

PD-AAU-644

47943

AUDIT OF
LONG-TERM PARTICIPANT
TRAINING PROGRAM IN AFRICA

AUDIT REPORT NO. 87-05
December 9, 1986

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
REGIONAL INSPECTOR GENERAL/AUDIT

UNITED STATES POSTAL ADDRESS
BOX 232
APO N.Y. 09675

INTERNATIONAL POSTAL ADDRESS
POST OFFICE BOX 30261
NAIROBI, KENYA

December 9, 1986

MEMORANDUM FOR AA/AFR, Mr. Mark L. Edelman

FROM: RIG/A/Nairobi, Richard C. Thabet

SUBJECT: Audit of Long-Term Participant Training Program in
Africa

This report presents the results of audit of the long-term participant training program in Africa. The objectives of this economy and efficiency audit were to: assess the adequacy of the design and planning efforts for the participant training components of projects; assess how well participant training components of projects were implemented and identify major issues/problems which may have prevented these components from achieving the intended objectives; and determine the effectiveness of follow-up and evaluation procedures for returned participants.

The audit showed that missions were not adequately assessing training requirements during the design and planning phase of projects; and effective follow-up and evaluation procedures had not been established for returned participants. As a result, effective implementation of many projects had been severely hampered.

Participant training projects or components of development projects reviewed were being implemented without (1) adequate consideration of the availability of candidates and timeliness of training; (2) considering third country training as a viable option to U.S. training; and (3) adequate justification for extensive undergraduate training. Also, missions lacked a formal system to follow-up and evaluate the effectiveness of training when participants return. Finally, evaluations of participant training programs did not address the developmental impact of training.

We recommended that the Bureau for Africa require detailed assessments of training requirements as well as country and project specific training plans; reassess human resources capability to carry out follow-up activities and require implementation of the Office of International Training's Participant Training Management System to assist in performing follow-up activities; and require future evaluations of projects to include an assessment of the impact of training.

Excerpts from the comments received are included at the end of each findings section along with Office of Inspector General comments. The full text is included as Appendix 1 to the report.

Please advise us within 30 days of any additional information relating to corrective actions planned or taken which we should consider in resolving or closing the report's recommendations. We appreciate the cooperation and courtesy extended to our staff by all African Mission and Bureau officials during the audit.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The AID participant training program is a vital element of foreign assistance. Its primary goal is the development of the human resources potential of citizens of developing countries. The term "participant training" refers to training accorded foreign nationals sponsored by AID to receive training outside their home countries. This includes both "academic" and "technical" training, with academic training defined as that which takes place in an accredited institution of higher learning and leads to a degree. Technical training includes observational visits, on-the-job training, special programs and seminars and training in an academic institution for specialized courses or a certificate.

The specific objectives of this economy and efficiency audit were to (a) assess the adequacy of the design and planning efforts for the participant training components of projects, (b) assess how well participant training components of projects were implemented and identify major issues/problems which may have prevented these components from achieving the intended objectives, and (c) determine the effectiveness of follow-up and evaluation procedures for returned participants.

The audit showed that missions were not adequately assessing training requirements during the design and planning phase of projects; and effective follow-up and evaluation procedures had not been established for returned participants. As a result, effective implementation of many projects had been severely hampered.

While numerous problems were noted with regard to the design and implementation of training projects and training components of projects, there were many positive aspects of the program noted. For the most part, participants sent for training did remarkably well scholastically and returned to the country where they were sponsored. Also, on newer projects being designed or just coming on line, it appeared that missions were doing a much better job of designing and planning these projects although much more needs to be done as demonstrated in this report, especially with regards to follow-up and evaluation activities.

Participant training projects or components of development projects reviewed were being implemented without (1) adequate consideration of the availability of candidates and timeliness of training; (2) considering third country training as a viable option to U.S. training; and (3) adequate justification for

extensive undergraduate training. Also, missions lacked a formal system to follow-up and evaluate the effectiveness of training when participants return. Finally, evaluation of participant training programs did not address the developmental impact of training.

We recommended that the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa require detailed assessments of training requirements as well as country and project specific training plans; reassess human resources capability to carry out follow-up activities and require implementation of the Office of International Training's Participant Training Management system to assist in performing follow-up activities; and require future evaluation of projects to include an assessment of the impact of training. The Bureau did not take exception to our recommendations.

AUDIT OF
LONG-TERM PARTICIPANT
TRAINING PROGRAM IN AFRICA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PART I - INTRODUCTION	
A. Background	1
B. Audit Objectives and Scope	3
PART II - RESULTS OF AUDIT	
A. Findings and Recommendation	
1. Participant Training Programs Were Not Being Properly Designed And Planned	6
2. Missions Were Not Adequately Following-Up On Returned Participants	13
3. Evaluations Of Participant Training Programs Did Not Address Training Impact	17
B. Compliance and Internal Control	20
PART III - EXHIBITS AND APPENDICES	
A. Exhibits	
1. Projects Selected For Review	
B. Appendices	
1. Management Comments	
2. List of Report Recipients	

AUDIT OF
LONG-TERM PARTICIPANT
TRAINING PROGRAM IN AFRICA

PART I - INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The AID participant training program is a vital element of foreign assistance. Its primary goal is the development of the human resources potential of citizens of developing countries. The term "participant training" refers to training accorded foreign nationals sponsored by AID to receive training outside their home countries. This includes both "academic" and "technical" training, with academic training defined as that which takes place in an accredited institution of higher learning and leads to a degree. Technical training includes observational visits, on-the-job training, special programs and seminars and training in an academic institution for specialized courses or a certificate.

Participant training arises out of projects agreed upon by the host government and the USAID mission in that country. In some cases, projects cover broad development objectives with training included as only a single element. Increasingly, however, major projects are being designed to upgrade human resources through general manpower development activities where participant training is the only program objective.

