

IMPACT OF THE
KELLOGG INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP
PROGRAM, FOOD SYSTEMS

EEA Educational Evaluation Associates
9230 Jellico Avenue
Northridge, California 91325
(818) 993-8070

IMPACT OF THE
KELLOGG INTERNATIONAL FELLOWSHIP
PROGRAM, FOOD SYSTEMS

Prepared by
Marvin C. Alkin

with assistance from
Jana Noel
Marla Sukstorf

December 1989

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation reports on the impact of the KIFP/FS program conducted by Michigan State University. It uses data from questionnaires, focus groups, individual interviews and group interviews to determine both the importance of various program components and the impact of the program on the individuals and institutions involved. Further, as this is the final year of the program, comparisons have been made to previous evaluation data, where appropriate.

THE KIFP/FS PROGRAM

Value of various program aspects. The KIFP/FS had a variety of different program aspects. Through questionnaires answered by the program's fellows, the value of these various program areas were determined from the participants' points of view. (See pp. 7-8 for further information.)

In evaluating the various program aspects through fellows' questionnaire answers, it is clear that each of the activities was highly valued. The international seminars, especially, were considered as "of great value" both in 1986 and in this final year of the program, while the KIFP/FS News was given the most average rating.

Valuing exercise. Next, because a simple ranking of program aspects might not give the judgment of "relative" worth, we conducted a valuing exercise in which participants were given 100 "value points" to distribute among the various program aspects. (See pp. 8-11 for further information.)

In the point allocation valuing exercise, the international seminars and the individual projects are viewed as the most valuable aspects of the program. Also, those who have institutional mini-grants view them almost as highly. The largest amount of change over time within the program appears to be a lessening of the perceived value of the interest group activities.

Management of KIFP/FS. The effectiveness of the management of the KIFP/FS was an issue of concern to the sponsors of the program. An evaluation of the management was conducted using data collected from questionnaires, interviews, and

focus groups, and from the participants, the steering committee, and the administrators themselves. (See pp. 11-15 for further information.)

Management of the KIFP/FS was regarded as a strong, positive aspect by all involved. Specifically, participants noted the strength of having a great deal of flexibility with low bureaucracy and minimum supervision. The Directors of the program were specifically cited as strong, positive, and helpful.

INDIVIDUAL IMPACT ON FELLOWS

Food systems. Next, the impact of the program on the individual fellows was examined. One specific area of impact evaluated was the individual's knowledge of food systems. (See pp. 16-18 for further information.)

All participants noted increased knowledge in food systems as a result of KIFP/FS, particularly in the areas of food and price policies, nutrition/nutritional assessment, marketing systems, and food production. Participants also commented that they gained knowledge outside of their own discipline and/or country and are now able to teach and apply these new understandings about food systems.

Professional skills. One of the goals of the KIFP/FS was the improvement of individual fellows' professional skills. Data was gathered about this area from questionnaires completed by individual fellows and the steering committee. (See pp. 18-19 for further information.)

The fellows in KIFP/FS clearly increased their professional skills. In particular, great increases in leadership abilities were mentioned, as well as improved communication, computer, research methods, and teaching skills.

Other benefits. Fellows were also asked about other benefits that may not have been specifically covered in the questionnaires. (See pp. 19-20 for further information.)

Other benefits of the KIFP/FS not discussed in specific questions include an increased awareness of different cultures, access to professional contacts with other fellows, and the development of close relationships with other fellows.

Networking. One of the expected outcomes for the KIFP/FS was an increased opportunity for networking for the fellows and their institutions. Fellows were asked their perceptions of their future networking activities. (See pp. 20-24 for further information.)

Fellows indicated an interest in networking with colleagues from the KIFP/FS program for professional collaboration, for a flow of information, and for friendship. Fellows in Asian countries indicated the most interest in future networking with others outside their own continent or interest group, while those in South American countries responded with the least amount of predicted future networking contacts outside their continent.

Professional attainments. Fellows were asked about their professional attainments-reached as a result of participating in the KIFP/FS program. (See pp. 24-26 for further information.)

Fellows indicated an increase in professional attainments as a result of KIFP/FS. Areas of the program that seemed to be of most help to these attainments included interaction with other fellows, greater resources, and increased knowledge.

Professional goals. Fellows were asked also if their professional goals had changed or had been affected by their participation in KIFP/FS. (See pp. 26-27 for further information.)

The overall perception of changes in fellows' professional goals was that the goals had not changed--fellows generally wanted to stay in their same fields--but that higher productivity and knowledge were more strongly felt as goals.

General assessment of impact (by Steering Committee). In order to get an overall, general assessment of the program's impact the members of the steering committee were asked to fill out questionnaires giving their perceptions on this matter. (See pp. 27-29 for further information.)

Areas of clear individual impact on the fellows were in leadership qualities, communication and interpersonal skills, and in self-confidence. KIFP/FS clearly had a positive and substantial impact on the participants.

OTHER IMPACTS OF KIFP/FS PROGRAM

Impact on the fellow's sponsoring institution. As well as the impact of the KIFP/FS on the individual fellows, an assessment was made of the program impact on those fellows' institutions. Data on the perceived impact was gathered from individual participants' questionnaires and from four focus group discussions. (See pp. 30-33 for further information.)

The impact of KIFP/FS on the fellow's sponsoring institution shows most clearly in three general areas: increased knowledge and experience of the fellows allows them to better serve their institutions; the purchase and use of equipment and materials; and the status of the institution being enhanced because of linkages with other institutions and colleagues.

Impact on fellow's country. The broader impact of the KIFP/FS on fellows' countries was assessed through interviews of fellows who had received institutional mini-grants as well as through steering committee questionnaires. (See pp. 33-35 for further information.)

KIFP/FS was considered to have a positive impact on the fellows' countries through improved policy decisions. It was indicated that fellows and institutions were better able to help their countries and communities through increased knowledge and improved decision processes.

Impact on MSU. Finally, an assessment was undertaken of the impact of the KIFP/FS on its sponsoring institution, Michigan State University. MSU administrators were interviewed for their perceptions of such impact. (See pp. 36-37 for further information.)

The benefits of KIFP/FS to Michigan State University were in the areas of improved teaching, a broader interest of the faculty, and improved image through increased linkages with other institutions.

Section I

INTRODUCTION

This evaluation reports on the impact of the KIFP/FS program conducted by Michigan State University. Most of the indicators used in this study are current measures of impact--are based upon progress and outcomes to date as well as perceptions of various individuals. The evaluators were not able to make visits to institutions in order to directly observe and validate perceptions shared with us. However, several institutional visits were made by the Project Directors, a Steering Committee member, and others which support the perceptions of the Fellows. It should also be noted that a true impact study would need to take place several years after the conclusion of the project in order to appropriately account for what the program had accomplished. Nonetheless, and within those constraints, we have attempted to obtain estimates of current and projected impact based on a variety of data sources. A strength of the procedure is the way in which we sought confirmation by relying on several information types and a variety of information sources.

Parts of this report

The second section of this report provides an overview of the KIFP/FS program and its operation. The program is briefly described along with some evaluative data on the relative importance of various program components. A major portion of this section is devoted to a discussion of the program management. Since this is the conclusion of the program, we were requested to gather data of this type for this final report.

The impact of the program on individual fellows is the focus of the third section. Topics addressed under this title include the impact of the program on individual fellows' food systems knowledge, professional skills, networking capabilities and other individual benefits. In addition we examined the professional attainments of the fellows

during this period. As an overview of individual impact we sought data on the current professional goals of individual fellows and compared these data to professional goals and aspirations noted at the beginning of the program.

The final section of the report considers other impacts of the program. It was felt that the program would likely have impact on the fellow's sponsoring institution. In some instances the nature of the fellow's activities, including individual projects or institutional mini-grants, might have far-reaching effect that would extend beyond the institution to the country itself. Finally, it seemed that it was worth examining the impact on Michigan State University of its participation and management of the KIFP/FS program.

The report concludes with an Appendix which consists of the questionnaire prepared for the Fellows and their responses.

Sources of data

There were four primary types of data collected as a part of this study: questionnaire, focus group interview, individual interview, and documentary data. The primary questionnaire, and one of the main sources of data for the study, was the Fellows' Assessments of the KIFP/FS Program Impacts. This "Fellows Program Impact Questionnaire" was administered at the end of the final project seminar in September, 1989, at East Lansing, Michigan. The questionnaire (See Appendix A) was provided to fellows early in the seminar meeting and collected from them during the final several days. In all, 28 Program Impact questionnaires were received. The questionnaires included topics related to the fellows' increased knowledge about food systems, development of professional skills, networking, professional attainments, professional goals, and the like. In addition fellows rated each aspect of the KIFP/FS program in terms of its value. An associated questionnaire used as part of the data base for this

study is the Expectations Survey that fellows filled out at the outset of the program several years ago. Various of the items in the current Program Impact Questionnaire were modeled after the Expectations Survey in order to be able to examine potential changes in the responses of fellows.

In addition, each Steering Committee member present at the final international meeting completed a questionnaire focusing on individual fellows' growth and the impact of their work. Steering Committee members responded only for those fellows with whom they had some familiarity and provided a description and estimate of likely impact of the fellows' project activities as well as their impression of the fellows' individual growth.

A second data type were group interviews. These group interviews, which we refer to as "focus groups," were conducted in a manner that would enable individuals to explore a narrow range of topics in-depth and to do so freely, benefitting from the interaction of individuals. Thus, individuals within the focus groups were more able to fully develop ideas and move in new relevant topic directions as they developed within the course of the interview. Focus group meetings were held with each of the interest groups. In the past, focus groups had been assembled independent of interest groups, but at this final meeting time constraints did not make this possible and the interest groups were used for the focus group discussions.

In addition, a group meeting was held with the Steering Committee. This group interview examined primarily issues related to the institutional impact of the fellows participation in the program. In addition the Steering Committee members considered, in retrospective, the operation and success of the program.

Individual interviews constituted the third major source of data obtained within the study. Individual interviews were conducted with fellows having institutional mini-grants as well as with appropriate Michigan State University administrators. The topics of the interviews with fellows was the impact of their institutional mini-grants.

Michigan State University administrators provided comments on the operation of the KIFP/FS program as well as their observations of its administration.

A final source of information was various documents available from the program. Indicative of this type of data is the publications list of individual fellows, which was examined and tabulated. Other documents were also provided by project personnel.

Section II

THE KIFP PROGRAM

Section II of this report gives an overall view of the KIFP/FS program. Part A is a general description of the program and its components. Parts B and C discuss the value of the various aspects of the program from the fellows' points of view. And finally, a description of the management of the program is given with information from individual and group interviews as well as focus group data.

Description

The Kellogg International Fellowship Program in Food Systems was a three-year program which had the purpose of the advancement of professional leadership in bringing about improvements in food systems in developing countries. It aimed to enhance leadership effectiveness by providing educational experiences that would broaden and deepen the fellows' understandings of food systems. Hopeful outcomes included the improvement of undertaken policy reforms, organizational and institutional innovations, and technological advancements in the area of food systems. Also included as goals of the program were the strengthening of the fellows' institutions through increased knowledge and networking. The program, administered by Michigan State University, involved 31 selected fellows. The original number of fellows was 32, but in a tragic airplane crash one of the fellows died and his services were lost.

