

PD-AAL-555
ISN 13668

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Development Training and Management Improvement	2. PROJECT NUMBER 608-0149	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Rabat
4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)		
<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION		
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>78</u> B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>82</u> C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>84</u>	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ <u>6,057.00</u> B. U.S. \$ <u>4,497,000</u>	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>Sept 78</u> To (month/yr.) <u>Jan 82</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>Jan 82</u>

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., aigram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
(SEE P. 17 ATTACHED PART II)		
1. In depth evaluation needed in early FY 82	W. Erdahl Program Officer DS/IT, NE/TECH	5/82
2. No new long term starts in FY 82 to allow present participants to complete studies by 12/83	M. Bidaoui Training	9/82
3. Update & review participant academic performance	W. Erdahl Program Officer M. Bidaoui Training Off.	7/82
4. Update & review English Language Training at ALC	M. Bidaoui Training Off.	
5. Review University Placement procedures for cost effectiveness	W. Erdahl Program Officer M. Bidaoui Training Off. DS/IT, NE/TECH AMIDEAST	6/82

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. Continue Project Without Change

B. Change Project Design and/or Change Implementation Plan

C. Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Name and Title)

William Erdahl, Program Officer
George Corinaldi, Human Resources Officer
Moussa Bidaoui, Training Officer

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

(Signature)
Name _____
Date 3/11/82

NEAR EAST EVALUATION ABSTRACT

PROJECT TITLE(S) AND NUMBER(S) Development Training and Management Improvement (608-0149)		MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Morocco	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION The purpose of this project is to improve the planning, management and technical expertise of Moroccans responsible for priority development activities to be achieved primarily through university-level training outside Morocco.			
AUTHORIZATION DATE AND U.S. LOP FUNDING AMOUNT 8/78 \$4.503m	PES NUMBER	PES DATE January 1982	PES TYPE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <input type="checkbox"/> Special <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal
ABSTRACT PREPARED BY, DATE Emily Baldwin, NE/DP/PAE <i>EB</i> April 12, 1982	ABSTRACT CLEARED BY, DATE Ann Domidion, NE/TECH/HRST <i>and</i> Gary Mansavage, NE/NENA <i>GM</i>		
<p>This is a mid-term evaluation performed by USAID personnel. The project is primarily a training project, designed to improve the planning and management capabilities of GOM ministry or quasi-government officials in order to improve the design and administration of further development efforts in Morocco.</p> <p>As of January, 1982, 98 participants had been selected for training in the U.S.; the project design had anticipated approximately 140 long-term trainees over the life of the project. Despite this positive early performance, however, the project has not been without problems. Of the 98 participants selected, 16 either never actually began training or were terminated prior to completing their training due to insufficient English skills or inadequate academic background. Of the remaining 82 participants selected, 2 had not yet left Morocco to begin training, 3 had completed their studies and returned to Morocco, and 77 remained in the U.S. enrolled in academic programs. Participants have not been completing their studies and returning to Morocco as rapidly as planned. There are several reasons for this, among them poor English capability, insufficient undergraduate and graduate backgrounds (requiring more course work than originally foreseen) and the addition of PhD students to the training program, contrary to PP expectations. In addition, the evaluation notes that neither the U.S. institutions nor the participants have a strong incentive to complete training quickly. These delays in on-going training programs have meant that far fewer new participants can be selected and funded for training over time. The Mission recommends that no or few participants be brought into training in the remaining life of project so as to avoid the need for increased funding. In addition, university procedures will be reviewed to assure the most cost effective education is being received.</p> <p>The evaluation notes that with so few (3) participants returned to date, project "impact"-- in terms of improved GOM capacity to plan and manage development projects-- is as yet difficult to assess. Also, no GOM annual training plans have been developed so that the project's success in meeting GOM training needs is difficult to determine. A lengthy appendix to the evaluation report gives an in-depth account of the English language training institutions used in this project. A number of recommendations for improved USAID utilization of these institutions are given, but overall, the assessment of their performance appears quite positive.</p> <p><u>Lessons Learned</u> - The evaluation was originally intended as a within-Mission effort only; therefore it does not follow the typical PES outline, i.e. there is no explicit "lessons learned" section. The evaluation states that the Mission has "learned a lot" about participant training through this project without elaborating. At least two lessons, however, must be that training takes longer than planned, and planning for participants must take this into account, and that host governments must participate in implementation (in this case, developing training plans) in order to achieve complete project success.</p>			

XD-AAL-555-A

ISN 13669

DEVELOPMENT TRAINING AND MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

(608-0149)

PROJECT EVALUATION

by

William Erskel, Program Officer

George Corinaldi, Human Resources Officer

Monique Bidaoui, Training Officer

USAID Moroc

August, 1981 (Updated January, 1982)

EVALUATION OF THE USAID/MOROCCO
DEVELOPMENT TRAINING AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT PROJECT

I. Introduction

The Development Training and Management Support project was approved in AID/Washington on August 4, 1978 and the Grant Agreement with the Government of Morocco (GOM) was signed on September 21, 1978. The Project was to be implemented over a five year period at a total cost to AID of \$4,503,000. The project's goal of increasing planning and management capabilities within Moroccan ministries to carry out development programs effectively was to be accomplished by providing Moroccan officials with training within four categories:

Long-term academic training (one to two years) in United States

Short term non-academic training (two to six months) in the United States

Third Country Training

In-country (including in-service) Training

Under the terms of the Project Grant Agreement, the following three special covenants were also stipulated.

"The Grantee shall (a) develop annual training plans, including selection criteria acceptable to AID; (b) reserve not less than 25 participant positions for women; and (c) reserve 20 participant positions for allocation by USAID in support of its project development activities in Morocco."

The purpose of the above training program is to upgrade the managerial and analytical expertise of key GOM officials

in public and semi-public institutions which are furnishing complementary support to development programs in Morocco.

AID's principal input to the project was to be the financing of training costs for approximately 140 long-term and 80 short-term trainees. In addition, it was anticipated that approximately eight consultants would be utilized during the Life-of-Project (LOP) to work with appropriate institutions in the analysis and development of in-country training programs.

The GOM input of \$1,660,000 included the salaries of the participants during training, the payment of any salary increments or additional benefits to personnel assuming the responsibilities of participant's during training periods and international air fares.

The GOM organization selected to coordinate the training provided under this project was to be the Secretariat of State for Executive Training (SSET) which is officially charged with coordinating all foreign and domestic government-wide training at the post-academic level. The SSET is also responsible for articulating bilateral assistance for development strategies of all the various ministries and sectors in Morocco. Situated in the Ministry of Education and Training, the SSET was expected to develop an annual training plan with the cooperation of the USAID Mission, the Secretariat of State for Planning and Regional Development and the National School of Public Administration. USAID advisors, working with the technical ministries on a regular

basis, were expected to act, ex officio, with specific ministries in structuring potential training programs, with USAID retaining a final veto over participant placement.

