institutional And Activity Coordinators</i>	<i>38</i>

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale (taken from project document)

Although key staff members and managers of all proposed partners have jointly collaborated to prepare this proposal, a short initial inception period of 2 months will be needed to raise awareness in the relevant faculties, and to collectively discuss, review and adapt this proposal to the requirements, needs and possibilities of this wider group.

The purpose of the inception phase will be to arrive at a collectively shared understanding by all 6 project partners and associates of the overall and specific objectives of the project, the proposed activities, the roles and responsibilities, budget and resource inputs by each partner. Although modifications to this current proposal are expected to be more operational than structural, a report with the refined action plan will be submitted to EDULINK at the end of this phase.

1.2 Description of activity (taken from project document)

Initially, key staff members from all partner universities involved in preparing this proposal will hold informal and formal workshops in each institution to raise awareness of the project, its objectives and implications. Resulting from these meetings, an institutional steering group of 4-5 persons will be formed in each of the participating universities to take responsibility for the institutional inputs to the overall project.

Following preparation at the individual institutional level, a joint 3-day workshop of 20 persons will be held in Kenya during the second month to bring representatives of the different institutional steering groups together, consolidate the overall project plan, and nominate the overall (inter-institutional) project steering group consisting of 2 persons from each partner institution. This workshop will also be attended by representatives of associate institutions (e.g. NARO, KARI) and other key stakeholders currently collaborating with the partners universities through the already existing IAR4D Steering Group (Uganda) and IAR4D national Task Force (Kenya).

These stakeholders will include the National Agricultural Advisory Service (NAADS, Uganda), the Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock (Kenya), The National Federation of Agricultural Producers (KENFAP, Kenya), and the International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT).

Following this initial inception phase, the project steering group will meet at 6-monthly intervals to monitor progress, review project documentation and expenses, replan the activities for the following phase and assign project reporting responsibilities.

2 RESULTS/OUTPUTS ACHIEVED

2.1 Inception workshop

A project inception workshop was held at the facilities of the Kenya School of Law, in Karen, Nairobi, during April 2-4. Twenty-three persons, representing project "partners", "associates" and other stakeholders from Uganda, Kenya and the UK attended this workshop. A full report of the workshop is given in Annex 1, with the main outputs and agreements summarised below.

2.2 A revised project action plan

At the inception workshop, all stakeholders represented (member Universities, ICRA, associates, and other key stakeholders) revised the project activities with particular attention to project activities 2 and 3. The main adjustments agreed upon were:

- o The need to expend greater effort on the planning of the learning cycles (activities 2 & 3); specifically the need for an additional workshop (as sub-activity), which was not included in the proposed activity (and sub-activities). In the case of the immediate “university-based learning cycle” in Kenya, this may necessitate reducing the number of workshops within the learning cycle itself from 5 to 4 (which would correspond with 1 workshop to be held at each university).
- o The need to start Activity 4 (curriculum development) from the initial stages of the project, to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the processes of curricula development/change currently underway in Kenyatta University. and University of Nairobi.
- o Some minor changes to wording were also suggested, as the participants at the workshop found the language a bit confusing in places.

The revised activity plan is attached as Annex 2.

2.3 A mechanism in each partner university for “in-house” coordination and management of project activities

At the inception workshop all stakeholders reported on the current status of IAR4D within their respective organisations and on the mechanisms (universities) and /or contact points (other stakeholders) that had been put in place for the coordination and management of SUCAPRI project activities. These reports are attached as Annex 3.

2.4 A joint Project Steering Group for overall project management, annual work planning, monitoring and evaluation

A 12-person project steering committee was elected, comprising:

- Makerere University representatives:
 - Moses Tenywa (Chair) and
 - Charles Muyanja (Secretary)
- Kenyatta University representative:
 - Speranza Ndege
- University of Nairobi representatives:
 - George Chemining'wa
 - Florence Olubayo
- Egerton University representative:
 - Sam Mwonga
- Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology representative
 - Christine Onyango
- Research representative:
 - George Karanja (KARI)
- Extension representative:
 - Joseph Okoryot (NAADS)

- ❑ Farmer organization representative
 - Peter Gitika (KENFAP)
- ❑ ICRA representatives:
 - Richard Hawkins
 - Robert Booth

This constitution represents a modification of the originally proposed Steering Committee, which only comprised university representatives.

It was agreed that this steering committee would meet twice a year – during the second weeks of January and July.

To assist the steering committee with project coordination and the implementation of project activities, country coordinators and University contact points were nominated along with an activity coordinator in each country for each project activity. Details of these contact persons and activity coordinators can be found in Annex 4.

2.5 A joint memorandum of understanding signed by all parties

Stakeholders at the inception workshop discussed the pros and cons of formal MOUs and other formal and informal agreement tools. Taking note that the request for project funding had already been signed by the appropriate authority within each member University, stakeholder representatives agreed that what would now best serve the interests of the project was:

1. A formal letter from the project coordinator to each stakeholder organisation informing them that the project a) had been approved (referring to the signed project contract agreement, a copy of which was given to each stakeholder organisation during the inception workshop), b) is now operational (during the period 4 January 2008 – 3 January 2011), and c) reminding each organisation of their commitment to the project.
2. An informal collaborative agreement signed by all stakeholder representatives – a copy of which is attached as Annex 5.

2.6 Collaboration with the Commonwealth of Learning

The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) is an intergovernmental organisation created by Commonwealth Heads of Government to encourage the development and sharing of open learning/distance education knowledge, resources and technologies (see www.col.org).

COL agreed to support the SUCAPRI project, particularly with respect to Activity 5 – development of learning materials. As part of this collaboration, COL has:

- o Developed a SUCAPRI-COL discussion list and website, to facilitate exchange of information between project partners, associates and other stakeholders.
- o Sponsored 2 workshops in Kenya for personnel of SUCAPRI partners and associates, to build capacity in content development and publishing (using WikiEducator and Moodle). Short reports of these workshops are included as Annex 6.
- o Agreed with project partners to seek additional funding to further strengthen the ICT component of project activities.

3 ISSUES

EduLink funds cooperative projects between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in the ACP Group of States and (15) EU Member States, with the objective of fostering capacity building and regional integration in higher education in ACP States and Regions, and to promote higher education as a means of reducing poverty. Within this framework, EDULINK documentation and application procedures refer to collaborators from HEIs as “partners”, and collaborators from non-HEIs as “associates”.

While the logic of this distinction is clear, given the nature of the financing mechanism, it nevertheless caused some degree of confusion and suspicion during the inception phase of the SUCAPRI project. The overall objective of this project is to strengthen the capacity of participating universities to engage in decentralised national agricultural research systems – an objective which requires them to work closely with non-university agencies in their respective countries. In previous collaboration in both Kenya and Uganda, these different agencies had referred to themselves as “partners”, and the introduction of what appeared to be – at first glance – a second class category of “associate” in this present project did not help maintain the equitable spirit of collaboration needed to achieve project objectives. The in-depth discussion of project objectives, activities and administration during the inception workshop clarified the potential roles and rules of the different stakeholders in the project, and although the EduLink terminology of “partners” and “associates” will be maintained for project documentation where necessary, the concerned stakeholders prefer to consider themselves as full “partners” in this project.

4. ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: SUCAPRI Inception Workshop

April 1-3, 2008, Karen, Kenya

RAPPORTEUR'S REPORT

TUESDAY - DAY 1

Chair: George Cheminig'wa

Rapporteur: Peter Masinde

Day 1 – Programme

1. Workshop programme
2. Overview of IAR4D/Rural innovation processes
3. Status of IAR4D and in-house coordination/management arrangements in participating organizations
4. Overview of EDULINK-SUCAPRI project
5. Purpose/outputs of activity 1 and inception workshop
6. Drafting of "Agreement Document" (2 working Groups)

Agenda 1: **Welcome Remarks - G. Karanja (IAR4D Task Force Chairman, Kenya)**

- That IAR4D concept has given rise to the SUCAPRI project
- Has also resulted in a water project in the ASAL

M. Tenywa (Team leader, SUCAPRI)

- Introduced SUCAPRI as strengthening capacity to promote rural innovation
- Project is on capacity building in higher education institutions
- Institutions of higher learning are facing difficulties in carrying out their mandates
- They face low investments, poor infrastructure, low staff salaries and brain drain
- The farming systems in the sub-Saharan Africa have not changed adequately and have not changed the people's lifestyle
 - The agricultural systems are complex
 - They face climatic constraints
 - They face socio-economic constraints
- The graduates from the universities have not been capacitated to help change the system: they are often considered "irrelevant"
- Universities have Education, Research and Outreach functions
- SUCAPRI will improve these functions and their interactions through capacity strengthening

Agenda 2: **Institutional reports – brief status of IAR4D and project coordination/management arrangements (see also Agenda 5) within partner organizations:**

MAK

- Together with NARO and ICRA, has implemented a first “learning cycle” in IAR4D, combining workshops and fieldwork and subsequent mentoring
- IAR4D needs to be scaled out
- Team work culture has to be improved and build mutual partnerships
- Deans of Agriculture and veterinary supportive of IAR4D
- Forestry also participated in IAR4D
- RU-FORUM considering Moi University for SUCAPRI

NARO

- NARO is working with MAK in implementing IAR4D concept
- Formulated projects in 2004-2005 that were conducted by teams as a learning process in integrating IAR4D in research work
- Observed that NARO and MAK staff took up IAR4D concept much easier than NGO and Field staff
- Institutionalization of IAR4D concepts into all activities of agricultural research
- Collaborative activities initiated with partners including NAADS, local government, and extension especially at zonal level.

