Course Description
Beginning after WWII with the US Marshall Plan for economic aid to Europe and Point 4 initiated by President Harry Truman in the 1940s to assist non-developed countries worldwide, US foreign development aid has been modified by every president since Truman. US aid programs originally designed to achieve long-term economic development were replaced by shorter-term efforts designed to meet more immediate US national security objectives. And foreign aid now includes humanitarian and disaster relief and programs designated as conflict resolution, pre- and post-conflict reconciliation, response to weak and failing states, etc. US foreign development aid originally planned and carried out by one US government agency is now provided by over 20 US government agencies, in addition to thousands of non-governmental organizations, large philanthropic foundations, and by government partnerships with the private sector. Each of these organizations applies its own policy, mission and goals, philosophic point of view and economic, and professional or technical specialty to the delivery of foreign aid.

Goal of the Course
The goal of this course is to enable students to build a sophisticated and historic perspective of long-term US foreign development aid issues and the opportunity to rethink and suggest reforms so that the US government might better use development assistance as an effective, long-term, foreign policy tool.

Major Course Themes
1. **Specific goals and objectives of US foreign aid have changed over time and will continue to change in the future.** As the process of change began to reflect the overlapping goals of the numerous US government agencies implementing their own aid programs, the US foreign aid effort became chaotic in policy, program, process, management and organization. For example:
   - Multiple foreign aid goals are reflected in organizational and programmatic overlap;
   - Presidential aid initiatives have become overly numerous and political;
   - Congressional earmarks and set-asides have constricted the effective use of development aid;
   - Reduced US aid staff size and reduced US institutional capability made it difficult for the US foreign aid structure to meet changing foreign policy challenges;
   - The last Bush administration used the terrorist attack of 9/11 to accentuate the short-term, national security threat in determining how to organize and manage US foreign aid;
   - President Obama’s 2010 Global Development Strategy and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s 2011 Quadrennial Diplomatic and Development Review did not resolve, and indeed, may have exacerbated many foreign aid problems.

2. The concept of **American exceptionalism** which guided much of US foreign policy and US foreign aid WWII is now being questioned. Two somewhat overlapping doctrines within this concept further confuse the US foreign policy and foreign aid approach to the rest of the world.
   - **The realist (conservative) doctrine** - A virtuous America, prosperous and democratic, is threatened by anti-democratic, antagonistic cultures, ideologies, and nations against which the US
must be on guard. The US must manage its diplomacy, military power and foreign aid programs primarily on the unilateral basis of securing and protecting short-term US national security interests.

- **The idealist (liberal) doctrine** - The belief that it is the mission of the US to lead the world by domestic example, and through foreign policy, foreign aid, and multilateral cooperation, into a more democratic, free market, and prosperous future. It is the moral position that foreign aid is “the right thing for the US to do” - to reduce poverty, achieve sustainable development, and spread American democratic and free market values.

- With the end of the Cold War in the 1990s, the unilateral foreign policy using extreme force by the former Bush administration, the 2008/9 world financial crises, the rise of other powers such as the BRIC countries, American fatigue with being the world’s police man, the unraveling of the Arab Spring, to what extent does the US need to rethink its “exceptional” position?

3. **The relationship among the three “ds” of foreign policy** - “development,” “defense” and “diplomacy” has become conflated with a negative impact on the policy and capacity of the US agencies responsible for each of the three “ds.” A thrust of this course is to encourage students to understand the unique role and benefit of long-term foreign development aid to world and to the United States, and to make recommendation on how to raise the “d” for long-term international economic, political, and social development to the level of the other two "ds."

4. It is urgent that the *Obama administration, especially Sec. of State Kerry and USAID Administrator Shah rethink management of US foreign aid taking into account lessons learned from past US foreign aid, experience during President Obama’s first administration, and new challenges of the 21st century*, including:
   - Reconfirming that long-term, worldwide economic development is in the long-term US national economic and security interest.
   - The increasing internationalization of public goods, e.g., food, health, climate, environment, water, energy, womens’ and human rights and democratic values.
   - Expansion in the number and type of international aid donors with the US government no longer being the only major or intellectual leader among aid donors.
   - New technological changes and innovations especially in worldwide information and electronic communication exchange and services.
   - Reinvigorating awareness of different local cultures and local values in applying US aid.
   - The need for the US to move from a unilateral to a multilateral, coordinated approach to foreign aid, especially since the creation of the G-20 group of countries.
   - Confirming the need for USAID independence from DoD as the US military phases out of war-zones such as Iraq, Afghanistan, and the Arab Middle East.
   - Changing the national security narrative for the US from the dangers posed by weak or failing states, freeing the US to focus on more important global roles and helping to achieve worldwide long-term economic and political development.
   - Insuring that aid-receiving countries, governments and local officials assume control, management and responsibility for their own development.
   - Necessary partnering among local government institutions, local civil society organizations, and the local and international private sector.
Readings and References

Reading Issues Paper (RIP)
Students will submit a weekly RIP, not to exceed one page, the evening before the class. The RIP should analyse what students consider the main points in the Lecture Notes and References. Each RIP will end with one or two questions which students wish to discuss in class. RIPs not submitted on time will be marked down.

Professor’s Class Lecture Notes
Professor will send to students in advance of each class his own review of references, and his comments on key foreign aid issues for the week. Class Lecture Notes are required readings.

Guest Lectures and Student Participation in Class Discussions
A strength of this course is that the professor invites former colleagues, who are in operational positions in development agencies, to meet with individual classes. Students will be judged by how they question and conduct discussions with these guest lecturers.

In addition to RIPs each student will complete:
- A take-home final exam in the form of a team final reform paper which will propose a Presidential reform to a US foreign aid issue. Team final paper topic is due Class 10.
- The thesis of the final paper will be presented to the full class in sessions 13/14.
- Graduate students are required to make one class presentation on a special topic.
- Class presentations, with questions and discussions, nte. 15-20 minutes.
- All students are expected to read newspapers, attend local professional meeting and report back for extra credit.

