The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training
Foreign Affairs Oral History Program
Foreign Assistance Series

PAULA GODDARD

Interviewed by: Carol Peasley
Initial interview date: March 15, 2023

This oral history transcription was made possible through support provided by U.S. Agency for International Development, under terms of Fixed Amount Award No. 7200AA21FA00043. The opinions expressed herein are those of the interviewee and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development or the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Secondment to FAO/Rome (1982 – 1983)
- Conversion from AD to FS-L Status

USAID/Ecuador, Project Development Officer 1990 – 1994
- Conversion from FSL to FS-1 Commissioned Officer
- Agency "Managing for Results" Experiment and Strategic Objective Teams
- Strong Foreign Service National Team

AID/Washington, Deputy Executive Secretary 1994 – 1996
- Political Tensions within the Agency
- Paper and Decision-making

Senior Seminar, Student 1996 – 1997
- Leadership
- Value of Training for Staff

USAID/Slovakia, Mission Director 1997 – 2000
- Mission Moving Toward "Graduation" and Closeout Mandate
- 1998 Election of Political Reformers
- "Graduation" Debate
- Defining a Post-Presence Program
- Anti-corruption Efforts

Retire from USAID (2000) and Become Anti-Corruption Consultant 2000 – 2003
- Corruption Assessments
- Armenia
- Finding Islands of Integrity and Building on Them

ARD/TetraTech, Vice-President 2003 – 2018
- Colombia Projects
- Change Management
- Localization – Recognizing Local Dynamics and Pressures on Local Actors
- Wrap-up Thoughts

INTERVIEW

Q: Today is March 15, 2023, and this is Carol Peasley for interview number one with Paula Goddard. Paula, we are delighted to have this chance to interview you. Perhaps you can start by telling us where you were born, where you grew up, as well as a bit about your childhood and family.

Childhood, Education, Family, and Early Background

GODDARD: Okay. Thank you, Carol. I am looking forward to this very much - it's an exercise in my memory and in my ability to not just sit here and say, "And then I did that, and I was so surprised, and then I did that, and I was so surprised," so I'm going to try and not be surprised at anything I did as I talk about my life and surprising career.

My father, Paul Oppermann, born in 1903, was from a German American family in Saginaw, Michigan. He had five brothers and one sister, living in a big house with a third floor used for making music; each member either played an instrument, or sang, or in the case of my Aunt Helen, danced. The prosperous family fur business unfortunately failed in the Depression years. As a result, my father dropped out of the University of Michigan in his last year of the architecture program and went to Chicago to find a job in an architecture firm – starting with erasing drawings from the linen sheets which were used and reused by the architects.

As the Roosevelt administration progressed federal jobs opened, and my father took a position at the Tennessee Valley Authority, in Johnson City. Later he moved to the Federal Works Agency in Washington DC, which is where I was born in 1944.

My mother was from an old New England family, one of four sisters, all of whom graduated from college in the early 1930's. My aunt Margot Cutter, with a master's in fine arts from NYU, worked at Princeton University and later signed up for the Red Cross and drove an ambulance in World War II. She then joined the predecessor to the United States Information Agency (USIA) and eventually became a career officer. I believe she was the first woman to reach the rank of FS-01 in USIA. So, when you ask about influences, she was a major one and she'll pop up in several places.

We spent my first four and a half, almost five years in Washington. Then in 1949 my father landed a big job in San Francisco, as the Director of the City Planning Commission. So, like the original 49'ers, we moved west.

Q: Please tell us more about his background as an architect.

GODDARD: Well, it's interesting. My father never finished his bachelor's degree in the 1930's but he built an impressive career without it. He moved away from architecture per se, into regional planning, becoming an internationally recognized planner, a professor at MIT and ultimately a USAID contractor; in 1969 as a consultant, he drew up a Master Plan for the city of Saigon! (I always felt my own career trajectory slightly mirrored that of my father's, in that whatever success I achieved, was without the impressive academic credentials of many of my peers.)

In San Francisco, we moved into Park Merced (a development exactly like McLean Gardens where we had lived in Washington DC) right on the edge of San Francisco State College. And there was a temporary little elementary school on the campus of San Francisco State where I went to school.

Q: The Lab School. My aunt used to teach there. (Laughs)

GODDARD: What I remember is I lived to go to school and ballet. When we arrived in San Francisco someone gave me a big picture book of Maria Tallchief, who was a famous native American ballerina. I was in love with Maria Tallchief, and I was in love with ballet. I pestered my parents until they gave me lessons. I started out around age four, in a little neighborhood ballet school, and then they moved me to the school downtown that was associated with the San Francisco Ballet Company.

For the next ten years of my life I was an aspiring ballerina, performing in the annual production of the Nutcracker Suite. We lived in a foggy area of San Francisco. My mother worked in Berkeley and my older sister went to school there. My father went downtown every day – they all got the sunny parts of San Francisco; I saw lots of fog except on my frequent bus rides to ballet class. At a very young age, I got on the Muni bus, paying my dime, three times a week, and on Saturday mornings to Sutro's for ice skating. Sunday afternoon was learning to ride horses at the Mar Vista Stables overlooking the Pacific Ocean, and finally, my mother's favorite, piano lessons, preparing me to become a proper young lady.

Q: You started at the Lab School at San Francisco State?

GODDARD: Yes, then in seventh grade I moved to a junior high school off Ocean Avenue, Aptos Junior High.

Q: And did you go to high school in San Francisco as well?

GODDARD: I went one semester of ninth grade downtown at Lowell High School, the public college prep high school, before we moved again.

My parents were rather formal and a bit old fashioned —my father was forty-two when I was born. My mother had an amazing education. She and her sisters attended school in France and Italy in the late 1920's and they were all fluent in both languages. She believed in good manners, being well-educated and culturally sophisticated, having good taste and knowing which length of glove to wear at what time of the day….

Q: (Laughs) I should add that in those days, because I was also a little kid there at that time, when you went into downtown San Francisco you wore gloves.

GODDARD: You wore gloves and had a hat. And the biggest outing of all was, I don't know if you remember, I think it was I. Magnin or Best & Company at Union Square where they had little coats for little girls.

For my parents San Francisco life centered around my father's job and the political dynamics surrounding his work. I don't recall my family being fans of any sports teams, but Franklin Roosevelt had always been a hero. My father was involved with Mayors, and with the business community and developers, in his city planning role. Discussions at home leaned heavily into politics. My father was a good politician in the sense that he

had a very gregarious personality and got along well with people. He had an aesthetic sensibility and was conscious of good design. But he was perhaps a little naïve about the powerful economic and political forces that challenged his positions, and he lost some big policy battles over the years. He had wanted to issue a bond to construct another bridge across the San Francisco Bay near San Jose. They never put the bond issue out, the bridge was never built, and ultimately that year he left and returned to Chicago for another big job.

Q: This wasn't the San Mateo Bay Bridge?

GODDARD: No; they never built his bridge. However, in time, Mother Nature rectified another of his failed initiatives in the 1950's. To alleviate traffic congestion coming into the city, a new freeway along the Bay was needed. For aesthetic reasons he proposed an expensive plan to locate part of the new freeway underground. He lost the fight, and the highway was built above ground. An eyesore, it passed right in front of the iconic Ferry Building, obscuring it from view.

However, this time he ultimately won, albeit posthumously. The 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake brought the Embarcadero Freeway tumbling down, reduced it to rubble, and the scenic view of the Ferry Building was restored for all to enjoy to this day.

In those days my father hosted city planners from everywhere. My fond childhood memory is sitting quietly under the piano and watching slide shows of famous cities in every part of the world.

I should mention that my parents went to an international City Planners' convention on the island of Ischia in 1955 where my father was one of the keynote speakers. I don't know if you know the actor, Kevin Bacon, who has the Hollywood game about "six degrees of separation from Kevin Bacon." Well, I'm three degrees of separation from Kevin Bacon. My father, Director of City Planning for San Francisco, and Kevin's father, Edmund Bacon, Director of the Philadelphia Planning Commission, shared the stage at that conference and were lifelong friends. So, my dad moved me into heady circles.

Our next move was back to Chicago where Mayor Daley and others were establishing a regional planning commission, perhaps the first in the country, for the six counties around Chicago: The Northeast Illinois Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (NIMAPC), and my father was appointed Director. My mother was a Northwestern University graduate and was familiar with Evanston so that's where they bought a house.
I entered Evanston Township High School (ETHS) in the fall of 1958.

ETHS was recognized as an excellent public high school. But the move wasn't good for me. Coming from a cosmopolitan big city into a suburb with political, social and even racial dynamics that I did not understand, I found it hard to fit in. I teetered between being an honors student and an adolescent in full rebellion. As an adult I look back on those years and understand the context much better but at the time I was baffled by my new environment. An occasional cross burning, the YMCA for whites only

(the teen room was named “the Plantation”), some poor friend choices, and a less than stellar academic performance, put me solidly in the middle of my 1962 graduating class.

By contrast, my next four years at the University of Wisconsin in Madison were really some of the happiest moments of my life. I loved it. I was a history major, an art history minor. I joined the sorority that was my first choice. It was a great sorority. A wonderful, eclectic group of smart, interesting, friendly girls. Jay Rockefeller came to campus to pitch the Peace Corps and several in the sorority eventually signed up. Madison in the early 1960’s was an odd mix of traditional college life and simmering social awareness.

The civil rights movement was taking shape on campus, and I was deeply attracted to the message. I was a sorority girl with a Delta Gamma pin. I was not out in the streets doing protests. But in my heart, I identified with the cause. I even got into some trouble with my sorority alumni for rushing Pam McAllister, a Black girl, a friend from my Evanston High School Dance Group. At that time Wisconsin’s sororities were segregated and Delta Gamma had never pledged any minorities. I lobbied to become the first chapter to do so but was unsuccessful. I was called before the DG national alums to apologize. Pam went on to an illustrious journalism career as editor of an important upstate New York newspaper. She didn’t need the DG’s.

My parents made another move in 1964. After six years in the Chicago position my father accepted a post at MIT, a prestigious position for someone without a college degree. They moved to Cambridge, Massachusetts and my father joined two other colleagues in forming an international consulting firm. Their first contract was with the Libyan government to develop a Master Plan for the city of Benghazi. (This later proved to be another point of connection between his and my career journeys.)

Q: This was also the period that the Vietnam War protests were beginning and then the feminist movement. All those things festered together.

GODDARD: Student activism about the Vietnam war started while I was in college. “Sit -ins “and “teach-ins’ were organized on campus beginning in 1965. The draft intensified in 1966. A dear friend from ETHS, Robert Scott, visited me in Washington DC on his way to Viet Nam as a fighter pilot. He arrived in Vietnam on June 2, 1968, and on June 25, 1968, he was shot down and killed over Binh Dinh province. The bombing of the physics department at the University of Wisconsin took place in August 1970.

Feminism was also emerging at that time, and I will come back to it when I talk about Arvonne Fraser and the early days of Women in Development (WID) at USAID.

Q: Okay. You said you majored in history. What was your area of specialization?

GODDARD: My advisor was Professor George Mosse. He was born in Berlin to a newspaper family, then fled the Nazis in the 1930s to Switzerland, the UK and ultimately the United States, to Madison in 1955. I had little appreciation at the time for his importance as a scholar, but his teaching of European cultural and social history was an

absolute joy for his students. Then there was Professor Harvey Goldberg, whose lectures on the French Revolution were so popular they were moved to the largest lecture hall on campus in the Agriculture College. When he took the podium and took off his glasses to speak, a hush fell, and he launched into spell-binding talks that are still available (bootlegged) on YouTube. I mean, this was intellectual stimulation/pleasure akin to a Carnegie Hall concert. And finally, Art History with the legendary Professor James Watrous. My four semesters of his courses, combined with summer travel to Europe my freshman and sophomore years, provided me with a basis for appreciating the arts I am grateful for to this day.

I received an outstanding liberal arts education at the University of Wisconsin. I feel fortunate to have experienced the kind of intellectual growth and political awakening nascent in those fervent times as well as warm and embracing friendships that I did not develop in high school. I discovered my taste for leadership in the sorority. I learned I was internationally inclined in the tradition of my parents. While this part of my formal education did not provide a practical path toward a particular career, it molded my values and tapped into a vein of aspiration to "do good" (the Delta Gamma motto) in the world.

When I finished college in 1966 my parents had moved to Cambridge, Massachusetts. I had a hard time leaving Madison. Most of my friends stayed in the Midwest, many in the Chicago area. I had no ties to Boston and no concrete plans for my future. My cousin Margot (yes named after that aunt), graduated from Wellesley College the same year. She was starting at Harvard Law School in the fall. But most of her Wellesley College friends were living in Cambridge and attending a Katie Gibbs secretarial school. I mention that because it is indicative of the contradictions and limitations women at that time experienced. Traditional gender roles were evolving but clerical jobs, nursing and teaching were still the preferred route for many women. Some, like my cousin, the daughter of two lawyers, pushed those boundaries. But there were few like her at the time.

I moved back in with my parents. Through my mother's administrative position at Tufts New England Medical Center, I got a summer job as a receptionist in a clinic that Tufts University established with War on Poverty funding, in an isolated, run-down East Boston housing development called Columbia Point. Just the daily walk from the subway to the clinic was to witness the random violence and abject poverty of the Boston "projects" in the mid 1960's.

Jay Rockefeller had mentioned VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America) in his visit to campus, so I applied. The position I was offered was teaching migrant workers in California's Central Valley. I was attracted to the teaching aspect, but I knew I was not cut out for the intense heat and rugged living conditions. So, I turned down the invitation to VISTA and applied to Boston University's (BU's) one-year Master of Education program. I was surprised to be accepted and even more surprised to run into Harlan Philippi, the Dean of BU's School of Education, on the day I turned in my application, and he offered me a tuition-free Graduate Assistantship working in his office, on the spot.

