

INTERNAL PROJECT REVIEW

**UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING PROJECT
150-0001**

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COOPERATION PROGRAM

BETWEEN

**THE PORTUGUESE JUNTA NACIONAL DE INVESTIGACAO
CIENTIFICA E TECNOLOGICA (JNICT)**

AND

THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (NAS)/NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

SEPTEMBER, 1985

Reviewed by:

**Carolyn I. Coleman
Bureau for Asia and Near East
Office of Technical Resources
Energy and Natural Resources Division**

NOTE OF APPRECIATION

The reviewer is grateful to a number of individuals and organizations who generously gave their time, information and support to this study. Without the many services and support of the JNICT staff and the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), this internal project review would not have been possible. They ably distributed and collected the surveys to participants, fellows, panel members, and hosts, and encouraged all to provide honest responses.

Special thanks are also extended to Luz Rezende and Michael Lukomski of USAID/Lisbon and Augustus Nasmith of the NAS for the personal interest and professional excellence they have exhibited in implementing this activity.

The careful and diligent typing of Jeanne C. Dougan is highly appreciated, as is the fact she prepared this document with her customary efficiency and good humor.

DEDICATION

This project review is in memory of Professor José Mendes-Mourão, late President of the Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica e Tecnológica (JNICT), who died on September 8, 1985. He was instrumental in initiating this program of scientific exchange and cooperation between the Government of Portugal and the United States of America. In not yielding to flags or imaginary boundary lines, he served the general welfare of mankind as ties of friendship were strengthened and opportunities of service illuminated. His presence and contributions shall long be felt and remembered.

As we strive to complete implementation of this program, we must do so in the spirit with which it was initiated. Let us strive to carry high the torch of scientific cooperation and may its light burn brightly. Professor Mendes-Mourão was a shining example for others to emulate. He left an unspoken challenge: a challenge of excellence, full investigation, cooperation, and problem solving. Let us be wholly committed to the tasks at hand.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AID	Agency for International Development
AID/W	Agency for International Development/Washington
BOSTID	Board of Science and Technology for International Development
JNICT	Junta Nacional de InvestigaçãO Científica e Tecnológica
LADF	Luso American Development Foundation
NAS/NRC	National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council
NRC	National Research Council
NSF	National Science Foundation
U.S.A.	United States of America
USAID/Lisbon	United States Agency for International Development/Lisbon Office

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY INTERNAL PROJECT REVIEW

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1-11
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Program Review Focus	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
A. History of Program	2
B. Project Objectives	3
III. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	4
1. Workshops	5
2. Fellows Visits to U.S.	7
3. U.S. Advisory Services	7
IV. SURVEY DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	9
Methodology	9
V. FINDINGS	13
A. Direct Benefits	13
B. Indirect Benefits	14
C. Contractor Performance	15
VI. CONCLUSIONS	16
VII. RECOMMENDATIONS	18
APPENDIX	20
Participant Questionnaire	21
Fellow Questionnaire	22
Panel Questionnaire	23
Host Questionnaire	24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Science and Technology Program funded under the AID Technical Assistance and Training Project (150-0001) is moving well toward achieving its purpose, namely in assisting the Junta Nacional de Investigacao Cientifica e Tecnologica (JNICT) in planning and implementing programs in selected areas, and encouraging cooperation between scientific institutions and scientists in the United States and Portugal.

This internal program review covers the period February 1982 - February 1985, the first three years of activities during which seven workshops were implemented in Portugal with the participation of 234 Portuguese and 31 NAS/NRC panelists; 26 Portuguese fellows visited or studied in the U.S.; and seven advisors worked in Portugal with research institutions.

The program has established itself as being a quality activity. Positive signs of program impact emerged repeatedly in responses to the questionnaires as provided by panelists, hosts, participants, and fellows. The participants are utilizing ideas, techniques and knowledge they gained through the workshops and, in the case of the fellows, during the tailored training programs.

At the same time, there is a key question pressing: Should the activity be continued, and, if so, what type of format would be most beneficial? The reviewer feels that the program should be continued, even if such is done without AID support, but several recommendations should also be considered.

1. Follow-up meetings for identification and design of key industrial development projects should be encouraged.
2. Decision making people should play a leading role in relating to high level policy makers final workshop recommendations which may be translated into action programs.
3. Draft summaries of findings and final recommendations should be distributed to all workshop participants and relevant key institutions and policy makers.
4. JNICT's leadership in R&D should be emphasized and utilized to explore new program modes, other than formal workshops, and to accelerate private sector development.
5. Establishment and/or expansion of professional societies and other human resource development mechanisms should be encouraged.
6. Fellows should receive certificates of accomplishment.