KARI

- Eight institution have undertaken joint activities under IAR4D initiative
- Have done institutional engagement to determine entry points for IAR4D
- They plan to hold a senior managers workshop on IAR4D
- KARI strategic plan has incorporated some elements of IAR4D concept

MOA

- Spearheaded a case study in which IAR4D was used to address a community problem of water
- Held workshop in December 2007 to evaluate progress of this case study project
- National agricultural sector policy document has been prepared by various ministries
- It draws from IAR4D
- The main challenge observed is weak institutional linkages

MOLFD

- Sensitization of staff on IAR4D done within the ministry
- However, awareness is still low
- MLD is participating in the activities reported in MOA

Egerton

- Spearheaded curriculum development for short courses and postgraduate courses in IAR4D
- That the outreach function of the university uses IAR4D approach

JKUAT

- Sensitization of Faculty of Agriculture staff done
- Institutional engagement done through interviews with senior management
- Faculty appointed 6 members to be on the IAR4D faculty committee
- Projects using IAR4D achieving desired results

ICRA

- Involved in activities in both Kenya and Uganda

- Have noted that MAK/Uganda has experience in personal mastery skills
- On the other hand, Kenya has high number of staff trained in IAR4D in the Netherlands
- Both countries can compliment each other in EDULINK/SUCAPRI project
- ICRA works to see IAR4D national committees working in both nations
- ICRA also working with S. Africa, Ethiopia, Ghana and Francophone countries in SSA

NAADS

- NAADS working in collaboration with MAK and NARO
- NAADS is active in promoting farmer organisation

UON

- IAR4D activities similar to other Kenyan reports
- Emphasis put on partnerships, community outreach, linkages, regional academic programmes, which are all IAR4D concepts

KU

- IAR4D spearheaded by the Faculty of Agriculture and Enterprise Development
- The curricula has incorporated IAR4D
- Management given support to IAR4D
- IAR4D linking to ICT4D

Agenda 3: Overview of IAR4D/Rural Innovation by C.A. Onyango

Introduction

- IAR4D is the way to address the complex challenges of promoting innovation and technology transfer
- Its multidisciplinary and inter-institutional
- In IAR4D, there is joint vision, leading to joint ownership

Key steps in IAR4D

- Identify challenge
- Raise awareness of opportunity
- Convincing stakeholders
- Form partnerships
- Achieve a common understanding
- Joint analysis & identity of joint strategies
- Formulate joint action plans
- Implement joint plans
- Institutionalize new ways of doing business
- Change is the outcome
- IAR4D is an iterative learning process
- Changes can come out at various stages

Comments

- That educational systems promote individuality and hence need to change to embrace IAR4D
- Little or no training is given to the individuals on team work
- In MOA, IAR4D is best introduced as a new way of thinking

- In the MOA, work is done jointly, but integration is not complete

Agenda 4: Broad overview of SUCAPRI project by M. Tenywa

- Gave the overall objective as outline in document
- Main activities were outlined as follows:
 1. Planning
 2. Core team establishment
 3. Multi-stakeholder workshop
 4. Analysis/review of agricultural curricula
 5. Development of learning resources
 6. International workshop
- Project sustainability measures discussed
- SUCAPRI is expected to have a multiplier effect

Agenda 5: Purpose and expected outputs of activity 1

Sub-activity 1; Partner Institution Steering Groups

- JKUAT has an "IAR4D Committee" comprising 6 formal members
- UON has an "Innovation Group" comprising 5 informal members
- Egerton has no formal group yet, but intends to include persons from the Faculty of Education and from the Committee on Outreach and Publications
- KU has 4 members, representing the newly established School of Agriculture and Enterprise Development, as well as the ICT4D.
- MAK has 4 members being formalized (from Faculty of Agriculture as well as Veterinary Medicine)

Summary of sub-activity 1

- Each institution to summarize their context, strategic objectives, who involved and how organized, in 1 page, for the website and report on Inception Phase of project
- Submit the draft by end of workshop
- Submit final write up within 2 weeks

Joint MOU/Agreement document

- A joint document should be signed by all the institutions
- This will be a statement of intent, vision and commitment
- It will contain roles and responsibilities
- Contain sanctions
- Document be short 1-3 pages
- Members split into 3 working groups to develop content and name of document

Group reports

- The 3 groups presented their proposed contents and name of document
- The agreed name of document is: Collaborative Implementation Agreement
- A member from each group was selected to form a committee to harmonize the three reports and present one report

- Members are C. Mayanja, J. Mwaniki and F. Olubayo

Letters

- It was noted that the role of each partner institutions in SUCAPRI is outlined in section 1.8.5 of the project proposal which was signed by each appropriate authority prior to submission.
- The project Team Leader (Moses Tenywa) will send letters to partner institutions informing them about the project and institutional participating staff and referring to the signed project contact (a copy of the signed contract between MAK and EDULINK was given to each stakeholder organization).

WEDNESDAY - DAY 2

Chair: Christine Onyango

Rapporteur: Samuel Mwonga

Agenda For Day 2

1. Reflection (Facilitator: George C.)
2. Introduction to Action Plan Revision Task (Facilitator. Richard. H)
3. Planning Activities 2 & 3 (2 Groups)
4. Plenary Reporting
5. Implications for activities 4, 5, 6
6. Summing-up and implementation for draft agreements doc.

A 1. **Refection of Day 1 activities**

Chair : George Cheminig'wa)

- What did not go well?
 - o Technology – there were a few problems with the LCD Projector.
- What went well
 - o Introduction – brought out the key issues for better understanding
 - o Discussions – participants felt that issues were discussed well, there was free exchange of ideas and trust
 - o Time management was good, most items were covered within the allocated time
 - o Overview of IAR4D – the presentation was well done, and was able to illustrate the link between IAR4D and the project
 - o Agreement document – Compliment with results from discussions during day 2.
- **The discussions brought out the following:**
 - o Sharing of experience among partners - Institutions
 - o Social interactions
 - o Opportunity for linkages to be established
- **Lessons learnt**
 - o Organization and the presenters should have tested LCD projector beforehand. There should always be a plan "B" in case of technology failure. The project needs to have its own presentation equipment.
 - o Common vision/integration is a continuous process thus realization may take sometime

- o The terminology used in document needed clarification as they seemed to be misunderstandings about the definitions of the participating institutions as per the SUCAPRI proposal document (Partners/Associates/stakeholders, etc)
- **Common Vision of SUCAPRI**
 - o Graduates capable of making impact at ground level
 - o Produce professional who are well grounded in rural innovation
 - o To change traditional modes of delivery in University, linking with users of services to satisfy need., change teachers mindsets
 - o Integrate/linkages of key player in problem identification and sourcing of solutions.
 - o Institutional approach
 - o Empower University/Research through capacity building.
 - o Competence of graduates to respond to farmer's needs

Agenda 2: Introduction to Action Plan Revision Task

It was pointed out that the inception workshop was obligated to review and submit a revised action plan to ACP/EU cooperation programme (EDULINK) based on the groups discussions and input. It was emphasized that the group discussions were not to plan the activities but to 'plan how to plan the activities in the project'.

It was agreed that the groups will spend more time on Activity 2 and 3 because they form the major part of the project in terms of time and budget.

1. Activity 2 involves the University-based learning cycle and will seek to build university capacity to build capacity in Rural Innovation.
2. Activity 3 has two learning cycles, one to be conducted in Uganda and one in Kenya and will involve a multi-stakeholder leaning cycles (University and Research and Development professionals).

Agenda 3: Planning Activities 2 & 3 (2 Groups)

Two groups were formed to handle the different issues, the university participants focused on Activity 2 whereas the non-university participants focused on the Activity 3. It was however noted that the implementation will require a mix of stakeholders. The following guiding questions were posed to help in the discussion:

- What should be the result of this activity?
- Who should do what to implement this activity (i.e. 2 or 3)? Include activities for the 3 sub-phases - planning, implementation and follow-up (scaling-up).
- How should these activities be organized (operationalized)?
- What are the implication for the budget and the administration of the budget?
- What might be the main problems/delivery be in implementing this activity?
- What measures can/should be taken to avoid/mitigate these (potential) problems?

The teams were to use the activities in the document as a starting point. The discussion was allocated 2 hours.

Agenda 4: Plenary discussions of group presentations

Activity 2 – University-based Learning Cycle

The output of the overall activity: A team of competent trainees from each university

Overall questions raised:

- o Who is responsible for coordination (each Institute)?
- o What support is need?
- o How to get the support?
- o What will be the motivation to the participants?
- o How many people are needed?
- o What is the entry level for the sensitization of the project?