The PP listed the following training criteria to be followed during project implementation:

1. Training will not be provided out of country if it can be provided in country. In this regard, it may be beneficial to provide short-term consultants to help direct operation and the establishment of specific component parts of potential in-country training. Such consultants are provided in this project
2. Degree training must be post-B.A. (in U.S. terms; post-licence in Moroccan terms) and will be supported out of country only.
3. Preference for training definitely will be given to government personnel and quasi-government institution employees. Training for the private sector will be provided only when it can be demonstrated clearly that such training impacts directly on the implementation of a SOM program definitely benefiting, in a substantial manner, Morocco's rural poor.
4. Short-term training will be provided in country, in the U.S., or in nearby developing countries when appropriate.
5. Training in the U.S. will be undertaken only

after a clear demonstration of sufficient English-language capability to participate to maximum advantage in the program.

In identifying the types of training to be offered, the PP states "The types of training A.I.D. will offer will include M.A. (though not Ph.D.) level academic training and short courses as well as on-the-job training; training will emphasize practical experience as well as observation tours. As also noted, third-country training will be utilized where appropriate. For long-term academic U.S. training, what will be emphasized is the acquisition of relevant knowledge, not the obtaining of academic titles of certification."

In February 1979, USAID, in project Implementation Letter No. 1, established a 4-person Training Programs Coordination and Action Committee (TPCAC) to implement the project. Its membership was made up of:

- The Director of Staff Training at the Secretariat of State for Staff Training or his representative, as chairman;
- The head of the USAID Training Office;
- The Director of the National School of Public Administration (ENAP);
- The Director of the National Institute for Statistics and Applied Economics (INSEA).

The Committee was responsible for coordination, meetings and exchanges and information dealing with the training program. For that purpose it was responsible for:

- a. reviewing training programs to be conducted in accordance with the provisions of Section B above, and making a selection of applicants for such programs;
- b. following up training programs from candidate selection through evaluation of results obtained during training;
- c. creating means likely to ensure the widest and swiftest diffusion among all organizations concerned of training possibilities in the fields under Section B above;
- d. ensuring wide training program scope, contributing to the progress of research, communication and dissemination of knowledge and capabilities acquired through such programs among the organizations which may be benefited by such knowledge;
- e. encouraging organization of short-term collective training programs where necessary;
- f. seeing that each trainee, upon his return to Morocco, be used within his specialty and that full use be made of his professional skills;
- g. establishing yearly training plans based on an evaluation of staff-training needs in the above-mentioned fields;
- h. serving as a springboard for general implementation of the project and offering recommendations to ensure such implementation in the most appropriate and opportune manner. It may, for example, establish

the ratio of academic and non-academic training program costs between the two categories, since it is significant to note that the monthly average for such costs in the United States now reaches \$1,250 for academic studies, as against \$2,600 for short-term training programs.

Implementation letter No. 1 also outlined the following items as being eligible for AID financing under this project:

- a. Participants' per diem during training. It is agreed that per diem (i) covers food and lodging and a "pocket money" allowance, and (ii) is that currently applied by USAID for training programs conducted under its sponsorship. It goes without saying that per diem rate varies from one country to another and from one U.S. institution to another according to cost of living rates within such countries or institutions.
- b. Administrative and technical organization.
- c. Schooling and/or academic or non-academic training.
- d. Training materials and supplies (such as books) and printing expenses for papers in academic studies.
- e. Study trips within the country where training is conducted.
- f. English language training for finally accepted participants to be conducted in Morocco as needed before the beginning of training programs in the United States, either through normal collective

- class instruction or intensive individual training.
- g. Medical examinations taken in Morocco as needed for participants who are to undertake training programs abroad.
 - h. Health insurance policy covering participants while in training.
 - i. Participants' subscription, upon completion of their training program, to technical publications published by American associations specialized in the technical field in which they have taken their training, thus enabling them, upon their return to Morocco, to have adequate information pertaining to their specialized field.
 - j. Participants' international travel between Morocco and training country and return. Such costs will be covered by USAID under the Trust Fund account established jointly by USAID and GOM Ministry of Finance.
 - k. Other miscellaneous expenses.

At some later time, item j. above was deleted and it was agreed that the GOM would fund international travel costs of USAID financed participants.

It was envisaged that a project evaluation would be conducted mid-way through the project implementation to review both "operation" and "likely impact." A major assumption at the time of project design was that by the time of the mid-project evaluation, sufficient numbers of long-term trainees would have returned and been working long enough for indicators

to have developed.

II. Progress to Date

A. Training Programs Coordination and Action Committee (TPCAC)

The TPCAC was established in early 1979 and was active in the selection of the first group of participants financed by the project. Almost all long-term participants that have been financed by this project were selected during year one although many did not actually depart until FY '81. Several never did depart because of inadequate English language fluency or poor prior academic performance. Due, in part, to personality differences, problems arose in 1980 and the Directors of INSEA and ENAP declined to participate in further committee meetings. Their primary concern was that the Director of Staff Training at the Secretariat of State for Staff Training held a veto over all GOM sponsored participants (including non-AID funded) since his approval is required for all training outside Morocco. He was, in effect, making all final decisions on participant selections and they felt that they were nothing more than a rubber stamp.

There have also been accusations that politics have been involved in participant selections. This may, in fact, be true since political connections are very important in Morocco, but a review of participant files does not lend much support to these types of comments. One is struck more by the wide range of parent agencies. Clearly, no one ministry has had a monopoly on sending participants for training under this

project. The majority of participants are either mid-level civil servants or faculty members with several years of working/teaching experience and with one exception (American Civilization), areas of academic study relate to the general scope and objectives of the project as well as to AID areas of concentration and interest.

B. Long-Term Training in the U.S.

As of January 1, 1982, ninety-eight (98) participants had been selected for long-term training in the U.S. (38 for Ph.D.'s and 50 for M.A.'s). Of this total of 98 participants, seventy-seven (77) are presently in the U.S., sixteen (16) have either been returned to Morocco before completing their first year or their programs were cancelled prior to departure, two (2) are in process and expected to depart for training during FY '82, and three (3) participants have completed their training programs and returned to Morocco.

During the preparation of the PP, training goals (total numbers of participants) were calculated based on two-year training programs. In fact, however, many participants will require three and four years to complete their studies. As a consequence, during years three and four of the project, funds available for "new starts" are severely limited due to the need to fund participants already in training. Instead of fifty new starts in year three, there were only twenty-one and in year four there may very well be no new starts as opposed to the planned twenty-five.

There are several reasons for individual training programs taking longer than anticipated, and among these are:

1. Participants have left Morocco with inadequate English language fluency. This has resulted in a requirement for English language training in the U.S. either prior to commencement of graduate programs or during the first year thus precluding the participants from taking a full academic workload.

2. A decision was made soon after the project was authorized to allow faculty of Moroccan Institution to be sent for PhD's. Since many U.S. institutions do not accept Moroccan M.A. degrees (particularly in engineering fields), participants were required to work on U.S. M.A.'s prior to doing course work for their PhD's.

