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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mid-Career Programme was initiated by SAA as its contribution to the development of trained manpower and agricultural development in Ethiopia through upgrading of frontline extension workers. It is designed to produce, not subject matter specialists, but all-round agricultural extension workers who are able to meet the diverse needs of farmers. It moves trainees from specializations such as animal science, forestry and home science to diversification and strengthens their social skills, self-confidence, and professional competence, making them efficient and effective communicators.

The Programme is well supported by all the stakeholders because it is flexible, demand-driven and in very high demand. It is also highly supported because of its experiential teaching / learning approach and the incorporation of off-campus supervised enterprise projects.

Recruitment: AU and the regional bureaus jointly recruited high quality candidates who completed their studies successfully. However, the recruitment notices were not reaching potential applicants in remote areas on time, participation of females is limited, and the number assigned to the regions is very small. To improve the recruitment process the Team recommended the following:

1. AU is encouraged to inform BoA well in advance when the recruitment will be done.
2. AU and BoAs should continue to ensure that the recruitment process is fair, transparent, objective, and that selection of students is based purely on merit.
3. The stakeholders are encouraged to consider allocating a specific quota for female candidates.
4. MoARD should request the assistance of SAA to expand the programme in other universities in the country.

Curriculum: Generally, the curriculum is well planned and balanced in terms of theory and practicals. However, the students identified courses that should be deleted, added and improved. Most of the suggested changes have already been incorporated in the current curriculum. It was observed that the Programme is well packed with courses and leaves little room for adding new courses. The main focus should be on how to improve the handling of the existing courses. The Team recommends as follows:

1. Revise the contents of the Crop Production and Management, Livestock Production and Management, and Soil and Water Management and make them participatory.
2. Improve the course Statistics by incorporating easily understandable examples.
3. Introduce a course Seminar in Agriculture Extension in all the semesters and offer one or two additional courses as home take during the long off-campus SEPs period.
4. Allow students to take elective courses from other departments.
5. Teach the Mid-Career students separately to avoid compromising the experiential nature of the Programme.
6. Conduct training on adult education skills for the staff involved in the Programme.
SEPs are constrained by problems related to supervision and funding and the following recommendations are forwarded.

1. Plan SEPs in partnership with stakeholders to ensure that the students choose appropriate projects.
2. Involve staff members from other departments of the college, MoARD and BoAs to co-supervise the off-campus SEPs.
3. Develop a checklist to be followed during supervision by the staff and co-supervisors to ensure uniformity of supervision.
4. Make a requirement for the students to prepare a field day whereby the heads of the institutions, colleagues and farmers are present and to prepare an extension leaflets resulting from each SEPs.
5. Make a requirement that the final report includes a chapter that describe measures needed to be taken for the SEP continuity.
6. Make an arrangement to obtain a written agreement with the BoAs which commit the institutions to give the necessary financial and material support for the SEPs.
7. Publish and distribute results of SEPS to various users.
8. Solicit fund for editions and publication of SEPs reports and plan for electronic publication.

**Human and Material Resource:** All the students appreciate the staff members in the Department of Agricultural Extension for their knowledge, dedication and motivation to teach. The Team observed that despite being very few they were able to run programmes in the Department very effectively. The Evaluation Team noted that shortage of qualified and experienced staff and lack of training opportunities in the Department are the major threats to the success and sustainability of the Mid-Career Programme. The Team recommends the following:

1. Continue to recruit staff from its programme and in the field.
2. Explore ways of recruiting staff from other sources such as UN Volunteers, American Peace Corps, and British Voluntary Service Organisation (VSO), among others, as a temporary measure.
3. Develop a capacity building programme for its staff by sourcing scholarships from the government and other donor agencies. In addition, AU could give scholarships to agricultural extension graduates in the field for MSc training with an agreement that they will serve as faculty members after completion of their studies.

AU commends SAA for providing vehicles and teaching materials. However, the Evaluation Team noted that availability of vehicles is critical to the success of the programme. In addition, teaching materials are limited. The Team recommends that the University should explore avenues of purchasing more vehicles and teaching materials.

**Collaboration:** The evaluation team noted the high level of collaboration among the stakeholders and University’s deep appreciation of the role played by SAA. Though the programme has done well, it can be improved further by addressing the following issues:
1. There is a general lack of awareness among stakeholders, outside SAFE and AU largely due to institutional memory loss.
2. AU and the MoARD staff did not conduct supervision of off-campus SEPs jointly as stipulated in the MoU.
3. Some regions failed to participate in the stakeholder workshops at AU.
4. The program lacks a project document even though it has a well elaborated MoU.

In this regard, the Team makes the following recommendations.

1. AU should hold one to two-days stakeholders’ annual meetings in order to reflect on the lessons learned, address issues of sustainability, and chart the way forward. A very good starting point for these annual meetings is for the University to organise a 10th Year Anniversary Workshop.
2. The University should secure a written agreement with each BoA committing it to financially support SEPs for its students.
3. The University in consultation with the stakeholders should make the modalities for involving qualified staff from MoA and regional bureaus in the supervision of off-campus SEPs.
4. AU and SAFE should prepare an agreed annual or bi-annual budgets and breakdowns, which will help the University to better plan and implement the Programme activities and remove uncertainties that may arise due to the absence of a project document.

Programme Output: The Programme has made significant progress in achieving its stated objectives. It has produced the following:

1. The programme has graduated 192 students (40 females and 152 males).
2. Almost all the students completed their studies with very few failures.
3. Through the programme, AU is producing all-round graduates who are well prepared to respond to farmers’ diverse technical problems and to fit in various positions of responsibility in the area of agricultural development.
4. Graduates exhibit a high level of confidence, motivation, and professional competence. They are highly respected by their employers.
5. SEPs have generated valuable information about agricultural development in the country, which can be used for teaching and as a basis for further research.
6. Its implementation has created an excellent working relationship between SAFE and the University staff and students as well as officials of the Regional Agricultural Bureaus.
7. The Programme has sponsored the launch of Alumni Association of Mid-Career students, which was the first time for such an association to be launched at AU.
Graduates are making an impact wherever they are. The stakeholders are satisfied with their work performance. Some of the impacts the Programme is making in other areas are as follows:

1. The programme motivates potential trainees to work hard in the hope of being selected for training.

2. The programme has given the University experience and confidence in running tailor-made, flexible, and practically oriented programmes.

3. It has given AU lecturers the opportunity to interact with adult students and to handle courses in a participatory and experiential manner.

4. The programme has improved the graduates’ well being and that of their families by empowering them economically.

5. Completing the programme enables the graduates to meet minimum requirements for pursuing advanced degrees and to qualify for positions requiring a university degree.

6. Graduates of this programme are able to do what they could not do previously in terms of delivering new technologies effectively, making better work plans and working independently, which improves their impact as extension workers.

7. Most of the graduates are in higher positions related to agricultural extension and rural development that enable them to positively influence a large number of field extension workers.

8. SEPs promoted technologies such as early maturing cassava variety in Amaro Woreda, coffee pulp compost to fertilise maize and coffee in Southern Ethiopia, tie-ridges techniques in Awassa, and production and marketing of selected vegetables in Gimbi, among others, that farmers adopted and continue to use up to now.

**Sustainability:** The stakeholders, in general, feel that the programme is likely to be sustainable because:

1. It is in high demand and many people are excited about it. Practical-oriented programmes of this nature are highly needed in the country.

2. The MoARD, BoAs and AU deeply support the programme and want it to succeed.
3. The government has recently opened 25 diploma-awarding institutions (ATVET), which further increase the demand for the Programme.

As noted earlier, the Programme is resource demanding and its sustainability depends largely on the availability and quality of these resources. The major challenges in sustaining this programme are shortage of staff and vehicles and operational funds for supporting SEPs. The Team offers the following recommendations:

1. The stakeholders particularly BoA should allocate more resources to the Programme and should help in SEPs supervision.

2. Officers of the national and local governments should solicit technical and financial support for the programme from donor agencies.

3. Strengthen collaboration among stakeholders

4. Develop a capacity building programme for the Agricultural Extension Department.
**ACRONYMS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATVET</td>
<td>Agricultural Technical and Vocational Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>Alemaya University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoA</td>
<td>Bureau of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGPA</td>
<td>Cumulative Grade Point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>Curriculum Vitae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoARD</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>Sasakawa Africa Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE</td>
<td>Sasakawa Africa Fund for Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPs</td>
<td>Supervised Enterprise Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS</td>
<td>Subject Matter Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNNPRS</td>
<td>Southern Nations, Nationalities, and People's Regional State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToRs</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSO</td>
<td>Voluntary Service Organisation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

The Alemaya University (AU) has been implementing a BSc Agricultural Extension programme that improves the performance of the frontline extension staff since 1997. During this time, the AU conducted internal evaluations and made adjustments to the curriculum and its implementation strategies in response to the needs of stakeholders. After going through six full cycles of this new programme, the Sasakawa Africa Fund for Extension Programme (SAFE) found it necessary to conduct an external evaluation to establish the extent to which the programme is meeting the original expectations and to identify areas that need improvement. For this reason, the SAFE Programme contracted the services of a three-member Evaluation Team from the 10\textsuperscript{th} to 28\textsuperscript{th} July 2005. This report is in fulfilment of this requirement.

Specifically, the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Evaluation Team (Appendix 1) were to:

1. Evaluate the curriculum of the BSc Agricultural Extension programme at Alemaya University, and make recommendations with emphasis on courses that need to be modified, added or deleted.