Guidance for team take-home final paper - 15-20 total pages (Due nlt. than Dec. 13)
Action Memo to the President summarizing final paper issues and recommendations - One page.
Statement of the foreign aid program/structural problem needing reform - One page.
Statement of proposed solution, program reform, improvement or reorganization - One page.
Assumptions and rationale for success of the reform - One page.
Downside and potential problems with implementing the reform – One page.
Body of the paper. Details and implementation of reform and how it will resolve the problem.
Bibliography and Appendices (Not counted in page total.)
Note: 2-3 students will form teams to write and present final papers. All team members will receive the same grade. Final paper will be assessed on its initiative and implementability.
Format: Times New Roman, 12 Point, Single Space
Think Tanks in Washington. D.C. is the headquarters of many international think tanks and associations. Students should attend Think Tank meetings and report back to class for extra credit. e.g.
- The Brookings Institution
- The Center for Global Development
- Council on Foreign Relations
- Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
- Center for Strategic and International Studies
- U.S. Global Leadership Campaign (Center for ...)
- House Foreign Affairs Committee
- School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS)

INTERNET GATEWAYS - CONGRESS, USAID, MCC, STATE and other AGENCIES

www@usaid.gov  publicationsinfo@imf.org  slee@thechicagocouncil.org (Food)
www@state/f.gov  briefing.devex.com  newswire@devex.com
decexpress@usaid.gov  www@mcc.gov  feedthefuture@usaid.gov
newsletter@usaid.gov  worldbank.org/external/default/main  USAID Knowledge Center
foreignassistance.gov  updates.modernizingforeignassistance.org/mail.cgi/u/mfa
info@devex.com  FP's Situation Report [fp@foreignpolicy.com]  dec.usaid.gov
www.usaid.gov/who-we-are/organization/advisory-committee/reports(ACVFA)

Course Grading

Attendance  10%
Active participation in class discussions and presentations  20 %
Weekly Reading Issue Papers (RIP)  15%
Mid-term take home examination  15%
Final paper on proposed reform of US foreign aid  40%
Extra credit  Up to 5%

Grading: Excellent-4.0; very good-3.7; good 3.3; trying-3.0; needs more work-2.7

Part. I. History of US Foreign Aid from the Marshall Plan to the end of the Soviet Era

Classes 1-7 examine 50 years of political, economic and programmatic changes in US foreign aid from US lend-lease programs to US European Allies before and during WWII, thru the Marshall Plan in 1947 after WWII, to Point 4 aid to the underdeveloped world, and to other reforms thru the end of the Soviet era in 1990. We discuss programs activities in agriculture and education – that have been the key economic sectors of US development efforts since its inception. In Part I we review development programs to the Latin America and Caribbean region (LAC) and to the Africa region (AFR) as examples of the economic development work carried out by the US around the world. We cover USAID activities in Vietnam from 1956-76 when that program was under the control of DoD. This is a lead in to USAID/DoD overlapping activities in Iraq, Pakistan, and Afghanistan in the 2000s covered in Part III. We have a unit on awareness and sensitivity to local culture essential to understanding the need for country-specific development solutions.
Class 1  Course Setting, Theses, Changing Goal, Objectives, Directions and Trends of US Foreign Aid

(Aug. 28)

Opening: This first class will review the major theses of US foreign aid to be covered during the semester. Students will be introduced to foreign aid jargon and made aware of how foreign aid has been a continuously changing element of US foreign policy in goal, content and approach. We will review OECD/DAC’s definition of “official development assistance” (ODA) and US foreign aid organizational, policy and program changes from 1947 to 2014. The class will discuss the multiple and changing goals and purposes of US foreign aid. Class notes and references will cover the concept of “American Exceptionalism” which had been one basis of US foreign aid. We cover the differences between “realism” and “idealism” which has guided much of US foreign policy and US foreign aid over the years. Students will need to decide to what extent these concepts still exists today and how they may have been changed.

Required Readings:
Course syllabus
Lecture Notes for Class 1. (Lecture Notes are required reading for every class.)
Butterfield Chap.1

References:
Ruttan, V. United States Development Assistance, Chap 2.
Wright, R., “American Foreign Policy for Realists and Idealists,” NYT, 7/16/06.
Haass, R.,” U.S. Foreign Policy in a Nonpolar World.” Foreign Affairs, 5/6 08.
Parker, K., "President Obama and that exceptional thing,” WP, 1/30/11.
Rice, C., “US must recall it is not just any country,” FT, 7/26/12.

Class 2.  1941-1955 - World War II Aid to Europe, the Marshall Plan, President Truman and Point 4. Early assumptions about US foreign aid.

(Sept 4)
This class will begin the review of thinking by which US foreign development aid programs were established after WW II. Foreign aid issues that face the US today began at the birth of the US aid program in the 1940s. Reform and change by both Executive branch agencies and legislative action by the Congress have been a constant factor. The World Bank, IMF, and many regional development banks (IFI) were also created after WW II under the political and policy leadership of the US. Management of US contributions to IFIs/IOs is discussed in class 15. While US contributions to IFIs also comes out of the US foreign operations budget (150 Account), this course will focus on US bilateral foreign aid policies, programs, budgets and organizational structures – primarily of USAID, but also State Department, MCC, PEPFAR, DoD, and the foreign aid activities of selected domestic agencies such as Treasury and USDA.

Required Readings:
Professor’s Lecture Notes (Lecture Notes are required reading for every class.)
Butterfield, Forward, Preface, Chap 2-6

References:
Ruttan, Chap 1, 3 (x 42-47), 4, 11 (339-348)
Judt, Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945, pp.82-99.
“Five Myths about Foreign Aid,” John Norris, WP, 3/28/11


(Sept 11)
This class will review the political, policy and organizational issues leading to the creation, under President Eisenhower, of the Foreign Operations Administration, the International Cooperation Administration and the Development Loan Fund. We will review President Kennedy’s “Decade of Development” and his special attention to Latin America and the Caribbean region (LAC) through creation of the Alliance for Progress. We cover President Johnson’s “War on Hunger.” Class notes explore early US aid programs in Latin America and the implications for today’s development of local issues such as Iberian history and culture, military rule and difficulty of achieving democratization. What is the changing role of US aid to Latin America today resulting from rising anti-Americanism, a swing to the left in the region, trade, drugs, growth of Brazil, political changes in Cuba, and the Fifth and Sixth Summits of the America’s.

Early in this period, the United States fought a major war in Vietnam during which time USAID was called upon to work with and under the direction of the US military. What was the nature of that relationship between the civilian and military side of the US government at that time? Why didn’t it work, and why was it unsuccessful? This session is to prepare students for later classes on USAID and DoD activities in Iraq and Afghanistan and civilian relations with the US military during military conflict and other potential civilian/DoD overlapping activities.

A major issue of development are the unique cultural factors in each country that help or hinder achievement of long-term, local economic development and sustainable growth. USAID used to require a Social Soundness Assessment during the project design phase. Unfortunately, a Social Soundness Assessment is no longer required and culture has been given insufficient attention by US aid agencies. Using the works of Harrison and Montaner, and using LAC as a regional case example, we will discuss cultural factors in achieving or limiting development. Student should review the referenced USAID Handbook on Social Soundness Analysis to see how USAID used to carry out social soundness assessments and answer the question whether it should continue to be done today.