The KIFP/FS also provided for fellows' participation in activities such as international seminars, individual projects, study trips, the receipt of institutional mini-grants, and networking opportunities. The annual international seminars were a key activity of the KIFP/FS for promoting professional interaction and group cohesiveness among the fellows. It was their opportunity to learn more about food systems problems and policies through sharing their country experiences with each

other. The annual seminars were held in different regions of the world in order to broaden the fellows' understanding of food systems through direct contact with government policy makers and field trips to food sector firms and institutions in the countries visited. Three or four days of each seminar were devoted to meetings of the four project interest groups to further the fellows' individual project activities.

Individual projects were required of each fellow which directly related to the goals of KIFP/FS. Examples of projects included "Agrarian Reform in the Philippines," "Agricultural Price Policy in Peru," and "Food Problems in Poor Mountain Areas and Scientific and Technological Progress in China." These individual projects were also selected for their institutional interest. The fellows' self-selected themselves into four project related Interest Groups that served to guide them on their individual projects.

Part of the individual projects might have included travel trips for study. Fellows commonly undertook direct observations of food system operations in other countries as well as the governmental policies in other countries which might be helpful in that fellow's own home country.

To help in furthering the goals of the individual projects, fellows were able to apply for and receive institutional mini-grants. These grants helped the fellows continue their work in their individual countries and with their individual projects.

Finally, KIFP/FS functioned in a way that encouraged networking among fellows and among institutions. Fellows were able to network during seminars and study tours as well as individually between meetings. Further, newsletters were distributed which informed the fellows and their institutions about the activities and progress of the program.

Administrative support for the project was headquartered at Michigan State University. The KIFP/FS office staff served as the main communication hub for the project and arranged travel, expense claims, ordering and delivering of equipment, and publishing the newsletter.

Value of various program aspects

The various aspects of the program were rated by fellows in the program impact questionnaire. The components of the program listed were: international seminars, supplemental travel study, individual projects, interest group activities, institutional mini-grants, microcomputer equipment, publication ordering service, and the KIFP/FS News. Each of these was rated on a 4 point scale (4="of greatest value"; 1="of no value').

Table 1 presents the fellows' average ratings of each aspect of the KIFP/FS program. Fellows rated each of the aspects of the KIFP/FS program as valuable. International seminars and institutional mini-grants received the highest ratings, 4.0 each. (In essence, every participant rated each of these as "of great value.") The KIFP/FS News was the lowest rated component (3.36)--nonetheless it received an average rating between "of some value" and "of great value." Overall, it appears that all aspects of the KIFP/FS program were highly regarded by fellows.

TABLE 1

Fellows' Ratings of the Value of Various Program Components**

Program Components	Avg. Rating	N
International Seminars	4.00	28
Institutional Minigrants *	4.00	08
Individual Projects	3.81	27
Publication Order Service	3.79	28
Supplemental Travel Study	3.78	27
Microcomputer Equipment *	3.76	21
Interest Group Activities	3.68	28
The KIFP/FS News	3.36	28

*According to KIFP/FS records, 8 Fellows received minigrants and 21 received computers.

**Rated on a 4-point scale: 4=of great value;
3=of some value; 2=of little value; 1=of no value.

A similar rating of aspects of the program was conducted in the April, 1986 evaluation report. While the program activities listed in that report were slightly different, the results are quite comparable. The international seminar was rated most highly in the earlier survey. Individual projects and interest groups were considered next most important in the 1986 rating. Each of these has declined somewhat in relative importance.

In evaluating the various program aspects through fellows' questionnaire answers, it is clear that each of the activities was highly valued. The international seminars, especially, were considered as "of great value" both in 1986 and in this final year of the program, while the KIFP/FS News was given the most average rating.

Valuing Exercise

We were concerned that in a simple ranking of program aspects all might be regarded highly and we would not be able to judge "relative" worth. Thus, as an additional indicator of value, fellows were asked to allocate 100 "value points" among the various aspects of the program. Tables 2A, 2B and 2C display the fellows' average weighting of the same aspects of the program. When institutional mini-grants and microcomputer equipment were eliminated from the calculations (because not all fellows participated in these aspects), individual projects and international seminars receive by far the heaviest weights (26 and 25 "value points", respectively). The other aspects had roughly equal weights with the exception of the KIFP/FS News (8%). A similar pattern results when Microcomputer equipment is included and only those fellows who had microcomputers were queried. Individual projects and international

seminars still receive the greatest weights while the other areas (including microcomputer equipment) receive roughly equal weights. The pattern changes slightly when institutional mini-grants are entered. (Again, only those fellows who had institutional mini-grants are included in this data set.) Individual projects remain at the top with the highest weight (26), yet international seminars and institutional mini-grants received nearly equal weights (17 and 16, respectively). Clearly, while the international seminars and the individual projects are viewed as the most valuable aspects of the program, those who have institutional mini-grants view them almost as highly.

In the earlier survey (reported in April 1988), fellows engaged in a "resource allocation" exercise which was comparable to the valuing exercise. Then, as now, fellows highly valued the international seminar and the individual projects. In the earlier study, interest groups were clearly next most important in value while the current value point distribution shows them to be about equal in importance to supplemental travel study and publication ordering. Apparently, the value of interest groups diminished in importance somewhat from April 1988 to September 1989.

In the point allocation valuing exercise, the international seminars and the individual projects are viewed as the most valuable aspects of the program. Also, those who have institutional mini-grants view them almost as highly. The largest amount of change over time within the program appears to be a lessening of the perceived value of the interest group activities.

TABLE 2A

**Allocation of "Value Points" to
Various Program Components
All Fellows
(N=28)**

Program Component	Average Allocation
International Seminars	25
Supplemental Travel Study	15
Individual Projects	26
Interest Group Activities	13
Institutional Minigrants	- -
Microcomputer Equipment	- -
Publication Ordering Service	13
The KIFP/News	08
Total	100

TABLE 2B

**Allocation of "Value Points" to
Various Program Components
Fellows' Receiving
Institutional Minigrants
(N=8)**

Program Component	Average Allocation
International Seminars	17
Supplemental Travel Study	13
Individual Projects	26
Interest Group Activities	11
Institutional Minigrants	16
Microcomputer Equipment	- -
Publication Ordering Service	10
The KIFP/News	07
Total	100

TABLE 2C

**Allocation of "Value Points" to
Various Program Components
Fellows Receiving
Microcomputer Equipment
(N=21)**

Program Component	Average Allocation
International Seminars	22
Supplemental Travel Study	12
Individual Projects	23
Interest Group Activities	12
Institutional Minigrants	- -
Microcomputer Equipment	13
Publication Ordering Service	11
The KIFP/News	07
Total	100

Management of KIFP/FS

Data on the management of the KIFP/FS program were gathered from a variety of sources. The topic was one of those discussed within the four focus group sessions. The group interview meeting with steering committee members also addressed this issue. Finally, three MSU administrators were interviewed for their perceptions on this topic.

Focus Group Data: Fellows. An evaluation of the management of the KIFP/FS program was gathered from the perceptions of the fellows in four focus group sessions. Fellows were asked to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the program in general--and many comments about the management of the program came out in these discussions. The overall perceptions of the management of the KIFP/FS program were positive. Management of the program was consistently commended for the flexibility it had allowed the fellows. Fellows commented that they felt free to decide what was to be included in the programs, to decide how to spend money, and to decide who to hire and

who to invite as speakers. The fellows attributed the program's strength to this flexibility and, along with it, the low amount of bureaucracy of the program. One fellow answered the question of what strengths were evident in the KIFP/FS program by stating that "The Directors were very flexible and didn't ask questions about spending money." Accordingly, the privilege appeared not to be abused. Another participant stated the same theme further by saying "KIFP/FS also gave us flexibility in terms of helping decide what was in the program."

Another area of the management of the KIFP/FS program noted by the fellows was the strength of the directors. The knowledge and experience of the directors apparently gave the fellows a sense of strength about the program. As one fellow stated, "The Directors' experience and knowledge of our countries was very important. (Things) would have been different if the Directors had not understood the constraints." Another fellow mentioned that the directors of the program visited with him several times during the year before an important seminar (that he was helping to organize) was held. Another fellow indicated that the directors had in-depth knowledge of other countries outside their primary area--this was viewed as invaluable: "The Directors knew how to plan properly in Asia and Africa, although their basic expertise was in Latin America." In an exemplary statement which seemed to summarize the feeling of the fellows, one noted: "Had it not been for the understanding of the directors of the program and their encouragement, it would have been difficult to go ahead."

Apparently fellows encountered little to find fault with in the management aspect of the program; comments such as "well-administered" and "well-managed" were typical during the discussions. One participant went so far to say that there were "zero faults".

Where problems were mentioned with the management of the program, they were entirely in the area of a felt need for more organization and direction at the beginning of the program. Apparently there was some confusion at that time about the purposes of the

program. As one participant described, "There was a lack of focus at the beginning. We didn't know what was expected. We wasted some time." Another participant indicated that "(We) could have gotten better research projects had that been the object, or better social projects had that been the objective." The fellows wanted more specific conditions set out at the beginning of the program, as indicated by one fellow who stated that it would have been better to have "originally set-out conditions--about budgets, what is allowed."

Group Interview: Steering Committee. Steering committee members were very positive about the management of the KIFP/FS program. They acknowledged the strong leadership that had been provided by the directorate. Their discussion tended to seek insights about management derived from reflecting on various project events. For example, the group noted the evolvement of management style vis a vis the participation of fellows in decision making. They indicated that at the first meeting fellows were treated almost as graduate students and the relationship has now evolved so that fellows were treated as peers. They were positive about these changes and concluded that the management had "been very pragmatic." The steering committee raised the question of "whether this evolving was necessary?" They concluded that it was--namely, that the current relationship could not have been established at the outset.

The steering committee also praised the directors for their flexibility. This was viewed as a "great strength." In particular, the way individuals "were dealt with" was an area of praise.

Finally, the steering committee wanted it to be noted that they thought it was unfortunate that the Kellogg Foundation had not chosen to capitalize on the institutional strength and strong management capabilities in the next food systems fellowship program.

MSU administrator perceptions. MSU administrators also were interviewed with respect to their perceptions of the administration of the KIFP/FS program. The three

administrators interviewed each had direct or indirect responsibility for the supervision of the program. The shared observation was that the program enjoyed a high degree of administrative autonomy. One administrator noted that he had reviewed annual plans, budgets etc. and felt that he had been extremely close to the program. Others may have had similar involvement but basically indicated that while they had great interest in the program, they did not have a high level of involvement. One administrator noted, in particular, that he had "very little contact (with the program) on a week-to-week basis." Another interviewee indicated that he "probably could have improved (his) top level involvement in the program." However, he concluded that the level of autonomy accorded the program was "a strategic decision."

