HRADSKY

creative associates, inc.

PD-AAB-054

17

EVALUATION REPORT

OF THE

SAHEL MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (SMDP)

625-0936

September 19, 1985

3201 NEW MEXICO AVENUE, N.W. • SUITE 270 • WASHINGTON, D.C. 20016 • (202) 966-5804 • TELEX: 440523 CREA
1901 N. MOORE ST. • SUITE 920 • ARLINGTON, VA 22209 • (703) 528-8626

EVALUATION REPORT

OF THE

SAHEL MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (SMDP)

September 19, 1985

This report was prepared under the auspices of Creative Associates' Education and Human Resources Indefinite Quantity Contract (EHR/IQC) #PDC-1406-I-03-4055, funded by AID's Bureau for Africa, Sahel and West Africa.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	v
TERMS OF REFERENCE	vi
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS	vii
I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
A. Project Description	1
B. Development Problem	2
C. Purpose of the Evaluation	3
II. PROJECT PURPOSE AND ACHIEVEMENT	3
A. Country Training Strategy	3
Recommendations	5
B. Utilization of Training	5
Recommendations	7
III. PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROCESS	7
A. Selection	7
B. Participant Involvement in Program Design	7
C. Pre-departure Orientation	7
D. Support Services	8
E. Follow-up	9
Recommendations	10
IV. PROJECT MANAGEMENT	10
A. AID/W Regional Management	10
B. Mission Level Management	12
Recommendations	13
V. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	13
A. Rate of Implementation	14
B. Training Categories	15
C. Means of Obligation	16
D. Apportionment of Funds	17
E. Rate of Funding	19
F. Third Country Training	19
G. In-country Training	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
CONT'D

	PAGE
H. English Language Training	23
Recommendations	25
VI. SPECIAL CONCERNS	26
A. Private Sector	26
B. Participation by Women	27
C. Undergraduate Training	27
D. Ph.D. Training	28
E. Equivalency	29
F. Management Training	29
G. Participant Tracking System	30
Recommendations	30
ANNEX A. Country Profiles	31
Burkina Faso	32
Cape Verde	38
Chad	44
Gambia	49
Mali	54
Mauritania	61
Niger	67
Senegal	73
ANNEX B. Utilization Cases	78
ANNEX C. Orientation Materials	82
ANNEX D. Evaluation Instruments	84
1. Mission Interview Guide	85
2. Host Government Interview Guide	92
3. Participant Interview Guide	94
ANNEX E. Bibliography	99

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The cooperation of all USAID Sahel Missions facilitated the task of the Evaluation Team. The team greatly appreciated the efforts of the Training Officers for arranging interviews with government ministries, local institutions and returned participants. A special thanks is due the participants who gave freely of their time to report on their training experience and professional work.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ABS	Annual Budget Summary
AFR/SWA	Africa Bureau/Sahel and West Africa
AFGRAD	African Graduate Fellowship Program
AFR/PD/SWAP	Africa Bureau/Project Development/Sahel and West African Projects
AFR/TR	Africa Bureau/Technical Resources
AMDP	African Manpower Development Program
AMEMBASSY	American Embassy
CDSS	Country Development Strategy Statement
CTS	Country Training Strategy
CTP	Country Training Plan
DH	Direct Hire
DLT	Development Leadership Training
EHR	Education and Human Resources
ELT	English Language Training
ETA	Estimated Time of Arrival
FSN	Foreign Service National
HRD	Human Resources Development
HRDO	Human Resources Development Officer
HG	Host Government
IC	In-Country (Training)
LDH	Local Direct Hire
LOP	Life-of-Project
LSGA	Limited Scope Grant Agreement
LT	Long-term
M/SER/IRM	Management Bureau Services/Office of Information Resource Management
PIET	Partners for International Education and Training
PIO/P	Project Implementation Order/Participant
PSC	Personal Services Contract/Contractor
RA	Regional Affairs
SDPT	Sahel Development Planning Team
SMDP	Sahel Manpower Development Project
SPSS	Small Program Strategy Statement
S&T/IT	Science and Technology/International Training
ST	Short-term
TOEFL	Teaching English as a Foreign Language
TCT	Third-Country Training
TO	Training Officer
TR	Technical Resources
WIC	Washington International Center

TERMS OF REFERENCE

An evaluation of the Sahel Manpower Development Project (SMDP) Phase II was conducted in April, 1985 to determine the quality and relevance of training received, and, based on findings to make recommendations regarding the continuation of the project through an additional Phase III.

The team comprised A.I.D. direct hires and consultants assembled by Creative Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C. A.I.D. personnel included Jean Du Rette, AFR/TR/HRD, and Denny Robertson and James Washington of REDSO/WCA, Abidjan. The consultants were Laurel Elmer, Gerald McIntosh and Thomas Murray. Prior to their departure, the team members reviewed relevant literature on participant training, developed questionnaires, and were briefed by the Office of the Sahel and West African Affairs (AFR/SWA), and members of the Project Committee. The six members divided into two teams to conduct the evaluation of the eight Sahelian countries. Team A (Du Rette, Elmer and McIntosh) were responsible for Chad, Niger, Burkina Faso and Mali, although neither Chad nor Niger were visited by all members of the team. Team B covered Cape Verde, Mauritania, Senegal and The Gambia. Each team spent a total of 16 days in the four countries and were reunited in Abidjan for an additional 10 day period. In each country the teams interviewed, where possible, USAID Mission Directors, Training Officers, returned participants sponsored under SMDP I and II, and local training institutions, including those with the potential for English language instruction. The Evaluation Team sought to identify numbers of participants trained under Phases I and II by country, sex, field and length of training, training site (U.S., in-country, or third-country) as well as in-country training activities. The team also interviewed returned participants to determine their satisfaction with the training received and how their acquired skills were being utilized. In addition, the team attempted to estimate the administrative/managerial burden of more than doubling the project funding from $2.5 million to 5.9 million in FY 1985.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY & PRINCIPAL RECOMMENDATIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sahel Manpower Development Project II (SMDP II) was authorized in June 1983 at a level of $10 million for the purpose of removing or alleviating critical development constraints in institutions that affect the success of AID projects in the Sahel. This was in response to the Sahel Missions' unanimous acknowledgement in their Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSSs) of the critical need for skilled manpower. SMDP II was intended to offer opportunities for specialized academic and technical training in the United States, in third countries and through in-country and regional training seminars.

The Evaluation Team found that while training accomplished under the project is generally satisfactory and that most participants are in positions to apply their skills and knowledge gained from their training, there seems to be little recognition for the important role training should play in the development process. Planning is often haphazard with participant processing taking a low priority. SMDP II attempted to improve the planning aspects of participant training through the use of long-term Country Training Strategies and annual training plans. These have proved helpful, although improvements could make them more useful to the Missions and the host governments.

Third country and in-country training were strongly encouraged under SMDP II although a viable mechanism for facilitating this training has not yet been identified. Is spite of this, Missions have substantially increased their country training activities. These experiences have not been without problems, but they indicate the acceptance of alternatives to U.S. training by Missions and host governments.

Although it is too early to draw definitive conclusions, the project appears to be lagging in implementation in most countries. The degree of third-country and in-country training requires a significantly increased management capacity not yet evident in many Missions. Chief among the findings is that the implementation capacity of the Human Resources Development (HRD) Training Office is often inadequate; and that AID/W should reconsider increasing the funding and numbers of participants in a follow-on project unless additional managerial and administrative support is also provided. Although there is a large project pipeline, it is partly the result of prematurely adding $6 million in FY '~~84~~ 85 without advance notice to the Missions.

Missions are making significant inroads into areas of special concern including private sector training, increasing opportunities for women through training, and introducing more appropriate ways of teaching management skills at the local level. Again, the success of these efforts depends on the strength of the HRD Training Office.

This evaluation finally puts to rest the notion of developing regional English language training (ELT) centers. Missions have taken steps to provide in-country ELT or to use other alternatives. Training provided under this and future projects will likely depend less and less on U.S. long-term degree training if third country training increases. Therefore, in-country ELT may become a less important issue from the viewpoint of cost-effectiveness.

The body of the evaluation report is followed by individual country profiles, which contain information about project implementation in a standardized format for each country.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluation report concludes the following (in order of importance):

1. Continuation with Phase III

   The evaluation team recommends the continuation of the project without an increase in funds "unless there is a concurrent increase in managerial and administrative support."

2. Importance of AID Participant Training

   The evaluation found "little recognition for the important role training should play in the development process. Planning is often haphazard with participant processing taking a low priority." The Training Officers lack skills required to implement programs, and they do not always have the guidance and support from Mission top management.

3. Project Management Weaknesses

   Absence of a full-time project manager prevented AID/W from reviewing and approving Mission's multi-year training strategies and annual country training plans in a timely fashion. Constant personnel turnover in AFR/PD/SWAP plus added workload following the dissolution of the Sahel Development Planning Team (SDPT) resulted in a project management overload. Since March 1, 1985, AFR/SWA has assumed responsibility and assigned the project to the Budget Analyst on a part-time basis. In the field, there is insufficient administrative/managerial capacity for handling in-country and third-country training.

4. Inadequate Bilateral Agreements

   Among all eight Sahel countries, the evaluation team found a broad range of agreements for obligating SMDP funds from PIO/Ps to detailed project agreements. Project implementation should be guided by the Limited Scope Grant Agreement (LSGA) as prescribed in the project paper, but further definition of objectives should be provided in the LSGA to address training policy areas such as equivalency, promotions, relationship of training to development strategy, etc.

5. _____

According to data collected during the evaluation, the average rate of expenditure for SMDP II funds obligated in FYs '83-'85 was 31% at the end of April, which means implementation had been slow-moving up to that time and there are large pipelines. It is still relatively early in project implementation to draw conclusions about implementation problems based on pipeline analysis, and note must be made of the premature allotment of an additional $6 million in FY '84.85 Nevertheless, project management should be more aware of Missions' capacities to implement training programs when allotting funds. The possibility of suspending funding to missions with large unexpended pipelines should be considered.

6. English Language Training (ELT)

If third-country training increases in the Sahel, there will be even fewer U.S. long-term academic programs than at present. Only 30% of the planned training is intended for U.S. long-term at present. Therefore, ELT centers will not be an issue for SMDP funding. Missions should investigate alternatives to direct support of centers including private sector possibilities.

7. Pre-Departure Orientation and Follow-up

Participant interviews reflected inadequate pre-departure orientation. The evaluation recommends that AID/W (S&T/IT) assist Missions in developing orientation materials and continue development of a participant tracking system.

8. Utilization of Training

The majority of participants interviewed were satisfied with the quality and relevance of training to their professional responsibilities, but short-term programs, focussed on specific skills, seemed to result more frequently in the initiation of new systems and programs in Sahelian organizations. Chief among the constraints to immediate and appropriate utilization of training are Sahelian budget limitations which have severely limited job opportunities and salary increases.

EVALUATION
OF
SAHEL MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT II PROJECT
(625 - 0960)

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

A. Project Description

The Sahel Manpower Development II Project (SMDP II) was authorized June 22, 1983, for four years at $10 million. In FY 1984, the project was amended to add $2.650 million for funding Sahelian participants in the African Graduate Fellowship Program (AFGRAD), increasing the total to $12.650 million.

The second phase was designed to remove or alleviate critical development constraints in specific fields that would contribute to the success of AID projects in the Sahel. To accomplish this, Missions had to identify such constraints and indicate as a part of a continuous planning process how their resolution would enhance the success of national and/or regional development programs. Two categories of training were to be provided: 1) pre-project training to assure that personnel with scarce skills needed for the implementation of a planned activity would be available in time to undertake bilateral project implementation; and 2) post-project training to strengthen institutions that affect AID-funded projects.

SMDP II was to provide funding for training approximately 1,200 Sahelians over a period of four years. The training was to be apportioned among five categories:

CATEGORY	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS TO BE TRAINED
Long-term U.S. academic participants (Master's level)	48
Short-term U.S. technical or special training (non-degree) participants	72
In-country training (workshops and seminars)	720
Regional workshops and seminars	288
Long and short-term third-country training	72
TOTAL	1,200

Unlike the first phase, SMDP II was not to be regarded as a general scholarship program. More specifically, SMDP II was to differ from the first phase in the following ways:

- Integration of training with a Mission's CDSS;
- Alleviation of institutional constraints rather than merely training people;

- Promotion of more training in Africa and less in the United States;

- Minimal English language proficiency to be achieved prior to training in the United States;

- Greater emphasis on short-term rather than long-term training;

- A multi-year Country Training Strategy was required from each Mission so that SMDP could be reviewed in relation to the CDSS;

- Decentralization of the management process by: a) requiring full forward funding of each participant; b) providing life-of-project planning levels to each Mission; and c) requiring annual cabled updates of the previous year's activities and the fiscal year's planned activities linked to the country training strategy;

- Reduction of mortgages for participant training by complete funding at the beginning of the program;

- Provision of programmatic oversight by the Human Resources Development Officer (HRDO) of the Sahel Development Planning Team (SDPT) formerly located in Bamako;

- Preclusion of use of SMDP II funds for training which could be financed through projects; and,

- Requirement that all long-term U.S. participants include general and financial management training in their programs.

Two additional activities to be funded under SMDP II were: a) the establishment of a mechanism for the placement and maintenance of participants in third-country training institutions; and, b) a study examining the cost effectiveness of conducting English language training in Africa.

B. Development Problem

All of the Sahelian program strategy documents and the Regional Development Strategy Statement (RDSS) identify the general lack of trained human resources as a critical constraint to development. The RDSS specifies human resources development training as one of four priorities to be addressed by Missions through various bilateral and regional projects. Although SMDP II cannot fully address this constraint, it endeavors to increase the limited supply of human capital in the Sahel, thus contributing to overall development of the region.

C. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess how well implementation has progressed and to determine the feasibility of increasing the size of a follow-on project. Administrator McPherson has called for increased levels of participant training to provide the necessary indigenous human capital to plan and implement development programs. As a regional training project, SMDP II has a potentially important role to play by providing Missions with additional resources to address training needs. An examination of actual Mission experience and an identification of the project's strengths and weaknesses is needed to help guide AID/W project management in making necessary adjustments in Phase III. Central issues to be addressed in the design of a follow-on phase include project management, absorptive capacity (of Missions and host governments), diversification of training modes, and utilization of trained Sahelians.

II. PROJECT PURPOSE AND ACHIEVEMENT

As indicated above, the purpose of the SMDP II Project is to identify and remove, through training, development constraints in institutions that affect the success of AID projects in the Sahel. Given the early stage of implementation (22 months), the finding that Missions have thus far programmed only about one-third of project funds, and the fact that few trainees have returned from training, the Evaluation Team is unable to make definitive statements about the achievement of project purpose at this time. Instead, its report indicates progress to date and identifies barriers to implementation of these and expanded training activities.

Without exception, Sahel field posts and host government officials report that SMDP II is a useful resource for financing development training. Nevertheless, Mission rates of implementation vary considerably. More will be said on this in a later section. For the moment we turn to a discussion of the country training strategies and the utilization of training.

A. Country Training Strategies

To encourage more effective planning and administration of AID-funded project training, SMDP II required that each Mission prepare and submit to AID/W a multi-year Country Training Strategy (CTS) with annual updates in the form of Country Training Plans (CTPs). The preparation of CTSs was innovative and was designed to guide project implementation in the following ways:

- Provide a mechanism for identifying human resource constraints and for planning training in collaboration with host government officials;

- Provide Missions with multi-year funding levels; and,

- Reduce central financial management tasks and prevent cost overruns.

Thus, although the CTS was a requirement for SMDP II funding, it was intended to improve the effectiveness of AID's overall training activities in the Sahel.

The Evaluation Team found that all Missions had prepared strategies addressing institutional constraints that affected implementation of their respective bilateral portfolios. (See individual country profiles in Annex A for summaries of training strategies.) In two countries, these strategies are no longer appropriate: In Burkina Faso, where political changes during the past two years have resulted in modification of Mission's training priorities; and in Cape Verde, where mutual Government of Cape Verde (GOCV) and USAID dissatisfaction with the current CTS exists. These Missions are in the process of revising their training strategies.

There were some indications that Missions which exerted a serious effort to produce strong strategies have had fewer problems implementing the project. USAID/Mali translated their CTS into French and used it with Ministry of Plan (MOP) officials as a basis for establishing training priorities that support the Mission's portfolio. The MOP is also the implementing agency for a bilateral development training activity, and the coordinated implementation of these two activities has reinforced MOP support for improved human resources planning. Chad has effectively used the CTS to establish an inter-ministerial mechanism with the host government to emphasize the importance of training and assist in the selection of participants. The HRDO in Mauritania views the CTS as a tool for making the Mission and host government aware of the potential impact of participant training programs. The CTS also helps the Mission to work more effectively with the counterpart ministry on candidate selection as well as on commitments of levels of training. In The Gambia, where the HG has not yet developed an overall HRD plan, the TO prepares the CTS with the various ministries thus acquainting them with the purpose and objectives of SMDP.

Missions reported some difficulties in developing the strategies, including the lack of a manpower planning unit in host governments to articulate, plan and coordinate long-term training needs; the lack of a mechanism for placing participants in third-country training institutions; and insufficient information on short-term training opportunities.