Much of the credit for the progress and success of the project is due to the Portuguese leadership, the performance of the U.S. contractor, National Academy of Sciences, and to good Portuguese-USAID/Lisbon cooperation and flexibility in quickly addressing project challenges as they arose. JNICT's ability in identifying key individuals in promising areas of development is a major contribution to the success of the program.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY INTERNAL PROJECT REVIEW

I. INTRODUCTION

The Technical Assistance and Training Project (150-0001) is one of two technical assistance projects for Portugal. Begun in February, 1975, and funded with \$750,000.00 the Project has subsequently been amended several times and an overall budget of \$12,750,000.00 has resulted from these amendments. The project was initially established as one which could quickly respond to requests by the Government of Portugal (GOP) for American support, thus demonstrating ongoing U.S. support for continued development and moderate political leadership. The Science and Technology Program, the focus of this program review, was but one of several activities funded under the mechanism.

Program Review Focus

The main purpose of the review was to determine progress made toward program objectives and to detect implementation strengths and weaknesses. Second order purposes were to:

1. Identify major issues;
2. Ascertain, where possible, developmental effects;
3. Suggest future options;
4. Make recommendations for improvements.

Hence, in addition to the fact that the U.S. Congress mandates periodic review of major projects such as the Technical Assistance Grant, the different entities involved wished to judge program merit in order to enhance impact. This program review came at a time when projectized assistance granted to Portugal was being gradually reduced.

The review focused on collecting specific information and was decision-oriented; it centered on worth, merit and value. It was comprised of antecedent, transactional and outcome data as it attempted to measure attitudes and results. It served a summative function in that it summarized what has happened during the program; it also served a formative evaluation function in that it was conducted prior to program completion in order to highlight successes and deficiencies so that adjustments and refinements could be made.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Historical Sketch of the Program

Programs in science and technology are a valuable tool in the conduct of American foreign relations and play a meaningful role in the diplomacy. Through our cooperation, we benefit from intellectual cooperation with other highly trained scientists and technical experts. Bilateral arrangements with developing countries are one of the effective ways of obtaining science and technology cooperation and excellence for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind.

The Portugal Science and Technology program began in 1982. Its goal was to assist the Junta Nacional de InvestigaçãO Científica e Tecnológica (JNICT), Portugal's National Board for Scientific and Technological Research, in encouraging cooperation between U.S. and Portugal in S&T development.

JNICT was established by Decree-Law Number 47 791 on July 11, 1967 to advise the Government of Portugal on national science and technology policy, and to develop and promote the implementation of science and technology research programs in areas identified as critical to Portugal's continued development. Located under the office of the Prime Minister, JNICT has been highly independent and continues to draw its strength and much of its advisory personnel from outside regular government channels and outside of Portugal.

Generally, JNICT is charged with the responsibility of advising the government on national science and technology policy and planning, as well as coordinating and promoting scientific and technological research. JNICT promotes the linking of science and technology policy, and support for research and application to Portugal's economic development goals. For these reasons, the Government of Portugal selected JNICT as the institution with which AID should work to meet the aforementioned objectives. Between February 1982 and February 1985 (period of this review), AID has allocated \$495,000 to this science and technology activity.

B. Program Objectives

1. Planning and implementation of programs in selected areas of science and technology;
2. Encouraging cooperation between scientific and technical institutions in Portugal and the United States;
3. Identifying human resource needs related to the selected areas by:

- a. Providing individually tailored orientation, research, study and fact finding programs in the United States for selected Portuguese scientists, engineers and science administrators;
 - b. Providing selected American scientists and engineers for advisory services in Portugal.
4. Providing relevant science and technology information to JNICT and identifying existing networks in which JNICT and other Portuguese institutions can participate.

III. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

AID contracted with the NAS National Research Council (NRC) Board on Science and Technology for International Development (BOSTID) for implementation of this cooperative science and technology planning and development program. In February, 1982, a contract was signed between AID and NAS having BOSTID accept the task of assisting JNICT in recommending measures for strengthening identified areas of science and technology, in strengthening the human resource base, and in establishing ties with knowledgeable and experienced individuals and institutions in the U.S.A. The contractual obligation has been met through: (1) workshops held in Portugal, (2) subsequent training visits to the U.S.A. for public and private sector Portuguese scientists and engineers, and (3) selected follow-up visits by U.S. advisors to Portugal.

