Assessment of the UNCFSP International Development Partnerships Program
(Cooperative Agreement #HNE-A-00-98-00150-00)

October 2005

Assessment of the UNCFSP International Development Partnerships Program

(Cooperative Agreement #HNE-A-00-98-00150-00)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Tables

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This assessment could not have been conducted without the cooperation of many organizations and people who shared information and experience with the assessment team. The assessment team interviewed and surveyed USAID officials, United Negro College Fund Special Program staff, International Development Partnership program Directors and Coordinators working in Historically Black Colleges and Universities and International Higher Education Institutions in host countries, development colleagues in other agencies and related higher education programs, and many other individuals. The team is indebted to all of those people who took time out of their busy schedules to meet with or talk to the team or respond to one of the assessment's survey instruments.[1]

The team wishes to thank officials of UNCFSP and EGAT/ED, especially John Grayzel, Director of USAID's Office of Education; Mei Mei Peng, Cognizant Technical Officer for the International Development Partnerships program within the Office of Education; Jacqueline Howard-Matthews, Director of International Development Partnerships program; DeLois Powell, International Development Partnerships program Manager of Research, Training and Evaluation; and Kimberle Osborne, International Development Partnerships program Manager of Organizational and Institutional Partnerships for their invaluable assistance. UNCFSP and EGAT/ED gave an initial orientation on the International Development Partnership Program, provided basic documents and other information needed to complete this assignment, and spent countless hours meeting with the team, arranging meetings with important stakeholders, and scheduling interviews with program participants.

While information came from many sources, the team is solely responsible for any errors or omissions in this report. The team hopes that this assessment report is useful to EGAT/ED and its USAID partners in their continuing effort to strengthen USAID's development cooperation with Historically Black Colleges and Universities and other Minority Serving Higher Education Institutions and to UNCFSP as it continues to implement the IDP program and seeks other opportunities to enhance the strength of HBCUs and their contributions to this nation and to the world.

---

[1] Appendix D provides information on the ISTI Assessment Team key contacts.

ACRONYMS

AFR	USAID's Bureau for Africa
ALO	Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development
ANE	USAID's Bureau for Asia and the Near East
CAPA	UNCFSP's Center for Assessment, Planning, and Accountability
CHP	Cross Hemispheric Partnership
CRSP	Cooperative Research Support Program
CTO	Cognizant Technical Officer
ED	Office of Education
EDDI	Education for Development and Democracy Initiative
E&E	USAID's Bureau for Europe and Eurasia
EGAT	USAID's Bureau for Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade
IDP	International Development Partnership
IHE	Institutions of Higher Education
HBCU	Historically Black Colleges and Universities
LAC	USAID's Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean
MSI	Minority Serving Institution
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
RFA	Request for Application
SO	Strategic Objective (of USAID)
TELP	Tertiary Education Linkages Project
TIES	Training, Internships, Exchanges and Scholarships Initiative
UDLP	University Development Linkages Program
UNCF	United Negro College Fund
UNCFSP	United Negro College Fund Special Programs Corporation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USAID/W	United States Agency for International Development/Washington DC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The International Development Partnerships (IDP) program funds Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) to work collaboratively with International Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) on social and economic development activities in developing countries. The program objectives are to: strengthen the ability of institutions in developing countries to meet national economic and social development needs; to assist in the achievement of USAID goals and the strategic objectives (SOs) of Missions; and to further the international involvement of HBCUs.

The program is funded through a $10 million USAID Cooperative Agreement with the United Negro College Fund Special Programs Corporation (UNCFSP). UNCFSP has organized a series of competitions open to any HBCU. To date, it has funded 44 partnerships under three different program elements. The core programs of IDP partnerships are three-year grants of up to $200,000, intended to reach all geographic regions. The Education for Development and Democracy Initiative (EDDI) partnerships are limited to Africa and focus particularly on expanding education opportunities, particularly for girls. The Cross Hemispheric Partnership (CHP) element funded one-year grants of up to $50,000 to develop programs to educate K-12 teachers, particularly but not exclusively in the U.S., about Afro-Latino history and culture.

Taken as a whole, the partnerships span a wide range of technical areas and all developing regions. The program is in its eighth year and is scheduled to end on June 2, 2006.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

USAID contracted with the International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI) to conduct this assessment. USAID asked the assessment team to monitor progress toward the achievement of program objectives during the course of the Cooperative Agreement; to provide USAID with an independent assessment it can compare to other higher education program assessments; and to recommend ways to strengthen the effectiveness and impact of USAID's collaboration with HBCUs and other minority-serving institutions (MSIs). The assessment was expected to answer a set of key questions. Did the IDP program stimulate interest and involvement of HBCUs and their partners in social and economic development in focus countries? Did it strengthen their capacities to contribute to national development programs? Did the partnerships contribute to the achievement of USAID goals and objectives in those countries? Did the programs assist HBCUs to establish international partnership relationships and involvement in international programs that will continue beyond USAID's funding cycle?

ISTI utilized a four-person team to conduct the assessment from July to mid-October, 2005. The team reviewed key project documents, interviewed stakeholders and program personnel, and conducted surveys of active and closed partnership projects. Budgetary limitations prevented the team from traveling to project sites overseas or visiting participating HBCU campuses in the United States. USAID and UNCFSP personnel worked closely with the team.

FINDINGS

UNCFSP's Program Management Activities

UNCFSP's small project staff organized and ran annual competitions, awarded grants to winning HBCUs, and established rules for program implementation and reporting. UNCFSP circulated its Requests for Proposals throughout the HBCU community, encouraged widespread participation and established an independent peer review process. The process resulted in the selection and participation of a diverse group of HBCUs, including HBCUs not affiliated with UNCF and smaller colleges and universities with limited prior international development experience.

To ensure that this program was accessible to those smaller and less experienced HBCUs, UNCFSP staff designed and organized an innovative technical assistance program, including workshops to help design and implement projects, to train HBCU participants in the financial management requirements pertaining to USAID programs and in other areas of program management. UNCFSP also provided extensive coaching through its frequent contacts with the HBCU project directors. Some of this technical assistance was also extended to the overseas university partners. The recipients of that assistance consistently rated it very highly and attribute their successes in part to UNCFSP's assistance, guidance and management.

UNCFSP allocated approximately 65 percent of the $10 million that USAID provided to the partnership activities. The remaining funds are available to support the management and technical assistance activities, with a very small share of that (seven percent) going to cover UNCFSP indirect costs. Available data suggest that the university partners have provided a matching contribution of nearly 50 percent, roughly double the level established as a benchmark in the Cooperative Agreement. UNCFSP records show that 72 percent of the resources have been expended. Given the lag in reporting expenditures from project sites around the world, actual expenditures are higher. In any case, it appears that the remaining resources will not be fully utilized by the current program end date.

USAID resources have been drawn from the Bureau for Economic Growth and Technology (EGAT) and, with the support of USAID's Administrator, from the four regional bureaus. However, outside of EGAT and the Bureau for Africa, there seems to be little awareness of or interest in this program (or in other centrally-funded university partnership programs).

USAID and UNCFSP have collaborated to use the program in innovative ways, e.g., taking advantage of opportunities such as the resources available in a previous Administration's initiative on Africa. However, the documentation supporting these initiatives is somewhat deficient and some (e.g., the CHP program) appear to be only distantly related to USAID goals. Additionally, reporting on the program, although voluminous, does not do adequately highlight the achievements (in terms of objectives) of the partnerships or the overall program. UNCFSP and USAID are currently introducing changes to address these issues.

Partnership Activities

Most of the IDP-supported partnerships were formed to take advantage of the opportunity the IDP program offered. This is a positive characteristic of the IDP program reflecting its success in broadening HBCU contacts in the developing world. At the same time, the "newness" of the relationships added to the time and effort required from the partners and from UNCFSP to make the relationships effective.

The partnerships have established a strong record of achieving their intended results. They established new and improved courses, trained people in technical areas important for social and economic progress, and achieved a variety of other intended and unintended positive outputs.

Participants from completed partnerships indicate that the development activities started under the partnership continue to be effective. Contact between the partners continues, although joint activities may be deferred until additional funding is secured.

Other than in the CHP partnerships, participating universities sought to work with the respective USAID Missions, and most of the partners were able to meet with Mission staff on one or more occasions. However, Mission staff seldom visited partnership projects, and direct Mission involvement was quite limited with the partnerships.

CONCLUSIONS

UNCFSP Management of Resources

In general, UNCFSP gets good marks for its management of IDP resources. It carried out its various roles with a small staff and relatively low overhead. UNCFSP was innovative, flexible and responsive to USAID. Of particular note were the technical assistance activities to assist HBCUs that lacked experience in international development to design and implement projects in collaboration with overseas universities. The very positive comments of the university participants suggest that the UNCFSP technical assistance role was critical to their success. UNCFSP stressed to the participating universities the importance of generating outside resources for future collaborative activities. UNCFSP could have done a better job of reporting, keeping track of matching contributions, and disseminating information ⎯ telling the program's story both to USAID and to the potentially interested groups in the broader community.

Partnership Activities

The program has generated a great many new relationships between U.S. HBCUs and overseas universities. The partnerships typically resulted in new or improved programs at the overseas universities, sometimes with better equipment to carry them out. At participating HBCUs, the program successfully increased the interest and capacity of the institutions to work internationally. The program has been quite successful in introducing smaller and less experienced HBCUs to international development work. Participating institutions believe that they have both contributed and gained from the experience.

The partners are strongly committed to continuing their partnerships, and the partners of completed partnership programs are still in touch with one another. However, since most have not yet secured the financing necessary to maintain their collaborative activities at a significant level, it is too early to determine if or how long the partnership relationships will be maintained. The institutions could have reported better on development results, responded better to USAID SOs, and worked harder to bring in additional implementation and funding partners.

USAID Management and Support for the Program

USAID was successful in creating a worldwide initiative involving HBCUs in international development in Asia, Latin America and Eurasia as well as Africa. The program expanded the base of HBCUs involved in international development, and strengthened the capacity of HBCUs with little international development experience. High CTO turnover resulted in some inconsistency in program oversight.

Strengthening the Ability of IHEs to Address Development Needs

IHEs stated that their interest in working in international development and their capacity to do so was strengthened by the IDP program. Better reporting on development results (e.g., reporting against clearly defined benchmarks and on a timeline) would have produced better evidence of what seems to have been strong performance by some partnerships.

Contributing to USAID's Goals and Strategic Objectives

Performance on this goal was mixed. In general, responsiveness to USAID's goals and strategic objectives was not very strong even though UNCFSP took this objective very seriously. The difficulty, in part, was caused by low interest on the part of some Missions for this centrally-funded and managed activity.

Increasing the Involvement of HBCUs in Development

The program successfully increased both the interest and involvement of HBCUs in international development, and it strengthen their capacity to contribute to overseas development efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for UNCFSP

The UNCFSP provided excellent support and oversight for the IDP program, although there were areas where performance could have been improved. The team recommends that UNCFSP:

- *Tell the IDP story better.* UNCFSP should develop materials for USAID and for broader audiences that tell the story of the program's successes and that would generate interest and garner additional support from USAID, other donors, the for-profit private sector, and the general public.

- *Be more aggressive in identifying funding partners for the partnerships.* UNCFSP, with support from UNCF, needs to reach out beyond USAID to generate financial support for future partnership programs.

- *Develop "best practices" manuals.* Lessons learned should be captured to inform future programs of a similar nature.

- *Develop plans for the remaining period of the project.* UNCFSP and USAID need to come to formal agreement about how remaining funds will be utilized.

Recommendations for USAID

With cooperation and support from other USAID Washington Bureaus and Offices, EGAT/ED designed and is managing this worldwide $10 million program that has successfully expanded participation of HBCUs in international development work. There are areas that could be improved. The team recommends that EGAT/ED:

- *Tell the IDP story better.* The public diplomacy efforts of the Agency and Missions should be tapped to better describe and publicize IDP success stories and get the word out to the broader development community.

- *Provide consistent and proactive oversight.* Individual CTOs have been very involved and supportive of this program but constant CTO turnover has had adverse impacts. EGAT should work closely with UNCFSP to ensure an efficient termination and closeout process.

- *Make timely decisions on closeout and future programs.* Substantial uncommitted resources remain. A formal agreement is needed on the timing and use of those funds.

Joint Recommendations for UNCFSP and USAID

The assessment team recommends that UNCFSP and USAID jointly:

- *Determine the status of matching funds.* Given the importance of matching funds, UNCFSP and the USAID CTO should review the status of the matching fund requirement and work out a way to capture, track and document matching contributions from the institutions and other partners.

- *Improve program reporting.* UNCFSP and USAID should collaborate on the development of a new, simple reporting format at least from UNCFSP to USAID. Progress toward the project's goals, discussion of current implementation and financial issues (including, for example, disbursement problems and matching fund levels) are areas that should be included in revised reporting procedures.

- *Allocate Remaining Program Funds.* UNCFSP should prepare a budget for the use of the remaining funds and UNCFSP and USAID should reach critical agreements on the time period necessary to complete any required action.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background: Program Goals and History

The International Development Partnerships (IDP) program is intended to create development-focused partnerships between Historically Black Universities and Colleges (HBCUs) in the U.S. and universities in developing countries in which USAID operates. Although USAID finances other university partnership programs, the IDP program is unique in its focus on HBCUs.

Federal government support for HBCUs has been a tenant of both Democratic and Republican Administrations. Every President since Jimmy Carter has executed Presidential Executive Orders in support of the development of HBCUs. On February 12, 2002, President George W. Bush signed a similar Order to strengthen HBCUs and increase their opportunities to participate and benefit from federal programs. That Executive Order established a Presidentially-appointed Board of Advisors, as well as the White House Initiative on HBCUs, located in the Office of the Secretary of Education. This series of Executive Orders require executive departments and federal agencies to identify and carry out programs and activities to enhance the capacity of HBCUs and instructed the departments and agencies to develop and report on annual implementation plans.

In response, USAID's decision to create the IDP program also reflects its own interest in expanding the role of HBCUs and other Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) in international development. At the end of the University Development Linkages Program (UDLP), a previous USAID project that gave USAID a venue to work with HBCUs, USAID leaders wanted to establish a new program through which it could continue to strengthen collaboration with HBCUs and MSIs. USAID thus created the IDP to increase the "critical mass" and capacity of HBCUs and MSIs and to ensure diversity among U.S. individuals and institutions working in the Agency's development effort abroad.

In February of 1998, USAID issued a performance-based Request for Application (RFA) for a five-year, $5 million program. The United Negro College Fund (UNCF) application was selected through a competitive bidding process. UNCF came to this project with considerable previous experience, including the management of the Tertiary Education Linkages Project[2] (TELP), a large UNCF-managed project in South Africa.

USAID awarded a Cooperative Agreement[3] to the UNCF Special Promotions Corporation (subsequently renamed the UNCF Special Programs Corporation - UNCFSP[4]) on June 8, 1998. USAID has amended the Cooperative Agreement periodically to increase the funds available for the IDP program. The most important change, incorporated through Modification 9 signed on February 28, 2002, doubled the total USAID estimated award amount from $5 million to $10 million and extended the IDP performance period by three years (from June 3, 2003 to June 2, 2006).

---

[2] The TELP project was aimed at increasing the capacity of HBCUs and South African Technikons to assist the Government of South Africa to implements its higher education policy.

[3] Cooperative Agreement HNE-A-00-98-00150-00

[4] UNCF made this name change effective on March 14, 2000. USAID formally accepted this change through a Change of Name Agreement signed on April 1, 2000.

The original Cooperative Agreement incorporated the six program objectives from the UNCFSP proposal. They were:

- To strengthen the capacity of HBCUs and their international partners to achieve their educational missions;

- To strengthen the capacity of HBCUs and their international partners to address national and international development issues;

- To promote collaborative research and cooperation in addressing social and development needs and concerns;

- To strengthen the capacity of partnering institutions to contribute to the achievement of USAID goals and the strategic objectives of field Missions;

- To promote greater understanding between HBCUs and international institutions; and

- To increase HBCU interest and capacity to compete for USAID funding.

In addition to adding resources and extending the program's length, Modification 9 also restated the three original program objectives that gave greater emphasis to the achievement of USAID strategic objectives (SOs).[5] Those three program objectives were:

- To strengthen the ability of institutions in developing countries to meet national economic and social development needs;

- To assist in the achievement of USAID goals and the SOs of Missions; and

- To further the international involvement of HBCUs.

USAID's intent to strengthen HBCU's participation in international development is prominent in both of these statements of goals and has been a constant theme throughout this program. IDP thus falls within a group of USAID programs, including some previous university, NGO and several minority-focused programs that are more "supply-driven" than the typical "demand-driven" USAID programs.[6] The strong emphasis in this program on strengthening the capacity of the targeted institutions (i.e., the HBCUs in this case) is less common in USAID, but not unprecedented.[7] In this program, HBCU capacity development occurs both through the HBCU's experience working overseas and through the technical assistance that UNCFSP provides. The technical assistance (described in Section 2.1.2 below) is an innovative and important characteristic of the IDP program.

Programs like IDP that seek to strengthen U.S. based institutions and to achieve development impact overseas often face trade-offs between those two objectives. There is a long history of USAID efforts, some successful and others not, to make such supply-driven programs responsive to USAID

---

[5]   The USAID's RFA that led to this program had given prominence to the achievement of USAID SOs, but that emphasis was lessened in the CA until Modification 9 was executed.

[6]   The other current USAID program explicitly designed to support university partnerships is a CA with the Association Liaison Office (ALO), an entity under the American Council on Education. In addition, USAID utilizes U.S. colleges and universities as contractors and grantees in a variety of technical programs, sometimes in partnerships with overseas universities.

[7]   USAID has, for example, offered NGO strengthening grants for many years. Strengthening universities capacities in international development was the principle focus of an earlier program under Section 211(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act, and the Cooperative Research Support Program (CRSP) program has an institutional development element incorporated within it.

development priorities. In assessing this particular program, it is important to keep the program's multiple objectives in mind; it should not be judged solely on its overseas development impact.

Over the course of IDP program's implementation, USAID added two types of special partnerships to the program, albeit without formally modifying the Cooperative Agreement. The first was the result of President Clinton's Education for Development and Democracy Initiative (EDDI) for Africa. In 2001, the inter-agency committee coordinating EDDI approved the channeling of some of USAID's Bureau for Africa (AFR) EDDI funds to UNCFSP to establish additional HBCU partnerships with selected African countries. The resulting EDDI partnerships had a somewhat different set of goals, reflecting EDDI's focus on encouraging the growth of civil society and encouraging women's access to education. Given these special goals and the fact that EDDI was an inter-agency initiative, EDDI partnerships gave correspondingly less emphasis to complementarity with USAID Mission SOs.

