PD-ABB-304

LAC

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES
TECHNICAL SERVICES PROJECT

U.S.A.I.D. DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

TRAINING FOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT EVALUATION

A contract between the U.S. Agency for International Development (LAC/DR/EHR) and the Academy for Educational Development and subcontractors Juarez and Associates, Inc., Management Systems International, and Research Triangle Institute. Contract No. LAC-0012-C-00-9036-00

MID TERM EVALUATION

DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROJECT

PN: 517-0216

Preliminary Draft

REVISION I

Submitted to Human Resources Division, USAID - Santo Domingo

Prepared by:

William Renforth

1506.002
(5/90)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Purpose of the Activities Evaluated

The activities evaluated are part of USAID/Dominican Republic Project 517-0216, Development Training, and are intended to train professional, technical and managerial personnel needed to meet the manpower needs of export activities in the agricultural and industrial sectors of the private sector economy. Activities in the project include providing short-term technical training in the US, training university faculty in areas related to curriculum development for meeting export related training needs, and long-term training in US masters degree programs for private sector managers. A project supplement added programs of in-country training and also priority development related long-term and short-term training for public sector and PVO institutions. The project goal is to improve the human resources base required for private sector export led growth and development. The project purpose is to increase the number of trained professional, technical, and managerial personnel needed to meet the manpower demands of an export oriented economy.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology Used

This initial project evaluation is in response to a project requirement for a mid course assessment to compare what was achieved with what was planned, reassess assumptions underlying the project, and suggest corrective actions. Evaluation scope of work specified a focus on the Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresas (CNHE), the implementing entity for private sector training. Issues to be considered relate to an evaluation of enterprise training plans, an impact analysis of returned participants, and a broad review of project administration.

Evaluation methodology included a review of project documents, interviews with USAID and CNHE project staff, discussions with training providers, structured interviews with current and returned participants, and interviews with managers of the firms employing participants. The time lags involved since program completion required that effectiveness and impact be assessed by documenting specific changes in participant firm behavior considered to have the potential for export or productivity enhancement and by obtaining management estimated costs and payback period.

3. Findings and Conclusions

A. Output Goals

The capability of the project to manage the level of activities required is best measured by its progress in meeting the targets specified in the original project grant, with PACD of June, 1991. As of May, 1990 the project had essentially met all of its goals for number of persons trained. Concentrated efforts overcame a slow start in placing masters candidates. Initial assumptions about the availability of mid career managers as candidates and level of English proficiency proved optimistic, but necessary numbers have been placed and are moving toward degree completion. Short-term

training targets have been met, with the exception of one program at a HBCU now being arranged. This performance suggests that institutional structures and procedures are in place and that achieving targets for additional activities under the project amendment is to be expected.

The project has been efficient in meeting financial targets. As of January, 1990, 86.4% of the short-term participants had been trained, but only 47% of the funds budgeted expended. Actual short- term costs have averaged under US$2,500 per participant, versus US$5,200 budgeted, primarily because average program duration is 2 1/2 weeks, instead of 6, as budgeted. This duration is appropriate, as most participants are unable to be away for more time than this. Assessing financial performance in masters degree training is more difficult, since the financial implications of student progress and the financial obligations to complete programs are not routinely reported by the contractor. Budgeted amounts seem adequate, however.

B. Enterprise Training Plans

This document has proven less efficient than envisioned in project design as a device for qualifying firms for participation or identifying specific training programs needs. In part because of unfamiliarity with the concept, intensive effort has been required to get firm involvement and the number of resulting plans has not been as high as expected. Firms view it as little more than an elaborate application, and evidence low levels of management involvement in its preparation. This process could constitute a bottleneck if it is retained as a prerequisite for short-term in-country seminar participation. Difficulties encountered relate only to the process of completing the document, as firms are enthusiastic and supportive of the project as a whole.

C. Training Impact Analysis

Participant satisfaction with the training received is high and programs on the whole are delivered by appropriate, competent, experienced suppliers. Returning short-term participants report an average of 0.8 actual changes in export related firm activities as a result of the program. Participants estimate that their costs are recovered in 5.25 months and impute a first year value of US$1,028 for the training. This level of impact is explained by the characteristics of the participant mix selected as well as the topics and design of the training offered. Current CNHE techniques for assessing impact are unlikely to measure project purpose level outcomes.

D. Project Administration

Enhancing training management could contribute to increasing project impact. Short-term seminars may not fully reflect the envisioned range of topics or anticipated customized training responses to the unique, identified needs of specific sectors or industries. The mix of participants is not sufficiently balanced toward those most likely to have direct, immediate, appropriate application of the skills taught. The pool of available candidates for masters training is smaller than project design anticipated. This, in turn, has made identification of suitable candidates more difficult than expected. Review of selection criteria, including

greater emphasis on academic qualifications, could improve placement outcomes and progress for masters candidates. Courses of study selected do not reflect the intended range, since technical, production oriented programs are underrepresented.

A.I.D. project management performance is capable, responsive, and appropriate. Reaffirmation of project vision and strategy is appropriate at this time. Augmented contractor reporting of financial information about long-term participants would benefit project performance. Contractor expectations for candidate qualifications and appropriate universities for placement need clarification in reaction to the smaller than expected candidate pool.

4. Principal Recommendations

A. Output Targets

1. Retain existing project targets, since adequate resources and capacity are present to meet very reasonable amendment requirements.

2. Consider substituting in later project years additional US short-term training for masters training, reacting to results in attracting suitable masters candidates.

B. Enterprise Training Plans

1. Use the ETP concept as a selection and qualification tool primarily for masters candidates and then secondarily short-term US training candidates. Convert the document into a more traditional application for in-country program selection.

2. Consider replacing the ETP process for US short-term programs with a proactive program of CNHE identification of training needs, cooperative training program specification, and contractor procurement of customized programs against those training requests.

3. Streamline and condense ETP format to facilitate completion. Consider substituting a detailed statement of exactly what the candidate will do in the firm on return for Section III of the form.

4. Monitor processes to insure that documents are complete, involve primarily employer input, and are completed before the selection decision is made.

C. Training Impact Analysis

1. Modify short-term training program design to increase impact by using an industry focus that reacts to the expressed needs of a specific training group. Emphasize technical and production topics, as well as specific commercialization themes, to respond to the range of identified training needs. Design programs to facilitate business networking, and to include instruction in applying knowledge upon return.

2. Redesign impact evaluation instruments and methodology to better measure project purpose level outcomes.

D. Project Administration

1. Improve management of short-term US training by revising selection criteria to weigh heavily in favor of firms and individuals with direct, line responsibility for project related activities.

2. Enhance management of masters training by modifying the selection process to rigidly enforce the 3.0 GPA requirement, introduce a PAEG test score requirement of approximately 500, and document employment eligibility criteria. Insure that study programs and university placements are responsive to project, and not individual, needs.

3. Improve project management by requiring contractor reports to monitor the budget for masters programs against anticipated (and not just actual) expenditures and actual student progress. Clarify expectations for the characteristics and mix of universities at which students are placed.

BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country : Dominican Republic

2. Project Title : Development Training

3. Project Number : 517-0216

4. Project Dates :

   a) First Project Agreement: August, 1986
   b) Final Obligation Date: FY 92 (planned)
   c) Most Recent Project Assistance Completion Date: 8/24/94

5. Project Funding:

a)	AID Bilateral Funding (Grant):	US$15,000,000
b)	Other Major Donors:	0
c)	Host Country Counterpart Funds:	6,689,000
	Total	21,689,000

6. Mode of Implementation:

   Host Country Contracts with FUNDAPEC and CNHE

7. Project Designers:

   USAID/Dominican Republic

8. Responsible Mission Officials:

   a) Mission Directors
      Henry Bassford
      Thomas Stukel
      Raymond Rifenburg

   b) Project Officers
      Toni Christiansen-Wagner
      Paul Struharik

9. Previous Evaluations

   None

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATE SHEET	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
EVALUATION REPORT	1
A. Evaluation Purpose	1
B. Project Background	3
C. Achieving Project Targets	5
1. Numeric outputs targets	5
2. Budget targets	8
D. Analysis of Enterprise/Institution Training Plans	15
1. Formats and Procedures	15
2. Receptivity to Plans	21
3. Training Plan Effectiveness	24
E. Training Impact Analysis	30
F. Project Administration	41
1. Training Management	41
a. US Short-Term Seminars	42
b. Masters Candidates	46
2. Project Management	55

ANNEXES

A. Scope of Work
B. Log Frames
C. Enterprise Training Plans
D. Persons Interviewed
E. Interview Protocols
F. CNHE Program Evaluation Instrument
G. Masters Candidate Information
H. Documents Consulted

A. EVALUATION PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide a mid-term evaluation of the activities related to A.I.D. Project No. 517-0216, Development Training. As such the overall objective is to assess the various components of the Development Training Project and to recommend methods to improve its implementation. In general terms this involves a review of the methods used and results achieved to date, as related to the assumptions, purposes, and intended outputs at the end of the project. The specific mandate for this evaluation is based on a requirement in the Project Paper for Amendment Number 4 to the original project (page 43) that:

> The total number of planned evaluations shall be increased from two to three to reflect the increased LOP period to eight years. The first evaluation will be undertaken in early FY 1989, the second in FY 1991, and the final evaluation will be conducted in FY 1994. The primary focus of the first evaluation will be on the initial private sector activities that were undertaken prior to this amendment, while the second evaluation will focus more heavily on the new training activities covered under this amendment.

The basic nature of this evaluation, the first of the three mentioned, is unchanged from that specified on page 41 of the original project paper:

> The major objective of the evaluation will be to assess the impact of the training in furthering the strategy of increased exportation and agricultural diversification and the role of the CNHE in this context. The mid-term evaluation will specifically measure the progress towards achieving the stated project goals and objectives, and will revalidate the project design based on implementation experience and progress, participant records, and management system information. Any project design modifications or changes in implementation strategies will be recommended at that time.

As a mid-term review the scope of this analysis is naturally limited, focusing primarily on Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresas (CNHE) activities dealing with short-term and long-term U.S. training. The evaluation will review progress toward project objectives, review project design and implementation procedures, and recommend measures to improve project design and project implementation.

The scope of work governing this evaluation is provided in Appendix A. This workscope identifies 12 specific issues to be considered, grouped around three broad considerations:

1. Enterprise/Institutional Training Plans
2. Impact Analysis of Returned Participants
3. Project Administration

For clarity of presentation the body of this report first reviews achievement of project goals and then is organized into sections corresponding to the three issues mentioned above. Within each section the general format of first presenting together findings and conclusions and then offering recommendations is followed.

B. PROJECT BACKGROUND

The activities reviewed in this mid-term evaluation are part of USAID/ Dominican Republic Project 517-0216, Development Training. The purpose of the project, as articulated in the initial project paper, is to train professional, technical, and managerial personnel to meet the manpower demands of the export-oriented agricultural and industrial sectors of the economy. The project paper, approved on July 2, 1986, specified three distinct components for these training activities, in addition to project management activities:

1. Masters level training in the U.S. for employees of the private sector.

2. PhD or Masters level training for 8 university faculty members in fields related to the manpower needs of the private sector.

3. Short-term training in the U.S. for private sector employees.

A Grant Agreement and Letter of Understanding were signed between A.I.D. and CNHE on August 5, 1986. CNHE project staff were hired, office space equipped, and initial activities underway by October. Selection of university faculty candidates for the program was made on October 21, 1986 and 9 individuals began English training in the Dominican Republic on November 5.

Under the terms of the Grant Agreement technical assistance for the CNHE was to be provided by a U.S. Contractor selected through A.I.D. procurement procedures. This selection process was not completed until July 13, 1987, when Development Associates was signed to a four year $3,600,000 Contract (Contract No. 517-0216-C-00-7089-00). Prior to this time participant management activities were done directly and jointly by CNHE and A.I.D. Seventeen participants (13 from universities and 4 from private sector firms) were thus placed and administered by OIT, through its contractor, Partners for International Education and Training, although CNHE retains responsibility for coordination and follow up within the Dominican Republic. Consequently CNHE, with the assistance of its contractor, Development Associates, is directly responsible for the recruitment and placement of 46 masters level candidates and 235 short-term participants.

The Project Activities Completion Date (PACD) for the project was August 5, 1991. In August 1988, a Project Supplement was signed increasing funding for the CNHE by US$3.8 million, for a total of US$10.8 million dollars, increasing training outputs, and extending the PACD to August 24, 1994. An additional 36 Masters degree, and 263 short-term participants were added to project outputs.

The Project Supplement also authorized a US$4.2 million dollar grant to the Educational Credit Foundation (FUNDAPEC) to carry out a similar project with public and non-profit institutions and organizations supportive of USAID strategy.

Training outputs established under the agreement with FUNDAPEC are an estimated:

a) 54 public and non-profit sector employees trained at the Masters degree level;

b) 135 employees trained in short-term programs in the United States or third countries.

In addition, an in-country training component was included in the Project Supplement. The CNHE budget for in-country training was established at US$975,000 for 54 training programs averaging 25 participants each. The FUNDAPEC budget for in-country training was established at US$450,000 for an estimated 32 programs averaging 25 participants each.

To adjust for the consequences of this Project Supplement Amendment, the technical assistance contract with Development Associates was renegotiated. After competitive responses to a RFP, Development Associates was awarded a US$3,360,000, 4-1/2 year contract on January 27, 1990. Primary activities involve identifying appropriate placements for approximately 299 participants (36 graduate students, 263 short-term participants) and establishing a system to procure offshore technical assistance for the CNHE in up to 54 in-country training projects.

This specific background is especially relevant to the purposes of this report since it establishes constraints which are important for understanding project performance to date. One additional background factor is the mobility of key personnel. All parties to this project have experienced what seems to be somewhat high turnover of key personnel during its approximate four year life.

In USAID, the Project Officer and Chief of the Human Resources Development Division, Ms. Toni Christiansen-Wagner, was replaced by Mr. Paul A. Struharik in July, 1988, who was joined by Mr. William Binford in November, 1988, to monitor the project.

At the CNHE, Dr. Jorge Max Fernández began working as Project Manager in June, 1988, replacing Lic. Frank González who had left the project at the end of March, 1988. In turn, Dr. Fernández left the CNHE in March, 1990, being replaced by Arsenio Jiménez.

At Development Associates, Dr. Donald Swanson resigned as Project Director in August, 1988, for personal reasons. He was replaced by Mr. Erich Hofmann, a Development Associates Vice-President and Corporate Treasurer. Also, Mr. Neil McConnel was replaced as Assistant Project Director at Development Associates by Mr. Steve Corbett.

Each of these changes is explained by essentially personal, non- project related motives of the individuals involved. To its credit the project does not appear notably affected by these changes, although some natural coordination and learning curve consequences have occurred as replacements integrate into an ongoing project.

C. ACHIEVING PROJECT TARGETS

1. Numerical Output Targets

a. Findings/Conclusions

The logical framework, copies of which are in Annex B for both the initial project and the amendment, specify that the goal of both the project and the amendment is:

> To improve the Human Resources base required for private sector export-led growth and development.

The purpose of both the project and amendment is:

> To increase the number of trained professional, technical, and managerial personnel needed to meet the manpower demands of an export-oriented economy.

The specific operationalized training outputs are indicated in the CNHE Grant Agreement, Project Papers, and Development Associates contract. Table I, following, summarizes key output expectations.

As the table indicates, goals for number of participants (or number of programs in the case of in-country seminars) are the only quantitative indicator for each of the training sectors targeted. Overall budget limits on a project basis are also a constraint. In contrast to other participant training programs involving seminars, a specific participant month target is not set. Thus only numbers trained, and not amount of training, counts for meeting project goals. It should be pointed out, however, that initial budgets were developed assuming average program duration and average costs per participant week. For short-term US training the budget assumption in the original project design is approximately US$6,000 for an average 2 months program duration. Long Term US academic training is budgeted at about $20,000 per year (with inflation adjustments), assuming 3 years for PhD training and 2 years for masters programs.

Information prepared by Development Associates on January 15, 1990 indicates the following outputs to date, compared against their initial contract obligation by PACD of the initial contract.

Sector	Goal	Placed
Private Sector Masters	46	46
Short-Term	235	207

TABLE I

DEVELOPMENT TRAINING, CNHE

Output and Budget Expectations

		Original[1]	New[2] Authorization	Total
I.	**OUTPUT EXPECTATIONS**			
A.	University Faculty	8	0	8
B.	Private Sector Masters	55	36	91
C.	Short-Term Participants	250	263	513
D.	In-Country Seminars	0	54	54
II.	**BUDGET EXPECTATIONS, US$**			
A.	University Faculty	63,000	-	-
B.	Private Sector Masters, each	32,490	49,937	-
C.	Short-Term Participants	6,245	3,996	-
D.	In-Country Seminars	0	18,055	-

1. Based on Development Associates Reports
2. Based on CNHE Project Amendment Letter of Agreement

Development Associates reports that the 28 short-term slots as of yet unused are intended for a seminar on agricultural diversification at a HBCU. Negotiations have involved a number of institutions over an extended time period, but DA is optimistic that this program will be offered in Summer, 1990. At any rate subsequent to January 15, 30 additional participants have been programed (26 to a seminar in Miami and 4 others to an INCAE program). It should be noted that programming for all of the university faculty, 15 short-term participants, and 8 masters students had been completed prior to DA being contracted. Thus, in essence, all of the programming required by the original project has been completed. Of course, the long-term candidates are still enrolled and will require continued support and monitoring. Nonetheless, this output represents a significant and positive accomplishment of project output goals. This achievement speaks well for the institutional capacity which has been developed to date and also augers well for the successful accomplishment of numeric output goals under the Project Amendment.

This accomplishment is all the more significant considering the chronological development of activities. As discussed previously the delay in selecting the US contractor reduced significantly the available lead time for placing masters candidates. Also, start-up times proved longer than expected, especially for masters candidates. As of January, 1989, only 7 were enrolled. In contrast, 133 participants had taken part in short-term programs. This resulted in efforts to place a group of 18 Masters candidates who had been identified by then and also significant, concentrated efforts to recruit additional candidates. That all remaining required placements were met is a noteworthy tribute to the efforts and persistence of all involved.

As is to be expected in this situation, such extraordinary efforts are not without costs. DA staff time required exceeded budget and resulted in a contract amendment to increase level of effort and costs. Short-term programming was at lower levels during this intensive placement period. This was not material, since the project was ahead of schedule on these short-term activities. As discussed elsewhere in this report, these efforts were required, in part, due to English training needs and also a difficult candidate placement task resulting from the selection process.

In retrospect it is important to point out that initial project assumptions about the size and availability of the candidate pool for masters candidates have proven very optimistic. The initial project design stipulated that candidates should be employed in management or professional level positions by private sector firms, have some involvement in export related activities, present academic credentials that would qualify them for admission to US graduate programs and, by implication of general Mission policy, not come from the elite segments of society that would otherwise have this training available on its own. In practice those criteria have proven to be quite circumscribing. Conversations with businesspeople indicate that mid level managers of the type desired are in short supply and heavily involved with their firms, which (at least by US standards) tend to have small, centralized management groups. Personally, such individuals are usually married, have young children, and are heavily involved with community activities. All of this means that these individuals are unlikely to be

available to leave their businesses and homes for the several years required to participate.

The experiences of the PUCMM graduate management degree program collaborate this situation. Enrollments in this MBA program (most recent graduating class was 25) have been below initial projections, notwithstanding its local availability. Viewed in this context, the DETRA target seems especially optimistic, given that local graduate business degree programs annually handle only slightly greater numbers.

Consequently, the project has found itself continually attempting to deal with what, in the judgement of this evaluator, seems a very small number of candidates of the type stipulated for this training.

b. Recommendations

1. Retain existing project targets, as amended.

Experience to date indicates that necessary institutional capacity to manage training activities at the numeric volume required by the amendment has been developed. Amendment outputs seem easily attainable in the approximately 4 1/4 years remaining to PACD. Of these 4 1/4 years of project effort available, past experience suggests that this is ample for both meeting masters and short-term participant goals and for managing the 54 in-country seminars planned.

2. Budget Targets

a. Findings/Conclusions

The financial efficiency of the training activities can be best judged by analyzing the performance of Development Associates during its initial contract. Table One provides information about expected budget performance. Table Two lists the short-term training provided to date and indicates program costs, as reported in the PIO/Ts available in CNHE files. As this table indicates short-term program costs have averaged about US$2,500 per participant in groups and about US$600 individually. The initial project budgeted US$5,200 per short-term participant. Thus, actual expenditures for short-term training are less than half those anticipated on a per person basis. This same difference is also evident on an aggregate basis. As of June 30, 1989, 86.4 percent of the short-term participants had been trained, but only 46.4% of the amount budgeted for this type of training had been expended. By any measure this represents a most commendable performance. Three factors seem to account for this performance:

1. Attention to cost containment. As documented in its reports, Development Associates takes cost containment seriously. Competitive bids are used for customized programs to encourage price completion among suppliers, and line item budgets are negotiated. Fee and tuition reductions are negotiated for open enrollment programs into which participants are inserted. A number of programs have been provided by one supplier, which increases negotiating leverage and opportunities for

operating economies. Such attention to detail may not result in dramatic individual economies, but savings are important over the course of a project. The policy of basing programs in only 1 site, usually Miami, perhaps the least expensive U.S. location to reach from the Dominican Republic, also contains costs for participants. Finally, the contractor has been innovative in its selection of training suppliers. The use of offshore suppliers (INCAE) and individual entrepreneurs has involved providers whose overhead and faculty costs are much lower than more traditional training organizations.