The placement and oversight of participants during their training programs is largely performed by private sector firms and non-profit organizations and institutions under contract or other arrangements with AID. These contractors usually assume full responsibility for the management of participants in accordance with AID training regulations and procedures. The Office of International Training is responsible for participant training policy and procedures, oversight of the program, direct management of several contractors and U.S. Government offices which provide training and a broad array of support services to all participants.

The AID Administrator has given a strong emphasis to participant training, stressing the importance of higher level training to meet more effectively the changing needs for managers, scientists, technicians, teaching faculties and institutional leaders in all sectors. The number of AID

sponsored participants receiving academic or technical training in the U.S. increased over 30 percent between fiscal years 1983 and 1985. There were approximately 12,000 participants in the U.S. during fiscal year 1985 for both academic and technical training. The cost of AID's participant training program was not readily determinable, but was estimated at \$170 million for fiscal year 1985.

B. Audit Objectives and Scope

Over the years, the Office of Inspector General has reported on various aspects of AID's participant training program. The most recent composite report was issued by RIG/A/Washington in December 1984 (85-08). It represented an analysis of prior IG audits and was supplemented by limited work in AID's Office of International Training and four USAID missions. While these audits have tended to focus on the mission perspective, little has been done to develop a regional or bureau perspective. Accordingly, this audit was undertaken to determine whether problems identified in the past still exist and to ascertain whether these problems are broad based systematic deficiencies which need to be addressed at the bureau level.

The specific objectives of this economy and efficiency audit were to (a) assess the adequacy of the design and planning efforts for the participant training components of projects, (b) assess how well participant training components of projects were implemented and identify major issues/problems which may have prevented these components from achieving the intended objectives, and (c) determine the effectiveness of follow-up and evaluation procedures for returned participants.

There are two types of participant training projects: general and project-related. General training projects provide short and long-term training in policy development areas to developing country leaders, mid-level managers and specialists. Participant training is the only program objective. Project-related training provides training in specific sectors such as agriculture or health as part of a broad development project. This audit covered both types of projects. However, it was limited to long-term or academic training, as defined earlier.

Selection of projects for the audit was based primarily on the number of participants sent to training and/or the planned dollar expenditures for a participant training component. Seventeen projects in 8 countries were selected for detailed review. These projects were authorized with AID funding approximately \$177 million. Of this amount, approximately \$46 million was designated for long-term or academic training. As of December 3, 1985, over \$17 million had been disbursed for long-term training. Disbursement information was not readily available for all projects. In addition, to a limited extent, past RIG/A/Nairobi reports which addressed participant training were utilized.

The review was made during the period from March to July 1986. The work was performed at appropriate USAID missions and USAID contractor and host government project field locations. It also included work within the Office of International Training and the Bureau for Africa in AID/Washington. To accomplish our objectives, project files and reports were reviewed, and officials of USAID missions, Office of International Training officials, Bureau for Africa officials, project contractors and participants were interviewed. The audit was made in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.

AUDIT OF
LONG-TERM PARTICIPANT
TRAINING PROGRAM IN AFRICA

PART II - RESULTS OF AUDIT

The audit showed that missions were not adequately assessing training requirements during the design and planning phase of projects; and effective follow-up and evaluation procedures had not been established for returned participants. As a result, effective implementation of many projects had been severely hampered.

While numerous problems were noted with regard to the design and implementation of training projects and training components of projects, there were many positive aspects of the program. For the most part, participants sent for training did remarkably well scholastically and returned to the country where they were sponsored. Also, on newer projects being designed or just coming on line, it appeared that missions were doing a much better job of designing and planning these projects. However, much more needs to be done especially with regards to follow-up and evaluation activities.

Participant training projects or components of development projects reviewed were being implemented without (1) adequately considering the availability of candidates and timeliness of training; (2) considering third country training as a viable option to U.S. training; and (3) adequate justification for extensive undergraduate training. Also, missions lacked a formal system to follow-up and evaluate the effectiveness of training when participants returned. Finally, evaluation of participant training programs did not address the developmental impact of training.

We recommended that the Bureau for Africa require detailed assessments of training requirements as well as country and project specific training plans; reassess human resources capability to carry out follow-up activities and require implementation of the Office of International Training's participant training management system to assist in performing follow-up activities; and require future evaluation of projects to include an assessment of the impact of training.

A. Findings and Recommendations

1. Participant Training Programs Were Not Being Properly Designed and Planned

Training requirements were not being adequately assessed during the early stages of project development. Detailed participant training plans were either not prepared or were not prepared adequately and expeditiously for effective implementation of participant training programs. Further, although not officially required by AID policy or regulations, country training plans were not being developed to assist in planning and designing projects to meet training needs. This was caused primarily because adequate high level management attention was not given to the design and planning of training projects. Also, adequate controls were not implemented to ensure that the requirements and tools available for designing and planning projects were adhered to. As a result, (1) project participant training was delayed and the targeted number of long-term participants not trained; (2) third country training was not considered as a viable option to U.S. training; and (3) extensive undergraduate training in the U.S. was financed without adequate justification. Accordingly, training costs were excessive and funds were spent on training that was either not used or did not significantly contribute to project goals and objectives.

Recommendation No. 1

We recommend that the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa:

- a. implement steps to prevent approval of projects with participant training components without comprehensive assessments of the training requirements;
- b. require AID missions within the Africa Bureau to develop a five-year Country Training Plan which identifies in a single mission document, AID and host country training policies, priorities and strategies; and
- c. require as part of projects with participant training components that detailed project participant training plans be made a condition precedent to disbursement of funds for training.

Discussion

AID policy requires that AID missions, working closely with host countries, assess training needs. In the early stages of developing the concept of a new project, the requirements for training must be reviewed and explored as early as possible. In accordance with AID Handbook 10, important factors to be considered are (1) types and numbers of skilled personnel required, (2) sources of training, (3) availability of trainees, and (4) lead time for selection and preparation of participants.

