

739  
11p.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT EVALUATION REPORT	1. Cooperating Country <b>Nigeria</b>	2. Data Current as of: <b>March 31, 1966</b>
3. Project Title <b>Faculty of Business and Social Studies, University of Lagos</b>	4. Project Number <b>62C-11-770-739</b>	
5. Date original ProAg Executed <b>January 22, 1963</b>	6. Estimated Date of U. S. Physical Completion <b>June, 1970</b>	7. Estimated Date of U. S. Financial Completion <b>December, 1970</b>

8. IMPORTANCE RANKING BY MISSION DIRECTOR  
In terms of overall importance to the achievement of U. S. objectives in this country, this project falls in the:

a.  Lowest Quartile    b.  3rd Quartile    c.  2nd Quartile    d.  Top Quartile

of all AID dollar TA projects in all activity fields in this country (exclude Technical Support). One fourth of the number of projects must be ranked in each quartile.

9. CONTRIBUTION - The actual contribution of the project to the following U. S. objectives during the last six months is:

a. U. S. Objectives	b. Rating					
	1. Not Relevant	2. Negative	3. None	4. Modest	5. Good	6. Outstanding
1. Directly Increase Production	X					
2. Improve Infrastructure	X					
3. Improve Economic Institutions					X	
4. Directly Improve Personal Welfare	X					
5. Improve Social-Political Institutions				X		
6. Security	X					
7. U. S. Relations			X			
8. U. S. Commercial Interest	X					

10. ACHIEVEMENT OF ACTIVITY TARGETS

a. How well are the activity targets of the project being achieved?

1.  Unsatisfactory    2.  Marginal    3.  Adequate    4.  (See narrative) (See narrative)    5.  Outstanding

b. In general, project execution in relation to schedule is:

1.  Seriously behind    2.  (See narrative) Slightly behind    3.  On time    4.  Ahead

11. MISSION DIRECTOR RECOMMENDATION: (Check one)

a.  This project should be discontinued earlier than originally planned. If checked, when? \_\_\_\_\_

b.  This project should be evaluated in depth as a basis for determining its effectiveness, future scope and direction.

c.  This project should be continued as currently planned.

12. PROJECT COORDINATOR  <u>William B. Rhode</u> Name <u>Public Administration Advisor</u> Title and Grade	<u>William E. Rhode</u> Signature <u>June 2, 1966</u> Date	13. APPROVED BY MISSION DIRECTOR  <u>[Signature]</u> Signature <u>June 20, 1966</u> Date
---	---	---

---

**I. ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

---

- A. List all significant accomplishments attributable to this project during the six months covered by this report. Be succinct, explicit and, where possible quantitative. For each accomplishment indicate whether it is substantially the same as, more than, or less than planned.
- B. List in comparable realistic terms expected accomplishments during the next six months.
- A. 1. Enrolled and trained about 290 students in Faculty of Business and Social Studies, including 115 new students (65 in the day program; 50 in evening studies). About as planned.
2. Processed and arranged U.S. participant training for 3 prospective Nigerian staff members. Less than planned.
3. Held 4, non-degree seminars for top and middle management staff of business firms in Capitol territory under Extra-Mural program. About as planned.
4. Developed limited number of case studies for class teaching purposes. Less than planned.
5. Continued to add books and periodicals in Social Studies and Business to University Library. About as planned.
6. Graduated first class of Business Administration majors in December, 1965, numbering 29 (Hold over from Spring term because of University crisis and shut-down).
- B. 1. Continue training of the 290 students (See A-1 above); anticipate graduating about 40 Business Administration majors in June, 1966.
2. Send four prospective Nigerian staff members to U.S. for participant training in August, 1966.
3. Recruit total contract staff of seven and commence strengthening of newly organized Faculty of Administration and expanded Continuing Education Program.
4. Continue library development and production of relevant teaching materials.
5. Develop policies, plans, and organization for expanded Continuing Education Program.