While most Missions agree that formulating a CTS is a good idea, there is less agreement regarding its function or utility. Some Missions have accorded high priority to CTS preparation and implementation, while others have treated it as an academic exercise to qualify for project funding. It was found that preparation of the CTS was often regarded as an internal exercise, not requiring host country participation or approval. Contractors were hired in some cases to prepare the document. Although the strategy was intended to support the contents of the CDSS and the ABS, its objective was to provide a forum in which all training needs could be considered on a comprehensive, long-range basis, not only for SMDP but also for all project-funded training. By establishing a dialogue and agreeing on a long-range plan with the host government, specific training issues such as training needs' identification, candidate selection and training utilization could be more adequately addressed.

Understandably, Training Officers may be so overburdened with the mechanics of running participant training programs that they do not have time to prepare a lengthy document. In addition, they may not have the analytic planning skills to undertake the required analysis. Ideally, the strategy preparation should be coordinated from the Program Office with input from all project managers. This practice would allow the strategy to reflect more accurately the Mission's CDSS and participant training policies and provide the Training Officer with parameters within which to implement the program.

Missions understood more clearly the annual CTPs, which provided a list of proposed training activities and estimated costs. Based on the conformity of the CTPs to the strategy or the Mission's justification for more third- or in-country training, the AID/W Project Committee approved annual budgets and allotted funds.

Although the Project Paper called for annual recapitulations of the previous year's activities, no reporting was required or undertaken to monitor implementation of the approved CTPs. The semi-annual Project Implementation Reports sent to AID/W provide only partial accounts of implementation activities. Thus, before the current evaluation activity, it was not possible to verify which training actually was approved and implemented.

The Evaluation Team also found that little assessment of training activities has taken place or is being planned by the Missions to ensure that the objectives of CTSs are being met. In some cases, sufficient time has not passed to make these kinds of judgements; in others, follow-up or assessment activities have not been viewed as very important.

In conclusion, the evaluation team recommends that the use of Country Training Strategies and Country Training Plans be continued with more refined guidelines for Missions and more involvement by host country governments.

B. Utilization of Training

To obtain information on the utilization of training, the Evaluation Team reviewed host country practices regarding the employment of returned participants and interviewed approximately 60 Sahelians who had completed training. In the absence of a sizeable number of returned SMDP II trainees, the team decided to include returned participants from SMDP I, AFGRAD and bilateral projects. Since random selection of trainees was not possible, efforts were made to select a representative group from each category of U.S., TC and IC trainees in each of the eight Sahelian countries. The team recognizes the limitations of this methodology for linking training utilization with SMDP II objectives. Nevertheless, the data collected should provide some insight into how training is generally utilized in the Sahel.

Most participants interviewed regarded their training positively in terms of quality and its appropriateness to their work environment and job responsibilities. A number of former U.S. and TC participants reported advancement in positions with more responsibility as a result of their training; others noted their adaptation or adoption of newly learned agricultural, health or management skills to their jobs. Several TC

participants indicated the advantages of training in Africa, where the physical environment is similar (e.g., in the case of agriculture) and the opportunity exists to establish links with Sahelian colleagues in their professional fields. As short-term training tends to focus on specific skills, short-term participants more often than long-term participants provided concrete examples of "innovative" behavior directly related to training. Furthermore, short-term participants were not absent from their positions for long periods and thus appear to have had an easier time initiating new systems or programs. Although the degree to which participants and in-country trainees are utilizing skills gained from training varies, most of the Sahelians interviewed claimed to have profitted professionally from their training experiences. (See Annex B for detailed case studies illustrating utilization of training.)

Despite the positive findings noted above, constraints to appropriate utilization of training exist. Niger and Burkina Faso require returned participants to complete at least one year of civic and/or military government service unrelated to training before being placed in salaried positions. The reintegration process in Mali may take from four to six months, leaving some participants without a source of income in most cases.

Inadequate recognition of foreign academic degrees is a continuing problem in Mali and Burkina Faso, resulting in underemployment and/or placement of returned participants in positions at lower pay or benefit levels than their training might justify. For example, two Master's degree recipients in Burkina Faso are unable to secure tenured positions at the University of Ouagadougou because their degrees are not recognized.

Economic and political considerations may further constrain proper utilization. Several Master's degree recipients complained of being underemployed due to lack of appropriate positions. The recent flux of government policy and economic changes in Burkina Faso has resulted in the removal of former participants from appropriate jobs. Budget constraints in several countries (e.g., Niger, Mali and Burkina Faso) severely limit government job opportunities and salary increases or other incentives that encourage fuller commitment to government jobs. For example, it was noted that five former AID participants are presently working in USAID-related jobs in Burkina Faso rather than in host country positions for which they were trained.

Chad's political situation has resulted in the departure of some former U.S. participants and the non-return of others, and the current SMDP II activity for Chad emphasizes short-term training and training in Africa to prevent such an outcome. Cape Verdean long-term participants report some initial dissatisfaction with their jobs upon returning; however, they are usually selected directly from high school and are entering the work force for the first time.

Other constraints noted through interviews with returned participants include the general lack of resources (both financial and material) to implement projects or carry out research, lateral job mobility into other technical institutions or agencies, and inefficient bureaucratic procedures, including communication bottlenecks.

While the successes noted earlier generally reflect positively on AID-sponsored training, the constraints discussed above suggest a continuing need to treat training as an integral part of a host country's overall development strategy. The capacities of Sahelians to apply their skills to development goals will clearly be inhibited without adequate resources to apply training and without the appropriate structures to absorb training.

The evaluation team recommends that missions continue the dialogue with host governments to improve upon the manner in which training is utilized upon the return of participants, including discussions of degree equivalency, appropriate placement and relation to the host country development strategy.

III. PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROCESS

A. Selection

The 1982 SMDP I evaluation recommended that AID take a more active role in the selection process, ensuring the nomination of qualified candidates. It was further recommended that missions submit new guidelines and criteria to host governments to include the CDSS parameters, the nomination of more women and candidates from the private sector, and the provision for Mission review and approval of nominated candidates.

Most of the Sahel countries have a host government mechanism for identifying training needs and selecting candidates. These mechanisms operate with varying degrees of efficiency, and for the most part, inter-ministerial training committees, under the auspices of the respective responsible Ministries (e.g., Higher Education, Plan and Cooperation, Establishment Office), coordinate the selection process and overseas training opportunities. Representatives of USAID/Mali and USAID/Chad participate in selection committees as full members, but other Missions have advisory roles and retain approval rights for AID-funded training. USAID/Gambia meets with individual ministries to verify the qualifications of their proposed candidates. Although the selection process is often haphazard, most countries make an effort to utilize systems based on merit.

B. Participant Involvement in Program Design

Most long-term participants reported having a degree of flexibility in the design and content of their programs; whereas short-term participants were generally presented with pre-designed courses or programs tailored to their special needs.

C. Pre-Departure Orientation

The SMDP I evaluation recommended that more systematic attention be given to pre-departure orientation by the Mission. This was to include information on the technical and administrative aspects of their program, as well as information on the cultural life and educational system of the country of training (i.e., U.S. or third-country). It was further suggested that USIS, Peace Corps, or an association of returned participants be used to assist in a more thorough pre-departure orientation. Each Mission has

different capabilities for orientation; Senegal and Cape Verde apparently do not have a formal orientation program, but Niger and Mali have built cultural orientation components into their English language training programs. The English Language Training center in Burkina Faso plans to incorporate a cultural orientation into its program, and already has an impressive package of materials in French and English and written guidelines for an orientation session. It is not clear, however, to what extent departing participants actually receive these materials or how they are oriented. The Gambia's Training Officer provides orientation for participants which includes the participation of other USAID personnel as well as returned participants, where possible. Although Mauritania and Chad both reported on current plans to collect material and improve their orientation programs, the strength of their efforts is not known.

Participant interviews reflected little orientation by Missions before departure, but many of these participants had departed several years ago. In recent years, some progress has been made in strengthening Mission orientation programs. Yet despite such progress, it is doubtful that short-term participants or third-country participants receive adequate orientation. Although this was less a problem for those short-term participants interviewed who reported generally good support services at their training site, third-country participants often mentioned having adjustment difficulties, primarily of an administrative nature.

Adequate provision of orientation is further constrained by frequent lack of lead-time before participants are notified of their departure. This was confirmed by many interviewed participants. In most cases, late departure often prevented participants from attending the orientation program at the Washington International Center (WIC). It is not known what additional orientation is received at different training sites. Those participants who reported no orientation either at the Mission or at WIC cited their most common problem as a lack of understanding of the American educational system, -- both its structure (semesters) and the methodological approach which differs greatly from the Francophone system.

The Evaluation Team noted a variety of orientation materials and resources on U.S. life and educational system at the different Missions. Those countries with English Language Centers appear to have the greatest potential for fulfilling the needs of U.S. long-term participants. Appendix C contains a list of orientation resources found at different Missions. This impressive collection, if assembled and standardized, could provide Missions with a useful tool to fill gaps due to lack of lead-time for U.S.-bound short- and long-term participants. The Directory of Francophone Training Institutions in Africa will provide guidelines for orientation to third-country participants as well as logistical and reporting requirements to USAID Training Officers. Supplemental materials should be developed where gaps exist and, with guidance, receiving Missions should be able to assemble such information.

D. Support Services

Missions use S&T/IT for programming U.S.-bound SMDP participants which is carried out by the major contractors, Partners for International Education and Training (PIET) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). These two

contractors are responsible for placing participants, monitoring their progress, responding to any major problems, and communicating with the Mission in this regard. Both agencies use the Washington International Center for orientation. While participants gave generally positive feedback on the assistance and information provided by these programming agencies, several Missions complained of not receiving regular progress reports and the estimated time of arrival for returning participants. Most participants interviewed also gave a positive evaluation of their WIC orientation, but sizeable numbers of those interviewed did not go through WIC or any other U.S. orientation. The reason given was the short notice for "call forwards" preventing participants from visiting Washington enroute to their respective training sites. Short-term participants generally expressed satisfaction with their programs--both the quality and logistical support. Several participants expressed a degree of dissatisfaction with one particular USDA program agent. Although AID policy does not provide financial support for spouses or dependents of long-term participants, this issue was mentioned numerous times as a hindrance to satisfaction with their training experience. Third-country training participants interviewed reported problems with lodging and cultural adjustments.

E. Follow-Up

Participant follow-up is generally weak in each of the eight countries. The most common complaint from Training Officers is the irregular receipt of ETA's for returning participants who sometimes fail to report to the Mission upon their return. Apparently, none of the Missions has a formal de-briefing system, although several mentioned distributing questionnaires to returned participants to determine problem areas and to assess the nature of their training experience (Mali, Niger and Chad). Mali and The Gambia seem to have the strongest follow-up system. The Gambian participants are obliged to write a report on their training experience after their return; Mali tries to follow-up on the job status of returnees with a second questionnaire one year after a participant's return. It is not known how systematic this is, nor whether full use is made of the data.

Several Missions have attempted to establish Alumni Associations of returned participants, and others have instituted computerized tracking systems in follow-up efforts. The Gambia has established an Alumni Association with elected officers, although the Training Officer's workload has prevented her from devoting enough time to it. Mali has had several reunions and tried to set up a structure for an association without success. Burkina Faso had its first reunion after several failed attempts due to political instability. Cape Verde had a reunion of returned participants, but was criticized in the local newspaper for politicizing participant training.

Niger, Mali and Burkina Faso have initiated their own tracking systems which will have to be integrated with S&T/IT's participant training management system (PTMS) when the software becomes available. The Gambia and Mauritania maintain fairly accurate training records on their computer systems.

All Missions expressed the desire to carry out more follow-up activities but acknowledged the constraints of scarce resources or time. Several suggestions made by Mission project managers to improve upon

participant follow-up include the following:

- o Establish an Alumni Association and directory of returned participants;
- o Oblige returning participants to report to the Mission;
- o Provide or renew professional society memberships and maintain subscriptions for professional publications;
- o Pay travel and per diem costs for guest speakers at Alumni Association meetings as a means for continuing professional development; and,
- o Provide guidelines for a follow-up questionnaire for adaptation and use by Missions.

The Evaluation Team recommends that Missions continue to support the training officer in improving the systems for participant processing. While progress has been reported with regard to orienting participants to training outside of their countries, Missions should continue to develop and strengthen their procedures. This could include the installation of computer tracking systems, the development and administration of follow-up questionnaires, the formation of Alumni Societies, and the renewal of professional society memberships and subscriptions to professional journals.

IV. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The evaluation of the SMDP I project management component recommended significant changes that AID/W and the Missions could make to improve management of participant training. Among those were: the use of the CTS and CTP, fully-funded PIO/P's to avoid mortgage build-up, and Mission-centered responsibility for programmatic and financial record-keeping. A complete list of the recommendations may be found in Annex D.

While all of the recommendations have contributed greatly to improved management, other changes have occurred that have impeded the project's effectiveness. Among these are: the lack of adequate annual reporting of previous years' training activities, the delay in establishing a TC training mechanism, changes in LOP funding levels provided to Missions, and the elimination of SDPT and its field-based program coordination function.

Key findings on project management are discussed below under two headings: 1) AID/W and regional management; and 2) Mission management.

A. AID/W and Regional Management

AFR/PD/SWAP, with assistance from the Project Committee, has had

overall responsibility for the project management. Until its dissolution in mid-1984, SDPT/Bamako played a coordinating role, providing advice to Missions on CTS preparation, participating in CTS reviews, and preparing PIO/Ts for the English language and third-country institutional studies.

The AID/W Project Committee, now headed by AFR/SWA, plays a central role in approving CTSs and annual CTPs and comprises representatives from AFR/TR/EHR, AFR/RA, S&T/IT and AFR/PD/SWAP. In a meeting with available committee members, the Evaluation Team discussed the committee's role, which is the review of long-term training strategies and annual country training plans. While committee members believe this function is valuable, they indicate that the absence of a full-time project manager prevented their being as responsive to Missions as they might have been if a permanent, full-time manager had been available.

The AFR/PD/SWAP manager role changed hands five or six times during project implementation. This constant turnover, plus the additional workload for the manager after the dissolution of SDPT, resulted in project-management overload and limited time for implementing or monitoring project activities. Some examples of slippage due to overload include the following: the delay in completing the Directory of Francophone Training Institutions in Africa, which was important for increasing third-country training, failure to institute a Mission reporting system as a means of monitoring training accomplished, the approval of Ph.D. training for the participants from Burkina Faso when such training was not included in the project guidelines, and, finally, the doubling or tripling of planned allotments to Missions in FY 1985 without clear evidence of implementation progress.

In discussing possible alternatives to the present management systems, most project committee members indicated a preference for placing management responsibility in a technical office or under a technically qualified project manager. Efforts were made recently to transfer responsibility to AFR/TR/EHR, but the Africa Bureau restrictions on TR's role precluded this change. AFR/SWA indicated that management responsibility should rest with them because of their responsibility for the special Sahel appropriation. Therefore, an AFR/SWA Project Manager was appointed in March 1985.

The SMDP II Project Paper designated the regional SDPT/Bamako to play a key coordinating regional role in implementing the project and coordinating regional seminars with Missions having programmatic management responsibility. The rationale for this system was to improve the management of the field-based programs. Placing more responsibility at the field-level has faciliated project implementation, but, without a field-based coordinating officer, program monitoring has not been carried out nor have regional seminars been implemented.

Missions for the most part do not object to AID/W overall management and view it positively since training plans have been approved, additional funds made available, and implementation has not been closely scrutinized. Some Missions, however, believe that a field-based coordinating office could better support Missions in the areas of TC training management, the identification of resources for conducting IC seminars or workshops, and the

provision of technical expertise to conduct training needs' surveys and/or to advise them on development of indigenous human resource planning capacity.

Although the Evaluation Team believes that project management should remain in AID/W for the duration of SMDP II, it recommends that alternative management systems, including a field-based component, be considered for a follow-on project. With the current Agency reorganization and cutting of AID/W positions, the placement of regional project management in Africa makes sense. One possibility is to place the responsibility in REDSO/WCA or in an individual Mission under a direct-hire HRDO, who could supervise a project-funded regional project coordinator to serve a monitoring and coordinating role for the entire region.

B. Mission Level Management

SMDP II was designed to place responsibility on individual Missions for planning and implementing project activities. In reviewing management practices of the various Missions, the Evaluation Team found a number of aspects which characterize the better managed project portfolios. These include: a close working relationship with host country counterparts, a high priority placed on training and human resources development by Mission leadership including the provision of the qualified Training Officers and Project Managers, and effectively-functioning Mission project committees to identify priority training needs and ensure coordination among various sectors. The Evaluation Team considered these management practices in examining each Mission's capacity to carry out current and possibly expanded training activities.

Missions vary in their capacities to implement human resources development projects. Mali is the most adequately staffed with a direct hire (DH) human resources development officer (HRDO) and two training assistants to manage SMDP II, a bilateral training project, and other Mission participant training activities. Niger, with an HRDO and a Training Officer, also appears to be adequately staffed for the current project load. To date, Chad and Burkina Faso have had DH project managers with Training Officer assistance to manage day-to-day project details. With plans to phase-out the DH slots, however, both Missions have hired additional training assistants to handle the Mission training load. In The Gambia and Senegal, the management of SMDP II and other Mission training activities rests with one Training Officer. Although the USAID/Gambia training portfolio is more limited, the amount of TC training undertaken by that Mission has increased an already heavy workload for the Training Officer. The workload for the Senegal Training Officer is especially heavy, given the size of the Mission portfolio and the added responsibility of attending to participant processing needs for other USAID TC participants studying in Dakar. Mauritania has a well-qualified PSC training specialist, who is presently recruiting an FSN to fill the Training Officer slot. Mauritania's emphasis on HRD activity and the initiation of a major bilateral HRD project require additional staff, especially indigenous staff who can serve to establish a more enduring training capacity at the Mission. Although Cape Verde's recent hiring of a U.S. spouse as its training assistant should facilitate implementation of SMDP II activities, over the long term the training functions could be strengthened by employing an indigenous Training Officer to provide a more permanent capacity to implement training programs.