Although never officially adopted, an Office of International Training strategy paper on the implementation of participant training policy dated January 1985 states that the results from training assessments should be combined with other information on (1) social and economic status of the country and (2) country development aspirations and constraints to produce a Country Training Plan. This is a five-year plan which identifies in a single mission document AID and host country training policies, priorities and strategies. It is to be used to help missions plan and design projects to meet effectively training needs in high priority development areas as well as help ensure that a training project, or the training component of a development project is part of a larger strategy to meet objectives of institutional development, technology strategy, etc. They can also be useful to track implementation of training activities and to serve as a yardstick to monitor and evaluate training.

Also, AID Handbook 3 requires that when training is a significant component of a bilateral project, the Project Paper should, prior to expenditure of initial funds for training, require the host country to present a training plan acceptable to AID. This plan should include but not be limited to:

- an overview of overseas and in-country training by year for the duration of the project;
- criteria for participant selection;
- a detailed, time-phased, twelve-month implementation plan including a list of candidates already identified for each training activity, pre-departure activities, testing dates, remedial study requirements, refined budgets, etc.; and
- annual evaluations, planning/implementation schedule.

The audit showed that detailed formal assessments of training requirements were either not performed or adequate consideration was not given to all training factors. This was the case for all 17 projects in eight countries included in the audit. At none of the missions visited were they preparing country training plans as described earlier. In most instances, detailed participant training plans were either not prepared or were not prepared adequately or expeditiously for effective implementation of participant training programs. As a result, (1) project participant training was delayed and the targeted number of long-term participants not trained, (2) third country training was not considered as a viable option to U.S. training, and (3) extensive undergraduate training in the U.S. was financed without adequate justification.

Availability of Participants and Timeliness of Training - USAID's were not carefully assessing whether the target host government had the type and number of employees who could be trained in a timely manner. Thus, actions to counter the constraints were not planned. Little consideration was given to the availability of candidates. As a result, most of the projects were seriously behind schedule and the targeted number of long-term participants not trained. Many of the projects had to be extended and even then, in some cases, the number to be trained were below original expectation. Out of the 17 projects included in the audit, 13 had been extended beyond the original Project Activity Completion Date (PACD). The other four projects were fairly new but may still have to be extended as well. For six of the projects with project-related training components and an original PACD prior to December 31, 1985 there was a shortfall of approximately 41 percent in terms of the number of participants that were to have been trained by the original PACD. At least five of the projects included in the audit will not achieve the project's original goal for the number of participant to be trained even with extensions of the PACD.

The following examples demonstrate these conditions:

- The Zaire Applied Agriculture Research and Outreach Project (No. 660-0091) was planned to send 34 participants for training during the first three years of the project. It was expected that they would replace AID-funded expatriate technical staff after their return from participant training. The participants would take over many technical assistance positions by year five and would subsequently be capable of carrying out applied research. Nearly three years after the project had started, the participant training component had fallen hopelessly behind schedule.

Only nine of the 34 participants had begun training. Another three were scheduled to begin before the end of the third year. Thus, the project, at best, would train 12 of the 34 participants or a shortfall of 22. To make up for the shortfall and continue project activities as planned, the mission expected it would need up to \$4.8 million of additional technical assistance. Notwithstanding additional costs, the shortfall of trained participant researchers would not achieve the research team balance sought by the project. The shortfall occurred because the mission did not adequately assess whether the Government of Zaire (GOZ) could provide the required number of qualified candidates. The project design did not recognize that the GOZ policy of only recruiting Department of Agriculture candidates posed a major recruiting constraint. Also, the project design did not recognize that some candidates needed additional undergraduate credits before they could qualify for participant training graduate studies at U.S. universities.

-- The Senegal Agriculture Research and Planning project (No. 685-0223) planned to provide long-term training of 24 Senegalese in agronomy, animal husbandry, agricultural economics and rural sociology. The trainees would replace more costly expatriates, most of whom were paid by the Government of Senegal (GOS) under bilateral agreement with the Government of France. The returning participants were to be integrated into the project as researchers. Of 24 participants needed to conduct research, 21 were sent for training. Of these three were still in school and four were not working for the project. This shortfall resulted because project designers did not adequately assess whether the GOS could provide enough qualified candidates, and absorb returning participants into the project. Lack of trained personnel has had an adverse impact on the cost and effectiveness of the project. Both the \$230,000 spent to train the four participants as well as the participants themselves were lost to the project.

-- The Zambia Agricultural Training, Planning, and Institutional Development Project (No. 611-0075) was planned to send approximately 35 participants for post-graduate training during the five-year life of the project. The purpose of the project was to improve the Government of Zambia's performance in the agricultural sector and strengthen its capacity for analysis, planning, and management. This was to be achieved primarily by training Government officials in those institutions having the greatest responsibility for managing the agricultural sector.

The project agreement was signed on September 26, 1980 with an original PACD of September 30, 1985. It was subsequently extended to June 30, 1987. As of March 31, 1986 only seven had completed training. Eleven were still in training. USAID officials estimated that only 22 in total would be trained under the project. Some of the trainees would not return until 1989. Accordingly, the project life will have to be extended again. This resulted primarily because the mission and design team did not adequately assess the availability of participant candidates when designing the project. Also, political circumstances beyond the control of the mission delayed the project for about two years. In addition, training was delayed because many participants did not have prerequisites necessary to enter a masters program and had to take undergraduate courses first in order to qualify. As a result of the delays, many participants will not return from training in time to work with the technical assistance team, and trained employees will not be available as expected, hindering program operations and adversely affecting project outcome. Furthermore, this has resulted in excessive training costs and funds were spent on training that was either not used or will not significantly contribute to project goals and objectives.

Host Country and Third Country Training - Little consideration was given to host country and third country training in designing and planning participant training programs for long-term academic participants. The audit showed that only six participants out of 580 selected for long-term academic training under 16 projects for which information was available went to third countries. None received in-country training.