A. History: 1955 -1968

Required Readings:
Butterfield, Chap 7-9. (Except pp 86-96)
Ruttan, pp.69-94, 301-323

B. Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC)

Required:
Obama at VI Summit of the Americas Opening Plenary, Columbia. 4/14/12.
References:
Fifth Summit of the Americas, Declaration of Commitment, April 19, 2009.
Romero, S. “Economies in Latin America Race Ahead,” NYT, 6/30/10
Romero, S. “Latin Economies Racing Forward As Others Creep,” NYT, 7/1/10
“Connecting the Americas,” Hillary Clinton, White House Conference, 4/12/12.
C. Culture and Development
Required:
Harrison, L.E., Underdevelopment is a State of Mind, Chap 1, 2, 8 (pp 57-82), 9.
References:
Required: Butterfield, pp.86-96.
References:
Ruttan, pp. 107-108, 256-278.
USOM Vietnam Provincial Representative Manual, 1/63

Guest speaker: Mark Lopes, USAID/LAC
Student presentation: Harrison and Montaner re impact of culture on development in LAC
USAID/DOD activities in Vietnam

(Sept 18)
Class Notes for this week start with consideration of President Nixon’s “New Directions” and the recommendations of the Peterson Task Force on Foreign Assistance set up by Nixon. Students will note the shift from attention to the rural poor to new issues of debt restructuring, macro-economic policies of national governments, and private sector development. The first formal effort to coordinate the growingly numerous and disparate US government agencies carrying out foreign aid programs was the creation under President Carter of IDCA - the “International Development Coordination Agency.” President Bush (1) shifted international development policy away from improving government policy and management to promote market forces as the engine of development. Later, reduced concern by
President Clinton with foreign aid in any form, after the end of the Cold War led, to the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 which shrank foreign development aid funds and USAID staff. This was matched by increased Congressional earmarking and Congressional “set asides” of aid funds that is a major issue today because it severely limits the ability of development professionals in the Executive Branch to design and carry out the most effective development programs under professional leadership.

Special attention will be given in this class to US assistance to sub-Saharan Africa. Early US aid programs to Africa were influenced by the East-West (Soviet Union and the United States) conflict. US aid was reduced as this conflict was reduced. What have been/are the special problems of development in Africa from those in other regions of the world? What lessons has the US learned from aid experience in Africa? What have African governments learned? Has US aid to Africa helped achieve US national security objectives? How has the increased cost of food and reduced availability of food-aid impacted on African growth, stability and sustainability? How do we account for recent and hopeful signs of long-term increase in Africa’s rate of development?

Long-term economic development, as opposed to shorter-term political development or even democratization and governance was the early approach of US foreign aid. This class will review some of the changing economic development paradigms. Unfortunately, today, USAID does not have an economic development policy paradigm under which the agency works.

A. History

**Required Reading:** Butterfield, Chap 11 (pps. 113-114), 12 13, 14, and 15.
Ruttan, Chap 7, 10 (pps. 301-332), 13.
“Strategies for Sustainable Development,” USAID, 1/94.
USAID Primer, pp 1-7. (Primer in this class Blackboard e-reserve is also for the rest of course.)

B. USAID Sub-Saharan Africa Programs

**Required:**
Butterfield, Chap 16

**References:**
Lancaster, C. *Aid to Africa: So Much to Do*. Chapters 2-5, 9.
President Barack Obama, Speech in Ghana, July 11, 2009.
Link to the site for the World Economic Forum (WEF) on Africa:http://www.weforum.org/events/world-economic-forum-annual-meeting-2011
USAID Participates in the 2011 AGOA Forum in Zambia,” USAID Notice, 6/9/11
“Africa, empowered,” Michael Gerson, WP, 7/1/13
“Obama Calls for a Partnership with Africa to Aid its Economy,” NYT, 7/2/13
*The Trouble with Africa*, Calderisi, Chap 4, 9, 12.

C. Economic Development Theories

References:


“Investing in Dvlp, a Practical Guide to Achieving MDGs” Rpt to UN Sec Gen, 2005

“The United States Commitment to the MDGs” USAID, 4/08


“Williamson, and the Washington Consensus,” WP, 4/21/08

“Economic Growth and the MDGs,” *ODI Briefing Paper 60, 6/10*


Guest Speaker: Dana Ott, USAID/Africa/DP

Student presentations: Rostow’s Stages of Economic Growth

Washington Consensus

Millennium Development Goals

Class 5  1940s to 2014: Changing Development Aid Techniques and Approaches. Treasury Department’s Office of Technical Assistance. USAID Educational Development Programs

(Sept 25)

This class will note selected aid techniques, not covered in depth elsewhere in the course, that fall mostly under the “development aid” category. This is an attempt to show important “nuts and bolts” of long-term development assistance. As new Congresses and new administrations with new ideas came to power, as the US government expands its aid efforts under pressure of special interest groups, as aid experts learn from past experience and experiment with new techniques, as the international political and economic environment changes, as the number of US government agencies, private philanthropies, and privet sector organization providing aid has increased, the number of development aid approaches and techniques have also increased and changed and will continue to increase and change in the future.

Achieving poverty reduction, long-term economic development, and sustainable growth are sophisticated, inter-related processes that must reflect the unique, time specific, and integrated social, economic and political life of the aided country and cannot be put into one-size-fits-all boxes. While students may initially become specialists in one or a few economic, social or political development aid techniques and approaches, to become a true international development professional, it is essential to understand the breadth of the components of international development aid and the linkages among the components. This is crucial to be able to understand the negative impact of the militarization and politicisation of foreign aid, especially since 2000, when foreign aid became a narrower tool of achieving shorter-term US national security objectives. The impact of President Obama’s second term and his new Secretary of State, John Kerry, remains to be seen.

In this class a guest speaker will cover US foreign aid carried out by U.S. Treasury Department’s Office of Technical Assistance (OTA) in such sub-specialties as budget management, tax administration,
financial institutions, government debt management, and managing financial crimes. A second guest speaker from USAID’s Educational Development Programs. Will cover USAID educational development which this professor considers the most critical sector for countries to achieve their own, long-term development goals. Unfortunately, at the present time, education is not a stated priority initiative.

A. History

**Required Reading:**
Butterfield, Chap 10-11, 14, 17.

**References:**
Ruttan, Chap 5 (86-93) 6, 8, 14 (On basic human needs, agriculture and food aid)
Rondinelli, D.A.: ”Reforming Public Administration in Post-Conflict Societies.”

B. U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Technical Assistance

**References:**
“Mission Statement,” Treasury, International Affairs, OTA, Fall 2007
“OTA Fact Sheet, 5/26/11
OTA Strategic Plan 2011-2015

C. USAID Educational Development Programs

**Required:**

**References:**
USAID Implementation Guidance for 2011 Education Strategy
“Redefining Education in the Developing World” Epstein and Yuthas, SSIR, 2012.
“A New Face of Education: Bringing Technology into the Classroom,” Brooke Shearer, 
Brookings, 1/20/12.
“A New Agenda for Education in Fragile States, Winthrop and Matsui, Brookings, 8/2013

Class 6. Agricultural Development, PL 480 Food for Peace, President Obama’s “Feed the Future” Initiative. Foreign aid carried out by the US Department of Agriculture (USDA).

(Oct. 2)
International agricultural development, food production and food security have always been one of the pillars of US foreign aid. How has the US foreign aid program planned and carried out agricultural development and food security programs in the past and what are the new approaches today. What is the changing nature of the US PL 480 and Food for Peace programs, their impact on the US domestic agriculture, and potential new legislation? How is President Obama’s “Feed the Future” Initiative different from earlier US agricultural development programs and how are old and new agricultural programs being integrated.