3. Participants have been accepted at U.S. institutions without having completed undergraduate courses required by these U.S. universities. These undergraduate courses have been taken in the U.S., consequently extending training.

4. Participants have left for the U.S. to begin Ph.D. programs without first completing equivalent U.S. Master's Degree programs or MA's acceptable to U.S. universities. The students, therefore, first study for their M.A.'s and then go on for their Ph.D.'s. In several instances, particularly in engineering fields, this has resulted in training programs lasting over three years. One of the difficulties in getting Moroccan M.A.'s accepted by U.S. universities

is a lack of knowledge in the U.S. concerning Moroccan universities, their curriculum, entrance requirements and degree requirements.

C. Third-Country Training

Only three participants have been provided with long-term training in a third country. All three were GOM officials who were to staff the USAID-financed Social Services Training Center in Tangier. Their training was approved prior to implementation of Project 608-0157 and the financing of their training was transferred to that project in late FY '81. No other long-term third country training has been proposed or is envisioned. By financing the training of these participants under Project 0149 prior to implementation of 0157, that project is now on schedule. The Institute in Tangier is open and functioning with these returned participants making up the core Moroccan staff of the Institute's faculty.

D. Short-Term Training in the U.S.

A total of fifty-eight short-term training participants were sent to the U.S. for training during the project's first two years. Training included short courses and seminars. This was thirty-eight participants more than planned.

In several instances, however, participants complained that courses/seminars were too general in nature and superficial.

E. Orientation Sessions

Prior to their departure for the U.S., long-term training participants are given an opportunity to attend five half-day orientation sessions given by AMIDEAST. These sessions are designed to give participants an orientation in "American

customs and culture." Questions and answers sessions following lectures allow participants to ask questions about "the American way of life." For those participants who have taken advantage of these sessions, their reactions have been positive.

F. English Language Training

In an effort to assist Moroccan participants perfect their fluency in English prior to their departure for the U.S., classes in conversational English, financed by this project, are provided at five (Casablanca, Rabat, Tangier, Marrakesh and Fes) American Language Centers (ALC). An evaluation of USAID-financed training at the ALC's was conducted in September-October 1980 and is attached. Several recommendations were made in that report and over the past year many have been implemented. For example, students with poor attendance have had their programs terminated, more attention is being given to performance during language training, and coordination between ALC and USAID greatly improved through more frequent contacts.

G. Selection Process

At the present time the initial screening of participants is done by the Director of Staff Training at the Secretariat of State for Staff Training. On the surface, it does not appear that any one ministry has a monopoly on proposing candidates for training and for the most part candidates are well qualified in their technical fields with several years of "on the job" experience. There have, however, been a

number of participants proposed and accepted who appear to have had little or no prior work experience.

Since the quality of prior academic performance and English language fluency has been unknown at the time of selection, it is very difficult to judge how well a participant will do during his/her training. It is only after a student has been selected and he or she begins submitting undergraduate records that questions arises as to a participant's possible capability to perform graduate level course work.

Under the present system, once students have been selected for training in the U.S., they are provided with the opportunity to take English language courses. Unfortunately, many students (especially several selected in year one) have not perfected their English to an acceptable level prior to departing for the U.S. This has resulted in either the need for English language training in the U.S. or termination of training program. In cases where students have been sent to the U.S., this extra training, besides being very costly, has resulted in a lengthening of individual training programs and unfortunately, has resulted in the termination of several individual programs for poor performance since the participant was never able to master English.

During FY '81 students who did not possess acceptable TOEFL and ALIQU scores were not allowed to proceed to the U.S. for training.

H. English Language Fluency

Although participants are expected to know English, there was no procedure for evaluating fluency prior to selection of students in year one. Once an individual was selected for training, he or she was given the American Language Institute, Georgetown University (ALIGU) test where they were expected to score a minimum of 90 in usage, 90 in comprehension and 75 in vocabulary/reading. If they score below the minimum, they were required to attend American Language Center courses to improve their English until they can meet ALIGU requirements. This procedure has been changed and tests are now given prior to selection for any training in the U.S.

Prior to departure for the U.S. and placement in U.S. schools, participants are also required to take the test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL).

I. Women Participants

In an effort to encourage the participation of women in this project, a minimum of 25 positions were reserved for women. To date, sixteen (10 long term and 6 short term) participants have been women. It has been very difficult funding women to go to the U.S. for long-term training. Families, family ties, and cultural restrictions all contribute to restrict the mobility of women for long-term training in the U.S.

J. Training Plans

The fact that no yearly training plans have been developed is unfortunate since there is no way of evaluating

the impact of this project on GOM training requirements. In fact, we have no way of knowing if the GOM has even identified its own requirements. What does exist are training quotas for each Ministry, but it is difficult, if not impossible, to know if these quotas are related to actual training needs.

Individual training programs have been worked out at the U.S. institutions by the participant and his/her student and faculty advisors. A review of these plans indicates that in a number of instances participants are being allowed to pursue their studies at a very leisurely pace and little or no attempt has been made to require the participant to complete his/her studies in a minimum period of time. Academic institutions appear to be less than motivated when it comes to "pushing" students to take heavy workloads. For the participants, particularly those who are unmarried, life in the U.S. at government expense is just not all that bad.

K. Schedule

The project is not significantly behind in implementation, but the fact that too many long-term participants are going to require several years to complete their training (instead of the planned two years) will require either increased funding or a reduction/elimination of planned new starts in FY's 82/82. The Mission has taken the view that we have learned a lot about participant training during the implementation of this project and we would prefer to eliminate new long-term training start, concentrate on in-country and short-term training and complete this project within authorized

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

funding levels. We would then propose that an entirely new project - Sector Support Training - be designed in FY '82 to build upon experience gained from project 0149.

The fact that as of this writing only six long-term participants have returned to Morocco makes it impossible to evaluate, in any meaningful way, the impact of this project on upgrading the managerial and analytical expertise of key GOM officials supporting Moroccan development programs. What we have been able to see, however, is the effect this project will have on other AID-funded projects in terms of providing U.S. trained personnel to implement those projects early on in implementation. For example, architects will soon be returning to work on the Slum Upgrading Project at Ben M'Sik, engineers and economists to work on the Energy Project, range specialists for the Range Management Improvement Project, statisticians for the Population Project, etc. If these participants had not been sent for training until other AID financed activities were approved, they would not be returning from U.S. training until U.S. technicians were ready to depart from Morocco. Many of these people, as in the case of the Social Services, will become key counterparts for U.S. personnel during project implementation. Under normal circumstances these participants would return at the earliest in years 4 and 5 of project implementation. We believe that the chances of success of these projects have been greatly improved through the use of this training project in training personnel in advance of other project implementation.

III. Recommendations

The following recommendations are made concerning the Development Training and Management Improvement Project.