Over \$46 million had been authorized for this training as of December 31, 1985 of which approximately \$17 million had been disbursed. This happened primarily because adequate needs assessments were not being performed which considered in-country and/or third country training as a viable option to more expensive U.S. training. In most cases it was assumed that the U.S. was the only place offering quality education in the field of endeavor being pursued.

AID policy requires that training in the U.S. should be limited to fields in which training is not available locally, for which U.S. training is cost-effective, or which support other strategic considerations such as the exposure of key leaders to U.S. institutions and practices. It specifically requires that the option of training more cost-effectively in local or third country institutions be explored before relatively expensive training in U.S. institutions is recommended.

A study dated April 1983 which was done by Jeffalyn Johnson & Associates, Inc. for the Office of International Training on third country training in Africa supports the position that not enough consideration has been given to local and third country training as a viable option to U.S. training. It concluded that there are Africa institutions which are capable of providing quality training experiences. Furthermore, third country training benefits Africa countries in a number of ways. It provides opportunities for individuals to discuss common problems, needs and solutions. Students learn to use technology that is appropriate in their home situation. Third country training provides African students with the opportunity to develop open and collegial relationships that will lead to inter-Africa regional and national cooperation. Finally, it fosters and enriches Pan-African sentiment and development. The study also concluded that educating Africans at third country training institutions was generally less expensive than sending students to the U.S. It was estimated at the time of the study that the cost of bringing an African student to the U.S. for long-term academic training was approximately \$19,000 to \$21,000 a year versus between \$4,000 and \$8,000 a year for comparable training in Africa.

There are many reasons for sending participants to the U.S. for training including the exposure of future technicians and statesmen to American social, political and economic systems and state-of-the art research and technology. Also, it paves the way for friendly supportive relations between the U.S. and newly independent African nations. However, greater recognition and use of qualified African institutions by AID would contribute to a more equitable and appropriate balance of training locations for African Trainees.

Undergraduate Training - Extensive undergraduate training in the U.S. was being financed by AID without adequate justification. Again, during the design and planning phase of projects, little consideration was given to the necessity for training participants in U.S. institutions at the undergraduate level although AID policy specifically prohibits it except under special circumstances. This resulted primarily because assessments of needs were not being done. While it is recognized that extenuating circumstances may dictate the need, the decision should be fully supported and documented. This was not the case. The audit disclosed that for most of the projects included in the review, participants were being sent to the U.S. for undergraduate degrees. The training files did not support these decisions. Training assessments were not being performed. Out of 571 participants sent for long-term academic training for which information was available, 237 participants were pursuing undergraduate degree.

AID policy dictates that most long-term training for non-teaching managers and technicians should be at the master's level or higher where circumstances dictate. In some specialized technical fields a baccalaureate, associate degree or certificate program may be appropriate. However, non-specialized undergraduate training in U.S. institutions is not encouraged and should be supported only as a limited and interim response for countries which have not yet developed local training capacity at this level. It is assumed that in most instances, undergraduate training usually can be accomplished in-country or in third countries.

In sum, without adequate planning based on an assessment of needs, missions are hampered in planning and designing projects to meet training needs effectively in high priority development areas. Inadequate design and planning of manpower development projects or training components of other projects can be attributed to many causes including oversight, lack of human resources, etc. However, most of the peripheral causes could be overcome if greater attention were given to the design and planning of training by installing adequate controls to ensure that the requirements and/or tools available for designing and planning projects were adhered to.

Management Comments - The Bureau for Africa agreed with the value and cost effectiveness of third-country training but objected to what they perceived as a sweeping statement that projects are being designed and implemented without considering third-country training as a viable option to U.S. training. They point out in some programs such as those in the Sahel and the prospective AMDP III project, third-country training is a very central element of the program.

Office of Inspector General Comments - While it is acknowledged that some attention has been given to third-country training, especially in the Sahel, our review showed that for the most part, little consideration was given to third-country training. This is evidenced as pointed out earlier that only six participants out of 580 selected for long-term academic training under 16 projects included in our review for which information was available went to third-countries for their degrees.

2. Missions were not Adequately Following-up On Returned Participants

Missions were not adequately following-up on participants after they return from training. Missions are responsible for maintaining a follow-up program for returned participants to ensure they are effectively used on development projects and to evaluate the effectiveness of the training in meeting its objectives. This was not being done because missions lacked the resources to implement a follow-up program and/or they did not have complete records on all participants. As a result, missions had little information on how or whether participants were being effectively utilized. Moreover, the ability to measure the impact of training and to determine whether training expenditures had been cost effective was severely hampered. This is especially significant when one considers that AID expends approximately \$170 million a year on the participant training program. While the Office of International Training had developed a Participant Training Management System (PTMS) which could facilitate follow-up and evaluation activities, it had not been made mandatory within the Africa Bureau. Accordingly, many of the missions included in the audit had received the package but none had implemented it.

Recommendation No. 2

We recommend that the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa:

- (a) identify ways of augmenting human resources capability within missions in order to effectively implement participant training programs.
- (b) require AID missions within the Africa Bureau to adapt the Participant Training Management System developed by the Office of International Training or a similar suitable system which will meet local requirements.

Discussion

AID's Handbook 10, which provides AID's policies, regulations, procedures and guidance on participant training, states that evaluation of participant training should be conducted on a continuing basis, and follow-up activities are an essential aspect of participant training. Missions are responsible for maintaining a follow-up program for returned participants to ensure their utilization in development activities and to evaluate the effectiveness of training in meeting its objectives.

Follow-up activities are a form of continuing education designed to further the technical and non-technical objectives of all AID-sponsored participant training. Follow-up activities are intended to:

- Ensure that participants utilize their training as planned.
- Assist returned participants in reinforcing, extending, and transmitting to others the technical and managerial knowledge acquired during their training.
- Strengthen the bonds of friendship and understanding between the U.S. and other countries by continuing to broaden the returned participant's knowledge about the U.S., its people, institutions and culture.

