

PARTICIPANT TRAINING

AN EVALUATION OF THE USAID/LISBON
PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

AND

A SUGGESTION FOR A STANDARDIZED
A.I.D. PARTICIPANT TRAINING
PLANNING, MONITORING AND
EVALUATION
METHODOLOGY

By

Michael F. Lukomski, Ph.D.
Program Officer, USAID/Lisbon

March, 1983

TABLE
OF
CONTENTS

SUMMARY CHAPTERS

- I - INTRODUCTION
- II - SUMMARY OF THE MODEL AND METHODOLOGY
- III - SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (LEVELS 4 THROUGH 10)
- IV - SECTORS AND INSTITUTIONS ASSISTED - (LEVELS 1 THROUGH 3)

DETAILED FINDINGS

- V - (LEVELS 9 AND 10) - PROGRAM RESULTS
- VI - (LEVEL 8) - PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION
- VII - (LEVEL 7) - PROGRAM DESIGN
- VIII - (LEVEL 6) - PROGRAM OBJECTIVES
- IX - (LEVEL 5) - PREDEPARTURE PREPARATION
- X - (LEVEL 4) - PARTICIPANTS SELECTED

ATTACHMENTS

- I - FILE DATA CODING INSTRUMENT
- II - QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER
- III - QUESTIONNAIRE CODING INSTRUMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose: The purpose of this document is two fold: first, to present a new participant training monitoring/evaluation methodology developed by the USAID; and second, to present specific findings relating to the USAID/Lisbon participant training program. It is our belief that the methodology developed can serve as the base for the development of a standardized participant training monitoring/evaluation methodology which could be used by other USAID's and AID/W, perhaps on a worldwide basis.

Background: Participant training has been, and continues to be, a major element in A.I.D.'s worldwide efforts to improve the quality of human resources and institutions. The same is true of USAID/Lisbon.

From the inception of the A.I.D. program in Portugal in 1975 through September, 1982 the USAID has provided training, mostly short-term and technical, for over 420 Portuguese participants at a cost in excess of \$3.5 million.

Though the USAID plans and implements its participant programs in accordance with HB 10 and our follow-up system for individual participants functions quite well, a global evaluation of our program had never been undertaken. In 1981 it was decided that such an evaluation would be appropriate.

Since A.I.D. participant training has existed for many years we assumed that there would be a large number of previous evaluations conducted by other USAIDs and an established participant training evaluation methodology. To our surprise that was not the case; the number of such evaluations was few and the methodologies employed varied greatly.

A decision was made to proceed with our evaluation and, at the same time, to attempt to develop a standardized monitoring/evaluation methodology for participant training which, if proven useful, could be employed by the other USAID's and by AID/W, perhaps on a worldwide basis.

Methodology: The methodology developed is straightforward and logical. It tracks the degree of success in achieving objectives at all levels from planning through implementation, to results and impact. Most important, it allows findings, at any one level to be related to findings at all other levels. It is simple and easy to employ and provides valuable information for planners, implementers and evaluators. Further, the same model serves as a conceptual frame for both program planning and implementation, and program monitoring and evaluation.

At its current state of development, the model consists of 13 logically related levels. Associated with each level is a block of variables. The levels are as follows:

- Level 1. Select sector to be assisted;
- Level 2. Select institution to be assisted within sector;
- Level 3. Identify problem to be solved within institution;
- Level 4. Select individual (the participant) who is to solve problem;
- Level 5. Prepare participant for his training program;
- Level 6. Establish program objectives (the training needs of the participant);
- Level 7. Design training program (content, type, duration, source);
- Level 8. Implement training program (provide training);
- Level 9. Program objectives met (participant training needs satisfied);
- Level 10. Participant uses information/knowledge gained;
- Level 11. Institution's problem solved;
- Level 12. Institution more efficient and/or effective;
- Level 13. Sector conditions improve.

Whether implicit or explicit, decisions and/or actions are taken at each level. The order of the steps (levels of actions or results) is important. With the exception of Levels 5, 6 and 7 (prepare participant, establish program objectives and design training program) which in practice occur more or less simultaneously, actions/decisions are taken in the order indicated. If a wrong decision or action is taken, or if a serious problem develops at any lower level, the participant's program probably will not be successful at higher levels.

Levels 4 through 8 (over which the USAID exercises varying degrees of control) represent the process of participant training; levels 9 and 10 represent the results and Levels 11, 12 and 13 the impact. An "evaluation" of participant training programs could take place at any level; if at Levels 4 through 8 - an evaluation of the process of participant training; if at Levels 9 and 10 - an evaluation of results; and if at Levels 11 through 13 - an evaluation of impact.

The critical point explicitly recognized is that the planning, monitoring and evaluation functions are closely related, complementary and, at certain levels, overlap. Data collected at Levels 1 through 8 (planning and monitoring data, which are essential to program managers in the field) are exactly the data required to "explain" differences in results at Levels 9 and 10 and, in part, in impact at Levels 11, 12 and 13. In other words, to conduct an adequate evaluation, one that not only determines results and impact, but that also identifies the reasons for success or failure, data are required at all levels suggested in the model.

Further, though perhaps collected at different times and places, the data must be collected in a systematic and standardized manner; if not, they cannot be incorporated in one data set and it is impossible to relate findings or results at one level with findings or results at other levels. In addition, the basic unit for data collection must be the individual participant. Data on individual participants can always be aggregated as needs dictate (Eg. assisted institution, project, sector, country, A.I.D. worldwide): they cannot be disaggregated if they do not exist. In terms of the model, data at Levels 4 through 10 relate to individual participants: at Levels 11 and 12 the data are aggregated to the level of the assisted institution; and at Level 13, to the level of the assisted sector. In other words, at Level 11 the unit of analysis switches from the individual participant to the assisted institution; at Level 13, from the assisted institution to the assisted sector.

If results in terms of individual participants are positive at Level 9 (program objectives were met) and at Level 10 (what was learned was used on-the-job), then there is at least an expectation of positive impact at higher levels, i.e. Level 11 (problem solving impact), Level 12 (institutional impact) and Level 13 (sector impact). If results at Levels 9 and 10 are negative, there is an almost zero expectation of positive impact (due to participant training) at higher levels.

To employ the model, data are required at each level suggested: in the first stage, for all participants at Levels 1 through 10; then depending on first stage findings, for selected institutions at Levels 11 through 13. At Levels 11 through 13, however, exogenous factors become increasingly important. Regardless, analysis at Levels 1 through 10 provides a good indicator of probable impact at higher levels and also allows the evaluator to determine whether higher level impact evaluation is necessary and appropriate.

Given staff and time limitations and, more important, the nature of the USAID program (for the most part, a large number of currently active sub-projects financed under one umbrella project) our evaluation was conducted at Level 10. Based on Level 10 evaluation findings, a number of sub-projects (institutional assistance efforts) were identified for which higher level evaluations would be appropriate when those sub-projects are completed.

All data required to employ the model were obtained from USAID files and a detailed questionnaire completed by returned

participants. USAID participants whose U.S. programs were completed prior to September 30, 1980 and who had been back on-the-job in Portugal for at least six months were included in the study, 248 participants in total with 109 variables for each participant.

Almost all data were coded for computer entry and processed using an SPSS package. The data processing sequence followed the basic outline of the model. At each level, starting at Level 10 and moving down to Level 4, basic results (findings) were determined. Then various techniques (cross tabulation, correlation, analysis of variance) were employed to determine the relationships between findings at different levels, i.e. Level 9 to Level 10, then 8 to 9 and 10, then 7 to 8, 9 and 10 . . . 4 to 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10.

Results: Overall results at Level 9 (degree to which program objectives were met) and Level 10 (degree of on-the-job use of information/knowledge gained) were quite satisfactory. At Level 10, 82% of the USAID's participants claimed that they had been able to use on-the-job in Portugal at least a significant part of what they learned in the U.S., while at Level 9, 88% claimed that their training needs (program objectives) were met to at least a medium/moderate degree. Based on the joint analysis of Level 9 and 10 findings, it was judged that 75% of the USAID's programs were truly successful, while 18% exhibited elements of both success and failure and only 6% were pure failures.

Based on these and other Level 9 and 10 findings it was concluded that there was a high probability that the majority of the USAID's programs resulted in positive impact at higher levels (Level 11 - problem solving impact, Level 12 - institutional impact and, in some cases, Level 13 - sector impact). Findings at lower levels (Levels 4 through 8) were consistent with, and supportive of, Level 9 and 10 findings and resulting conclusions.

USAID participants experienced few problems during program implementation in the U.S. (Level 8). All program designs (Level 7), with the exception of medium term "canned" courses provided by the U.S. Government, were appropriate to program objectives. In particular, very short-term observation/consultation programs were as successful at Levels 9 and 10 as other designs. When appropriate, the USAID's participants actively participated in establishing the objectives and content of their programs (Level 6). Most important, all measures of participation at Level 6 were positively and strongly related to all measures of success at Levels 9 and 10. USAID pre-departure contacts with participants (Level 5) were timely, comprehensive and of high quality. Participants selected for training (Level 4) were both capable of learning in the U.S. and located in positions within their institutions which allowed them to use what they had learned. In sum, at Levels 4 through 8, the USAID's participant training program has been well planned and implemented. As a result, at Levels 9 and 10 results were quite satisfactory.

Overall findings at Levels 1 through 3 (sectors and institutions assisted) were mixed. Some participant programs, mostly early in the Portugal program, were clearly directed at "targets of opportunity" and did not lead to the development of well defined institutional development projects. The great majority, however, 87%, were targeted at specific institutions. Of these, 52% were related to assistance efforts which eventually led to well defined projects and the signing of major contracts for project implementation; 21% to well defined projects for which no major implementation contract was signed; 10% to assistance efforts which provided both participant training and U.S. consultant services, but for which no well defined project was developed; and 17% to assistance efforts in which the only USAID input was participant training.

Given the overall purpose of the umbrella project under which almost all participant training was financed and the political situation in Portugal after the 1974 revolution when the USAID was established, the USAID's record in selecting sectors and institutions to assist is more than acceptable. Participant training was used in a way which served the broad U.S. objective of demonstrating support for Portugal in a difficult period of transition while at the same time insuring that resources allocated to participant training in most cases resulted in impact at least at Levels 11 and 12 (problem solving and institutional impact) and in some cases at Level 13 (sector impact).

We believe the research executed by the USAID demonstrates that the participant training monitoring/evaluation methodology developed is sound, useful, and useable even in very small USAIDs with limited resources. Successful participant programs require correct decisions and/or actions at all levels suggested in the model. If a serious mistake is made or problem develops at one level, the program will probably fail at all higher levels. Proper use of the model as a program planning and monitoring tool allows one to identify mistakes or problems on a timely basis so that corrective actions may be taken to salvage ongoing programs. Use of the model as an evaluation tool allows one not only to determine success or failure, but to identify the reasons for success or failure so that corrective actions can be taken to make future programs more successful. Finally, use of the model provides the information required to determine whether more costly higher level impact evaluations are necessary and appropriate.

Clearly, the model and methodology have to be modified to serve the needs of other USAID's and AID in general. The number of levels may be expanded, levels may be subdivided, or new levels may be added. The model is intended to be flexible; there is nothing magic in the number 13. The model is a first step. However, we believe that it is a significant first step and that with some additional effort it could serve as the base for a standardized A.I.D. participant training monitoring/evaluation methodology.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The A.I.D. program in Portugal was initiated under difficult conditions only shortly after the 1975 revolution, during the period in which Portugal lost its two major African colonies, Mozambique and Angola. The political situation was highly unstable and the resources of the economy severely strained. As demonstrated below, the A.I.D. response to the crisis situation was rapid and relatively low profile: by the end of 1982, \$583 million in loan, grant and housing guarantee assistance had been made available, while the USAID U.S. direct hire staff never exceeded 6 persons.

TABLE I. (1)

THE A.I.D. PROGRAM IN PORTUGAL - CY 75 THROUGH CY 82 (\$583.0 MILLION)

(A) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS (\$21.4 million)

- 1975 - Technical Consultations and Training Grant* (\$10.8 million, Project 150-0001)
- 1975 - Consulting Services Loan (\$0.6 million, Project 150-0002)
- 1980 - Agricultural Production Program Grant (\$10.0 million, Project 150-0022)

(B) SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS (\$128.3 million)

- 1975 - Low Income Housing I Loan (\$13.3 million, Project 150-0003)
- 1975 - Housing Guarantee I HIG (\$20.0 million, 150-HG-001)
- 1976 - School Construction I Loan (\$10.5 million, Project 150-0004)
- 1976 - Basic Sanitation I Loan (\$6.9 million, Project 150-0005)
- 1977 - Low Income Housing II Loan (\$9.9 million, Project 150-0006)
- 1977 - Housing Guarantee II HIG (\$20.0 million, 150-HG-002)
- 1977 - School Construction II Loan (\$14.0 million, Project 150-0018)
- 1977 - Basic Sanitation II Loan (\$12.0 million, Project 150-0010)
- 1977 - Health Sector Support Loan (\$15.7 million, Project 150-0011)
- 1977 - Rural Vocational Education Loan (\$6.0 million, Project 150-0012)

(C) BALANCE OF PAYMENTS SUPPORT (\$300.0 million)

- 1978 - Balance of Payments Loan (\$300.0 million, 150-K-013)

(D) REFUGEE ASSISTANCE PROJECTS (\$43.5 million)

- 1975 - Angola Airlift Grant (\$7.5 million)
- 1976 - Refugee Assistance Grant (\$35.0 million, 150-0007)
- 1977 - Catholic Relief Services Grant (\$1.0 million, 150-K-602)

(E) DISASTER ASSISTANCE (\$10.0 million)

- 1980 - Areas Rehabilitation/Reconstruction I Grant (\$5.0 million, Project 150-0019)
- 1981 - Areas Rehabilitation/Reconstruction II Grant (\$5.0 million, Project 150-0025)

(F) AGRICULTURE TRANSFER (\$80.0 million)

- \$20.0 million/year 1979-82

* \$0.75 million in 1975, plus \$1.0 million in 1976, plus \$4.0 million in 1977, plus \$5.0 million in 1980 = \$10.75 million.

From the beginning a concerted effort was made to "projectize" A.I.D. assistance monies. Of the \$178 million made available prior to the end of 1977, \$128 million (72%) was provided for 10 social infrastructure development projects (housing, health centers, schools, basic sanitation, etc.) and \$6.4 million (3.6%) for 2 technical assistance projects. The remaining \$43.5 million (24.4%) was allocated to 3 refugee projects.

The major technical assistance project, eventually totalling \$10.75 million, was the Technical Consultation and Training (T.A.) Grant, Project 150-0001. The initial T.A. Grant Agreement was signed in February, 1975 and provided funds for (a) contracts with U.S. consultants to provide advisory services, or to prepare projects for implementation, and (b) "training programs for personnel directly engaged in development fields of high priority to the Portuguese Government."

An early USAID objective was the use of T.A. Grant funds to develop assistance efforts targeted at specific institutions. In general, both participant training and consultant services were used first, to develop a working level relationship with a targeted institution and then, to actually design a specific assistance project. In most cases where a specific assistance project was eventually designed, the USAID then used T.A. Grant monies to fund a contract with a U.S. institution to implement the project. However, only one such contract, the \$632,000 URI Contract for assistance to the University of the Azores, was signed prior to 1980. In 1980 and after, 6 additional contracts, funded under the T.A. Grant and totalling \$4.1 million, were signed. Also in 1980, the USAID signed a PASA with the USDA to implement its second major technical assistance project, the Agricultural Production Program (Project 150-0023).

The first years of the A.I.D. technical assistance program in Portugal were difficult. Initially, the USAID was required to select and process all participants through the Institute of State Participation (IPE). IPE was created by the Portuguese Government shortly after the 1974 revolution to supervise, and in some cases manage, the large number of firms which had recently been nationalized. Relations between the USAID and IPE were at best strained. In addition, for political reasons many ministries were not initially receptive to USAID offers of technical assistance, neither participant training nor U.S. consultant services. Relations with the GOP improved over time and gradually the USAID gained more control over its activities. Still, during the first two to three years, both training and advisory services were to some degree provided in response to targets of opportunity.

Participant training, mostly short term and technical, has always played an important role in the USAID's overall program of technical assistance. As with U.S. advisory services, however, participant training got off to slow start, no departures in

1975 and only 37 in 1976. In 1977 the number jumped to 73 and then averaged about 65 departures per year thereafter.

TABLE I.(2)

THE USAID/LISBON PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM:
DEPARTURES BY FY (FY 76 - 82)

FY	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	TOTAL
DEPARTURES	37	73	62	63	47	62	92	436

Between FY 75 and the end of FY 80, the period covered by the field work for this study, the USAID allocated in excess of \$2.5 million to participant training. Almost all of this amount was funded under the T.A. Grant. The only exceptions were 12 programs funded through central projects and 4 funded under the Basic Sanitation II loan. Further, and more important, over 94% of the participant programs provided during the FY 76-80 period were planned by the USAID and implemented through ST/IT. Contractors did not become a significant source of training until late 1980 and after.

The planning of the USAID's participant programs was accomplished with only a minimal staff. During 1975 and part of 1976, the USAID had no training officer and participants were processed with occasional TDY assistance from AID/W. In March 1976 a full time Portuguese training assistant was hired and trained on-the-job. At no time did the USAID's training office consist of more than two Portuguese employees, supervised by one U.S. direct hire, either a General Development Officer or a Program Officer.

Clearly, participant training has been, and continues to be, a major element in the USAID's efforts to improve the quality of Portuguese human resources and institutions. Significant financial resources are allocated to such programs and the level of USAID involvement in program design and implementation is extremely high.

As is true with other USAIDs, our participant programs are planned and implemented in accordance with HB 10. Our follow-up system functions well. Based on constant feedback from individual participants, the USAID had the "feeling" that its participant program was functioning quite well. However, a comprehensive global evaluation of the program had never been undertaken. Given the resources already invested, and plans for even higher levels of investment in the future, the USAID decided in early 1981 that such a global evaluation would be appropriate. The two basic questions to be answered were: What mistakes have we made in the past? and What can we do to make future programs better?

Since A.I.D. participant training had existed for many years we assumed that there would be a large number of previous evaluations conducted by other Missions and an established participant training evaluation methodology. To our surprise that was not the case; the number of such evaluations was few and the methodologies employed varied greatly.

A decision was made to proceed with our evaluation and, at the same time, to attempt to develop a standardized monitoring/evaluation methodology for participant training which, if proven useful, could be employed by the other USAID's and by AID/W, perhaps on a worldwide basis.

The methodology developed is straightforward and logical. It tracks the degree of success in achieving objectives at all levels from planning through implementation, to results and impact. Most important, it allows findings, at any one level to be related to findings at all other levels. It is easy to employ and provides valuable information for planners, implementers and evaluators. Further, the same model serves as a conceptual frame for both program planning and implementation, and program monitoring and evaluation.

The purpose of the remainder of this document is two fold: first, to present the model developed by the USAID and demonstrate its use and usefulness; and second, to present findings with respect to the USAID/Lisbon participant training program.

The following chapters will demonstrate that the basic frame of the model and methodology developed by the USAID is solid, but, as would be expected, certain modifications are required if it is to be used on a worldwide basis. Further, it will be shown that the great majority of the USAID's participant programs have in fact been well designed and implemented and, as a result, successful. The problems and mistakes identified, though in some cases serious, were not generalized.

The next Chapter presents the basic model and methodology while major findings are summarized in Chapters III and IV. Chapter III emphasizes findings which may be generalized and Chapter IV concentrates in findings specific to USAID/Lisbon. More detailed discussions of findings are found in Chapters V through X.

CHAPTER II

SUMMARY OF THE MODEL AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present and describe the model and methodology employed by the USAID in evaluating its participant training programs. The main virtues of the model and methodology are:

1. they are logical and thus easy to understand;
2. they are simple and thus easy to apply; and
3. most important, they provide uniform and useful information which is easy to process and interpret, even on a worldwide basis.

All required data are either obtained from USAID files or from a questionnaire completed by returned participants. Almost all data are coded and computer processed using an SPSS package.

Based on the USAID experience it is clear that some modifications and improvements are required in both the model and the methodology. However, it is hoped that a first step has been taken in the development of a standardized procedure for the monitoring and evaluation of AID participant training programs.

The Model

Logically a successful participant training program includes at least the following steps, or Levels of actions and results:

- Level 1. Select sector to be assisted;
- Level 2. Select institution to be assisted within sector;
- Level 3. Identify problem to be solved within institution;
- Level 4. Select individual (the participant) who is to solve problem;
- Level 5. Prepare participant for his training program;
- Level 6. Establish program objectives (the training needs of the participant);
- Level 7. Design training program (content, type, duration, source);
- Level 8. Implement training program (provide training);
- Level 9. Program objectives met (participant training needs satisfied);
- Level 10. Participant uses information/knowledge gained;
- Level 11. Institution's problem solved;
- Level 12. Institution more efficient and/or effective;
- Level 13. Sector conditions improve.

Whether implicit or explicit, decisions and/or actions are taken at each level. The order of the steps (levels of actions or results) is important. With the exception of Levels 5, 6 and 7 (prepare participant, establish program objectives and design training program) which in practice occur more or less simultaneously, actions/decisions are taken in the order indicated. If a wrong decision or action is taken, or if a serious problem develops at any level, the participant's program probably will not be successful.

In a general sense success at any given level depends on success at all previous levels:

- if the "correct" sector, institution and problem are selected (Levels 1, 2 and 3); and
- if an appropriate and qualified participant is selected (Level 4); and
- if the participant is prepared well, objectives are "proper" and the program well designed (Levels 5, 6 and 7); and
- if no major problems develop during implementation (Level 8);
- then program objectives (training needs) should be met (Level 9);
- and, the participant should use on-the-job what he learned (Level 10);
- and, the institution's problem should be at least partially solved (Level 11);
- and, the institution should be at least somewhat more effective and/or efficient (Level 12);
- and, sector conditions should to some degree improve (Level 13).

Given "correct" decisions at Levels 1, 2 and 3; any serious wrong actions, mistakes or problems at any level or levels between Level 4 and Level 8 may well result in program failure at Level 9 (program objectives will not be met). Further, failure at Level 9 almost certainly implies failure at all higher levels (Levels 10 through 13).

Levels 4 through 8 (over which the USAID exercises varying degrees of control) represent the process of participant training; levels 9 and 10 represent the results and Levels 11, 12 and 13 the impact. An "evaluation" of participant training programs could take place at any level; if at Levels 4 through 8 - an evaluation of the process of participant training; if at Levels 9 and 10 - an evaluation of results; and if at Levels 11 through 13 - an evaluation of impact.

The critical point explicitly recognized is that the planning, monitoring and evaluation functions are closely related, complementary and, at certain levels, overlap. Data collected at Levels 1 through 8 (planning and monitoring data, which are essential to program managers in the field) are exactly the data required to "explain"

differences in results at Levels 9 and 10 and in impact at Levels 11, 12 and 13. In other words, to conduct an adequate evaluation, one that not only determines results and impact, but that also identifies the reasons for success or failure, data are required at all levels suggested in the model.