Sub-activity (i) Planning

The following issues were raised:

- Awareness creation and point of entry – Awareness needs to be done at the Faculty, Departmental and Individual level.
- The University IAR4D Team leader will be responsible for their institution.
- The duration of the sensitization process will be 1 month.
- The i need to for a planning workshop by the inter-institutional steering committee before the initiation of the learning cycles
- The need to develop and/or acquisition of learning materials before the learning cycle.
- Budgetary implication: Facilitation for communication (telephone, internet and meetings), curricular development and learning material development will be needed.

The output of this sub-activity should be:

- Buy-in of project by university administrators and potential learning cycle participants.
- Identification of willing participants for the learning cycle.
- Development of the TOR for the learning teams.

Sub-activity (ii) - Implementation

The discussion raised the following issues:

- Need to develop criteria for selection of participants.
- Need for an inter-institutional planning session for workshop design/contents – (not currently budgeted)
- Need for a review meeting following each workshop during the learning cycle, to identify implications for following workshops (content and process)
- Development and acquisition of learning materials.
- Emerging issues during each workshop should be dealt during following workshops of the cycle.
- Peer learning groups should not be restricted to those mentioned in the project document and should include other interests of the learning groups.

The outputs of this sub-activity should be:

- Reviewed content of learning cycle.
- Learning groups formed.
- Core teams capacitated in participating institutions.

Sub-activity (iii) - Evaluation

Issues raised:

- TOR for the evaluation should be developed in consultation with Head of Department and Managers (and not “by” them, as in the project document).
- “Resource persons for the learning cycle will be from the lead institution, MAK, with support from resource persons from ICRA and IAR4D alumni from Kenya” (and not only MAK, as implied in the project document).

Challenges

The challenges identified by the group were:

- How to effectively sensitize the university administration to support the capacity building process.
- How to create commitment among participant for the learning cycles
- How to integrate universities activities with project activities within and between institutions (semester timetables being different in each university).
- How to source resource persons from each institution

Activity 3 – Multi-stakeholder learning cycles

Expected results

The group noted that they had difficulties understanding the proposed activities in the project document mainly because of the terminologies used in the section (e.g. “core groups”, “communities of practice” – it is not clear exactly what/who these refer to). The group had the following suggestions for improvement in respect to the expected results for this Activity (as described in the project document):

- o Under the first bullet point – insert “further” into “Further strengthened “communities of practice” in each university, to emphasize the continuity from Activity 2.
- o In second bullet point of expected results, clarify that “at least 24 professionals with strengthened competencies in guiding rural innovation in Kenya and Uganda will be drawn from universities, research institutes, NGO, private sector and extension”. Clarify (e.g. with time frame as milestone) the last bullet point (stakeholder involvement), which currently reads as an activity , not a result. E.g. “inter-agency multi-stakeholder mechanisms such as the Task Force and PIT consolidated for support to subsequent activities”.

Sub-activity (i)

- o Include a joint (multi-stakeholder) planning session before the start of the learning cycles in each country.
- o In general, the step-wise process for planning the learning cycles of Activity 3 should include:
- o Expansion of the current Kenyan IAR4D Task Force/ Ugandan IAR4D Planning & Implementation Team to include other stakeholders such as NAADS and farmers organizations in Uganda.
- o Establishment of a small inter-agency group to identify priority opportunities (e.g. based on commodities)
- o Identification and establishment of local innovation platforms which will determine the participants for the learning cycle.

It was suggested that the use of the word “accreditation” in respect to learning cycles was not appropriate, as universities did not require “accreditation” for new courses but formal approval (“accreditation” normally referring to universities or professionals, not individual courses).

Sub-activity (ii)

- The group felt that the section needed to be re-written for easier reading and flow.

Agenda 5: Implications for Activity 4, 5, and 6

- Issues that emerged from activity 4 mainly centered on how the curriculum development sub-activity can benefit institutions presently reviewing their curricula, for example KU. It was noted that KU could take advantage of some of the outputs of this sub-activity and incorporate some of the concepts of IAR4D in their programmes as they develop their new agriculture and enterprises curriculum. It was pointed out that it is much easier to incorporate the ideas on a clean slate as the curriculum is developed than in an operational curriculum.
- In page 18 (of the proposal document) curriculum review process (vi) Development of marketing strategy (not “business plans”) to further familiarize employers with new courses.
- In page 18, the last sentences should be adjusted to “The Schools of Education in each university and individuals with relevant skills will also be involved where possible”.
- Activity 5 sub-activity (i) Review existing/available information... to add “and reports developed in activity 2, 3 and 4”.

Agenda 6. Discussion

- The main discussion centered on how the universities will obtain the needed competencies without consulting a much wider group than the ones noted in Activity 2, sub-activity (i).
- It was agreed that there was a need to use experts representing other stakeholders outside the university.
- The feasibility in the use of personal mastery (PM) and the IAR4D concepts in the training were seen as a challenge given that the two overlap. It was felt that this was an issue that needed further discussion in the proposed planning meeting (see following bullet point). A question was raised as to whether there was sufficient time to include sufficient content from the two approaches in the learning cycle.
- There was general agreement that activity 2 needed a planning workshop before we can embark on the learning cycles. A 3-day workshop was proposed to be held during the week of 12th -16th May 2008, at one of the universities in Kenya with the following participation: MAK -2, the 4 Kenya Universities – 8, KARI- 2, Kenya Ministries -2, KENFAP -2 and ICRA -2. The output of this workshop would be a plan for the university leaning cycles.
- It was noted that the cost implications of this planning workshop might require a reduction in the workshops during the learning cycle from 5 to 4. The desirability of holding these workshops at the different participating universities in Kenya, to give the project more visibility, was also noted.
- Internet access was seen as an opportunity to reduce the need for the teams to physically meet and therefore save on time and resources. However, it was noted that almost all of the Kenyan IAR4D team members did not have reliable access to internet for one reason or the

other. It was agreed that the possibility of looking into ways to get connections through pre-paid (mobile 3G) systems available with Celtel and Safaricom be explored.

- It was agreed that activity 3 should be made more reader friendly by simplifying the language and improving its flow.
- In general there was agreement on the contents of both activities 2 and 3 except for the few suggested and agreed changes.
- It was agreed that activity four needed to be spread out by bringing some activities forward so that institutions currently reviewing their curricula could start to benefit from some of its outputs.
- The subgroup on the agreement document was to re-look at the document again considering the suggestions of revisions in the activities.

THURSDAY - DAY 3

Chair: Gitonga Nkanata

Rapporteur: Rosemary Mwanza

Reflection Facilitator: Christine Onyango

AGENDA FOR DAY 3

1. Reflection
2. Reconfirmation of in-house arrangement
3. Steering committee
4. Agreements
5. Revised action plan
6. Project management
7. ICT
8. Way forward

Agenda 1. Reflection of Previous Day's Activities

What went well?

- i) Good discussion and participation by all
- ii) Objective of revising our activities was achieved
- iii) Clarifications of ideas that were not clear were made (e.g. the artificial divide between partners and other stakeholders) and contributed towards deepening the understanding and buy-in to the whole project.
- iv) Flexibility & willingness for curricular development by UoN & KU
- v) Group discussions successfully done i.e. activity done
- vi) Partnership in the project clarified i.e. players noted their responsibilities.

What did not go well?

- i) Time keeping – ended later than expected
- ii) Group lost focus of the discussion

- iii) Task not clear
- iv) Difficult language made understanding of the documents difficult

Lesson learnt

- i) In future good to have clear task definition
- ii) Sharing of documents and involving of key stakeholder at the onset is important for buy in
- iii) Task should be clearly defined including language used

Implications

- i) Facilitation of institutions for effective communication (ICT) should be initiated
- ii) There should be commitment of partners to roles assigned.

Agenda 2 -Reconfirmation of in-house arrangement

Organizations involved in the project are MAK, UoN, JKUAT, KU, Egerton U., ICRA, KENFAP, MoA, MoLFD, KARI, NAADS and NARO. By the end of the day each institute is to submit a document, of maximum of one page, on IAR4D activities within their institutions.

Agenda 3- Steering Committee constitution

The following members were initially proposed as members of the steering committee within their respective institutions:

KU – Gitonga Nkanata, Speranza Ndege
UoN - George Cheminig'wa and Florence Olubayo
JKUAT – Christine **Onyango**, **Peter Masinde**
MAK- Moses Tenywa, Charles Muyanja,
EU – Sam Mwonga, Mary Ambula
ICRA - Richard Hawkins, Bob Booth

Workshop participants asked if it was possible to incorporate associate institutions into the steering committee, as the committee seemed to be too university focused. After some deliberation, participants agreed that the steering committee should be more representative by including associate partners. To this end it was proposed that 3 university members step down. The proposed members are as follows:

Peter Masinde - JKUAT
Mary Ambula - Egerton University
Gitonga Nkanata - Kenyatta University

These were replaced by the following associate partners:

George Karanja - KARI – representing research stakeholders
Joseph Oryokot - NAADS – representing extension stakeholders
Peter Gitika - KENFAP – representing farmers associations

Members of the SC agreed to meet twice a year during the second weeks of January and July and thus agreed to hold their next planning meeting on July 8th – 10th 2008 at Kenyatta University.

