

4-1-2012

## A Biotechnology Course for Developing Countries

Karim M. Maredia

*Michigan State University*, [kmaredia@msu.edu](mailto:kmaredia@msu.edu)

Joseph F. Guenther

*University of Idaho*, [guenther@uidaho.edu](mailto:guenther@uidaho.edu)

Cholani K. Weebadde

*Michigan State University*, [weebadde@msu.edu](mailto:weebadde@msu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://newprairiepress.org/jiaee>



Part of the [Growth and Development Commons](#), and the [University Extension Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Maredia, K. M., Guenther, J. F., & Weebadde, C. K. (2012). A Biotechnology Course for Developing Countries. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, 19(1), 12-15. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5191/jiaee.2012.19103>

This Research Article is brought to you for free and open access by New Prairie Press. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education* by an authorized administrator of New Prairie Press. For more information, please contact [cads@k-state.edu](mailto:cads@k-state.edu).

---

## A Biotechnology Course for Developing Countries

### Abstract

Biotechnology offers benefits, but few developing countries have approved genetically engineered (GE) crops. Extension educational programs could help prepare stakeholders in developing countries to influence biotechnology policies. Michigan State University (MSU) developed a two-week course that was taught 14 times from 2002 to 2010 for 251 participants from 58 developing countries. This course helped form an international network of biotechnology specialists who collaborate with stakeholders.

### Keywords

Agricultural Biotechnology, Biosafety, Capacity Building, Developing Countries, Education, Training, Transgenic Crops

DOI: 10.5191/jiaee.2012.19103

## **A Biotechnology Short Course for Developing Countries**

### **Karim M. Maredia**

Professor and Program Director  
World Technology Access Program (WorldTAP)  
Department of Entomology and Institute of International Agriculture  
416 Plant and Soil Sciences Building  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824, U.S.A.  
Tel: (517) 353 5262  
Fax: (517) 432 1982  
E-mail: kmaredia@msu.edu

### **Joseph F. Guenther**

Professor  
Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology  
University of Idaho  
Moscow, ID 83844, U.S.A.  
Tel: (208) 885 6056  
Fax: (208) 885 5759  
E-mail: jguenther@uidaho.edu

### **Cholani K. Weebadde**

Assistant Professor and Associate Director  
World Technology Access Program (WorldTAP)  
Department of Horticulture and Institute of International Agriculture  
274 Plant and Soil Sciences Building  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824, U.S.A.  
Tel: (517) 355 0271 Ext. 1159  
Fax: (517) 432 1982  
E-mail: weebadde@msu.edu

### **Abstract**

*Biotechnology offers benefits, but few developing countries have approved genetically engineered (GE) crops. Extension educational programs could help prepare stakeholders in developing countries to influence biotechnology policies. Michigan State University (MSU) developed a two-week course that was taught 14 times from 2002 to 2010 for 251 participants from 58 developing countries. This course helped form an international network of biotechnology specialists who collaborate with stakeholders.*

**Key words:** Agricultural Biotechnology, Biosafety, Capacity Building, Developing Countries, Education, Training, Transgenic Crops

### **Introduction**

Agricultural biotechnology can reduce hunger, enhance farm profitability and protect the environment, but only fifteen developing countries have approved genetically engineered (GE) crops (James, 2010). Davis, Irani and Payson (2004) identified a need to train international stakeholders to participate in agricultural biotechnology policy development. Navarro (2006) claimed that extension educators could help lead a new Green Revolution with biotechnology. Others cited a need to build biotechnology capacity, including human resources, infrastructure, facilities, policies and partnerships (Grebmer & Omamo, 2005; Johnston, Monagle, Green & Mackenzie 2008).

Continuing a Michigan State University (MSU) legacy of international education and outreach, we developed an international short course in agricultural biotechnology for participants from developing countries. The intent was for this course to become part of a basket of international training programs that MSU offers to build human resources and institutional capacity in agriculture (Weir & Maredia, 2006).

### **Development and Implementation**

We sought collaboration and financial support from the United States Department of Agriculture Foreign Agriculture Service (USDA-FAS). The agency provided funding for the development and initiation of this course at MSU in 2002. Since then, USDA-FAS has helped identify and recruit participants from developing countries, and it sponsors many of them through the Cochran Fellowship Program.

To develop course curriculum we obtained input from experts in universities, government agencies, non-profit organizations, biotechnology companies, and USDA-FAS. Based on needs identified in developing countries we decided to go

beyond the science of biotechnology to also cover policies, regulations, commercialization, and communication. We offered the first course in September 2002, and since then have taught it thirteen more times. For the fourteen courses, 251 participants from 58 developing countries in Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East have attended. Government employees made up 46% of the participants, and 39% were scientists. Other participants included lawyers, journalists, business managers and NGO representatives.

