

Proceedings

Stakeholder Workshop

**The Status of Agricultural Economics
in East and Southern/Central Africa**

Nairobi, Kenya

October 9–10, 2001

Organized by
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

in collaboration with
The East and Central Africa Program for Agricultural Policy Analysis (ECAPAPA)
and
The African Economic Research Consortium (AERC)

with support from
The Rockefeller Foundation

Proceedings

Stakeholder Workshop

**The Status of Agricultural Economics
in East and Southern/Central Africa**

Nairobi, Kenya

October 9–10, 2001

Organized by
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)

in collaboration with
The East and Central Africa Program for Agricultural Policy Analysis (ECAPAPA)
and
The African Economic Research Consortium (AERC)

with support from
The Rockefeller Foundation

**Stakeholder Workshop on the Status of Agricultural Economics
in East and Southern/Central Africa
Nairobi, Kenya, October 9–10, 2001**

PROCEEDINGS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The workshop was convened to discuss the status of agricultural economics in Eastern, Southern, and Central Africa. Concerned about the ability of universities in the region to produce sufficient numbers of well-trained agricultural economists, the Regional Advisory Committee Meeting of the International Food Policy and Research Institute's 2020 Vision Network for East Africa in September 2000 in Entebbe, Uganda, decided to undertake an assessment of the demand and supply of agricultural economists in the region.

Following the meeting, the 2020 Vision Network prepared and presented a concept note to the Rockefeller Foundation, which actively supports the strengthening of capacity in the agricultural sector in the region. A collaborative effort involving the 2020 Vision Network, the East and Central Africa Program for Agricultural Policy Analysis (ECAPAPA), the Rockefeller Foundation and the Africa Economic Research Consortium (AERC), which has been coordinating an effort to strengthen capacity in economics, thus ensued. A steering committee consisting of representation from these institutions was established. Two eminent consultants, Prof. David Norman from Kansas State University, United States of America, and Dr. Marios Obwona from the Economic Policy Research Center, Makerere, Uganda, were requested to undertake the study in Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, and Zimbabwe. Its objectives were to:

- Assess the ability of academic institutions to produce well-trained M.Sc. and Ph.D. agricultural economists and to conduct research;
- Review existing training programs for their suitability, strengths and weaknesses, and indicate the areas needing attention;
- Evaluate the market for agricultural economists, focusing on supply gaps, and provide some indicators of demand for them; and
- Suggest and evaluate ways to improve agricultural economics training capacity in the region.

The main objective of the stakeholder workshop was to discuss the consultants' report and to pave the way forward. In addition, a number of presentations on initiatives that are proposed or are being implemented in the region that contribute to strengthening of capacity in agricultural economics were made. Workshop participants were mainly drawn from the various institutions visited by the consultants during the study, i.e. university agricultural economics and economics departments, national agricultural research stations, policy research institutes, and networks.

Opening the workshop, Dr. John Lynam of the Rockefeller Foundation noted that the timing of the initiative is opportune because (i) there is renewed interest in support to tertiary education among bilateral and multilateral donor agencies; and (ii) more importantly, there is a recognized need to focus on microeconomic issues and support services within the economy

in general and the agricultural sector in particular, on which many economies in the region depend, given the limited economic growth response to the economic reforms entailing macroeconomic and market reforms. In this respect, the demand for a new generation of agricultural economists at all levels of the economy is emphasized.

Study Findings and Recommendations

Staffing

The study finds that the quality of teaching in the departments of agricultural economics is constrained by lack of staff and by the limited abilities of the existing staff owing to the level and quality of their terminal degrees. This is particularly the case for graduate training. The poor incentive structure is an important factor contributing to the failure to attract the necessary capacity and to the low return rates to capacity developed through staff development programs.

Work Responsibilities

The demands on faculty are typified by more teaching hours per week, 15–20, where faculty would have been teaching for 6–9 hours a week; and a marked increase in class sizes especially at the undergraduate level where a class of 200 students is common and the blackboard, despite its inadequacy, remains the more common teaching tool. In contrast, at the graduate level, classes are often very small for departments to benefit from the economies of scale in resource utilisation.

On the one hand, consultancies have become an important means for faculty to supplement their incomes and in the course of doing so, not only does the individual but often their respective departments and the university also benefit as the proceeds may be shared accordingly. On the other hand, however, little research is being done in part due to limited funding support for research but also because of lack of time owing to the heavy workload and the same poor incentive structure. There is a clear need to balance between teaching, research, and consultancy work which on average take up 30–40 percent, 10–15 percent, and 30–40 percent of faculty time respectively; to encourage the more efficient use of postgraduate students to capture the multiplier effects of research work; to improve the conditions of service; and for universities to change their perception/philosophy towards consultancy work.

Degrees and Courses

At undergraduate level, agricultural economics draws fewer students than economics departments and in some universities it is not offered at all or is offered in the economics department. However, where it is offered as an option, it is the most popular option. At the Masters level, there are fewer students and much less in the agricultural economics than in the economics departments, although this is not for lack of demand but rather decreasing opportunities for sponsorship. There is demand for agricultural economists in the private and public sector and at the micro, meso, and macro levels.

In response to the policy and economic environment, agricultural economics departments are placing explicit emphasis on agri-business but, in addition, they should also mainstream participatory/system/sustainable livelihoods approaches. As important tools to training, access to literature and the essential electronic agricultural library (TEEAL), Internet connectivity, analytical software, and computer hardware are often limiting.

Proposed Way Forward

The study notes that improving agricultural economics in the region will call for producing well-trained graduates to satisfy the demand in all aspects, i.e. quantities and qualities. This, in turn, calls for strong agricultural economics departments, an associated incentive structure, the necessary support facilities, and relevant courses. The study suggests four models:

- The Individual Department (going-it-alone) model;
- The Twinning model;
- The Center of Excellence model; and
- The African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) model.

The consultants recommend the AERC model with a separately funded and managed agricultural economics component within the AERC itself. Consideration would also have to be given to upgrading staff without Ph.D.s, rotating the Joint Facility for Electives (JFE) among participating departments, encouraging research with an applied orientation, and encouraging cooperation between agricultural economics and economics departments.

In addition, they argue that universities would have to create a favorable working environment and provide personal incentives to faculty, all agricultural economics departments should have access to the TEEAL, the 2020 Vision Network and ECAPAPA should extend research opportunities to faculty in agricultural economics departments, and that a regional journal be established/revived.

Discussions

- The discussions underscored sustainability as being a crucial factor for any chosen model and in this respect, raised concern over the sustainability of the AERC model given that it is reliant on donor funding.
- Over concerns that the AERC model would be at the expense of resource deployment, utilization, and development at the agricultural economics departments, it was emphasized that, on the contrary, all participating departments stand to benefit from additional resources and capacity strengthening.
- It was agreed that the administrative factor is important in determining faculty and departmental performance, and that employers of agricultural economists are important stakeholders with whom dialogue on a number of issues, including the nature of courses offered and the quality of the degrees based on the output of the employees, needs to be maintained.
- It was recommended that at the graduate level, other disciplines in addition to agriculture, should be acceptable to entry to a Masters degree in agricultural economics, and that the association for agricultural economists in the region needs to be revived.

Other Presentations and Discussions

During the second session of the workshop, presentations on other efforts that are underway, i.e. the collaborative doctoral program in Africa by the AERC and the joint Masters in environment and natural resource economics and policy by the University of Pretoria, or proposed, i.e. the distance delivery of graduate education in agricultural economics by the National Association of Agricultural Economics Administrators (NAAEA) and linking thesis research to applied research, were invited.