2. The nature of the training provided. Course descriptions and training materials for the courses listed in Table 2 were reviewed as part of this evaluation. Almost all of the programs reviewed seem to represent routine topics and repetitive offerings, with only moderate customized or original material developed for that unique program. Also topics offered seem general and non specialized, hence not requiring unusual (and expensive) expertise to present. Thus, supplier preparation time and material development costs are minimal for these essentially "off the shelf" programs. Consequently the programs offered are among the least expensive of their type to provide.

3. Unmet budget assumptions. As described above, project performance is based on numbers of people trained. However, the initial project paper budget for short-term training was developed assuming an average program duration of two months and average participant costs of US$3,000 per month, which were negotiated in the best and final process to the level indicated in Table 1. In practice the assumption that practicing managers can attend a two month training program abroad appears highly unrealistic. Many private sector managers are at a stage in their personal and professional life when it is difficult to be away from home for that long. Moreover in the Dominican Republic most firms are small, management personnel limited (the Enterprise Training Plans reviewed, which included those of some of the largest firms in the country, indicate an average of about 8 management/supervisory people per firm) with decision making highly centralized and personalized. All of this suggests that, with the exception of government agencies or the very largest firms, managers of the type targeted in these programs can not attend programs listing more than 3 weeks.

Programs offered to date have averaged about 2 1/2 weeks. Surveys of program participants, reported elsewhere in this paper, indicate that almost all view this length as appropriate. The University of California - Davis Program, which lasted 8 weeks, was criticized by participants as being too long. Viewed in this context current program duration is appropriate, and suggests that unrealistic overbudgeting, and not cost containment, is primarily responsible for the funds unexpended.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC DEVELOPMENT TRAINING

Training Program Completed and In Progress

1987 - 1990

Group Training

ROGRAM	DATES	LOCATION/SUPPLIER	PARTs	TOTAL COST	COST PER PART
		Completed			
urniture	April 5 - 27, 89 (23)	Miami, Ben Cruz	30	75,000	2,500
gri. Mgt.	March 4 - 18, 9 (14)	Miami, INCAE	19	47,500	2,500
extiles	Feb. 6 - 24, 89, (19)	Bogotá, FEPEC	14	43,265	3,090
in. Restr.	Jan. 19 - Feb. 10, 89 (23)	Boston, AD Little	7	38,703	5,529
x. Mkt. ntry	Oct. 17 - 28, 88 (12)	New York, WTI	2	4,160	2,080
x. Strategy	Oct. 2 - 15, 88 (14)	Miami, INCAE	24	61,536	2,564
x. Plans	July 25 - Aug. 13, 88 (20)	Miami, INCAE	21	56,876	2,708
ivs. Ag.	June 1 - July 30, 88 (60)	Davis, U - CAL	24	142,245	5,926
st. Tec.	Feb. - April, 88 (56)	Phoenix, AGSIM	10	73,988	7,398
x. No Trd.	Nov. 15 - 27, 87 (13)	Miami, INCAE	19	43,700	2,300
x. No Trd.	Aug. 17 - 30, 87 (14)	Miami, INCAE	15	35,100	2,340
	Average Cost Per Participant Week:		$1,025		
		Pending			
x. to US	April 16 - 28, 90 (13)	Miami, INCAT	26	48,700	1.873
g. Mgt.	March 25 - April 7, 90 (14)	Miami, INCAE	4	10,000	2,500
BCU	?	?	28	?	?

506.005

Best Available Copy

Individual Training

Completed

PROGRAM	DATES	PERSON	COST	COST PER WEEK
Project Adm.	March 1987	A. Garcia		
Micros	April 6 - May 7	A. Severino		
Bank Mktg.	May 29 - June 5, 87 (7)	M. L. de Ruíz		
Mgt.	June 1 - 16, 87, (14)	N. Pichardo		
Ex. Strat.	June 22 - July 3, 87 (12)	J. Núñez		
Fert. Mktg.	Aug. 10 - Sep. 18, 87 (23)	I. González	4,620	
Budgets	Jan. - Feb., 88 (21)	F. Báez	1,615	
Mgt.	Jan. 17 - Feb. 12, 88 (26)	M. Majri		
Flowers	March 28 - May 28, 89 (60)	R. M. Ureña	3,680	
Systems	Sep. 5 - May 5, 89 (180)	C. Pacheco	7,180	
Manuf.	July 4 - 29, 88 (25)	R. Silfa	1.615	
Computers	July 11, Jan. 6 (175)	B. Acosta	8,108	
Crops	Aug. 21 - Sep. 23, (30)	M. De Los Santos	5,173	
Dairy	Sep. 18 - Oct. 22, 88 (34)	E. Rivero	5,788	
Mktg.	Oct. 3 - Dec. 16, 88 (74)	J. C. Bonnelly	8,800	
Actg.	Oct. 10 - Nov. 4, 88 (25)	B. Portes	1,840	
Computers	Oct. 24 - Dec. 23, 88 (61)	N. de Cabrera	6,950	
Fin.	Oct. 30 - Nov. 4, 88 (5)	F. Rodriguez	2,750	
Audit	Sep. 18 - Oct. 13, 89 (26)	R. J. Cantizano	1,635	
Capital	Oct. 9 - Nov. 3, 89 (30)	F. D. García	4,500	

Average Cost Per Week, based on available data: $589

1506.005

The budget situation for short-term training under the project amendment is slightly different. As Table One indicates, approximately US$4,000 is available per participant under this new budget, which seems adequate given likely seminar length. As discussed below, future programs may be somewhat different. Future program design should emphasize more specialized, focused, programs greater technical, customized content, and a specific industry target. This, in turn, may imply smaller groups and more tailor made programs. This all will likely increase costs slightly from present levels, but is believed necessary for program impact and quality.

Individual programing has proven to be exceptionally cost effective. In large part this is due to tight budget control by the contractor, i.e. a maximum CNHE cost contribution is negotiated, with the employing firm expected to cover any remaining costs. Individual programing is also attractive for its flexibility, ability to respond to specific, unique training needs, and relative ease of administration. Evaluations indicate that such training can be very positively received by participants, although there is also some risk that some individual arrangements will be much less successful than others. This project has recently used fewer individual programs than previously. Given demonstrated cost effectiveness, CNHE may wish to consider more utilization of this training mode in the future.

Financial performance for long-term candidates is more difficult to evaluate. The amounts budgeted (approximately US$50,000 per masters candidate) seem adequate under both the original and amended project. However, these amounts seem to assume only two months of English training in the US and normal progress toward completing the degree on schedule. There is some evidence that some participants require more English training than planned and that transfers to different programs or universities after initial enrollment have been more common than one would expect (at least 5 to date). Since even minor deviations from normal progress can easily add 1 or 2 semesters to a course of study, the possibility of cost overruns may be present. Mitigating against this possibility is the fact that DA has been attentive to tuition costs in student placement. Students interviewed frequently report being counseled away from a high cost university. Also, the tuition supplement fund provided in the initial budget to pay for higher than average cost enrollments has not been utilized for this purpose, which also indicates attention to costs in placement.

The financial information provided by Development Associates in its semi-annual reports does not report training expenditures in a consistent format. Also, more importantly, only expenses actually paid out are reported against the budgeted aggregates. The amount of funding necessary for the conclusion of a student's program (against either planned or actual progress) is not indicated. The lack of this information represents an impediment to evaluating financial performance and effective management of this component. Notwithstanding this problem, some estimates are possible based on data appearing in the January-July, 1989 and July 1989 - January 1990 semi-annual reports submitted by Development Associates. These reports indicate about $650,000 remains in the long-term training account. This remaining amount seems adequate, assuming that the

expenditures reported in January, 1990 included prepaid tuition through May and that students remain on schedule:

Training Category	Budget US$	Cumulative July, 1989	Expenditures as of January, 1990
Short-Term	1,467,657	681,123	690,000 *
Long-Term	1,494,866	296,595	850,038
TOTAL	2,962,523	977,718	1,540,038

(*) Estimated by author based on activities reported in the period. No actual figure was reported.

The key point of this analysis is that although subjectively the figures "feel" on target, no objective judgement is possible, based on the data made available. Yet more complete knowledge is critical for project management and evaluating the financial consequences of student transfer requests.

b. Recommendations

1. CNHE should review seminar duration targets. To assist in the budget and cost control process implicit in project design, programming should include a flexible, suggested duration guideline of approximately two working weeks, as an average. This is consistent with amendment budget assumptions and also participant expectations. Since this is an average target, reasonable variation between programs can be tolerated.

2. CNHE should continue reasonable amounts of individualized programming, including past cost sharing practices with specific CNHE contribution limits. This training mode has proven effective in the past. It also provides needed flexibility for unique or specialized training situations, especially appropriate for top managers.

3. A.I.D. should require more detailed financial reporting for long-term training expenditures. To expedite management toward EOP status all parties should monitor the variables of budgeted amount, actual amounts, and expected expenditures until degree completion for masters candidates. The new Development Associates contract requires that "pipeline financial" information be submitted in all subsequent semi-annual reports, but does not specify in operational terms what that information actually is. A specific format should be agreed upon now, before the first report under this requirement is due. Information of the type discussed above should be included, as well as any other data necessary to measure the training expenses which the project might incur until participant degree completion. To assist in this process all requests for approval of program or university

transfer should include an estimate of possible effects on student progress and resulting funding implications.

D. ANALYSIS OF ENTERPRISE/INDIVIDUAL TRAINING PLANS

a. Findings/Conclusions

1. Formats and Procedures

The development of training plans has been considered a key element in project implementation. For both long and short-term programs it attempts to serve an important role in qualifying the firm for participation, identifying specific firm constraints that can be addressed training, suggesting the training needed, establishing the relationship of this training to firm performance, and identifying training candidates. As such it is central in establishing firm eligibility for participation, doing training needs assessments, and suggesting training program topics. It also is useful in determining if a viable and supportive institutional environment exists for the trainee to apply knowledge upon program completion. Given its importance the use of this document throughout the life of the project is reviewed, with an eye toward evaluating its performance and suggesting improvements in its utilization. From the viewpoint of CNHE, the ETP is seen as having three purposes:

1. Identify, evaluate, and prioritize training needs for improving performance.

2. Provide the base for developing training plans.

3. Qualify firms for participation, i.e., only those firms with completed plans are eligible to participate in the project.

The utilization of ETP has evolved through 3 stages in the project. The first stage corresponds to the period from the beginning of the project until about July, 1987. The specific format used then appears in ANNEX C. That format, in questionnaire style, asked managers for basic descriptive information about the firm and its product sales, requested a summary of personnel policies, asked to identify training needs, by priority, in each functional department, requested specific types of training desired, and asked for personal information, job descriptions, and a description of how needed training would be applied on the job for each candidate presented for training.

At the beginning of the project it was believed that the form could be mailed to potential participants, along with program descriptive materials, and then returned as part of the application to participate in the program. Initial response was low, in part attributed by CNHE personnel to the limited planning capacity of local firms, unfamiliarity with the general process of training needs identification or human resource planing, and constraints of management time. A series of personal visits by project personnel was initiated to obtain cooperation and actually work with people in the firm to complete the plan during the visit. With persistence and the influence of the personal visits, 60 completed plans (out of 200 initially distributed) were obtained by July, 1987. Conversations with project personnel at that time indicate that the plans, and especially the face to face discussions with managers, were useful in getting a feel for the

realities of training needs (a good orientation at this stage of the project) and also for "selling" the project and disseminating information. Interviewee participation, especially in individual programming, was reported as frequent, with the required training plans being completed on the spot.

Several problems were also seen as inherent in this approach:

1. The uniqueness and innovativeness of this formalized, firm level human resource planning perspective among local businesses was underestimated. Businesspeople, although supportive of the concept, had little experience in actually drafting such documents. This meant that personal visits were necessary for motivation and assistance. Further, only general plans would result, given knowledge and time constraints.

2. Coupling plan completion with a visit by project representatives suggested that the document was more of an application form than a legitimate diagnostic instrument, and conditioned responses.

3. Efforts required to obtain completed plans were substantial. This, in turn, greatly reduced the universe of eligible firms for participation and represented a bottleneck.

4. Training needs statements were seldom sufficiently specific to be translated into training program design, and, hence, were not meeting one critical purpose.

5. Format design appeared somewhat intimidating, thereby suggesting substantial effort to complete.

6. Format focused on overall, general firm training needs, with no specific tie to project purposes of economic development enhancement.

In August, 1987, the ETP format was redesigned, which marks the second phase of its use. The new form (which continues in basic use today and is presented in ANNEX C) differs from the old in several key respects:

1. More specific information is sought about firm limitations and constraints, i.e. problems that can be resolved by training are more clearly identified.

2. Much less information about current personnel practices is sought.

3. A description of export activities is required.

4. The presentation follows a logical sequence to lead the preparer through the process:

a) Basic firm descriptive data

b) Analysis of limits and problems

c) Development of the training plan

d) Presentation of training candidates

In addition, the process was made much more "user friendly" by developing more detailed directions and also providing a "case study" of a plan completed by a Dominican firm to serve as an example and guide.

Another important change was in the development of a series of 5 workshops, attended by a total of 28 firms. These workshops were designed to assist firms in completing and ETP and were intended to produce the desired document at the end of the 1 day program.

The net result was the generation of an additional 60 ETPs by January, 1988. CNHE reports that a total of 243 completed plans are in its files as of January, 1990.

This second period was characterized by a strong need to increase project output, especially of masters candidates, to meet numeric targets. Project personnel report that these pressures resulted in a subtle shift toward an individual focus, instead of an enterprise orientation. In this stage CNHE approached individuals directly, developed their interest in the program, and then relied upon these individuals to motivate their firms to participate by completing the necessary documentation and agreeing to provide the counterpart sponsorship required. In retrospect, this second phase was effective in obtaining the number of candidates necessary. This may have not been possible without dramatic action, given the previous pace. At the same time, as documented below, it is the judgement of this evaluation that this was accomplished at a cost in two important areas that resulted directly from that change in focus:

1. The relationship of some candidates with their sponsoring firms may be tenuous, raising questions of both participant eligibility and impact on firm activities upon return.

2. The specific programs of study proposed may reflect individual interests as much as demonstrable firm human resource needs for productivity enhancement.

The third phase of ETP utilization is prompted by the prospect of in-country training programs, which implies a much larger number of participants, i.e., about 1,350 versus 300 previously, and represents an attempt to accommodate the ETP process to that activity. The elements of this process are described in the document "La Actualización de los Planes de Desarrollo de Recursos Humanos: Eje Primordial del Proyecto" prepared by Max Fernández in July, 1989.

The heart of this phase is the use of a series of 1 day workshops, totaling perhaps as many as 64, where groups of 25 participants would receive basic orientation about needs for human resource development, project information, and assistance in completing the ETP and other project documents. These workshops would then be followed by visits (by a team of 4 hired for this purpose) to finalize the ETP.

Each type of training (masters and short-term) would be approached in a slightly different way. Masters candidates would be approached as individuals, complete the ETP via the workshop process, determine their training needs, and then enter into the selection process. Short-term candidates (both in the U.S. and in-country) would make contact on an individual basis, complete preliminary application materials, be awarded the training scholarship, and then participate in the workshops to develop the ETP which would be incorporated into the CNHE data base.

This process was implemented for the selection of the 1990 group of masters candidates, but has not been continued for short-term programs. In the judgement of this reviewer the process did not result in discernibly better documents, either when judged against previously completed plans or against the absolute criteria used in the content analysis described below. Indeed, one concern is that in spite of these efforts only 20% of the plans examined appear to contain the discussion of the supplemental information asked for in Section III.

This review of the evolution of the ETP process suggests that CNHE has been responsive, aggressive, and flexible in putting forth substantial efforts to make this process work. A continuous, intensive and very real response is evident. On a conceptual basis the process remains attractive for several reasons. First, its emphasis on the firm and not the individual is consistent with the project's vision of improving firm capacity. It is also consistent with the implicit policy of training currently employed individuals. Second, it helps to insure that training is responsive to firm needs and will be employed upon completion in a way that is likely to lead directly to the impact needed. Third, it can be effective in pointing out training needs and thus lead to identification or design of appropriate training programs. However, the process also implies duplication of previous training need identification efforts. Both project papers as well as the ISA study contracted by the CNHE identify training needs in terms that seem at least as specific as those identified in the ETPs. These studies also have the advantage of a national focus and somewhat greater methodological rigor. Although these studies do not identify specific candidates for training, they are, in the judgement of this evaluator, sufficiently directive to identify priority industries, topics, and technical skill area needs. This, in turn, can establish CNHE training targets and initiate training program development. Thus, at the project level the ETP process seems most useful for recruiting and enabling firms to judge the relevance of available training than in providing new guidance for program identification.

In practice the process has also illustrated a number of disadvantages. First, it has proven time consuming and effort intensive to guide firms through this process. Consequently, the number of plans developed (243) has been low, relative both to the number of firms identified as potential project beneficiaries (1,400) and the number of eligible firms needed to meet project goals. The result has been a bottleneck which may be untenable if the process continues to be required for in-country programs. Second, the quality of the information generated is not especially good. As discussed below, completed documents sometimes omit some sections and are not

adept at identifying training needs or translating these needs to appropriate training activities. This is to be expected given the novelty of the concept in this environment and competition for the attention of those completing the document. Third, there are some indications that in practice the process has not been used as effectively as possible. Some plans appear to have been completed after the fact of selection, or done by the candidate with only token firm input. In short, the ETPs seem to be viewed by some as an application requirement instead of an analytical document. Fourth, the process seems to condition the candidate nomination base, especially for masters programs. Since most firms are small, there are probably only 1 or 2 candidates who are even remotely likely to participate. Thus ETPs seem to somehow frequently accommodate their personal interests in training as much as those of the firm.

Finally, the strongest criticism of the process may be that the information provided is not extensively utilized. The content analysis described below indicated that for the masters candidates the training recommended or provided could be directly linked to identified firm needs in only 20 percent of the plans examined. Further, examination of the seminars listed in Table II suggests that few of them have been customized or tailor made to the extent that would be expected by utilization of the document according to its potential. In part, this may be due to the fact that this information is not communicated to the training suppliers.

A final observation is that the process treats all training candidates alike, irrespective of the type of training sought. Yet there are clear differences in cost, potential impact, and training nature. This suggests that the same degree of analysis may not be necessary for each type of training and could vary for short-term or masters degree programs.

The FUNDAPEC Plan De Entrenamiento Institucional (ANNEX C) is an almost verbatim adoption of the current CNHE process and documents, with only three modifications:

1. Institutional descriptive information requested is formatted in appropriate non private sector terms.

2. A general description of the principal objectives of the institution is requested, instead of an export plan.

3. The TP process is not strongly emphasized for short-term programs. Instead a more traditional application, incorporating much of the TP information, is used for selection by a technical committee.

Discussions with project officials indicate that some experiences have not been too different from those of the CNHE. The uniqueness of the concept has meant that significant persuasion and assistance is required to produce finished plans. Some see it as a forced exercise and participate only to meet a requirement and not as a true plan. Some difficulty is also evidenced in translating training needs into specific training programs. Management attention, especially at small PVOs, is sometimes difficult to get. The small PVOs also report few available candidates for long-term training. In such case, the exercise becomes little

more than a justification of individual training and hence loses some of its salience.

FUNDAPEC also exhibits some characteristics which set its experience apart from that of the CNHE. First, target institutions were first identified and prioritized, thereby prequalifying only the most promising target institutions. Second, human resource officials, and not candidates, were used to complete the plans, at least in the larger institutions. Their presumed greater familiarity and sympathy could have facilitated the process. Third, the plans were not used as a tool to qualify for short-term programs. This enabled efforts to be focused on more critical and plan relevant long-term training. Results of the short-term training process are believed by FUNDAPEC officials to be at least as good as would have been obtained through the plan process, yet achieved with less effort. Finally, completion of plans seems reasonably efficient. Some 70 have been approved, with about 50 indicating the potential to benefit from long-term training. With only reasonable additional efforts this should represent an adequate number for developing a candidate pool.

A brief content analysis of 10 plans revealed the following:

Criteria	Percent Plans Judged to Meet Criteria
1. Completeness	90
2. Identified Project Relevant Needs	90
3. Training Sought Flows From Needs	70
4. Analytical Rigor	40
5. Supplemental Training Plan Included	60
6. Original Language Used	60
7. Presentation	100
8. Useful for Placement	50

The specific procedures and definitions used in this content analysis procedure are those described in the section which discusses CNHE training plan effectiveness.

This analysis suggests that the FUNDAPEC process is functioning at an acceptable level. This is to be expected given the opportunity to incorporate CNHE experiences into these procedures, and strong A.I.D. urging that this be done.