At a minimum, missions are required to maintain personal and/or written contact with returned participants, especially those who received long-term training, to obtain the information needed to accomplish follow-up objectives. Although long recognized as important, missions continue to devote little attention to follow-up and evaluation activities. A report, dated December 1, 1984, prepared for the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination which summarized past evaluation studies of the AID participant training program covering a 30-year period showed follow-up to be the most often cited issue plaguing effective implementation of the program. Over 150 recommendations were made in these studies relating to follow-up. The recommendations included the need for more attention on removing constraints to utilization of training after returning home; membership in U.S. professional societies and subscriptions to professional journals; need for programs for updating and sharing training; and the need for more accurate participant follow-up records. Nearly half of the follow-up recommendations were made in the 1960s but interest was reasserted in recent years with 37 recommendations since 1980 with Africa leading in frequency in recent years. Also, GAO reported in 1980 that missions were not conducting follow-up activities.

This audit disclosed that follow-up and evaluation continues to be a major problem. At almost all of the missions included in the audit, no formal system or mechanism was in place to track the utilization and progress of participants after they returned from training. Some efforts had been made to create alumni associations and conduct award ceremonies whereby participant achievements could be recognized. Also, in some countries efforts were made to interview participants upon their return from training. In Lesotho, it was noted that an

effort had been made to contact returned participants through a questionnaire. However, in most cases there was no formal system or mechanism in place which allowed missions to periodically follow-up on returned participants to ascertain their utilization and progress. To some extent it was being done on an ad hoc basis as part of the project officer's or training officer's normal contacts with government officials in relation to their other duties. While the scope of our audit was somewhat limited because of time constraints, we did interview 20 participants to determine whether they had returned to their workplace and were utilizing their training as expected. Many of the participants expressed concern that they were not being properly utilized and prospects for advancement were dim.

At most of the missions visited, officials acknowledged that follow-up was a problem. Without exception, they blamed it on the lack of human resources to carry out follow-up activities effectively. In most instances, foreign service training officer positions had been eliminated leaving only a local national staff who had little time to devote to follow-up activities. Also, lack of readily available information on all participants had severely hampered follow-up activities. In almost all instances, we found that management tracking systems being implemented by the various missions visited were inadequate. In some instances, formal systems were non-existent. If information was needed on the program, it was necessary to go to each individual participant file and manually compile the information. In other cases, the systems were not kept up-to-date, information was unreliable, or types of information needed to manage the program were not maintained. Systems ranged from antiquated manual systems to highly sophisticated computer systems. However, with the exception of Zimbabwe, none of the systems included a mechanism for tracking the status of returned participants.

The Office of International Training has developed an integrated participant training management system which should enable missions to plan, develop and implement training programs more effectively. It is a microcomputer-based software package which will allow monitoring of all mission training activity from the initial Project Identification Document or Project Paper stage, throughout the life of each training program, and for as many years after program completion as desired. The tracking system will include implementation benchmarks for management oversight, trigger evaluation and follow-up activities and provide a historical record for each mission participant training program. While theoretically this is what needs to be done, in no instance had any of the missions visited implemented the system. Also, there is no requirement for missions within the Africa Bureau to implement the system.

Over the years, AID has invested hundreds of millions of dollars in training thousands of participants. Yet today there is little information available to assess the effectiveness and impact of this training. Despite the recognized importance of participant follow-up and evaluation, these activities continue to be seriously neglected. We believe that the Participant Training Management System developed by the Office of International Training can greatly facilitate mission follow-up and evaluation activities. Accordingly, we believe that the Africa Bureau should require missions to implement the system or a similar one. Further, we believe that the Africa Bureau should reassess human resources capability within Africa mission to ascertain whether current resources are adequate and if not, identify ways of augmenting current capability.

Management Comments - The Bureau for Africa took exception to the statement in the draft report that in no instance had any of the missions visited implemented a system which includes implementation benchmarks for management oversight, trigger evaluation and follow-up activities and provide a historical record for each mission participant training program. It was pointed out that Zimbabwe has had in place for well over a year such a system. Furthermore, they suggest that our recommendation be modified to acknowledge the Zimbabwe system as a suitable substitute to the Office of International Training system.

Office of Inspector General Comments -- We agree with the Bureau's comments and have incorporated appropriate changes to the final report.

3. Evaluations Of Participant Training Programs Did Not Address Training Impact

Past evaluations of training projects or participant training had focused almost exclusively on how well training was conducted and whether or not participants gained new knowledge. Little effort had been made to determine if training provided participants with the intended knowledge and skills and had enabled them to contribute effectively to their job or project after they returned home. Even more importantly, training programs should be evaluated for their impact on AID and host country development objectives and whether or not they were in this broader sense, a worthwhile investment of aid funds. AID policy states that to be fully effective as a strategic investment for AID, it is essential that participant training programs be related as directly as possible to the local processes of policy dialogue, technology transfer, and institutional development. Only through critical evaluation can further training programs be designed and conducted better to accomplish their objectives. The failure of past evaluations to address the impact of training resulted primarily because of the lack of adequate criteria and methods for measuring the impact of training on the participant's job effectiveness. However, the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination had recently developed a methodology to evaluate the developmental impact of AID assisted training.

Recommendation No. 3

We recommend that the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa require future evaluations of training projects or training components of projects to include an assessment of the impact of training using the methodology developed by the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination as a guide.

Discussion

Since its inception, A.I.D. has emphasized participant training as a key means to develop high-level skills and institutional capacity. A.I.D.'s participant training policy is to:

- Relate participant training activities to institutional development in the public and private sectors;
- Use participant training programs for staff development for A.I.D.-assisted projects;
- Use participant training to improve local training capacities;

- Use participant training programs to meet specific needs for technical skills identified in CDSS analyses, sector assessments, institutional profiles and project design exercises; and,
- Use participant training to support policy reforms and develop closer economic and political ties between the U.S. and lesser developed countries.