## II. TECHNICIANS - U. S. and Third Country

 None

## A. ON BOARD AND RATING

Enter the number of technicians in each category.

1. Type of Technician	2. Total on Board		3. Rating of Performance					
	a. Scheduled	b. Actual	a. Unsatisfactory	b. Marginal	c. Adequate	d. Good	e. Outstanding	f. Not Rated
a. U. S. Contract	7	3		2		1		
b. U. S. PASA								
c. U. S. Direct Hire								
d. Third Country								

## B. CONTRACTORS

1. Contract Number	2. Name of Contractor	3. Type of Contractor
a. AID/4fe-31	New York University	University
b.		
c.		
d.		

## C. PARTICIPATING AGENCIES

1. PASA Number	2. Name of Participating Agency	3. Organizational Entity
a.		
b.		
c.		

D. Indicate the number of each type of technician with any of the following problems which have had a significant adverse effect on the project during the past six months.

1. Type of Technician				2. Problem
a. Contract	b. U. S. PASA	c. U. S. Direct Hire	d. Third Country	
				a. Inadequate technical knowledge
				b. Inadequate knowledge of country and culture
				c. Language barrier or translation difficulties
				d. Health problems resulting in evacuation or excessive absenteeism
2				e. <del>Personality</del> or emotional problems
				f. Negative attitude toward project
3				g. Poor personal relations with U. S. technicians
				h. Poor personal relations with Third Country technicians
				i. Poor personal relations with counterpart technicians
				j. Poor personal relations with local citizenry
				k. Inadequate communication between project technicians and Mission
				l. Lack of occupational adaptability (inability to apply technical knowledge to country situation)
				m. Other (Specify in Narrative Section)

## III. PARTICIPANTS

 None

A. Give the number of participants falling in each of the following categories by the location of training.

1. Location of Training		2. Participant Program Status
a. U.S.	b. Third Country	
2		a. Participants have received training and returned to country from start of project to the beginning of this reporting period
		b. Participants have returned to country during this six month reporting period
3		c. Participants are being trained
		d. Participants are being processed for training
9		e. Participants have yet to be selected
14		f. Participants will have been trained when project terminates (Item f. is the sum of a. through e.)

B. In general, the participant training component of this project in relation to schedule is:

1.  Seriously behind      2.  Slightly behind      3.  On time      4.  Ahead

C. Of the returned participants, indicate the number whose performance in their job is rated as follows:

1. \_\_\_ Unsatisfactory      2. \_\_\_ Marginal      3. \_\_\_ Adequate      4. 2 Good  
5. \_\_\_ Outstanding      6. \_\_\_ Not Rated

D. Indicate the number of returned participants who fall into each of the following categories:

1. \_\_\_ Have undesirable character traits
2. \_\_\_ Are hostile to the United States
3. \_\_\_ Received inadequate training in the United States
4. \_\_\_ Received inadequate training in a Third Country
5. \_\_\_ Are assigned to positions below their level of competence
6. \_\_\_ Are assigned to positions above their level of competence
7. \_\_\_ Are unable to get their ideas accepted by their supervisors
8. 2 Are using their training almost as planned
9. \_\_\_ Are employed in higher rank positions than planned
10. \_\_\_ Are not being utilized to take good advantage of their training
11. \_\_\_ Have been lost to the project but are using their training
12. \_\_\_ Are no longer in contact with the Mission

IV. AID DOLLAR FINANCED COMMODITIES  None

 A. Quality of commodities delivered for use in this project in general is: (Check)

- 1.
- 
- Unsatisfactory    2.
- 
- Marginal    3.
- 
- Adequate    4.
- 
- Good    5.
- 
- Outstanding

 B. Use being made of commodities in this project in general is: (Check)

- 1.
- 
- Unsatisfactory    2.
- 
- Marginal    3.
- 
- Adequate    4.
- 
- Good    5.
- 
- Outstanding

C. U. S. Government Excess Property

 1. Has any such property been delivered to date for use on this project?  Yes  No

2. Original acquisition cost of such property: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

 3. Has the quality of the excess property satisfied the needs of the project?  
 Yes     No    If no, briefly describe problem in the Narrative Section.