2. Receptivity To Training Plans

Given the importance of ETPs in the project, it is desirable that firms be active, receptive participants. Firm receptivity was assessed using several approaches:

1. Interviews with firm officials who had signed the document to gauge their reactions.

2. A content analysis of completed ETPs, assuming that high levels of receptivity would be reflected in the characteristics of the resulting document.

3. Discussions with project officials to summarize experiences in developing the process.

As the basis for conducting the interviews a sample consisting of executives from all 18 firms of the masters candidates for the 1990 cycle and 20% (8) of previous cycles was identified. ANNEX D contains a list of the persons interviewed. Nineteen executives were available for interviews. A standard interview protocol was developed and served as the guide for the discussion and framework for structuring results. (ANNEX E). Table III summarizes these results. As these data suggest firms do not have highly positive attitudes toward the ETP process. On a 1 to 10 scale firms rank the usefulness of the process to them at 4.8. Semantic differential scale items indicate that firms strongly view the process as not useful to them, quite general, but of medium ease to complete. Reinforcing this feeling is the fact that not one of the firms reports using the document for any purpose other than applying for this program, not withstanding that an average of 2.1 people and 5.6 person hours were involved in its preparation.

Several other conclusions also emerge from the data.

TABLE III

FIRM RECEPTIVITY TO TRAINING PLANS

Survey Responses

Source of Program Knowledge

Direct CNHE Initiated Personal Contact	40%
Scholarship Candidate	45%
Media	10%
Other	5%

Signatory Participation in Plan Preparation

YES	NO	No Knowledge
45%	55%	4 respondents

Becario Participation in Plan Preparation

YES	NO
80%	20%

Becario Sole Preparer - 50%

Average Number of Participants, if Multiple - 2.1

Preparation Time Needed 5.6 man hours

Recommended Programs or University 0%

Becario Task On Return

Clear, specific	10%
General indications	30%
Use skills	40%
No answer	20%

ATTITUDES TO ETP

Useful	___	___	___	___	X	Not Useful (4.5)
Too General	___	X	___	___	___	Too Specific (2.3)
Hard to Complete	___	___	X	___	___	Easy to Complete (3.3)

ATTITUDES TO PROGRAM

Easy to Inform	___	___	X	___	___	Hard to Inform (3.3)
Many Candidates	___	___	___	X	___	Few Candidates (4.1)
Cheap	___	X	___	___	___	Costly (2.3)

ETP USED FOR OTHER PURPOSES

YES: 0 % NO: 100%

Usefulness of ETP process (1 - 10) - 4.8

Time to Recover Firm Investment:

20.8 months, imputed valve US$17,800

(assumes 30 months of firm salary at RD$3,500 per month, plus airfare)

Note: Based on 19 interviews with the executive identified as responsible for approval of the candidate application. Sample based on a universe of all CNHE candidates in English training and 10% of those now studying in the U.S. Percentages are based on responses to each question and are rounded to the nearest 5 percent.

First, the interviews revealed that firms are quite enthusiastic about the program as a whole. Interview results indicate firms view their contribution as quite inexpensive and expect a return on their expenditures through increased productivity in about 7.5 years after training completion. Comments during the interview indicate that executives are highly enthusiastic about this CNHE project, view it as a significant contribution to development and view the counterpart requirement as reasonable. Without exception executives requested more information about other training opportunities in short-term programs and were anxious for more communication with CNHE, in part because information was viewed as somewhat hard to obtain. This is a strong reaffirmation of support for the basic elements of the project. Although, as discussed below, firms may not be especially profuse or proficient in generating ETP documents, they are, nonetheless, strongly supportive and receptive to the project. The observation that costs (i.e. firm counterpart) appear cheap is especially encouraging, given the present economic environment. In this sense care should be taken to be sure that the observations made in this section are interpreted only in respect to the process of completing the ETP document, and not in the context of overall support for the project.

Second, interviews suggest that some firms seem to have limited involvement in the ETP process. Four of the 19 executives interviewed reported no knowledge at all of the process, which suggests that some may merely have signed the document, with no real involvement. Also, the candidate is reported to have been the sole preparer of the ETP in half the cases, and an active participant in an additional 30%. Finally, the plans do not do a good job of indicating specific roles for the candidate upon return from training and provide limited specific guidance for programs of study. Thus, little firm input in these areas is obtained.

Conversations with DA, CNHE, and FUNDAPEC officials confirm this impression. They report that extensive efforts are required to obtain completed plans, as the CNHE experiences discussed above indicate. Development Associates has suggested that this, coupled with severe time pressures, may have resulted in as many as 50% of the 1990 cycle masters candidates being approved without completed plans.

3. Training Plan Effectiveness

Training plan effectiveness was assessed by a content analysis of 20 ETPs submitted by CNHE masters program candidates. A set of 8 criteria believed to represent critical dimensions of ETP utility and quality were developed. The evaluation then judged the extent to which each plan was believed to substantively meet each of these criteria. The results of the analysis are presented in the table on the following page.

As a group plans are presented in an attractive, professional format and the specific information requested is reasonably complete. The supplemental information requested (the original draft of the training plan which corresponds to Section III of the document) is present for only 20% of the cases reviewed.

PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO EMPRESARIAL

CONTENT ANALYSIS RESULTS

	Criteria	Plans Judged to Substantively Meet Criteria (Base = 20)
1.	Completeness	15
2.	Identified Firm Needs Directly Related to Exporting	9
3.	Training Sought Flows From Needs (Section II leads to Section III)	4
4.	Analytical Rigor	4
5.	Supplemental Information	4
6.	CNHE Promtped Phrasing (Section III)	15
7.	Presentation	17
8.	Useful for Placement	7

Notes:

1. Based on content analysis by author of 20 ETPs submitted by 1990 Master's Program candidates.

2. Two candidates were from 1 company. Two ETPs were submitted, but were identical in every respect. These were evaluated as two separate documents.

Several other observations are relevant. First, plans do a good job of identifying firm limitations and constraints. Second, the translation of identified firm needs into specific training program requests is done adequately in only 20% of the cases. Frequently fairly specific firm limits are noted, but only general training (a masters degree in computer science or business) is suggested. Thus, the flow from Sections II and III to Section IV is generally inadequate. This observation is reinforced by the conclusion that ETP information would be useful for candidate placement in only 35% of the cases. Finally, the general analytical rigor of the documents, including the specificity of statements and use of logic or evidence to support conclusions, is loosely judged acceptable in relatively few plans. Phrasing of key conclusions, for example, often is prompted by wording in instructions, the case study example, or promotional materials, which suggests little original thought.

The above findings about the receptivity and effectiveness of ETPs suggest several overall conclusions:

1. Firm receptivity (perhaps better phrased as capability) for the process may have been overestimated in initial assumptions. Firms are enthusiastic about the project but in practice view the ETP as a bureaucratic requirement and act accordingly. In large measure this may be due to the novelty of the general concept, and hence lack of experience in its application. Thus, the amount of effort necessary to facilitate plan completion seems underestimated and the quality of the results anticipated overstated in the initial project design documents.

2. The quality of the information derived from the process is not especially high or useful. Firms themselves do not use the information and, except as general background or for the qualifying information on Section I, the information is used for little more than potential participant identification by CNHE.

3. Administrative implementation of the process by the CNHE, although attempted with considerable responsiveness and effort, may be somewhat lax recently, with indications that there are some instances of incomplete plans, plans completed after the fact, low firm involvement, and selection without completed plans. This is perhaps best interpreted as a de facto admission that the utility of the process does not fully justify the effort involved.

4. CNHE input and effort required to obtain a completed plan seemed to be underestimated in project design. Processing the number of candidates needed for the in-country programs does not appear feasible if the ETP process is retained as the primary qualification mechanism.

5. The ETP process may be seen by businessmen as somewhat abstract, impersonal, and theoretical, at least from the perspective of current local practices. The interviews conducted suggest that businesspeople actively consider and are quite insightful about the training needs of their firm, especially the management group with which they closely identify. However, business people seem to think about training on a level and in a logical sequence quite different from that suggested by the ETP.

Business thinking usually starts with a particular individual, evaluates that person's skills and training needs, and then considers how new skills can be best utilized by the firm. This is essentially the reverse of the firm level, top down process expected by the ETP. Viewed from this perspective the problems noted may reflect, as much as anything, difficulties in following a specific document through a new and unfamiliar pattern, rather than an inherent inability to identify valid training needs and suggest appropriate training responses.

b. Recommendations

The following section presents recommendations for expediting the ETP process and also suggests alternatives to accomplish the purposes intended by other means. The recommendations are grouped according to short-term training, long-term training and in-country training. It should be noted that these recommendations are directed at CNHE. However, given similarities in the formats and procedures, these recommendations may also apply to FUNDAPEC.

For Short-Term Programs

1. Consider replacing the ETP process for short-term programs with a program of CNHE identification of training needs, cooperative training program development, and selection of participants/firms against stated criteria. This process would require that CNHE itself use previously conducted need assessments, supplemented with interviews of business managers, knowledgeable industry leaders and potential participants, to identify training program opportunities on a sector or industry basis. Once such an opportunity has been identified CNHE could visit businesses and supporting institutions to discuss training issues and sector problems with appropriate, knowledgeable informants. As part of this process a meeting could be convened with key persons and potential participants to make suggestions about training content, types of training, timing, training mix, and potential training sites in the US.

This information should then be transformed into a several page training request which would serve as the primary vehicle for requesting course development assistance from Development Associates and as a starting point for course design by potential suppliers. The information in the training request could also provide the basis for developing promotional information and recruiting participants.

This process should both improve the specificity of program design and result in programs that are more responsive to firm needs. Communications between CNHE and training suppliers would also be improved. The extra work involved at this stage (much of which is now done informally anyway) would be compensated by the reduced burden of ETP generation. Since the current pace of activities requires that only 3-4 such programs be developed per year, adequate time and resources are available. Participant selection could then be based on a set of simple criteria that measure the eligibility of the firm for the project and demonstrate a likelihood of benefiting from the training.

2. Allow candidates from those 243 firms who have completed ETPs to qualify for short-term training by merely updating Section I and IV, and parts V and VII of Sectión III.

For Long-Term Training

3. For long-term training, consider substituting a detailed statement of what the candidate will do in the firm on return from training for Section III. This statement, about a single spaced page in length, should be produced and negotiated jointly by the candidate and employer. It should focus on very specific tasks that require training for implementation and are critical for firm performance. Examples would be conduct a market survey, design products, implement quality control, or the like. This would serve several purposes:

a. provide a very clear basis for judging the impact of the training. This is important for selection criteria and also the necessary follow-up measures of project impact.

b. the task accomplishment discussion with the employer helps to focus training and also insure a supportive, relevant, and receptive environment for applying training in the firm.

c. retain project emphasis on institutional development.

d. offer guidelines for selecting degree programs, courses, and even assignments during the academic program.

4. Primary emphasis and assistance in completing ETPs should be directed at firms likely to provide masters programs candidates and then secondly on short-term US training candidate employers. This is necessary to insure that the best plans are developed where the most costly and potentially higher impact training is directed. In doing so greater administrative care should be exercised to insure that plans are complete, that plans are finalized before candidate selection decisions are initiated, and that plans are completed by a responsible firm official and not the candidate. If judged necessary the workshops can be continued for this group, but streamlined to about 1/2 day, with specific focus on document completion.

5. Implement relatively minor changes in the document.

a. Eliminate items 13, 14 and 15 of Section I, which seem irrelevant.

b. Require a statement of exactly who prepared the document.

c. Request that firms not exporting currently provide a statement of plans and intentions for item 16, Section I. Also require a comparable statement of current or intended activities for support firms who

do not export but offer facilitating services to those who do. This section may require redrafting to accommodate other, non exporting, firms who are also eligible under the project amendment.

d. Provide more detailed instructions for completing Section III.

e. Streamline Section III by eliminating Part I and VI, which seem to add little relevant information.

f. Resequence the logical flow to start the process with individual training recommendations, and then back into firm level training needs.

For In-Country-Training

6. Streamline the format to facilitate the volume of candidates anticipated under the in-country training program. This should follow the lead of FUNDAPEC and convert the document into a more traditional application, which could then be judged against suitable criteria by the selection committee. A suggested form would retain Section I, as modified above, and parts V and VII of Section III. This assumes that CNHE has identified an appropriate seminar topic and the task is to qualify/select firms and individuals for participation.

E. TRAINING IMPACT ANALYSIS

1. Findings/Conclusions

The grant agreement requires that CNHE conduct periodic impact analyses of its programs to measure outcomes at the project goal and purpose level described in the log frames. Training impact, in this sense, is thus defined by project documents in terms of primarily:

> Improved productive capacity and expanded export marketing in the participating enterprises;
>
> and
>
> A trained pool of professional managers and technicians in key sectors of the economy.

CNHE has developed, with DA assistance, a questionnaire instrument that collects both program satisfaction and training impact information at the same time. ANNEX F contains this instrument. The instrument solicits opinions about three program areas: satisfaction with pre-departure procedures (the 3 series of questions), satisfaction with the training experience itself (the 4 series of questions), and impressions of impact (the 5 series of questions). The tabulated average responses to each of these questions for the 11 group seminars and also individual programming appear on the next page.

Impact is measured by yes/no responses to six questions and coded as yes = 2, no = 1 for tabulation. As the table indicates average response for all five series questions at all 11 seminars was 1.7. Interpretation of forced choice, yes/no, responses is extremely difficult when the concepts measured are actually continuous and multidimensional, as is the case here. For this reason such questions are usually not considered appropriate for measuring training impact. The 1.7 average response means that 30% of the responses were no and 70% yes. There are no absolute or comparative standards against which to interpret this response level. Considering the very general nature of the questions asked, and natural positive response tendencies, the feeling here is that this represents a somewhat low participant impression of impact, but this is not much more than a subjective opinion, given the nature of the methodology employed.

Two other observations are relevant, based on this data. First, there is little difference between impact evaluation for seminars (1.7) and individual programming (1.6). Both training modes seem equally effective in this respect, at least based on these measures. Second, there is no evidence

EVALUATION MEAN RESPONSES
Seminar

QUESTION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
3A	4.1	3.7	3.0	3.8	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.6	3.4	3.2
3B	3.9	3.5	2.0	3.5	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.0	2.8	3.2
3C	4.3	3.2	3.0	3.5	1.0	3.6	2.3	2.9	2.8	3.5	3.4	2.7
3D	4.3	3.5	3.0	3.7	1.5	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.2	2.7	3.1	2.5
3E	4.0	3.2	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.1	3.1	2.9	3.6	2.9	2.3	3.1
3F	4.3	3.0	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.6	3.0	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.6	3.4
3G	4.1	3.0	3.0	3.2	0.5	3.3	2.7	3.3	2.4	2.9	3.3	2.7
3H	4.4	3.7	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.2	3.7	3.5	3.8
3I	4.4	4.0	4.0	3.2	2.0	3.6	3.1	3.5	3.0	3.9	3.5	2.8
3J	3.3	3.3	4.0	3.2	1.5	3.4	3.1	3.2	3.4	3.3	2.9	3.4
3K	4.7	4.0	3.0	4.0	2.5	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.7
3L	4.3	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.7	2.7	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.9	3.7
3 MEAN	4.2	3.6	3.4	3.6	2.5	3.4	3.0	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2
4A	3.7	3.0	3.0	3.2	3.5	2.9	2.9	2.0	2.6	3.4	3.7	3.5
4B	4.1	4.0	3.0	3.2	4.0	3.3	2.6	2.8	3.0	3.5	3.3	2.9
4C	4.5	4.0	4.0	3.5	4.0	3.6	3.8	3.5	3.4	3.7	3.7	3.0
4D	4.4	3.7	4.0	3.7	4.0	3.6	3.6	3.8	2.6	3.7	3.9	2.6
4E	4.4	4.0	3.0	3.3	-	3.7	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.5	3.0
4 MEAN	4.2	3.9	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.4	3.2	3.2	2.9	3.6	3.6	3.0
5A	2.0	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.9
5B	1.1	1.3	1.0	1.3	0.5	1.1	1.0	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.6
5C	1.8	1.7	2.0	1.3	1.0	1.0	1.7	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.3
5D	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.6	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.0	1.6	1.6
5E	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.7	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.8
5F	2.0	1.7	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.9	2.0	1.8
5 MEAN	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.6

NOTES:

SEMINAR NUMBERS

1. Export. de Muebles 6-26 abril, 1989
2. Gerencia Agroindustrial, INCAE, 5-18 marzo, 1989
3. Export. de Textiles, 2-25 febrero, 1989
4. Financial Restructuring, 26 enero-10 febrero, 1989
5. Export Entry Strategies, oct., 1988
6. Estrategias de Exportacin, INCAE, 2-15, oct. 1988
7. Est. y Planes de Exportacion, INCAE, julio 25-agosto 13, 1988
8. Divers. de la Produccion Agricola, Davis, jun-julio, 1988
9. Des. Gerencial y Mercadeo, Thunderbird, Feb-abril, 1988
10. Adm. y Financ. a las Export., INCAE, agosto 1987
11. Adm. y Financ. a las Exportaciones, INCAE, nov. 1987
12. Programacion Individual

Evaluation questions correspond to those appearing on the CNHE administered fo
Results are as reported by CNHE cómputer tabulation, rounded to the nearest te
This computer program, however, contains an apparent logic error in handling
missing data (non responses) which does not correctly adjust for the smaller
denominator resulting from non responses. Consequences belived minor, however
given few instances of missing data.

Best Available Copy

of experience effects among group seminars. The average impact of the first half of the seminar series (1.7) is exactly that of the second half (1.7). One would normally expect improvement in outcomes over project life, based on repetition and improvements. This suggests that impact evaluation information is not being used as feedback or that programs are not actively designed and managed for impact enhancement over time.

A review of the instrument and procedures used to collect responses was conducted. This review raised several questions for consideration:

1. As discussed above yes/no responses do not completely capture the distinctions necessary and are extremely difficult to interpret. Specific quantitative information, frequency counts, or scaled responses are not used, but would be useful.

2. Questions have no direct link to project goals and purposes, as listed above. Four of the six questions deal only with impact on the individual, or the individual's role in the firm. Although quite meaningful for the individual participant, there is no direct impact on the firm, which is the focus of this project. Only 2 questions (D and F) relate to firm consequences and even then impacts measured are extremely general (usefulness and knowledge sharing). No questions deal with issues of firm sales, output, productivity, or efficiency.

3. All responses were collected on approximately the same date (January, 1989), notwithstanding the fact that seminars were conducted over a several year period. For some programs this meant that it may have been too soon to expect impact and for others that the relatively long time lapse could have introduced confounding variables that influenced results.

4. Although baseline data on firm sales, exports, and export activities are collected as part of the ETP, the questionnaire does not request any comparable updated data for comparative purposes as an indication of impact. Yet the rationale for developing the computer data base of ETP data was to make such analysis possible.

For this reason the conclusion here is that current procedures may not produce the depth of evaluation information required. Correction of this situation is one consideration for CNHE management.

An independent impact evaluation was undertaken as part of this review. Telephone interviews were conducted with 41 of the 205 participants in US short-term training. Participants were selected using a random stratified quota sampling technique, i.e., an attempt was made to get an approximate 20% sample of each training group (and individual programs) selecting interviewees at random within each group until the required number of responses was obtained. A structured interview protocol (ANNEX E) was developed to elicit information in two areas:

1. Participant satisfaction with the training delivery process. This aspect focuses on the training experience itself and is intended to supplement and confirm the program evaluations conducted by CNHE. The assumption is that a satisfactory training experience is required to lead to

the firm level activity necessary for increased performance, but, by itself, is not conclusive or sufficient for such impacts. These results are reported elsewhere.

2. Training impact, designed to measure the direct increase in firm export productivity attributed to the training experience. Given the lack of systematic baseline data and a wide range of time lags since completing training, specific export increases and individual salary changes could not be measured or interpreted. Consequently, indirect measures were used to itemize activity changes which, if successful, would lead to meaningful project purpose level results.

As is true in any interview situation, not all of the potential respondents could be contacted. The following data indicate the relevant information for this survey:

SHORT-TERM PARTICIPANT SURVEY CONTACTS

Participant Universe	205	
Phone Contacts Attempted		126
Interviews Completed		41
Telephone disconnected, out of service		21
Business never at that number		9
Participant unknown at that business		8
Participant no longer employed there		8
Away, out of country, did not return call		39

Approximately three respondent contacts were initiated to result in one completed interview. Although somewhat high this ratio is not unreasonable. About 45% of the unsuccessful attempts (39 out of 85) were due to the individual being away, occupied, or not returning messages; 25% were attributed to disconnected or out of service telephones. Surprisingly 14% of the 126 calls revealed that the business never did exist at that number or that the individual called was unknown at that number. This suggests that CNHE records may be inaccurate in some cases or that the selection process may have included some participants with only tenuous business links.