The second type of special partnership grew out of a UNCFSP workshop held in Peru in 2003. Participants at that meeting resolved to address the dearth of information in the United States about Afro-Latino history and culture. This led to the development of Cross Hemispheric Partnerships (CHP), funded by EGAT. CHP partnerships are HBCU partnerships with Latin American and Caribbean (LAC) universities focused on the creation of courses on Afro-Latino history. While CHPs seem to have focused primarily on the development of programs for the instruction of future U.S. K-12 teachers at HBCUs, some CHP partnerships developed courses that were also offered in LAC countries.[8]

At the time of this assessment, the IDP program had funded 44 partnerships under these three program elements: 26 IDPs,[9] 7 EDDIs, and 11 CHPs.

1.2. This Assessment

1.2.1. Goals

USAID contracted for this study to obtain an independent assessment of the IDP. The scope of work (Appendix A) indicates that USAID expects this study to do the following:

- To monitor progress toward the achievement of program objectives during the course of the Cooperative Agreement;

- To provide USAID with an independent assessment it can compare to other higher education program assessments, and

- To recommend ways to strengthen the effectiveness and impact of USAID's collaboration with HBCUs and other MSIs

---

[8] While not responding directly to USAID strategic interests, CHP was an innovative program that addressed an issue facing many countries in this hemisphere. CHP's impact was broader than curriculum development focused on the African Diaspora. In Brazil, three CHP partnership programs, working collaboratively, have contributed to a movement to infuse Brazil's rich black cultural tradition into the basic education curriculum.

[9] A somewhat confusing aspect of the project's terminology is that the term "International Development Partnership" or "IDP" is used to refer both to the 26 "regular" partnerships (i.e., those that do not fall under either the EDDI or CHP elements) and to the overall program that includes all three types of partnerships. In this paper, unless specifically indicated in the text, the terms "IDP" or "IDP activities" will refer to the entire program.

1.2.2. The ISTI Assessment Team and Methodology

The four-member ISTI assessment team was led by Paul White, a former USAID Mission Director and the champion of university partnerships who created the Training, Internships, Exchanges and Scholarships (TIES) program[10] in Mexico. Jim Washington is a former USAID senior education and training officer with vast experience designing and implementing programs to improve the quality of life for the underserved domestic and global population. Jerry Wein, a former USAID deputy and acting USAID Mission Director, has worked extensively in education and was a member of the 2004 ISTI team that evaluated the Association Liaison Office (ALO) university partnerships program. Kristi Chaveas, an ISTI program associate, has several years of experience in data collection and analysis and also worked on that ALO assessment. (Appendix B provides a biographic sketch of each of the assessment team members.)

The team's methodology included the following key activities:

- *Review of documents.* The team reviewed the Cooperative Agreement, quarterly and annual reports, special reports, agendas and evaluations for workshops, RFAs, guidance to review panels, review panel assessments of proposals, partnership completion reports, evaluations conducted by UNCFSP, and other relevant documents. The team is particularly indebted to Dr. Komanduri Murty, author of *UNCFSP Global Center Partnerships Evaluation Report,* who permitted the team to use the survey data that he collected for his report. (Appendix C provides the assessment bibliography.)

- *Interviews with key personnel.* The assessment team interviewed current and past UNCFSP staff, current and past USAID Cognizant Technical Officers (CTOs), other USAID personnel working in the Bureau of Economic Growth, Agriculture and Trade (EGAT) and regional bureaus, partnership directors and coordinators, leaders of the African American community, and others. The team also held a focus group discussion on key issues with 50-odd attendees at the program's 2005 Conference. (Appendix D provides a list of the team's contacts.)

- *Survey of current partnership directors and coordinators.* The team developed a survey instrument [see Appendix E, IDP Assessment Questionnaire for Partnership Directors and Coordinators (Active Partnerships)] for current project directors and coordinators. The survey, distributed at UNCFSP's August 2005 International Affairs and Development Partnership Conference, elicited a total of 22 individual responses from 15 of the 20 active partnerships.

- *Survey of completed partnerships.* To explore whether partnerships were continuing after the termination of IDP funding, the team sent an email survey [see Appendix F, IDP Assessment Questionnaire for Partnership Directors and Coordinators (Closed Partnerships)] to the project directors and coordinators of closed partnerships and followed-up with phone calls to encourage responses. The team received a total of 14 individual responses from 12 of the 24 closed partnerships.

- *Discussion of preliminary findings.* The team presented its preliminary findings to USAID and to UNCFSP at a meeting on September 15, 2005.

---

[10] TIES initiative was designed as a component of the U.S. – Mexico Partnership for Prosperity. It supports higher education partnerships specifically targeted on USAID/Mexico Strategic Objectives.

- *Drafting of the report.* The team presented its draft report on October 3, 2005. USAID and UNCFSP provided corrections, clarifications and comments on October 6. ISTI will present the final report to USAID on October 17, 2005.

Budgetary limitations prevented the team from visiting overseas sites or HBCU campuses in the U.S. Fortunately, the availability of many of the partnership directors and coordinators at UNCFSP's annual conference helped the team to overcome this constraint.

These abovementioned steps were incorporated into a work plan and schedule that the team developed in collaboration with the USAID Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) and with the UNCFSP staff. (See Appendix G, Work Plan.)

1.2.3. Report Organization

This report is organized into the Introduction and three additional sections. Section 2 reports the team's findings; Section 3 presents conclusions and lessons learned; and Section 4 presents the assessment team's recommendations. Attached as an addendum to this report is a narrative on Creating a New Partnership Relationship.

2. FINDINGS

2.1. UNCFSP's Program Management Activities

2.1.1. Grant Award Characteristics

To date, IDP has funded 44 partnerships, divided among its three categories of grants as shown in the following table.

Table 1. Number of Partnerships Awarded by Year

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Totals
IDP	4	4	4	4	4	6	26
EDDI			3	4			7
CHP					5	6	11
Total	4	4	7	8	9	12	44

Source: UNCFSP data

There is considerable variation in the size and length of grants:

- IDP: three-year grants with average grant amount of $173,000;

- EDDI: three-year grants (reduced to two years) at $200,000 per grant (and two $50,000 EDDI grants to partnerships primarily financed as IDPs); and

- CHP: one-year grants with funding ranging from $35,000 to $50,000 per grant.

Table 1 shows that the program has developed partnerships in all of USAID's four regions and in a wide array of technical areas.

Table 2. Distribution of Partnerships by Region and Cluster

	AFR	ANE	EE	LAC	Total	Percent
Agriculture and Rural Development	4	0	0	0	4	9
Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	5	0	1	2	8	18
Curriculum Development	0	0	1	12	13	30
Economic Development	3	2	0	0	5	11
Environment and Transportation	0	3	1	0	4	9
Science, Research and Health	1	0	0	1	2	5
Technology Access and Training	5	0	1	2	8	18
Total	18	5	4	17	44	100
Percent	41	11	9	39	100	

Source: UNCFSP data

The program's broad geographic distribution is important not only in terms of contributing to USAID development goals around the world, but also and very importantly to the goal of enhancing HBCUs' capacity to work in international development. The fact that HBCUs have worked effectively throughout the world helps to dispel the myth that, because of the racism in our own

society and common in many countries in which USAID works, HBCUs involvement is best limited to programs in Africa.

Appendix H provides information on the individual UNCFSP partnerships, including the years of operation, the U.S. and overseas partners, the country and region, the program category (IDP, CHP, and EDDI), the partnership amount, and the sector or technical cluster.

2.1.2. Non-partnership Activities: Technical Assistance Planning and Implementation

UNCFSP plays a number of roles in the implementation of this program. Its role in organizing the competitions, managing the funds, reporting and evaluation are all complex and very critical roles, albeit ones that are common to any university partnership program. (These roles will be discussed in later sections.) In addition to these "normal" roles, this program assigns to UNCFSP an unusual role – that of providing technical assistance to the HBCU community to raise interest in international programs and to train and assist HBCUs in designing and implementing overseas partnership activities.

This role reflects the reality that many HBCUs have little international experience, even more limited with federally-funded programs, and in particular, most have done little work for USAID. The program's planners realized that this program would probably not successfully develop partnerships, or that the resulting partnerships would be limited to the small number of HBCUs with substantial prior experience, unless the implementing organization aggressively sought to interest additional HBCUs and to train and assist their staff to plan and implement the programs.

To carry out this unique technical assistance role, UNCFSP has organized and implemented a program of regional workshops (that address specific concerns such as proposal writing and development or financial management), campus visits (to meet with project personnel and the broader academic community and assess how the partnership is being supported), marketing IDP and HBCUs to USAID Missions and IHEs (to point out the strengths of partnerships and establish a foundation for continued growth in the relationship between HBCUs and Institutions of Higher Education (IHE) and/or between HBCUs and Missions), electronic and in-office consulting (to address specific questions that partnerships may have in planning, implementing or evaluating their partnership activities or relationships), and electronic information sharing (preparing information that can be used to highlight the program's accomplishments, disseminate lessons learned, etc.).

Key areas in which UNCFSP provided training and technical assistance to the HBCUs included, among others:

- Proposal writing
- Project management
- Budgeting and financial controls
- Funding opportunities
- Community outreach
- Building support for partnerships

In designing and implementing these activities, the IDP has aggressively courted HBCUs that were new to international programming. The generation of proposals from the HBCU community, and

particularly from the less experienced HBCUs, is one indicator of the effectiveness of UNCFSP's technical assistance activities. As a further measure to keep the more experienced HBCUs from dominating the program, UNCFSP instituted a rule that an HBCU could be the lead university in only one partnership.

Respondents to the assessment team's survey of active partnerships gave these UNCFSP activities very high marks. The technical assistance workshops and campus visits were rated excellent by all respondents. Information exchange received 20 of 22 very high or excellent ratings, and marketing was close at 18 of 22. About one-half of the respondents rated consultations and information exchanges as excellent.

In addition, the assessment team reviewed several other indicators of the effectiveness of UNCFSP's technical assistance activities. It reviewed the evaluations from technical assistance workshops, other UNCFSP evaluation reports, and both Dr. Murty's evaluation report and the raw data that he collected for that purpose. All of these assessments suggest that participants valued the UNCFSP technical assistance services highly and that those services provided very useful and necessary information and training. (Appendix I provides some of the data collected by the Dr. Murty's evaluation of UNCFSP activities. Section 2.1.6. provides additional information on UNCFSP evaluation activities.)

2.1.3. Organization and Management

The original proposal outlined a requirement for three key personnel positions – a Project Manager, Partnership Coordinator and Budget Manager. An Administrative Assistant was also proposed. This staff was expected to manage the programmatic and financial aspects of IDP and to organize and provide technical assistance to the participating HBCUs.

However, initial funding for management costs was limited to $200,000/year and had to cover many items in addition to staff costs. As a result, UNCFSP's IDP management team during the early years of the program consisted of only 1.3 persons. Eventually, the financial constraint was eased, and the UNCFSP staff grew from 1.3 to 3 people, still very small for the size of the program and the complexity of their tasks. Although there are some management areas that could benefit from increased attention, the staff's achievements are highly commendable, a result that reflects the high caliber and commitment of the individuals involved. From the outset, the program has benefited from considerable staff continuity at UNCFSP. The assessment team did note, however, that the short tenure of the current staff, coupled with the recent office move, limited their ability to speak with authority or to provide information about events that occurred several years ago.[11]

IDP has also benefited from the support of UNCF[12] and non-project UNCFSP staff. For example, the program receives evaluation assistance from UNCFSP's newly created Center for Assessment, Planning and Accountability (CAPA), from UNCFSP's recently enhanced information technology

---

[11] The team spoke to former IDP staff to obtain important background information and incorporated those comments into this assessment report.

[12] During the IDP's start-up phase, the attention it received from UNCF was overshadowed by the TELP project. However, as the project implementation progressed, the IDP team won and now enjoys full and equal support from both the UNCF and UNCFSP levels.

unit, and from UNCFSP's accounting division. The project is housed in UNCFSP's facilities in Fairfax, VA.

2.1.4. Solicitation, Application, Review, and Award Process

Given the differing objectives of the IDP, EDDI and CHP programs, UNCFSP issued separate RFAs for each. It issued a total of ten RFAs over the 1999-2004 period, including six for IDP awards (one each year from 1999-2004), two for EDDI awards (in 2001 and 2002) and two for CHP awards (in 2003 and 2004). (The years in which awards were made for each of these elements can be seen in Table 1.) The assessment team reviewed several RFAs and found them clear on objectives, operational information, proposal requirements, selection criteria and other key areas.

In the earlier years of the program, UNCFSP utilized a two-stage process. It first required a pre-application, screened those applications to select the best, and then invited the HBCUs that had submitted the top-rated pre-applications to develop and submit a full proposal. The papers submitted at each stage were evaluated and ranked by a panel of independent reviewers.

To generate better and more comprehensive proposals, this process evolved over recent years to one in which the UNCFSP staff provided leadership and technical assistance in project design through specific proposal writing workshops. Because most HBCUs have only limited international experience, UNCFSP has utilized campus visits and workshops to generate interest in international partnerships and to teach the skills of proposal development, drafting and management. In order to attract participation of below 3rd tier institutions in the proposal development process, UNCFSP hosted proposal writing workshops at some of these institutions (i.e. Texas College and Florida Memorial College). (These technical assistance activities are described in Section 2.1.2. above.) Attendees were required to come with a partnership project in mind, and the workshop provided an opportunity to develop that idea into a full-fledged proposal.

UNCFSP's various efforts to distribute the RFAs widely[13], to convince HBCU personnel and to help HBCUs to develop and to draft proposals led to the submission of 110 full proposals over the life of the program. UNCFSP received approximately four proposals for each award it was able to make. (Appendix N provides the number of proposals each year for each type of award.)

In designing and implementing these activities, the IDP has aggressively courted the smaller HBCUs, which tend to have less experience in international programming. These efforts have been very successful; UNCFSP data show that only 12 of the IDP awards have gone to HBCUs in (the stronger) tiers one and two and 32 have gone to HBCUs in tiers three, four and five.[14] (See Appendix O.) UNCFSP's proposal development workshops were key to helping the smaller schools to compete successfully for grant awards. As a further measure to keep the more experienced HBCUs from dominating the program, UNCFSP instituted a rule that an HBCU could be the lead university in only one partnership.

UNCFSP convenes peer review panels to review proposals against the criteria identified in the RFA. Panelists are required to read and rate the proposals independently, and then meet to discuss their

---

[13] UNCFSP announced RFAs through it's listserve which goes to more than 700 representatives at HBCUs.

[14] A five-tiered system is used to distinguish the international experience and activities of colleges and universities.

reviews. Panelist may adjust their ratings after having discussed the proposals. The panel submits an overall ranking to UNCFSP, which then notifies the winners and losers of the results. UNCFSP provide the reviewers' comments to HBCUs whose proposals were not grant winners, but only if those HBCUs so request. USAID's role in that process begins at the point of concurrence with the recommendations from the peer review panel, although in some cases, the partnerships actually visited USAID field missions prior to developing proposals to gain USAID support and to try to align project activities with the Mission's Strategic Objectives.[15]

The assessment team reviewed the guidance provided to one of the proposal review panels and found it clear and balanced. The panels seem to have been comprised of appropriate scholars and, in some cases, development experts. (Appendix N provides the reviewers names, positions and institutions for each of the partnership award competitions.) USAID did not participate in those reviews. The reviewers' comments (based on a small sample that the assessment team reviewed) indicate that panel members took their responsibility seriously and were not hesitant to make critical judgments.

The evidence shows that the UNCFSP and the proposal review and award process were open to the many HBCUs that are not UNCF members. The IDP program has reached well beyond UNCF's own 39 member colleges and universities. Of the 44 partnership awards, 11 HBCUs are members of UNCF and 21 are not.[16] The colleges and universities that make up each group are shown in Appendix J.

2.1.5. Financial Aspects

a. Sources of Funds

EGAT/ED has provided the leadership necessary to establish and maintain this program within USAID. EGAT provided 52 percent of the USAID's contribution, and it secured the remaining funding from the various USAID regional bureaus. Obtaining regional bureau support has been a challenge. At the project's inception, EGAT/ED anticipated that the four regional bureaus would voluntarily provide resources. When voluntary contributions were not forthcoming, EGAT sought and received support from USAID Administrator Brian Atwood for "a tax" on those bureaus. With Atwood's support, each of the regional bureaus contributed $800,000, provided in four annual installments of $200,000 each, and the overall program level was increased to $10 million. In addition, the Africa Bureau voluntarily contributed additional funds under EDDI. Table 3 below summarizes the USAID sources of financing by Bureau.

Table 3. Sources of IDP Program Financing by USAID Bureau

USAID	Amount	Percent

---

[15] While supply-led models are often used in partnership programs, there are examples of demand-led partnership programs. The Training, Internships, Exchanges, and Scholarships (TIES) initiative, developed by USAID/Mexico, started the partnership concept by asking Mexican universities to identify development problems that could be solved by higher education institutions, and asked that the Mexican institutions identify potential U.S. partners. In addition, USAID/Mexico Strategic Objective teams were tasked to draft the requirements section of sector-specific RFAs and to participate in the peer review process to assure that winning applications were directly focused on priority problems and issues of the sector as defined by the SO team. The ALO university partnerships program, while "supply driven" for the most part, includes a number of Mission buy-ins that were demand-led and to which interested universities then responded. The new leader-with-associate format of the ALO program is intended to encourage more Missions to come forward with additional programs of that kind.

[16] Eleven UNCF member institutions received 14 grants; twenty-one non-UNCF member institutions received 30 grants. No institution received more than one grant per program element (IDP, CHP, EDDI).

Bureau	($000)	
AFR	2,425	24
ANE	800	8
E&E	800	8
LAC	800	8
EGAT	5,175	52
Total	10,000	100

Source: USAID data

The team has not been able to identify Mission resources that were provided for this program. UNCFSP marketing to Missions seems to have been successful in securing an opening for the program to operate in some countries, but was less than successful in obtaining a commitment of funds from USAID Missions.[17] On the USAID side, the various project CTOs do not appear to have aggressively sought Mission funds. Securing Mission funds for centrally-funded projects is typically only successful when the programs financed with those resources are designed by the Missions and contribute directly to the Mission SOs. In this regard, the ALO partnership program has had some limited success in expanding resources by encouraging Mission "buy-ins" to finance partnership programs in which the Missions determine the objectives and strategy. Selling this same idea under the IDP might be possible, as well, but it would face the additional obstacle that this program is designed in part to remedy ▯ the relative inexperience of many HBCUs in international development. Thus, EGAT/ED's strategy ▯ depending exclusively on Washington funding ▯ was probably appropriate.[18]

The USAID-UNCFSP Cooperative Agreement establishes two requirements for matching contributions. Section 1.13 of the Cooperative Agreement indicates that the recipient is "...to expend an amount not less than 23 percent of the total management and administrative contribution."[19] This section is apparently intended to require that UNCFSP devote resources to the project that are at least equivalent to the overhead that it charges, which is 23 percent of directly charged management and administration expenses. Although UNCFSP is not required to track the support services that it provides to the program, the assessment team observed that there are considerable resources provided to the program in terms of accounting, IT, evaluation, and senior management services.