Further, though perhaps collected at different times and places, the data must be collected in a systematic and standardized manner; if not, they cannot be incorporated in one data set and it is impossible to relate findings or results at one level with findings or results at other levels. In addition, the basic unit for data collection must be the individual participant. Data on individual participants can always be aggregated as needs dictate (Eg. assisted institution, project, sector, country, A.I.D. worldwide): they cannot be disaggregated if they do not exist. In terms of the model, data at Levels 4 through 10 relate to individual participants; at Levels 11 and 12 the data are aggregated to the level of the assisted institution; and at Level 13, to the level of the assisted sector. In other words, at Level 11 the unit of analysis switches from the individual participant to the assisted institution; at Level 13, from the assisted institution to the assisted sector.

If results in terms of individual participants are positive at Level 9 (program objectives were met) and at Level 10 (what was learned was used on-the job), then there is at least an expectation of positive impact at higher levels, i.e. Level 11 (problem-solving impact), Level 12 (institutional impact) and Level 13 (sector impact), although exogenous factors become increasingly important at higher levels. If results at Levels 9 and 10 are negative, there is an almost zero expectation of positive impact (due to participant training) at higher levels.

Evaluation of the impact of participant training is complicated by the fact that most A.I.D. institutional assistance efforts involve the provision of both participant training and advisory assistance (U.S. consultant services) to meet project objectives. Participant training and advisory assistance are joint inputs which interact to produce impact at Levels 11, 12 and 13. As joint inputs, the impact of one cannot be evaluated independently of the other. Any attempt to estimate the impact of participant training at Levels 11, 12 or 13 without controlling for differences in advisory assistance inputs would result in an erroneous, and thus potentially misleading, estimate of the impact of training.

On the other hand, if both participant training and advisory assistance are inputs, negative results at Levels 9 and 10 do not necessarily imply that an assistance effort did not have impact at Levels 11, 12 and 13. Impact could be totally due to advisory assistance. However, negative Level 9 and 10 results would clearly indicate that the contribution of participant training toward impact at Levels 11, 12 and 13 was null. This in itself is valuable information.

Though a Level 13 (sector impact) or Level 12 (institutional impact) evaluation is highly desirable, it is in a number of cases neither

necessary nor appropriate. First, not all institutional assistance efforts are designed, nor do they provide sufficient inputs, to impact at the institutional and sector levels. Second, even if the assistance effort is designed to impact at Level 12 or 13; depending on the mix of inputs, negative results at Level 10 can be reasonably taken to indicate that there almost certainly was no positive impact at Levels 11, 12 and 13. Finally, a Level 11, 12 or 13 impact evaluation requires costly on site research within each assisted institution. Such impact evaluations should only be undertaken when the expected benefits (new information to be gained) more than cover the projected costs.

In those few cases of participant training evaluation of which the USAID is aware, the highest level covered was Level 10 (Has the participant used on-the-job what he learned?). Further, the highest level findings (Level 9 or Level 10) were not related in any systematic way to findings at lower levels. Judgements were made as to success or failure, but the reasons for success or failure were not adequately identified so that proper actions could be taken to improve future programs. Finally, specific areas in which higher level evaluations were necessary and appropriate were not identified.

On the other hand, a Level 10 evaluation, using the model and methodology developed by the USAID, is relatively inexpensive (data are obtained through questionnaires and from existing files) and its benefits more than justify its cost. First, it immediately provides the USAID and AID/W with valuable process and results information. Second, under certain conditions it provides a good indicator of probable impact at higher levels. Third, it provides the information required to determine whether a higher level impact evaluation is necessary and appropriate. Finally, if higher level impact evaluation is necessary and appropriate, it provides the data which are required to "explain" differences in impact.

As previously stated, the result measures of the success of a participant training program are found at Levels 9 and 10:

Level 9 - Have the participants returned from their training programs in the United States with the belief that they have in fact gained the information and knowledge that they set out to gain; in other words feeling that their training needs (program objectives) were met?

Level 10 - Have the participants actually been able to use on-the-job in Portugal the information and knowledge they gained as a result of their training programs in the United States?

Other things equal, one would expect a strong positive relationship between findings at Level 9 and findings at Level 10; the higher the degree to which training needs (program objectives) were met, the higher the degree of actual on-the-job use of what was learned. Unfortunately, other things are seldom equal (problems develop or mistakes are made) and the relationship actually observed between

findings at Level 10 and findings at Level 9 cannot be expected to be perfectly linear, e.g. for any given training program, training needs (program objectives) may be met to a very high degree (Level 9), yet almost none of what was learned may be used on-the-job (Level 10).

Both Levels 9 and 10 must be evaluated jointly, for only if a given program is judged successful at Level 9 and, at the same time, judged successful at Level 10, it is truly successful. Positive results at Level 9 (program objectives met) indicate that a program (from the point of view of the individual participant) was, given its objectives, well planned and implemented. Positive results at Level 10 (on-the-job use of what was learned) indicate that program objectives were "proper", i.e. that program objectives were consistent with problem solving needs.

For the purpose of this study a successful program was operationally defined as a program in which training needs (program objectives were met to at least a medium or moderate degree (Level 9) and at least a significant part of what was learned was actually used on-the-job (Level 10). Such programs were judged successful not simply because they met both the minimum Level 9 and Level 10 standards, but because the joint meeting of those standards implied that there were few serious problems encountered or mistakes made at lower levels, e.g. at:

- Level 8 - No major problems developed during implementation (i.e. no serious English language problems, logistic/financial support was adequate to permit participant to concentrate on program, no personal problems or problems with persons contacted, etc.); and at
- Level 7 - The program was well designed (i.e. type, duration and source were appropriate to objectives); and at
- Level 6 - The "proper" training objectives were established (i.e. the objectives specified in the PIO/P were proper in that, in addition to satisfying the training needs of the participant, they were also what was required by (useful to) the participants institution); and at
- Level 5 - The participant was prepared well for his program (i.e. his English language capability was adequate and predeparture services provided by the USAID were timely and appropriate); and at,
- Level 4 - An appropriate and qualified individual was selected for training (i.e. the participant had the ability to absorb and then to evaluate the applicability of his experience to his home country; and was in a position within his institution which allowed him to utilize what he learned).

On the other hand, if a program is judged not successful (did not meet both the minimum Level 9 and Level 10 standards), then there were one or more serious problems or mistakes made at one or more of the levels listed above, Levels 4 through 8. The joint analysis of Level 9 and Level 10 findings permits, under certain conditions, the rapid identification of the one or two lower levels at which the problems developed or the mistakes were made.

It should be noted that an "evaluation" which examines only Levels 4 through 8 (an evaluation of the process of participant training) is not an evaluation of program success or failure. Rather it is a monitoring exercise and a search for problems and/or mistakes which may, or may not, have caused programs to fail.

It is only when an evaluation is conducted at all levels (Levels 4 through 10), and the relationships between levels is specified in some systematic way, that success or failure can be determined and the possible causes for failure identified. And this, after all, is a basic purpose of an evaluation: to determine results and identify problems and mistakes which lead to failure so that they may be solved or corrected and future programs made more successful.

Finally, even if programs were judged to be successful at Levels 9 and 10, there is still good reason to examine lower levels (Levels 4 through 8). Given successful programs one would not expect to discover serious problems or mistakes at lower levels. If this were the case, the lower level findings would be consistent with, and supportive of, the Level 9 and 10 findings; if so, the degree of confidence in Level 9 and 10 findings would be increased. If this were not the case, and serious lower level problems or mistakes were identified, then the Level 9 and 10 findings would be seriously questioned.

The Data

To employ the model described in the previous section appropriate data were required for each participant at each level investigated. The following list of variables is intended to provide the reader with a quick overview of the types of information which are required to employ the model and which were obtained for each participant and used in the analysis.

VARIABLES CODED FOR COMPUTER ENTRY

V001 Evaluation Control Number
 V002
 V003 FY Implementation Document Issued
 V004 Type of Implementation Document
 V005 Source of Funding
 V006 Type of Program
 V007 Type Entities Which Provided Program
 V008 Duration of Program in Weeks Open
 V009 Duration of Program Coded
 V010 Month Program Initiated
 V011 Calendar Year Program Initiated
 V012 Functional Area of Program (USAID Code)
 V013 Major Functional Area of Program (USAID Code)
 V014 Area of Program (DSP Code)

VARIABLES CODED FOR COMPUTER ENTRY (Cont'd)

V015 Major Area of Training (DSP Code)
 V016 Program Cost in Dollars
 V017 Program Cost Per Week in Dollars
 V018 GÓP Agency Which Requested Program
 V019
 V020 International Travel Paid By
 V021 Level in Employing Organization Att* (scale)
 V022 Type of Employing Organization Att (scale)
 V023 Level in Employing Organization Current (scale)
 V024 Type of Employing Organization Current (scale)
 V025 Job Responsibility Current vs Att AID
 V026
 V027
 V028 Sex
 V029 Age Att*
 V030 Marital Status Att
 V031 Place of Birth
 V032 Educational Level Att
 V033 Area of Highest Academic Degree Att
 V034 Place Highest Academic Degree Obtained
 V035 Prior Foreign Training Att
 V036 Hours of English Training Provided ALI**
 V037 Final English Score Usage
 V038 Final English Score Oral
 V039 Final English Score Listening
 V040 Final English Score Average
 V041 Is Current Job Same as Job Att
 V042 Job Responsibility Current Vs Att Part
 V043 Type of Program
 V044 Participation in Setting Objectives (scale)
 V045 Participation in Establishing Content (scale)
 V046 Degree To Which Training Needs Met (scale)
 V047 Pre-Departure Info On Objectives (scale)
 V048 Pre-Departure Info On Content (scale)

*Att = at time of training

**ALI = American Language Institute

VARIABLES CODED FOR COMPUTER ENTRY (Cont'd)

- V049 Pre-Departure Info On Schedule (scale)
- V050 Pre-Departure Info On Institutions (scale)
- V051 Pre-Departure Info On Individuals (scale)
- V052 Pre-Departure Info On Finances (scale)
- V053 Pre-Departure Info On Medical Exams (scale)
- V054 Pre-Departure Info On Insurance (scale)
- V055 Pre-Departure Info On Reception WIC (scale)
- V056 Pre-Departure Info On Climate (scale)
- V057 Pre-Depart Assist With English Tests (scale)
- V058 Pre-Depart Assist With English Classes (scale)
- V059 Pre-Depart Assist With Travel (scale)
- V060 Pre-Depart Assist With Visa (scale)
- V061
- V062
- V063 Pre-Depart Assist With Travel Advance (scale)
- V064 Additional Pre-Depart Info or Assist
- V065 Other Pre-Departure Improvements
- V066 English Training Provided By ALI
- V067 Quality of ALI English Training (scale)
- V068 Suggestions For Better ALI Training
- V069 Orientation Services Provided By WIC
- V070 Usefulness of WIC Services (scale)
- V071 Non WIC Orientation Services Provided
- V072 Usefulness of Non WIC Services (scale)
- V073 Duration of Program
- V074 Number of Contacts Made
- V075 U.S. Domestic Travel
- V076 Relevance of Organizations Contacted
- V077 Professional Level of Persons Contacted
- V078 Advance Preparation of Persons Contacted
- V079 General Technical Level of Program
- V080 Problems With Understanding English (scale)
- V081 Problems With Speaking English (scale)
- V082 Problems With Reading English (scale)

VARIABLES CODED FOR COMPUTER ENTRY (Cont'd)

- V083 Problems With Writing English (scale)
- V084 Problems With Amount of Per Diem (scale)
- V085 Problems With Receipt of Per Diem (scale)
- V086 Problems With Adequate Lodging (scale)
- V087 Problems With Changes in Program (scale)
- V088 Problems With Contacts Missing Meetings (scale)
- V089 Problems With Americans in General (scale)
- V090 Problems With Other Participants (scale)
- V091 Problems With Persons Contacted (scale)
- V092 Other Problems
- V093 Degree Professional Capability Increased (scale)
- V094 Importance of Technical Information (scale)
- V095 Importance of General Information (scale)
- V096 Importance of Professional Relationships (scale)
- V097 Other Important Factors
- V098 Information Actually Used In Present Job (scale)
- V099 Information Shared With GOP Colleagues (scale)
- V100 Info Shared Thru Informal Discussions (scale)
- V101 Info Shared Thru Formal Lectures (scale)
- V102 Info Shared Thru Written Reports (scale)
- V103 Info Shared On-the-Job Training (scale)
- V104 Info Shared Thru Loan of Publications (scale)
- V105 Significant Lasting U.S. Relationships
- V106 Joined U.S. Professional Society
- V107 Still Member of U.S. Professional Society
- V108 Received U.S. Journal Subscription
- V109 Still Receive U.S. Journal
- V110 Should Number of AID Programs Increase
- V111 Post Program Contact With AID
- V112 Post Program Contact Significant Lasting
- V113 Time Since Last Contact With AID
- V114 More Contact With AID Desired
- V115 Available For Follow-up Interview

The Sources of Data

All information required to develop the data listed in the previous section was obtained either from USAID Training Office files or from a questionnaire which was developed by the USAID and mailed to returned participants. The instrument used to collect and code USAID file data is Attachment I to this document. The questionnaire and its cover letter are Attachment II. Attachment III is the instrument employed to code the questionnaire.

The Collection Process

At the time the evaluation was initiated 257 USAID participants had returned from their programs, and had been back at their jobs in Portugal for at least six months, and thus had adequate opportunity to initiate on-the-job use of what they had learned. USAID files contained information on all 257. Questionnaires, along with stamped and addressed return envelopes, were mailed to 248 participants: 9 participants were eliminated from the study because they had either been trained in Brazil and not the U.S. (4 cases); or they currently occupied very high positions in the Portuguese Government (5 cases). Of those mailed questionnaires, 200 or just over 80% responded.

The great majority of participants responded within 6 weeks of the initial mailing. At that point a second letter was sent requesting a response. Most of those whose questionnaires were outstanding replied within 2 or 3 weeks. As a final step, the USAID attempted to telephone those who still had not responded. Approximately 12 weeks after the first mailing, all attempts to obtain additional responses were terminated.

Coding

Data were coded by the USAID staff with the assistance of a summer intern, a U.S. University student who was fluent in Portuguese. Most variables were relatively easy to code as the questionnaire contained a high percentage of precoded responses. The process, however, was time consuming and required almost constant checking and supervision by the Program Officer. Initial computer runs indicated coding problems (inconsistencies) most of which were resolved. Some cost data problems have yet to be resolved. The use of a detailed coding manual is essential. The USAID did not use one and paid a price for not doing so.

Data Processing

An SPSS package was used for data processing and statistical analysis. The package proved very flexible and quite easy to use. It allowed for all types of statistical analysis up to regression. Since none of the variables employed (with the exception of cost) was truly quantitative, the regression sub-package was not employed.

Data Processing Methodology

The processing of the data followed the basic outline of the model. At each level, starting with Level 10 and moving down to Level 4, basic results (findings) were determined. Then various techniques (cross tabulation, correlation, analysis of variance) were employed to determine relationships between the findings at different levels i.e. Level 9 to 10, then 8 to 9 and 10, then 7 to 8, 9 and 10 . . . 4 to 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10. In our specific case, a major "problem" from an analytical point of view was the lack of variation at Levels 9 and 10. Since most of our participants claimed their training needs were met (Level 9) and also claimed they used a significant part of what they learned on-the-job (Level 10), there was not much variation to "explain". Had Level 9/10 results been more negative, then the analysis (search for causes) would have been more interesting. Regardless, a significant number of statistically significant relationships were established, and the overall findings of the study were quite interesting and useful. The USAID identified a number of areas in which its actions could be improved. Most important, however, it was demonstrated that the model and methodology were practical and worked.

Summary

The main problem encountered by the USAID was that it did not have an existing model and methodology to build upon. All things (the model, the questionnaire, the coding, the processing sequence, interpretation, etc.) were new. Overall it was a time consuming process. Many things were tried which did not work. Some relationships expected to develop did not. In sum, many bugs had to be worked out both in the model and methodology. Most were worked out but a number still remain.

Regardless, we believe that the following chapters will demonstrate that both the model and methodology are valid and useful. Further, given what has been developed as a base, future applications will be much simpler and much less time consuming. One will not be forced to start from the beginning; if we are correct, the basis for standardized participant training evaluation model has been developed

The following chapters present the findings of the USAID participant training evaluation and demonstrate in more detail how the model and methodology may be employed.

III-1

CHAPTER III

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS (LEVELS 4 THROUGH 10)

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a quick summary of the basic findings of the USAID's evaluation effort (Levels 4 through 10) and to demonstrate how the model may be employed to relate findings at one level to findings at other levels. The specific topics covered are those suggested in the model:

- Level 10 - On-the-job use of information/knowledge gained;
- Level 9 - Degree to which program objectives (training needs) were met;
- Level 8 - Problems encountered in U.S. during implementation;
- Level 7 - Program design (type, duration and source);
- Level 6 - Establishing program objectives;
- Level 5 - Predeparture contacts and preparation of participants; and
- Level 4 - Participant selection.

A more detailed discussion of the findings for each of the above levels is found in Chapters V through X. Findings for Levels 1 through 3, which are unique to the USAID and not critical to the immediate purpose, are summarized in Chapter IV.

Levels 9 and 10 - Program Success

The basic and most important measures of program success at Levels 9 and 10 are:

- Level 9 - Have the participants returned from their training programs in the United States with the feeling that they have in fact gained the information and knowledge that they set out to gain; in other words that their training needs (program objectives) were met?
- Level 10 - Have the participants actually been able to use on-the-job in Portugal the information and knowledge they gained as a result of their training programs in the United States?

As is explained in detail in Chapter V, for a given participant program to be judged truly successful it must be judged successful both at Level 9 and at Level 10. For the purposes of our evaluation, a participant training program was judged successful if it met the following two criteria:

- (1) at Level 9, program objectives (training needs) were met to at least a medium or moderate degree; and
- (2) at Level 10, at least a significant part of what was learned was used on-the-job in Portugal.

Findings, as demonstrated in the table below, were very favorable.

TABLE III.(1)
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES (TRAINING NEEDS) MET AND INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE USED

DEGREE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES (TRAINING NEEDS) MET	INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE USED					TOTAL	
	ALMOST NONE ALL				
	1	2	3	4	5		
5. Very High (II)	3	3	20	25	20	71	(I)
4. -	2	9	25	17	9	62	
3. Medium/Moderate	1	6	18	9	2	16	
2. - (III)	3	9	8	1	1	22	(IV)
1. Not At All	0	0	0	2	0	2	
TOTAL	9	27	71	54	32	193	

Approximately 75% of the USAID's programs met both criteria (Quadrant I of table above) and were judged truly successful: training objectives were met and what was learned was used. In these cases, program objectives were "proper" (as indicated by use) and programs were well designed and implemented (as indicated by objectives met). It is hypothesized that these programs were successful because no serious problems developed, or mistakes were made, during the program planning and implementation stages, i.e. Levels 4 through 8. As is demonstrated later, findings at lower levels supported this argument.

Only 6% of the USAID's programs were pure failure (Quadrant III): objectives were not met and what was learned was not used. In these

cases mistakes were made or problems developed at any or all levels between Level 4 and Level 8.

For 12%, training objectives were met, but what was learned was not used (Quadrant II). This finding suggests that, given their training objectives, these programs were well designed and implemented. However, as what was learned was not used, serious mistakes may have been made either at Level 6 ("proper" objectives were not established for the program), or at Level 4 (the participant was not located in a position within his institution which allowed him to use the information/knowledge he gained), or at both Levels 4 and 6.

In an additional 6% of the cases (Quadrant IV), participants claimed that objectives were not met, but that what was learned was used. This is by far the most complicated case and a number of explanations are possible.

In sum, 75% of the USAID's participant programs were judged successful while only 6% were judged to be pure failures. For the remaining 18% there were elements of both success and failure.

Given the generally favorable basic findings at Levels 9 and 10, it is reasonable to conclude that the majority of the USAID's participant training programs probably resulted in positive impact at higher levels. If training needs were met and what was learned was used, then institutional problems were to some degree solved (Level 11), institutions were somewhat more efficient and/or effective (Level 12), and sector conditions to some degree improved (Level 13). At a minimum, the necessary, though perhaps not sufficient, conditions for positive impact at Levels 11 through 13 were established. Had basic Level 9/10 findings been negative (training objectives not met, and what learned not used), there would be an almost zero probability of positive impact at higher levels.

The judgement made above as to probable positive impact at Levels 11 through 13, is based not only on the basic findings presented so far but also on additional Level 9/10 findings.

First, over 84% the USAID's participants claimed to have shared at least a significant part of what they learned with their colleagues thus creating the potential for a multiplier effect. Further, the relationship between degree of on-the-job use by the participants and degree of sharing with colleagues was strong, statistically significant and positive: those who used more of what they learned also shared more. In addition, the most important channels for sharing were informal and on-the-job during the work process. Since colleagues work within the same institution and face the same institutional problems, what was useful to and used by the participant was useful to and used by his colleagues: thus, the link between Level 10 (On-The-Job Use) and Level 11 (Solution of Institution's Problems) is strengthened. Had there been no positive relationship between degree of use by the participant and degree

of sharing with colleagues, the usefulness of what was learned by the participant would have to be questioned (regardless of the participant's claimed degree of use) and the link between Level 10 and Level 11, though not destroyed, would be weakened.

Second, it may be argued that there is an intermediate step between meeting program objectives (Level 9) and on-the-job use (Level 10). That step is an increase in professional capability. The relationships between degree to which program objectives were met, degree of increase in professional capability, and degree of on-the-job use were strong, statistically significant and positive. Thus, findings with respect to increases in professional capability were consistent with, and supportive of, basic findings at Levels 9 and 10. Further, analysis revealed that the higher the degree of increase in professional capability the greater the importance of the specific technical elements of the program. Thus, the more training needs were met and the more what was learned was used, the greater the importance of the technical (specific problem solving) elements of the program.

Finally, as Level 4 (Participant Selection) findings will demonstrate, the USAID's participants, at the time they were selected for training, were already in professional positions which allowed them to use what they learned. After training was completed, a very significant number moved into positions which afforded even greater possibilities for use: at least 31%, and perhaps 40%, were promoted to positions of higher responsibility, while only 6% moved into positions of less responsibility. The professional levels of the remainder did not change. These findings are particularly significant given that only 18% of the participants studied changed institutions after training. Further, those who did switch institutions generally moved to institutions within the same sector which were closely related to the original institution.

In sum, all additional Level 9/10 findings were positive and consistent with basic Level 9/10 findings and lend further support to the conclusion that the majority of the USAID's participant training programs probably resulted in positive impact at higher levels. The link between Level 10 (On-The-Job Use) and Level 11 (Solution of Institution's Problem) was particularly strengthened.

The next operational step was to analyze each lower level to determine the causes for failure so that corrective actions could be taken. A "problem" in our case was that overall our participant training program was too successful, i.e. there were only 11 observations in the pure failure category. With only 11 observations it was not possible to identify any generalized pattern of problems or mistakes at lower levels which caused these programs to fail. In each individual case problems did develop or mistakes

were made at one or more of the lower levels, but these appear to be more or less random and the pattern of their occurrence did not differ significantly from the pattern for programs which were successful. Had a larger number of programs been pure failures at Levels 9 and 10, it might have been possible to identify a generalized pattern of causes for failure.