1. **WORKSHOPS.** Pre-workshop planning sessions were held in the U.S.A. for approximately two weeks for each of the seven workshops. The JNICT-designated workshop chairman, JNICT representative and contract coordinator spent this time finalizing the workshop agenda, reviewing/assigning workshop papers, and traveling to various institutions. Seven workshops were held in Portugal for approximately three days each with additional time available for field visits. Each had approximately thirty five participants with up to six American panelists. The workshops were designed to arrive at concrete conclusions by producing practical recommendations for addressing various aspects of the problem being discussed which were relevant to JNICT and the Portuguese community as a whole.

Workshop areas were identified by the JNICT because of the need for multidisciplinary and multisector contributions to analysis for recognized problems and opportunities for cooperative problem solving. The workshops were on the following topics:

1. Energy Conservation
2. Marine Sciences Development
3. Management of Research for Economic Development
4. Water Resources Planning
5. Biotechnology Research
6. The Future of Portuguese Forestry
7. Innovation - Based Technology

JNICT officials planned and organized the activities in such a way as to encourage and enable extensive participation and utilization of BOSTID advisory services. Workshop topics reflect a broad array of areas within the loosely operationally defined area of science and technology.

Workshop chairmen and participants have been extensively involved in the problem areas. The requirement for participants to prepare papers and lead discussions ensured prior planning and concentration, minimizing significantly the orientation time necessary for workshops. The "fellows" chosen for post-workshop specialized training programs in the U.S.A. completed a rigorous JNICT application procedure and completed the respective workshop. This application procedure proved valuable, as all fellows successfully completed their tailored training programs.

BOSTID complemented the aims and objectives defined by JNICT by recruiting workshop panel members from a mixture of academia, government and industry. As with all NRC committee members, the panelists accepted their appointments as a public service. They assisted in the identification of individuals and institutions with which the Portuguese could be linked for supplemental information and to act as hosts to the touring JNICT fellows. BOSTID chose panelists who were able to be objective because they had no vested (personal or financial) interest in Portuguese research, and the specific expertise they possessed related to various aspects of the individual target problems and approaches for which solutions were sought. The multidisciplinary BOSTID panels helped foster interaction among participants and reach, to varying degrees, a consensus on institutional, coordination, funding and procedural measures necessary for maintaining and strengthening basic and applied research on the identified problems.

JNICT limited the numbers of Portuguese workshop participants because the demand had been higher than anticipated and it was decided that less actual interaction would occur if the groups were too large. Two-hundred thirty four (234) Portuguese participants and 31 BOSTID panelists attended the seven workshops, an average of approximately 35 participants and four panelists (including the chair) per workshop. There were six visits to the U.S.A. by the Portuguese chairmen prior to the respective workshops to provide contact with panelists and institutions that would act as hosts to the fellows after the workshops.

2. FELLOWS VISITS TO U.S. Short-term observation and consultation visits were tailored to needs defined in the workshops and post-workshop sessions. Approximately three people from each workshop were sent to the U.S.A. for an average of three months.

Twenty six (26) fellows participated in study/observation tours. Table 1 shows the distribution of travel to either the U.S.A. or Portugal for consultation in connection with the program. These visits by the workshop chairmen and fellows have provided primary contact with approximately 175 institutions comprised of a mix of government agencies, universities, research facilities, private companies, and non-profit organizations.

3. U.S. ADVISORY SERVICES. Short visits to Portugal by a total of seven U.S. specialists were planned for intensive follow-up consultancies on particular problems or needs identified during each workshop and post-workshop planning session. Approximately one week of U. S. advisory services were available after each workshop.

Table 1. FOREIGN VISITS FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

WORKSHOP	CHAIRMAN VISIT (TO USA)	FELLOW VISITS (TO USA)	FOLLOW-UP CONSULTANTS (TO PORTUGAL)
Energy Conservation	1	3	0
Marine Sciences Development	1	7	1
Management of Research for Economic Development	1	3	0
Water Resources Planning	1	4	2
Biotechnology Research	0	1	2*
Portuguese Forestry	1	3	1
Innovation-Based Technology	1	5	1
TOTAL	6	26	7

*JNICT funded four additional consultations outside of this program.