The general feeling among administrators was that a greater level of supervision was simply not viewed as necessary or appropriate for this program. In large part this was a function of the high regard in which Dr. Riley was held by each of the administrators. One interviewee pondered: "Would it have changed the direction of management if I were involved more? I doubt it--I have so much respect for Harold and his judgement." On the same theme, another administrator noted "Harold Riley is viewed very positively by people and has a long-term tradition of running this kind of program." Similarly, a third administrator noted: "People like Dr. Riley have a high level of responsibility and autonomy. They have spent their whole career here, are well-known, and have a high level of confidence vested in them by the administrators...Harold and Darrell make a pretty good team."

The high regard in which the Steering Committee is held reinforces the view of the program's ability to run itself well and with minimum supervision. One administrator particularly commented on the "very competent Steering Committee" as an added element for the high level of autonomy granted to the program.

In summary, MSU administrators concluded that the program was "well-handled on the management side." This observation appears to be based on general perceptions of the program, no perceived difficulties, and a very high regard for the program's director.

Management of the KIFP/FS was regarded as a strong, positive aspect by all involved. Specifically, participants noted the strength of having a great deal of flexibility with low bureaucracy and minimum supervision. The Directors of the program were specifically cited as strong, positive, and helpful.

Section III

INDIVIDUAL IMPACT ON FELLOWS

The impact of the KIFP/FS on individual fellows was considered to be an important goal of the program. An evaluation of this individual impact was determined from questionnaires, fellows' focus groups and individual and group interviews. Specific areas of individual impact examined include knowledge of food systems, fellows' professional skills, networking opportunities, professional attainments, professional goals, and other benefits. Further, a general assessment of the individual impact on fellows was gathered from the steering committee questionnaire, in which steering committee members commented on the impact on the fellows as a result of KIFP/FS.

Food Systems

The KIFP/FS Program Impact Questionnaire included a question about the areas in which the fellows had increased or developed new knowledge about food systems. Responses to this question stipulated a wide variety of areas (see Appendix B). The largest number of responses are summarized as falling within four topics: food and price policies, nutrition/nutritional assessment, marketing systems, and food production.

The earlier noted "Expectations Survey" which was administered at the beginning of this project had a similar question on it. In the earlier survey, there was a smaller number of respondents indicating "food production" as an area where they expected to increase expertise and a much larger number who responded in a more general fashion (food systems, generally).

These noted areas of current impact with respect to food systems correspond with program emphases. It is heartening also to note the greater specificity of the responses as well as the apparent increased interest in food production fostered through the program.

Fellows were asked what activities contributed most to the development of this food systems expertise. Eighteen respondents indicated the international seminars and fifteen respondents noted travel study tours and field trips of various types. Thirteen respondents indicated that the individual project was among those most important for the development of this expertise. All other areas indicated consisted of five or less responses.

The impact of KIFP/FS upon individuals was also determined through the focus group discussions. Several participants in the focus groups indicated that they had an increased knowledge of food systems, and that this increased knowledge positively impacted their institution as well as themselves individually--through the increased professional responsibilities they were able to assume. One fellow commented on this by stating "We learned a lot about food systems in that country. Now I am using them as comparisons. What I learned in Thailand I am using for (my country)." Other fellows indicated that they were now able to teach new courses in their institutions as a result of the new knowledge they had gained about food systems through the KIFP/FS program.

Additional comments on the impact of KIFP/FS on individuals' knowledge of food systems was gathered from Steering Committee questionnaires. Several Steering Committee members noted that individual fellows had gained an increased understanding of food systems specifically outside his or her own area or discipline. For example one Steering Committee member described the individual growth of a fellow by mentioning an "expanded knowledge and understanding of food system issues outside narrow economics." Another exemplary statement indicated that a fellow had a "strengthened

understanding of food-related issues outside her own discipline." This seemed to be the predominant theme in Steering Committee comments.

All participants noted increased knowledge in food systems as a result of KIFP/FS, particularly in the areas of food and price policies, nutrition/nutritional assessment, marketing systems, and food production. Participants also commented that they gained knowledge outside of their own discipline and/or country and are now able to teach and apply these new understandings about food systems.

Professional Skills

Fellows were asked about the professional skills or tools they developed as a Kellogg fellow. In their statements of specific skills, the most widely cited were: computer skills; communication skills (both written and oral); and, skills in research methodology and procedures (including research design, survey methods and data collection). In noting the activities that led to the development of these skills fellows cited their individual research projects and the annual seminar (particularly the project interest group meetings) about equally. Each was cited by over 1/3 of the participants. All other activities were substantially less in number.

A great deal of information about impact on individuals in the area of professional development was gained from the Steering Committee questionnaires. Steering Committee members indicated "excellent professional growth" by the fellows overall, with specific areas of positive impact including leadership qualities, analytic skills, communication ability and professional output. The general outlook on individual impact indicated that professional skills was a major growth area. Comments about specific

individuals commonly stated "[this fellow] has definitely developed leadership qualities to a higher degree during the program" and that a fellow's "leadership qualities seemed to have blossomed." Regarding the impact on other professional skills, an exemplary comment was that a particular fellow had "gained significantly (in his) ability to communicate and undertake simple and pragmatic analyses." It appears that the positive impact of the KIFP/FS program on the individual fellows development of professional skills was very clear and noticeable. This was the case even when the fellow was recognized as having come into the program with already acknowledged skills. As one Committee member noted about an individual fellow, "(he) had good leadership qualities at the start of the program and has continued to build very well on these."

In focus group discussions, individual fellows also noted their own growth in professional skills as a result of the KIFP/FS program in their focus group discussions. Importantly, all of the noted impacts were viewed as positive and were discussed as beneficial beyond the individuals--to their institutions as well. The two areas of recognized impact were on the individuals' teaching abilities and on the policy advice that they shared. One fellow commented that "The program has enabled me to improve my teaching." Another fellow noted "My professional skills have improved. When I give policy advice it is better."

The fellows in KIFP/FS clearly increased their professional skills. In particular, great increases in leadership abilities were mentioned, as well as improved communication, computer, research methods, and teaching skills.

Other Benefits

Fellows were asked in the Program Impacts Questionnaire to indicate the ways that KIFP/FS had benefited them other than knowledge of food systems and development of professional skills. The preponderance of remarks fell in three areas: awareness of different cultures (broadening views); access to professional contacts with other fellows; and development of friendships and close relationships with other fellows. Two of the three focused on interpersonal aspects of participating in the program. With respect to these kinds of benefits, the following comments are representative:

- Establishing personal and academic relations with concerned fellows, which will be life-long beneficial.
- I have established useful contacts in many countries with people working in different fields.
- Given me access to highly knowledgeable people--the other fellows.

Other benefits of the KIFP/FS not discussed in specific questions include an increased awareness of different cultures, access to professional contacts with other fellows, and the development of close relationships with other fellows.

Networking

In an attempt to determine the impact of the project on fellows' networking possibilities and intents a question on future intended "contacts" was asked in the fellows questionnaire (see Appendix A). On average, fellows reported that they expected to have extensive contacts with approximately 10 fellows after the conclusion of the project. Their responses on this item ranged from a low of 5 to a high of 15.

In another question, fellows were also asked to list by name those fellows with whom they would have the most contact. Based on this actual listing of names, the average number of fellows listed was approximately 8. The distribution of those responses was further analyzed. (See Table 3A and 3B.) First, averages were calculated by fellow's continent of origin (North American and Australia data were merged). By continent, the fewest number of expected contacts were reported by the two fellows in the North America/Australia Group (one additional response was received too late for inclusion in this report). The greatest number of expected responses was found among South American fellows (average=8.8).

TABLE 3A

Extent of Expected Contacts with other Fellows
Overall and by Fellow's Continent of Origin

	N	Total	Avg.	Percentage of Contacts Outside of Fellows':	
				Continent	Interest Group
Overall	28	220	7.9	44.3%	52.6%
Africa	7	56	8.0	45.3	38.3
Asia	8	57	7.1	61.4	56.1
N. America/Aus.	2	10	5.0	100	60.0
South America	11	97	8.8	27.8	26.8

TABLE 3B

**Extent of Expected Contacts with other Fellows
Overall and by Fellow's Interest Group**

	N	Total	Avg.	Percentage of Contacts Outside of Fellows':	
				Continent	Interest Group
Overall	28	220	7.9	44.3%	52.6%
Interest Group I	6	51	8.5	41.2	70.6
Interest Group II	5	29	5.8	51.7	55.2
Interest Group III	10	81	8.1	42.0	45.7
Interest Group IV	7	59	8.4	46.9	44.0

Further, responses were analyzed to determine the extent to which the anticipated networking activities went beyond others in their own continent and beyond those who were in their interest group. (See Table 3A.) Of those for whom there was a sufficient sample (that is, excluding "North America/Australia"), the Asians tended to anticipate greater contacts outside their own continent (61% of the anticipated contacts) while South Americans were more continent bound (only 28% of contacts outside the continent). A similar pattern was noted with respect to going beyond those in one's own interest group (Asians=56%; South Americans=27%).

Similar analyses were conducted by interest group. In essence, we asked whether participants of particular interest groups were more or less likely to anticipate establishing contact with others outside their own continent and/or outside their interest group. First, it should be noted that a far fewer average number of contacts was noted by those in interest group 2 (5.8) than those in other interest groups (8.5; 8.4; 8.1).

With respect to the percentage of contacts by each of the two categories (continent and interest group) there are also differences. Those in interest group 2 are more likely to establish contacts outside their own continent (51.7%). Of course, it must be noted that this might be an artifact of the continent "make-up" of this group relative to others--an issue we have not examined.

Interest groups 1 and 2 are most likely to establish contacts with others outside their own interest group (71% and 55% respectively).

Fellows were asked to predict the nature of future contacts with other fellows. They overwhelmingly noted that the exchanges would be in the form of general networking and information exchanges about professional matters. One fellow noted, "...due to my interest in their countries, I expect to correspond with them just to have the flow of information." Collaborative work projects and joint research were also mentioned frequently. One fellow expected to co-author works with another fellow. Several fellows also expected to interact with other fellows at seminars and meetings related to their special interests. Many expected to work as consultants for other fellows or hire other fellows as consultants. Other types of contacts reported were bibliography and publication exchanges, visits to other fellows' countries, and a unique response, "selection of graduate students for study at my institution." Finally, fellows reported that nature of future contacts would likely be personal as well as professional. One fellow summed it up nicely, "Professional (seminars, collaboration); consulting (for me, for them, joint); and, yes, friendship."

Another set of data regarding the impact of the KIFP/FS program on the fellows' networking opportunities was gathered in the focus group sessions. Several fellows indicated the importance of the networking ties which they developed through participation in the program. Of special importance was the new contacts made and the chance to refer to fellows in other countries and in other disciplines when working on professional projects. As one fellow commented, "I will seek _____'s (a particular

fellow) advice when I need information on a particular field or country. The link is strong." Other fellows followed this theme by indicating "Our reports are full of points where we can make linkages." Several fellows gave specific examples of the networking that they would like to undertake:

- Two years from now I can refer interested people to _____, for example.
- One of my colleagues wanted to send papers to _____ for review.
- We can refer colleagues (to fellows).
- I was reading _____'s paper--and now have colleagues interested in composite flour.