Agenda 4 -Collaboration Agreement

Participants went through the proposed agreement document and suggested the following changes

1. Title OK but include the place - i.e. Kenya - where the agreement was formulated.
2. Introduction:
 - Reference to the two National Initiatives in Kenya and Uganda not included!
 - Text detailed – summarize by highlighting the challenges.
3. Vision should be converted into an overall project goal and should read “our collective vision is to be regional leaders for promoting and enhancing rural innovation in regional agricultural research and development systems”
4. Objectives
 - Typing errors corrections
5. Institutions

Replace type of institutions with participating institutions and include the following in the list:

- Ministry of Agriculture (MoA)
- Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (MoLFD)
- Commonwealth of Learning (COL)

In *addition* give a list of acronyms and correct spelling mistakes

6. Give a small introduction of collective roles each institution in rural innovation listing the individuals’ roles.
7. Conformity to Agreement

Avoid word MOU

8. Institutional Benefits/Impact
 - Make the section a title independent of Roles and Responsibilities (upper case)
 - Phrase sentences as benefits and not as activities

Agenda 5 – Revised Action Plan

Major changes in the Activity 2 proposed are as follows.

- Need for additional multi stakeholder planning workshop scheduled for week of May 12-16 2008 in Kenya
- Institutions responsible to be involved in this workshop are: Universities (in Kenya and Uganda), KARI, KENFAP, MoA, and MoLFD,
- The output from this workshop will be a plan for the university based learning cycles, including a schedule of resource inputs and other inputs, a budget and a follow up plan.
- Implementing agencies will utilize trained resource persons from stakeholder group in learning cycles
- Combine workshop 4 & 5 hence a revised set of activities and alternative budget to be developed - George C and Richard to work on this on Friday.

Changes proposed for Activity 3 are as follows:

- Initial planning workshop in each country
- Minor rewording to make the proposal clearer.

Changes proposed for Activity 4 are as follows:

- Minor editing works such as substitution (clarification) of words such as “accreditation” and “joint business plans”.
- Spread out activities over more years to enable earlier activities in KU & UoN.

In summary, it was agreed that a Report on the Inception Phase of the project should be prepared, for submission to Edulink with a covering letter by April 30. This report will contain as appendices:

- The report for this Inception Workshop, (to be ready by 4th April 2008 action - Sam Mwonga)
- In house coordination mechanisms reports (to be completed and sent to Moses by April 18).
- Details of contact persons and activity coordinators
- The consolidated Collaborative Agreement document
- Revised action plan and budget (Richard to prepare).
- SUCAPRI-COL reports.

Agenda 6 –Project Management

i) Activity Coordination

The following activity coordinators were nominated/agreed for each activity in Kenya

Activity 2 - George Cheminig'wa

Activity 3 - Sam Mwonga

Activity 4 - Gitonga Nkanata

Activity 5 - Peter Masinde

Overall Coordinator - Christine Onyango (JKUAT)

Uganda team yet to appoint coordinator for its activities

ii) Budget Management

Partners and Associates discussed the budget for the project. The following points are noted:

- The total budget for the project is EUR 717,108, of which EUR 499,558 has been approved for EDULINK funding. The difference of Euros 217,550 is contribution in kind from the various participating institutions. In kind contribution will mostly be in staff salaries and office rent.
- It was proposed that each partner will be responsible for invoicing personnel fees for their respective institutions on a monthly basis. A simple form should be developed for this which should also indicate in-kind contribution.
- Each activity coordinator will be responsible for the “operational budget” (i.e. not including fees) of that activity. The funds will be disbursed to activity coordinators by the MAK coordinator.
- The Project Coordinator (Moses) will be responsible for requesting for and accounting according to the EDULINK rules and regulations.

Agenda 7 – ITC (Nicholas Kimolo and James Wire)

The website for EDULINK given as: www.acp-edulink.eu all members were encouraged to look at it. The website contains an attractive “flyer” for the SUCAPRI project that partners are encouraged to use/distribute.

Project partners and associates were informed that ICT could play a key role in the three SUCAPRI objectives. To this end COL could assist in the following activities

- Technical support to the portal and the content developer in each institution
- Continued capacity building on the use of the e-platform and supporting content developers to produce content
- Integration to the university based learning cycles
- Help in the preparation and consolidation of learning materials
- ICT level assessment among stakeholders

The COL representative posed the following questions to the workshop

- Should we integrate these activities?
- If, yes now (global or at institutional level) is there a possibility in the SUCAPRI budget?
- Do we need a project plan for this?

In reply to these questions:

- Workshop members agreed that SUCAPRI – COL collaboration fits predominantly in activity 5 - on the development of learning resources. Approximately EUR 23,000 is available for this activity between the two countries.
- It was therefore proposed that some components from SUCAPRI could be used to formulate a joint proposal between SUCAPRI and COL for funding of the ICT component.
- In addition it was suggested that some learning materials are available from the ICRA site and could be used so long as ICRA is acknowledged. Other sites with learning materials were also proposed but issues on licensing would need to be looked at.
- With regard to the above a small committee was formed to look into the issues of licensing as well as to develop a SUCAPRI - COL proposal for funding of the ICT component. The committee comprises of
 1. Peter Masinde - JKUAT
 2. COL representatives (Nicholas and James)
 3. All the activity leaders

Agenda 8 – Way Forward

Activities	Actions/Changes suggested	Expected Outputs	Participating Institutions	Requirements	Timeframe	Who
Activity 1	Letter of project approval to partner organization Finalization of report Invoice format Data card-“dongles” Purchase LCD Inception Phase Report Collaborative Implementation Agreement SUCAPRI Project Steering Committee Preparation of Simplified Budgets per Activity M&E Outcome Mapping Impact Pathways Familiarization	Awareness by Organization leaders Report	MAK Rapporteuring institutions Richard to send advance document two weeks before the next SC workshop	Addresses	11/2 week 04/04/2008 2 Weeks 2 Weeks End of April 03/04/08 8-10 th July 8-10 th July	Moses Sam, Rosemary Jessica Bob, Richard, Moses Moses Moses All Moses/ Christine Moses and Richard All
Activity 2.	Include Multi-stakeholder Planning meeting for Univ. learning cycle, Utilization of trained R-P from SH group in L-Cycle. Planning Meeting Awareness Creation and Buy- in	Revised plan pertaining to resource persons, inputs, budgets	Univ. Ken + Mak + ICRA+KARI + KENFAP + MoA + MoL + Implementing agencies	Alternative plan/budget to be submitted to EDULINK by Moses	1 Week May 12-16 07/04/08	George C Bob, Richard Christine and George C Institution Reps
Activity 3 Initial planning workshops in each of the countries	1. Include Planning meeting for multi-stakeholder learning cycle 2. Rewording	Resource persons, Inputs, budgets	All	Work with person on alternative plan/ budget	2 Weeks	Sam Mwonga and Charles Muyanja Richard
Activity 4.	Spread out to enable earlier activities (e.g. KU and UoN)	Make changes and put cover letter. Revised			2 Weeks	Gitonga and George C Richard
Activity 5	Contribution towards ICT Develop Proposal for further funding				2 Weeks May 2008	Peter Masinde Richard Activity Leaders Nicholas James
Activity 6	Conference/Symposium					Moses Nicholas Christine

Appendix 1 – List of Participants at SUCAPRI Inception Workshop, April 1-3, 2008, Karen, Kenya.

Name	Organization	Contact email address
Moses Tenywa	Makerere University, Uganda	tenywamakooma@yahoo.com
Charles Muyanja	Makerere University, Uganda	ckmuyanja@yahoo.co.uk
Sam Oketch	Makerere University, Uganda	sgokech@vetmed.mak.ac.ug
James Wire	Makerere University, Uganda	
George Chemining'wa	University of Nairobi, Kenya	umchemin@hotmail.com
Florence Olubayo	University of Nairobi, Kenya	fmmogi@yahoo.com
Christine Onyango	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agricultural Technology, JKUAT, Kenya	cakoth2002@yahoo.co.uk
Peter Masinde	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agricultural Technology, JKUAT, Kenya	masinde_peter@yahoo.co.uk
Speranza Ndege	Kenyatta University, Kenya	speranza_ndege@yahoo.com
Gitonga Nkanata	Kenyatta University, Kenya	gitonga35@yahoo.com
George Karanja	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)	gmkaranja@kari.org
Sam Mwonga	Egerton Univeristy, Kenya	smwonga@yahoo.com
Isaac Kosgey	Egerton Univeristy, Kenya	isaac_kosgey@yahoo.co.uk
Jessica Ndubi	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)	jmndubi@kari.org
Rosemary Ndunge	Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development	mdunge_r@yahoo.co.uk
John Mwaniki	Ministry of Agriculture	johnmmwaniki@yahoo.com
Peter Gitika	Kenya Federation of Agricultural Producers (KENFAP)	petergitika@yahoo.com
Imelda Kashaija	National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO), Uganda	ikashaija@yahoo.co.uk
Robert Mutaka	National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO), Uganda	mutakanrc@yahoo.co.uk
Joseph Okoryot	National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS), Uganda	joryokot@naads.or.ug
Nicholas Kimolo	Commonwealth College of Learning (COL)	nkimolo@gmail.com
Richard Hawkins	International Centre for development oriented Research in Agriculture (ICRA)	richhawk@btinternet.com
Robert Booth	International Centre for development oriented Research in Agriculture (ICRA)	r.h.booth44@btopenworld.com

ANNEX 2: Amendment of detailed description of SUCAPRI activities¹

1.7.1 Activity 1 - The initial planning phase and project management

Rationale:

Although key staff members and managers of all proposed partners have jointly collaborated to prepare this proposal, a short initial inception period of 2 months will be needed to raise awareness in the relevant faculties, and to collectively discuss, review and adapt this proposal to the requirements, needs and possibilities of this wider group.