IV. THE SURVEY DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS

After three years of implementation it was critical to examine the program to determine:

1. If objectives were being accomplished;
2. If the program should be continued;
3. If recommendations were needed.

Methodology

Due to factors beyond the control of USAID/Lisbon, the reviewer was unable to conduct post-workshop, on-site interviews in Portugal. Procedurally, the survey involved the following major activities:

1. Mailed questionnaire admission;
2. Analysis of questionnaire responses;
3. Analysis of pertinent secondary (filed) data archives.

Questionnaires were distributed to all workshop panel members, participants, fellows, and primary contacts at institutes/agencies/companies which had acted as hosts for the U.S.A. visits. It was decided that the entire population could be surveyed given an "n" of 300 or less, the population here being defined as persons participating in implementing or taking an active part in the program.

Admittedly, there were problems with employing this type of survey mechanism. In the interest of not having the questionnaire itself so extensive that people would not respond, questions were direct but offered opportunity for expansion. Judgmental responses were solicited. In light of the fact that no follow-up interviews were conducted,

interpretation of some of the comments was left solely to the reviewer without benefit of other concrete input. The strength of conducting interviews would have been that they allow for depth and free response, and are flexible and adaptable to individual situations, and allow for glimpses of a respondent's gestures, tone of voice, etc. that reveal his/her true feelings. Weaknesses of interviews are usually that they are costly in time and personnel, are frequently difficult to summarize, and are subject to several biases (i.e. the interviewer's, respondent's, situational, etc.).

The questionnaires were distributed by JNICT and BOSTID to a total of 279 people, 87 of whom replied. Table 2 gives a breakdown of distribution and response rate, on a numerical and percentage basis.

The questionnaire approach had limited success in evaluating project performance. Future reviews or evaluations should provide for follow-up interviews.

Table 3 summarizes the participant responses by workshops. The purposive sampling represents 31% of the universe. Due to the economy of time, the reviewer chose not to have second and third mailings in an effort to increase the response rate although JNICT did make follow-up telephone calls.

Table 2. QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION AND RESPONSES

<u>Category</u>	<u>Questionnaires Distributed</u>	<u>Questionnaires Returned</u>	<u>Response Rate</u>
Panelists	31	21	69%
Participants (Including Fellows)	234	56	24%
Hosts	14	10	74%
TOTAL	279	87	31%

Table 3. PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRES RETURNED BY WORKSHOPS

<u>WORKSHOP</u>	<u>WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>FELLOWS</u>
Energy Conservation	3	1
Marine Sciences Development	4	2
Management of Research for Economic Development	2	1
Water Resources Planning	8	2
Biotechnology Research	9	0
Future of Portuguese Forestry	10	1
Innovation-Based Technology	10	3
TOTAL	46	10

The four survey instruments were designed to be administered to the fellows, hosts, panelists and participants, respectively. Copies of each are attached in the Appendix. Items were designed to be open-ended and, at the same time, capable of being tabulated. This provided respondents with adequate opportunities to elaborate while allowing less verbally fluent respondents to indicate approval/agreement or disapproval/disagreement relative to all variables under study.

Generally, the hosts, panelists and fellows were found to elaborate, while workshop participants tended not to do so.

Analysis of questionnaire responses, for the most part followed the standards for simple tabulation, which involved counting each item/variable independently. In addition, the data generated by the questionnaire was combined with archival/file data--reports, cables, letters--in order to provide a more complete picture.

V. FINDINGS

A. Direct Benefits

There was widespread praise for the program, the list of contributions and the technical and scientific applications in all areas. There was immediate (keeping in mind the time that has elapsed between some of the workshops and this review) and direct applications of the knowledge, techniques and ideas acquired in the workshops and, by the fellows, through executing research in the United States. The participants appreciated and profited from:

- o The AID sponsored program serving as a catalyst in bringing Portuguese from various institutions together to establish internal networks;
- o Introduction to new techniques and processes;
- o Being made aware of new trends in their respective professional fields;
- o Having opportunities to conduct publishable research;
- o Becoming better acquainted with books, equipment and other professional materials;
- o Gaining access to specialized libraries;
- o Discussions and assimilation of new ideas, techniques and opinions;
- o Meeting experts and practitioners in the field
- o Expanding their knowledge of major issues and problems;
- o Establishing domestic and international professional and personal contacts;
- o Practical training, opportunities to collaborate, attendance at professional conferences and meetings, and chances to work in more updated laboratories for fellows visiting the U.S.;
- o Mutually beneficial experience for Portuguese fellows and U.S. hosts leading to durable program linkages.