Fellows indicated an interest in networking with colleagues from the KIFP/FS program for professional collaboration, for a flow of information, and for friendship. Fellows in Asian countries indicated the most interest in future networking with others outside their own continent or interest group, while those in South American countries responded with the least amount of predicted future networking contacts outside their continent.

Professional Attainments

Another questionnaire item asked fellows what had been their primary professional attainments since beginning KIFP/FS. A related question asked the extent to which KIFP/FS had helped or hindered those attainments. A large number of fellows indicated that they had received a promotion, new position, or achieved greater professional recognition in general.

- I have worked extensively as a consultant for the World Bank.
- Creation of a new institution oriented toward poverty redressal policy analysis.
- I was appointed Deputy Director General of the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA) [a position in which] I am in charge of 27 offices in all of Latin American and the Caribbean.
- I've been actively publishing papers and books on food issues.
- I have been able to advise on some community level projects on food and nutrition implemented by state agencies.
- I have finished the analysis of an important food policy for [my country].
- I was named Vice Minister of Agriculture.
- Recognition by interational agencies like UNDP, FAO, World Bank, etc. that I am an expert in the field of price policy.

Other fellows reported that they had become better researchers and teachers. Publications, speaking engagements, increased research scope and quality, and better quality teaching were also mentioned as areas of professional attainment. In addition, some fellows reported other changes: more broadminded, better prepared for challenges, and more maturity in dealing with other people.

Fellows overwhelmingly reported that KIFP/FS has helped them in achieving their professional attainments. Fellows commented, "[They were] always positive, in every way possible."; "Participation in KIFP/FS has helped greatly." and "The programs under the KIFP/FS and the infrastructure support provided the right environment for the above attainments." One fellow simply wrote, "Great!"

Fellows identified a number of reasons for the program's effect on their achievements: interaction with other fellows, increased subject area knowledge, and resources provided. One hindrance was noted by a fellow who commented that participation in KIFP/FS had taken time away from his other duties.

Another measure of professional attainment is to be found in the publications produced by the fellow. An examination of the fellows Publication List revealed that fellows had published a variety of materials. We categorized each publication as one of the following: a paper presented at a meeting or conference; a technical report or research monograph; a journal article; a book; or a chapter in a book. As of the writing of this report, fellows had written a combined total of 216 publications (90 technical reports, 51 chapters, 32 journal articles, 30 papers, and 13 books) since beginning the KIFP/FS program.

On average, fellows have written 3 technical reports, 1.7 chapters, 1.1 journal articles, 1 paper, and .43 books. The maximum number of technical reports written by one fellow is 18. Similarly, the greatest number of chapters by one fellow is 7; journal articles 10; papers 8; and books 2.

Fellows indicated an increase in professional attainments as a result of KIFP/FS. Areas of the program that seemed to be of most help to these attainments included interaction with other fellows, greater resources, and increased knowledge.

Professional Goals

We also sought to determine fellows' future professional goals and the extent to which these goals had changed as a result of participation in KIFP/FS. A question in the questionnaire dealt with this. A variety of goals were mentioned. However, fellows most frequently noted that they wanted to remain in their current fields, continue to increase their understandings of food systems, become experts or leading figures in their fields, to be productive researchers, to be better teachers, and to have more influence on policy

making. Many fellows hoped to publish more. One fellow had the specific goal to become Minister of Agriculture in his country. Another hoped to conduct research in the United States for a few years. Still another hoped to develop a new curriculum for his university.

Overall, fellows reported that participation in KIFP/FS had strengthened and reinforced their future goals. One fellow noted, "The goals have not changed but I see that [they] have been made clearer as a result of my being a Kellogg fellow." Others reported that their goals had become higher, "The fellowship helped me that I can aim higher." The overall feeling was that the goals had not changed but had been reinforced, enhanced, clarified, strengthened, and made "more potent, more urgent" as a result of KIFP/FS participation. Finally, a fellow commented, "KIFP/FS has allowed me to continue doing what I wanted to--further study [of] international food trade issues."

The overall perception of changes in fellows' professional goals was that the goals had not changed--fellows generally wanted to stay in their same fields--but that higher productivity and knowledge were more strongly felt as goals.

General Assessment: Steering Committee

A general assessment of the KIFP/FS program's impact on individual fellows was determined from the Steering Committee members' perspective. Members responded to a brief questionnaire for each fellow with whom they had had sufficient contact to form a judgment. Every single comment excepting one was positive about individual fellows' growth. In the exception case, one Steering Committee member wrote that "we made the wrong choice of candidate." However, this was an obvious exception to the norm, as all other comments were highly positive. Two fellows received "minimal" growth

comments, on the basis of being strong individually upon entry into the program, resulting in less room for noticeable growth. Other comments by the Steering Committee members expressed recognition of growth by the fellows in the range from "considerable" to "excellent."

Especially noted as specific areas of growth were 1) leadership qualities, 2) communication and interpersonal skills, and 3) self-confidence. An improvement in leadership qualities, discussed earlier in section IIIB, was deemed to be an important and noticeable area of growth. One Committee member wrote about a fellow that had "consolidated many of his leadership characteristics. No doubt an emerging solid leader." There were several comments similar to this, indicating a quite positive impact of the KIFP/FS program on the leadership qualities of the fellows.

Communication skills and interpersonal skills were also described as areas of growth. Most comments were in the form of "interpersonal skills and communications have increased greatly." One member wrote that a fellow had "gained in ability to communicate and interact with other disciplines and hence perform better." The Steering Committee members indicated that growth in areas such as interpersonal and listening skills was important to the development of the fellows' institutions. An exemplary statement of this indication was made by a Steering Committee member: "improved listening and communication abilities thus enhanced his leadership capabilities as the catalyst of ideas and action programs."

A third major area of growth indicated was in self-confidence. Each of the comments regarding this area was stated in some form of "confidence has increased greatly." Other important areas noted for individual growth included analytic abilities, knowledge and understanding, maturity, professional output, and professional stature.

The general picture of the impact of the KIFP/FS program on the individual fellows is one of positive impact on a combination of many characteristics of the

individual and, correspondingly, on the individual fellow's work inside and outside the program. Exemplary statements include the following:

- Enriched his knowledge base with the perspective of other disciplines, and as a consequence his...thesis on agrarian reform evolved considerably.
- Overcame inhibitions to participate actively in discussion. Gained confidence and self-assurance. Emerged as a potential leader in her own right.

Statements such as these, consistently given throughout the Steering Committee questionnaires, clearly indicate the substantial and positive impact that the KIFP/FS program had upon the individual fellows within the program.

Areas of clear individual impact on the fellows were in leadership qualities, communication and interpersonal skills, and in self-confidence. KIFP/FS clearly had a positive and substantial impact on the participants.

Section IV

OTHER IMPACTS OF KIFP/FS PROGRAM

The final section of this evaluation involves the assessment of other impacts of KIFP/FS. The impact of the program on the fellows' sponsoring institution is examined in part A through the views of the fellows and the steering committee members. The impact of the program on the fellows' countries is assessed in part B, and the impact on Michigan State University is discussed in part C through MSU administrator interviews.

On Fellow's Sponsoring Institution

In addition to the ways in which participation in KIFP/FS had benefitted them individually, fellows were asked in the questionnaire to identify the ways in which their sponsoring institutions had most benefitted from their participation. Many fellows noted that computer equipment was a primary benefit to the institution. Also mentioned frequently was that the fellows' professional improvements and increased knowledge of their fields were a benefit to the institution. Books and other publications for the library, faculty and students were also mentioned. Increased status/ visibility and image of the institution was reported by several fellows. Fellows also reported that there was an increased awareness of food systems and the importance of food systems problems among others at their institution. In the words of one fellow, this is the "spillover on colleagues" effect. Other, less frequently mentioned institutional benefits were resources for research, and research assistants, broadened research and teaching areas, and acquisition of human capital.

When asked whether their sponsoring institutions had been negatively affected by their participation in KIFP/FS, fellows' responses were very succinct. Either they felt there had been no negative effects, or they felt only that any negative effects were related to the time demands of KIFP/FS.

- Time spent in KIFP/FS activities, particularly for the international workshops, may have taken time I could have spent with my home institution.
- I have missed classes...
- On balance there was no negative effect.

Data pertaining to this topic were also obtained from focus group discussions. Fellows in the focus groups were asked to discuss the impact of KIFP/FS on their sponsoring institutions. They discussed this both from their own points of view as well as from their perceptions of others at their institutions. When asked to discuss the positive impacts of the program upon their institutions, a multitude of different answers were given. Three general areas appeared to be considered of utmost importance to the institution. These included: 1) the importance of increased knowledge and experience enabling the fellows to better serve their institutions; 2) the purchase of equipment and materials; and, 3) the status of the institution being enhanced because of linkages with other institutions and colleagues.

With respect to the first of these, several participants mentioned that increases in their knowledge and experiences result in their being able to provide better services to their institutions. One participant described this experience in an exemplary way by stating "As part of the KIFP/FS program, (I gained) more experience in the developing world (and was able to) share ideas...Now I would help with a course on international development, before I could not...(It is easier) for the department to fulfill its teaching obligations." Other fellows noted that their expertise had facilitated increased institutional involvement in policy making--hopefully, a positive impact.

By far the greatest number of discussions about one topic was about the positive impact of money for purchasing literature, books, equipment, and especially computers. Each participant who mentioned this topic discussed it in highly positive terms, such as there was "a clear and positive impact." One participant indicated that after he had purchased a computer, "Other professors were inspired to learn to use the

computer...most professors have now managed to get their own computers and learn." Another fellow stated that "The number of computers has increased and capacity has expanded. Now we are able to train people." Other fellows commented on the institution's ability to hire additional personnel because of KIFP/FS. These comments confirmed those already noted on the discussion of the fellows questionnaire results.

Other fellows discussed the positive impact of KIFP/FS on their institutions by discussing the importance of improved collaboration with other colleagues at the institution and at other institutions. Fellows indicated that they were able to produce reports of higher quality as a result of collaborating with fellows in other countries. Further, their institutions benefitted by inter-institutional collaboration. As one fellow noted, "Collaboration with other institutions (was important)...Now the department is more well-known to policymakers." Also noted was the increase in foreign visitors and students to the institution. This outgrowth of collaboration and of participation benefitted the institution not only by the sharing of new ideas but also from the enhanced positive image it provided to the institution.

Fellows also commented on the perceptions of others at their institution. They noted that other persons from their institutions considered KIFP/FS to have had a positive impact. Comments included

- The department considers KIFP/FS a good idea.
- (The institutions) felt there was a positive contribution.
- My colleagues' reports...were very positive.

Focus group participants were asked also to discuss any negative impact they felt KIFP/FS had caused their institutions. They commonly felt that the area of most identifiable negative impact was their loss from professional activities individually which impacted negatively on their institutions. As one fellow described, "The department is small. I teach a big chunk (of the classes). When I am absent the students suffer...The absence affects the institution." Another participant states further that "The

annual seminar participation (prevented) my participation in other activities which are important to the development of my institution. Sometimes (it would have been) in the best interest of the institution to send me elsewhere, but I was committed to KIFP."