The purpose of the inception phase will be to arrive at a collectively shared understanding by all 6 project partners and associates of the overall and specific objectives of the project, the proposed activities, the roles and responsibilities, budget and resource inputs by each partner. Although modifications to this current proposal are expected to be more operational than structural, a report with the refined action plan will be submitted to EDULINK at the end of this phase.

Description of activity:

Initially, key staff members from all partner universities involved in preparing this proposal will hold informal and formal workshops in each institution to raise awareness of the project, its objectives and implications. Resulting from these meetings, an institutional steering group of 4-5 persons will be formed in each of the participating universities to take responsibility for the institutional inputs to the overall project.

Following preparation at the individual institutional level, a joint 3-day workshop of 20 persons will be held in Kenya during the second month to bring representatives of the different institutional steering groups together, consolidate the overall project plan, and nominate the overall (inter-institutional) project steering group consisting of representatives from each partner institution, as well as one representative each from research, extension and farmer organisations. This workshop will also be attended by representatives of associate institutions (e.g. NARO, KARI) and other key stakeholders currently collaborating with the partner universities through the already existing IAR4D Steering Group (Uganda) and IAR4D national Task Force (Kenya). These stakeholders will include the National Agricultural Advisory Service (NAADS, Uganda), the Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock (Kenya), The National Federation of Agricultural Producers (KENFAP, Kenya), and the Commonwealth of Learning (COL).

Following this initial inception phase, the project steering group will meet at 6-monthly intervals, during the second week of January and also July, to monitor progress, review project documentation and expenses, replan the activities for the following phase and assign project reporting responsibilities.

¹ These amendments (see highlighted text) to the "detailed description of activities" described in Annex 1 (description of the action) of the Grant Contract are made on the basis of discussions during the Inception Workshop during the planning phase of the project, as stipulated in the Project Grant Contract. The amendments do not involve a change in the nature of the main activities proposed, the overall budget for the action or the total grant awarded by Edulink, or the disbursement schedule.

Expected results of the initial planning phase:

The results of the initial planning phase will be:

- A revised project action plan.
- A mechanism in each partner university for “in-house” coordination and management of project activities.
- A joint Project Steering Group, not exceeding 12 persons, for overall project management, annual work planning, monitoring and evaluation.
- A joint collaborative agreement signed by all partners.

1.7.2 Activity 2 - University-based learning cycle to create core teams of competency in rural innovation skills in the staff (teaching, research and outreach) of the 4 Kenyan universities.

Rationale:

Before curriculum review or establishing new programmes of the type proposed by this action, it is necessary to deal with the basic elements of changing mindsets and building new skills for training, research and consultancy amongst the academic staff. A core group with personal mastery and innovation skills has already been established at MAK through the I@MAK programme within the university and the IARD initiative with NARO and ICRA (Kibwika, 2006). In Kenya, there is considerable interest in rural innovation approaches, and one or two key staff members at each of the 4 universities have participated in the ICRA European-based programme on rural innovation (IAR4D), but as yet there is not a sufficient critical mass in these universities to initiate change, serve as advocates and trainers of others. The purpose of this key activity will therefore be to establish a core team of change agents in each of the 4 Kenyan universities that can then develop tailor-made programmes both individually and collectively.

Description of activity:

This activity will consist of 3 phases:

(i) Preparation. Initial consultations, organised by the university IAR4D team leader, will be held at faculty, departmental and individual level with staff of the participating universities and relevant faculties/ colleges/ schools (e.g. agriculture, social sciences, education) to enhance ownership, explain the background, purpose and rationale of the programme, discuss how this fits into the wider context, develop criteria to select participants, and agree on how programme will be monitored, evaluated and institutionalised. Also included in the discussions will be the academic registrars, managers of innovative projects in the university and members of the schools of education (e.g. U. of Nairobi, Kenyatta U). Following these in-house discussions, an inter-agency planning workshop (including project partners and Kenyan associates) will be held to determine the TOR for the learning teams, finalise the content of the learning cycle cycle, select resource persons and participants, and identify learning materials needed.

(ii) Implementation, through four or five iterative workshops of 5-7 days (in semester breaks, where possible). A preliminary schedule of concepts and skills covered in the workshops includes:

Workshop 1 - Personal development (emotional intelligence, personal feedback); systems thinking (types of systems, innovation systems); experiential and adult learning; facilitation of interactive learning (selecting techniques, preparing teaching modules); building peer learning groups.

Workshop 2 - Personal growth; team building and performance; facilitating interdisciplinary interaction; action learning/research; conceptualising consultation; project planning; stakeholder analysis and collective action; facilitation of diverse stakeholder groups.

Workshop 3 - Problem and opportunity analysis; scenario analysis and strategic planning; value chains and market analysis; resource sustainability and environmental impact analysis; strengthening partnerships.

Workshop 4 - Social analysis; strengthening participation, community organisation and producer associations; mainstreaming equity and gender concerns; concepts and tools of communication; deepening personal development (drivers, personality models).

Workshop 5 - Deepening process observation and aspects of personal development. conflict resolution Participatory monitoring and evaluation; outcome mapping; formulating competitive proposals.

In between workshops, these concepts and skills will be applied to:

- Teaching programmes (to improve interactive learning in academic programmes and short courses)
- Consultancies, outreach and community service (to improve process facilitation of diverse stake-holders)
- Research (especially interdisciplinary research between departments/faculties, and collaborative research with diverse stakeholders into complex rural development challenges)

Developing personal and group action plans for the following semester will form a key element of each workshop. Following each learning workshop, a short review meeting will be held by representatives from each university to identify implications for following workshops (content and process). Each subsequent workshop will then build upon practical experience gained during the previous semester in these three main activities (teaching, consultancy and research), through reflection of experience with and by the peer learning groups and focussing on constraints/ challenges encountered. Learning groups will be formed on, for example: (a) enhancing undergraduate teaching and research, (b) enhancing graduate training and research, (c) improving interdisciplinary and inter-agency collaborative research (d) facilitating community learning, (e) facilitating insitutional change processes, and or other themes of interest to the learning groups.

(iii) Evaluation of the learning cycle and planning of follow-up.

Evaluation of the learning cycle will be carried out both by the participants themselves and by an inter-university group representing all the participating partner universities according to terms of reference developed with the Heads of Department and managers consulted at the planning stage of the learning cycle. Based on the outcomes of the activity, follow-up activities will include measures to

develop the learning groups into “communities of practice” within the participating universities, develop additional learning activities to scale up the improved teaching and research practices, and . expose senior university personnel and managers of relevant stakeholder groups, etc, to the new innovation approaches to rural development.

Location:

The activity will be conducted using the facilities of the partner universities in Kenya.

Implementing agencies:

Given their experience in managing the PM and IAR4D learning cycles during 2004/2005, facilitators from MAK will take the lead role in this learning cycle, with support from resource persons from Kenyan partners and associates (IAR4D alumni) and ICRA. The learning cycle will be overseen by the project steering group established during the initiation phase (see above).

Expected result:

The results of the initial social and rural innovation learning cycle will be:

- A core learning group “communities of practice” formed in each participating university in Kenya for: (a) enhancing undergraduate teaching and research, (b) enhancing graduate training and research in rural innovation, (c) improving interdisciplinary and inter-agency collaborative research (d) facilitating community learning, and (e) facilitating insitutional change processes;
- Action plans for scaling up rural innovation skills in teaching, research and consultancies;
- Reviewed content for use in future learning cycles.

1.7.3 Activity 3 - Multi-stakeholder learning cycles to develop innovation systems skills in agricultural R&D professionals in Uganda and Kenya.

Rationale:

This proposal recognises that building capacity in rural innovation requires an action-learning process to acquire the necessary skills and mindsets by actually engaging with stakeholders. in collective innovation . In other words, it is “action-research”.The core groups of competency formed in each Kenyan University during Activity 2 (to mirror the group that already exists in MAK), further “learning cycles” will therefore organise learning events for practicing professionals in mixed institutional groups working within the context of major national R&D programmes in rural innovation.