Results of this interview process are summarized on the following page. These results show that most individuals are doing different tasks for the firm after training. Forty-four percent report that they now perform

SHORT-TERM CNHE PARTICIPANTS

Program Satisfaction

Support Considerations:

Average response on a scale of 1 to 5 (highest)

Hotel	4.56
Food	3.97
Orientation	4.51
Selection	3.36
Relevance	4.17

Program Considerations

Short			x			Long (2.82)
Boring				x		Lively (3.53)
Excellent Professors		x				Poor Professors (2.30)
Defficient Support				x		Excellent Support (3.7)
Advanced		x				Elementary (2.5)
Local			x			Foreign (3.4)
Slow Pace			x			Rapid Pace (3.0)
Much Variety			x			Little Variety (2.9)
Good Topics		x				Poor Topics (2.3)
Homogeneous Group				x		Heterogenous group (3.7)
Satisfied		x				Dissatisfied (2.3)

SHORT-TERM CNHE PARTICIPANTS

Program Satisfaction

Support Considerations:

Average response on a scale of 1 to 5 (highest)

Hotel	4.56
Food	3.97
Orientation	4.51
Selection	3.36
Relevance	4.17

Program Considerations

Short			X			Long (2.82)
Boring				X		Lively (3.53)
Excellent Professors		X				Poor Professors (2.30)
Defficient Support				X		Excellent Support (3.7)
Advanced		X				Elementary (2.5)
Local			X			Foreign (3.4)
Slow Pace			X			Rapid Pace (3.0)
Much Variety			X			Little Variety (2.9)
Good Topics		X				Poor Topics (2.3)
Homogeneous Group				X		Heterogenous group (3.7)
Satisfied		X				Dissatisfied (2.3)

additional duties, carry out new tasks or have increased functions that they attribute to having participated in training. For these individuals the new activities represent job enlargement with no associated formal change in position. An additional 17% report now holding new positions within the business, almost all involving lateral moves to positions with different responsibilities. Of course, some task and position mobility is normal among any work group. The levels of change suggested here are indicative that firms are making efforts to put training outcomes into practice. The most common new activities reported involved planning, studying markets, or carrying out tasks that had been done by others previously.

The survey results also indicate that the training is having some, but perhaps limited, impact on firm level production efficiency and export capability. On the average each participant was able to identify 0.80 things that are related directly to productivity or export capability that the firm is doing differently as a result of the training.

The average reported number of new suppliers or customer leads generated through the program is 0.83. Participants also estimated the time needed to recover the counterpart costs through training benefits. Firms spent an average of about US$450 for salary and airfare during the programs, and estimated that this could be returned in 5.25 months through benefits imputed to training. This implies that on average the imputed value of the training is US$1,028 during the first year.

By mandate of project design all programs were to consider export capability enhancement, at least until August, 1988, when the project amendment broadened this mandate to also include firm productivity and economic development contribution as well as facilitating functions such as banking. In spite of this broader mandate since August, 1988, all short-term US seminars, except one involving 7 participants, have still explicitly targeted exports and included exporting in course design. Thus, consideration of effects on firm export performance is one additional criteria for measuring program impact. The participant interviews reported that only about 1/3 of participant firms export and over 1/2 have no plans to do so.

To put these results in content a comparable training project in Costa Rica reported per participant averages of 6.4 activity changes, 9 customer contacts, 75% of firms exporting, and an imputed benefit value of $8,108 for the training.

Two factors appear important in accounting for the level of impact obtained:

1. Participant Selection. Selecting the right participants is one important factor in determining impact, and also cost effectiveness. Review of short-term participant application materials indicated that about half were from firms that did not currently export or were involved in facilitating activities, such as banks, transportation, trade associations, or the like. Such firms are clearly eligible for the project and can be potential high impact participants in some cases. The point is the relative

balance of participants may have become too heavily weighted away those firms mostly likely to have immediate impact.

2. Training Program Design. The training programs selected, for the most part, appear, based on a review of course outlines, quite standard and generic, mostly emphasizing a general management orientation on how to export. Little production or technical information is provided, at least compared to the mix of topics suggested in the project paper. Moreover, this basic theme, with some variation, has been repeated for about half of the programs. Although such training can be useful in providing understanding and motivation, it is not likely to produce the direct impacts intended. Thus, training program design seems to overemphasize management topics and underemphasize production topics. Both are necessary, but the balance, once again, appears heavily uneven.

Participant interviews also indicate that four other aspects of training design may be influencing impact:

a. Lack of industry or product focus, which makes it difficult to impart specific information of immediate applicability. Interestingly those seminars with an industry focus have all reported higher impact.

b. Diversity within training groups, in terms of participant involvement, experience, background, and also interest. The fairly low experience level of some participants was reported in interviews to result in instructors reducing the pace and level of training to accommodate the least common denominator, and of necessity a generalist approach to material. Although some diversity is valuable and inevitable given the need for economies of scale, more balance may be appropriate. This implies more attention to selection criteria and that such criteria may vary from group to group.

c. Limited opportunity for individual field visits or industry contacts, due to programming constraints. Participants reported benefiting from such contacts when possible. Most programs, however, did not build this into the program, offer assistance with arrangements, or allow post-program time for individual arrangements.

d. Supplier briefings. Participants in some of the earlier programs and also the individual programming indicated that in some cases the training supplier did not seem to have a clear, advance understanding of the nature of the group and its specific needs and expectations. This resulted in midprogram changes and some loss of efficiency and relevance. Communication seems to have improved in more recent programs, however, as CNHE has attempted to have suppliers present at participant organization meetings.

As the satisfaction measures reported in these results indicate, participants are pleased with the training experience. One exception is the point about group diversity noted earlier. Thus, the training satisfaction prerequisite for impact seems in place.

b. Recommendations

1. Redesign Impact Evaluations. CNHE should immediately move to develop a more appropriate instrument and methodology to measure project impact, as defined and suggested in the project paper. It is suggested that outside assistance be contracted, preferably from someone conversant with A.I.D. evaluation requirements. As a minimum the impact evaluation should attempt to relate back to the extensive firm baseline data previously collected, focus on firm level impacts, and explicitly consider export or productivity enhancement activities. Instrumentation should collect quantitative information that can be easily analyzed using appropriate response scales.

2. Improve impact evaluation implementation. CNHE evaluations should be administered about one year after the conclusion of a training program on a rolling basis, not all at one time, as appears the current practice. To facilitate this the impact evaluation should be done separately from the satisfaction evaluation of the training program and departure procedures. Such satisfaction measures are most logically administered upon conclusion of the training program. Results should be tabulated and analyzed within 2 weeks. Results should be disseminated on a program basis to both CNHE, DA, and the training supplier for incorporation into future programs. This is especially important given the number of program and supplier repetitions. The error in the computer tabulation program, which does not exclude non responses, should be corrected.

3. CNHE should fine tune selection decisions to emphasize impact. This would require preference and active recruiting to obtain mid level managerial or professional personnel from firms and reducing the proportion of candidates from non production or facilitating firms, even if this implies somewhat smaller training groups.

4. CNHE should modify training program design to increase impact. This recommendation involves deliberately designing training to maximize the impacts intended and should:

a. Limit presentation of additional generalist, open entry, basic orientation type courses that involve variants of the theme "How to Export." These are low impact potential, have exhausted the likely relevant market, and have been excessively dominant in the programming mix.

b. Emphasize programs that feature technical and production topics, as well as specific marketing and commercialization themes related to those priority areas described in Annex D of the amendment Project Paper.

c. Use an industry focus, along the lines described in Part D, to develop customized training programs that react to the expressed training needs of a specific sector or industry. This implies tailor made programs whose design will require interaction between participants, CNHE, DA and the training suppliers. The slight additional effort, higher costs, and possible smaller group size shall be accepted as a necessary trade-off for higher impact.

d. Expand the range of training suppliers and training sites from the few currently utilized to incorporate alternative approaches. DA's response to the RFP indicated an exceptionally broad pool of potential suppliers, only several of which have been used to date.

e. Design programs to actively facilitate business contacts and networking with potential customers and suppliers as an integral part of each program. This could be accomplished in a variety of ways, ranging from initiating contacts and scheduling appointments for participants, to merely providing unprogrammed time (perhaps 1/2 day in mid program) for participants to follow-up on individual arrangements. If possible, programs should be scheduled to overlap with trade shows, exhibits or association meetings to facilitate this process.

f. Design a standard "applications module" which would prepare participants to introduce changes in their organization upon return. Such a module could include basic techniques on the adoption of innovations, force field analysis, promoting change and feature specific discussion on how to employ these techniques in the DR context. Such a one teaching unit module (1 1/2 - 2 hours) could easily be incorporated into each program by any training supplier. The philosophy behind the recommendation is that if participants are to change institution performance they should be prepared with the tools and processes to do so.

F. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

This section assesses project management efficiency for the CNHE portion of the Development Training Project. Following the instructions of the work scope, it is not intended to be an exhaustive administrative review, but is of sufficient depth to highlight areas where improvement can be achieved. For ease of presentation it is divided into two parts: 1) training management and 2) project management.

1. Training Management

Training management refers to the logistical and administrative tasks related to delivering the actual training activities which are the heart of the project. Conceptually this process consists of a sequential series of tasks involving training needs assessment, project promotion, participant recruiting and selection, training delivery, and participant evaluation and follow-up. The project paper does a creditable job of describing an implicit strategy for relating training activities to the overall project. Key elements of this intended strategy include:

1. A firm level focus on private sector institutions as the primary beneficiaries of the training received, i.e. training is for the purpose of developing organizational, and not individual, capacity.

2. Purposive training intended to be directly supportive of A.I.D.'s development strategy, primarily by facilitating private sector exports and productivity.

3. Targeting currently employed mid level managers and professionals in private sector firms that are currently exporting, have potential for exporting, or are otherwise supportive of A.I.D.'s private sector development efforts.

4. Utilizing a relatively broad mix of training and topics, which includes technical aspects of production and distribution, as well as general management skills.

The project design specifies that this process is essentially shared between CNHE and the US contractor. Although cooperation is encouraged at all stages, CNHE initiates the process in the Dominican Republic by requesting training programs and identifying participants, passes responsibility to Development Associates for the actual training development and delivery, and then receives participants upon return for follow-up activity. As such there is some inherent potential for conflict, since what is essentially one process sequence is carried out by separate parties. Dysfunctional conflict has been avoided to date; to the credit of all involved the process in functioning adequately.

This evaluation focuses on the two CNHE training activities which have been most active to date, long-term masters degree training in the US and short-term US seminars. Since the implementation of the training process varies for each program type they are discussed separately, in turn.

a. US Short-Term Seminars

Findings/Conclusions

1. Training Needs Assessments

The project paper identified several studies which offered guidance for needs identification. Also, CNHE contracted for a needs study in the first year of the project which identified specific training needs and target industries. These documents provide a clear picture of training needs. The programs offered to date seem to deal only with one part of the needs identified, at least as a whole. Although general export management topics have been well covered, the narrower technical areas have not been developed to the extent suggested by the needs assessments. Also the industry focus implied by these studies (training needs are presented as unique to a specific sector) has not been extensively developed. The relatively small number of customized courses offered to date (2 appear to have been tailor made, 2 or 3 involve modifications before presentation, and 7 seem straight off the shelf repetitions of standard offerings) also suggests that specific identified needs are not being responded to. Further, management subjects, in contrast to production topics, have dominated the offerings.

2. Project Promotion

The first two CNHE annual reports document an intensive promotional campaign involving personal visits, mass media, mailings, and speeches that was effective in informing a broad audience about the general project and also attracting participants for individual programming and the initial series of seminars. As described previously, one focus of this campaign was to obtain a completed ETP. Firms completing an ETP comprise the core pool of potential participants. As discussed previously, the 243 ETPs represent a good base, but must be supplemented to insure an adequate participant pool.

The interviews conducted for this review indicate two relevant facts. First, newspaper ads and publicity, by far and away, are reported as the most frequent means by which participants first learn of CNHE programs, accounting for 68% of first impressions. Direct CNHE contact and supervisor recommendations account for about 10% each. Apparently personal visits have not been extensive and information that is directed to only one person in a firm is not usually disseminated. The dominance of newspaper contacts suggests a clear guideline for focusing the majority, but not all, communication activities. Second, respondents report some difficulty in obtaining program information and were all anxious to have more communication with the CNHE. This suggests that earlier promotion efforts may have decayed or are not currently emphasized. In large measure this can be explained by the one year hiatus in short-term programs (no programs were held from April, 1989 until late March, 1990 because planned targets were exceeded and the decision was to focus on long-term programs). CNHE should be aware that renewed promotional efforts may be required to regenerate awareness for

future programs and to ensure that information is received by a broad audience.

3. Participant Selection

CNHE currently requires that short-term participants have a completed ETP and also be approved by the CNHE selection committee. The selection committee approves applicants based on these five qualifications:

- the priority of the firm within the objectives of the project.
- the capacity of the firm to improve its productivity or resolve problems through the training proposed.
- the time of the candidate with the firm.
- the position of the candidate in the firm.
- relationship of the responsibilities of the candidate to the object of the training requested.

CNHE reports approving about 70% of the applicants. In practice the selection committee appears to act more as a qualification committee than a selection committee. That is, if the candidate meets the stated minimums, he is selected. This observation is supported by the results of the CNHE program satisfaction survey, reported earlier. Participant comments indicated dissatisfaction with the inclusion of some few participants who had lower levels of interest, relevance, and ability. Although this may be natural in general purpose courses, somewhat tighter selection criteria may be indicated. The criteria most needing emphasis are actual level of firm activities and direct line involvement of the participant in management. For this reason a weighing system, giving priority to such candidates, and working to reduce participation of those others, should be considered. The objective should be to select a participant group commensurate with project purposes and situated to apply what is learned immediately.

In this respect these activities may be confronting a common phenomena in projects of this sort in relatively small, developing economies; namely a small and narrow pool of potential participants. This is especially acute as the project moves toward maturity and programs become more specialized. This shrinking base for selection means that either some less than ideal candidates must be accepted, or programs be quite broad to attract wider audiences, or smaller participant numbers (and hence higher unit costs) be accepted. Consequently to some extent a less than ideal selection process must be accepted as the price for program specificity and reasonable cost effectiveness. Care should be taken, however, to be sure that desires to achieve a minimum group size do not affect overall program quality.

There are some indications that a few participants may not go through all steps of the selection process. Although some flexibility

may be appropriate in unusual circumstances, this practice should be very limited. Approximately 20% of short-term participants are female, which seems reasonable, considering that 5 of 13 programs have an agricultural focus, an area in which women are underrepresented.

4. Training Program Design and Delivery

In some cases once a program topic was suggested, DA would develop a RFP which would be given to potential suppliers for a technical and cost response. The process appears to also include a number of repeats or variants of previously offered courses, inserts into open enrollment programs, or responses to programs offered by trainers. This may result in a portfolio of training that is narrower and less dynamic than envisioned or possible. Correction of this tendency could increase training impact. Key elements involve a wider range of training providers and sites, a greater emphasis on production topics, an industry focus, and customized programs that respond to specific industry needs. The point is that no one mode is appropriate for all situations and that the project may benefit from a greater variety of approaches.

CNHE appears to be getting good quality training delivery from its suppliers. Most of the suppliers (INCAE, AGSIM, U- CAL-DAVIS, WTI, AD LITTLE) are established, experienced, and have very good international reputations for producing good education programs. This favorable impression is confirmed by the CNHE satisfaction measures reported earlier. With the possible exception of 1 program (AGSIM), participants are quite satisfied with the training received. More importantly, satisfaction is increasing over time, as the following figures calculated from the CNHE survey results suggest:

CNHE PROGRAM EVALUATION SUMMARY

Predeparture Arrangements (1)	Program Satisfaction (1)	Impact (2)
	Averages 11 seminars	
3.3	3.5	1.7
	Average first 6 seminars	
3.3	3.3	1.7
	Average last 5 seminars	
3.4	3.7	1.7
	Averages Individual Programming	
3.2	3.0	1.6

Notes: Based on a scale of 0 - 4 (highest)

2. Bases on YES (2) NO (1) responses

The interviews with 41 returned participants described earlier also collected information about satisfaction with the training process. These results portray a favorable response to the training per se. Programs are seen as of appropriate length, lively, at reasonable levels and pace. Professors, topics, and local relevance is considered good. Logistical arrangements are also well received. Only two areas of criticism emerged: more homogeneous groups seem preferred and some difficulties were reported with language and translations at the Davis and AGSIM programs. Overall, however, it is clear that participant reaction is quite positive. This indicates that training delivery is successful in meeting participant expectations and that reactions to the experience are positive.

5. Evaluation and Follow Up

The CNHE procedures for evaluating training satisfaction were described in the section discussing program impact evaluation, since both are done at the same time and use the same instrument. Thus, the points made in that analysis apply here also and will not be repeated. Several observations will be emphasized, however. First, the format, coverage, and questions of the instrument used for the satisfaction measures seem standard and adequate. Thus its use can be continued without modification. Ideally it would have been better to scale responses 1 to 5 (instead of 0 to 4), but the current practice should continue for comparability. Second, the form should be administered immediately after training. Third, results should be tabulated quickly and shared with suppliers for feedback.

Recommendations

1. CNHE should review existing training needs studies to identify specific areas on which to focus future programs, prioritizing programs based on potential contributions to development strategy. Such identification should indicate the 10 - 12 programs that will be developed between now and PACD.

2. DA and CNHE should work together to broaden the mix of topics, training suppliers, training sites, and program approaches to become more representative of the diversity and focus anticipated in project design.

3. CNHE should utilize a customized program development stance, insuring that remaining programs respond to the specific expressed needs of an individual industry or sector. After CNHE has identified an appropriate priority training opportunity, it should work closely with potential participants, sector leaders, and knowledgeable individuals to identify needs and develop a general description of the training requested. This training request should contain training objectives, suggestions for specific training content, expected training outcomes, field visit requests, proposed dates, participant profiles, and suggested training sites and suppliers. Development Associates would then work with this information to locate suppliers and develop appropriate programs. The extra effort and cost involved is believed essential for delivering the project purpose impact required.

4. CNHE should revitalize promotion efforts, to offset the break in programming, counteract decaying awareness of the project, and meet desires for information. Such efforts should be based on newspaper publicity and specific program advertisements, working through appropriate trade or industry associations (especially CNHE constituents), and periodic general information dissemination to firms with completed ETPs.

5. Enhance CNHE selection procedures by modifying criteria so as to weight more heavily in favor of line managers and not facilitating activities firms. If the industry focus is used, criteria should be adjusted accordingly. Additional efforts should be made to insure that all participants are approved by the selection committee. Selection should be against criteria, and not adjusted to reach an arbitrary number of participants, even if somewhat higher per participant costs result.

6. CNHE procedures for conducting post program evaluations of participant satisfaction with the training process should be modified so that evaluations are conducted upon or close to the conclusion of training and that results are analyzed and communicated to all parties for timely feedback.

b. Masters Candidates

Findings/Conclusions

The project has 46 participants who have been selected and currently enrolled in US masters degrees. These students have been processed in 3 groups, as follows:

1.	FY 87 (I)	6 students, one of which terminated on 1/13/90
2.	FY 88 (II)	19 students
3.	FY 89 (III)	21 students

This is in addition to the university faculty and others (17 in all) who were processed before the DA contract started. Also, 18 have been accepted for Fall, 1990 and are currently in English training or awaiting the start of classes in the US. ANNEX G lists these students and their universities, along with basic academic test scores and GPA's as reported in CNHE files. Following the format developed previously each of the elements of the training process will be reviewed in turn.

1. Needs Assessments

The project paper and previous needs assessments appear to provide an adequate starting point for identifying priority training areas. As with short-term training, there is evidence that performance may not reflect the breadth and focus of training actually intended. A review of the major field of study listed for current participants supports this conclusion. Of the 46 placements, 12 (26%) are in computer science, 30% in general international business, and 33% in some functional area of business. The specific technical, production oriented programs suggested in the project

paper are clearly underrepresented, given the current almost exclusive emphasis on management and management staff areas.

The interviews with candidate supervisors, described earlier, underscore this point. Supervisors were not able to recommend a program of study or university. Candidate interviews indicate that major choice is more or less left to the individual, subject only to limits of program admission requirements. As suggested, many of these individual choices may stray from project purposes. The project paper for the amendment is clear in stating that individuals are expected to follow the specialization for which the participant is selected. The direction necessary and permissible to insure that areas of study meet project needs has not been exercised to the extent desirable.

2. Promotion

Interviews with supervisors indicate that recent promotion has focused on personal contacts and visits by the former project director. Half of the firms report learning of the scholarships directly from him and 30% from the scholarship candidate who, in turn, had learned of the program from its director. Media promotion was relatively ineffective. Naturally, promotion of this type must be targeted and not broad. The personal contact blitz was effective in generating the number of participants desired, but may have also missed likely candidates. Future promotion should be broader and less personal, incorporating ETP firms, CNHE members, and relevant associations in a two step process.

3. Participant Selection

The specific selection procedures utilized are detailed in the CNHE semi-annual report for January, 1988, and parallel those for short-term candidates. The process begins with the completion of the ETP and submission of application blanks, personal data, employment history, and academic transcripts. In the process a package is assembled which includes a letter of sponsorship from the firm, a completed ETP, a certificate from the firm that it will meet the counterpart requirement (continue salary, pay airfare, employment history, and utilization of skills upon return), a certificate from project personnel that the candidate's firm has been visited and employment verified. This material is evaluated by the technical committee (in practice, 1 or 2 employees of the project) using the criteria and point system on the following page. This material, along with the candidate's GPA, is then passed to the selection committee for a final decision. The impression is that the selection committee relies on the recommendations of the technical committee but also takes its responsibility for an independent judgement seriously. In the last round of selections 3 of 21 candidates presented were eliminated (1 for being non Dominican, not permissible under A.I.D. rules, and 2 with extremely low GPAs).

