

1. PROJECT TITLE PD-AAL-991 Project Management Effectiveness Project (PME)	2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-0096 / 10	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE S&T/MD
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) 82-23 11/05/82		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION		

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY _____ E. Final Obligation Expected FY _____ C. Final Input Delivery FY _____	A. Total \$ _____ B. U.S. * \$ 641,589	From (month/yr.) 1978 To (month/yr.) 1982 Date of Evaluation Review _____

B. 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., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
* Core funding only. Not USAID funded amendments. Evaluation Committee recommended that: A. The project and its successor continue as an evolutionary flexible activity. Rec. 1, and 2	ST/MD DPMC NASPAA	Throughout project
B. The project increase the focus of attention on developing and using its knowledge base: on analyses of methodology of individual interventions and in relation to the sociopolitical context; on integration of applied research in technical assistance; on dissemination of findings and on building on comparative advantage of each cooperator/implementor. The implications are for greater allocations of core funding and AID/DPMC/NASPAA staff time for these increased emphases as demand for TA from USAID missions increase. Rec. 3,4,5,6,7,9,10	ST/MD DPMC NASPAA	Particularly at beginning of new project and when implementation plans are made and approved.
C. The project improve representations to Agency as a whole, and to collegial organizations, of project resources and methodology. Rec. 8-12	ST/MD DPMC NASPAA	
D. Assure DPMC (OICD-USDA) has facilities which are commensurate with work the center is doing and that is expected from it.	ST/MD USDA/OICD	

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS	10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT
<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"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P _____	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project D. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New Project (some changes)

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval design Signature & implementation)
Project Officer: Jeanne North	Signature: _____ Typed Name: ST/MD Jerome T. French Date: 11/05/82

13. Summary: This project was designed to 1) provide AID an easily accessible supply of expertise to serve Mission and Regional Bureau-generated requests for assistance in management improvement. (Fifty consulting teams - management training and consulting - assisted third world programs which are supported by eighteen USAID Missions.) 2) Undertake applied research in developing and refining conceptual and methodological bases for improvement of management of development programs. (The technical assistance efforts provided the basis of applied research which had two foci: management training and organization development in developing countries and the management of social development. Lessons learned from the project helped provide the basis for further, more focused efforts in the advancement of both research and field services); and 3) synthesize and disseminate and exchange the results of lessons learned from field service and applied research within the U.S. and third world countries.

The evaluation committee concluded that this project is more a thematic framework for learning and innovation in management improvement than a discrete, easily discernable project. Thus the evaluation reviews the learning as well as the technical assistance provided by the project.

Technical resources were provided the project through a PASA with the Development Project Management Center of the USDA (6 years), and a cooperative agreement with the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (3 years).

14. Evaluation methodology: The evaluation committee, composed of representatives of each regional bureau, PPC and DSP reviewed available project reports and conducted interviews with PME project participants from NASPAA and DPMC and with regional bureau members who had first hand knowledge of field service activities. They analyzed individually and in discussion the methodology and strategy employed.

15. Inputs: 1) Three foci for technical resource development and knowledge generation (including ST/MD which coordinates.) 2) Central funding for most activities in early years, project funded research, core activities and dissemination 3) USAID Missions funded technical assistance.

17. Outputs: Assistance with management development aspects of mission projects in 18 countries. Aside from reports on these separate activities, learnings have been recorded and shared in papers and seminars particularly in regard to management of social development and management training issues.

18. Goal/Subgoal: "16 LDCs design and implement development projects that (a) serve priority needs of their people and (b) fall in the categories specified in the U.S. Foreign Assistance Act. Sub-goal: 16 LDCs increase their capability to design and implement development projects of the kind specified." This goal can be judged to be accomplished, if this can be assumed without measuring the lasting impact of each intervention. The latter was not done.

20: Beneficiaries: The direct beneficiaries of this project have been development managers seeking the improved performance of the programs with which they work. The indirect beneficiaries have been the beneficiaries of these programs which have been, in the main, rural populations.

22. Lessons learned: The chief lesson is the need to have a learning approach coupled with a "technical assistance" one when cooperatively developing management improvement interventions. Associated with this is the value of a project which learns from experience and concentrates on the significance of this learning.

**EVALUATION OF PROJECT
MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS
PROJECT (#931-0096)**

June 1982

Evaluation Team

Chairman:

James F. Smith, LAC/DR

Regional Bureau Representatives:

Frank Mann, ASIA/TR

William Fox, NE/TECH

Diane Blane, AFR/DR

Primary Drafters:

Gary Hansen, PEC

Linn Hammergren, PM/DSP

Project Manager:

Jeanne North, ST/MD

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS
EVALUATION OUTLINE**

- I. Executive Summary**
- II. Project Management: A Thematic Framework for Learning and Innovation**
 - A. Scope of the Evaluation**
 - B. ST/MD Perspectives on Project Management**
 - 1. Background
 - 2. Mission demand for services
 - 3. Constraints on current directions
 - 4. State of the art in project management
 - C. ST/MD Support to and Management of Project**
- III. Evaluation of Progress to Date**
 - A. DPMC**
 - 1. Overview of staff and activity development
 - 2. Methodologies for project management
 - 3. Field service
 - 4. Professional exchange
 - 5. Conclusions
 - B. NASPAA**
 - 1. Overview
 - 2. Accomplishments to date
 - a. Applied research
 - b. Field service
 - c. Professional exchange
 - 3. Conclusions
- IV. Conclusions and Recommendations**
- v. Annexes**

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This evaluation of the Project Management Effectiveness Project (#931-0096) (PMEP) is less an end-of-project evaluation than a review and analysis of what has been learned and promulgated in the area of major concern to development practitioners with which PMEP deals, namely, the improvement of project management. Underlying the evaluation is the concept that accumulation of such knowledge is an evolutionary process. Thus PMEP constitutes more of a thematic framework for learning and innovation than a discrete, readily discernible project. Lessons learned from PMEP help provide bases for further, more focused efforts in the advancement of both research and field services which attempt to generate and utilize new approaches to problems and issues in project management. Two organizations received support from and collaborated with S & T under this project, the Development Project Management Center (DPMC) of the Department of Agriculture, and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). The technical applied research assistance which they have provided has been built upon analyses and methods which relate particularly to their own previous operational experience, as well as to that of their peers. Thus both organizations, with the overall project supervision of S&T/MD, are in the midst of building on (especially recent) past experience with a view both toward concentrating applied research efforts and toward developing still more data and analyses directed to the purpose of the project.

The focus of PMEP activity was and is in keeping with a renewed concern for management improvement which began to surface within AID during the mid 70s. The Agency increasingly relies on host government management of development projects for both pragmatic and analytical reasons. The stage was ready for the ST/MD management development strategy and the PMEP approach—one which sought means for: (a) improving operations performance; (b) devising contextually

appropriate management strategies; and (c) tying institution-building to specific outputs. PMEP's thrust is characterized also by an emphasis on comprehensive, multilevel interventions directed at performance unit flexibility and adaptation, and continuous commitment and involvement of key host country program and support staff. It incorporates both ongoing interventions based on these principles and applied research to advance the state of the art.

PMEP itself was initiated in 1976 in response to the noted renewed concern with host country management performance as an obstacle to project success. The project currently represents a revised extension of a Project Management Applications project in effect from 1976 to 1978. The 1978 revision called for channeling services and research provisions through both DPMC and NASPAA, with ST/MD as the central managing entity.

Each of the implementing organizations has had stipulated types of activities to carry out under PMEP. NASPAA's responsibilities included consulting on country development programs and projects, applied research, development of training methods and materials, and preparation of professional rosters and exchange. During early stages, NASPAA's activities involved a number of start-up actions. Second-stage activities have embraced a wider range of operational activities--necessary to establish project viability and visibility--which admittedly were experimental and less selective than will be desirable in the future. During the third stage--planned for activation under the Performance Management project--NASPAA intends to focus its activities on "selected areas of concern."

NASPAA's intended focus and efforts to build on its accumulated knowledge is to be aided by an expansion of personnel with long-term overseas assignments. In

the past, some fifty consulting teams have provided assistance which responded to eighteen mission or regional bureau requests, ranging from analyses of management constraints to development or strengthening of management training programs. On the applied research side, which recognizedly is only thinly divided from the service areas, two major efforts are underway, one focusing on social development issues and the other on assessment of management training in development countries. In the first of these, through a series of applied research projects (centered largely around activity in the Philippines), a social development management technique is being further articulated. This builds on the concept of project design and implementation as a social learning process, in which participation of government sponsors, clients and facilitators creates new sets of institutional relationships and patterns of interaction. The definition of such methodology and strategy has not progressed as rapidly as has its application. NASPAA's second concentration, assessment of management training programs, has been part of NASPAA's agenda for some time. Based on that experience, future research in this area should focus on five aspects: training needs analysis, linkages between training and performance, program versus individual training, incentives and networking.

These two areas of concentration, together with ongoing testing of training materials and methods, and development and utilization of rosters and professional exchange in management training, comprise NASPAA's main efforts currently and should do so for the immediately foreseeable future.

DPMC was established in 1976 specifically for the purpose of undertaking applied research and providing short and long-term service to the field for improvement in project management. The small size of the staff limited DPMC's early efforts

to provision of short-term consultancies, organization of a documentation center, sponsorship and monitoring and one long-term management project (in Jamaica). More recently, with acquisition of additional professional staff, DPMC has reached a take-off point where field services are attaining a dimension capable of supplying the kind of learning and applied research opportunities intended.

DPMC also is evolving an approach to management improvement based on methodologies for collaborative goal setting and collaborative adaptation of available technologies to the goal sought. This approach relates training to the definition of systems and their modification which are required to accomplish the desired goal. This "performance approach to management development" is characterized by: (a) multilevel interventions, (b) mobilization of informal and formal structures, (c) group and individual change, focusing on (d) process and output, through targeted improvement in (e) performance and capacity by (f) accelerated learning, embodied in (g) action training, which develops management skills through addressing actual ongoing problems and/or projects. The various short-term and long-term experiences of DPMC, while amply deserving high marks, also point up the need for development of still longer range organizational frameworks for DPMC as a service and research institution.

In addition to specifics concerning DPMC and NASPAA the evaluation emphasized: 1) the need to clearly articulate management improvement technologies in an evolutionary fashion under the planned Performance Management project, 2) the flexible modus operandi of both organizations has served well in providing rapid response to the need for high-quality field service, informed by applied research. That flexibility should be retained in the continuation of activities, 3) the applied research agenda of both institutions should be more selectively

focused and clarified, to build systematically on in-dept knowledge bases in the several identified management domains. Finally, dissemination, identification and outreach to specific target audiences in LDCs and within the development practitioner community (including AID) should be emphasized with materials and methodologies tailored to their needs.

II. PROJECT MANAGEMENT: A THEMATIC FRAMEWORK FOR LEARNING AND INNOVATION

A. Scope of Evaluation

The scope of work for this evaluation differs markedly from the typical end of project evaluation for a road construction effort or for the development of an agricultural research station. In many ways the Project Management Effectiveness Project is not a project, but, as referred to earlier, constitutes a thematic "framework for learning and innovation."