Regardless of this "problem", each lower level was analyzed to determine whether findings were consistent with, and supportive of, basic Level 9 and 10 findings. As the following sections will demonstrate, lower level findings were consistent with and supportive of Level 9 and 10 findings. Had this not been the case, the basic Level 9 and 10 conclusion of a very high percentage of successful programs would have been seriously questioned.

Level 8 - Program Implementation

For the purposes of this study, the period of program implementation was defined as the period of time between arrival in and departure from the U.S.. Thus, it includes both orientation (usually provided in Washington, D.C.) and actual program implementation (usually at several different locations). The actions taken or decisions made at lower levels (Level 4, select an appropriate and qualified participant; Level 5, prepare the participant in terms of expectations, English, logistics, etc.; Level 6, establish "proper" program objectives; and Level 7, design a program appropriate to objectives) were, in major part, taken or made so that implementation at Level 8 would proceed smoothly and that serious problems, which could impact negatively on program results at Levels 9 and 10, would not develop. From the USAID point of view, Levels 4 through 7 are planning and preparation, for which the USAID is primarily responsible; at Level 8 ST/IT and the organizations contracted to provide training assume responsibility. If the USAID has done a good job at Levels 4-7, and if ST/IT and the contractor perform as expected, then the occurrence of serious problems during implementation should be minimized.

Findings at Level 8 were in general very favorable. Few USAID participants experienced serious difficulties or problems which could have impacted negatively on their programs.

About 68% of the USAID's participants were provided WIC general orientation services in Washington, D.C.: of these, 88% found them to be at least somewhat useful, while almost 47% found them to be very useful. Only 44% were provided non WIC technical orientation services. Overall, these were valued much more highly than WIC orientation and it is disturbing that a higher percentage did not receive them. Finally, about 13% of the USAID's participants did not receive, and in most cases did not require, any form of orientation in the U.S.. We have concluded that under normal conditions technical orientation early in program should be an essential and required part of every participant program funded by A.I.D.. A significant percentage of USAID participants who could have benefited were not provided such services.

Few problems specific to program design and implementation were identified: 90% felt the technical level of their program was about correct; only 4% felt a significant number of the organizations contacted were not relevant; and none felt a significant number of the persons contacted were of low professional capability. On the negative side, about 16% claimed a significant number of contacts were not well prepared for their visit; 21% thought their programs were too short; 13% that there should have been more contacts; and 15% wanted more U.S. travel (and presumably contacts).

Fully 65% claimed to have experienced no English language problems while in the U.S.. An additional 31% claimed only a few problems. Significant numbers of participants did, however, claim to have experienced serious problems with the amount of the per diem (16%), timely receipt of per diem (12%), and adequate lodging (9%), although these numbers were less than we had anticipated. About 13% also experienced some difficulties due to last minute changes in their programs. Very few experienced personal problems with the persons contacted, other participants or with Americans in general.

In sum, though some problems were encountered during program implementation, they were neither sufficiently generalized nor serious enough to contradict the favorable findings at Levels 9 and 10.

Level 7 - Program Design

The three main characteristics of the training programs designed by the USAID are:

1. short duration (85% lasted less than 3 months; 43% less than 1 month);
2. heavy reliance on public sector entities to provide training (U.S. Government entities and/or universities participated in over 90% of all programs, while private firms participated in only 23%); and
3. individually tailored programs (about 70% of the USAID's programs were specifically developed to meet the needs of individual participants - observation/consultation, on-the-job training, etc.; 4% were academic; while 26% were regular "canned" courses such as those offered by the USDA or BLS).

The above data only describe the types of programs provided by the USAID and by themselves tell very little. The important questions can only be answered by relating program design characteristics (Level 7) with measures of program success (Levels 9/10).

First, Level 10 responses (Degree of On-The-Job Use) were broken down by the design characteristics of duration, program source and program type. None of the relationships revealed were statistically significant. In other words, it cannot be claimed that, at Level 10,

shorter programs are better or worse than longer programs; public training is better or worse than private training; or specially developed programs are better or worse than "canned" or academic programs. It may be argued that this result was obtained because Level 10 is too far removed from Level 7 and that the more appropriate measures of the influence of program design are found at Level 9.

Level 9 (Degree Program Objectives Met) responses were broken down by each of the three basic design characteristics. Results are as follow:

1. Duration - The relationship between program duration and degree to which objectives were met was statistically significant; however, the direction of the relationship was not clear. Both very short (less than one month) and long (6 months or more) programs appeared to be more successful than programs in the 1 to 6 month range. At a minimum, it cannot be claimed that very short programs satisfied training needs (program objectives) less than longer programs.
2. Source - The relationship between the degree objectives were met and program source was also statistically significant. The initial finding was that purely private sector courses were most successful and that purely government courses were least successful. Further analysis indicated that it was really only "canned" courses provided by the government which were less successful in meeting objectives than others.
3. Type - The basic relationship between program type (observation/consultation, "canned", on-the-job training, academic, etc.) and degree objectives were met was not statistically significant. However, as noted above further analysis indicated that it was only "canned" courses provided by the government which were less successful.

In sum, only one program design (medium duration "canned" programs provided by the government) was less successful (at Level 9) than other designs. All other designs were about equally successful.

The basic conclusion is that, in general, the designs (duration, source and type) developed by the USAID were appropriate to their respective program objectives. Level 7 findings in no way contradict, nor are they inconsistent with, findings at higher levels.

Level 6 - Establishing Program Objectives

Given the highly individualized, short-term and technical nature of the USAID's training programs, the participant's active participation in establishing the objectives of his program (explaining his training needs as they relate to his institutions problem) and his participation in establishing program content (suggesting

individuals and institutions to be contacted) is particularly important. Other things equal, one would expect that the higher the degree of participation:

- (1) the greater the probability that program design and actual implementation would be appropriate to objectives (Levels 7 and 8); and
- (2) the higher the probability that program objectives would be met (Level 9) and that what was learned would be used on-the-job in Portugal (Level 10).

As noted previously, approximately 70% of the USAID's training program were specially designed to meet the needs of individual or small groups of 2 or 3 participants and the remainder were either regular "canned" courses (such as those offered by the BLS or USDA) or, in a few cases, academic programs. Those whose programs were specially designed were requested to estimate their degree of participation in establishing objectives and content. Findings with respect to objectives are presented in the table below.

TABLE III.(2)

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN SETTING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES (establishing training needs)

DEGREE	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
5. Very Great	54	38	38
4. -	28	19	57
3. Medium/Moderate	30	20	77
2. -	16	11	88
1. No Participation	19	13	100
TOTAL	147	100	-

$N = 147$

MEAN = 3.6

STD. DEV. = 1.4

Overall findings were satisfactory: 57% claimed very great or only slightly less than very great participation; 20% medium or moderate participation; and only 19 (13%) no participation. Of those who claimed no participation in setting objectives, 4 did participate in establishing content: in almost all of the remaining 15 cases (usually short-term observation/consultation programs for high level GOP officials) the USAID was "calling the shots" and exposing the participant to what the USAID thought he should see and the participant merely concurred. Level 9 and 10 results in these cases were quite good.

As would be expected the degree of participation in setting objectives and the degree of participation in establishing content were positively related: those who participated more in one also participated more in the other.

Most important, however, analysis clearly revealed strong, positive and statistically significant relationships between participation at Level 6 and results at Levels 9 and 10. The higher the degree of participation in establishing objectives and content (Level 6), the greater the degree to which program objectives (training needs) were met (Level 9) and the greater the degree of on-the-job use of what was learned (Level 10).

In sum, when appropriate the great majority of USAID's participants actively participated in establishing the specific objectives and content of their programs. Further, the more they participated the more successful their programs were. Findings at Level 6 were clearly consistent with, and supportive of, findings at Levels 7, 8, 9 and 10. Given the strong link between participation and program success, the USAID should make every effort to increase the degree of participant participation in setting objectives even more.

Level 5 - Predeparture Preparation

USAID predeparture contacts with the participant are extremely important for a number of reasons:

- (1) to confirm that a qualified and appropriate individual was selected (Level 4);
- (2) to establish program objectives and content (Level 6);
- (3) to obtain initial views as to program design and later to review the TIP provided by ST/IT (Level 7);
- (4) to ensure that the participant is adequately prepared for the implementation of this program in terms of expectations, language capability, logistics, etc. (Level 8).

During the predeparture period, the USAID provides the participant with a set of different services which includes technical, orientation and logistic elements. As the table on the next page demonstrates, general findings with respect to the USAID's performance were highly favorable.

TABLE 11(3)

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF PREDEPARTURE SERVICES PROVIDED
 BY USAID BY YEAR PROGRAM INITIATED
 (Mean of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5; where
 1 = poor, and 5 = very good)

ITEM	MEAN SCORES					OVERALL	
	CY 76	CY 77	CY 78	CY 79	CY 80	MEAN	STD. DEV.
<u>INFORMATION</u>							
<u>Provided/Exchanged On:</u>							
- Objectives	3.2	3.9	3.8	4.2	4.1	3.9	1.1
- Content	2.8	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.6	1.2
- Schedule	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.0	1.1
- Institutions	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.6	1.3
- Persons (Contacts)	2.8	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.5	1.3
- Finances	3.3	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8	1.2
- Mod. Exams	3.8	3.2	4.2	4.0	4.3	3.8	1.1
- Insurance	3.9	3.4	4.1	4.0	4.4	3.9	1.2
- WIC (Orientation)	4.1	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.9	4.0	1.1
- Climate	3.6	3.5	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.7	1.2
<u>ASSISTANCE</u>							
<u>Provided With:</u>							
- English Exams	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	.9
- English Classes	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	.8
- Travel Arr.	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5	.7
- Visa	4.4	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	.6
- Travel Advance	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5	.9

Overall the USAID appears to have done a particularly good job in its predeparture contacts with participants. Appropriate and timely logistic support was provided and participants were highly satisfied with their technical and non-technical exchanges with the USAID.

The USAID record with respect to predeparture English language preparation was mixed. In some cases (about 14%) USAID files did not contain sufficient information to make a firm judgement as to predeparture English ability. While 60% clearly met established AID minimum standards (ALIGU, TOEFL or demonstrated fluency), about 9% were allowed to travel to the U.S. with less than the minimum required average ALIGU score. The remaining 17% did not demonstrate fluency nor were they tested. Most of these were provided translators or travelled with groups in which other members were fluent

in English. Regardless of the mixed record, Level 8 (Program Implementation) findings revealed that USAID participant did not experience serious English language problems while in the U.S..

In sum, the USAID provided a wide range of services to its participants and these were apparently very much appreciated. High standards were established early in the program and maintained over time. Higher level findings of a high degree of participation in establishing program objectives (Level 6), program design adequate to objectives (Level 7) and few problems during implementation (Level 8), are clearly supported by the findings at Level 5.

Level 4 - Participants Selected

A key element in any participant training program is the individual selected for training. The best designed and implemented training program has little chance for success at Level 9 (that training objectives will be met) or at Level 10 (that information/knowledge gained will be used on-the-job) unless:

- (1) the participant has the ability to first absorb and then to evaluate the applicability of his U.S. experience to local conditions; and
- (2) the participant is located in a position within his institution which allows him to utilize what he has learned.

Overall, it appears that participants selected by the USAID were both capable of absorbing what they were exposed to in the U.S. and of evaluating its applicability to Portugal. Most were relatively young, but with significant work experience. Only about 20% were more than 45 years old, with 46% between the ages of 25 and 34. Those over 45 were generally in policy and administrative positions, while those under 45 generally occupied technical positions. Levels of formal education were very high. Over 90% were University graduates, and of these about 7% held graduate degrees. Slightly over 70% held degrees in the development related areas of economics, engineering or agriculture. Up to 76% had previously received at least some training outside Portugal: 57% received at least part of their prior training in Europe, while about 9% had some prior training in the U.S..

In addition, participants selected by the USAID were clearly in positions which allowed them to utilize what they learned and thus solve problems within their institutions.

TABLE III.(4)

LEVEL IN EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION	No.	%
1. Top Policy	9	4
2. Oth. Policy	12	5
3. Top Administrative	14	6
4. Oth. Administrative	65	26
5. Top Technical	88	36
6. Oth. Technical	58	23
7. Other	3	1
TOTAL	248	100%

As demonstrated in the above table, at the time of their selection some 15% of the USAID participants were in positions which allowed them to establish policy (categories 1, 2 and 3), while an additional 26% (category 4) were in positions which allowed them to both influence policy and direct implementation. The remaining participants, almost 60%, held technical positions with primary responsibility for implementation. The balance between policy and implementation appears appropriate: policy makers were made part of the process, while the technical levels were emphasized.

As noted previously, a further indication that appropriate individuals were selected for training is that approximately 1/3 of those sent to the U.S. by the USAID advanced professionally, moved to higher level positions, after they returned to Portugal. These individuals were in positions to use what they learned at the time they were selected. Later they moved to even better positions.

In sum, findings at this level are consistent with, and supportive of, findings at Levels 9 and 10. Because of their educational levels, prior foreign experiences and professional positions, the participants selected by the USAID were capable of learning and evaluating the applicability of what they learned and then actually using what they learned on-the-job in Portugal. Further, such individuals would be expected to work well with the USAID and require only limited predeparture preparation (Level 5), contribute greatly to the establishment of their program objectives and design (Levels 6 and 7), and experience few difficulties during implementation (Level 8).

Summary and Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the data for Levels 10 through 4 thus far presented it may be concluded that:

- (a) The great majority of the USAID's participant training programs were successful in that training objectives were met (Level 9) and what was learned was used on-the-job in Portugal (Level 10);
- (b) The USAID performed well in that, in almost all cases, appropriate and qualified individuals were selected for training (Level 4); participants were well prepared for their programs (Level 5); when appropriate, participants actively participated in setting the objectives of their programs (and, most important, those objectives were "proper" in terms of institutional problem solving needs) (Level 6); and finally program design (type, duration and source) was, with the possible exception of medium term, canned programs provided by the government, appropriate to objectives (Level 7);
- (c) ST/IT and the institutions contracted to actually provide training performed well in that, in almost all cases, no major problems developed in the U.S. during the program implementation phase (Level 8); and
- (d) Given the above, plus additional Level 9 and 10 findings, there is a reasonable expectation of problem solving impact (Level 11), institutional impact (Level 12) and sector impact (Level 13).

Actual impact at Levels 11, 12 and 13, as discussed in the previous chapter, depends on a number of factors (i.e. whether the assistance effort also involved the provision of advisory assistance, the objectives and magnitude of the effort, etc.). Depending on these factors an evaluation of impact at Levels 11, 12 or 13 may be neither necessary nor appropriate. In accordance with the model developed, the analysis of the data for Levels 1, 2 and 3 provides the information necessary to determine whether and when such higher level impact evaluations are necessary and appropriate. This is the topic of the following chapter.

14-1

CHAPTER IV

SECTORS AND INSTITUTIONS ASSISTED - (LEVELS 1 THROUGH 3)

Introduction

Basic data for the USAID's participant training program from its inception through FY 82 are presented in the table found on the next page. All participant programs are classified by sector, institution and year initiated. For each institution assisted through participant training, additional information on technical assistance (U.S. consultant services provided in Portugal), specific project development and contract mechanism used to implement the project are also provided. Note that only participants whose programs were completed by the end of FY 80 were included in the evaluation undertaken by the USAID.

Before proceeding to the more detailed analysis and interpretation of the data presented in the table, a number of relevant preliminary points are again called to attention.

- (1) Prior to the end of FY 80 and the signing of the USDA PASA for the Agricultural Production Program (Project 150-0023), almost all USAID participant programs were financed under the T.A. Grant (Project 150-0001). The only exceptions were 12 programs which were centrally funded and 4 financed under the Basic Sanitation II loan.
- (2) The T.A. Grant provided for the contracting of U.S. consultant services and the financing of participant "training programs for personnel directly engaged in development fields of high priority to the Portuguese Government."
- (3) The A.I.D. program in Portugal was initiated under difficult conditions only shortly after the 1974 revolution. A significant number of important ministries were not initially responsive to USAID offers of technical cooperation, primarily for political reasons. During the first two or three years the USAID was forced in a number of cases to respond to targets of opportunity in order to move T.A. Grant funds.
- (4) In its efforts to develop projects targeted at specific institutions, the USAID generally used both participant training and advisory (U.S. consultant) assistance to first, develop a working level relationship, and then, to actually design the assistance project. In some cases, participant training led to advisory assistance; in others, the sequence was reversed.

GENERAL OVERVIEW OF U.S./JAPAN PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAMS - FY 76 THROUGH FY 82
(Sector, Institution, T.A. and Project/Abstract Development)

11-2

SECTOR Institution	PARTICIPANT NUMBERS*										TOTAL NO.	No. U.S./JAPAN RATIO	ALSO FINANCED	SPECIFIC PROJECT DEVELOPED	"OTHER" CONTRACT FOR OTHER T.A. AND TRAINING SECURED	
	FY 76	FY 77	FY 78	FY 79	FY 80	FY 81	FY 82	TOTAL								
AGRICULTURE																
1. Ministry of Agriculture	1	14	1	0	5	10	30	61	14.0	21	Yes	Yes (FY 79)	USDA PASA (9/16/80) \$10,000,000			
2. Rural Universities (3)	0	0	4	11	13	9	16	53	12.2	23	Yes	Yes (FY 80)	Funhuo (8/25/80) \$ 2,400,000			
3. Univ. of Arizona	0	4	6	1	11	2	0	24	5.5	20	Yes	Yes (FY 77)	U.R.I. (1/16/78) \$ 632,000			
- Other Institutions	0	0	3	0	1	1	2	7	1.6	2	Yes	No	No (Perhaps in FY 83)			
SUB-TOTAL	1	18	14	12	30	22	48	145	33.3	66	-	-	-			
HEALTH																
4. Min. of Social Affairs	2	5	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.1	6	Yes	Yes (FY 80)	PSM (12/14/82) \$ 303,000			
5. Inst. Emergency Med.	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	8	1.8	3	Yes	Yes (FY 80)	DEHS PASA (2/5/81) \$ 235,000			
6. Min. of Public Works	0	2	3	3	6	12	0	26	6.0	8	Yes	Yes (Support)	for Basic Sanitation Loans I/II			
- Other Institutions	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	.9	4	Yes	No	No			
SUB-TOTAL	5	10	4	3	6	19	9	56	12.8	21	-	-	-			
EDUCATION																
7. Ministry of Education	1	1	0	2	0	0	11	15	3.4	4	Yes	Yes (FY 80)	No			
8. M.E. MBA Program	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	.5	2	Yes	Yes (FY 80)	NUL Grant (10/12/80) \$ 492,000			
9. IRE**/CIITA** Int. Training	15	5	1	1	0	0	3	25	5.7	19	No**/Yes	Yes (FY 81)	IRN (2/12/82) \$ 169,000			
SUB-TOTAL	16	6	1	3	2	0	14	42	9.6	25	-	-	-			
PUBLIC AFF. AND FINANCE																
10. Ministry of Finance	1	4	6	1	1	0	2	15	3.4	13	Yes	No	No			
11. Regional Commissions	1	1	0	2	0	5	3	12	2.8	4	Yes	No	No			
12. Nat. Statistics Institute	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	4	.9	4	Yes	Yes	BLISS - Central Funding			
- Other Institutions	1	1	5	3	1	2	0	13	3.0	7	Yes	No	No			
SUB-TOTAL	3	6	14	7	2	7	5	44	10.1	28	-	-	-			
LABOR																
13. Ministry of Labor	4	13	18	3	1	3	0	42	9.6	37	No	No	(Indirectly related to AFLJ Grant)			
HOUSING																
14. Housing Development Fund	2	0	1	14	0	0	0	17	3.9	14	Yes	Yes	(Support for Housing Loans I and II)			
INDUSTRY																
15. Steel	6	6	3	2	0	0	0	17	3.9	14	Yes	Yes	(Support for major GDP Industrial/Tort Cas)			
- Other Institutions	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	13	3.0	10	Yes	No	No (DEEC Grant 12/9/82 \$50,000)			
SUB-TOTAL	6	6	4	10	2	1	1	30	6.9	24	-	-	-			
OTHER SECTORS/INSTITUTIONS																
16. BAT/NIET	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	1.6	0	Yes	Yes	IAS (2/23/82) \$ 495,000			
17. Energy/Sec. State for Energy	0	0	1	2	3	0	3	9	2.1	5	No	No	(perhaps in FY 83)			
18. Import/Export Dev. Fund	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	6	1.4	5	No	No	No			
19. Eng./Arch. Engineering Lab.	0	5	3	0	0	0	0	8	1.8	8	No	No	No			
20. WFD/Com. Status of Women	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	.9	1	Yes	No	No			
21. CDC/Civil Protection Service	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	6	1.4	6	Yes	No	No			
SUB-TOTAL	0	9	9	6	4	1	13	47	9.2	25	-	-	-			
OTHER AFFAIRS																
- (Investment Promotion)	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	1.4	0	Yes	Yes	SEI Grant (1/31/82) \$ 50,000			
- (Transportation)	0	2	0	2	0	7	0	11	2.5	4	Yes	No	No			
- (Cooperative)	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	.9	4	No	No	No			
SUB-TOTAL	0	5	1	3	0	9	2	20	4.6	8	-	-	-			
TOTAL	37	73	42	63	47	42	92	434	107.0	248	-	-	-			

* 202 @ quarter FY 76 - 80
- 300 @ evaluated
M not evaluated

Note of analysis in the individual participant.
17 participants transferred to U.S. before.
8 were still in U.S. at end of FY 82.
9 were not evaluated because they were VIII's or
Unit projects were in Brazil (17 + 6 + 9 = 30)

(FY 79) unless otherwise noted and those in
and in the U.S. in 1979-80 using
the FBI Grant are not included in
this or other tables and were not
included in this study.

- (5) The time period between initial contacts with an institution and the development of a specific assistance project in some cases extended over two or three years: both advisory assistance and participant training were generally provided during these periods. In some cases a specific project was never developed.
- (6) Only one major contract, calling for both participant training and technical assistance, was signed prior to 1980 (the \$632,000 U.R.I. contract for assistance to the University of the Azores, signed in 1978 and financed under the T.A. Grant). Thus over 90% of the participant programs provided prior to FY 81 were planned by the USAID (Levels 1 through 7) and implemented through ST/IT (Level 8). Beginning in 1980 a number of major contracts were signed and the USAID and ST/IT planning and implementation burdens were somewhat reduced.
- (7) The USAID's participant training office never consisted of more than two foreign national employees supervised by one U.S. direct hire.

In sum, there are a number of factors which probably make the A.I.D. participant training effort in Portugal somewhat atypical. Nevertheless, certain major aspects of the program and how it was used and developed should be of interest to AID/W and other USAIDs.

Analysis

The data on the USAID participant training program provided in the previous table may be better analyzed if they are grouped in five categories. The five categories are determined in accordance with the following criteria.

Whether or Not

- (1) a specific institution was targeted for assistance;
- (2) participant training was also supported by early USAID financed advisory (U.S. consultant) assistance to the institution
- (3) a well defined project (with specific objectives and requiring both additional participant training and advisory assistance) was eventually developed; and
- (4) a "major" contract was signed to implement the project.

Each of the five categories is defined below.