To determine whether these objectives are being achieved, it is imperative that evaluations of participant training programs include an assessment of the impact of training. Our analysis of 18 evaluations of 13 of the 17 projects included in the audit disclosed that no attempts were made to assess the impact of training.

In addition, an assessment of past participant training evaluation studies conducted for the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination in 1984 reinforces our contention. The study which covered a span of 30 years concluded that measures to assess the direct and indirect impact of training--as opposed to evaluating operational aspects of the participant training process remains the most important issue which has not been adequately addressed. Furthermore, a draft strategy paper on the implementation of participant training policy issued by the Office of International Training in January 1985 stated that in the past, evaluations of training have focused almost exclusively on how well training was conducted and whether or not participants gained new knowledge.

In the past, inadequate consideration of this problem as well as other issues affecting participant training has been attributed to the uncertain nature of AID's constituency leading to shifts in policies and strategies; frequent turnover of personnel in Washington and the field; lack of personnel and funds to follow through with recommended improvements; and the lower priority given to participant training in general. However, the consensus of opinion amongst AID officials was that improvements were needed, especially in light of the substantial expansion of the program. While the above causes still persist to some degree, it was believed that the major bottleneck to effective evaluation of participant training was the lack of adequate criteria and methods for measuring the impact of training. While some attempts had been made in the past to assess input, they did not generate much interest in replication or further research and development. More recently, the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination in consultation with the Office of International Training had developed a methodology to evaluate the developmental impact of AID assisted training. It was scheduled to be tested in Nepal. Based on our review of the methodology as well as the impressions of responsible AID officials, this appears to be a definite step in the right direction.

In sum, future evaluations should determine if the training has provided participants with the intended knowledge and skills and has enabled them to contribute effectively to their job or project after they have returned home. Even more importantly but perhaps more elusive, training programs should be evaluated for their impact on AID and host country development objectives and whether or not they were, in this broader sense, a worthwhile investment of AID funds. Only through critical evaluation can future training programs be designed and conducted better to accomplish their objectives and ensure that the benefits outweigh the costs. This is especially important in view of AID's increased investment in participant training. To obtain continued support, it will be important to demonstrate the overall value and effectiveness of its training programs.

B. Compliance and Internal Control

Compliance

In the areas audited, there was an adequate level of compliance with applicable laws and AID guidelines, with the exception of the matters discussed in the appropriate sections of our report. Nothing else came to our attention that indicated non-compliance in areas not tested.

Internal Control

Internal controls and system records for participants departing for training were adequate. However, in some instances, records were not complete or up-to-date on participant's progress while in training. Also, as discussed in our report, no systematic follow-up records were maintained on participants after they returned from training. Also, adequate integrated participant management systems which would allow missions to monitor all their training activity throughout the life of each training program and for as many years after program completion as desired were not being implemented.

AUDIT OF
LONG-TERM PARTICIPANT
TRAINING PROGRAM IN AFRICA

PART III - EXHIBITS AND APPENDICES

PROJECTS SELECTED FOR REVIEW

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	Life of Project Funding <u>(000)</u>	Planned Long- Term Participant Training Expenditures <u>(000)</u>
Lesotho	Manpower Development and Training (Project No.632-0069)	\$ 9970	\$ 3319
	Training Systems Research (Project No. 632-0065)	11194	1375
	Agricultural Planning (Project No. 632-0218)	6200	2191
Swaziland	Southern Africa Manpower Development (Project No. 645-0069)	8402	5813
	Teacher Training (Project No. 645-0214)	5595	772
	Swaziland Manpower Development (Project No. 645-0218)	19630	10230
Malawi	Polytechnic Engineering Expansion (Project No. 612-0201)	8314	1280
	Agricultural Research (Project no. 612-0202)	9000	1581
Zimbabwe	Manpower Development (Project no. 613-0215)	13139	6978
Zaire	Basic Rural Health (Project No.660-0086)	5000	213
	Applied Agricultural Research/ Outreach (Project No. 660-0091)	10000	2200

<u>Country</u>	<u>Project Name</u>	Life of Project Funding <u>000</u>	Planned Long- Term Participan Training Expenditures <u>000</u>
Zambia	Agricultural Training, Planning, and Institutional Development (Project No. 611-0075)	9775	1470
	Agricultural Development Research and Extension (Project No. 611-0201)	12515	2100
Botswana	Health Services Development (Project no. 633-0078)	4607	500
	Botswana Workforce and Skills Training (Project No. 633-0231)	14558	4380
Senegal	Casanance Regional Development (Project No. 685-0205)	23710	837
	Agricultural Research and Planning (Project No. 685-0223)	5350	1239
Totals		<u>\$176959</u>	<u>\$46478</u>

ACTION: AID-2

VZCZCHAO731
 RR RUSHNR
 DE ROEHC #2511/01 3382012
 ZNR 0000U 22H
 R 020010Z DEC 86
 FM SECSTATE WASHDC
 TO AMEMBASSY NAIROBI 9021
 BT

LOC: 038
 02 DEC 86
 CN: 26144
 CHRG: AID
 DIST: AA

511
 2614

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 02 STATE 372511

Appendix 1

AIDAC RIG/A

page 1 of 4

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS:

SUBJECT: AUDIT OF LONG-TERM PARTICIPANT TRAINING
 PROGRAM IN AFRICA, NOVEMBER 1, 1986

- THE FOLLOWING CONVEYS AFR/PD AND AFR/TR COMMENTS
 CONCERNING SUBJECT AUDIT REPORT:

1. (A) THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING: THE AUDIT
 POINTS OUT SOME OF THE ADVANTAGES OF THIRD-COUNTRY
 TRAINING AND CRITICIZES THE BUREAU FOR NOT RELYING MORE
 ON THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES TO MEET THE
 HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF MISSION
 PROGRAMS.