ST/MD collaboration with DPMC and NASPAA is designed to: 1) provide AID with an easily accessible supply of expertise to service mission and bureau-generated requests for assistance in management improvement; 2) undertake applied research in developing and refining conceptual and methodological bases for improving project management; and 3) analyze, synthesize and disseminate the results of lessons learned from field service and applied research in order to advance the state of the art in development management science within the United States and Third World countries.

The knowledge base on which the project builds includes development and application of: 1) methodologies for improving project management, organ-

izational structure and management systems; and 2) intervention methodologies for technical assistance in management improvement and methodologies for the training of trainers/consultants in management. Both DPMC and NASPAA address these concerns, although with somewhat different emphasis and perspectives.

The evaluation task therefore, was to review the interrelated field service and applied research undertaken by these two separate implementors. Field service was comprised of various kinds of management improvement elements for a number of different projects in a number of different countries. The applied research was similarly diverse.

In summary, the PMEP project has combined in one effort a range of concerns: service to missions of short or long-term duration, the accomplishment of which can be only measured in more evolutionary terms; and institution-building efforts which requires a long-term time horizon. The nature of this multifaceted activity requires that ST/MD investments be sustained well into the 1980s.

In conducting this evaluation, the interbureau evaluation committee reviewed all available reports on project activity, including previous evaluations. In addition, the committee conducted a number of interviews with personnel from both NASPAA and DPMC, as well as the project managing office. Representatives of the regional bureaus serving on the committee also conferred with appropriate personnel in their respective bureaus concerning activities which had taken place or were underway in their respective regions. Reports on the more significant of those were channeled to the committee members who drafted the central portions of this report.

The evaluation was conducted in a collegial fashion throughout, with frank and open discussion among all parties. In light of the relatively ready access to information and cooperation of all concerned, it was determined that no field visits would be required, and that both data collection and analysis would be conducted in house. However, it is recognized that evaluation of the total impact of project activity in any given site would require much more profound, on-scene (before and after) examination. In addition, the evaluation was undertaken with the anticipation that preliminary documentation for a follow-on project (Performance Management, #931-5317) was then being prepared, and that results of this evaluation would contribute to development of that project. This in fact took place.

The comments, findings and recommendations which follow reflect the circumstances outlined above.

Insofar as administrative arrangements are concerned, ST/MD has had a PASA arrangement with USDA which, for the work of the project, maintains a small unit of management specialists. A cooperative agreement with NASPAA enables that organization to strengthen its program of constituency service by providing opportunities for enrichment of programs and skills of constituents' programs, while at the same time meeting AID's need for technical assistance and applied research.

With initial RAD support, DPMC came into operation in 1976. In the past year and a half additional staff acquisitions have allowed it to forge ahead with a substantial field service and applied research agenda. RAD funding for NASPAA began in 1980; a period of lead time has been required as NASPAA sought to

gear-up and initiate its own set of activities. In brief, the thrusts of the Project Management Effectiveness Project are still in relatively early stages of development. However, DPMC is now well underway and recently-initiated long-term field efforts will soon begin yielding a rich harvest of data and insights; NASPAA, while a more recent participant in this effort, has passed through the start-up stage and having completed an initial sequence of field service activities, is in the midst of building on this experience to strengthen and focus its applied research effort. Thus, this evaluation may be viewed as an early or at most mid-term concept review. Overall activity requires another three or four years for emergence of major impact and therefore this evaluation is designed to determine if DPMC and NASPAA are moving in an appropriate direction and whether mid-course corrections should be undertaken in relieving constraints and pursuing opportunities for expediting activity progress.

B. AID ST/MD Perspectives on Project Management

1. Background

Under one title or another, development of management resources in host countries has been a constant theme of AID efforts since the Agency's beginnings. Definition of the nature of the problem, and the major thrust of proposed solutions have varied considerably over time in response to a number of factors both internal and external to the Agency. Internal factors include changes in the wider definition of development objectives, shifts in major program emphasis, variations in the level of Agency resources, and changes in country and target group emphases. External factors include a variety of political, social and economic changes in the host countries themselves, and not incidentally, some major shifts in the state of the art in development administration, public administration, and management.

The Agency's earliest efforts to tackle the problem were characterized by an emphasis on administrative reform. Major components included the proposed wholesale transformation of national bureaucracies, the introduction of westernized civil service systems, and establishment of local institutes of public administration. There was also a major emphasis on foreign national training through a series of programs which brought participants to the United States for lengthy study programs. These programs were most often in technical areas although management or public administration courses also played a part.

By the mid 1960s disillusionment with this approach, at least in its administrative reform component, led to a substantial cutback in efforts. Three considerations were fundamental to this decision. First, many of the programs had proved difficult, sensitive and unwieldy to implement. Second, there had been few clear payoffs in terms of improved performance. Finally, it was argued that the strategy of importing westernized administrative techniques and models failed to take into account differences in the cultural and social environment and so was doomed to failure. In response to these and other considerations, the Agency in the early 1960s abolished its central technical Office of Public Administration. By the end of the decade most field technicians in public administration had gone as well. A new Development Administration Division was placed in PPC, but it was small in size and lacked operational or program responsibility.

AID's shift in the late 1960s and into the 1970s to a greater emphasis on sectoral analysis and programming had a further impact on the management issue. In 1969, the office of Development Administration was relocated in the new Technical Assistance Bureau (TAB) where it was charged with "key problems" research. Local action programs were also stressed and the office began to

collaborate in this area with the Rural Development Office when the latter was established in TAB in 1974.

Disillusionment with the in-country reform programs did not produce comparable cutbacks in the area of training, however. The emphasis on the latter continued on several fronts, and while the main thrust of training continued and continues to be in technical fields, management was not ignored. Important programs here included those channeled through the USDA/ITD (for host country employees) and a number of courses (eventually housed in AID's Training Division) for in-house training. Two points should be made about training activities directed at host country officials. First, training tended to be seen as a separate function, one that could be carried out with little coordination with other management development efforts. Second, training efforts, whether in technical areas or in management, were aimed at those destined to fill the top levels of host country public or private bureaucracies. In both cases, the underlying assumption was that a concerted effort to upgrade human resources at the top-most administrative levels would in itself produce improvements in bureaucratic performance and output. While it can be argued that this assumption was borne out in some cases, it now appears that a reliance on training alone is a very inefficient and uncertain way of producing these outcomes.

By the mid-1970s a renewed concern with management emerged within the Agency. Its roots lay in part in a dissatisfaction with past achievements and with identification of management shortcomings as a major obstacle to sector program goals. A second source of this concern arose in changes within the Agency itself. Cutbacks in field personnel forced a greater reliance on host country organizations for program implementation and a consequent preoccupation with the

latter's administrative and management capabilities. In addition a new emphasis on participation and local level development introduced new criteria for management effectiveness. Finally, changes in the state of the art in public and development administration theory, and in particular a new focus on problems of management, implementation and policy, redirected thinking as to how these issues ought to be approached. Evidence of this renewed and redefined concern are found in early studies and working papers leading up to the Hall Task Force Report of 1975 and Policy Determination No. 69 of 1977, both of which emphasized the importance of LDC management development. The more recent emphasis on institution building and private sector initiatives (especially as regards the desirability of establishing an appropriate environment for private sector development) demonstrate a continuation of this concern for upgrading management capability in both the public and private sectors.

2. Mission Demand for Services

The emphasis on management development extends far beyond AID/W. There are a number of indicators of an existing and growing concern with this issue at the mission level and of resultant demand for services provided by ST/MD and other entities. Evidence cited in the 1981 strategy paper on management development includes a review of FY 81 and FY 82 projections of project starts which shows management improvement efforts to be a "major area of ongoing and projected assistance funding." The paper's authors go on to note that:

During the two year period, sixty-three projects have been proposed in which management improvement is either an area of prime focus or a principal component. The total AID resources associated with these projects is \$453,000,000. Thirty-four of these projects have training as the major input and over half are within the agriculture and rural development sectors.

In regard to services provided by ST/MD in particular, during the period of June 1980 to June 1981, thirty-six field service requests were made by twenty-six missions.

A survey of mission demand made in conjunction with the strategy paper and two informal cable surveys run by the Near East and Africa Bureaus provide further evidence of field concern with improved management as an essential determinant of project success and with the need for increased technical assistance to that end. These surveys and other reports from the field indicate a general satisfaction with the quality of service so far provided and, significantly, a good deal of concurrence (much of it apparently spontaneously generated) with many of the new strategy themes.

3. Constraints on Current Objectives

The decision to stress management development and the mission demand for services met an immediate obstacle in the form of human resource constraints. As noted, earlier cuts had eliminated management or administration as a sectoral program and with it many in-house staff experts. By 1980 AID had the equivalent of four full-time direct-hire management specialists in the Development Support Bureau and four others in various missions. There were none in the regional bureaus and no positions reserved for them. The staffing situation clearly posed problems for a renewed emphasis on management development. It has had a major impact on the choice and design of strategies subsequently mounted and for some of the problems encountered.

The personnel shortages not only strained the capability of central support services, but also contributed to problems of coordination and information sharing

with the field. The many fronts on which the management issue is approached pose further problems of coordination and continuity of efforts. These difficulties are compounded by the fact that management and management training exist as components of programs rather than as sectors in their own right. There currently seems to be little demand to change that status and indeed the prevailing consensus—that management should be seen as a means rather than an end—argues against any such move. It does not, however, eliminate the desirability of facilitating further contact among those who approach the management issue on several fronts and of providing for more systematic means of information exchange both among and between them and their potential clients, the missions, regional and support bureaus. While, as will be elaborated below, some progress has already been made in that direction, a good deal remains to be done.

4. State of the Art in Project Management Development

While later sections of this evaluation focus more specifically on directions taken and methodologies developed, the shifts in emphasis referred to above are summarized briefly here, as they relate specifically to AID ST/MD efforts. As noted, a part of the shift comes from state of the art changes in the disciplines of public and development administration and dissatisfaction with the previous focus on institution and capacity building in the abstract—that is a focus on macro-level changes, blue-print designs and other efforts to upgrade performance independent of consideration of the task at hand or the task environment. Criticism was also leveled at the apparent preference for a top-down approach to reform, both because it tended to affect only those levels and hence had a limited or even counterproductive impact on total organizational performance, and because, in light of the programmatic emphasis on service delivery, local impact,

and client involvement, it seemed to be starting at the wrong end of the problem. Beginning with that dissatisfaction with previous theoretical and applied approaches, the disciplines have moved to focus on improving operational performance, devising contextually appropriate strategies, and tying institution-building to specific outputs.

Adapted to the AID ST/MD environment, the state of the art advances combined with the organizational considerations outlined above, have produced a new strategy, a "Performance Approach to Management Development." As outlined in the June 1981 Strategy Paper:

In its most fundamental form, a performance approach emphasizes that the purpose of a management improvement effort is more than the improvement of management capacity. Rather, every management improvement effort should be judged in terms of whether it contributes to a performance improvement, e.g. an effort which substantially improves the likelihood that joint AID/LDC (less developed country) development policy objectives be achieved.