CATEGORY I

Includes participant training programs associated with an assistance effort which met all four of the individual criterion: a specific institution was targeted for assistance; early advisory assistance was also provided; a well defined project was eventually developed and a "major" contract to implement the project was signed.

CATEGORY II

Includes programs associated with efforts which met criteria (1), (2), and (3), but not (4): a specific institution was targeted; advisory assistance was provided; a well defined project was eventually developed, but no "major" contract to implement the project was signed.

CATEGORY III

Programs which met criteria (1) and (2) but not (3) and (4): a specific institution was targeted, and advisory assistance was provided, but no specific project was developed.

CATEGORY IV

Programs which met criterion (1), but not (2), (3) and (4): a specific institution was targeted, but no advisory assistance was provided and no specific project developed.

CATEGORY V

Participant training assistance provided to more than one institution in some defined "area of assistance" and one or more of criteria (2), (3) and (4) not met.

In general, it may be expected that Category I assistance efforts are "better" than Category II assistance efforts; that Category II is better than III . . . that IV is better than V. The term better is used in the sense that as one moves up the scale from Category V to Category I, the assistance effort is more focused in terms of objectives, inputs and implementation mechanism and thus is more likely to have greater impact at higher levels (Levels 11, 12 and 13). As the following sections demonstrate, the general rule holds, but there are exceptions.

Based on the FY 76 through FY 82 data provided in the table and using the categories defined above, the USAID participant training program may be summarized as follows:

CATEGORY I	198 programs (45.3%)	8 institutions assisted
CATEGORY II	79 programs (18.1%)	5 institutions assisted
CATEGORY III.	37 programs (9.5%)	4 institutions assisted
CATEGORY IV	65 programs (14.0%)	4 institutions assisted
CATEGORY V	57 programs (13.1%)	N.A.
<hr/>		
TOTAL	436	(100.0%) 21 institutions assisted

A more detailed discussion of the individual assistance efforts within each category follows.

CATEGORY I

45% of the USAID's programs (198 participants) were associated with assistance efforts (8 institutions) which met criteria (1), (2), (3) and (4): a specific institution was targeted; early advisory assistance was also provided; a well defined project was eventually developed and a major contract to implement the project was signed. These are:

- (1)* Ministry of Agriculture
- \$10.0 million USDA PASA, signed 9/16/80;
- (2) Rural Universities
- \$2.4 million Purdue Contract, signed 8/25/80;
- (3) University of the Azores
- \$632,000 URI Contract, signed 1/16/78;
- (4) Ministry of Social Affairs
- \$303,000 MSH Contract, signed 12/24/80;
- (5) Institute of Emergency Medicine
- \$235,000 DHHS PASA, signed 2/5/81
- (8) New University of Lisbon (NUL) MBA Program
- \$492,000 NUL Grant, signed 10/12/80;
- (9) IPE/CIFAG Mgt. Training
- \$169,000 HRM Contract, signed 2/12/81;
- (16) National Science and Technology Board (JNICIT)
- \$495,000 NAS Contract, signed 2/23/82.

* Numbers in () correspond to institution identification numbers used in table IV.(1).

All of the projects/contracts associated with the above institutions are currently active. All, with the exception of the Ministry of Agriculture, \$10.0 million USDA PASA, are financed under the T.A. Grant (Project 150-0001). The USDA PASA is financed under the Agricultural Production Program Grant (Project 150-0023). As the USAID financed (under the T.A. Grant) both participant training and advisory assistance for each institution prior to the signing of contracts, contract amounts in all cases are less than the total value of USAID financed assistance to each institution.

All eight projects/contracts in Category I are clearly candidates for eventual higher level impact evaluations when they are completed. However, as all are projects which provide both participant training and advisory assistance to accomplish project objectives, the higher level impact of participant training should not, indeed cannot, be evaluated independently of the higher level impact of advisory assistance. Any attempt to estimate the impact of participant training at Levels 11, 12 or 13 without controlling for differences in advisory assistance inputs would result in an erroneous, and thus potentially misleading, estimate of the impact of training. As participant training and advisory assistance are joint inputs which interact to produce impact, they must be evaluated as such. The USAID is aware of no technique which would allow measures of impact at Levels 11, 12 or 13 to be disaggregated into a portion due to participant training and a portion due to advisory assistance.

Though all eight of the above listed projects/contracts are similar in that they meet the criteria established for Category I, the histories of their development are quite different. These differences are explored below.

Early USAID assistance to the Ministry of Agriculture (16 participants plus some advisory assistance in FY 76 through FY 78) represented a USAID response to a target of opportunity. Agriculture was recognized as an important sector and the Ministry's requests were honored. The early assistance was not directly related to the Agricultural Production Program which was designed in late 1979 and early 1980 and resulted in the signing of a \$10.0 million PASA with the USDA in late 1980. Some advisory assistance and participant training, financed under the T.A. Grant and which was directly related to the Agricultural Production Program was, however, provided in 1980. In this case the flexibility of the T.A. Grant allowed the USAID to maintain momentum while negotiations were underway with the USDA. Of the 61 participant programs provided to the Ministry through FY 82, 37 (60%) were funded under the USDA PASA. The number of such programs is expected to increase significantly over the next years.

An evaluation of early (FY 75 - 79) USAID assistance to the Ministry of Agriculture beyond Level 10 is probably not necessary as impact, even at Level 11 (problem solving impact), is doubtful. Given the scope and objectives of the USDA PASA for the Agricultural Production Program, an eventual Level 13 (sector impact) evaluation is clearly appropriate.

All early USAID assistance to the Rural Universities at Vila Real, Covilha and Evora was directly related to the \$2.4 million Purdue Contract which was signed in late 1980. In this case T.A. Grant funds were used to finance technical assistance to help design the project and then again to initiate implementation while AID/W was moving through the contractors selection and contract negotiation processes. Eventual evaluation at Level 12 (institutional impact) is clearly appropriate.

The \$623,000 URI Contract for assistance to the University of the Azores in fisheries and agriculture was the first major contract signed under the T.A. Grant. Seventeen of the 24 participants trained from the University of the Azores were funded under the URI Contract; the other 7 under the T.A. Grant before the Contract was signed. The current Estimated Completion Date for the Contract is 6/30/83. A Level 12 (institutional impact) evaluation would be appropriate within one year of that date. The USAID views this project as not particularly successful and any impact level evaluation should devote considerable resources to identifying major planning and implementation problems which could be avoided in future projects of a similar nature.

The USAID relationship with the Ministry of Social Affairs was initiated in 1976. Considerable resources (USAID and GOP) were invested in the design of a comprehensive health sector assistance project which was to be implemented through a host country contract funded under the T.A. Grant. Though the RFP was published and a significant number of U.S. companies submitted proposals, a contract was never signed. Estimated contract costs were very high and no one GOP Government remained in power long enough to make a final contracting decision. The USAID maintained its contacts with the Ministry and these bore fruit in 1980. The USAID developed an excellent working relationship with the new Director of the Ministry's planning unit and a number of the activities originally planned in 1976 were finally initiated. Both advisory assistance (mostly under IQC's) and participant training (11 programs) were used to replan and reinitiate long stalled activities. A well defined project and RFP were developed in 1981, but the \$301,000 contract with MSH was not signed until 12/24/82. Regardless of the relatively small size of the contract, the project/contract is a clear candidate for evaluation at Level 13 (sector impact). The USAID believes that there will be a significant positive impact on hospital costs (currently about 80% of the Ministry's budget) and that USAID's labor intensive method of working with the Ministry will demonstrate that large benefits can be obtained from a relatively small financial investment, if the investment is well targeted and responds to changing circumstances.

All USAID financed assistance to the Institute of Emergency Medicine (8 participant programs) was directly related to the \$235,000 DHHS PASA signed on 2/5/81. The Institute and DHHS have collaborated in a number of areas related to the PASA, but with funds obtained from other sources. It is expected that by the time the project/PASA is completed there will be significant improvements in Portuguese emergency health care ranging from more rapid pick-up of accident victims, to better emergency care at the scene and on the road to hospitals, to better care within hospital emergency rooms. An eventual Level 12 (institutional impact), and perhaps a Level 13 (sector impact), evaluation would be appropriate.

The \$492,000 Grant to the New University of Lisbon was signed on 10/12/80. The purpose of the Grant is to assist the University in establishing the first MBA program in Portugal. To date the University has employed Grant funds to contract U.S. visiting professors, through an agreement with the Wharton School of Finance, and to obtain badly needed bibliographic materials. To strengthen its Portuguese faculty the University has recruited a number of young Portuguese business scholars who recently completed Ph.D programs in the U.S. and whose programs were financed through other sources. USAID assistance will terminate in 1984 and a Level 12 (institutional impact) evaluation would be appropriate.

Early USAID assistance to the Institute of State Participation (IPE), 20 participant programs in 1976 and 1977, did not represent a choice on the part of the USAID. After the revolution and the start-up of AID activities in Portugal, the USAID was told by the GOP that all USAID financed training programs would be controlled by IPE. The early relationship between IPE and the USAID was strained at best and improved only slightly over time. As Portuguese Governments changed, the USAID was allowed more flexibility in dealing with GOP Ministries directly. Eventually IPE was bypassed altogether. Given the nature and purpose of the early IPE participant programs, their evaluation beyond Level 10 is not necessary.

CIFAG is the business training and consultancy arm of IPE. While the role of IPE has declined that of CIFAG has increased. Currently CIFAG is the only public sector entity in Portugal providing regular short-term management training programs for small and medium Portuguese firms. CIFAG came to the USAID for assistance, and it came because of the former USAID relationship with IPE. The \$169,000 HRM contract signed on 2/12/81 was the direct result. However, as in most other cases, considerable advisory assistance was provided to design the project before the contract was signed. Upon completion of the project/contract a Level 12 (institutional impact) evaluation would be appropriate.

The JNICT is to some degree the Portuguese equivalent of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences (NAS). The \$495,000 NAS contract signed of 2/23/82 provides for a number of joint U.S./Portuguese workshops on topics of major importance to Portugal, highly technical and specialized participant training programs for Portuguese scientists in the U.S. and some technical assistance in Portugal. Overall NAS is providing assistance in 6 different S&T areas. Upon completion of the project/contract a Level 12 (institutional impact) evaluation, and perhaps a Level 13 (sector impact) evaluation, will be appropriate. Given the large number of sectors assisted through JNICT activities, only Level 12 evaluation may be feasible.

CATEGORY II

18% of the USAID's programs (79 participants) were associated with assistance efforts (5 institutions) which met criteria (1), (2) and (3), but not (4): a specific institution was targeted; early

advisory assistance was also provided, a well defined project was eventually developed, but no major contract to implement the project was signed. These are:

- (6)* Ministry of Public Works;
- (7) Ministry of Education;
- (12) Nat. Stat. Institute;
- (14) Housing Development Fund;
- (15) Sines.

Assistance, both technical and participant training, provided to the Ministry of Public Works (26 participants) and the Housing Development Fund (17 participants) was intended to support the implementation of the USAID's major social infrastructure loan programs, Basic Sanitation I and II and Low Income Housing I and II, respectively. In the case of the Ministry of Public Works, 22 out of the 26 programs were financed under Basic Sanitation II. The impact of these two assistance activities should only be evaluated within the larger context of the Basic Sanitation and Low Income Housing Loan projects.

Assistance to the National Statistics Institute (4 participants) led directly to the use of a central BUCEN project to obtain, install and train Institute staff in the use of a number of computer packages (CONCOR, CENTS and CENTS-4) developed by BUCEN. A Level 12 (institutional impact) evaluation would be appropriate.

Sines (17 participants) was a major GOP port/industry development program. USAID assistance was provided in response to specific GOP requests. USAID inputs probably had some impact on the development of the Sines program, but, given its overall size relative to the USAID input, the actual impact of USAID inputs would be very difficult to measure. Evaluation beyond Level 10 is probably not appropriate.

Since 1976 the USAID tried to develop a close working relationship with the Ministry of Education (15 participants). Advisory assistance and training were provided in a number of areas. However, it was only in 1980 that a specific project in the area of continuing adult education was developed. Planned projects in the areas of educational planning and management information systems never got off the ground. The adult education activity is currently active and being implemented by the USAID through a combination of PCSs and 8-A set asides. Given the limited scope of the project, one small division within the Ministry is being assisted, only a Level 11 (problem solving impact) evaluation will be appropriate at some later date.

* Numbers in () correspond to institution identification numbers used in Table IV. (1).

CATEGORY III

9% of the USAID's programs (37 participants) were associated with assistance efforts (4 institutions) which met criteria (1), and (2), but not (3) and (4): a specific institution was targeted; early advisory assistance was also provided, but no well defined project was developed. These are:

- (10)* Ministry of Finance;
- (11) Regional Commissions;
- (20) Com. on Status of Women;
- (21) Civil Protection Service.

The Ministry of Finance (15 participants) played and continues to play the key financial role in the implementation of all USAID projects in Portugal. Funds for all USAID projects (U.S. dollars and Portuguese escudos) are allocated and released by this Ministry. The USAID relationship with the Ministry is very important and has been very close. Early in the A.I.D. program it was agreed that the USAID would, to the degree possible, honor specific Ministry requests for technical assistance and participant training in areas of high priority to the Ministry. The specific areas of assistance were varied, but the U.S. input much valued. Given the nature of the assistance, any impact at Level 12 (institutional impact) could probably not be linked to specific USAID inputs. A Level 11 evaluation (problem solving impact) may, however, be appropriate.

USAID financed assistance to the Civil Protection Service (6 participants) did not lead to a specific project, but the Service, as a partial result of USAID assistance, developed and continues to maintain close ties with U.S. institutions and individuals working in the same area. At most a Level 11, and probably only a Level 10 evaluation, is appropriate.

The Commission on the Status of Women (4 participants) is charged by the GOP with promoting women's rights and integration into the modern labor sector. To some degree USAID assistance has probably had an impact on how the institution functions (Level 12). This, however, would be difficult to measure and an evaluation beyond Level 10 is probably not appropriate.

The Regional Commissions (12 participants) are important in the GOP's program of decentralization and the USAID has for years tried to develop specific projects in a number of areas. Assistance provided to date has been highly valued, but no well defined project has resulted. Relationships between the USAID and the Commissions remain very good and one or two specific projects may be developed in 1983. Evaluation beyond Level 10 is not appropriate at this time.

* Numbers in () correspond to institution identification numbers used in Table IV. (1).

CATEGORY IV

15% of the USAID's programs (57 programs) were associated with assistance efforts (4 institutions) which met criterion (1), but not (2), (3) and (4): a specific institution was targeted, but no advisory assistance was provided and no well defined project developed. These are:

- (13)* Ministry of Labor;
- (17) Secretary of State for Energy;
- (18) Export Development Fund;
- (19) National Engineering Laboratory.

After the 1974 revolution, labor policy and union activities were important in the U.S./GOP relationship. The Ministry of Labor (37 participants) assistance effort was primarily the responsibility of the Embassy Labor Attache, as were the FTUI and AAFLI labor union grants. Higher level evaluation of these programs may some day be appropriate.

USAID assistance to the Export Development Fund (6 participants) resulted in the signing of a \$50,000 grant to the Fund which was to be used to finance further advisory assistance and training. Over several years funds were not employed and the grant was deobligated by the USAID. Any impact beyond Level 10 is most doubtful.

Training programs provided to the National Engineering Laboratory (8 participants) represented a USAID response to a target of opportunity. Impact beyond Level 10 is probably doubtful.

The USAID relationship with the Secretary of State for Energy (9 participants) was initiated in 1978 and continues today. Though not financed by the USAID, the D.O.E. collaborated with the Secretary in conducting a detailed Portuguese national energy assessment. The documents produced are currently being used in the formulation of GOP energy policy. The USAID is currently in the process of developing a wind energy demonstration project, a contract for which should be signed in 1983. Upon completion of the project, a higher level evaluation will be appropriate.

CATEGORY V

The final group of USAID participant training programs (57 participants, 13% of the total) consists of various assistance actions which in general never reached the stage of being focused in one target institution. In these cases the USAID was interested in assisting the GOP in some area and a number of institutions within the area were contacted to explore their potential role in overall USAID and GOP plans. In some cases individuals were sent to the

* Numbers in () correspond to institution identification numbers used in Table IV.(1).

U.S. to gain exposure to relevant U.S. institutions to return to Portugal with fresh ideas for possible collaboration with the USAID. In others, the USAID simply responded to a training request supported at the highest levels in some Ministry. Seven such programs were provided in Agriculture, 4 in Health, 13 in Public Administration and Finance, 13 in Industry, 5 in Investment Promotion, 11 in Transportation and 4 in Cooperatives. Most were successful at Level 10, and probably also at Level 11. Beyond Level 10 or 11 there is little chance of impact: objectives were too limited and the number of participants per institution too few. With three possible exceptions, these assistance efforts simply did not move beyond the first stages.

The possible exceptions are in the areas of Investment Promotion (the \$50,000 SPI Grant which is now supporting the development of a private investment association in northern Portugal; and the Regional Development Society in the Azores, which, though moving slowly, may yet develop into a project) and Industry (the \$50,000 Grant to IESC to provide consultant services to small and medium Portuguese business firms). Both the SPI and IESC Grants are candidates for eventual higher level evaluation.

Summary and Conclusions

Given A.I.D. objectives in Portugal, the unstable political situation (14 governments between the April 1974 revolution and the end of FY 82) and the purpose of the T.A. Grant under which almost all participant training programs were financed, the USAID has in general used its participant training programs well. Out of 436 participant programs:

- 379 training programs (Categories I, II, III and IV, 86.9%) were targeted at specific institutions (21 institutions in total);
- 314 programs (Categories I, II and III, 72%) were combined with U.S. advisory assistance inputs in Portugal;
- 277 programs (Categories I and II, 63.4%) were associated with advisory efforts which eventually developed into well defined projects;
- 198 programs (Category I, 45.3%) were associated with assistance efforts for which major contracts were eventually signed;
- finally, 57 programs (Category V, 13.1%) were essentially target of opportunity responses to high level GOP requests.

CHAPTER V

DETAILED FINDINGS (LEVELS 9 AND 10) - PROGRAM RESULTSIntroduction

The most significant measures of the results of a participant training program at evaluation Levels 9 and 10 are:

Level 9 - Have the participants returned from their training programs in the United States with the belief that they have in fact gained the information and knowledge that they set out to gain; in other words feeling that their training needs (program objectives) were met?

Level 10 - Have the participants actually been able to use on-the-job in Portugal the information and knowledge they gained as a result of their training programs in the United States?

However, to evaluate only at Level 10, or evaluate only at Level 9, would be a mistake. Both levels should be evaluated jointly, for only if a given program is judged successful at Level 9 and, at the same time, judged successful at Level 10, is it truly successful. Independent evaluations at Level 10 or at Level 9 provide indicators of success, they do not establish which programs were truly successful.

For the purposes of this study a truly successful program is one in which training needs (program objectives) were met to at least a medium or moderate degree (Level 9) and at least a significant part of what was learned was actually used on-the-job (Level 10).

Level 10 - The On-The-Job Use Of Information/Knowledge Gained

The basic question asked at this level was: Have participants actually been able to use on-the-job in Portugal the information and knowledge they gained as a result of their training programs in the United States? Findings are presented in the table below.

TABLE V.(1)

INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE ACTUALLY USED IN CURRENT JOB
(DISTRIBUTION of scores on response scale ranging from
1 to 5; where 1 = almost none, and 5 = almost all)

INFORMATION/ KNOWLEDGE USED	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
5. Almost All	33	17	17
4. -	54	28	45
3. Significant Part	72	37	82
2. -	27	14	96
1. Almost None	10	5	100
TOTAL	196	100%	-

N = 196

MEAN = 3.4

STD. DEV. = 1.1

The independent results at Level 10 are quite satisfactory: over 80% claimed that they had in fact been able to use a significant part (or more) of what they had learned. Only 10 participants (5%) claimed almost no use, while 27 (14%) claimed only limited use.

If the evaluations were conducted only at Level 10, and if the minimum standard for success was the use of at least a significant part of what was learned, then 82% of the USAID's programs would be judged successful. Since this is not the case, it is only concluded that, based on independent Level 10 findings, up to 82% of the USAID's programs appear to have been successful. Further support is required.

At a minimum, however, it appears that a significant part of what was provided through the USAID's programs was in fact applied to the solution of institutional problems at Level 11.

Level 9 - Degree Program Objectives (Training Needs) Were Met

The basic question asked at this level was: To what degree did participants feel that their training program really provided them with the knowledge and information they needed, i.e. that the objectives of their programs were met? As demonstrated in the table below, the independent findings at this level, as at Level 10, were quite satisfactory.

TABLE V.(2)

DEGREE TRAINING NEEDS (PROJECT OBJECTIVES) MET

(DISTRIBUTION of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5;

where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very high degree)

DEGREE MET	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
5. Very High Degree	73	37	37
4. -	64	33	70
3. Medium/Moderate	36	18	88
2. -	22	11	99
1. Not At All	2	1	100
TOTAL	197	100%	-

N = 197

MEAN = 3.9

STD. DEV. = 1.0

Almost 70% of the participants claimed their needs were met to a high or very high degree, and another 18% claimed that their needs were met to at least a medium or moderate degree. Only 2 participants claimed their needs were not met at all.

Again, if the evaluation was conducted only at this level, and if the minimum standard for success was at least medium or moderate satisfaction of training needs, then 88% of the USAID's programs would be judged successful. Further it would appear that Level 9 findings (training needs were met) are consistent with, and supportive of, Level 10 findings (knowledge and information was used).

Levels 9 and 10 - The Relationship Between Use and Objectives (A Measure of Program Success)

The basic data for the relationship between degree program objectives were met (Level 9) and use of information/knowledge gained (Level 10) is presented in the table below. As would be expected the relationship between the two variables is statistically significant and positive, but not perfectly linear. Note that the table is divided in four quadrants in accordance with the previously discussed

TABLE V.(5)

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES (TRAINING NEEDS) MET AND INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE USED

DEGREE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES (TRAINING NEEDS) MET	INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE USED					TOTAL	
	ALMOST NONE ...		ALMOST ALL				
	1	2	3	4	5		
5. Very High (II)	3	3	20	25	20	71	(I)
4. -	2	9	25	17	9	62	
3. Medium/Moderate	1	6	18	9	2	36	
2. - (III)	3	9	8	1	1	22	(IV)
1. Not At All	0	0	0	2	0	2	
TOTAL	9	27	71	54	3	193	

independent indicators of program success: Level 9 - programs objectives met to at least a medium or moderate degree; Level 10 - at least a significant part of what was learned was used on-the-job.

The Quadrants, starting from upper right and moving counter clock-wise are:

Quadrant I: Program objectives met and information/knowledge gained actually used (140 cases, 75% of the total).

Program objectives were "proper" (as indicated by use); Programs were well designed and implemented (as indicated by objectives met). Given the simultaneous satisfaction of both Level 9 and Level 10 minimum standards, these programs are judged truly successful, and it is hypothesized that these results were obtained because no serious problems developed, or mistakes were made, at Levels 4 through 8. Had there been serious mistakes or problems at any one of the lower levels, this result would not have been attained. It now remains, of course, to look at Levels 4 through 8 to determine whether findings at those levels are consistent with, and supportive of, the Levels 9/10 findings. If yes, the confidence in Level 9/10 findings is increased. If not, the Level 9/10 findings must be seriously questioned.