BU was a rather dry experience. I found the education courses too theoretical without a significant grounding in the tools and tradecraft of classroom teaching. I had hoped to focus on Urban Education and planned to find a job in the inner city. Remarkably, at that time BU had no such program. The School of Education had no ties with the Boston school system, and I ended up doing my student teaching in a small rural town in central Massachusetts. I learned enough to think of myself as a teacher, if not actually function as one.

1967 Teaching in Washington, DC

My next move was back to Washington, DC to teach in the DC public school system. I was offered a position at MacFarland Junior High, located at 7th and Varnum Streets NW, adjacent to Roosevelt High School. The 950 students and most of the 55 teachers were Black, the Principal was White. The neighborhood was in transition, with mostly low-income families. I taught World History, American History, Civics, and Geography to seventh, eighth and ninth graders. It was a tough environment for a twenty-three-year-old inexperienced teacher. I faced many of the issues of today's urban schools just without guns. In April of my first year, Martin Luther King was assassinated, and Washington DC saw heartbreaking riots in many parts of the city, including the neighborhood surrounding my school.

One anecdote from this period. I had identified one student as troubled - but with some potential – who was sixteen and in my eighth-grade class. He was a charming kid named James Randolph, with a street name of Black Jesus, probably gang related. I was able to enroll him in a special National Institutes of Health (NIH) after-school youth enrichment program. On the morning in April 1968 when the Washington DC riots broke out, the school fire alarm went off, students ran out and outsiders ran into the school. They set off fires in the bathrooms and there was smoke filling the halls; people broke into a liquor store across the street and the parking lot was filling with rioters. James Randolph, Black Jesus, saw me through a window in my first-floor classroom, unable to get out of the school. He ran through the smoke, put his trench coat over my head, moved me through the crowd, out to my car in the parking lot, where he patted the back of my little VW bug and said, "Get going Miss Oppermann!" I headed out onto the street amid the chaos and promptly ran into another car at the corner. Mr. McClain, our basketball coach watching from the gym, came running out to the street, pulled my car off the other car, patted my little VW on the fender and said, "Get going Miss Oppermann."

But I was all in. I was all in. The next week, when they reopened the DC schools, I went back. I taught for the remainder of the semester, and I went back the following year.

1969 Joining the Peace Corps

I had a boyfriend, and the boyfriend was having some issues with his draft board. He received one deferment to get a Master's Degree, another one for teaching in a New Hampshire High School. In 1969 we figured that maybe we were going to be a couple; we both had teaching experience, so we decided to get married and join the Peace Corps

for that final deferment. We were first offered volunteer positions in Afghanistan, which we turned down. The second Peace Corps offer was to Libya…where my father had worked as a consultant. In the summer of 1969, we got married in Woods Hole, Massachusetts and immediately flew to Bisbee, Arizona, where we had three months of Peace Corps/Libya training in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) and Arabic language, taught by 40 Libyan school teachers sent to the US by their government to learn English from us. Every day, we had Arabic training in the morning, and practiced teaching English to the Libyans in the afternoon.

At the end of twelve weeks of training in Bisbee, we were preparing to get on the plane for Tripoli, when (surprise), there was a coup d'etat. Colonel Gaddafi came to power, banished King Idris, closed all American programs and Peace Corps/ Libya ended. We were fully trained, 2-plus in Arabic, and going nowhere. Peace Corps/Washington reassigned some of our training group to Tunisia and others to Iran. My husband and I drew the lucky straw for Somalia, and we were sent back to Washington, DC for language training.

t

We stayed at the National Hotel on L Street. I recall sitting in our room, counting rats running outside along the windowsill for recreation and relief from our Somali language training. The Foreign Service Institute (FSI) hired several lovely Somali taxi drivers to teach us Somali, which at that point was hopeless. It wasn't a written language, and our brains were filled with Arabic. We struggled for eight weeks between September and December 1969. Then on the morning of our planned departure for Mogadishu (surprise) we learned Somalia had just had a coup d'état and, of course, the Peace Corps program was closed. (Laughs)

1970 Peace Corps Assignment to Kenya

During those many weeks in Washington DC my husband played rugby with the Washington Rugby Club on the Mall. One of those Rugby players was the recently returned Peace Corp Director in Kenya. So, to make a very long story short, that guy called somebody, who called somebody, and they got us into Peace Corps' next Kenya Education program departing at the end of the month. So, overnight on New Year's Eve 1969/1970, I was on a TWA charter from Kennedy Airport to Nairobi dropping off 150 newly minted Peace Corps Volunteers (PCVs) across Africa as we went. I wore a red suit and patent leather shoes, befitting my mother's ideal of international travel. Mine was the only suitcase among the many backpacks.

We were assigned to Kerugoya, in the Central Province. It was beautiful countryside. We had a perfect view of Mount Kenya out our window. We taught in the girls' and boys' secondary schools that were run by Consolata nuns and Xaverian Brothers. For the most part it was an idyllic, happy time. I taught World History, and African History and Literature, all of which I had to teach myself, and I am sure I learned as much if not more than my students did.

Q: As your career evolved over time, how important was that Peace Corps experience? Were there things that you learned and observed that years later you relied on? Was it an important grounding for your later career?

GODDARD: I think it was everything, really. There was always something driving me in this direction, a desire for public service, in my father's tradition. Expanded horizons, seeing other parts of the world like my mother, being a part of something, a movement for change. I am still proud I was in the Peace Corps.

Q: Were you teaching at a girls' school?

GODDARD: It was an all-girls' school. It wasn't government-aided; it was a self-help "Harambee" school supported by the Catholic mission. The nuns ran the place and were seriously dedicated to educating their girls to get O level Cambridge certificates and A level certificates with high marks. But there were aspects I was uncomfortable with - the UK curriculum that emphasized memorizing answers to tests, rather than critical thinking, and the physical condition of my school which was very rustic compared to the boys' school where my husband taught. I also observed for the first time the shocking conditions of rural Kenyan women. Besides seeing beautiful Mt. Kenya out our window we also watched a constant parade of women walking to town from their farms. Many were permanently stooped, bent over, supported by walking sticks, balancing babies while carrying on their backs, heavy sacks of coffee beans, tea and other farm products. It was my introduction to the phenomenon of "female headed households" which I would focus on later in my WID career.

Q: As a Peace Corps volunteer, did you have exposure to USAID or to the embassy?

GODDARD: We did. Ambassador McIlvaine was a good Peace Corps ambassador. Peace Corps Volunteers had a real prejudice about the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in those days. When PCVs were invited to go swimming at the Ambassador's residence on Saturday mornings, we had the pool to ourselves from say, 9:00 to 10:00 am, and then other Embassy staff and families would get their pool time. The PCVs had a particular thing about the CIA and would avoid contact with any CIA people even socially. I think it was our hair-brained way of distancing ourselves from US government policies we disapproved of and feeling a little superior to boot. (Peasley laughs) It was 1970-72, Kent State happened just after our arrival in Kenya, and we were probably ambivalent in our own way about serving in our government during the VietNam War. Strangely, we reserved that dissing behavior for the Langley types rather than the Military group, and of course we absolutely loved the Marines!

When we finished our two-year tour my husband and I had no plan for our next chapter. We traveled to Ethiopia on a cheap airline ticket, flying in DC 3's around Ethiopia for a month, seeing all the major tourist sites. Then we flew Ethiopian Airlines across to West Africa. We got off the plane in Douala, Cameroon and surprise! said "let's hitchhike somewhere from here". We hitchhiked through West Cameroon to Buea, where we met the Peace Corps/Cameroon Director and through him, Ben Muna, a distinguished lawyer

and son of the Prime Minister. At Ben's invitation we traveled to visit his home in Bamenda. From there we crossed by taxi into eastern Nigeria to Enugu, the site of the recently ended Biafran War. There were still abandoned tanks on the side of the road.

From a Kenyan friend we had been given the name of a classical musician in the Nigerian Broadcasting Company, NBC, who greeted us warmly and invited us to his house on an island in Lagos. Unfortunately, there my husband got malaria, so we got on a plane and flew to Ghana. In Accra we went into the Peace Corps office and found a Peace Corps doctor, but, surprise, we had landed in Ghana in the middle of a coup d'etat. The country was on lock-down. We stayed in the Avenida Hotel for ten days while he was being treated for malaria. The restaurants and markets were closed, food was scarce, but in front of the hotel a little push cart full of ice cream bars managed to stay in business and we survived on frozen treats until we were able to leave the country.

We booked a flight to Morocco where my Aunt Margot was assigned to the Embassy in Rabat. That was her last post before mandatory Foreign Service retirement at age 60. In her era, women who married had to leave the Foreign Service, so she never married. It was only in or around 1972 that those restrictions ended. She retired in Washington, DC.

1972–1978 Peace Corps, Washington DC – (FSR hire)

After our African travels I also wanted to go back to DC. I felt strongly the tug of my hometown, and I wanted a home base after many moves. My husband got a job at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) which was a new government agency. I first worked for an educational association then in December I was hired by Peace Corps/Washington in the Office of Staging and Orientation, conducting week-long pre-departure sessions for the PCV's leaving for their assignments. We did these send-offs from Miami, from San Francisco, from Denver and from Philadelphia. It was just a fabulous job.

At first it was during the Nixon Administration. Nixon had created ACTION and he had placed the Peace Corps and VISTA and the other Kennedy voluntary organizations all together under this new agency. Suffice it to say, it was an unpopular move. The director of ACTION was Mike Balsano. I don't know if you remember him, but ACTION was not a happy home for the Peace Corps.

Then came the Jimmy Carter Administration. I have a photo of myself in Peace Corps Headquarters with Miss Lillian, first mother and Returned Peace Corps Volunteer (RPCV); Sam Brown came in as head of ACTION and John Lewis headed the domestic staff. Relations between the Peace Corps and ACTION did not improve. Carolyn Payton was the head of the Peace Corps. From her first day, lobbying began to split Peace Corps off from ACTION and to become a separate agency again.

I was offered a Desk Officer position in 1974 for Afghanistan, Nepal, India, and eventually the Gulf States. When Peace Corps/India was closed, I locked the Peace Corps door and took the key to the embassy and turned it in.

Q: What were the main responsibilities of a desk officer for Peace Corps? Close-out was one function. Did you also have to work out things when volunteers got into difficulties?

GODDARD: As a Staging Officer, my job had been to go to the US departure city, and, in five days, check out whether the new trainees seemed mentally fit, read them their rights and responsibilities, finalize their medicals, swear them in and get them on the plane. Once I became a Desk Officer, I was Headquarters representative for the country program. Everything in support of the PCVs and staff passed through the Desk Officer. Where we were getting new programs started, we worked with embassies for clearances and access to ministries. There was a lot of coordination with the State Department. In emergencies we supported volunteers and their families. All legal and program information was transmitted to the field by the Desk Officer as well as providing budget development and oversight.

Once a year I visited the volunteers. In Nepal, I went up in a helicopter to visit the PCVs who were building gravity-flow water systems in the mountains, dropping off a mail pouch at Everest Base Camp on the way. In Afghanistan, we had a university program where women were admitted for the first time. I went to Mazar-i-Sharif with the two women who were going to be the new PCV instructors, and there you could almost feel the presence of the Russians on the northern border ready to invade. In my second year on the Desk, Peace Corps added a Gulf States program, so there were new volunteers in Yemen, Oman and Bahrain. I went with Skip McGinty, the Peace Corps director who started the program, on a program development visit. Sultan Qaboos bin Said of Oman had just opened the gates to the country by a year or two. The few roads from the capital just went out into the desert and stopped. Every day the road went a little farther into the desert. Skip was trying to introduce PCVs into several sectors, animal husbandry and water systems in the beginning. One Peace Corps staff had a lovely house in the old city of Muscat, directly adjacent to a house owned by a family member of the Sultan's that, truly, had a fully air-conditioned open-air garden. Such was Oman in 1974. Also, in the South it was a war zone. At one point Skip and I found ourselves escorted by British soldiers in the mountainous Djebel Plateau interviewing the local Omani population in their primitive homes, looking for opportunities to send in PCVs. (Peasley laughs) It was wonderful and naïve and totally idealistic.

I don't know if you remember the journalist and feminist Perdita Huston. She wrote a book, *Voices from the Village*, about family planning and population issues and the role of women in developing countries. She was appointed Peace Corps' Regional Director for the North Africa, Near East, Asia and Pacific Region (NANEAP) and became my boss. I got my first real understanding of "Women in Development" from Perdita, during my final year on staff.

Peace Corps has a "five-year rule" … I was lucky enough to get a rare 6th year extension. I was promoted to the Acting Deputy Regional Director of NANEAP. My tour ended in December of 1978, and I said, "I want to keep doing this. I want to do the technical work and maybe I can get involved in the women's part because that really interests me."

1978 Applied to USAID

So, I threw my hat in the ring at USAID. The agency had let go many employees after the termination of the Viet Nam program, but the staff numbers had dropped below requirements. Jerry Pagano set up a recruitment task force to address the staff shortage. Jerry got my CV from Anne Dammarell, a USAID Desk Officer. When I was Desk Officer at Peace Corps, she had been my counterpart at USAID, and we worked together on various things. Anne knew me and in passing, I told her I was applying to USAID. She said, "That's great," and she gave me some tips. I applied for the Foreign Service. I was accepted and assigned as Lebanon Desk Officer in USAID. I was ready to go, but at the last minute, surprise, something came up in my medical and I failed the clearance.