2. Assess the off-campus Supervised Enterprise Projects (SEPs) component of the programme, with particular reference to its quality and relevance to farmers, the Ministry of Agriculture, students, Alemaya University staff particularly those who have participated in field supervision and make suggestions on how best to plan, implement and evaluate SEPs.

3. Conduct the evaluation in some of the regions of Ethiopia where students have come from to assess employers’ and graduates’ perceptions on the programme, and to assess the current status of the previous SEPs.

4. Make strategic recommendations to AU and its partners (Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Governments and SAFE) on how to improve and sustain the programme.

5. Conduct the entire evaluation exercise, including data collection, analysis and write-up of the report within a maximum of three weeks.

1.1. Background of the Mid-Career Programme

The Mid-Career Programme was initiated by a request from the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia for upgrading the technical and professional skills of Mid-Career front-line extension workers. Following this request, AU established the Mid-Career BSc Programme which specifically targeted field extension professionals through the SAFE Programme funded and supported by Sasakawa Africa Association (SAA), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MoARD) and AU. The programme was launched after wide consultations with local and international organisations on its feasibility.
During the consultations, some staff members of AU including high-ranking officials heavily resisted introduction of the programme for several reasons. First, because they were used to the traditional in-service programmes where advance-standing candidates from the field join the regular BSc programme and are exempted from doing courses in which they had scored B and above but students in the Mid-Career Programme were to be exempted from doing all first year courses. Second, the training period was to be shortened to 2.5 years. For these reasons, they thought introduction of the programme would compromise academic standards of the University.

Stakeholder workshops, funded and supported by the SAA, MoARD and AU, were held with representatives from the MoARD, Regional Bureaus of Agriculture (BoAs), Institute of Agricultural Research, Agricultural Colleges and the Ministry of Education during which more staff members of the University came on board and supported the establishment of the programme. Consequently, AU launched the programme in January 1997.

Once the programme started, the university staff members were impressed by the performance of students in the Mid-Career Programme. They excelled in class assignments, examinations, exchange of ideas, and in the actual implementation of the SEPs. Some students even did better than the regular students and one of them received a Gold Medal for the best performing student. Stakeholders later learnt that the students addressed very important issues related to farmers’ problems in their SEPs. Staff members who had earlier opposed the programme changed their attitudes and now consider the Mid-Career Programme a model. Apart from being an excellent programme, it is a very popular and widely sought programme in the country because it prepares trainees for the real field environment and attracts more students than the University can handle. Details of the background of this program are contained in the MoU (Appendix 2).

2. METHODOLOGY

In order to gather the information needed to accomplish the tasks specified in the ToRs, the Evaluation Team developed a checklist (Appendix 3), after an orientation meeting with the SAFE coordinator, which would capture the process, inputs, outputs and sustainability of the programme. The checklist sought to solicit data on:

- Students’ recruitment.
- The curriculum including quality and relevance of SEPs.
- Human and materials resources.
- Collaboration with stakeholders.
- Programme sustainability.
- Suggestions for improvement.

In consultation with the SAFE Coordinator and Head of the Department of Agricultural Extension, the Team arranged to interview the following categories of people who have been involved with the programme:

- Current and former students of the programme.
- Senior officers of AU who included the President and Vice Presidents, the Dean of the College of Agriculture and Head of the Agricultural Extension Department.
- Lecturers in the Agricultural Extension Department.
• Head of Agricultural Extension Department and Head of Water Harvesting, Small Scale Irrigation and Infrastructure Development and Promotion Department in the MoARD.
• The State Minister for Agriculture.
• Agricultural Bureau Heads in Dire Dawa, Harar, SNNPRS and Oromia region.

In total, the Team interviewed 59 people in Alemaya University, Harar, Dire Dawa, Addis Ababa, Awassa and Alage. Some of the stakeholders were interviewed in groups while others were interviewed individually depending on their convenience. Details of the itinerary and people interviewed are in Appendix 3 and 4, respectively.

3. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The next sections are devoted to the results from the interview and the Team's recommendations. They cover recruitment, curriculum, human and material resources, collaboration among the stakeholders, program output, and sustainability.

3.1. Recruitment of Students

Students’ recruitment for the Mid-Career Programme is conducted in three stages. First AU makes an announcement to regional agricultural bureaus (BoAs) for them to send candidates for the entrance exam. The second stage involves evaluation and recommendation of the applicants by their respective BoAs based on their rules and regulations as well as University requirements for admission as stipulated in the MoU (a minimum of 5-years service, diploma qualification with a minimum Cumulative Grade Point Average [CGPA] of 2.00), to take the entrance examination. The third stage involves administration of the examination by AU and actual selection of best performers based on the quota assigned to the specific region.

3.1.1. Strengths of the Recruitment Process

1. AU and the BoAs work together to identify suitable candidates for the training. The candidates’ supervisors in the BoAs who know them well are involved in their initial selection process.

2. The recruitment process focuses on the experiences of the applicants and their communication skills.

3. All diploma holders working as frontline field extension agents are eligible.

4. Applicants who are not selected can re-apply the following year.

3.1.2. Weaknesses of the Recruitment Process

1. The BoAs complained that the announcement is often given on short notice. Potential applicants from remote areas are therefore often left out because they cannot be reached on time for them to apply.
2. Some of the students indicated that the entrance examination does not screen candidates critically. They reported that with a good knowledge of English and past examinations, one can easily pass the examination without adequate involvement in field extension work and without a positive attitude toward farmers.

3. The number of students recruited is too small compared to the large number of potential trainees who need upgrading. For instance, in the SNNPRS there are many nationalities and only 12 candidates are recruited annually. Oromia, the largest region of the country in area and population, has only a quota of 10 to 12 students annually. Many deserving cases are left out.

4. Very few women candidates are being trained. Those who joined the programme are mainly from SNNPRS and Amhara regions through a sister programme by Winrock International.

3.1.3. Stakeholders’ Suggestions for improvement

1. Graduates suggested recruiting only targeted students and ensuring that the process is transparent and fair. They also advised that the recruitment process should be clear to everyone.

2. Graduates suggested that extension workers from the Cooperative Department should also be recruited.

3. Graduates suggested that AU should evaluate applicants’ CVs to ensure they are involved in extension.

4. The BoAs suggested that AU should give the notice on time to ensure that they contact applicants from every zone.

3.1.4. Evaluation Team’s Recommendations

1. The entrance examination for the Mid-Career Program should assess candidates’ attitudes toward farmers

2. AU is encouraged to inform BoA well in advance when the recruitment will be done so that the BoAs can notify all interested candidates particularly those from remote areas to apply.

3. To maintain staff motivation in the field, BoAs should ensure that the recruitment process is fair, transparent, objective, and that selection of students is based purely on merit.

4. To increase participation of women candidates in the program, the stakeholders are encouraged to consider allocating a specific quota for female candidates.
5. To maintain the candidates’ hope of being selected and increasing the number of candidates enrolled annually from each region, MoARD should request the assistance of SAA to expand the programme in other universities in the country.

6. Vary examination questions annually and ensure that the questions can identify appropriate candidates.

Although the students suggested that AU should evaluate the CVs of applicants, the Evaluation Team found that this process is unnecessary because the job should be left to the BoAs who have better information on the performance of the applicants. Involving AU in evaluation of the applicant CVs will add unnecessary workload.

In line with comments given to include extension workers from the Cooperative Commission, the team noted that such trainees can benefit from the Mid-Career Programme. However, it will be difficult to meet the training requests of various departments related to rural development of the country due to limited capacity of the SAFE Programme. It is advisable if the Cooperative Commission emulates the Mid-Career Programme at AU and look for partner universities to train its diploma holders in Cooperatives.

3.2. Curriculum
The Mid-Career Programme has two main components: The courses taught at AU and off-campus SEPs.

3.2.1. Courses
The courses are of two types: Extension courses from the Department of Agricultural Extension and discipline courses from other departments. The Evaluation Team found that students were generally happy with the curriculum. The students said it is well balanced, integrates theory with practice, and in each course they learn something new and useful. Students, who had not taken extension courses, for instance, took several of them while those who had taken some extension courses studied them more deeply. Students found courses taught in the Department of Agricultural Extension to be very relevant and well handled in a participatory manner but were dissatisfied with courses from other departments because lecturers did not allow interactive learning. Additionally, they lacked adult teaching skills, incorporated very few practical exercises into the courses and in some cases covered more materials than were appropriate for the credit hours assigned to the course. This tended to overburden the students with unnecessary workload.

Courses the students considered relevant and very useful to them include Gender & Youth in Extension, Agricultural Journalism, and Programme Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation in Extension. The latter was particularly useful for many of the graduates involved in evaluating projects. They recommended deletion of Crop Protection, Animal Diseases and On-campus SEPs from the Programme and revision of Crop Production and Management as well as Livestock Production and Management to make them practical and more participatory. Some students said that other courses, which they consider very relevant and valuable to their fieldwork but were missing during their time include Agricultural Marketing, Cooperatives, Statistics and
Agricultural Economics. They also noted that courses dealing with agricultural policy and entrepreneurship were missing. They commented that the Computer Applications course tends to concentrate more on programming rather than applications, which is more useful to them.

The students found some courses to be very difficult partly due to

- Variation in their diploma training (Crops, Animal Science, Extension etc.).
- Taking difficult courses without first taking prerequisites.
- Taking courses with regular students who already had taken related courses.
- Teachers’ failure to give the students enough practical exercises.
- Covering too many materials for the assigned credit hours.