There are several points that suggest the selection process is not functioning as envisioned in the project paper. First, as described previously the ETP element is not functioning as easily as anticipated and some candidates seem to be approved without completed plans. Second, DA has suggested that the requirement of employment in an eligible

Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresa, Inc.

EVALUACION DE LA EMPRESA Y CANDIDATOS

NOMBRE DEL CANDIDATO _____

EMPRESA _____

PROGRAMA DE ADIESTRAMIENTO _____

FECHA DE LA EVALUACION _____

EMPRESA	PUNTOS
1. Evaluación del Plan de Entrenamiento de la Empresa	25_____
2. Relación de la empresa y sus actividades de exportación con los objetivos del Proyecto	25_____
CANDIDATO	
3. Evidencia que el adiestramiento del candidato está relacionado con el Plan de Entrenamiento de la empresa y que se puede aprovechar el adiestramiento para mejorar las exportaciones y la eficiencia de la empresa.	20_____
4. Experiencia del candidato y su puesto como evidencia de su capacidad de poder aprovechar el adiestramiento	10_____
5. Entrevista con CNHE para explicar sus planes de adiestramiento y posibilidades para el futuro	20_____
TOTAL	100_____

EVALUADORES

_____

_____

_____

1506.001
(5/90)

Ave. A. Lincoln No. 1056, 7mo. Piso, Santo Domingo, R. D. • Apartado Postal 22020
Teléfonos: 562-1414 / 562-1666 / 562-1449 / 562-1434

firm (6 months of at least 50% full time) may not be met in all cases. DA's estimates range up to 50% of the 1990 group and 23% of the 1989 and 1988 groups. This is a significant issue since this represents a technical eligibility requirement of A.I.D. which must be upheld. More importantly, it is absolutely essential in project design for obtaining the type of impact required and insuring application of skills on return. The counterpart requirement is also dependent on firm salary continuance and airfare payment, which might not be forthcoming if a valid employment relationship does not exist. The employment requirement, in the judgment of this evaluator, seems quite minimal and unlikely to present a meaningful obstacle for legitimate aspirants.

Concentrating on the 1990 candidate pool, three separate approaches were used to evaluate this situation: personal interviews with candidates themselves, interviews with candidate employers, and an independent review of application materials against project paper guidelines. Naturally these approaches cannot be conclusive, especially in individual cases, but taken together can give one indication of the performance of the process. Personal interviews were conducted with 10 CNHE candidates currently studying English at ICDA, primarily to discuss work experience, job related expectations for training, their experience in the selection process, and how information about the program was obtained. Judgement based on these interviews is that 3 people could be out of compliance with selection requirements, although perhaps only in a technical sense, based on exactly when the cut off date for employment is deemed to occur.

The interviews with employers, described previously, focused heavily on experiences with the ETP as the link between the firm, the candidate and the project. The assumption is that supervisors who were knowledgeable and involved in that process would have the strongest employment relationships with candidates. Also, as part of this process specific documentation was requested to establish an employment history. Judgement of the nature of that documentation and the circumstances under which it was provided was also considered. Of the interviews planned, it was possible to make judgements in 18 cases, which are classed as follows:

Impeccable compliance	6
Reasonable compliance	3
Questionable, but probable compliance	5
Likely non compliance	4

As a final measure a review of the completed applications for 1990 participants was carried out. The attempt was to make a holistic judgment of the suitability of the candidate based on the intent of the criteria listed in the project paper. As such it did not judge technical eligibility, but rather desirability from an overall project perspective and, thus, represents a more ideal standard than minimal technical compliance with requirements. Factors of firm potential, relevant, meaningful work experience, and the impact of training on firm activities were most heavily considered. By these standards 7 of 16 applications reviewed were classed as representing attractive candidates.

In the last analysis the quality of any selection process must be judged by its output, in this case appropriate candidates for US graduate degrees. DA reports document that suitability of some candidates in the 1988 and 1989 groups for graduate study is low, if measured by US university admission criteria, which emphasize TOEFL and GRE/GMAT test scores and undergraduate GPA. Development Associates reports that at the time it was to initiate the placement process 12 of 40 candidates had GRE/GMAT scores which met minimum levels for most accredited universities; 27 of 40 had reported TOEFL scores above 500, the common minimum, with many universities requiring 550. It must be noted, however, that placement starts before students complete English training. The test scores used are, therefore, not fully reflective of eventual attainment, since later testing should result in better scores and hence easier placement (although problems of timing do arise). This picture is confirmed by examining the universities in which candidates have been placed. Students with good credentials have, by and large, been placed at good schools. However, about 25% are also in "third tier" programs that one would not normally associate with a project of this nature. Prospects appear brighter for the 1990 group. Of the eleven currently in English Training, 8 have predicted TOEFL scores over 500, and appear likely to do adequately for the upcoming TOEFL exam in the Dominican Republic.

In this sense, the selection process in some respects may not be serving the project well. Some participants with marginal credentials (at least as viewed by US admission committees) have been accepted. This results in placement at less desirable universities, restricted options for courses of study, longer completion times (with higher costs) and ultimately diluted project impact. Since candidate selection is usually the primary determinant for both impact and cost containment, improvement of this function may be useful before any of the remaining 16 slots are filled.

Two factors seem to account for most of the selection problems. First, the evaluation sheet used by the technical committee may not reflect in sufficient detail the specific criteria of the project paper. More important, applications may not be evaluated rigorously against these criteria. Second, selection procedures do not adequately consider the academic criteria of US university admission. The only academic criteria considered is undergraduate GPA. Even this is not administered rigorously, as 3 of the 1990 group have GPAs below 3.0 (one as low as 2.76) when most US universities view 3.0 as a minimum. GRE or GMAT scores are not required and logically so. However, it may be advisable to follow the FUNDAPEC policy and require the PAEG test as an indicator of academic aptitude. This Spanish language test correlates reasonably with the English GRE and would offer a prediction of admissability. Since this is a FUNDAPEC requirement, logistical details of scheduling frequent offerings would be reduced.

English language proficiency is a more problematic requirement. Experience suggests that the combination of ICDA in-country training and "topping off" at ALIGU in Georgetown for two months is reasonable, providing entrance with minimal skills. Those with no abilities at entry have difficulty reaching the expected levels. The ICDA program is designed to develop students to the level of a 450 TOEFL score. The ALIGU experience should move the score to 525 - 550. Requiring English proficiency

as a selection criteria is not reasonable. Appropriate policies have been developed for those who, in the judgement of ICDA staff, are unlikely to progress sufficiently to the levels required. Likewise, clear policies exist for those whose TOEFL scores are low at the conclusion of Georgetown training. Thus, criteria for English proficiency development are in place and have been communicated to participants.

At the heart of the selection issue is the very real problem of a narrow candidate pool from which to select. This is compounded by the fact that the project papers, in retrospect, seem to have been quite optimistic in estimating the demand for training and, hence, in establishing the amount of masters degree slots to be offered. In a methodological sense the most serious criticism is that these studies only considered the need for masters level training. Although precise estimates of significant need were demonstrated (at the level of approximately 400 masters degrees to meet backlog), these studies did not consider if this need could be translated into effective demand, i.e., were there enough people who were willing, available, interested, and qualified to participate. As mentioned earlier, firm involvement, family considerations, and academic interest significantly restrain participation by the type of managers originally targeted. The language necessity and relocation necessity add further constraints, as do the A.I.D. eligibility criteria (non elite, employment, and female preference). As previously discussed, the problem of a small candidate pool is not unique to this project. The PUCMM MBA program (also supported by A.I.D. funding) is well administered and respected, but has attracted only about 1/2 the enrollments initially estimated. This confirms the existence of a smaller candidate pool (or at least the tendency of A.I.D. studies to overestimate training demand, which is the same problem). The project paper assumption that the PUCMM and other local graduate programs would not be competitive with this project has not proven valid. In practice both target more or less comparable individuals.

From the perspective of this project, the above-mentioned factors mean that the real local selection task is to select in and not to select out, i.e. the perceived error is to exclude someone who might benefit from training, rather than to include some who may not be ideal. This situation has not been problematic for the majority of decisions, but has shown up at the margin, where 20 to 25 percent of the candidates may not have credentials as strong as desired. The implicit response of the project has been to "select in" up to the limit of the slots available.

This approach is, of course, just one of several possible alternatives. Processing fewer candidates, and perhaps reallocating funds to short-term training is another. Increased third country training, where language is not a constraint, is a third. Relaxing eligibility criteria, primarily employment requirements, might also expand the candidate pool to increase participants in some skill areas. Each alternative has its advantages and disadvantages. However, the impression of this reviewer is that these alternatives have not been considered explicitly and that the implicit response has merely evolved.

4. Program Delivery

In this context program delivery refers to the process of obtaining admission to US universities. A general evaluation of this activity was presented in the context of participant selection. Several additional observations are relevant, however. First, some students report having little input for the university selection process. It is certainly understandable that preferences can not be accommodated in all cases. Since participation in university choice is an important determinant of satisfaction, and also project impact, maximum student input should be encouraged. Most students report heavy reliance on ECO and ICDA for information and assistance in locating suitable universities. A recent A.I.D. evaluation of ECO has documented the good quality of its performance and the appropriateness of its materials for this task.

Second, a need exists for TOEFL and GRE/GMAT test coaching. ICDA has voluntarily provided extra TOEFL prep sessions, but a more formal arrangement could be beneficial. Likewise, informal GMAT test coaching is in the process of being arranged, and should be expedited.

Third, the ICDA English training, by all accounts, is functioning well. Students appear motivated and are enthusiastic in their praise for the instruction, professors, personal attention and organization exhibited.

Fourth, the project currently does not allow enrollment in MBA programs, justified by overlap with local offerings. DA has urged that this prohibition be relaxed, suggesting that it would make placements easier. Several reasons suggest that this ban should be continued. First, the local MBA was designed after the US model and incorporates all of the "core curriculum" or common body of knowledge. Most US MBAs allow for no more than 4 free electives, after prerequisites and core requirements have been met. Thus, those desiring a MBA could obtain it in the Dominican Republic, and if the additional specialization is desired obtain that through a one semester US business school certificate program. Second, by design the US MBA is a general management degree, with little in-depth specialization or international content and, thus, seems inconsistent with the specific training envisioned. Finally, adequate amounts of general business training have been provided by previous placements, at least from the perspective of the project.

Fifth, there is some evidence that the cycle of English training may start somewhat late for easy placement. Students may not have official TOEFL test scores until their arrival in the US for English topping off (or even worse may be relying on scores from early in the process) which does not allow sufficient time for placement or additional study, if needed. The ALIGU test scores, administered three times during English training in the Dominican Republic, are available and promptly reported to Development Associates. However, these scores are predictive only and most US university admissions committees will not act without official TOEFL or TSE scores. From the viewpoint of DA, this means that placement in borderline cases can be rushed. Also, since all move in lock step, there may be downtime for those who develop proficiency at different rates. Most participant's

currently receive topping off at Georgetown. It may be advantageous to allow placement in English training at the participants likely university, since these programs usually have a strong orientation to academic English, often allow attendance at one or two academic classes, and facilitate the transition to an academic program. A full semester of such training may be a preferable option over the 2 month Georgetown program for those with borderline test scores.

Sixth, only limited third country placements have occurred, which is appropriate. This is clearly permitted by the project paper and several countries (Mexico, Chile, Costa Rica) have programs that are especially appropriate to project purposes. Thus, slightly more extensive use of this option (say about 3 of the 16 remaining placements) should be explored. Placements should be solely on the basis of programmatic needs, and not a default option for US placement difficulty. This implies that these participants will not require English training and should be placed directly into those programs that are judged uniquely suited to their training needs.

5. Evaluation and Follow-Up

No systematic evaluations of participant satisfaction have been undertaken. Given present timing, it may be appropriate to briefly monitor participant reaction to the process to provide feedback for the management of the remaining candidates. Likewise, no process for measuring the impact of returnees has been developed. This is not a pressing issue, but development of an impact evaluation system will be required later in the project. This should be regarded as a part of project responsibilities, and not relegated to the mandated external evaluations.

Recommendations

1. CNHE should become more directive in insuring that study programs are responsive to identified project (and not individual) needs. Monitor future student programs to insure that they reflect the mix envisioned. This implies more emphasis on technical, instead of general management, degrees. Increase the weight given in selection criteria to the match between the program proposed and project targets.

2. CNHE should modify the selection process to introduce additional academic selection criteria. Fortunately the relatively small number of placements remaining, and the amount of time available all indicate that improvements are possible. Priority attention is needed in these areas:

a. Require specific documentation of A.I.D. eligibility requirements (employment, citizenship, etc.) <u>before</u> candidates are accepted or begin any part of the program.

b. Revise the technical committee evaluation sheet to reflect directly the specific criteria envisioned in the project paper and supplement.

c. Revise selection criteria to include more measures of potential for academic success.

1. Continue using a GPA criteria, but rigidly enforce a 3.0 minimum, at least for the last 2 years of study.

2. Require a PAEG test and expect a total scaled score of 500 (equivalent to a 50 percentile rank).

3. Continue the present policy of no formal requirement for English proficiency, but modify the present lockstep English training program to accommodate different levels of proficiency, especially at the extremes.

3. A.I.D. should monitor program placements to insure that they reflect project needs and reinforce the requirement that participants are expected to complete the program in the area for which they were selected. Curtail future placements at Webster University and the University of Illinois (which together account for close to 30% of all placements) since such concentration does not reflect the diversity appropriate.

4. CNHE should facilitate preparation of students by contracting for enhanced support for TOEFL test preparation, and GRE/GMAT preparation.

5. CNHE should measure satisfaction levels of current participants to aid in improving procedures for the remaining placements. Develop procedures for measuring program impact upon the return of students to their jobs.

6. CNHE should consider offering a limited number (say 3 or 4) of the remaining scholarships to high achieving recent graduates (say the top 10% of their graduating class), restricted for study in specific, scarce skill, technical areas that the project has identified as critical for enhancing export performance, but as of yet have not attracted any candidates (food processing, quality control, electronics, etc.) Although this may sacrifice the immediate employment link with a firm, it could be an acceptable trade off in those few cases to attract academically superior students and, more importantly, obtain coverage of necessary skills. To be effective the project must be highly selective and directive in the course of study selected, insist on exceptionally qualified students, and strive to insure return upon completion. This project design deviation may be justified as one alternative to enlarge the pool of eligible candidates in these skill areas.

7. If, for whatever reason, the project is not able to generate the required number of clearly qualified masters candidates within the next two years, consideration should be given to reprogramming unused funds to short-term US training. The cost of one masters program is roughly equivalent to the cost of a US seminar program for 20 participants. Indications are that at present levels of impact, this would be an acceptable, almost equivalent, trade off.

2. Project Management

Findings/Conclusions

This discussion focuses on relationships between USAID and the US contractor, but of necessity also considers the way all actors define and implement their different tasks in the project. As such the points made emerge from the previous discussions, but assesses them in the more general sense of overall project management. As pointed out in Section B, the project is very much on track, as judged by quantitative and financial standards. Moreover, basic systems and procedures are in place, functioning, and fairly well institutionalized, as evidenced by performance to date. Personal relationships appear professional.

Handbook 13 projects assume a high degree of autonomy for the counterpart and its contractor. This is appropriate for CNHE and DA, who are well established institutions. However, this activity also involves CNHE in an area in which it has no previous experience, notwithstanding its well developed institutional strengths. This results in a dilemma for A.I.D., since it is inherently in a reaction mode to many situations that, under other mechanisms, would be handled through more direct monitoring. This situation, although perhaps frustrating at times, should be regarded as the natural trade off for the contracting mode selected, and within the range of the expected.

This evaluation revealed several concerns:

First, there is some concern that day to day routines may have lost sight of the vision, strategy, and focus intended for the project by A.I.D. This is most evident in the mix and types of topics selected for the US short-term training, the selection of masters candidates, and the placements and courses of study selected for masters programs. Consequently, likely project purpose level impact for these activities may be lower than expected. Changes in project personnel, the recent signing of the second contract with DA, and the present transition into activities under the project amendment all suggest that this is an especially appropriate time to reaffirm basic project strategy and vision, especially as it relates to contractor responsibilities.

Second, as discussed in the section on financial management, Development Associates is not presently providing sufficient information to monitor and plan, on a mortgage basis, the budget for masters candidates. Consequently the extent of future costs is not known and also the level of student progress against plan (critical for funding program extensions, transfers, etc.) is not known. Yet this information is indispensable as planning for the later group of candidates and EOP status approaches. Since the project paper amendment imposes more stringent reporting standards in this regard, A.I.D. may wish to instruct DA on the exact format required before the next reporting date.

Third, standards for contractor placement of masters candidates do not exist. Currently there is essentially no direction or oversight to the contractor for the type, quality, and nature of the universities utilized.

As discussed previously, some of these placements appear less than optimal, although this statement must be mitigated by consideration of the credentials of some of the candidates. For this reason, A.I.D. may wish to require some general qualitative minimum (say AACSB accreditation of the graduate program for business schools, with exceptions upon approval) for placements. Viewed from another perspective, the related issue is that all parties have not agreed on minimum academic credentials for students. A.I.D. may wish to take the lead in discussing options and setting standards. In a similar manner, expectations for short-term seminar design characteristics may also require clarification.

Fourth, an appropriate understanding for programmatic trade offs has not yet been developed. As events unfold, program demand and available funding may suggest opportunities to trade masters funds for short-term training, or process more short-term participants than expected. Although it is too early to predict specifics, a conceptual understanding may be appropriate.

Fifth, former project personnel are currently employed by institutions that are training suppliers to the project. This is in no way a violation of procurement policies. However, it may, to some, present an inappropriate image that reflects on project credibility. A.I.D. may wish to develop a specific policy to consider these circumstances.

Sixth, a comparable A.I.D. project, carrying out many of the same activities, is underway in Costa Rica. A.I.D. may wish to encourage DA and other project personnel to meet with personnel of that project and its US contractor to interchange experiences and explore the possibility of joint programming. Improved management procedures, better programs, and economies of scale may result.

Finally, as discussed previously female participation in short-term programs is reasonable and seems to meet project paper expectations and fully reflects the gender composition of the target audience. Approximately 27% of all long-term participants are female, which also is reasonable and consistent with project paper expectations. To date no long-term or short-term activities have involved HBCUs. DA reports efforts to program one short-term seminar at a HBCU for 28 participants, with an expected presentation in late summer.

Recommendations

1. A.I.D. should establish standards for the nature and characteristics of universities that are considered appropriate. As a necessary complement, clarify expectations for handling students whose academic credentials after English training are marginal (less than 500 TOEFL and GRE/GMAT scores).

2. A.I.D. should provide DA with specific operational instructions for reporting long-term training financial data on a mortgage basis.

3. CNHE should develop a stated policy for procurement from institutions that employ former project personnel.

4. A.I.D. should initiate strategic planning discussions to reaffirm project vision and enhance shared understanding of the conceptual framework under which project activities are implemented.

5. A.I.D. should encourage contacts with CINDE, Costa Rica and EDC, Boston, to explore possibilities of joint programs.

ANNEX	A	SCOPE OF WORK
ANNEX	B	LOG FRAMES
		DETRA DETRA AMENDMENT
ANNEX	C	ENTERPRISE TRAINING PLANS
		INITIAL CNHE VERSION CURRENT CNHE VERSION FUNDAPEC VERSION
ANNEX	D	PERSONS INTERVIEWED
ANNEX	E	INTERVIEWS PROTOCOLS
		MASTERS CANDIDATE EMPLOYER SHORT-TERM PARTICIPANTS MASTERS CANDIDATES
ANNEX	F	CNHE PROGRAM EVALUATION INSTRUMENT
ANNEX	G	MASTERS CANDIDATE INFORMATION
ANNEX	H	DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

STATEMENT OF WORK

I. OBJECTIVE

The objective of the evaluation will be to assess various components of the Development Training Project and to recommend methods to improve its implementation.

II. BACKGROUND

In August 1986, a U.S. 7.0 million dollar Grant Agreement was signed with the National Council of Businessmen (CNHE) to implement a project to improve the efficiency and productivity of persons employed by the Dominican private sector. Training needs were to be identified in enterprise training plans, and specific human resources constraints to enterprise growth were to be the focus of U.S. and third country academic and short-term training.

Training outputs established under the Grant Agreement signed August 5, 1986 were an estimated:

a) 55 private sector employees trained at the masters level.

b) 8 university faculty members at the P.h.D. or masters level in the United States or third countries.

c) 250 private sector employees trained in short-term programs in the United States or third countries.

Under the terms of the grant agreement, technical assistance was to be provided by a U.S. firm selected through AID procurement procedures. Prior to the selection and the contracting of technical assistance, the CNHE and the USAID were directly responsible for the university subcomponent of the project and for the placement of several short-term candidates. The CNHE became directly responsible for the recruitment and placement of 47 masters level candidates and 235 short-term candidates, with the assistance of Development Associates, a U.S. contractor.