Jerry Pagano then told me "Listen, I think I know a couple of people who are looking for Special Assistants and such, and they might be able to bring you in without this whole Foreign Service appointment thing…."

<u>USAID Office of Women in Development, Deputy Director/Acting Director, 1979 – 1982</u>

Sandy Levin was setting up the Science and Technology Bureau (S&T) at the time. Arvonne Fraser was looking for a Deputy. Anne Dammarell went to Arvonne, and said, "You should pick her," and Arvonne said, "Well, she looks like she's very young, but she knows how to move in the bureaucracy." To Arvonne that was not a compliment because one thing she was not fond of (both laugh) was bureaucrats, but nevertheless, she needed somebody who could help her manage her growing program.

Q: Please give us more details on how you were hired? You had to abandon the Foreign Service route; was this a Civil Service appointment?

GODDARD: Correct. No FS (Foreign Service) or GS (General Schedule) appointment. Arvonne was a political appointee in the Carter Administration and with the approval of Administrator John Gilligan I was appointed as non-career AD (Administratively Determined) employee.

Q: Was there any kind of orientation or training for AD appointments? Did you get any training or were you simply hired and then dropped into the office on day one?

GODDARD: (Laughs) The first time I participated in USAID's new entry program was after I had been in the agency for over eleven years, when I finally joined the Foreign Service. I even taught several New Entry classes over the years. I was an AD for all that time.

What I did get was membership in the Women in Development (WID) community, which by this time was made up of serious women who were founding their own research firms, managing their own grants programs at their universities, and running women's NGOs.

They were activists and they were devoted followers of Arvonne Fraser. A few weeks before I started at the WID office, a couple of them gathered in Georgetown, at someone's house; they invited me to tea, and they were checking me out. They considered themselves the Women in Development "brain trust" and they questioned me about what I knew about WID. At this point, I am not sure what I even answered, and I made it through somehow. But I quickly realized that this is not an administrative job, exclusively working in the administration of programs, which is what I had done before. I may have been a good bureaucrat in Arvonne's eyes, but this was something much, much bigger and much, much more challenging. In February 1979, I started in USAID's Women in Development Office as Deputy Director.

Q: Okay. because you initially mentioned a special assistant position.

GODDARD: Yes, if I'd gone with Sandy Levin in the Science and Technology Bureau, I'd have been a Special Assistant.

Arvonne had already been in her position a year and a half, with her Deputy who was a former professor and scholar in what we would call today, Gender Studies. Elsa Chaney was an early feminist. She was older than Arvonne, and Arvonne was older than Gloria Steinem. They were part of one of the major social movements that defined the 1970s in America. Arvonnne was determined to take it global.

Q: And Arvonne's husband was a congressman?

GODDARD: Don Fraser was a Congressman from Minnesota. The Frasers were important in Minnesota Democratic politics, and Arvonne managed Don's office on Capitol Hill. Vice President Mondale was responsible for Arvonne being appointed to her position at USAID. In her first year Arvonne and Elsa and several other women from that generation had provided funding to a small number of non-profit women's organizations. Some of the US Land Grant universities had already started specialized women's programs in agriculture, and side-by-side moving in two lanes with the Health and Family Planning community, developing country women were coming into focus in USAID.

There was competition between the WID and Health/Pop programs. Funding for Family Planning and Health dwarfed what resources were available for WID. The WID office was particularly sensitive to the idea that women's roles be defined only as baby-makers. Women were farmers, and entrepreneurs, and they contributed significantly to developing economies, beyond the traditional view of first world, mostly male practitioners. The Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination (PPC) was home to several units overseeing Budget, International Organizations and Policy Review (PDPR) in addition to the WID office. The policy staff for PDPR/Health and Population was initially a source of minor irritation to Arvonne, who was determined to broaden the agency's policy approach to women beyond the limited scope of early Health/Pop programs.

Q: Right. Because the Women in Development office was part of the policy bureau?

GODDARD: Correct. In the beginning. Alex Shakow was the head of PPC, and Charlie Paolillo was the Deputy. Both were highly supportive of WID.

Q: Paula, you spoke briefly about your recruitment into USAID, including the interesting, albeit informal, interview process you went through to become the deputy director of the Office Women in Development in USAID. Could you tell us a bit more about the office: who was in it, and how big it was?

GODDARD: At the beginning it was just Arvonne Fraser, and her deputy Elsa Chaney. Mary Herbert was Arvonne's Secretary and Faye Thompson was a program assistant. Debbie Purcell, a writer, started on the same day I did, as the communications officer. Kathy Staudt, and later Jane Jaquette, later came on board as scholars in residence from their universities.

Let me interject here that the story of WID in USAID is hard to tell now from forty years distance. Much changed and evolved over time. I like to describe it in phases. In the 1970's, the program was launched by feminists with support from Democratic politicians and a few Republicans like Senator Percy. The emphasis was on Women, their needs, their role in the family and their other contributions to society. In the 1980s, the Reagan years, conservatives were less friendly to feminist activism, so we downplayed that aspect in favor of a more technocratic approach to WID in USAID. The emphasis shifted from Women to Development, the "efficiency approach", demonstrating the impact women had on development, that women were critical to the successful outcome of USAID's programs, and understanding how gender significantly affects the development process. The 1990's and beyond saw a shift toward women's rights as the centerpiece of WID policy, with a concentration on political power, eliminating discrimination and legal concerns that were beyond the scope of USAID's traditional programming, and in some ways almost a full circle back to the early feminist activism of WID's foundation in USAID.

At the same time the concept of Women in Development became a global movement. The 1970 book Women's Roles in Agricultural Development by Danish economist, Ester Boserup, is the global reference point for all WID scholars. In 1975 the first UN Conference on Women was convened in Mexico City, followed by one in 1980 in Copenhagen (which Arvonne attended as a US delegate), Nairobi in 1985 and Beijing in 1995.

Arvonne had been up on the Hill for years. She worked on the Percy Amendment to the Foreign Affairs legislation in 1973. She said her role was "getting the little old ladies in tennis shoes out in the streets and beating the drum for international women's programs." And she did wear tennis shoes. She walked from her apartment in Southwest DC across the Mall to the State Department twice a day, rain or shine, in her tennis shoes.

When Arvonne started in April 1977 the WID Office had a budget of $300,000. (It was $3 million by the time I left in 1982). Arvonne divided her funding into four buckets:

support for data collection, for women's organizations, for other donors and for USAID staff training.

Regarding the USAID bureaucracy, Arvonne had been told by somebody that she could give out grant funds under $9,999 without much competition. So, she gave out many of them, largely to her network of university-based women doing international research on rural women, intra-household distribution of labor and assets, agricultural production, micro enterprise, water and health, etc. With those small funds she created a researchers' network with considerable reach into the broader academic institutions where they worked. Women in Development centers sprang up on campuses. Kate Cloud founded the Women's Food Network at the University of Arizona. At the University of Florida Anita Spring introduced gender analysis into global farming systems research. Jane Knowles at the Univ of Wisconsin was one of the founders of the Midwest University Consortium for International Activities. Subgroups on WID were established by the USAID-funded BIFAD (Board for International Food and Agriculture Development) and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC). A Resource Center was created in the WID Office to hold all the research papers for USAID staff to access. All this with a bunch of purchase orders.

Q: By changing academia and research priorities, it really had an important long-term impact as well.

GODDARD: Absolutely. I called Arvonne Fraser the Johnny Appleseed of development and its apt. She just threw seeds out there and when you look at what she spawned in this period, it's mind boggling.

The first funding bucket was for women primarily in public universities doing academic research.

The second bucket was for new or existing women's organizations. Again, the list is long. Arvonne helped Nadya Youssef and Mayra Buvinic create the International Center for Research on Women (IRCW). She supported Michaela Walsh to form Women's World Banking, which was a bank for women entrepreneurs. She funded Martha Lewis's project on cook stoves at Partners for the Americas. She supported The Center for Development and Population (CEDPA). There was support given to Judith Bruce at the Pop Council in New York City. Funds went to the Overseas Education Fund (OEF), Lutheran World Relief, and many others, all geared to the establishment of WID projects, or WID components or new women's organizations.

At the UN programs for women were also established by partners in Arvonne's network:Marilyn Hoskens in the UN's Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Community Forestry unit and Ruth Finney, who changed the direction of FAO's Home Economics Service to one focused on Women in Agriculture. (I was detailed there for a year after I left the WID office in 1982). I believe funds were also given to the UN Women's Tribune Center and the NGO Forum in support of the UN World Conferences on Women.

And, the third bucket, probably Arvonne's favorite: the OECD/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) subcommittee on WID. This was a committee of her WID counterparts in the other bilateral donor agencies, Canada, the UK, the Scandinavian countries, France, Italy, etc. They met regularly to exchange policy and project experience and formulated WID input for the larger donor community as members of the DAC.

The fourth bucket was the WID training of USAID staff… this one is a long story and the toughest of all (both laugh). It did not get much attention from Arvonne, and most of the work in this area took place after she left.

Q: Let me interrupt for one second because it seems to me that the role of the UN and these international conferences on women were instrumental to changing how people looked at the development landscape and the role of women. It's interesting because we tend to dismiss some of the UN sponsored conferences as fluff. But in this case, they seem to have really had a very major impact, this series of conferences.

GODDARD: Yes, on many levels, Carol. For one thing the funding to prepare for the UN conferences produced research and background papers and policies that were very important consensus-building documents. The internal agency process of clearing the various policy statements up through the chain of command, through USAID senior management, the State Department, other agencies, even the White House, for use by the conference delegations, was an important political process. It was the first-time developing country women were seen in international leadership positions. And I think it sort of shook up the establishment. Take the Agriculture sector for example. I know from spending a year at the FAO it was a tough role for Ruth Finney to go into the Home Economics Service of the Food and Agriculture Organization and say …the job isn't home economics, cooking and sewing. This is your technical job. You guys in the other departments are ignoring who is doing the Food and Agricultural work. I mean, people laughed, people laughed.

I don't know how long it took for them to change the title of that office from Home Economics to something else, but it was a while. Agricultural university men from agricultural development institutions in the United States that had been exported around the world in the Green Revolution, saw rural development as strictly men's work. A generation of assistance to India was modeled on 1950's and 1960's US institutions. In the mid 1990's, when I conducted an impact evaluation of USAID assistance to an agriculture college in Bihar, India, we visited there and found the university, with the same exact books and the same little desks the college had received in the 1950s. (Peasley laughs)

So, there was a big establishment to penetrate in the late 1970's. The modern American family where the men did the outside work and the agriculture, and the women did the indoor work, say, in the cheese processing, and in the kitchen, was the fixed point of reference for much of the USAID establishment.

As the countries' incomes rose, populations shifted. Men seeking work in towns and cities left a growing number of households headed by women. The WID message was, if the agriculture is done by women and we offer our assistance to build irrigation systems only to men, maybe we should look at whether the training we're doing in this irrigation technique is going to the wrong people. The data collection and research on women's roles conducted in the 1970's started to penetrate in the 1980's and an awakening about gender roles, particularly in the agriculture sector, took hold. Gender analysis demonstrated who does what, who has access to what resources, e.g. training, credit, technology, in such a way that assistance could be targeted more effectively.

Q: Yes, I think there is a very important lesson here for changing how people think about an issue. Arvonne's use of a lot of small grants to develop information and to build advocacy within those organizations was very important. Since the budget went from $300,000 to $3 million, they were obviously effective at advocating for additional resources as well.

GODDARD: Right. Arvonne had some real advantages; she had Alex Shakow and Charlie Paolillo who were supportive of her and understood the significance of the WID program, both inside and outside USAID. And their successors in PPC also understood the importance of WID, through much, but not all, of the Reagan/Bush era.

Q: And just for the record, when you mentioned Alex Shakow and Charlie Paolillo, they were the assistant administrators for the Policy Bureau.

Going back to these organizations that you all supported. I assume that the heads were women and that those women also became important actors in all of this.

GODDARD: Right. I mean, for example, Partners for the Americas. It was a long-standing NGO providing aid and humanitarian assistance in Latin America. Alan Rubin was the Director, and he hired Martha Lewis to develop her own project and to introduce WID concepts into the larger portfolio.

1982 Women in Development policy paper

Q: Okay, so we can go onto the 1980s now, including publication of the first Women in Development policy paper in 1982. In the development of that policy paper, were there any serious issues or controversies that had to be resolved? Or, by this time, was there a growing consensus within the agency and therefore it was relatively easy to put a policy forward?

GODDARD: Arvonne left USAID in May 1981. By the time the WID Policy Paper was written, the agency had gone through its transition to the Reagan Administration and all the senior players were new. Peter McPherson was Administrator; John Bolton became head of PPC. One would expect a clash between a politically conservative administration and a centrist-to-liberal agency like USAID. You probably remember Tony Babb quit

USAID because of the infant formula controversy. However, generally, Peter was highly regarded and well-liked. Except for his extremely unpopular population policy, most people I knew felt they were in an agency that was going in the direction they wanted to go. His "Four Pillars" gained early acceptance among the staff.

Q: Right.

GODDARD: Arvonne was a big character doing a lot with very, very little in terms of resources. And she opened so many doors. I knew that in this shift from the Carter Administration to the Reagan Administration there was going to have to be something a little bit new and different about the way we characterized the WID program. Maybe we would survive under the radar, staying low and out of sight. But I didn't feel that was enough of a strategy to keep WID moving forward. So, in 1981, fearing a reaction to "Women's Lib" sounding rhetoric, I played down the "Women" part, which had the message "…look at us, see us, acknowledge us, know what we do, we're here!" and put the emphasis on "Development". "What role did women play in getting to the objective that we are trying to reach? How is this new understanding of gender roles achieving better program outcomes?" I hoped this was a less "feminist", less politically sensitive, and more neutral policy approach.