Description of activity:

The construction of the “multi-stakeholder” learning cycle will be similar to that described in activity 1.7.2 above, although the participants in the learning cycle, and application of concepts and skills will be carried out within a different context. The main phases of this activity will therefore include:

(i) A planning phase. This phase will comprise consultations and needs assessment with key national stakeholders, including:

- In Uganda, the National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO) and its public agricultural

research institutes, the National Agricultural Advisory Service (NAADS) and others, through expansion of the current Planning and Implementation Team (IAR4D-PIT)

- In Kenya, KARI, the Ministry of Agriculture; the Ministry of Livestock & Fisheries Development; the National Association of Agricultural Producers (KENFAP), through the existing IAR4D Task Force (IAR4D-TF) Following initial discussions of the IAR4D-PIT and IAR4D-TF, a joint (multi-stakeholder) planning workshop will be held to agree plans for the learning cycle and identify priority development opportunities that will serve as focus for the “innovation teams” (As a result of this initial planning phase, a small interagency coordination group will be formed to oversee the learning cycle, implementation of fieldwork and evaluation. Finally, approval for these “learning cycles” (e.g. as certificate or diploma courses) will be sought from the relevant university committees and authorities. This process will thus further the engagement of outside stakeholders in the process of curricular change.

(ii) An implementation phase. A series of five iterative workshops of 5-7 days, will be held over a period of about 12-18 months (see activity 1.7.2 (ii) above for preliminary schedule of concepts and skills covered in these workshops). These workshops will be facilitated by members of the university “core teams” formed as a result of activity 1.7.2, with support from ICRA and other project associates as necessary. Fieldwork between the workshops, will be carried out by the local innovation teams, comprising staff (e.g. local government, locally-active NGOs, community based organisations, etc).

The exact objectives and hence activities of the fieldwork will thus depend on each individual context, but these activities are expected to include workshops or consultations with a wider range of local actors and interest groups, including private producers, traders, etc; joint analysis, planning, implementation and evaluation of innovation activities (research-development-production-commercialisation). These local innovation teams will be “mentored” by members of the core teams from partner universities and/or project associates.

These 2-3 day mentoring visits will consist of facilitated sessions to reflect on the a) the effectiveness of processes established by the innovation team, b) the outcomes of these processes in terms of improved stakeholder interaction and rural innovation, c) the lessons learned by the innovation team in terms of enhanced rural innovation; d) action plans for follow-up activities by the implementation team and e) identification of topics that need more in-depth treatment during the main “knowledge acquisition” workshops.

(iii) An evaluation phase. Evaluation of the learning cycle, both by the participants themselves and by the inter-agency coordination group formed in the planning phase. The evaluation will then feed into the design of follow-up activities, including any subsequent learning cycles and additional capacity strengthening activities, as well as continued collaboration to continue and deepen the activities of the local innovation groups. The evaluation will also inform the curriculum development activities described in section 1.7.4 below.

Location:

This activity will take place in both Uganda and Kenya.

In Uganda, the workshop elements of the activity will be located at the Continuing Agricultural Education

Centre (CAEC) of Makerere University. This is a well an excellent quiet learning environment with 47 self contained rooms and can accommodate up to 78 residents. The facility has two conference halls and a computer laboratory with unlimited access to internet-mail and is currently used for regional and local workshops. In Kenya, the workshop elements will be located at Egerton University, which also has an excellent training facility with 60 self contained rooms, three conference halls and access to internet, TEEAL Electronic Library, and the adjacent ARC Hotel run by the University. The activities of the practical field experience will be located in priority districts of both countries as designated by the interagency coordination groups.

Implementing agencies:

The main implementing agencies will be MAK in Uganda and the four participating universities in Kenya, with support from ICRA and project associates as necessary. In each country, the activities will also be coordinated through the interagency coordination groups established; these groups will be based on the IAR4D-PIT and the IAR4D-TF Planning and Implementation Team already established in Uganda/Kenya, respectively. Technical backstopping (planning and review of the learning cycle workshops and fieldwork; provision of learning materials) will be provided by ICRA.

Expected result:

The expected results of the additional earning cycles to develop innovation systems skills in practicing agricultural R&D professionals include:

- Further strengthened “communities of practice” (see expected results of activity 1.7.2, above) in each participating university.
- At least 24 professionals with strengthened competencies in guiding rural innovation in Kenya and Uganda, drawn from universities, research institutes, NGOs, private sector and extension.
- Established rural innovation “pilot sites” (processes and outcomes) in at least 4 locations in each of Uganda and Kenya.
- Case studies (publications, DVDs) of rural innovation processes that can be used as teaching resources in the participating universities and others in the region.
- Further strengthened stakeholder involvement in curricular development processes. · Inter-agency multi-stakeholder mechanisms such as the Task Force (Kenya) and PIT (Uganda) consolidated for support to subsequent activities.

1.7.4 Activity 4 - Improvement of curricula, curricula development and management/ incentive procedures.

Rationale:

Several new programs have been initiated at the participating universities to respond to this demand (e.g. the Bachelor of Agricultural Extension Education (BAEE), Bachelor of Agribusiness management and entrepreneurship, Bachelors of Agricultural land use and Management, at MAK; BSc Agribusiness, BSc Agric. Education and Extension, MS in Agricultural Resource Management at UoN, the new Faculty of Agriculture and Enterprise Development at KU). These programs seek to produce new types of professionals; however, their curricula are often rooted in the BSc. Agriculture curriculum which still forms the foundation of many

of these new courses. To further overcome these constraints the other elements need to be integrated into curricula of courses that seek to form competencies in rural innovation. In addition to the “normal” or specialist professional capacities that each graduate needs, a capacity for promoting rural innovation requires competencies in a range of analytical, process and technical skills as well as a certain “professional ethos”. Based on our experience, and that of colleagues in other countries, we propose a framework for reviewing the integration of rural innovation competencies in academic curricula which includes the following elements:

1. Competencies of staff in facilitating learning (facilitating group and experiential learning, mentoring, building confidence of learners).
2. Inclusion of new “competencies” in the syllabus:
 - a. “Metadisciplines” such as process facilitation, systems thinking, planning, epistemology (“learning how to learn”), promoting equity, rural innovation processes and approaches, etc.
 - b. “Personal and social skills”, such as empathy, sensitivity, self-awareness, self-regulation, social and gender awareness, inter-personal communication abilities, being a “team player” etc.
3. Enabling interdisciplinary studies (facilitating students of different disciplines to work together on a common problem or research theme, both in classroom-based case studies as well as in practical work with non-academic stakeholders).
4. Embedding practical work within “real world” action research projects (involvement of a diversity of non-academic rural stakeholders, including communities, farmers organizations, traders, local government, NGOs, etc).
5. Assessment (for team work, personal and social skills, problem solving rather than knowledge per se, etc.).
6. Management of the curricula development process (involvement of non-academic stakeholders, such as potential employers, in determining the curricula).

Of course, behind each of these “desirable” elements exist a range of institutional factors which limit their current implementation. Incorporating fieldwork outside the university increases costs and time for organization – and can be unpredictable in its outcomes, even if our universities include “outreach programs”. Assessment based on group outputs, using e.g. peer assessment, raises issues of subjectivity. Approval of new courses and programmes often takes time. All of these “institutional” factors need to be analysed with university managers and administrators, to determine a realistic plan of institutional change that creates the enabling environment for more relevant and effective curricula and teaching strategies. In addition, consultation and negotiation with major national stakeholders is necessary to determine at what level (Bachelor, Masters, Diploma), new courses can most effectively fulfil the need for adapted and/or new programmes in rural innovation.

Description of activity:

Based on the above, the curricula review process will involve:

- (i) Consultation and engagement with project associates and other stakeholders, especially the main employers and development agencies, to identify and agree on the key competences, over and above

specific disciplinary skills, required in the various professions offered by the target Faculties /Centres of the partner universities.

- (ii) Redesign of curricula (syllabus, teaching methods, integration of experiential learning, assessment procedures, etc.)
- (iii) Development of the learning resource materials / modules (see activity 1.7.5 below).
- (iv) Application and submission of new curriculum approved by senate for the case of MAKand/ or other authorities in each country.
- (v) Testing of the new curricula in pilot courses; evaluation and adjustment of the curricula.
- (vi) Development of a marketing strategy to further familiarise potential employers with the new courses.

At the same time, other accompanying measures (activities) described in this section will be necessary to develop the culture and environment which enables and encourages staff and students to learn together and implement the new approaches to teaching in rural innovation.

Location:

Implementing agencies: This activity will be implemented by the core groups formed in each of the 5 partner universities. The Schools of Education in each university and individuals with relevant experience will also be involved where possible. ICRA will provide technical backstopping role through consultations to these core groups and the project steering group. Where appropriate, a joint workshop may be organised with a similar initiative involving 5 university partners in South Africa collaborating with ICRA under a similar rural innovation capacity building initiative.

Timing:

To take advantage of the opportunities afforded by new faculties and programmes such as those at KU, UoN, etc., this activity will take place from the first months of the project (and not only during months 18-30 as indicated in the original project proposal).

