<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Summary of Themes cited by Conversation Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Trust**     | • Partnerships and symmetry  
• Inter-institutional governance modalities  
• Early wins; infrastructure investments  
• **Budgets and timeframe**  
• Multi-level buy-in at the outset and routine participation in work plan development |
| **Budgets**    | • Decentralized; USAID rules inhibiting  
• Multiple levels of negotiation from institution, ministry to USAID  
• USAID contracting arrangements; long-term perspective  
• Lack of national government funding  
• Transparency in budgeting; infrastructure & training investments need to be balanced  
• Funding level needs to be appropriate to the task; local accounting capacity needs to be developed and follow USAID guidelines |
| **Timeframe**  | • Long-term  
• Minimum of 5 years  
• Donor funding cycle inappropriate; organizational transformation takes time to establish  
• Impact not measurable in 4-5 year project; question of institutional development arose later |
| **National/ system level** | • Institutional analysis; local ownership  
• Stakeholder associations; national level challenge  
• Multiple institutions; diversity of interests (levels & partners); policy development; different levels of maturity allows for development of models for others  
• Curriculum standardization  
• Public/private AET institutions have different interests/conditions |
| **Curriculum/pedagogy** | • Soft skills, leadership, critical thinking  
• Multiple levels of stakeholders (NGO, private, student, faculty, admin)  
• Introducing new appropriate (teachable) soft skills demos practical skills  
• Curriculum change involves faculty composition  
• Skills and practices (incentives); teaching/research infrastructure & skills in use are required  
• Lack of student readiness |
| **Training**   | • US based; sandwich; local leadership; study tours  
• An end or means to an end  
• Easy buy-in  
• Teacher skills questionable  
• Degree training and re-entry of newly trained faculty are important  
• Teacher training required  
• Training in project accounting for institutional partners |
| **Governance** | • People ‘wired’ for leadership; particularly national level  
• Across the institution  
• System level champion; quality assurance  
• No models or expertise; organizational experiments; mid-level management weak  
• Dysfunctional processes are often shaped by vested groups satisfied with the status quo  
• Mid-level management weak |
| **Incentive Systems** | • Negotiate with teachers  
• Faculty compensation  
• Faculty get more work without incentives; infrastructure not sufficient  
• Lack of interest in outreach; research provides more incentives |
| **Project Management** | • Scale of management team; sensitivity of team; practical logistical challenges (differing information, timetables, trajectories, interests)  
• Local participation in project design; how to manage communication  
• Conversations that matter  
• Administrative infrastructure and skills of host institution; USAID contracting, funding mechanisms and timetables  
• Vested interests of development organizations to reduce risk and assure profits; champions identified and mobilized; universities are best suited for this type of project  
• Project hiring trade-offs: jealousy/ envy versus performance; physical access to agricultural farm; USAID turnover; in-country office critical; competence and value of contractual middleman |