Aside from its focus on performance (outputs) as the target of change and the measure of short term and long term success, this approach is also characterized by an emphasis on comprehensive, multi-level interventions directed at the performance unit (organization or project), flexibility and adaptation (appropriate management technology), and continuous commitment and involvement of key host country program and support staff. While it gives less priority to such conventional management improvement techniques as long-term training and large-scale institution building and structural reform (unless associated with a specific impact on performance) it does acknowledge a reliance on "a generic body of management principles, concepts, and tools—a management technology."

The ST/MD strategy thus incorporates both ongoing interventions based on these

principles and applied research to advance the state of the art. It further emphasizes the expansion of the group of involved practitioners within the United States and in the host countries and facilitation of knowledge exchange and dissemination among them and their prospective clients in missions and foreign governments. Knowledge dissemination is clearly essential if clients are to make use of the services available but it is also seen as crucial to further development of performance strategy. As the 1981 strategy paper further notes:

. . .management assistance efforts will need to be streamlined and rapidly disseminated due to accelerating pressures on resources and pressures for improved results. The task of testing and refining the 'performance approach' thus becomes a high priority along with the application and dissemination of such methodology to ongoing field programs.

C. ST/MD Support to and Management of Project 0096

This project (931-0096, Project Management Effectiveness) was initiated in 1976 in response to the renewed concern with host country management performance as an obstacle to project success. It was one of a variety of such efforts undertaken throughout the Agency, but unlike the others, it began with the potential for a more comprehensive focus (i.e. not limited to a specific region, sector or project). It also offered the potential for resolving two problems confronting these activities: the shortage of direct hire experts in management and the lack of coordination of efforts and information among the ongoing programs. Thus from the start, and increasingly over time, the objective of the project was not only to help resolve immediately identifiable management problems but to generate, collect, build on and disseminate knowledge and experience for the benefit of future efforts.

Given these additional objectives it comes as no surprise that the project's course has been an evolutionary one. The earlier experience and lessons learned have produced changes in structure, strategies, and tactics. The current project is a revised extension of the initial Project Management Applications in effect from FY 76 to FY 78. Both the original and current versions aimed at the general objective of management improvement and both were monitored by the Office of Multisectoral Development (first as DSB/RAD/DA, then DS/RAD and S&T/RAD, and now ST/MD/DA). Both versions were funded through a core budget and through mission add-ons for field consultancies. The initial project, Project Management Applications, emphasized two lines of attack: the development of regional management institutions and assistance to host country programs. For the latter, the main vehicle was the RSSA-supported Development Project Management Center (DPMC) established in USDA/OICD in April 1976. Support of regional management and training institutions was realized through a series of grants some of which predated the project.

When the project was extended in 1978 and FY 79 to FY 83, both its organizational components and specific objectives underwent some revision. While RAD maintained its central role in managing the provision of services, the latter were now channeled through two participating institutions, DPMC (under a PASA) and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA-through a cooperative agreement). The management training institute component of the initial project was incorporated as one of NASPAA's responsibilities although with a somewhat more open-ended set of objectives - i.e. as one possible channel for training activities and also as a focus of networking efforts.

Provision for funding through a core budget and mission add-ons remained as before, but the lines of action included under the project were more specifically defined and equitably divided among three principal areas: field support, applied research, and professional exchange and development. In realizing these activities, both cooperating agencies were expected to develop and utilize a network of support and research personnel who could provide immediate assistance to aid projects while helping to develop more general change strategies.

The specific resources and orientations brought to the project by DPMC and NASPAA resulted in some differences in the precise responsibilities assigned to each. DPMC's activities were to emphasize "project management training and administrative systems." Its immediate professional network was composed of trainer-consultants skilled in these areas. NASPAA, with its university affiliations, focused its networking activities and drew its field staff from members of these institutions. Its assumption of the responsibility for strengthening the capacity of management education and training institutions, and for developing training materials also arose from these professional linkages. Aside from these relatively minor differences the agreements with each agency fundamentally stressed the same types of output:

- Direct mission support in the form of short term consulting interventions
- Applied research
- Expert network formation and the development of a specialist consultant roster
- State of the art papers
- Information dissemination, including the former, as well as other publications, workshops, seminars, etc.

Project management responsibilities have been and continue to be lodged in ST/MD. Since that management covers coordination of the activities of both NASPAA and DPMC, a brief summary of that office's responsibilities in the PMEPP project is in order.

1. ST/MD has overall responsibility for development of the project resources, both for fostering acquisition of competent staff and consultants and for developing Agency backing and funding for their work.
2. ST/MD also bears major responsibility for direction of the use of these resources, as to purpose, quality and scope. This requires decisions regarding use of the implementor's time and staff for resource and development work vis-a-vis field service, including decisions as to whether to respond to targets of opportunity and spontaneous field requests, rather than promoting a deliberately planned strategy of field service. This includes both vetting applied research products and directing responses to field needs and initiatives.
3. ST/MD also has responsibility for providing guidance and support to operational development administration programs managed by regional bureaus and USAID Missions to help guide development of project strategy responsive to Agency needs. (These responsibilities are exercised collaboratively.) Either ST/MD or the implementing organization may exercise initiative in meeting some of these responsibilities but, because of its ultimate oversight responsibility, ST/MD must participate and approve where it does not initiate.

III. EVALUATION OF PROGRESS TO DATE

A. DPMC

1. Overview of Staff and Activity Development

DPMC is a unit in the Office of International Cooperation and Development within the USDA. It was established with funding from RAD in late 1976, for the primary purpose of undertaking applied research and providing short and long term field service to AID missions for improving project management. In the early years of its operation attention was focused on provision of short-term consultancies, organization of a document center for dissemination of training materials to Third World institutions, and support of a long-term management improvement project in Jamaica (1976-79). Expansion of these activities was somewhat constrained by its limited staff, which until 1981, consisted of no more and sometimes less than two professionals, and by the fact that as a new organization, considerable energy had to be devoted to establishing its visibility and credibility with missions and AID/Washington staff. In several cases where long term field service opportunities did arise, staff turnover or fluctuating political and economic conditions in the field served to cut short DPMC involvement in these efforts.

DPMC began to come more into its own in early 1981 when it acquired two additional professional staff, thus making a core total of four professionals. This gave the DPMC the kind of critical mass which it never had before. As a consequence it is reaching a take-off point where field service activities, both of short and long term character, are attaining a level of scale sufficient for providing DPMC with the kind of learning and applied research opportunities originally envisaged by RAD in its support for activities in this area.

The rapid increase in DPMC short and longer term consultancies is reflected in the fact that DPMC has fielded fifty technical assistance teams. There has been long term concentration on three USAID projects. Some other consultancies have entailed the "spin off" to mission contracts of former DPMC consultants. Approximately four-fifths of DPMC's operating budget is now derived from mission funded services. In the past year and a half all field service was funded by AID missions. Prior to that the central project funded start-up activities. This growth in field service serves to highlight the need for examining future staff needs. Further discussion of this issue and related topics concerning the future direction of DPMC growth will be discussed in the final section of this report.

2. Applied Research

Methodologies for Project Management

The ST/RAD "Management Development Strategy Paper," 1981, takes the position that the . . . "greatest short-term gains in LDC management development are to be made by concerted application of known and proven management development technologies rather than heavy expenditures for more knowledge building and R and D efforts." DPMC priorities reflect this concern as relatively little of its attention is being devoted to breaking new ground in the development of project management methodologies. Rather, its major focus has been on design and application of intervention or process methodologies for the transfer, adaptation and absorption of management technologies within existing organizational contexts. The emphasis on process or intervention methodology is significant, since the record indicates that approaches which attempt to introduce a single management model or predefined technology in a client organization have frequently proven counterproductive because of inattention to significant var-

ibilities in client needs and goals. Emphasis on the development of intervention methodologies is predicated on the fact that location-specific variabilities with respect to culture, goals and tasks are such that processes must be set in motion which allow for tailoring management technologies to meet these conditions. Furthermore, this effort can be most effectively undertaken if client groups assume a primary role in adapting technology to meet their own particular needs.

While experience and analysis strongly indicate that it is not appropriate to think of a common management technology which could be utilized by all organizations, it nevertheless is quite appropriate to identify generic management functions which characterize most organizations. Thus, DPMC has sought to distill from the management sciences and their experience a set of management functions which seem to constitute the basis for building effective management performance. These functions include, as they appear in DPMC documentation, the following:

- Having clearly stated and shared objectives;
- Having a consensus on the strategies and means for carrying out objectives;
- Having a consensus on roles and responsibilities;
- Having realistic implementation planning and support systems; and
- Having operational guidance and adaptive mechanisms for policy and program modification and redesign.

In simplified form, the core DPMC approach to management improvement can best be visualized in the following diagram:

MISSING PAGE
NO. _____

entitled "Management Development Strategy Paper, AID's Response to the Implementation needs of the 1980's," June 1981.

The initial 1975 statement articulated a training process which seeks to improve project management. In Jamaica this approach was applied in conjunction with design of a national system for project identification, planning and approval. In effect, the Jamaican experience witnessed the evolution of the "action training" approach from one of identifying project management as the target of change to one including a concern for changing organizational systems and behavior in conformance with improved processes for project development.

The experience accumulated by completion of the Jamaican project (in 1979) and the addition to the core staff of two seasoned professionals has put DPMC in a position of being able to more fully articulate, from both a conceptual and experimental perspective, an intervention methodology which underlies its approach to management improvement. The distinctive characteristics of this methodology, commonly referred to as a "performance approach to management development," or "performance management," perhaps can best be clarified and conveyed through the polarities outlined below.

— Multi-level interventions

The DPMC approach seeks to involve both executive level, middle management and project level staff in a shared commitment to management improvement. The superimposition of a more top-down approach for improved management performance is eschewed because of an anticipated lack of support and sustainability at lower levels in the administrative hierarchy.

— Informal and formal structure

The approach seeks to mobilize informal resources within existing structures with the intent of stimulating change from within as well as directly changing existing structural constraints. Structural constraints are not seen as an obstacle to change if an opportunity exists for engaging organizational participation in a process of self-initiated change.

— Group and individual change

Group norms are viewed as a major determinant of management and administrative behavior and, therefore, the approach seeks to involve project groups or teams in a process of self-defined change, rather than focusing on changing individual behavior independent of a larger social process.

— Process and output

Achieving results, i.e., improvement in management performance, is closely related to the manner or process by which such results are achieved. It is assumed that target group participation in defining and guiding the change process will serve to generate rapid and sustained improvement. In this sense, an emphasis on improved management output should not take precedence over the manner in which such achievements are attained.

— Performance and capacity

Engaging participants in skill application opportunities and problem-solving processes within the actual job context, and thereby developing capacities in the process of task performance, is considered more effective than developing capacities independent of actual job situations. Capacity

building alone provides no promise that new skills will be translated into actual performance.

— Accelerated learning

Participants in management improvement are guided through a structured and telescoped process of learning in which they seek agreement on a number of generic management functions. The pace and direction of this activity is not left to a random or indeterminate evolution of group responses and intentions.

— Action training

Training is not undertaken as an activity independent of actual management and implementing conditions. Rather, project management teams are engaged in a process of identifying existing needs, and then proceed to develop skills by addressing actual ongoing problems and/or projects within the organization. In brief, project managers acquire new capacities in actual management actions through a task-oriented medium addressing management and project conditions within the organization.