Although some Missions are better staffed now than three years ago, increased TC and IC training and an expanded Phase III portfolio will tax the present capacity of most Missions. Responsibility for SMDP management typically rests with the Training Officer who is a host country national whose major responsibility is processing and documenting SMDP and other project participants. Training Officers often lack the authority and/or capability to negotiate with the Missions' technical officers and responsible host government officials on the quality and appropriateness of candidates and the proper procedures for selecting and processing participants. Additionally, the Training Officer's workload is often too great to permit him/her to manage the SMDP adequately and still support all other Mission training. Although Missions have established improved pre-departure orientation for U.S. long-term participants, more attention needs to be given to orientation for TC and U.S. short-term participants.

As stated earlier, follow-up activities need attention in all Missions. The capacity to provide assistance in human resources planning is undoubtedly the weakest area in most Missions, and Training Officers are generally not skilled in this area. Nor do Training Officers always enjoy steady guidance and support from higher echelons in the Mission. Taken together, these aspects suggest that the capacity of Training Officers needs to be strenghtened, especially if an expanded training portfolio is to be implemented. Providing training is one means of accomplishing this and a number of Missions are currently updating Training Officer skills -- for example, Mali, Niger, Chad, The Gambia and Burkina Faso sent their Training Officers to the May 1985 African Training Officers Workshop in Washington, D.C. Another possibility is to provide increased support for Missions in HRD planning and possibly management of TC training through project-funded technical assistance.

Missions also have differing mechanisms for the internal coordination of project activity, including the identification of training priorities and the implementation of training plans. Generally, Missions with the most effective implementation activity provide strong guidance and support to the Training Officers, have a Mission-wide project committee functioning on a formal or informal basis, and have centralized training functions in one office.

1. The Evaluation Team recommends the following:

    1. The assignment of a full-time project manager in AID/W or alternative project management from the field;

    2. Strengthening the position of and support to the Training Officer;

    3. The development and mobilization of supplementary implementation assistance.

V. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Project implementation will be discussed from the following perspectives: actual rate of implementation compared to the original schedule, relative mix

of training compared to the limitations originally envisioned during project design, means of obligating funds in reference to improved implementation (LSGA or individual PIO/Ps), and amount of funding for each country.

A. Rate of Implementation

The Missions involved in the implementation of SMDP II demonstrate a wide variance in ability to expend funds. Available data reveal an expenditure rate from a high of sixty-six percent (66%) for Niger to a low of seven (7%) for Burkina Faso. The average rate of expenditure for all countries included in the evaluation is thirty-one percent (31%). While this low rate suggests that countries have experienced difficulty in accurately planning, effectively implementing, and/or identifying candidates, the problems associated with project implementation are varied and complex.

In the case of Burkina Faso, all Mission projects have suffered significant set-backs, or cancellations because of the changing political environment. In addition, the fact that the host government has no training plan of its own could also be a significant factor in delaying implementation and the identification of qualified candidates.

Conversely, USAID/Niger, which enjoys an excellent relationship with the host government, has the highest rate of implementation. The only deterrent to expansion in Niger is the need for additional staff to handle an increased workload.

The Missions which fall in the mid-range of implementation/ expenditure (Cape Verde, The Gambia, Mauritania, Mali and Senegal) have cited the following reasons/issues for disparities between planned and actual rates of implementation:

- delay in signing LSGAs;
- delay in host government identification of candidates;
- late allotments of funds;
- change/turnover in project/Mission staff;
- lack of host government manpower development training plan;
- delay in publication of Directory of Francophone Institutions in Africa; and
- dissolution of the SDPT/Human Resources Development Office.

Generally, the Missions have well-developed training plans which, if not constrained by the above-mentioned factors, have had a reasonable chance of success. It is the perception of the Evaluation Team that most of the Missions can eventually come close to achieving their targets. It is

recommended however, that AID/W pay attention to the issues cited above in making funding decisions for phase III of this project.

B. Training Categories

The Project Paper for SMDP II provided training for:

- 48 long-term participants in the United States (Masters' level);

  72 short-term participants receiving technical or specialized training in the United States (non-degree);

  72 long-term participants in Third-Country training institutions;

  720 in-country "participants" through workshops and seminars; and

  288 participants in regional workshops and seminars.

TOTAL 1200

A total of 1,200 participants were to be trained over a period of four years. While the project allowed for some fluctuation in the mix of U.S., TC and IC training, subject to country development strategies, it set a 50 percent ceiling on the amount of project funds which could be used by any given country for training in the United States. This restriction was subsequently lifted in October 1984 due to the absence of a mechanism for placing and monitoring third-country participants, and in response to the AID Administrator's interest in significantly increasing participant training. Budget allowances were doubled or tripled in FY 1985.

The following are the modified training targets as a result of increased funding in FY 1985, compared to the actual achievements to-date.

The modified targets are:

- 83 long-term participants training in the United States;

- 146 short-term participants in technical or special training in the United States (non-degree);

- 104 long-term participants training in third-country institutions;

- 136 short-term participants in third-country institutions; and,

- 2257 in-country "participants".

TOTAL 2826

The actual achievements to-date are:

- 26 long-term participants training in the United States;
- 69 short-term participants training in the United States;
- 57 long-term participants training in third-country institutions;
- 43 short-term participants training in third-country institutions; and,
- 182 in-country "participants".

TOTAL 377

To date, Missions have accomplished thirteen percent (13%) of planned training. Although this is not impressive in terms of expenditures, several limiting factors account for the delayed implementation. Among these are the lack of a mechanism for placing and monitoring third-country participants. The Project Paper placed a limit on the amount of U.S. long-term training to be carried out under this project in order to encourage Missions to use third-country training. The ceiling was lifted in the third year after project authorization pending the availability of such a mechanism. A Directory of Francophone Training Institutions in Africa is about to be distributed. Included in the Directory is a handbook on procedures for third country placement including reporting and follow-up.

Even without a limitation on U.S. training, Missions appear to be taking the initiative in third-country training experimenting with different mechanisms for placement and monitoring. In fact, U.S. training accounts for only about 33% percent of training completed under the project. USAID/Gambia notes that as the GOTG regularly sends participants to Nigeria, they may be able to channel AID participants through the GOTG system. USAID/Niger has used a similar procedure with some success. All Missions have some experience with third-country training and are learning on a trial-and-error basis how best to process participants. It is largely because of the need to gain experience with third-country training that Missions are lagging in implementation of many project targets. Missions should be commended, however, for their resourcefulness in developing this more cost-effective, and often more appropriate form of training.

It is still early in the implementation of the project to draw conclusions regarding the rate of implementation achieved thus far. SMDP II was designed as a four-year project. Less than two years have elapsed since project authorization, and many Missions are only now gearing up for the challenges of implementing more in-country and third-country training.

C. Means of Obligation

The Project Paper recommended that Missions obligate their SMDP II allotments through Limited Scope Grant Agreements (LSGAs) with their

respective host country governments. The LSGA provides a simple mechanism for obligating funds quickly with a minimum of detail regarding the specific use of the funds. Yet it allows USAID and the host government to formally agree on the general uses of the funding. More detail provided in the grant agreement would ensure more guidance for project implementation. It is understood, however, that detail may not be possible at the time of grant agreement signing, especially in regard to taking advantage of unanticipated opportunities for short-term and in-country training.

Based upon visits to the Missions, there appears to be little standardization in wording of agreements for obligating funds under this project. Although most participating countries used the LSGA, there was a wide difference in the amount of detail provided (a sample LSGA was included for Missions in the Project Paper); some consist of little more than a paragraph and a dollar figure, while others include a level of detail approaching a standard project agreement.

USAID/Dakar obligates funds through PIO/Ps instead of by LSGA. Their system involves filling out the PIO/Ps when project funds become available. Normally, candidates are not yet identified for the use of the funds, so PIO/Ps are issued without names. It is not clear how the technical PIO/P components are filled out. When PIO/Ps have been completed to reserve available funds, the Mission signs and holds them in their training office. When a training opportunity and candidate are identified, the PIO/P is amended to reflect this information. At no time in the process does the host government concur in the use of the funds.

The Evaluation Team found Senegal's system to be unnecessarily burdensome for the Training Officer and of marginal utility for planning the variety of training envisaged with the host government. Under these circumstances, the project loses its bilateral quality. Furthermore, grant agreements provide a forum for government-to-government dialogue regarding the general use of funds, while PIO/Ps are intended to add specificity to the grant agreement.

D. Apportionment of Funds

Under SMDP II, apportionment of funds was based on:

a) availability of funds at the time of authorization; b) the size of the AID program in each country; c) Mission access to other project training funds such as AMDP, AFGRAD, bilateral projects; d) relationship of proposed training to the success of the individual Mission strategy; and e) the existence of a discrete bilateral training project (e.g., DLT in Mali; HRD in Mauritania).

Accordingly, the annual funding was to be apportioned through four levels, ranking the countries as below:

Level:	I	Cape Verde, Chad	-	$184,500
	II	Gambia, Mauritania	-	205,500
	III	Mali, Burkina Faso	-	274,500
	IV	Niger, Senegal	-	313,500

The total for each year was $2.5 million for eight countries: $1.956 million allotted to Missions. The $544,000 balance intended for Sahel regional activities such as the SMDP II project evaluation and the publication of the Directory of Francophone Training Institutions in Africa.

As shown in Table I below, all countries, except Burkina Faso, have received more than originally planned. Missions reacted favorably to the increased funding in FY 1985. They indicate that they can absorb even more funds. Niger, Mali and Senegal have earmarked FY'85 funds for forward funding of the FY'86 program.

Although host country capacity to utilize training should be a major consideration in apportioning funds, a Mission's ability to expend rather than simply obligate funds is also an equally important factor. In theory, the Missions with the more experienced Training Officers and HRD planning capacity as well as clearly-defined needs should receive the largest share of funds. However, some Missions are attempting to develop innovative forms of training under this project that require different skills than those usually possessed by participant Training Officers (such as contracting for technical assistance, institutional grants, etc.) which slow implementation. While important in evaluating overall implementation progress, the level of expenditure may be misleading if judged outside of the context of the diversity of training envisioned.

TABLE I - FINANCIAL SUMMARY ($000)

LEVEL	COUNTRY	ORIGINAL LOP ALLOTMENT (PER PP)	REVISED LOP 6/30/85	OBLIGATIONS AS OF 6/30/85
I	Cape Verde	738	759	759
	Chad	738	1,012	1,012
II	Gambia	822	884	884
	Mauritania	822	1,208	1,208
III	Mali	1,098	1,349	1,349
	Burkina Faso	1,098	1,155	991
IV	Niger	1,254	1,467	1,302
	Senegal	1,254	1,798	1,585
TOTALS		7,824	9,632	9,090

The issue of absorptive capacity is applicable to the Mission training staff as well as the host government planning capability. While it is probably impractical to apportion funds in this way (due to the changing staffing patterns and potential instability), the relative strength of the Mission's participant training office should be considered. This includes Mission staff as well as the operational quality of the relationship between the training staff and the counterpart ministry. Apportionment of funds should also take into consideration the existence of bilateral training projects. Senegal, Mauritania and Mali are developing or implementing HRD training projects. While Missions are expected to recognize larger training needs and address them on a bilateral level, apportionment of SMDP funds in countries with bilateral training projects should be limited to pre- and post-project training.

E. Rate of Funding

As shown in Table II, (page 20) SMDP II has exhausted its LOP funding of $12.650 million. The new Project Paper for Phase III will define funding criteria and amounts to be provided.

F. Third Country Training

Third-country training is proving to be a viable alternative to U.S. training especially for some Sahelian Missions. This is particularly significant considering that the mechanisms for TC training intended to be operational by late 1983 are still not in place. Nevertheless, administering TC training is time-consuming and will tax Missions' capacities as more of this type of training increases.

TABLE II SMDP II 625-0960 PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED TRAINING BY COUNTRY AND NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS

	PLANNED							IMPLEMENTED							
	TCT		US		IC	RG	Amount	TCT		US		IC	RG	Amount	
Mission	ST	LT	ST	LT			($000)	ST	LT	ST	LT			($000)	%
Level I															
Chad	52	11	12	-	260	-	1,040	33	18	14	-	13	-	614	59
Cape Verde	1	1	1	6	60	-	759	-	-	1	1	-	-	102	13
Level II															
Gambia	19	13	20	14	100	-	884	8	7	10	4	3	-	427	28
Mauritania	4	11	8	4	40	-	1,208	6	8	14	3	-	-	410	34
Level III															
Mali	29	11	15	11	119	-	1,349	2	-	10	4	81	-	334	25
Burkina Faso	4	3	22	14	138	-	1,155	1	-	4	-	-	-	72	6
Level IV															
Niger	20	47	24	10	1480	12	1,467	2	33	13	3	85	-	751	51
Senegal	2	7	63	28	200	25	1,798	1	-	32	17	723*	-	361	20
TOTAL	127	104	164	87	2,397	37	9,632	47	65	95	32	921	0	3,071	31(average

* Dakar 9658, 9/13/85 shows unusually high figure of 723 in-country trainees from FY'83-'85. Figure to be verified with Mission.

In Chad, where the need for trained manpower in all areas is acute, SMDP II has targeted a total of 59 long and short-term training programs in other Francophone countries. To date, 44 have received training with 19 studying in agricultural fields. USAID/Chad spent about one year developing its extensive TC program, identifying institutions, placing students, and monitoring activities. Administering the program continues to be time-consuming and the Mission has recently hired a training assistant financed with SMDP funds to help the Training Officer with the many administrative tasks.

USAID/Niger has supported a large increase in TC training under SMDP II by sponsoring the last two years of 30 undergraduates in third-country African institutions on a reimbursable basis to the Government of Niger (GON). AID pays maintenance costs while the GON pays for transport and tuition and handles administrative details, including selection, monitoring and follow-up.

In The Gambia, the Mission is financing Bachelor-level training under SMDP II in the Philippines. Other Anglophone institutions in England, Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania have also trained participants, but problems of funds, maintenance allowances, housing, and orientation are often encountered.

Cape Verde is not presently conducting TC training and has no plans for doing so in Francophone institutions. It expects to take advantage of cost-effective training in Portugal and Brazil.

While Mauritania's TC training achievements under SMDP II reflect some implementation lag, a great deal of progress in implementation has been achieved in FY '85.

Mali, Burkina Faso and Senegal have accomplished little third-country training because of difficulties in identifying appropriate programs and placing participants. Senegal's few placements in other African institutions reflect the Mission's concern about overburdening the receiving Missions.

Costs for TC training can best be summarized using the USAID/Chad experience since it has programmed a considerable number of participants for TC training under SMDP II. A summary of TC training costs based on the USAID/Chad data follows:

TYPE OF TRAINING	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS	COSTS	DURATION OF TRAINING
ST	19	$1,230/mo.	5.3 months (average)
LT	20	5,670/yr.	2 years

The above costs are considerably less than ST training at U.S. institutions (management training at the University of Pittsburgh averages about $6,660 per month including travel) and if appropriate third-country training is available, it could be more cost effective. However, it should be pointed out that TC programs in certain fields may not be available or, if available, there may be quotas for foreign students. In addition, the costs of employing

a contractor or additional training officers to administer an expanded TC training program can raise total costs.

The results of a recently conducted survey of Francophone Africa technical and academic institutions will soon be published as the Directory of Francophone Training Institutions in Africa and distributed to USAID and other donors. This directory should be updated periodically. While it is expected that the directory will be helpful to Training Officers in identifying institutions, programs, degrees and costs, it is also recognized that TC training will place an additional burden on the USAID Mission in the receiving country in terms of logistical and other support. In participant interviews, problems in third-country monitoring surfaced: non-standardized allowances for USAID-financed participants in the same institution, vacation periods when no travel or other arrangements were provided, and medical problems. More attention needs to be given to strengthening the capacity of receiving countries to handle the monitoring tasks if this type of training is to be successfully implemented. USAID/Dakar may be one such Mission requiring additional assistance in this area, since Senegal has a number of potential TC training institutions which can be used for training other Sahelians as well as Senegalese.

Furthermore, there is much more to be learned about the TC training, not just the quality of training or its professional relevance, but how it influences a spirit of Pan-Africanism or might contribute to the strengthening of institutions. Selected African institutions may merit consideration for small grants as an incentive to improving their programs and increasing enrollment of foreign students.

Understanding the government-to-government relationships that exist between sending and receiving countries could facilitate the implementation of increased TC training. For example, one country may already have established agreements with others concerning scholarships in particular fields, or may be a member of a regional body which accepts nominations, conducts examinations, and finances training. More effective placement systems may need to be developed in some cases. USAID/Chad, which has programmed extensive amounts of TC training, has found that placing participants in Cameroonian Government institutions, where tuition is free, takes far longer than placing them in the Ivory Coast where institutions often charge tuition and operate more autonomously. The Governments of Mali, Niger and Burkina Faso are already sending numerous students to neighboring countries under their own or other donor-supported programs. USAID Missions may be able to utilize such existing channels to facilitate implementation. In fact, USAID/Niger has already done so by financing Nigeriens when foreign exchange shortages threatened the stoppage of scholarships by the Nigerien Government.