- 1) The AERC emphasized the need to engage in capacity strengthening in the region for a number of reasons; the need for local ownership of initiatives is now better appreciated and this entails strengthening institutions, developing and retaining capacity to train, conduct research, and participate actively at the policymaking level. Since 1988/89, AERC has supported 147 Africans through Ph.D. research and since 1993 it has supported 38 through Ph.D. fellowships. While 15 Ph.D.s on average are produced per annum from both African and foreign universities, they estimate that the region needs about 160 Ph.D.s per annum and of those trained, the nature of their training renders them partly relevant to African issues. The supply of Ph.D. graduates is therefore far below demand. The development of capacity at the Ph.D. level should have trickle down effects at the Masters and undergraduate levels in addition to having professionals engaged in policymaking and research. However, the effort calls for collaboration and recognition and use of different comparative advantages across the region. The AERC itself is ready to support the strengthening of agricultural economics in the region.
- 2) The University of Pretoria has a Joint Masters program in Environment and Natural Resource Economics and Policy, a collaborative effort among the universities in the region. The course was introduced at the University of Pretoria with the objective of improving the quantity and quality of agricultural economics services in environment and resource policy analysis. In response to a high demand at both the national and regional levels, it has since expanded to become a field of study among five other programs.
- 3) With technology advancements, distance learning is rapidly gaining ground in terms of technique, numbers of institutions, and students involved. The region could explore how best to benefit from the proposed program by the National Association of Agricultural Economics Administrators (NAAEA) to offer distance education in agricultural and resource economics at Masters and Ph.D. levels tailored to the needs of developing countries. The courses would be computer based with options of being Internet and/or CD-ROM based depending on accessibility and the cost implications.
- 4) Dr. Opio argued that, given the limited supply of human resource to do applied research, graduate students would be a cost-effective manner of having research work done and at the same time provide an opportunity to mainstream academic research into applied research. To the students, it would provide an opportunity to access research funds; to the country, the research done would contribute directly to its priority research agenda and be relevant to the policymaking process; and to the funding agencies, training would be made more cost effective as the tuition costs and research component would be separately covered.

On the second day of the workshop, the participants broke out into three working groups mandated to look at training at the M.Sc. level, Ph.D. level, and research to support training at both levels, respectively. The groups were to, among others, reflect on the existing models/situation, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and suggest ways of improvement and the prioritization of training at the graduate level.

Broadly, the group discussions on different aspects of training at the Masters and Ph.D. levels concurred with the report findings, identifying the incentive structure, lack of facilities, and limits to the ability of faculty owing to the level and nature of training, as some of the issues that need to be addressed to strengthen training in agricultural economics. The working groups also recommended that a further evaluation of the existing models be done to guide the choice of model. For research in particular, it was recommended that a body to coordinate, ensure quality control, and avoid resource duplication, among others, be

established and that networking among institutions involved in research activities be encouraged.

The Way Forward

Participants at the workshop agreed that, while many recommendations in the report could be implemented in the different and individual capacities, there is a need for a common and institutionalized strategy for addressing the strengthening of capacity in agricultural economics in the region. A way forward was proposed and agreed upon by the participants:

- Immediately following the workshop, the report will be finalized and circulated as will the proceedings of the workshop;
- The institutions that facilitated the activities to date, especially the networks, will be encouraged to stay on board to see the initiative through;
- The heads of departments of agricultural economics in the region will be invited to participate in a workshop to deliberate further and develop a proposal to strengthen the capacity of agricultural economics in the region. This proposal, when finalized, will be presented to the donor community; and
- The committee will be charged with, among other things, prioritizing activities across the three areas (Masters, Ph.D., and research) and sequencing them in accordance with available resources.

**Stakeholder Workshop on the Status of Agricultural Economics
in East and Southern/Central Africa
Nairobi, Kenya
October 9–10, 2001**

PROCEEDINGS

Session I

Chair: Mr. Harris Mule

Welcome Remarks: Mr. Harris Mule, Chairman of the Regional Advisory Committee of the 2020 Vision Network for East Africa

Mr. Mule welcomed the participants to the workshop, informing them that the workshop had been called to discuss a subject of great importance in the region, i.e. capacity building in agricultural economics through training at the Masters and Ph.D. levels. He noted that during the last 10 years there has been a perceptible erosion of interest in funding at these levels compared to 20 years ago when training in agricultural economics, both within the region and abroad, was vibrant and supported by a number of donor countries and/or organizations. He argued that there is need for the region to rekindle that interest.

Mr. Mule noted that, at its September 2000 meeting in Entebbe, the Regional Advisory Committee (RAC) was greatly concerned about the depletion of capacity in agricultural economics in the region. The RAC then requested the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) to relay their concerns to the Rockefeller Foundation, which actively supports the strengthening of capacity in the agricultural sector in the region. The 2020 Vision Network, in collaboration with the Rockefeller Foundation, the East and Central Africa Program for Agricultural Policy Analysis (ECAPAPA), and the Africa Economic Research Consortium (AERC), retained two eminent consultants, Prof. David Norman from Kansas State University, United States of America, and Dr. Marios Obwona from the Economic Policy Research Center, Makerere, Uganda, to review the status of agricultural economics in the network countries, i.e. Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, and Uganda as well as Rwanda and Zimbabwe.

The main objective of the stakeholder workshop is to discuss the consultants' report and pave the way forward.

Introductory Remarks: Dr. Fred Opio, IFPRI

Dr. Fred Opio pointed out that the undertaking is in recognition of the demand for agricultural policy research in the region where agriculture is often referred to as the backbone of many of the economies. In order to embark on capacity strengthening, it was necessary to establish the gaps in demand and supply, but more especially the supply of agricultural economists.

Following three weeks of traversing the region, the consultants produced a draft report, which was discussed by the steering committee, which is composed of representatives from the 2020 Vision Network for East Africa, ECAPAPA, AERC, and the Rockefeller Foundation. The steering committee in turn recommended that a workshop be held, bringing together the different stakeholders visited by the consultants and others who are key to the subject matter but who the team was not able to visit, to discuss the draft report.

Opening Remarks: Dr. John Lynam, Rockefeller Foundation

Dr. John Lynam emphasized that the time is right for the initiative to strengthen agricultural economics in the region for two reasons:

1. There has been a real turn around in university education with universities selectively on the move in the region especially following the difficult times of structural adjustment programs. Many private universities have taken off and publicly-funded ones are increasingly taking on privately-sponsored students. Curricula are being made more relevant to the changing times and a number of organizations have come up to support university education. Notable are two programs: The university partnership supported by the four foundations (Rockefeller, Ford, Carnegie, and MacArthur) and the Forum for Agricultural Resource Husbandry which has been supporting students at the Masters level in Eastern and Southern Africa for the last eight to nine years. He, however, noted that of concern is that agricultural economics had the fewest submissions for research support.
2. The eastern and southern Africa region has gone through 15 years of structural adjustment programs with an emphasis on macroeconomic and market reforms. However, while reform is well entrenched in the region, there has been a limited response in overall economic growth and more particularly in agricultural growth, compared to expectations. He argued that there is therefore an increased need to focus on microeconomic issues to identify what is constraining sectoral response to the positive economic environment. This, he said, has implications for the demand for well-trained agricultural economists.

Dr. Lynam further noted that the 1980s and 1990s saw the opening up of agriculture by the removal of tariff and nontariff barriers, liberalization of markets, etc. It is now pertinent to ask what the appropriate policy areas to get agriculture moving are and he cited some areas that need to be looked at:

- Market failures, which are increasingly recognized as a problem in the sector. There is need, he said, to address connectivity within the private sector and legal issues to enhance the performance of agriculture markets;
- Productivity in the staple food market where market failures are pronounced;
- The implications for the natural resource base and its management; and
- The role of public institutions and service delivery.