1. An in-depth evaluation of this project, with AID/W participation (DS/IT, NE/TECH, etc.) should be conducted in early FY 1982 since by that time a significant number of long-term participants will have returned to Morocco.
2. There should be either no new starts or very few in either FY '82 or beyond since the participants will not be able to complete their studies by December 1983, the project assistance date (PACD).
3. A review of all participants' academic performance should be made and the training programs of these students who are not doing acceptable work should be cancelled. Note that this was done during the course of this evaluation and 16 individual programs were cancelled.
4. The USAID Training Office should review the performance of students at the ALC and all students who continue to miss a significant number of classes, for which USAID is financing the costs, should have their programs cancelled. Note. This was also done during late FY '81.
5. During an early FY '82 evaluation a review of university placement procedures and student performance should be made to see if we are being as cost effective as we should be.

Purpose: Evaluation of USAID-Morocco Finance English Language Training

Scope: The evaluation focuses on the English language training provided by the American Language Centers located in Marrakech, Tanger, Casablanca and Rabat. It was not possible to evaluate the training provided by the British Council in Rabat due to that center being closed for the summer vacation.

Approach: The evaluation viewed the USAID-Morocco training program as a time-line system in recognition of the fact that critical features of the program comprise a series of action points, or events having duration, all of which occur in a sequence through time. The program was viewed as a system in so much as the various components of the training program interact with and on each other. The evaluation therefore was a modified form of system analysis which focused on the English language training and the related items which impact on, or are impacted by it. Consequently it was necessary to pay particular attention to management actions relating to the program in addition to examining the English language program itself.

Conclusions: The evaluation believes that the English language training is being conducted in a professionally acceptable and reasonably efficient and economical manner. The ALC personnel are sincere and professional in their effort to provide USAID with the best language training possible within the means at their disposal. In many particular areas they over-perform in regard to the services contracted for. This is not to imply that the English training program is fault free or trouble free. The nature of the English training program is such that it requires continuing close management and supervision. In this situation it is necessary to fix responsibility for performing the management functions and to specify what those functions are. It is the evaluator's opinion:

1. That management responsibility and functions have not been fixed.
2. That this responsibility must rest with USAID, and can not be delegated.
3. This lack is the primary fault identified in the evaluation.

1. General

1.1 The USAID-Morocco conducts a number of projects which send Moroccan participants to U.S. universities to receive professional and academic training. The training ranges from attendance at technical seminars and/or short courses, to enrollment in courses of studies which lead to advanced degrees. The end-goal of the training projects is to have the participant return to Morocco equipped to make an increased contribution to the needs of the government and society in the area of his specialization.

1.2. English language training is a mandated critical component of the training system. Except in rare cases, U.S. universities are unable to provide instruction in any language but English. Students who are non-native speakers of English must take and pass a standardized English language proficiency examination in order to be accepted for enrollment in a formal course of studies. The Moroccan educational environment is such that it is unlikely that a typical candidate for USAID training participation will be already English language qualified to the level established as a pre-requisite for U.S. university enrollment. Thus the function of the English language program is to provide the language instruction necessary to have the candidate meet the U.S. university English language pre-requisites in a timely manner.

1.3. The criticalness of the English language training program derives from the fact that participation in the U.S. university training phase and program end-goal attainment is all contingent on the candidate's first having successfully completed the English language training phase. Also, as English training is one of the earlier events in the training sequence, the timing of later events is dependent on and established in anticipation of English training completion. This results in the English training having an importance that is out of proportion in regard to the end-goals of the program.

1.4. The English language training necessary to support the USAID program is provided by service-contract arrangement with the American Language Centers in Marrakech, Tanger, Casablanca, and Rabat; and the British Council center in Rabat. In exceptional cases some participants are enrolled in English language preparatory programs conducted at the individual U.S. universities. However, the cost-efficiency of English training conducted in Morocco as compared to similar training conducted in the U.S. with associated student support costs is so strong that it is not only highly desirable, but virtually necessary to continue the present arrangement.

2. Overview of the System Components and Relationships

2.1. USAID-Morocco

2.1.1. The USAID-Morocco Participant Training Status Report, 1 April 1980 indicated that English language training was being conducted for participants in regard to the following projects: 608-122 (Agricultural Research and Training), 608-0136 (Dryland Agricultural Applied Research), 608-0139 (Non-Formal Education for Women), 608-0147 (Commercial and Industrial Job Training for Women), 608-0149 (Development Training and Management Improvement), and 608-0155 (Population and Family Planning Support). The latter two projects accounted for a large majority of the participants at the time of the report.

2.1.2 USAID-Morocco coordinates the training projects with the appropriate Moroccan government agencies. Candidates for participation in the training program are selected by the respective Moroccan government agencies; USAID does not participate in the selection process. At the time of selection depending on the project and the particular time in the training system sequence, the participant may be identified in a one to one relationship with a particular course of studies to commence at a

known date at a known university, or the participant is entered into training in anticipation of training at a not yet specified location and time.

2.1.3. After the participant has been selected and identified to the USAID program personnel, the program personnel issue authorization for the candidate to attend English language training classes at the appropriate language training center. Procedures at this point are necessarily flexible and guided by on-going feed back. It is necessary to have the candidate language tested, estimate the length and type of language training required, negotiate what hours the candidate will be free to attend language class (most participants follow a split schedule of attending English classes part of the day and working at their normal job the other part of the day), and either place the candidate in an on-going class, form a new class, or provide individual instruction. The USAID program controller must successfully manage these items in coordination with the language training center, the participant, and the participant's agency.

2.1.4. In addition to the local coordination to enter the participant into language training and the monitoring of his subsequent progress, it is necessary for the program coordinator to assemble the participants' academic documentation to meet U.S. university entrance requirements, and to coordinate with the USAID Washington office the actual selection of university, actual program of studies and enrollment dates. As many of the actions overlap, or have co-duration over a period of time, considerable on-going feed-back takes place and influences minor and major modifications in the participants training schedule sequence. Program coordination must be recognized as a highly demanding job which requires considerable management expertise if it is to be done effectively.

2.1.5. Later portions of this document will deal with some of the specific management actions which are recommended for implementation. At this point it is to be noted, that contact with the Moroccan government agencies, control of language training enrollment and fiscal authority/accountability for language training costs, and coordination of follow-on U.S. university training rests exclusively with the USAID program coordination.

2.2. The American Language Centers

2.2.1. Until recently the American Language Centers were functional components of USIS/ICA. After reorganization the language centers and the American book stores were spun off to independent non-U.S. government agency status. The spun-off components were reorganized as a joint Moroccan-American cultural association. The cultural association is structured as a non-profit (but note, not charitable) organization. The direct impact of the reorganization was to require the American Language Centers to become in effect commercial enterprises functioning on a non-subsidized basis. In order to survive the language training centers must implement the same financial policies and procedures as any commercial language teaching institution in regard to producing cash flow, meeting of direct and overhead costs, plus providing for expansion, up-grading, and reserve. This is an important aspect which must be kept in mind by both USAID and the American Cultural Centers when entering into their service contract arrangements.