When asked whether there were course repetitions, the students felt that some repetitions were inevitable due to their varying academic backgrounds. What was a repetition for some students was new for others but to avoid repetition, they suggested that some courses be offered as electives and that the current programme focus on agricultural extension be broadened to address issues of rural development, primary education and health. They further suggested that both the regular and Mid-Career Programmes be reviewed regularly and concurrently to keep them up to date.

The team found the courses to be well planned and balanced in terms of the mix between extension and the supportive courses from the other departments as well as between theory and hands-on practicals. It enabled students to acquire the knowledge to formulate and implement action-oriented research, analyse problems and formulate and test envisaged solutions and develop the skill of writing up of reports. It gave them the chance to develop leadership qualities and instilled deep social responsibility. The quality of the graduates, current positions and excellent performances indicate the high quality and success of the programme.

Current and former students of the programme have made several suggestions on how to improve course offerings, which include additions, omissions and improvement in course handling. The University has thoroughly looked into the course offerings in its internal review (Mutiimba, Lemessa and Bati, 2000) and the Department has taken very important measures. It has included Statistics, Agricultural Economics, and Agricultural Marketing courses into the programme and deleted courses on Crop Protection and Animal Health and Diseases as suggested by former students during the evaluation.

The Team observed that the programme is well packed with courses. The current students are taking 19, 20, 19 and 21 credit hours during the first, second, third and fourth semesters, respectively, which leave little room for adding new courses. On the other hand, increasing the programme duration to three years to accommodate more courses would make it unattractive to students and employers. Furthermore, inclusion of many courses to address all rural development issues in the country is impossible within the 2.5 years. Since this is a BSc programme, trainees who need advanced courses in extension should be encouraged to pursue graduate study. Course offering should allow individual students to take a few elective courses if they need them. Therefore, the main focus should be on how to improve the handling of the existing courses. Each course should be evaluated individually in terms of its content and match with the allotted credit hour, incorporation of missing topics and removal of unnecessary ones. Effort should be
made to deliver courses in a participatory manner in the class and to link the subject to real farmers’ conditions in the country.

The students repeatedly raised concerns that the training is short of experience sharing within and outside the country, which can be incorporated by introducing a course *Seminar in Agriculture Extension* in all the semesters. Carefully selected persons with rich experiences from the extension (MoARD & BoAs, NGOs), education (universities) and the research system (Ethiopian Agriculture Research Organisation and Regional Agriculture Research Institutes) should be involved. The seminar should mainly focus on issues related to the country’s agricultural development and policies, and experiences sharing on agricultural extension systems of other countries, among others. During the seminar the facilitator should prepare discussion points so that students interact and debate the issues and are graded on their attendance and their brief reports on the lessons they learn from each seminar.

Another possibility of creating room for an additional course without prolonging the programme duration is to introduce take home courses during the long off-campus SEPs period. With the help of standard teaching materials, the Department can add one or two courses, which are amenable to distance education. The teaching materials should be accompanied with carefully planned exercises that force the students to read through the whole document and students are evaluated by their reports.

### 3.2.2. Teaching and Learning Approach

The students were generally satisfied with the teaching and learning approach used. However, they observed great variations in handling of courses by staff in the Department and those outside the Department. Effective teaching, they said, varied greatly between local and expatriate lecturers. Expatriate lecturers often used examples from their countries that the students could not easily relate to.

The most practical courses, according to the students, were Audio-visual Techniques, Research Methods in Extension; Communication Theory & Practice, and SEPs. On the other hand, Programme Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in Extension as well as Soil and Water Conservation were found to be most theoretical. Lecturers of Livestock Production and Management and Soil Conservation and Watershed Management used fewer practical activities. These courses together with Statistics were very difficult particularly because some of the students had little background knowledge and the courses were not handled in a friendly manner. Though they considered the Programme Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation in Extension course to be very useful, they found it too wide to be covered within the assigned 3 credit hours and they took it together with regular students. They suggested that courses with mathematics and chemistry components be handled in a way that makes students understand and find them applicable.

The Team observed that courses offered by staff in the Agriculture Extension Department are more participatory and practical. Lecturers from the Department indicated that they enjoy teaching Mid-Career students because the students appreciate them more than the regular students do. The students were also able and willing to share practical field experiences with lecturers. However, the courses given by other departments are worrisome in terms of their
handling. The lecturers tried their best to introduce the material but lacked skills in adult education that are necessary when dealing with mature students. The students found that the course on crop production, livestock production, soil management, and computer sciences to be very useful, and appropriate as they help the students to have an all round knowledge. Each of the production courses was offered by many staff and was not commensurate with the allotted credit hour. A common level of understanding about the nature of the programme and its objective in other departments seems to be lacking. Though it is very difficult to make changes on courses offered by other departments, the Agriculture Extension Department is encouraged to hold continuous discussions and consultations with the staff members from the other departments to make these courses more practical and participatory instead of the usual method of "chalk and talk". The Department should outline these discussions, which include the kind of knowledge that trainees need to learn, the mix in the theoretical and practical lessons, and educational materials to be given to students. Moreover, faculty members have to be reminded repeatedly that the Mid-Career trainees are not novice to agriculture but have rich field experiences. The department is also advised to arrange training on adult education skills for the staff involved in the program.

Teaching regular with Mid-Career students together compromises the experiential nature of the programme and disadvantages them because the regular students often take several prerequisite courses. In terms of the use of the expatriate staff in the Department, at the moment the university has to use the available staff including expatriates at its disposal. The expatriates are valuable in sharing international experiences and teaching basic courses but, if possible, they should not be assigned to teach courses that need the use of practical national examples.

3.2.3. Supervised Enterprise Projects (SEPs)

SEPs are important components of the Mid-Career Programme. When the programme started they were organised in two stages: On-campus and off-campus.

On-campus SEPs

Students start on-campus SEPs (which is no longer being offered) after first year of training. On-campus SEPs are designed to enable them go through the process of problem identification and proposal development in preparation for off-campus SEPs and also to acquire experience in dealing with farmers in a setting similar to what they will encounter during the off-campus SEPs.

A few of the former students praised on-campus SEPs because of two main reasons. First, students do on-campus SEPs in groups and therefore learn to work as a team. Second, through on-campus SEPs, students get a chance to share the rich experiences of the Harar farmers, which they found to be unique and advanced, compared to many regions of the country. However, most of the graduates suggested the omission of the on-campus SEP on account that it did not add much to their training. It was also reported that the supervision of on-campus SEPs was often weak and some students could have passed it with high grades without going to the field. Furthermore, its implementation disadvantages students who could not use the local language to communicate with farmers. They therefore recommended that on-campus SEPs be deleted from the curriculum. If it is retained, it should be reviewed critically to ensure that the students implement their action plans effectively.
Off-campus SEPs

All academic staff and students greatly appreciate this course due to its experiential learning nature and its contribution to the body of knowledge in agricultural extension that can be used for advising farmers, training students, further research, and policy formulation. Additionally, it gives the University community and farmers an opportunity to interact and learn from one another. The presentation of SEPs’ results to colleagues, instructors and the university community is both a learning and confidence building process for the students. The students find the off campus SEPs useful and are committed to implementing them as planned.

The Evaluation Team tried to investigate the status of SEPs within the limited time it had. The interviewed graduates gave examples of how SEPs lead to adoption of agricultural technologies around the country. In collaboration with Southern Agriculture Research Institute, SEPs have been used to introduce an early maturing cassava variety in Amaro Woreda (district), which is well accepted and adopted by farmers. The SEP, which promoted the use of coffee pulp compost to fertilize maize and coffee in Southern Ethiopia has increased maize yield and created a disposal mechanism for the pulp thereby preventing pollution of the environment. Many farmers adopted the technology and are still using it. In Awassa, tied-ridges (box ridges) techniques were introduced to farmers who adopted and continue to use them. In Gimbi, Western Ethiopia, production, marketing and consumption of selected vegetable crops was introduced through SEPS resulting in increased consumption and sales of vegetables thereby improving their health and income.

The team visited Bee Hive and Sericulture projects. The SEPs project technology on bee keeping raised the adoption of improved beehives from 10 to 100 farmers around Harar. In Sidama area, introduction of sericulture has given farmers and their families a regular source of income and its adoption rate is very high. In addition, the project is currently serving as a training ground for farmers.

Supervision of SEPs: Weaknesses / Challenges

SEPs are constrained by problems related to supervision and funding.

Supervision: The University had initially planned to have two supervisions per year. During the first supervision, the staff would focus on how the project is laid and make the necessary modifications. During the second supervision, the staff would determine whether the students are following directions contained in the action plans and find common solutions for the problems faced. Due to shortage of staff and vehicles, supervision is currently conducted once towards the end of SEPs and focuses on data management, analysis and report writing. The students also indicated that staff spend a short time with the students during supervision. This type of supervision, according to the students, is less effective. They suggested that co-supervision with qualified and experienced MoARD & BoA staff be arranged and implemented.

Vehicles: The staff reported that supervision is very tiresome, because they have to cover very long distances. Shortage of vehicles forces many of them to travel in one vehicle instead of visiting different students concurrently, which would have reduced the time spent on supervision.
**Collaboration:** The people interviewed in the regional bureaus felt that the University did not involve them enough in students’ supervision since they did not usually ask the regional staff to accompany them to the field. Most of them indicated that they are willing to help if given material assistance in addition to technical guidelines on what to look for during the exercise.

**Funding:** Budget decentralisation to the districts (Woreda) has created problems in funding SEPs because some officials at the district and regional levels are not aware of the Programme. Due to lack of effective communication related to budgets for SEPs between the districts and the regions, the current students fear that they might not get enough funds for their SEPs. They proposed that a written agreement between the University and the regional bureaus be signed. During project proposal defence, the University should ensure that SEPs budgets are not exaggerated. They should also ensure that implementation of off-campus SEPs is consistent with the approved budget.