This was not uncontroversial in the Women in Development community, but most were ready to put their own technical credentials forward. So, here's the outline for the 1982 Women in Development Policy Paper: agricultural development, employment and income generation, human resource and institutional development, energy and natural resource conservation, water and health. There were technical offices for each of these areas in the agency that we hoped would see WID policy in their purview and take responsibility for its implementation. Sarah Tinsley, the Reagan Administration's appointment to lead the WID office, and I worked very closely together. We were of one mind about this.

Q: And so, that also meant more integrated programs as opposed to women-focused programs?

GODDARD: Yes, there had always been debate, do we have a women's component of a larger project, or does that just scale down resources for women and keep them outside of the mainstream funding? In the beginning, women's projects and components were important to bring an initial focus on women. Later it became clear that the more the focus was on a women's project or component, the less women were understood to be central players in the broader development process. In many areas women were contributing more than half of the effort to achieve results in overall assistance programs, yet specific resources were confined to small scale income-generating projects that isolated and confined them.

Q: I think you obviously came across an approach that was better in getting complete buy-in from the agency but also making nuanced changes that would get buy-in from a new administration as well.

GODDARD: Correct. It was a two-pronged strategy. I mean, look, I was a political appointee from the Carter Administration.

Q: Yes, right. (Laughs)

GODDARD: It was good for my job survival (laughs) but it also reflected understanding of how the foreign aid program intersects with domestic politics. There are buzzwords and catchphrases and if you press a bad button, you're going to get a bad reaction. So, at that time I began focusing on how gender analysis worked. It was a technical skill. And fortunately, in my next position as Deputy Director of the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) I was able to lead a multi-country impact evaluation of the agency's decade-long experience with WID. That study demonstrated the positive link between adapting project elements to reflect gender distinctions in the target population and successful project outcomes.

Q: While you were Deputy in the WID office, John Bolton was head of the Policy Bureau. When you were finalizing the policy paper on women in development, how supportive was he of the development of this strategy? I ask in part because he is so well known.

GODDARD: Another anecdote here. After I left USAID I took a job with ARD, a USAID contractor based in Burlington, Vermont. My favorite story to tell people in crunchy Burlington was about John Bolton. I finished the first draft of the Women in Development policy paper. Sarah Tinsley, who was close friends with John, said, "Just go for it. Just take it in there and just go for it." And John Bolton in his usual fashion, a little gruff and kind of humorless, said, "Okay. Leave it on my desk. I'll get back to you." So, I went, "oh, God" and went back to my office. Twenty-four hours later, I got an envelope, an intra-office holey envelope, with my draft, and red markups on my paper. John Bolton had edited my paper carefully and constructively and written "cleared" in big letters on the front page. Surprise.

Q: (Laughs) Very good. No, that should be in the record. I believe his wife was working in the field, so I suspect he was supportive.

GODDARD: And Sarah Tinsley has been his aide-de-camp until this day.

Q: Oh, I didn't know that.

GODDARD: She worked for him at State and in the PAC (Political Action Committee) they created.

Q: Okay, good. We need a positive John Bolton story.

GODDARD: Absolutely. (Laughs)

1982 Wingspread Conference

This is something else I think is important in the WID story. With funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, Arvonne pulled together a conference at the Wingspread House designed by Frank Lloyd Wright in Racine, Wisconsin. The purpose of the meeting was to create a professional association for the women in development community. About thirty women from Arvonne's network of WID researchers, UN and NGO staff, university professors, many of whom I have already named, and a few of us from USAID, attended the conference to do what Arvonne did best: take a seed of an idea, with a purpose, and launch it. The Association for Women in Development (AWID) was born at that meeting. At its core AWID was a platform bringing three groups, academics, policy makers and development practitioners together in a "Trialogue" for debating and exchanging ideas in furtherance of WID objectives. (Jane Knowles was appointed AWID President at Wingspread, and I was the first elected AWID President in 1985).

Q: When the conference took place in 1982, was Arvonne gone?

GODDARD: Yes. She was gone from USAID.

Q: An election had taken place in 1980, so she presumably left by early 1981? And there was a new head of the WID office by the time this conference took place in 1982. Who came in and replaced her?

GODDARD: Sarah Tinsley.

Q: Was that again a political appointee in the policy bureau heading up the WID office?

GODDARD: Yes. Sarah was named in 1981. Another good John Bolton story. She went to John and said, "Please keep Paula on. I need her." So, John said, "Fine." And we spent the next year and a half together, helping her learn the ropes, introducing her to the WID community, and writing the policy paper, which was published in 1982.

Q: Was the 1982 paper the first policy paper on Women in Development?

GODDARD: First one.

There have only been two that I'm aware of and the next came out in the 2000's.

Q: I think one was recently issued, but they now refer to it as gender policy.

GODDARD: Okay, so that's probably the number three.

But our Policy Paper on Women in Development, was published in October 1982 and survived close to twenty years.

Q: And so, you probably had even started working on some of this during the previous administration. Policy papers evolve over a long period of time.

GODDARD: Alex Shakow initiated the series of policy papers. The PPC Bureau kept churning them out over several years, with the same red, white, and blue covers.

Sarah Tinsley was in her mid-twenties when she started at USAID. Her background was in Republican party campaigns, specifically the Reagan presidential campaign. My politics were quite different, but we bonded with each other across political lines. She was serious about her interest in USAID and WID and we had no difficulty creating an excellent relationship.

Q: And the World Bank itself was also doing the same kind of policy development at the time?

GODDARD: Yes Gloria Scott, the first Advisor on Women in Development at the World Bank was developing a similar policy. Again, it was a very nuanced but serious effort to keep the lane of Women in Development separate from the lane of Health/Population - as those technical sectors were already bringing considerable attention and resources to women, but in their narrow, traditional roles in the family.

One anecdote from my first months in the WID office. Our section of USAID's Report to Congress was due. We had to document how the agency was implementing the Percy Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Bill. Arvonne was really having difficulty getting information to put into the report. She sent a cable to all USAID Mission Directors, asking them for data on how much funding they had devoted to ensuring the Percy Amendment was being addressed.

She got back a smattering of unhelpful replies, but the one that became a classic in WID office lore, came from Egypt I think, a huge program with a big infrastructure component. The Mission reported, and I am paraphrasing here… "Our biggest program here is building roads. Since women walk on roads, and they are half the population, we allocate fifty percent of the roads budget to WID". (Peasley laughs.) I mean, there are so many angles on that one …. (Laughs).

Arvonne did not find it funny. She knew they were kind of messing with her. Those and others like it were the frustrations of the early days in USAID. I think those experiences stimulated her to get her community together, to rally around her, to be taken seriously. AWID was a way of accomplishing that.

Q: Can we go back again? Was AWID an actual organization or was it a network?

GODDARD: It was a professional association.

Q: It had its own staff as well, okay.

GODDARD: It did. It had its own Board. It took two or three years to build it from 1982. 1985 was when we held the first election, and a Board was established by a *pro bono* legal team. We held our first conference in 1985 at the Washington Hilton Hotel. Peter McPherson was the keynote speaker. I was presiding over the conference and to my great chagrin Peter was booed by some AWID members who walked out over his adherence to the infamous "Mexico City" population policy. He took it well and I am still here to tell the story.

Q: You were President of the Board of AWID, not an employee of AWID?

GODDARD: Right. AWID had one staff, an administrative employee. The rest of us were volunteers.

Q: Right. So, it was this network of various organizations doing this work?

GODDARD: No not organizations. AWID members were individual experts from three professional backgrounds, academics, policy makers and practitioners. The organization basically existed to have a conference. The first couple of years were spent simply to get it established and then create the program for the first conference in 1985.

And they were international conferences. We had funds to bring speakers from all over the world. Mohammed Yunus, founder of the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh, was one of the early conference speakers. USAID Missions supported staff and local people from their countries to attend.

Let me go back to an important activity during my final months in the WID office. Remember that fourth bucket? Training of USAID staff. Several of the WID researchers had ties to Harvard University and one was married to Jim Austin, a professor at the Harvard Business School. I knew about the Case Study method used in training MBA students and thought it might work as a training technique in gender analysis for USAID staff. With Sarah Tinsley's full support, we engaged Jim and others to develop case studies of various USAID projects that would be relevant for gender analysis. Jim was hired to teach a series of class sessions, using the Harvard case study teaching method, to engage USAID participants in learning how to conduct gender analysis. It was an amazing success. We gave invitations to key staff from all the Bureaus, people who were in positions of decision making as well as experts in project design. As word spread about the experience in this gender analysis training, more and more USAID staff asked to be included.

Q: That was used for training USAID staff?

GODDARD: Yes, you get invited, you go to a class, you're given three project cases to read beforehand. They were not business cases; they were development cases. Through guided discussion, Jim Austen would lead the group discussion and conduct gender

analysis, linking that analysis to the goals and outcomes of the project. It was a masterpiece.

Sadly, Sarah Tinsley's successor Kay Davies, was not supportive. She made no secret of her belief that Harvard was too "liberal" an institution and she canceled the program. So, USAID did not get to complete all those training seminars, probably one of the most successful WID initiatives in the decade. It was a great disappointment to me and all those who worked so diligently to create the materials and methods that went into this project.

Q: I think it is important to show that something you thought was very successful ended prematurely for political reasons.

AID/W, Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE), Deputy Director, 1983 – 1990

Q: When did you transfer to CDIE and who was the director at that time?

GODDARD: In 1983. Haven North, a wonderful guy and a true believer in USAID, Haven knew something that Arvonne also knew, that with support from Capitol Hill, you can do anything in USAID. He built the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) on Bob Berg and Dick Blue's popular impact evaluation series and expanded the library to include digitized development information, with analytical staff and new technology, as well as promoting new evaluation methods and "Managing for Results".

Q: Okay. Given the WID office's focus on research and analysis, it does seem that becoming the deputy of CDIE was a very natural progression.

Yes; As I mentioned earlier, one of my early responsibilities was an evaluation of USAID's Decade of Experience with Women in Development. To develop a framework for the evaluation we started by rating each selected project on how much attention had been paid to gender dynamics, and giving the project a score, high attention or low attention. The highest scores were given to the projects that demonstrated explicit "adaptation" to gender dynamics. Then we had a rating scale for how well the project met its own internal objectives, meeting whatever the success criteria were for the project itself. By comparing the two, we found, in ten case studies, across-the-board, higher ratings in gender sensitivity and analysis correlated with more success in the project itself.

This was a look at ten years of WID work in USAID. With this evaluation we reached a point where we could say, "If you can figure out what the gender dynamics are and where they intersect with your activities in the project, then adapt accordingly, you are going to find the project more successful." And it ended the debate about women's components because we were talking about gender roles at this point.

Q: Yes; that's an important lesson to have done that research ten years on.

Let me ask you about someone who was a political appointee during that period who I believe had worked in Senator Percy's office, Julia Chang Bloch. Given Percy's focus on women, I wonder if she ever had any involvement with the Women in Development office?

GODDARD: She wasn't unhelpful, but she was the AA (Assistant Administrator) for the PVO (Private Voluntary Organization) and Food Aid Bureau.

In my recollection the women at USAID in the Reagan Administration were not particularly tight with each other and there were a fair number of them at high levels. I don't recall Julia ever being a major factor one way or another, positively or negatively. She was there and a kind of friend of the whole program, but not an activist.

Q: It is interesting the large number of women in senior jobs during that administration. I suspect that's probably something that people would be surprised to learn.

GODDARD: Yes. To name a few: Michelle Laxalt, daughter of the Senator, Elise du Pont, Carol Adelman, and even Liz Cheney, although I think she was in a more junior position.

Q: Interesting. One thing I meant to ask you about, although this may be taking us back to the seventies, I was reading something earlier today about the Women's Action Organization (WAO) and the discrimination suits against the State Department. As that office was being set up in the mid- to late-seventies and early eighties, did you and the WID Office have any relationship with them? I believe that Marilyn Zak from AID was very active in WAO.

GODDARD: Arvonne was a supporter of Marilyn Zak but I don't think there was ever any WID funding connection with WAO. Arvonne was a firm believer in affirmative action. But after Arvonne left USAID and the Reagan team came in there were two reasons I wanted to avoid anything having to do with affirmative action or other USAID personnel practices. One, because it was very unpopular (both laugh) with the new team, two, because it blurred our focus on issues affecting developing country women. Personnel issues for American women were far afield from our focus in the WID program. We were intent on highlighting women's contribution to development, and not on women as victims. In fact, we bristled every time we saw women included in sentences about "…women, children, handicapped and other minorities…".

Q: Okay; that's fair enough. I was just curious because these things were happening at the same time.

GODDARD: There were people assigned to USAID by the Reagan White House, specifically to inject certain partisan politics into the aid program. Cliff Lewis comes to mind. As long as Sarah Tinsley was in the WID office though, USAID was able to keep the WID program on an apolitical course and not fall victim to political partisanship. Her

successors were not of that mind set; the cancellation of the Harvard training being an unfortunate example. By the end of the 1980s partisan politics had eroded a lot of what I think we were able to accomplish earlier, and I began to lose interest.

Q: Could you perhaps talk a bit more about how you saw the whole concept of Women in Development evolve over the years in USAID, including the period you were there, and then from other seats in USAID that you sat in over the years.

GODDARD: I see over time almost a full circle evolution of thinking about how to approach Women in Development. In the 1960s, you find the beginning of feminist theory and Women's Studies scholars, some with a Marxist orientation, who focused on the structure of society, patriarchy and the subordination of women. The early women's movement was concerned with injustice and inequality. For USAID, women's importance was limited to Health and Population programs. In these early years development activities were largely aimed at the welfare of women, providing access to services that would raise their status as caretakers and improve the basic needs of the family.