2.2.2. The recentness of the spin-off has left most American Language Center personnel in a somewhat ambivalent status. Intellectually they recognize the impact of the reorganization and the need to adjust to commercial profit motivated orientations. However, the majority of the personnel acquired their experience and personal orientation in government service or service related agencies. Consequently the American Language Centers have a genuine commitment to being instrumental to the success of the USAID training programs as strong as that found in USAID itself. The evaluator was strongly impressed by this attitude in every center he visited. USAID should note that this attitude provides stronger language training support than it will find in its contacts with any other language instruction source. This relationship between USAID programs and the American Language Center support should be considered as a unique resource.

2.2.3. Although various aspects will be commented on in detail later, it is appropriate to say here that the evaluator was favorably impressed by the American Language Centers he visited. The Tanger, Rabat, and Casablanca centers are well located and supported by strong enrollments. The Marrakech center seems somewhat weaker than the others, particularly in terms of location and facilities. Director quality, experience, and motivation were very acceptable. The directors in Marrakech and Tanger do not have the same depth of experience as the directors at Casablanca and Rabat; all are strongly committed to their programs. Every center devotes considerable extra attention to the USAID programs, all over-perform on the normally expected requirements in one way or another.

2.2.4. Each American Language Center handles the USAID participant enrollment in a somewhat different fashion. The Casablanca center, with its high enrollment, makes maximum utilization of integrating USAID students into its normal procedures. The Tanger center was forced by virtue of low input to handle each student on an individually scheduled basis. The Rabat Center is able, due to larger numbers of USAID students enrolled, to form a number of efficiently sized class groups. The Marrakech center conducted one group class off location at the participants place of work in addition to individual sessions for other participants. All centers showed a great deal of willingness to make special arrangements to provide instruction to USAID students.

2.2.5. The day-to-day activities of the American Language Centers are those which would be expected. The normal enrollments are composed of self-motivated students who spend their own money for tuition in normal part time English language instruction classes. All centers, with the possible exception of Marrakech, have strong enrollments which at the moment are more than sufficient to ensure their continued existence. No center is dependent on USAID enrollment to provide critically needed income. This is to say that while the American Center instruction is functionally necessary to the USAID programs, USAID financing is not functionally necessary to the continuance of the language centers. It is necessary to keep this aspect in mind when drawing up the service contract arrangements.

2.2.6. It is useful to have an understanding of commercial language instruction pricing practices to appreciate the relationship between USAID

and the American Language Centers. Each school builds a survival base by calculating plant and administrative overhead; this in turn is divided by the total number of students in an economical minimum class size which is determined by the number of classrooms available in the anticipated normal hours of instruction. Depending on school type, teacher cost may be included as overhead, or as a direct draw-down on the student number, i.e., X number of students pay for the teacher and X number pays for the overhead with any additional up to maximum class size constituting margin. Most language schools use the latter method. The addition of special classes or classes held outside the normal operating hours are mainly priced by the latter method, thereby protecting the school by having each class literally pay for itself.

2.2.7. The American Language Centers have built their survival base on the enrollment of the tuition paying students who attend their normal classes. Due to the nature of the student, classes normally are held in late afternoon and evening, except during the summer session. The USAID input complements these hours in that most participants attend classes during their working hours, either in the morning or early afternoon. The classes allow the centers to make more efficient use of plant space and to offer their instructors opportunity to work more extended schedules, some of which approach full time employment hours. The centers price USAID classes on a "pay for the class" schedule, mainly based on teacher cost plus overhead. The arrangement is generally beneficial to both parties, but improvement in terms of efficient utilization is possible.

2.2.8. There are some special problems concerning providing English language instruction to USAID participants. The participants are selected in reference to their suitability and profession qualification for the U.S. university program rather than for their linguistic skills and/or aptitude. This is as it should be but it does result in the enrollment of personnel who in other circumstances might not be considered the most suitable personnel for English language training. Also in general there are motivational differences between the USAID participants and the normally enrolled student. The motivational differences are more related to the differences in general profile, i.e., age, marital status, job status, reason for enrollment etc., rather than "bad attitude" characteristics.

2.2.9. Also the language instruction for USAID students is different in that the time of study and length of study factors are established by external requirements rather than by English language considerations. The USAID language instruction program operates under notable time pressure as compared to the normal programs run by the centers. The ALC's are tasked with not only bringing a widely varied input up to a measurable standard of proficiency but are also required to do this within a certain calendar time period.

2.2.10. As stated in the conclusion, the English language instruction programs are acceptably and reasonably efficient. However they do have problems and operate under time pressure which is generally associated with each and every individual USAID participant. It is unlikely that foreseeable

improvements will ever enable the program to run in an automatic "hands-off" manner. It will require continuing close management and supervision to ensure that the English language training phase effectively integrates with the time schedule of the U.S. university training.

3. Particular Point Evaluation.

3.1. The evaluation of the American Language Center English language programs had its origination in the MEMO of 4 April 1980, Subject: USAID Financed English Language Training. While stressing the need for a general evaluation the memo asked that several specific questions be addressed. This section will attempt to answer those questions.

3.2.1. Are the training classes carried out with an acceptable level of professional skill on the part of the teachers?

- The short answer is a definite yes. However the question does indicate that some expansion on what constitutes a "professional" language teacher is useful. Professional, in the meaning of degree certified, is a relatively recent term in regard to English language teachers who teach English as a second language. Initial use of the term probably does not date earlier than the mid 1960's. In that period, Georgetown University, Michigan, and Columbia University, began to offer courses in linguistics and the teaching of English as a foreign language. At that time the field was considered a specialization within the normal degree in linguistics, Education or English. Some schools did offer certificates which attested to a certain number of hours/courses taken in the field. Until recently the output in the field has never been large. Currently the stress on bi-cultural/bi-lingual education in the U.S. school systems has created a new group of graduate level degree courses, usually attended by public school teachers in order to meet HEW and court mandated requirements.

By and large the teaching of English as a foreign language, particularly in overseas areas, has been done by persons not having degrees in the field. When selecting instructors great emphasis is given to previous experience in doing the same work. One is much more inclined to give preference to a person having experience than to an inexperienced degree bearer. This is largely due to the fact that most overseas schools do not have the resources and/or facilities to act as training institutions.

The American Language Centers have an unusually high quality group of English language instructors. The Tanger and Marrakech schools have a mix of degrees and/or highly experienced native English speakers (US and UK), and highly qualified Moroccan teachers who have TEFL degrees both from Morocco and abroad in addition to a number of years of teaching experience. The Pabat school has all UK or US native speakers, all but one having degrees (several in the field of TEFL), and most highly experienced. The Casablanca center uses its most experienced native speakers (10 have 7 or more years experience at the ALC) with the USAID program. All of their teachers have degrees, with many being TEFL trained.

In summary, yes, the training classes are being taught at an acceptable level of professional skill, as the instructors are professionals as is normally defined in the context of their employment.

3.2.2. Do the teachers receive training in language teaching methods?

Short answer - yes. All ALC's have various types of training programs both for new and for experienced instructors. However in context no schools of this type have extensive programs. Persons applying for employment in the field are expected to be qualified, or fast learners on a self initiated basis. The schools are not equipped for or capable of providing extensive training to inexperienced personnel. Turnover and attrition of first session instructors is high, both due to individuals finding they are not job suited, and as the institutions find it more practical to replace than to train lesser qualified and lesser apt personnel.