Quadrant II: Program objectives met, but information/knowledge gained not used (24 cases, 12% of the total).

Programs were well designed and implemented (and indicated by objectives met). In other words, given the objectives established for the program, in which the participant assisted in developing and/or concurred; there were no serious problems or mistakes at Level 5 (the participant was prepared well for his program), or at Level 7 (the program was well designed), or at Level 8 (no major problems developed during implementation). However, since the information/knowledge gained was not used on-the-job, there were problems or mistakes at either Level 6 (the "proper" training objectives were not established, i.e. that which was learned was not appropriate to the participant's institution and therefore was not used), or at Level 4 (the individual selected for training was not located at a position within his institution which allowed him to use the information/knowledge he gained), or at both Levels 4 and 6. Such cases may be judged successful in that given their objectives programs were well designed and implemented. They may not, however, be judged truly successful: what was learned was not used.

Quadrant III: Program objectives not met and information/knowledge not used (12 cases, 6% of the total).

These programs were pure failure: objectives were not met, so not much was learned, and what was learned was not used. The problems or mistakes which caused such negative Level 9/10 results could have been at any, or all, levels between Level 4 and Level 8.

Quadrant IV: Program objectives not met, but information/knowledge gained actually used (12 cases, 6% of the total).

These cases are more difficult to explain: objectives were not met,

yet a significant part of what was learned was used. Perhaps there were no problems or mistakes at Level 4 (an appropriate and qualified individual was selected for training), or at Level 6 ("proper" objectives were established), or at Level 5 (the participant was prepared well for his program); but there were problems or mistakes at higher levels, i.e. Level 7 (the program was poorly designed), or Level 8 (major problems developed during implementation). Other explanations are possible. To the degree that what was learned was used (Level 10) these programs may also be judged successful: they may not, however, be judged "truly successful".

In sum, the data indicate that at least 75% of the USAID's programs were truly successful: program objectives were met (Level 9) and what was learned was used (Level 10). To attain these results, it is argued that no serious problems developed, or mistakes were made, at Levels 4 through 8. On the other hand, only 6% of the USAID's programs may be judged as pure failures: program objectives were not met (Level 9) and what was learned was not used (Level 10). The remaining 18% of the USAID's programs may be judged as at least partially successful: either program objectives were met (Level 9) or what was learned was used (Level 10). However, in these cases there were serious problems or mistakes at some point, or points, between Levels 4 and 8.

Though overall Level 9 and 10 findings were quite satisfactory, there was sufficient variation in the responses of the participants at each level to justify further investigation. Before proceeding with the more detailed discussion of findings at lower levels, and how those findings relate to Level 9/10 findings, it is appropriate to discuss how Level 9 and Level 10 results have varied over time.

Prior to the evaluation it was expected that early USAID programs (1976 and perhaps 1977) would have been less successful than later programs. The data did not support this assumption. The relationships between the year a program was initiated and the degree program objectives were met (Level 9) and the degree that what was learned was used (Level 10) were not statistically significant. This finding does not prove that later programs were not in some sense better than earlier program. For example those early participants who claimed to have used an approximately equivalent amount of what they learned as did some later participants, may have done so only because they have had more time on-the-job to use what they learned.

In sum, the USAID's training programs between 1975 and 1980 appear to have been generally quite successful. Further, the success rate does not appear to have varied over time: high standards were established early in the program and then maintained.

Additional Level 9/10 Findings

The basic findings at Level 9 (the degree to which program objectives were met) and Level 10 (the degree of on-the-job use of what was learned) were presented in the previous section. The purpose of this section is to set forth additional findings at Levels 9 and 10. Specifically, the following relationships are explored:

1. the sharing of information/knowledge with colleagues;
2. the degree of increase in professional capability; and
3. the professional advancement of participants.

The Sharing of Information/Knowledge

Additional support for the generally favorable basic findings at Levels 9 and 10 is provided by the data on sharing. Participants were asked to estimate how much of what they learned as a result of their programs they actually shared with their colleagues in Portugal. Results are presented in the table below.

TABLE V.(4)

INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE SHARED WITH COP COLLEAGUES

(DISTRIBUTION of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5;
where 1 = almost none, and 5 = almost all)

INFORMATION/ KNOWLEDGE SHARED	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
5. Almost All	49	25	25
4. -	63	32	57
3. Significant Part	52	27	84
2. -	23	12	96
1. Almost None	9	5	100
TOTAL	196	100%	-

N = 196

MEAN = 3.6

STD. DEV. = 1.1

Almost 85% claimed to have shared at least a significant part of what they learned with their colleagues, while 25% claimed to have shared almost all. At the other end of the scale, only 4 participants claimed to have shared almost nothing. In sum, not only did the great majority of participants use a significant part of what they learned, but they also shared a significant part with their colleagues, thus creating at least the potential for a multiplier effect.

It is reasonable to assume that the degree of actual on-the-job use by the participant is a good indicator of how appropriate (useful) what was learned was to the solution of problems within the participant's institution. Participants and their colleagues work within the same institutions on the same problems: what would be useful to one would be useful to the other. Under such conditions, it is reasonable to assume that both the participant and, perhaps particularly, his colleagues, would have a mutual interest in sharing what the participant learned in the U.S., provided what was learned was useful. If so one would expect a positive relationship between degree of use by the participant and degree of sharing with colleagues. The data do in fact reveal such a statistically significant positive relationship.

Though the relationship between use and sharing is positive, it is not, as is demonstrated in the table below, perfectly linear.

TABLE V.(5)

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE USED AND INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE SHARED

(DISTRIBUTION of responses on response scales ranging from 1 to 5; where 1 = almost none, and 5 = almost all)

INFORMATION/ KNOWLEDGE USED	INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE SHARED					TOTAL	
	ALMOST NONE		ALMOST ALL				
	1	2	3	4	5		
5. Almost All	2	1	4	9	17	33	
4. - (II)	1	2	8	26	17	54	(I)
3. Significant Part	2	10	27	20	12	71	
2. - (III)	2	9	8	5	2	26	(IV)
1. Almost None	2	1	4	2	1	10	
TOTAL	9	23	51	62	49	194	

Of the 158 participants who claimed to have used a significant (or better) part of what they learned, 140 or 89% (Quadrant I) also claimed to have shared a significant part: the remaining 18 or 11% (Quadrant II) claimed to have shared only little. Of the 36 participants who claimed only little use of what was learned, 22 or 61% (Quadrant IV) claimed that they shared a significant part. Only 14 participants (about 7% of the total) claimed that they neither used nor shared a significant part of what they learned (Quadrant III).

Thus it appears that for at least 72% of the USAID's programs (Quadrant I) what was learned was appropriate (useful) to the participant's institution and that the impact (actual use) of what was learned was probably multiplied through sharing. In another 40 cases (20% of the total) either a significant part was actually used by the participant himself (Quadrant II) or a significant part was shared with his colleagues (Quadrant II), thus creating at least the potential for use.

Not all channels for sharing or transferring information and knowledge with colleagues were equally important. As the following table demonstrates, the most important channels employed by Portuguese participants were informal discussions and on-the-job training. Since most transfers took place at work, or during work, the argument that that which was transferred to colleagues is probably used by those colleagues is supported.

TABLE V.(G)

IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS CHANNELS FOR SHARING INFORMATION/KNOWLEDGE
(PERCENT DISTRIBUTION of responses on scale ranging from 1 to 5;
where 1 = not important, and 5 = very important)

CHANNELS FOR SHARING	VERY IMPORTANT NOT IMPORTANT					TOTAL/OVERALL		
	5	4	3	2	1	No.	MEAN	STD. DEV.
Informal Discussions	40	30	18	9	3	191	4.0	1.1
On-The-Job Training	24	30	27	14	6	188	3.5	1.2
Loan U.S. Materials	19	26	25	20	10	187	3.2	1.3
Written Reports	15	30	17	17	21	186	2.9	1.4
Formal Lectures	9	16	10	13	52	176	2.2	1.4

The argument that what was shared with colleagues was also probably used by those colleagues was further supported by the finding that, as the degree of sharing increased, so did the importance of informal and on-the-job sharing channels. Thus, those who used more on-the-job tended to share more with colleagues; those who shared more with colleagues tended to share more through informal and on-the-job work related channels. In other words, use by the participant, sharing with colleagues and use by colleagues are complementary and mutually reinforcing. As one increases, so do the others.

In sum, an additional benefit of the USAID's programs was the sharing of information with colleagues who actually used the information. The link between Level 10 (on-the-job use) and Level 11 (solution of the institution's problem) is strengthened. To the degree that both participants and their colleagues used what was learned by the participant, the probability of problem solution at Level 11 was increased.

Increases In Professional Capability

It may be argued that there is an intermediate step between meeting program objectives (Level 9) and the actual on-the-job use of what is learned (Level 10). That step is an increase in professional capability. A question on degree of increase in professional capability was included in the questionnaire. Responses are presented in the table below.

TABLE V.(7)

DEGREE PROFESSIONAL CAPABILITY INCREASED

(DISTRIBUTION of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5; where 1 = no increase and 5 = very high increase)

DEGREE OF INCREASE	No.	PERCENT	CUM. PERCENT
5. Very High	50	25	25
4. -	73	37	62
3. Medium/Moderate	59	30	92
2. -	16	8	100
1. No Increase	2	1	-
TOTAL	200	100%	-

N = 200
 MEAN = 3.8
 STD. DEV. = .9

Given the overall high average of the responses (62% claimed that their professional capabilities were increased to a high or very high degree) and the nature of the USAID training program, it must be assumed that most participants interpreted this question in a very narrow sense, i.e. professional capability directly related to the specific objectives of their program (their training needs) and not overall professional capability. Responses to the training needs question and the professional capability question were, however,

consistent; for almost all participants the claimed degree of increase in professional capability was either equal to or less than the claimed degree to which program objectives (training needs) were met.

Regardless of whether an increase in capability is or is not an intermediate step between Level 9 and Level 10 two facts are clear: first, most USAID participants were very thoughtful (consistent) when responding to the questionnaire and second, the responses to the capability question were consistent with, and supportive of, basic findings at Levels 9 and 10.

As a follow-up to the capability question, participants were requested to indicate the importance of various elements of their programs as they related to the claimed increase in professional capability.

TABLE V.(8)

IMPORTANCE OF VARIOUS PROGRAM ELEMENTS IN INCREASING PROFESSIONAL CAPABILITY BY DEGREE OF INCREASE IN PROFESSIONAL CAPABILITY
(MEAN of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5; where 1 = not important, and 5 = very important)

INCREASE IN PROFESSIONAL CAPABILITY		IMPORTANCE OF					
		SPECIFIC TECHNICAL INFORMATION		GENERAL INFORMATION		PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS DEVELOPED	
DEGREE	No. *	MEAN	STD. DEV.	MEAN	STD. DEV.	MEAN	STD. DEV.
5. Very High	50	4.7	.6	4.3	1.1	3.7	1.3
4. -	73	4.3	.8	3.8	.8	3.4	1.4
3. Medium/Moderate	59	3.4	.8	3.4	1.0	2.5	1.3
2. -	16	2.0	.8	3.0	1.2	2.6	1.4
1. No Increase	2	1.0	-	3.0	-	2.0	-
TOTAL/OVERALL	200	3.9	1.1	3.8	1.1	3.1	1.4

* Not all participants responded to each of the 3 individual importance questions. Actual number of responses to each importance question may be 1 or 2 less than number shown in this column.

Overall, specific technical information was more important than either general information or the development of professional relationships. Further, specific technical information was most important to those who claimed the highest increases in professional capability.

The above would tend to indicate that USAID programs should focus on providing specific technical information. However, too narrow of a technical focus might be shortsighted. General information allows the participant to place specific technical information in context and to better evaluate its applicability to Portugal.

Participants' Professional Advancement

The following table is a cross tabulation of participants' professional positions at the time of their training programs by their current professional positions (at the time the questionnaire was applied). Data for both position at time of training and current position are arranged on a scale of 1 to 6; where 1 is the highest level policy position and 6 is the lowest technical position. As one moves up the scale the policy aspects of a given position become more important: as one moves down the scale, the implementation responsibilities become heavier. At the top level (Level 1), the emphasis is almost purely on policy; at the lowest level (Level 6) almost purely on implementation. Note, however, that in Portugal it is not unusual for a technical person (Level 5 or 6) to have direct access to a Minister (Level 1). Basic data for the position at time of training were obtained from USAID files: Data for the current position were obtained from both the questionnaire and USAID files (the USAID had current job data on a number of participants who did not respond to the questionnaire).

TABLE V. (9)

PARTICIPANTS' PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT

(Position at time of training vs. current position)

		LEVEL IN EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION					
AT TIME OF TRAINING		CURRENT POSITION					
LEVEL	TOTAL	6	5	4	3	2	1
		TECH Oth/Top	TECH Oth/Top	ADM. Oth/Top	ADM. Oth/Top	POLICY Oth/Top	POLICY Oth/Top
1. Policy - Top	8	-	-	-	-	-	8
2. - Oth.	11	1	1	-	2	7	-
3. Adm. - Top	13	-	-	3	9	1	-
4. - Oth.	59	1	5	39	7	6	1
5. Tech. - Top	85	1	60	17	3	3	1
6. - Oth.	56	22	23	4	4	1	2
TOTAL	232	25	89	63	25	18	12

The data presented in the table on the previous page are not adjusted for the relative importance of the institution in which the participant was/is employed, i.e. both a Minister (Ministry) and Rector (University) are classified as top level policy positions. The implications of this failure to adjust are discussed below. Also note that for some participants the current position is only slightly more than six months after program completion (1980 participants); for others the time lapsed may be up to three years.

Based on the data in the table presented on the previous page, the 145 participants (63%) located on the upward sloping diagonal of the matrix have remained at the same professional level; those to the left of the diagonal (6%) have moved down the professional scale; and those to the right (31%) have moved up.

While it cannot be claimed that 31% of the USAID's participants advanced professionally because of their programs, the percentage that advanced is significant. At a minimum the USAID selected individuals who were capable of moving up and assuming more responsibility.

Two points are particularly noteworthy. First, all top policy participants remained in top policy positions, most within the same institution. Second, over 40% of the technical level participants (Levels 5 and 6) moved into higher level positions, a significant number into top administrative and a few into policy positions. This is particularly noteworthy as the public service in Portugal is quite rigid, with little turnover and limited opportunities for advancement.

Based on the table, 31% of USAID participants advanced professionally and, it may be assumed, have increased job responsibility. In the questionnaire participants were also asked to compare their current responsibilities with their responsibilities at the time of their programs: 45% claimed their responsibilities had increased. The USAID also made its own estimates, adjusting the data presented in the table for differences in the relative importance of institutions when a major job change had occurred. The USAID estimate for increased job responsibility was about 40%; slightly less than the participants claimed, but 9 points higher than the estimate obtained from the unadjusted data in the table. These findings are particularly significant given that only 18% of the participants studied changed institutions after training. Further, these who did switch institutions generally moved to institutions within the same sector which were closely related to the original institution.

Clearly a very significant percentage of USAID participants are moving up in their careers. Given that most are quite young, the trend should pay future dividends.

Summary

The additional Level 9/10 findings presented in this section were consistent with, and supportive of, the basic Level 9/10 findings presented in the previous section. The fact that a great majority of the USAID's participants claimed both that their training needs (program objectives) were met (Level 9) and that they have actually

used on-the-job what they learned (Level 10), is consistent with:

- (1) the high degree of sharing of information with colleagues;
- (2) the claimed degree of increase in professional capability;
and
- (3) the actual professional advancement of the participants.

In sum, the degree of confidence in basic Level 9/10 findings is increased. Further, because information and knowledge was not only used by participants but also shared with colleagues, and those colleagues also used the information and knowledge, the link between Level 10 (use of what was learned) and Level 11 (solution of institutional problems) is strengthened. USAID programs may actually be more successful at Level 11 than the basic Level 9/10 findings indicate.

The next step is to determine whether lower level findings (Levels 9 through 4) are consistent with, and supportive of, Level 9/10 findings. These relationships are explored in the following chapters.

CHAPTER VI

DETAILED FINDINGS (LEVEL 8) - PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction

For the purposes of this study, the period of program implementation was defined as the period of time between arrival in and departure from the U.S.. Thus, it includes both orientation (usually provided in Washington, D.C.) and actual program implementation (usually at several different locations).

From the USAID point of view, Levels 4 through 7 are planning and preparation. At Level 8 ST/IT and the organizations contracted to provide training assume responsibility. The actions taken or decisions made at lower levels (Level 4, select an appropriate and qualified participant; Level 5, prepare the participant in terms of expectations, English, logistics, etc.; Level 6, establish "proper" program objectives; and Level 7, design a program appropriate to objectives) were, in major part, taken or made so that implementation at Level 8 would proceed smoothly and that serious problems, which could impact negatively on program results at Levels 9 and 10, would not develop. If the USAID has done a good job at Levels 4-7, and if ST/IT and the contractor perform as expected, then the occurrence of serious problems during implementation should be minimized.

Findings at Level 8 were in general very favorable. Few USAID participants experienced serious difficulties or problems which could have impacted negatively on their programs.

Orientation Services

The USAID provides the participant with a general idea of what to expect in the U.S. prior to departure from Portugal (Level 5 - Pre-departure Preparation), but it is perhaps orientation services provided in the U.S. which contribute more to the smooth transition from home country to the program to be initiated. Two types of orientation are usually involved: general orientation provided by the Washington International Center (WIC) and technical orientation usually provided by an individual closely related to the design and implementation of the participant's program.

As the table below demonstrates almost all USAID participants were provided with some type of orientation in the U.S..

TABLE VI(1)

U.S. ORIENTATION SERVICES

TYPE	#
WIC (only)	42
WIC and technical	26
Technical (only)	18
None	13
TOTAL	100%

About 68% had some contact, usually 2-4 days, with the WIC, while only 44% were provided what they considered technical orientation by an individual or individuals outside WIC. Some 13% received no orientation in the U.S..

Though most Portuguese participants had travelled outside Portugal (Level 4 - Participants Selected), few had previously visited the U.S.. For most, the first contact in the U.S. was with the WIC. The WIC provides a 2 to 7 day orientation session in Washington, D.C. to introduce AID participants to American cultural life and customs. Services include seminars and lectures; tours to points of interest, including a visit to an American supermarket; tickets are arranged for concerts, theaters and sporting events; and, in some cases, an opportunity to meet Americans informally is provided through the WIC Host Family Program.

Prior to this evaluation and based on informal feedback from a number of quite vocal participants, the USAID had come to question the relevance of the type of general orientation services provided by WIC to persons of Portuguese (European) background. While some of our participants clearly did not require WIC orientation, the 68% WIC participation rate to some degree reflects the USAID's partially negative view of the program; participants who objected were not required to participate. To our surprise, of those who had WIC orientation, 88% found it to be at least somewhat useful, while 47% found it to be very useful. In the future, depending on participant's previous experiences, the USAID may push WIC orientation a bit more forcefully.

The low 44% rate for technical orientation outside the WIC was not expected. The USAID had assumed that almost all participants were provided technical orientation, either by ST/IT or by the institution contracted to provide training. Though our individual par-

participant follow-up system it was known that most of our participants had an initial interview with their ST/IT program coordinators prior to the initiation of training. However, the initial interview apparently dealt with logistical and not technical program aspects. Of those who were provided with what they considered technical orientation, almost all found it to be somewhat useful, while a full 80% found it to be very useful. Clearly something valued so highly should be provided. It is reasonable to assume that such technical orientation would be of even more value if sessions were always provided by a person with a technical background in the substantive area of the program and not just the person responsible for program scheduling and logistics.

The major portion of the 13% who received no orientation in the U.S. did not require it: most were high level GOP officials on very short observation consultation visits. Regardless, under normal conditions technical orientation early in the program should be an essential and required part of every participant program funded by A.I.D.. A significant percentage of USAID participants who could have benefited were not provided such services.

English Language Experience

The success of a U.S. participant training program may be greatly influenced by the participant's English language capability. With a few minor exceptions, the USAID's programs were conducted in English and of short duration: participants had to arrive in the U.S. ready to converse, read and, in some cases, write in English.

To determine if English was a problem for Portuguese participants (and to evaluate USAID language testing and training procedures, Level 5 - Predeparture Preparation), participants were requested to evaluate various types of English problems they might have encountered while in the U.S.. Results are presented in the table below.

TABLE VI (2)

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF SERIOUSNESS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN THE U.S.

(PERCENT DISTRIBUTION of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5; where 1 = no problem, and 5 = serious problems)

RESPONSE SCALE	INDIVIDUAL PROBLEM AREAS				OVERALL*	
	Read	Understand	Speak	Write	Percent	Cumulative Percent
1. No problems	83	62	53	61	65	65
2. -	11	27	30	25	23	88
3. A Few Problems	4	9	12	8	8	94
4. -	2	2	5	5	4	100
5. Serious Problems	0	0	0	1	0	-
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
MEAN	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.4	-	-
STD. DEV.	.6	.7	.9	.9	-	-

* Unweighted average of the four individual problem areas.

A full 96% of the USAID's participants claimed that they had no, or only a few, English language problems while in the U.S.; 65% stated they had no problem at all. Some credit for this extremely favorable result must go to those Americans who dealt with the participants and participated in their programs in the U.S.. As many participants have reported, these Americans clearly made an effort to understand and be understood.

Even though the initial findings indicated no serious problems, the data were further broken down by the year programs were initiated to determine whether the pattern varied over time. The degree of problems associated with understanding English (perhaps the most important area) were fairly constant with no significant variations from year to year. A statistically significant pattern with respect to speaking, reading and writing was, however, discovered. Participants in 1976 clearly experienced more problems than in following years. Given that the USAID program was just starting and selection was made primarily by IPE rather than the USAID, this would be expect

Of more concern is the 1980 data: though not conclusive, it appears that the seriousness of problems with English encountered increased in 1980. As the overall USAID program mix did not change significantly in that year, it may be that participants were simply less well prepared. If the trend continued after 1980 (beyond the scope of this study) the USAID has cause for concern. Every effort should be made (at Level 5) to insure that past high English language standards are maintained.

General Design/Implementation Problems

The favorable results registered at Levels 9 and 10 would probably not have been achieved if large percentages of participants had experienced serious problems related to the design and implementation of their programs. The relationships between program design (Level 7) and Levels 9 and 10 is explored in detail in the next chapter. However, as an independent check, participants were requested to provide their views on a number of key design and implementation related elements. Results are presented in the table in the next page.

The great majority of participants, 90%, felt that the technical level of their program was about correct, while only 4% thought it too low and 6% too high. Not one participant claimed to have had a significant number of contacts with persons of low professional capability while almost 50% thought all their contacts were of high capability. In sum, there appear to have been very few problems with the general technically professional levels of the programs provided.

The 4% of participants who claimed a significant number of organizations which they contacted were not relevant may not represent a serious problem. As the largest share of USAID programs were observation/consultation, and as the objective was sometimes to expose the participant to what the United States had to offer, a negative response may indicate that the participant judged the organization not to be relevant to Portugal (i.e. his institution's problem, Level 11). As one program objective was to make this determination, that program objective may have been met.