The engagement of non-foreign aid US agencies in providing policy advice, technical assistance and
training to its substantive counterparts in specialized international organizations, e.g., USDA with FAO and IFAD, has increased over time. There are also increasing bilateral foreign aid programs by the Departments of Justice, Labour, Transportation, Commerce, Interior, and Energy. In our last class we discussed foreign work of the US Treasury Department. This class discuses agricultural development foreign aid activities managed by USAID and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Some of the money spent overseas on international development by US domestic agencies such as USDA is provided to them through a PASA - Participating Agency Service Agreements with USAID. Other US domestic agencies carry out foreign aid activities using their own congressional budget appropriations which may or may not be included in the 150 Foreign Operations Account. These funds, therefore, may not be recorded as US ODA or controlled by, or coordinated with, overall US foreign policy and aid leadership or by US foreign affairs agencies such as the NSC, State or USAID.

Once other domestic agencies establish programs abroad and allocate staff to manage their foreign aid projects, it becomes very difficult to close them. A1994 study by OMB estimated such funding to be at least $1 billion. The US government foreign policy leadership continually attempts to find ways to coordinate and make more effective this disparate uses of US taxpayers money for U.S. foreign assistance – but it continues to be a problem. How, for example, do other US government agencies’ country selection criteria and development activities impact on overall US international development activities? Which of these many agencies on the ground represents the US to countries and international organizations overseas?

A. USDA Support to US International Agricultural Development Assistance

Required Reading:
“Roadmap to End Global Hunger,” Consortium to End Hungar in Africa, 7/2012

References:
“Role of USDA in Feed the Future,” Fact Sheet, 8/3/11

B. PL 480 Food for Peace

References:
“Reconsidering Food Aid,” Simmons, Emmy, www.africahungr.org., 2/20/07
“Monetization of Food: Reconsidering US Policy and Practice,” Simmons, E., 6/09
“Analyzing Local and Regional Procurement of Food Aid,” Cornell U., 1/12.

C. Feed the Future – President Obama’s New Initiative

Required:
“USAID’s Legacy in Agricultural Development,” USAID, November 2013

References:
“Remarks by the President at Symposium on Global Agriculture,” Washington, 5/18/12
“How USAID can engage civil society in Feed the Future,” Michael Igoe, inShare, 6/13
“Feed the Future: Progress made, Challenges,” Michael Igoe, inShare, 7/4/13

Newsletters, The Chicago Council, news@thechicagocouncil.org
”Advancing Global Food Security” Bertini and Glickman, Chicago Council, 3/13

Guest Speakers: Roger Mireles, USDA/FAS
Margaret Spears, USAID/Food Security

Student presentation: PL480/Food for Peace

Class 7


(Oct 9)

Completed mid-term Exam Papers are due at the start of this class. Answer any 3 questions - nte 2 pages per question. Optional questions:

- To what extent does the concept of American Exceptionalism apply today to the US?
- Describe the idealist and the realist approaches to US foreign policy and US foreign aid.
- What are some lessons learned over the first 50 years of providing US foreign aid?
- Discuss program policies, approaches and management of US foreign aid by the USDA.
- Discuss how local cultures and local value systems impact on achieving development.
- What lessons have we learned for today from the 1950-60 US aid program to Vietnam?
- How does longer-term US international development aid impact US national security?
- Review special challenges/approaches to US development assistance in Africa.
- Describe economic/political foreign aid paradigms under different US presidents.
- Discuss some positive, negative, and changing features of the Feed the Future Initiative.
- Discuss some positive, negative, changing features of PL 480, Food for Peace program.
- What are the latest policy issues in implementing development education programs.
- How does education/agriculture fit into the larger economic development process?

The first topic discussed in this class sessions is emergency, disaster, and humanitarian assistance. Partially as a result of more intensive media coverage, but also because of increased pressure from NGOs, the media, special interests, and increased politicization of foreign aid, larger amounts of US foreign aid has gone for emergency, disaster and humanitarian activities, at the expense of longer-term economic and institutional development. As Congress cuts funding in lean years, or for political reasons, this becomes a real, on-the-ground, development issue.

The second topic is the changing role in international development of the PVO/NGO Community. Non-profit, civil society organizations have always been part of the fabric of America. PVO/NGOs were originally mostly charity or religious organizations concerned with domestic poverty, social services and local political action. When the US foreign aid program
was created PVO/NGOs recognized the opportunity to secure US funds to carry out their activities overseas. From about zero in the 1940’s to thousands today, the number of PVO/NGOs are actively involved in a wide variety of foreign aid activities. In this class we will review the positive, negative and changing role of NGOs in foreign aid.

A. History and Mid-term Exam

Required:
Butterfield, Chap 18

B. Emergency, Disaster and Humanitarian Assistance

Required:
Hansch, S., “Humanitarian Assistance Expands in Scale and Scope,” Security by Other Means

References:
Foreign Aid in the National Interest, pps. 24-26, USAID, (on humanitarian aid)
USAID/ADS Handbook 251- International Disaster Assistance. USAID Website.
USAID Website: usaid.gov/our work/humanitarian assistance/disaster assistance.
“One year after the earthquake, foreign help is actually hurting Haiti,” WP, 1/7/11

C. Increased Influence and Activities of the PVO/NGO Community

Required:

References:
USAID/PVC, December, 2002.
“Aid NGOs under Attack,” Devex, Rolf Rosencrantz, 8/11/11
“NGO Proliferation,” Eliza Villarino, Devex, 5/11/11
Carothers, T., Aiding Democracy Abroad, Chap. 8. (On role of PVOs)
“Procurement for Country Ownership and Better Results,” Interaction, 9/12.
InterAction Newsletter, Communication@InterAction.org

Guest speakers: Mia Beers, Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance
Julien Schopp, InterAction

RIP not required for Class #7

Part II (Classes 8 - 9) 1990-2000s - Shifts in US Foreign Aid After the Collapse of the Soviet Union.

Class 8 Presidential Initiatives - GHI and HIV/AIDS; President Bush’s creation of the Millennium Challenge Corporation. Commitment to Development Index.
(Oct 16)
In this class we will cover GHI – The Global Health Initiative, originally “to be managed and
coordinated centrally by USAID.” In 2012, however, “it was decided” that each US agency involved in health and HIV-AIDS, such as USAID, HEW, State, and the Centers for Disease Control would manage its own programs and that inter-agency coordination would become a political decision controlled by the Department of State. The reasoning for this decision was a behind the scenes political decision.

We will touch briefly in the readings in Part A of this class the HIV/AIDS program managed by State Department. Under the present Obama administration, GHI and HIV-AIDS have been included in the same budget line item in the Foreign Operation Account. The 6-year GHI–Global Health Initiative is $63 billion of which $50 billion is for the HIV-AIDS programs. The HIV-AIDSpportion was cut-back in the FY 2014 budget request. In Part B. of the class we will cover the health portion of the GHI programs managed by USAID.