The Project Activities Completion Date (PACD) for the project referred to above was August 5, 1991. In August 1988, a Project Supplement was signed increasing funding for the CNHE by US$3.8 million dollars for a total of

US$10.8 million dollars, increasing training outputs, and extending the PACD to August 24, 1994. An additional 36 Masters degree, and 263 short-term participants were added to project outputs.

The Project Supplement also authorized a US$4.2 million dollar grant to the Educational Credit Foundation (FUNDAPEC) to carry out a similar project with public and non-profit institutions and organizations supportive of USAID strategy.

Training outputs established under the agreement with FUNDAPEC were an estimated:

a) 54 public and non-profit sector employees trained at the Master's degree level;

b) 135 employees trained in short-term programs in the United States or third countries.

In addition, an in-country training component was included in the Project Supplement. The CNHE budget for in-country training was established at US$975,000 for 54 training programs averaging 25 participants each, and the FUNDAPEC budget for in-country training was established at US$450,000 for an estimated 32 programs averaging 25 participants each.

The Development Training Project, as amended, calls for three evaluations during the life of the project. The first is scheduled for FY 90 and this scope of work establishes the parameters of the first evaluation.

III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The purpose of the evaluation will be to review the progress toward achievement of project objectives, to review project design and implementation procedures, and to recommend measures to improve project design and project implementation.

IV. SPECIFIC SCOPE OF WORK

The contractor is requested to review and assess the following components of the Development Training Project. Please note that for FUNDAPEC, the contractor is requested to evaluate only the institutional training plan as described below:

A. Enterprise/Institutional Training Plans

The development of training plans is considered a key element to project development. The contractor is requested to review:

1. The receptivity to the CNHE enterprise training plan by private enterprises, and the understanding and receptiveness of institutional training plans by public and non-profit institutions worked with by FUNDAPEC.

2. The effectiveness of training plans in identifying constraints to growth in both the private sector (CNHE) and the public and non-profit sectors (FUNDAPEC).

3. Review the formats and procedures;

a. initially used by the CNHE to develop training plans for participants financed under the original project;

b. currently used by the CNHE to develop training plans for participants financed under the project supplement;

c. used by FUNDAPEC to develop training plans; Also, the contractor is requested to review the usefulness of the institutional training plan for identifying academic, overseas short-term and in-country training needs.

4. In the final report, the contractor is requested to report its findings, and to recommend modifications to the training plan and suggest ways of using the plan to implement the project.

B. Returned Participants: Impact Analysis

This portion of the scope of work applies only to the CNHE portion of the project.

The majority of academic participants sponsored under the Development Training Project have not yet returned to the Dominican Republic. However, approximately 229 CNHE participants have completed short-term training in the United States or in third countries. A majority of these participants participated in group rather than in individual training.

The contractor is requested to review and analyze:

a) The methodology used to identify short-term training programs for groups and individuals.

b) The relevance and utilization of skills acquired in the training in relation to job performance, from both the view point of the participant and their sponsoring enterprises.

(c) The impact of training on participants' position within the enterprise, changes in salary, and changes in the participant's effectiveness and productivity.

Where applicable, sample survey methods are to be used to develop information and documentation.

C. Project Administration

This portion of the scope of work applies only to the CNHE portion of the project.

The contractor is requested to review the practices and procedures used by the CNHE to implement the Development Training Project. This component of the evaluation is not intended to be an exhaustive administrative evaluation but one in sufficient depth to permit the contractor to highlight areas where improvement can be achieved.

Administrative aspects of the project to be reviewed are:

1. Project promotion
2. Participant screening
3. Role of the CNHE Selection Committee
4. Participant evaluation and follow-up
5. Relationships with the USAID and the U.S. contractor, to include AID technical assistance and monitoring.

V. QUALIFICATIONS

The contractor is requested to employ a senior evaluation specialist who has previously conducted training and administrative evaluations, and be fluent in the Spanish language. The evaluation specialist must have no less than an FSI 3 rating in speaking and reading in Spanish. Candidates chosen by the contractor for this position must have prior USAID/DR approval. The contractor is authorized six day work week.

VI. CONTRACT IMPLEMENTATION

In addition to the U.S. evaluation specialist, the contractor is authorized to employ Dominican citizens to carry out sample surveys or for other surveys and document reviews, subject to CNHE, and USAID approval.

VII. LEVEL OF EFFORT

1.	One U.S. Evaluation specialist	5 weeks/6 days per week
2.	Three local hire Evaluation and Survey Specialists	4 weeks/6 days per week

VIII. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In order to accomplish the scope of work the contractor will:

a. review project information and files at the CNHE, FUNDAPEC and AID and interview AID, CNHE and FUNDAPEC representatives.

b. develop an evaluation plan and implementation agenda for review with the CNHE, FUNDAPEC and AID prior to initiating the evaluation.

c. develop interview formats and institutional and participant evaluation formats or other instruments, for review with the CNHE, FUNDAPEC and AID prior to use.

d. conduct interviews/surveys with a representative sample of enterprises sponsoring long and short-term candidates under the Project.

e. prepare the final report as described under Section X.

IX. PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

The following documents are included with the above scope of work.

1. Project Papers
   a. Original
   b. Supplement

2. Grant Agreements
   a. CNHE original Grant, signed 8/3/86
   b. CNHE Supplemental Agreement, signed 8/24/88
   c. FUNDAPEC Grant

All project files records and administrative or program formats and/or other available information, such as list of private firms, public and non-profit organizations, participants, training programs, etc. will be provided by the CNHE, FUNDAPEC or the USAID.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENT

The contractor will prepare a draft evaluation report in English and Spanish three days prior to the end of the evaluation period. The report will contain information that will permit the USAID and the CNHE to review project progress, and to determine the appropriateness of project design and implementation procedures. The report is to contain evaluative and review information, observations and recommendations for each of the following components of the scope of work:

1. Enterprise and Institutional Training Plans, to include the information requested in the scope of work for both the CNHE and FUNDAPEC.

2. Returned Participants: An impact analysis of CNHE short-term participants.

3. Project Administration: The appropriateness of the practices and procedures used by the CNHE to implement the project.

The draft report will be discussed by the contractor with the USAID and the CNHE at an exit briefing prior to departure from the Dominican Republic. Written comments will be provided by the USAID two days following the contractor's exit briefing.

The final report is due no later than 15 days after the close of the evaluation. The budget contains two days for final report preparation.

XI. PAYMENT

Payment will be made by USAID/DR Controllers office upon submission of invoices.

XII. PERIOD OF SERVICES

The total contract time is five weeks. Estimated starting date is March 19, 1990. Estimated termination date is o/a April 20, 1990.

Best Available Copy

Doc. 4094A

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project : $9.1 million
Total U.S. Funding: $7.0 million
Date Prepared : 6/23/86

Project Title & Number: Development Training (517-0216)

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
A.1 Goal To improve the Human Resources base required for private sector export-led growth and development.	A.2 A trained pool of professional managers and technicians in key sectors of the economy.	A.3 1) Reports of the Central Bank and IBRD 2) IMF Economic Memorandum 3) Reports by the National Council of Businessmen (CNHE).	A.4 - Private sector willing to re-orient its activities - GODR will support export-led growth with appropriate policies - Political stability and economic growth will continue.
B.1 Purpose To increase the number of trained professional, tech., and managerial personnel needed to meet the manpower demands of an export-oriented economy.	B.2 End of Project Status 1) Improved productive capacity and expanded export marketing in the participating enterprises. 2) Improved graduate-level curriculum in the priority areas of study related to private sector economic development. 3) Improved and more effective private sector communications network to plan and coordinate training requirements at the national level and for the individual firm.	B.3 1) Records of AID and the training organizations 2) Participant tracking systems 3) Project evaluations.	B.4 - Employment opportunities exist for trained personnel.
C.1 Outputs (1) Long-term Graduate Trng. in the U.S. and third countries; (2) Short-term U.S. and 3rd. country training.	C.2 Output Indicators 1) An estimated 55 private sector employees trained at the Master's level in the U.S. or Third Countries. 2) An estimated 8 university faculty members trained at the PhD or Masters level in the U.S. 3) An estimated 250 private sector employees trained in short-term U.S. or 3rd. Country courses or observational visits.	C.3 1) Reports from the universities & training institutions 2) Feedback from students 3) Feedback from firms 4) Contractor's reports 5) Participant tracking system.	C.4 - Private sector firms will financially support employees in training.
D.1 Inputs 1) Training 2) Project Administrative Costs 3) Project Evaluation/Audit	D.2 Budget ($000) AID / HCC 5,461,700 / 2,100,000 1,403,300 / 303,000 85,000 / - 7,000,000 / 2,403,000	D.3 AID Records Counterpart Records.	D.4 - Availability of AID funds - Availability of local currency counterpart organization.

Project Title & Number: Development Training (517-0216) Amendment

Narrative Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
A.1 Goal To improve the Human Resources base required for economic growth and development.	A.2 A trained pool of professional managers and technicians in key sectors of the economy.	A.3 1) Reports of the Central Bank and IBRD 2) IMF Economic Memorandum 3) Reports by the National Council of Businessmen (CNHE).	A.4 - Private sector willing to re-orient its activities - GODR will support export-led growth with appropriate policies - Political stability and economic growth will continue.
B.1 Purpose 1) To increase the number of trained professional, tech., and managerial personnel needed to meet the manpower demands of an export-oriented economy. 2) To improve the efficiency and productivity of the private and public sector institutions and organizations supportive of USAID's strategy by providing training to Dominicans already employed.	B.2 End of Project Status 1) Improved productive capacity and expanded export marketing in the participating enterprises. 2) Improved graduate-level curriculum in the priority areas of study related to private sector economic development. 3) Improved and more effective private sector communications network to plan and coordinate training requirements at the national level and for the individual firm. 4) Improved communication channels between private and public sectors.	B.3 1) Records of AID and the training organizations 2) Participant tracking systems 3) Project evaluations.	B.4 - Private sector firms recognize need for upgrading of employee skills. - Employees view further training as factor in job enhancement - Certain public sector institutions supportive of private sector growth.
C.1 Outputs 1) Long-term Graduate Trng. in the U.S. and third countries; 2) Short-term U.S. and 3rd. country training. 3) In-country seminars and workshops.	C.2 Output Indicators 1) An estimated 90 private sector and public sector employees trained at the Master's level in the U.S. or Third Countries 2) Some 400 employees sent for short-term U.S. or 3rd Country courses or observational programs. 3) Approximately 2000 Dominicans attending in-country seminars and workshops.	C.3 1) Reports from the universities & training institutions 2) Feedback from students 3) Feedback from firms 4) Contractor's reports 5) Participant tracking system.	C.4 - Private sector firms will financially support employees in training. - Availability of qualified candidates. - Local institutions have facilities and capabilities for organizing seminars and workshops.
D.1 Inputs 1) Training a) U.S. LT b) U.S., 3rd Country ST and in-country c) ELT 2) Project Management	D.2 Budget ($000) AID / HCC / TOTAL 1) 7,675 / 2,100 / 9,775 a. 4,500 / 1,000 / 5,500 b. 3,025 / 1,000 / 4,025 c. 150 / 100 / 250 2) 1,825 / 1,100 / 2,925 Total 9,500 / 3,200 / 12,700	D.3 AID Records Counterpart Records.	D.4 - Availability of AID funds - Availability of local currency counterpart funds. - Continuation of in-country ELT program.

CONSEJO NACIONAL DE HOMBRES DE EMPRESA, INC.

(C.N.H.E.)

GUIA PARA LA PREPARACION DE SOLICITUDES DE ADIESTRAMIENTO GERENCIAL

(VERSION PRELIMINAR)

ANEXO 1

1. INFORMACION SOBRE LA EMPRESA

1.1 Nombre: _____

1.2 Dirección (postal, teléfono, cable, télex): _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

1.3 Ubicación de la planta u oficina principal: _____

_____

_____

1.4 Sucursales: _____

_____

_____

1.5 Tipo de empresa (según las leyes de incentivos a las cuales está acogida).

_____

_____

_____

1.6 Nombre de los principales directivos:

_____

_____

_____

2. LINEAS DE ACTIVIDAD

2.1 Objetivos de la empresa: _____

_____

2.2 Productos y Mercados de la Empresa: (*) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. AFILIACION A ASOCIACIONES, CAMARAS DE COMERCIO, ETC.

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.

Personal por Area	NO.
Ventas/Mercadeo	_____
Producción/Operación	_____
Finanzas/Contabilidad	_____
Organización/Personal	_____
Informática	_____
Otras	_____
TOTAL	_____

5. TAMAÑO DE LA EMPRESA(Grande, Mediana o Pequeña) _____

PROPIEDAD DEL CAPITAL: Nacional _____% Extranjero_____%

(*)Favor agregar, de ser posible, el volumen y el valor de sus ventas y/o exportaciones en los últimos tres(3) años.

ANEXO 2

ORGANIZACION Y POLITICA DE PERSONAL

1. Anexar Organigrama de la empresa

2. Políticas del Departamento de Personal relativas a:

   2.1 Selección y reclutamiento:

   2.2 Adiestramiento y desarrollo del personal:

   2.3 Evaluación del desempeño y promoción:

3. Tiene la empresa manuales de organización y procedimientos vigentes

4. Rotación del personal de gerencia media en los últimos dos(2) años:

   Indice de rotación de la gerencia media _____

ANEXO 3

Conforme al crecimiento de la empresa en los últimos tres(3) años y a los objetivos y metas de su presupuesto anual, indique cuáles son sus necesidades de -- adiestramiento en las diferentes áreas o gerencias y la prioridad de las mismas:

(A.P.:Alta Prioridad; P.M.: Prioridad Media; B.P.: Baja Prioridad)

AREA/GERENCIA/DEPARTAMENTO	PRIORIDAD
1. Ventas/Mercadeo	
2. Producción/Operaciones	
3. Finanzas/Contabilidad	
4. Organización/Personal	
5. Sistemas de Información y Procesamiento de Datos	

ANEXO 4

REQUERIMIENTOS DE ADIESTRAMIENTO ACTUALES

AREA CRITICA/GERENCIA/DEPARTAMENTOS

PUESTOS POR AREAS

NOMBRE DEL RESPONSABLE DEL PUESTO

ADIESTRAMIENTO REQUERIDO

FECHA

ANEXO 5

1. AREA O GERENCIA: _____

2. NOMBRE Y PUESTO DEL CANDIDATO:

_____

_____

_____

3. EXPERIENCIA DE TRABAJO:

Dentro de la Empresa: _____

Fuera de la Empresa: _____

4. EDUCACION(Estudios realizados a nivel técnico, profesional u otros):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. CONOCIMIENTO DEL IDIOMA INGLES(Bueno, Regular, Insuficiente):

_____

6. TIEMPO DISPONIBLE DEL CANDIDATO PARA EL ADIESTRAMIENTO SOLICITADO Y A PARTIR DE QUE FECHA:

_____

_____

7. NIVEL GERENCIAL DEL CANDIDATO(Ejecutivo, Gerente Medio, Supervisor, otro):

_____

_____

8. OBJETIVOS DEL ADIESTRAMIENTO SOLICITADO:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. RELACION ENTRE LAS PRINCIPALES FUNCIONES QUE REALIZA EL CANDIDATO EN SU PUES_ TO ACTUAL Y LOS OBJETIVOS DEL ADIESTRAMIENTO SOLICITADO:

10. POSIBILIDADES DE TRANSFERIR LOS CONOCIMIENTOS ADQUIRIDOS EN EL ADIESTRAMIENTO A OTRO PERSONAL DE LA EMPRESA:

11. INDICAR PROBABLES FUNCIONES Y RESPONSABILIDADES FUTURAS DEL CANDIDATO EN LA - EMPRESA:

12. COMO CONTRIBUIRA EL CANDIDATO CON SU REINTEGRACION A MEJORES RESULTADOS DE LA EMPRESA:

NOTA: Este Anexo 5 debe ser completado por cada candidato presentado.

CONSEJO NACIONAL DE HOMBRES DE EMPRESA, INC.

PROYECTO DE ADIESTRAMIENTO PARA EL SECTOR PRIVADO
CNHE/USAID

PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO EMPRESARIAL

El Plan de Entrenamiento Empresarial es un instrumento para analizar la situación actual de la empresa dominicana, la cual está involucrada en la actividad exportadora, tiene la intención de diversificar las exportaciones de productos no tradicionales. El objetivo específico es determinar el tipo de capacitación que puede beneficiar a la empresa dentro del Proyecto para el Adiestramiento del Sector Privado. El resultado del diagnóstico ayudará a establecer un Plan de Entrenamiento Empresarial.

Dentro del Plan existen áreas de coyuntura donde se puede contribuir con la colaboración del Proyecto y sus eventos de capacitación. El diagnóstico es indispensable para determinar en qué forma y hasta que punto el Proyecto pueda contribuir y colaborar con la Empresa en sus necesidades. Sin el diagnóstico es imposible evaluar con certeza las necesidades de la Empresa. Por eso, el diagnóstico es un requisito obligatorio.

El modelo de diagnóstico es relativamente simple.

a) El diagnóstico revela limitaciones
b) Se identifican áreas de limitaciones en los recursos humanos.
c) Se identifican destrezas, conocimientos, actitudes y percepciones necesarias para superar las limitaciones.
d) Se especifican áreas de capacitación.

El Proyecto solamente concierne a las áreas de conocimiento y no limitaciones como, por ejemplo, la falta de crédito y la falta de maquinaria. Por eso, la capacitación se dirige a cómo adiestrar las personas de las empresas para que ellos puedan hacer cualquier cambio o solución de las limitaciones o problemas que les afectan.

El Plan de Entrenamiento incluido con este instructivo debe llenarse lo más completo posible. Por favor, debe analizar y contestar todas las preguntas. En la parte de diagnóstico se requiere un análisis de la empresa antes de responder.

Los componentes del Plan son los siguientes.

Sección I Datos básicos sobre la empresa.
Sección II Diagnóstico de Adiestramiento.
Sección III Plan de Entrenamiento.
Sección IV Candidatos.
Resumen del Plan de Entrenamiento.

Este Plan de Entrenamiento debe estar aprobado por el responsable máximo de la empresa.

PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO EMPRESARIAL

SECCION I - INFORMACION BASICA

1. NOMBRE DE LA EMPRESA _____

   DIRECCION _____

   CIUDAD _____

   PROVINCIA _____

   TELEFONO _____ TELEX _____ FAX _____

   SUCURSALES _____

2. TIPO DE EMPRESA (Marque uno)

   _____ Agroindustria AI
   _____ Agronegocios AN
   _____ Banco de Servicios BN
   _____ Empresa Liviana EM
   _____ Zona Franca ZO
   _____ Otros OT

3. TIPO DE PRODUCTOS (describa en detalle los productos que obtienen o venden).

4. PERSONAL DIRECTIVO DE LA EMPRESA.

5. FECHA DE LA CONSTITUCION DE LA EMPRESA. _____

6. OBJETIVOS DE LA EMPRESA.

7. PERSONAL POR AREA

	NO. DE EMPLEADOS
GERENCIA Y ADMINISTRATIVO	_____
VENTAS Y MERCADEO	_____
PRODUCCION Y OPERACIONES	_____
FINANZAS Y CONTABILIDAD	_____
INFORMATICA	_____
OTRAS	_____
TOTAL	_____

8. TAMAÑO DE LA EMPRESA

PEQUEÑO _____ MEDIANA _____ GRANDE _____

9. FUENTE DE CAPITAL (%).

NACIONAL _____(%) EXTRANJERO _____(%)

10 PRODUCTOS Y MERCADO (más reciente)

PRODUCTO	VALOR ULTIMO AÑO	VALORES EXPORTADO

11 MIEMBRO DEL CNHE. SI_____ NO_____

12 MIEMBRO DE OTRAS ASOCIACIONES. SI_____ NO _____ NOMBRES.

13 POLITICAS DE LA EMPRESA. (Describa dos o tres políticas sobresalientes de la empresa en relación con los beneficios que otoraga la empresa a sus empleados).

14 ADIESTRAMIENTO Y DESARROLLO DEL PERSONAL. (Describa las políticas de la empresa).

15 EVALUACION DE LOS EMPLEADOS EN SU DESEMPEÑO Y PROMOCION. (Describa el sistema de la empresa).

16 DESCRIPCION GENERAL DEL PROGRAMA DE EXPORTACION

Describa en detalle el programa actual de exportación de la empresa. Debe incluir detalles completos incluyendo contratos, relaciones con empresas extranjeras, y cualquier evidencia de su exportación, incluyendo telex de negociación.

SECCION II

DIAGNOSTICO DE ADIESTRAMIENTO

La Sección II contiene el análisis fundamental de la empresa sobre sus requerimientos de adiestramiento. El análisis de la empresa es un proceso de reflexión sobre los problemas de la empresa y las posibles soluciones con el adiestramiento. Hasta cierto punto la empresa está involucrada en un mini diagnóstico de desarrollo organizacional para lograr la identificación de sus necesidades de adiestramiento. Lo escrito en este documento es simplemente el procedimiento final del análisis.

El análisis tiene un flujo lógico desde el problema hasta la solución, en la forma siguiente.