TABLE VI (3)

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF SELECTED PROGRAM ASPECTS
(PERCENT DISTRIBUTION of responses)

(A) TECHNICAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM

- Too Low 3.6
- About Correct ... 90.3
- Too High 6.1

Total 100.00

(B) RELEVANCE OF ORGANIZATIONS CONTACTED

- All Relevant 40.6
- Most Relevant 55.2
- Significant Number
Not Relevant 4.2

Total 100.00

(C) PROFESSIONAL LEVEL OF PERSONS CONTACTED

- All High Level 47.4
- Most High Level 52.6
- Significant Number
Low Number 0.0

Total 100.00

(D) ADVANCE PREPARATION OF PERSONS CONTACTED

- All Well Prepared ... 27.1
- Most Well Prepared .. 57.3
- Significant Number
Not Prepared 15.6

Total 100.00

(E) DURATION OF PROGRAM

- Too Short 21.3
- About Right .. 74.6
- Too Long 4.1

Total 100.00

(F) NUMBER OF CONTACTS MADE

- Too Many 6.2
- About Right .. 60.4
- Too Few 13.4

Total 100.0

(G) U.S. DOMESTIC TRAVEL

- Too Much 4.3
- About Right .. 81.1
- Too Little ... 14.6

Total 100.00

The fact that almost 16% of the participants felt that a significant number of their contacts were not well prepared for their visits does represent a serious problem. Much time can be lost if the participant must at every new contact explain the objectives and purposes of his visit. At a minimum all contacts should be provided with the basic information contained in the PIO/P. The USAID does not know whether this is standard ST/IT procedure.

A significant number of participants believed their programs were too short, too few contacts were made, and there was too little domestic travel. Most of those who felt this way were on observation/consultation or specially developed programs. In both cases, the average duration of such USAID programs had dropped considerably over time, from 6.4 weeks in 1976 to 2.8 weeks in 1980 for observation/consultation; and from 10.0 weeks to 4.5 weeks for specially developed programs (Level 7, Program Design).

Based on the above facts, the USAID at first thought that it perhaps had decreased the average duration of its programs too much.

Further analysis indicated that this was not the case. First, there was no statistically significant relationship between responses with respect to duration, number of contacts and U.S. travel and time (year program initiated). While program duration has decreased, the percentage distribution of responses to the three questions has remained fairly constant. Second, as will be discussed in detail the next chapter (Level 7 - Program Design), the USAID's very short duration programs have been at least as successful as longer duration programs in terms of results at Level 9 (degree program objectives met) and Level 10 (degree of on-the-job use).

A possible explanation for the 21% who felt their programs were too short is that in many cases GOP officials initially claim that they are not available for longer programs; however, once their programs are implemented, and found to be more useful than originally anticipated, they wished that they had made themselves available for a longer period. This explanation is consistent with informal feedback received by the USAID.

Other Problems

There are also a number of general problems which, if serious enough, may impact negatively on a participants training program. Findings for a number of such potential problem areas are presented in the table below.

TABLE VI (4)

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY PARTICIPANTS WHILE IN THE U.S.

(PERCENT DISTRIBUTION of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5; where 1 = no problems, and 5 = serious problems)

AREAS	NO PROBLEMS.....SERIOUS PROBLEMS					OVERALL		
	1	2	3	4	5	MEAN	STD. DEV.	No.
- Amount of Per Diem	55	16	13	14	2	1.9	1.3	196
- Receipt of Per Diem	79	9	3	4	4	1.5	1.1	196
- Adequate Lodging	67	11	13	7	2	1.7	1.1	196
- Changes in Program	87	8	4	1	.5	1.2	.6	196
- Contacts Missing Meetings	94	5	1	0	.5	1.1	.4	193
- Persons Contacted	95	3	1	.5	.5	1.1	.4	193
- Other Participants	91	7	2	0	.5	1.1	.5	189
- Americans in General	96	3	.5	.5	.5	1.1	.4	199

About 29% of Portuguese participants experienced difficulties due to what they regarded as a too low per diem rate and the resulting inability to obtain adequate lodging. Only 13% had problems with the timely receipt of the per diem. In some cases these problems were considered quite serious. The degree to which these problems were encountered has remained fairly constant over time.

The above finding is consistent with feedback constantly received from participants upon their return to Portugal. Food and lodging in the larger U.S. cities, particularly New York and Washington, D.C., are quite expensive. It is unrealistic to assume that foreigners visiting these cities, most for the first time, will be able to live as inexpensively as Americans. ST/IT attempts to find less expensive hotels, but in many cases the participants reported that general hotel conditions and locations left much to be desired. A review of current participant per diem levels and ST/IT lodging assistance policies in major cities is clearly called for.

About 5% of the USAID's participants also experienced problems with last minute program changes or with contacts missing scheduled meetings. In most cases these problems were not regarded as too serious and were probably unavoidable. Regardless, every effort should be made to minimize such occurrences.

On the positive side, very few Portuguese participants experienced personal problems with their professional contacts, other participants or Americans in general. The few participants who experienced problems with other (non-Portuguese) participants were mostly early in the program (1976 and 1977). The main complaint was that they were forced to live and associate with persons of quite different educational and cultural levels. Historical and cultural differences should in some cases be respected, or at a minimum program backstop officers and program coordinators should be aware of such differences.

Given the rates of occurrence, types, and seriousness of the general problems encountered by Portuguese participants, there apparently was no overall generally negative impact.

Summary

In general the findings at this level (Level 8) were consistent with findings at Levels 9/10: for the great majority of participants, no major problems were encountered during program implementation.

Orientation services provided by the WIC were found to be useful. Technical orientation was valued even more highly, yet 59% claimed that they were not provided such services. Technical orientation should be made a formal part of every participant training program.

The technical level of the great majority of programs was judged appropriate. However, a significant number of participants claimed some of their contacts in the U.S. were not adequately prepared for their visits. Also, a significant number felt their programs were too short.

Few Portuguese participants experienced English language problems while in the U.S.. Most of those who did received training early in the program in 1976 or 1977. There was some indication, however, that the level of English language problems increased somewhat in 1980. The situation calls for close monitoring by the USAID.

Finally, few participants experienced difficulty with Americans or other participants. Last minute changes in programs caused problems for some participants, but there were few such cases and the problems were not too serious. The level of the per diem in large U.S. cities did cause serious problems for a relatively high percentage of participants. AID/W should review the situation.

Overall, findings at Level 8 were consistent with findings at Levels 9 and 10. Though some problems were encountered during program implementation, they were neither sufficiently generalized nor serious enough to contradict the favorable results at Levels 9 and 10.

CHAPTER VII

DETAILED FINDINGS (LEVEL 7) - PROGRAM DESIGN

Introduction

As previously noted, the three main characteristics of the USAID participant training program were short duration, individually tailored programs, and heavy reliance on U.S. Government entities and universities to provide training. The purpose of this chapter is to first provide more descriptive detail on the program designs employed by the USAID and second, and most important, to explore the effects of differences in program design on results at Levels 9 and 10.

Detailed Description of Program Designs

As shown in the table below, the USAID's training programs have largely been tailored to meet the needs of individual participants.

TABLE VII(i)

THE USAID/LISBON PROGRAM - TYPES OF TRAINING PROGRAMS (1976-1980)

TYPE OF PROGRAM	YEAR PROGRAM INITIATED					TOTAL	
	CY 76	CY 77	CY 78	CY 79	CY 80	No.	%
Academic - Ph.D.	0	0	1	0	0	1	-
- M.A.*	0	4	0	0	0	4	2
- Non-Degree	0	3	2	0	0	5	2
Regular (Canned) Course	7	29	10	13	6	65	26
On-The-Job Training	0	0	9	0	4	13	5
Specially Developed	8	9	7	20	11	55	22
Observe and Consult	10	22	32	14	11	89	36
Other/Combinations	12	3	1	0	0	16	7
TOTAL	37	70	62	47	32	248	100%

* In 3 cases the USAID financed less than 1 year of the program and the GOP financed the remainder.

Over 70% of the programs provided were specifically designed and developed to meet the training needs of individual participants, or, in a few cases, for small groups of two or three participants. Within the group of specifically designed programs, 89 were clas-

sified as observation/consultation programs, 55 as specially developed (fewer contacts, with each contact having a significantly longer duration than the observation/consultation visit) and 13 as on-the-job training (usually only one or two contacts, with each contact of relatively long duration).

Few academic programs were provided; only 10 during the period under study: 1 Ph.D., 2 complete M.A. programs, 2 partial M.A. programs and 5 non-degree programs.

Regular (canned) courses, such as those offered by the USDA and BLS, accounted for 26% of all programs. Though the USAID still uses this type of program, they were more important during the early phases of the USAID program in Portugal.

As the table below clearly demonstrates, the USAID program has been very heavily weighted towards short-term training.

TABLE VII.(1)

THE USAID/LISBON PROGRAM - DURATION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS (1976-1980)

DURATION	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT	DURATION IN WEEKS	
				MEAN	STD. DEV.
1 Month Or Less	106	43	43	3.0	1.0
1 To 3 Months	104	42	85	7.9	2.2
3 To 6 Months	20	8	93	19.1	4.0
6 To 9 Months	4	2	95	31.5	5.4
9 Months To 1 Year	11	4	99	48.7	4.1
More Than 1 Year	3	1	100	71.0	28.6
TOTAL/OVERALL	248	100	-	9.7	12.7

During the period studied, overall average program length was only 9.7 weeks. Over 40% of all programs lasted one month or less and a 85% were completed in 3 months or less. Medium term programs of from 3 months to one year accounted only for 14% of all programs, while only three programs were programmed for more than one year.

In general, and as the following table demonstrates, observation/consultation programs were shorter in duration than specially developed programs. However, the duration of individual programs within each program type category varied greatly. Significant numbers of observation/consultation programs had durations in excess of the average duration of specially developed programs.

TABLE VII.(3)

THE USAID/LISBON PROGRAM - MEAN DURATION OF MAJOR TYPES OF PROGRAMS
BY YEAR PROGRAM INITIATED (1976-1980)

YEAR PROGRAM INITIATED	TYPE OF PROGRAM*								
	OBSERVE AND CONSULT			REGULAR (CANNED) COURSE			SPECIALLY DEVELOPED		
	No.	MEAN (wks)	STD. DEV.	No.	MEAN (wks)	STD. DEV.	No.	MEAN (wks)	STD. DEV.
CY 80	11	2.8	.7	6	9.8	3.4	11	4.5	1.5
CY 79	14	3.2	1.5	13	7.4	4.2	20	4.0	4.6
CY 78	32	5.7	3.0	10	5.9	4.0	7	7.1	6.6
CY 77	22	7.0	6.5	29	8.4	6.3	9	9.4	7.1
CY 76	10	6.4	5.5	7	7.1	4.0	8	10.0	7.9
TOTAL/ OVERALL	89	5.3	4.4	65	7.8	5.1	55	6.2	5.9

* The three types of programs listed account for over 84% of all USAID programs.

The trend in program duration over time is clear; short duration USAID programs have become even shorter. In 1976 the average duration of an observation/consultation program was 6.4 weeks, in 1980 such program averaged only 2.8 weeks. The same occurred with specially developed programs, average duration dropped from 10 weeks in 1976 to 4.5 weeks in 1980.

In terms of program source, the USAID has relied heavily on the U.S. Government and U.S. universities to provide training.

TABLE VII(4)

THE USAID/LISBON PROGRAM - TYPES OF ENTITIES WHICH PROVIDED TRAINING PROGRAMS (1976-1980)

(DISTRIBUTION of programs by types of entities which actually provided training, regardless of organization which held training contract)

TYPE OF ENTITY	PROGRAMS PROVIDED	
	NUMBER	PERCENT
Government	69	28
University	71	29
Govt. and Univ.	49	20
Private Firm	18	7
Private, Govt. and Univ.	17	7
Private, and Govt. or Univ.	24	9
TOTAL	248	100%

Government entities, almost all federal, and universities provided or participated in about 93% of all training programs. The split between purely government and purely university programs was almost equal, just less than 30% each. Private sector entities (profit and non-profit) participated in 23% of all programs, but only provided 18 programs without government or university collaboration. The mix of sources has changed somewhat over time with more programs being provided by universities and private firms. Government, however, continues to play an important role.

With the exception of academic programs and to some degree regular (canned) courses, no one source was closely identified with any one type of program. Universities provided all the academic programs; while government provided about 50% of the canned courses. Observation/consultation, specially developed and on-the-job training programs were provided by all sources.

In sum, the three main characteristics of the training programs designed by the USAID are:

1. short and historically decreasing duration (85% lasted less than 3 months; 43% less than 1 month);
2. heavy reliance on public sector entities to provide training (U.S. Government entities and/or universities participated in over 90% of all programs, while private firms participated in only 23%); and
3. individually tailored (about 70% of the USAID's programs were specifically developed to meet the needs of individual participants - observation/consultation, on-the-job training, etc.; 4% were academic; while 26% were regular "canned" courses such as those offered by the USDA or BLS).

The above data are interesting only in that they describe the types of programs provided by the USAID: by themselves they tell very little. The important questions can only be answered by relating program design characteristics (Level 7) with measures of program results at Levels 9 and 10. Have certain program designs tended to be more or less successful than others?

Program Design and Results

As demonstrated in detail in Chapter V, overall results at Level 9 (degree to which program objectives were met) and at Level 10 (degree of on-the-job use of information/knowledge gained) were quite satisfactory. Based on joint Level 9/10 findings, 75% of the USAID's programs were judged truly successful, while 18% exhibited elements of both success and failure and only 6% were judged pure failures. Independent Level 9 and Level 10 findings were even more favorable. At Level 10, 82% claimed that they had been able to use on-the-job in Portugal at least a significant part of the information/knowledge gained, while at Level 9, 88% claimed that their training needs (project objectives) were met to at least a medium/moderate degree.

As a first attempt at determining the relationship between program design (Level 7) and program results, joint level 9/10 findings were cross tabulated with each of the three design characteristics of type, duration and source, first individually and then jointly. The findings were not conclusive: there were too few observations in some cells, only 11 cases of pure failure, to make a firm judgement. Thus, the hypothesis that all program designs were about equally successful could not be rejected.

As a second attempt at determining the relationships between program design and program results, independent Level 10 and Level 9 results were broken down independently by each of the design characteristics of type, duration and source.

When Level 10 findings (degree of on-the-job use) were broken down independently by program type, duration and source, none of the

relationships revealed was statistically significant. In other words, as with the joint Level 9/10 attempt discussed above, it could not be claimed (at Level 10) that shorter programs were better or worse than longer programs, public training (government or university) was better or worse than private training, or that specially developed programs were better or worse than "canned" or academic programs.

It may be argued that this result was obtained because Level 10 is too far removed from Level 7 and that the more appropriate measures of the influence of program design on program results are found at Level 9 (degree training needs (program objectives were met)).

The basic data for the relationship between program type and Level 9 results are presented in the table below.

TABLE VII.(5)

DEGREE TRAINING NEEDS (PROGRAM OBJECTIVES) METBY TYPE OF PROGRAM

(MEAN of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5;

where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very high degree)

<u>TYPE OF PROGRAM</u>	<u>MEAN</u>	<u>STD. DEV.</u>	<u>No.</u>
Academic - Ph.D.	4.0	.0	1
- M.A.	5.0	.0	3
- Non degree	4.7	.6	3
Regular (canned) Course	3.7	1.0	50
On-The-Job Training	4.2	.9	13
Specially Developed	3.9	1.1	46
Observe and Consult	4.1	1.0	70
Other/Combinations	3.5	1.3	11
TOTAL/OVERALL	3.9	1.0	197

At first reading it appeared that academic programs were most successful and that regular canned courses were least successful. However, the first reading could not be confirmed statistically; the differences in mean responses presented in the table, though visually significant, were not statistically significant.

On the other hand, the relationship between program duration and Level 9 results was statistically significant. As demonstrated in the table below, however, the direction of the relationship was not clear.

TABLE VII.(6)

DEGREE TRAINING NEEDS (PROGRAM OBJECTIVES) MET
BY DURATION OF PROGRAM

(MEAN of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5;
where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very high degree)

DURATION	MEAN	STD. DEV.	No.
Up to 1 Month	4.1	1.1	87
1 to 3 Months	3.8	1.0	80
3 to 6 Months	3.4	1.2	17
6 to 9 Months	4.3	.6	3
9 Months to 1 Year	4.8	.5	8
More Than 1 Year	4.5	.7	2
TOTAL/OVERALL	3.9	1.0	197

Both very short programs (1 month or less) and long programs (6 months or more) appeared more successful than medium term programs (1 to 6 months).

The relationship between the third design characteristic, program source, and Level 9 results was also statistically significant.

TABLE VII.(7)

DEGREE TRAINING NEEDS (PROGRAM OBJECTIVES) WERE MET
BY TYPE OF ENTITIES WHICH PROVIDED PROGRAM

(MEAN of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5;
where 1 = not at all, and 5 = very high degree)

ENTITIES	MEAN	STD. DEV.	No.
Government	3.6	1.1	56
University	4.0	1.1	54
Govt. and Univ.	4.1	.9	42
Private	4.3	.9	15
Other/Combinations	3.9	-	30
TOTAL/OVERALL	3.9	1.0	197

In this case it appeared that programs provided by the government were less successful in terms of meeting training needs (program objectives) than programs from other sources.

In sum, based on the independent breakdowns of Level 9 findings by program type, duration and then source, it appeared that perhaps only regular (canned) programs, medium term (1 to 6 month) programs, and Government programs were less successful than others. However, the independent relationships in all cases were not statistically significant.

As a further check, Level 9 results were broken down jointly by program type, duration and source. The analysis revealed that only one program design was really less successful in meeting training needs (program objectives) - medium duration, regular (canned) courses provided by the U.S. Government. In the case of the USAID, almost all of these courses were provided by the BLS and USDA.

This result was not surprising. Most of the USAID's participant programs were specifically designed to meet the training needs of individual participants: the "canned" courses were not. Though the general topic may be of interest, certain parts of a "canned" program may not be relevant, or, for the relatively well educated Portuguese participants, the level of presentation, at times geared to the Third World, may be too low. A significant number of USAID participants registered this complaint.

Summary and Conclusions

In sum, only one program design (medium duration "canned" programs provided by the Government) was less successful at Level 9 than other designs. All other designs were about equally successful.

A long-term academic program may in an absolute sense provide more information and knowledge (at higher cost) than a short-term observation/consultation program. However, both may be equally successful in providing what they were designed to provide. The data at a minimum indicate that the USAID's short-term observation/consultation programs were at least as successful in meeting program objectives at Level 9 and in providing information/knowledge which was used on-the-job at Level 10 as other types of program designs.

The basic conclusion is that, in general, the designs (type, duration and source) employed by the USAID were appropriate to their respective program objectives. Level 7 findings in no way contradict, nor are they inconsistent with, findings at higher levels. Further, Level 7 findings are firmly supported by findings at lower levels; particularly Level 5 (establishing program objectives and content).

VIII-1

CHAPTER VIII

DETAILED FINDINGS (LEVEL 6) - PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

Introduction

As noted in the previous chapter, about 70% of the USAID's participant training programs were specifically designed to meet the needs of individual participants, or in a few cases, a small team of 2 or 3 participants. The remaining 30% were either regular (canned) courses or academic programs.

Given the highly individualized, short-term and technical nature of the USAID's training programs, the participant's active participation in establishing the objectives of his program (explaining his training needs) and his participation in establishing program content (suggesting institutions and individuals to be contacted) is extremely important. Other things equal, one would expect that the higher the degree of participation in establishing objectives and content (Level 6) the greater the probability that an appropriate program would be designed (Level 7) and that the program would be successful. In other words, that the participant's training needs would be met (Level 9) and that he would actually use on-the-job what he learned (Level 10).

Basic Findings

Participants whose programs were specifically designed to meet their individual training needs were requested to estimate their degree of participation in establishing both the objectives and the content of their programs. Basic findings are presented in the two tables which follow.

TABLE VIII. (1)

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN SETTING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES (explaining training needs)

DEGREE	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
5. Very Great	54	38	38
4. -	28	19	57
3. Medium/Moderate	30	20	77
2. -	16	11	88
1. No Participation	19	13	100
TOTAL	147	100%	-

N = 147

MEAN = 3.6

STD. DEV. = 1.4

With respect to objectives, the overall degree of participation was quite satisfactory. Over 77% of those who responded claimed to have had at least medium/moderate participation; while 57% claimed more than medium/moderate participation and 38% very great participation. On the negative side, 13% claimed no participation in establishing objectives.

In general, the degree of participation in establishing content was less than the degree of participation in establishing objectives.

TABLE VIII.(2)

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN ESTABLISHING PROGRAM CONTENT (suggesting institutions and individuals to be contacted)

DEGREE	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
5. Very Great	27	18	18
4. -	22	15	33
3. Medium/Moderate	33	22	55
2. -	33	22	77
1. No Participation	32	22	100
TOTAL	147	100	-

N = 147

MEAN = 2.9

STD. DEV. = 1.4

55% claimed at least medium/moderate participation in establishing content; 33% claimed more than medium/moderate participation and only 18% very great participation. About 22% responded that they did not participate at all.

The difference in degrees of participation, however, was expected. In general, participants know more about what they need to learn (establishing objectives), than they know about what the U.S. has to offer in terms of training in a specific area (establishing content). Given that few Portuguese participants had previous U.S. training experience, the overall degree of participation in establishing content was quite high. Apparently the Portuguese know more about the U.S. and U.S. institutions than might have been anticipated.

In theory, the first step in developing a participant training program is to establish program objectives (a USAID function), then, based on those objectives, the second step is to establish program

content (a ST/IT function). In practice, both take place more or less simultaneously and the PIO/Ps forwarded to ST/IT by the USAID contain not only program objectives, but also specific suggestions for institutions to be visited and individuals to be contacted. In extreme cases, the program objective may be to expose the participant to specific U.S. institutions, so that the participant may determine whether the institutions' structures and operations are relevant to the participant's institution in Portugal and thus whether further contact (participant training and/or consultant services) is appropriate.

Given the nature of the USAID programs, the line between establishing objectives and establishing content is not always clearly defined. Thus, the independent data presented in the two previous tables must be interpreted with care. Participation in setting objectives is the most important, but to some degree, and under some conditions, participation in establishing content may be a substitute. In general, however, one would expect that they would be complements; participants more capable of participation in setting objectives would also be more capable of participation in establishing content. Such a statistically significant positive relationship does in fact exist, however, as demonstrated in the following table, the relationship is not particularly strong.

TABLE VIII. (3)

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN SETTING PROGRAM OBJECTIVE AND DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN ESTABLISHING PROGRAM CONTENT

(DISTRIBUTION of responses or response scale ranging from 1 to 5; where 1 = none and 5 = very great)

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN:								
SETTING OBJECTIVES	ESTABLISHING CONTENT							
	NONE VERY GREAT					TOTAL		
	1	2	3	4	5	No.	%	
5. Very Great	6	5	10	9	24	54	37	
4. -	1	5	12	9	1	28	19	
3. Medium/Moderate	6	12	10	1	1	30	20	
2. -	4	9	0	1	1	15	10	
1. None	15	1	1	2	0	19	13	
TOTAL	No.	32	32	33	22	27	146	-
	%	22	22	23	15	18	-	100%

Overall, the USAID appears to have done a good job of involving its participants in the planning and development of their programs. Almost 90% participated in establishing objectives and/or content (75% in objectives and content, 12% in objectives only and 3% in content only). However, about 10% (15 participants) claimed no participation in establishing either objectives or content. In most of these cases (usually observation/consultation programs for relatively high level GOP officials) the USAID was "calling the shots" and exposing the participant to what the USAID thought he should see and the participant merely concurred. As will be demonstrated in the following section; results in such cases were also quite good.