He argued that a new generation of agricultural economists is needed to address the current challenges and changes in the economic environment and in this respect, it is very timely that “How to Move Forward,” is addressed.

Overview of the Report on the Status of Agricultural Economics in the Region: Prof. David Norman, Kansas State University

Prof. Norman noted that the study had four objectives:

- Assess the ability of academic institutions to produce well-trained M.Sc. and Ph.D. agricultural economists and to conduct research;

- Review existing training programs for their suitability, strengths, and weaknesses, and indicate the areas needing attention;
- Evaluate the market for agricultural economists, focusing on supply gaps, and provide some indicators of demand for them; and
- Suggest and evaluate ways to improve agricultural economics training capacity in the region.

He reported that in the nine countries, several institutions were visited and in some cases, although not visited, information about the institution was collected.

	Visited	Additional Information Collected on
Universities	15	1
Agricultural economics departments	12	1
Economics departments	10	1
Policy research institutes	5	6
National agricultural research stations	4	1
Networks	2	2
Other institutions	8	

1. Staffing

a) Establishment

The team established that, on average, agricultural economics departments are smaller than economics departments. In agricultural economics departments, on average, the establishment is 17 positions out of which 13 were filled. In the economics departments, 21 out of an average establishment of 30 were filled. The range of filled positions in the agricultural economics departments, 4–28, is indicative of the fragility in some of them.

Issues

- The vacancies are fairly high and they are relatively higher at the higher ranks. It is therefore questionable that the departments can service higher degrees especially Ph.D. level.
- Promotions at the lower levels may be blocked by those at the higher level where ranks may be held while faculty are on leave without pay.

b) Gender Distribution

The gender distribution shows that, although women are poorly represented in either of the departments, the agricultural economics departments have a smaller male:female ratio on average, 7.4:1 compared to 9.7:1 in economics departments.

c) Terminal Degrees

Agricultural economics departments on average have 49 percent of their actual staff having Ph.D. degrees compared to 58 percent in economics departments. More of the terminal degrees have been attained from within one's university, raising the concern of "in-breeding".

Issues

- The ability to provide postgraduate training is constrained by:

- i) The nature of the terminal degree, e.g. there are cases where a student on a Masters-degree program is supervised by a Masters-degree holder.
 - ii) The merits of Ph.D.s done in Africa is that they have a wider focus and relate more to the practical issues facing the region while that done in North America has more analytical rigor but with a narrow focus. There is need for both approaches.
 - Refresher courses for the older Ph.D., who may be out of touch with recent literature and computer software for research work, are needed.
- d) Staff Augmentation

Most universities have staff development programs and those on study leave (often to obtain a Ph.D.) are more concentrated in the lower ranks.

Issue

- There are relatively low rates of return and strategies are needed to encourage those on training to return to the university upon completion of their programs.

e) Leave Without Pay

This practice, an exit strategy taken by the risk averse often in reaction to the low incentive/reward system, is more pronounced at the higher ranks and in specific universities. Strategies need to be put in place to discourage the practice and different universities are dealing with it in various ways, e.g. no leave without pay is permitted in Ethiopia, the permitted length of leave without pay has been reduced in Sokoine, consultancies are allowed in some cases, while in others there is a bid to improve the incentive structure or encourage part-time teaching while on leave without pay.

Implications of the Status of Staffing

- i) There is need to adopt a strategy that enables stronger departments of agricultural economics to help in improving the capacity of weaker departments.
- ii) There is need to improve faculty capacity through enabling them to complete their Ph.D.s and helping those who completed theirs sometime ago to update themselves.
- iii) An incentive structure that encourages faculty to return from study leave and ensures retention, rather than going on leave of absence, is necessary.

2. Work Responsibilities

a) Teaching

Although on average faculty would be teaching for 6–9 hours a week, some were found to be teaching for 15–20 hours a week owing in part to staff shortages for the very same reasons mentioned above, large amounts of service teaching in other faculties, increased popularity of part-time students and proliferation of degrees at the undergraduate level in agricultural economics-type departments.

There has also been a marked increase in the class sizes. In undergraduate classes, 200 students are common in the introductory courses (the largest class was found to have more than 500 students) and yet the blackboard, despite its inadequacy, remains the more common teaching tool in use. In the later years however, the numbers reduce. In contrast, at the postgraduate level, classes are often very small.

Issue

- At the undergraduate level, there is concern over the quality of teaching and the ability to provide adequate evaluation/assessment. At the postgraduate level, the limited numbers of faculty who are qualified to teach and supervise is a constraint.

b) Research

The study found that little research is being done by many faculty, reasons being the heavy teaching loads, the low salary package which means many have to supplement their incomes from other activities, lack of postgraduate students to create multiplier effects for research efforts and limited ability to transform them into publishable material and lack of funding for research.

Research funding itself is decreasing over time although more qualified and experienced faculty with proven track records have greater opportunities to access such funds where they exist, more so if the research is in more applied/practical areas. More opportunities also exist where faculty are linked with other researchers in the same or other organizations, or are linked with a network.

Some of the inducements for greater research productivity include:

- Research funding of proposals which contain student sponsorship request and has the potential of creating faculty multiplier effect.
- Honorarium for supervising students and funding from the public sector partly based on publications.

c) Consultancies

In the recent years, consultancies are an increasing fact of life/necessity as a means to improving material well-being. They can have positive benefits since they are demand-driven and therefore tend to be relevant to the needs of society, they help dispel the “ivory tower” image of academia and improves their credibility in the “outside world,” and can have several spin-off benefits to the faculty/department/individuals, e.g. providing current case studies which can be used in teaching, opening the door to other opportunities, may help in improving the equipment inventory of the department, individual, etc. Universities may also directly benefit from the consultancies. To varying degrees, the proceeds are shared between the individual (50–75 percent), department (2–40 percent), and university (5–10 percent).

However, for consultancies to work effectively, it is necessary for universities to:

- change their perception/philosophy to incorporate money-based orientation, accepting consultancy work as normal and not just an appendage;
- resolve conflicts that arise in terms of time and timing with other university responsibilities; and
- accept consultancy work/reports as an input into the promotion process.

Consultancies are not necessarily incompatible with teaching or research work. On average, 30–40 percent of time is spent teaching, 10–15 percent on research, and 30–40 percent on consultancies. By implication, there is need to balance between teaching, research work, and

consultancy through greater and more efficient use of postgraduate students, and improving incentives and conditions of service.

3. Degrees and Courses

At undergraduate level, agricultural economics draws fewer students than the economics departments and in some universities is taught in economics departments by economics department staff. Some countries (Ethiopia, Mozambique, and Rwanda) do not offer agricultural economics as a degree or an option. However, where it is offered as an option, it was found to be the most popular option.

At the Masters level, there are fewer students, much less in agricultural economics than in the economics departments and over the last decade, indications from an earlier study are that the numbers have been on the decline. This, however, is not for lack of demand but rather decreasing opportunities for sponsorship.

The study finds that the agricultural economics departments in the universities given an AERC category B status with regard to their economics departments are potentially the strongest, having graduated substantial numbers. Otherwise, for many universities offering M.Sc. degrees, their classes are very small. Possible strategies to circumvent the problem of small classes includes restricting entry to M.Sc. degrees to once every two years, combining two different groups, e.g. part-time and full-time students into one class, using more of a tutorial than formal lecturing format and exploiting the comparative advantage of the agricultural economics and economics departments in the teaching of some of the courses.

Theses remain an important part of the M.Sc. in agricultural economics, although a recurring problem is that many students take longer than two years to complete their degrees.

Agricultural economics departments are becoming more demand-driven and increasingly placing an explicit emphasis on agri-business. There is an unsaturated demand for agricultural economists in both the public and private sector, although the wide variation from the micro level to the meso and macro level complicates training. There is also need to mainstream training to include participatory/system/sustainable livelihoods approaches.