As with the discussions on the positive impacts on institutions, the participants were asked to describe the impressions of others regarding negative impact on institutions. Three answers were given--two which discussed travelling as causing a negative strain, one which mentioned the problem of missed responsibilities.

- Traveling was a problem...People attacked me for going to exotic places.
- I get hassled a bit for traveling.
- Others noticed that I had other responsibilities (and) missed meetings.

The impact of KIFP/FS on the fellows' sponsoring institution shows most clearly in three general areas: increased knowledge and experience of the fellows allows them to better serve their institutions; the purchase and use of equipment and materials; and the status of the institution being enhanced because of linkages with other institutions and colleagues.

Impact on Fellow's Country

Data on broader impact was also obtained during the course of interviewing fellows who had institutional mini-grants. Some interviewees felt obliged to comment on the benefits of their institutional mini-grant to the broader society. Perhaps the most striking set of societal influences were related to decision processes. One Fellow noted that his project had had substantial impact on the total society and indicated that

this was "the first instance of consensus-seeking activities related to the productive sectors." Another set of related examples was presented by a Fellow who indicated the role that his project had played in bringing farmers into the process of decision-making. He further noted that farmers participating within the survey of the institutional mini-grant had a heightened political awareness that they can influence policy. A once per year newsletter produced under the auspices of the mini-grant also was a source of influence on the farmers. He indicated that as farmers examined aggregated data this had an influence on various of their own agricultural decisions (e.g. choice of crop mix). This Fellow noted that his survey had specific governmental impact, leading to a policy of increasing grain purchasing prices by 20% (instead of 15%) at the provincial level. Other impacts were noted at the county government level as well.

Another institutional mini-grant had documented results in improving the income of a community by assisting them in engaging in fish raising and chicken raising. In addition to the documented income improvement, another important benefit noted by the interviewee was the influence on communal decision-making. One community which had participated in the institutional mini-grant initiated their own commune to "fish farm in the small lake." Thus, the community's ability to initiate projects of its own had been greatly enhanced.

Several participants also commented on increased knowledge as an important benefit to the larger community. One interviewee noted that his work had "provided a sound background as to what has been going on. At present it is bits and pieces."

Members of the Steering Committee likewise provided insights into KIFP/FS program impact on the fellows' countries. They were asked to comment specifically on the impact of the individual projects conducted by the fellows. The feelings about the amount of impact were mixed, ranging from "very limited" to "very great" impact, while many projects were described as having potential for future impact. Typical quotes were in the form of "very great impact on his institution and great potential

impact in his country." One Committee member describe the impact of one particular project as "Potentially extremely large. Could benefit...millions of people..." On the other end of the scale, some projects were cited as having only limited or minimal impact. Examples of these opinions are "minimal (impact), well-executed but will have little impact on the clientele" and "limited impact in short run."

Specific activities undertaken within the projects were noted by the Committee members as having positive present and potential future impacts on the fellows' countries. Especially important appeared to be the formal examination and documentation of the limitations and impacts of program policies. One Committee member discussed this by indicating that "(the project) documented...limitations of previous policies...this would lead to more pragmatic policies.

Another highly regarded component of the projects which were considered to have impact on the countries was the creation of new understandings and/or new programs. Exemplary quotes in this area include the following:

- Developed a conceptual framework for the analysis of agrarian reform...Such framework will help in..the dialogue needed for an effective and socially/politically feasible agrarian reform.
- Has begun already generating useful dialogue with Parliament and involved government decision makers through workshops.

KIFP/FS was considered to have a positive impact on the fellows' countries through improved policy decisions.

It was indicated that fellows and institutions were better able to help their countries and communities through increased knowledge and improved decision processes.

Impact on MSU.

Another kind of impact of the KIFP/FS program is on MSU itself. We sought to explore the possible impacts of the program on the university by conducting interviews with three key MSU administrators to determine their views on this issue.

One interviewee framed the discussion within the broader context of MSU's stated desire to act with a social purpose in mind and in a manner that contributes to the lives of people. He cited the mission statement of the university that indicated "that we are a part of a big world." Thus, this interviewee stipulated that it is important for MSU to engage in projects like KIFP/FS because "I am convinced that it is important to do and it is part of our philosophy." Another MSU administrator reiterated the same theme by noting that at an institution like MSU, "We are involved in a global setting...and have to be involved with players in that arena."

Interviewees cited a number of specific benefits to the university. One of those noted was the impact on faculty. A comment was made on the broadening effect on fellows who visited with MSU faculty and thereby enriched their interests. Another administrator discussed the need to "refurbish the next generation of faculty-scholars within the college" and noted the importance of getting faculty members involved in international activities early. He indicated that if a faculty member did not have an "international exposure in the first 10 years then they won't develop that interest."

Other comments highlighted the importance of the KIFP/FS program in teaching and instruction. One interviewee noted that MSU needed to maintain an international perspective. He indicated the changing demographics of our society, wherein "in about 2020 the majority will not be the majority." Thus, the view was that learning about other cultures would allow the university (and our country) to deal with our own problems better. The feeling among all interviewees was that this kind of program would enrich not only graduate education but undergraduate education as well.

The linkages developed through KIFP/FS were cited as "invaluable." The opportunity to continue to interact with the program's Fellows was cited as a source for "identifying people for graduate study." Another benefit of this linkage was the opportunity to interact with fellows as a "source of counsel in research studies." Another interviewee cited the need in graduate training for international students to be able to do a portion of their research within their own countries and the placement and logistics that might be enhanced through the KIFP/FS linkages.

A final benefit cited was the enhanced image of the university and its increased ability to conceive and manage similar programs. One administrator summarized the university's view about the benefits of the program by simply stating that MSU engages in a great deal of international contracting work and the university clearly must view work for Kellogg as having high priority and payoff since, in contrast to other contracts, there is no indirect cost recovery allowed.

Interviewees were asked to consider the costs to MSU of participating in the KIFP/FS program. The only items cited were the opportunity costs of personnel participating in the program. As one interviewee noted "Harold had other things in mind for the concluding years of his career." The same theme was repeated by other interviewees as well. However, one commentator noted that in a comparative benefit cost analysis, the payoff on other studies "would never have been greater." One interviewee summarized the combined view nicely when he noted "I would count the benefits (of participating in KIFP/FS) as far exceeding the costs."

The benefits of KIFP/FS to Michigan State University were in the areas of improved teaching, a broader interest of the faculty, and improved image through increased linkages with other institutions.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Name

September 1989

Fellows' Assessments of the
KIFP/FS Program Impacts

[Your cooperation and assistance is again required. There are a number of areas in which your views are needed. They will be used along with other information in compiling a final report to the Kellogg Foundation.]

1. In what specific areas have you increased or developed new knowledge about food systems during the period that you were a Kellogg fellow?

1a. What specific KIFP/FS activities contributed most to the development of this expertise?

2. What specific professional skills or tools did you develop as a Kellogg fellow?

2a. What specific KIFP/FS activities contributed most to the development of these skills?

3. Aside from knowledge of food systems and development of professional skills, in what other ways has KIFP/FS benefitted you?

4. How many fellows do you believe you will continue to have extensive contact with after the conclusion of the project? _____

4a. Which fellows (by name) do you believe you will have the most contact with?

4b. What do you anticipate will be the nature of that contact?

5. What do you feel have been your primary professional attainments since you began the KIFP/FS program?

5a. To what extent has participation in KIFP/FS helped or hindered in these attainments.

6. What are your future professional goals?

6a. To what extent have any of these goals changed as a result of being a Kellogg fellow?

7. In what ways has your sponsoring institution most benefitted from your participation in KIFP/FS?

8. Has your sponsoring institution been negatively affected by your participation in KIFP/FS? How?

9. In what ways has your country benefitted from your participation in KIFP/FS? In what ways might it benefit in the future?

10. Please rate the various aspects of the KIFP/FS program in terms of their value (or usefulness) to you.

	(Circle your rating)			
	Of Great Value	Of Some Value	Of Little Value	Of No Value
International Seminars	4	3	2	1
Supplemental Travel Study	4	3	2	1
Individual Projects	4	3	2	1
Interest Group Activities	4	3	2	1
Institutional Minigrants (where applicable)	4	3	2	1
Microcomputer Equipment (where applicable)	4	3	2	1
Publication Ordering Service	4	3	2	1
The <u>KIFP/FS News</u>	4	3	2	1

10. Assume that you have 100 "value points" to assign among the KIFP/FS program aspects; how would they be allocated?

International Seminars -----

Supplemental Travel Study -----

Individual Projects -----

Interest Group Activities -----

Institutional Minigrants
(where applicable) -----

Microcomputer Equipment
(where applicable) -----

Publication Ordering Service -----

The KIFP/FS News -----

100 points

Please return to Ardell Ward or Marv Alkin before Thursday evening. Again, your cooperation has been appreciated.

Marv

APPENDIX B

Fellows' Assessments of the
KIFP/FS Program Impacts

1. In what specific areas have you increased or developed new knowledge about food systems during the period that you were a Kellogg fellow?

- *Macro and micro economics; methodology and execution of projects.
- *Working of public institutions in food systems; political aspects of the programs; understanding of the poor and their behavior.
- *If we think on food systems as a chain that goes from production--distribution--consumption. The program helped me to understand better the linkages among these sectors. This was important for me because my previous work in the area was mainly on the aspects of consumption and on the retail system. Also, on the area of consumption, the program gave me the opportunity of a three-year research, which meant I had more time to plan my work and (most important) to have an in depth work with the quantitative results (e.g. running a discriminant analysis) which usually I don't have because the research contracts I usually have are of a shorter range.
- *Areas: Institutions in Africa, Asia and Latin America; government policies in Africa, Asia and Latin America.
- *Characteristics of the peasant agricultural groups in my country. Similarities of this issue in other countries and cultural contexts.
- *Nutrition (particularly, individual food and programs); agricultural policy; state participation in agriculture; agricultural organization.
- *Methodology of conducting surveys; integrated approach to understanding food systems = multidisciplinary.
- *Food consumption and nutrition assessment; food insecurity assessment.
- *Price policy, equity consideration and structural reform (agrarian reform), nutrition programs.
- *Policy design (and implementation) of food systems; macroeconomic-sectorial (micro) linkages and relations--agricultural international economic issues; price policy for agriculture; anti-poverty policies linked to food and nutrition.
- *Role of government interaction in food systems; public vs. private participation in food systems; role of private sector in research and how this can be promoted.
- *Government programs and private sector reactions to those programs; complementarities among public and private sector actions.
- *Assessing and measuring the extent of malnutrition.

*The specific areas have been on food consumption and nutrition, household economic behavior, and agricultural marketing.

*Price and marketing policies; nutrition.

*Importance of macroeconomic policy on food availability; various aspects of technology of food production; the over-riding importance of state intervention in developing countries.

*Food production including the role of technological and institutional changes; food consumption--regional variations; human nutrition.