As noted previously, almost all the PIO/Ps for the specifically designed courses were drafted by the USAID and forwarded to ST/IT for development of the Training Implementation Plan (TIP) and then actually implemented through ST/IT. The USAID staff, and not a Contractor, sat down with the participant to discuss his institution's problems, his position and role within his institution, and his training needs as related to his institution's problems and his role. Obviously, the above did not take place at one meeting with one USAID staff member; it was in general a long process, involving a number of meetings before the participant was formally nominated by the GOP and approved by the USAID. At a minimum the process of establishing program objectives and content involved the USAID Project Manager and Training Assistant, with approval by the Program Officer and AID Representative. Overall, it was a time consuming and labor intensive effort. As already demonstrated a high degree of participation was achieved, but was it worth the effort? Does the participants active participation in establishing objectives and content lead to better programs?

Participation and Program Success

Encouraging participation in establishing program objectives and content may require extra time and effort, but it is definitely worthwhile. Analysis clearly revealed strong, positive and statistically significant relationships between participation at Level 6 and results at Levels 9 and 10. In general, the higher the degrees of participation in establishing program objectives and program content (Level 6), the higher the degree to which program objectives (training needs) were met (Level 9) and the higher the degree to which what was learned was used on-the-job in Portugal (Level 10).

Though all four relationships (objectives/needs met, objectives/on-the-job use, content/needs met and content/on-the-job use) were positive and statistically significant, the strongest relationship, as demonstrated in the table on the next page, was between degree of participation in establishing objectives and degree to which training needs were met.

TABLE VIII.(4)

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DEGREE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES MET AND PARTICI-
PATION IN ESTABLISHING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

(DISTRIBUTION of responses or response scales ranging from 1 to 5)

DEGREE OF PARTICIPATION IN SETTING PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	DEGREE PROGRAM OBJECTIVES MET							
	Not At All Very High					OVERALL		
	1	2	3	4	5	No.	MEAN	STD. DEV.
5. Very High	1	1	4	16	31	53	4.4	.9
4. -	0	0	9	11	8	28	4.0	.8
3. Moderate	0	7	6	5	11	29	3.7	1.2
2. -	0	5	4	3	4	16	3.4	1.2
1. None	1	4	1	7	6	19	3.7	1.3
TOTAL	2	17	24	42	60	145	4.0	1.1

Though the general relationship demonstrated in the table is statistically significant and quite strong, it is the exceptions to the general rule which draw attention. First, in the previously discussed cases in which the USAID was "calling the shots" and the USAID established objectives and content, the results were quite good. Of the 19 participants who had no participation in setting objectives (nor in most cases in establishing content), 13 (almost 70%) claimed their program objectives were met to a high or very high degree. On the other hand, one participant who claimed high participation, also felt that his needs were not met at all.

In sum, though participation in setting objectives and content at Level 6 is extremely important and in general strongly related to program success at Levels 9 and 10, it is neither a necessary nor sufficient condition for success. The general rule holds, but there are exceptions.

Summary

The great majority (90%) of USAID participants whose programs were specifically designed for them were given the opportunity (actively encouraged) to participate in the establishment of the objectives and/or content of their programs. Given the strong relationship

between such participation (Level 6) and program success (Levels 9 and 10), the USAID should expand and intensify its efforts to involve participants to an even higher degree. Nonetheless, in some cases such involvement may not be appropriate; if properly designed, the resulting programs can also be quite successful.

Overall, the findings at this level (Level 6) were consistent with, and supportive of, findings at higher levels: at Level 7 (design appropriate to objectives), at Level 8 (institutions and individuals contacted relevant to objectives), and at Levels 9 and 10 (objectives met and what was learned used on-the-job in Portugal).

CHAPTER IX

DETAILED FINDINGS (LEVEL 5) - PREDEPARTURE PREPARATION

USAID predeparture contacts with the participant are extremely important for a number of reasons:

- (1) to confirm that a qualified and appropriate individual was selected (Level 4);
- (2) to establish program objectives and content (Level 6);
- (3) to obtain initial views as to program design and later to review the TIP provided by ST/IT (Level 7);
- (4) to ensure that the participant is adequately prepared for the implementation of his program in terms of expectations, language capability, logistics, etc. (Level 8).

In addition to checking the participant's qualifications (a topic covered in detail in the next chapter) and establishing program objectives and content, USAID predeparture contacts with participants are important also to make sure that the participant is adequately prepared for his program in the U.S..

The USAID provides the participant with a set of different services which includes technical, orientation and logistic elements. Information is provided on such varied topics as financial arrangements, the Washington International Center (WIC) and climatic conditions. In addition the USAID provides direct assistance with travel arrangements, obtaining visas and travel advances. Finally, it is the USAID's responsibility to ascertain that the participant's level of English language capability is sufficient to meet the requirements of his program.

If these things are well done, not only should the program better meet the participants training needs, but also the participant should arrive in the U.S. with realistic expectations and a more positive initial attitude toward the United States.

USAID Predeparture Assistance

To judge how well the USAID has performed, participants were requested to respond to 15 questions on USAID predeparture assistance. For each area (question) participants ranked the quality of USAID assistance on a five point scale ranging from 1 to 5; where 1 corresponded to poor and 5 to very good. Results by calendar year are presented in the table presented on the following page.

Overall, the results were very favorable. The USAID has, since the initiation of its participant training program, provided good

TABLE IX. (1)

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF PREDEPARTURE SERVICES PROVIDED
BY USAID BY YEAR PROGRAM INITIATED

(MEAN of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5; where
 1 = poor, and 5 = very good)

ITEM	MEAN SCORES					OVERALL	
	CY 76	CY 77	CY 78	CY 79	CY 80	MEAN	STD. DEV.
<u>INFORMATION</u>							
<u>Provided/ Exchanged On:</u>							
- Objectives	3.2	3.9	3.8	4.2	4.1	3.9	1.1
- Content	2.8	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.9	3.6	1.2
- Schedule	3.8	4.2	3.9	4.0	4.3	4.0	1.1
- Institutions	3.1	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.8	3.6	1.3
- Persons (Contacts)	2.8	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.6	1.3
- Finances	3.5	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8	1.2
- Med. Exams	3.0	3.2	4.2	4.0	4.3	3.8	1.1
- Insurance	3.9	3.4	4.1	4.0	4.4	3.9	1.2
- WIC (Orientation)	4.1	4.1	4.2	3.8	3.9	4.0	1.1
- Climate	3.6	3.5	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.7	1.2
<u>ASSISTANCE</u>							
<u>Provided With:</u>							
- English Exams	4.2	4.2	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	.9
- English Classes	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.3	.8
- Travel Arr.	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.5	.7
- Visa	4.4	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.7	.6
- Travel Advance	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.2	4.5	.9

to very good predeparture assistance. As would be expected, the quality of assistance in 1976, the year the program was established, was lower, though still adequate, than in following years. Even given an early high level, the quality of predeparture assistance has improved over time. Areas in which the USAID has direct control (Assistance Provided) were consistently rated higher than areas in which the USAID has only partial control (Information Exchanged or Provided).

Based on these results, the analysis was not pushed further. As no major problems were identified, the findings at this level (Level 5) were judged consistent with and supportive of findings at higher levels of the evaluation. The USAID's Portuguese training assistant is to be complimented.

English Language Testing And Training

During the first year after the initiation of the AID program in Portugal the USAID had no participant training officer or assistant. English language testing and training was conducted on an ad hoc basis. In mid-1976, the USAID reached an agreement with the American Language Institute (ALI) in Lisbon. Since then ALI has provided the USAID with ALIGU testing services and, as required, English language classes for participants. The USAID initiates all testing and training requests and monitors participant's progress during training. No participant may depart for the U.S. without USAID approval. This power is exercised in its most extreme form through the J-1 visa process. The U.S. Consulate will not process the visa unless the top USAID officer has signed the appropriate forms.

The table presented below was developed from data contained in the USAID Training Office files. The purpose is to allow some judgement as to how well the USAID has exercised control over participant departure in terms of demonstrated predeparture language capability. Scores presented are for the ALIGU test which covers three areas - Listening, Oral (Speaking) and Usage (grammar). An average score of 65 is regarded as adequate for non-academic work.

TABLE IX. (2)

PREDEPARTURE ENGLISH CAPABILITY OF PARTICIPANTS

ITEM	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
No Test (Fluent)	43	17.3	17.3
ALIGU TEST*:			
- 80 or higher	48	19.4	36.7
- 75-79	20	8.1	44.8
- 70-74	21	8.5	53.3
- 65-69	16	6.5	59.8
- 60-64	6	2.4	62.2
- 59 or lower	16	6.5	68.7
No Test (Other)	43	17.3	86.0
Missing Data	35	14.1	100.0%
TOTAL	248	100.0%	-

* Unweighted average of Listening, Oral and Usage Tests.

Based on personal interviews and previous training experience, 17% of participants were judged fluent in English by the USAID and were

not formally tested by ALI. An additional 43% (some previously tested and then trained by ALI) were tested by ALI and met minimum standards for program initiation. Twenty-two participants were allowed to travel to the U.S. without meeting minimum average requirements; however, in almost all of these cases, the low average score was caused by Usage (grammar) problems, and not Oral and Listening deficiencies.

A significant number of participants (43) were allowed to travel to the U.S. without either demonstrating full fluency or passing the ALI administered ALIGU test. Most of these cases were early in the program and the reasons were diverse: a small number were provided interpreters, some were high GOP officials the USAID did not wish to offend by requiring an English test, then perhaps English language training; some travelled in a group in which at least one GOP counterpart served as interpreter; some were tested and provided language training in the U.S..

USAID files did not contain readily available and firm information on an additional 35 participants. It may be assumed that their cases were not too different from those discussed immediately above.

Perhaps due to missing data on a significant number of early participants, the USAID record in determining predeparture English capability appears mixed. The important fact is, however, that, as was demonstrated in an earlier chapter, USAID participants did not encounter serious language problems while in the U.S.. Though the available data may not fully support this conclusion, it would appear that the USAID has dealt with the English language problem in an appropriate yet flexible manner and, at a minimum, has ensured that participant's language capabilities have at least met the language levels required for successful program implementation. The USAID's record keeping in this area has improved over time.

Of the 248 participants studied in this evaluation, 109, or 44%, were provided English language training by ALI. For 28 of these individuals, USAID files did not contain firm data on the number of hours of training provided. For those for which firm data did exist, the breakdown was as follows:

15 hours	12%
30 hours	58%
60 hours	15%
90 hours	7%
120 hours	7%

Since the initiation of the AID program, it has been general USAID policy not to finance more than 60 hours of training. Some exceptions were made, but the majority of those provided training by ALI actually received 30 hours or less. It should be noted that in a significant number of cases, when initial test scores were extremely low, the USAID suggested to the GOP that the nomination for participant training be withdrawn, or that the GOP itself finance long-term

English training and then reinitiate the nomination process. For the most part the GOP responded favorably and financed training. In some cases the nomination was withdrawn.

As the table below demonstrates, most of those trained by ALI felt that the overall quality of training was quite good.

TABLE IX. (5)

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION OF THE QUALITY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING PROVIDED BY ALI

(DISTRIBUTION of scores on response scale ranging from 1 to 5; where 1 = very high, and 5 = poor).

QUALITY	NUMBER	PERCENT	CUMULATIVE PERCENT
5. Very High	24	27	27
4. -	44	48	75
3. Adequate	22	23	98
2. -	2	2	100%
1. Poor	0	0	-
TOTAL	92	100%	-

N = 92

MEAN = 4.0

STD. DEV. = 0.8

Only two of the participants who had ALI training and responded to the questionnaire felt training was not adequate. Over 75% thought ALI training to be more than adequate, and 27% judged it to be of very high quality.

It should be noted that those who "failed" the ALI program were not sent to the U.S. and thus were not included in this study. Though their numbers are estimated to be quite small, their views, one may assume, would be different.

The available data were further broken down by year, but no statistically significant yearly variations were discovered. The quality of training provided by ALI has consistently been more than adequate.

One problem now being faced by the USAID is English language training outside the Lisbon area. Given GOP decentralization policies and the USAID current program emphasis on the rural sector, an increasing number of participants are now coming from smaller cities outside

Lisbon. Where concentrations have warranted, ALI has provided regular classes using visiting teachers. In areas of less concentration the problem has yet to be resolved in a satisfactory manner. Participants are now required to drive long distances several times per week or to actually move to Lisbon for a period of time. Both of these solutions are quite costly and inconvenient. Unfortunately, a satisfactory alternative has not been developed.

Summary

The USAID appears to have done a particularly good job in its predeparture contacts with participants. Timely logistic support was provided and participants were highly satisfied with the USAID's technical and non technical orientation services.

The record with respect to English language preparation was mixed. In some cases USAID files did not contain sufficient information to make a firm judgement.

As no major problems were identified, the basic findings at Level 5 are judged to be consistent with, and supportive of, higher level findings.

X-1

CHAPTER X

DETAILED FINDINGS (LEVEL 4) - PARTICIPANTS SELECTED

Introduction

A key element in any participant training program is the individual selected for training. The best designed and implemented training program has little chance for success at Level 9 (that training objective will be met) or at Level 10 (that information/knowledge gained will be used on-the-job) unless:

- (1) the participant has the ability to first absorb and then to evaluate the applicability of his U.S. experience to local conditions; and
- (2) the participant is located in a position within his institution which allows him to utilize what he has learned.

Participants' Professional Positions

The participants selected by the USAID were clearly in positions which allowed them to utilize what they learned to solve problems and promote change within their institutions.

TABLE X. (1)

LEVEL IN EMPLOYING ORGANIZATION	No.	%
1. Top Policy	9	4
2. Oth. Policy	12	5
3. Top Administrative	14	6
4. Oth. Administrative	65	26
5. Top Technical	88	36
6. Oth. Technical	58	23
7. Other	2	1
TOTAL	248	100%

As the above table demonstrates, 4% were located in top policy positions (eg. Minister, Rector, Agency President). An additional 5% were located in second level policy positions (eg. Secretary of State, Special Advisor to the Minister, Vice-Rector, Vice-President). Most of these 21 policy level participants were sent to the U.S. on short-term observation/consultation programs. It should be

noted that the USIS International Visitors Programs sometimes have objectives which may be similar to those of these USAID programs and make it less necessary or appropriate for the USAID to send very high level participants.

Just below the policy makers in the Portuguese bureaucracy are the top level administrators (eg. General Directors, Division Heads, Chief of Services). Most are career public servants, who normally retain their positions from government to government. They are primarily concerned with the daily operations of their institutions (implementing policy), but can also make a strong input to policy formulation. Fourteen participants (6%) were drawn from this top administrative category.

In Portugal, the functional line between second level administrators and top level technical is somewhat blurred. Second level administrators are usually technicians themselves and head technical departments (eg. Chief of Planning Unit, Director for Agricultural Extension, Chairman of Crop Research Department). Sixty-five of the USAID's participants (26%) were second level administrators.

Within the technical departments are those individuals charged with the daily implementation of policy and operational level problem solving. In the formalized Portuguese system, these are the top technicians (técnico de 1º grau) followed by the general technicians (técnico de 2º grau). The distinction between top and general technicians is in Portugal based primarily on length of service. Almost 60% of the USAID's participants were classified as technical personnel.

In sum, at the time of their selection some 15% of the USAID participants were in positions which allowed them to establish policy (categories 1, 2 and 3), while an additional 26% (category 4) were in positions which allowed them to both influence policy and direct implementation. The remaining participants, almost 60%, held technical positions with primary responsibility for implementation. The balance between policy and implementation appears appropriate: policy makers were made part of the process, while the technical levels were emphasized.

Participants' Educational Characteristics

Prior education and training are also important to the success of a training program. The participant's educational level and prior training experiences provide relatively good indicators of both the participants ability to absorb what is provided during his program in the U.S., as well as his ability to evaluate the applicability of what he learns to his institution's situation in Portugal.

The participants selected by the USAID were generally very well educated. In 1979, only about 3% of the Portuguese population held university degrees. At the other end of the scale approximately 23% of the population (mostly older women in rural areas) were

illiterate. As the table below demonstrates, over 90% of the USAID's participants were University graduates or had completed a three year University course (the Bacharel).

TABLE X.(2)

EDUCATIONAL LEVELS	No.	%
- MA or Ph.D	6	3
- Doutoramento	10	4
- Licenciatura	192	77
- Bacharel	17	7
- High School	4	2
- High School Inc.	6	3
- Unknown	13	5
TOTAL	248	100%

Sixteen participants (7%) held graduate degrees, 5 from foreign Universities. It should be noted that though the Portuguese Doutoramento has existed for years, M.A. programs have only recently been established; one, an M.B.A. at the New University of Lisbon, with USAID assistance. An additional 102 participants (77%) held the Licenciatura, which may be considered slightly more advanced than a B.A. or B.S. in the United States, as it requires 5 years of University study. Only 12% of USAID participants held less than the Licenciatura. Firm data were not available for 13 individuals, but it is reasonable to assume most at least held the Licenciatura.

The academic areas in which the participants' degrees were obtained also appear appropriate to the solution of development problems.

TABLE X.(3)

AREA OF HIGHEST DEGREE	No.	%
- Agriculture	41	17
- Engineering	50	20
- Econ./Bus.	83	34
- Law	10	4
- Soc. Sci.	5	2
- Medicine	21	9
- Arts & Letters	8	3
- Other	20	8
- Unknown	10	4
TOTAL	248	100%

The greatest number of participants (83 or 34%) were trained in economics or business. The Portuguese University level economics program places much heavier emphasis on business (accounting) than an economics program in the U.S.. The second greatest number (50 or 20%) were trained as engineers. Both the economics and engineering degree are well respected in Portugal and, as the curriculum in each is rather broad, provide opportunities for employment in a wide variety of areas. Forty-one participants (17%) held degrees in agriculture. Given the USAID interest in the agricultural sector, this was appropriate. Beyond the three areas mentioned above, there were no other great concentrations; degrees ranged from law and medicine to the social sciences and arts and letters.

A particularly good indicator of ability to evaluate the applicability to Portugal of what is learned in the United States, is prior foreign training. Other things equal, one would assume that the greater the exposure to different ways of approaching a problem, the greater the probability of correctly evaluating and selecting an appropriate solution. As the table below demonstrates, Portugal has historically been very much oriented toward Europe.

TABLE X.(4)

PRIOR FOREIGN TRAINING	No.	%
- None	60	24
- Europe	80	32
- Europe/Other	22	19
- Europe/U.S.	15	6
- U.S.	6	2
- U.S./Other	2	1
- Other	8	3
- Unknown	55	22
TOTAL	248	100%

Only 24% of the USAID's participants did not have some prior foreign training experience. However, even in these cases, almost all had at least travelled outside Portugal. The Portuguese European orientation is clearly demonstrated by the fact that almost 60% of the participants had some prior training in Europe. On the other hand, for almost 90% their first exposure to the United States was through their USAID financed training programs. Perhaps because of prior European experiences, during predeparture contacts with the USAID, many participants demonstrated some initial bias, or at least scepticism as to the relevance of training to be provided in the United States. In such cases, the nature and substance of USAID predeparture contacts with the participant were extremely important.

Participants' General Characteristics

A very important factor in any training program is the age of the participant. If too young, they may lack the professional experience necessary to critically evaluate the applicability of what they are exposed to in the U.S.. If too old, they may lack the drive, innovative spirit, or career time left to act and fully follow-up on the new knowledge and information acquired. There are, of course, always exceptions.

As the table below demonstrates, the age distribution of Portuguese participants was heavily weighted toward the younger age groups.

TABLE X.(5)

AGE	No.	%	Cum. %
- 24 or Less	5	2	2
- 25 to 29	59	24	26
- 30 to 34	55	22	48
- 35 to 39	34	14	62
- 40 to 44	40	16	78
- 45 to 49	25	10	88
- 50 to 54	16	6	94
- 55 or More	12	5	99
- Unknown	2	1	100%
TOTAL	248	100%	-

Only 5 participants (2%) were twenty-four years old or less, while almost 90% were less than 50. The highest concentrations (46%) were in the 25 to 34 year age brackets. Most of those 50 years or older (12%) were in policy or administrative positions. Given their high level positions within the Portuguese bureaucracy, most of these still had time to make an impact on their institutions.

Of some importance is the sex and marital status of participants. In Portugal the career oriented woman is still the exception. The situation is changing, particularly in the larger cities, but only slowly. There is little overt sex discrimination and women may be found at all levels in the Government from Prime Minister to Secretary. Most, however, are found at the sub-technical levels.

As the table below demonstrates, given the actual distribution of women within the Portuguese Government at technical levels and above, the USAID program does not appear to have been discriminatory as almost 20% of all participants were women. It is interesting to note that most of the female participants were single, while most of the males were married. The overall percentage of married participants was 80%.

TABLE X.(6)

SEX	No.	%
Male	202	81
Female	46	19
TOTAL	248	100

Prior to this study, the USAID had expected to find that a high percentage of its participants were retornados who were born in Mozambique and Angola and who were forced to return to Portugal when those countries gained their independence. This expectation was perhaps based on the high percentage of retornados working with the USAID and Embassy. This did not turn out to be the case. As the following table demonstrates, participants born in Mozambique or Angola accounted for only 10%, approximately their same percentage

TABLE X.(7)

PLACE OF BIRTH	No.	%
- Lisbon	76	31
- Porto/Coimbra	11	4
- Oth. Mainland	95	38
- Azores or Madeira	26	11
- Mozambique or Angola	24	10
- Other	4	2
- Unknown	12	5
TOTAL	248	100%

in the general population. This finding would also tend to indicate that the GOP has not discriminated against those who returned from the former colonies.

A final point is the GOP, and thus USAID, bias toward selecting participants from Lisbon where almost all central Government offices are located. While only 31% of the USAID's participants were born in Lisbon, almost 70% received their highest academic degrees from Lisbon Universities. This is not because there are not other universities in Portugal; there are, Coimbra and Oporto to mention the two best known. It would be interesting to know, but beyond the scope of this study, if the situation had tended to change given the GOP's recent emphasis on decentralization and regionalization.

Summary

Overall, it appears that participants selected by the USAID were both capable of absorbing what they were exposed to in the U.S. and of evaluating its applicability to Portugal. Most were relatively young, but with significant work experience. Only about 20% were more than 45 years old, with 46% between the ages of 25 and 34. Those over 45 were generally in policy and administrative positions, while those under 45 generally occupied technical positions. Levels of formal education were very high. Over 90% were university graduates, and of these about 7% held graduate degrees. Slightly over 70% held degrees in the development related areas of economics, engineering or agriculture. Up to 76% had previously received at least some training outside Portugal: 57% received at least part of their prior training in Europe, while about 9% had some prior training in the U.S..