Access to literature is still a problem and the essential electronic agricultural library (TEEAL) is not always available. Internet connectivity, also required for quality training and research, is often limited, although the Rockefeller Foundation, IFPRI's 2020 Vision Network, and ECAPAPA have provided some assistance in these areas.

Towards a Model for Collaborative M.Sc./Ph.D. Training in Agricultural Economics and Other Related Disciplines: Dr. Marios Obwona, Economic Policy Research Institute

Dr. Obwona noted that improving agricultural economics in the region will include producing well-trained graduates who satisfy the demand for agricultural economists, as well as producing products and services that fulfil the objectives of the employer and contribute to agricultural development. In order to do this, there is need for strong agricultural economics departments and an associated incentive structure for faculty. There is need for facilities like equipment, literature access and Internet connectivity, and the courses and degrees should be relevant and of good quality in order to produce good quality graduates.

Four possible models may be applied in order to improve training in agricultural economics:

- i) The individual department (going-it-alone) model;
- ii) The Twinning model;
- iii) The Center of Excellence model; and
- iv) The African Economic Research Consortium model.

The consultants recommend the AERC model as the most appropriate, albeit with a number of considerations to be made:

- a. Whether to incorporate agricultural economics component into the present AERC itself or another system modelled on AERC be established. The consultants recommended the former.
- b. If AERC did accept the recommendation, there would be merit in having separate management for the agricultural economics component and to raise funds specifically for enhancing agricultural economics capacity.

The basic essentials of the AERC model are:

- i) It has an academic board with representatives drawn from different participating institutions;
- ii) The principle of Category A and B Universities is applied;
- iii) Resource persons from within and outside the region are contracted to lecture at joint facilities for electives sessions;
- iv) Contributions are made towards equipment needs of the different participating universities;
- v) It provides sponsorship support for M.Sc.-level students; and
- vi) It provides support for faculty to engage in research work.

Four other issues that were proposed for the AERC to address:

- i) Upgrade academic staff without Ph.D.s;
- ii) Explore the potential of rotating the Joint Facility for Electives (JFE) among the participating universities. This may reduce the costs of paying for the current JFE commercial site; would enhance local support infrastructure and would bring the JFE closer to participating institutions;
- iii) Consider confining the approval of research grants in agricultural economics fields to those with an applied orientation; and
- iv) Encourage cooperation and collaboration between the economics and agricultural economics departments.

As for research in agricultural economics, a thematic group on sectoral policies in which agricultural economics will fall, could be added to the present AERC research groups. Separate funding may be mobilised to specifically support this group. IFPRI and ECAPAPA would play a vital role as technical committee members for the group.

Other issues call for collaboration between different funding and implementation agencies in the region.

- i) The TEEAL, a collaborative effort between the Rockefeller Foundation and Cornell University, seeks to improve access to agricultural economics literature. Not all agricultural economics departments have access to it nor are they aware of its existence. This needs to be rectified.
- ii) Complementarities with the distance learning initiative proposed by the AAEA need to be explored.

- iii) Ways should be sought to increase the research opportunities extended by the IFPRI and ECAPAPA research networks to faculty in agricultural economics departments.
- iv) Because of the proposal that research done under the auspices of the Networks, AERC or the Rockefeller Foundation should have an applied focus, which may however not be attractive to international journals for publication, there is need for a regional journal as an outlet for such work. This would necessitate that a thesis remains part of the partial requirements at the M.Sc. level and that faculty are encouraged to work with students to produce publishable material and that students work on topics of interest to the faculty.

The Incentive Issue

This is mainly the responsibility of the respective universities, which have to create a favorable working environment and provide personal incentives to faculty.

Discussions

- Comments and questions were raised about the sustainability of the AERC model given that it is heavily reliant on donor funding.
 - ⇒ In the recent past, a concern has been the general shift of focus to basic education at the expense of tertiary education. Focusing on graduate education, it is important that the role public universities play and will continue to play is appreciated. The recommended AERC model is largely dependent on donor funding and therefore its sustainability is questionable. The weaknesses of the public system should be addressed and where possible it should borrow from the advantages/merits in other models.
 - ⇒ How would the public institutions claim ownership if the AERC model is adopted, and would sustainability be guaranteed?
 - ⇒ A number of departments of agricultural economics were started with donor funding and once the funding stopped, they have not been sustainable.

The consultants reiterated that the recommended “AERC model” is not intended to substitute the role of public universities. It places ownership in the stakeholders in the region. The Academic Board, for example, consists of heads of the participating departments in the region while the program utilizes the skills present in the region. There is need to recognize varying comparative advantage and sustainability is an important factor for whatever model is decided upon.

- Institutional Issues
 - ⇒ The AERC draws capacity from individual departments within universities that are participating in the program. The survival of these departments, it was thought, would be questionable since they rely on the courses they are able to offer.
 - ⇒ Lately, there has been a haphazard and nonrationalized expansion in university education, e.g. in Kenya there are now four to five universities each of which offers agricultural economics but with little cooperation among them. They thus further constrain the available resources. In comparison, the Inter-University Council for East Africa in the 1960s and 1970s rationalized the utilization of resources within the region, e.g. doctors were trained in Makerere, engineers in Nairobi, and lawyers in Dar es Salaam.

The consultants clarified that a few and specialized electives would be offered at the JFE while the respective universities would offer the core courses and also award the degrees. Individual participating departments would also benefit directly from the program.

- Administrative Issues

⇒ The report, especially Chapter 5, should provide more discussions on administrative support, which is a major weakness and negatively impacts on the performance of the departments. The consultants concurred that administrative support is undoubtedly important and that there is an apparent strong association between strong leadership and the better-performing departments.

⇒ There are cases where promotions are on the basis of availability of staff rather than on qualification, i.e. not necessarily based on credentials. This negatively affects performance. The consultants again concurred that non-meritorious promotions undermine the quality of education offered.

- Training Issues

⇒ Whether a basic degree in agriculture is still necessary as a requirement for graduate education in agricultural economics and whether theses should remain an important partial requirement at the Masters level, the consultants noted that in many developed countries agricultural economics no longer draws from holders of the basic agricultural degree only and that other disciplines have been appreciated as well. A thesis at the Master's level facilitates an applied focus and ability to relate to agriculture in a practical manner.

- It was noted that the recommendations do not address the quality of the product. This requires that the consumers of the product, i.e. the employers, be consulted. In this respect, the diversity of needs poses a challenge to training.

- It was noted that agriculture is a unique sector in which profitability, especially in developing countries, is questionable. The current disparities that exist between the developed and developing countries in accessing markets need to be addressed and capacity must be developed to anticipate market performance.

The consultants reported that it was difficult to quantify the demand for agricultural economists as figures are hard to come by and the report largely relies on anecdotal information. The need for agricultural economists is there, across the micro-meso-macro levels. Nevertheless, manpower studies to establish the supply and demand of agricultural economists and how the public and private sector is using available human resource, is necessary.

Other Comments

- The opportunity is present for donors to take advantage of economies of scale, since many countries would benefit simultaneously from the same project.

- It was recommended that:

- i) the report should present the identified constraints and point out how the recommended AERC model addresses each constraint;

- ii) both negative and positive aspects of consultancies be highlighted, citing that many reports done by faculty have often reflected their being out of touch with reality; and
- iii) an outlet for publications be sought, possibly on a regional basis to take advantage of economies of scale.

Session II

Chair: Prof. Chacha Nyaigotti Chacha

Future Potential for a Collaborative Ph.D. Program: Ms. Jennifer Mpungu, Africa Economic Research Consortium

The Current Situation

To avert the risk that economics in Africa will continue to be led from outside the continent, the AERC introduced Ph.D. thesis research support in 1988/89 with the objective of speeding up the completion of studies to augment the pool of potential researchers. Ph.D. fellowships for study abroad were introduced in 1993 to strengthen teaching capacity of universities participating in the collaborative Masters program.