In the 1970s the Percy Amendment was the first impetus to see developing country women in a broader context in USAID programs. In 1975 the Mexico conference was held by the UN and the declaration of the International Year of the Woman. But the "welfare approach", inherent in the Population and Health sectors, featured women as society's dependents, needing protections. The initial WID resources were still largely confined to separate, women-only activities supporting them in traditional roles within traditional families. Health and family planning funds far outpaced resources for women in any other setting.

The 1979 report to Congress was the first attempt on USAID's part to collect data on funding for women outside of Health/Pop sectors. My recollection is of Arvonne complaining bitterly about the lack of seriousness among USAID staff during that exercise. (Recall the Egypt Mission response.)

So, that was the origin of Arvonne's four budget "buckets". The early WID research exposed a lack of knowledge about intra-household dynamics. Project design had been based on erroneous assumptions about who controlled and benefitted from resources flowing into the community. The female-headed household was a growing phenomenon. Western models assuming every adult in the family had equal status were false. This was a breakthrough in thinking and an intellectual leap in understanding the development process, which was built upon in subsequent years.

In the 1980's during the Reagan years, WID entered a new phase based on better knowledge of how rural societies responded to assistance on a micro-level. Farming systems research, small enterprise and credit, environmental protection, community mobilization, all are development efforts influenced by gender dynamics.

Do you remember *Horizon*, the USAID magazine? The Summer 1985 edition of Horizon, with an introduction by Peter McPherson, was a collection of essays by WID experts. The

June 1985 version of USAID's newsletter *Front Lines* had a page one article describing the AWID Conference. The *Foreign Service Journal* devoted its 1985 July/August edition to WID. OECD-DAC promulgated guidelines on Women in Development for legislation in the entire bilateral donor community. International NGOs like the Ella Bhat's Southeast Women's Association of India (SEWA), a union of informal workers, had grown into a national political force. The NGO forum at the UN grew to a membership of hundreds of NGOs with a global plan of action. In 1985 when the UN Conference of Women took place in Nairobi, President Reagan's daughter Maureen, was head of the delegation.

The WID Office's fourth bucket of funds, for USAID education and training, is the one that in the end, I think, was probably the most effective WID effort in the early eighties. Harvard's gender analysis training for USAID's senior and mid-level management, conducted by Jim Austen with case studies by Kathleen Overholdt and Kate Cloud, impressed staff with the importance of this new form of analysis, and gave the WID program technical "legitimacy" for the first time.

By 1985 there was enough data on the initial WID effort, women's projects, the women's components and the projects where gender analysis had been done, for an impact evaluation to be conducted. I had moved over to CDIE, and I had Haven North's full blessing to evaluate WID. Ray Blumberg from UC San Diego and Alice Carloni from FAO developed criteria to determine whether a project reflected any sensitivity to gender roles, any awareness of WID principles, and if there was correspondence to project success.

Q: How did you choose the set of projects to look at or were you looking at everything they had approved?

GODDARD: Yes. The sample was a variety of types of traditional "mainstream" USAID projects.

I was on the team that went to Haiti looking at a community-based, small-scale, low tech flood control project, and a large agricultural plantation project in Antigua.

Q: Okay, so it was projects all over the world.

GODDARD: Projects all over the world in a crosscutting group of sectors.

And the data came out quite clear. I am not a statistician, so I don't know what the pinnacle of data correlation is, but it was solid.

In my opinion, 1985 is when the early WID work coalesced around the so-called "efficiency" approach to Women in Development. It served as both a practically useful and politically acceptable means to claim resources and buy-in for what began as a pretty marginal activity in USAID in the 1970's.

Sarah Tinsley and John Bolton left USAID. They went to positions in the State Department. The new team in PPC (Dick Derham) and Kay Davies, Sarah Tinsley's successor in the WID office, were more ideological. In an interesting Front Lines interview with all three of us, Sarah, Kay Davies, and myself, Kay indicated that she was "fully onboard" with everything in the 1982 WID Policy Paper but she wanted the Missions to know she would not be *pushing* the subject of Women in Development, she would merely "support what the Missions are doing," an indicator of a future down shift in PPC WID's approach to its mandate. At that point most Missions had a nominal Women in Development Officer; every bureau had its designated Women in Development point of contact, a result of the WID office planting them and giving resources to them and being there to guide them. Without meaningful technical support from PPC's WID office those functions would wither and die. The late 1980's saw a decline in WID technical support and a loss of momentum in the agency, from my point of view.

In the 1990's the context for WID shifted again. American women professionals began to feel pushback from their host country counterparts. For example, AWID, originally an American organization of WID professionals, had added international members, including developing country women. Some were elected to the Board. AWID was, quote, "going global and therefore global voices needed to be heard." Some international members then criticized the American professional women who, speaking from "privilege", were too "disconnected" from local populations. Politicization emerged. The international voices grew louder and ultimately transformed AWID from a platform for "Trialogue" among US professionals, into a bully pulpit for developing country women, something far removed from its origins at Wingspread. The organization was moved to Canada, and I don't know what happened to AWID after that….

Q: Was any of this prompted by issuance of the Mexico City policy during the Reagan Administration? Did the politics around abortion affect the ability of American women in government to play global leadership roles?

GODDARD: The politics around abortion certainly played a part and the Mexico City Population policy was an obstacle to WID programming throughout the Reagan Administration.

Early on, Peter McPherson had to walk a fine line on this issue. The day after he was booed at the AWID conference and I had to pick up the pieces, the next day, I got a call at my desk in CDIE from Peter. Any call from the Administrator was a surprise. He said, "Had to do it. I'm sorry, I had to do it. And you know, you're brave and carry on, just carry on." (Peasley laughs)

Q: That's a nice story.

GODDARD: Very nice. He was a good guy.

At the 1995 conference in Beijing, Hillary Clinton introduced another phase of WID focusing on women's rights. USAID was expanding its portfolio of Democracy and Governance. The definition of WID broadened and broadened again and perhaps became a little muddy at this point. Nothing is wrong with "Women's Rights are Human Rights" but for a development agency this was a difficult mandate. So, I would say the end of the 1990s is when the World Bank probably took over WID technical leadership. They charted the economic rate of return on gender analysis and developed the slogan, "smart economics" which examined intra - household dynamics and gender. If you read the World Bank annual reports from this period, you will find the data we lacked back when we started on the WID policy in 1982. Data that show if you invest in women your projects are going to have more success. Simple. So, a full circle, in my opinion.

Then, in my opinion, the worst blow to professionals in Women in Development after, say, 2000, is that "gender" started becoming a loaded word. Just the word gender was no longer neutral. The politics around the LGBTQ movement injected new significance into the terminology. Two genders, male and female, was no longer a straightforward concept for analysis.

Q: Almost then by definition if you look at gender broadly you must look at it in terms of rights as opposed to simple agents of production?

GODDARD: As important as human rights are, it is a challenge to imbue development schemes with one more layer of purpose, and not risk blurring their original intent. I certainly worked closely with USAID when I was at ARD, and later at Tetra Tech until 2018. I believe WID was alive and smart economics had taken hold, but I don't know how the Women in Development office functions today. I would like to think that all that early WID work evolved into something durable, sustainable, with lasting impact.

WID was always political. It was political in the beginning when Marxist-leaning academics were looking at the subjugation of females and it is political now when the interpretation of "gender" includes LGBTQ rights in the development equation.

Q: Right. That's an important summary of a lot of change for a subject matter over the years. And I think it would be helpful to people today to make sure as it has evolved that they don't forget some of the important lessons of the earlier focus.

GODDARD: Right. The WID activism of the early years ruffled feathers in USAID but ultimately found its place in mainstream thinking. Arvonne, a Minnesota Democrat, John Bolton, a Reagan Republican, and many WID professionals in the US and globally, all played their part in the WID story.

Q: It's also interesting to consider whether anyone in today's world other than the USAID administrator would ever be given the ability to be such a high-profile activist. (Laughs)

GODDARD: I'd be curious whether the Biden Administration has put somebody in that role in USAID.

Q: Yes; I think there is a senior person working on gender. And then, of course, the State Department has its ambassador on women's issues as well. So, there are some high-level positions within the government focused on it.

GODDARD: Well, the important thing about the 1985 CDIE Evaluation report was it revealed there are WID tools of trade. Development practitioners, if you want to call us that, or development professionals, have our tools of the trade. WID was an additional set of tools that turned out to be extremely important in reaching development goals.

Q: Yes. I think that's a very important lesson so thank you for that.

You became the deputy director of CDIE, the Center for Development, Information, Evaluation, in 1983, and in 1985, you were part of the evaluation of WID efforts.

GODDARD: I think it was called "A Decade of USAID's Experience with Women in Development."

Q: Were there other important things that you'd like to highlight from your time in CDIE, other evaluations or thoughts about how USAID does evaluation?

GODDARD: I would say that creating CDIE was one of the best things USAID ever did. It started as a library located in an Annex building where you could check out paper documents and view CD ROMs. It was all very primitive. CDIE was groundbreaking. Building on an impact evaluation series," twenty-five pages to read on a plane", launched by Berg and Dick Blue, and Nina Vreeland's work on "managing for results" CDIE grew to a staff of close to a hundred. The research and reference unit digitized project and program documents and provided analysis along with their searches. Country data sets and economic analysis was provided to offices and Missions. The evaluation staff continued the important impact evaluation work and developed guidance on evaluation methods to inform and advise managers at various levels. "Mission Director, don't bury that report, take that evaluation and look at the results and see how you can do better!" No one could have been more committed to the mission of CDIE than Haven North. And the staff, under-appreciated, but advancing important knowledge, inspired me every day. I don't know what happened after I left USAID in 2000. I know Jerry Brittan struggled to keep it alive, but the funding was reduced, and it was ultimately closed. I think that was a mistake.

Q: Yes. They still have the online research capacity, but I don't believe they retained the earlier unit with technical expertise looking at important issues for the agency.

GODDARD: Yes

Q: Was it part of PPC?

GODDARD: Yes.

I was Deputy Director of CDIE from 1983 to 1990. Haven had to retire in 1989, which was unfortunate. Janet Ballantyne took over for him and I think later John Eriksson. Neither of them had the interest in CDIE's mission that Haven North had. Being a Senior Foreign Service Officer in an obscure Washington office located in Rosslyn, Virginia, well ….(laughs.)

Did USAID ever pump up an evaluation function again?

Q: Yes. I think there have been periodic efforts to strengthen the evaluation capacity within the agency.

I also thought CDIE's contract with, I believe, AED (the Academy of Education and Development) was interesting because it enabled field Missions to send in requests for a research study on X, Y, or Z. They would then send a summary report with lots of very useful information.

GODDARD: Right. We had funding which we could share with Missions for services like that. The technology developed over time. It went from microfiche to on-line internet connection, and analysts to produce reports.

GODDARD: I don't know if that's still around.

Q: It is because I look things up periodically. It's called the Development Experience Clearinghouse.

GODDARD: And that was Haven's idea. Haven's mantra was "Learning from AID's and Others' Experience" and this resonated on Capitol Hill.

1989 Conversion to Foreign Service Limited post CDIE

Q: That's good. When you came into USAID, it was with an AD appointment. Were you still an AD when you went to CDIE as the deputy or at some point did you convert to GS (General Services) or did you go directly from AD to Foreign Service? Because I know that when you left CDIE you went into the Foreign Service.

GODDARD: I retained my status as an AD from February 1979 until January 1990. Another nice John Bolton story. At the point when Sarah Tinsley felt comfortable taking over as Director of WID without my help, again I needed to find another job. Sarah and John basically told me to find one and they would make it happen. So, I went to Ruth Finney at the FAO, and she arranged for me to join her staff on a USAID-funded (!) detail. Still on an AD appointment, with John's sign-off, I spent almost a year in Rome, trying to break down barriers to women in agricultural development projects, larger obstacles than those I had encountered in USAID. I came back from Rome in the summer of 1983 just as CDIE was being created.

In 1989 before Haven retired, he established my CDIE Deputy Director role as a GS-15 position. I applied. Surprise. The Office of Personnel "was not processing conversions" at the time, so I was not selected. Haven then withdrew the personnel action. No GS hire for me. A year later I joined the Foreign Service, though not easily.

Q: On an AD appointment, that's probably a record.

GODDARD: It might be. The intellectual leadership I witnessed in USAID, being at the forefront of so many initiatives and working with impressive individuals, who mentored me, was the chance of a lifetime. And I saw so much of the political process that fuels the USAID program. From Arvonne and Haven and their understanding of Capitol Hill, I learned how those connections worked in favor of USAID. They both knew that congressional overseers could push USAID. Practically to his dying days Haven North was getting people on the Hill pumped up about USAID. He, as Arvonne had, created a Subcommittee on Evaluation at the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), to infuse the donor community with evaluation expertise and the impetus to create modern systems for accessing and utilizing development information.

Q: Yes; this is probably a subject matter that doesn't get enough recognition, so it is important to note that.

Do you want to talk today about the conversion process from AD to Foreign Service and how that happened? Was it easy or was it difficult? I don't think there have been a lot of conversions from AD to Foreign Service, so it will be good to talk about how that came about.

GODDARD: At times I believed USAID was allergic to me. (laughs).

A couple of Foreign Service Officers in PPC suggested to me that I convert. I was encouraged by the fact that under new HIPAA rules my medical clearance would not be an issue. I was divorced, I had two young daughters, and people convinced me, you can do this. I got a lot of advice about which panel to apply to, which backstop. (Peasley laughs)

I was told the agency had an abundance of Program Officers, so I applied as a Backstop 94 Project Development Officer. I went to the panel interview, feeling confident and prepared. I remember Don Boyd and Tom Nicastro were interviewers. I answered all their questions, and the final task was to read a rural development Project Identification Document and choose appropriate staff for the design team. I neglected to place an all-important environmental expert on the team. Surprise, I failed USAID's Foreign Service exam. (Both laugh).