B. Indirect Benefits

The indirect benefits of this type of program are an important part of the activity itself because they embody the extension of knowledge to a larger group. Theoretically, the examination of indirect benefits is important because it sheds light on program impact and suggests improvements.

Indirect benefits are attempts to influence large numbers of people over a long period with what is a small amount of effort. Unfortunately, they were not a focus of the survey and are much harder to document than direct benefits. The task becomes much more difficult and complex when the methodology employed did not include interviews, questions of this nature were not a focus of the survey instrument, and the return rate of surveys was low.

In spite of this paucity of input, several indirect benefits were apparent.

- o Information dissemination was achieved through the number of people who read articles in technical publications reporting the findings of the research of fellows.
- o Fellows identified contact points for colleagues, thus expanding the international professional exchange.
- o Panelists returned to Portugal, sometimes under other funding, and also expanded and extended the information exchange.

C. Contractor Performance

All respondents agreed that the BOSTID staff did an outstanding job in implementing this program. They were able to secure panelists who would volunteer their time, thus the limited funding was able to cover a broader range of services. They personally met the fellows who came to the U.S.A., and were cooperative in honoring requests for enhancing individual programs, including participation in technical and professional meetings. Even though the panels did not meet as a group prior to going to Portugal, BOSTID did provide general information to assist in the preparation and arranged orientation meeting in Portugal prior to the start of each workshop. The Portuguese

workshop chairmen worked closely with their BOSTID counterparts during their pre-workshop visits.

Several respondents felt that the final recommendations took too long to be compiled. One cannot be sure that the recommendations were widely circulated among participants as soon as they were available or if they were kept in a central location for a time prior to distribution.

To read the files and correspondence between the host country agency, JNICT, and NAS, one is easily led to the conclusion that they worked well together with neither hindrances of formality or bureaucracy. Part of the success of the program can be directly attributed to the fact that the contractor was innovative, sensitive and went the second mile to try to ensure that participants and fellows got the greatest possible benefit from the experiences enabled by the program.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The Science and Technology Program appears to have been generally quite successful. Heavy reliance on workshop format cannot be criticized based on the results obtained. The data indicate program effectiveness, and did not support rejection of the hypothesis of success. Positive aspects and successes of the program can be documented.

The success of the program in general can be directly attributed to eight concrete factors.

1. There was planned and documented transfer of knowledge and techniques. Lasting domestic and international professional ties were established.

2. There was immediate benefit for workshop participants as they were intellectually stimulated and exposed to in-depth discussions of problems. The future benefits reside mainly in possessing increased knowledge which may directly be pertinent or usefully serve as a base for expansion.
3. Fellows received advanced practical training, opportunities to work with and know Americans, attend professional conferences and meetings, and jointly perform quality research and laboratory work. They were also able to use new or hitherto unknown laboratory equipment, and form professional ties. Although the fellows were not afforded opportunities to earn additional recognized degrees or certificates, employers and families were much less likely to pose opposition to a three month absence than a much extended time.
4. The science and technology resources within Portugal can be effectively mobilized to address national development problems through using multidisciplinary approaches. The full values of technology assessment and adaptation are realized.
5. The careful attention JNICT paid to the program in selecting participants, fellows and workshop topics and in making contacts within different institutions in bringing together a cross section of individuals.
6. The careful and caring implementation by NAS which accommodated specific needs of various workshops, stretched a limited budget by getting panelists and hosts to volunteer their time, took extensive time with fellows, and remained cooperative and flexible in addressing on-going operational issues.

7. The careful planning of USAID/Lisbon in having enough insight to offer a general program description and parameters, yet leave adequate room for dynamic and responsive implementation. The Mission staff remained supportive throughout the program.
8. The interaction among USAID/Lisbon, JNICT, and NAS which made the S&T Cooperation Program one of high impact and visibility.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the program be continued, even if such is done without additional AID monetary support. However, the very concrete recommendations that emerge from this review should be considered.

1. Activities should be expanded to encourage follow-up meetings to bring selected participants together. Thus, participants can share post-workshop ideas and developments and trigger identification and design of new projects in key sectors of industrial or scientific development with direct impact on Portugal's economic growth.
2. People responsible for decision making should be invited to the opening session of the workshops to help ensure serious attention at policy levels. This will help ensure that the concrete recommendations which result from these meetings and are then submitted to high level officials, will receive appropriate attention and may be translated into action programs.