Since then, the program has supported 147 Africans through Ph.D. thesis research and 38 through Ph.D. fellowships. Nonetheless, supply remains far below demand. It is estimated that 160 Ph.D.s are required per annum and yet currently about 15 per annum are produced from both African and foreign universities. Secondly, it was thought that Ph.D. training overseas is often only partly relevant to African issues and the graduates find reintegration difficult. On the other hand, within Africa, thesis direction and lack of course work means doctoral students are inadequately trained. Even the few Ph.D.s may therefore be ill-prepared to respond to the needs of the region, perpetuating the excessive influence of non-Africans in analysing and formulating policies on the continent.

In the last 10 to 15 years, donor funding for Ph.D. fellowships involved a cooperative program between a university in the north and an African university. They have also supported individual training through the AERC thematic research program and its collaborative Masters program (CMAP).

The Changing Environment

Today, donors and senior African policymakers have a much better understanding of the importance of locally-based institutions in the process of development and the need for highly skilled graduates. Donors, e.g. the four American Foundations (Rockefeller, MacArthur, Carnegie, and Ford) are committed to support tertiary education. The need for locally-rooted analyses of problems and ownership of the solutions is also better appreciated. Opportunities for postdoctoral assignments in the region are on the increase but many are faced with the difficulty of filling these positions, a reflection of both the need and present opportunities.

Several European cooperative Ph.D. programs are coming to an end with donors moving to fully African programs and, in this respect, the AERC's CMAP demonstrates that an interuniversity graduate program can work well.

The AERC Response

- The AERC proposes a four-year Ph.D. program combining coursework and thesis grounded in African empirical realities and revolving around the research agenda in the region. It will build on the Masters program, have a life of 15 years and is estimated at US\$33.96 million.
- To start with, three universities chosen competitively and distributed equitably on a regional basis would act as the center for the region from which students and the bulk of the teaching faculty will be drawn. However, all participating universities will benefit from *inter-alia*, one-off capacity building grants, institutional development grants, staff development, curriculum development, and participate in teaching.
- The program would include 40 weeks of core courses, 40 weeks of elective courses, 40 weeks of field work and write up of a paper of preliminary results, and 40 weeks of analysis and write up.

Expected Output

- A pool of professionals to shape and determine Africa's development agenda, changing the status quo where the agenda is mainly developed from outside the region.
- A trickle down effect on the CMAP program and undergraduate training in participating universities following a boost in the level of human and financial resources to support local programs.
- An expanded and revitalized pool of researchers in the region.

Management

It is proposed that the management of the program would rest with three bodies: a Ph.D. academic board, a training advisory committee, and the AERC secretariat.

Discussion

Asked how many of those so far trained are agricultural economists and how relevant the past students have been to the African situations, Ms. Mpungu emphasized that the AERC currently offers agricultural economics as an elective and not a stand-alone program. Alumni records would be a good indicator of where the products of the existing programs are being utilized but nonetheless, the ministries of planning, finance, research, and policy institutions and academia are some of the areas in which the graduates have been employed.

Regarding how coursework would be handled and the curriculum drawn, and what would happen to existing Ph.D. programs, it is proposed that course work is done in the first year prior to the process of thesis writing, and would include micro to macro level issues. It is also proposed that the advisory board, whose membership is drawn from the different participating universities, and a research committee to address the research areas, are responsible for the development of the curriculum. The program would explore ways of collaboration with existing Ph.D. programs.

**Possible Role for a Joint Masters in Natural Resource Management and Economics:
Dr. T. M. Makhura, University of Pretoria**

Dr. Makhura informed the workshop that the Environmental Economics course was introduced at the University of Pretoria in 1996/97 to improve the quantity and quality of agricultural economics services in environment and resource policy management. In response to a high demand both at the national and regional level, it has since 1999 become a field of study among five other programs.

It is a collaborative effort between universities in the region with the University of Pretoria and seeks to fill an apparent gap in agricultural economics. Students register in their home universities, do course work in Pretoria, and return to their home for research work and thesis writing. The program tries to maintain equitable representation from participating countries.

The degree consists of three components, which should be completed in two years: three core economic courses in micro/macro and quantitative methods, six environment resource economics courses, and lastly the thesis component overseen by a research committee. An academic committee makes decisions and recommendations on admission criteria, assesses standards, and monitors performance. It also facilitates the appointment of lecturers.

Discussion

With regard to the role of the collaborating institutions, the workshop was informed that the core courses are offered at the respective collaborating universities and that facilitators are drawn from within the same participating institutions in the region. The courses on environmental and resource economics are offered at the University of Pretoria over two semesters with a choice of eight to nine electives.

As to the number of students on the program, this depends on the capacity that is available. Of paramount interest is that the design and institutional format should guarantee the quality of the program.

Distance Learning Approach: Prof. Richard Shumway, American Agricultural Economics Association

Objective

- i) To outline a proposal for a program to offer distance education in agricultural and resource economics at Masters and Doctoral levels tailored to the needs of the users in developing and transitional economies and done in collaboration with local universities.
- ii) Elicit a response from those who are potentially interested as to whether the proposed program could meet their needs and, if so, the form it should take.

Prof. Shumway informed the workshop that the proposal is a product of a group of agricultural economists under the auspices of the National Association of Agricultural Economics Administrators (NAAEA) with funding from the Farm Foundation and the AAEEA Foundation.

With technology advancements, distance learning is rapidly gaining ground in terms of technique and numbers of institutions and students involved. The overall strategy is to make the education process as inexpensive and accessible as possible.

Program Content and Characterization

- i) Receiving universities would choose from a wide selection of courses on offer to ensure that the needs of their own programs are met. The intention is to have complete programs for the Master's and Doctoral level.
- ii) Courses would be developed by faculty members in a group of interested universities to spread the development costs, avoid duplication of programs and provide a pool of instructors to deliver the courses.
- iii) The standards for the content would be those required by the departments of the institutions providing the courses.
- iv) Courses would be computer based with options of being Internet and/or CD-ROM based depending on accessibility and the cost implications.
- v) The courses would include a significant element of interaction among students and between students and faculty.

Participating universities may adopt some courses in the program to broaden their own degrees, or students taking the NAAEA courses may receive certificates for those courses in addition to their local university degree. If the program develops to the point where it is offering a full range of graduate-level courses, the nature of the degree offered would be open to discussion, i.e. could be from receiving university or from institution in North America or be a joint degree. The standards that apply to the courses offered would be subject to discussion with those who are interested in the program.

There would be costs attached to participation in the program by the different participating institutions, ranging from costs of computers, accessing a line, to that for preparing the courses, etc. Nonetheless, costs would as much as possible be according to "ability to pay". Creative ways to keep costs down are needed and would include choice of medium, approaching donors, and negotiations between institutions involved.

He informed the workshop that the association is seeking guidance on the volume and nature of demand, the desirable form in which instructions should be delivered, the priority areas, level, and the nature of collaboration between the universities.

Discussion

Distance learning is not totally new in the region. It has been a mode of instruction used by Wye College in collaboration with the University of Zimbabwe, the University of South Africa, and the Open University of Tanzania. From these experiences, contact has been an important factor but the presentation did not make reference to how this would be handled. In response, Prof. Shumway reported that contact could still be made possible via the Internet or else students could be got together for actual physical contact with a local instructor.