In sum, findings at this level are consistent with, and supportive of, findings at Levels 9 and 10. Because of their educational levels, prior foreign experiences and professional positions, the participants selected by the USAID were capable of learning and evaluating the applicability of what they learned and then actually using what they learned on-the-job in Portugal. Further, such individuals would be expected to work well with the USAID and require only limited predeparture preparation (Level 5), contribute greatly to the establishment of their program objectives and design (Levels 6 and 7), and experience few difficulties during implementation (Level 8).

ATTACHMENT I

FILE DATA CODING INSTRUMENT

V. PROFESSIONAL POSITION:

Prior to Departure:

. Job Title: _____

. Job Description: _____

. Organization: _____

. Location: _____

Current Position:

. Job Title: _____

. Job Description: _____

. Organization: _____

. Location: _____

(a) Prior to Departure: (See codes below)

(1) Level within organization _____ 21 JB-PD-LV

(2) Gov't Private Scale 41 - JB-PD-SC

(b) Current Position: (See codes below)

(1) Level within organization _____ 23 JB-CR-LV

(2) Gov't Private Scale 44 - JB-CR-SC

Levels within organization:

- 1 - Minister, President, Rector, etc.
- 2 - Sec. of State, Vice Rector, etc.
- 3 - Advisor to Minister, President, Rector, etc.
- 4 - Director General, etc.
- 5 - Dept./Division Chief, etc.
- 6 - Technical (Superior)
- 7 - Technical (Other)
- 8 - Other

Gov't Private Scales:

- 1 - Ministry (Central office)
- 2 - Ministry (Regional office)
- 3 - Institute, Fund, Center, Laboratory, etc.
- 4 - Public Enterprise (100%)
- 5 - Public Enterprise (Nationalized)
- 6 - University
- 7 - Other Public
- 8 - Other/Private

(c) Comparison of Job Responsibilities:

- 1 - Present job responsibilities are less
- 2 - Present job responsibilities are about the same
- 3 - Present job responsibilities are more

(d)	25	-	JB-CPR
(e)	26	-	JB-
(f)	27	47	JB-

10. PERSONAL DATA:			
(a) Sex: 1 - Male, 2 - Female	28	48 -	PD-SEX
(b) Age: _____ 1-24 or less, 2-25/29, (Year Program) _____ 3-30/34, 4-35/39, 5-40/44, (Year Birth) _____ 6-45/49, 7-50/54, 8-55+	29	-	PD-AGE
(c) Marital Status: 1 - M, 2 - S, 3 - Oth	30	-	PD-MS
(d) Place of Birth: _____ 1-Lisbon, 2-Porto, 3-Coimbra, 4-Och/land, 5-As/Mad, 6-Moz, 7-Ang, 8-Oth	31	51 -	PD-PL-BR
(e) Education:			
(1) Level: _____ 1-SS, 2-UnivInc, 3-Bac, 4-Lic, 5-Doc, 6-MA, 7-PhD, 8-Oth	32	-	PD-ED-LV
(2) Area: _____ 1-Ag, 2-Eng, 3-Ec/Bus, 4-Law, 5-SocSci, 6-Med, 7-Arts/Let, 8-Oth	33	-	PD-ED-AR
(3) Location: _____ (Same code as (d) above)	34	-	PD-ED-LO
(4) Foreign Training: _____ 1-Mene, 2-US, 3-US/Eur, 4-US/Eur/Oth, 5-US/Oth, 6-Eur, 7-Eur/Oth, 8-Oth	35	55 -	PD-ED-FT
11. ENGLISH LANGUAGE:			
(a) Hours of Training (ALI): 1-0, 2-15, 3-30, 4-45, 5-60, 6-75, 7-90, 8-120+	36	-	ENG-TR
(b) Final Test Scores * (ALI): * If no test			
Usage _____ Waived: 1-TOEFL or proven ability,	37	-	ENG-TS-U
Oral _____ 2-Translator/Oth	38	-	ENG-TS-O
Listening _____ Taken: 3-less than 60, 4-60/64, 5-65/69,	39	-	ENG-TS-L
AVG. _____ 6-70/74, 7-75/79, 8-80+	40	60 -	ENG-TS-A

ATTACHMENT II

QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER

5



EMBASSY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Lisboa, Portugal

17 de Fevereiro de 1981

Exmo. Senhor
Dr. João Bento Raimundo
Rua General Humberto Delgada 395-3
3000 Coimbra

Exmo. Senhor:

Como é do conhecimento de V. Exa., um dos componentes mais importantes do Programa de Cooperação Luso-Americana, coordenado pelo Gabinete de Cooperação Económica (AID), consiste na organização e financiamento de visitas e programas de especialização nos Estados Unidos, destinados a técnicos portugueses ligados a projectos de desenvolvimento.

Após 4 anos de actividade (1976-1980), ao longo dos quais este Gabinete financiou a visita aos E.U.A. a mais de 300 técnicos portugueses, entendeu-se ser a altura oportuna de avaliar retroactivamente a consistência e eficiência deste tipo de cooperação, através de uma ponderação dos comentários dos participantes quanto às suas impressões gerais e específicas dos seus programas. Ninguém melhor do que os participantes poderá aferir, objectivamente, os resultados desta forma de cooperação. Por isso, o seu contributo é extremamente valioso. Só através da sua análise crítica, franca e objectiva, se poderá melhorar a qualidade de programas futuros.

Dentro deste espírito, elaborámos o questionário em anexo que visa proporcionar a ideia global que o participante formou à volta do seu programa, desde a fase de concepção, passando pela execução, até à fase de pós-programa. O principal objectivo do questionário é tentar identificar pontos mais fracos na concepção, organização e execução do programa, passíveis de serem melhorados através de medidas adequadas.

E dentro deste contexto que vimos solicitar a V. Exa. o preenchimento e envio deste questionário a este Gabinete, até princípios de Março do ano em curso.

Embora tenha 9 folhas, o questionário foi concebido de modo a poder ser preenchido num espaço mínimo de tempo, aproximadamente 20 minutos. Gostaria de recordar a V. Exa. que o preenchimento deste questionário poderá melhorar os programas de um elevado número de futuros participantes e, deste modo, contribuir para o desenvolvimento profissional dos mesmos e para o fortalecimento institucional dos organismos portugueses em que estão inseridos.

Na expectativa de receber notícias breves, subscrevo-me com os meus melhores cumprimentos.

Michael F. Lukowski
Coordenador de Cooperação Técnica do
Gabinete de Cooperação Económica

4. O Gabinete da AID em Portugal financia dois tipos distintos de programas nos E.U.A. para "participantes" (bolseiros) portugueses:

Programa Especial - Determina-se a natureza da informação ou especialização requerida para o indivíduo e seguidamente organiza-se um programa especial que satisfaça os requisitos. (A título de exemplo, considere-se um técnico de investigação agrícola ligado à produção de novas variedades de milho para o qual é organizada uma visita a determinadas universidades americanas que se dedicam à investigação nesse mesmo sector).

Programa Regular - Uma instituição americana tem um programa numa determinada área de especialização que se ajusta à natureza da informação ou especialização requerida para um certo indivíduo, que é proposto para participar nesse programa. (A título de exemplo, os cursos que o Departamento de Agricultura dos Estados Unidos - USDA anunciam com regularidade, subordinados ao tema da política de crédito para pequenos agricultores, podem ser frequentados por um funcionário do MAP, ligado ao sector).

- (a) Com base no anterior, indique qual a classificação do seu programa:

- 1 - Especial, na sua totalidade ou maioria
- 2 - Regular, na sua totalidade ou maioria ... (Passe para a alínea (d))
- 3 - Misto Especial-Regular

- (b) Indique qual o grau da sua participação na definição dos objectivos do seu programa (identificação e explicação da natureza de informação e especialização requerida para uso do Gabinete da AID no planeamento do seu programa):

<u>Nulo</u>	<u>Médio</u>			<u>Elevado</u>
1	2	3	4	5

- (c) Indique qual o grau da sua participação na escolha do conteúdo do seu programa (selecção de instituições, organizações americanas a visitar ou indivíduos a contactar no contexto do programa):

<u>Nulo</u>	<u>Médio</u>			<u>Elevado</u>
1	2	3	4	5

- (d) Indique até que ponto, na sua opinião, o seu programa se ajustou, na prática, à natureza da informação ou especialização requerida.

<u>Nulo</u>	<u>Médio</u>			<u>Elevado</u>
1	2	3	4	5

. . . Explique sucintamente _____

5. Antes de iniciar o seu programa, o Gabinete da AID em Portugal prestou-lhe assistência, sob diversas formas. Qual a sua opinião quanto ao grau de eficiência por parte desse Gabinete relativamente aos pontos seguintes:

	<u>Deficiente</u>	<u>Satisfatório</u>	<u>Muito Bom</u>		
(a) Informação Relativa A:					
(1) objectivos do programa	1	2	3	4	5
(2) conteúdo do programa	1	2	3	4	5
(3) calendário do programa	1	2	3	4	5
(4) instituições-organizações a visitar ou frequentar	1	2	3	4	5
(5) indivíduos a contactar	1	2	3	4	5
(6) subsídio de alojamento e alimentação e outros aspectos de ordem financeira	1	2	3	4	5
(7) exame médico obrigatório	1	2	3	4	5
(8) seguro médico e de acidentes pessoais	1	2	3	4	5
(9) serviço de recepção e informação do "Washington International Center - WIC"	1	2	3	4	5
(10) condições climatéricas e vestuário apropriado ao local do seu programa	1	2	3	4	5

(b) Assistência Relativa A:

(1) marcação de testes de Inglês	1	2	3	4	5
(2) marcação de aulas de Inglês	1	2	3	4	5
(3) coordenação da viagem internacional	1	2	3	4	5
(4) obtenção de visto consular	1	2	3	4	5
(5) obtenção do subsídio de viagem adiantado sobre o programa	1	2	3	4	5

(c) Pensa que existem outros pontos, além dos referidos nas linhas anteriores, relativamente aos quais o Gabinete da AID em Portugal deveria informar ou assistir antes do início dos programas?

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Indique esses pontos _____

(d) Do seu ponto de vista, existem outros factores que considera primordiais para modificar e melhorar o nível da assistência dada pelo Gabinete da AID aos participantes, antes do início dos seus programas?

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Dê sugestões _____

6. Ensino de Inglês - "American Language Institute (ALI)":(a) Como parte da preparação para o seu programa, foi-lhe facultado algum ensino de Inglês através do ALI em Portugal?

1 - Não . . . (Passe para a Pergunta Nº 7)

2 - Sim . . . Nº de horas de aula: _____

(b) Como qualifica o ensino de Inglês dado pelo ALI?

De Baixo Nível	Satisfatório			De Alto Nível
1	2	3	4	5

(c) Quer fazer alguma sugestão que possa contribuir para elevar o nível qualitativo do ensino da língua inglesa administrado em Portugal pelo ALI, ligado ao programa da AID?

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Exponha sucintamente _____

7. Serviços de Recepção e Informação nos Estados Unidos:(a) Após a sua chegada aos Estados Unidos, beneficiou do serviço de recepção e informação dado pelo "Washington International Center - WIC"?

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Nº de dias no WIC: _____

(b) Dum modo geral, qual o grau de utilidade do serviço de recepção e informação do WIC?

Utilidade Nula	Moderadamente Útil		Muito Útil	
1	2	3	4	5

(c) Qual a parte dos serviços do WIC pensa ser:

De maior utilidade? _____

De menor utilidade? _____

(d) Houve alguma outra organização, excluindo o WIC, que lhe tivesse providenciado serviços de recepção e informação?

1 - Não . . . (Passe para a Pergunta Nº 8)

2 - Sim . . . Explique sucintamente _____

(e) Qual a utilidade dos serviços referidos em (d)?

Utilidade Nula	Moderadamente Útil		Muito Útil	
1	2	3	4	5

8. Em termos de avaliação, como classifica os seguintes aspectos do seu programa?

- (a) Duração total do programa 1 - Demasiadamente curta
2 - Aproximadamente certa
3 - Demasiadamente longa
- (b) Número de instituições-organismos contactados 1 - Excessivo
2 - Mais ou menos correcto
3 - Insuficiente
- (c) Número de viagens internas nos E.U.A. ligado ao programa 1 - Excessivo
2 - Mais ou menos certo
3 - Insuficiente
- (d) Relevância das instituições-organismos contactados 1 - Todas relevantes
2 - Maioria relevante
3 - Um número significativo sem relevância
- (e) Nível profissional dos indivíduos contactados 1 - Todos competentes
2 - Maioria competente
3 - Um número significativo pouco competente
- (f) Os indivíduos com quem contactou estavam bem informados sobre o objectivo da sua visita ou estadia? 1 - Totalidade bem informada
2 - Maioria bem informada
3 - Um número significativo mal informado
- (g) Nível técnico do programa 1 - Excessivamente baixo
2 - Mais ou menos satisfatório
3 - Excessivamente elevado

9. Durante o período do seu programa nos E.U.A., teve problemas em alguns dos aspectos abaixo indicados? Responda indicando o grau de gravidade desses problemas.

	<u>Sem Problema</u>	<u>Alguns Problemas</u>			<u>Problemas Graves</u>
(a) Língua Inglesa:					
- compreensão	1	2	3	4	5
- conversação	1	2	3	4	5
- leitura	1	2	3	4	5
- escrita	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Montante do subsídio de alojamento e alimentação	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Pontualidade na recepção do subsídio referido em (b)	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Obtenção de alojamento compatível	1	2	3	4	5

9. (Cont.)

	<u>Sem Problema</u>	<u>Alguns Problemas</u>			<u>Problemas Graves</u>
(e) Alterações inesperadas no itinerário ou calendário do programa	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Falta de comparência a reuniões marcadas consigo, por parte de elementos-chave do programa	1	2	3	4	5
(g) Relações com:					
- Americanos, em geral	1	2	3	4	5
- outros participantes do seu programa	1	2	3	4	5
- monitoras ou indivíduos contactados no âmbito do seu programa	1	2	3	4	5
(h) Teve qualquer <u>outro problema</u> durante o seu programa, não especificado acima, que deva ser exposto a consideração do Gabinete da AID em Portugal?					

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Exponha sucintamente _____

10. Aumento de Capacidade Profissional

(a) No seu entender, qual a contribuição do seu programa em termos de aumento da sua capacidade profissional?

	<u>Nula</u>	<u>Média</u>		<u>Elevada</u>	
	1	2	3	4	5

. . . Exponha sucintamente _____

(b) Em termos de aumento da sua capacidade profissional, qual a importância que teve cada um dos seguintes factores do seu programa?

	<u>Sem Importância</u>	<u>De Alguma Importância</u>			<u>De Grande Importância</u>
(1) informação técnica específica adquirida	1	2	3	4	5
(2) informação geral não-técnica adquirida	1	2	3	4	5
(3) estabelecimento de relações profissionais	1	2	3	4	5

10. (Cont.)

(c) Em sua opinião, existem outros factores do seu programa, não mencionados na alínea anterior, que possam ter contribuído igualmente para o aumento da sua capacidade profissional?

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Exponha sucintamente _____

11. Aplicação ou Utilização da Informação ou Conhecimento Adquiridos

(a) Em termos quantitativos, indique qual o grau de informação ou conhecimento adquiridos como resultado do seu programa que, efectivamente, tem utilizado no exercício do seu cargo profissional actual?

<u>Nulo</u>	<u>Parcial</u>				<u>Quase Total</u>
1	2	3	4	5	

(b) Na sua opinião, qual o factor ou factores de maior relevância que impedem uma maior aplicação ou utilização da informação ou conhecimento adquiridos, no exercício do seu cargo profissional actual?

12. Troca de Informação ou Conhecimento com Colegas Portugueses:

(a) Após o seu regresso a Portugal, até que ponto partilhou com os seus colegas portugueses a informação ou conhecimento adquiridos através do seu programa?

<u>Nenhum</u>	<u>Algum</u>			<u>Quase Todo</u>
1	2	3	4	5

(b) Com base na alínea anterior, indique a importância que teve cada um dos seguintes meios na troca de informação ou conhecimento com os seus colegas portugueses?

	<u>Nenhuma</u>	<u>Alguma</u>			<u>Muita</u>
	1	2	3	4	5
(1) através de discussões informais ...	1	2	3	4	5
(2) através de palestras formais	1	2	3	4	5
(3) através de relatórios escritos	1	2	3	4	5
(4) através de formação informal prestada no exercício do seu cargo ..	1	2	3	4	5
(5) através de troca de material didáctico ou publicações adquiridas através do seu programa ...	1	2	3	4	5

13. Relações Profissionais Pós-Programa com os Estados Unidos:

(a) Estabeleceu com alguns dos americanos contactados nos E.U.A., durante o seu programa, um relacionamento que possa qualificar de significativo e durável, do ponto de vista profissional?

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Exponha sucintamente _____

(b) Após terminado o seu programa, foi inscrito numa sociedade profissional americana?

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Qual? _____

. . . Continua a ser sócio? 1 - Sim

2 - Não

(c) Após terminado o seu programa, facultaram-lhe a assinatura dum jornal profissional americano?

1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Qual? _____

. . . Continua a receber esse jornal? 1 - Sim

2 - Não

14. Sugestões Para Futuros Programas:

(a) A maioria dos candidatos a programas financiados pela AID são seleccionados pelos seus superiores hierárquicos, sendo depois formalmente aprovados pelo Secretário de Estado competente. Indique quem o seleccionou, porque foi seleccionado e como, na sua opinião, o processo de selecção poderia ser melhorado.

(b) Pensa que a cooperação técnica com os Estados Unidos, concretamente o tipo de programa em que participou, deve ser incrementada ou reduzida?

1 - Incrementada (Mais Programas)

2 - Reduzida (Menos Programas)

. . . Exponha sucintamente _____

111

15. O Gabinete da AID em Portugal procura manter contacto (follow-up) com todos os participantes portugueses após o seu regresso a Portugal. Este contacto reveste-se de várias formas: entrevistas informais, contactos telefónicos, comunicação por escrito, colaboração no desenvolvimento de outras actividades de cooperação técnica, etc..

(a) Após o seu regresso a Portugal, teve qualquer contacto com o Gabinete da AID?

- 1 - Não (Passe para a Pergunta Nº 15 (d))
- 2 - Sim

(b) Do ponto de vista profissional, pode qualificar o seu contacto com o Gabinete como significativo e durável?

- 1 - Não
- 2 - Sim

. . . Exponha sucintamente _____

(c) O seu último contacto com o Gabinete foi:

- 1 - há menos de 3 meses
- 2 - há 3 - 6 meses
- 3 - há 6 meses - 1 ano
- 4 - há 1 - 2 anos
- 5 - há mais de 2 anos.

(d) Costaria de ter mais contacto com o Gabinete da AID?

- 1 - Não

2 - Sim . . . Indique a forma de contacto e a sua finalidade _____

16. A próxima fase de avaliação dos programas de especialização, financiados pelo Gabinete da AID, será constituída por entrevistas com um número reduzido de participantes portugueses, conduzidas nos nossos escritórios. Estará disposto a participar nessas entrevistas?

- 1 - Não
- 2 - Sim

Por fim, agradecemos a sua valiosa colaboração. Sem dúvida, será um excelente contributo para o melhoramento dos programas dos futuros participantes portugueses.

Obrigado.

ATTACHMENT III

QUESTIONNAIRE CODING INSTRUMENT

0 ... Missing Data 9 ... N.A.

PAGE 1										
3.b.	Y 1-2	41			JOB-SM	9.a.1.	+1-5	80		LG-UDST
c.	1-3 (LSM)	42			JOB-RSP	2.	+1-5	81		LG-SPK
PAGE 2						3.	+1-5	82		LG-READ
4.a.	(SCM) 1-3	43			PR-CLASS	4.	+1-5	83		LG-WRIT
b.	1-5+	44			PR-GBJ	b.	+1-5	84		H-A-AMT
c.	1-5+	45			PR-CONT	c.	+1-5	85		H-A-TMLY
d.	1-5+	46			PR-NEEDS	d.	+1-5	86		H-ADQ
			66						28	
PAGE 3						PAGE 6				
5.a.1.	1-5+	47			AD-OBJ	9.e.	+1-5			PR-CHGS
2.	1-5+	48			AD-CONT	f.	+1-5	88		NO-PERSN
3.	1-5+	49			AD-SCHED	g.1.	+1-5	89		AMERICNS
4.	1-5+	50			AD-IN-OR	2.	+1-5	90		OTHERS
5.	1-5+	51			AD-PERS	3.	+1-5	91		TEACHERS
6.	1-5+	52			AD-FINAN	h.	N1-2	92		PR-IMPR
7.	1-5+	53			AD-MED				34	
8.	1-5+	54			AD-INSUR	10.a.	1-5+	93		PROF-CAP
9.	1-5+	55			AD-WIC	b.1.	1-5+	94		TCH-INFO
10.	1-5+	56			AD-CLIM	2.	1-5+	95		GEN-INFO
			76			3.	1-5+	96		CONTACTS
b.1.	1-5+	57			AD-LG-EX	PAGE 7				
2.	1-5+	58			AD-LG-TR	c.	1-2 ^Y	97		OT-PRCAP
3.	1-5+	59			AD-TRVL	11.a.	1-5+	98		INFO-APL
4.	1-5+	60			AD-VISA				40	
***		61			CONTROL	12.a.	1-5+	99		INFO-EX
		62		2	CARD.B	b.1.	1-5+	100		IEX-TLK
5.	1-5+	63			AD-ADV	2.	1-5+	101		IEX-LEC
c.	N1-2	64			AD-OTHR	3.	1-5+	102		IEX-WRIT
d.	N1-2	65			AD-MODIF	4.	1-5+	103		IEX-OJT
						5.	1-5+	104		IEX-MTRL
PAGE 4									46	
6.a.	1-2 ^Y	66			ALI	PAGE 8				
b.	1-5+	67			ALI-QLT	13.a.	1-2 ^Y	105		PROF-REL
c.	N1-2	68		10	ALI-IPRV	b.1.	1-2 ^Y	106		SOCIETY
7.a.	1-2 ^Y	69			WIC	2.	1-2 ^Y	107		SOC-STIL
b.	1-5+	70			WIC-USFL	c.1.	1-2 ^Y	108		JOURNAL
d.	N1-2	71			NOT-WIC	2.	1-2 ^Y	109		JOUR-STL
e.	1-5 ^Y	72			OTHER-OR	14.b.	+1-2	110		EXPAND
									52	
PAGE 5						PAGE 9				
8.a.	1-3 ⁺	73			PR-LNGTH	15.a.	1-2 ^Y	111		AD-CTS
b.	+1-3	74			PR-NOCTS	b.	1-2 ^Y	112		AD-CT-SG
c.	+1-3	75			PR-TRVL	c.	+1-5	113		AD-CT-WH
d.	+1-3	76			PR-RLCTS	d.	1-2 ^Y	114		AD-CT-EX
e.	+1-3	77			PR-PRIV	16.	1-2 ^Y	115		INTERVW
f.	+1-3	78			PR-PREP				57	
g.	1-3 ⁺	79			PR-TCHLV					
			21							

PART II

PARTICIPANT TRAINING EVALUATION

USAID/LISBON

MAY, 1981

11