The above concepts capture in relatively simplified form the major elements of the DPMC approach to improving project management. Important differences do distinguish the DPMC effort from approaches utilized by other management trainers/consultants. The DPMC staff has developed this methodology through an inductive and deductive synthesizing of insights from a wide range of disciplines, drawing upon lessons learned from its field service experience.

In actual practice the DPMC intervention methodology includes engaging an

organization in a series of intensive workshops and follow-on consultations in which they seek to involve participants in addressing identified generic functions, with subsequent collaboration in the diagnosis of current organizational management problems and follow-on actions in the design and implementation of new modes of improving project effectiveness. The full application of this methodology is ideally undertaken in more long-term consultative situations, as opposed to its more limited use under time-constrained conditions. Under longer time conditions, DPMC can focus on a wider range of concerns including the introduction of entirely new management and implementation systems. The discussion in the following section on long-term DPMC involvements in Jamaica, Thailand, Portugal and the Sahel region reveal in greater detail the manner in which DPMC seeks to improve project management in a context of a long-term field service endeavor.

Training Methodology for Trainers and Consultants

Following on the training of Jamaican trainers/consultants in the Jamaica management improvement project, DPMC recently has begun to focus sustained attention on issues concerning the training of trainers/consultants. Such attention is warranted as the performance management approach depends upon sustaining management improvements through training indigenous trainers/consultants to carry on the process of organizational change after DPMC consultants depart. Therefore, the role of the indigenous trainers/consultants and ways by which their contributions to management improvement can be maximized will need to remain as major components of DPMC applied research agenda.

In addition to the training of host country trainers/consultants, DPMC is beginning to devote attention to the training of expatriate trainer/consultant cadres. A

projected DPMC activity for FY 1982 includes organization of two workshops; one sponsored by DPMC to improve the skills of consultant cadres, and another sponsored jointly by DPMC and NASPAA to explore the effectiveness of different consultant intervention strategies for management improvement.

Finally, DPMC is seeking to draw lessons from its short-term consultancy experience in order to improve the effectiveness of expatriate consultant teams who undertake such assignments. Initial attention is being devoted to the conduct of intensive two to five day pre-departure sessions whereby DPMC staff assists consultant teams in clarifying how the terms of reference for their assignment relate to broader project or program objectives, and the extent to which client perceptions may diverge from or reflect a wider set of issues from those contained in the prescribed scope of work. These sessions are also designed to engage teams in a process whereby they can more precisely formulate the objectives and strategies they will pursue in the assignment. This effort includes the design of a work plan which involves team agreement on individual member assignments and the process by which the team will review and evaluate its work.

The contribution of these pre-departure sessions in building a common frame of reference and understanding is particularly important in those situations where team members represent diverse technical and disciplinary specializations, and where the work assignment includes a difficult and complex task environment. A properly structured pre-departure orientation can greatly enhance team sensitivity and awareness of the kinds of issues which will need to be prepared for in undertaking its work.

3. Field Service

Short-term field service

DPMC has undertaken fifty short-term field consultancies in twenty-one countries. A list of these consultancies since 1980 is shown in Table 1. One of these efforts, the technical assistance supplied to USAID/Kenya, and four longer term field service efforts were reviewed by the evaluation committee with Regional Bureau personnel who have monitored the work. A brief comment on the Kenya work will serve to illustrate general impressions.

Kenya Agricultural Systems Support Project

At the request of the USAID/Kenya Mission, DPMC organized a five man team which worked in Kenya over a five week period (February-March, 1982) to evaluate the Kenya Agricultural Systems Support Project. A 95-page draft evaluation report was completed in March and is presently being reviewed by USAID/Kenya, AID/W, the GOK and project contractors. Both the Mission and AFR/DR believe the team was a strong one and the evaluation well done, and support DPMC findings.

Long-term field service

Jamaica

In 1976, a DPMC consultant began a four year AID funded field assignment in Jamaica to assist the GOJ in the planning and conduct of development projects with the intention of increasing the flow of development capital from international donor agencies and, in general, to improve capital utilization from both internal and external sources. The basic focus of this effort involved an intensive use of the DPMC action-training and performance management approaches in training Jamaican officials, and in improving GOJ systems for project design and

approval.

During the four years of project life, the action-training reportedly improved the capability of Jamaican officials to design and implement projects, and by all accounts significant technical improvements were made in the GOJ project design and implementation system. The project has also left in place a Jamaican trainer/consultant unit which is able to provide back-up support for continuing training in project design and management. The GOJ has published the training materials which DPMC assisted in developing for use by the training unit. As to the second goal of increasing the flow of development capital, it became clear during the project life that improvements in project planning and implementation did not directly result in an increased volume of foreign lending and increased expenditures on foreign loans. There was no indication within the GOJ, or in the donor community, including USAID/Jamaica, of a willingness to leverage program resources on the basis of improved host-country technical performance. Finally, concerning the third goal of improving capital utilization, no impact evaluation has been undertaken to determine if such improvement has occurred as a result of AID assistance.

In summary, it appears that DPMC was able to exercise considerable impact in improving project design and review procedures within the GOJ, although for reasons beyond its control this did not result in enhanced donor lending. One of the major contributions of the project was that it gave DPMC its first long-term opportunity to field test and refine its approach to management effectiveness. This served to greatly expand its awareness of those factors which must be addressed in undertaking management improvement efforts.

Sahel

In early 1981 a DPMC consultant served as a member of a management team sent to the Sahel on short-term assignment for the purpose of formulating a set of strategies and implementation procedures in addressing major deficiencies in host-country financial management of the AID sponsored Sahel Development Program. As a consequence of this activity DPMC undertook some immediate on-site activities to assist in improving host-country financial accounting; it is now undertaking the design of a second and larger follow-on effort involving the use of financial accounting instruments for improving project implementation and management performance.

In the first activity, which addressed the short-term need for bringing about immediate improvements in financial accounting, DPMC helped design an accounting system along with an applications manual and training materials for use in training host country accountants to use the system. DPMC has pretested the manual and training materials and a series of orientations and workshops are being organized in the Sahel, whereby the proposed accounting system will be adapted to host-country needs. DPMC is assisting in organizing these activities in a manner consistent with its emphasis on action training and performance management. Thus, host country project managers, administrators, and accountants are identifying their accounting needs and are participating in a process of tailoring proposed new systems to address these needs through applications in actual project activities.

The second activity will be a more long-term effort, with DPMC functioning as a contractor and providing general direction over those activities undertaken by

it as well as related sub-contractors. The focus of this endeavor will be to use financial accounting to improve project management, with financial data being utilized to monitor and evaluate the progression of project activities. The Sahel financial management effort constitutes a major opportunity for DPMC to improve management practices within an eight country region. It will also provide a challenging testing ground for refining and developing its methodology and approach to project management improvement. As of this date, DPMC has received very positive feedback about its contribution to the Sahel effort from both host-country participants, USAID/REDSO and AID/W.

Portugal

DPMC is providing the public management development component of the Portugal Program for Agricultural Production (PAP). This project, begun in FY 1981, has as its major thrust increasing the limestone and agricultural output of Portugal. Another stated objective is to provide public management development for involved institutions (basically the Ministry of Agriculture). The project has approximately U.S. \$200 million of funding including host country and PL480 contributions and a direct AID grant of U.S. \$10 million. The direct AID money is designed primarily to employ U.S. consultants for agricultural technology and institution building.

The PAP is being coordinated by USDA under a PASA agreement. DPMC, as the USDA in-house institution-building agency, was brought into the project from the beginning as the public management consultant. The DPMC role is to provide project management training for the Ministry of Agriculture with significant effort being aimed toward diverse regional offices. Three workshops were held during the summer of 1981 to introduce project implementation concepts and team processes to 50 regional planners from various regional offices. These

workshops were also used to discern the needs of management. An ongoing function which DPMC has assumed is improving communication within the Ministry of Agriculture by being a liaison between the national and regional offices, a contribution which the AID country desk feels is important and useful. Finally, DPMC is seeking to introduce management tools into the Ministry planning and implementation process for agricultural projects.

The DPMC staff has been well received in Portugal. Both the AID country desk and USDA staff indicated that DPMC performance has been good. A project evaluation was conducted in February, 1982, and though that document has not been released yet, it will call for a more focused effort by the DPMC. The Project Backstop Officer has noted that DPMC will be asked to limit its activities to those parts of the agency and types of training that directly contribute to agricultural output goals of the project, rather than providing a wide range of management training for the Ministry. Apparently the evaluation team is concerned that the DPMC's efforts may be dissipated if not focused more carefully. Thus DPMC's management training in this project will serve as a pilot for the Ministry of Agriculture. If this work is successful the potential exists for broadening the training to the entire Ministry. The GOP has given its approval to the management development approach. The DPMC role is planned for the duration of the project, which has about four more years to go.

Thailand

In the Fall of 1981 two DPMC consultants on short-term assignment worked with the AID Thailand mission and RTG officials in the design of a project management information system (PMIS) for application to the mission project portfolio. This activity is to be followed by a one year assignment (in 1982) of one DPMC consultant to assist the mission and counterpart RTG agencies in

adapting and utilizing the PMIS. The introduction of the PMIS is premised on the assumption that an effective reporting system should be built around realistic and detailed project implementation plans. Thus the PMIS is linked to formulation of sound project implementation plans, with implementation milestones and indicators constituting the baselines for project monitoring.

Once established as a component of mission procedures, PMIS will be utilized to bridge the often encountered gap between the completion of project papers (PP) and project implementation actions. While not specified in the project documentation, this presumably implies that RTG teams would be formed to undertake pre-implementation activities (the documentation does include a recommendation that PDS funds be authorized to support such an activity) in order to identify major implementation constraints and requirements, with the project teams then working with the mission in designing feasible implementation plans. In effect, therefore, the transition from PID to PP to actual project implementation would become a more integrated process with RTG project teams acquiring early project initiative and understanding of what needs to be done in moving ahead without delay in project start-up directly after PP approval.

The PMIS methodology has been successfully tested in two mission projects and this has served to generate optimism about its eventual effectiveness when scaled-up to meet a larger set of needs. The evolution of this process bears close study. For if DPMC can overcome the general organizational inertia and structural constraints which inhibit the sustained use of project reporting systems, the lessons learned from this effort can be applied for more generalized adoption by other missions and thereby shift attention from an overemphasis on project design to a more balanced integration of design and implementation functions

early on in the project development process.

4. Professional Exchange

An important activity for DPMC concerns the exchange and dissemination of ideas within management and development administration disciplines. This activity includes the regular issuing of a literature review, entitled "DPMC Update," for presentation in seminars/conferences/workshop sessions. The "DPMC Update" is a small four-page document which briefly reviews new publications in the applied management area. This is a valuable document similar in format to the the "Pasitam" notes which has enjoyed such wide use within the development administration profession. A list of DPMC publications is presented in Table 2.

DPMC has been active in professional meetings and in early 1981 sponsored its own workshop on "Evolving Technologies for Project Management Improvement," which involved the participation of management development specialists active in Third World nations.