G. In-Country Training

In-country (IC) training is often more cost-effective than U.S. or TC training, and Missions and host governments generally support its increased use. Five Missions have conducted in-country training under SMDP II. Chad sponsored a one-week seminar conducted by the University of Pittsburgh that helped to strengthen management skills for 13 government officials; a similar two-week program was conducted in Mali, in addition to a seminar on recurrent

costs for a total of 81 trainees. Niger sponsored a series of IC training conferences for the National Development Council and has plans for vocational skills and cooperative management training with the Office for the Promotion of Nigerien Business. Senegal supported an educational statistics seminar assisted by the Sahel Regional Financial Management Project personnel, and The Gambia is considering support of IC training through the Management Development Institute, a World Bank/UNDP project which is also being assisted by the Sahel Regional Financial Management Project.

In-country possibilities are many and varied. In addition to the U.S. training programs conducted by American firms, possibilities exist from other sources such as African training institutes. Some are well known; others can be identified in the soon to be published Directory of Francophone Training Institutions for Africa. Nevertheless, Missions may need assistance in identifying appropriate agencies or individuals to conduct training activities which meet their specific needs and require minimal management time. As discussed previously, Mission capacity will be taxed by expanded training activities. In-country training requires considerable Mission time for coordination even when an outside contractor is used. After having audit and related problems in using host government officials to administer a seminar, USAID/Mali recommends using an independent contractor to carry out such activities. The legal/financial mechanism is also a problem that can confront Missions interested in conducting IC training. Ways should be explored to support Missions in the planning, managing, and coordinating tasks associated with IC training. Using a regionally-based contractor to manage in-country training is a possible solution. The contractor could also coordinate regional seminars.

H. English Language Training

In order to provide more cost-effective ELT, SMDP II stipulated that Missions, wherever possible, require participants to achieve a TOEFL level of 475 prior to their departure to the United States. The Project Paper proposed that a study of ELT in the Sahelian countries be undertaken to determine the feasibility of establishing ELT centers. The study was performed by ALIGU staff, in 1983*. They examined ELT possibilities in four Sahel countries and provided recommendations for more cost-effective language training. Among their conclusions were the following: that in-country ELT be strengthened in Mali, Niger and Senegal to provide skills up to the 450-475 TOEFL level, and that if warranted, a regional center be established in Bamako or Dakar rather than in The Gambia.

In reviewing Sahelian Missions' current practices, the Evaluation Team found that the ELT centers in Niger and Bamako have been strengthened since the ALIGU study and that a new ELT center has been established in Burkina Faso. Current Mission practices concerning ELT vary widely among the other Sahelian countries: USAID/Mauritania and USAID/Cape Verde send all long-term U.S. participants to ALIGU for ELT; and USAID/Senegal has used a

---

*See Suzanne M. Peppin and M. Louise Krumm, ALIGU, SMDP II In-country English Language Training feasiblity study, April 15, 1984, for details on study.

local private organization for intensive ELT in addition to sending some participants to the United States. USAID/Senegal does not consistently adhere to the requirement that participants reach a 475 TOEFL score before departure. USAID/Chad is not currently programming long-term U.S. participants. Therefore, for Chad, ELT is not a critical issue.

The Evaluation Team was asked to explore the possibility of strengthening the Bamako ELT Center to serve regional needs. The Center is a host-country institution established by USAID-funding many years ago. It currently provides ELT for Malian participants to the TOEFL level required for university admission, 500 or 550. During the evaluation visit to Mali, USAID/Bamako and host government ELT Center officials expressed interest in expanding the "Cours de Langues" program, provided that a long-term commitment could be made on numbers of participants and financial support, and that other issues such as the legal status of the Center and management aspects could be resolved. The ELT program could currently accommodate 4-15 participants annually from other countries without expanding facilities. USAID/Bamako, however, is reluctant to take responsibility for the management of room and board arrangements for non-Malian participants. The GRM Director of the ELT program indicated that, with advance notice, the school could possibly locate boarding facilities for a limited number of participants.

Other concerned Sahelian Missions do not support the establishment of a regional center in Mali, but, in some cases, could use it on a temporary basis. USAID/Niamey's ELT program can accommodate the current and expanded program; USAID/Praia, because of the Portuguese language base, prefers sending participants to the United States for ELT; USAID/Ndjamena, with its emphasis on third-country training, has little need for ELT but would be willing to consider using Bamako, or U.S. facilities if U.S. training becomes a possibility in the future. USAID/Nouakchott expressed interest in establishing its own ELT program, possibly in conjunction with USIS and/or the English Department at the GIRM Teacher's Training Institute; USAID/Ouagadougou has recently initiated its own ELT center and, at present, has the capacity for ELT beyond their own needs. USAID/Dakar has several options available for ELT besides the U.S., including the British Council classes and the possibility of working through a local, privately-operated center to provide ELT and orientation activities for a limited number of SMDP participants. Thus, in general, the Sahelian Missions do not support establishing a regional ELT center in Mali. Most prefer using or establishing cost-effective ELT facilities in their respective countries.

The ELT Center in Burkina Faso deserves special mention. Based on the ALIGU recommendation and the expectation of a bilateral portfolio with large U.S. participant training components, USAID/Ouagadougou initiated plans in October 1983 to establish an English Language Training Center in cooperation with USIS and the Peace Corps. In the meantime, the political situation has resulted in program changes, which significantly reduced the number of participants to be trained. Nevertheless, USAID/Ougadougou decided to go ahead with the Center, financing up to 70 percent of the start-up and operational costs for the first year. SMDP II has budgeted $92,000 for the Center and has already expended about $39,000. The Center began classes in January 1985; however, only three of the 151 initial students are AID participants.

The considerable reduction in the USAID program in Burkina Faso and the fluctuating political situation lead the Evaluation Team to raise four issues about the cost-effectiveness of such a program and its potential long-term viability. Specific issues raised include:

1. Cost-effectiveness: In-country ELT is supported as a cost-effective alternative to ELT in the United States. Can the Burkina program become self-supporting after SMDP II investment capital is expended? Should USIS pick up major future costs since the Center largely serves their clients? Is in-country ELT really as cost-effective as alternative programs?

2. U.S. versus Host Country Institution: Given the fact that the ELT Center is basically a U.S., rather than a host country facility, can USAID hope to institutionalize the program over the long term?

3. Intensity of Program for USAID Participants: The intensive program provides 20 hours/week of training. Would a 30 hour/week program be more effective?

4. Use by other Sahelian Countries: Given its present excess capacity, should USAID consider offering training for a limited number of U.S. participants from Chad or Mauritania?

The Evaluation Team believes USAID/Ouagadougou must address these important issues in reviewing their participant training activities over the next year.

In summary, the Evaluation Team finds that the Sahelian Missions have made progress in establishing or improving in-country ELT capacity in the Sahel for current and an expanded number of U.S.-bound participants. Recommendations reflect these findings and provide suggestions for follow-on activities.

Recommendations on Implementation

1. Project management should explore ways to support Missions in planning, managing and coordinating tasks associated with IC training.

2. In light of the implementation problems to date, SMDP should continue without an increase in funding unless there is a concurrent increase in managerial and administrative support. More attention must be paid to problems such as delays in signing LSGAs, identifying candidates, late allotment of funds, lack of a host country development participation in planning, delay in project service procurement, the shifting role of field management, etc.

3. Project funds should be obligated by the use of standardized Limited Scope Grant Agreements (LSGAs) containing a greater

level of detail useful for agreements but allowing flexibility in determining specific training.

4. More attention should be given to Mission capacity to expend funds.

5. Project management should establish a mechanism to facilitate third-country training, including the processing of documents, orientation, progress reporting, tracking and follow-up.

6. As the use of third country training increases, there will be fewer long-term U.S. academic participants than at present. ELT centers should not, therefore, be an issue for direct SMDP support.

VI. SPECIAL CONCERNS

A. Private Sector

To a large extent, private sector training under SMDP II is meeting the project's objectives. Support for this training is evidenced in many Sahelian countries by the interest of their respective business and industrial communities. The public sector in many of these countries is also increasingly recognizing the significant employment potential offered through private sector development. Linkages between the public and private sectors have been established in several countries, where both are involved in assessing manpower needs, identifying the available human resources, and planning practical and timely training activities. Staff training is taking place for institutions that are assisting small enterprises with credit, management and technical assistance, and in-country management seminars are being implemented in practically all countries. Long-term U.S. graduate degree programs are being utilized, and specially prepared short-term courses are meeting more immediate needs. Private sector training is also taking place in third-country African institutions and in several instances, SMDP is providing pre-project training to lay the groundwork for larger bilateral assistance programs aimed at private sector development.

Key to the successful development of private sector training is an experienced, committed and knowledgeable Training Officer. There are no established criteria for this training, and, as with other SMDP training categories, there is wide latitude for creativity. At present, planned and actual private sector training activities range from in-country training for boat captains and crews to increase fishing revenues to short-term U.S. training in banking.

The Africa Bureau has recently initiated an inquiry on private sector training resources for Mission use in expanding training in this area. In a follow-on project, project management could use this information to assemble a list of opportunities and resources which are appropriate for addressing Sahelian private sector training needs. Missions should be asked to provide priority training needs in this sector as a basis for compiling the information.

B. Participation by Women

It was recognized during the design of SMDP II that many African countries have difficulty identifying women candidates for long-term training outside the host country. The reasons cited are primarily cultural, with family responsibilities being most important. It was hoped that the provision for more in-country and short-term training in SMDP II would increase the participation of women in AID training programs. However, despite the increase in this type of training under SMDP II, women are still significantly under-represented.

All Sahelian governments readily acknowledge the importance of providing training opportunities for women. Women candidates are most easily identified in the areas of health, nutrition and population, but greater efforts could be made in agricultural and rural development areas. Mali has plans to conduct an in-country seminar on the role of women in agriculture. Cape Verde has the most impressive record for long-term training, with women accounting for just over 50 percent of SMDP I participants. These were mostly undergraduate participants recruited directly from high school. Recruiting from high school was also suggested by other Sahelian countries as a way to increase the number of female participants. Using undergraduate training as the sole means of increasing women's participation, however, is not consistent with other key premises of the project and should not constitute a justification for undergraduate training. In instances where other factors justify undergraduate training (e.g., bilateral project training and special SMDP cases), it could be argued that priority be given to women candidates for such positions. More background work needs to be done to identify short-term and in-country training opportunities and to actively recruit women for these slots.

C. Undergraduate Training

SMDP II was not intended to finance undergraduate training in the United States, although several exceptions have been made. In addition to being very costly, this limitation was based on the view that undergraduate training is probably more relevant in an African milieu. This position also assumes that there exist suitable in-country or third-country institutions to fulfill this need. Yet, Cape Verde, The Gambia and Mauritania have difficulty in finding in-country or third-country alternatives for this level of training.

Cape Verde has no university for undergraduate training. As a Portuguese-speaking country, however, Cape Verde continues to have access to undergraduate training under the African Manpower Development Project. Under SMDP I, participants were routinely recruited out of high school for overseas studies. A disproportionate number go to Portugal and are financed by the Portuguese Government. Former Mission personnel felt sufficient opportunities already existed for studies in Portugal without A.I.D. financing and opted for more costly U.S. training as a balance. Brazil provides a very attractive possibility, but training there would require a waiver.

If there is no in-country capability for providing undergraduate training, it may not be possible to find sufficient qualified candidates for long-term graduate training. Experience in Cape Verde and The Gambia has

borne this out.

While there is no university in The Gambia, there are several third-country possibilities for undergraduate training. The GOTG has been sending students to Nigeria for undergraduate studies. Because of the British-based system in both The Gambia and Nigeria, the undergraduate degree from Nigeria is well-accepted and may even be preferable. Ghana has not been considered stable enough for the placement of Gambian students, but this could afford another possibility if and when conditions change. As the University of Nouakchott only prepares undergraduates in Letters and Law, Mauritania could explore the possibilities of undergraduate training in the sciences and other disciplines with neighboring Francophone countries.

In sum, U.S. undergraduate training appears to be justified in certain cases for Mauritania, The Gambia, and Cape Verde. The Evaluation Team recommends, however, that Missions limit undergraduate training to third countries whenever possible.

USAID Missions in Chad and Niger have proposed using SMDP to fund in-country undergraduate scholarships. The Evaluation Team has reviewed this issue and recommends that such funding not be permitted for these reasons: (a) maintaining in-country institutions requires considerable recurrent budget resources and (b) strained budgets may also limit the quality of education being provided, including inadequate materials and equipment and poorly-trained teaching staff. If Missions believe that strengthening a local institution has merit and can be justified in terms of skill surveys and budget resources, they should develop separate projects or components for such purposes.

D. Ph.D. Training

SMDP II specifically called for graduate training to the Master's level. In reviewing training plans for Missions, the Evaluation Team found that USAID/Burkina Faso has requested and received approval to conduct Ph.D. training under the project.

Training Sahelian participants at the doctoral level under a general training program raises a number of issues. Doctoral-level training is usually reserved for university instructors, researchers, or high-level policy-makers and planners. Very few civil servant positions in the Sahelian governments require doctoral-level training, which is expensive and takes at least four years to complete. The brain drain among Ph.D. holders is greater in Sahelian countries than at other levels of training. Training at the Ph.D. level outside the context of a project or institutional building activity can leave the Ph.D. without sufficient institutional and financial resources for utilizing his/her skills.

For these reasons, the Evaluation Team recommends that doctoral-level training not be conducted under a general training project such as SMDP.

E. Equivalency

A number of Sahelian Missions have made significant progress in resolving issues on the equivalency of U.S. degrees: in 1984 the Government of Niger established adequate recognition of U.S. degrees; more recently, the Government of Senegal has agreed to give equitable recognition to U.S. degree-holders in regard to job placement and pay levels; the Government of The Gambia has improved its level of recognition of U.S. diplomas.

Of significance, however, is the continuing inadequate recognition given to U.S. graduate degrees by the Governments of Chad, Burkina Faso and Mali. Although the GOC and USAID/Chad are now emphasizing short-term U.S. and third-country training rather than long-term U.S. training, the fact that inadequate equivalency is granted for U.S. degrees undoubtedly contributes to the reluctance of previously trained Ph.D. participants to return to Chad. In Burkina Faso, participants cited equivalency problems as contributing to the underemployment of returned participants, to the increasing reluctance of returned participants to fill jobs in the public sector, and to the unwillingness of universities to grant tenure to U.S.-trained Master's degree-holders. In Mali, similar problems exist for returned U.S. participants in spite of the extensive efforts of USAID and USIS to obtain GRM recognition of U.S. degrees.

Missions recognize that the resolution of equivalency problems is the responsibility of the individual Mission concerned. Nevertheless, several USAID officials supported the proposal that a follow-on project provide resources for Missions to use in resolving this issue. Suggested activities to address this issue include sending key government officials to the United States to observe and become familiar with the U.S. education system, purchasing published materials on U.S. degrees (such as guides to U.S. universities and colleges) and inviting U.S. professional educators to speak on equivalency issues.

F. Management Training

Both USAID and host government officials recognize the severe shortage of qualified management expertise in government service and other developmental institutions. They also agreed that management training is appropriate and necessary for developing host country officials' skills for making more efficient use of very scarce resources available to Sahelian countries. SMDP II is viewed as one of the means by which management training could be provided to help alleviate some of these constraints.

While it is necessary to wait for the evaluation of the management training required by SMDP for all U.S. long-term participants, all Missions have been involved in specific management training activities via short-term U.S., TC and in-country seminars/workshops. Mission and host country officials and participants have expressed a great deal of satisfaction with the results of these training opportunities. Most Missions preferred a more direct and applied management skills training approach (U.S. TC and in-country seminars/workshops) to the enrollment of U.S. long-term participants in management training courses for credit, as the Project Paper required. The

Directory of Francophone Training Institutions in Africa may prove helpful in planning and conducting in-country management training.

G. Participant Tracking System

With the loss of FSO Training Officers and the lack of consistent attention and resources given to training in general, Missions have found that their ability to carry out a comprehensive training program is limited. In response to this situation, S&T/IT is developing an integrated participant training management system (PTMS) which will enable Missions to plan, develop and implement training programs more effectively. This system will link the CTP process with a management tracking system using a microcomputer based software package. The PTMS is being designed jointly by S&T/IT and M/SER/IRM for the purpose of improving collection, storage, retrieval, analysis and reporting of training data. While some Missions have already integrated their participant training program reporting with other microcomputer operations, other have not yet taken steps to computerize. Some Missions expressed concern over the compatibility of the system with their own equipment. The Evaluation Team was informed by S&T/IT that the system will be adaptable for operation on approved mission microcomputers, and that it should be ready for introduction in Africa in the next few months.

Recommendations

Based on the above findings, the Evaluation Team recommends the following:

1. Project management should provide information on resources for private sector training to address Missions' training needs.

2. Project management should continue to encourage more training opportunities for women by identifying short-term and in-country training opportunities for women.

