

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Control
Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE A Study of AID Participant Support Program (Contract No. AID/SOD/PDC-C-0394. Work Order No. 6)	2. PROJECT NUMBER 926-0071-4 / 15	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE S&T/IT
	4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ 34,143 B. U.S. \$ 34,143	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY _____	B. Final Obligation Expected FY _____	C. Final Input Delivery FY _____		From (month/yr.) <u>October 1981</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>January 1982</u>

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., program, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
See attached Memo.		

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) _____	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change	
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C		C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P			

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

Willard Hoing
Acting Assistant Director
Resources and Support Division
S&T/IT

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director

Signature Dona Wolf

Typed Name Dona Wolf, Director, S&T/IT

Date 0/13/83

M E M O R A N D U M

OCT 13 1983

TO : S&T/PO, Francis Campbell
FROM : S&T/IT, Dona Wolf *DW*
SUBJECT: Project Evaluation Summary
Contract No. AID/SOD/PDC-C-0394 Work Order No. 6

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An important function of S&T/IT is providing support services to participants in the management and administration of the AID participant training program. These support services cover a wide range of activities and are designed to provide participants with (1) exposure to American cultural and political systems and (2) technical and academic support in their training programs. In addition, the support services include activities designed to facilitate the programming, placement and training of AID participants as well as support U.S. institutions and others concerned with foreign students studying in the U.S. Thus, an important goal of S&T/IT is to improve the relevance, quality and effectiveness of support services provided by S&T/IT contractors to participants in meeting the objectives of the participant training program.

S&T/IT entered into a contract with Development Associates, Inc. to evaluate support services provided through S&T/IT contracts with (1) the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), (2) the National Council for International Visitors (NCIV), (3) the American Language Institute, Georgetown University (ALIGU) and (4) the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). Specifically, Development Associates was to evaluate the performance of the support services provided, assess the effectiveness, relevance and appropriateness of the services in support of S&T/IT participant training objectives, identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in delivery of services and provide recommendations on the use of services to improve the participant training program.

Development Associates conducted this evaluation principally by reviewing program materials and documents and by interviewing key staff of S&T/IT and the four support service contractors. The conclusions might have been stronger if Development Associates also had sought views of other AID offices and university staff who provide academic training. Nevertheless, a number of useful findings and recommendations emerged.

Development Associates concluded that each of the four support service contractors was providing useful services to S&T/IT and participants, and recommended that each contract be continued. Following are major conclusions and recommendations regarding each contract:

NAFSA

NAFSA needs more policy direction from S&T/IT on program issues and support services. The contract should be reexamined carefully with regard to services, including research and evaluation. Perhaps activities should focus more on public relations and direct services, while surveys and studies might be limited and funded only in coordination with S&T/IT's own research and evaluation activities.

NCIV

NCIV could use more direction from S&T/IT in providing services to participants and in the planning, focus and content of mid-winter seminars. Communications should be improved among local communities, sponsors, organizations, participants and S&T/IT. S&T/IT should participate directly in more NCIV activities.

ALIGU

ALIGU, in providing English language training to participants, represents an important, flexible resource which would be difficult if not impossible to duplicate. However, to promote program continuity and social adjustment, it might be preferable in some cases for the participant to receive English language training at the same institution that will provide the academic training.

AACRAO

While providing an important service to S&T/IT at the time the study was conducted, S&T/IT will need to consider carefully the level of continuing services required as more participant training is arranged in the future by a single major outside contractor (Partners for International Education and Training).

S&T/IT Actions

S&T/IT has studied these findings and is taking appropriate action in light of more recent changes in S&T/IT structure, policy, program objectives and relationship to bureau and mission activities regarding support of participant training.

This \$34,143 contract with Development Associates, Inc. for the three month period October 1981 to January 1982 was completed on schedule. The attached Project Evaluation Summary is based on a direct and objective comparison of what the contractor did, as reported in the Final Report dated February 25, 1982, with what the contractor was required to do, as set forth in the contract Scope of Work.

cc: S&T/HR, Ruth K. Zagorin

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART II

13. SUMMARY

This three month project finished on schedule in January 1982. Although the contractor did not meet all output targets (para 17 below), it generally achieved the intended purpose (see para 18 below). The purpose might have been achieved more fully and objectively if the contractor had incorporated the views of a broader audience as called for in the contract. Nonetheless, several useful recommendations emerged which S&T/IT can study and act on in making progress toward the stated goal (para 19 below).

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

This is the Final Evaluation of a project which was completed in January 1982. The principal methodology used for the evaluation was a direct and objective comparison of what the Contractor did, as reported in the Final Report dated February 25, 1982, with what the Contractor was required to do, as set forth in the contract Scope of Work. S&T/IT staff performed the evaluation. There were no interim progress reports or evaluations of this three-month project.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

Not pertinent.

16. INPUTS

Inputs were adequate to produce target outputs.

17. OUTPUTS

The project was completed on schedule. Although not all output targets were met, the purpose of the project was generally achieved. (See Purpose, para 18 below, for discussion of shortfalls in terms of causal linkage between outputs and purpose.) Output targets are tabulated as follows.