(B) WE CERTAINLY DO NOT DISPUTE THE VALUE OR
 COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING. THE
 BUREAU HAS, IN FACT, BEEN DILIGENT IN ENCOURAGING
 MISSIONS TO DO MORE IN THIS AREA. THIS IS ESPECIALLY
 EVIDENT IN THE THIRD PHASE OF THE SAHEL HUMAN RESOURCES
 DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, APPROVED LAST YEAR, WHICH, DRAWING
 ON MORE MODEST EXPERIENCE IN THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING
 UNDER THE PRIOR TWO PHASES, IS DESIGNED WITH SPECIAL
 EMPHASIS ON THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING. IT ALSO PROVIDES
 FOR EXAMINING THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A

CONTRACTOR IN REDSO/W TO HANDLE PLACEMENT AND MONITORING
 OF THIRD-COUNTRY PARTICIPANTS FOR THE RIGHT SAHEL
 COUNTRIES. THE AMDP III PROJECT, CURRENTLY IN THE
 DESIGN STAGE, IS LIKELY TO REFLECT A SUBSTANTIALLY
 INCREASED FOCUS ON THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING. THESE RECENT
 EFFORTS SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED IN THE AUDIT REPORT.

- (C) IN ADDITION, IT SHOULD BE APPRECIATED THAT
 THERE ARE SOME VERY REAL, PRACTICAL CONSTRAINTS TO
 THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING IN AFRICA, AS REPORTED BY OUR
 MISSIONS. PLACES ARE LIMITED IN THE BETTER REGIONAL
 UNIVERSITIES, SUCH AS UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI, AND
 STUDENTS FROM OTHER AFRICAN COUNTRIES ARE TYPICALLY NOT
 ADMITTED UNTIL THEIR OWN NATIONALS ARE TAKEN CARE OF.
 FREQUENTLY THIS MEANS THE REGION'S BEST INSTITUTIONS ARE
 EFFECTIVELY CLOSED TO AFRICAN NATIONALS OF OTHER
 COUNTRIES.

- (D) FOR THOSE STUDENTS WHO ARE ADMITTED, TRAINING, ESPECIALLY AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL, IS FREQUENTLY INTERRUPTED BY POLITICAL ACTIVITY OR INSTABILITY IN UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION. AGAIN, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI, IT HAS BEEN REPORTED THAT TWO OR THREE DISRUPTIONS CLOSING DOWN THE UNIVERSITY FOR ONE WEEK OR MORE OVER A SINGLE TERM IS NOT UNCOMMON. THIS LEADS TO LOST CLASSROOM HOURS, LEADING IN TURN TO LONGER PERIODS OF TRAINING REQUIRED TO COMPLETE A DEGREE, AND IN TURN TO HIGHER PER STUDENT COSTS TO COMPLETE A GIVEN TRAINING PROGRAM. IF THESE COSTS ARE CALCULATED, TOGETHER WITH THE ADDITIONAL COSTS OF TRAVEL HOME IN CASES OF PROLONGED DISRUPTION, AND THE FOREGONE EARNINGS DURING THE EXTRA YEARS OF TRAINING, THE DISPARITY BETWEEN THE PER STUDENT COSTS OF U.S. VS. THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING MAY NARROW CONSIDERABLY.

- (E) WE THEREFORE TAKE ISSUE WITH THE SWEEPING STATEMENT MADE IN THE AUDIT THAT PROJECTS ARE BEING DESIGNED AND IMPLEMENTED "WITHOUT CONSIDERING THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING AS A VIABLE OPTION TO U.S. TRAINING" (P. 11). IN SOME PROGRAMS, SUCH AS THOSE IN THE SAHEL AND THE PROSPECTIVE AMDP III PROJECT, THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING IS A VERY CENTRAL ELEMENT OF THE PROGRAM. IN OTHER PROGRAMS, THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING MAY SIMPLY NOT BE A VIABLE OPTION FOR THE REASONS OUTLINED ABOVE.

2. (A) MONITORING/TRACKING SYSTEMS: THE AUDIT ARGUES THAT THERE HAS BEEN INADEQUATE FOLLOW-UP ON PARTICIPANTS AFTER THEIR RETURN FROM TRAINING AND SUGGESTS THAT THIS

IS IN LARGE PART A RESULT OF THE MISSIONS' FAILURES TO INSTALL EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS. SPECIFICALLY, THE AUDIT STATES THAT IN NO INSTANCE HAD ANY OF THE MISSIONS VISITED IMPLEMENTED A SYSTEM WHICH INCLUDES "IMPLEMENTATION BENCHMARKS FOR MANAGEMENT OVERSIGHT, TRIGGER EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES AND (PROVIDES) A HISTORICAL RECORD FOR EACH MISSION PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM" (P. 26).

- (B) IT IS CLEAR THAT THE AUDIT TEAM OVERLOOKED ZIMBABWE IN MAKING THIS ASSERTION, SINCE ZIMBABWE HAS HAD IN PLACE FOR WELL OVER A YEAR AN AUTOMATED INFORMATION SYSTEM WHICH INCLUDES ALL THOSE FEATURES. AT LEAST ONE OTHER SOUTHERN AFRICA MISSION HAS ALREADY TAKEN STEPS TO REPLICATE THAT SYSTEM FOR ITS OWN TRAINING PROGRAM, WITH THE TDY ASSISTANCE OF THE ZIMBABWE STAFF. WE SUGGEST THE AUDIT TEAM REVIEW ITS FINDING IN THIS REGARD. AUDIT RECOMMENDATION 2(F), WHICH REQUIRES THE BUREAU TO REQUIRE THE IMPLEMENTATION

25

OF THE CIT TRAINING SYSTEM (P. 22), SHOULD ALSO BE BROADENED TO ACKNOWLEDGE THE ZIMBABWEAN SYSTEM AS A SUITABLE SUBSTITUTE.

3. EVALUATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL IMPACT OF TRAINING: THE POINT IS MADE THROUGHOUT THE AUDIT THAT THERE HAS BEEN INADEQUATE EVALUATION OF THE DEVELOPMENTAL IMPACT OF TRAINING. IN THIS REGARD, IT SHOULD BE REMEMBERED THAT THERE IS A TIME LAG BETWEEN PARTICIPANTS' RETURN AND THE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT THEY MAY HAVE IN THEIR COUNTRY'S ECONOMY, AND EVALUATIONS NEED TO BE SCHEDULED ACCORDINGLY. NEVERTHELESS THIS IS A POINT OF CONCERN WITHIN AFR, ESPECIALLY AS FOLLOW-ON TRAINING PROJECTS ARE BEING PROPOSED AND DESIGNED. ACTING ON THAT CONCERN, WE HAVE BUILT INTO THE DESIGN OF A LARGE, RECENTLY APPROVED TRAINING PROGRAM IN BOTSWANA (BWAST II) PROVISION FOR PRECISELY SUCH AN EVALUATION. THAT EVALUATION WILL TAKE PLACE IN EARLY 1987 AND WILL SERVE AS A PILOT TO TEST METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES WHICH WILL BE THEN EXTENDED TO OTHER AFRICAN MISSIONS WHERE TRAINING FORMS A MAJOR PART OF THEIR PROGRAMS. AFR HAS EVERY INTENTION OF TAKING CONCRETE STEPS TO RESPOND TO THIS CONCERN, AND WELCOMES THE AUDIT'S RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS REGARD.

4. (A) PLANNING FOR PARTICIPANT TRAINING. THE AUDIT, BASED ON ONLY 17 PROJECTS IN 8 COUNTRIES, DOES NOT LIST THE PROJECTS REVIEWED. IT STATES, HOWEVER, THAT "NUMEROUS PROBLEMS WERE NOTED WITH REGARD TO THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAINING PROJECTS." AT THE SAME

TIME, IT ACKNOWLEDGES THAT ON "NEWER PROJECTS BEING DESIGNED OR JUST COMING ON LINE .. MISSIONS (ARE) DOING A MUCH BETTER JOB OF DESIGNING AND PLANNING." (P. 6)

- (B) THE AUDIT RIGHTFULLY STRESSES THE IMPORTANCE OF COUNTRY TRAINING PLANS. TWO LARGE SCALE REGIONAL TRAINING PROJECTS IN AFRICA ARE IN FACT DESIGNED AROUND THE CONCEPT OF LONG-TERM COUNTRY TRAINING PLANS. UNDER THE SAHEL HUMAN RESOURCES III PROJECT EACH MISSION MUST SUBMIT A COMPREHENSIVE FIVE-YEAR PLAN BASED ON CAREFUL ASSESSMENT OF COUNTRY NEEDS. THE AFRICA MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT NOW PROCEEDING INTO ITS THIRD PHASE, PROVIDES FOR ANNUAL COUNTRY TRAINING PLANS WHICH ARE BASED ON MISSION AND HOST COUNTRY ASSESSMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS. IN THE CASE OF BOTH PROJECTS, TRAINING MUST TAKE INTO CONSIDERATION THE COUNTRY CDSS, AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS ARE MADE BY A PROJECT COMMITTEE AFTER CAREFUL REVIEW OF THE TRAINING PLANS.

- (C) IT SHOULD ALSO BE RECOGNIZED THAT IN THE BWAST PROJECT IN BOTSWANA, PLANNING FOR TRAINING IS GEARED TO ASSESSMENT OF THE COUNTRY'S NEEDS IN CERTAIN SKILL AREAS. NOW IN ITS SECOND PHASE, THE PROJECT IS DESIGNED TO HELP BOTSWANA ALLEVIATE SHORTAGES OF SKILLED MANPOWER AND SIMULTANEOUSLY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IN EMPLOYMENT GENERATION. PARTICIPATING MINISTRIES AND THE PRIVATE

SECTOR SUBMIT ANNUAL TRAINING PLANS FOR TRAINING BASED UPON CRITERIA TIED TO EMPLOYMENT GENERATION ACTIVITIES.

Appendix 1
page 4 of 4

5. UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING IN THE U.S.: IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT UNDERGRADUATE TRAINING IN THE U.S. SHOULD ONLY BE PROVIDED UNDER EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES. IN THE CASE OF SMALL COUNTRIES SUCH AS CAPE VERDE, THE GAMBIA, GUINEA-BISSAU, DJIBOUTI, AND COMOROS, THERE ARE NO APPROPRIATE UNDERGRADUATE INSTITUTIONS. OTHER EXCEPTIONS INCLUDE TRAINING IN CERTAIN TECHNICAL AREAS SUCH AS STATISTICS, COMPUTER SCIENCES OR LAND DEVELOPMENT WHICH MAY BE BEST PROVIDED IN THE U.S. THE AUDIT CORRECTLY POINTS OUT, HOWEVER, THAT SUCH CASES SHOULD BE FULLY SUPPORTED AND DOCUMENTED." (P. 19) SHULTZ

BT

#2511

NNNN

List of Report Recipients

No. of Copies

Field Offices

USAID/Zambia	1
USAID/Zimbabwe	1
USAID/Lesotho	1
USAID/Swaziland	1
USAID/Botswana	1
USAID/Malawi	1
USAID/Zaire	1
USAID/Senegal	1
REDSO/ESA	2
AA/M	2
AA/AFR	5
LEG	1
GC	1
AA/XA	1
AFR	1
M/SER	1
M/FM/ASD	2
PPC/CDIE	3
IG	1
AIG/A	1
AIG/II	1
IG/EMS	12
RIG/A/C	1
RIG/A/D	1
RIG/A/K	1
RIG/A/M	1
RIG/A/T	1
RIG/A/W	1
RIG/II/N	1