The second and more important matching contribution is expected to come from the participating universities. Attachment 2 of the Cooperative Agreement indicates that UNCFSP will use the "degree to which applicants offer the best product or value for the cost and provide up to 25 percent in matching funds and/or in-kind contributions"[20] as one of the criteria for selecting grantees. In fact, the partnerships committed to matching contributions of $3.3 million, or more than 51 percent of the $6.5 million of USAID resources that UNCFSP has allocated to those partnerships. (Expected matching

---

[17] Although no Mission funds were directly transferred to the IDP program, several Missions provided support in other ways. For example, the Liberia Mission financed the participation of two nationals at the recent UNCFSP annual conference, and the Ethiopia Mission provided $7 million for follow-on financing (see Section 2.2.6.).

[18] In the future, HBCUs might well be successful in getting Mission support for partnership programs targeted on Mission SOs. There is some evidence that this is already happening with the most experienced HBCUs.

[19] See the CA, Attachment 1, page 10 of 40.

[20] See the CA, Attachment 2, page 7.

contributions by partnership are provided in Table 1, Appendix K. [21]) UNCFSP data on actual matching contributions are incomplete. UNCFSP was able to provide data on the matching contributions from 23 of the 44 partnerships. Those data show total matching resources to date of $1.3 million against expenditure by those partnerships of $2.7 million of USAID resources. Thus, the match provided to date is equivalent to 48 percent of the expenditures of USAID resources on those partnerships. (See Table 2, Appendix K)

UNCFSP does not monitor matching contributions closely and had difficulty providing information on matching to the assessment team. Data on matching funds are not routinely reported to USAID in quarterly or annual reports. USAID does not appear to have monitored the program's performance in this area. While the matching requirement may seem to work against the poorer resourced HBCUs, in fact many very small and poorer resourced HBCUs were able to participate in the program.

Reports on individual partnerships often indicate that the programs benefit from collaboration with local partners from the government, non-profit organizations and the private sector. Those groups frequently provide real resources to the programs, and such contributions are typically not included in the calculation of matching funds. Thus, USAID funds are probably leveraged to a greater extent than the matching figure would suggest.

b. Uses of Funds

Of the $10 million that USAID has made available for this program, UNCFSP has committed $6.5 million (65 percent) for partnership programs. Table 4 below shows that the IDP grants are by far the largest part of the program, followed by EDDI grants. Together these two elements constitute 93 percent of partnership commitments to date, with the CHP program absorbing only 7 percent of partnership resources.

Table 4. UNCFSP Commitments by Type of Partnership Award

Category	Amount ($000)	Percent of Award $s	Percent of Total $s
IDP Awards	4,500	70	45
EDDI Awards	1,500	23	15
CHP Awards	460	7	5
Total	**6,460**	**100**	**65**

Source: Data from UNCFSP, March 2005 Quarterly Report

This distribution of resources may change somewhat in the future. USAID's decision to cut the length of the EDDI grants has freed-up resources committed to that program element.[22] USAID has agreed to allow UNCFSP to reallocate those unutilized funds to other program elements. UNCFSP has indicated that it would like to reprogram those resources to IDP grants focused on three new technical areas of particular interest to USAID. The $3.5 million (35 percent of total resources) not committed for partnerships awards is available for the direct and indirect costs of program management.

---

[21] Table 1 of Appendix K provides data on the matches for all but five of the partnerships. Data on the missing five were not available at the time of this assessment. The $3.3 million figure cited above and found in that table thus understates the expected matching contribution.

[22] The Africa Bureau informed the team that the EDDI programs were cut to coincide with the termination date of the overall Presidential Initiative. This was a contracting error that was subsequently corrected, to the detriment of the program.

Table 5 below shows that expenditures to date on all activities total $7.2 million, or 72 percent of available USAID resources. Of that amount, disbursements for partnerships total $4.3 million (60 percent) and for management $2.9 million (40 percent). However, these figures overstate the percentage of funds used for program management. The reason for this is that management costs are recorded immediately, but there is often a lengthy delay in reporting partnership costs back to UNCFSP. The fact that management expenses (including overhead) in Year 7 were only 29 percent of total costs for that year lends credence to this hypothesis.

Table 5. UNCFSP Expenditures by Category of Program, 1996 to September 15, 2005

Category	Amount ($000)	Percent
Grants	**4,343**	**60.1**
IDP Grants	2,843	39.3
EDDI Grants	1,147	15.9
CHP Grants	353	4.9
Management/Overhead	**2,885**	**39.9**
Management	2,347	32.5
UNCFSP Overhead	538	7.4
Total	**7,228**	**100**

Source: UNCFSP data

When all costs are in, the actual management costs as a percentage of total costs are likely to be about 35 percent, which is in fact the share of resources that UNCFSP has not programmed to partnerships. This is considerably higher than the original Cooperative Agreement, which showed management and administration (which presumably included overhead) at 20 percent of total costs. The 20 percent figure seems quite unrealistic, particularly in light of the need for extensive technical assistance from the UNCFSP to inexperienced HBCUs and their overseas partners. USAID explicitly recognized the need for an increased level of management support in Modification 9. The assessment team views these higher costs as reasonable.[23] (Appendix L provides a breakdown of UNCFSP's management costs.)

The low level of resources going to UNCFSP overhead (seven percent of total expenditures) is particularly interesting and commendable. This low rate is realized because UNCFSP charges no overhead on funds passed on to universities for partnerships.[24]

These figures, reflecting expenditures as of mid-September 2005, indicate that UNCFSP has approximately $2.8 million remaining to be expended (although a significant share of these funds has probably been utilized but not yet submitted to UNCFSP for reimbursement). As it is unlikely that UNCFSP will be able to utilize these resources effectively in the time remaining under the Cooperative Agreement, USAID and UNCFSP will need to reach an agreement about the disposition

---

[23] Although Modification 9 provides additional funds for management, there is no explanation. The assessment team believes that the considerable change in resource allocation represented by these changes should have been better documented, i.e., the subject of a dialogue and written agreement between the UNCFSP and the USAID CTO and Awards Officer. The assessment team has not seen evidence that such a dialogue occurred.

[24] This UNCFSP practice contrasts with that employed in some other partnership programs, which charge more than 20 percent overhead on all dollars, including those passed on to participating universities.

of those resources. The team understands that there have been preliminary discussions about a no cost extension.

c. UNCFSP Financial Management

UNCFSP's practice is to channel all grant awards through the U.S. partner, which it then depends upon for financial reporting and accurate accounting. UNCFSP staff indicates that the lack of experience at some HBCUs with international programs and the common accounting weaknesses in the overseas partners has been a recurrent problem. UNCFSP has run training workshops in financial management to help correct this problem.

Although UNCFSP administers the partnerships largely on cost-reimbursement basis, it does provide an initial advance to new grantees. These advances are intended to kick start the programs, which otherwise might suffer long delays in obtaining operating funds from their respective universities. The advances effectively allow program activities to get underway while project directors work out the procedures for subsequent operating funds from their financial officers.

The most common complaints about financial flows come from the overseas partners. They do not control the funds and do not always understand the limitations that need to be enforced by the U.S. partner.

Another often mentioned issue is transferring resources overseas. While mechanisms for transferring funds clearly exist, they are often cumbersome, time-consuming, and costly, and meshing the financial systems of the two universities can make transfer far more difficult than partners expect at the outset of their programs.

2.1.6. Evaluation and Reporting

UNCFSP has carried out a variety of useful evaluation activities. These include, first, a requirement that each partnership conduct an assessment of its own activities and incorporate the results into a final report. The assessment team reviewed a sample of those reports and found them to be, in light of the small size of the programs themselves, quite adequate, sometimes very well done, and useful. Second, UNCFSP asks participants to evaluate each of its major events. The team found those evaluations provided useful feedback to event planners. Third, UNCFSP hired a consultant, Dr. Murty, who work has been mentioned previously, to conduct an independent assessment of the program. That report, based on a survey of partners, includes a wealth of useful information and analysis. Fourth, UNCFSP has collaborated in an EGAT effort to collect indicators across projects for reporting to the Congress. Although the team questions the both the nature of the data and its utility to UNCFSP or to the USAID CTO, the need for a system of this type for reporting to the Congress is understood. Finally, UNCFSP's newly formed Center for Assessment, Planning and Accountability recently conducted interviews with a variety of stakeholders on three partnerships in West Africa. The assessment team was impressed with the methodology developed for this exercise. However, the assessment team found that the resulting reports did not provide a great deal of useful new information. In sum, it is clear that UNCFSP takes evaluation very seriously and has worked diligently to assess program activities.

The program's basic reporting documents are quarterly and annual reports. UNCFSP uses these documents to transmit to USAID (as annexes) copies of most of the documents that it produces (e.g.,

RFAs, workshop agendas; workshop participant lists and evaluations; and activities conducted by each partnership during the reporting period). Many of these documents are helpful in understanding the activities that UNCFSP is implementing. However, the regular reporting does not adequately reflect the results of the evaluation activities.

The reporting requirement, as described in the UNCFSP proposal and the Cooperative Agreement is that quarterly reports should present an "assessment of impact of each funded activity against Mission results frameworks." That reporting requirement was not met by UNCFSP and was apparently not monitored and enforced by the EGAT CTOs.

Although the quarterly and annual reports incorporated a great deal of information, the assessment team found these documents difficult to read and to interpret. The reader tends to get lost in lists of administrative and program actions, some quite important (e.g., a new course launched) and some quite minor (e.g., getting a visa for a participant). These lists of actions completed are not compared to planned activities so the reader does not know whether the achievements are better or worse than expected. There is no indication as to whether partnerships are on schedule or not.

These concerns also apply to UNCFSP activities. The reports indicate what activities took place, but are not presented against planned activities and do not generally discuss problems that impeded progress. For example, the team did not see any discussion of some major issues (e.g., USAID's decision to cut the EDDI program and its effect on various partnerships and institutions, the difficulties encountered in holding overseas workshop and conferences). The reports do not include information on the solicitation/proposal review process, e.g., the number of concept papers submitted, the composition of the review panels and Mission comments on those proposals. Financial reporting is limited to a one-page summary of monthly expenditures by partnership. There is no narrative to explain what the data mean (e.g., where difficulties lie, what has changed over time, what actions need to be taken in the next quarter).

It is difficult to fault the UNCFSP for what the team perceives as reporting deficiencies, since there is no indication that USAID has signaled that it was dissatisfied with any of the deficiencies noted above. Nevertheless, the team felt that the reports do not adequately tell the story of this program to the USAID audience.

Similarly, the assessment team felt there is inadequate information about the program packaged for the general public. Although there are some attractive publications that are somewhat outdated, there is a dearth of current publications that highlight the accomplishments of the program. The Cooperative Agreement described the use of webpages and newsletters as a way to communicate development results and lessons learned. The team did not find that this was done, nor did it find that USAID's CTOs sought to correct this reporting deficiency. The UNCFSP website has a one page summary description of the program, but there is no up-to-date list of partnerships showing their objectives, funding levels and development results.

In sum, UNCFSP publications provide a large amount of information in each of its reports, but that information is often not in a form that highlights accomplishments and issues to be resolved. It does not adequately tell the excellent story of the program, and it is not packaged in a way that makes it most useful to a USAID audience or to the general public.

2.1.7. USAID's Role

EGAT/ED deserves credit for creating this program and for helping it to prosper in a difficult environment. Securing funding for the program has required ingenuity and perseverance. Although the assessment team is not aware of any USAID officers or office that openly opposed the program, it suffers from the same lack of regional bureau and Mission interest and support that is quite common to centrally funded programs, particularly those not driven by Mission buy-ins. In this environment, EGAT's success in obtaining double the initially expected funding for the program is a major accomplishment. However, by not telling the IDP-HBCU story better, opportunities to also capture Mission "buy-ins" may have been lost.

The program has had a succession of CTOs, each of whom seems to have established good working relationships with the UNCFSP staff. However, the CTOs had many other responsibilities demanding their attention, with the result that the program did not receive the attention one might hope to see. Had this not been the case, the assessment team believes that a number of things might have been done better. For example, the documentation of the project might be more complete, including explicit documents establishing the EDDI and CHP components; the decision to fund the CHP (a useful program to HBCUs but of less direct relevance to USAID SOs) might have been more thoroughly considered; USAID might have participated more actively in the solicitation process to encourage closer alignment of partnership-funded activities with Mission SOs; information cost-share and fund leveraging might have been more complete, and quarterly and annual progress reports might have been more meaningful and useful to USAID.

In summary, the IDP program was ultimately affected by a series of internal USAID factors: relatively low priority in the oversight office, reorganizations, questionable funding decisions and levels, lack of an annual program statement to allow sufficient planning, and a USAID philosophy of higher education as a mode of program implementation primarily limited to one sector as opposed to as a development partner relationship across all USAID sectors.

2.2. Partnership Activities

2.2.1. Partnership Planning

Most of the university partnerships supported under this program are newly formed.[25] This finding reflects the fact that the program is successful in expanding opportunities for HBCUs reaching HBCUs with few overseas relationships and encouraging them to form new relationships in order to participate. It also means that the partnerships face additional burdens. The partners must create relationships, shared visions, divisions of labor, understanding of one another's priorities, strengths and weaknesses, and they must develop a sense of trust, all while also trying to design and then implement a solid project intervention.

> **Developing a shared vision and trust**
>
> *"The primary challenge centered on the communication process between the HBCU and the IHE. The IHE was unclear as to the contribution which would be made by the HBCU. There was an assumption that the HBCU had unlimited resources, and several program were initiated that were beyond the scope of the IDP grant objectives. Once the objectives were understood by the IHE, the execution of the grant ran more smoothly."*

---

nts to the IDP survey for active partnerships were in partnerships

A key challenge that impacted the IDP program was a lack of strategic focus at the planning stage. As a result, many of the clusters or technical sector projects were wide-ranging and not necessarily responsive to priority USAID interests. (See also Section 2.2.5 below.)

Partnership leaders identified[26] the following as key implementation problems:

- transfer of funding from the HBCU to the IHE; communications (lack of, or poor, telephone, internet, and fax facilities, as well as language problems)

- travel and visa issues

- limited funding (budget reductions)

- exchange rate problems

- overly ambitious implementation goals

- staff turnover at all levels in both the HBCU and IHE

- financial reporting issues (understanding what was required and providing timely reports)

- arriving at shared goals and objectives

- security issues in the host country that impacted on travel or implementation

- securing broader university community support

- Intellectual Property Rights issues regarding books, videos and other products produced by the projects

> **Participants describe implementation problems**
>
> *"Money transfer between the HBCU and the IHE was problematic. HBCU checks took an average of 8 – 9 months to clear in the banking system."*
>
> *"The unstable political situation in the host country since 2002 slowed the project down and made some implementation impossible."*

Partnership directors attribute some of the problems they have encountered to inadequate pre-proposal consultation between the partners. In the assessment team survey for active partnerships, 10 of 22 responding partnership directors reported that the HBCU either took the lead in planning or was the sole planner. This suggests the need for more initial contact and communication between the HBCU and its IHE partner, and more involvement of the IHE in the planning process.

UNCFSP has utilized post-award workshops as a vehicle to prepare project directors to expect and to meet these challenges. Such conferences are certainly an important support for relatively inexperienced partners. Although the overseas partners are invited to those conferences, their participation has been limited.

Another useful tool would be written guidance to project directors. The assessment team understands that UNCFSP is now preparing "best practices" manuals to address many of the common problems faced by partnerships, such as how best to transfer funds to a developing country institution; most cost-effective means to communicate when partners have limited access to the internet and telephone service; procedures for obtaining J-1 visas, etc. The UNCFSP effort is primarily directed at helping HBCUs confront challenges faced in dealing with IHEs. It may also be useful to prepare guidelines to assist IHEs in working with HBCUs. Since ALO partnerships face the same issues, a collaborative

---

[26] This list is based on responses to the assessment team and Murty surveys.

approach to developing "best practices" manuals may be useful. USAID should consider publishing these manuals and making them broadly available to its project collaborators and the development community.

2.2.2. HBCU Partnership Management

Key HBCU responsibilities communications, effectiveness of collaboration with IHEs and overseas partners, generating counterpart contributions, reporting, evaluation and financial management are discussed in other sections of this report. In general, the assessment team believes that HBCUs were diligent in working within their own institutions and with their IHEs partners to support their approved partnership activities to achieve results. From the assessment survey, it was clear that there often was a "trial and error" approach to key challenges discussed above, but there was a willingness to struggle through difficulties and eventually come up with a workable solution. The assessment team's interaction with HBCU project directors and their overseas partners at the UNCFSP'S August 2005 conference revealed the high degree of dedication and determination that the university partners brought to this program.

The participating HBCUs prepare quarterly reports and a final report. Quarterly reports focus heavily on the tasks completed during the corresponding time period. The final reports attempt to look more comprehensively at what has been achieved, and those sampled by the assessment team were quite good. Judging from the comments of UNCFSP staff, the HBCUs performance on financial reporting has been mixed. UNCFSP has provided workshops to strengthen financial record keeping and reporting.

2.2.3. Roles of the IHEs

As shown in Table 6, over half of the respondents to the active partnership survey (11 out of 22 respondents for planning and 14 out of 22 respondents for implementation) state that the overseas or IHE universities have equally shared leadership roles with the HBCUs. The data suggest that IHE participation is somewhat greater during implementation (2 of 22 respondents report that IHEs took the lead) as compared with the planning phase (of 22 respondents, none thought that IHEs took the lead).

Table 6. Leadership in Planning or Implementing Partnership Activity

Activity	HBCU Lead	IHE Lead	Joint Leadership
Planning Partnership Activity	10 of 22	-	11 of 22
Implementation of the Activity	5 of 22	2 of 22	14 of 22

Source: IDP Assessment Team Survey

Key roles for IHEs involved making and maintaining contact with the USAID Mission and with host country institutions having a role to play in the impacted sector. Often, initial coordination and planning took place via telephone or email. A number of respondents to the assessment team survey suggested that the UNCFSP might want to support an early conference after each RFA process to put the new partners face-to-face so that the projects could start off with a solid base of understanding.