All the students, employers and AU staff agree that despite the shortcomings, SEPs are likely to be sustained. This is because there is a felt need for them. It is observed that the off-campus SEPs are central in making this Mid-Career training relevant. Not only has it benefited the students but has also created a learning environment for the university as a whole. The Evaluation Team has observed that the department has done commendable job in handling the SEPs despite facing various problems.

The Team would like to stress that the quality and relevance of the SEPs, their adoption and continuity mainly lie on effective collaboration in terms of selection and supervision of projects, adequate staff, vehicles and funds, regular supervision, and effective dissemination of the results. The development of the SEPs projects and their approval should be given high priority to maintain the quality and relevance. During approval, the importance of the proposed SEP, the load of each SEP in light of the 8 months stay in the field, the new knowledge the student acquires and the possible outputs should be assessed in the presence of peers, instructors and employers’ representatives who understand farmers’ problems of the area. It is inevitable that students from the same or other batches will pick up related topics. Such topics should be approved if they have merits of improvement over the earlier projects and address the shortcomings.

The Team observed that the reduction of the SEPs supervision frequency from two to one could seriously comprise the quality of the programme. The current supervision, which is done once at the end of the SEPs project, is insufficient in helping the students to acquire the needed knowledge and skills. Up to now, the staff members of the Agriculture Extension Department solely conduct the supervision. As the Department suffers from acute staff shortage, the supervision can be improved by involving faculties from the other departments. For example, staff from the department of plant sciences can easily supervise projects related to crop production while animal science staff members supervise animal production. The involvement of staff from other departments of the agriculture faculty is possible only if all the departments of the faculty feel that they have the responsibility in sustaining this programme and the Agriculture Extension Department should try its level best to make them aware of this responsibility. AU should also look for potential collaborators in other universities while making it mandatory for a student to have an advisor from his/her institution to improve the quality of guidance and the
help the student gets during project implementation. The team recommends a minimum of two supervisions.

The Evaluation Team observed that most of the students, except those sponsored by donors other than the government, faced problems of financial and material support. There is a genuine fear among the currently enrolled students that they may not get enough funds from their employers to conduct their off-campus SEPs. The university has to work very hard in creating awareness about the programme so that the students will not face these problems. The University is encouraged to secure a written agreement with the BoAs committing them to give the necessary support. Such arrangements will force the regional, zonal and woreda level bureaus of agriculture to assign budget for the off-campus SEPs. AU is also encouraged to hold high-level discussions with officials in the MoARD on how to get budgetary support for off-campus SEPs on a permanent basis. It is also encouraged to seek assistance from international donors.

Adoption and continuity of SEPs can only be ensured if the employers also own the programme. It is therefore necessary for stakeholders to participate in the planning, monitoring and evaluation of the SEPs and to receive feedback on its status and final outputs. To ensure continuity, the University is encouraged to require that students prepare a field day of their work through which their employers, colleagues and farmers are informed about the achievements. In addition, a chapter in the final report of SEPs should describe measures that should be taken to ensure its continuity and what the student has done on that line. The University is encouraged to make it a requirement for students to prepare an extension leaflet from each SEPs as a means of extending the results to a wider audience. Some of the graduates had used these methods resulting in high rate of SEPs adoption and continuity.

The reports of off-campus SEPs should be distributed to all the stakeholders including universities, ATVET colleges, research centres, BoAs and NGOs involved in agricultural development. SAFE is encouraged to provide funds for the publication of the reports including editing and printing. The University is encouraged to start publication of the SEP reports as early as possible including electronic media, which make it easier for distribution and access. The Evaluation Team recommends annual publication of SEPs reports in the form of summaries/abstracts for immediate distribution and use.

3.2.4. Course Workload and Programme Duration

Most current and former students of the Mid-Career Programme indicated that the workload was well balanced and the 2.5 years period allocated to the programme was optimum. They recommended that the current course duration be retained.

3.3. Human and Material Resources

In this section, the Team discusses the findings related to human and material resources in that order.

3.3.1. The Human Resource

All the students appreciate the staff members in the Department for their knowledge and dedication to their jobs noting that despite their heavy workload in academic and administrative
matters, they are able to run the Mid-Career Programme, which requires continuous follow-up and interaction with students. Additionally, they provided students with teaching materials of their own and often travel long distances to supervise SEPs annually. The Evaluation Team concurred with the students’ appreciation of their lecturers but noted the following problems:

1. Shortage of qualified and experienced staff in the Department of Agricultural Extension is the biggest threat to the success and sustainability of the Mid-Career Programme. This issue was highlighted in the MoU during the initial phase of the programme and has continued to be a challenge as is evident from responses from all stakeholders as well as the annual reports throughout the programme by the SAFE Programme Coordinator. At the inception of the programme, the Department had 8 members of staff teaching only the regular and the Mid-Career Programmes. Currently, there are only four members of staff and only 2 of them are without administrative responsibilities. Yet the number of programmes has increased to four (Mid-Career, Regular Agricultural Extension, M.Sc. and summer in-service programme) and the number of students has increased. The lecturers work up to 12 months without a break and are highly concerned with whether they can continue to give the same quality of training, let alone coping with increasing demand for staff time. The University, former graduates and current students acknowledge that this situation overworks the staff and forces students to receive guidance and lectures from less experienced graduate assistants and assistant lecturers as noted earlier.

2. Apart from staff shortage, some stakeholders pointed out that staff members in the Department generally lack training opportunities. This situation has demoralized some members and forced them to seek further training in fields other than Agricultural Extension. The SAFE programme lacks a capacity-building component for staff in the Agricultural Extension Department which could have alleviated the problem.

3. Graduates of the programme observed that staff members at AU have a strong theoretical background but lack the practical experience necessary for effective teaching in this programme.

To improve the staff situation, the University made efforts to recruit staff locally as guest lecturers and on permanent basis as an on-going activity but is unable to attract and retain qualified staff due to, among other reasons, poor salaries offered to lecturers and the location of AU in a rural setting. As a temporary measure, the University also recruited expatriates, mainly from India, for teaching. The graduates of the programme noted that although some of the expatriates are highly qualified and do their best in teaching, they are limited by lack of familiarity with local agricultural issues and problems, which is essential for this programme.

All the stakeholders interviewed agreed that AU should recruit more staff. They made the following suggestions for improving the staff shortage situation:

1. The University should recruit not only high performers from the regular students but also people with field experience in order to have a very good mix.
2. Lecturers in extension should have field experience to enable them give realistic, practical and appropriate examples. In this regard, employers stressed that lecturers should be familiar with farmers’ problems and needs, macro agricultural policy setting, and mainstream activities in the MoARD.

3. University staff should know what is happening in other countries through participation in conferences, research and consultancies to enrich their teaching and learning so that they can use suitable examples from neighbouring countries when local or national examples are not available.

Based on the above discussion, this evaluation confirms that staff shortage in the Department is critical and needs urgent attention. Unless AU takes measures to build capacity, the Mid-Career Programme and related BSc and MSc agricultural extension programmes may collapse and negatively affect agricultural development activities in the country. Therefore, the Evaluation Team recommends that AU should:

1. Continue to recruit staff from its programmes and in the field.

2. Explore ways of recruiting staff from other sources such as UN Volunteers, American Peace Corps, and British Voluntary Service Organisation (VSO), among others, as a temporary measure.

3. Seriously consider developing a capacity building programme for its staff by sourcing scholarships from the government and other donor agencies. Such a strategy could be a specific capacity building project or built in capacity building components in other agricultural related development projects across the country. In addition, AU could give scholarships to agricultural extension graduates in the field for MSc training with an agreement that they will serve as faculty members after completion of their studies.

3.3.2. Material Resources

**Vehicles**

The University has commended SAFE for providing vehicles used to run this programme particularly for supervising SEPs. These vehicles have been in use since 1997 and are now worn-out as a result of wear and tear as well as poor roads and hence need to be replaced. However, it was reported that the government did not provide the University with money for buying new cars and is not allowing purchase of new cars even if the University has money from other sources due to a country-wide freeze on purchase of new vehicles. Noting the severe transport problem in the Department, the University pleaded with SAFE to procure an additional vehicle, although it had met all its commitments as stipulated in the MoU. In this regard, SAFE generously complied with the request and is in the process of procuring the vehicle. It was noted that the current policy of disallowing government organisations to buy new vehicles is a management strategy for rationalizing the use of public vehicles due to their high running costs and is temporary. It is not clear when the policy will be reviewed.

The Evaluation Team noted that availability of vehicles is critical to the success of the programme. It therefore welcomes the purchase of an extra vehicle from the SAFE programme.
However, it encourages the University to explore other avenues of purchasing more vehicles and continue to dialogue with the Government on this issue to avoid killing the SEP component.

**Teaching materials**
Staff and students noted that the Department is relatively new and therefore has limited teaching resources compared to departments established earlier. The increase in the number of programmes in the Department has made the need for new books and other materials more critical. The Evaluation Team noted that SAFE has provided materials for students’ use for which the University community is very grateful. It also noted that teachers have individually contributed their own materials to students. However, reference materials were few and Mid-Career students had to share whatever was available with the regular students. Lack of Internet services on campus made it harder for both staff and students to update available materials through the electronic media. The Evaluation Team would like to encourage the University to explore the possibilities of purchasing more teaching materials and establishing an Internet Service on campus.