3.2.3. Are the teaching materials used adequate to the purpose?

Short answer - yes. The schools have a wide range of modern validated material. There is some difficulty in assembling the materials into an appropriate curriculum for the particular requirements of the USAID participants. Since most USAID participants attend class several hours a day, several days a week it is necessary to assemble a varied and balanced curriculum to provide change of pace and to meet individual needs. This requires the utilization of a number of different text's and or series to focus on particular problems as identified by ALIGLU test or teacher observation. The centers have excellent and extensive textual resources and make good utilization of the inventory. In addition the centers are developing audio-visual aids at a rapid pace.

3.2.4. Are the students grouped so as to encourage maximum teaching effectiveness.

The answer is a qualified yes and no. The centers group for maximum effectiveness to the best possible. The question has no bearing in regard to Marrakech and Tangier; the number of students is so small that they are handled as individuals, or as in the case of the off-site class at Marrakech they are pragmatically grouped by place and function. Grouping by level is only possible at Rabat or Casablanca, and then only to the degree that USAID schedules students in sufficient numbers with similar hours to allow effective grouping. In this case economy and effectiveness go hand in hand. It would be more economical for USAID to schedule students to the ALC's in the largest numbers possible in the same or very similar hours. This would allow the ALC's to group the students for maximum English language instruction effectiveness. In turn this would reduce the cost of training in general. The ALC's base instruction cost on teacher hour cost. The teacher hour cost is the same in principle for one student or for several students. By providing students in sufficient numbers to allow grouping for instructional effectiveness, USAID can achieve greater economy in instructional costs. Currently USAID pays for substantial amounts of individual or small group instruction.

3.2.5. How should the problem of absenteeism be handled?

Short answer - by USAID. The American Language Center should have no responsibility in handling absenteeism beyond promptly reporting the event

to the program manager, or in extreme cases, in requesting the withdrawal or rescheduling of a student whose absenteeism has caused him to fall behind his class. This position is based on several factors. Firstly the ALC's have no authority or control over the participant. USAID arranges for the student to attend classes in coordination with the responsible Moroccan agency or the participants supervisor, and USAID contracts with the ALC to provide instruction to that participant. The ALC has the responsibility to have instructor/instruction available for the period contracted for but has no method to enforce the participants attendance or to impose sanctions on his absence. Enforcement of attendance must be done by USAID as absence by the student constitutes a default in his agreement, or in the agreement by his agency, where-in USAID agreed to pay tuition in return for the students agreement to attend classes. The ALC's have no agreement with the student but deal directly with USAID.

The question does call attention to another problem, which is, how shall the cost of absences be handled. In normal language school practice the student pays full tuition up-front at the time of enrollment. This enables the ALC's to contract with the teacher to provide instruction for that period of class time. Attendance or absence has no impact on the arrangement, being solely the students decision as to whether he shall derive benefit from his class or not. The ALC/USAID arrangement differs somewhat from the basic arrangement. Guidelines need to be derived which protect the ALC's in regard to having a teacher contracted to be available at the reserved times, and which also protect USAID's authority to terminate student attendance without severe cost penalty. The problem becomes acute when the ALC has provided an instructor for individual tutoring. The evaluator feels, that in the case of unplanned-for absences, the ALC should bill and USAID should pay the stipulated costs for any hours in which the center has had the instruction and class space available in anticipation of providing the instruction contracted for. In the case of planned for and/or anticipated absences the centers and USAID should jointly derive guidelines which protect the interests of both while allowing the ALC to meet its obligations to its agreements with the instructor. A sliding scale of instructor compensation should be used when the ALC cannot provide alternate or compensating employment.

The evaluator recommends that the ALC's provide attendance reports to USAID program coordinator on a weekly basis at the minimum. When a student is receiving individual tutoring daily for a substantial number of hours (high cost situation) unplanned absence should be reported by telephone at the end of the second sequential day of absence. Normal cost-efficiency requirements make it necessary for the USAID program coordinator to take prompt action with the sponsoring agency in regard to absences.

3.2.6. Of the following alternative approaches to English language training which should be used for (a) participants, (b) non-participants: Group classes, individual training, training in Morocco vs training in the U.S., intensive training for a shorter period vs regular training over a longer period.

(1) Group classes. It is desirable from both a cost-efficiency point of view and a language instruction point of view to conduct group

classes for participants and non-participants where ever and whenever possible.

(2) Individual instruction: Individual instruction from a cost-efficiency view is a necessary evil. It is used when it is not possible to provide group instruction either because of lack of personnel to make a group, or lack of personnel to make a group at that level, or when a particular individual is being crammed to make a quickly approaching cut-off date - all the preceding have application only to participants. It is hard to imagine any justification for individual instruction for a non-participant except on a no-choice political basis. Decisions of that type are not dependent on normal considerations and must be approved on a case-by-case basis. It is recommended that such decisions should only be made at the highest management level and only in rare circumstances.

(3) Training in Morocco vrs training in the U.S. From a cost efficiency point of view there is no contest. Training costs in Morocco are so much cheaper to both USAID and the Moroccan government agencies that U.S. English language training can only be considered a special or unusual item. When the participant is English trained in Morocco, USAID pays language tuition costs only, and that at a lower than U.S. rate. In many, if not most, of the cases the Moroccan agency releases the personnel for part of the day only and keeps them in an "on-the-job/working" status. The agency does not pay personnel replacement costs and USAID does not pay participant support costs. When U.S. training is used, USAID pays language training tuition at a higher rate, incurs student support costs, and the Moroccan agency either must replace the person for that additional period of time or let the work go undone. Quality and timeliness of language instruction at the ALC's, if done at an intensive rate of 30 hours per week or more, is either equal to that offered in the U.S. or so little different that the difference can be ignored when cost considerations are taken into effect. U.S. training may have some peripheral benefits in regard to impact on the U.S. language orientation in movies, TV, 24 hour a-day living, etc., but it is doubtful that the impact can be quantified in meaningful cost accounting or language progress terms.

(4) Intensive training for a shorter period vrs regular training over a longer period. In regard to participants a combination of both is probably the most desirable; in regard to non-participants regular training over a longer period will probably meet most requirements. It is the evaluators belief that both the Casablanca center and the Rabat center have sufficient numbers of participants to level and group for intensive training, if USAID can exert sufficient pressure to have the numbers of participants available in the required time frame. Both of the above centers probably have the experience necessary to provide intensive training. Intensive training should be considered as nothing less than 4 hours per day of classroom training (not supervised study), five days per week. It is desirable that the four hours be continuous, i.e., 0800-1200, or 1400-1800, etc. It is equally desirable that intensive training should in addition include no less than 2 hours per day of support activity such as audio-visual and/or taped oral practice, supervised and directed study, and/or

a genuine assignment of productive (vrs busy work) home work in the form of written exercises, vocabulary study, or readings.