3. Missions should limit undergraduate training to third-country institutions.

4. SMDP funds should not be used to support in-country undergraduate programs.

5. Doctoral-level training should not be conducted under SMDP.

A N N E X A

COUNTRY PROFILES

BURKINA FASO COUNTRY PROFILE

PROJECT NUMBER: 625-0960

LOP AMOUNT: $1,155,000.00

AMOUNT OF OBLIGATIONS THROUGH 6/30/85:

FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
-0-	$549,000	$606,000 (allotted)

MEANS OF OBLIGATION: Limited Scope Grant Agreement (LSGA)

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

PROJECT MANAGER: Robert Zigler (DH)

TRAINING OFFICER: Fati Ouedraogo (FSN)

IN-COUNTRY ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING

USAID/Burkina Faso, in cooperation with USIS and Peace Corps, has established an institution for ELT called the American Language Center (ALC). A former US-trained participant (Ph.D.) is the director and is assisted by a PCV recruited for the position. A good deal of planning has gone into establishing the Center; Facilities have been renovated, materials and furnishings procured, and teaching staff hired. The Center began operating in January 1985, USAID having provided 70% of the start-up costs and $92,600 overall. Plans are for USAID to pay operating costs for the first year. USIS will contribute $40,000 annually to the program from FY 85 onward. Of the 151 students presently in the program, there are three USAID participants, largely due to the slowdown in the research program.

COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY SUMMARY

The USAID/Burkina Faso training plans, as amended, propose training in the agriculture, health and private sectors. Because of the sensitivity of the political climate, many of the mission's bilateral programs have been eliminated or are in a phase-out mode. The amended training program includes the following:

Four short-term third country participants;

Three long-term third country participants;

Five in-country seminars;

2 short-term U.S. participants; and,

14 long-term U.S. participants.

Completed training:

One short-term third country participant; and,

Four short-term U.S. participants.

DISCUSSION OF DISPARITY (See breakdowns on training included herewith)

A fluctuating political situation and shifts in program priorities have contributed to a very slow rate of project implementation to date. Only 1 ST TC and 4 ST US participants have been programmed for training. Indeed, only about 6 percent of obligated funds have been committed, with the largest expenditure of project funds being spent for establishing the American Langugage Center.

PARTICIPANT UTILIZATION

- U.S. responsibility: USAID approves candidates, debriefs returned participant and maintains logs on participants; and,

- Host country responsibility: GOBF is not in a position to guarantee participants appropriate positions upon their return, due to political instability and economic slowdown. Participants report experiencing equivalency problems, and are often placed in positions unrelated to training. Students and/or non-civil servant participants must spend one year without salary (nine months in a ministry, and three months in the military) before being assigned a permanent position with the Government.

SPECIAL PROJECT CONCERNS

- USAID has included Ph.D. training in its amended strategy. Ph.D. training was not to be included in SMDP II, but the AID/W project committee approved such training, nevertheless.

- The political situation has affected project implementation considerably, requiring constant revision of training plans.

- USAID project committee has not provided feedback on a regular basis to technical offices on its decisions.

LIMITATIONS TO PROGRAM EXPANSION

- Feasibility of project expansion should be carefully explored. USAID believes that SMDP can address critical training needs in key development areas where the bilateral portfolio is being reduced.

- Host country capacity to employ returned participants is limited by its own economic and planning problems.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

- Cost-effectiveness of ELT program for the long term;

- Resolution of equivalency issue (for U.S. degree training); and,

- Political environment and its effect on development activities.

BURKINA FASO

PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED TRAINING BY FIELDS,
NUMBERS OF PARTICIPANTS AND FUNDING LEVELS

	PLANNED							IMPLEMENTED						
	TC		US		IC		Amount	TC		US		IC		Amount
FIELD	ST	LT	ST	LT	ST	LT	($000)	ST	LT	ST	LT	ST	LT	($000)
Health		2	2	3		58	97			1				7
Agriculture				8	12		615			2				21
Private Sector		2	1	11	2	80	314	1		1				8
Misc.														
Returned Part.							9							36
ELT							40							
Contingency							80						3	
TOTALS		4	3	22	14	138	1,155	1		4			3	72
UNEARMARKED														1,026

LIST OF OFFICIAL CONTACTS IN BURKINA FASO:

Emerson Melaven, USAID Director

Larry Heilman, USAID Deputy Director

John Ford , USAID Human Resources Development Officer

Robert Zigler, USAID Project Manager

*Fati Ouedraogo, USAID Training Officer

Helen Gunther, USAID Agriculture Officer

Them Trung, USAID Private Sector Project Officer

*Richard Traore, USAID Private Sector Project Officer

Monty Harper, USAID Health/Pop./Nutrition Officer

Leslie Curtin, USAID Health/Pop./Nutrition Officer

Donald McKenzie, USAID Program Officer

William Weinhold, USIS Director

*Michel Kabore, American Language Center Director

*Sidiki Traore, Director, Orientation and Scholarships, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Mr. Millogo, Scholarship Officer, Directorate of Orientation and Scholarships

*Francoise Diendere, unemployed (former AFGRAD)

*Honore Diendere, Office of Planning and Research, Ministry of Agriculture

*Sogossi Traore, waiting for position with Ministry of Economic Promotion, formerly with Ministry of Agriculture

*Aboubakary Cisse, Controller, National Cereals Office, Ministry of Agriculture

---

* Former Partiticpants

*Henry Ye, University Instructor, Polytechnical Institute, University of Ouagadougou

*Sanders Aitchedji, ELT Instructor, American Language Center

*Pascal Dianda, Deputy Chief of Services, Ministry of Water

*Former Participants

CAPE VERDE COUNTRY PROFILE

PROJECT NUMBER: 625-0960

LOP AMOUNT: $759,000

AMOUNT OF OBLIGATIONS THROUGH 6/30/85:

FY83	FY84	FY85
$184,500	$184,500	$390,000

MEANS OF OBLIGATION: Limited Scope Grant Agreement

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Secretariat for Planning and Cooperation in conjunction with Ministry of Education and Culture

PROJECT MANAGER: Thomas Ball, USAID Representative

TRAINING OFFICER: Maria Richardson (LDH)

IN-COUNTRY ELT PROGRAM

There is no ELT program in Cape Verde. The Mission traditionally sends all long-term participants to ALIGU for ELT combined with Orientation. Although costly, the Mission experience has been that Cape Verdean students finish ELT more quickly than most and that it is worth the expense to have the time to adjust before beginning studies. Cape Verde's public school system offers three years of English which provides a base for ALIGU training. The evaluation team interviewed Embassy staff (there is no USIS) and were told that there is interest in ELT, but no funding for such activities.

COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY SUMMARY

The approved country training strategy for Cape Verde is based on the Small Program Strategy Statement (SPSS). The foundation of the program is in agriculture and rural development. Identified constraints to development in Cape Verde include: a) lack of skilled manpower; b) limited domestic market; c) lack of natural resources; d) deficiencies in basic infrastructure; e) physical/geographic constraints; f) overcentralization of planning; and, g) inefficient management. The SMDP is intended to fund training which is not within the context of any of the bilateral projects, or rather, for pre-project and post-project training.

TRAINING COMPLETED UNDER SMDP I AND II

SMDP II Training -

Ester Sequeira	ELT/Management short course
Jorge dos Reis	B.S. Electrical Engineering

SMDP I Training - (all degree participants)

Julio Almeida	Ag Engineering	Arizona (U of A)
Maria H Azevedo	Soil Science	Arizona
Jose Augusto de Brito	Ag Economics	Arizona
Sergio A. Centeio	Econ Policy	Northeastern
Celia Delgado	Bus Administration	American Univ.
Joaquim Delgada	Hydrogeology	Arizona
Antonio Fortes	Ag Mech	Arizona
Elvio Fernandes	Economics	American Univ.
Joao Miguel Lima	Irrigation Eng	Arizona
Claudio dos Santos	Hydrogeology	Arizona
Helder Santos	Ag Economics	Utah State Univ.
Maria Tolentino	Bus Administration	Boston Univ.
Raul Varela	Georgraphy	Arizona
Emanual Veiga	Bus Administration	Arizona
M. Tereza Veracruz	Arid Lands	Utah State Univ.

Planned Training (per Praia 2417 - FY'84)						Actual Training				
Discipline	LT	ST	TC	IC	TOTAL	LT	ST	TC	IC	TOTAL
Economics	1				1	0				0
Rural Soc	1				1	0				0
Marine Bio	1				1	0				0
Range Mgmt	1				1	0				0
Elect Eng	0				0	1				1
General Tech Training		12			12		1			1
Education				30	30				0	0
Extension				30	30				0	0
General Regional				18	18				0	0
TOTAL	4	12		78	94	1	1			2

DISCUSSION OF DISPARITY (Refer to Breakdown)

As is shown above, very little training has been accomplished under SMDP II. This is partially explained by the turnover in Mission personnel since the project was authorized and by the difficulties experienced in reaching an agreement with the GOCV on training goals. Neither the GOCV officials nor present Mission staff support the Training Strategy as approved in 1984. As a result, training plans have been developed on an ad hoc basis. The Government of Cape Verde has several proposals ready for the Mission related to short term training in-country and the Project Manager is now developing the training plan for the remaining funds. No updated plan has been received as of the publication of this evaluation.

PARTICIPANT UTILIZATION

The experience to date indicates that the Mission has not instituted any formal mechanism to ensure maximizing participant utilization. Participants are not required to report to AID upon return from training, and participant monitoring is limited to the informal contacts maintained by the former training officer (a Cape Verdean national). The Mission does not require participants to sign commitments in exchange for training, nor is there any system for debriefing or follow-up. On the part of the GOCV, participants are required to sign a commitment agreeing to work for a minimum of five years for the government upon completion of long-term training. The GOCV officials stated that the government is committed to provide the returned participants with a job upon their return. The evaluation team found no instances of unemployed participants.

The Mission has recently hired a part-time Training Officer to handle the increased participant training. As she becomes more familiar with the procedures in Handbook 10, it is the Mission's expectation that policies and practices regarding orientation, monitoring and follow-up will improve in the future. In addition, the Mission points to the eventual introduction of the PTMS as a means of tracking participants.

SPECIAL PROJECT CONCERNS

1. USAID/Praia traditionally sends participants to the United States for long-term degree training. The lack of a skilled cadre at the B.S. level causes a shortage of qualified candidates for graduate training opportunities. Twenty five B.S. degree scholarships were funded under SMDP I (at $90,000 each) which led to restrictions on undergraduate training. Although the need certainly exists in Cape Verde, the evaluation recommends a diversification of training to include more short-term, third-country and in-country participants. In addition, if undergraduate training is to be funded, it is recommended that it take place in a third country institution.

2. There is no full time Training Officer in the Mission. A combined Executive Assistant/Training Officer has recently been hired (spouse of Embassy Employee), but has no previous AID training experience. This person is in Cape Verde temporarily and may leave as early as November 1986. It is the judgement of the evaluation team that the Training Officer should be a foreign national in order to provide continuity to the participant training program and build contacts within the government.

3. The Mission reports it is unable to identify any opportunities to fund private sector training. Opportunities certainly exist and perhaps the Mission should consult the Bureau for Private Enterprise for suggestions.

4. The GOCV strongly advocates the involvement of women in developing its human resources. Under SMDP I, women represented half of the participants for degree-training. Women occupy many influential positions in the Government and continued significant involvement of women in Cape Verde's development can be expected.

LIMITATIONS TO PROGRAM EXPANSION

- Lack of an agreed-upon USAID/GOCV strategy.

- Inexperienced, temporary training officer.

- Uncertainty of sufficient qualified candidates unless undergraduate training is permitted.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

- Development of mechanism for increasing use of in-country and third-country training.

- Inclusion of undergraduate degree training (Portugal and perhaps blanket waiver for Brazil);

- Increasing the flexibility of training allowed under the project; and

- Developing the role of the Training Officer.

LIST OF OFFICIAL CONTACTS IN CAPE VERDE:

Thomas H. Ball, USAID Representative/Praia

August Hartman, USAID Agriculture Development Officer

Maria Richardson, Executive Assistant/Training Officer

Frank Dimond, Former Program Officer, USAID/Praia

Alda de Macedo, Former Training Officer, USAID/Praia

John Yates, Ambassador to Cape Verde

Jose Luiz Rocha, Director of Bilateral Cooperation, Secretariat for Planning and Cooperation

*Esther Sequeira, Ministry of Education and Culture

*Quirino Spencer, Ministry of Education and Culture

*Antonio Carlos de Silva Bastos Fortes, Ministry of Rural Development

*Maria Manuela Azevedo, Ministry of Rural Development

---

*Former Participant

CHAD COUNTRY PROFILE

PROJECT NUMBER: 625-0960

LOP AMOUNT: $1,040,000

AMOUNT OBLIGATED THROUGH 6/30/85:

FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
$184,500	$184,500	$671,000

MEANS OF OBLIGATION: Limited Scope Project Agreement

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Ministry of Plan and Reconstruction

PROJECT MANAGER: Kurt Shafer

TRAINING SPECIALIST: Isaac Tedambe (FSN)

TRAINING ASSISTANT: Ahmet Djimet-Seid (FSN)

IN-COUNTRY ELT PROGRAM

No in-country ELT program exists. In the future, the Mission would consider using ELT program in Bamako or in the United States for U.S. LT training.

COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY SUMMARY

USAID/Ndjamena did not have an approved CDSS in August 1983 when the CTS was prepared. Instead, the Mission used the FY 1985 ABS as the basis for identifying constraints. The CDSS prepared in 1984 continued to emphasize constraints similar to those in the FY 1985 ABS. The CTS identifies these constraints which SMDP II has been addressing through training or a combination of training and other assistance: (a) need for food and the transport of food and medicine to the interior; (b) diminished small farmer productivity; (c) lack of health planning capability; and (d) lack of qualified civil servants.

As a result of the departure of many formerly trained Chadian civil servants or the non-return of previously trained long-term U.S. participants, the GOC and USAID have agreed to emphasize short-term training in Africa and in-country seminars to provide without delay the skills needed to reconstruct the nation. The CTS and annual plans reflect these emphases.

DISCUSSION OF DISPARITY (See Breakdown On Training Below)

Although there are differences in planned and actual levels of training and fields of study by fiscal year, the training achieved for all fiscal years combined generally adheres to the plan and supports institutional strengthening in priority sectors. Exceptions include the addition of limited short-term U.S. training and, to date, the undertaking of less in-country training than planned under the project. In the latter case, one planned in-country seminar was eventually financed under another project; others are being planned. Because of delays in placing the considerable number of TC participants, overall implementation was delayed one year. The present rate of implementation is commendable, however: 59 percent of obligated funds have been implemented and almost all FY 1983 and FY 1984 and more than 20 percent of FY 1985 funds have been committed, with substantial planning already underway for the remaining funds. In general, more TC training has been carried out than anticipated. No long-term U.S. training has been implemented because of the Chadian and Mission policies of focusing on immediate skill needs and because of experiences with significant numbers of previously-trained U.S. participants who never returned to Chad. USAID/Chad has recently hired an assistant for the Training Officer, financing his salary under SMDP II. The Training Officer has initiated a mini-directory on TC institutions for Mission and GOC use and a questionnaire for the follow-up of participants, their training experiences, and job reintegration.

PARTICIPANT UTILIZATION

- USAID responsibility: Participates in GOC training committee activities, approves candidate selection, requests participants to complete questionnaires upon their return, interviews participants, and maintains up-to-date logs on participants.

- Host country responsibility: Ensures that participants are assigned to positions relevant to their training, develops and maintains systems of evaluation, and identifies additional skills needed.

SPECIAL PROJECT CONCERNS

- Planning of and placement for TC training has required considerable time and effort for the Training Officer.

- Although the SMDP II Project Paper did not specifically include the employment of a training assistant as an activity to be financed under the project, USAID/Chad believes this use of project funds is important for undertaking the additional administrative workload required for planning and placement of participants in TC training.

LIMITATIONS TO PROGRAM EXPANSION

- Capacity of USAID Missions in other countries to manage an increasing number of TC training participants.

- Capacity of TC governments or institutions to place an increasing number of TC training participants.

- Mission need for project-funded Training Assistant to assist with heavy workload in order to conduct more TC and IC training.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

- Financing of Mission Training Assistant as TA under follow-on project.

- Obtaining adequate monitoring and administrative services from TC receiving Missions.

- Funding of follow-up activities, including establishment of alumni association, newsletter, and similar activities.

- Financing of study to identify orientation materials for U.S. and TC training program.

- Identifying resources for conducting IC seminar training.