Expected results:

The exact results will depend on the outcome of consultation and negotiation with stakeholders. However, potential results include:

- Engagement of key stakeholders in curricular review processes.
- Mainstreaming of key elements of rural innovation systems (PM/SS and IAR4D) into existing curricula, where this can be achieved without the need to seek approval for new programmes from national or university authorities.
- Development of a diploma program for those who wish to “re-tool” or improve their professional competency in rural innovation systems. Such a programme could be offered as one of several optional or compulsory cross cutting themes in the new CAFFES (MAK) and the College of Agriculture at Nairobi University, for example.
- Development of a collaborative (inter-university), two-year Masters programme especially designed to encourage interdisciplinary interaction and to integrate practice and knowledge acquisition on the key elements of rural innovation systems (the above mentioned diploma could be considered as part of such a Masters programme). For example, the first year could be devoted to learning about rural innovation processes and the second year to deepening

relevant disciplinary capabilities. The second year disciplinary thesis in this case would be based upon action research undertaken as a member of a problem focussed team. This type of program will require collaboration across disciplines and with other organizations engaged in research and development to provide "pilot sites" for practice and action research. The research would have to be co-designed with all the partner/stakeholder organizations and should be geared towards contributing solving real life-problems. The possibility of offering such a Masters programme through distance learning (involving the AVU at Kenyatta, MAK and Nairobi University, Egerton) will be explored.

1.7.5 Activity 5 - Development of learning resources for facilitation processes and rural innovation.

Rationale:

A wide range of learning materials, relevant to Ugandan and Kenyan conditions, will need to be adapted/developed for use in the range of learning programmes that will be offered. These will include written handouts and/or audiovisual material on concepts, approaches and methods, as well as case studies. Given the existing plans to develop open and distance learning programmes at the partner universities (Makerere, Nairobi, Kenyatta, Egerton), the materials need to be available for distribution and use in a digital format and structured in such a way as to facilitate distance learning.

Description of activity:

Activities to develop learning resources will include:

- i Reviewing reports and materials developed from activities 1, 2, 3 and 4, as well as existing/available information from the personal mastery/soft skills and IAR4D programmes already carried out by MAK and collaborators, the Schools of Education in the different partner universities, ICRA, the centres of the CGIAR (Consultative Group for International Research), and others.
- ii Modification/editing of these materials as needed, to integrate these into a structured rural innovation framework.
- iii Preparation and publication of the materials in written and electronic formats: books, training manuals, website, cd rom, paper, etc.

Implementing agencies:

This activity will be implemented by the core groups formed in each of the 5 partner universities. ICRA will support the activity by making available its own extensive collection of learning resources available in electronic format.

Expected results:

- Jointly published learning materials and supplementary CDs/DVDs on "Rural Innovation Approaches" and case studies.
- A joint website with resource and reference material, links on rural innovation approaches

1.7.6 Activity 6 - International Workshop on “Capacity Strengthening in Rural Innovation”, to present project results to wider regional audience

Rationale:

The participating universities are not the only ones in Africa to be reviewing curriculum in agriculture and rural development. There is a general consensus that current academic programmes are failing to produce competent professionals (see, for example, papers presented at the recent “Innovation Africa Symposium”, held in Uganda during November, 2006: www.innovationafrica.net). Several international networks have also tackled this issue (e.g. RUFORUM, which MAK coordinates and of which the University of Nairobi, Egerton, Kenyatta University and Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology are all members), as have collaborative projects implemented by ICRA and its partners in other countries such as South Africa. The exchange of experience gained through this project will enrich and strengthen the continuation of activities after the project, as well as expose findings to these networks and sister projects.

Location:

The proposed workshop will be held in Uganda during the last year of the project.

Implementing agencies:

The workshop will be jointly planned and promoted by the partners (5 universities and ICRA). Participants will be invited from S. Africa (e.g. Universities of Kwa-Zulu Natal, Free State, Fort Hare, Venda), Tanzania (Sokoine U.), Ethiopia (Alemaya U, Makelle U.) and others.

Expected result:

- Improved linkages with similar initiatives elsewhere.
- A jointly published proceedings on “Capacity Strengthening in Rural Innovation”.

ANNEX 3: Status Reports from SUCAPRI partner and associate institutions

Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

1. The dean faculty of Agriculture has appointed 7 members as IAR4D committee
2. This committee is charged with helping to operationalize SUCAPRI activities.
3. The Members are:-
 - Dr. Christine A. Onyango – IAR4D Team Leader
 - Dr. P.W. Masinde
 - Dr. E. Ateka
 - Dr. J.M. Maina
 - Dr. P. Kajwang
 - Dr. Home
 - Mr. A. Maina (Faculty administrator)
4. Faculty has an independent account operated by food science and Technology department.
 - The dean is one of the signatories
 - Its agreed that monies from SUCAPRI will be received through this account
 - It will be subjected to university accounting procedures.
5. Sensitization has been done at faculty level
 - With support from the dean, this will be done also at higher level than the faculty
 - More sensitisation is planned for at departments level.

Kenyatta University

- The existing Integrated Agriculture Research for Development (IAR4D) Committee will be the focus for building a group to implement the ACP-EU Cooperation Programme in higher education (EDULINK).
- The committee has representation from the school of agriculture and Enterprise development, E-learning coordinating centre, school of environmental studies and school of pure and applied science.
- The committee will be expanded and new methods of communication (e.g. a mailing list scheduled meeting) incorporated in preparation for implementing the project.
- The e-learning coordinating centre will give the required technical support to the SUCAPRI activities with the School of Agriculture. This means once the curricular has been developed access of course materials will be provided.
- The e-learning coordinating centre will provide a common group email and keep above communication among members.

Activities for Kenyatta University will be monitored by the two key person representing the universities in this SUCAPRI meeting (Gitonga Nkanata and Speranza Ndege).

- A system for monitoring and evaluation of Kenyatta university activities will be put in place. The university will have its own time for meeting deadlines for the activities stipulated in SUCAPRI PROJECT.

National Agricultural Advisory Services, NAADS, Uganda

The National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS) is the organisation put in place by Parliament to

undertake and guide agricultural extension services in Uganda. A key responsibility of the organization is to support the creation of farmer institutions that are empowered to articulate demand for extension services and technology needs. Farmers' institutions that provide the platform for demand articulation are considered vital for agricultural development and rural transformation.

NAADS is only coming to the institutional relationship that has been established by Makerere University and NARO for Integrated Agricultural research for Development (IAR4D). Its entry therefore complements the integration of Training/Research/Extension and farmer roles that is essential for participation learning processes that support the production of professionals that are equipped with both personal mastery and soft skills that are vital for their roles in servicing moral innovation as well as rural transformation.

Kenya Agricultural Research Institute

EDULINK/SUCAPRI is an offspring of the Integrated Agricultural Research for Development (IAR4D) Initiative, currently coordinated by the Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI). As the Chief Executive Officer of KARI, the Director has ultimate responsibility for the Initiative, which he has delegated to Mr. George Karanja, the de facto Coordinator. The Director is assisted by two Deputy Directors, the DD (Research and Technology) and the DD (Finance and Administration). Mr. Karanja, a Principal Research Scientist and Coordinator of a related KARI Initiative, the Agricultural Technology and Information Response Initiative (ATIRI) is directly answerable to the DD (Research and Technology).

The Director is well versed with IAR4D activities, having been the DD (Research and Technology) at the time when the Initiative was started. The DD (Finance and Administration) is responsible for all financial matters and, through the Chief Accountant, has been involved in the facilitation of IAR4D activities. So far two KARI scientists have undergone the 6-months' IAR4D training programme at ICRA, Kenya and Uganda and are sufficiently well versed with IAR4D principles and practices to impart them to others (capacity building).

Coordination has been done through a Task Force of 8 members drawn from the 8 national participating institutions. So far a number of activities have been jointly implemented, including a series of stakeholder workshops in a field study site (Katulani in Kitui District), an institutional engagement study to determine the entry points for IAR4D in member institutions and a training material development where draft curricula for a post graduate diploma and short courses in IAR4D were developed. There are still a number of pending activities, among them a policy level workshop to sensitise policy makers on IAR4D.

The National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO), Uganda

NARO closely collaborates with MAK, ICRA and AHI in running activities of the IAR4D initiative in Uganda. They are generally coordinated by /through a project implementation team (PIT) that reports to the steering committee (SC) for endorsement.

The PIT is composed of members from the above-mentioned four (U) organizations, and NAADS will soon be recruited. This team is currently composed of IAR4D & PM/SS experts (Diana Akullo, Imelda Kashaija, and Emily Twinamasiko from NARO, Moses Tenywa, Charles Muyanja, Peter Walekwa and Sam Okech from MAK, and Chris Opondo from AHI).

While the current PIT chair (Moses Tenywa) is from MAK, the current activities coordinator (Diana Akullo)

is from the NARO secretariat but mainly to assist the overall NARO-MAK-ICRA initiative coordinator (Emily Twinamasiko) who is the Director, Research Coordination in NARO.

In each of the actively participating NARO Institute (7) there is an IAR4D contact person, whose main duties include (i) leading the creation of awareness of IAR4D among new staff members and collaborations in the zone (ii) linking with mentors & PIT on necessary activities. NB Kachwekano ZARDI. Where I (Imelda) am based is one of the 7 actively participating institutes

Mbarara Zonal Agricultural Research and Development Institute (MBAZARDI) is one of 8 Zonal Research Institutes, and is currently instituting IAR4D in all activities with key partners including NAADS, local government authorities, extension services, local NGOs and MAK. Staffs recruited recently are being brought on board internally. New research proposals now include MAK scientists, subject matter specialists from local government as well as researchers from sister NARO institutes. Examples of projects running currently include Agriculture Research and Extension Network (ARENET), Evaluation of mango fruit varieties, evaluation and verification of indigenous technology (ITK) in the control of livestock and crop pests and diseases, control of invasive plants, performance evaluation of cattle and goat breeds in the region, Newcastle disease control trials using thermo-stable vaccine, establishment of fruit mother gardens in the district of Kiruhura.