A. NOMBRE DE LA LIMITACION O PROBLEMA DE LA EMPRESA

B. DESCRIPCION DE LA LIMITACION

C. ESTIMACION DE LA CAUSA DE LA LIMITACION

D. LIMITACIONES EN RECURSOS HUMANOS SOBRE EL PROBLEMA

E. DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS REQUERIDOS

En las tres hojas siguientes hay que analizar tres limitaciones principales de la empresa que impiden un funcionamiento adecuado para diversificar la producción de productos no tradicionales. Algunos ejemplos son.

1) Diversificación de exportaciones
2) Productividad de exportación
3) Calidad de producción
4) Control de inventario
5) Sistemas de informática
6) Eficiencia financiera
7) Tecnología apropiada de nuevos productos,
8) Otros

ANALISIS DE LIMITACIONES

A. LIMITACION NO. 1. _____

B. DESCRIPCION DE LA LIMITACION.

C. ESTIMACION DE LA CAUSA DE LA LIMITACION (Porcentaje hasta 100%)

TECNOLOGIA_____, RECURSOS ECONOMICOS_____, RECURSOS HUMANOS_____

OTROS _____.

D. LISTA DE LIMITACIONES EN RECURSOS HUMANOS.

E. LISTA DE DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (Destrezas, conocimientos y actitudes que se requieren para superar las limitaciones).

1._____

2._____

3._____

4._____

5._____

6._____

7._____

8._____

9._____

10_____

ANALISIS DE LIMITACIONES

A. LIMITACION NO. 2. _____

B. DESCRIPCION DE LA LIMITACION.

C. ESTIMACION DE LA CAUSA DE LA LIMITACION (Porcentaje hasta 100%)

TECNOLOGIA_____, RECURSOS ECONOMICOS_____, RECURSOS HUMANOS_____

OTROS _____.

D. LISTA DE LIMITACIONES EN RECURSOS HUMANOS.

E. LISTA DE DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (Destrezas, conocimientos y actitudes que se requieren para superar las limitaciones).

1._____

2._____

3._____

4._____

5._____

6._____

7._____

8._____

9._____

10_____

ANALISIS DE LIMITACIONES

A. LIMITACION NO. 3. _____

B. DESCRIPCION DE LA LIMITACION.

C. ESTIMACION DE LA CAUSA DE LA LIMITACION (Porcentaje hasta 100%)

TECNOLOGIA_____, RECURSOS ECONOMICOS_____, RECURSOS HUMANOS_____

OTROS _____.

D. LISTA DE LIMITACIONES EN RECURSOS HUMANOS.

E. LISTA DE DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (Destrezas, conocimientos y actitudes que se requieren para superar las limitaciones).

1._____

2._____

3._____

4._____

5._____

6._____

7._____

8._____

9._____

10_____

SECCION III

PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO

El Plan de Entrenamiento Empresarial es un documento interno de cada empresa como guía de acción para aliviar los problemas de la institución relacionados con los conocimientos. Cada empresa debería tener el interés e iniciativa para determinar sus necesidades. Como propósito del Proyecto, tenemos interés en la justificación de su propuesta de adiestramiento que esté de acuerdo con los objetivos del Proyecto. Aunque cada Plan de Entrenamiento es diferente, sugerimos seguir los puntos del bosquejo que se usan en producto final de la descripción de cada empresa.

BOSQUEJO DEL PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO

I. Objetivos Generales y Específicos del Plan de Entrenamiento.

II. Areas críticas de adiestramiento.

III. Relación del adiestramiento con los objetivos del Proyecto de Adiestramiento del Sector Privado del CNHE.

IV. Relación del adiestramiento de los candidatos con el Plan de Entrenamiento de la empresa.

V. Transferencia de conocimientos del candidato hacia la empresa y sus colegas.

VI. Formas para mejorar posibilidades de exportación de la empresa debido a los resultados de adiestramiento.

VII. Resultados esperados en la empresa como resultado del adiestramiento de los candidatos.

SECCION IV

CANDIDATOS

Escriba una lista de los candidatos propuestos para becas. Incluya en este Plan de Entrenamiento el Formulario de Solicitud de Beca para CADA candidato. Escriba aquí un resumen de los candidatos.

NOMBRE DEL CANDIDATO NO. 1 ._____

CARGO EN LA EMPRESA._____

OBJETIVO ESPECIFICO DEL ENTRENAMIENTO.

AREAS DE ENTRENAMIENTO.

DURACION Y FECHAS._____

SUGERENCIAS LUGARES DE ENTRENAMIENTO.

NOMBRE DEL CANDIDATO NO. 2._____

CARGO EN LA EMPRESA._____

OBJETIVOS ESPECIFICOS DEL ENTRENAMIENTO.

AREAS DE ENTRENAMIENTO.

DURACION Y FECHAS.

SUGERENCIAS Y LUGARES DE ENTRENAMIENTO.

RESUMEN DEL PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO

EMPRESA_____ CODIGO_____

SECCION I

PROGRAMA DE EXPORTACION (RESUMEN, SECCION I. 16)

SECCION II

LISTA DE LAS TRES LIMITACCIONES (SECCION II. A DE TRES HOJAS)

1._____

2._____

3._____

LIMITACIONES DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (SECCION II. D DE TRES HOJAS)

1._____

2._____

3._____

DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (SECCION II. E DE TRES HOJAS)

1._____

2._____

3._____

SECCION III RESUMEN PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO.

SECCION IV. CANDIDATOS PROPUESTOS, CARGOS, AREAS DE ENTRENAMIENTO.

1._____

2._____

PROYECTO DE ENTRENAMIENTO PARA EL DESARROLLO

SECTOR GOBIERNO Y SIN FINES DE LUCRO

El Plan de Entrenamiento es un instrumento para analizar la situación actual de la Instituciones gubernamentales y sin fines de lucro dominicanas, las cuales juegan un papel en la estrategia para el desarrollo patrocinada por la AID en la República Dominicana. El objetivo específico es determinar el tipo de capacitación que puede beneficiar a la institución dentro del Proyecto. El resultado del diagnóstico ayudará a establecer un Plan de Entrenamiento Institucional.

Dentro del Plan existen áreas de coyuntura donde se puede contribuir con la colaboracion del Proyecto y sus eventos de capacitación. El diagnóstico es indispensable para determinar en qué forma y hasta que punto el Proyecto pueda contribuir y colaborar con la Institución en sus necesidades. Sin el diagnóstico es imposible evaluar con certeza las necesidades del sector. Por eso, el diagnóstico es un requisito obligatorio.

El modelo de diagnóstico es relativamente simple.

* El diagnóstico revela limitaciones.
* Se identifican áreas de limitaciones en los recursos humanos.
* Se identifican destrezas, conocimiento, actitudes y percepciones necesarias para superar las limitaciones.
* Se especifican áreas de capacitación.

El Proyecto solamente concierne a las áreas de conocimiento y no limitaciones como, por ejemplo, la falta de crédito y la falta de maquinaria. Por eso, la capacitación se dirige a cómo adiestrar las personas de las instituciones para que ellos puedan hacer cualquier cambio o solución de las limitaciones o problemas que les afectan.

El Plan de Entrenamiento incluido con este instructivo debe llenarse lo más completo posible. Por favor, debe analizar y contestar todas las preguntas. En la parte de diagnóstico se requiere un análisis de la empresa antes de responder.

Los componentes del Plan son los siguientes -

Sección I	Datos Básicos sobre la Institución
Sección II	Diagnóstico de Adiestramiento
Sección III	Plan de Entrenamiento
Sección IV	Candidatos
Resumen del Plan de Entrenamiento	

Este plan de Entrenamiento debe estar aprobado por el responsable máximo de la Institución.

PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO INSTITUCIONAL

SECCION I - INFORMACION BASICA

1. NOMBRE DE LA INSTITUCION _____

DIRECCION _____

BARRIO _____ CIUDAD _____

PROVINCIA _____ TELEFONO _____

TELEX _____ FAX _____

OTRAS OFICINAS

Provincia	Dirección	Teléfono	Encargado

2. TIPO DE INSTITUCION: GBNO_____ SFL _____

3. AREA DE TRABAJO

_____ AGRICULTURA

_____ SALUD

_____ EDUCACION

_____ INST. PARA DESARROLLO

_____ SERVICIOS

_____ COOPERATIVISMO

_____ OTRO (ESPECIFIQUE)

4. TRABAJO REALIZADO: DESCRIBA EN DETALLE EL TRABAJO O SERVICIO QUE REALIZA LA INSTITUCION

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. PERSONAL DIRECTIVO DE LA INSTITUCION:

NOMBRE	CARGO	TELEFONO

6 FECHA DE CREACION DE LA INSTITUCION: _____

7. BASE LEGAL: LEY DECRETO NO. _____

DE FECHA _____

8. OBJETIVO DE LA INSTITUCION:(MISION ¿QUE ES? ¿QUE HACE?)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. PERSONAL POR AREA	TOTAL	FIJO	VOLUNTARIO
GERENCIA Y ADMINISTRATIVO	_____	_____	_____
OPERACIONES	_____	_____	_____
FINANZAS Y CONTABILIDAD	_____	_____	_____
INFORMATICA	_____	_____	_____
PROGRAMACION	_____	_____	_____
OTRAS	_____	_____	_____

10. FUENTE DE FONDOS (%) NACIONAL _____% EXTRANJERO _____%

(MONTO) REC. PROPIOS _____ AGENCIA INT`L _____

DONAC. SECTOR PRIVADO _____ OTROS _____

11.POLITICA DE COMPENSACION DE LA INSTITUCION. Describa dos o tres políticas sobresalientes de la institución en relación con los beneficios que otorga a sus empleados.

12. ADIESTRAMIENTO Y DESARROLLO DEL PERSONAL. Describa las políticas de la institución.

13. EVALUACION DE LOS EMPLEADOS EN SU DESEMPEÑO Y PROMOCION. Describa el sistema de la institución.

14. DESCRIPCION GENERAL DE LOS OBJETIVOS DE LA INSTITUCION

Describa en detalle los principales objetivos de la institución.

SECCION II DIAGNOSTICO DE ADIESTRAMIENTO

La Sección II contiene el análisis fundamental de la institución sobre sus requerimientos de adiestramiento. El análisis de la institución es un proceso de reflexión sobre sus problemas y las posibles soluciones con el adiestramiento. Hasta cierto punto la institución esta involucranda en un mini diagnóstico de desarrollo organizacional para lograr la identificación de sus necesidades de adiestramiento. Lo escrito en este documento es simplemente el procedimiento final del análisis.

El análisis tiene un flujo lógico desde el problema hasta la solución, en la forma siguiente:

A. NOMBRE DE LA LIMITACION O PROBLEMA DE LA INSTITUCION

B. DESCRIPCION DE LA LIMITACION

C. ESTIMACION DE LA CAUSA DE LA LIMITACION

D. LIMITACIONES EN RECURSOS HUMANOS SOBRE EL PROBLEMA

E. DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS REQUERIDOS.

En las tres hojas siguientes hay que analizar tres limitaciones principales de la institución que impiden un funcionamiento adecuado de la institución para alcanzar sus objetivos principales.

ANALISIS DE LIMITACIONES

A. LIMITACION NO.1 _____

B. DESCRIPCION DE LA LIMITACION _____

C. ESTIMACION DE LA CAUSA DE LA LIMITACION (Porcentajes hasta 100%)

TECNOLOGIA_____ REC. ECONOMICOS_____ RECURSOS HUMANOS_____

OTROS_____

D. LISTA DE LIMITACIONES EN RECURSOS HUMANOS

E. LISTA DE DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (Destrezas, conocimientos y actitudes que se requieren para superar las limitaciones.

1

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

ANALISIS DE LIMITACIONES

A. LIMITACION NO.2 _____

B. DESCRIPCION DE LA LIMITACION _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. ESTIMACION DE LA CAUSA DE LA LIMITACION (Porcentajes hasta 100%)

TECNOLOGIA_____ REC. ECONOMICOS_____ RECURSOS HUMANOS_____

OTROS_____

D. LISTA DE LIMITACIONES EN RECURSOS HUMANOS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. LISTA DE DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (Destrezas, conocimientos y actitudes que se requieren para superar las limitaciones.

1 _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

6. _____

7. _____

8. _____

ANALISIS DE LIMITACIONES

A. LIMITACION NO.3 _____

B. DESCRIPCION DE LA LIMITACION _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

C. ESTIMACION DE LA CAUSA DE LA LIMITACION (Porcentajes hasta 100%)

TECNOLOGIA_____ REC. ECONOMICOS_____ RECURSOS HUMANOS_____

OTROS_____

D. LISTA DE LIMITACIONES EN RECURSOS HUMANOS

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. LISTA DE DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (Destrezas, conocimientos y actitudes que se requieren para superar las limitaciones.

1 _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

6. _____

7. _____

8. _____

SECCION III PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO

El Plan de Entrenamiento para el Desarrollo: Sector Gobierno y Sin Fines de Lucro es un documento interno de cada institución como guía de acción para aliviar los problemas de la institución relacionados con los conocimientos. Cada institución debería tener el interés e iniciativa para determinar sus necesidades. Como propósito del Proyecto, tenemos interés en la justificación de su propuesta de adiestramiento que esté de acuerdo con los objetivos del Proyecto. Aunque cada Plan de Entrenamiento es diferente, sugerimos seguir los puntos del bosquejo que se usan en

BOSQUEJO DE PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO

I. Objetivos Generales y Específicos del Plan de Entrenamiento.

II. Areas Críticas de Adiestramiento.

III Relación del adiestramiento con los objetivos del Proyecto de Adiestramiento de la institución.

IV. Relación del adiestramiento de los candidatos hacia la institución y sus colegas.

V. Transferencia de conocimientos del candidatos hacia la institución y sus colegas.

VI. Formas para mejorar posibilidades de exportación de la institución debido a los resultados de adiestramiento.

VII Resultados esperados en la institución como resultado del adiestramiento de los candidatos.

SECCION IV CANDIDATOS

Escriba una lista de los candidatos propuestos para becas. Incluya en este Plan de Entrenamiento el Formulario de Solicitud de Beca para cada candidato. Escriba aqui un resumen de los candidatos.

NOMBRE DEL CANDIDATO NO.1 _____

CARGO EN LA INSTITUCION _____

OBJETIVO ESPECIFICO DEL ENTRENAMIENTO _____

AREAS DE ENTRENAMIENTO _____

DURACION Y FECHAS _____

SUGERENCIAS LUGARES DE ENTRENAMIENTO _____

NOMBRE DEL CANDIDATO NO.2 _____

CARGO EN LA INSTITUCION _____

OBJETIVO ESPECIFICO DEL ENTRENAMIENTO _____

AREAS DE ENTRENAMIENTO _____

DURACION Y FECHAS _____

SUGERENCIAS LUGARES DE ENTRENAMIENTO _____

RESUMEN PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO

INSTITUCION _____ CODIGO _____

SECCION II DIAGNOSTICO

LISTA DE LAS TRES LIMITACIONES (Sección II.A de tres hojas)

1 _____

2. _____

3. _____

LIMITACIONES DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (Sección II.D de tres hojas)

1 _____

2. _____

3. _____

DESTREZAS DE RECURSOS HUMANOS (Sección II.E de tres hojas)

1 _____

2. _____

3. _____

SECCION III RESUMEN PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO

_____

SECCION IV. CANDIDATOS PROPUESTOS, CARGOS, AREA DE ENTRENAMIENTO

1 _____

2. _____

3. _____

PERSONAS ENTREVISTADAS

A. PARTICIPANTES EN PROGRAMAS CORTOS EN EEUU

Programación Individual

Irys N. González	FERQUIDO, Fertilizer Marketing Management
Rosa Mildred Ureña	Flores Antillanas, S.A., Flower Marketing
Francisco Rodríguez	FERQUIDO, Accounting and Administration
Betsy Portes R.	PROMEDOCA, Financial Management

Seminarios

Exportación de Muebles

Dilecio Guzmán	Cache Muebles, C. por A.
Yuri Calvin Chez Bueno	Centro Rattan
Euda Feria Peña	Interior D'Marca
Modesto Alcántara	Modesto Alcántara Com.

Gerencia Agroindustrial

José Manuel Canario	Fundación Pro-Ambiente
Sucre J. Zacarías R.	Chacuey Industrial
Juan R. De Jesús Méndez	Finempresa
Héctor Ledesma	Agrohorti, S.A.

Estrategias y Planes de Mercadeo

Pavel García Matos	Laboratorio de Aplicaciones Médicas
Brunildo A. Soto	Aluminio Rhomer
Francisco Bonarde Guerrero	La Oficina, S.A.
Jaime González Vallejo	Productora Nac. de Algodón

Asistencia Técnica a la Pequeña y Mediana Empresa

José Rafael Acosta Pujols	Envases Antillanos
Maritza Guzmán	Asoc. para el Desarrollo de la Provincia Espaillat

Exportaciones No Tradicionales (Su Adm. y Financiamiento)

Carlos Pimentel	CEDOIS
Rafael Armando Romero	Consejo de Fundaciones Americanas de Desarrollo
Miriam Jiménez H.	Colgate Palmolive
Eduardo A. Saladín	Impresora Saladín
Domingo H. del Rosario Z.	Creaciones Lerggull
Manuel de Js. Viñas Ovalles	Banco Comercial BHD
Angela M. Rodríguez	Bco. de Desarrollo de Exportación
Manuel A. Pérez	FRUDOCA

Diversificación de la Producción Agrícola

Angel José Taveras	AntonioTaveras
Carlos Ariza Pujals	Cía. Anónima de Explotaciones Industriales
Víctor R. Rodríguez	Crespo & Rodríguez
Carmen Figueroa Rodríguez	Peralta Export
Diómedes Martínez	Productora Agrícola Oriente

Financial Restructuring

Luis Sabater	Grupo Financiero BHD
José Miguel Barceló	Barceló Industrial

Estrategias de Exportación

Pensilvania Henríquez	Exp. Persivanio
Ana Mercedes Villanueva	METALDOM
Patricia Villaona	Industrial Jabonera
Fernando Báez Acta	Ing. Báez Acta & Asoc.

Exportación de Textiles

Máximo F. Del Valle Objío	Artesanía Textiles
María Argentina Candelario	Saagi Industrial
Julia Antonia Durán	Roisores Comercial

B. SUPERVISORES DE BECARIOS, PROGRAMA MASTERS

PERSONA	CARGO	EMPRESA	BECARIO
Ricardo Romero	Vicepresidente Ejecutivo	Banco de Desarrollo de Exportación	Juan Eu Liao
Alex Pimentel M.	Vicepresidente Recursos Humanos	Banco Popular Dominicano	Juan Leoux Amell
Fernando Capellán	Presidente	F.M. Industries	Rosalina Rodríguez
Gustavo J. Taváres	Presidente	Marítima Dominicana	Gustavo Ariza
Enmanuel Castillo	Sub-Gerente Rec. Humanos	Banco del Comercio	Lina Montano
Juan Cohen	Presidente	Hispano Dom. de Cemento Blanco	Virginia Marmolejos
Federico Lalane José	Presidente	Federico Lalane José & Asociados	Federico Lalane U.
Mario Lama Haché	Presidente	Lama, C. x A.	Rubén Andújar
Eduardo Hued	Presidente	Cartonera Alfredo Hued	M. Hued
Juan Henderson	Presidente - Administrador	PROSEDOCA	Luis Henderson Farias
Felipe Santana Cordero	Vicepresidente Ejecutivo	Alimentos del Norte	Carlos Pellerano
Ramón A.Piantini	Administ-Asist. Gerente Gral.	Banco Gerencial & Fiduciario	Lawrence Hazoury
Esmeraldo Rodríguez	Presidente Ejecutivo	Banco Universal	Jesús A. Rodríguez
Byron Smalley	Presidente	CARIPLANT	Lumi Yanai
Juan José Attias	Presidente	Ind. de Muebles y Colchones La Nacional	Ricardo Arbaje
Vanessa Cruz-Ayala	Presidente	Albo, C. x A.	Néstor Basora
Luis A. Caminero	Gerente Gral.	Financiera Nacional de Empresas	Miguel Arias Romero

Simeón F. Ramírez	Gerente	FINADE	Ramona E. Fernández
Juan Alorda Thomas	Vicepresidente	Font Gamundi	Pedro Gamundi Peña
Miguel Molinari	Presidente	Insular Trading	Miguel Molinari (Hijo)
Héctor Sautreaux		Cía. An. de Inv. Imb.	Claudia Cabral
Fernando Capellán	Presidente	FM Industries	Rosalina Rodríguez
Juan Henderson	Presidente	PROSEDOCA	Luis Henderson
Simón Ramírez Cruz	Gerente	FINADE	Ramona Fernández

C. MASTER'S PARTICIPANTS

Yuan Eu Liao
Lissette Fernández B.
Juan Lehoux Amel
Fernando Columna
Miguel Molinari
Lina Montano
Federico Lalane Ureña
Virginia Marmolejos Joal
Luis Henderson Farias
Mercedes Castillo
Radhamés Lora
Wagner Méndez
Juan José Aracena
José Tomás Pérez
Jeremías Rodríguez
Francisco Méndez
Ramón Alvarez
Elnio Durán
Nohivo Lugo
Pablo Portes

D. AID AND PROJECT PERSONNEL

Sandra Mancebo, Dominican Republic Representative, Development Associates
Erich Hofmann, Project Director, Development Associates
Arsenio Jiménez, Project Director, CNHE
Lic. Carmen Salcé, Project Assistant, CNHE
Lilibeth Ogando, Administrative Assistant, CNHE
Hingrys De Peña, Administrative Assistant, CNHE
Dr. Jorge Max Fernández, Former Project Director, CNHE
Dr. Don Swanson, Former Project Director, Development Associates
Rafael Alba, FUNDAPEC
Bertran De Windt, FUNDAPEC
Sandra Santana, English Language Training Director, ICDA
William Binford, Project Liason, AID/HRD/DR
Lisa Doig, AID/HRD/DR
Amelia Ramirez, AID/HRD/DR
Paul A. Struharik, Director, HRD/AID/DR

FORMULARIO PARA ENTREVISTAS

1. NOMBRE: _____

   CARGO : _____

   EMPRESA: _____

2. NOMBRE DE LOS PARTICIPANTES EN EL PROGRAMA DE MAESTRIA

_____

_____

_____

3. COMO SE ENTERARON DEL PROGRAMA?

_____

_____

4. HAN PARTICIPADO EN EL PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO EMPRESARIAL?

_____

5. COMO FUE ESTE PROCESO? _____

_____

6. CUANTOS HAN PARTICIPADO? _____

7. LOS BECARIOS HAN PRESTADO AYUDA PARA LA ELABORACION DEL DOCUMENTO PLAN DE DESARROLLO EMPRESARIAL?

_____

8. CUANTO TIEMPO DE TRABAJO SE NECESITA PARA LA ELABORACION DEL PLAN? _____

9. HAN USADO ESE INSTRUMENTO CON OTRO PROPOSITO ADEMAS DEL REQUERIDO POR ESTE PROGRAMA?

_____

10. USANDO UNA ESCALA DE 1 A 10, CUANTA UTILIDAD TIENE ESTE PROCESO EN SU EMPRESA?

_____

11. UNA VEZ DETECTADAS LAS NECESIDADES, COMO DETERMINARON CUALES ERAN LAS PERSONAS MAS IDONEAS PARA PARTICIPAR.

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. QUE PROGRAMAS O UNIVERSIDADES HA RECOMENDADO LA EMPRESA?