2.2.4. Partnership Financing

Most of the financial issues have been discussed above.[27] An additional issue is the adequacy of the level of financing of individual grants. This is a difficult question, because with a fixed amount of money, the size of grants determines how many programs can be undertaken.

The IDP and EDDI partnerships (which represent 93 percent of partnership financing) were intended to be three-year programs at up to $200,000 each. As previously noted, USAID cut the EDDI partnerships to two years. Without adequate advance notice of this change, the partnerships were unable to utilize all of the available resources. However, putting this anomaly aside, the level and length of the partnership grants seem to be appropriate. They permit a significant and sustained level of HBCU involvement, and they are sufficient to generate meaningful results. In the assessment team's survey and interviews, neither the level of financing nor the matching contributions were identified as significant problems.

2.2.5. Capacity Building and Development Results

Given the small size and short duration of the IDP partnerships, one should expect that the capacity building and development impacts of individual partnerships on national development would be modest. The IDP program should be viewed as "seed funding" to explore concepts, establish relationships, create interest and demand, and perhaps put into motion a development activity that would grow over time based on its initial success. Well-designed and implemented projects, even with low funding levels and short durations, can achieve rather significant and laudable development results and impacts that are sustainable in host countries. Some of the IDP activities are an example. In fact, encouraging partnership activity sustainability has been a key part of the sub-agreement process. Proposal authors were required to submit sustainability plans, and the peer review process judged their proposals, in part, on the likelihood that sustainability would be achieved.

As the assessment team was not able to make field visits, it reviewed partnership results and development impacts identified through the assessment team survey and a variety of project documents. As shown in Table 7, partnership participants overwhelming see beneficial results in terms

---

[27] Partnership financing, including the sources and uses of funds and matching resources, is discussed in Section 2.1.5. The need to tap new sources of financing for sustainability is discussed in Section 2.2.6.

of increased capacity in their own institutions. The few respondents that did not report excellent results faced some overwhelming circumstance, such as civil war in the host country. This almost unanimous view of success is corroborated by the Murty survey data, which found that 81 percent of responding partnerships rated their project as very successful and 19 percent rated their projects as mostly successful.[28]

Table 7. Examples of Successful Development Results and Enhanced Capacity

Result	Response	Examples
Positive development impact or results	17 of 22 respondents	Set up and operated vacuum packaging plant Established MS in International Business Conducted training courses in grant writing Discovered way to purify water using bagasse Trained indigenous AIDS workers in isolated areas Established youth Peace Clubs Collaborated on private sector business courses
Enhanced capacity to work internationally	20 of 22 respondents	Respondents believed that enhanced capacity was established either within their own faculty or more broadly in the HBCU or IHE university community

Source: IDP Assessment Team Survey

Respondents to the assessment team survey identified a number of unintended results of their partnership activities. Examples of some of the positive results are provided in Table 8 below.

Table 8. Unintended Results of Partnership Activities

Result	Activity	Responses
Positive	New faculty or academic exchange program initiated New areas for collaboration identified Unexpected NGO relationship fostered Trade Mission planned and implemented New areas for collaborative research identified Scholarship programs initiated New development fund established Unexpected donor provides support or follow-on funding	18 of 22 respondents

Source: IDP Assessment Team Survey

Reported impact seems to be strongest in those areas where higher education institutions see their own mandate transmitting skills and knowledge to others through collegial or faculty-student relationships. The institutions perceive themselves as less successful in changing overall systems or motivating groups of people to work together. They see themselves as least successful in having an impact on a complex issue like economic development in a developing country. (See Appendix M, Patterns of Success.)

---

[28] Self –reporting is an issue that was partially dealt with by UNCFSP's use of independent evaluators to examine project activities and results. Reporting against plans and targets helps put self-reporting in a more realistic light.

In the assessment team's view, IDP program objectives often complement Mission SOs but do not directly address them. In few cases would the Mission choose the specific IDP program and invest its own limited resources to carry it out. For example, the establishment at the IHE of computer labs and the improvement of training in information technology might indirectly contribute to USAID SOs, but that connection is frequently too indirect for it to be financed by the Mission. Although USAID's current programming processes have important strengths, many observers have noted that the difficulty of investing in institutional strengthening, capacity development and long-term training are significant weaknesses.[29] Following in Table 9 is a sample listing of specific results from IDP projects that could be seen as being responsive to USAID's general development thrust.

Table 9. Illustrative Results by Cluster

Cluster	Example of USAID-like Results
Agriculture	Establishment of a women's group for goat production, provision of goats and training for 188 women.
Curriculum Development	Cultural infusion Teacher Training modules developed by the program are being incorporated into the basic education system in Bahia.
Economic Development	Establishment of an executive diploma program.
Democratization	Training of targeted civil society groups.
Environment	Training of 283 engineers, scientists, teachers, researchers and government officials dealing with the environment/pollution control.
Technology Access	Establishment of a computer lab with 70 computers.
Science	Development of a patented product for purifying water.

Source: Dr. Murty's Survey

2.2.6. Partnership Sustainability

Partnership sustainability can only be determined over a considerable period of time. Of the 44 partnerships supported through this program, 24 are completed. However, many of these completed their programs only in the last two years.

The assessment team's survey of project directors and coordinators of on-going partnerships shows that the desire to maintain the partnership relationships is very strong. Most of the respondents to the assessment team's survey of active partnerships indicated that they expect their partnerships to continue over the long term (see Table 10).[30]

Table 10. Illustrative Sustainability Results

Activity	Response	Examples
Partnership Activity	19 of 22 respondents	$7 million follow-up funds from USAID/Ethiopia $300,000 in follow-on funding from Embassy CAO

---

[29] Interestingly, the USAID Administrator has recently spoken out for increased USAID investment in long-term training.

[30] It should be noted that partnership sustainability, while highly desirable for the future collaboration that might occur, may not be essential to the sustainability of the development activity that the partnership fostered.

	Positive	Tobago Assembly's budget funds follow-on program
		Self-financing MBA or SB programs established
Partnership Relations	20 of 22 respondents Positive	New cooperation areas identified and funding sought
		Faculty and student exchange initiated
		Joint research identified and initiated

Source: IDP Assessment Team Survey

However, experience shows that good intentions are not sufficient: financial support is critical to the maintenance of long-term relationships. Although the Cooperative Agreement suggests that partnerships should address future funding early in their programs, the partnerships are understandably focused on implementing their current programs. Thus, the information provided by partnerships in this survey may be a strong indicator of interest and intent, prerequisites for sustainability, but it does not necessarily indicate that the intent will be achieved.

To get a better view of what is being and will be achieved in terms of partnership sustainability, the assessment team also surveyed the directors of completed partnerships. Of those responding,[31] most claimed that their partnerships were continuing. Respondents were able to cite specific activities, although the level of activity was typically less intense than during the IDP-funding period, and in some cases the activity was primarily an effort to secure funding so that concrete activities could be undertaken in the future. In one case that of dramatic success (in terms of partnership continuity), the partners had secured $7 million of USAID Mission funding to continue program activities. (See text box.)

> **USAID/Ethiopia Funding Leads to Program and Partnership Sustainability**
>
> "*We just received funding for $7 million from* the USAID M*ission in Ethiopia over five years to carry out* [a] *goat and sheep (small ruminant) improvement program for Ethiopia. This* [funding] *could only have come because of our previous partnerships work that were supported by both IDP and ALO.*"

These responses were interesting and encouraging. However, in light of the short period of time since program support for the partnerships ended and the possible bias in responses (those having continuing relationships may be more inclined to respond to the survey), it is impossible to draw conclusions about the partnership sustainability at this time.

2.2.7. Other Stakeholder Views

The UNCFSP has had success in attracting prominent leaders like former Secretary of State Collin Powell as speakers in its conferences and events. It also designed and managed a well-attended workshop to put HBCUs in contact with Washington-area donors such as the World Bank. Another UNCFSP effort resulted in the Cultural Attaché at an Embassy in Africa providing $300,000 in follow-on funding support for an IDP initiative.

For the most part, however, the ISTI assessment team found that the IDP program has been a fairly well-kept secret, unknown to potential supporters in USAID/Washington, within USAID Missions, and in the broader minority community. Many stakeholders contacted were familiar with UNCF and its outstanding fund raising efforts in support of scholarships but had little or no knowledge of the IDP activities

---

[31] Despite phone follow-ups, the team was able to secure responses from only 12 of 24 completed partnerships.

under the UNCFSP umbrella.[32] There is little evidence of a sustained UNCFSP effort to reach, educate, and market the partnership program to the broader community, to have a presence in the discourse with political and donor institutions that direct or influence public spending, or to compete for and raise additional funds for IDP activities from the private philanthropic or for-profit private sectors.

2.2.8. Factors That Make This Program Unique

As indicated at the beginning of this report, the focus on HBCUs and the technical assistance provided to facilitate HBCU participation are unique to this program.

The HBCUs and their overseas partner institutions make a strong case that there is a third unique characteristic special attributes that HBCUs bring to international development. Among the HBCU attributes they identified were:

- Experience working and achieving success in resource-scarce environments
- An understanding of what it takes to work with marginalized populations
- Quality educational services at a lower cost than many higher education institutions
- Strong technical expertise and experience in selected development fields
- An ability to represent face and reality of America's diversity to overseas partners
- High sensitivity to the social and cultural aspects of development
- In education, a student-centered, caring and mentoring approach
- A perspective about development based on bottom-up approaches
- A collaborative approach to partnership and counterpart relationships

HBCUs were created to eliminate the adverse residue left from slavery while still maintaining a "separate" system that suffered from lack of funding and support. The HBCU system survived more than a century of legally-sanctioned discrimination against the institutions themselves and against their main clients, Americans of African descent. That unique history has produced institutions with survival and coping attributes, a sense of dedication to their educational mission and students; attention to the culture and social aspects of education, and more broadly, development; and a drive to reach those less advantaged and raise them up out of their situation using patience and persistence. Those qualities may be relevant in other parts of the world.

In addition to those characteristics, HBCUs have performed another role that has been and continues to be important internationally training leaders from developing countries. In many African countries, post-colonial leaders were trained in the United States at HBCUs. So, there is a strong connection between the leadership class in many countries and HBCUs. Illustrative of this is an impressive list of Lincoln University alumni from Africa: Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, first President of Ghana; Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, first President of Nigeria; Dr. Ozumba Mbadiwe, Federal Minister in Nigeria just after independence; and two government ministers from South Africa and from Namibia.

---

[32] For example, Walter and Andrew Young are strong supporters of the UNCF but knew little about UNCFSP international programs. They indicated interest in learning more about the program and a willingness to explore ways in which the Atlanta community might support IDP programs. Dr. Curtis Huff, Office of Citizen Exchange and Cultural Affairs in the US Department of State was not familiar with the IDP activity but expressed a willingness to consider funding support.

The assessment team wishes to reiterate that under the IDP and other USAID-funded programs HBCUs have demonstrated their ability to work worldwide, not just in Africa. As an example, the Mississippi Consortium for International Development trained the first democratically-elected government in Romania and was invited to be on-the-ground advisors for the inauguration.

3. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

3.1. UNCFSP's Management of Resources

In general, UNCFSP gets good marks for the management of IDP resources.

Positive Attributes:

- *Relatively low overhead*
- *Small staff for a large, complex activity*
- *Innovative use of initial advances*
- *Flexibility and responsiveness to USAID guidance*
- *Relevant and well-utilized technical assistance*
- *Use of evaluation as a management tool*

Negative Attributes:

- *Poor marketing of program to USAID and the general public*
- *Weak financial and results reporting*

3.2. Partnership Activities

Partnership activity results were successful in increasing the interest and capacity of HBCUs and IHEs to work internationally.

Positive Attributes:

- *Heightened HBCU and IHE interest in participating in international development activities*
- *Strengthened capacity of HBCUs and IHEs to work in development overseas*
- *Introduction of smaller, less experienced HBCUs to international development work*
- *High confidence that activities and partnership relations are sustainable*

Negative Attributes:

- *Weak reporting on development activities and results*
- *Mixed responsiveness to USAID Mission SOs and priorities*
- *Limited evidence of participation by groups other than the university partners and of financial support from non-university sources*

3.3. USAID Management and Support for the Program

USAID was successful in creating a worldwide initiative involving HBCUs in international development in Asia, Latin America and Eurasia as well as Africa. The program expanded the base of HBCU's involved in USAID development, and strengthened and enhanced the capacity of HBCUs with little international development experience to work abroad.

Positive Attributes:

- *Creativity in program design and in generating funding from many USAID sources to support the program*
- *Close work by CTOs with UNCFSP to help develop financial reporting that met federal government standards*

Negative Attributes:

- *CTO turn-over introduced differing management styles and impeded consistent USAID monitoring and oversight of the IDP program*
- *Weak budget oversight*
- *Lack of a clear paper trail on important events and issues*
- *Failed to adequately involve Mission management and high levels in USAID/Washington*

3.4. Achievement of Program Goals

3.4.1. Strengthening the Ability of IHEs to Address Development Needs

Some activities of IHEs directly addressed development needs of interest to USAID, although the results in this regard were mixed. IHEs stated that their interest in working in international development and their capacity to do so was strengthened by the IDP program. (Better reporting on development results would have produced better information supporting what seems to be strong performance by some partnerships.)

3.4.2. Contributing to USAID's Goals and Strategic Objectives

Performance on this goal was mixed. In general, responsiveness to USAID's goals and strategic objectives was not very strong even though UNCFSP took this objective very seriously. The difficulty that participating HBCUs experience working collaboratively with Missions is common to programs of this type.[33] A tighter design from the outset focused on involvement of Missions would have helped correct this deficiency.

3.4.3. Increasing the Involvement of HBCUs in Development

The program clearly demonstrated that it was possible to increase both the interest and involvement of HBCUs in international development and to strengthen their capacity to do so.

---

[33] Similar difficulties were reported in the 2004 ISTI assessment of the ALO university partnerships program.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1. Recommendations for UNCFSP

The UNCFSP has done an excellent job in providing required support and oversight for the IDP program. As with all programs, there are always areas that could be improved. The assessment team recommends that in the time remaining in the IDP program, UNCFSP should focus attention on the following areas:

- *Tell the IDP story better.* There is an excellent story to tell. While UNCFSP has produced some materials, much more is needed to tell the story in compelling ways that will generate interest and garner support from USAID regional bureaus, field Missions, other donors, the private sector, and the general public. These materials should highlight the unique attributes that HBCUs and MSIs bring to development and to the task of representing America to the world.

- *Be more aggressive in identifying funding partners for the partnerships.* With the marketing material mentioned above, UNCFSP should reach out to USAID and beyond to find new funding that would help successful partnerships continue their programs and enable support for new activities beyond the life of IDP.

- *Develop "best practices" manuals.* There are many examples of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation bottlenecks that have been confronted and addressed by the current program. Collecting, organizing and synthesizing these lessons learned to inform future partnership programs should be a high priority over the remaining months of IDP.

- *Develop plans for the remaining period of the project.* UNCFSP needs to determine the amount of remaining funds that could be committed to new activities and, together with USAID, consider how those funds might best be utilized.

4.2. Recommendations for USAID

EGAT/ED, with cooperation and support from many USAID/Washington Bureaus and Offices and USAID field Missions, developed and has overseen implementation of a worldwide $10 million program that is assuring expanded participation of HBCUs and other MSIs in international development. There are areas that could be improved.

- *Tell the IDP story better.* Work with IDP in finding ways to tell the story better and market the program. The public diplomacy efforts of the Agency and Missions should be tapped to better describe and publicize IDP success stories and get the word out to the broader development community.

- *Provide consistent and proactive oversight.* Even though individual CTOs have been very involved and supportive, the constant turnover in CTOs has had adverse impacts. Through IDP's termination, EGAT should work closely with UNCFSP to ensure efficient termination and closeout process.

- *Make timely decisions on closeout and future programs.* USAID should consider with UNCFSP how any uncommitted resources should be employed. USAID also needs to begin a decision-making process on the merits of designing future university partnership programs.

4.3. Joint Recommendations for UNCFSP and USAID

- *Determine status of matching funds.* UNCFSP and the USAID CTO should review the status of matching funds to ensure that the requirement is being met and that an adequate record is maintained.

- *Improve program reporting.* UNCFSP and USAID should collaborate on the development of a new, simple reporting format. Such an effort will be constrained by the fact that the program is in its final year and the participating HBCUs cannot be expected to adopt significant increased burdens. Even without changing the reporting from the partnerships to UNCFSP, the new reporting format could address progress toward the project's goals, discuss current implementation and financial issues (including, for example, disbursement problems and matching fund levels).

- *Allocate Remaining Program Funds.* UNCFSP should prepare a budget for the use of the remaining funds, including funds that are no longer needed for suspended EDDI partnerships and reach critical agreements about the timing and nature of any required actions.

ADDENDUM – CREATING A NEW PARTNERSHIP RELATIONSHIP

This report documents that much has been achieved through the IDP program. At the same time, probably for very legitimate reasons (e.g., competing priorities, limited staff) some opportunities to increase the size and impact of the program were not exploited. Reference to this has been made in the previous pages. This section summarizes those lost opportunities and proposes that USAID consider developing a new partnership relationship with HBCUs/MSIs that builds on the needs of the Agency and the strengths of the HBCU/MSI community.

Centrally-funded programs often have trouble finding traction in USAID field Missions. This program was no exception. Because it was Washington funded and managed, many Missions failed to fully engage with partnership activities. This resulted in missed opportunities and a program that fell short of achieving one of its main objectives, assisting Missions address SO issues. In addition, USAID Missions lost opportunities to utilize the talent of universities to address key development issues in their SO framework and universities lost opportunities to demonstrate to USAID Missions and Embassies the quality of services that they can offer when brought in to work on development issues. HBCUs and their IHE partners also lost opportunities to establish relationships with USAID and Embassies that might have led to follow-on funding. When relationships were strong (Ethiopia, for instance), the Mission perceived the benefits of the partnership program and funded a $7 million follow-on activity.

The failure of USAID and UNCFSP to proactively market specific HBCU partnership successes to various communities (USAID, State, and other federal agencies, to the higher education and the development communities, to bilateral and multilateral donors, NGOs, private foundations, the for-profit private sector, and to host country institutions and governments) represents a major missed opportunity. A compelling story attracts funding. There are many compelling stories in the IDP program. Better marketing and promotion could have attracted new implementation and funding partners for IDP; partners who could have enhanced the impact of project activities and contributed to the continuation of activities and partnership relationships beyond USAID's funding cycle.