D. Are there any commodity problems which have had a significant adverse effect on the project during the past six months? (Check)

- 1.
- 
- Late delivery of commodities to port of entry
- 
- 2.
- 
- Difficulty or serious delays in transporting commodities from port of entry to project site(s)
- 
- 3.
- 
- Lack of adequate storage facilities
- 
- 4.
- 
- Severe damage in shipment
- 
- 5.
- 
- Commodities have arrived but are not being used
- 
- 6.
- 
- Significant portion lost or stolen
- 
- 7.
- 
- Commodities received did not meet PIO specifications
- 
- 8.
- 
- Related facilities not ready to receive commodities
- 
- 9.
- 
- Unsited to climate/environmental conditions
- 
- 10.
- 
- Unnecessarily sophisticated for use by country nationals
- 
- 11.
- 
- Lack of satisfactory maintenance facilities and sufficient spare parts
- 
- 12.
- 
- Other (Specify in Narrative Section)

E. OVERDUE COMMODITY DELIVERIES

If any deliveries on any PIO/C are overdue 120 days or longer, check the responsible authorized procurement agent and describe the situation in the Narrative Section.

- 1.
- 
- Cooperating Country    2.
- 
- Mission    3.
- 
- GSA    4.
- 
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

F. List the P/O/Cs issued for this project and the dollar value of commodities authorized, ordered and delivered. Check Column 2 for P/O/Cs on which deliveries are 120 days or more overdue.

1. P/O/C Number	2. Deliveries 120 Days Overdue	Dollar Value (000)		
		3. Authorized	4. Ordered	5. Delivered
a. Total Number Completed P/O/Cs: 2	///	9.	5.	5.
b. AID/afe-31		10.	8.	5.
c.				
d.				
e.				
f.				
g.				
h.				
i.				
j.				

#### V. COOPERATING COUNTRY

A. In general, the country government's participation in this project is:

1.  Unsatisfactory    2.  Marginal    3.  Adequate    4.  Good    5.  Outstanding

B. Check country problems of a serious nature having a significant adverse affect on this project's progress in the last six months:

1.  Disagreement between government ministries
2.  Disagreement between government officials within a single ministry
3.  Change in executive leadership
4.  Sufficient cooperating country funds have not been provided
5.  Necessary enabling legislation is not being developed/passed
6.  An organization has not been established or staffed as agreed
7.  Excessive red tape, bureaucratic delays, or important deadlines missed
8.  Delays in the clearance of U. S. Technicians
9.  Qualified counterpart technicians have not been assigned
10.  Qualified counterpart technicians have not been assigned on time
11.  Qualified participant trainees are not available
12.  Qualified participant trainees have not been nominated
13.  Qualified participant trainees have not been nominated on time
14.  Maintenance of facilities and equipment is sub-standard
15.  Local political differences
16.  Tribal, class, or caste conflicts
17.  Cultural resistances to changes
18.  Cooperating country personnel not receptive to U. S. technician major recommendations
19.  Other (Specify in Narrative Section)

C. Mission estimate of attitude toward the project. If there are significant differences between government entities, check Mixed and explain in Narrative Section.

1. Cooperating Country	2. Rating Categories				
	a. Negative	b. Mixed	c. Pessive	d. Favorable	e. Enthusiastic
a. Government in General				X	
b. Citizens Being Reached				X	

D. Take-over and Continuation Plans of the Cooperating Country

- Does the Cooperating Country have take-over and continuation plans?
  - Yes
  - No
  - Inapplicable
- Cooperating Country attitude with respect to take-over and continuation of the project:
  - Uncertain
  - Intenis to take over
  - Anxious to take over
- If take-over stage is in progress, are Cooperating Country's activities proceeding satisfactorily?
  - Yes
  - No
  - Inapplicable