**3.4. Collaboration among the Stakeholders**

The University conducts this programme in partnership with other stakeholders whose involvement is critical for programme continuity and sustainability. Its success depends largely on collaboration among the stakeholders who include AU, MoARD, Regional Agriculture Bureaus (BoAs) and SAFE. Each collaborator has very unique and specific responsibilities. The Evaluation Team noted that there is a high level of collaboration among the stakeholders as follows:

1. The University and the BoAs recruit the students jointly.

2. All the stakeholders contribute financial support to the programme. SAFE, for instance, provides operational funds, resources and technical support. BoAs provide salaries and scholarships as well as material and financial support for off-campus SEPs. The students sign agreements to serve their regions after graduation.

3. AU offers its staff and facilities for training and trains the students. To ensure effective management of the programme with stakeholders’ involvement and ownership, AU also signed MoU with all the stakeholders clearly specifying their responsibilities.

4. The MoARD provides an enabling policy environment for trainees to pursue their BSc studies. It sanctioned the programme thereby allowing the regions to provide scholarships to trainees and to pay their monthly salaries while in training. This was the first time in Ethiopia that diploma holders in the civil service received their salaries while on training.

The University deeply appreciates Sasakawa’s flexibility in supporting the programme as it has honoured all its commitments despite the absence of a project document. All the stakeholders interviewed appreciated SAFE’s Coordinator, Dr. Jeff Mutimba, for his quality leadership, commitment, cooperation, and reception to suggestions. Though the programme has done well, it can be improved further by addressing the following issues:
1. There is a general lack of awareness among stakeholders, outside SAFE and AU largely due to institutional memory loss. The stakeholders reported that when the responsible persons change positions, the new staff members may not be familiar with the programme and in some cases knowledge of the programme is confined to the head. This lack of awareness causes great variation in the level of financial and material support the BoAs give to students during training at AU and for off-campus SEPs. Some regions, for instance, failed to pay students’ salaries and to finance inputs for SEPs. However, unlike other regions, the SNNPRS has consistently supported the programme.

2. AU and the MoARD staff did not conduct supervision of off-campus SEPs jointly as stipulated in the MoU. This may have affected the quality of SEPs as well as their rate of adoption and continuity after the students graduated.

3. Some regions failed to participate in the stakeholder workshops at AU even though the Mid-Career Programme was willing to cover their expenses.

4. The program lacks a project document even though it has a well-elaborated MoU. The University is concerned that the MoU has not specified the operational budget, financial management procedures, project duration and time for various activities, measurable indicators for success and exit strategies. A clear description of these issues in a written project document would have facilitated proper planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme. Knowledge of the exit strategies, for instance, would have enabled the University to know specifically when it is expected to take over some of the SAFE financial programme responsibilities.

The Evaluation Team noted that the University made efforts to discuss issues of sustainability with stakeholders such as representatives from the regions, graduates, and other universities during the course of implementing the SAFE programme. Agreements were made but generally not much has been implemented. The Team confirmed the stakeholders’ willingness to be involved and to support programme activities for purposes of jointly owning the programme. In this regard, the Team makes the following recommendations based on its interviews with stakeholders:

1. AU should hold one to two-days stakeholders’ annual meetings in order to reflect on the lessons learned, address issues of sustainability, and chart the way forward for effective collaboration. In order to organize a successful meeting, senior University officials should carefully prepare the meeting agenda, send invitation letters, and personally invite the appropriate officers well in advance. During the meeting, the University should prepare specific activities that would show the status and output of the programme, and why it should be supported.

2. A very good starting point for these annual meetings is for the University to organise a 10th Year Anniversary Workshop.

3. The University should secure a written agreement with each BoA committing it to financially support SEPs for its students. In cases where the BoAs fail to meet their
financial commitments for this Programme, the MoARD has expressed its interest and willingness to mediate in order to solve the problem.

4. The University in consultation with the stakeholders should make the modalities for involving qualified staff from MoA and regional bureaus in the supervision of off-campus SEPs. For this to be successful, the agreement should specify who should provide logistical support such as vehicles and staff per diem during the teaching and supervision of students by non-University staff. It should also commit the Ministry to recognise its staff members’ contribution to the programme when it is evaluating the staff.

5. The MoARD, and BoAs should invite the University officials to participate in development meeting in order to share information, experiences and to chart the way forward.

6. AU and SAFE should prepare an agreed annual or bi-annual budgets and breakdowns, which will help the University to better plan and implement the Programme activities and remove uncertainties that arise due to the absence of a project document.

3.5. Programme Output

All the people interviewed highly commended the programme for its excellent and practical training approach, its contribution to improving extension delivery services to farmers and overall agricultural development in the country.

The partnership between AU, SAA, the MoARD, the BoAs and farmers in running the Programme has made significant progress in achieving its stated objectives. The programme outputs are discussed in terms of the products and impact.

3.5.1. Products

1. Since being launched in 1997, the Programme has graduated 192 students (40 females and 152 males). Employers rate the professional knowledge and skills of these graduates highly and express full satisfaction with their job performance noting that the training has greatly improved the graduates’ professional competence, self-confidence and communication skills.

Table 1 Summary of the Mid-Career Graduates by Year
2. Almost all the students completed their studies despite their long absence from class. This impressive academic performance alleviated fears of some university officials that the programme would compromise academic standards. It put impetus in the continuity of the programme.

3. The Mid-Career students interact very well with their teachers and peers in class.

4. Through the programme, AU is producing all-round graduates who are well prepared to respond to farmers’ diverse technical problems and to fit in various positions of responsibility in the area of agricultural development.

5. The graduates of this program exhibit a high level of confidence, motivation, and professional competence. They are holding very high positions in government, NGOs, and in the private sector and performing very well on their jobs, advancing in their positions and qualifications. They are highly respected by their employers. However, care should be taken when deploying Mid-Career graduates to ensure that they are not discouraged.

6. Through SEPs, the Programme has generated valuable information about agricultural development in the country, which can be used for teaching and as a basis for further research.

7. Its implementation has created an excellent working relationship between SAFE and the University staff and students as well as officials of the regional agricultural bureaus.

8. It improves the knowledge and skills of diploma holders working as frontline extension workers who, without this upgrading programme, would not advance to higher positions even if they had the potential to do so.

9. In 2002, SAFE sponsored the launch of Alumni Association of Mid-Career students, which was the first time for such an association to be launched at AU.
3.5.2. Impact
Measuring the impact of an extension programme on farmers requires time and clear description of its indicators. These may include the actual improvement in yields of crops and livestock, adoption of recommended practices, community’s change of attitude towards extension workers and demand for services provided by the extension agents. With only 192 graduates spread all over the country for only a few years, their visible impact cannot be expected to be very high. However, stakeholders observed clear evidence of the impact the graduates were making wherever they are. As described earlier, high adoption rate of technologies disseminated through SEPs was observed. There was a general satisfaction with the graduates among the stakeholders in terms of the way they are performing their duties. Some of the impacts the Programme is making in other areas are as follows:

1. The programme motivates potential trainees to work hard in the hope of being selected for training, which would enable them advance to higher and more responsible positions.

2. The programme has given the University experience and confidence in running tailor-made, flexible, and practically oriented programmes.

3. It has given AU lecturers an opportunity to interact with adult students and to handle courses in a participatory and experiential manner.

4. The Programme has improved the graduates’ well being and that of their families by empowering them economically.

5. Completing the Programme enables the graduates to meet minimum requirements for pursuing advanced degrees and to qualify for positions requiring a university degree.

6. Graduates of this Programme are able to do what they could not do previously in terms of delivering new technologies effectively, making better work plans and working independently, which improves their impact as extension workers.

7. Most of the graduates are in higher positions related to agricultural extension and rural development that enable them to positively influence a large number of field extension workers.

3.6. Sustainability
The stakeholders, in general, feel that the programme is likely to be sustainable because:

1. It is in high demand and many people are excited about it. There are very many diploma holders in the field who need upgrading through this programme. The estimated average years of service for the current and former students that we interviewed was 15 but ranged from 5 to 27.

2. The country has a very high demand for trained extension workers as indicated during needs assessment that preceded the launch of the programme. Stakeholders said that the
The programme was long overdue because of the country’s shortage of qualified agricultural extension professionals and the fact that district officers are now required to have a minimum of a BSc degree. It is because of this staff shortage that graduates from disciplines other than extension such as plant science, animal science and forestry continue to do most of the agricultural extension work.

3. Practical-oriented programmes of this nature are highly needed in the country.

4. The MoARD, BoAs and AU deeply support the Programme and want it to succeed.

5. The government has recently opened 25 diploma-awarding institutions (ATVET), which further increase demand for the programme.

As noted earlier, the programme is resource demanding and its sustainability depends largely on the availability and quality of these resources. The following challenges need to be addressed in order to sustain the programme:

1. Critical staff shortage at AU in terms of numbers and time for teaching, supervision and research.

2. Severe shortage of vehicles for supervision of SEPs.

3. Dependence on financial support from SAFE particularly on vehicles for supervision of SEPs.

The Team offers the following recommendations to improve overall programme sustainability:

1. The stakeholders particularly BoA should allocate more resources to the programme and should help in SEPs supervision in their areas.

2. Officers of the national and local governments should solicit technical and financial support for the programme from donor agencies such as UNDP, FAO and the World Bank.