University contributions of time and facilities are important to success, but continued cooperation and programming usually depends on financial contributions. Recognizing the limits of universities in making significant financial contributions, UNCFSP might consider following a more market-oriented approach to funds mobilization, perhaps following Global Development Activity models. UNCF has gained tremendous experience over its many years of operation and has been very successful in raising funds for its domestic scholarship activities. Not using the UNCF experience and approach to raise matching funds for international programs such as IDP represents a missed opportunity on the part of UNCFSP.

Related to this was the missed opportunity to document and disseminate best practices and lessons learned from the IDP program. Many questions demand answers, among them:

How could USAID make best use of the newly acquired technical assistance and outreach competence of UNCFSP? How does USAID and UNCFSP best capture and make use of planning and implementation lessons from participating HBCUs and IHEs? How can USAID build upon IDP development results and take HBCU partnerships to a new level? How can the modality of higher education partnerships be more widely disseminated/accepted in USAID as resources and assets to address development issues across all sectors? How can institutional capacity building lessons learned through higher education partnerships be

disseminated throughout the Agency and serve as a model for new technical assistance and training approaches in all sectors? What has been learned by higher education partners about attracting and retaining private sector funding in support of development goals and objectives? How can that knowledge be better utilized by USAID?

This assessment was not scoped or funded to obtain answers to these important questions but UNCFSP and USAID should find ways to collect, synthesize and make available broadly within and outside of the Agency information on these and similar questions. In the waning months of the IDP program, USAID and UNCFSP should take action to address this as a foundation for future program and design decisions.

As opportunities were missed, a new opportunity emerges – elevating USAID's relationship with HBCUs and the minority institution community to a new level of partnership that is mutually beneficial to both sides. This proposed new relationship could be built on what has been learned from the IDP program, especially from the lost opportunities discussed above.

If a ledger were made of opportunities lost under the IDP program, it might be divided into two columns. Opportunities that were lost because Missions and Bureaus did not take full advantage of using HBCUs could form the left column. That column could be described as a "self-limiting" prophecy. The program modality of IDP gave a limited amount of funds for a limited purpose (largely defined by the institutions themselves) to particular institutions. In many cases, the relatively small amount of funding restricted opportunities for program growth and for significant growth in institutional capacities although for new entrants into international development, it did provide a solid experience. The goals of seeking integration with Mission SOs and programs and of capturing Mission complementary funding for IDP were impeded as many Missions did not perceive the benefit of working closely with and providing additional resources to IDP.

While IDP offered an opportunity to think expansively about how USAID – HBCU cooperation could maximize benefits for USAID and for the institutions, that opportunity was lost because USAID often viewed the universities as an implementation modality rather than as development partners. It was lost because many USAID officers in the field and in Washington did not adequately understand the strengths and experience of HBCUs and minority institutions and therefore did not necessarily engage those institutions in ways that tapped their strengths. Even so, there were IDP successes that signal future directions and possibilities.

Some IDP partnerships reached out to marginal communities in their host countries. HBCUs were able to successfully transfer to a host country setting the techniques that they had accumulated over many years in the U.S. while serving such populations. The IHE partners learned a great deal from this unique reservoir of HBCU knowledge and the countries benefited from this special "niche" that HBCUs and other minority-serving institutions are uniquely qualified to offer beyond traditionally understood technical assistance and expertise. USAID's new education strategy calls for a "full access" approach to development. Following the above-mentioned example, HBCUs (and MSIs in general) may be the best institutions to help EGAT/ED implement this new strategic mandate. This would require USAID and the minority institution community to engage one another and think expansively about the relationship, identifying areas where the relationship could prosper based on USAID's interests and the strengths and comparative advantages of the universities.

Opportunities lost by the minority institutions themselves would form the right hand column of the ledger, which could be described as a "self-fulfilling" prophecy. As mentioned above, work remains to identify and document the true strengths and capacities of HBCUs and minority institutions, and to use that as the basis for consideration of a new relationship with USAID. The institutions themselves have the primary responsibility for looking deep into their own capacities and identifying what their comparative advantages are in areas of interest to USAID. To not do so would represent a lost opportunity of major proportions.

In assessing their own strengths, the focus would have to be on what the opportunities are for working with USAID (and possibly State). In addition to traditional development programs, USAID now faces an increasing challenge as it tries to address the development needs of alienated, marginal, and disadvantaged populations in transition and post-conflict nations, and as it attacks the most demanding development problems remaining in other countries. Finding ways to provide "full access" is a promising area for engagement that should become at least one key marketing focus for HBCUs, other minority institutions, and umbrella organizations such as UNCFSP and NAFEO, based on the special approaches, capacities and other unique attributes of HBCUs to reach out to those groups either domestically or internationally. To date, those capacities have not been clearly articulated, or if they have been, they have not clearly emerged or have gone largely unnoticed and appreciated.

There are hurdles to be overcome. While USAID encourages innovation, it generally puts its funding behind "established " programs and strategies. This is changing as USAID faces new development challenges that require more than standard development approaches. HBCUs and MSIs should aggressively position themselves on the forefront of this opportunity and insist that USAID lead the international donor response to the new development challenge of expanded access to previously underserved or unserved populations.

The Agency would have to take a more direct role in developing a new partnership as well. It would have to commit to working with minority institutions to assist them understand the development challenges that USAID faces. It would have to make USAID staff available to better understand and relate to the minority institution community. Perhaps staff exchanges could be considered. The Agency would also have to be responsible for preparing the terrain with Missions and help break through the press of immediate business by stepping back to identify and work on looming future needs. EGAT's success in getting youth activities accepted as an independent approach and concern within the Agency might serve as a model. It has taken years of proactive softening up on the conceptual side and centrally subsidized preparation on the activity side to achieve this. Can that same investment of time and effort be made to achieve the new strategy's "full access" mandate? And, in doing so, can a new USAID partnership relationship be developed with minority higher education institutions?

In conclusion, despite the important missed opportunities discussed above, much was achieved by the IDP program with a relatively modest funding investment. That is a tribute to the hard work and effort by a small but dedicated leadership staff at UNCFSP; the vision and creativity of the HBCU and IHE partners who realized win-win situations in difficult situations; and to the funding and other support from EGAT/ED and other USAID/W partners whose $10 million in funding underpinned the IDP program.

HBCU and IHE capacity has been strengthened; the base of participating institutions has been expanded; and excellent development results have been achieved in some cases even though in some

countries the results may have been complementary to rather than directly focused on USAID's strategic thrust. There is an opportunity for USAID to build on the IDP experience and that of other such programs by thinking expansively about a new development partnership between USAID and the minority higher education institution community, and then by acting, to make it happen. That is an opportunity that should not be lost.

APPENDIX A: USAID'S SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF UNCFSP'S INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

BACKGROUND

In February of 1998 USAID issued a performance-based Request for Applications for a five-year $5 million dollar activity and awarded the Cooperative Agreement to the United Negro College Fund Special Programs Corporation (UNCFSP) in 1998. The activity has been extended three years beyond the initial estimated completion date.

The "International Development Partnerships (IDP)" provides a mechanism whereby Missions, Bureaus and Centers initiate higher education partnerships between Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and international Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) in Africa, Asia and the Near East, Europe and Eurasia, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

IDP aims to:

- Strengthen the ability of institutions in developing countries to meet national economic and social development needs;

- Assist in the achievement of USAID goals and the strategic objectives (SOs) of Missions; and

- Further the international involvement of HBCUs.

TITLE

Global Evaluation and Monitoring (GEM)

OBJECTIVE

The purpose of the assessment is to do the following: (1) monitor progress toward the achievement of program objectives during the course of the Cooperative Agreement; (2) provide USAID with an independent assessment it can compare to other higher education program assessments; and (3) make recommendations for strengthening the effectiveness and impact of partnerships between USAID and HBCUs, and other U.S. Minority Serving Institutions.

STATEMENT OF WORK

The assessment will be conducted in two parts- Part A and Part B.

Part A consists of an assessment of the programmatic activities and financial management of the IDP Program. Part A considers partnership accomplishments as they address the objectives of the Cooperative Agreement.

- Overall Results
- Partnership Planning and Activity Implementation

- Characteristics of the Grant Award

- Cost-Effectiveness

- Role of USAID and UNCFSP

- Capacity-Building

- Sustainability of the Partnership

- Networking and Disseminating Information about Partnerships

Part B consists of an assessment of the non-partnership activities under the IDP Program through UNCFSP. Non-partnership activities are characterized as technical assistance, and include: regional workshops, campus visits, marketing IDP and HBCUs to USAID Missions and IHEs, electronic and in-office consulting, and electronic information sharing. Part B considers the impact of these activities.

- Overall Results

- Technical Assistance Planning and Implementation

- Cost-Effectiveness

- Capacity Building

ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY AND QUESTIONS

1) Develop a work plan for achieving the goals and deliverables of this SOW.

2) Review all key documents, including the Cooperative Agreement, modifications, UNCFSP request for applications, sub-grants between UNCFSP and HBCUs, annual work plans, quarterly program reports, quarterly financial reports, annual or interim reports, conference reports, results indicator data, special reports, other publications that have been produced, and EGAT/ED's Higher Education Strategic Objective 2 results framework, indicators, and targets.

3) Develop an assessment instrument to achieve the objectives of the assessment; work closely with the EGAT/ED Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO), EGAT/ED's Higher Education Strategic Objective 2 Team staff, and UNCFSP to ensure the quality and practicality of the resulting instrument.

4) Conduct key interviews in person or by telephone with senior USAID officials, senior leaders within the HBCU community, selected institutional partnership directors and co-directors (US and host country) and other development partners and stakeholders associated with this relationship (public and private donors, NGOs, etc.) using the instrument to study the issues and questions raised below.

5) Work closely with the CTO and the UNCFSP Project Manager.

The Contractor will address the following questions and concerns in conducting the assessment of IDP:

Part A. Assess and compare the accomplishments of IDP activities with the objectives of the Cooperative Agreement:

Overall Results of IDP Program

- What were the intended and unintended results and impacts of IDP activities? What factors led to each set of results and impacts?

- What were the strengths and limitations of IDP activities?

- Are there certain patterns in results, impacts, and effectiveness for IDP activities as they address USAID strategic objectives? Does the success of IDP activities in achieving USAID objectives vary, if at all, by thematic cluster? What recommended actions could enhance effectiveness?

- Have partnership activities affected policy change at local, regional, or national levels to meet economic and social development needs in host countries?

Partnership Planning and Activity Implementation

- What were the key challenges to planning and implementing partnership activities and how did partnerships overcome these challenges?

Characteristics of the Grant Award

- How effective was the solicitation process, including the development of the solicitation, application process, and the determination of evaluation criteria used to review proposals in generating excellent project outcomes?

Cost-Effectiveness

- Do IDP activities achieve objectives in a cost-effective manner?

- To what extent were there sources of matching and leveraging in partnership implementation? Did the matching or leveraging increase the productivity of the partnership in any measurable fashion?

Role of USAID

- How effective is EGAT/ED in facilitating the strategic engagement of Central Bureaus, regional bureaus, and Missions with the HBCU community in support of USAID's development agenda? What recommended actions could enhance effectiveness?

Capacity Building

- To what degree do the partnerships go beyond technical assistance to capacity-building for sustainable development in host countries?

Sustainability of the Partnership

- Have the partnership activities resulted in an increase in collaborative research and cooperation between HBCUs and international institutions of higher education in addressing

social and development needs and concerns? To what extent does this collaboration continue beyond the USAID grant? Why or why not? With what consequence?

Networking and Disseminating Information about Partnerships

- How well do EGAT/ED's Higher Education indicators tell the story of the Cooperative Agreement and partnerships? What other indicators could enhance the story? Could any of the results assessed serve as additional SO2 indicators?

- What is the level of support by USAID officials involved with IDP activities for collaboration with HBCUs and other Minority Serving Institutions?

- What are the views of selected HBCU leaders regarding priories and opportunities for more strategic collaboration with USAID?

Part B. Assess the impact of non-partnerships activities under the IDP Program:

Overall Results of IDP Program

- Have the non-partnership activities increased HBCU interest and capacity to address international development issues, particularly for those HBCUs with little or no international experience?

- How effective were IDP non-partnership activities in helping to strengthen HBCUs' capacity to achieve their educational missions?

Technical Assistance Planning and Implementation

- How effective was UNCFSP in facilitating the strategic engagement of the HBCU community in support of partner universities' development agenda? What recommended actions could support universities' development goals?

- To what degree did IDP technical assistance activities (regional workshops, campus visits, marketing IDP and HBCUs to USAID Missions and IHEs, electronic and in-office consulting, and electronic information sharing) assist HBCUs to be more effective in their partnership activity or in international development work in general?

Cost-Effectiveness

- How effective was UNCFSP at assisting HBCUs to leverage matching funds?

- Could technical assistance be conducted in a more cost-efficient manner across various federal agencies?

Capacity Building

- What lessons learned can be distilled regarding the level of mentoring and outreach needed to further the international involvement of HBCUs?

- Is it in the Agency's best interest to support this type of capacity building?

REPORTS AND PROJECT DELIVERABLES

1. A work plan with due dates outlining how Parts A and B will be implemented and how the overall goals of this SOW will be achieved, due within one week after beginning work.

2. An oral progress report due halfway through the assessment period.

3. A report presenting the scope and methodology used, important findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned for Parts A and B. The separate sections on Parts A and B shall contain the results of the findings and recommendations on the questions listed in the relevant portions of Sections IV and V. The section on Part B shall include an actionable list of agreed upon recommendations for how the USAID and MSI relationship, fostered by the IDP Cooperative Agreement, can be strengthened strategically and programmatically.

The report shall be no longer than 20 pages and shall include an Executive Summary, Table of Contents, Body of the Report, and Appendices (not included in page count).

A draft in 5 copies shall be submitted to both USAID and the UNCFSP for their review, due by October 3, 2005. The team shall schedule a meeting with USAID, UNCFSP and higher education representatives to review and receive comments on the draft. From that meeting the team shall prepare a final report and submit 10 copies to the EGAT/ED CTO, along with a digital copy in Microsoft Word, due by October 17, 2005.

APPENDIX B: IDP ASSESSMENT TEAM SHORT BIOGRAPHIES

Paul White, IDP Assessment Team Leader

Paul White served USAID for almost 35 years in five Asian and four Latin American countries. As Mission Director in Mexico, Mr. White was responsible for developing and implementing a complex portfolio of democracy, health, environment, energy, micro-enterprise, and education and training activities in partnership with Mexican institutions. He led the development of a South-South program that addressed U.S.-Mexico cooperation with Central and South America, the Caribbean, and other regions of the world, and designed a $50 million Presidential Initiative - the U.S.- Mexico Training, Internships, Exchanges and Scholarship (TIES) program to involve U.S. and Mexican higher education communities in social and economic development partnerships.

Before Mexico, Mr. White was Minister Counselor for Development Cooperation in Japan where he established USAID's office in Tokyo in 1991, and developed and coordinated the foreign assistance aspects of the U.S.-Japan Common Agenda – a $15 billion worldwide policy and project partnership between USAID and Japan's official development assistance program. Under his leadership, the Common Agenda and related programs supported over 250 U.S. - Japan cooperation projects worldwide in priority development assistance areas.

In the late 1980's, Mr. White served as Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for the Asia-Near East Bureau, directing USAID's cross-border programs in Cambodia and Afghanistan. He was a participant in the Cambodia Peace process, and he initiated the first USAID-funded projects in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam after the war. Mr. White developed USAID's project support for the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) process.

Mr. White served in Guatemala as USAID's Deputy Director from 1986 to 1988. In the mid-1980's, as Director of the USAID Education, Environment, Energy, and Training office for Latin America in Washington, he developed a Peace Scholarships project that supported training in the U.S. and university partnerships for more than 15,000 Central and South Americans. During that period, he headed the Agency's Minority Recruitment and Retention Committee and worked extensively with the Agency's HBCU support programs. From 1981 to 1983, he served in Peru as Director for USAID's Health, Education and Nutrition program. From 1976 to 1979, he was Director of the Health and Education office in Panama.

James R. Washington, Education and Training Evaluation Specialist

Mr. Washington, a retired Senior Foreign Service Officer with over 35 years of diversified public sector experience (25 with USAID), has been responsible for planning and implementing and evaluating a variety of formal and non-formal education and training programs. He began his career with USAID/W 1970 in the Office of Personnel as the special recruiter for Minorities and for the International Development Interns (IDI) program.

Mr. Washington later assigned overseas as Chief Education and Human Resources Development Officer in Accra, Ghana (79-83); Human Resources Development Advisor in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire (83-89; and General Development Officer in Yaounde, Cameroon (89-92).

Upon his return to USAID/W in 1992, Mr. Washington was assigned as the Deputy and interim Director for the Office of International Training (92-94) and as the Senior Advisor to the Assistant Administrator for the Africa Bureau (94-96).

During his tenure as Senior Advisor to the AA for Africa, Mr.Washington assisted in the creation of the Agency's Minority Serving Institutions Committee, which was comprised of senior level representatives from each of Agency's bureaus and independent offices. The MSIC was created to ensure compliance with the Gray Amendment and other Executive Orders concerning the development and recommendation of policies and activities to increase the participation of MSIs in USAID hiring and procurement. As Senior Advisor to the AA for Africa, Mr. Washington also served as the MSI coordinator.

Since retiring from USAID in 1996, Mr. Washington has been working part-time as the Human Capacity Development Advisor at Howard University Continuing Education.

Gerald Wein, Evaluation Specialist

Mr. Wein began his 26-career as a USAID employee (1966-92) as an economist. He worked as an education economist in East Africa and in Latin American and Caribbean region. He rose through the ranks to become the Deputy or Acting Director of USAID Missions in Nicaragua, Tunisia and Ecuador. Mr. Wein's extensive experience at USAID included 15 years living in developing countries, and it afforded him numerous opportunities to collaborate with U.S. colleges and universities and U.S. university associations on strengthening overseas higher education institutions.

Following his USAID career, Mr. Wein joined Abt Associates in 1993 to serve as the director of two worldwide USAID-financed projects on health financing and management reform. In that capacity he encouraged and facilitated an expanded role for sub-contractors Howard University and Harvard University.

As an independent consultant from 1993-2005, Mr. Wein has led or participated in numerous evaluations that highlighted the contributions to international development of U.S. colleges and universities, including Boston College, Georgia State, the University of Alaska, the University of Maryland, Georgetown University and many community colleges. In 2004, he participated in an assessment of the USAID-financed university partnership program with Association Liaison Office (ALO) for University Cooperation in Development.

In March 2005, Mr. Wein joined the Centre for Development and Population (CEDPA). He serves there as Director of the Technical Assistance in AIDS, Child Survival, Infectious Diseases, Population and Basic Education (TAACS) program.