Among the many changes and shifts that have taken place in US foreign aid was the creation of the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) in 2002 as a new US foreign aid organization distinct from USAID. In Part C of this class we will have a guest speaker from MCC discuss the latest developments in MCC. In this class a student will present a review CGD’s “Commitment to Development Index” which compares US funding of foreign aid with funding of other OECD countries.

A. (PEPFAR) HIV/AIDS

References:
Lancaster, C., George Bush’s Foreign Aid ...., Chap.3
“Role for USAID in the fight Against HIV/AIDS” Security by Other Means, Chap. 3.
“Obama Picks Leader for Global AIDS Effort,” NYT, 4/28/09
Three Articles by Donald McNeil, NYT, 5/9/10
“US Global AIDS Chief Puts Science before Ideology,” Andrew Jack, FT, 12/09

B. Global Health Initiative

Required:

References:
Sheryl Stolberg, “Obama seeks a global health plan broader than Bush,” NYT, 5/6/09
Remarks by USAID Administrator Shah, National Institutes of Health, 2/15/2011
“Key Health Activities” USAID FrontLines, Special Edition. May 2011
“Failure to Launch: A Post-Mortem of GHI 1.0,” Amanda Glassman, CGD, 7/9/12.

C. Millennium Challenge Authority/Corporation

Required:
Title VI, Millennium Challenge Act of 2003, FSA, Sec. 601-619

References:
Lancaster, C., George Bush’s Foreign Aid, pp.15-22, 48-54.
“Mishay, B. and Frank Weibe,”Can Aid Agencies Follow Best Practices,”

D. Commitment to Development Index

Reference:
“Commitment to Development Index: 2013,” CGD.

Outside Speakers: Karen Cavanaugh, USAID Bureau of Global Health
Christopher Broughton, Millennium Development Corporation

Student Presentation: Commitment to Development Index

Class 9  

Public Institution Building, Democracy, Human Rights, Governance, and Corruption. Congressional Role in Foreign Aid Reform. OECD/DAC Peer Review of US Foreign Aid.

(Oct 23)
The US has provided technical assistance to improve public administration and government institutional management since the inception of foreign aid in the 1950s. These earlier efforts related to organizational arrangements and administrative process improvements. They did not touch upon the politics and public policies of the countries aided. Before the 1980s USAID did not take into account the important linkages among economic, institutional and political development. Earliest US foreign aid focused on economic development not taking onto account that it could not succeed without reform, as well, of institutional governance and larger political policies. With the fall of the Soviet Union in the 1990s, when former Soviet bloc countries wanted to copy the Western political and democratic model, USAID began to provide assistance for political democratization and to help governments work on political policy decisions, improve judiciary and legislative processes, focus on the rule of law, strengthen free and fair election, create and foster open public and private media, and reduce corruption. Professionals stood on both sides of the question of which came first – economic or political development? The economic success of Chinese and Asia model of development under an authoritarian government made scholars rethink earlier economic, management and political development paradigms.

Some experts have written that USAID has not done a credible job in carrying out sophisticated political democracy and governance development efforts - merely imposing a US-based
democracy template on aid-receiving countries and governments. At the same time, other experts began to believe that some parts of the world may be experiencing a democratic rollback. To what extent has the US government’s approach to democracy building been rethought as a result of the “failure of Arab Spring” - especially the upheaval in Egypt and the lack of movement in Libya? How the concept of democracy being reconsidered today is as a result of what was/is happening in the Ukraine (in early 2014).

During the 2000 U.S. Presidential campaign, candidate Bush said the US should not become involved in “nation building.” However, in his 2002 National Security Strategy (NSS) statement President Bush said he would support “the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture.” He made “democracy and freedom” key thrusts of his foreign policy. But he was strongly criticised for using “hard-power” techniques, such use of the US military, to achieve these democracy and freedom goals. His approach was also questioned because it did not take into account that democracy fits different cultures in different ways, and the necessity of bringing local leaders and the local population into the democratic development process, and that democratic development requires cooperation among citizens at all levels of government, and participation of civil society organizations, and the private sector, rather than just using US military force as the driver.

On a 2009 visit to China, Sec. of State Hillary Clinton “misspoke” by saying publicly that promoting democracy and human rights would not get in the way of the US achieving larger foreign policy objectives in dealing with China. She was charged with subsuming efforts for achieving long-term democratic governance under short-term US national security interests. This tension exists to this day with short-term goals very often driving out the longer term perspective. In September 2010, President Obama announced his new global development strategy of which one of the “core areas” was to promote democracy, human rights and good governance. Sec. State Clinton then created in State Department a new Bureau of Democracy and Human Rights? In 2013 USAID issued a new democracy development strategy that added “human rights” to “democracy” and “governance” changing DG to DRG. The new 2013 strategy affirmed DRG as integral to USAID’s overall development agenda.

To what extent are State and USAID supporting or, indeed, duplicating one another’s efforts at democratization? How has US foreign aid - by USAID, Treasury, MCC, State, etc. - approached the issues of corruption which has become a thorn in the side of democracy and governance efforts around the world - as well as negating parts of the larger economic development effort? What is the impact on USAID activities of the addition of “Human Rights” to be part of its Democracy and Governance program? It is clearly impossible to handle this topic of democracy, human rights, and governance in depth in one class subtopic but the class will establish the background for further study.

This class will also review the impact of the US Congress on US foreign aid reform through Congressional draft bills, public hearings held by Congressional committees, Congressional reports, GAO audits, and new Congressional legislation on US foreign aid policy, organization, implementation, US government coordination, and program and project evaluation. How does the Congressional Research Service impact on US foreign aid during Congressional budget
reviews, studies, and program oversight? What is the impact on aid programming of Congressional earmarks and set-asides? Foreign aid may be the only US government program where the legislative authorization process has been “temporarily” set aside and Congress moves directly to annual appropriations without a substantive authorization. Will the US Foreign Aid Legislation of 1961 ever be updated to bring US foreign aid up to date with changing world circumstances? What might new legislation look like? Again, more extensive study of this topic is up to individual student interest.

The US government is an active member of OECD/DAC which periodically reviews the foreign aid programs of all of its members. In the readings for this class students will review the 2011 – the most recent OECD/DAC Peer Review of US foreign aid.

A. Democracy, Human Rights, Governance and Corruption

Required:
“USAID Strategy on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance,” USAID, 6/13

References:
Carothers, Thomas, Aiding Democracy Abroad, 1999, Chap. 2, 5, 6, 7, 12.
Lancaster, Carol, Transforming Foreign Aid, 2000, pp. 82-87.
“Freedom’s Frontiers: Democracy and Governance Strategic Framework,” USAID, 12/05
Rendon, M., “Bringing ‘Best Value’ to Anti-corruption Approaches,” USAID/11/06
“Development,” SID Journal, Vol. 50 #1, 3/07 (Issue dedicated to Democracy)
Fukuyama, Francis, State Building, Chap 1, 2.
“Field Guide (for DG): Assistance in Civilian Law Enforcement,” USAID Website
“Democracy, Rights and Governance Conference,” Dr. Rajiv Shah, June 20, 2011
Carothers, T. and Diane De Gramont, “Development Aid Confronts Politics,” 2013

B. Congress and Foreign Aid Reform

Required:
Flickner, C. ““Removing Impediments to an Effective Partnership with Congress,” Security by Other Means, Chap 8.