Good management planning would require that a participant enter intensive training immediately after being selected and to continue the intensive training until he was judged as being language qualified as measured by the ALIGU test. At that time the participant could be put into a reduced schedule of study-skill and field particular specialized vocabulary training. The use of intensive instruction usually results in less total number of hours of instruction being provided to bring the student up to the qualification level. Such an approach uses intensive training on a premeditated or anticipatory basis rather than the current approach of increasing the number of hours of training as the departure/cut-off date approaches in desperate hope that the participant can be qualified in time.

Use of intensive/non-intensive training in sequence would reduce the problems by a large degree in regard to meeting cut-off/departure date requirements. On the other hand there is no doubt that the approach would initially cause increased problems in negotiating the time-off from work for the participants. A powerful counter-argument for the use of intensive training in this circumstance is that it requires all parties concerned; USAID, the Moroccan agency, and the participant, to demonstrate a strong up front commitment to the program. The intensity of the situation will provide early weed-out of non-committed personnel and agencies, and also identify weak participants at an early stage, allowing timely readjustment of scheduling.

3.2.7. What are the comparative costs and benefits of English language training as presently carried out by the American Language Centers in Morocco vrs English language training carried out by professional English language training laboratories in the United States.

Exact price comparisons can not be provided but normal common and business sense leads to the conclusion that if the quality and duration of the training are equal, then training in Morocco must be considered as not only the most cost-efficient alternative, but that the scale of difference is great. The question does give indication that there is some doubt as to the quality and the professionalism associated with the American Language Centers as compared to the "professional language training laboratories in the United States". The point is worth discussion.

"Professional language training laboratories in the U.S." fall into two general types: those run as incorporated commercial enterprises, and those run by universities as commercial enterprises; a third type, those run by government agencies, is not taken into consideration. The evaluator has experience with all three types, therefore it is possible to make a point by point comparison.

a. Instructional materials and/or training devices.

The same materials are available to all English language teaching institutions with the rare exception of some minor proprietary systems. The ALC's use standard materials that are used by other institutions. Various

particular materials may prove more suitable for particular circumstances, and individual choice and preference may dictate selection of others. The evaluator found that the ALC has access to, and uses common standard materials and has an exceptionally wide selection of them. The actual benefit in the use of electronic language laboratories in a context of small class/experienced instructor environment has never been proven, either from a cost-efficiency basis or an improved and/or more rapid instruction basis. There is no doubt that they do have benefit in the context of large class size (30-35) academic programs i.e., typical U.S. high school, where they provide each student an opportunity for oral practice that is not possible in a classroom. In each instance that the evaluator has had experience with, when dealing with programs of the type being discussed, the presence and use of a language laboratory has been justified on an administrative basis, i.e., handling more students with less and/or less costly instructors, or on an advertising-image basis. In a few cases when the evaluator has visited overseas programs conducted by non-native English speakers of doubtful ability, the use and cost of the language laboratory has seemed to be justified. The evaluator does not believe that the lack of full-function electronic language laboratories is a significant factor in regard to the ALC's programs in comparison with U.S. centers which do have them.

The ALC's do use a wide range of training devices such as films, wall charts, pass out sheets and cassette tapes and/or records. The utilization seems to be functional and in support of the classroom instruction. It is believed that the ALC's are professionally equal to U.S. institutions in regard to materials and training aids.

b. Quality and Professionalism of Instructors.

The questioner would be suprised to realize that there is little or no difference in the quality and professionalism of the ALC instructors and those used by comparable U.S. professional language teaching institutions. The ALC instructors not only compare favorably but in most cases would seem to have a slight edge in regard to experience and documentation. The only potential negative comparison arises from the presence of Moroccan non-native English speakers on some of the ALC staffs. However the evaluator found all of those personnel to be exceptionally well documented, experienced, and within an acceptable range, speaking good English. Lest the reader feel that the last point is a deficiency, he should be cautioned to remember that in regard to U.S. programs, affirmative action policies for minority groups have resulted in a re-evaluation of what is an acceptable range of spoken English for native speakers, and that staffs of U.S. schools are no longer limited to those speaking a uniform mid-western or east-coast dialect. The evaluation feels that the ALC staffs are equal to or better than those found in comparable U.S. institutions.

c. Quality and proficiency of the programs.

The evaluator finds that the available staff and materials, which are the program components, are equal to those in U.S. institutions. The ALC's do lack depth of experience in operating intensive language training curricula

however they have competence to acquire the skills through utilization. But it must be noted that this ALC deficiency only exists if the ALC is compared to a U.S. institution that has a history of operating intensive programs over a period of several years with very low managerial, administrative, and staff turn-over. The business environment for English language instruction institutions in the U.S. is not stable. Many institutions cannot meet the above criteria due to high staff turn-over. Some university programs have a solid record but others are annual summer institutes that quickly assemble staffs to meet each year's needs. Exact comparison between the ALC's and "U.S. professional English language training laboratories" is not possible in a general sense. The ALC's are stronger than some and weaker than others. Comparison would have to be made on a one to one individual in-depth basis. Given experience in intensive program management and operation, the evaluator believes that both the Rabat and Casablanca ALC's have the potential to become equal to all but the best U.S. institutions quickly.

d. Cost structure. There is no doubt that the Moroccan based non-profit ALC's provide comparable instruction at a lower cost than U.S. institutions. This factor coupled with support costs is significant.

e. Program Commitment: The USAID programs receive more individual commitment from the administration and staff of the ALC's than would be obtainable in a normal commercial or university type language teaching institution.

The evaluator believes that continued utilization, and development of the ALC's capabilities is strongly advantageous to USAID's Moroccan training program.

4. Management Considerations

4.1. System Description and Related Concepts.

4.1.1. USAID Morocco English language training is one component of a group of components which comprise the USAID-Morocco participant training system. The system is understood to include all those events, personnel, institutions, and operations which inter-act with each other in the accomplishment of the system's purpose. By example, but not complete enumeration, the system includes the following components: personnel; USAID employees in Morocco employees who select the participants, the participants supervisor, the participant, American Language Center staff and administrative personnel, British Council staff and personnel, etc. Events; the English language training phase, the U.S. university training phase, the screening and selection of participants, etc. Institutions; USAID-Morocco, the American Language Centers, the British Council, the U.S. universities, etc. Operations; participant enrollment in English, language testing, record keeping, coordination of travel, university and/or program selection, etc.

4.1.2 One identifying feature of a system is the inter-action, and at times inter-reactions which take place between the components. This feature, wherein action taken on one component can produce a ripple effect on other components, should be kept in mind when considering modifications of the various components. Fortunately ripple effect in a system is analogous

to ripple effect in a pond; the effect is diminished and dissipated over time and distance. The evaluator has tried to anticipate this effect in regard to suggestions and recommendations.

4.1.3. The USAID-Morocco participant training system is basically a time line system. It can be represented as a straight line, time line, extending from a point in the past to a point in the future. The operations and events which take place within the system can be represented as points on the line or as segments of the line. Some segments, for example, the English language training phase are subdivided by point events such as test administrations. The participant is seen as progressing along the line, having entered the system at a particular point and moving to an exit or termination point some distance/time away.