E. Counterpart Technicians

- Indicate the number in each of the following categories:
  - 2 On Board
  - \_\_\_ Unsatisfactory
  - \_\_\_ Marginal
  - \_\_\_ Adequate
  - 2 Good
  - \_\_\_ Outstanding
  - \_\_\_ Not Rated
- Indicate the number of counterpart technicians in each of the following areas which have had a significant adverse effect on the project during the past six months:
  - \_\_\_ Inadequate technical education
  - \_\_\_ Inadequate technical experience
  - \_\_\_ Inadequate leadership and supervision skills
  - \_\_\_ Working only part time, whereas full time is required
  - \_\_\_ Technicians have been assigned and then transferred
  - \_\_\_ Unwillingness to work or travel in rural or provincial areas
  - \_\_\_ Pay and allowances are too low
  - \_\_\_ Maturity and age
  - \_\_\_ Motivation
  - \_\_\_ Morale
  - \_\_\_ Other (Specify in Narrative Section)

## F. Total Cooperating Country Financial Contribution Directly to Project

1. Type of Contribution	In Dollar Equivalents (000)		
	2. Total Planned for Life of Project	3. Actually Committed to Date	4. Disbursements to Date
a. <i>See last item in (oh narrative section)</i>	8,120.0	4,775.00	4,012.5
b. In Kind			
c. TOTAL			

G. Were the contributions of the cooperating country over the past six months reasonably in accordance with agreements?

Yes  No If no, discuss problem in Narrative Section

## VI. PROJECT SUPPORT

A. Rate the backstopping for this project as shown below:

1. Type of Backstopping	2. Rating Categories				
	a. Unsatisfactory	b. Marginal	c. Adequate	d. Good	e. Outstanding
a. Timeliness	i. AID/W		X		
	ii. PASA				
	iii. Contractor			X (See narrative)	
b. Quality	i. AID/W		X		
	ii. PASA				
	iii. Contractor		X		

B. Check any backstopping deficiencies which have had a significant adverse effect on the project's progress in the last six months:

1. Backstop			2. Deficiency
a. AID/W	b. PASA	c. Contractor	
			a. Technicians have not been recruited on schedule
			b. PASA/Contract negotiations have not been concluded on schedule
			c. Participant call forward dates have been delayed
			d. Commodities have not arrived on schedule
			e. Approvals and guidance required have been significantly delayed
			f. Information and technical support have been inadequate
			g. Actions currently pending are impeding project progress
		X	h. Other (Specify in Narrative Section)

## VII. GENERAL (If answer is Yes to any of the following, describe in Narrative Section)

Yes	No	
	X	A. Are there any significant problems or causes of delay in this project not already covered in this report?
	X	B. Has this project revealed the need for technical aids, e.g., pamphlets, materials or equipment, which are not currently available from back-stopping sources?
	X	C. Has this project revealed any requirement for research to be financed by AID/W?
X		D. 1. Does the project involve participation of organizations or countries other than AID and the cooperating country?
	X	2. If the answer to D.1. is Yes, are there any significant personal, logistic, technical, or financial problems resulting from this arrangement?
	X	E. 1. Does the project have significant characteristics transferrable to other countries?
	X	2. Are there important lessons (positive or negative) to be learned from this project?
	X	3. Has the project employed any unusual techniques, devices, or tools from which others may profit?
	X	F. Do any aspects of the project lend themselves to publicity (newspaper, magazine, television, or films) in the United States?

9. Indicate the number of times in the reporting period the project site(s) was visited by each of the following:

- |   |                             |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. <u>10</u> Project Coordinator          | 3. <u>0</u> AID/W Personnel |
| 2. <u>4</u> Local Mission U. S. Personnel | 4. <u>25</u> U. S. VIPs     |

## VIII. NARRATIVE SECTION

Organize this section to correspond with the order of the structured portion of the TAPER. Identify each narrative statement by the appropriate section and item number.