3. Strengthen collaboration among stakeholders

4. Develop a capacity building programme for the Agricultural Extension Department.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Considering programme outputs in relation to its targets, the information obtained indicates clearly that the programme has been successful. It is contributing significantly to the development of trained manpower as well as agricultural development in Ethiopia. The curriculum is very good because it has mixed theory with practice. The programme was able to produce all round graduates that fit different positions in extension organisations. The problems experienced during programme implementation are not insurmountable and can easily be overcome. This is mainly due to the outstanding leadership qualities of those charged with the
responsibility of implementing the programme, their flexibility and commitment to its success and their willingness to learn from one another and accept suggestions for improvement. It improved collaboration among the various stakeholders and trained Mid-Career extension workers at BSc level as planned. The Programme has improved the overall effectiveness of frontline staff in agricultural extension.

Looking at the available evidence gathered through the interviews with the various stakeholders, the Evaluation Team concludes that the Programme is on track towards the achievement of its stated purpose and objectives. As a way forward, the University should give due attention to the issues of staff shortage, provision of vehicles and funding of SEPs, which may constrain the success of this programme.

On the other hand, SAA is encouraged to continue supporting the programme until all the national stakeholders start to collaborate effectively and AU is able to run the programme on its own. In the meantime the following areas need financial and technical support from SAA:

1. SEPs programme, which is the main part of the training.
2. Staff training at graduate level to build a very good critical mass of lecturers in the Agricultural Extension Department.
3. Production of reports in hard copy and in electronic media.
4. Stakeholders’ workshops particularly the 10th Anniversary Workshop.
5. Adult education training for lecturers.
6. Networking for information sharing through staff exchange.
7. Production and acquisition of teaching materials.
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6. APPENDICES

6.1. Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

EXTERNAL EVALUATION OF THE B.Sc. PROGRAMME FOR MID-CAREER EXTENSION PROFESSIONALS AT ALEMAYA UNIVERSITY, ETHIOPIA

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR REVIEWERS

The B.Sc Agricultural Extension programme at Alemaya University was launched in 1997 following a request from the Federal Ministry of Agriculture for a tailor-made programme that would improve the performance of the frontline extension staff. After going through six full cycles of this new programme, it is necessary to conduct an external evaluation to establish the extent to which the programme is meeting the original expectations and to identify areas that need improvement.

Specifically, reviewers are expected to:

6. To evaluate the curriculum of the B.Sc. Agricultural Extension programme at Alemaya University, and make recommendations with emphasis on courses that need to be modified, added or deleted.

7. To assess the off-campus Supervised Enterprise Projects (SEPs) component of the programme, with particular reference to its quality and relevance to farmers, the Ministry of Agriculture, students, Alemaya staff (especially those who have participated in field supervision), and provide suggestions on how best to plan, implement and evaluate SEPs.

8. To conduct the evaluation in some of the regions of Ethiopia where students have come from to assess the employers’ and graduates’ perceptions on the programme, and also to assess the current status of the previous SEPs.

9. To make strategic recommendations to Alemaya and its partners (Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Governments and SAFE) on how to improve and sustain the programme.

10. To conduct the entire evaluation exercise, including data collection, analysis and write-up of the report within a maximum of three weeks.
6.2. Appendix 2: MoU

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
ALEMAYA UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE,
AND
SASAKAWA AFRICA ASSOCIATION

1.0 Introduction

This document serves to formalize the partnership and understanding between Alemaya University of Agriculture (AUA) and Sasakawa Africa Association (SAA) through its Sasakawa Africa Fund for Extension Education (SAFE) in the implementation of the new B.Sc program in Agricultural Extension for mid-career front-line extension workers in Ethiopia.

2.0 About the partners

AUA has a long and proud history dating back to its inception as the Imperial College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts in 1952. Until recently, it has been the only university offering degree level training in the various agricultural disciplines. AUA is, therefore, the leading institution in the country in the area of agricultural human resource development.

The SAA, whose president is the Nobel peace laureate, Norman E. Borlaug, was established in 1986 to promote the transfer of improved agricultural techniques to small scale farmers. SAA was later joined by Global 2000 Inc. program of the Carter Center, whose chair is former U.S. president, Jimmy Carter, to work with governments of African nations to form effective agricultural policies. The two operate as Sasakawa-Global 2000 (or SG-2000). SG-2000 agricultural programs are a joint venture between the two non-government organizations.

After working with extension specialists and researchers for some time, SG-2000 realized the need for upgrading the skills of mid-career national extension professionals. Consequently, in 1991, the board of the Sasakawa Africa Association established the Sasakawa Africa Fund for Extension Education (SAFE) to support efforts directed at strengthening extension education. SAA has teamed up with Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development (WI), a leader in human resource development and enhancement of agricultural university training, to implement the SAFE initiative. SAFE operates in countries where SG-2000 programs are implemented. SAFE is an integral part of SG-2000 programs.

Funding for the SG-2000 and SAFE comes from the Nippon Foundation, whose President is Yohei Sasakawa.

3.0 Background to the program
Following demands from the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia for up-grading the technical and professional skills of mid-career front-line extension workers in the country, AUA is embarking on a new and innovative program targeted specifically at field extension professionals.

Before reaching the decision to launch the program, AUA held extensive consultations with local and international organizations on the feasibility of such a program. In particular, AUA benefited from the experiences of SAA and WI at the University of Cape Coast in Ghana.

In November 1994, a four member team from SAA and WI, accompanied by the Head of the Extension and Cooperative Development, MoA, visited AUA and held discussions with the Academic Vice President (AVP). During the discussions: the representative from MoA reiterated the need for an up-grading program for extension staff; AUA confirmed its acceptance to face the challenge of coming up with an appropriate program; and the SAA/WI team indicated its willingness to collaborate with AUA in this innovative program.

Following the discussions at AUA, SAA/WI invited the AVP and a senior staff from the Department of Agricultural Extension to a workshop on ‘Professional Development of mid-career front-line Agricultural Extension staff in sub-saharan Africa’ held in March 1995 at the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. The SAA funded the trip whose main objective was to provide an opportunity for sharing the experiences of the University of Cape Coast (UCC) - a pioneer institution in such type of initiative. The trip provided insights which proved useful in the initial preparation and designing of the program.

After the visit to UCC, AUA conducted a (mailed) questionnaire survey in the different regions of Ethiopia to try and ascertain and quantify the demand for such a program. The results indicated a high demand for the program and also gave some indication on areas to be covered by the degree program. From the results, AUA was able to develop a draft curriculum.

This exercise was followed by a workshop of the major stakeholders (MoA, Regional Bureaus of Agriculture, Institute of Agricultural Research, Agricultural Colleges, and Ministry of Education) in the country to review the proposed curriculum and also to create a common understanding on the strategy for human resource development in extension.

The workshop was jointly funded and supported by SAA, AUA and MoA.

The workshop recommended a further detailed needs assessment to ascertain the level of demand for, and commitment to, this program by the regional governments. The study, which was supported by SAA/WI and conducted in September 1995, confirmed the need for the program and the willingness of the regional governments to support the program by granting paid study leave to their staff and facilitating the students’ field work.

A second workshop was then held in February 1996 to discuss the findings of the needs assessment and to finalize the modalities. This workshop was also funded and supported by SAA, AUA and MoA.
The program was approved by AUA Senate in June 1996.

4.0 Purpose of the program

The purpose of the program is to contribute towards the agricultural development efforts of the nation through the production of qualified human resources in the field of agricultural extension required to raise agricultural production and productivity.

5.0 Objectives of the program

The objectives of the program are:

- to train frontline, mid-career extension workers at BSc level in the field of agricultural extension;
- to improve the effectiveness of grassroots extension workers involved in the agricultural development programs of the nation;
- to upgrade the academic and professional qualifications of front-line extension workers by equipping them with up-to-date theoretical and practical knowledge in the field to enable them to meet the challenges of the ever increasing and sophisticated multidimensional issues in agricultural development.

6.0 Duration of the BSc program

The duration of the program will be two and half years involving intensive course work and practical field work.

After three semesters of course work at Alemaya, students will be required to return to their work places to undertake supervised practical work for eight months. After the field work, students come back to the University to write, defend and submit their project reports and complete remaining course work.

7.0 Criteria for admission to the program

To qualify for admission to the program, a prospective student must satisfy the following minimum entrance qualifications:

- have worked for at least five years and have distinguished him/herself as a field extension professional as assessed by his/her employer(s);
- have a diploma (or equivalent) in agriculture or related field of study from a recognized institution;
- have a minimum GPA of 2 upon graduation with a diploma;
- pass a qualifying exam offered by the University
The average intake will be 20 annually.

Preference will be given to female applicants.

**8.0 Uniqueness of the program**

A unique characteristic of the program is its practical oriented nature. The program will provide practicums, hands-on laboratories, problem-focused courses and field-based enterprises. Experiential learning is at the foundation of the program. After an initial 12 months of intensive instruction at AUA, students will return to their work places for 8 months on-the-job supervised practical application. Each student will conduct, in collaboration with their employers who own the program, a series of supervised enterprise projects relevant to their job as extensionists. All of the practical training will be planned with farmers and researchers and implemented under direct supervision of AUA and MoA-appointed staff.

This program is in addition to a regular full time BSc Agricultural Extension program already being offered by AUA. Whilst the regular program attracts largely high school graduates, the new program is meant for diploma holders with years of field experience. The new program, therefore, seeks to buttress the practical experience of agricultural extension agents to enable them to deal with the challenges of agricultural development in Ethiopia.

Unlike the regular four-year full-time program, the new program will be run over two and a half years - eight months of which will be practical field work. An evaluation will be conducted at the end of every class.