Mr. Wein holds a BA degree in international relations and economics from the University of Southern California, a MA degree in economics from the University of California at Berkeley and a MA degree in public administration from Harvard University.

Kristi Chaveas, Analyst and Activity Support Specialist

Kristi Chaveas is a mid-level professional with over five years of research and program support experience. Currently, Mrs. Chaveas is working as a Program Associate for the International Science and Technology Institute, Inc. (ISTI). Mrs. Chaveas has been involved in a variety of technical

projects, including data analysis and report preparation for USAID evaluation and monitoring assessments and for a cost and cost effectiveness analysis on micronutrient programs in Tanzania. Her other responsibilities at ISTI involve executing multiple program management activities, liaising with ISTI clients, and research for micronutrient activities.

Mrs. Chaveas worked for over two years as a Research Analyst for Indiana University where she prepared reports on economic development and conducted analysis on Latin American resources. Prior to her work at Indiana University, Mrs. Chaveas worked in program and planning support at FINCA International Inc. in Washington DC. She also has experience working in program and conference support for Cook Inc. in Spain and the Department of State in Washington DC. Mrs. Chaveas holds an MPA from Indiana University in Public Finance and Economic Development. She is fluent in Spanish and English.

APPENDIX C: BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lincoln University, *Final Report, Partnership for Democracy and Empowerment: Lincoln University – Cocody University,* September 30, 2004.

Mississippi Consortium for International Development, *Final Report, Information Technology Enhancement: A Partnership between the Mississippi consortium for International Development and the University of Mauritius,* under the Education for Development Initiative (EDDI), September 30, 2004.

Mississippi Valley State University, *Final Report, Pathways to Globalization: Language and Entrepreneurship Program Development Through Information Technology: A Partnership between Mississippi Valley State University and the University of Nouakchott – Mauritania,* undated.

Murty, Komanduri. *UNCFSP Global Center Partnerships Evaluation Report*, 2003.

Nagle, Barry. *Documentation for Impact and Lessons Learned: Building a Portfolio of*

International Development Partnership Experiences, Commissioned by United Negro College Fund Special Programs Corporations, Fairfax, Virginia, August, 2005.

_____. *International Development Activity Evaluation: Mauritania, Cote d'Ivoire, and*

Ghana Site Visits, United Negro College Fund Special Programs, Fairfax, Virginia, August 2005.

North Carolina A&T State University, *Final Report, International Development Partnership with Bangladesh University of Engineering & Technology (BUET) to Develop Collaborative Research in Pollution Prevention,* September 10, 2004.

Savannah State University, *Final Report, Renewable Energy for the Empowerment of Women and Girls,* September 30, 2004.

United Negro College Fund Special Programs.

UNCFSP IDP Program Annual Reports, Quarterly Reports and Work Plans

- Annual Work Plan, June 8, 1998- May 31, 1999.
- Quarterly Report, June 3, 1998- August 31, 1998.
- Quarterly Report, October 1, 1998- Dec 31, 1998.
- Quarterly Report, January 1, 1999- March 31, 1999.
- Annual Report , June 3, 1998- May 31, 1999.
- Annual Work Plan, June 1, 1999- May 31, 2000.
- Quarterly Report, June 1, 1999- August 31, 1999.
- Quarterly Report, October 1, 1999- Dec 31, 1999.
- Quarterly Report, January 1, 2000- March 31, 2000.
- Annual Report, June 1, 1999- May 31, 2000.

- Annual Work Plan, June 1, 2000- May 31, 2001.

- Quarterly Report, July 1, 2000- September 30, 2000.

- Quarterly Report, October 1, 2000- Dec 31, 2000.

- Quarterly Report, January 1, 2001- March 31, 2001.

- Annual Report, June 1, 2000- May 31, 2001.

- Quarterly Report, July 1, 2001- August 31, 2001.

- Quarterly Report, September 1, 2001- November 31, 2001.

- Quarterly Report, December 1, 2001- February 28, 2002.

- Annual Report, June 1, 2001- May 31, 2002.

- Quarterly Report, June 1, 2002- August 31, 2002.

- Quarterly Report, September 1, 2002- November 31, 2002.

- Quarterly Report, December 1, 2002- February 28, 2003.

- Annual Report, June 1, 2002- May 31, 2003.

- Quarterly Report, June 1, 2003- August 31, 2003.

- Quarterly Report, September 1, 2003- November 30, 2003.

- Quarterly Report, December 1, 2003- February 29, 2004.

- Annual Report, June 1, 2003- May 31, 2004.

- Quarterly Report, June 1, 2004- August 31, 2004.

- Quarterly Report, September 1, 2004- November 30, 2004.

- Quarterly Report, December 1, 2004- February 28, 2005.

- Annual Report, June 1, 2004- May 31, 2005.

UNCFSP IDP Program Special Reports

- IDP Workshop Evaluation Report (Funding and Training Opportunities in International Development), December 1, 2003.

- IDP Workshop Evaluation Report (Proposal Writing in International Development), January 1, 2004.

- Special Report, *Requested Documents Pertaining To: International Development Partnerships, Education for Development and Democracy Initiative, Cross Hemispheric Partnerships, Financial Reporting,* April 5, 2004.

- Special Report II, May 17, 2004.

UNCFSP IDP Program Requests for Applications

- International Development Partnership Activity, Request for Applications (RFA), November 10, 2003.

- Cross Hemispheric Partnership (CHP), Promoting Latin American Studies for Teacher Trainers at Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Announcement, September 29, 2003.

_____Program for: *2005 Annual International Affairs and Development Partnership*

Conference: Strategically Strengthening Higher Education's Involvement in Pressing International Issues, August 13 – 15, 2005.

United States Agency for International Development (USAID). *Assessment of the*

Higher Education Partnerships for Global Development Program, Volume I and II, November 30, 2004.

_____. Cooperative Agreement between USAID and the College Fund/UNCF for Award No. HNE-A-00-98-00150-00, June 8, 1998.

_____. Generations of Quiet Progress, The Development Impact of U.S. Long-term

University Training on Africa from 1963 to 2003, Volume I, August, 2004.

_____. Modification 09 to Award No. HNE-A-00-98-00150-00, November 1, 2001.

_____. Request for Application (RFA) No. M/OP-98-513 International Development

Partnership Activity (IDP), February 11, 1998.

_____. Reports to USAID Missions (on 11 individual IDP partnerships), June 22,

2004.

_____, and Natsios, Andrew S. *Memorandum for USAID Mission Directors, USAID Initiative for Long Term Training and Capacity Building*, June 10, 2005.

_____, Russo, Sandra and McPherson, Malcolm. *The Transformation of Higher Education in South Africa: Guidelines for USAID Support*, March 4, 2005.

APPENDIX D: ISTI ASSESSMENT TEAM CONTACTS

I.   United Negro College Fund Special Programs (UNCFSP) Corporation

2750 Prosperity Avenue, Suite 600

Fairfax, VA 22031-8044

www.uncfsp.org

- Jacqueline Howard-Matthews, IDP Director
- Shelby Lewis, Former IDP Director
- Liz Lowe, Former UNCFSP Director, President/CEO
- Denee F. McKnight, CFO
- Kimberle Osborne, IDP Manager of Organizational and Institutional Partnerships
- DeLois Powell, IDP Manager of Research, Training and Evaluation

II.   Association Liaison Office (ALO) for University Cooperation in Development

1307 New York Ave. NW, Suite 500

Washington, DC 20005-4701

- Kay Ikranagara, Director of Partnership Programs
- Christine A. Morfit, Executive Director
- Johnson Niba, Administrative Associate

III.   Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs)*

- Dr. Gemma Beckley, Department of Social Work, Rust College
- Dr. Emmanuel Babatunde, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Lincoln University
- Dr. Jean Bailey, Center for Drug Abuse and Research, Howard University
- Dr. Alfredo Cambronero, Division of Business Administration, Fisk University
- Ms. Reginia Doster, Center for Excellence, Division of Community Development,Benedict College
- Dr. Bonita T. Ewers, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Elizabeth City State University
- Dr. Ghirmay Ghebreyesus, School of Business, Grambling State University
- Dr. Alex Kalu, Director, Center for Advanced Water Technology and Energy Systems, Savannah State University
- Dr. Jesse Lutabingwa, Assistant Vice President, Office of International Education and Development, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Florida A&M University

- Dr. Kathie Golden, Delta Research and Cultural Institute, Mississippi Valley State University
- Dr. Shamsuddin Ilias, Department of Chemical Engineering, North Carolina A&T State University
- Dr. Adriane Ludwick, Chemistry Department, Tuskegee University
- Dr. Alisa Mosley, Jackson State University
- Dr. Renatus Mussa, Dept. of Civil Engineering, Florida A&M University
- Dr. James Natsis, Office of International Affairs, West Virginia State University (IDP/ EDDI)
- Emmanuel O. Oritsejafor, North Carolina Central University
- Dr. Gloria Poole, College of Education, Program of Educational Leadership, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
- Dr. Talihun Sahlu, Langston University (IDP/ EDDI)
- Dr. Janice Sumler-Edmond, Huston-Tillotson College
- Dr. Oluropo Sekoni, Lincoln University
- Dr. Mwalimu J. Shujaa, Professor and Executive Director, African World Studies Institute, Fort Valley State University
- Dr. Priye S. Chris Torulagha, Florida Memorial University Dr. Maurice Taylor, Dean, School of Graduate Studies, Morgan State University
- Dr. Sayku A. Maseru Waritay, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Department of Natural and Applied Sciences Livingstone College & Barber Scotia College
- Dr. Ashagre A. Yigletu, College of Business-Department of Economics & Finance, Southern University and A&M College

IV. Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs)*

- Dr. Neth Barom, Royal University of Phnom Penh (Cambodia), Universidad Tecnologica de Honduras (UTH), Professor Licenciado Flavio Melara
- Mrs. Noel Esther Didla, Mahatma Gandhi College (India)
- Dr. Fatou Diop, Professor of Sociology, University Gaston Berger at Saint Louis (Senegal)
- Dr. Thomas K. Gaie, Cuttington University College (Liberia)
- Cuttington University College (Liberia)
- Dr. Vinesh Y. Hookoomsing, Pro Vice-Chancellor, University of Mauritius (Mauritius)
- Dr. Mark Kirton, Government and International Affairs, University of Guyana (Guyana)
- Dr. Saaime Naame, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Office of the President, Cuttington University College (Liberia)
- Father Glyn Jemmott Nelson, Mexico Negro, A.C. (Mexico)
- Winston Murray, President, Tobago Community College (Tobago West Indies)

- Dr. A,K.M. Abdul Quader, Department of Chemical Engineering, Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (Bangladesh)
- Valter Roberto Silvereo, Universidade Federal de Sao Carlos (Brazil)

V.   USAID

- John Anderson, ANE
- Gary Bittner, Higher Education Team Leader and Prior IDP CTO, EGAT/ED
- Carolyn Coleman, Education Advisor, AFR/SD
- Lubov Fajfer, Education Development Specialist, E&E
- Charles Feezel, Education Advisor and Prior IDP CTO, AFR/SD
- John Grayzel, Director, USAID Office of Education, EGAT/ED
- Alfred Harding, Former MSI Coordinator
- Martin Hewitt, ALO CTO, EGAT/ED
- Cheryl Kim, Education Division Chief, LAC
- Barbara Knox-Seith, Social Science Analyst, LAC
- Ken Lee, Higher Education Team, EGAT/ED
- Sarah Moten, Education Division Chief, AFR/SD
- Mei Mei Peng, Higher Education Team, Current CTO, EGAT/ED
- Sandra Russo, Higher Education Team, EGAT/ED
- Tracy Scrivner, MSI Program Support, OSDBU
- Ron Senykoff, Training Division Team Leader and Prior IDP CTO, EGAT/ED
- Dra. Nilka Varela, USAID/Panama, Program office
- Joe Williams, Prior Education Division Chief, ANE

VI.   Other

- Christine Allison, Project Coordinator for EGAT/ED Monitoring Results task order (GEM 17), Aguirre International
- Curtis E. Huff, Office of Citizens Exchange, Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs, US Department of State
- Hiram Larew, Director, International Programs, USDA
- Dr. Komanduri Murty, Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice, Clark Atlanta University
- Walter Young, Private Citizen

*In addition to the university personnel listed, the IDP Assessment Team led a focus group at the IDP workshop on August 14, 2005 at the 2005 Annual International Affairs and Development Partnerships Conference hosted by UNCFSP which included around 20 additional unlisted participants.

APPENDIX E: IDP ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNERSHIP DIRECTORS AND COORDINATORS (ACTIVE PARTNERSHIPS)

August 13, 2005

Purpose, importance and description of the exercise: As the IDP program comes to an end, USAID is interested in understanding program achievement against stated objectives and in garnering lessons learned for strengthening the effectiveness and impact on partnerships with HBCUs and other Minority Serving Institutions. This assessment addresses those issues.

Instruction and time table for completing and returning the form: Please complete the form and return it at breakfast on Sunday. There will be a luncheon on Sunday to discuss your responses.

Autonomy of comments: You will not be quoted and your responses will not be shared unless you specifically authorize the assessment team to do so.)

Identifying information. Briefly provide the following identifying information.

Your name:

Your institution:

Your partner institution:

Country:

Sector:

Year implementation work was initiated:

Approximate % of work completed:

I. OVERALL RESULTS

1. *Partnership objectives.* Briefly, what are the key objectives of your partnership program?

2. *Results.* How would you assess the level of success to date in achieving the objectives of the partnership program?

   __ Remarkably successful

   __ Very successful

   __ Satisfactory

   __ Disappointing

   __ The program to date is pretty much a disaster!

   __ It is too early to comment.

   Were there any unanticipated results?

3. *Increasing the capacity of higher education partners to work in international development.* Is the partnership improving the capacity of your institution to work in international development?

   __ Absolutely, in a manner that is likely to affect several departments

   __ Yes, but probably limited to one department

   __ Yes, but probably limited to a small number of faculty involved in this activity

   __ Probably not

   __ It is too early to tell whether sustainable interest and capacity are being developed

4. *Involvement of other partners.* Are other partners (e.g., NGOs, private sector partners, government agencies) involved? If so, please explain.

II. PLANNING THE PARTNERSHIPS

5. *Creating a program that meets the needs of both partners.* Which partner institution took the lead in planning, your institution or your partner? In implementation, your institution or your partner? Were others involved in planning? Y or N. Who?

6. *Creating a program that reflects USAID Mission objectives.* How important were efforts to link the program to USAID Mission Strategic Objectives (SOs)?

    __ Extremely important

    __ Quite important

    __ Marginally important

    __ Not important

    __ A total waste of time and perhaps counterproductive

    __ I don't know

    Please explain briefly.

7. *Working effectively with USAID Missions.* How many times did you meet with USAID during the project's planning and implementation phases?

    __ Never

    __ 1 – 5 times

    __ 6 – 10 times

    __ More than ten times

    What constraints have you faced in collaborating with the USAID Mission?

8. *The origin of your partnership.* Was the collaborative relationship with your partner started as a result of the IDP or did it exist prior to this program?

___ Existed previously

___ Was formed to take advantage of the UNCFSP program

9. *Choosing the right partner and the right program.* In retrospect, do you feel that you are working with the right partner on the right program?

What lessons, if any, have you learned about selecting partners and programs?

10. *Lessons learned about the planning process.* What lessons, if any, did you learn during the planning process that would lead you to do things differently next time?

11. *Making UNCFSP more effective.* How could UNCFSP improve the solicitation, review and awards process? (For example, was the RFA sufficiently clear? Is more assistance needed on program planning? Was the review process fair and transparent? Was there adequate time to develop the application? Was the technical assistance in proposal writing helpful to this process? The RFA require too much information, too little, or was it about right?).

III. IMPLEMENTATION

12. *Implementation problems.* What types of implementation problems did you encounter? (For example, were there particular problems with different perceptions about goals, communications, money transfers, accounting, visas, reporting, etc.?)

What lessons, if any, did you learn that would help others to avoid implementation problems?

13. *The involvement of other organizations during implementation.* How important are other institutions (e.g. the NGOs, the private sector, the community, government ministries, USAID) in your partnership program?

14. *UNCFSP Technical Assistance to HBCUs and IHEs.* An important element of this assessment is to determine the importance of the technical assistance and counsel that UNCFSP is providing to HBCUs and to suggest how the level and mix of that assistance might usefully be adjusted in future programs. Your views of this TA are critical. How useful were the following types of UNCFSP technical assistance activities?

Please rate each of these activities in terms of their usefulness using this scale:

5= critical; 4= very helpful; 3= helpful; 2= marginally helpful; 1= not effective; 0= not applicable

   a)   Regional Workshops. Usefulness rating: __

   Suggestions for changes in format, frequency, topics, or other factors:

   b)   Campus Visits (U.S. and Overseas). Usefulness rating: __

   Suggestions for changes in format, frequency, topics, or other factors:

   c)   Electronic and In-office Consultation. Usefulness rating: __

   Suggestions for changes in format, frequency, topics, or other factors:

   d)   Electronic Information. Usefulness rating: __

   Suggestions for changes in format, frequency, topics, or other factors:

15. *Outreach to support the overall program (IHEs may answer if they have an opinion on this question.* How effective would you rate your own institution's and UNCFSP's role in facilitating the strategic engagement of the HBCU community in support of partner an international development agenda? What could be improved in the future?

16. *Lessons learned on outreach in support of partnerships.* What lessons learned can be distilled regarding how programs such as this one can further the international involvement of HBCUs and their partnerships with host country educational partnerships?

17. *Assistance from UNCFSP to partners.* Could support and technical assistance to HBCUs and HBCU partnerships in developing countries be conducted in a more cost-efficient manner?

18. *Financial flows.* Is funding or the flow of funding to the partnership program a constraint? Describe.

19. *Length of partnership programs.* Is the duration of the partnership program long enough to achieve its objectives? If not, what time frame would have been better?

IV. MONITORING AND REPORTING

20. *Monitoring, reporting and evaluation.* How useful and effective are monitoring, reporting, and evaluation activities? How often did you submit written reports? To whom? How could the reporting process be improved?

V. COST SHARE

21. *The importance of cost sharing.* How important was cost share in implementing your program? Were there other partners involved in providing cost share? If so, who were they?

VI. USAID'S ROLE

22. *Collaboration with USAID Missions.* Did you visit the local USAID Mission during planning and implementation? How would you describe local Mission's interest in the project?   Did USAID visit the project partners and project site? Did you approach the USAID Mission for follow-on funding? Was that successful?

23. *USAID involvement.* At any point in the process, did the USAID Mission suggest substantive changes to the program or more direct links to its strategic objectives? If so, what was the response?