*Nutrition intervention analysis (from Group III): I learned to discriminate among several types of food transfer mechanisms, the non-food factors in nutrition-enhancement schemes; marketing boards and their different degree of success in developed vs. underdeveloped countries.

*In general in all areas. In particular in the area of the economies of nutrition (evaluation of food and nutrition programs, nutrition and health factors,...) and in the area of macroeconomic policies and their effects on nutrition three different mechanisms (income, employment, agricultural production, ...).

*The multi-disciplinary nature of the problem; macro-economic issues in food systems, food production problems.

*International agriculture; international trade.

*Food security and malnutrition; methodologies for food consumption measurements.

*Issues in agriculture and food policy and their analysis; agriculture marketing, prices and trade; nutrition problems and government interventions; technology issues; strategies and programs to promote efficient food production, processing and equitable distribution.

*Price policy its decision making and implementation; distribution policy; production support; market support and marketing policies; world grain trade and implications of changing patterns to domestic policies.

*In policy formation and its elements mostly affecting the food systems; the importance of a comprehensive policy embracing pricing, marketing, institutions and technologies; why do the farmers do what they do.

*Soyabean use in food preparation; how to manage a community based project; book writing on subjects of agriculture; how do you get small farmers interested in a new intervention; strategies used in Asia, and South America to improve food supplies.

*Marketing and technology in food systems.

1a. What specific KIFP/FS activities contributed most to the development of this expertise?

- *Experts who delivered papers in seminars; panel and group discussions.
- *Country project; conferences; networking; study tours.
- *First (to improve the knowledge of the linkages), the seminars and travel study; second, the research project.
- *Regional trips and visits to different institutions.
- *The development of my research project; interest group activities; African seminar.
- *Research; study tour; meetings (international seminar).
- *The fellowship project; study visits; annual seminars.
- *Exposure to seminars at both international levels; consultative discussion with knowledgeable persons; interest group meetings (Group III); publication distribution/ordered during KIFP/FS seminars.
- *International workshop; country visits; individual project.
- *My own research and activities (seminars, policy discussions, etc.) sponsored by KIFP/FS; the interaction and discussions with other fellows and resource persons; the international travel programs which enabled me to learn about how other countries are dealing with similar problems.
- *Seminars; travel studies.
- *Annual seminars; study trips.
- *Field visits during the travel studies and lectures from experts.
- *The research project I was involved with and the international seminars in Brazil, Africa and Asia.
- *Discussions within interest group; reading materials provided by KIFP/FS; speakers at annual seminars; development of my own project.
- *Annual seminars and post-seminar field trips.
- *In-country project; field visits associated with annual seminars; study tour.
- *The international seminars which provide exposure to both country cases and the presentation of fellows' papers.
- *The development of my project and the successive interactions with the fellows, the steering committee (in particular, Dr. Per) and resource people. Very important was the seminar. Also the literature that the project made available (recent books, articles). And in a broad sense the contact with other fellows, the visits to several countries, and the presentation of the other interest groups' projects and results.

*Annual seminars: presentations by invited speakers, groups discussions; travel tours.

*Minigrants; publications; international seminars.

*Interest group activities; implementation of participatory action research of improvement in food and nutrition systems in rural communities (PAR-PN).

*All the activities as rated under #10.

*Annual seminar; study travel; project interest group meetings; joint publication projects.

*Annual seminars; personal interactions through PI groups, regional seminars and co-work on projects.

*In-country project; international travel; interaction with other fellows.

*International seminars, individual project and field trips to selected countries.

2. What specific professional skills or tools did you develop as a Kellogg Fellow?

*Things that help in the development of leadership such as: good communication; ability to interact with fellows from different regions; ability to listen and try to understand other disciplines.

*Communication with groups and people; working through computer software; analysis of food system.

*The project gave me the opportunity to have access to computer skills, which I wouldn't have otherwise. The project was also important to me as it gave me conditions to learn new techniques in quantitative methods (e.g. discriminant analysis).

*I have enhanced my institutional knowledge of the world food system.

*Better understanding of statistical tools applied to economics.

*Research design; speaking/arguing about food systems around the world; writing about food systems.

*I think the multidisciplinary approach.

*Knowledge on nutrition status assessment; knowledge on assessments of food security.

*Giving summary talks and making assessments of agrarian reform.

*I substantially improved my macroeconomics knowledge. I learned a lot on price policies and agriculture and connected topics such as subsidies, trade and protection, etc.

*Better analytical skills in food systems especially in assessing private/public roles in such systems in general and in research in particular; computer skills; travelling skills

*Knowing other methodologies; understanding more some methodologies.

*Designing and analyzing questionnaires and using computer.

*I developed skills in using a computer, learned to chair sessions at seminars, and organizing the publication (editing too) of a book.

*Analysis; communication of ideas; interdisciplinary work.

*An appreciation of the fact that most important problems related to food systems require an interdisciplinary approach toward their solution; create skill in applying traditional microeconomic tools of analysis.

*Skills in data collection on food consumption--particularly intra-household consumption.

*Computer software skills like word processing, spreadsheet and database management.

*The area of economics of nutrition was kind of marginal given that I had worked much more on rural development. But due to lack of people in this area I had frequently to advise the Brazilian Institute of Nutrition on policy topics. Now I feel much more confident because of the knowledge of the most recent literature, the visit to similar project in very diverse countries, and the discussion along these years. Beside a broadening and improvement in my understanding of food systems I also started working with microcomputers, an essential instrument in the future.

*Field data collection; use of microcomputer in research; laboratory investigations; research proposal--formulation, evaluation.

*I feel more comfortable meeting people.

*The methodology of Participatory Action Research (PAR); measurement of food consumption.

*Use of various computer softwares; analysis of issues; team working in multidisciplinary groups.

*Analytical skills for handling situations where outcomes are going to be different; capturing impact of exogenous factors on policy induced variables in commodity-specific policy models.

*Policy analysis of a broader perspective; field survey on rural households.

*Communication with both professional and grass-root people; project management; project writing.

*Microcomputer operations.

2a. What specific KIFP/FS activities contributed most to the development of these skills?

*Seminars; travel to specific places (China).

*Project in my country and networking in conferences and study tours.

*My study trip to MSU; the resources for research which permit me to hire a professor from other department at our university and learn some of these techniques as on the job training; the seminar on methodological issues organized by Dr. Per Anderson in Cornell.

*Travelling; seminars; networking.

*The development of the individual research project.

*Group meetings; seminars.

*Discussions in the annual seminars.

*Research; seminars and consultative meetings with knowledgeable persons.

*Country visits to Taiwan, Japan and S. Korea.

*My own study and research; my interaction and discussions with other fellows and resource persons; the Buenos Aires seminar on macroeconomic adjustments and agriculture (and its connected activities); some "resource persons," talks and workshops.

*Seminars and travel study; the project activity.

*PIG's discussions; acquisition of books.

*Methodology workshops.

*The research project, which included purchasing a computer and the activities of my interest group.

*Own project; interest group work; annual seminar.

*My project; debate at seminars.

*In-country project; Cornell seminar on research methodologies.

*The computer and the software package funded by the fellowship program.

*Same as 1a; in addition the support for the acquisition of hardware and software and technical advice in these subjects.

*In-country project.

*Seminars and social activities.

*PAR-PN minigrant; individual project; interest group activities.

*The acquiring of a microcomputer; participation in seminars and travel studies; individual research project; networking activities.

*Interest group meetings and annual seminars.

*Cross-group discussions; in-country project research.

*In-country project.

*Individual project.

3. Aside from knowledge of food systems and development of professional skills, in what other ways has KIFP/FS benefitted you?

*Gave me better recognition from my country people and policy makers; gave me a better status among my colleagues at the institute where I work.

*Made my objective of working for the poor more focused.

*In terms of: access to bibliography; know different cultures and how they solve their nutritional problems and their food availability problem; interact with people who have a different perspective of food systems, e.g. the food technologists; networking with fellows from other countries (I actually have benefitted from it while working as a consultant for the W.B. in Latin America); learning the importance of long range planning; learning something about leadership.

*Given me access to highly knowledgeable people--the other fellows.

*Improving interpersonal and cross-cultural communications.

*Deeper knowledge on political systems, model of growth, cultural aspects; human relationship with other cultures.

*Developed friendship and close relationship with other fellows.

*Experiencing the food systems in many parts of the world with different socio-economic environments; enable me to work on personal computer, knowledge on PC increasing and exciting; able to accomplish many professional papers, a textbook, and close interaction with other institutions inside the country.

*The fellowship itself with highly-qualified professionals from other countries.

*Knowing some very nice people from many countries, friends, contacts with sound professionals in my own field; lots of travelling; knowing much better the world; my Asia experience will be very important for my new job.

*Greater interaction with different culture; better organizational skills were acquired.

*Understanding other cultures; knowing more about other political and economic systems; a little more knowledge of why scientific people and economists do not communicate too well.

*I have established useful contacts in many countries with people working in different fields.

*It opened my mind to the viewpoints of others, it broadened the horizon for a better comprehension of other realities. It gave me a group of friends with similar interests and training but from different countries of the world. It made me gain more self-confidence. It put me in closer touch with civil servants and policy makers.

*I have made consulting activities with other fellows; I have become better known by people involved in international and national institutions and increased my job opportunities; I expended and intensified my personal relations with people from all over the world.

*Development of professional contacts; opportunity to visit countries that otherwise would probably never have been visited.

*By way of initiating and developing contacts with people and institutions working on food systems within and outside of my own country.

*I got a nice set of friends well placed in a large number of countries; I was able to travel and know countries I would otherwise know only in the papers.

*The knowledge and contact with other cultures enlarges one understanding of its own problems and realities. This is true for professional and personal aspects. I would stress, perhaps against the program view, that my wife's participation in some travel studies has had very important effects on her understanding of other cultures and in our relationship with final reflections on my work.

*The migrant award has helped in improving my interactions with policy makers; it has helped build a base for further research.

*Provide equipment (computer), books, confidence, friendship and a sense of working in teams and with people.

*Get contact with fellows; greater possibility to have contact with professionals at local/rural areas as well as at national levels; accessibility to books/published materials; opportunity for publishing book(s); enrich teaching activity; create stronger collaboration with other institutions dealing with food and nutrition.

*Greater understanding of issues in development on a global scale; knowledge about other cultures and social organizations and history of some societies.

*It has helped in widening the horizons and in appreciating that in most situations, solutions can be found in the domain of only one or two policy variables. It has also made possible to develop friendship with people working in the same area in which I am working.

*Establishing personal and academic relations with concerned fellows, which will be life-long beneficial.

*Developing other interests such as transport systems; establish new friendships.

*Rural development and international trade.

4b. What do you anticipate will be the nature of that contact?

*Literature exchange; visits; consultations.

*Exchange of publications; seeking information about professional matters; seminars.

*With group I: professionally, due to my job with PAHO; with Group II: due to our common interest, I anticipate that I will be sharing bibliography, and exchanging our papers; with Group III: due to my interest in their countries, I expect to correspond with them just to have the flow of information.

*Joint research; professional exchange of information.

*Agricultural economists meetings; other academic meetings; governmental meetings; consultancy work.