**9.0 Nature of collaboration**

It is recognized that extensionists are key actors in the agricultural development arena. They are the main link between the technology development and technology use subsystems. Their effectiveness depends largely on the training they receive for the job. As the MoA in Ethiopia has observed, recent studies in Africa have identified discomforting neglect of the extension training aspect - particularly at university level. The studies have recommended the up-grading of the professional and scientific skills of the extension professionals to enable them to better meet the ever growing challenges of agricultural development. In pursuance of this objective, SAA/WI have joined hands under the SAFE program to assist African Agricultural Education Institutes in coming up with responsive curricula for front-line extensionists.

The SAFE program has two objectives. The major one is to assist selected African Agricultural Education Institutions to develop responsive, farmer-focused training programs in agricultural extension for the development of mid-career extension staff. Institutional capacity building and strengthening are the core activities in this regard. The second, and minor one in terms of funding, is to grant few fellowships to national outstanding extension workers to pursue degree level training at BSc and MSc levels.
With regard to the major objective, SAFE’s guiding philosophy is that greater continuing educational opportunities can be created by strengthening the capacity of African Agricultural Education Institutions. In this way, an increased number of mid-career staff will have opportunities to receive quality extension education locally. Consequently, the SAFE program is primarily to support those institutions which are willing to be more flexible in designing and implementing responsive programs in agricultural extension.

10.0 Areas that need strengthening in the Department of Agricultural Extension

10.1 Staff development

The Department of Agricultural Extension is relatively new with the first graduates only expected to graduate mid-1997. The staff in the department are young and relatively inexperienced. Most have MSc level education and none have a PhD. The department, therefore needs support in the area of staff development to enable it to run such innovative programs like the new extension program.

10.2 Instructional materials

The department lacks basic instructional materials and equipment and relies entirely on ‘chalk and talk’ - a method which is not only inappropriate for teaching adults, but is also monotonous.

The department is also critically short of reference books and has no facilities for producing even the most basic instructional materials. The impact of this problem is likely to worsen with the launching of the new program.

10.3 Transport

The success of this practical-oriented program will depend on the level of exposure to the different aspects of farming the students will be able to receive during their training. This exposure is important in broadening the students’ perspectives in terms of problems bedevelling small-holder agriculture and the unexploited opportunities in the country. The exposure also enables the students to discover their own unexploited potential in terms of making their full contribution to agricultural development.

Currently, there is only one bus for a student population of over 1500. Clearly, the travel needs of the new BSc program cannot be met by this one bus. The learning visits envisaged have to be carried out timeously to achieve the objectives of the program.

During their supervised enterprise projects, students will need constant guidance from AUA staff. These field visits by staff will also help them keep in touch with changing realities on the ground. This type of contact is important in ensuring that the curriculum remains dynamic, relevant, and responsive to farmers’ needs.

11.0 Inputs into the new BSc program
In support of the AUA initiative, the SAFE program will provide a portion of the resources that the Department of Agricultural Extension needs. It will not, for example, provide financial support for MSc and PhD level training. It is recommended that AUA seeks alternative partners for this area.

Specifically, the safe program will:

a) Second an Agricultural Extension Specialist to AUA to assist in organizing the new BSc Agricultural Extension program during the first two years from September 1996.
b) Provide a 26-seater bus for the students’ practical field trips.
c) Provide basic equipment for producing training materials which will include two computers, a photocopying machine, ring binder, video camera. SAFE will also consider other equipment if considered essential.
d) Provide basic teaching aids which will include three overhead projectors, a video playback system.
e) Assist in the acquisition of relevant literature in the form of books.
f) Facilitate and support exchange visits and sharing of experiences between African universities engaged in the transformation of their extension programs.
g) Support other curriculum enhancement activities like workshops and research.
h) Supply the Agricultural Extension Specialist with a program vehicle and communication facilities (telephone, e-mail, and a facsimile machine) which will become the property of AUA’s Department of Agricultural Extension.
i) Support the alteration of some lecture rooms to make them more suitable for adult teaching.

On its part, AUA will:

a) Provide competent staff to run the program.
b) Evolve mechanisms for running the program on a sustainable basis.
c) Provide a house and an office for the Agricultural Extension Specialist.
d) Provide a guest house for visiting staff of SAA/WI and exchange staff of other institutions.
e) Pay import duty on equipment, books and other materials supplied under this program.

12.0 Outputs resulting from AUA/SAA/WI partnership

12.1 Enhancement of agricultural extension curriculum

The curriculum development process will lead to the development of an innovative extension education program with a strong farmer focus. Such enhanced program will stress not only competence in technical agriculture, but also proficiency in human relations and the management of participatory processes.

Extension practitioners will acquire positive attitudes, knowledge, and leadership skills necessary for building dialogue with men and women farmers and community groups - all necessary for forging robust farmer-extension interaction.
Students will also cultivate a capacity to interact and communicate on a technical and interpersonal level with agricultural researchers - essential for fostering solid research-extension linkages.

12.2 Organizational learning capabilities

Staff of the Department of Agricultural Extension will adopt an active learning posture as they go through the curriculum development process which will include: using the farm as a laboratory, consultations with farmers, employers, other experts and participatory evaluation.

12.3 Establishment of African extension networks and linkages

Staff will be given opportunities to network with other institutions engaged in reforming extension education programs in Africa, they will attend seminars, and symposiums.

Nationally, staff will network with the MoA, regional governments, and non-government organizations. This will be done through planning and evaluation workshops, field visits, monitoring of the students, and regular correspondence.

12.4 Instructional materials

Availability of instructional materials will improve through:

- the provision of relevant reference books; and,
- the provision of basic production facilities like computers, photocopiers, paper and a binder.

12.5 Teaching aids

There will be an improvement in the availability of teaching aids through the provision of overhead projectors, video camera and play-back system and a still camera.

12.6 Transport for field work

The Department will have a minibus for student’s field trips and a four-wheel drive vehicle for field visits and supervision by staff.

12.7 General agricultural development

The outputs outlined above will contribute to, and have an impact on, the agricultural development efforts of the nation. Specifically, the major output will be trained agricultural extensionists who are professionally competent to promote agricultural and rural development in Ethiopia.

13.0 Note
This memorandum of understanding, which became operational even before formalizing it through signatures hereunder, can be reviewed at the request of any of the two partners.

Signed this……day of ……………………………199….at…………………………

NAME…………………………………………Signature……………………
ON BEHALF OF ALEMAYA UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE

Signed this……day of ……………………………199….at…………………………

NAME…………………………………………Signature……………………
ON BEHALF OF SASAKAWA AFRICA ASSOCIATION
6.3. Appendix 3: Checklist for Data Collection

CURRICULUM

Questions for Head of the Agricultural Extension Department and Lecturers in the Department

1. Has the curriculum been changed? If so, how and why?
2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the present curriculum?
3. What problems related to the curriculum do students face?
4. What are your views on the Mid-Career Program duration? Is it too long, too short or just adequate and why?
5. What recommendations would you like to make on the Mid-Career Program?

Questions for the Current Students

What are your general views of the program?
What are your views on the workload? Is it too heavy or too light?
Are you learning something new? If there are repetitions? If so, in which areas?
What are your views on how the courses are handled?
What are your comments concerning the teaching / learning approach?
What are the most difficult courses?
Comment on the teaching materials. Are they adequate, current and appropriate?
Do you find the teaching generally theoretical or mostly practical and what are the reasons for your views?
What in your opinion is the ration of theory to practical?
Which courses are the most theoretically taught (rank up to 3) and which ones are most practically taught (rank up to 3)?

Questions for the Graduate Students

What are your general views of the program?
What are your general views of the workload?
Did you learn something new or there were some repetitions? If there were repetitions, in which areas?
What are your views on how the courses were handled?
What are your comments concerning the teaching / learning approach?
What were the most difficult courses?
Comment on the teaching materials in terms of them being adequate, current and appropriate.
Did you find the teaching of the courses generally theoretical or mostly practical and what are the reasons for your views? What in your opinion was the ratio of theory to practical?
Which courses were the most theoretically taught (rank up to 3 in decreasing order of importance) and which ones were most practically taught (rank up to 3 in decreasing order of importance)?
What do you consider to be the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum?
What are your views on the time allocated for this program? Is it too long, too short or just adequate and why?
What recommendations would you like to make?
   A. Addition or deletion of courses
   B. Modification of current courses
   C. Any other

Employers
In terms of skills for the job, where do you find graduates of this program well trained
and where do you find them weakest?
How do you compare the graduates of this program with those of the regular program
in terms of job performance?
How would you like their training improved?
What other recommendations would you like to make?

ASSESS SUPERVISED ENTERPRISE PROJECTS IN TERMS OF:

QUALITY
1. To what extent do SEPs lead to adoption of new technologies or ideas?
2. Through SEPs do students learn new ways of doing extension work?
3. What form of collaboration exists among stakeholders (students, farmers,
   University and employers) when planning, implementing and evaluating SEPs?
4. What does the supervision entail and how regular is it?
5. What are your views concerning the duration of SEPs in terms of quality and
   relevance?
6. What recommendations would you like to make?

RELEVANCE
7. What in your opinion makes SEPs relevant or irrelevant?
8. Is the program sustainable and why?
9. What recommendations would you like to make?

SUSTAINABILITY OF SEPs
10. Are SEPs sustainable in terms of quality and relevance? What are the reasons for
    your answer?
11. What is the current status of the previous SEPs?

SUGGESTIONS
12. What general suggestions would you like to make about SEPs?