VII. SUSTAINABILITY

24 *Sustainability of the development activities.* In your opinion, how sustainable are the development activities under partnerships?

25. *Sustainability of the partnership.* How confident are you that a long-term beneficial partnership relationship has been established that will last beyond the grant funding period?

__ Very confident

__ I hope so, but it is too early to know

__ Unlikely

If you expect the relationship to continue, do you think that it will/should change in significant ways?

How do you expect future activities will be financed?

Do you think that the USAID Mission is a possible source of follow-up funding? Why or why not?

26. *Capacity and networking.* To what degree did the partnership build capacity for sustainable development in the host country?   Have the partnership activities resulted in an increase in collaborative research and cooperation between HBCUs and host country institutions of higher education to address social and development needs and concerns? Give examples from your HBCU or host country institution perspective.

VIII. NETWORKING AND INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

27. *Usefulness of the annual conferences.* Did the annual conferences and reporting provide adequate information sharing and help you with important aspects of the program? Please give an example. How often did you participate in annual conferences, and when (at the beginning, middle, or end of your partnership activity?

Did participation in the conference change anything that you were doing in the partnership program? How?

28. *Program promotion.* Were there dissemination and outreach activities by your institution or by the UNCFSP that helped to promote the program, to generate political support or to encourage financial contributions within the HBCU or IHE community, or the general public?

    To whom and by whom? What activities were the most successful?

    Did you keep a media file of news and magazine coverage of your program?

29. *Best Practices.* What advice would you give to other HBCUs interested in participating in international development programs to assure their success?

IX. UNIQUENESS

30. *Unique assets of HBCUs and other minority-serving institutions.* Although some HBCUs need to overcome their limited international experience, it is also sometimes argued that HBCUs and MSIs have special assets, perhaps growing out of their experience as minorities needing to overcome additional obstacles that make them particularly effective agents of international development. Can you describe those characteristics and provide some evidence or examples from your HBCU or host country higher education institution perspective to substantiate that case?

31. *Making more effective use of HBCUs in development.* How could the US Government better prepare MSI's for and utilize them in overseas development activities?

32. *Future Plans.* Have either the HBCU partner or the host country partner applied for other international programs since beginning the UNCFSP partnership grant? What were the results? If no, do you plan to continue or expand your international cooperation? How likely is it to be with your same partner and in the same country?

Are there other comments that you wish to share with the assessment team about your partnership program and about minority institution involvement in international development?

Thank you for taking the time to offer us your thoughtful comments. They will help us and in turn will help USAID and UNCFSP to improve this or similar programs in the future.

APPENDIX F: IDP ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARTNERSHIP DIRECTORS AND COORDINATORS (CLOSED PARTNERSHIPS)

Name:

Institution:

Partner Institution:

Host Country:

Sector of partnership or partnership title:

Type of Partnership:

      IDP__

      EDI__

      CHP _

1. How do you evaluate your partnership project?

___ Very Successful

___ Successful

___ Average

___ Poor

___ Not Successful

2. In your opinion, what were the one or two most significant, long-lasting results?

3. How would you assess the effectiveness of your collaborative relationship with your partner?

___ Excellent

___ Good

___ Average

___ Poor

___ Bad

4. Which of the following best describes the interest and involvement of the USAID Mission in the planning or implementation of your partnership?

___ Interested and involved. Made substantive comments on the proposal, visited the IHE, met

several times with the HBCU and/or the IHE staff involved.

___ Interested but not involved. Perhaps met once but did not participate in the activity in any

way.

___ Uninterested. Perhaps met once or commented on the program, but the activity was not a

priority for the Mission.

5. Is there a specific activity or program continuing or taking place in the partner country today that is largely the result of your partnership?

___ Yes

___ No

If yes, please describe the activity and indicate the source or sources and the magnitude of funding supporting that activity.

6. Has the partnership relationship with your partner university continued?

___ Yes

___ No

If yes, please describe in what form it has continued; or if no, was there a reason why it has not continued?

7. Please make any other comment that you would like to make about the program that you think it would be useful for the assessment team to know.

APPENDIX G: WORK PLAN FOR ASSESSMENT ON UNCFSP'S INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Background

The Scope of Work (SOW) states that the purposes of this assessment of the United Negro College Fund Special Programs Corporation's (UNCFSP) International Development Partnerships (IDP) Cooperative Agreement with the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) are:

1) To monitor progress toward the achievement of program objectives during the course of the Cooperative Agreement;

2) To provide USAID with an independent assessment it can compare to other higher education program assessments; and

3) To make recommendations for strengthening the effectiveness and impact of partnerships between USAID and Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), and other U.S. Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs).

The assessment will be conducted in two parts – designated Part A and Part B.

Part A, titled UNCF's Program Management Activities, will consist of a description of: the UNCFSP's organization and management; the solicitation, application, review and award process; the characteristics of grant awards; an assessment of the non-partnership activities under the IDP Program, including regional workshops, campus visits, marketing IDP and HBCUs to USAID Missions and International Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs); financial management issues; and USAID's role in relation to UNCFSP.

Technical assistance provided by UNCFSP as it relates to strengthening HBCUs to be more effective in partnership activities and international development work will be assessed, as will be the overall cost-effectiveness and fund leveraging results of the program. Lessons learned on mentoring and outreach to further HBCU international involvement will be compiled.

 Part B, titled Partnership Activities, will assess partnership accomplishments as they address the objectives of the Cooperative Agreement. Partnership planning, HBCU partnership management, the role of the International Higher Education Institutions, partnership financing, capacity building, development results, sustainability, and outside views of the program will be assessed in Part B, as will the important involvement of EGAT/ED and other USAID Bureaus and offices, including field Missions.

Approach

The assessment team's approach will be guided by the SOW. The team will work closely with USAID's Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) for the IDP program and with the Director of the UNCFSP.

Given the close relationship between the two separate but related sets of concerns outlined in Part A and Part B of the SOW, the team will gather information on both simultaneously and over the course of the assessment period. By collecting data in an integral manner, Part A information should inform Part B, and vice versa.

The assessment will be constrained by a lack of travel funding. The team will not be able to travel to HBCU, other MSI, and IHE campuses; dialogue face-to-face with program and project managers and implementation personnel at project sites, and make site visits in the company of USAID field Mission officers. In-situ appraisals of project successes and problem will not be possible.

To overcome this significant constraint, the team plans two approaches. First, it will access and analyze available raw data from a comprehensive survey of key IDP program conducted by Dr. Murty of Clark-Atlanta University. Selected evaluative questions/items from the Murty evaluation will be modified and expanded to reflect specific objectives of this assessment. Assessments, evaluations, trip reports and visits to HBCUs and partnership activities by non-UNCF participants will also be reviewed as input into the assessment process to provide in-situ information.

Second, the team will arrange for individual face-to-face interviews and/or focus group discussions with HBCU officials, IHE officials, USAID officers and other partners at several conferences to be held in the Washington area during the course of this assessment, including the USAID Education conference (August 8 - 12); the ALO Synergy Conference (July 27 - 29) and the IDP annual conference (August 13 -16).

Recognizing the importance of this program to expanding the participation of MSI's in international development work, the team will address key aspects of this seminal program so that USAID can compare the program's results with similar higher education programs. Success stories will be highlighted and unique contributions of HBCUs and MSI to social and economic development will be identified as an important part of the assessment process. The team will make recommendations about how USAID can strengthen the programmatic and strategic effectiveness and development impact of USAID partnerships with HBCUs and other Minority Serving Institutions.

The assessment will be carried out over three months, and will consist of six specific stages, as follows:

1. Document Review and Initial Meetings (June 29 – July 29)

   a) Review all key documents, including the Cooperative Agreement, modifications, UNCFSP requests for applications (RFAs), sub-grants between UNCFSP and HBCUs, annual work plans, quarterly program reports, quarterly financial reports, annual or interim reports, conference reports, results indicator data, special reports, other publications, and EGAT/Ed's Higher Education Strategic Objective 2 results framework, indicators, and targets.

   b) Hold initial information gathering meetings with UNCFSP, USAID/EGAT/ED, other USAID stakeholders and interested parties.

   c) Request contact lists for USAID Bureau and field officers and for UNCFSP directors, coordinators, HBCU and IHE officials, and for UNCFSP USAID field Mission contacts.

   d) Request a list from USAID and from UNCFSP of other partners and influential leaders who know about or are involved in the program.

2. Work Plan Drafting and Review Process (July 6 – July 22)

   a) Prepare a first draft work plan, report outline, general strategy for data collection that will be based primarily on telephone interviews.

b) Review existing raw data collected in 2004 from university participants in the IDP program to determine the degree to which it provides answers to this assessment's questions and gaps that must be filled.

c) Develop interview protocols and instruments for ground-truthing available data and gathering other information needed for Part A/Part B.

d) Pre-test protocols and instruments and revise, as necessary. Analysis and reporting will be on-going and modified based on pre-tests and on CTO's approval of the protocols.

e) Discuss draft work plan with USAID CTO and UNCFSP Director, review contact lists and information, and discuss scheduling issues.

f) Submit Work Plan to USAID.

3. Data Collection (July 6 – September 9)

General information will be collected starting early in the assessment period.

a) Request that USAID and UNCFSP send initial communication to contacts via USAID and UNCFSP channels to inform them of the assessment and to alert them to expect communication from the assessment team.

b) Begin data collection process on Part A and Part B of the assessment with non-Washington contacts based on an agreed contact list and schedule.

c) Begin data collection process with field Missions based on an agreed interview protocol, contact list and schedule.

d) Begin data collection process with other key partners and individuals based on an agreed contact list and schedule.

NOTE: Team will meet with individuals and try to arrange focus group discussions with USAID officers and HE partners during the USAID Education Conference (August 8 - 12), ALO Synergy Conference (July 27-29), and the IDP annual conference (August 13 - 16).

One member of the team may arrange a meeting with key partnership university Presidents attending a White House event for HBCUs.

e) Maintain interview data into a Part A/Part B data base.

4. Oral Progress Report – Analysis and Planning (September 15)

a) Meet with USAID CTO, UNCFSP Director and regional bureau representatives to provide an oral update on progress to date in assessing Part A and Part B of the SOW, outline any preliminary findings, and discuss critical data gaps.

b) Discuss with USAID and UNCFSP any follow-up approaches that may be required to address data gaps, substantiate preliminary findings or assess important areas not covered during the initial assessment period.

c) Outline schedule for remaining assessment period and receive USAID and UNCFSP approval to proceed.

5. Continue Data Collection (August 29 – September 15)

   a) Request that USAID and UNCFSP communicate with any new contacts via USAID and UNCFSP channels.

   b) Continue with Part A/Part B data collection process.

6. Final Report Preparation, Review, Submission (September 15 – October 17)

   a) Draft individual sections of Part A/Part B report.

   b) Submit draft report to USAID and UNCFSP (October 3).

   c) Meet with USAID and UNCFSP for review session; schedule any follow-up meetings necessary to reach consensus (October 6).

   d) Based on feedback, incorporate comments and prepare report for internal review and submission to USAID and UNCFSP (October 7 – 17).

   e) Submit final report to USAID/ED by COB October 17, 2005.

APPENDIX H: IDP PARTNERSHIP LIST

Partnership Years	Status	US University	International University	UNCFSP Cluster Area	Country	Region	Type	Grant Size
04-05	Active	Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	Universidade do Estado da Bahia	Curriculum Development	Brazil	LAC	CHP	35,000
04-05	Active	Florida Memorial University	Universidade Federal de Sao Carlos	Curriculum Development	Brazil	LAC	CHP	35,000
04-05	Active	Fort Valley State University	Federal University of Bahia	Curriculum Development	Brazil	LAC	CHP	35,000
04-05	Active	Southern University- Baton Rouge	La Universidad Veracruzana	Curriculum Development	Mexico	LAC	CHP	35,000
04-05	Active	Elizabeth City State University	Tobago Community College	Curriculum Development	Trinidad and Tobago, West Indies	LAC	CHP	35,000
04-05	Active	LeMoyne Owens College	Pontifice Universidad Catolica Madre y Maestra	Technology Access and Training	Dominican Republic	LAC	CHP	35,000
02-05	Active	Fort Valley State University	Awassa College of Agriculture Debub University	Agriculture and Rural Development	Ethiopia	AFR	IDP	200,000
02-05	Active	Wilberforce University	University of Benin	Agriculture and Rural Development	Nigeria	AFR	IDP	200,000
04-06	Active	Livingstone College & Barber Scotia College	Cuttington University College	Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	Liberia	AFR	IDP	100,000
04-06	Active	LeMoyne Owens College	Mexico Negro, A.C. (Mexico) & University of Gaston Berger at Saint Louis (Senegal)	Economic Development	Mexico and Senegal	AFR	IDP	90,000
04-06	Active	Savannah State University	University of Namibia	Economic Development	Namibia	AFR	IDP	55,000
03-06	Active	Southern University and A&M College	Makerere University	Economic Development	Uganda	AFR	IDP	200,000
04-06	Active	Rust College	Cuttington University College	Science, Research and Health	Liberia	AFR	IDP	90,000
02-05	Active	Fisk University	National Institute of Management (NIM)	Economic Development	Cambodia	ANE	IDP	200,000
03-06	Active	Jackson State University	Mahatma Gandhi College-	Economic Development	India	ANE	IDP	200,000
02-05	Active	Mississippi Valley State University	Western University	Environment and Transportation	Azerbaijan	EE	IDP	200,000

Partnership Years	Status	US University	International University	UNCFSP Cluster Area	Country	Region	Type	Grant Size
04-06	Active	North Carolina Central University	Academy of Economic Studies in Moldova (ASEM)	Technology Access and Training	Moldova	EE	IDP	90,000
03-06	Active	Lincoln University	University of the Autonomous Regions of the Caribbean Coasts of Nicaragua	Curriculum Development	Nicaragua	LAC	IDP	200,000
04-06	Active	Delaware State University	Universidad de Panama	Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	Panama	LAC	IDP	75,000
03-06	Active	Morgan State University	Universidad Tecnologica de Honduras	Technology Access and Training	Honduras	LAC	IDP	200,000
03-04	Closed	Huston-Tillotson College	University of Costa Rica & TEC de Monterrey-Estado de Mexico Campus	Curriculum Development	Costa Rica	LAC	CHP	49,908
03-04	Closed	Winston-Salem State University	University of Veracruz	Curriculum Development	Mexico	LAC	CHP	49,981
03-04	Closed	Clark Atlanta University	University of the Autonomous Regions of the Caribbean Coasts of Nicaragua	Curriculum Development	Nicaragua	LAC	CHP	48,424
03-04	Closed	MCID and Jackson State University	Bluefields Indian and Caribbean University	Curriculum Development	Nicaragua	LAC	CHP	49,962
03-04	Closed	Spelman College	Afro America Foundation	Curriculum Development	Venezuela	LAC	CHP	50,000
01-04	Closed	Benedict College	University of Buea	Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	Cameroon	AFR	EDDI	200,000
01-04	Closed	Lincoln University	University of Cocody	Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	Cote d'Ivoire	AFR	EDDI	200,000
02-05	Closed	Savannah State University	Eduardo Mondlane University-	Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	Mozambique	AFR	EDDI	200,000
02-05	Closed	Mississippi Valley State University	University of Nouakchott	Technology Access and Training	Mauritania	AFR	EDDI	200,000
02-05	Closed	Mississippi Consortium for International Development (MCID)	University of Mauritius	Technology Access and Training	Mauritius	AFR	EDDI	200,000

Partnership Years	Status	US University	International University	UNCFSP Cluster Area	Country	Region	Type	Grant Size
02-05	Closed	Clark Atlanta University	Universite Abdou Moumouni	Technology Access and Training	Republic of Niger	AFR	EDDI	200,000
01-04	Closed	Florida A&M University	University of Dar Es Salaam	Technology Access and Training	Tanzania	AFR	EDDI	200,000
01-04	Closed	Alcorn State University	University of Ghana-Legon	Agriculture and Rural Development	Ghana	AFR	IDP	200,000
00-03	Closed	Howard University	University of the Western Cape	Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	South Africa	AFR	IDP	200,000
01-04	Closed	North Carolina A&T State University	Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology (BUET)	Environment and Transportation	Bangladesh	ANE	IDP	200,000
01-04	Closed	Florida A&M University	Royal University of Phnom Penh	Environment and Transportation	Cambodia	ANE	IDP	200,000
00-03	Closed	Tuskegee University	Assiut University	Environment and Transportation	Egypt	ANE	IDP	200,000
00-03	Closed	Grambling State University	State Engineering University of Armenia	Curriculum Development	Armenia	EE	IDP	200,000
99-02	Closed	Mississippi Consortium for International Development (MCID)	University of Bucharest	Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	Romania	EE	IDP	200,000
99-02	Closed	Coppin State College	University of the West Indies	Curriculum Development	Trinidad and Tobago	LAC	IDP	200,000
01-04	Closed	Clark Atlanta University	University of Guyana	Democratization, Conflict Resolution and Community Development	Guyana	LAC	IDP	200,000
00-03	Closed	Tennessee State University	University of Amazonas	Science, Research and Health	Brazil	LAC	IDP	188,280
99-02	Closed	Langston University	Alemaya Unviersity of Agriculture	Agriculture and Rural Development	Ethiopia	AFR	IDP/ EDDI	200,000/50,000
99-02	Closed	West Virginia State University	National Unviersity of Benin	Technology Access and Training	Benin	AFR	IDP/ EDDI	200,000/50,000

APPENDIX I. UTILIZATION OF AND APPARENT DEMAND FOR UNCFSP TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ACTIVITIES

The table below, based on data collected by Dr. Murty, provides information from 26 respondents on their participation UNCFSP in non-partnership activities. It shows specific services provided by UNCFSP (not categorized in the same format of the CA), the number of reported contacts by the HBCU to UNCFSP for major assistance, and the number of different times that assistance in the particular service areas was requested. This establishes that the services provided by UNCFSP were used by a significant number of HBCUs and it gives a sense of which services were most in demand.

Utilization of UNCFSP Services by HBCUs and IHEs

Service	Percent of Users	Range of Contacts
Information on Funding Opportunities	81	1-9
Proposal Writing and Development Assistance	69	1-5
Increasing HBCU international involvement	69	1-5
Budget and Financial Assistance	65	1-6
Bridging Partnership Working Relationships	62	2-15
General Technical Assistance	62	1-6
Enhancing Support for HBCU/IHE Partnerships	62	1-5
Information on Training Opportunities	58	1-15
Assisting IHEs to Meet Community Needs	39	1-10

Source: Dr. Murty's Survey

The high percentage of service users and strong positive testimony from clients about the quality and utility of the various UNCFSP technical assistance services demonstrate that HBCUs needed and requested services, and that they valued those services highly. This would suggest that the HBCUs were better equipped to carry out partnership activities and international development work as a result of the service provision.