That's when Terry Brown and Jeff Evans stepped in and said, "Look, maybe there's a way we can kind of get around this Foreign Service thing …

My case is unique. There were three people who basically pulled me over the wall, Terry Brown, Jeff Evans, and ultimately Chuck Costello.

Jeff and Terry reached out to several colleagues in the LAC Bureau. Chuck Costello, Mission Director in Quito replied that Mike Deal, head of the Program Development and Project Development Office had one unfilled position for an American. Mike was scheduled to rotate in a year, and I was posted as his FSL Project Development Officer in USAID/Ecuador.

USAID/Ecuador, Project Development Officer, 1990 – 1994

In January 1990 I started at FSI, again. I didn't know a word of Spanish. My classmates were mainly newly hired Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) agents, many of them retooled Sheriff's Deputies and Highway Patrol Officers with zero background in Latin American language or culture. It was challenging and at times hilarious. One of my class buddies, Jay, kept us all up to date on his attempts to teach his pet parrot to shout the *very worst* Spanish swear words, a trick he thought might prove useful when he got to his post in Peru.

Q: So, you did get your Spanish in spite of the FSI experience?

GODDARD: I received a 3/3 by the skin of my teeth. Thank you, Sonya, my incredible teacher.

I spent my first year in Quito under Mike Deal learning the ropes of project development. It was a steep learning curve, and I enjoyed great support from all the Mission staff.

One day, beyond surprising, Bob Kramer and Chuck Costello called me down and said, "Why don't you take Mike Deal's job?" "And why don't you go for conversion to the regular FS?" With their support, USAID's Office of Personnel put together a Backstop 94 panel which included Jeffrey Bakken. He and a couple of others interviewed me by phone. No case study. I passed. When I was finally commissioned as a Foreign Service Officer at FS 1 in 1993, I had served below my original pay grade for almost three years, and without career status for almost fourteen. I'm grateful to the good people who helped me along the way.

Q: Do you want to talk about the Ecuador program? Chuck Costello was Mission Director?

GODDARD: Chuck Costello and then John Sambrailo.

Q: The Ecuador Mission has ebbed and flowed over the years. I believe it was a significant program during this period.

GODDARD: It was. While I was there, we celebrated fifty years of USAID assistance to Ecuador with a big celebration. That was thirty years ago. I think there's still a USAID program there. They may be celebrating their eightieth anniversary, I don't know.

We worked in agriculture, health/pop, education, and we had an environmental program with parks. We had a private sector program and policy dialogue activities; no democracy activities, those came later. It was a full, traditional LAC program, plus a Regional Housing Office (RHUDO). We had positions for six or seven Americans, but most of the staff was Ecuadorian. It was a great family post.

My first two years, USAID and the embassy clashed a bit. Some of the State Department officers did not appreciate what USAID was trying to accomplish, which caused occasional friction. My second two years those relations improved, and we worked together better. There is always that little bit of hierarchy at post, the diplomats, the development professionals and the military group, each thinking they are superior. (Laughs)

Q: Right. Were you doing any anti-narcotics work at that point?

GODDARD: No. It was traditional agriculture development, technical assistance, cooperatives, marketing, no "alternative development" the way it later evolved in LAC. I think at that point Ecuador was not producing coca. It was a transshipment country, so there was DEA presence at post, but USAID's program was not involved.

Q: And did you have a good and effective program related to the role of women in promoting development in Ecuador?

GODDARD: (Laughs) I would have to say that the WID focus in USAID/Ecuador was rather unremarkable, in part because women did not play the significant role in agricultural production as say, in Africa and Southeast Asia. Our Health, Family Planning and Education programs did focus on women quite successfully.

What USAID Ecuador was known for at the time was the introduction of Strategic Objective Teams in the Mission. The Program and Project Development Office rolled out what we called "The Ecuador Experiment" in 1992, which was a framework for "managing for results" with SO Teams drawn from multiple technical offices. (Terry Brown and Don Boyd in the Guatemala Mission followed our lead with their own version of Strategic Objectives and got credit for the initiative but USAID Ecuador was the first to implement this management approach. Laughs.) John Sambrailo succeeded Chuck and bought in fully. We had five or six Strategic Objectives (SOs) each managed by a multi-sector team. The concept lasted in USAID a long time. Surprise. (Both laugh)

Q: That's super. I know that there had been some serious issues in the Ecuador Mission earlier, in the eighties. Was there still any residual of that and did it affect your relationships with the host country government officials?

GODDARD: No, not really. It had to do with the management of local currency accounts during Mike Deal's predecessor's time.

Q: I don't mean to go into specifics. It was just whether it affected relationships and ability to do your work.

GODDARD: Managing local currency has always been tricky. I think there were just some ground rules that were unclear to the Ecuadorians and needed to be strengthened.

Q: But it didn't affect the relationships with the host country?

GODDARD: No, By the time I got there it was over and gone.

Q: I'm trying to think if there's anything else on Ecuador. Were relationships with the government of Ecuador good at that point? Again, because that's something that has ebbed and flowed also over time.

GODDARD: You know, they were good enough. I mean, in Health our people worked well in that Ministry. The environmental sector was challenging and hit bumps along the way. The government was threading the needle with expanding oil exploration while responding to social pressure around nature conservation and protection of the environment. Cisco Roybal who managed that program, faced many political headwinds.

But Ecuador in 1990-1994 was a safe, sunny and pleasant place to work. It was a classic LAC program from that era.

Q: Yeah. And you said there was a relatively small number of Americans, which would suggest that you had a very strong FSN staff, with many of them playing important roles. Can you talk about how that worked in the Mission?

GODDARD: Well, for example, Patricio Maldonado was the Program Officer, and he could have run the whole Mission. Eventually, he came to the US and worked for several USAID contractors in key positions. The FSN Mission Economist, Guillermo Jauregui developed an excellent policy dialogue program. The FSN Project Officers in Peter LaPera's Private Sector Office, and my FSN Project Development Officers were filling positions previously held by Foreign Service Officers. Ken Yamashita and Kate Jones had an excellent Health Pop team of FSNs. My Program and Project Development Office consisted of myself, an intern, a junior FS PDO, two US contractors and the rest were FSN Project Development Officers.

Q: A small number of people but all superstars. (Laughs)

GODDARD: In 1993 Chuck went to head the El Salvador Mission. Some of us from USAID Quito went on TDY to El Salvador after Chuck arrived to help them set up their Strategic Objectives.

Q: So, you were in Ecuador 1990 to 1994?

GODDARD: Right.

Q: Anything else on Ecuador that would be important to mention? It sounds like you had a very strong program, you had a very strong staff, things worked well, there weren't any things that were particularly difficult. Right?

GODDARD: Yes, sure, there was a little stress. Not atypically, Bob Kramer, the Deputy Mission Director and Chuck Costello, had a little competition thing going on… and if you had walked into the Mission in 1992 people might have been talking about it at the water cooler. But they worked it out. I enjoyed working with them both, and from previous USAID experience I had learned how to navigate those situations.

In terms of the substance of the program I don't remember any big problem. I mean, as I said, it was a very strong American staff, the Ecuadorians were great. It was an easy place to live, like what's to argue with here. (Laughs)

Q: Maybe a last question on Ecuador. The Latin America bureau has always been known to play a very strong role vis-à-vis its Missions, so I am wondering about the relationship. Was there a lot of communication and was that an effective collaboration?

GODDARD: Yes. Sharon Epstein was our desk officer. She came regularly on TDY. We did bring PPC/WID Women in Development experts to look at projects.
Both Chuck and John had great relationships in USAID Washington. Chuck would go back to DC, he'd lay out the program or project and who was going to argue with Chuck Costello, or John Sambrailo for that matter?

Maybe if you asked Chuck Costello what he would say about it all, he'd see it differently. I know he had to fire one of the contractors on the SUBIR project, a major environmental activity, which was unpleasant. But that's regular stuff for a Mission Director.

AID/Washington, Deputy Executive Secretary, 1994 – 1996

Q: So, meanwhile, you've converted to full Foreign Service status. It's 1994 and you have to start thinking about what you're going to do next. And you ended up doing a very different job. I'm wondering how that evolved.

GODDARD: I was going to bid on another Foreign Service position overseas after Quito. My older daughter graduated from high school, she was going off to college and I had another daughter who was going into tenth grade. I needed somewhere with a good high school. I looked at Deputy Director openings in the Dominican Republic and Sri Lanka.

But around this time, I started a serious relationship with Mark Wiznitzer, the Political Counselor at the Embassy. His tour in Quito was ending at the same time as mine, and we wanted our relationship to continue. Washington DC seemed the best option for the two

of us. Kelly Kammerer, who had worked in Peace Corps/Washington with me years before, and a good friend, was now the Counselor to the Agency. "Kelly, do you need a staff assistant? "I don't - I don't get any staff with this job. Let me look around." (Both laugh) And at that point, Toni Christiansen-Wagner, who was Aaron Williams's Deputy in the Executive Secretariat, was rotating out, so there was a vacancy. I got the job. Another Deputy.

After a brief stint in State Department's Bureau for Politico-Military Affairs, Mark was assigned as State's Director of the Office of Current Intelligence.

Q: And you were the deputy executive secretary?

GODDARD: As Deputy Executive Secretary, which was absolutely the best.

Q: Tell us about what the Executive Secretariat does and what you did during that period.

GODDARD: The Executive Secretariat (ES) is staff to the USAID Administrator. It is responsible for preparing documentation for his signature, acting as the interface with the White House, the Secretary of State, other cabinet and agency leadership. Briefing materials are prepared for the Administrator when he participates in high level meetings, on the Hill, the National Security Council, or with foreign leaders. Program and management policy determinations are cleared and distributed by ES. There's permanent staff and each Administrator chooses his own Executive Secretary. The Secretariat functions like triage, the last stop in the clearance process for the most important decisions and commitments made by the Administrator. Decision documents are then funneled back through the Secretariat for record keeping, distribution and storage. The Executive Secretary and the Deputy sit in the daily Senior Staff meetings and follow up on actions in USAID or other agencies.

It was a 7:00 in the morning to 7:00 at night job. Put on your skates and roll around the building. It was a "don't make any mistakes" kind of job. And working with Aaron Williams was a gift. Walking into the State Department cafeteria to have lunch with him meant you would never get to eat; he stopped and greeted 100 people. It was an amazing two years.

Q: Oh, so you spent two years in Exec Sec? Any highlights?

GODDARD: There was drama.

Q: A lot happened.

GODDARD: Larry Byrne.

Q: I was going to ask you about Larry Byrne, who was such a controversial character, along with "Re-Engineering," closure of AID Missions, and the RIF. There was a lot of tension and animosity.

GODDARD: Somebody said to me, probably Janet Ballantyne, that the Clinton Administration early crew took an agency full of bleeding-heart Liberals and turned them into card-carrying Republicans. (Peasley laughs) There was a lot of animosity at first, particularly towards Reengineering; remember Brian Atwood came in and practically on his first day he terminated a swath of Mission Directors and other senior officers who, in previous years would have had their time in class extended.

There were people weeping in the halls after that. So, that was the first thing.

That summer I was attending the three-month Development Studies Program (DSP). We studied classic development theory, for example private-sector development. At the end of the course Brian came in and made a speech and said, "None of that. We're doing NGOs."

It was tumultuous. The USAID ship didn't take well to being turned around.
For me, however, it was an amazing perch.

Q: Were there issues—I know that when the USAID Missions were closed there were some issues with the State Department. Was that something that Exec Sec ever had to deal with?

GODDARD: Closing Missions was a negotiation with the Congress and the State Department. Once decided, our role was to prepare all the clearances, sign offs, paperwork, decision memos and coordinate the internal and external notifications.

The flow of people and paper, decisions and actions, through the Administrator's Office touched upon every aspect of USAID's multi-billion-dollar mandate. Aaron probably talked to the Administrator ten times a day. The Administrator personally took the most counsel, however, from ten or so political appointees.

Q: Right, Aaron was one of the few career people that, I think, had a strong relationship and was respected by all.

I know that one of the functions of Exec Sec was to make sure that the right people were informed when NSC meetings were scheduled, and the right papers prepared.
Was that at all problematic or difficult, especially in making sure the Regional Bureau voice was heard before the front office made decisions?

GODDARD: My favorite story about Exec Sec is about Deputy Administrator Carol Lancaster's in-box. Remember: we were in the age of paper and multi-colored pieces of tissue carbon copies. Carol would view every document submitted to the Administrator. Sometimes a paper would stay in her in-box for a while. Senior Staff from various

Bureaus would regularly try and sneak in to raise an issue on a matter already closed and finalized for signature. Sometimes they would request the Executive Secretariat staff to pull something back from her in-box, or send somebody in through a backdoor, to get to Carol with a dissenting opinion before her clearance was signed. There was so much competition, so much jockeying for position, about who would have the last word. And again, these were written words, these were documents and papers that had gone through an extensive process of vetting numerous points of view and hand-written signatures were attached. "Could you just let me see that and let me make a little change in the wording?" On something with eight clearance signatures? NO! (Laughs) It was a bit of a circus. I mean, it wasn't funny at the time. Remember this was all pre-internet. It was a completely different world.

Q: And part of the function was also the preservation of decision-making documents, right?

GODDARD: Correct. The paper filing.