CHAD

PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED TRAINING BY FIELDS,
NUMBERS OF PARTICIPANTS AND FUNDING LEVELS

	PLANNED						IMPLEMENTED					
	TC		US		IC	Amount	TC		US		IC	Amount
FIELD	ST	LT	ST	LT		($000)	ST	LT	ST	LT		($000)
Agriculture	25	8	1		20	525.5	13	9	2			161.9
Development Planning & Management	8		3		240	180.5	3		6		13	142.6
Human Resources Planning/Education	1					36.0		1				14.8
Health/Population/ Nutrition	5		3			72.5	3	5	3			118.5
Energy		3				83.5		3				40.9
Transportation/ Maintenance	5		1			42.5		6				24.6
Industry/Mining	4					24.0						
Documentalist/Librarian/ Archivist						-		5				62.5
Technical Skills (Mechanics, etc.)						-	6					24.6
Labor	1					6.0	1					7.2
Housing/Urban Development	2		1			22.0						
Private Enterprise	1					6.0		3				21.3
Special Training			3			36.0			2			19.9
Training Assistant*						5.0						
TOTALS	52	11	12	0	260	1039.5	33	18	14		13	614.2
Unearmarked funds												425.8

*Works in Mission as Training Assistant

LIST OF OFFICIAL CONTACTS IN CHAD:

John B. Woods, USAID Representative

Kurt Shafer, USAID Program Officer

Samir Zoghby, USAID General Development Officer

Isaac Tedambe, USAID Training Officer

Ahmat Djimet-Seid, USAID Training Assistant

Richard Slocum, VITA Project

Hassan Adoum Bakhit Haggar, Director General, Ministry of Planning and National Reconstruction (MOPR)

Allofoza Allatchimi, Director of Planning and Chairman of the Selection Committee, MOPR

Mr. Raseef, Consultant, UNESCO

*Mougabet Lotard, Chief of Statistics Service Ministry of State for Agriculture and Rural Development (MSARD)

*Souleyman Mamadou, Director of Personnel, Ministry of Civil Service

*Tahitagarti Ngarmadji, Chief of Agronomy Experimental Station, (MSARD)

*Mbairbe Ndouba, Director of Professional Training, (MSARD)

*Langarsow Anouye, Chief, Division of Equipment and Production, (MOPR)

---

*Former Participant

GAMBIA COUNTRY PROFILE

PROJECT NO: 625-0960

LOP AMOUNT: $884,000

AMOUNT OBLIGATED THROUGH 6/30/85:

FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
$318,500	$205,500	$360,000

MEANS OF OBLIGATION: Limited Scope Grant Agreement

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Establishment Office

PROJECT MANAGER: Binta Sidibe (FSN)

IN-COUNTRY ELT: N/A

COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY SUMMARY

The CTS focuses on the need for improved management capabilities in the public and private sector and the development of technical skills to be utilized in projects of agricultural diversification and research. Management training will be offered both in-country and in the U.S. In-country workshops will be given at the Management Development Institute (MDI) and will include practical coursework in statistics, accounting, and economics. These will be complemented by other short courses in specialized areas, including tax administration and loan negotiation. MDI's programs will also include a special program for high-level and mid-level government cadre where topics such as report writing, decision-making, planning, supervision, and communications will be studied. These topics will also be presented to the private sector through "spot workshops". Problems related to agriculture diversification and research will be addressed through training at third-country and U.S. institutions.

DISCUSSION OF DISPARITY (See Breakdown of Training Below)

Most of SMDP training carried out has been under phase I. The SMDP II number of planned participants include FY 86 estimates as well as FY 85. Placement generally is based on the areas identified in the CTS. Of the total $884,000 obligated, $427,000 has been committed and disbursed.

PARTICIPANT UTILIZATION

- USAID responsibility: The Training Officer/Project Manager personnally follows up on participants to ensure that they are being promoted or that their degrees are recognized. USAID obtains a GOTG commitment to employ long-term participants upon completion of their training. In addition, participants are debriefed and are often required to file reports with USAID summarizing and evaluating their training experiences.

- Host country responsibility: In the past, participants were bonded to ensure that they would return to Government service. Because most participants have returned in the past, the GOTG has discontinued this practice. The Government assures employment for AID-funded participants.

SPECIAL PROJECT CONCERNS

- GOTG has no effective system for identifying training needs or selecting candidates, there is no overall training strategy or guaranteed mechanism for providing candidates. The GOTG acknowledges their need for human resource planning assistance to establish and systematize such procedures.

LIMITATIONS TO EXPANSION

- Inadequate selection procedures and lack of qualified candidates for graduate-level training.
- Lack of in-country undergraduate facilities.
- Limited information on Anglophone African training institutions.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

- Developing a mechanism for support to the Management Development Institute.
- Developing a mechanism for third country placement and monitoring in Anglophone African countries (primarily Nigeria, Kenya).
- Including U.S. undergraduate degree training.

THE GAMBIA

PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED TRAINING BY FIELDS,
NUMBERS OF PARTICIPANTS AND FUNDING LEVELS

	PLANNED						IMPLEMENTED					
	US		TC		IC	Amount	US		TC		IC	Amount
FIELD	ST	LT	ST	LT		($000)	ST	LT	ST	LT		($000)
Food Science				2		82		1				$ 41
Pharmacy Technology		4				28		2				14
Mass Communications		2				12		1				6
Project Development	2					6	1					3
Nutrition		2				42		1				21
Rice Production		2				42		1				21
Agriculture		2	1			35		1				14
Horticulture		2				42		1				21
Veterinary (Lab Tech)		4				60		2				30
Animal Sciences				2		170				1		85
Management				2	5	104				1		31
Tax Administration			2			18			1			16
Clinical Microbiology				2		46				1		23
Public Administration		1		1		74				1		37
Accounting			2			14			1			7
Loan Negotiation			2			12			1			6
Financial Management			1			5	1					5
Statistics				2		92				1		46
*TOTALS	2	19	8	11	5	$884	2	10	3	5	—	$427

* Numbers of planned and implemented programs do not agree with statistics shown on page 20 for the Gambia, although dollar figures are the same. Figures to be verified with Mission.

LIST OF OFFICIAL CONTACTS IN THE GAMBIA:

Thomas Mahoney, Acting USAID Representative

Binta Sidibe, USAID Program Assistant/Training Officer

Mary Langley, Establishment Secretary

Dr. Jabez Ayo Langley, Secretary General

Abdou N'Jie, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Economic Planning & Industrial Development

Thomas Garman, U.S. Advisor to Sahel Regional Financial Management Project

M.I. Secka - Auditor General, Auditor General's Office

Alan Goodridge, Chief Auditor, Auditor General's Office

*Hassan Sowe, Auditor General's Office

*Momodou Jarboh, Training Officer, Indigenous Business Advisory Service (IBAS)

*Dawouda Jagne, Lecturer, School of Public Health

*Felix Forster, Ministry of Finance

*Charles Thomas, Ministry of Economic Planning

*Mousa Colley, Auditor General's Office

*Haddijatow MacAuley, Pharmacy Technician, Pharmacy Ghana

*Saihou Ceesay, Health Educator, Ministry of Health

*Cherno Mballo, Chief Accountant, Gambia Cooperative Union Ltd.

---

*Former Participant

MALI COUNTRY PROFILE

PROJECT NUMBER: 625-0960

LOP AMOUNT: $1,349,000

AMOUNT OF OBLIGATED THROUGH 6/30/85:

FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
$274,500	$274,500	$800,000

MEANS OF OBLIGATION: Limited Scope Grant Agreement

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Ministry of Plan

PROJECT MANAGER: HRDO, Sherry Suggs-Morin (DH)

HRDO PROGRAM ASSISTANT: Boubacar Diallo (FSN)

TRAINING ASSISTANT: Manlafi Keita (FSN)

IN-COUNTRY ELT PROGRAM

GRM ELT Program, established through USAID financing, provides ELT training up to the TOEFL level required for U.S. university admission.

COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY SUMMARY

The Mission CTS defines five constraints to be addressed during the period 1983-86 in support of the CDSS objective of enhancing rural household productivity and incomes. Training was to be provided primarily to encourage policy reform, improve the planning and management of development activities, provide skills for developing agricultural extension systems, encourage the development of agricultural research capacity, and improve agricultural education curricula and practices. Initially, SMDP II training was to emphasize in-country and third-country training with long-term U.S. training to be provided for pre-project training and agricultural policy specialties for key officials in the Ministries of Agriculture and Natural Resources. As restrictions were lifted for U.S. training, increased long-term training was planned to support the major rural development emphasis.

DISCUSSION OF DISPARITY (See Breakdown on Training Below)

The initial PROAG was signed September 15, 1983, thus delaying actual implementation of the program until FY 1984. USAID together with the GRM planned SMDP II funds to strengthen institutions supporting USAID projects in agriculture, energy and forestry, health, and in the private sector. The CTS and annual plans for SMDP II training continue to emphasize agriculture and rural development. More U.S. training has been programmed than intended, in part because of the unavailability of or the lack of information on appropriate TC training institutions. To date only about 25 percent of the obligated funds have been expended. Two factors have contributed to a somewhat slower rate of implementation than anticipated: (a) USAID and GRM agreed to select candidates from a pool of nominees but the initial nominations included an insufficient number of qualified candidates, thus requiring a second nomination process; and (b) the process of inter-ministerial nomination of candidates through the Ministry of Plan (implementing ministry) has yet to become routinized. Nevertheless, it appears that better trained manpower in key development areas is a priority need and sufficient candidates are available for training. The challenge is to streamline the nomination and selection process. Also several participants have recently begun in-country ELT in preparation for U.S. training.

PARTICIPANT UTILIZATION

- U.S. responsibility: USAID interviews participants upon their return and tries to maintain up-to-date logs on returned participants. A new computer-based tracking system is being initiated.

- Host country responsibility: The GRM agrees to (a) integrate returned participants into the Civil Service; and (b) require all participants

to sign an agreement that following the completion of their training they will remain and work in Mali for at least five years.

SPECIAL PROJECT CONCERNS

- Malian participants are required to undertake ELT in Mali, obtaining the TOEFL level required by the particular university concerned. An LSGA amendment was signed in July 1984 to stipulate additional ELT requirements: That candidates scoring less than 450 on the TOEFL after 6.5 months of training will not be retained, that those scoring between 450-475 will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, and that those scoring more than 475 will continue ELT in Mali until accepted by the university concerned. USAID and the GRM also agreed to try to obtain placement in the U.S. with an initial semester of combined English and academic training.

- GRM agreed to continue in-country salary payments up to eight months while participants are in ELT in Mali. Beyond eight months, USAID agreed to pay a monthly allowance of 75,000 CFA to cover maintenance expenses. (This measure was introduced to provide a definite period for which the GRM would continue salary payments for all participants.)

- USAID advanced funds under a stipulated accounting system to the GRM to administer an IC seminar. This mechanism was less effective than anticipated, requiring USAID to spend considerable time and effort to account for the funds. Future IC seminars will be formally contracted out to avoid such implementation problems.

LIMITATION TO PROGRAM EXPANSION

- Considerable amounts of training have been planned within bilateral projects, thus raising the question of how much additional training can be programmed. USAID/Mali, however, anticipates using SMDP to train increased numbers of LT participants in management or related areas as the bilateral training activity is phased out.

- Insufficient information on TC training opportunities limits the amount of TC training implemented.

- HRDO and staff workload limits time to assist GRM in identifying training needs and encouraging institutionalization of effective mechanisms for identification of candidates.

- IC seminars require considerable mission management time; better sources of information on potential contractors to plan and implement seminars could possibly alleviate this constraint.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

- Minimal staff will be required for implementation of an expanded program. Severe USDH cuts could leave the Mission without an HRDO.

- Financing of computer hardware for participant tracking out of project funds. (Cost of computer is estimated at $3000 plus $500 emulator board.)

- Undergraduate training for women to increase number of women participants financed under project.

MALI

PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED TRAINING BY FIELDS,
NUMBERS OF PARTICIPANTS AND FUNDING LEVELS

	PLANNED						IMPLEMENTED					
	TC		US		IC	Amount	TC		US		IC	Amount
FIELD	ST	LT	ST	LT		($000)	ST	LT	ST	LT		($000)
Agriculture, including Livestock	2	5	1	7	29	581				4		176
Development Management		1	7		45	161			6		45	94
Energy, including Forestry		1		2		106						
Private Sector	18		3			136	2		4			23
Health	2		2	2		158						
Development Planning including Educ. Planning	5				40	85.5					30	30.5
Community Development	2	2	2			18						
Documentalist/ Archivist		2			5	50						10
Misc. ELT, Technical Assistance						53.0					6	
TOTALS	29	11	15	11	119	1349.0	2		10	4	81	333.5
UNEARMARKED FUNDS												1015.5

LIST OF OFFICIAL CONTACTS IN MALI

David M. Wilson, USAID Director

James Anderson, USAID Deputy Director

Roger Simmons, USAID Program Officer

George Jenkins, USAID Controller

Zack Hahn, USAID Design and Evaluation Officer

Richard Day, USAID Assistant Program Officer

Sherry Suggs Morin, USAID Human Resources Development Officer (HRDO)

Diane Ponasik, USAID, Acting General Development Officer

Karen Russell, USAID, Project Development Contractor

Boubacar Diallo, USAID, Program Assistant, HRDO

Manlafi Keita, USAID, Training Assistant, HRDO

Ousmane Fofana, Cours de Langues, Ministry of Natural Resources and Livestock

Gerald Ponasik, Language Advisor, Cours de Langues, Ministry of Natural Resources and Livestock

Harvey Smith, British Council Education Advisor to Ministry of National Education

Mamady Traore, Deputy Director Planning Division, Ministry of State for Plan

*Dr. Amadou Diallo, Epidemiology, Prevention Division, Ministry of Public Health

*Moctar Traore, Inspector of Agricultural Services, Ministry of Agriculture

*Don Van Noy, Mali Team Leader, Sahel Regional Financial Management Project

*Mariam N'Diaye, Administrative Assistant, UNICEF

*Sadio Diarisso, Project Coordinator, New Bridge Project, Ministry of Transport

---

*Former Participant

*Daouda Cisse, Technical Advisor, Ministry of State for Parastatals and State Enterprises

*Bougou Dembele, Financial Division, Haute Vallee Rural Development Operation, Ministry of Agriculture

*Ibrahim Diallo, Chief, Embouche Paysan, Ministry of Natural Resources

*Mamadou Dembele, Chief, Financial and Planning Division, Ministry of Plan

*Sylla Hawa Diallo, Chief, Office for Studies and Control, Ministry of State for Parastatals and State Enterprises

---

*Former Participant

MAURITANIA COUNTRY PROFILE

PROJECT NUMBER: 625-0960

LOP AMOUNT: $1,208,000

AMOUNT OF OBLIGATION THROUGH 6/30/85:

FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
$205,500	$205,500	$797,000

MEANS OF OBLIGATION: Limited Scope Agreement (dated April 11, 1984)

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Ministry of Plan and Territorial Administration

PROJECT MANAGER: Cynthia Wise (PSC)

IN-COUNTRY ELT PROGRAM

USIS has a limited capacity to provide part-time ELT.

COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY SUMMARY

The training strategy was designed to address the constraints identified in the CDSS, including natural resources, financial, human resources and government policy. SMDP II was to be used for pre-project training for a bilateral Human Resources Development Project and for supplementing project-funded manpower components. The FY '85 and proposed FY 1986 interventions aim at training in key sectors related to rural and community development, institution building, management and financial administration, improving capabilities of local training institutions in areas of rural development, fisheries, rural health, and development planning and policy formation.

DISCUSSION OF DISPARITY (See breakdown of training below)

The major disparity in the planned and actual training programs is in the area of third-country training. Of the 11 participants proposed, none has yet been processed for training. Six long-term participants are scheduled to begin their training by late FY 1985. The remaining five candidates were originally scheduled for U.S. long-term academic training, up to five years per participant, under the Integrated Pest Management Project in Ouagadougou. Due to the project termination schedule and funding constraints, USAID was requested by FAO/Nouakchott to assume training costs.

In-country and regional training are planned prior to the end of FY 1985.

PARTICIPANT UTILIZATION

- USAID Responsibility: Under the direction of the former Training Officer, little was done by USAID to ensure that participants were utilizing their skills. The current HRDO maintains close contact with many former participants and has access to all levels of government in order to monitor their re-entry and integration.

- Host Country Responsibility: Upon return of long-term participants to Mauritania, the Directorate of Civil Service places them in relevant Ministries, according to their degree specialization. Upon Director's recommendation, an Inter-ministerial Diploma Equivalency Committee makes final decisions concerning grade and step level. Long-term participants are obliged to work for the Government for a ten-year period.

SPECIAL PROJECT CONCERNS

- Mission is in early stages of implementing large bilateral training project - Human Resources Development Project, $6 million.

- The Human Resources Officer responsible for project implementation is a contract employee, whose contract expired in April 1985. It is expected that the contract will be extended for an additional year.

- The former Training Officer was terminated and recruitment has just begun for a replacement. The identification of a Mauritanian with these qualifications could lead to a long search for a qualified candidate with bilingual language skills and a university degree.

LIMITATIONS TO PROGRAM EXPANSION

- Assured management coverage of HRD bilateral project and SMDP.

- Employment and training of a new Training Officer.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

- Overlap in function between SMDP and bilateral HRD project.

- Alternatives for in-country ELT using SMDP funds.

- Undergraduate training under certain circumstances.

SMDP II - Mauritania
Planned Training FY85*

FIELD	TCT		TCT		US		Amount
	ST	LT	ST	LT	ST	LT	($000)
Forestry/Environmental Protection						1	61
Ag. Extension		1				2	161
Development/Management					3	1	91
Pest Management		5					201
Fisheries/Community Health/Management		5			2		231
Port Management					1		7
Union/Management Relations					1		7
Womens Cooperatives					1		7
Regional Workshop Irrigation/Dam Mgmnt.	4						12
Seminars			40				20
TOTALS	4	11	40		8	4	$798

Implemented Training FY85*

FIELD	TCT		TCT		US		Amount
	ST	LT	ST	LT	ST	LT	($000)
Agricultural Economics (Credit/Marketing)					1	1	75
Accounting	1						13
Port Management					1		7
Management					4	1	135
Cooperatives & Family Planning	1				1		13
Fisheries					1		22
Animal Husbandry						1	39
SUB TOTAL	2				8	3	304
OTHER TRAINING							86
UNALLOCATED							20
TOTALS	** 4				16	6	$410

* "Planned" and Implemented" data available for FY'85 only
** Number of participant programs implemented does not agree with those shown on page 20. To be verified with Mission.