References:
HFAC Committee Chair Berman on HR 2139, 4/28/09.
Senators Dodd, Durbin and Cardin Resolution to Strengthen USAID, 10/13/09
HR 2139 Proposed Foreign Assistance Legislation, 111 Cong, 1st. Sess.
Part III of this course covers the period from the collapse of the former Soviet Union beginning around 2000 and foreign aid reforms introduced by Presidents Bush (2) and Obama and Secretaries of State Rice, Clinton and Kerry. With increased US military involvement in nation building pushed by former Sec. Defense Rumsfeld in the early days of the Bush (2) administration, USAID and DoD efforts came to overlap in Iraq, Pakistan and Afghanistan. At the beginning of this period President Bush wrote his 2002 National Security Strategy Statement. President Obama’s reforms began with his 2010 Global Development Policy (GDP). Hillary Clinton’s reforms were initiated through her 2010 Quadrennial Diplomatic and Development Review (QDDR) – which is today being reconsidered. Development professionals are hoping that Sec. of State John Kerry will introduce reforms more favorable to foreign aid policy and management by implementing ideas in the foreign aid legislation he proposed while he was the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The present USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah has introduced reforms under his “USAID Forward.” However, he brought to USAID many views learned while he worked at the Gates Foundation, which I believe do not apply to the US government’s foreign aid organization.

(Oct. 30.)
Class 10. While President Bush (2) made “democracy and freedom” a key thrust of his foreign policy, he has been criticized for his use, and for the use by his Sec. Defense, Rumsfeld, and Sec. of State Rice of “hard-power” to achieve these goals. In moving in this direction President Bush did not seem to have learned lessons from earlier US civilian/military failed efforts in Vietnam. The actions by Rumsfeld and Rice sublimated longer-term economic development in favor of achieving shorter-term national security objectives. Sec. of State Rice brought USAID under the policy and management control of State Department by elimination of USAID’s Policy and Planning Office and moving most of these planning and budgeting functions into the newly created State/F. After these action by DoD and State, USAID became the headless arms and legs of the Department of State. The ground rules put in place by President Bush and his administration, made it difficult for President Obama to change U.S. foreign policy and the approach to foreign aid when he came on board. This difficulty to change was further impacted on by sharp differences the Democrats had with the Republican majority in the House of Representatives.

What was the relationship between the U.S. military’s 12-year counterinsurgency efforts in Afghanistan to USAID’s attempted long-term approach to political, institutional, social and
economic development reform? Why was General Patraeus’s counterinsurgency (COIN) a failure in Afghanistan? What might the US foreign aid program look like in Afghanistan after 2014 when the US military is scheduled to pull out? How should concepts of local civilian community security and democratic policing replace DoD’s military led counter-insurgency approach in Afghanistan?

A. US National Security and Foreign Aid Policy and Programs under former President G.W. Bush and Sec. of State Condolezza Rice

**Required:**


**References:**


DFA and State/F Documents in Blackboard e-reserves, such as:
- “New Directions for US Foreign Assistance,” Sec. State Rice, State Dept. 1/19/06

B. USAID and DoD Programs in Afghanistan

**Required:**


**References:**


“Governance in Afghanistan: Looking Ahead to What We Leave Behind,” Cookman and Wadhams, Center for American Progress, May 2010.


SPRT 112-21-1, Connie Veillette, Director of the Foreign Aid Reform Blog, CGD.


*FrontLines*, Special Issue on Afghanistan, 1/11.

C. Community Policing, Local Security and Governance

**References:**

“Program aims to rebuild Afghan police force, repair its image,” NYT, Jaffe, 3/12/10.

Guest Speakers: Alan Van Egmond, USAID AfPak Bureau
                      Eric Beinhart, DoJ/ICITAP
Student final paper teams submit a one-page outline of their final reform paper, with initial bibliography.

Class 11. National security and foreign aid policy, planning and implementation reforms under President Obama, Secretary of State Clinton, Secretary of State Kerry and USAID Administrator Rajiv Shah. 2009-2013 
(Nov 6)
In 2008 Barak Obama became President. Obama appointed Hillary Clinton as his first Secretary of State. President Obama submitted his first Foreign Operations Budget request to the Congress for FY 2010. In the introduction to the budget request Obama wrote that this was the beginning of a new “Era of Responsibility” for the United States. President Obama and Sec. State Clinton called to “merge, consolidate, and reorganize the federal government” in international affairs. In September 2010 at the United Nations meeting in New York Obama presented his new Global Development Strategy. In December 2010 Hillary Clinton published her Quadrennial Diplomatic and Development Review (QDDR). According to Obama PR staff these were the first Presidential and first State Department long term diplomatic and development strategy statements ever produced by the US government. There is disagreement among professional development personnel with these statements certainly with regard to Obama’s Development Strategy.

In February 2010, one year into the Obama administration, Rajiv Shah came on as the new Administrator for USAID. In September 2010, Administrator Shah created a new USAID Office of Program, Policy and Learning (PPL) to replace the Office of Program and Policy Coordination (PPC) which had been eliminated by Bush/Rice. And Shah created a new Budget and Resource Management Office (BRM), the function which used to be part of the former PPC which had also been deleted along with PPC by Bush/Rice. What is the present relationship between USAID’s new Office of Program Planning and Learning (PPL) and USAID’s new Budget and Resource Management Office (BRM) to one another, to the rest of the agency, and to the State Department Planning Office (State/S), State Department’s Office of Foreign Assistance (State/F) created by the QDDR and State Departments Office of Resource and Management (State/SP)? Many in the professional development community including many USAID staff, and indeed, some State Department staff, feel that President Obama and Sec. State Clinton continued the Bush/Rice administrative approach of State Department control over USAID development planning, budgeting and program implementation.
Among other things, Administrator Shah initiated his “USAID Forward” reforms of USAID. How important or effective has been Administrator Shah’s “USAID Forward” effort. We will review other program reforms introduced by Shah including his emphasis on innovation and science and technology. What new ideas has John Kerry introduced to improve foreign aid management since he was appointed Secretary of State during President Obama’s second term? Recall that when Kerry was Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he introduced legislation which, if passed by Congress, would have strengthened USAID enabling it once again to become the world leader in international foreign aid.

By the time of this class, it is appropriate to remind students that the goal of this course is for students to understand how USAID has been reformed up to now, and to come up by the end of the course with new ideas for further improved reform.

A. President Obama’s Ideas for Foreign Aid Reform - 2008-11

Required:
Remarks by the President on a US Global Development Policy at UNMDG, 9/23/10.

References:
“On a new beginning,” Obama Speech at the University of Cairo, 6/4/09.
“Fact Sheet: US Global Development Policy,” White House, 9/22/10
“Trip Treats Africa as Land of Promise, “M. D. Shear, NYT, 7/2/13,

B-I Secretary of State Clinton Ideas Effecting Foreign Aid – 2009-12

Required:
“QDDR Executive Summary,” State Department 12/10

References:
“Leading Through Civilian Power,” Clinton, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 89 #6, 11/10
“Briefing by Anna Marie-Slaughter on release of QDDR,” State, 12/15/10
State Clinton announces the creation of the QDDR, 7/13/09
“QDDR Fact Sheet,” State, 12/10
“Weighing an Ambitious QDDR,” CFR, 12/16/10

B-II. Secretary of State Kerry’s Ideas Effecting Foreign Aid-2013

References:
Confirmation Statement of Senator Kerry for SFRC, 1/24/13
John Kerry. “Remarks at the USAID Headquarters,” 2/15/13
Address at the University of Virginia, John Kerry, 2/20/13

C. USAID Administrator Shah’s Ideas for Foreign Aid Reform – 2010-14

Required:

References:
USAID General Notice, “Establishment of PPL,” 6/7/10
“Moving Forward,” Shah at Center for Global Development, 1/19/11.
“Rajiv Shah Names Challenges as USAID Administrator” Deve, 6/16/11
Shah, Commencement Address at American University, AU/SIS, 3/12/12.
“Remarks by USAID Administrator Dr. Rajiv Shah “Aspen Institute. 8/1/12
“Shah’s Third Annual Letter,” May 15, 2014
Guest speakers: Matt Walsh, State/SP
Larry Garber, USAID/PPL

Class 12. USAID’s Revised Budget Resource Management Office, Shah’s Focus on Science and Technology, and Implementation of President Obama’s Climate Initiative
(Nov 13)
This class will review the foreign aid budget authorization and appropriation processes and the role of USAID’s Budget Resources Management Office (BRM) in managing USAID’s portion of the 150 Foreign Operations Budget Account. Before 2006 BRM was part of USAID’s Program and Planning Office (PPC) before both were abolished by former Sec. of State Rice and both functions were moved to the new Dep. Sec. State for Foreign Assistance (State/F). Under Administrator Shah BRM was recreated as an independent budget unit reporting directly to him. But not part of PPL – USAID’s new planning office also re-established under Shah.

This class will review ideas and programs resulting from the creation by Administrator Shah of the Office of Science and Technology (OST) and the Office of Innovation and Development Alliances (IDEA) which were then both combined and included in USAID’s Global Development Lab. The Lab was launched by Administrator Shah to develop and scale up new solutions to global change focusing on science and technology but including prior function such the Global Development Alliance which stressed working with and developing the local private sector. Most of the “new” ideas stressed by the IDEA Bureau and Global Development Lab approaches are all useful but very narrow and do not take into account the other sophisticated elements of an effective social and economic development program.

Leading the international efforts to combat global climate change and prepare for its impacts as part of President Obama new initiative on environment and climate change was assigned to USAID for implementation. USAID has been slow to start up its work on climate change.

A. USAID new Office of Budget and Resource Management
Required:
John Kerry’s Statement on the 2014 Foreign Operations Budget Request.
References:
Ruttan, pps. 116-119.
Lancaster, C. “Transforming Foreign Aid,” Chapter 3.
B. Learning Lab and Emphasis on Science and Technology
Required:
Aligning the Goals of Business and Development,” Maura O’Neill, IDEA, 3/12
References:
“Development Innovation Ventures,” Fact Sheet, USAID/DIV, Undated

22
FY2011 Global Development Alliance Annual Programs Statement and RFP, 2/29/12.
“Is corporate social responsibility (CSR) profitable for companies?” Floyd Whaley, InShare0, 2/20/13.

C. President Obama’s Climate Initiative

**Required:**
USAID Climate Change and Development Policy, 1/13
Global Climate Change Initiative, GCC Trifold Brochure, USAID, 10/30/13.

**References:**
“Kerry Quietly Makes Priority of Climate Pact,” C. Davenport, NYT, 1/2/14.
Global Climate Change Initiative in 2015 Budget Request to the Congress, 3/2/14
“Climate Study Puts Diplomatic Pressure on Obama.” C. Davenport, NYT, 3/31/14
“Obama Pursuing Climate Accord in Lieu of Treaty,” Coral Davenport, 8/26/14
www.usaid.gov/climate

**Guest Speakers:** Director, USAID Budget Management Office
Ricardo Mitchel, USAID/IDEA

**Part IV.**

**Classes 13/14. Student, ThinkTank, and Academic Proposals for US Foreign Aid Reform**
(Dec 20/Dec 4)

**A. Examples of Prior Student US Foreign Aid Reform Proposals to the President**
- Amend/reauthorize Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to clarify goals and objectives.
- Improve coordination and dialogue on foreign aid between the US Exec Branch and the Congress.
- Better integrate programs of economic development with programs that improve political democracy and government institutional effectiveness.
- Better integrate MCC and PEPFAR with other parts of the US foreign aid program.
- Reform educational, health, agricultural and/or other sectoral aid program policies and management so they better respond to US foreign policy goals.
- Improve coordination of foreign aid policy and programs among USG domestic agencies such as Treasury, Agriculture, Commerce, Education, Peace Corps, etc.
- Improve coordination of US foreign aid with aid provided by other international donors.
- Improve coordination among disaster, humanitarian, reconstruction, development aid.
- Clarify distinctive roles of US agencies responsible for each of the three “Ds.”
- Improve the US aid program’s ability to “win the hearts and minds” in the Muslim world.
- Increase the size and role of USAID direct hire staff and reduce the large number of private sector mega-contractors.
- Expand the role and use of Third Country Nationals in USAID field missions.
- Redesign economic development policies following the 2008/09 world financial crises and the 2010/11 economic debt crises.
- Increase the role and responsibility of aid-receiving countries for preparing their own development programs.
- Combatting “hard” and “soft” corruption in Higher Education development programs.
- USAID’s Climate Change Program Needs Reform

B. **Examples of Earlier Action Memoranda to the President,**
   (See Class Black Board)

C. **Think Tank, Academic, and Other Proposals for US Foreign Aid Reform**
The development Think Tank and academic communities were very active during President Bush’s second term recommending that his Administration reverse the reforms made earlier by his Secretary of State Rice. The Think Tank community and others were much more reserved during the first term of President Obama hoping that he would come up with his own reforms. They supported his September 22, 2010, Global Development Strategy but were concerned that Secretary of State Clinton had been holding USAID back from fully implementing Obama’s 2010 strategy. More proposed reforms were written and published during President Obama’s second term.

**References:**
Rosenthal, I., Summary of paper for 2004 Kerry Presidential Campaign, “Rethinking the role of international development assistance.”
McPherson and Atwood, “Helping to Enhance the Livelihood of People around the Globe Commission, 10/15/07
Andrew Natsios, “The Clash of the Counter-bureaucracy and Development,” CGD, 7/13/10
“Aid for a Purpose: Show Me the Goal, Then Show Me the Money,” C. Veillette, CGD 3/11
“6 big development business themes in 2012,” Devex, Pete Troilo, 12/17/12
“From Policy to Practice,” MFAN, 5/12
“Charting a New Path for Foreign Assistance in the Middle East and North Africa,” MFAN.
“USAID: Destined to Disappoint,” Kate Almquist Knopf, CGD, 8/2/13
RIPs not required for Classes 13/14
Class 15. US aid relationships with International Development Donors (IFI). Overall Effectiveness of US Foreign Aid.