And the management of the premises of the Administrator's office suite in the old State Department building. It had walnut paneled walls and velvet drapes and carved ceilings. There's a story about one USAID Administrator who had photographs taken of himself in every country he visited. He put them in cheesy four-by-six-inch CVS frames, got nails and hung them all over his grand office. When he left, the Exec Sec staff went around and carefully filled all the little holes in the walnut paneling (Peasley laughs).

Q: Well, that's a great way to learn the agency, for sure, and to learn how important process can be. We can make fun of process, but it also is important.

GODDARD: In the Mission in Quito, the Project Development Office operated with a record-keeping system of tissue carbon paper. We used yellow sheets for the project office, pink sheets for the Director, white sheets for the circulating file and blue sheets for permanent storage. That one piece of colored paper, with the proper initials on the signature line, might commit $4 million dollars for a project somewhere. And we had WANGS.

Q: Well, I would think that two years at the exec sec would be very exhausting. Was Aaron there the whole time you were?

GODDARD: Yes.

If I could do it again, I would do it in a heartbeat. It was just the most amazing experience. I saw myself as late to the game in USAID. I was an AD, and I was not part of the Foreign Service "in-crowd" at USAID, engaged in what some viewed as marginal activities during my career. Talking on the phone with a guy at the White House who called me ma'am was something quite new.

Q: Okay. That's good. And if you think of any stories at any point that you want to share, you can add them.

Senior Seminar, Student, 1996-1997

Q: So, you said you did that for two years and then in 1996 you went off to the Senior Seminar.

GODDARD: Yes. Which was a whole other incredible experience.

Q: Yes. Can you tell us about what that was and who all was in the class and what you did?

GODDARD: I was the only USAID person. There were thirty of us, fifteen people from the State Department and fifteen from other US foreign affairs agencies and departments. The State people were at the point in their careers when becoming an ambassador would be the next step. There was one representative from each of the Military services, and two from the CIA. We had a budget for visits, and we had an Air National Guard plane at our disposal to take us to the various locations where we met and interviewed individuals selected by the seminar members in keeping with the seminar theme.

The Senior Seminar was founded on the assumption that Foreign Service and military personnel who spent much of their careers overseas would become removed from events in their own country, and, after a period of time they would benefit from returning to the US for a structured year of familiarization.

The focus of my Seminar year was leadership; we met all kinds of leaders at many levels and in many contexts. Politicians, educators, community activists, news and media professionals, military, business, policy makers. We brought in speakers and took trips to meet leaders around the US. The idea was to study how leaders came into their roles, what personality traits and other characteristics they demonstrated, what training they received, and what values they espoused.

The list of experiences is too long to repeat here. I could write a whole volume about my time in the Senior Seminar. Among the highlights was our visit to the Los Angeles County Jail where we met a young man who had just come off the street and asked to be jailed, for his own safety. Leadership of street gangs was a novel angle on our seminar theme. He told us the story of his life and he showed us a photograph of his newborn baby with the Crips bandana on its head. Gang hierarchy exploited the powerful human need for belonging, the drive to identify with a group and be part of a community. Leadership was brutal. Only full adherence to the rules could guarantee survival. We met with Native Americans in Alaska who spoke of leadership in a different way but also as an element of survival.

On the first day of the Seminar, during introductions, we each had to answer the question: who are you? The first person stood up and said "I am G.K. Cunningham, I'm a Marine,

I'm a Mormon. That's all you need to know." (Peasley laughs) Bear McConnell the guy from the Army answered by saying "if you were drowning, I would rescue you." We visited several military bases. In North Carolina we drove tanks. I shot a fifty-millimeter machine gun at Fort Pendleton with two Marines holding me down.

One of the Air Force Generals who spoke to us defined leadership as "what motivates an Air Force mechanic to clean out each and every one of the tiny air holes in the wings of the airplanes he services." If this is the "deep state" then the deep state has some mighty fine people.

Q: And committed to what they're doing.

GODDARD: And committed. We met Mayor Giuliani and his police chief and discussed how they had applied the "no broken windows" theory of management to police work in New York city. We came away impressed! We met with an editor of the Chicago Tribune, and toured CNN headquarters in Atlanta. Arianna Huffington spoke to us about leading a large media enterprise. Each speaker described leadership differently. Seminar members grappled with multiple definitions. My favorite was "… a good leader must have good followers."

Q: Obviously, a very valuable experience. And I would think that the opportunity to be a peer with people from other agencies would also enhance one's ability to collaborate over the long-term. And there were opportunities to do that? As I recall, people were assigned special projects?

GODDARD: We did a capstone project. I chose to do mine about issues facing Alaska that appeared so similar to the ones facing countries receiving assistance from USAID.

Our first Seminar trip was to Alaska, where we met people in Barrow, living off whale harvests and ice. After that trip I kept thinking that what we do in USAID might be done in Alaska. USAID has the development tools of trade, the technical sectors, water, sanitation, agriculture, health, family planning. I wrote about water in Alaska and drew parallels with various issues and program strategies in USAID-assisted countries.

I had been to maybe half of USAID's Missions by that time because I had done so much TDY. I took every training program available, the Senior Seminar, Economics training, Project Design, Mid-Level and Senior-Level Management courses, and the Development Studies Program.

Q: It's interesting because you've mentioned two training programs that were significant investments and also had significant impact. One of them was the development studies program and the other the Senior Seminar.

GODDARD: Senior management training was an important one. I relied on that training heavily when I went to Slovakia as Mission Director, but also post-USAID in the private

sector, where I was a senior executive in a big consulting company. That training gave me important management tools which helped me through the rest of my career.

USAID/Slovakia, Mission Director, 1997 – 2000

Q: When we finished up last time you had completed the Senior Seminar and obviously, you then had to consider what you were going to do next. Could you tell us about how that process worked and where you ended up going?

GODDARD: Well, I suppose once you're in the system, the pinnacle position would be being a Mission Director. And even though I had come up rather sideways through the USAID personnel system I did get to know the Regional Bureau DAAs during my time in Exec Sec. The senior management selection process was largely in their hands. I said that I would really love to do something in the Eastern Europe (ENI) program because I have worked in Africa and Latin America and ENI was the newest arena for USAID. I bid on USAID Croatia, but Pamela Baldwin was selected. I ended up assigned to Slovakia, which was, as it turned out, quite fine because Mark was posted to the US Mission to the OSCE in Vienna, an hour's drive from Bratislava. I don't know exactly how that happened, but I think Barbara Turner had something nice to do with it.

So, that's the plus side of the coin. The minus side of the coin was that the peak in Eastern Europe assistance funding had passed, and Congress was already calling for ending many USAID programs. They kind of randomly came up with close out dates for different countries that they thought could "graduate from assistance." On a separate track was a process for these countries to apply for European Union membership and the timetable of the two tracks didn't really line up.

Q: So, in planning for graduation the criteria were defined by EU membership?

GODDARD: In a way, but the US and the EU were not operating in tandem. USAID/Slovakia did not explicitly frame its program around EU accession.

Q: And so, did you know that—as you were being assigned you knew that it would be moving towards a graduation?

GODDARD: Correct. In fact, my dear friend, Terry Brown, sat me down over lunch a week or so before I got on the plane for Bratislava and said, "You have one job and one job only and that is to close that Mission. And don't get distracted, don't get bamboozled, close that Mission in 2000 as agreed."

Q: There was also a program in the Czech Republic?

GODDARD: Yes.

Q: And was it on the same schedule?

GODDARD: The Czech Republic was farther along in the "graduation process" and the USAID Mission was already closed.

Q: And Terry at this point was the Assistant Administrator for Management?

GODDARD: Yes. The responsibility for closing Missions by that time had largely moved over to the management bureau. So, I had my marching orders. When I look back on all the aspects of my career in USAID. My time as Mission Director in Slovakia was both the highest of my experience and to be honest, also the lowest.

Q: What do you mean by that? Did they not want to send a Mission Director?

GODDARD: Well for example, the previous Mission Director who had been there since 1992 or 1993 had done a remarkable job of building USAID Slovakia's program. But when she left, staff had been cut to two FS positions with about $30 million in program funds, most of it for the Democracy and Governance activities. Kathy Stermer, a Personal Services Contractor (PSC) was the DG Officer and with several FSNs she managed support for Parliament, political parties, NGO strengthening, local governments, legal reform, investigative journalism. She had very good contacts with the activists in the Slovak NGO leadership and had built a very strong base of NGO partners through grants assistance.

In 1997, when I arrived at post Vladimír Mečiar, Slovakia's Soviet-style leader had been Prime Minister since 1990. The Parliamentary Elections in 1998 were the first to offer a hope of reform and possibly the unseating of Meciar and his corrupt, anti-democratic regime. Functional opposition parties were emerging. Strong local NGOs that were largely donor created were effective in mobilizing the anti- Mečiar forces. The election of 1998 was a pivotal event in Slovakia's transition to democracy. USAID and the work of Kathy Stermer's DG staff provided leadership to the entire donor community during that election which paved the way for a new direction for the country.

The new prime minister Mikulas Dzurinda and the deputy prime minister Ivan Miklos were real reformers, committed to addressing Soviet style corruption and the passivity it engendered. It was a cultural as well as political change. Much has been written elsewhere about the success of the USAID democracy program in the late 1990's.

However, operating a highly effective program, with visible success, under the shadow of a planned close out date in 2000, and with mixed signals coming from Washington about the wisdom of closing USAID Slovakia on schedule, it was a tense and uncomfortable time.

There were various factions, in USAID and the Embassy, lobbying for an extension of the Slovakia program. The ENI Bureau itself was conflicted, with some taking a hard line about close-out and others openly opposing it. The donor representatives in Slovakia and the local NGOs were using their influence on decision-makers at all levels to delay the end of the USAID program. There were those who held to the belief that the case for

accession to the EU would be weakened if the country was still reliant on development assistance. Slovakia was seen to be at pace with Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic in satisfying the requirements for the next round of EU enlargement.

Within some quarters of the ENI bureau, and among the Mission staff and our partners in Slovakia, there was very vocal opposition to terminating USAID's program. I would have preferred to continue the activities we were supporting which were clearly successful and having the intended impact, but I was aware of the strength of my original mandate to adhere to the close out schedule. The concept of a "post-presence" program was being formulated, within a vague framework and an unclear management structure. Funding was identified, and a procurement was initiated. In my final months we successfully launched a consortium of local NGOs to administer a grants program for several more years beyond the life of the USAID Mission. But it was a difficult time, and one when, for the only time, I felt unsupported by the leadership in AID/W.

Q: What was the discussion of how those residual funds would be managed? Would they be managed by the regional office or out of Washington or—?

GODDARD: Kathy Stermer and myself, others in the USAID Mission and in the embassy felt very strongly that the NGOs that we had supported and developed were now able to manage the post-presence program. They were able to decide what the priorities were, and for a year, a year and a half we had been strengthening them and preparing them to do just that.

But I think, there must have been some sort of a backlash in the ENI bureau and even the post-presence program became controversial because there were some, very few, who thought the funding should go to a US NGO not a Slovak one. But I was firm that we made the right choice.

Q: And this was March of 2000?

GODDARD: Yes. A little office was created in Embassy with a senior USAID FSN from the Democracy Office to backstop the NGO funding and to write a review of USAID assistance in Slovakia.

In the meantime, I had gotten seized with a small anti-corruption activity we had started in cooperation with the US Justice Department Advisor in Bratislava, who was working with USAID on justice sector reform, and we began to discuss where he could see some entry points for anti-corruption work. I was familiar with the World Bank's anti-corruption program to train field staff in the topic. Sanjay Pradhan, at the World Bank Institute prepared studies of corruption for the Slovak government. Ivan Miklos, the Deputy Prime Minister and his colleague Katherina Maternova became engaged in the World Bank effort to address corruption.

When I retired from USAID in the summer of 2000, I was hired in the ENI Bureau, under an institutional contract to identify anti-corruption efforts in the ENI region. Out of that

little contract came USAID's first Conference on Anti-corruption which was held in Budapest with Miklos, the Slovak deputy prime minister as the keynote speaker.

Q: Right. As I recall, it was a bureau wide conference—

GODDARD: Correct. When I sent an email out asking if there was any interest in doing this conference you were the first to say, "Absolutely. It's a good subject."

Q: Okay. I know I went to the conference from Moscow. We supported participation of a Russian hero who had supported the human rights group, Memorial that revealed truths about the Stalin period. Saakashvili from Georgia also spoke at the conference.

GODDARD: Yes. Think about it - big names. And we're talking 1999.

I can remember the people from some other Missions, people that I rode a bus with to some of the meetings saying "…this is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard." One Mission Economist told me "We don't have corruption in Croatia." (Peasley laughs). "You guys, maybe a little further East you've got a problem, but not with us." Again, it was another bubbling up of an unpopular idea. That was my whole career. I was selling unpopular ideas from the day I started to the day I left. (Peasley laughs)

Bert Spector from MSI had been working in Ukraine on anti-corruption for ten years. He opened a door to the topic of Anti-corruption in the bureau and I was successful in bringing greater attention to and interest in what soon became another significant theme in the evolution of the development program.

Retire from USAID (2000) and Become an Anti-Corruption Consultant, 2000 - 2003

GODDARD: Under the contract with ENI I spent the next year or two traveling to Missions and conducting anti-corruption assessments, a technique I had learned from my colleagues at the World Bank. I did an assessment in Croatia and one in Armenia. I took a short-term consultancy at the UN Office for Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and conducted an assessment of the court system in Romania. That is where a Supreme Court justice told me about "telephone justice" … "the President calls on the telephone and tells me how to decide the case."

Q; Croatia, did you find any in Croatia?