A concern raised was that, in faculty in the American universities developing the curriculum, faculty in the universities in the developing world would be put out of work. The importance and need of developing the curricula in a collaborative manner was emphasized. This collaboration could range from joint development of the program to developing particular modules only. It was also brought to the attention of participants that the curricula in many places in the world is very dynamic and is developed in collaboration with those who consume the services of agricultural economists as well.

Other Comments:

- The medium of instruction may have to vary depending on the nature of the course. Econometrics was cited as one course, which may not be suitable for a CD-ROM because it is highly interactive. The CD-ROM could also be used as a supplement to the courses on offer but not as a substitute.
- Although the issue of the brain drain from the developing to the developed world is appreciated, it was noted that experiences derived from studying in universities in developed countries also contribute towards the individuals' development and should not be discouraged entirely.
- Distance learning would provide opportunity for the older faculty who currently do not benefit from donor funding and yet are in need of upgrading or refreshing their knowledge.

Linking Thesis Research to Applied Research: Dr. Fred Opio, IFPRI

Research is an important component of Ph.D. training, whatever model is applied. Given the limited supply of human resource to do applied research, such students would be a cost-effective manner of having research work done while at the same time providing an opportunity to mainstream academic research into applied research.

- It would ensure that students have access to funding for research work.
- Research done would contribute directly to a country's priority research agenda and relevant to the policymaking process.
- Training would be made more cost effective to the sponsors as the research component would be separately covered by research grants while the tuition for coursework is covered from other sources.
- Research work would be more rigorous as both academic standards and general research processes are employed.
- Ultimately, the student's research would be integrated into on-going applied research activities in the region.

The research project would be directed at meeting the needs of the academic institution and that of the institution funding the research work. Ultimately however, the student should benefit from additional interaction with other researchers and exposure to the policy environment in which they are working. The agency funding the research work should in turn benefit from having research work done more cost-effectively, and bringing academic researchers to focus on policy-related research.

A system of a basket of funds to which different donors and interest groups can contribute could be adopted to bring other donors into the initiative although it would have to be managed by a selected institution.

Discussion

Clarification on the difference between applied and academic research was sought, to which there was a consensus that both are important and not necessarily exclusive. The relevance to the existing policy environment is important and implications could be short term, transitory, or long term. The dissemination of findings is equally important.

Applied research would also allow for further collaboration between the academia and other institutions in many areas including research areas. Such collaboration would contribute to improving the quality of supervision, which has so far done little to contribute towards enhancing the morale, ability, and skills of younger capacity.

Session III

Chair: Prof. Ruth Oniang'o

Three working groups were convened, each with a specific mandate.

Group A: What Modality Should be Adopted for M.Sc. Training in Agricultural Economics and Related Disciplines?

Facilitator: Dr. Isaac Minde

Rapporteur: Prof. Imungi

The terms of reference for this working group were as follows:

- i) Reflect on the existing training models;
- ii) Reflect on the existing Masters training programs and determine the extent of their suitability, weaknesses, problems, and the needs that require addressing;
- iii) Suggest ways to improve agricultural economics-related disciplines in the region;
- iv) As a way forward, suggest the appropriate entry point for training at Masters' level;
- v) Determine priority to sequence the progression from Masters to Ph.D; and
- vi) Make recommendations on the next steps.

TOR 1

Three models can be identified.

- i) Country-specific training where students in a country are taught by staff at the faculty of the respective university.
- ii) "Regional Centers of Excellence" which are often donor funded. The lecturers are drawn from the hosting institution but the students are from a wider area, i.e. a region.
- iii) Part-time programs with stipulated periods of residential training, otherwise most learning is off-campus. These part-time programs are usually longer than the residential ones.

Strengths and Weaknesses:

- i) In the case of country-specific training, there is a high possibility of in-breeding which would be reduced by more international collaboration.
- ii) Centers of excellence allow for the easy exchange of ideas on a regional basis but they are often not sustainable following the donor's withdrawal.
- iii) Of concern is whether or not it is possible to maintain the quality of part-time programs.

In general, there are too few students for most Masters programs because of limited staffing.

TOR 2

- i) Because government funding has generally been dwindling, the sustainability of programs that rely on the public sector for financial resources is questionable.
- ii) Exodus of staff to “greener pastures” and lack of commitment because of poor incentive structures.

TOR 3

- i) There is need for concrete methods of quality assurance that are common to the region. Some standardisation needs to be done. Collaboration between programs within the region could still be increased from the point where they are at now, i.e. mainly in the process of external examination.
- ii) There are some programs offered within the region that are not known and thus students are forced to seek education in Europe/United States of America/Canada, etc. Such programs need to be advertised more widely.
- iii) The incentive structure, which includes staff development, needs to be addressed.

TOR 4

- i) Most programs are currently too closed (entrance requirements is a bachelors degree in agriculture). There is need to widen disciplinary collaboration by identifying and including other disciplines that qualify for entry into a Masters in agricultural economics.
- ii) Equivalent levels need to be established to cater for higher diplomates whose experience would qualify them for direct entry into a Masters program without a first degree.

TOR 5

- i) Because Ph.D. is biased towards research work, at Master’s level potential researchers should be identified and encouraged to proceed to a Ph.D. program.
- ii) Research projects done at the Master’s level should be one of the criteria of assessing the potential to undertake a Ph.D. program. This requires that some kind of crediting the projects be designed and effected.
- iii) Where lack of staff time result in insufficiently prepared students for a Ph.D. program, the introduction of course work at the Ph.D. level should serve to fill in such gaps left at the Master’s level.

TOR 6

- i) It is important to take stock of their different strengths and weaknesses and an appropriate model is designed and ways of implementation suggested. Sustainability should be given paramount consideration. A modified AERC model is recommended although arguably, the models are not necessarily exclusive.
- ii) The need for an instrument to carry this process forward is appreciated and a working group that is wider than the current steering committee and draws from a wider cross-section of stakeholders is proposed. A concrete proposal is then necessary to guide implementation.

Group B: What Modality Should be Adopted for Ph.D. Training in Agricultural Economics and Related Disciplines?

Facilitator: Prof. Okot

Rapporteur: Prof. Mbogoh

The terms of reference for this working group were as follows:

- i) Reflect on existing Ph.D. training models;
- ii) Reflect on the institutional set-up in the region (your country) and their ability to provide enhanced capacity for Ph.D. training programs;
- iii) Reflect on the existing Ph.D. training programs and determine the extent of their suitability weaknesses, problems, and the needs that require addressing;
- iv) As a way forward, suggest appropriate entry point for training at Ph.D. levels;
- v) To determine priorities for sequencing the progression from Ph.D. training to research; and
- vi) Make recommendations on the next steps.

TOR 1

Ph.D. programs are currently done by research and thesis although with local variations.

- i) Local registration with a sandwich between a university in the north where the coursework is done and the home university. The student would have a cosupervisor in either country.
- ii) Overseas registration with research work done in the home country.
- iii) All components (research and thesis) done in local university with no coursework.

TOR 2

- i) Training at Ph.D. level is constrained by lack of staff with Ph.D.s.
- ii) Good course work is often lacking and is strongly recommended.
- iii) Few students register for Ph.D. and this creates problems of cost-effective training that would otherwise be derived from economies of scale in especially coursework.
- iv) Lack of facilities and resources to facilitate the training, e.g. poor libraries with lack of up-to-date literature, computers, etc.
- v) A poor incentive structure and facilities for supervision are often lacking. Poorly motivated supervisors result in lengthy and discouraging programs.

TOR 3

On the demand side, the need for good Ph.D. training is there and the main consumers of Ph.D. graduates are:

- i) Universities, national agricultural research systems (NARS), international agricultural research centers (IARCa), and nongovernmental organizations;
- ii) Governments do not yet appreciate that Ph.D. graduates have a role to play in the public sector and the graduates who return to their departments often suffer frustration (poor incentives and less qualified supervisors who see them as a threat to their position);
- iii) On suitability, Ph.D. by coursework and thesis (research) is thought to be the best although existing programs are nonetheless thought suitable.