5. Conclusions

Until recently DPMC was limited to a core staff of two professionals and therefore it has been difficult for it to undertake a wide-ranging and substantial field and applied research effort. It completed one long-term activity in Jamaica in addition to a number of short-term field service consultancies. DPMC has sought to further develop its methodological interests through these endeavors. With the acquisition of two additional core staff members DPMC rapidly initiated a number of long-term field opportunities, and these should serve to greatly strengthen its field service and applied research portfolio.

The record indicates that DPMC has provided high quality short-term services in meeting mission needs. The Jamaican experience constitutes the only long-term field endeavor completed by DPMC. It received high marks from the Mission. The Jamaica project served as a major impetus for further refinement of the DPMC "performance management" methodology, and this approach is now being applied with consistency in evolving a set of long-term field efforts. In this sense, DPMC should be credited with the fact that its concern for testing and refining methodology remains at the center of its activity profile. It should be stressed, however, that the performance management approach to management improvement, and particularly the intervention methodology now employed by DPMC, are still very much in the formative stage of development. Its application in Jamaica appears to have yielded positive results, although the impact of the project through its training cum project development thrust, has not been studied, nor has the effectiveness and viability of the unit left behind when the consultants left been examined. The current application of the performance management methodology in Portugal, Thailand and the Sahel should reveal how much of the Jamaican-derived methodology can be replicated in other cultural and institutional contexts. These current activities should also illustrate the length of time and resources required in order to achieve sustained management improvements.

It can be expected that the performance management approach will undergo a considerable range of change, reorientation and refinement as the Thailand, Portugal and Sahel efforts evolve over the next several years. The challenge for DPMC will be to remain sensitive to the complex nature of these country engagements in order that it can adapt its practices, make mid-course corrections, and capture lessons learned as it assesses and reflects on what it is

accomplishing. A number of recommendations in the final section of this evaluation are offered which relate to bringing a more focused effort on expediting methodological advances through an integrated applied research and field service agenda.

In summary, for what DPMC has and is accomplishing it deserves high marks. An important question looms, however, in making judgments of this kind without some frame of reference of a longer term development design for DPMC as a service and research organization. In brief, past and current DPMC involvements can be positively evaluated as discrete activities, but in the absence of a long-term organizational and programmatic plan, it is difficult to determine whether the past, and importantly the current portfolio represents an appropriate and judicious use of its limited resources. The following section on future directions seeks to address this issue and a related set of factors concerning mid-course changes in the definition of applied research and the nature of the DPMC's future growth and relationship to USDA.

Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations: DPMC

1. Long-term Planning

It would seem imperative at this point in the organizational evolution of the DPMC that design of a long-term development plan for DPMC programs and attendant staff and facility needs should immediately proceed. In the early years of DPMC activity a more focused long-term view was not particularly warranted, as a considerable amount of time was devoted to cultivating mission demand for DPMC services. DPMC has now passed beyond this threshold; it is currently responding to a level of increased demand which will soon begin exceeding its present capacity to service short and longer term field requests. The extent to

which DPMC will need to exercise greater or less selectivity over what it excludes or includes in its activity portfolio will depend upon what is envisaged for this organization in the longer-run development of its service and research agenda. Should DPMC remain at current levels of staffing with the implication of a "no-growth" scenario in future programming? Should certain priorities be downgraded in allowing for the up-grading of others? Should there be a general expansion of DPMC programs and staff in response to increased mission demand for short and longer term services? Avoiding any of these choices by maintaining current staffing levels, yet trying to respond to increased demand through DPMC sub-contractors, is not a viable alternative, as a corresponding growth in DPMC staff and management capacity would be needed in maintaining quality control over sub-contracting services.

DPMC has reached a take-off point with no clear indication of what the destination point will be. In order to avoid a randomized and improvised program response, which would only serve to dissipate its resources in a mix of unrelated engagements, discussion should now begin in order to sort out priorities with respect to where DPMC wants to be in five years from now. These discussions will need to focus particular attention on how DPMC will allocate its resources vis-a-vis short and longer term field engagements and how these activities will be related to its applied research effort.

Decisions and plans about program development involve an attendant range of issues with respect to staff, facilities and budgetary resources. The following comments are directed at some of these concerns.

Staffing

The DPMC currently has two of its professional staff filling permanent positions, whereas the other two recent professional appointments are in temporary positions. In brief, half of its professional staff are subject to an uncertain future with respect to further career development and security. It is recommended that MD should begin immediate discussion with USDA to help clarify prospects and conditions for securing permanent positions for the temporary staff, or determine the extent to which existing arrangements can be designed to provide longer-term certainty and support for the temporary staff. Without assurances of longer-term staff involvement, there is a very real danger that one or more of the current staff will leave. This would represent a serious setback for DPMC. The prospects of staff attrition under these circumstances are such that ST/MD should act now in seeking to avert such a possibility. If USDA cannot provide the longer-term conditions required for sustaining current staff levels, serious consideration should be given to placing DPMC under the auspices of another umbrella agency or establishing it as an independent non-profit corporation. The most desirable option would be to keep DPMC within the USDA structure.

Discussions between ST/MD and USDA on staffing issues should also include future needs or objectives for the increase of DPMC staff positions. The current professional and administrative staff are operating under a maximum work load, and it can be anticipated that further demand for their services will soon be forthcoming. The question emerges as to what is intended with respect to how DPMC should cope with an increased work flow. For instance, how are demands for field service to be balanced off against staff time for undertaking applied research? The current rate of growth for DPMC services would suggest that an increase of core staff from the current four positions to a total of six to eight

positions will soon need to take place, in order to support a robust and well integrated field service/applied research agenda.

Facilities

The physical facilities for DPMC's home office are woefully inadequate. Staff members are sequestered in partially partitioned cubicles which are not only exposed to the noise and distractions of ongoing transactions conducted within each office, but also to the clerical work conducted by support staff adjacent to these offices. The total work environment is not conducive to sustained thinking and it is a tribute to the DPMC staff that they have remained so productive under such trying conditions. There is also a very small meeting room, which is again fully exposed to surrounding noise and therefore not suitable for the conduct of any sustained endeavor involving more than four or five people. This constitutes a severe constraint given DPMC's effort to conduct training and orientation sessions for consultant teams and trainee groups. Finally, the space available for easy shelving and access to DPMC's expanding materials collection is grossly insufficient.

It is recommended that ST/MD undertake immediate negotiations with USDA to improve DPMC office facilities. At a minimum the following three needs should be addressed:

- 1) the need for having a fully private office for each professional staff member;
- 2) the need for an easily accessible and fully private meeting room sufficient in size for ten to twelve people;
- 3) the need for a meeting room for larger groups to be available on DPMC request.

Overhead Fees

DPMC earned nearly \$60,000 in overhead fees during the past year. Little if any of this was returned in cash or in kind for facility improvement or program support. It is recommended that ST/MD engage in immediate discussions with USDA on a formula whereby some of the overhead fee could be retained for DPMC purposes.

2. Applied Research

During the past several years DPMC staff has devised intervention methodologies for management and implementation improvement which were utilized in Jamaica, and are now being applied on an in-depth scale in Portugal, Thailand and the Sahel region. The methodology is therefore not untested, but neither is it a proven procedure for undertaking effective organizational change. DPMC staff recognize that there is a need to further refine and adapt its approach in different country contexts. The Thailand, Portugal and Sahel region projects should provide a rich, ongoing harvest of insights and lessons about how to engage host country organizations in a process of management improvement, and the various ways different intervention strategies succeed or fail in achieving this end. In essence, these three long term field projects should constitute the primary and major basis for DPMC's applied research agenda. In this instance, applied research is taken to mean a continuous recording and assessment of those efforts wherein DPMC seeks to apply its strategy and methodologies for management improvement. In brief, applied research is "research on application," i.e. an ongoing effort to capture what is being learned from a field-based endeavor.

Most development assistance efforts are not designed with a built-in mechanism

for learning about what approaches are working or not working in achieving the intended outcomes. This explains why in most instances there is a general absence of documentation which explains the progression of events, issues and problems punctuating the life of a project effort. Frequently, all that is known is that a project started at point A and ended at point Z, with little evidence of what transpired in between. This information gap occurs either because project designer and implementors were certain that their approach would work, and therefore documentation was not desired, and/or because few resources were available to support an intensive process of self-monitoring and evaluation.

The distinctive feature of ST/MD's long-term support for the DPMC is that it derives from an effort to cultivate a learning environment where sufficient resources are available for assessing and analyzing the effectiveness of intervention processes for project management improvement. For this reason the Thailand, Sahel and Portugal projects should constitute the major priorities for the DPMC applied research agenda. Sufficient manpower and resources should be devoted to documenting and analyzing the progression of events in these projects to account for variable degrees of success or failure in project outcomes. The substance of these three projects involve complex and difficult issues and there is no guarantee of success in any of the DPMC endeavors. It would seem appropriate therefore to start with a measurable baseline of where host country organizations are now, and proceed to record the pattern of events thereafter, even for several years beyond the life-of-project, in order to adequately measure the intangibles of management improvement or lack thereof.

Continuous reporting and assessment is the key to a vital learning experience. Thus it is recommended that quarterly or biannual assessment reports, richly

contextual in their content, should be prepared for each of the Sahel, Thailand, and Portugal projects. Such reporting could serve greatly to expand DPMC visibility and foster the sharing of these learning experiences with a wide professional audience. In this respect, it would seem appropriate for DPMC to approach these learning opportunities in a manner which puts them in the same category as the highly visible Comilla project in Pakistan, the Vicos experience in Latin America, the Gal Oya effort underway in Sri Lanka, and the NIA irrigation project in the Philippines.

Moving the Thailand, Portugal and Sahel projects to the forefront of the DPMC long-term applied research agenda would not only constitute the basis of a rich learning experience, but it would also serve to more fully elucidate the DPMC approach to project management improvement. There is a definite need for some brief and animated publication which clearly spells out in simple terms what the DPMC methodology is, the central assumptions behind the approach, and how it is being applied in different countries.

B. National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration
(NASPAA)

1. Overview

NASPAA's participation in Project 0096 began in 1979 as part of the revision and extension of the initial project. It was incorporated via a cooperative agreement with then DS/RAD (now ST/MD), running through 1983. The precise definition of NASPAA's responsibilities under the agreement has taken various forms, but it generally coincides with those outlined in the revised cooperative agreement (dated 5/15/79). Here four types of activities are stipulated as follows:

- Country Development programs: direct consultancies with the missions for the purpose of elaborating and incorporating methods of management training into country development programs.
- Applied Research: with an emphasis on institutional capabilities and management training. One output will be knowledge generation and dissemination in the form of reports and state of the art papers.
- Methods and Materials: for use by LDC's within and outside of formal training institutes.
- Rosters and Professional Exchange: with an emphasis on LDC and NASPAA's member institutions.

To date NASPAA's activities under the project fall into two stages. The first (lasting a little over a year) involved a number of start-up activities including the creation of a roster file and the establishment of procedures for handling field requests. The second stage (roughly two years) has entailed a wider range of operational activities in line with those outlined in the agreement. This second stage has been frankly experimental; NASPAA has been less selective about its undertakings than it is likely to be in the future. However, it is felt that this

wide range of activities was necessary to establish project viability and visibility. As NASPAA now enters what it defines as a third stage it will focus its activities on a narrower range of "selected areas of concern" where it feels it can be most effective.

To date NASPAA's permanent staff has been limited to one full time professional in Washington and one in the field (the latter added in 1981). A second full time professional was added to the Washington office as of January 1982; another professional will be added to its overseas staff in September 1982. An envisioned expansion of overseas assignments to four persons may eventually require additional backup in Washington. Over the short run the Washington staff will be augmented by a series of graduate student interns serving on a three to four month basis.

2. Accomplishments to Date

Before reviewing NASPAA's accomplishments, it should be noted that it is difficult to separate them into a discrete number of mutually exclusive areas. This is a natural and intended consequence of the integrated nature of the work, which is expected to increase over time as the organization moves into a third stage of its activities under the project, focusing on areas of greater concern and attempting to build on and consolidate knowledge—for example, emphasizing short term technical assignments that tie directly into its applied research agenda. Still, with this caveat in mind, accomplishments to date can be divided into the following general areas:

- a. Country development programs: provision of short-term assistance to respond to mission field service needs.

As of April 1, 1982 NASPAA had provided thirty-two consulting teams drawn from its roster, eighteen of which were funded by regional or mission budgets, the balance by core project money. A complete list is given in Table 3.

The majority of these activities have dealt directly with one of two major issues: the assessment of training programs and training institution capacity, or organizational assessments focusing on organizational management capacity.

Examples of the former include:

- 1980 CAFRAD evaluation (core funded)
- 1980 survey of Central American Management education (core)
- 1981 institutional review of development administration in Sri Lanka (core)
- 1982 management training assessment in Pakistan (mission funded)

Examples of the latter include:

- 1981 evaluation of the Central Tunisia Development Project (mission)
- 1981 Haitian Administrative Reform evaluation (mission)
- 1982 management constraints study in Pakistan (mission)

The nature of the final product in these activities varies according to the nature of the assistance requested. In most cases it has been a report featuring an assessment of existing conditions and problems with recommendations for future action. In some instances, the product has entailed more direct action — as in the case of NASPAA's involvement in the Dominican Mission's design of a PID for

a Management Education/Training project, their assistance in the design of a Haitian Agricultural/Food Systems project incorporated in the CDSS, or in the design and utilization of management training materials described under section c. The list of NASPAA-produced documents, shown in Table 4 includes papers prepared during these interventions.

The available comments on the quality of assistance provided are uniformly favorable, indicating both a high level of satisfaction with the assessments and evaluations and a perception of their utility to the design and implementation of future and ongoing projects. The following statement by the Pakistan Mission Director in response to the 1982 Management Constraints study is typical of those received:

The result was imaginative, and substantive and responsive. . . (the) work was very useful and we will draw upon it heavily as we proceed further in the design of our assistance projects.

Comments also demonstrate satisfaction with NASPAA's quick response capability as contrasted with alternative means for meeting these requests. As noted specifically in the context of NASPAA's activities in African management training, "NASPAA's willingness to proceed with recruitment of consultants prior to internal completion of the necessary paperwork (PIO/T, ProAg amendment, etc.) is especially appreciated."

Given the short time frame and the fact that implementation of their recommendations depends on factors entirely outside NASPAA's control, evaluation of their impact in a more substantive sense is difficult. Aside from the general statements that findings and recommendations will be used in future project design, there has been some indication of more specific follow-up activities. The PID from USAID/DR mentioned above, is an example, as is the

use of the Central Tunisia Development Project study in the Mission's preparation of a position paper and the subsequent tie-in with Richard Roberts' activities in Morocco and Tunisia (see section b). The utilization of the report on "Human and Organizational Resources" in the Sahel in the design of the Sahel Financial Management Improvement Project is another. These examples and the generally favorable responses to the consultancies suggest that impact in terms of follow-up activity has been substantial although difficult to measure precisely in light of the many other factors contributing to design and implementation decisions.

On the subject of impact, it bears mentioning here that NASPAA's own research agenda has been directed at this issue, especially as regards actual management improvement, as opposed to inputs to project design. As described below, both applied research agendas include efforts to identify linkages between management and training techniques and performance. To the extent such linkages can be identified, both the design and assessment of interventions should benefit.

b. Applied Research

Two major applied research efforts are now underway, one focusing on social development management and related themes and the other on the assessment of management training in developing countries. Each of these is associated with at least one long-term field project, but related activities also cut across the three other major areas of project efforts — technical assistance, networking and professional exchange, and the development of professional and training materials. It is within the area of applied research that the integrated nature of NASPAA's work is most apparent and it is also from this area that the direction and content of future efforts will increasingly be shaped.

Social Development Management and Bureaucratic Reorientation

The first of the research agendas stems from work begun by David Korten and his associates in the Philippines. Korten began this work while associated with the Ford Foundation and came under NASPAA's sponsorship in 1980. While the research agenda has been strongly influenced by Korten's activities, it should be noted that prior to and after his addition to the project, NASPAA has been involved in a number of related efforts in this area. These include a workshop held in February of 1982 and attended by representatives of Partners for Productivity, Cornell University, DPMC, and representatives of constituent NASPAA programs, a workshop at the 1982 ASPA Conference, a series of working papers, and various networking activities. Beyond their immediate purposes, all of these undertakings have facilitated the exchange of information and a collaborative learning process drawing from other field experience. Thus, in some sense, Korten's inclusion in the project can be seen as simply giving a sharper focus to work already under way.

This first research theme is really a collection of interrelated issues, key among which are people centered planning, social development management, social learning, and bureaucratic reorientation. As a NASPAA working paper notes in contrasting this to more conventional approaches to project planning and design:

. . . the emphasis here is on more complete systems analysis to produce better models that include the calculus of uncertainty made necessary by political and cultural variables that in earlier days were largely ignored or considered irrelevant. . . It takes the position that only broad goals and objectives should be centrally determined and that operational planning should be done in the field and involve directly those individuals and/or their representatives who are to be the beneficiaries of the project.

Starting from this premise the approach moves on to the redefinition of project design as a social learning process including participants drawn from the

government sponsors, clients, and facilitators and entailing the creation of new sets of institutional relationships and patterns of interaction. The resulting research agenda thus has two major components: testing the approach or general theory of social development management and identifying the management techniques it implies. This latter is particularly difficult given the emphasis on flexibility, inductive processes, and continuous adjustment and adaptation.

To date progress on the research has moved more rapidly along the first dimension than the second, a fact which has been recognized and reported in a number of NASPAA internal documents. Reports on Korten's work in the Philippines, both under Ford sponsorship and under NASPAA, and those from other field activities utilizing this approach, have demonstrated its utility in the context of what Korten terms "second generation projects" — that is those "directed to the development of new institutional capacities and involving untested technologies." Analyses of these cases also supply a number of innovative strategies and tactics (e.g. the emphasis on personal contacts, identification of "progressive elements", networking, etc.) which separately or in combination might be adapted to other projects. However, despite these successes and the burgeoning collection of publications they have inspired (a part of them included in NASPAA's working papers) progress has been slower in the second area which entails defining a methodology, identifying management techniques, determining a strategy of bureaucratic reorientation, and developing training programs to prepare people for social development management. Significantly, these issues now figure in NASPAA's research agenda, both for the long term work of Korten and his associates in the Philippines and Thailand, and for other shorter term interventions and related work. Considering the accomplishments in those instances in which social development management has

been applied and AID's longstanding concern with shortcomings in project implementation in LDCs, this appears to be a very promising area of activity.

Assessment of Management Training Programs

Informally, this second area of applied research has been a part of NASPAA's research agenda since its entrance into Project 0096. This theme runs through all aspects of NASPAA's activities as stipulated in the original agreement, and, as noted above, has been emphasized in its short term technical assistance, networking, and contacts with LDC management institutes. More recently, NASPAA has moved to further consolidate its activities in the area and to formalize it as an applied research theme. Two events are critical here: a workshop held in April of 1982 and arrangements made for a long term field project, to begin in September, 1982.

The workshop, which brought together eight NASPAA consultants and a number of other interested experts, is particularly important. It represents an effort to define a range of research concerns and issues which will be used to direct and coordinate NASPAA's future efforts in this area. Among the many concerns identified, five in particular warrant special mention:

- Training needs analysis — the development of a simple methodology directed to management capabilities
- Specification and identification of linkages between training and performance
- Program or project specific versus individual training
- Incentives — as applied to student motivation and the establishment of viable training institutions
- Networking and the identification of institutions and resources in LDCs

These five issues and the expanded list from which they are drawn constitute a tentative agenda for future research and for directing and consolidating the experience of ongoing short term technical assistance. It is suggested, for example, that the agenda can be used as part of an orientation program for field consultants who can then address these issues as part of their technical assistance activities. In addition, the agenda will provide a basis for long term field interventions like that to be conducted by Richard Roberts in Morocco and Tunisia. Those undertakings, scheduled to begin in September of 1982, will involve work done out of Morocco where Roberts' "major role will be to work with USAID/Morocco and the Ministry of Interior on a project to train local civil servants and locally elected officials in project design and management." Roberts will also assist AID/Morocco with management training components of other projects, conduct a series of short term workshops for the Central Tunisia Development Authority in Tunisia, and devote the remainder of his time to research agenda items. Funds proportionate to time allotted will be provided by USAID/Morocco, USAID/Tunisia and S&T. NASPAA has provided three preparatory technical assistance visits to Morocco, and will cooperate with DPMC and perhaps DAI in supplementing Roberts' training efforts in Tunisia.

A further potential element of this research area, although one still in the planning stage, is the organization of a group of three to five individuals from NASPAA schools as an inner corps of consultant/researchers. As envisioned now this group would be responsible for more intensive short term field research aimed specifically at the research agenda, for continued elaboration and refinement of a research strategy, and for consolidating the lessons drawn both from their own work and that of others. One objective of this plan is the acceleration and systematization of the process of knowledge creation, consoli-

dation, and dissemination for the benefit of future field activities and the state of the art as a whole.

c. Training materials and methods

The major activities here revolve around the development of French language management materials for use in Francophone Africa. This effort was begun by David Gould working independently at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Gould subsequently approached NASPAA for support in adapting his French language seminars into training modules specifically designed for use in Africa. With that support, a team headed by Dr. Gould visited Africa in Spring of 1981 to gather case study materials. In this effort they drew on work they had done earlier under NASPAA sponsorship to develop an inventory of public administration training institutions in Francophone Africa. The resulting training materials are already being used (subsequent to an independent mission request) in the elaboration of a development administration/project management seminar to be held in Ouagadougou, Upper Volta, at the PAID regional institute in November of 1982. In regard to this seminar in particular, the AFR/RA EHRD officer had noted that:

. . . the evolving relationship with NASPAA is proving to be quite cost effective. Specifically, for an investment of only \$4,300 an innovative and potentially replicable seminar drawing on francophone participants from all over the continent has been designed using quality, tailored teaching materials. . .

Interest in the realization of similar seminars has already been expressed by the governments of both Djibouti and Congo. Utilization of these materials in Africa in these and other programs is a high priority for NASPAA in the coming years, as is the exchange of other types of training materials and of relevant findings emerging from the organization's applied research agenda. One other project which should be mentioned in this regard is the "Evaluation of Selected Films for

Management" done under core funding in October 1980. It should be further emphasized that the whole area of management training materials is closely integrated with NASPAA's other activities. It has a clear application to NASPAA's short term consultancies and is furthermore a specific focus of the applied research agenda as described above.

d. Rosters and professional exchange

Many of the activities here have already been touched upon in the preceding sections, but they are important enough to merit a more specific treatment here. Furthermore, NASPAA's approach to this activity warrants further explanation because of the several factors shaping it. This approach responds to two sets of complementary but still independently generated responsibilities. On the one hand there is the stipulation under the project agreement that NASPAA develop a roster, sets of networks, and systems of professional exchange as a basis for its technical assistance efforts and other project-related activities. On the other, there is NASPAA's own organizationally based interest (but one, it should be emphasized, of direct benefit to the project) in building the capabilities of its member institutions, and of LDC institutions with which it works, in development administration and management. These two concerns, independently and in interaction, have produced a multi-level approach to the issue of rostering and exchange and one with potentially greater pay-offs than a more single-minded strategy.

NASPAA's rostering activity began with its initial elaboration of a list of some 500 individuals associated with member institutions and selected on the basis of their potential availability and suitability for consultancy work. It has been a continuing concern of NASPAA's to keep the pool of consultants relatively large

and to continue to draw on new talent for actual field work. In this sense it serves the project's ends by expanding the resource pool and by opening the way for more innovative approaches. It also furthers its organizational concerns by involving members institution staff in field experience which should enhance their own professional development and consequently the resources they take back to their universities.

At the same time, however, NASPAA has more recently begun developing an inner corps of consultants on which it draws more heavily for long and short term technical assistance. This is seen as essential from the standpoint of further coordinating activities, developing a research agenda and tying it in with all phases of NASPAA's activities, and instituting a mechanism for consolidating and utilizing lessons and findings from field experience. This inner corps is in no sense seen as superceding the larger roster, but instead will be used in conjunction with it.

Other activities in this area include the formation of several networks around more specific themes (and including professionals drawn from the wider roster and the inner corps); the establishment of a variety of relationships with and among LDC institutes for the purpose of identifying host country resources, mounting cooperative programs, and also drawing them into the first set of largely US-based networks; information exchange, including the publication of a newsletter, and the development of orientation programs for consultancy teams. As noted, most of these activities overlap substantially with the other three areas and have to some extent been described above.

3. NASPAA: Preliminary Conclusions and Recommendations

Given the short time during which the NASPAA component of the project has been fully operational, the conclusions that can be drawn as to its performance are fairly tentative. NASPAA's activities, like those of the rest of the project, have been evolutionary but the indications are that it has made substantial progress at an organizational level and in establishing a base and agenda for future work. In regard to the areas of activity outlined in the cooperative agreement, at first glance the initial progress appears uneven with the take-off stage in some coming considerably later than in others. However, as NASPAA enters its third stage of operations and the interrelationship of its various activities becomes more visible, it appears that this first impression is less than accurate and that it now is well advanced in all four areas. Furthermore, much of the earlier work has provided NASPAA with what is, in effect, a working plan for its future activities. Although the plan has not been formalized within each of the four major areas of action, NASPAA has set out an extensive set of related activities and priorities, many of which are already being pursued. The importance of the issues included in the agenda and the heightened sense of direction they suggest, seem to further justify NASPAA's own sense of entering a third stage.

Two aspects of this third stage warrant particular attention. The first is NASPAA's decision to be more selective in defining its areas of action and to concentrate its emphasis on the themes of management training and organizational capacity, areas in which it was originally assumed to have a comparative advantage. The second is the decision to work for greater coordination among all four areas of activity and the creation of a series of mechanisms to achieve this. Both decisions coincide with the more general

recommendations of this evaluation that the project identify and develop a sharper focus on its areas of strength and concentrate its efforts there. This does not mean a necessary de-emphasis on the general technical assistance component, but it does mean as representatives of both DPMC and NASPAA have suggested, that there may need to be some greater selectivity in terms of technical assistance and consultancies provided. The only feasible alternative would seem to require an immediate increase in the size of the Washington offices to provide the administrative back-up for a larger and more general service component.

In terms of overall organization, scope of work, and direction, there seems to be no need to press for radical changes. NASPAA is progressing well with an evolutionary approach and may be one of its own best examples of organizational learning strategies in action. It is clear that in order to proceed with a number of the long term objectives it has more recently laid out, it will eventually require the addition of more full-time or part-time personnel both in Washington and in the field. However, the recent addition of two professionals, one in the field and one in Washington, should facilitate matters over the short run. In regard to other possible recommendations, it appears that NASPAA has already included most of them in its most recent working plans. The emphasis on coordinating activities both at the stage of designing scopes of work and identifying lessons learned seems particularly critical as does the stress on refining methodologies and techniques so as to make them applicable to future undertakings. Having proved that it is organizationally and technically capable of providing the field services promised, NASPAA should now be encouraged in its efforts to simultaneously expand the state of the art and so create the basis for still more effective approaches to the problem of management development.

IV. Overall Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The program should be continued in the form to which it has evolved by present date—as opposed to the precise format of the 1978 proposal.
2. The program should retain sufficient flexibility (as in the past) to allow evolutionary development; this should be viewed at one level as a research or learning effort in its own right, in which ongoing activities will contribute to reshaping and redirecting future efforts.
3. The program should encourage both DPMC and NASPAA to continue in their respective aims to define and concentrate on their areas of comparative advantage. This does not mean a hard and fast division of turf. It is in fact expected that considerable overlap will remain, and that the organizations will continue to interact cooperatively and learn from each other. It does mean, however, that each should become more selective in channeling its resources and deciding where its activity can most profitably be expanded.
4. Heightened effort should be made to coordinate technical assistance, applied research and other activities within each organization.
5. Heightened effort is also needed to consolidate and disseminate findings (from 3 above), especially as these relate to development of new methodologies of management development.
6. More intensive effort should be made also to explore and respond to regional

differences in management development and management development needs. More precision is needed in stipulating contexts in which specific methodologies are appropriate and how they might be adapted to others.

7. Increased demand for field services and heightened concentration on research agenda put heavy demands on MD project officers. To continue a creative role in the substantive development as well as to facilitate a busy field program, MD will need to project staff time, guard its management efficiencies, and give priority to planning and reporting collaboratively with the two implementors.
8. The program should assure better provision of information to missions and regional bureaus on the project as a whole, what it provides in the way of services, and what its aims are.
9. The program should develop some kind of system for collecting and processing information from missions and regional bureaus on: a) management needs, b) host country resources in management development area, c) response to evaluation of technical assistance both in short-term consultancies and applied research.
10. Greater emphasis should be paid to assuring that applied research activities become a more integral feature of field service activities, particularly the long-term DPMC efforts in Portugal, Sahel, and Thailand, in order that sustained field level applications can be continuously monitored and impact assessed in improving management.

11. Greater emphasis should also be placed on continuous documentation and reporting of field service activities, particularly long-term field efforts, in order that lessons learned can be captured and disseminated within professional and AID networks.

12. There is urgent need for preparation of a publication which briefly and clearly states the key elements of DPMC's intervention methodology for management improvement, the fundamental assumptions behind this approach, and how the methodology is being applied in different country and problem contexts. Dissemination of this publication would serve to increase AID awareness of what DPMC has to offer and it would also constitute a baseline for measuring long-term changes and advances in DPMC's approach to management improvement.

13. There also is urgent need for DPMC, AID and USDA discussions concerning the future role of DPMC and where it wants to be in five years, with the design of a programmatic and operational plan which indicates substantive priorities of concern and attendant staffing and facility requirements for addressing these tasks. It also is questionable whether DPMC can sustain the quality and quantity of its work without more adequate workspace and support staff, not to mention continue its growth in either dimension. It is urgent that ST/MD negotiate with USDA/OICD to assure this unit is given facilities commensurate with the work they are doing and which is expected of it.

TABLE 1

FIELD SERVICE BY PROJECT MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT (931-0096)
DEVELOPMENT PROJECT MANAGEMENT CENTER (DPMC) IMPLEMENTATION

DATE	DURATION	COUNTRY/REGION	PURPOSE/ASSIGNMENT	CONSULTANT
Feb. 10, 1980	5 weeks	Ghana, Senegal, Kenya	CAFRAD Evaluation	M. Solomon
Mar. 6, 1980	3 weeks	Nepal	Agricultural Sector Implementation Project	J. Hannah
Apr. 6, 1980	5 weeks	Ghana, Senegal	Training for Project Analysis ENA Evaluation	M. Solomon
Apr. 14, 1980	2 days	Jamaica	National Planning Project	B. Brooks
Apr. 15, 1980	4 weeks	Egypt	Management Development for Productivity	R. Roberts
Apr. 17, 1980	12 weeks	Indonesia	Provencial Development Program	J. Hannah
Jul. 17, 1980	2 weeks	Guatemala	External Financial & Trust Control	E. Rizzo F. Cruz-Villalba
Sep. 1, 1980	6 weeks	Jamaica	National Planning Project	M. Kettering
Oct. 3, 1980	4 weeks	Egypt	Egyptian Industrial Development Program	J. Haybyrne
Nov. 10, 1980	2 weeks	Guatemala	Monitoring Systems for Programs	T. Murray
Nov. 10, 1980	4 weeks	Egypt	Vocational Training for Productivity	R. Roberts
Nov. 15, 1980	5 weeks	Egypt	Egyptian Industrial Program	J. Haybyrne
Dec. 8, 1980	3 weeks	Mauritania	RAMS	W. Rutherford

TABLE 1
(continued)

DATE	DURATION	COUNTRY/REGION	PURPOSE/ASSIGNMENT	CONSULTANT
Jan. 4, 1981	5 weeks	Egypt	Egyptian Industrial Program	R. Roberts
Jan. 7, 1981	4 weeks	Guinea-Bissau Cape Verde	Manpower Needs Analysis	R. Galli R. Duncan
Jan. 15, 1981	4 weeks	Egypt	Vocational Training for Productivity	J. Haybyrne
Jan. 25, 1981	1 week	Senegal	Senegal Rural Decentral- ization Effort	C. Salem
Mar. 8, 1981	4 weeks	Senegal, Upper Volta, Mali & Ivory Coast	Financial Management Improvement	M. Kettering
Mar. 10, 1981	4 weeks	Senegal, Upper Volta, Mali & Ivory Coast	Financial Management Improvement	T. Murray
Mar. 23, 1981	1 week	Egypt	Vocational Training for Productivity	J. Haybyrne R. Roberts
May 14, 1981	2 weeks	Niger	Evaluation Assistance Project (PP design)	P. Countryman R. Vengroff
Jun. 14, 1981	5 weeks	Egypt	Management Development for Productivity Project	R. Roberts
Jul. 1, 1981	4 weeks	Portugal	MAP - Procalfer	M. Thompson M. Ingle
Sep. 1981	1 week	Washington, DC	Workshop for AFR/SWA - Financial Management Improvement Program	M. Kettering M. Solomon
Sep. 11, 1981	7 weeks	Thailand	Systems for Monitoring & Evaluation	T. Schmidt

TABLE 1
(continued)