(Dec 11)
The first focus of this final course session is on policy and program changes made within international development organizations (IO) and international financial organizations (IFI) of which the US is a member. We will review the work of the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to whom this Professor was the USAID representative and the World Bank to which one of our guest speakers will be from the Office of the US Executive Director to the World Bank. We will review changing policy developments and financial roles of these agencies and the changing US attitudes toward them. We may have come full circle in the role of bilateral foreign aid compared to the work of IFIs when a Financial Times editorial (1/23/05) suggested that “(T)he world has come to a ... consensus that certain <problems> ... deserve stronger outside action ... But the right instrument for such ... intervention is the United Nations <and other international aid organizations>, not one of its members ...” In 2006/7/8 there were suggestions to diminish the mandate and role of the World Bank and IMF. After the 2008/9 world financial crises, this attitude was reversed and there were calls, instead, to strengthen the World Bank and IMF and to expand their activities beyond the original Bretton Woods mandate. Such activities have been initiated. Each of the World Bank and IMF Presidents has brought his/her own approach to reforming the role and approach of the organization. In this class we will consider some of the reform ideas of the new World Bank President, Jim Yong Kim.

The second and final focus of this class and this course will be the question of determining and measuring the effectiveness of foreign aid and how results, outcomes and outputs are evaluated. This question is not so much about project level input/output ratios but whether US aid has been effective in achieving larger macro-development and higher level political and foreign policy goals. An understanding of US foreign aid policies and implementation processes needs to take into account reforms made and proposed over time, throughout the larger US foreign aid community, as well as the private, non-governmental, institutional sectors, and with IFIs. The 2009 Kerry-Lugar draft foreign aid bill paid particular attention to monitoring and evaluation. However, USAID Administrator Shah may have gone too far in insisting on results, results, and narrowly quantifying and evaluating foreign aid.

A. Coordination with IOs/IFIs

References:
Ruttan, Chap 11 (pps. 348-380, Chap 12 (pps. 381-436)
Cohn, T.H., Global Political Economy, 2/22/12, pp 369-375, 393-400
“Multilateralism and the Role of the IMF in the (2008/09) Global Financial Crises,”
Dominique Strauss-Kahn, IMF Managing Director, 4/23/09 at SAIS.
“To Avoid a Lost Decade, Look to the Developing World,” Robert Zoelick, FT, 5/25/10
“The World Bank as a Foundation? Why I’m Scratching My Head over the World Bank’s New Vision ” Todd Moss, 4/7/11
“Five ways Largarde can rescue the IMF,” FT, 5/29/11
“Why We Still Need the World Bank,” President of World Bank. Annual Address, 2/27/12
“My call for an open, inclusive World Bank, “Jim Yong Kim, FT, 3/28/12
“World Bank portfolio and staff ‘re-mapping’ finalized,” Paul Stephens, Devex, 6/12

B. Effectiveness of International Development Assistance

Required:

“Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness: Ownership, Harmonization, Alignment, Results and Mutual Accountability,” OECD High Level Forum, 2/28-3/2/05.
“Busan Partnership for Effective Development Partnership,” Busan, 11/30/11

References:
“Initiative to Revitalize Evaluation in USAID,” Natsios, General Notice 7/8/05
“Strengthening Evaluation at USAID,” USAID General Notice, 11/10/08
“Foreign Assistance Revitalization and Accountability Act of 2009,” S.1524,
“Evaluation of the Paris Declaration: Phase 2, Final Report,” 5/11,
Cassen, Robert and Associates, Does Aid Work, Intro., Chap 10.
“Department of State Program Evaluation Policy,” 2/12.

Outside Speakers: The Office of the US Executive Director to the World Bank Group
: Director of State Department Evaluation Unit
RIP not required for Class 15.

SUMMARY OF CLASS BOOKS IN AU LIBRARY BOOK RESERVE

Carothers T., Revitalizing Democracy Assistance: The Challenge of USAID, Carnegie, 2009
Carothers, T. and Diane De Gramont, Development Aid Confronts Politics, Carnegie, 2013
NRA, *The Fundamental Role of Science and Technology in International Development*, 2006

COMMISSIONS THAT HAVE REVIEWED THE US FOREIGN AID PROGRAM
Report to Committee on Foreign Affairs,”Economic Assistance: Ways to Reduce the Reprogramming Notification Burden and Improve Congressional Oversight.” GAO, 9/89.
“Beyond Assistance: The HELP Comm. on Foreign Assistance Reform, 12/7/07

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY CODE
“Standards of academic conduct are set forth in the University's Academic Integrity Code. By registering, you have acknowledged your awareness of the Academic Integrity Code, and you are obliged to become familiar with your rights and responsibilities as defined by the Code. Violations of the Academic Integrity Code will not be treated lightly, and disciplinary actions will be taken should such violations occur. Please see me if you have any questions about the academic violations described in the Code in general or as they relate to particular requirements for this course.”

Revision as of August 28, 2014
Professor Irving Rosenthal, PhD

EXPERIENCE  Senior, long-term, US government policy, management, and evaluation practitioner in international economic and social development and US foreign aid management. Specialist in governance, democratization, and institution building in new market-oriented economies. Expert in national economic strategic planning, budget policy, and management. Minister-Counselor in US Foreign Service and USAID field Mission Director. Six long-term, overseas assignments in Turkey (Public Administration), Tunisia (Program Officer), Ivory Coast (Deputy Director for Sahel and West Africa), Italy (US representative to international food agencies), Niger (USAID Mission Director) and Lithuania (Budget Policy and Management Advisor to Ministry of Finance). Short term consultant in over 30 countries with concentrations in Africa, the Middle East, and transition countries of former Soviet Union on such subjects as health, family planning, environmental protection, private sector, education and agricultural development.

In USAID/Washington held positions including Evaluation Coordinator on Development Management in the Center for Development Information and Evaluation, Coordinator for US Contributions to International Organizations in the Office of Program and Policy Coordination, Deputy Director of the Office for Sahel and West African Affairs, Budget Chief for preparation of USAID’s annual budget to OMB and the Congress, and Management Analyst in USAID’s Office of Management Planning. Examiner of US international programs in President’s Office of Management and Budget.


B.S., Industrial Management, City University of New York, 1952.

TEACHING  Planning, programming, budgeting, economic development management at George Washington U. Guest Lecturer on foreign aid at Georgetown, Michigan, Princeton, Johns Hopkins University (Italy), and University of Vilnius in Lithuania. Advisor to students working on PhD dissertation in economic development. Recommended Lithuanian who won a graduate Fulbright Scholarship in economics to the United States.