Ways to Improve

- i) Staffing problems need to be addressed through capacity building as a long-term measure.

- ii) Stop-gap measures include distance learning to fill the gap while building the necessary capacity. It should be offered in collaboration with local supervisors to maintain strong and vital student-supervisor relationship.
- iii) An interim measure is to have regional level institutions to take advantage of economies of scale and comparative advantage in resource distribution. The teaching staff can be sourced from other institutions and engaged for specific time periods
- iv) There is need to get good staff to collaborate with local staff to ensure quality.
- v) Training should be linked to the needs of the end-users, thus making it relevant.
- vi) Attractive staff remuneration packages are necessary and should include adequate facilities, books, and literature. Research grants to students should include supervision allowances to cater for some of these logistics.

TOR 4

Entry point to a Ph.D. program is relevant training at the M.Sc. and M.A level.

TOR 5

Research is part of Ph.D. training but sponsorship for postdoctoral research is useful and secondly graduates should be encouraged to publish their research findings.

TOR 6

- i) The steering committee should continue with the leadership/guidance of the process and co-opt members as found necessary.
- ii) The proceedings of the workshop need to be circulated.
- iii) A study to analyze the costs, benefits, and quality of the programs currently offered, is recommended.
- iv) Donors should be made to appreciate the need to provide funding for a strong Ph.D. program as part of capacity building given that the staffing constraint is faced by many universities in the region.

Group C: Research to Support Training in M.Sc. and Ph.D.

Facilitator: Dr. Belay Kassa

Rapporteur: Dr. Bernard Bashasha

The terms of reference for this working group were as follows:

- i) Reflect on the existing research activities/themes and determine the extent of their relevance/weakness, draw-back, and the needs that require addressing;
- ii) Suggest ways to mainstream academic research into applied research. As a way forward, suggest appropriate modality for integrating academic research into applied research;
- iii) Determine priority for selecting research proposals; and
- iv) Make recommendations on the next steps.

TOR 1

- i) Research activities are currently uncoordinated, fragmented, and oriented towards meeting the interests of the individual/scholar.
- ii) The records on the kind or type of research that has been/is being done are poor or lacking altogether.
- iii) Research has until recently had a discipline bias, i.e. very limited multidisciplinary research teams.

- iv) There is often a long time lag between research results and implementation or translation into tangible results.
- v) Key stakeholders, policymakers, and final consumers need to be involved. Research has often ignored the indigenous technical knowledge that the farmers have, i.e. farmers are researchers in their own right.

Issues

- i) There is a general tendency to account to the donors only without adequately accounting to the clientele.
- ii) It is necessary to determine a research agenda in a participatory manner with a cross-section of stakeholders.
- iii) Current institutions charged with ensuring quality control, e.g. National Research Councils, are weak or underutilized. These organs also lack capacity for dissemination.
- iv) There is a degree of dishonesty on the part of researchers many of whom are degenerating into consultants driven by short-term benefits.

TOR 2

- i) There is need for an apex body to coordinate and institutionalise research activities. It should ensure dissemination, quality control, avoid resource duplication, and identify research themes.
- ii) There is need to revive the East African Agricultural Economics Association.
- iii) Networking between existing institutions and sharing of research findings should be encouraged. To this effect, the Inter-University Council of East Africa and the National Council of Science and Technology are institutions whose role in coordinating research needs to be acknowledged and furthered.
- iv) The steering committee should take the process forward although at all levels this calls for commitment from the different stakeholders.

TOR 3

- i) Technical feasibility;
- ii) Potential economic return;
- iii) Potential social acceptability;
- iv) Environmental compatibility and impact;
- v) Relevance to development issues;
- vi) Multidisciplinary of the research and research team;
- vii) Timeliness; and
- viii) Departmental targeted funding.

The Way Forward: Mr. Harris Mule, The RAC Chairperson

In summary, Mr. Mule noted that the team of consultants have produced a good and useful report, and that the recommendations made, to some degree, can be individually implemented.

The workshop provided participants with an opportunity to dialogue among ourselves, and in so many ways also reminded us of self-accountability in all we do and that the spirit of self-reliance is vital in taking us forward. The challenge is therefore for participants to begin the process of reform by looking at themselves and their respective institutions.

He welcomed the useful ideas that the workshop received from the University of Pretoria, National Association of Agricultural Economics Administrators from the United States, and from the AERC.

However, he said that there is a consensus that, while many recommendations in the report could be implemented in the different and individual capacities, there is need for a common and institutionalized strategy of addressing the strengthening of capacity in agricultural economics in the region. In this respect, Mr. Harris Mule concluded by outlining the way forward as follows:

- i) The consultants' report is to be edited to include the workshop deliberations and the final report circulated.
- ii) The proceedings of the workshop will be circulated to participants.
- iii) There is need to solicit for support and encourage the institutions that have facilitated the activities of the steering committee to date, especially the networks, to stay on board.
- iv) A committee of chairpersons representing departments of agricultural economics will be established and will convene and map out a proposal to be presented to the donor community.
- v) The committee will be charged with among others prioritizing activities across the three areas: Masters, Ph.D., and research; and sequencing them in accordance with available resources.

Concluding Remarks: Dr. Delphin Rwegasira, Executive Director of AERC

Dr. Rwegasira reiterated that agricultural development is critical to poverty reduction in the region and therefore the renewed interest in addressing weaknesses in agricultural economics is pertinent.

He informed the participants that the AERC had an initial bias towards macroeconomic issues in accordance with the then priorities for adjustment programs. However, its thematic areas have evolved in response to existing needs and demands and now include poverty as a strategy towards long-term growth, and the African economy in the global market.

AERC, he said, has run a successful and a cost-effective CMAP program but, he argued, it is not a cheap program either and funding is a critical issue that needs to be seriously discussed up-front. The AERC will place the experiences gained in running its programs at the disposal of the steering committee to promote agricultural economics in the region.

He concluded by emphasizing that agricultural development is critical to the New African Economic Initiative. With the shift in favor of higher education as a means to develop the capacity that is needed in the region, agricultural economics should be able to take advantage of the tide.

APPENDICES

Stakeholder Workshop on the Status of Agricultural Economics in East and Southern/Central Africa Nairobi, Kenya, October 9–10, 2001

THE AGENDA

PLENARY SESSION I

Chairperson	Mr. Harris Mule, Executive Director TIMS Ltd.
9.00 am	Welcome Remarks by Mr. Harris Mule, Regional Advisor of the 2020 Vision Network
9.10 am	Introductory Remarks by Dr. Fred Opiyo, 2020 Vision Network for East Africa
9.20 am	Opening Remarks by Dr. John Lynam of the Rockefeller Foundation, Kenya
9.30 am	Overview of the Report on Status of Agricultural Economics in the Region by Prof. David Norman (Lead consultant) and Dr. Marios Obwona
10.15 am	Discussion
11.00 am	Tea Break
11.30 am	Towards a Model for Collaborative M.Sc./Ph.D. Training in Agricultural Economics and Other Related Disciplines by Prof. David Norman/Dr. Marios Obwona
12.30pm	Discussion
1.00 pm	Lunch Break

PLENARY SESSION II

Chairperson	Dr. Chacha Nyaigotti Chacha, Executive Secretary Inter-University Council for East Africa
2.00 pm	Future Potential for a Collaborative Ph.D. Program by Ms. Jennifer Mpungu, AERC
2.20 pm	Brief Discussion

2.40 pm	Possible Role for a Joint M.Sc. in Natural Resource Management Economics by Dr. T. M. Makhura, University of Pretoria
3.00 pm	Brief Discussion
3.30 pm	Tea Break
4.00–4.20 pm	Distance Learning Approach by Prof. Richard Shumway, American Agricultural Economics Association (AAEA)
4.20–4.40 pm	Brief Discussion
4.40–5.00 pm	Linking Thesis Work to Applied Research by Dr. Fred Opiyo, 2020 Vision Network for East Africa
5.20–5.40 pm	Brief Discussion
5.40–6.00 pm	GROUP DISCUSSION Identification of Groups

10th OCTOBER 2001

GROUP A	What Modality Should be Adopted for M.Sc. Training in Agricultural Economics and Related Disciplines? Facilitator: Dr. Isaac Minde
GROUP B	What Modality Should be Adopted for Ph.D. Training in Agricultural Economics and Related Disciplines? Facilitator: Dr. M. W. Okot
GROUP C	Research to Support Training in M.Sc. and Ph.D. Facilitator: Dr. Belay Kassa
8.00–10.00 am	Group Discussion
10.00–10.30 am	Tea Break

PLENARY SESSION III

Chairperson	Prof. Ruth Oniang'o, Professor of Nutrition – Kenyatta University
11.00am–12.30 pm	Presentation of Group Discussion and recommendations
12.30–1.00 pm	Closing Remarks by Dr. Delphin Rwegasira, The Executive Director, AERC
1.00 pm	Lunch
Departure	

**Stakeholder Workshop on the Status of Agricultural Economics
in East and Southern/Central Africa
Nairobi, Kenya, October 9–10, 2001**

ATTENDANCE LIST

Name	Organization	Address/Email/Telephone
Prof. C. Ackello-Ogutu	REMPAI Ltd.	ackello@accesskenya.com
Dr. Evelyn C. Apili Ejupu	IFPRI, 2020 Vision Network for East Africa, P.O. Box, 28565, Kampala, Uganda	Tel: 256-41-234616 2020network@africaonline.co.ug
Dr. Bernard Bashaasha	Dept. of Agricultural Economics and Agribusiness Makerere University P.O.Box 7062, Kampala	agecon@infocom.co.ug aspsmuk@infocom.co.ug
Dr. Simon Bolwig	IFPRI, 2020 Vision Network for East Africa, Kampala, Uganda	P.O. Box, 28565 Tel: 256-41-234616 s.bolwig@cgiar.org
Dr. Tenkir Bongor	Ethiopian Development Research Institute P.O.Box 1268, Addis Ababa Ethiopia	edri@telecom.net.et
Prof. Chacha Nyaigetti Chacha	Inter-University Council for East Africa P.O.Box 7110 Kampala, Uganda	chachanyai@hotmail.com or iuc@infocom.co.ug Tel: 256-41-256251/2 Fax: 256- 41-342007 Mobile: 077-614362
Mr. Paul Gamba	Egerton University P.O. Box, 536, Njoro, Kenya	Paul_gamba@hotmail.com
Prof. John Bosco Gashagaza	Faculty of Agriculture, Dept of Animal Production, National University of Rwanda B.P. 629 Butare/ B.P. 117 Butare	gashabo@yahoo.com gashabo@mail.rw Tel: (250) 5300608/ (250) 530023 Mobile: 08505299
Dr. Kange'the H. Gitu	Gitu Associates Ltd. P.O.Box 49038 Nairobi, Kenya	Gihassociates@iconnect.co.ke
Prof. J.K. Imungi	Dean, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Nairobi P.O.Box 29053 Kabete, Kenya	imungijk@hotmail.com Tel. 632121
Mr. Richard Kachule	Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi P.O.Box 219 Lilongwe, Malawi	richard@apru1.malawi.net Tel: 265-277433/272

Name	Organization	Address/Email/Telephone
Prof. George Y. Kanyama - Phiri	Bunda College of Agriculture, University of Malawi	gykphiri@bunda.sdrp.org.mw (265) 277 324 (O) (265) 277 357 (H) (265) 277 364 (Fax)
Dr. Belay Kassa	Alemaya University, P.O.Box 138 Dire Dawa, Ethiopia	belayk@hotmail.com Tel: 251 (05) 112374
Dr. John Lynam	Rockefeller Foundation, Mama Ngina St. 3 rd Floor, International House Nairobi	jlynam@rockfound.or.ke Tel: 254-2-228061/332361
Mrs. Kevin Akoyi Makokha	Vredeseilanden – COOPIBO, Uganda P.O.Box 7844, Kampala	kevin.akoyi@vecu-uganda.org or kevinakoyim@yahoo.co.uk veci-ug@vecu-uganda.org Tel: 256-41-269635/ 256-77-469744 Fax: 256-41-266109
Prof. S. Mbogoh	Dept. of Agricultural Economics, University of Nairobi P.O.Box 29053 Nairobi, Kenya	agecon@insightkenya.com Tel: 254 – 2- 631354
Dr. Isaac Minde	ECAPAPA, 13 John Babiha Road, P.O.Box 765, Entebbe, Uganda	ecapapa@imul.com Tel: 256-41-321780
Ms. Jennifer Mpungu	AERC P.O.Box 62882 Nairobi International House, 8 th Floor	Jennifer.Mpungu@aercafrica.org or training@aercafrica.org
Mr. H.M. Mule	TIMS Ltd P. O. Box 49946 Electricity House, 11th floor Nairobi, Kenya	hmule@bdokenya.com
Mr. John K. Mutunga	KAFU, P.O.Box 43148 Nairobi	farmers@kafu.org Tel: 254-2-608324
Prof. David Norman	Kansas State University, USA	Dnorman@agecon.ksu.edu Tel: 785-532-4484 (USA)
Dr. Hezron Nyangito	KIPPRA P.O.Box 56445 Nairobi	hnyangito@kippra.or.ke Tel: 254-2-719933/4 Fax: 254-2-719951
Dr. Marios Obwona	Economic Policy Research Centre, Makerere University Campus, Kampala	obwona@eprc.or.ug Tel:256-77-440473
Dr. Matthew Okai	Teso University 15/17, Soroti Road P.O.Box 299 Soroti, Uganda	
Prof. Ruth K. Oniang'o	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, P.O.Box 62000, Nairobi, Kenya	oniango@iconnect.co.ke Tel/fax: 254-2-249799

Name	Organization	Address/Email/Telephone
Dr. Fred Opio	IFPRI 2020 Vision Network for East Africa, P.O. Box, 28565, Kampala Uganda	f.opio@cgiar.org or 2020network@africaonline.co.ug Tel:256-41-234616 Fax: 256-41-234614
Ms. Rajul Pandya-Lorch	Head, 2020 Vision Initiative, IFPRI, 2033 K Street NW Washington, DC	r.pandya-lorch@cgiar.org Tel: 1-202-862-8185 Fax: 1-202-467-4439
Dr. Lovemore Rugube	Dept. of Agricultural Economics University of Zimbabwe P.O.Box MP167 Mt. Pleasant, Harare, Zimbabwe	lrugube@agric.uz.ac.zw (04) 303211 Ext. 1516
Dr. Germina Semogerere	Institute of Economics, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda	Ssemo 2@africaonline.com Tel: 256-41-530-115
Prof. Richard Shumway	Department of Agricultural Economics, Washington State University Pullman, WA 99164-6210 USA	shumway@wsu.edu Tel: 509-335-5555

For more information, contact:

Dr. Fred Opio
Coordinator, 2020 Vision Network for East Africa
International Food Policy Research Institute
2020 Vision Network for East Africa
Colline House, 4 Pilkington Road
P. O. Box 28565, Kampala, Uganda
Tel: [256] (41) 234-616 • Fax: [256] (41) 234-614
E-mail: f.opio@cgiar.org
Web: www.ifpri.org