DATE	DURATION	COUNTRY/REGION	PURPOSE/ASSIGNMENT	CONSULTANT
Sep. 28, 1981	8 weeks	Thailand	Systems for Monitoring & Evaluation	M. Kettering
Sep. 30, 1981	1 week	Haiti	Monitoring Systems for Project	L. Cooley M. Ingle
Oct. 19, 1981	3 weeks	Portugal	MAP - PROCALFER	E. Rizzo M. Ingle
Oct. 25, 1981	2 weeks	Egypt	Management Development for Productivity	R. Roberts
Nov. 28, 1981	4 weeks	Sahel Region	Financial Management Improvement Project	M. Solomon J. Raleigh C. Ritzert C. Wilding-White
Dec. 1, 1981	2 weeks	Costa Rica	IICA/USDA Workshop	M. Ingle D. Spears
Dec. 4, 1981	1 week	Costa Rica	IICA/USDA Workshop	M. Kettering P. Countryman
Dec. 30, 1981	4 weeks	Niger	Ministry of Health Project Certification	R. Quirk
Dec. 31, 1981	4 weeks	Upper Volta	Project Certification	S. Baranson
Jan. 4, 1982	4 weeks	Portugal	Agricultural Productivity Team - TAD	E. Rizzo M. Thompson
Jan. 1982	5 weeks	Kenya	Evaluation & Upgrade of Mission Agricultural Support Project	I. Mayo-Smith
Jan. 1982	8 weeks	Kenya	Evaluation & Implementation of Planning Effort	E. Gilbert

TABLE 1
(continued)

DATE	DURATION	COUNTRY/REGION	PURPOSE/ASSIGNMENT	CONSULTANT
Jan. 1982	4 weeks	Portugal	MAP - PROCALFER	M. Thompson
Feb. 1, 1982	10 weeks	Mali, Upper Volta, Niger	Financial Management Improvement Project	P. Countryman J. Raleigh C. Ritzert M. Kante
Feb. 6, 1982	10 days	Portugal	MAP - PROCALFER	M. Ingle
Feb. 24, 1982	8 weeks	Upper Volta, Niger	Financial Management Improvement Project	M. Kettering
Feb. 28, 1982	3 weeks	Pakistan	Water Management Project	T. Schmidt
Feb. 1982	4 weeks	Mali	Financial Analysis (OMBEVI)	W. Furst
Mar. 1982	12 weeks	Sahel Region	Financial & Program Management Project (PP design)	M. Solomon J. Williams J. Tuthill
Apr. 12, 1982	2 days	Switzerland	ILO	M. Kettering
May 1982	5 weeks	Portugal	PIMS	E. Connerley
May 1982	8 weeks	Senegal, Upper Volta	Financial Management Improvement Effort	F. Murray
May 1982	12 weeks	Guinea-Bissau, Cape Verde Gambia	Financial Management Improvement Effort (Portuguese)	N. Robinson P. Perkins
May 1982	10 weeks	Portugai	MAP - PROCALFER	M. Thompson
Jun. 1982	4 weeks	Thailand	MIS	M. Kettering
Jul. 1982	1 week	Pakistan	Water Management Project	M. Kettering

TABLE 2

DEVELOPMENT PROJECT MANAGEMENT CENTER
Publications
(Partial List)

An Action-Training Strategy for Project Management, Morris J. Solomon, Flemming Heegaard and Kenneth Kornher, 1977.

Applying Project Implementation Monitoring and Accelerated Learning Systems Concepts to Improve the On-Farm Water Management Program: A Discussion Paper for USAID/Pakistan, Terry Schmidt, 1982.

Appropriate Management Technology: A Development Administration Perspective, Marcus D. Ingle, 1981.

Development Project Management Center (Brochure)

Guidance for Performance Improvement: Case Studies, (Draft), Edward Rizzo, 1981.

Improving Financial and Program Management, Merlyn H. Kettering, 1982.

Action-Training in Project Planning and Management - A Review of the Experience of the National Planning Project, USAID - Government of Jamaica, 1976-1979, Merlyn H. Kettering (also in French and in Spanish), 1979.

A Multi-Faceted Action-Training Approach for Improving Project Management: The National Planning Project in Jamaica, Merlyn H. Kettering, 1981.

Introduction to the Financial Management Improvement Effort in the Sahel, DPMC, 1982 (also in French and Portuguese)

User's Manual for Basic Accounting System, DPMC (also in French and Portuguese) 1981.

Improving Project Monitoring and Implementation Systems: A Strategy and Implementation Plan for a Project Management Information System (PMIS) for USAID/Thailand, Merlyn Kettering and Terry Schmidt, 1981.

Microcomputers and Agriculture Management in Developing Countries, Proceedings from Practitioner Workshop, DPMC, 1982.

Organization and Conceptual Approach of the Development Project Management Center (DPMC), Presentation by Marcus D. Ingle to the IICA-PROPLAN/USDA-DPMC Seminar in Turrialba, Costa Rica, 1981.

Project Analysis: Towards an Integrated Methodology, J. Robert Herr, 1982.

Promising Approaches to Project Management Improvement, DPMC Staff Report, 1981.

Reaching the Poor Through Development Assistance: An Overview of Strategies and Techniques, Marcus D. Ingle, 1982.

TABLE 3

**FIELD SERVICE BY PROJECT MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS PROJECT (931-0096)
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS & ADMINISTRATION (NASPAA) IMPLEMENTATION**

DATE	DURATION	COUNTRY/REGION	PURPOSE ASSIGNMENT	CONSULTANT
March 1980	2 days	Panama	Interdepartmental Relations Study	S. Neuse
March 1980	2 weeks	Africa	CAFRAID Evaluation	R. Roberts
April 1980	1/2 week	Guatemala	Training and Educational Study	L. Thornton
April 1980	2 weeks	Africa (Cameroon)	PAID Evaluation of Regional Rural Development	R. Jumper
May 1980	3 weeks	Swaziland	Personnel Improvement	E.P. Morgan
July 1980	4 weeks	Central America	Regional Management Education	W. Schaeffer
July 1980	3 weeks	Ecuador	Vocational Skills Training for Disadvantaged Youth	G. Lamb A. Orellano
Sept. 1980	3 weeks	Ecuador	Management Education Project	D. Jickling J. Doubleday
Jan. 1980 Aug. 1980	6 weeks	Zaire	Local Level Development Administration and Training Needs	R. Vengroff
Sept. 1980	3 months	Francophone Africa	Inventory of Public Administration Training Institutions	D. Gould M. Kabundi C. Sooprayen R. Tshibanda
Jan. 1981	1 week	Jordan	Administrative Reform Training	J. Jreiset
Jan. 1981	4 weeks	Sri Lanka	Institutional Review of Development Administration	J. Kerrigan I. Mayo-Smith

TABLE 3
(continued)

DATE	DURATION	COUNTRY/REGION	PURPOSE/ASSIGNMENT	CONSULTANT
Feb. 1981	2 weeks	Cameroon	Implementation Planning for Higher Education	R. Thompson
April 1981	3 weeks	Zaire	Training Implementation and Evaluation	M. Diambomba
May 1981	4 weeks	Tunisia	Evaluation of the Central Tunisia Development Project	H. Birkman J. Nellis
May 1981	2 weeks	Africa Regional	Francophone Africa Training Institution Visits to Support Development of French Language Materials	D. Gould
July 1981	one year	Philippines	Start-up and Budget Costs for Philippines-based "Senior Advisor on Development Management"	D. Korten
July 1981	4 weeks	Cameroon	Urban/Rural Linkages	S. Fass
August 1981	4 weeks	Senegal	Project Design - ENEA	D. Brinkerhoff D. Kops
Sept. 1981	1 week	Thailand	Program Decentralization Strategies	D. Korten
Oct. 1981	2 weeks	Morocco	Development Training for Locally Elected Officials	R. Roberts
Oct. 1981	1 week	Near East	Evaluation of Selected Films for Management	R. Makharita
Nov. 1981 Zamor	3 weeks	Haiti	Administrative Reform	J. Garcia- I. Mayo-Smith A. Goldsmith J. Nelson

TABLE 3
(continued)

DATE	DURATION	COUNTRY/REGION	PURPOSE/ASSIGNMENT	CONSULTANT
Feb. 1982	3 weeks	Haiti	Agricultural/Food Systems Management Study	J. Garcia-Zamor S. Fass R. Adams
Feb. 1982	3-4 weeks	Cameroon	North Cameroon Urban Functions in Rural Development	S. Fass
Feb. 1982	2 weeks	Djibouti	Management Training Needs Assessment	J. Katuala
Feb. 1981	5 weeks	Sahel	Assessment of Human and Organizational Resources	R. Tshibanda
March 1982	3 weeks	Tunisia	CTDA Management Improvement	R. Roberts
March 1982	3 weeks	Morocco	Project Design/Training of Locally Elected Officials	J. Nellis S. Bertoli
Feb. 1982	4 1/2 weeks	Pakistan	Management Training Assessment	R. Klauss L. Thornton D. Eskey
Feb. 1982	3 1/2 weeks	Pakistan	Management Constraints	R. LaPorte
Feb. 1982	4 weeks	Dominican Republic	Project Design/Management Education Training Project	W. Schaeffer R. Boatler
Apr. 1982	4 weeks	Portugal	Assistance to GOP in Program Budgeting	J. Villelobos

TABLE 4

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
AND ADMINISTRATION

Publications

Working Papers

No. 1: David C. Korten and Norman T. Uphoff. Bureaucratic Reorientation for Participatory Rural Development. November 1981.

No. 2: George Carner and David C. Korten. People Centered Planning: The USAID/Philippines Experience. June 1982.

No. 3: David F. Pyle. From Project to Program: Structural Constraints Associated with Expansion. June 1982.

No. 4: David C. Korten. The Working Group as a Mechanism for Managing Bureaucratic Reorientation: Experience from the Philippines. June 1982.

Social Development Management: An Annotated Bibliography. Prepared by Elisabeth Shields, June 1982.

Reports

Wendell G. Schaeffer and Robert Boatler. Management Training Project for the Dominican Republic. March 1982.

John Nellis and Herman Berkman. An Evaluation of the Area Development Sub-Project: Central Tunisia Development Project. July 1981.

Derick W. Brinkerhoff. Review of Recent and Planned Field Projects with a Development Management Focus of Component in the AID Bureau for Africa. May 1981.

R. Moses Thompson. Implementation Planning: Higher Education in Cameroon. February 1981.

John E. Kerrigan and Ian Mayo-Smith. The Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration. January 1981.

Ragaa Makharita. An Evaluation of Selected Films for Management Training in the Arab World. October 1980.

David Gould, Mpenza Kabundi, Claude M. Sooprayen, Ray Tshibanda. Public Administration Training Institutions in Francophone Africa: An Inventory. September 1980.

Richard Vengroff. Local Level Development Administration and Training Needs in Zaire. August 1980.

Wendell G. Schaeffer. Regional Management Education Institutions in Central America and Mexico. June 1980.

E. Philip Morgan. Personnel Improvement in the Kingdom of Swaziland. May 1980.

Mid-Term Evaluation of Regional Rural Development Training (PAID). April 1980.

Richard S. Roberts, Jr. and Morris Solomon. Centre Africain de Formation et de Recherche Administrative pour le Developpement. March 1980.