*Personal and professional.

*Regional meetings; interest meetings (professional).

*Information exchanges.

*With Simej, collaboration with the South China Agriculture University in training courses for international participants--through SEARSOLIN (South East Asia Rural Social Leadership Institute).

*Professional (seminars, collaboration); consulting (for me, for them, joint); and, yes, friendship.

*Through seminars, visits, correspondence on various issues both on food systems and other matters.

*Information exchange.

*Professional--part as a continuation of the present field of interest and for some in other fields.

*Based on our common interests, I anticipate it will be both professional but also as friends.

*Occasional visits to their countries; participation in international seminars; work relations.

*Research; selection of graduate students for study at my institution.

*Professional and personal.

*Consulting work--they may hire me or my company, or I may hire them for specific projects; efforts underway that were sponsored by KIFP/FS but are not finished, e.g. grains book, my paper on Chile's wheat policy.

*Exchange of papers; eventually discussions on particular subjects and visit for short periods.

*Exchange of information; exchange of visits; collaborative work.

*Interchange of information; consulting.

*Exchange of information; collaborative research/project.

*Exchange of information; consultancies.

*It will mainly be bringing to my notice new research in areas of our interest. To seek help in reasoning some particular methodologies or in analysis. Seeking my participation in seminar/conferences devoted to areas of my interest.

*Joint research; participating in seminars.

*Consultations.

*Academic cooperation in agricultural economics, including visits, research programs, seminars, and co-authors.

*Continued collaborating in research activities; collaborative activities in the field, seminars, research, teaching, etc.

5. What do you feel have been your primary professional attainments since you began the KIFP/FS program?

*Building up leadership in food system.

*Communications with various types of people; better understanding of the poor, government officials and people in the profession.

*I became head of the Department of Economics at our university; I have worked extensively as a consultant for the World Bank on a project called "Feeding Latin American Children" (to be released); I was selected by PAHO as a Regional Advisor in food and nutrition economics.

*Publication of work on Chinese agriculture.

*Creation of a new institution oriented toward poverty redressal policy analysis; improving my stature in the agricultural economics community in Chile and in Latin America.

*Opportunity to increase my participation and effectiveness to influence change on Brazilian food systems; new job (IICA).

*Completed my duties as a dean in a successful way; attainment of a leadership role in the academic and agriculture fields in Jordan; assuming an obvious role in education and agriculture in the region.

*Research on food consumption.

*Continuation in my field in agrarian reform through some publications and speaking engagements.

*I've had two appointments which I consider promotions: a) in late 1986 I've been appointed Deputy Director General of the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA). I am in charge of 27 offices in all of Latin America and the Caribbean. I have to supervise 200 professional people and 800 administrative employees. I've been actively publishing papers and books on food issues. I've been appointed Ambassador of Mexico to South Korea.

*Higher profile in the system; promotion.

*Professionally I acquired more strength.

*I have become broadminded on food systems and capability to undertake own studies.

*Greater interaction with professionals from other disciplines. I am now invited to attend the meeting of policy groups looking at food intervention programs, to give lectures to medical doctors and nutritionist. To participation in international conferences in the subject of my research project.

*Improvement of analytical capacity; "internationalization" of my work--I began to involve increasingly in agricultural policy advising work in other countries (Honduras, Mexico, El Salvador); professional recognition in my own country--I am considered within the few agricultural policy experts in my country.

*I feel I have attained more flexibility in the topics I can teach and research.

*I have been able to advise on some community level projects on food and nutrition implemented by state agencies.

*Foremost, to be professional. The commitment of 25% of time to the project gave me the opportunity to get away from unproductive administrative work. Second, exposure to other disciplines help me relax the confidence in my profession and open new approaches and techniques to examine development problems. Third, knowledge of broad spectrum of marketing situations and institutions.

*I have finished the analysis of an important food policy for Brazil; the discussion in a seminar supported by a migrant in Brazil with government personnel and experts on health resulted in a better understanding of the necessary changes in nutrition policies in Brazil. By participating in the program I think I improved the quality of my research and teaching and this has been recognized by students and colleagues.

*Increased my research scope in food processing; leadership in research; improved by teaching material especially a course in food process engineering.

*I was named Vice Minister of Agriculture (in charge twice, and many times I have been named (*in charge) General Manager of IDEMA.

*Improved.

*Improvement in leadership through better understanding of food system issues.

*Recognition by international agencies like UNDP, FAO, World Bank, etc. that I am an expert in the field of price policy.

*Been prepared for challenges at any time.

*Maturity particularly in dealing with others; promotion to become head of a research division; regarded as an expert on soyabean production and use at peasant farmer level.

*Broaden the food systems vision, better understanding the situation, sources and solutions of the food problems in poor mountainous areas.

*Increased knowledge in food system, mainly the links among the different components; working with professionals in the policy making institutions; broadening knowledge regarding food systems of other regions: problems, main issues, implementation of solutions, etc.

5a. To what extent has participation in KIFP/FS helped or hindered in these attainments?

*Helped in building up leadership and recognition in my country.

*No hindrance.

*In my selection to work at PAHO the Kellogg fellowship was an important factor that weighted in my favor; the invitation to work as a WB consultant was in part based on my preliminary report for the KIFP/FS (submitted May 31st 1987).

*Allowed me to interact with Simei Wen and this was a help.

*It has helped a great deal, as indicated in question 7; the Latin American seminar and the book published, had also an important effect.

*KIFP/FS was fundamental for these attainments by : deep knowledge on the issues; personal relationships.

*I think that participation had positive and negative roles. In the positive way: exposure and participation in the broader thinking of food systems. Furthermore, the contacts have helped. Also there was a feeling of recognition among foreign visitors to my institution. On the hindrance side, the time allocated to my principal duties was affected.

*None.

*KIFP/FS provided the deadlines, as well as the support.

*With regard to IICA's and publishing my KIFP/FS helped me very directly and very much. Through resources (financial, ideas, interchanges, etc). In some way my new appointment was motivated by an adequate performance in my past jobs and in my discussions on policy matters with the Mexican government.

*Within a greater matrix of various factors, KIFP/FS has definitely enhanced my C.V.

*More knowledge, learning more about human nature (people's reactions and behavior).

*It has enhanced by providing reading material and other related inputs to bring the project to fruition.

*Always positive, in every way possible.

*Learning experience through my own project, seminars, interest group and visits to other countries has increased my professional capacity for evaluation of current policies and for delivering advice.

*I think the program has contributed about 80% to this attainment.

*KIFP/FS facilitated my participation to a great deal.

*There was no hindrance at all. KIFP helped me accomplish all the above attainments even though it was not the only factor.

*Answered above.

*The programs under the KIFP/FS and the infrastructure support provided the right environment for the above attainments.

*It helped due to a more open mind and experience about policies and programs from other countries.

*Of great value.

*Participation in KIFP/FS has helped greatly.

*It has helped greatly through providing opportunity to present my views in various seminars.

*Great!

*My participation in KIFP/FS activities helped significantly in the attainments.

*

*Mainly the research component of the project; the three week yearly seminars in different regions which gave me opportunity to know and understand different settings; access to publications; interaction across disciplines.

6. What are your future professional goals?

*To continue serving along this line of Food System; to improve the situation in my country in relation to grain production & utilization; to improve the status of the poor.

*Immediate future--use the information available through project for communicating to relevant people; long-term--find out ways of understanding the poor, the organizations trying to reach poor and help them improve in reaching the poor.

*I intend to spend two years at PAHO and afterwards return to Brazil to resume my teaching responsibilities. If possible (and I'll work in that direction) I would like to spend two years in a research institution in US before going back to Brazil.

*Continue working on Pacific Rim Agricultural Trade Issue.

*Further development capacity to influence public policy in favor of better integration of Chilean society & Latin America.

*Move back to Brazil to university; to finish to write a book about Latin America.

*Advancement in my profession at both levels education, research and administration.

*Completion of two text books; publication of two project' output (combine them into a single volume).

*To continue discussing agrarian(?) reform issues, and to prepare a textbook on this.

*I'm getting back to public service (as an ambassador). I want to keep on publishing on agriculture and food issues as well as individual economic issues. I eventually may go back to the agricultural sector as a policy maker.

*Advancement in my job in the area of economic analysis.

*To be more effective in communicating (the right proposal and/or decision at the right time).

*Continue writing in food systems.

*Become an expert on food distribution programs and food policy. Someday assume direct responsibilities at policy level.

*Help to improve the situation of the agricultural sector, especially poor farmers, through the adoption of adequate policies at government level, consistent with increasing efficiency in the use of resources.

*To be a productive researcher and good teacher.

*To make use of my knowledge to assist community and rural development projects.

*Continue doing research on Latin American marketing problems, particularly those of Dominican Republic. I believe marketing modernization is essential to an increased food supply but we need studies showing what is to be gained from changes in policy.

*Continue teaching and researching!

*Will continue to work with the university and be involved in community development work.

*Improve economics knowledge to increase participation in designing policy; be Minister of Agriculture; be more sensitive to people's needs.

*Develop agro-nutrition training and research programs (agro-nutrition is a discipline of nutrition with strong background on agriculture and socio-economic aspect using a multidisciplinary socio-technological approach)--as complement of medical-nutrition.

*Dedication to offering leadership to improve food systems including training others for the same goal.

*To become an expert in field of macro policy decision making. To become a leading figure in the field of food policy.

*Be a great scholar on policy issues; involvements in policy making.

*Be involved in community development work.

*Establishing a new curriculum on title of "Food Economics."

*Continue doing research in health and nutrition; continue teaching but incorporating many issues discussed in the KIFP/FS.

6a. To what extent have any of these goals changed as a result of being a Kellogg fellow?

*Little but at least the reaction is positive.

*I wish to focus for more targeted programmes not just poor in general.

*The fellowship helped me that I can aim higher.

*KIFP/FS has allowed me to continue doing what I wanted to--further study international food trade issues.

*They have been reinforced and further support to achieve them.

*Kellogg fellowship was fundamental for me to obtain my job in IICA. Thus, my first goal "move back to Brazil" is directly associated with that.

*Enhanced my aspirations to assume a leadership role in the area of food systems, nationally, at the regional or international levels.

*A lot, it may not happen without fellowship.

*The goals have been sharpened.

*Not much in scope. But my knowledge and policy issues awareness has improved a lot. Through my travelling and seminars I feel much more prepared for policy making. I have "renovated skills."

*Difficult to say but my involvement in the KIFP/FS has definitely sharpened my perception of priorities and areas of highest interest.

*The fellowship has enhanced the goals since it has opened doors to sources of literature.

*Increased my chances in these directions.

*It has reinforced my commitment with the agricultural sector, and my previous considerations of this sector development as the key to the solution to the overall economic and social development in my country.

*Very little.

*By being a Kellogg fellow my desire to work at grass-roots level got further strengthened.

*They have become more potent, more urgent as I have learned from other countries' experiences that policy issues can be quite costly in human suffering (African examples).

*In this restricted sense, more.

*The goals have not changed but I see that it has been made clearer as a result of my being a Kellogg fellow.

*I've moved them up.