THE PROCESS
a. Students’ Recruitment and Examination
   1. What are the challenges in the recruitment process and what improvements would
      you like to see?
   2. Are you satisfied with the quality of the students enrolled in the programme?
   3. Comment on the class performance of students enrolled in the programme.
4. How would you compare them with the regular students?
5. Are there regional variations that affect the quality of the programme? If there, please explain.

b. Administration
   1. What are the challenges of administering this program and how do you overcome them.

c. Human and Material Resources
   1. What are your views on the availability and adequacy of both human and material resources?

d. Collaboration with stakeholders
   1. What are your views on the level and quality of collaboration with stakeholders who include students, employers, Regional Agricultural Bureau, the University, Sasakawa, farmers and other local leaders?
   2. What, in your opinion, should be done to improve collaboration with the various stakeholders?

OUTPUT/OUTCOME
   1. How has implementation of this program affected teachers’ attitudes towards training?
   2. What lessons can we learn from this program?
   3. What difference has it made in the University?
   4. Is there increasing demand for the programme?
   5. Are the graduates of this programme making a difference in the field?

SUSTAINABILITY
   1. What is the future of this programme from the national, regional and university level?
   2. How can this program be sustained?
6.4. Appendix 4: Itinerary

Day 1 July 9  Travel to Dire Dawa

Day 2 July 10  Orientation meeting with SAFE Coordinator, Dr Jeff Mutimba. Perusal of documents (curriculum and reports) and design of checklist for data collection.

Day 3 July 11  Meeting with Head, of DAE, Dr Tesfaye Lemma. Meeting with current first year students. Meeting with graduates of the programme now pursuing M.Sc. at Alemaya – including Chairperson of the Alumni Association. Visit SEPs site in Harar with Ato Kefyalew.

Day 4 July 12  Meeting with the President of Alemaya University, Professor Belay Kassa. Meeting with the Dean, CoA, Dr Wogayehu Bekele. Meeting with ARVP (Dr Tena Alamirew). Meeting with Head and Staff of DAE.


Day 6 July 14  Travel to Addis Ababa.

Day 7 July 15  Meeting with Hon Minister of State for Agriculture, Mr Belay Ejigu. Meeting with Head of Extension, Federal MoA, Mr Ibrahim Mohammed. Meeting with graduates of the programme in the Federal Ministries.

Day 8 July 16  Travel to Awassa – Southern Region.

Day 9 July 17  Reflection and draft report writing.

Day 10 July 18  Meeting with Regional Agric Heads, Awassa. Meeting with graduates, Awassa.

Day 11 July 19  Meet with some graduates near Awassa. Visit SEPs site in Sidama.

Day 12 July 20  Travel to Alage. Meet with a graduate at Alage ATVET.
Travel to Addis Ababa

Day 13 July 21  Meeting Head, Water harvesting, Small Scale Irrigation and Infrastructure Development and Promotion, Mr Dejene Abesha.
Meet with Regional Agric Heads -- Oromiya Regional Office
Meet with graduates of the programme

Day 14 July 22  Meet with Oromia Head, Natural Resource Administration and Irrigation Department
Bureau Head and Extension Head

Day 15 July 23  Travel to Dire Dawa
Preliminary report writing

Day 16 July 24  Preliminary report writing

Day 17 July 25  Present preliminary findings to Alemaya University Management

Day 18 July 26  Travel to Addis Ababa

Day 19 July 27  Final report writing

Day 20 July 28  Final report writing

Day 21 July 29  Presentation of final report to SAFE
Travel back home
6.5. Appendix 5. People Interviewed

Addis Ababa
Honourable Belay Ejigu, Minster MoA, Addis Abeba.

Birhanu Deyasso, General Manager, Yirgacheffe Coffee Cooperative, Tel 09 66 32 98, Addis Ababa.

Dejene Abesha, Head, Water harvesting, Small Scale Irrigation and Infrastructure Development and Promotion, MoARD, Tel 01 61 1655, P.O. BOX 62347, Addis Ababa.

Fikre Enku, EC / Africa , 09 43 55 33, Addis Ababa.


Ibrahim Mohamed, Head Extension, MoA, Addis Ababa.


Tsehaynesh Kidane, Women's Affair, Federal MoA, Addis Ababa.


Alage, ATVET
Amsalu Bedaso, Academic Dean, Alage ATVET, Ziway.

Alemaya University
Belay Kassa (Prof), President, Alemaya University, P. O. Box 138, Dire Dawa, belayk@ethionet.et

Belayneh Legges (PhD), Vice President for Administration, Alemaya University P. O. Box 138. Dire Dawa.

Jeff Mutimba, SAFE Coordinator, Makerere University, Uganda. jeff.mutimba@africaonline.co.ug,

Jemal Yesuf, Lecturer, Alemaya University. Jemaly2001@yahoo.com,

Kinde Tesfaye, College of Agriculture, Alemaya University, P. O. Box 138. Dire Dawa.

Tena Alamirew, (PhD), Academic and Research Vice President, Alemaya University, P. O. Box 138. Dire Dawa.

Ranjan S. Karrippai, Asso. Prof, Agriculture Extension Department, Alemaya University, P. O. Box 138. Dire Dawa. ranjan@telecom.net.et,

Tamado Tena (PhD), Academic Program Officer, Alemaya University P. O. Box 138, Dire Dawa.

Tesfaye Beshah (PhD) Asst. Prof, Alemaya University, P. O. Box 138. Dire Dawa, tesafye2003@yahoo.com

Tesfaye Lemma (PhD) Asst. Prof, Head, Agriculture Extension Department, Alemaya University. P. O. Box 138. Dire Dawa. tesfayel@yahoo.com,

Wogayehu Bekele (PhD), Dean College of Agriculture, Alemaya University, P.O.Box 138. Dire Dawa.
Benshangul Gomez
Kelbessa Tesso, Head, Wombera Woreda, Benishangul Gumuz.

Tefera Teshome, Head, Natural Resources Department, Benishangul Gumuz.

Yared Awgechew, Expert, Natural Resources Department, Benishangul Gumuz.

DireDawa Region
Girma Getachew, Senior Expept, Food Security, DDPF, P.O. BOX 449, Tel, 1208 73, Dire Dawa.

Tegaye Weldemeskel, Dire Dawa Administration Council, P. O. BOX 240, Tel 05-113326, Dire Dawa.

Wegayehu Gashaw Former Head, BoA, Tel 05 115840, Dire Dawa.

Harari Region

Beker Abdulahi, Extension Promotion Team Leader, Tel, 05 667194, Harar.

Kefyalew Worku. Instructor, Menschen Fur Menschen, Tel. 05 667272 Harar.

Wudie Bekalu. Instructor. Tel 06 139180, Harar.

Oromia
Abdi Effa, Woreda Head, East Wellega, Oromia Region.

Ayan Merkana, Team leader, Crop Production and Inputs in Extension, Addis Ababa

Berhanu Gemeda, Woreda Rural Development Office, Arsi Zone.

Biffa Bedada, Head, Natural Resource Administration and Irrigation Department. Tel. 515127, Addis Ababa.

Emeru Negasa, Expert, East Wellega,

Getahun Mulu, Cooperative Organizer, Arsi Zone.

Gutema Itana. Team Leader, Coffee Quality, Oromia Regional Bureau, Tel 15 87 17, Addis Ababa.

Melaku Bedada, Extension Expert, North Shoa.

Mulisa Mirkena, Woreda Head, North Shoa.

Nezif Abachebsa, Extension Expert, Jimma Zone.

Tesfaye Gaddisa, Natural Resources, East Wellega Zone.

Tolera Megersa, East Wellega.

Worku Mekuria, Extension Expert, West Shoa.
SNNPRS
Alemensh Lemma, Extension training Expert, Pastoralist food security, P. O. Box 1619, Awassa.

Alemu Foche, Head, Disater Prevention and Preparedness Bureau, Tel. 06 209914, P.O.BOX 223, Awassa.

Belaynesh Gelaye, Rural Women Affairs Team Leader, BoA, Awassa.

Berhanu Abitew, Extension, Communication and Technology Dissemination Coordinator. Sidama Zone. Tel. 06 206218, P. O. Box 242, Awassa.

Deribe Kaske, Extension Communication Team Leader, BoA, Awassa.

Dessalegn Tassew, Head, Amaro Woreda, SNNPRS.

Lulsged Asfaw, Team Leader, Hadiya Zone, SNNPRS.

Feleketch Basaznew, Zonal Assistant project Officer, UNICEF, Tel 06 208804, Awassa.

Kassu Kubayo, Head Agriculture and Natural Resource Developoment Desk, Sidama Zone. Tel. 06 206218, P. O. Box 242, Awassa.

Mathewos Bunde, District MoA, Team Leader, Gamo Gofa Zone, Bonke, SNNPRS.

Ousman Surur. Team leader, BoANRD, Tel. 06 20 63 67 Awassa.

Sebsebe Teklu, Head Extension, BoANRD, Awassa.

Solomon Dejasie, Extension Expert, Debub Omo Zone, SNNPRS.

Tegene Tilahun, Expert, Kafa Zone, SNNPRS.

Woldemedhin Fita, Extension Expert, Yem Special Zone, SNNPRS.

Seyoum Tesfaye, Expert, Soil and Water Conservation, SNNPRS.

Yitbarek Ambaye, Natural Resources, Gurage Zone, SNNPRS.

Aschalew Aweke, Team Leader, Amaro Wereda, SNNPRS.

Zerihun Bekele, Horticulture Expert, Burji Zone, SNNPRS.

Zenebe Worku, Head, Cooperative Bureau, Awassa.

Somali Region
Guled Abdullahi. Researcher, Somali Region Research Institute, Tel 09 741574, Jigjiga


Tigray
Abadi Tekelhaimanot. BoNARD, Team Leader, Tigray. Tel. 09 70139, Box 372, Mekele.