_____

_____

13. QUE VAN A HACER LOS BECARIOS CUANDO REGRESEN?

_____

_____

_____

14. SOBRE EL PLAN DE ENTRENAMIENTO EMPRESARIAL:

UTIL _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ INUTIL

DEMASIADO GENERAL ____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DEMASIADO ESPECIFICO

DIFICIL DE HACER ____ _____ _____ ____ _____ FACIL DE HACER

15. SOBRE EL PROGRAMA EN GENERAL

FACIL INFORMACION ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ DIFICIL INFORM.

MUCHOS CANDIDATOS ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ POCOS CANDIDATOS

BARATO ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ COSTOSO

16. CUANTO TIEMPO NECESITA LA EMPRESA PARA RECUPERAR ESA INVERSION:

_____ MESES.

17. OBSERVACIONES. RECOMENDACIONES.

_____

_____

_____

_____

FORMULARIO PARA ENTREVISTAS

1. NOMBRE: _____

2. NOMBRE DE LA EMPRESA: _____

3. TELEFONO: _____

4. CUALES SON LOS PRODUCTOS QUE LA EMPRESA EXPORTA O PIENSA EXPORTAR? _____

_____

_____

_____

5. CUAL ES EL MONTO DE VENTA DEL ULTIMO AÑO? _____

CAMBIO _____ %

6. MONTO DE EXPORTACION. _____ CAMBIO _____ %

7. DESCRIPCION DE PUESTO Y FUNCIONES.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. CUANTO TIEMPO TIENE LABORANDO EN LA EMPRESA Y CUANTO EN EL PUESTO? _____ MESES _____ MESES.

9. SEÑALAR SI HA CAMBIADO SUS FUNCIONES DESPUES DE REALIZAR EL CURSO

_____

MOTIVO: _____

_____

10. ANOTAR LOS DATOS PERSONALES DEL GERENTE O SUPERVISOR DIRECTO DE LA PERSONA QUE SE ENTREVISTA:

NOMBRE: _____ TELEFONO: _____

CARGO: _____

11. COMO SE ENTERÓ DEL PROGRAMA: _____

_____

12. CUAL ES SU OPINIÓN SOBRE:

HOTEL	1	2	3	4	5
COMIDA	1	2	3	4	5
ORIENTACIÓN	1	2	3	4	5
PROCESO DE SELECCIÓN	1	2	3	4	5
RELEVANCIA	1	2	3	4	5

13. DURACION DEL PROGRAMA:

CORTO _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ LARGO

14. OPINIÓN SOBRE LOS INSTRUCTORES:

ABURRIDOS _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ AMENOS

EXCELENTES _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DEFICIENTES

15. APOYO LOGISTICO.

DEFICIENTE_____ _____ _____ _____ _____ EXCELENTE

16. TEMAS OFRECIDOS:

BASTANTE AVANZADOS _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DEM. ELEMENTALES

17. CONCEBIDOS EN BASE A PATRONES:

LOCALES ____ _____ _____ _____ ____ EXTRANJEROS

18. PROGRAMACION DE ACTIVIDADES:

LENTAS _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ RAPIDAS

POCAS _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ MUCHAS

MUCHA VARIACION _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ POCA VARIACIÓN

19. RESULTADO DE LA PROGRAMACION EN RELACION CON LOS PARTICIPANTES:

SATISFECHOS ____ _____ _____ ____ _____ INSATISFECHOS

POCAS ____ ____ _____ _____ ____ MUCHAS

BUENOS TEMAS _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ MALOS TEMAS

20. CONSTITUCIÓN DEL GRUPO.

HOMOGÉNEO ____ ____ _____ ____ ____ HETEROGÉNEO

21. RECOMENDADO A OTRAS PERSONAS, SI LA RESPUESTA ES AFIRMATIVA A CUANTAS PERSONAS?: _____

22. ESTA DISPUESTO A ASISTIR A OTROS SEMINARIOS?_____

23. CALIFICACIÓN DEL SEMINARIO (1-10) _____

24. DURANTE EL PROGRAMA HAN HECHO CONTACTO CON CLIENTES DISTRIBUIDORES O SUPLIDORES?

(ESPECIFICAR NUMERO Y EXPLICAR SI DA SEGUIMIENTO A DICHOS CONTACTOS):

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

25. EN BASE A ESTA EXPERIENCIA, QUÉ ESTAN HACIENDO DIFERENTE EN SU TRABAJO. ESPECIFIQUE:

_____

_____

_____

_____

26. HAN HECHO ALGUNAS REUNIONES DE EGRESADOS, DESPUÉS DEL PROGRAMA?

_____

PROPÓSITO DE LAS MISMAS: _____

_____

27. CUANTO TIEMPO NECESITA LA EMPRESA PARA RECUPERAR ESTA INVERSIÓN

_____ MESES.

OBSERVACIONES Y RECOMENDACIONES:

_____

_____

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Long Term Participants

Name _____ Age _____

Contact _____

University _____

Why here? _____

_____

How influential was Company _____ CNHE _____

D. A. _____ Self _____ in Selection?

What degree? _____ Major _____

Why this? Self interest _____ Company _____ D.A. _____

University _____

When did you declare major? _____

What did you do in D.R. before trainig? Title _____

Post / duties _____

_____

_____

Employer _____ Industry / Products _____

_____

Size # Employees _____ P Exports _____

What do you expect to do when go back? _____

_____

_____

Same Company _____ Post _____

What understanding do you have with your employer regarding your return? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Previous Salary _____ Expected Salary _____

Has employer been paying your salary while in program? _____

Full? _____ Timely receipt? _____

Where did you do ELT? _____

How long? _____

Why There? _____

Indicate your feelings and reactions to your studies along these dimensions:

Relevant training	____	____	____	____	____	Irrelevant Training
Too Advanced	____	____	____	____	____	Too Specialized
Excellent Instructors	____	____	____	____	____	Poor Instructors
Rapid Progress to Degree	____	____	____	____	____	Slow Progress to Degree
Satisfied	____	____	____	____	____	Dissatisfied

How would you rate:

The Quality of your university

1 2 3 4 5

The usefulness of the orientations

1 2 3 4 5

Help provided by Development Associates

Before arrival	1	2	3	4	5
at your university	1	2	3	4	5

Do Allowances arrive on time? _____

Understand amounts _____

When will you complete your program? _____

_____

(Did you)
Have you thought of transfering to another university? _____

Why? _____

Have you heard of any problems experienced by other Dominicans in the program? _____

_____

What suggestions do you have for change and improvement?

_____

_____

How did you learn about this program? _____

_____

_____

EVALUACION DEL PARTICIPANTE

1. Datos Generales

Nombre: _____

Empresa: _____

2. Programa de Adiestramiento

Nombre: _____

Lugar: _____

Duración: _____ Fecha de Inicio _____

Fecha de Término _____

3. Evaluación del Proceso

En cada uno de estos ítems de la izquierda, escoja la respuesta más adecuada. Exprese su opción poniendo en un círculo el número que mejor describa su posición de acuerdo a la escala que se presenta. Si el espacio en la columna de la derecha no es suficiente, hágalo al dorso de la página.

Escala de Respuestas

0 Malo	1 Mediocre	2 Aceptable	3 Bueno	4 Excelente

						Comentarios
A) Proceso de tramitación de su solicitud.	0	1	2	3	4	
B) Claridad de los Formularios a llenar y ser entregados al CNHE.	0	1	2	3	4	
C) Orientación recibida para su participación en el Programa.	0	1	2	3	4	

						Comentarios
D) Proceso de Ubica-- ción en su progra- ma en el extranjero.	0	1	2	3	4	
E) Facilidades y proce dimientos del Examen Médico.	0	1	2	3	4	
F) Procedimientos para la obtención de la visa.	0	1	2	3	4	
G) Adecuación del apoyo financiero del programa.	0	1	2	3	4	
H) Apoyo de la empresa. patrocinadora.	0	1	2	3	4	
I) Alojamiento y facili dades en el curso.	0	1	2	3	4	
J) Arreglos para viaje de ida y vuelta.	0	1	2	3	4	
K) Trato del Personal - del CNHE.	0	1	2	3	4	
L) Trato del Personal - de la Institución -- responsable de impar tir el curso.	0	1	2	3	4	

4. Evaluación del Curso

						Comentarios
M). Adecuación del contenido a las necesidades del país.	0	1	2	3	4	
N) Desarrollo de la temática propia del curso.	0	1	2	3	4	
Ñ) Capacidad y experiencia de los profesores en general.	0	1	2	3	4	
O) Material entregado durante el curso.	0	1	2	3	4	
P) Satisfacción general con el Curso.	0	1	2	3	4	

Otros comentarios generales:

5. Evaluación del Impacto

En cada uno de los ítems de la izquierda escoja la respuesta deseada. Exprese su opción haciendo una cruz(X) debajo del encabezado de su elección. Siéntase libre de hacer los comentarios que estime pertinentes. Si el espacio en la columna de la derecha no es suficiente, hágalo al dorso de la página.

	SI	NO	Comentarios
A) Estima que recibió un trato adecuado en su empresa.	___	___	

	SI	NO	Comentarios
B) Ha sido cambiado de posición después de su regreso?	____	____	
C) ¿Estima que ahora lo toman más en cuenta?	____	____	
D) Considera que el curso lo ha hecho más útil en su empresa.	____	____	
E) Considera su experiencia en el curso como fructífera.	____	____	
F) Ha hecho algunas iniciativas en términos de traspasar sus conocimientos a otros colegas.	____	____	

Haga un breve Informe del Programa en el cual participó.-

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROJECT
PARTICIPANTS BY MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY AND PLACEMENT

*1.	Alcantara, Victor	Engineering	Florida State University
2.	Almonte, Ayda	Int'l Bus.	University of Illinois, Champaign
3.	Alonzo, Mirna	Marketing	Webster
4.	Arbaje, Ricardo	Marketing	Drexel
5.	Arias, Miguel	Computer Science	Rochester Institute of Technology
6.	Asencio, Carlos	Computer Science	American University
7.	Basora, Nestor	Computer Science	Rochester Institute of Technology
8.	Bournigal, Tabaré	Computer Science	American University
9.	Brito, Nelson	Int'l Bus.	University of Illinois
***10.	Castillo, Hampton	Int'l Bus.	Florida Atlantic University
11.	Chevalier, José	Eng. Admin.	George Washington
12.	Curiel, Angel	Finance	University of Wisconsin
13.	Delgado, Yolanda	Mgmt. Science	St. Thomas University
14.	Díaz, Margarita	Int'l Bus.	University of Illinois
15.	Díaz, Ruben	Int'l Bus.	University of South Carolina
16.	Dimitri, Pietro	Computer Science	Florida Atlantic University
17.	Fernández, Juan	Ind. Eng.	University of Florida, Gainesville
18.	Fernández, Manuel	Computer Science	American University
19.	Fernández, Ramona	Finance	Interamerican University of Puerto Rico
20.	Gamundi, Pedro	Law	Georgetown University Law School
21.	Hernández, Rafael	Computer Science	New Hampshire College
***22.	Hernández, Romeo	Int'l Bus.	Florida Atlantic University
23.	Imbert, Ana Amparo	Finance	INCAE
24.	Jiménez, José	Bus. Economics	Webster
25.	Llinás, Gregory	Economics	American University
26.	Martínez, Víctor	Int'l Bus.	University of Illinois
27.	Mejía, Ramón	Int'l Bus.	University of South Carolina
28.	Noboa, Juan	Ind. Eng.	Penn State
29.	Nuñez, Norma	Marketing	Webster
30.	Olivo, Cándida	Int'l Bus.	University of Illinois
31.	Pellerano, Pura	Int'l Bus.	University of Illinois

32.	Quiñones, Ingrid	Mgmt. Science	St. Thomas University
33.	Ramírez, Augusto	Marketing	Pace
34.	Ramírez, Enrique	Marketing	Webster
35.	Rivera, Grace	Computer Science	University of Maryland
36.	Rodríguez, Jesus	Computer Science	American University
37.	Rodríguez, José	Mgmt Science	Drexel
38.	Sánchez, Eduardo	Computer Science	University of Maryland
39.	Sánchez, José	Computer Science	Penn State
40.	Santoni, Fabio	Marketing	Drexel
41.	Seravalle, Riccardo	Int'l Bus.	Webster
42.	Suero, Camilo	Int'l Bus.	University of Illinois
43.	Valencia, Francisco	Finance	Drexel
44.	Víctor, Ray	Int'l Bus.	University of Illinois
**45.	Yanai, Lumi	Int'l Bus.	New Hampshire College
46.	Yeara, Miguel	Computer Science	George Washington

* Program Terminated 1-13-90
** Transferred to New Hampshire College, December 1989
*** Transfers requested to either Arthur B. Little or University of Illinois

Int'l Bus.	International Business
Eng. Admin.	Engineering Administration
Ind. Eng.	Industrial Engineering

GROUP I

NAME	FIELD	G.P.A.	TOEFL	GRE	GMAT	ACCEPTED AT
1. Ayda Almonte	Finance	3.5	497	--	290	Univ. of Illinois
2. Mirna Alonzo	Mktg	3.26	450	--	230	--------
3. Hampton Castillo	Mktg	3.13	570	--	310	--------
4. Jose Chevalier	Ind. Eng.	3.0	470	290 360	--	Geo. Wash.
5. Yolanda Delgado	Mgt. Sci.	2.5	597	--	330	--------
6. Ruben Diaz	Int'l Busi.	3.4	557	--	430	South Carolina
7. Pietro Dimitri	MIS	2.78	497	290 440	--	--------
8. Juan Fernandez	Agri. Econo.	3.6	583	320 590	--	Purdue N.C. State U. Florida
9. Rafael Hernandez	MIS	3.4	467	200 370	--	New Hamp. College
10. Romeo Hernandez	Int'l Busi.	2.89	557	--	320	--------
11. Victor Martinez	Int'l Busi.	3.35	593	--	350	--------
12. Ramon Mejia	Int'l Busi. Agri. Econ.	3.8	590	380 580	410	South Carolina Purdue
13. Juan Noboa	Ind. Eng.	3.2	573	390 720	--	Penn State
14. Ingrid Quinones	Mgt. Sci.	2.71	463	--	230	--------

NAME	FIELD	G.P.A.	TOEFL	GRE	GMAT	ACCEPTED AT
15. Jose Sanchez	MIS	3.6	620	470	510 630	Penn State Rochester Tech Stevens Tech Drexel
16. Fabio Santoni	Mktg	2.73	613	400	440 690	Drexel Worcester Polytech
17. Camilo Suero	Mktg	3.06	573	--	340	Univ. of Illinois
18. Francisco Valencia	Finance	2.7	570	400 530	390	--------
19. Lumi Yania	Int'l Busi.	3.1	570	--	390	American

GROUP II

NAME	FIELD	G.P.A.	TOEFL	GRE	GMAT	ACCEPTED AT
1. Ricardo Arbaje	Mktg	3.68	630	420 510	--	--------
2. Miguel Arias	Computer Science	3.0	470	370 450	--	Geo. Wash.
3. Nestor Basora	Computer Science	3.3	550	370 590	--	--------
4. Tabare Bournigal	Oper. Mgt.	3.24	530	330 460	--	--------
5. Nelson Brito	Int'l Busi.	3.08	--	260 410	--	Univ. of Illinois
6. Margarita Diaz	Mktg	3.48	550	330 380	--	Univ. of Illinois
7. Ramona Fernandez	---	---	---	---	--	INCAE

NAME	FIELD	G.P.A.	TOEFL	GRE	GMAT	ACCEPTED AT
8. Pedro Gamundi	Comp. Law	3.3	603	---	--	Georgetown Geo. Wash. Temple
9. Jose Jimenez	Int'l Busi.	3.5	510	330 460	--	--------
10. Gregory Llinas	Ag.Econ Develop. Banking	3.0	520	---	--	American
11. Norma Nunez	Mktg	3.5	513	360	--	--------
12. Candida Olivo	Int'l Busi.	3.9	---	230 350	--	Univ. of Illinois
13. Pura Pellerano	Mktg	3.8	547	360 660	--	Univ. of Illinois
14. Augusto Ramirez	Mktg	3.09	517	360 430	--	--------
15. Enrique Ramirez	Mktg	3.09	420	280 440	--	--------
16. Grace Rivera	MIS	3.2	537	340 540	--	--------
17. Jose Rodriguez	Finance Mgt Sci	3.04	563	380 590	--	--------
18. Eduardo Sanchez	MIS	3.01	567	360 460	--	Geo. Wash.
19. Riccardo Seravalle	Int'l Busi.	2.47	450	270 530	--	--------
20. Ray Victor	Mktg	3.3	603	300 450	--	Univ. of Illinois
21. Miguel Yeara	Computer Science	3.54	460	--	--	Geo. Wash.

DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

517-0216 Development Training Project (CNHE Grant) Correspondence FY 88, AID, Dominican Republic.

517-0216 Development Training Project, Development Associates Financial Information, FY 89-90, AID, Dominican Republic.

517-0216 Development Associates Contract 0216-C-00-7089-00 Vouchers, FY 88-89, AID, Dominican Republic.

Evaluation of Impact of USAID/DR Foreign Training Programs And Opinions of Returned Participants, Martin F. Murphy and Maricela Ramírez, Human Resources Division, USAID, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, July, 1988.

517-0216 Development Training Project (CNHE Grant) Correspondence, FY 86-87, AID, Dominican Republic.

517-0216 Development Training Project (CNHE Grant) Correspondence, FY 89, AID, Dominican Republic.

Dominican Republic, Project Paper, Graduate Management Training, United States International Development Cooperation Agency, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., 1983.

HRD Development Training Project 517-0216 Development Associates Proposal, T.A. CNHE, AID, Dominican Republic, 1982.

IFZ and Herrera Skills Training Needs Assessment, Frequences for Demand Study, Volume 2, International Science and Technology Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1988.

Meeting Labor Needs of the Industrial Free Zones in the Dominican Republic: Assessment of Training Needs and Resources, International Science and Technology Institute, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1988.

Employment in Industrial Free Zones in the Dominican Republic: A Report with Recommendations for Improved Worker Services, Susan Joekes, International Center for Research on Women, Washington, D.C., 1987.

HRD IND ISTI-Free Trade Zone Employer Based Training Demand Report, AID, Dominican Republic, 1988.

Technical Assistance For the Development Training Project, RFP No. DR-899-004, Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Virginia, 1989.

Carta Mensual, Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresa, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, December, 1989.

La Actualización De Los Planes De Desarrollo De Recursos Humanos: Eje Primordial Del Proyecto, Jorge Max Fernández, Consejo Nacional de Hombres de Empresa, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, July, 1989.

Dominican Republic Project Paper Development Training, United States International Development Cooperation Agency, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., 1986.

Dominican Republic Project Paper Development Training Amendment Number 4, United States International Development Cooperation Agency, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., 1988.