### **Course Components**

The first week of the course is held at Michigan State University. Scientists share information on their research projects in plant and animal biotechnology so that participants become familiar with biotechnology applications in agriculture. Participants also meet farmers who grow GE crops and, together with extension specialists, discuss their experiences with GE crop production and marketing. The first-week curriculum also covers societal acceptance of technology, communication, intellectual property rights (IPR), technology transfer and an open forum with faculty members involved in biotechnology research.

During the second week, participants travel to observe biotechnology firms that develop and commercialize agricultural products worldwide. Visits to the Donald Danforth Plant Science Center and Monsanto have been included in some courses. Then the course moves to Washington, D.C for a concluding session. Representatives from the federal government, international organizations and the media discuss their programs related to biotechnology regulation, communication and outreach.

The short course provides a platform for stakeholders in the U.S. to create new linkages with participants involved in

agricultural biotechnology around the world. Graduates receive copies of the presentations on a CD, which also contains web links of biotechnology resources and a list of faculty and participants for future networking.

### **Evaluation**

In 2009 we surveyed participants in the previous twelve courses. Ninety-two percent of the respondents strongly agreed with the following statement: “The MSU course provided me with sufficient information and training to raise my understanding on biotechnology issues.” All of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the course provided them with tools to influence policy in their countries. None disagreed with the statement that the course provided tools to build stakeholder coalitions.

We asked participants, in an open-ended question, about key strengths of the course. They identified opportunities to see GE crops in the field and to interact with various stakeholders, especially farmers, as hallmarks of the course. The farm visits included a lunch in which participants were served GE sweet corn. Participants also valued other communications-related components, including networking with participants from other countries and practical exercises in GE acceptance.

Participants suggested several enhancements, including sessions related to co-existence of GE crops with organic agriculture, new GE products in development, and international trade regulations. Some suggested a session to reveal perspectives of stakeholders who oppose biotechnology. Many participants expressed strong interest in forming partnerships for collaborative research and for offering similar courses in their home countries.

### **Impacts**

Short course graduates contribute to biotechnology programs in their home countries. One participant from Albania published articles in agricultural magazines and is involved in the Ministry of Agriculture’s discussions about biotechnology. A participant from Peru is serving on the Advisory Board of PeruBiotec, a new NGO that brings stakeholders together for discussions on biotechnology. Another graduate is working with Malaysian Biotechnology Information Center (MABIC) in building coalitions among biotechnology stakeholders. One Sri Lankan is actively involved in the formulation of the National Biotechnology Research and Development Program.

Many other participants use course materials and resources that were provided for their teaching needs. These spillover effects have been significant and will continue in the future. The success of this course has made it an integral part of the international agricultural development programs at MSU. Faculty have conducted Training of Trainers programs for offering similar courses in developing countries for academic and non-academic audiences. This is achieved through collaboration with local universities and non-profit organizations with interest in training and capacity building. Many universities around the world are using materials from this course in their educational programs.

### References

- Davis, K., Irani, T. & Payson, K. (2004). Going forward in education on agricultural biotechnology: Extension's role internationally. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, 11(4), 25–34.
- Johnston, S., Monagle, C., Green, J. & Mackenzie, R. (2008). Internationally funded training in biotechnology and biosafety: Is it bridging the biotech divide? Yokahama, Japan: *The United Nations University—Institute of Advanced Sciences*.  
[http://www.ias.unu.edu/sub\\_page.aspx?catID=111&ddlID=673](http://www.ias.unu.edu/sub_page.aspx?catID=111&ddlID=673)
- Grebmer, S. & Omano, K. (Eds.) (2005). Lessons and recommendations. *Biotechnology, agriculture and food security in southern Africa*, S. Were Omano & K. von Grebmer, eds., Washington, DC: IFPRI and Harare, Zimbabwe: FANRPAN.
- James, C. (2010). *Brief 41: Global status of commercialized biotech/GM crops: 2009 International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech Applications*  
<http://www.isaaa.org/resources/publications/briefs/41/contents/default.asp>
- Navarro, M. (2006). How can agricultural and extension educators contribute to a successful new green revolution? *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, 12(2), 83–95.
- Weir, C. & Maredia, K. (2006). Building food safety capacity worldwide: An example of international extension opportunities. *Journal of International Agricultural and Extension Education*, 13(3), 103–106.