LIST OF OFFICIAL CONTACTS IN MAURITANIA

Walter Boehm, USAID Program Officer

Cynthia Wise, USAID Human Resources Development Officer (contract)

James Toliver, Director Peace Corps/Mauritania

Ms. Hyoka White, Public Affairs Officer, USIS

Honorable Edward L. Peck, U.S. Ambassador

M. Souleymane Sow, Ministry of Plan and Territorial Administration

Cheikh Ould Abdellahi, Ministry of Plan and Territorial Administration

Mr. Ba Oumar dit Foussala, Chief, Finance Service, Ministry of Plan and Territorial Administration

Mr. Yahya Ould M'Khaitir, Ministry of Rural Development, Direction of Agriculture

Mr. Mohamed Ali, Secretary General, Confederation Genérale des Employeurs de la Mauritanie

M. Almamy Samba Boly Ba, Director of Economic Planning and Regulations, Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Economy

M. Moctar Ould Hmeyada, Technical Advisor, Ministry of Rural Development

M. Bocar Soule Ba, Technical Advisor, Ministry of Rural Development

M. Mohamed Lemine Ould Ketab, Director of Higher Education,, Ministry of National Education

M. Mohamed Lemine Ould Deidah, Director of Finance, Ministry of Plan and Territorial Administration

Mme. Malado Coulibaly, PMI Pilote

M. El Hadj M. Wone, Director General, BIMA

*Ms. Aicha Liman, Chief, Statistics Division, Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Economy

---

* Former participant

*M. Ahmed Salem O/Maouloud, Controller of Administrative Affairs, Ministry of Rural Development

*M. Aldiouma Cissoko, Chief, Port and Infractructures, Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Economy

*M. Oumar Fall, Deputy Governor, Ministry of the Interior

*Ms. Zuleca N'dow, Women's Cooperative

*M. Amadou Cire Kane, Technical Advisor, Ministry of Fisheries and Maritime Economy

---

*Former Participant

NIGER COUNTRY PROFILE

PROJECT NUMBER: 625-0960

LOP AMOUNT: $1,467,000

AMOUNT OF OBLIGATION THROUGH 6/30/85:

FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
$313,500	$313,500	$675,000 ($840,000 allotted)

MEANS OF OBLIGATION: Limited Scope Grant Agreement

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: Ministry of Higher Education and Research (MHE&R)

PROJECT MANAGER: George Corinaldi (DH)

TRAINING OFFICER: Abdou Yorontou (FSN)

IN-COUNTRY ELT PROGRAM

There is an annual agreement between AID and USIS language training facilities to provide ELT to AID participants up to the 475 TOEFL level required for a call forward.

COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY SUMMARY

Within the broader country strategy aimed to achieve food self-sufficiency, USAID/Niamey's efforts are focused on relieving the basic constraints in transport, energy, human resources, and governmental policy environment, especially in relation to the private sector. A recent education and training sector assessment concluded that the absence of trained manpower is a major development constraint. The 1983-84 CTS programmed 92 percent of U.S. training in accounting, public administration, management, development planning, research, and special technical training. The lack of trained engineers is a growing concern. Skilled personnel in all of these fields are needed in Nigerien institutions facing shortages in areas identified in the CDSS as important for Niger's development.

While U.S. long and short-term training emphasizes trained technicians and managers, strategy for third-country training is designed to relieve GON of the direct cost of financing its students in the last two years of their university programs. Administrative costs and procedures for handling this program are met by MHE&R, while AID pays maintenance costs on a reimbursable basis. In-country training is geared to the support of the private sector through assistance to the National Development Council and the Office for the Promotion of Nigerien Business. SMDP assistance to these agencies represents "seed money" to encourage their activities.

DISCUSSION OF DISPARITY (See Breakdown of Training Below)

The analysis of the actual budget expenditures as compared to those proposed in the SMDP II Country Training Plans (CTPs) generally reflects positively on project implementation. There is some disparity in the long-term U.S. category as well as for projected in-country short-term training. It should also be noted that SMDP II funds were used to carry over four SMDP I long-term U.S. participants.

The disparity in U.S. training (i.e., 10 LT/24 ST were proposed compared to three LT/13 ST who were actually programmed) can be attributed to late funding and the English language requirement. Projections are that original goals will be met. Third-country training proposed in the CTP's (47 LT and 20 ST participants to be trained in African institutions) compares favorably to the number actually programmed (i.e., 33 LT and two ST, TC participants are in training or have been trained). It is very likely that goals will be met in the third-country training category. In-country training was projected at 1,480 in support of private sector training in cooperation with the National Development Council objectives and the Office for the Promotion of Nigerien Business (OPEN). Although only 85 participants have been trained to date, the HRDO expects to reach its original goals. Plans are already underway to

carry out a major in-country training effort in the areas of vocational skills training and cooperative management and business techniques.

PARTICIPANT UTILIZATION

- U.S. Responsibility: Approves candidate selection and monitors U.S. participants. Upon return to Niamey, returned participants are expected to meet with Training Officer and Project Manager to discuss their training experience and job expectations. AID/W is supposed to forward ETA's for returning participants, but often these are not received. Follow-up in the past has been weak. Efforts are being made to improve on this. Sixty-five long-term U.S. participants were recently selected for interviewing with a standardized questionnaire. In 1983, twelve returned participants were interviewed and most reported positively on the program and its value to their professional capabilities.

- Host Country Responsibilty: Requires 10-year commitment from subsidized participants. GON publishes and maintains an annual list of all students in training abroad, indicating field, degree and Ministry to which students are attached. PIO/Ps contain the statement that participants will be "usefully employed" upon their return. Non-civil service participants must serve one year as teachers before assuming a regular salaried position.

SPECIAL CONCERNS

- Funds from SMDP II were used to complete financing of long-term U.S. participants originally funded under SMDP I.

- Third-country training is a major part of CTS. GON handles administrative costs and procedures while AID pays maintenance costs on a reimburseable basis. Mission is willing to consider paying for tuition in addition to maintenance.

- In-country training is viewed as a special target of opportunity for the private sector in both the rural and urban context.

- Undergraduate U.S. training: Mission would like to be able to fund this in cases where no local or third-country opportunities exist.

LIMITATIONS TO PROGRAM EXPANSION

- USAID/Niamey has the ability at present to expand the program. There are available candidates at all levels; but, availability of candidates will be a problem in the future given GON's reduced numbers of secondary-school students due to education budget reductions. Furthermore, the small percentage of university students in science or agronomy further limits the potential pool of candidates for AID-sponsored training.

- Because of reporting requirements and the labor intensive nature of participant training, an HRDO and one assistant appears inadequate in regard to an expanded program. Mission does not have the OE funds to allow for addditional staff. Mission suggested that SMDP funds finance an assistant under contract.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

- Finance training assistant under follow-on project.

- Consider changing focus of SMDP from institutional to sector strategy, especially in light of rapid job shifts, to allow more flexibility to meet training needs.

- Use SMDP funds for in-country university training in order to offer science and agronomy scholarships to increased pool of available candidates.

- Finance follow-up activities.

- Consider preparation of pre-departure reference booklet (French/ English) to supplement English Language Center's orientation efforts.

NIGER

PLANNED AND IMPLEMENTED TRAINING BY FIELDS,
NUMBERS OF PARTICIPANTS AND FUNDING LEVELS

	PLANNED							IMPLEMENTED						**
	TCT		US		IC		Amount	TCT		US		IC		Amount
FIELD	ST	LT	ST	LT	ST	LT	($000)	ST	LT	ST	LT	ST	LT	($000)
Development Management	1	33	7	1			$352	7	30	6	3			363
Energy			4	2			379			3	8			117
Private Sector		2	6	3	1020		395	1		1	4	10		228
Health	3					8	96							
Agriculture & Fisheries	5	5			8	4	73			1				5
Specialized Technical	5		9		2		99							
Civic Training					450		32					75		38
Selected Development Areas		10					41							
TOTAL	20	47	24	14*	1480	12	$1467	2	33	13	7*	85	0	$751
Unearmarked funds														$761

* Includes four SMDP I Participants ($140,000) carried over.
** Breakdown represents summary of sectors and budget proposed in CTP reduced by 28% to coincide with actual LOP budget.

LIST OF OFFICIAL CONTACTS IN NIGER

Abbe Fessenden, Acting USAID Director (Program Officer)

George Corinaldi, USAID Human Resources Development Officer (HRDO)

Abdou Yorontou, USAID Training Officer (FSN)

Tony Doggett, USAID Project Development Officer

Gaston Kaba, Secretary General, Ministry of Higher Education & Research

Tekoye Seydou, Director of Training (Ministry of Higher Education & Research)

Secretary General, National Development Council

Kelly, English Language Teacher, USIS Language Center

*Mme. Mariama, English Language Teacher, USIS Language Center

*Abdouramane Tilly, Plant Protection Technician, Ministry of Ag.

*Barti Oumanrou, Chief of Hygiene and Sanitation Division, Ministry of Health

*Adele Agbesi, Chief of Personnel-Family Planning Center, Ministry of Health

*Dr. Moumouni Dioffo, Senior Researcher, Institute of Solar Energy, University of Niamey

*Rhamatou Talata Alkaly, Secondary School Teacher, Niamey (Obligatory Civil Service)

N.B (Susan Rosenfeld, Director of USIS Language Center on leave during team visit, but she was highly recommended as a strong director)

---

*Former Participant

SENEGAL COUNTRY PROFILE

PROJECT NUMBER: 625-0960

LOP AMOUNT: $1,798,000

AMOUNT OF OBLIGATION THROUGH 6/30/85:

FY 83	FY 84	FY 85
$418,000	$210,000	$958,000 ($1,170,000 allotted)

MEANS OF OBLIGATION: Project Implementation Order/Participant (PIO/P)

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY: None

PROJECT MANAGER: Ousemane N'Dao (FSN)

IN-COUNTRY ELT PROGRAM

No regularly scheduled ELT program currently exists.

COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY SUMMARY

The approved country strategy for Senegal is tied very closely to the CDSS, which proposes strengthening the efforts of rural producers in three zones of geographical concentration (Casamance, Sine Saloum and Senegal River Basin) through official and parastatal agencies, PVOs and the private sector. USAID also seeks to strengthen personnel of community-based organizations through training in areas supporting decentralization and privatization of Senegal's agricultural system. And, finally, the CDSS proposes specialized training for GOS personnel in the Ministries of Plan and Cooperation, Finance, Rural Development and Industrial Development, Environmental Protection, Scientific Research, Health and Higher Education, and central and local government offices. The Country Training Strategy and subsequent annual plans have generally reflected developmental efforts in these areas.

DISCUSSIONS OF DISPARITY (See Breakdown on Training Below)

USAID/Dakar has done little private sector training but expects to approach the private sector more aggressively in FY'86, particularly in agribusiness and health. Remaining and future funds will finance certain short-term courses and in-country seminars to assist in privatizing activities in these sectors, e.g., citizens to pay for some health care costs.

PARTICIPANT UTILIZATION

- U.S. Responsibility: Approves candidate selection, requires participants to sign "Condition of Training" form prior to departure. No systematic participant debriefing or follow-up is done.

- Host Country Responsibility: Ministry of Planning and Cooperation coordinates donor financed training opportunities and is also responsible for the placement of participants in appropriate positions after training. GOS, however, does not guarantee participants a job when they return.

SPECIAL CONCERNS

- Training Officer is overburdened with current workload, which includes SMDP, project-related training, and in-coming third-country training participants.

- Mission has not been using Limited Scope Grant Agreement, as called for in the Project Paper, as the means for planning for and obligating funds. PIO/Ps are used as the obligating documents, although they are not signed by the GOS.

LIMITATIONS TO PROGRAM EXPANSION

- Capacity and willingness of other USAID and Host Governments to assist in placement of an increasing number of third-country participants in African institutions.

- Inadequate capacity of the training office.

ISSUES FOR FOLLOW-ON PROJECT

- Expanding the use of third-country and in-country training.

- Maintaining flexibility of training activities allowed under project.

- Project funding of a training assistant to assist in conducting Mission participant training activities, especially third-country and in-country training.

- Providing management training for all participants.

SENEGAL

PLANNED TRAINING
BY NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS AND FUNDING LEVELS

Fiscal Year	TC		US		IC	REGIONAL	AMOUNT ($000)
	ST	LT	ST	LT			
FY 1983	1	0	4	16	0	0	418
FY 1984	0	3	8	1	100	20	210
FY 1985	2	4	51	11	100	5	1,170
TOTALS*	2	7	63	28	200	25	1,798
EXPENDED							200
UNLIQUIDATED							1,598

* Number of planned participant programs in '83-'85 updated by Dakar, 9658, 9/13/85. Number of training programs implemented for these years shown on table, page 20.

LIST OF OFFICIAL CONTACTS IN SENEGAL

Carole Tyson, USAID Deputy Director

Campbell McClusky, USAID Program Officer

Norman Rifkin, USAID Non-project Assistance Program

Joel Schlesinger, USAID Project Development Officer

Barney Mosely, USAID Engineering Advisor

John Balis, USAID Agricultural Development Officer

Ousemane N'Dao, USAID Participant Training Officer

Fatou Rigoulot, USAID Human Resources Development Officer

Steven Wallace, USAID Management Officer

Vito Stagliano, Director, OMVS

Michael White, USAID Health Officer

Ibrahima Sene, Regional Agricultural Inspector

Aida Lo, Ministry of Health

Elimane H. Sy, Ministry of Plan and Cooperation

Alassane Sow, Livestock Laboratory, Ministery of Agriculture

Gilbert Diatta, Senegalese Institute for Agricultural Research

A N N E X B

UTILIZATION CASES

U.S. LONG-TERM TRAINING

- A Ministry of Water Deputy Chief received a BS in Civil Engineering in 1983 from the University of West Virginia under a regional project (Entente Fund). Although head of a Wells Construction Division before training, he is now directly responsible for several major water projects as Deputy Chief of Services. He claims to be fully applying his training and has advanced to a position with more responsibility.

- A recipient of an MS in Fisheries in 1983 under SECID, this participant received further short-term training in the Ecology of Natural Resources at the University of Tennessee in 1984 under SMDP to broaden his background in forestry management. Currently teaching at the university in fields related to his training, he claims his training was thoroughly useful. Because he was sponsored for training for the purpose of strengthening the Institute's pedagogical capabilities, he is being considered for further U.S. training under SMDP to ensure his tenure at the University.

- A recipient of an MA in History in 1968 from Howard University under the AFGRAD program is now responsible for all higher education and training activities, including training needs assessment and the selection and orientation of scholarship recipients. He also coordinates all training matters with the Mission and serves as project counterpart.

- As an employee of the Ministry of Transport, he received his MS in Civil Engineering in 1981 under the AFGRAD program. His current position carries more responsibility, and as a Section Head, he is involved in coordinating several major transportation projects, including the construction of a new bridge. Under the SMDP program, he received short-term training at Georgetown University in Investment and Loan Negotiation in 1984. In addition to being directly responsible for negotiating with a foreign government for the constructions of a bridge, he is responsible for negotiating investment terms for the government when a new regulatory code is established.

- As a Secretary General in the Ministry of Education, he received an MA in TOEFL at UCLA in the early 1970's under AID financing. He is responsible for all matters relating to higher education and research, including overseas training, and reports directly to the Minister. He also coordinates training activities with the Mission and serves as project counterpart.

- This participant received a combine BS/MS degree in Agricultural Education in 1982 under the SMDP project. He received a special award from Ohio University for superior achievement and upon his return, was promoted to Director of the new extension unit. Since completing his training program, he has started a monthly newsletter which is distributed nationwide to farmers and extension workers and has also developed videotape "farmer feedback" programs.

- He received a combined BS/MS degree in Agricultural Education in 1983 under the SMDP project. Formerly an Agriculture Superintendent, he was promoted to head the new Agriculture Department in the College and he now delivers lectures up to the "certificate" level.

- He was one of the first Africans to attend Timiriazev Academy in Moscow in 1967 where he studied pedology and agrochemistry. Following Russian language instruction and passing examinations in math, physics and chemistry (all in Russian), he began the academic track. There were more women than men in the program and he met and married a local fellow classmate. He received his master's degree in 1973. Upon his return home and assignment to the position of Regional Agricultural Inspector, where he evaluated agriculture proposals, he realized that his job performance would be more effective if he had a background in economics. He applied to USAID through his ministry in 1977, and following ELT at ALIGU, he attended Michigan State University under SMDP. He received a master's degree in agricultural economics in 1979. His U.S. training has helped both in his own job and as advisor to other colleagues.

SHORT-TERM U.S. TRAINING

- Now controller in the Cereals office, he received short-term training in Grain Storage and Marketing at Kansas State University in 1980 under SMDP. As his current position involved managing the national grain storage system in addition to financial accounting responsibilities, he found his short-course very useful.

- She attended a short-course in Public Health Administration at Columbia University in 1984 under SMDP. As her position of Head of Personnel is fairly new at the recently-opened Family Planning Center, she fully anticipates using the management and administrative techniques learned in her training program in her duties as Head of Personnel.

- A Senior Researcher received short-term training in computer programming and solar energy applications. In his research at the Institute, he works with a KAPRO personal computer utilizing the BASIC and FORTRAN programming he learned in his training program. He also teaches at the University and incorporates the concepts learned in training in discussing computer applications in solar energy research.

- A Principal Auditor in the Auditor General's Office attended a short-course in 1982 at the U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C., in financial accounting under the SMDP project. As a direct result of this training, he has established a system to monitor development projects based on the fundamental accounting concepts learned in the course, i.e., "economy, efficiency, and effectiveness."

- As a result of training received at a University of Pittsburgh Management Seminar in 1984 under the SMDP project, he has increased responsibility for organizing personnel and has initiated a number of new activities including organizing a census of civil service employees, updating the civil service code (which has been in effect since 1967), and developing an employee payment program to encourage early retirement.