APPENDIX J: UNCF MEMBER AND NON-MEMBER HBCUS THAT HAVE RECEIVED IDP AWARDS

HBCU Members of UNCF	HBCU Non-Members of UNCF
Benedict College, Columbia, SC Clark Atlanta University, Atlanta, GA Fisk University, Nashville, TN Florida Memorial College Huston-Tillotson Universtiy, Austin, TX LeMoyne-Owen College Livingston College Rust College Spelman College, Atlanta, GA Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, OH	West Virginia State College Langston University Coppin State University Mississippi Consortium for Int. Dev (Alcorn State University, Jackson State University, Mississippi Valley State University, Tougaloo College) Grambling State University Tennessee State University Howard University North Carolina A&T University Florida A&M University Alcorn State University Lincoln University Mississippi Valley State University Fort Valley State University Savannah State University Winston-Salem State University Jackson State University Morgan State University Southern University Elizabeth City State University Delaware State University North Carolina Central University

APPENDIX K. IDP PROGRAM COST SHARING

Table 1. Planned Cost Sharing/Matching Commitments by Partnership

University	Start Date	End Date	Status	Approved Total Amt. of IDP Share	Approved Total Amt. of Cost-Share	Cost Share as a Percent of IDP Share	Approved Total Program Amount	Cost Share as a Percent of Total Program Amount
IDP								
Langston University	1998	1999	Closed	200,000	80,834	40	280,834	29
West Virginia SC*	1998	1999	Closed	200,000			200,000	
Coppin State College*	1998	1999	Closed	200,000			200,000	
Tuskegee University	1999	2000	Closed	200,000	55,000	28	255,000	22
Howard University	1999	2000	Closed	200,000	216,383	108	416,383	52
Alcorn State University	2001	2004	Closed	200,000	110,250	55	310,250	36
Florida A&M University	2001	2004	Closed	200,000	52,758	26	252,758	21
Fisk University	2002	2005	Closing	200,000	50,000	25	250,000	20
Fort Valley State University	2002	2005	Closing	200,000	58,214	29	258,214	23
Southern University	2003	2006	Current	199,782	128,110	64	327,892	39
Morgan State University	2003	2006	Current	200,000	212,908	106	412,908	52
Rust College	2004	2006	Current	90,000	39,000	43	129,000	30
No Carolina Central University	2004	2006	Current	90,000	115,140	128	205,140	56
Delaware State University	2004	2006	Current	74,977	18,744	25	93,721	20
Mississippi CID	1998	1999	Closed	200,000	66,383	33	266,383	25
Tennessee State University	1999	2000	Closed	188,280	66,750	35	255,030	26
Grambling State University	1999	2000	Closed	200,000	186,011	93	386,011	48
Clark Atlanta University	2001	2004	Closed	200,000	79,315	40	279,315	28
North Carolina A & T University	2001	2004	Closed	199,994	54,609	27	254,603	21
Mississippi Valley State University	2002	2005	Closing	200,000	247,694	124	447,694	55
Wilberforce University	2002	2005	Closing	200,000	45,423	23	245,423	19
Lincoln University	2003	2006	Current	200,000	114,750	57	314,750	36
Jackson State University	2003	2006	Current	199,965	154,461	77	354,426	44
Livingston College	2004	2006	Current	100,000	29,532	30	129,532	23

Savannah State University	2004	2006	Current	55,000	14,000	25	69,000	20
LeMoyne-Owen College	2004	2006	Current	90,000	37,500	42	127,500	29
SUBTOTAL				**4,487,998**	**2,233,769**	**50**	**6,721,767**	**33**

(Appendix K continued)

Table 1. Planned Cost Sharing/Matching Commitments by Partnership (continued)

University	Start Date	End Date	Status	Approved Total Amt. of IDP Share	Approved Total Amt. of Cost-Share	Cost Share as a Percent of IDP Share	Approved Total Program Amount	Cost Share as a Percent of Total Program Amount
EDDI								
West Virginia College*	1998	1999	Closed	50,000			50,000	0
Lincoln University*A4	2001	2004	Closed	200,000			200,000	0
Florida A&M University	2001	2004	Closed	200,000	183,389	92	383,389	48
Mississippi CID	2002	2004	Closed	200,000	137,325	69	337,325	41
Benedict College	2001	2004	Closed	200,000	200,000	100	400,000	50
Mississippi Valley State University	2002	2004	Closed	199,949	110,848	55	310,797	36
Savannah State University	2002	2004	Closed	200,000	50,505	25	250,505	20
Clark Atlanta University	2002	2004	Closed	200,000	48,078	24	248,078	19
SUBTOTAL				**1,449,949**	**730,145**	**50**	**2,180,094**	**33**
CHP								
Jackson State University*	2003	2004	Closed	49,962			49,962	
Southern University	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	15,142	43	50,142	30
Florida Memorial University	2004	2005	Closing	34,996	59,950	171	94,946	63
Huston Tillotson College	2003	2004	Closed	49,908	19,764	40	69,672	28
Clark Atlanta University	2003	2004	Closed	48,424	27,000	56	75,424	36
Winston Salem University	2003	2004	Closed	49,981	15,323	31	65,304	23
Spelman College	2003	2004	Closed	50,000	87,031	174	137,031	64
Elizabeth City State University	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	28,905	83	63,905	45
Fort Valley State University	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	36,082	103	71,082	51
Florida A & M University	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	9,544	27	44,544	21
LeMoyne-Owen College	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	21,572	62	56,572	38
SUBTOTAL				**458,271**	**320,313**	**70**	**778,584**	**41**
TOTAL				**6,396,218**	**3,284,227**	**51**	**9,680,445**	**34**

A-41

* Data on matching commitment not currently available

Source: Data provided by UNCFSP

(Appendix K continued)

Table 2. Projected and Actual Grant and Matching Expenditures for Selected Partnerships
(Cost Sharing/Matching as of October 03, 2005)

| Component/Partnerships | Grant Period | | | Planned Expenditures | | | | | Actual Expenditures | | | | | | |
University	Start Date	End Date	Status	IDP Grant Amount	Cost-Share	Total Program Amount	Cost Share as a Percent of IDP Grant	Cost Share as a Percent of Total	Total IDP Grant Outlay to Date - 10/03/05	Percent IDP Share Spent	Cost-Share Spent to Date	Percent Cost Share Spent	Total Program Cost to Date - 10/03/05	Cost Share as a Percent of IDP Grant	Cost Share as a Percent of Total
IDP															
Mississippi CID	1998	1999	Closed	200,000	66,383	266,383	33	25	200,000	100	66,520	100	266,520	33	25
Tennessee State University	1999	2000	Closed	188,280	66,750	255,030	35	26	180,619	96	154,305	231	334,924	85	46
Grambling State University	1999	2000	Closed	200,000	186,011	386,011	93	48	178,538	89	107,308	58	285,846	60	38
Clark Atlanta University	2001	2004	Closed	200,000	79,315	279,315	40	28	184,617	92	106,226	134	290,843	58	37
North Carolina A & T University	2001	2004	Closed	199,994	54,609	254,603	27	21	199,948	100	59,584	109	259,532	30	23
Mississippi Valley State University	2002	2005	Closing	200,000	247,694	447,694	124	55	200,000	100	115,125	46	315,125	58	37
Wilberforce University	2002	2005	Closing	200,000	45,423	245,423	23	19	194,885	97	54,883	121	249,768	28	22
Lincoln University	2003	2006	Current	200,000	114,750	314,750	57	36	95,954	48	15,541	14	111,495	16	14
Jackson State University	2003	2006	Current	199,965	154,461	354,426	77	44	104,649	52	96,936	63	201,585	93	48
Livingston College	2004	2006	Current	100,000	29,532	129,532	30	23	50,330	50	22,474	76	72,804	45	31
Savannah State University	2004	2006	Current	55,000	14,000	69,000	25	20	11,303	21	5,200	37	16,503	46	32
LeMoyne-Owen College	2004	2006	Current	90,000	37,500	127,500	42	29	42,147	47	17,000	45	59,147	40	29
Totals for IDP				**2,033,239**	**1,096,428**	**3,129,667**	**54**	**35**	**1,642,990**	**81**	**821,103**	**75**	**2,464,093**	**50**	**33**
EDDI															
Benedict College	2001	2004	Closed	200,000	200,000	400,000	100	50	172,450	86	103,964	52	276,414	60	38
Mississippi Valley State University	2002	2004	Closed	199,949	110,848	310,797	55	36	195,274	98	63,898	58	259,172	33	25
Savannah State University	2002	2004	Closed	200,000	50,505	250,505	25	20	200,000	100	75,000	149	275,000	38	27
Clark Atlanta University	2002	2004	Closed	200,000	48,078	248,078	24	19	156,606	78	21,285	44	177,891	14	12
Totals for EDDI				**799,949**	**409,431**	**1,209,380**	**51**	**34**	**724,330**	**91**	**264,147**	**65**	**988,477**	**36**	**27**
CHP															
Huston Tillotson College	2003	2004	Closed	49,908	19,764	69,672	40	28	49,908	100	18,300	93	68,208	37	27
Clark Atlanta University	2003	2004	Closed	48,424	27,000	75,424	56	36	48,424	100	26,000	96	74,424	54	35
Winston Salem University	2003	2004	Closed	49,981	15,323	65,304	31	23	49,981	100	15,342	100	65,323	31	23
Spelman College	2003	2004	Closed	50,000	87,031	137,031	174	64	50,000	100	87,914	101	137,914	176	64
Elizabeth City State University	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	28,905	63,905	83	45	27,709	79	10,750	37	38,459	39	28
Fort Valley State University	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	36,082	71,082	103	51	35,000	100	21,048	58	56,048	60	38
Florida A & M University	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	9,544	44,544	27	21	23,065	66	9,272	97	32,337	40	29
LeMoyne-Owen College	2004	2005	Closing	35,000	21,572	56,572	62	38	35,000	100	21,572	100	56,572	62	38
Totals for CHP				**338,313**	**245,221**	**583,534**	**72**	**42**	**319,087**	**94**	**210,197**	**86**	**529,285**	**66**	**40**
TOTALS, ALL PROGRAMS				**3,171,501**	**1,751,080**	**4,922,581**	**55**	**36**	**2,686,408**	**85**	**1,295,447**	**74**	**3,981,855**	**48**	**33**

Source: Data from UNCFSP

APPENDIX L: COMPONENTS OF IDP MANAGEMENT COSTS, 1996 TO PRESENT

Category	Amount ($000)	Percent
Personnel Services	1,539	66
Consultants	208	9
Conferences	179	8
Travel	236	10
Misc. (tel., postage, printing, etc.)	184	8
Totals	**2,346**	100

Source: UNCFSP data

APPENDIX M: PATTERNS OF SUCCESS

The assessment team's analysis of Dr. Murty's data reveals that those involved directly in the partnerships view their activities as having a significant impact on enhancing the role of IHE's in international development. These data, summarized in Survey data collected by Dr. Murty suggest that impact of the partnerships on capacity of the overseas partners is strongest in functional areas that are closest to the universities' traditional roles and experience (e.g., in teaching and research). This point is illustrated in Table A1 below. The percentage of respondents rating the impact as very strong or strong in universities' traditional functional roles was very high (88 to 96 percent). The percentage rating the impact as very strong or strong on securing fund and economic development were far lower, 62 percent and 42 percent respectively.

Table A1. Partnerships' Impact on Enhancing the Role of IHEs in International Development		
Category	Activity Description/IHE Capacity	Rating Very Strong or Strong Impact (Percent)
A	Expertise in Focus Area or Discipline	96
	Research and/or Training	92
	Student Academic Development	89
	Staff Development	88
	Capacity Building	88
B	Project Management/Administration	73
	Curriculum Development	73
C	Securing Funds	62
	Economic Development	42

Source: Dr. Murty's Survey

Using a similar set of questions, Dr. Murty examined the perception of participating universities on enhancing the role of HBCUs in international development (see Table A2). A very similar pattern emerges in most cases (with a few notable exceptions): the respondents felt that the impact was greatest within the university itself on traditional university functions (e.g., teaching and research) and weaker in projecting a new development role overseas.

Table A2. Partnerships' Impact on Enhancing the Role of HBCUs in International Development		
Category	Activity Description	Very Strong Plus Strong Score Total (Percent)
A	Expertise in Focus Area or Discipline	96
	Research and/or Training	96
	Project Management/Administration	93
	Student Academic Development	89
	Capacity Building	89
	Staff Development	88
	HBCU presence in Partnership Region	88
B	Curriculum Development	81
	Securing Funds	77
C	Economic Development	38

The fact that HBCUs rate the impact on "project management/administration" more highly than the IHEs presumably reflects that HBCUs tend to take the lead in program planning, management and accounting. Similarly, the impact on "securing funds" is viewed as greater at the HBCUs, again because the HBCU is the lead partner on financial matters and perhaps takes more responsibility for securing additional funds. Economic development was at the bottom of the ranking for both IHEs and HBCUs. In the economic development arena, the participating universities are often relative newcomers with much yet to learn.

APPENDIX N: PARTNERSHIP REVIEWERS, PROPOSALS AND AWARDS, BY TYPE AND YEAR

Year	IDP			EDDI		CHP		Reviewers
	Proposals Received		Awards	Proposals Qualified	Awards	Proposals Qualified	Awards	
	Pre-applications	Full Proposals						
-1- 1999-00	25	12	4	--	--	--	--	1. Carolyn S. Williams, President, Consolidated Services Worldwide 2. Johnson Niba, President, Global Dynamyx (USAID project coordinator) 3. Maginet Shriffraw, Professor of Political Science, World Bank, UNICEF and University of the District of Columbia
-2- 2000-01	29	17	4	--	***	--	--	1. Mortimer Neufville, Director, NASULGC 2. Getachew Metaferia, Associate Professor, Morgan State University 3. Margaret Lee, Associate Professor, Georgetown University 4. Jacqueline Howard-Matthews, Africana Women's Studies, Clark Atlanta U
-3- 2001-02	34	29	4	11	3	--	--	1. Marvin Haire, Professor, Clark Atlanta University 2. Lorenzo Morris, Professor, Howard University 3. Kendrick Curry, NASA/UNCFSP
-4- 2002-03	20	11	4	15	4	-	-	1. Calvin Brooks, Professor, Howard University 2. Patricia Morris, Int'l Dev. Specialist, Interaction 3. Lorenzo Morris, Professor, Howard University
-5- 2003-04	*	18	4	--	--	26	5	IDP & EDDI Review Panel Only 1. Cora Presley, Professor, Georgia State University 2. Mae King, Professor of Political Science, Howard University 3. Patricia Morris, Program Manager, Interaction International CHP Review Panel Only 1. Luiz Barcelos, Executive Director, Inter-American Dialogue 2. Deidra Fair, Investment Officer, The World Bank 3. Ronald Smith, VP International Programs, NC A&T State University
-6- 2004-05	*	23	6	--	--	19	6	1. Tendai Johnson, Professor, Coppin State University 2. Cora Presley, Professor, Georgia State University 3. Calvin Brooks, Professor, Howard University
-7- 2005-06								
Sub-totals	** 108	110	26	26	7	45	11	
Total # Awards Under CA: 44								

*   Pre-application phase dropped from evaluation process and incorporated into proposal writing workshops that required participants to respond to the current solicitation in concept paper format.

**   Pre-applications 1999/00-2002/03 + Full proposals 2003/04-2004/05

*** UNCFSP utilized EDDI funds to supplement two IDP awards. These are not counted as separate awards in this table.

Source: UNCFSP data.

APPENDIX O: REVIEW OF HBCUS LEADING IDP FUNDED PARTNERSHIPS BY UNCF-MEMBER INSTITUTION, FUNDING PROGRAM AND HISTORY OF INVOLVEMENT IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (TIER)

Historical Black Colleges and University	UNCF Member Institution	Funding Program			Category by Tier
		IDP	EDDI	CHP	
1999-02					
Coppin State University	No	*			3
Langston University	No	*	*		3
Mississippi Consortium for Int'l Devel.	No	*			1
West Virginia State University	No	*	*		4
2000-03					
Grambling State University	No	*			4
Howard University	No	*			1
Tennessee State University	No	*			3
Tuskegee University	Yes	*			2
2001-04					
Alcorn State University	No	*			2
Benedict College	Yes		*		5
Clark Atlanta University	Yes	*			1
Florida A&M University	No	*			1
Florida A&M University	No		*		1
Lincoln University	No		*		3
North Carolina A&T State University	No	*			3
2002-05					
Florida Memorial College	Yes		*		5
Fisk University	Yes	*			4
Fort Valley State University	No	*			4
Mississippi Consortium for International Development	No		*		1
Mississippi Valley State University	No	*			5
Mississippi Valley State University	No		*		5
Savannah State University	No		*		4
Wilberforce University	Yes	*			4
2003-04					
Clark Atlanta University	Yes			*	1
Huston-Tillotson College	Yes			*	5
Jackson State University	No			*	3
Spelman College	Yes			*	3
Winston-Salem State University	No			*	5
2003-06					
Jackson State University	No	*			3
Lincoln University	No	*			3
Morgan State University	No	*			5
Southern University and A&M College	No	*			1

(Appendix O continued)

Historical Black Colleges and University	UNCF Member Institution	Funding Program			Category by Tier
2004-05					
Elizabeth City State University	No			*	4
Florida A & M University	No			*	1
Florida Memorial College	Yes			*	5
Fort Valley State University	No			*	3
LeMoyne-Owen College	Yes			*	5
Southern University and A&M College	No			*	1
2004-06					
Barber-Scotia/Livingstone College	Yes	*			5
Delaware State University	No	*			5
LeMoyne-Owen College	Yes	*			5
Rust College	Yes	*			5
North Carolina Central University	No	*			5
Savannah State University	No	*			4

Source: UNCFSP data

UNCFSP comment on this table:

The above table contains a list of HBCUs partnering in IDP Activity-funded programs. Non-UNCF member institutions and member institutions roughly received an equal amount of the IDP Activity awards. In the first half of the awarding process, first through third tier institutions received the majority of awards. In the last half of the process, fourth- and fifth-tier institutions obtained more awards. UNCFSP attributes this change to the following: 1) proposal writing workshops were shifted to fourth- and fifth-tier institutions; 2) UNCFSP staff increased visits to these institutions; 3) even when fourth- and fifth-tier institutions did not receive an award on the first try, they were strongly encouraged to submit the next year and offered increased technical support in between proposal writing workshops; and 4) an HBCU could only serve as the lead in a partnership once, making it possible for more institutions to compete for the opportunity.