Support Service
Contractor

OUTPUT TARGETS IN PROJECT DESIGN
(From Contract Scope of Work)

Target Met?

NAFSA:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| o Interview NAFSA staff, contracting agents and S&T/IT officials to assess how services are delivered. | Yes |
| o Review relevant documents/materials. | Yes |
| o Interview by telephone appropriate staff at universities/colleges which provide training to AID participants to identify what impact support services have had on participant training. | No |
| o Interview other (non-S&T/IT) AID staff to gather their perceptions of the utility/relevance of services and to what extent such services are needed/can be improved. | No |
| o Examine type/degree of coordination/communication between S&T/IT and NAFSA. | Yes |
| o Evaluate how services are consistent with S&T/IT program needs, and how such services are monitored by S&T/IT for continuous improvement. | Yes |

NCIV:

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| o Interview NCIV staff and S&T/IT officials to identify specific activities conducted by NCIV and for what purposes they are directed. | Yes |
| o Interview by telephone appropriate staff at universities/colleges which provide training to AID participants to identify what impact support services have had on participant training. | No [*] / |
| o Interview other (non-S&T/IT) AID staff to gather their perceptions of the utility/relevance of services and to what extent such services are needed/can be improved. | No |
| o Examine type/degree of coordination/communication between S&T/IT and NCIV. | Yes |

*

Participants were interviewed regarding their perceptions of the impact of services; what they said was reported for ALIGU but not for NCIV.

6

Support Service Contractor

OUTPUT TARGETS IN PROJECT DESIGN
(From Contract Scope of Work)

Target Met?

- o Evaluate how services are consistent with S&T/IT program needs, and how such services are monitored by S&T/IT for continuous improvement. Yes

ALIGU:

- o Visit ALIGU Center to discuss with appropriate officials the English language training being conducted. Yes
- o Observe classes. Yes
- o Assess materials, course content, scheduling, testing, placement and programming techniques. Yes
- o Interview by telephone appropriate staff at universities/colleges which provide training to AID participants to identify what impact support services have had on participant training. No ^{*}/
- o Interview other (non-S&T/IT) AID staff to gather their perceptions of the utility/relevance of services and to what extent such services are needed/can be improved. No
- o Examine type/degree of coordination/communication between S&T/IT and ALIGU. Yes
- o Evaluate how services are consistent with S&T/IT program needs, and how such services are monitored by S&T/IT for continuous improvement. Yes

AACRAO:

- o Interview AACRAO staff and consultants to identify specific activities and their relevance to participant acceptance/placement at U.S. universities/colleges. Yes
- o Interview other (non-S&T/IT) AID staff to gather their perceptions of the utility/relevance of services and to what extent such services are needed/can be improved. No

*/ See footnote at bottom of page 2.

7

18. PURPOSE

To evaluate support services provided to academic training participants and to S&T/IT staff through S&T/IT contracts with (1) The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA), (2) The National Council for International for International Visitors (NCIV), (3) The American Language Institute, Georgetown University (ALIGU) and (4) The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). More specifically to evaluate the performance of the support services provided, to assess the effectiveness, relevance and appropriateness of the services in supporting S&T/IT and AID participant training objectives, to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in the delivery of services and to provide recommendations on the use of services to improve the participant training program.

The contractor achieved the purpose in so far as it included its own perceptions and those of the staffs of S&T/IT and the support service contractors. However, the purpose might have been achieved more broadly and objectively if the contractor also had included perceptions of other AID (non-S&T/IT) staff and university staff who provide academic training to participants (see Outputs, para. 17 above).

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

An important function of S&T/IT is the provision of support services to participants and to S&T/IT staff in the management and administration of the academic participant training program. These support services cover a wide range of activities and are supposed to be designed to provide participants with exposure to American systems, with cultural, political, technical and academic support in their training programs and with overall support as visitors to the U.S.

In addition, the support services include activities which are designed to facilitate the programming, placement and training of AID participants as well as to support U.S. institutions and others concerned with foreign students studying in the U.S. Thus, an important goal is to improve the relevance, quality and effectiveness of support services provided by S&T/IT contractors to participants and to S&T/IT staff in meeting objectives of the participant training program. S&T/IT now is making progress toward this goal by studying the findings and acting on several of the recommendations resulting from achievement of the purpose (see Purpose, para. 18 above).

20. BENEFICIARIES

Direct beneficiaries are training participants and S&T/IT staff. S&T/IT staff benefit because administration and management of the participant training program is improved. The 8000 or so participants who receive support services each year benefit because their adjustment to life in the U.S. is eased and their ability to profit fully from their academic training is enhanced (e.g., through provision of supplemental English language training).

Indirect beneficiaries include the U.S. and the developing countries from which the participants come. The U.S. benefits from the positive attitudes toward the U.S. which participants take home with them. The developing countries benefit because participants return with new technical and managerial skills, (e.g., in agriculture, health, family planning, business administration, law) which can be applied to achieving development objectives and improvement in the quality of life.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

Not pertinent.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

Not pertinent.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS

Before acting on recommendations in this report, S&T/IT should reexamine them carefully in light of more recent changes in S&T/IT structure, policy, program objectives and relationship to bureau and mission activities regarding support of participant training.