- She attended the CEDPA program in Semptember 1983 under SMDP sponsorship. The training received has helped her in the work as director of a women's rug cooperative where she also teaches accounting principles to illiterates. The training in family health has also afforded her an opportunity to discuss population issues with the cooperative members.

THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING

- As Chief of Agricultural Statistics, he attended a three-year diploma program in Rwanda in General Statistics under the SMDP project. After this training, he was promoted from Assistant Chief of the Division. In 1984, he received further short-term training in the Ivory Coast in agricultural statistics. As a result of this specialized training, he has organized surveys to collect data and has initiated a cost survey on agricultural production.

- A Health Inspector, he was sponsored in 1982 for a one-year Health Education diploma program in Nigeria under the SMDP project. After training, he was promoted and placed in the newly-established Health Education Unit with responsibility for the Unit's extensive radio work. He also served as the counterpart for an AID Oral Rehydration education project.

- His present position is Head of Finance and Currency Division. He attended a short-course in Dakar at IDEP in Analysis and Evaluation of Investment Projects in 1984. As his duties involve the analysis of recurrent costs and the cost effectiveness of development projects, he found the IDEP program to be extremely relevant and useful. He also teaches economics at the University and tutors students in evaluation techniques learned in the IDEP program.

- Now the Head of Animal Husbandry and Marketing Division, he attended the Pittsburgh Management Seminar in Ouagadougou in 1983 under the SMDP project. He especially benefited from the communications module of this seminar and, as a result, reorganized and clarified the channels of authority in his division. He also assisted in interpreting some of the material presented in this seminar for several colleagues participating in a similar program in Bamako.

A N N E X C

ORIENTATION MATERIALS

LIST OF ORIENTATION MATERIALS FOUND AT MISSIONS:

- USIS pre-departure handbook in English
- USIS booklet on U.S. education system (in French and English)
- Master's and Doctor of Philosophy Booklets (in French and English)
- Pre-departure Travel checklist (in French)
- Background paper on USAID participant training program (in French)
- Background notes on Host Country (in English and in French)
- How to Survive in USA - ELT textbook with audio cassette
- Outline of orientation program;

  1) Get acquainted session
  2) Pre-departure information
  3) Movie - "University Today"
  4) Life in USA and on campus
  5) "Foreigners as Seen by Americans"
  6) Review and Questions

Films: "University Today" (French - USIS "Dialogue" Series)
"Dear Participant"
"Engineering in the U.S."

Videos: "Foreign Graduate Student" Iowa State University
"Agriculture Today"
"America" - Alistair Cook series

A N N E X D

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

ANNEX D.1 MISSION INTERVIEW GUIDE

A. PROJECT PURPOSE AND IMPACT:

1. As you probably know, SMDP II was particularly designed to remove or alleviate critical development constraints in institutions that impact upon the success of AID's projects in the Sahel. Two types of training were to be funded: (a) Pre-project training and (b) training to strengthen institutions that impact upon AID-funded projects.

In your opinion, to what extent has the project accomplished its primary purpose? Has the host country re-employed returned participants or in other ways is utilizing the training provided? How has the project supported CDSS objectives? What have been the most effective types of training funded under SMDP II? Least effective?

2. Do you believe that the purpose of Phase III should remain the same or be modified? Please explain. (Try to get at the degree of flexibility desired and reasons for this.)

3. Can the host country effectively absorb a doubling of funds under this project? Are there sufficient candidates available? Does the host country have an effective HRD planning mechanism or studies that provide good information on training needs? In general, what evidence do you have to support your viewpoint?

4. If given flexibility in planning training activities under Phase III, what types of training have the highest priority for your Mission (both types of training and fields)? (Note: Try to get a fairly detailed list.)

5. What priority would you give to the following areas:

a. Strengthening training institutions through use of short-term technical assistance. What about the use of OPEX-type TA/training activity? Please discuss.

b. Using funds to encourage private sector development. (Some examples: banking, finance, small-scale business or industry, cooperatives training, etc.) Please discuss.

c. Increasing the involvement of women in training for development. (Try to have facts on numbers of trained women before discussing this.) Please discuss.

d. Improving development management capacity. Should Phase III include specific plans by each country to address training needs in this oft-identified area? Please discuss.

e. Use of "training of trainers" approach for multiplier effects.

6. What is your view on using AID funds for U.S. undergraduate training (BA/BS) for your country? If Mission supports: Are there alternative approaches which are more cost effective?

7. Do you believe that SMDP II apportionment of funds for your country was fair? Explain.

8. For Phase III, what criteria should be used to apportion funds among the Sahelian countries?

9. Do you have additional suggestions for improving the cost-effectiveness of training activities overall?

B. COUNTRY TRAINING STRATEGY/PLANS:

1. SMDP II included an innovative feature, the development of a five-year country training strategy (CTS) and annual country training plans (CTPs) for all Mission training. How useful have you found the CTS? The CTPs? Please discuss and provide examples if possible to support your response.

2. To what extent did the host country participate in preparing the CTS? Has such participation had any notable effect on host country HRD planning?

3. To what extent have you met training targets in annual CTP's? (Get specific data from Project Officer or Training Officer on planned targets, achieved targets, reasons for shortfalls, extensions, changes, etc.)

4. Have you achieved other CTS planning objectives? (Prior to this, review CTS and note proposals on improved orientation, ELT or other such areas which they planned to undertake or improve.)

5. What suggestions do you have for improving Phase III use of the CTS and CTPs? (For example, mid-term strategy review, re-doing of strategy in conjunction with CDSS preparation, revised CTS model such as that of ST/IT?)

C. PROCESSING PARTICIPANTS:

1. Would you outline a typical chronology of processing participants for U.S. training for your Mission, noting which stages apply to long-term, short-term or both? (If one of the steps is left out, clarify if this is a slip-up or if in fact Mission does not do it.)

Selection
Pre-departure orientation (administrative, program, cultural)
ELT
Monitoring of training (e.g., being sure reports from Partners or USDA are received and reviewed)
Re-entry
Follow-up

2. How does typical process described earlier vary for third-country training? Please discuss.

3. In your opinion, which of the above-delineated steps are carried out most effectively? Least effectively? Note responses for both U.S. and TC training.

4. What can Phase III include to improve the processing of participants? For U.S. ST? U.S. LT? TC ST? TC LT?

5. Should selection criteria be specified in Phase III-- e.g., the requirement that participants have at least two years of experience in the job area and position before being considered for training, participant must commit himself/herself to working five years in country upon return, etc.?

D. THIRD COUNTRY TRAINING:

NOTE: Some of these questions may elicit responses similar to those in description of processing. Use those for which responses have not already been provided.

1. As you know, SMDP II was designed to encourage greater use of third-country training. Has your Mission increased, decreased or continued the same amount of third-country training as a result of the project? Get statistics and explanation.

2. (Please note that some countries were not visited during institutional study survey; perhaps more background explanation will be required in those cases.) Do you believe a directory and third-country training manual will facilitate use of this mode of training? How do you plan to upgrade information on institutions to be used for third-country training in your country? (Note that this was to be a part of Mission role once directory and mechanism were in place.)

3. What suggestions do you have for Phase III to assist you further in using this mechanism?

4. Should a limit be established for use of U.S. training in Phase III to encourage use of and strengthening of third-country institutions? Please discuss.

E. IN-COUNTRY/REGIONAL SEMINARS:

1. To what extent has the Mission used SMDP II funds for in-country and/or regional seminars? Get data on both IC and regional.

2. What is Mission assessment of the IC training activities implemented? Strengths? Weaknesses? (NOTE: Project Paper called for Mission assessment of each IC seminar. Any documentation or its absence on assessment should be noted.)

3. What suggestions do you have for designing Phase III for improving this type of training?

4. Should limits be put on U.S. training to encourage greater use of this generally more cost-effective method?

F. ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING:

1. What is the Mission's current practice in regard to ELT, including location, length of time, etc.?

2. To what extent did the Mission adhere to SMDP II basic minimum (475 TOEFL score) to be achieved prior to allowing departure? Discuss reasons for practices followed.

3. Has the Mission implemented any suggestions from the ALIGU study on ELT and predeparture materials? What action has the Mission taken?

4. What is the Mission's reaction to the proposed strengthening of the Bamako ELT program to permit attendance by other Francophone Sahelian participants?

5. What cost-effective alternative to strengthening the Bamako ELT program does your Mission support? (Elicit responses other than sending participant to U.S.)

G. PROJECT MANAGEMENT:

1. In your opinion, has the project management (PM) mechanism worked well? Discuss in terms of AID/W and Mission roles/levels.

2. To what extent were project funds used to complete SMDP I project training?

3. Have you fully forward-funded SMDP II Participants?

4. What suggestions do you have for improving the PM in Phase III? Would you prefer a regional field location of PM? AID/W? Please discuss.

5. In your opinion, can your Mission manage an expanded program, including possible third-country training monitoring? (Get as many specifics on response as possible since this will be a key element of Phase III design.)

H. PARTICIPANT TRAINING DATA SYSTEM:

1. How does the Mission currently keep participant training information? In logs, on the computer, etc.? Please describe. (Note: Team should observe documents or whatever on the actual method used.) How effective is the current system in your opinion?

2. Does the Mission now have or plan to establish a computer-based participant tracking system? What equipment (hardware and software) is now used or anticipated?

3. Has the Mission requested a software package from ST/IT for participant tracking?

4. What can Phase III include to facilitate better tracking of participants?

I. EQUIVALENCY:

1. Are you satisfied with the equivalency allotted U.S. degrees in the host country? Please explain, especially noting negative consequences of inadequate equivalency recognition.

2. Do you believe Phase III should address this issue systematically? Discuss.

3. AID/W has recently received a "proposal" from an independent consultant suggesting a mechanism for facilitating equivalency recognition. The proposed method suggests that an office be set-up in the U.S. (a contractor's office) to develop dossiers on returning participants. Dossiers would stipulate in detail such information as the number of hours and credits studied and recommended equivalency level. The assumption here is that over time the host country would become familiar with the various degrees and institutions and would eventually accept a standard recognition of U.S. degrees.

Do you believe such a system has merit for your situation? What alternative approach do you propose?

ANNEX D.2. HOST GOVERNMENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Country Training Strategy. To what extent did your Ministry or Department participate in formulating the Country Training Strategy for the SMDP Project? Do you have a copy of this document (in French)?

2. Host Government Relationship with SMDP Project. What is this Ministry's/Department's role in managing and administering the SMDP Project? Who is host government counterpart and what position?

3. Participant Monitoring. Do you receive periodic reports on participant progress in U.S. or third-country training institutions?

4. Training Needs Assessment

a) What mechanism or formula have you used to identify your country's training needs? (check the CTS)

b) What combination of type, level, and location of training would best suit your country's development needs given the limitation on resources?

short-term	non-degree	technical	U.S.
long-term	degree	vocational	3rd-country
		academic	in-country

c) What skill areas are important in improving the effectiveness of government service?

5. Absorptive Capacity of Returned Participants. What growth areas in government do you forsee in the next five years?

6. Impact

a) Long-Term Training. What impact has this project had institutionally? Have returned participants been placed in positions which utilize the knowledge and skills acquired from the AID training program?

b) In-country Training. What impact have the in-country training seminars had, and how have you assessed these programs?

8. Special Areas

a) Strengthening institutions via short-term technical assistance (e.g., special seminars) and/or long-term TA (e.g., OPEX)
b) Private Sector Development
c) Increase number of women candidates
d) Training of trainers approach
e) Improving development management capability (i.e., more management training)
f) Training for HRD Planning
g) Training to encourage policy reform

ANNEX D.3 PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW GUIDE

PARTICIPANT FACESHEET

NAME:_____ Interview Date:_____

M___ F___ US___ 3rd Cntry_____ Date Returned_____

Accompanied by Spouse/Family_____

TYPE OF TRAINING----------

Short-Term

___Observation/Field Tour
___Workshop/Seminar
___Short Course

# of weeks/months___

Long-Term

___Diploma/Certificate
___Undergraduate
___Graduate

# of months___

INSTITUTION:_____

FIELD:_____

JOB HISTORY----------

Present Position:_____

Department/Ministry:_____

Former Position:_____

- o Before leaving for training, did you know what job you would be returning to? ___yes ___no
- o Is your current job in the same field for which you were trained under the AID program? ___yes ___no
- o Have you advanced in grade or position since returning? ___yes ___no Is this a result of training?___yes ___no
- o Compared to your level of responsibility before training, does your present job have:

  _____less responsibility
  _____same responsibility
  _____more responsibility

COMMENTS:

GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPANT INTERVIEWS

A. PRE-DEPARTURE PHASE

1. Selection: How were you selected? (e.g., nominated by supervisor, open competition, committee selection, etc.)

2. Program Design: To what extent did you participate in planning your program? (e.g., selecting institution or agency to be visited, setting objectives/degree)

3. Orientation and Preparation

   a) Lead-Time: How long had you known about plans for your AID program, and how much notice were you given prior to departure date?

   b) What kind of an orientation did you have before leaving? (e.g., workshop, lectures, videotapes, written materials, etc.) Was this orientation adequate for preparing you for your program?

   c) To what extent were you briefed on the following:

      o administrative aspects (visa, allowances, travel, contacts in country of training, health insurance)

      o technical aspects (program content, schedule, objectives)

      o cross-cultural (living conditions and education system in country of training)

4. English Language Training

   a) Where and for how long did you study English before your training program?

   b) Did you have any difficulties during your training with the English language in understanding, speaking, reading, or writing?

B. TRAINING EXPERIENCE IN THE U.S. OR THIRD COUNTRY

5. Arrival Orientation & Contact With AID Program Agent

a) What kind of an orientation did you have upon arrival and where? (e.g., WIC, training site)

b) How satisfied were you with the orientation? If not, what kinds of information would have facilitated your training experience?

c) How satisfied were you with the support provided by the AID Program Agent throughout your training with technical or personal matters?

6. Support at Training Site

a) How satisfied were you with academic guidance in planning your program? (e.g., choosing relevant courses or research topics; field trips, etc.)

b) What were the major strengths and weaknesses of your training program? (elicit information on quality, relevance, and appropriateness of training)

c) Program Completion: Did you finish all your program requirements? Did you finish your program by the date originally planned? If not, why not?

d) Did you have any adjustment problems with American life and culture or educational system? If so, how satisfied were you with counseling services at training site (e.g., foreign student advisor)?

C. RE-ENTRY IN HOME COUNTRY

7. De-Briefing: Upon return, did you report to the mission? What kind of de-briefing did you have after finishing your program? By whom?

8. Contact with USAID: Since returning, how often have you been in contact with the AID mission, either formally or informally?

9. Post-Training Re-adjustment: Have you had any difficulties in re-adjusting to your job or life-style since returning?

D. UTILIZATION OF TRAINING

10. Appropriateness: Was your training appropriate (relevant) to your country's local conditions? If not, please explain.

11. Current Use of Training: Are you using the knowledge and skills acquired from training in your current job? If not, why not? (probe and elaborate)

12. Constraints to application of training: Have you experienced any constraints to applying the knowledge and skills from training to the performance of your current job? (e.g., lack of resources, lack of support from supervisor, resistance from peers)

13. Innovative Behavior: What kinds of new activities have you undertaken in your job as a result of training? (e.g., develop or revise policy or operating procedures, develop new projects and proposals, plan workshops, publish works in professional journals, etc.) Elaborate with examples.

14. How successful have you been in introducing these new activities to your peers and/or supervisors?

E. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

15. Professional Contacts: Since your return, have you corresponded with persons met or agencies visited during training? How frequently?

16. Professional Associations: Do you belong to any professional association? Do you receive any professional journals or publications?

17. Alumni Association: Do you meet regularly with other colleagues trained under the AID program? Is this a formal or informal group? Do you think a formalized group would be desirable?

18. Spread or Multiplier Effect: To what extent have you shared your knowledge and skills from training with your colleagues? Through what channels? (e.g., informal discussion, formal presentation, on-the-job training, reports)

19. Equivalency: Compared to the overseas training of others, does your training have less, more, or the same prestige? In your opinion, have you received sufficient recognition for your degree/training?

20. Overall Satisfaction: How satisfied are you with your overall training experience? Are there any other problem areas or highlights which we haven't covered? (elaborate)

21. What suggestions would you have for improving future training programs?

A N N E X E

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Project Documentation

SMDP I Project Paper, 1979
SMDP I Evaluation, 1982
SMDP II Project, 1983
Country Training Strategies, 1983-84
SMDP II Files, 1985
PID Preparation Files

Strategy/Policy Papers

Africa Bureau Strategy Paper, 1984
Policy Determination Paper on Participant Training

Other Publications, Reports

Qualitative Assessment of Participant Training in the Sahel (AFR/SWA-sponsored study), A. Monares: Report and Appendix O: "List of Participants Trained in the U.S." (Academic and Technical FYs '78-'84);

Equivalency of U.S. and Francophone African Degrees (AFR/TR and S&T/IT), 1985;

AFGRAD Follow-Up Study Outline (AFR/RA), 1984-85;

Inspector General Report: "How to Make Participant Training More Effective", 1984;

Review of Participant Training Evaluations & Annotated Bibliography, PPC/CDIE study, 1985

AID Handbook III; Guidelines for PID Preparation;

Worldwide Evaluation of Participant Training, 23-country study summary by F. Clements, 1966;

English Language Training in the Sahel: Feasibility Study, ALIGU, 1983;

Third Country Training in Africa, Jeffalyn Johnson & Associates; 1983.