4.1.4. Once the program is viewed in this manner it is possible to introduce some useful concepts and terms. Points or segments on the time line referring to past events are history; points and segments referring to events which have not yet occurred are expectations. Information as to the precise time and nature of the occurrence of an expected event is lead time information. Historic information can be analyzed to determine progress type of progress, and rate of progress. Historic rate of progress can be utilized as a guide to predict the location of a point on the time line in the future when a quantified degree of progress will have occurred, this is projection. Projection can be utilized to estimate if a particular degree of progress will occur in correct sequence with other expectations, this process allows prognosis.

4.1.5. The management of a time-line system can be described as taking those actions necessary to ensure that events occur as desired in reference to the time line. Management action which utilizes lead time information, prediction, and programs to control and structure the occurrence of events is called lead time planning. The term is particularly appropriate when management attempts to assure correct sequential order of events at some distance in the future. This is desirable because it gives management time/room to take actions to ensure that the events will occur as desired, either by rescheduling critical points or by taking remedial actions. Information which describes the impact of previous actions and information that up-dates data used in projection is called feedback. Leadtime planning continually modified by feedback is essential to the management of a time line system.

4.2. Management of the System

4.2.1. USAID-Morocco has direct responsibility for managing the portion of the time line training system which was examined by this evaluation. This segment commences with the testing and enrollment of the participant in English language training and terminates with the scheduled departure of a language qualified participant to the U.S. for university training. In order to accomplish these actions the program manager must primarily coordinate the progress of English language training and the scheduled departure date so that they occur in the desired sequence.

4.2.2. The program manager currently has no access to dependable statistical data concerning the known history of participant progress rates. With out this data it is almost impossible to make meaningful predictions and prognosis. Raw data in the form of ALIGU scores and training hours purchased records are available; it is recommended that they be analyzed as soon as possible to create a record of what the historic rate of progress has been, in terms of hours studied, to proceed from various entry scores to the desired final score. Of the three components of the ALIGU test; Grammar, Reading and Vocabulary, and Listening Comprehension the Listening Comprehension score can not be considered dependable to the degree required for analysis. It is suggested that an initial trial set of data be developed on the Grammar portion and on the Reading Vocabulary portion separately to determine if they are sufficiently correlated to allow them to be averaged into a single score. If this is possible, the complete data base should be analyzed to determine typical student progress rates. using those factors.

4.2.3. The tool would enable the American Language Centers and USAID to make meaningful predictions as to the length of language training required to bring a particular

participant to a specified level of proficiency. The data would enable the USAID program manager to project student progress on the time line in relation to the lead time data on U.S. university enrollment date. Availability of the data would also allow the American Language Centers to provide USAID with meaningful statements as to the number of hours of training required to bring the participant to the required level of proficiency. Constant comparison of the participants test score to the data base profile produces feedback as to whether the student is progressing more or less rapidly than is to be expected.

4.2.4. No great mathematic skill is required to analyze the ALIGU data base. Any pocket calculator in the \$20.00+ range which has capability for linear regression trend line analysis can accomplish the calculation simply and quickly. Most of the programmable calculators in the \$30.00+ class can in addition derive correlation and standard deviation information. It is suggested that since the development of the information required is equally beneficial to USAID and the ALC's that it be accomplished as a joint project.

4.2.5. The current system is weak in feedback flow. The problem of absenteeism is a prime example. From a time line system management and a cost management point of view, it is highly desirable that the USAID program manager receive and act on absenteeism data as rapidly as possible. Feedback from USAID to the ALC's should be improved, in one instance the ALC thought a non-qualified student had been entered into university training without regard to score data they had furnished, in actuality the student was entered in U.S. university English training in September in anticipation of January acceptance. The flow of feedback on the matter could have prevented the misunderstanding. The ALC's need to interchange data - the Casablanca center has no lag factor with reading vocabulary scores, where as the Rabat and Tanger centers do. In an inter-related component system it is desirable to maximize information flow up and down and laterally between components.

4.2.6. As part of the information flow each participant should be given a guide sheet or booklet specifying exactly what is expected of him and a general out-line of what will be happening to him, when it will happen, and why it will happen. Project departure dates and English language progression requirements should be discussed with the participant periodically. This should be viewed as a USAID responsibility. The participant is more capable of making extra effort than any other component of the system. The participant should be encouraged to be an active part of the system rather than passive.

4.2.7. Within the range available to it, USAID should adopt a more "hard-nose" managerial attitude toward the participants agencies and the participants. Agencies should be exposed to constant pressure to send participants to language training at time periods that are advantageous to USAID for the purpose of grouping and leveling classes. USAID needs to exert constant and immediate pressure on the agencies to reduce participant absenteeism. USAID should be less cooperative in letting participants choose English study hours, vacation periods etc. which are counter-productive to program goals. Student progress should be tracked closely in order to identify and remove from the program, as soon as possible, inept students, those having excessive absences, and particularly those who are poorly motivated.

4.2.8. It is recommended that USAID adopt fiscal attitudes more closely in line with "He who pays the fiddler, calls the tune". This is not only recommended in the sense of imposing strong program control as a management tool, but also in the sense that in these times of limited funds, it is necessary to be economically hard nosed in order to get the maximum benefit, both for the U.S. and Morocco, from the funds available. Possible recommendations in this area include not accepting short term participants unless they are English language qualified, or nearly qualified. It can not be economically justified to provide English language training for six months as proposed for a four week seminar. It might be desirable to try to negotiate with the Moroccan agencies that USAID will pay a portion of tuition costs in regular ALC classes for personnel wishing to prepare themselves as candidates for short term participant training. As a novel approach USAID might try negotiating with the Moroccan agencies that USAID will pay for English language training but that either the participant or the agency should pay for costs incurred as a result of absences. The evaluator realizes that change occurs slowly in the Moroccan context but he does feel that the advent of change is hastened by steady pressure both in actions and in attitudes.

4.2.9. The process of evaluation has stimulated USAID and ALC personnel to examine their own practices and to look for better and different ways of doing things. This is a healthy attitude which should be encouraged. Personnel within the system should be encouraged to make changes particularly in those areas where they have more expertise and familiarity than persons who hold higher level positions. Not all of the changes will be beneficial, but if the attitude to change is positive, and if changes are frequent and varied enough for the purpose of program improvement, it is unlikely that personnel will become ego-defensive about unsuccessful changes. Many of the

recommendations in this document originated from personnel interviewed as the result of stimulus of discussion. The evaluator believes that it would be beneficial to promote more discussions among the personnel concerned with the program, the contents of this document should be used as discussion stimulus rather than as set facts and guides.

4.2.10 The evaluator recommends strongly that USAID and the American Language Centers schedule a series of meetings for the purpose of producing a working agreement between the two institutions as to what their relationship is and what their responsibilities to the program are. It is believed that the discussions would be more beneficial than the agreement produced.