Item 10-a. This rating must be tempered by the behavior and virtual expulsion by the University of Lagos of a couple NYU team members (including the Chief of Party/Dean of the Faculty) for their participation in the faculty and Senate response to the crisis over selection of a Vice-Chancellor which swept over the University campus from February to June of 1965. Their participation and subsequent departure did not have a significant effect upon achievement of project objectives, but did have an impact/evaluation of U.S. participation by a number of people. The post-crisis period has not revealed any serious consequences for actual project achievement as a result of this episode.

It should also be kept in mind that the closing of the University from March until October, 1965, and the fact that only three NYU staff members remained in Nigeria after July, 1965 (because of expulsions and resignations) caused an abrupt halt to certain activities (e.g. teaching) or a considerable slow-down in others (e.g. book ordering and library development, participant training).

Item 10-a (Cont'd.)

During the reporting period only three staff members were in residence. The University reopened in October, 1965. The professional performance of the three was good; their interpersonal relations left considerable to be desired. Nevertheless, this personal problem had limited impact upon their efforts to carry out project activities.

Item 10-b

The crisis at the University, which led to the closing of the University and its operations from March to October, 1965, put the project implementation behind schedule, especially as regards staff development and participant training. Serious effort in participant training commenced again when three Nigerians, already in the U.S., were put under the participant training scheme in January, 1966.

Section II.D.

The ratings apply to the interpersonal problems among the three-man team remaining at the University after the crisis. After the departure of the Chief-of-Party/Dean (see Item 10-a above) a fairly young man, who had been serving as Deputy Chief-of-Party to handle day-to-day administrative details, was placed into position as "team coordinator." The team was briefed on this arrangement, and it was explained that the "coordinator" role did not involve substantive supervision or official field leadership, but rather the team was to "work together" during the difficult post-crisis period. The other two team members were older and more senior in terms of experience and rank.

These two technicians had certain emotional needs and tensions which led them to resent the arrangement and feel frustrated by it. In addition, the coordinator felt he had no authority or mandate to determine rules and give directions.

As a result the situation gradually deteriorated during the reporting period to the point of increasingly open clashes and covert maneuvers between the coordinator and the two senior men.

Eventually the Mission called them together to attempt to resolve the problem. Shortly after that (March, 1966) the Chancellor and the Dean of the Graduate School of Business of NYU came to Nigeria. They appointed the coordinator as "Acting Chief-of-Party" with full authority and command responsibilities, and informed the other two men they would not be reappointed after completion of their assignments (July/August, 1966). The situation immediately improved.

It should be understood that this personnel problem had no serious affect upon achievement of project objectives. Each man continued to carry out his assignment during this time. The main cost was the emotional drain and time consuming bickering that took place.

Sec. VI.A. This rating should be tempered by the continuing tardiness of the contractor in submitting reports. Despite persistent urging, required reports continue to be submitted late, sometimes by several months.

Sec. VI.B,h In this writer's judgment the contractor erred in attempting to conduct the field operation after the University crisis by a loose and ill-defined system of "team coordinator" and team operation (see Section II.D above), plus a rather limited response to the growing interpersonal tensions and a breakdown reflected in various conflicting communications by different team members to the campus.

The situation was not completely resolved until NYU representatives came to Lagos (See Section II.D above).

Sec. VII.D.1 Several countries, private organizations, and individuals have donated modest sums for scholarships, library development, and equipment. No major donor agency is involved in providing major financial support or technical assistance for the Faculty of Business and Social Studies.

Sec. V.F The figures are based on period 1962-1970 inclusive, and are made up of actual and estimated commitments and expenditures for capital items, recurrent items, and participant training. The total for the "life of the project" is made up of 4,050.0 for recurrent budget, 4,000.0 for capital budget, and 70.0 for participant training, for a total of 8,120.0. "Commitments to date total 4,775.0, made up of 1,750.0 for recurrent budget, 3,000.0 for capital budget, and 25.0 for participant training. "Disbursements to date" are estimated as follows: Recurrent expenditures -- 1,750.0; capital expenditures -- 2,250.0; and participant training -- 12.5. A total of 4,012.5.