GODDARD: We didn't get very far. (Laughs)

But we had a stock approach. We wanted to see within the government what their checks and balances systems were and whether they had auditors and whether their auditors were independent. Anti-corruption by this time was a growing movement. National anti-corruption offices were starting to emerge. And then a backlash would develop, and the most corrupt people took over the Anti-corruption offices or functions and…it was a strange time.

Q: Right. And I'm sorry that I interrupted you because you said you did assessments in Croatia and Romania. You mentioned a third country, but I interrupted you.

GODDARD: Armenia, which was one of the most substantive of the ones I did.

Q: Okay. So, these were under different auspices?

GODDARD: Yes, different contracts with the UN and USAID.

Q: A corruption question because I remember in Russia when an assessment was done, they identified different kinds of corruption. Some were built into the old Soviet system of scarcity in which you had to bribe someone to get anything or any service.

GODDARD: Right.

Q: And our own staff in the Mission would say, "If you wanted to get good care at the hospital you had to give extra money to everyone along the way."

GODDARD: Well, one of the things we found in Armenia was that if you had a baby in the hospital to get your newborn released from the hospital it cost you $700 in cash.

Q: Okay. So, there's that kind of corruption and then there's the fraud related to government resources. Did you look at the whole breadth of corruption and then try to help countries or people think through where they should focus their major attention?

GODDARD: At that point the way to analyze and identify corruption problems was a pretty well-established process. Solutions, however, were much harder to implement. The Armenian example is probably the best of all. The president of the country and his ministers divided up the fruits of the country amongst themselves. The head of the Health ministry had a monopoly on all imports of drugs, allowing for major kickbacks. The head of the Agricultural ministry personally had thousands of hectares under cultivation of apricots but was never hooked up to a metering system and got free electricity for his irrigation pumps. The lake that supplied the country's water supply was dwindling and becoming a crisis, an environmental crisis, while the ministry of Agriculture was basically stealing water.

We interviewed a farmer who was growing fruit used for brandy, which is one of Armenia's largest exports. He described to us the process he went through to get a health certificate for exporting his product. Someone would visit the farm and introduce himself as the health inspector. The inspector would ask the farmer to fill out a form saying what kind of product he had, whatever inputs he used, what types of chemicals and so on and list those. The farmer filled out the form then, for a price, the inspector would go out to the field, collect samples of the fruit and take them to the lab for examination. But when our team went to find the laboratory that analyzed the samples and studied them, there was none. So, a little bit of payoff to that inspector, and soon someone at the top has

enough in his pocket and the farmer gets his meaningless export certificate. (Peasley laughs)

Our report was then shared with the Embassy staff. The recommendations included a number of steps that the US (and other donors) could take at the highest levels to address our corruption concerns. But we found that USAID had little leverage in this context, and in reality, most of our Embassies were not equipped to dive into such a sensitive issue.

Q: This study in Armenia, was that done through USAID or was that the UN?

GODDARD: Yes, it was a USAID contract with ARD.

Q: It was funded by USAID? I'm curious because you said the embassy didn't take it up very seriously.

GODDARD: We were led to understand that US domestic politics and relations with the Armenian Americans dictated how actively the US was able to pursue a reform agenda in the country program. The EU donor coordination committee was also reluctant to embrace our findings, fearing a slowdown in the disbursement of their funds. That was in 2001, twenty years ago. It would be interesting to see where Armenia is in regard to corruption today.

Q: Right. Interesting too, with the politics. Anti-corruption programming is probably as complicated as anything that one could ever conceive of.

GODDARD. To me it was fascinating. I found Anti-corruption the most intellectually challenging work I did, and I think probably the most durable in terms of problems in today's world.

Q: I know Sally Shelton was at the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in Paris at that time; she had some kind of a unit on anti-corruption as well. Did you have any involvement with them?

GODDARD: No, and I knew Sally Shelton from her early days at the State Department when I was in the WID office. But all these cross-cutting topics, WID, Evaluation, anti-corruption, were subjects for donor coordination at the OECD. So, I'm not surprised.

Q: You talked about the EU coordination group, to what extent was the EU looking at those anti-corruption issues as it was assessing countries for membership?

GODDARD: The only anti-corruption assessments I did for the UN were in Romania, I teamed with a young Romanian magistrate and the focus was specifically on Rule of Law requirements for EU accession.

The other was a little mini project to attend and document a meeting of military leaders from eastern Europe to address corruption in the military.

Q: Yes. I was going to ask if during this consulting period you saw any best practices or things that you think were the most successful?

GODDARD: I would say the World Bank's work was the most evolved.

Q: And can you briefly summarize what you recall the essence of that was? Or if not, I mean, that's fine, we can leave it as it is. If anyone's interested, they can look it up.

GODDARD: They had a good analytical framework defining what is petty corruption, what is grand corruption, what is systemic corruption. We learned in Armenia that corruption is a thread throughout the development process and pops up in surprising places. Corruption in the health sector? holding babies hostage before they can leave the hospital? Corruption in the military? Corruption in the construction trades? Corruption in educational institutions? Yes, everybody was familiar with paying the policeman who stopped them on the road at night. And people are familiar with a system of bribes at City Hall for permits and such. To start, combating corruption is just picking away at the problem. Pick away until you build an accounting system that is transparent. Look for leaders and successful models. My boss at the UN called them "Islands of Integrity." Find an island of integrity and build on it.

Q: Okay. That's helpful, thank you.

So, you did this for several years, doing different kinds of anti-corruption consulting. And then as you mentioned, one of those assignments led to you going to work for ARD.

ARD/TetraTech, Vice President, 2003 – 2018.

GODDARD: In 2003, I moved back to the US from Vienna. Consulting jobs in Armenia and Albania led to an offer from George Burrill, President of ARD and a former Peace Corps volunteer, who had gone back to Vermont and said, "I love Vermont, I love development, I'm going to do it from here." And he founded a Vermont-based consulting firm with an extensive portfolio of USAID contracts.

Q: And you all had your granola every morning, right?

GODDARD: We did, and we wore our socks with our Birkenstocks. (Both laugh)

Q: Okay. You are now working for a firm that did work for a lot of different donors but USAID being one of the prime ones. Any observations you have from sitting on the other side of the table? Anything you wish you'd known when you worked for USAID, or that you might have done differently, or that you wish AID would now consider doing?

GODDARD: Well, I think the old canard is when you get on the outside you see all the warts on the inside. Honestly, I did not really end up with a dim view of USAID work. I reserve my one reservation about USAID to just my time in Slovakia and how it ended.

ARD had a large presence in Colombia, the first project was $400 million, the second one was $500 million.

Q: I didn't mean to ask you to take potshots or anything. Were you close enough to the Colombia work to be able to talk about it a bit. Colombia is seen as very much of a success story and if you have some thoughts on that program that would be nice to be able to document.

GODDARD: So, Tetra Tech acquired ARD when the MIDAS and ADAM projects were in the pipeline already. It was one of the reasons Tetra Tech bought ARD, because there was a multimillion-dollar backlog that was going to keep the work coming for a couple of years. The projects were to introduce crops that produced sustainable income and reduce coca production. There were activities to strengthen local governments and participation in civil society. There were over 100 people on the staff.

Q: So, these were two simultaneous projects?

GODDARD: Two simultaneous projects.

Q: So, you were the major implementing partner then for USAID-Colombia?

GODDARD: Correct.

And the way ARD-Tetra Tech in Burlington was organized, there was a group of people who wrote proposals and then my group, which managed the projects being implemented. My title was Vice President for Program Operations. I had responsibility for a dozen or so project managers, each with a technical person assigned to every project.

Q: So, you had to probably do a lot of troubleshooting as well.

GODDARD: Yes. And we did have some serious issues sometimes. After a run-in with a Contracting Officer, I had to appear in Bambi Arrelano's office in Bogota and explain myself to her. So, it wasn't smooth sailing the entire time. But it was my kind of role, to figure out how to get those problems solved.

Q: Okay. Was ARD also working in Afghanistan during this period? Was that another big program that you all might have had?

GODDARD: Yes, but I was not involved in the Afghanistan program. George Burril decided early on, not to bid on any contracts in Iraq, but we were quite engaged in Afghanistan.

Q: Okay. Were there any projects that you were particularly enamored by during your time at ARD that you would like to highlight at all? And if so—and if you can't think of it now, we can always add it during the editing process.

GODDARD: The bulk of my time was devoted to the Colombia projects.

ARD had a very strong governance division and a very strong agricultural staff. Those were the two longest suits for ARD. Experts with strong technical skills, some PhDs. It was a knowledgeable and experienced consulting staff.

Q: Yes. And intellectually stimulating, I'm sure, to work there.

GODDARD: Yes, absolutely. And the other part was the opportunity to be a part of senior management in the private sector, compared with being a senior manager in the government. In 2007 when ARD was acquired by Tetra Tech, a multi-billion dollar, California-based engineering firm, "change management" was a major task. The Vermont way was confronted with overseers from the corporate world in suits and ties. As it turned out they were good overseers, but the initial resistance was a bit painful for some.

Q: Yes, that's interesting. You certainly have seen change management in USAID when new administrations come in.

GODDARD: Right.

Q: You've seen it from the point of acquisition. Any lessons learned that you think leaders need to take into account when they're doing change management?

GODDARD: Tetra Tech does it a lot because a large share of the company's growth comes from acquisitions, and they regularly incorporate both large and small entities under the Tetra Tech umbrella. The approach is systematic and culturally sensitive, down to the pace of the name change and a slow adjustment of the chain of command. Vermonters live in Vermont because they are free from "big business". George Burrill did not have a "Personnel" office. The folks in Birkenstocks did not see themselves as "corporate". (laughs) So it was challenging.

Q: But ultimately that was a successful merger?

GODDARD: Yes, it was. Because the approach had been honed by Tetra Tech's many acquisitions and frankly, there were few, if any, other opportunities to work in development in Burlington.

Q: Okay, so there were adaptations on both sides.

GODDARD: Yes. Yes.

Q: So, Birkenstocks were still acceptable?

GODDARD: And none of them go to the office anymore, but I imagine today many of them are probably wearing even less than Birkenstocks. (Both laugh)

Q: Barefoot now.

GODDARD: Exactly.

Q: Any other thoughts about the consulting world or on management and leadership more generally before we begin to wrap up our discussion?

GODDARD: I would just comment that the two worlds of government and the for-profit world, like Tetra Tech, operate differently. Competing for new work is the bread and butter of the Tetra Techs of the world. Winning contracts meant keeping yourself and others in jobs. In the government you have the security of drawing down on an allocated budget. But every action you take is owned by and owed to the public. Your obligation is to benefit the people whose funds you are using. A different type of professional responsibility. For me personally, I'm grateful that I experienced both.

Q: Yes. That's an important insight.

You've made a lot of stops in interesting places and worked on interesting issues. Before asking any final thoughts, several times you've mentioned that you specialized in working on topics that were not always everyone's favorite. Any thoughts on how to lead change on these kinds of issues? You've given a lot of credit to Arvonne Fraser and how she went about those early steps in the Office of Women in Development. Could there have been an Arvonne Fraser on anti-corruption programming?

GODDARD: Probably not. What Arvonne did in the 1970's as an American woman, generating a global movement and providing meaningful leadership in an international context, representing poor women from other countries, advocating and speaking for them, being their voice, that's a very tricky role to play. There was the inevitable blowback. Because you're at once the good guy and at the same time seen as coming from an exploitative bad guy world. As far as anti-corruption goes, again, it is something that is embedded in the society itself and outsiders, foreigners, have a limited role to play in promoting that kind of change. The stakes are high when it comes to fighting corruption. Some technical skills will be relevant but the more important forces for change are going to be political.

Q: And finding the right local partners.

GODDARD: Exactly. Find those islands of integrity. This is where that Parliamentary election in 1998 in Slovakia is revelatory. USAID did not address corruption directly. But supporting local leaders and strengthening local institutions proved enough to mobilize voters who demanded change and brought in a new reform-minded Administration.

Back to the topic of change management for a minute, I was going to say, the changes that Brian Atwood and Larry Byrne brought into USAID, when Re Engineering ran into such resistance in the beginning, probably did not reflect the best change management

technique. Economists I worked with told me: always start a policy dialogue with a little graphic of who are the winners and who are the losers. Pay attention to the losers first, because they are not always the little guys. (Both laugh) And that's going to be the case whether it's about policy change or about change in an organization.

Q: Those are all important views.

Just, because you highlighted the critical role local organizations played in Slovakia. You know that USAID is focused yet again on localization policy. Any thoughts about how AID goes about supporting local organizations. Again, I think in the WID area too, there was often support of local women's organizations.

And I'm curious if you have any thoughts that would be useful to AID as they think about how to improve their localization work.

GODDARD: For us "outsiders" I think first about a technocratic approach which looks at systems and the rules of the game and helps understand the dynamics at the local level. But then see which leaders are likely to work with you. And what are the pressures on them. Local governments do not function in isolation. One look at the plight of Mexico's mayors today and you can see the complex web of factors affecting them and their towns. It may not be possible for USAID to be effective facilitators of localization in every context.

Q: Yes, that's important. Lastly, any final thoughts about a career in international development? A good thing?

GODDARD: Yes, a good thing. You retire after leading this fragmented life, bouncing all over and living in a series of temporary communities but you don't have community. Not the way you would if you stayed in one place for your entire life. You get used to being an outsider. It's not for everybody. There are sacrifices. And when you get to the end of your career, the end of your whole life, you see how other people lived their lives, you see other models that are more secure and more comforting at the end, when people who went to elementary school with you are still your friends (both laugh). Some prefer that.

But this life was, for me, probably just what I had to do.

Q: Yes, that's a nice summary.

Thank you again, Paula, for sharing your story and valuable experiences and lessons learned with us.

End of interview