*Improved understandings and the needs for a multidisciplinary approach; more convincing and promising.

*Participation in the program has enhanced this dedication.

*To the extent that I have been able to appreciate that price policy alone cannot solve the problem of human hunger: Technology directs interventure programs and world trade--all have profound impact and therefore what is of more relevance is macro policy.

*No.

*Used to be more concerned with research issues.

*Without this professional goals before being a Kellogg fellow.

*I would say that the teaching activity has been mainly a result of KIFP/FS; close communication and working and participating in inter-institutional committee with policy maker.

7. In what ways has your sponsoring institution most benefitted from your participation in KIFP/FS?

*Through: equipment; publication; workshops; development of the product through my project.

*A professionally developed leadership resource in food systems and security is now available in the institution. Also technology of computer has now become widespread, after I installed computer.

*My program gave me the conditions to train students in the area of food and nutrition. Also, I could have in the project the participation of other professors of my university who, through this activity, get acquainted with food and nutrition problems and issues. The institution also benefitted from the bibliography I received from the program.

*Visiting scholars.

*Project plus minigrant was determinant in allowing the take off of the new institution, (CEDRA) providing resources to establish a critical mass of professional capacity. The project provided the guiding principles for the new institutions.

*My knowledge about food systems.

*Availability of equipment; availability of funds for research personnel; take a leading role in the project area; exposure of the institution to other fellows.

*Computer machine; greater recognition of professional knowledge on food consumption from other institutions.

*My own growing confidence in discussing food systems; ordering service for books and articles.

*Through my own professional improvement from my KIFP program; specifically: IICA published book on the KIFP/FS seminar on macro-adjustment and agriculture in Latin America; through my (and some other fellows') publications; thanks to KIFP/FS IICA hired 2 fellows to its staff--very good acquisition of human capital.

*The greatest benefit is that the institution has been able to host a national conference through which a great impact was made on policies relating to greater participation of the private sector in research and cooperation between the various sectors. This has of course added to a better image of the institution. 2) A micro computer was acquired.

***I have become more effective on my professional activities (administrator, professor, advisor, researcher); computing equipment was greatly appreciated.**

***The knowledge gained has been put into use and the Ministry is now having nutrition as a top priority on the agenda. The guys collecting data were trained under the minigrant. Results of the study should benefit in policy re-thinking.**

***Obtained a computer; contacts abroad; improved teaching; students as research assistants; publications.**

***More resources for research and computer facilities; more experienced advice delivering.**

***My flexibility in what I can teach and the research topics I can supervise.**

***By increasing the research capability and broadening the teaching areas.**

***First, I benefitted by participating in KIFP/FS because my sponsoring institution had already received grants from the Foundation, including the continuing benefits of scholarships for faculty. Second, my sponsoring institution has benefitted by a broader exposure to world food system problem, opportunity and resource to study a national problem (my project), a computer that stays for others to use, publications for the library, and the paper produced by me for the KIFP.**

***From spillover on colleagues (through seminar, informal contacts, profiting from the books and equipment I acquired) and on my students (present--involved in the field survey; future--from my teachings).**

***Supply of equipment, books and journals; ability to organize workshops and seminars--Food Technology Extension.**

***Participation in seminars; keep the microcomputer; my participation has changed because I have moved to other institution.**

***Through implementation of seminars and workshops as well as consultancy meetings strong cooperation with other institutions has emerged; availability of good books and published materials which can be used by other faculty; dissemination of a concept of the importance of agriculture in nutrition improvement and rural development.**

***A human resource has been improved through knowledge and skills gained; equipment and software acquired has improved the institution's capacity in research and training; participation of colleagues in the project has similarly had a positive impact in improving understanding of food systems and issues; in-country project results are a contribution of the institution.**

***Since I am an advisor to my country's price policy any improvement in my professional expertise directly benefits the sponsoring institution and since through participation I have gained substantially as a professional, my sponsoring institution has gained.**

***More active involvement in policy making about food systems; more people become aware of the food issues importance; through equipment purchase, publications.**

*Equipment; established a relationship with the Kellogg Foundation; new ideas from me as a result of my experience in KIFP/FS activities.

*Organized nearly 20 post-graduates in KIFP/FS program; equipment; new economic theories, ideas and methods were introduced in teaching; a new curriculum will be established.

*Research; teaching, I am presently responsible for giving course in socio-economic development in a Master's program; outreaching to other institutions (academic and policy).

8. Has your sponsoring institution been negatively affected by your participation in KIFP/FS? How?

*Sometimes: my absence during the annual seminars; involvement in Kellogg's program hindered my participation in other programs.

*No.

*In the sense that I had to take time that otherwise I could have been spending in the activity of selling projects.

*I have missed classes--this was a problem during the Brazilian seminar.

*To a certain extent through the time required to finish the project, on balance, however, the benefits received were substantially higher.

*Yes. By reducing my work time for the institution.

*Could be that my participation in KIFP/FS deprived me from opportunity to represent my institution at other important activities. Also, graduate students were affected.

*No.

*Time spent in KIFP/FS activities, particularly for the international workshops, may have taken time I could have spent with my home institution.

*Somewhat, from my long absences for the international seminars. But the balance is very much favorable to my institution (IICA).

*No.

*On balance there was no negative effect. Sometimes KIFP/FS and the Colegio were competing for my time.

*Not really, albeit absence as head of section tend to affect direction of work.

*No.

*No.

*Some negative impact through my absences but this is 'no big deal'--absences of colleagues always means a little more work for someone else.

*No.

*Frankly, I do not see any negative effects.

*Yes. Brazilian universities depend on external finance, there we do research to obtain resources to pay secretarial staff, junior researchers and buy equipment and supplies. During the Kellogg project I had no time to get involved in other projects and thus contributed nothing for the financial aspect. But other contributions were evaluated (by me and the institution) as much higher.

*Yes. This has been mainly in the area of my absence from the university during the scheduled seminars and travel tours.

*No.

*Not much; miss my involvement in some activities while attending overseas/travel study.

*To some minor extent yes--the time off to participate in the project would have been used in fulfilled my other functions in my institution without delegation as it often happened when I was away. This not of significant importance considering the fact that research is a major function of my institution and the project I was involved in way of priority.

*No, because the project on which I was working was of direct interest to my institution.

*No.

*Maybe, during my absence from important meetings.

*No.

*No.

9. In what ways have your country benefitted from your participation in KIF/FS? In what ways might it benefit in the future?

*My institution benefits will reflect on my country. In future: through more involvement in policy being international fellow will help in participating in more international discussion. May have a better ability to solicit new funds through projects.

*My analysis of the working of the system and interaction with official who run programs would benefit in reducing cost in reaching the poor.

*My country can benefit in the future from my fellowship if I can be effective in influencing and advising in policy formulation. I have already tried to have this sort of influence writing about relevant issues which were being discussed in the process of

shaping up our Constitution. What I had written was very much influenced by our observations in study trips (but I can't claim that the country has benefitted from that).

*KIFP/FS has enhanced my appreciation of the realities of the global food system.

*1) Minigrant was crucial in the finishing of CED's agricultural project and CED's activities this was the first instance of a gathering of main actors in a sector that until then had been marked by with sectarian strife. It brought together academicians and intellectuals of different ideological trends, farm leaders, peasant and censor leaders, all realizing the great degree of consensus existing. 2) My project topic was strongly oriented agricultural program for a future democratic government.

*Influence on the formulation of the economic policy; results of my research in which I evaluated one of the main food aid programs in Brazil.

*I hope Kellogg Foundation will have some programs in the Middle East; Jordan should benefit from this opportunity.

*Information on food consumption of rural population; assessment of food consumption programs which government has been implementing.

*Agrarian reform in the Philippines is a national issue that has aroused much controversy. My increasing familiarity with this issue, esp. from other country experiences as shared during the KIFP/FS activities, is one way to help constructively in the formulation of a national policy on agrarian reform.

*Well, as you can see in my report of accomplishments, almost all of my work was precisely on advising and discussing with the relevant authorities on food policy matters. So is my published research. Through IICA I was able to interact with other Latin American and Caribbean countries. As far as the future is concerned I think I am much better prepared for giving advice on making policy decisions.

*As in 7 above. The greatest benefits of this activity will be in the future. I hope and recommend that Kellogg broaden its activities in Kenya and that more Kenyans will benefit from similar fellowships.

*We can say that we provide useful information to policy makers and use information to make decisions. Therefore, KIFP/FS provided new information that will be used for the time to come.

*My work involves interaction with other ministries. The Minigrant workshop participants were inter-ministerial and from the university. The project also covered the three regions of the country. The results should therefore be of interest at the national level.

*I participated in a study which has increased knowledge of our reality and helped to suggest ways to improve food distribution programs. It also benefits others by way of improving my teaching at the university which has a multiplier effect.

*Through the papers written and advice delivered I have contributed to broaden the policy alternatives open to my country with respect to the agricultural sector. Although these ideas have not resulted in policy implementation, I am sure they will be considered in the future.

***I believe that those fellows who visited Australia gained a very favorable impression of the country; my country should benefit in the future from my enhanced skills as a policy analyst.**

***By way of developing expertise in the area of food systems which the country needs. As I intend to participate in village-level programs and projects in food and nutrition and community development the country will be benefitted in the future.**

***The country has gained a series of studies about its grain marketing system that might contribute to future improvements in the way the government intervenes in the food system.**

***Again, due to improvements in my teaching and researching capabilities, i.e., profited and will profit from the quality of the students and the usefulness of the research. Benefitted from the results of the evaluation that may lead to an assessment of nutrition policy and its correction under the new government that is going to be elected this November. Also, fellow researchers with whom I discussed the results are profiting and will improve their research, and goes on and on.**

***I was recently invited by the Ministry of Agriculture to help prepare a medium term agricultural development plan on agro-processing. My selection was partly because of the in-country project under the Kellogg fellowship. 2) Infrastructure provided (computer, etc.) is used not only on KIFP/FS project, but students and colleagues have access.**

***Better knowledge for helping the Ministry of Agriculture designing policy.**

***Indonesia is more well-known regarding food systems, for example through Roley's project in addition to my project. Through seminar and travel study in Indonesia policies and programs in food and nutrition has been disseminated to participating fellows for Africa and Latin America.**

***1) I have gained more skills and knowledge or greater understanding of issues in food systems and hence a human resource has been improved. 2) Results of individual project useful in improving the national agricultural research system reorganization. 3) Facilities acquired have improved my institution's capacity in training.**

***To the extent increased professional expertise of mine is going to result in better policy advice my country will get benefitted. Further, some of the results of my research project may lead to rethinking on managing India's food economy, and policy makers may agree to changing the policy. In time it will generate discussions and further work on policy improvements required.**

***Not so clear because of such a big country.**

***In-country project has introduced a general awareness of what soyabeans can be used for at household level; increased soyabean production by small farmers.**

***Seminar, lectures and papers relating poor mountainous situation, sources and solutions, have been done, aroused wide interest and concern. A new book "Food Problems and Technological Progress in China's Poor Mountainous Areas" and several policies making suggestions will be published and presented.**