Ministry of Livestock & Livestock Fisheries Development, MoLFD, Kenya

Within the MoLFD, the IAR4D initiative is represented by two members.

- Task force member – 5 Matoke
- Core team member and trainer – Rosemary Mwanza (Ministerial representative)

The Ministry joined the Kenyan IAR4D Initiative in 2006 and has been involved in the following activities.

- 1) Addressing the water challenge at the Katulani site together with other members of the initiative.
- 2) Curriculum development, in which two drafts curricular on rural innovation were developed as follows.
 - a) Postgraduate diploma in rural innovation processes
 - b) A series of short courses in (IAR4D) all 1 week long, which focus on various components of IAR4D. It is hoped that these two drafts will be inputs in the senior policy workshop within partner's institutions.
- 3) Capacity building workshop for Katulani farmers on water harvesting. The workshop also included a town in which farmers were able to see how technologies on water harvesting.
- 4) Institutional engagement on activity that was geared to determine the entry points for IAR4D within the participating and therefore mainstream IAR4D.
- 5) More recently we have been included as partners in the CHE (Commission of Higher Education) project that is an offshoot of the original challenge, using micro-catchments to grow cassava to grow cassava within the pilot site.

The Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), Kenya

The Ministry has several project and programmes (extension based) that are integrated in nature both in planning and implementation. Therefore most elements of the IAR4D approach are embedded in these

project i.e. emphasis on stakeholders collaboration in revitalising the agricultural sector.

The National initiative on IAR4D has a pilot testing site (Laboratory) in Kitui District (Katulani location). Under the coordination of Mr. J.M. Mwaniki from the Extension & Training directorate. Activities on Water harvesting and management for crop, livestock and domestic use are going on the site.

International Centre for development oriented Research in Agriculture (ICRA)

ICRA is a capacity building organisation. Its mission is to stimulate innovation by strengthening the abilities of people and organisations in the rural sector, research and education to collaborate and learn from each other. ICRA does this by:

- Developing partnerships with national or regional organisations
- Building national teams that can facilitate learning between rural development partners and develop academic learning programmes
- Learning from experience and diffusing good practices to improve rural innovation and organisational change.

ICRA's activities include support to national steering groups and "core teams" to enable these to facilitate IAR4D activities at national level, as well as the sharing of experience across countries. Currently, ICRA is working in South Africa, Ghana, Benin, Burkina Faso, Mali, Madagascar, Ethiopia, Armenia, Venezuela and Cuba, as well as in Uganda and Kenya. In Kenya and Uganda, ICRA has been acting in partnership for several years to strengthen capacity in IAR4D through its European based programmes, in-country learning cycles, and facilitation of steering groups and implementation core teams in both countries.

ICRA's resources consist mainly of its staff: 10 professional staff and associates currently based in the Netherlands, UK, France, South Africa and Venezuela are all familiar with IAR4D concepts and methods. For the purposes of SUCAPRI, the main responsible persons will be Dr Richard Hawkins (main contact person) and Dr Robert Booth. Other staff will be called upon as needed. Information on SUCAPRI will be shared within ICRA through its website (both public pages and intranet), through regular 6-monthly staff meetings, and through informal communication using email, video-conferencing (skype), etc .

ICRA's main contribution to SUCAPRI will be through support to strategic planning of project activities, facilitation of workshops in learning cycles (where appropriate), sharing of experience and learning materials, etc.

ICRA's main activities during the inception phase were to encourage and support the planning of the inception workshop (through emails and telephone calls), as well as co-facilitation of the event itself.

Status of IAR4D at Egerton University

Egerton has two members who have been trained in IAR4D at ICRA. These two members form the core of the team that will be formed to spearhead the IAR4D activities in the Institution. Sensitization at Egerton had been conducted earlier to the administrators of the Faculty level and with the division of Research and Extension. The Dean of the Faculty (present and past dean) has maintained close contacts with the activities of the team and has provided the team with support. The IAR4D base and focus is thus the Faculty of agriculture. The other focus Faculty which will be brought on board is the Faculty of Education and Community Studies. This Faculty is the home to the Department of Agricultural Educational and Extension. In the current Egerton University's strategic plan, Extension and outreach activities have been given high

visibility at the highest levels of the university structure. Outreach, research and extension activities use some of the aspects of the IAR4D approaches. This, it is hoped, would be further institutionalized as the sensitization and implementation of the SUCAPRI project and with the other IAR4D activities initiated by the National Initiative.

The formation of IAR4D team will thus focus on the Faculty of Agriculture and include representation from the Departments of Agricultural Education and Extension, and Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness Management.

The proposed “in-house” management team is as follows:

1. Samuel Mwonga – Crops, Horticulture and Soils
2. Mary Ambula – Animal Sciences
3. Thomas Akuja – Crops, Horticulture and Soils
4. Mary Lopokoyit – Agricultural Education and Extension

The Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture, Dr. Isaac Kosgey, who is also a Task Force member, has been very supportive of the IAR4D activities, we are most certain he will continue giving us full support in our activities.

By the end of the week we intend to look into the possibilities of recruiting one more person targeting the Department of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness Management.

Status of the IAR4D at the University of Nairobi

Efforts to introduce IAR4D originated from the current College of Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences Principal, Prof. Agnes Mwang'ombe. Two academic members of staff were capacitated in IAR4D by ICRA in 2005 and 2006, respectively. The capacitated staff conducted seminars in the Faculty of Agriculture and held meetings with the Principal and the Dean during their study period and upon completion. An institutional engagement study conducted by the 2005 and 2006 ICRA alumni in 2007 showed that there was a good level of awareness of IAR4D at the Faculty level though there was variation in the understanding of its principles and concepts.

CAVS is represented at the National IAR4D Initiative Task Force and is actively involved in pushing the IAR4D agenda at the national level. Members of CAVS are involved in tackling the water challenge problem at Katulani through IAR4D approach. A good number of academic staff members in the Faculty of Agriculture are involved in research programmes that are multi-institutional, multi-sectoral, agricultural product value chain focused and interdisciplinary in nature. For example, the Kenya Agricultural Productivity Project (KAPP) CGS requires that all proposals must have at least 3 partner institutions and cover the agricultural product value chains. The KAPP CGS has provided a good opportunity for inter-institutional and interdisciplinary research. The Faculty of Agriculture has done pretty well in teamwork across departments and institutions as evidenced by the good number of KAPP grants. The University is increasingly focusing on community outreach. It is involved in dissemination of tissue culture citrus and sweet potato technologies to farmers. The university is also focused on income generation through consultancies. Student evaluation/supervisor

evaluation/peer evaluation. There is need for training in IAR4D to improve service delivery.

The SUCAPRI:

Consultative meetings have been held with the Dean and Associate Dean of Faculty of Agriculture and the Chairman of the Department of Plant Science and Crop Protection on the SUCAPRI project. The Principal of CAVS has also been made aware of the project. The college Principal and the Dean of Faculty of Agriculture are supportive of the project. The contact person has also informally discussed the SUCAPRI project with academic staff in the various departments of the Faculty of Agriculture with the aim of creating awareness. The Dean undertook to formally institute a Faculty of Agriculture Rural Innovations Committee to spearhead in-house coordination of the SUCAPRI project. This committee would consist of Dr. George Chemining'wa (Coordinator/IAR4D capacitated), Dr. Florence Olubayo (National IAR4D Taskforce member), Dr. James Muthomi (Plant Pathologist), Ms. Sophie Ngala (Nutritionist) and Dr. Mugivane (Rural development and extension specialist). These individuals have been sensitized on the content of the project in one-on-one meetings. The University of Nairobi has participated in three E-platform meetings/trainings conducted by COL.

Plans are underway to sensitize the larger college/faculty community by presenting an overview of the SUCAPRI project and IAR4D principles and concepts at the College Academic Board, the Faculty Board and in departmental meetings.

ANNEX 4: Institutional and Activity Coordinators

Institution/Activity	Responsible	Email	Telephone
Makerere University (and Project Coordinator)	Dr Moses Tenywa	tenywamakooma@yahoo.com	256-772827710
Kenyatta University	Dr Speranza Ndege	speranza_ndege@yahoo.com	
JKUAT (and overall Kenya activity coordinator)	Dr Christine Onyango	cakoth2002@yahoo.co.uk	254-733730918
University of Nairobi (and Coordinator Activity 2, Kenya)	George Chemining'wa	umchemin@hotmail.com	254-721723806
Egerton University (and Coordinator Activity 3, Kenya)	Sam Mwonga	smwonga@yahoo.com	254-733825657
Coordinator Activity 4, Kenya	Dr Gitonga Nkanata	gitonga35@yahoo.com	254-722380602
Coordinator Activity 5, Kenya	Peter Masinde	masinde_peter@yahoo.co.uk	
Coordinator Activity 3, Uganda	Dr Charles Muyanja	ckmuyanja@yahoo.co.uk	