3. The JNICT should continue to distribute draft summaries of the findings and recommendations at the end of each session. It is essential that all participants receive final copies and that the recommendations be conveyed to all relevant institutions and policy makers.
4. New modes for building upon the program experience should be explored which will take forms other than formalized workshops. Preferably these new modes should emphasize JNICT's role in R&D and in exploring new sources of funding available to Portugal, particularly related to private sector development, Portugal's entry into the Common Market, and the newly established Luso American Development Foundation (LADF).
5. Portuguese scientific human resource development should be encouraged through the establishment and/or expansion of professional societies, newsletters, interest groups, etc. There is a growing role and need for information systems linked to worldwide networks.
6. Fellows should receive a certificate of accomplishment to document their program and for resume purposes.

APPENDIX

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Were the purposes of the workshop clear, the subject important and the paper topics included?
2. Were the agenda and format effective? Was there adequate time for discussion and formulation of recommendations?
3.
 - a. Did Portuguese participation reflect an appropriate level of experience and cross-section of disciplines and institutions?
 - b. Did the American participation reflect an appropriate cross-section of experience and disciplines? Did American participation contribute to workshop achievement or failure? (please explain)
4.
 - a. Were the workshop recommendations sound and properly focused?
 - b. Do you feel that the workshop conclusions and recommendations accurately described needs and provided direction for improving policy and research? Please comment.
 - c. To your knowledge, have the workshop recommendations (or the workshop itself) effected any changes? Please comment.
5. Did the workshop fulfill its objectives as you understand them?
6.
 - a. Do you think that the workshop experience and related activities, including the visit by JNICT selected "fellows," are an effective means of strengthening Portuguese-American S&T ties? Please explain.
 - b. Have you or your colleagues had further communication or interaction with American colleagues as a result of the workshop?
7. Were there any unexpected results coming from the workshop?
8. Additional comments:

FELLOW QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please describe your objectives in going to the U.S. under the JNICT/NAS program.
2. Did the U.S. experience meet your expectations?
3. Were the appropriate host institutions and related visits chosen to your needs?
4. Did your host institution/individual provide adequate guidance and assistance?
5. Was NAS/BOSTID administrative support adequate and appropriate?
6. Were there unexpected results from your U.S. program?
7. Do you maintain ties with the host individuals or other contacts as a result of the program?
8. Did your U.S. program benefit your work upon return to Portugal?
9. Did your U.S. experience have any benefit that can be shared with your colleagues in Portugal?
10. How could your program have been improved?
11. What did you find most helpful about the experience?
12. Other comments:

PANEL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Were the purposes of the workshop clear and appropriate topics included?
2. Were the agenda and format effective? Was there adequate time for discussion and formulation of recommendations?
3. a. Did Portuguese participation reflect an appropriate cross-section of experience and representation of disciplines and institutions? Were interactions with BOSTID panelists fruitful?
b. Was the BOSTID panel comprised of appropriate expertise?
4. Were the workshop recommendations sound and properly focused?
5. Did the workshop fulfill its objectives, as you understood them?
6. a. Do you think that the workshop experience and related activities, including the visit by JNICT selected Portuguese "fellows", are an effective means of strengthening Portuguese-American S&T ties? Please explain.
b. Have you or your colleagues had further communications or interaction with Portuguese scientists/engineers? If yes, who initiated the exchange?
7. Were there any unexpected results coming from the workshop and/or your BOSTID assignment?
8. Was BOSTID staff preparation and support for your assignment adequate? How could it have been improved?
9. Suggestions for the conduct of future workshops:
10. Additional comments:

HOST QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Were the objectives of the visit of the Portuguese visitor clear?
2. Was there adequate information and preparation prior to arrival of the visitor?
3. Did the visitor attain his or her primary objectives (as you understand them)?
4. Was the visitor adequately trained to make use of the opportunities offered?
5. Was the visitor industrious?
6. Were there any collaborative or "mutually beneficial" endeavors?
7. Did the visit initiate ties with Portuguese scientists/engineers which have continued? If so, please explain. Do you maintain direct contact with the visitor?
8. What suggestions would you have for improvement of such activities?
9. Would you be willing to host another visitor in a similar program?
10. Other comments: