

PD-ABB-505

Best available copy -- illegible pages in
attachment A

— PD-ABB-505 —
67616



LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES
TECHNICAL SERVICES PROJECT

**EVALUATION OF THE BOLIVIA
TRAINING FOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

A contract between the U.S. Agency for International Development (LAC:DR:EHR) and the Academy for Educational Development and subcontractors Juárez and Associates, Inc., Management Systems International, and Research Triangle Institute. Contract No. LAC-0032-C-00-9036-00

EVALUATION OF THE TRAINING FOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Prepared for:

**USAID/Bolivia
Project # 511-0584**

Prepared by:

Allan Broehl

February, 1990

This report was prepared under contract No. LAC-0032-C-00-9036-00 between USAID/Bolivia and the Academy for Educational Development and subcontractor Juárez and Associates.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Training for Development Project was designed as part of USAID/Bolivia's response to the return of a democratically elected Congress and President which took place in October, 1982 after nearly eighteen years of military rule. Given the economic crisis of the time, it was USAID/Bolivia's immediate objective to support the future of a democratic and constitutional government by assisting Bolivia to resolve its economic crisis while at the same time promoting the expansion of the private sector. The long period of economic crisis and political turmoil prior to 1982 had caused many of Bolivia's most talented policy planners and private sector business and labor leaders to seek employment outside Bolivia -- especially those with U.S. training or those sympathetic to private sector expansion. These same years were characterized by dramatic increases in Soviet Bloc training for Bolivians as well as an increasing leftist movement within Bolivian universities. In response to this situation, the Training for Development Project was created to increase the number of U.S. trained individuals to occupy policy level and leadership positions in the private sector, the government, the labor movement and in rural Bolivia. These individuals were to participate in the development and implementation of more rational economic policies and programs and were to provide clearer orientation to the development of a free-market economy in a western-style democracy. The Project was also to expose the children of rural families to the operations of the U.S. economy, labor movement and political systems.

The Training for Development Project was a bold departure from traditional A.I.D. training programs oriented toward development. Earlier projects provided training where additional or improved technical and management skills could be related to increases in output or productivity in selected economic and service sectors. Never had a training project been directed to promote democracy or expand the free enterprise system. Consequently, very little previous experience was available to guide the Project's development. It is interesting to note that subsequently, the Latin American/Caribbean Bureau developed the Andean Peace Scholarship Program with similar objectives.

Evaluating the Training for Development Project is a unique challenge. There are no other A.I.D. projects to use for comparisons. The relationship between training outputs and their impact on influencing macro-economic policy, private sector expansion and democratic awareness is not a short-term relationship which can be demonstrated in a few years. Only when participants have completed their training and have had sufficient time in their public and private sector organizations to guide policy determinations can the impact of their training be adequately evaluated. Even such quantitative factors as training time and

training costs escape easy comparison with other projects given the Project's requirement that most participants be present or potential decision makers and leaders. The evaluation criteria to be used, therefore, are directed to how well Project implementation has followed the Project Paper guidelines and how effective these guidelines have been to the attainment of the Project purpose. The Evaluation Plan that was used is attached as Annex A. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation are designed to provide guidance for the development of a Training for Development Project amendment which is to be completed later this year.

The evaluation will focus primarily on the Long and Short-term Training Components of the Project. The Democracy Awareness and Seminars Components were discontinued in a Project amendment dated January 6, 1989. The impact of discontinuing these components on the attainment of the Project purpose will be discussed in Section IV of the evaluation, Training Activities.

The Training for Development Evaluation is divided into the following sections:

A. Project's Anticipated Effectiveness in Fulfilling the Project Purpose: Is the Project design demonstrating that training can lead to influencing policy decisions which have an impact on private sector expansion and strengthening democratic, constitutional government? Does the Project purpose continue to be relevant at the present time?

B. Candidate Selection: Are the candidates meeting the selection criteria outlined in the Project Paper and do they exhibit qualities that indicate they will contribute to meeting the Project purpose?

C. Training Activities: Is the Project meeting the revised quantitative targets and have Project modifications affected the attainment of the Project purpose?

D. Training Costs: Has the Project met the original cost targets included in the Project Paper and the cost containment guidance in A.I.D. Handbook 10? Could additional cost savings have been attained without affecting the quality of training?

E. Project Management: Have USAID/Bolivia and the Project Contractors managed the Project adequately to ensure the attainment of the Project's purpose as well as meeting Project output targets on a timely and efficient basis?

F. Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations: What problems were identified in the design and implementation of the Training for Development Project and what are the recommendations for overcoming these problems in an amended Project?

II. PROJECT'S ANTICIPATED EFFECTIVENESS IN FULFILLING THE PROJECT PURPOSE

There was general agreement among all persons interviewed that the Project purpose - to expand the country's human resources base by increasing the number of U.S. trained individuals who occupy policy level and leadership positions in the private sector, the government, the labor movement and in rural Bolivia - continues to be as important in today's Bolivia as when the Project was developed five years ago. In spite of continuing democracy and improvements in the country's economy over the last five years, the state of both in Bolivia remains fragile. The challenge of stimulating private sector-led economic growth to nurture a still very fragile democracy is present today and the Project continues to be required to respond to this challenge.

Certain modifications in the list of organizations and fields of study specified in the Project Paper were suggested. A major addition to the list of organizations is the Bolivian universities. It was pointed out that the quality of instruction in the fields of economics and, above all, business administration and management is low. Add to this the orientation in many of the state universities to a leftist ideology and you have a great many young people entering the labor market each year who simply are not prepared to contribute to a democratically oriented free market system. The Training for Development Project could make a significant contribution by allowing Bolivian professors in the fields of economics, business (including management, finance, banking, marketing, export promotion) and public administration to receive Master's level training in the United States. Because of the limited number of highly qualified Bolivians in these fields, it may be useful for the Project to simultaneously allow U.S. professors to come to Bolivia to fill in for the Bolivians studying in the U.S. This has the added advantage of introducing an immediate U.S. influence in Bolivian universities. Prior to including the university community within the Project, some additional investigation should be done as to where to focus this assistance. There are some graduate programs at the Catholic university in business and economics as well as an Economics Research Institute. The professors in these programs may require Ph.D. level training yet salaries in Bolivia are not sufficient to retain them here upon completion of their programs. Undergraduate programs in private universities in La Paz, Cochabamba and Santa Cruz also should be strengthened. These universities, however, tend to have pro-private sector orientations already. The real target of opportunity may be the undergraduate economics and business programs in the state sponsored universities, especially UMSA. For that reason, additional thought in this area will be required so that sufficient guidelines may be developed for a Project Paper amendment.

A second modification generally put forward was the addition of selected agricultural areas to the fields of study outlined in the Project Paper. There is agreement that one of Bolivia's major comparative advantages lies in the field of agriculture. Macro-economic policy decisions related to a more open economy will revolve around what agricultural exports can be generated. Fields of study in agriculture related to research, quality control and crop/product improvements will be relevant to meeting the Project purpose. Care must be taken, however, not to open the Training for Development Project in such a way that it merely allows any technical field in agriculture to participate. Clear guidelines will be required as to the exact fields of study that are to be addressed by the Project. Again, some investigation of this area should be undertaken prior to developing the Project Paper amendment.

A review of the long-term participants that have been sent under the Training for Development Project indicates that the Project is clearly meeting the targets established in the Project Paper. Two of the long-termers who have returned to Bolivia have already attained important, decision-making levels in the Bolivian government. Juan Carlos Requena was appointed -- after completing his training -- to be the Executive Director of UDAPE which is the leading public sector agency responsible for developing macro-economic policy. Jaime Aliaga, originally selected from the private sector, has returned to first become an advisor to the President of Bolivia and more recently appointed to a high post in the Fondo Social de Emergencia. Of the twenty participants sent forward by the Project for U.S. training at the Master's level, only one appears to have not been selected within the guidance of the Project purpose. The twenty participants can be broken down into the following categories:

1. Development of public sector macro-economic policy	5
2. Public sector support (national level) for private sector	3
3. Public sector support (regional level) for private sector	3
4. Policy guidance for the private sector in the private sector	1
5. National private sector support for the private sector	2
6. Local private sector support for the private sector	3
7. Larger or medium-sized private sector firms	2
8. Did not meet Project purpose	<u>1</u>
TOTAL	20

The Project Paper and the Project Paper Amendment outline a number of Bolivian organizations which, by their functions, clearly contribute to the attainment of the Project purpose. Of the total twenty long term participants, fifteen came from the organizations indicated in the Project Paper. Four others came from universities which have been identified as an addition that should be made to the Project focus. Only one came from an organization not truly contributing to meeting the Project purpose. In this case, the individual was from a small Bolivian private sector firm not addressed by the Project purpose and not demonstrating any relationship to macro-level policy or overall strengthening of the private sector.

The Project Paper also outlined a number of fields of study which contribute to meeting the Project purpose. Again, of the twenty long-term participants, fifteen were in the specified fields of study:

1. Economics	7
2. Business-Related Fields	6
3. Public Administration	2

The remaining five fields of study were in the area of agriculture exactly as has been suggested for improving the Project design. While the fields of study were highly specific (e.g. food technology, animal science, poultry science), in all cases, the individuals were working in institutions directly related to strengthening the private sector. In some cases they worked in large private firms or in associations which provided technical assistance to their members. In other instances, they worked in research to improve crops or soil and natural resource management. In summary, these agricultural fields of study clearly contribute to attaining the Project purpose.

In the area of short-term training, the evaluation demonstrates that the candidates selected have been much less oriented to meeting the Project purpose. Of the 53 files of short-term participants that were reviewed, only 30 of those participants clearly met the guidance of the Project purpose. An additional nine participants worked in organizations which were mentioned specifically in the Project Paper or in fields of study relevant to the Project objectives. In these cases, however, the candidates did not meet the criterion of potential or future leaders -- most were very low level technicians in public sector institutions. Finally, 14 participants were in organizations and fields of study which have no bearing on the attainment of the Project purpose. These were fields related to health, municipal management, occupational safety and some agricultural specialties not directly related to private sector development. It appears

that, in some cases, the Mission has used the Training for Development Project as a last resort source of training funds to meet pressing needs not able to be met elsewhere.

Of the 30 cases of short-term training relevant to the Project purpose, there are a number of indications that the Project has indeed reached high level decision makers capable of making significant contributions. For example, Senator Hector Ormachea, then Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, was allowed to visit U.S. institutions engaged in government procurement. This coincided with the presentation of a bill related to this field in the Bolivian Congress. Sr. Victor Hugo Perez was sent to investigate export possibilities for Bolivian wood and rattan furniture. Subsequently, he was appointed to be the head of the Ministry of Commerce's Industry Division where he has taken important steps to stimulate Bolivian exports in this area. Sr. Ramiro Gutierrez, Chief Legal Counsel to the Central Bank, had the opportunity to study the legal aspects of divestiture of state enterprises. In these cases, the Project allowed high level individuals who cannot be away from their jobs for lengthy periods to get important, highly specialized training critical to their job performance. Although short-term training is expensive, it can be a vital part of meeting the Project objectives. The general guidelines for application of the short-term training provisions of the Training for Development Project must be formulated in such a way as to identify promising targets of opportunity which can benefit from short, highly specialized courses, rather than being concerned about relative costs of training. Specific guidelines should be developed so that the short-term training is not so easily utilized, thereby reducing its volume and enhancing its impact.

It is very difficult to compare the relative benefits of long and short-term training. Long-term training requires that a present or potential decision-maker be away from Bolivia for a period of approximately two years. Not all such candidates can do so. Short-term training is therefore required to reach a large number of Bolivian leaders essential for attaining the Project purpose who are not available for long-term training. Short-term training, however, is subject to many abuses as people seek to take advantage of a wide variety of programs when other sources of funds cannot be found. Short-term training opportunities are circulated to ministries by U.S. agencies. Ministers request Embassy or USAID/Bolivia funding. It is difficult to say no. Private sector individuals too are made aware of seminars, international meetings and conferences. They make their way to the Embassy or the Mission requesting assistance. Finally, USAID Technical Offices also find short courses of use to Bolivians working in their area of expertise. They too seek funding. The pressures therefore are placed on the USAID Training Office to meet these requests. The Training for Development Project has become a "last resort" for satisfying some of these training requests. The evaluation has demonstrated that some short-term training opportunities have

contributed to attaining the Project purpose while many others have not. In order to resist pressures to use Project resources for activities not within the Project objectives, the Project should:

1. Establish clear guidelines for how the short-term training provisions of the Project are to be used.
2. Allocate Project resources at the beginning of each year to the courses and the fields of study to be addressed by the Project. Technical Offices may participate in the course selection and in the identification of the best candidates. The Project, therefore, has no unallocated "pot of money" available to outside "predators".
3. Establish a Short-term Training Selection Committee within USAID which must approve all requests for short-term training under the Project. In order to facilitate meetings on short notice, this Committee may use representatives (not necessarily Office Chiefs) from the Technical Offices under the chairmanship of the Mission Training Officer. Procedures for selecting long-term candidates are discussed in Section III, Candidate Selection.

It is the opinion of the evaluator that short-term training is essential to attaining the Project's purpose. The evaluation demonstrates, however, that the short-term training must be utilized much more carefully and much less widely. The percentage of the Project's resources for short-term training might well be reduced.

Finally, it is important to review the assumptions that were made at the time the Project was developed to determine if they are still relevant. They are:

That the Project can identify appropriate types of training and sufficient numbers of candidates.

Factors external to the Project do not cause the demise of the democratic form of government before this and other U.S. Projects can achieve desired impacts.

That the training and seminars being provided by the U.S. under this Project are sufficient to counterbalance the large amounts of similar training being provided by the Eastern Bloc countries.

The assumptions have proven to be valid. Fortunately, it appears that the Project has evolved under a stable, although fragile, democracy. Appropriate candidates and training have been available. Eastern Bloc activities have not interfered with the successful implementation of Project activities. With changes in international political relationships, it is possible that the last

assumption related to Eastern Bloc training may not be so valid in the future. This assumption should be investigated to see if it is appropriate for the Project amendment. An additional assumption, however, appears to be necessary. The Project has encountered difficulties in the lack of continuity within the Bolivian public sector. One long-term participant and several short-term participants have had their employment terminated by the Bolivian government subsequent to their return to Bolivia. This, of course, coincided with a change in the leadership of the government. Therefore, an additional critical assumption for the Project to meet its objectives is:

That public sector employment of returned participants is sufficiently stable to allow them to utilize and apply the skills they have acquired in training.

Certainly, great care must be given in selecting public sector candidates to determine that there is reasonable probability that they can resist the turnover which is common in the Bolivian government. Also, any leverage that can be applied by using the Mission's technical and development projects to stabilize the employment of Project participants should be applied.

In 1989, opportunities for training at the Ph.D. level were added to the Project. In interviews with Mission and Embassy personnel, it was indicated that Ph.D. training for Bolivians is very hard to justify. Ph.D. training is directed to research and to publishing which is not the direct focus of the Training for Development Project. The Master's level training focusses on operational activities related to policy planning and improvements in management and technical areas in the private sector. Returned participants, however, greatly favored Ph.D. training which is not a surprise. They believe that Bolivia must have this training to develop its own solutions to pressing national problems such as reordering the financial system, developing appropriate exports and increasing graduate training within its universities. There was agreement among them, however, that local salary levels will simply not retain Ph.D. graduates in Bolivia and they will be looking for jobs in international organizations once they meet the requirements of their scholarships. It appears that the attainment of the Project purpose offers little justification for including Ph.D. level training and that economic incentives for Ph.D. recipients may induce talented Bolivians to leave the country.

Conclusions:

1. The Project continues to be required to meet USAID objectives in Bolivia.
2. The Project purpose continues to be valid.
3. The organizations and fields of study selected to attain

the Project purpose remain valid. It has been suggested that universities be added to the earmarked organizations and selected agricultural areas be added to the fields of study.

4. Short-term training has been more difficult to implement in line with the Project purpose. It is suggested that more precise guidelines be established, that Project resources be clearly allocated to the training desired, and that a better internal Selection Committee composed of Technical Office representatives and chaired by the Mission Training Officer be established.

5. The assumption related to Eastern Bloc training should be investigated to determine if it is appropriate to include in the Project amendment.

6. Labor turnover in the public sector is a factor which will likely influence the attainment of the Project objectives. It is suggested that an additional assumption be added to the Project logframe related to the employment stability of public sector participants.

7. Ph.D. training does not appear to be relevant at this time to the attainment of the Project purpose.

III. CANDIDATE SELECTION

The Project has had many difficulties related to candidate selection. The major problem has been with English language requirements. The Project Paper stipulates, in agreement with A.I.D. Handbook 10, that a maximum of three months of U.S. language training may be provided. In practice, however, one participant had an entire year of English Language Training (ELT) in the U.S. In many cases, participants were sent to the U.S. knowing they would require more than three months training. A deeper investigation of the ELT requirement demonstrates that many present or potential Bolivian decision-makers simply do not speak English. Eliminating them from consideration would seriously affect attaining the Project purpose. It is therefore clear that more satisfactory guidelines need to be established to orient candidate selection with respect to English language capabilities. In perhaps one-half of the cases, candidates will score 70% on the ALIGU test indicating they could meet the English requirements of most graduate programs with three to six months of intensive ELT in the U.S. In these cases, it is reasonable to allow them to go to the U.S. In the remaining cases, guidelines need to be established with respect to in-country ELT. In Bolivia, English training progress is slow since candidates continue working while doing their language training. There are some reports that the quality of ELT in Bolivia is weak. Finally, students' employment and other selection-related characteristics change while they are in ELT meaning they may no longer meet other Project selection requirements when they finally complete their training. USAID/Bolivia should review the circumstances of those highly-qualified candidates who score below 70% on the ALIGU test to determine what the most efficient way is to prepare them for U.S. graduate school training. Failing to come up with a solution will either result in eliminating good Project candidates or will perpetuate the current practice of maintaining students in highly costly U.S. ELT programs for lengthy periods of time.

A second selection criterion which has not been met in many cases is the 100% payment of salary by the sponsoring institution. This has been most frequent in the private sector since the public sector has provisions which cover this requirement. In some cases, the sponsoring organizations obligate themselves to paying no more than 50% of the participant's salary. In other cases, they obligate themselves to pay all of the salary but simply do not comply. It is important that the Project selection requirements fully cover private sector participants and that provisions be made to work out an equitable solution with the sponsoring organization so that the participant is able to meet his/her financial obligations while in training. It is interesting to note that one participant brought his family to the U.S. under tourist visa provisions (staying on as illegal aliens) because his sponsoring institution did not pay

him and he could not provide evidence of sufficient financial support to obtain visas through USAID channels.

The selection process for long-term participants was only partially implemented. The Project Paper called for developing a network of support institutions throughout Bolivia using AIFLD and other Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) to assist in identifying candidates. This did not work out satisfactorily due to some instances where the organizations showed favoritism in making information on the program available only to their own members. Instead, the Mission used a widespread publicity program to acquaint as many people as possible with the scholarships available and the selection requirements. Applications were received and reviewed by the USAID Training Office. Those candidates that fitted the Project purpose were interviewed and given the ALIGU English test. Summaries were prepared on each one's characteristics and submitted to a Selection Committee. The Selection Committee, composed of USAID, USIS and Embassy representatives, then made the final selection. Those in conditions to depart for the U.S. were allowed to do so while others were required to stay in Bolivia until they could meet the English language requirement. The process has worked well although it is very time consuming on the part of the Training Office. Suggestions have been made to make the process more streamlined by only going to the organizations targeted by the Project and to use the facilities of the USAID Technical Offices in identifying candidates. Widespread dissemination of scholarship possibilities, however, permits a more diverse group of candidates to be considered, opens the program to lower income Bolivians and allows the general public to know that the U.S. is providing scholarships. One former participant believes that young Bolivians are now more reluctant to accept Eastern Bloc undergraduate scholarships because they would rather have an opportunity for graduate studies in the U.S. It appears that continuing the current selection process with the addition of inputs from the Mission's Technical Offices may be the most effective way to select participants.

One additional selection criterion not currently in the Project Paper appears to be important. This would be guidelines for applicants with high incomes. Given the Project orientation to present and potential decision makers -- especially those in the private sector -- it is impossible to eliminate individuals from consideration who have moderate and even high incomes. They are essential to meeting the Project objectives. However, it is not fair that the limited resources of the Project be used to cover all of the training costs of those who can afford to contribute to their own training. Some equitable guidelines must be worked out both for long and short-term participants to address how affluent candidates will be expected to contribute to program costs. Among the current long-term participants, at least four appear to be in condition to meet part of the training costs. In one case, the participant agreed to pay more than 50% of the cost of training.

In another case, the participant has agreed to contribute to the cost of the program only because her training has taken so long. One participant was forced to drop out of the program after not being able to meet English requirements after one year of U.S. study (he did not contribute to his own training costs). The remaining participant has not contributed to his training costs. In the case of short-term participants, again many have paid a portion of their training. In many cases, they covered their air fare and in other cases have provided their own maintenance or paid for their tuition costs. No guidelines, however, have been established to ensure an equitable distribution of cost sharing and some negative impressions among participants have arisen.

Guidelines were developed by the Mission Training Officer with respect to the geographic distribution of scholarships. The outside perception was that La Paz, because of its proximity to the Mission, was getting more than its fair share. A review of Project files has demonstrated the following geographic distribution of training opportunities:

Long-term Training Opportunities

La Paz	12
Cochabamba	4
Sucre	2
Trinidad	1
Oruro	1

Short-term Training Opportunities

La Paz	36
Santa Cruz	7
Cochabamba	6
Tarija	2
Chuquisaca	1
Beni	1

Also, the Project may not be giving enough attention to Bolivian women. While the Project has as its target present and potential decision-makers, the training provided by the Project enhances the individual's possibility of entering the decision-maker category. Hence, it may be important to address the particular needs of women. The Project has had the following experiences:

Long-term Training Opportunities

Males	17
Females	3

Short-term Training Opportunities

Males	45
Females	8

The distribution between the private sector and the public sector should also be noted:

Long-term Training Opportunities

Public Sector	10
Private Sector	10

Short-term Training Opportunities

Public Sector	27
Private Sector	26

The Mission may wish to establish some guidelines to assure a more equitable distribution among geographic regions and among men and women. Certainly, the distribution between the public and the private sectors is equal.

Conclusions

1. Improved guidelines must be established for dealing with those Project applicants who require in-country English Language Training.
2. More realistic guidelines should be developed on the responsibilities of private sector firms to pay participants' salaries while they are in training.
3. Improved guidelines must be established for dealing with candidates whose income levels indicate that they might contribute to covering their own training costs.
4. Some small modifications should be made in the selection procedures for long-term candidates while major modifications must be made in the selection of short-term candidates (See Section II).
5. Guidelines may be desirable to attain a more equitable distribution between geographic regions and male/female participants.

IV. TRAINING ACTIVITIES

The Project has been successful in meeting its original long and short-term training targets. It was originally estimated the project would train 16 long-term participants while 19 have either completed training or are in the process of doing so. One additional participant was forced to drop out of the program. In the area of short-term training, Project files account for 71 trainees while the Mission Semi-Annual Reports indicate 69 have completed short-term training. In either case, these numbers exceed the target of 44 short-term participants in the original Project Paper.

The Project amendment of January 6, 1989 altered the Project's output targets. The total for long-term participants was increased to 25. The Project currently has resources to train an additional 8 long-term participants, meaning the revised target will be surpassed since 19 are in training or trained and 8 more will be added. The revised target for short-term trainees is 136. Project resources will permit an additional 30 short-termers. Adding this increment of 30 to the 71 who have completed short-term training indicates that the Project will have missed its target by approximately 35 short-term trainees. An analysis of the training costs in the following section may explain this projected shortfall.

The original Project Paper called for 100 young people from rural and semi-urban areas to enter Democracy Awareness programs. These young people were the targets of Eastern Bloc scholarship programs. As recent high school graduates, they were being recruited in great numbers to undertake undergraduate studies in Bloc countries. The Project's Democracy Awareness component was to offer these young leaders an alternative of at least having a few months in the U.S. to understand its economic and social system. It was anticipated that many of them would prefer to have a U.S. experience, however short, rather than the Bloc programs. Also, they would go on to the university with a better understanding of what the U.S. was about. Three groups of 20 each actually went to the U.S. under the Democracy Awareness component. Reports are that the program was highly successful. The U.S. training was reported to be excellent. Participants returned so enthusiastic that they formed local organizations and even put out a newsletter for a period of time. The Democratic Awareness component was discontinued in the Project amendment of January 6, 1989 because it was thought to be too similar to the training available under the Andean Peace Scholarship Program (APSP). It is not clear, however, that identical training has yet been provided by the APSP. The Project purpose in the original Project Paper made special provisions for including this group of young people. It is not clear that the reason for discontinuing this component has been valid. Given the

reported success of the groups that went to the U.S., it would seem fitting that the Democracy Awareness component be reviewed prior to undertaking the Project amendment. It would be particularly interesting to have a short investigation of the experience of these young people after they returned to Bolivia to see if their U.S. training had an impact on their view of and support for a democratic form of government and the free enterprise system. A Bolivian researcher could perform such a study in one month's time allowing the Mission to determine whether the Democratic Awareness experience bears repeating in the Training for Development Project or any other Mission activity.

Similarly, the Project Paper provided resources for a large number of seminars either to be held in the U.S. or in Bolivia. This was to have been the multiplier aspect of the Project. Long and short-term training will reach a relatively limited number of people. The seminars were to reach a large number of people either in general areas related to economic issues facing the country or in highly technical areas applying to very special interests. The same fields of study were to apply as for the long and short-term trainees. The Seminars component was discontinued for two reasons. First, it was believed that the Private Sector Management Project and the creation of IDEA would offer sufficient seminars to meet the needs of the Training for Development Project. Secondly, outside technicians estimated that developing seminars in Bolivia would both be very costly and consume a lot of Training Office staff time. No seminars were ever developed under the Project.

Again, in practice it appears that IDEA does not offer the full range of seminars which were anticipated in the Project Paper. IDEA's target area is that of private sector management and some highly specialized areas within the development of the private sector. Areas such as economic policy and analysis or public administration are simply not addressed. The establishment of IDEA however has provided a cost-effective vehicle for the development of seminars in any field. IDEA is now designing and implementing specialized seminars in fields outside of its own area for clients which request these services. The cost range for these seminars is anywhere from \$2,500 for a several day seminar using Bolivian speakers to \$15,000 for a week-long seminar using foreign and Bolivian speakers. In certain areas of concern to the Project, the seminars are a much more cost-effective solution for addressing problems than sending people away for training. It is recommended that the Mission investigate reincorporating the Seminars component to the Project amendment as an effective way of having a greater multiplier effect.

Conclusions:

1. The Democratic Awareness Component should be investigated to see if it bears being reinstated in the Training for Development Project or in some other Mission activity.

2. The Seminars Component also should be investigated to see if it is a cost-effective way of reaching larger numbers of the Project's target population.

V. TRAINING COSTS

The evaluation indicates that Project training costs have exceeded those anticipated in the original Project Paper. The evaluation further demonstrates that the cost containment guidance in Handbook 10 has not been consistently applied in Project implementation. The original training cost estimates were as follows:

A. Long-term training costs -- Approximately \$3,000 per training month later modified to \$47,000 per participant.

B. Short-term training costs -- Approximately \$5,000 per person/month later modified to \$5,000 per participant.

C. Seminar costs -- Approximately \$720 per person/week later modified to \$7,200 per seminar.

D. Democracy Awareness Program costs -- Approximately \$220 per person/month later modified to \$3,500 per participant.

Actual costs for those participants who have already completed training indicate their long-term training costs have been an average of \$45,200. This, however, is below the average for all participants because they were the ones to accelerate their training or to meet their original training schedule. Those currently in training for some period of time already have an average training cost of \$49,100. This average may yet increase as more extensions are required for them to finally complete their training. The performance of short-term training in meeting original training cost targets is further from the original goal. The actual average training costs for short-term participant has been \$7,800 as compared to an original target of \$5,000 per participant.

When one reviews the performance of the Project in applying cost containment principles, one can better understand why long-term training costs have exceeded their original targets. In the first place, there was an initial tendency in the Project's implementation to use high tuition cost training facilities. Such universities as Boston University, the University of Miami, the University of Illinois and California Polytechnic University were all high tuition schools which raised long-term training costs. In addition, some of the universities were in high maintenance cost areas such as Boston, Chicago and Washington, D.C., further increasing training costs. Certainly, the most important factor raising training costs was the lengthy period that participants spent in English Language Training. Six, eight and twelve months were spent in U.S. ELT programs which far exceeded the three months allowed by the Project Paper. Finally, many participants were sent

to the U.S. to begin their academic programs in January. Most of the professional level Master's degree programs are designed to begin in September. Therefore, many students had their programs delayed awaiting courses or awaiting their comprehensives only because of scheduling problems. Better Project guidelines referring to cost containment will permit the Mission to make considerable savings in the long-term training activities. This must be done, however, without reducing the quality of studies.

Specific reference should be made to the Harvard University Edward S. Mason Public Policy and Management Program. The Mission may wish to support this activity quite apart from its open applications for Master's degree training under the Training for Development Project. It should be made very clear to participants in the regular Master's program that the conditions of these scholarships are very different. This is to eliminate the impression that occurred in the early implementation of the Project that some people are getting better treatment than others.

Short-term training costs are basically determined by the fixed costs of the training opportunities made available to the Mission. The justification for short-term training is that some highly critical Bolivian decision-makers cannot be away for long-term training. It is necessary that they have access to well designed, relevant programs meeting highly specialized, immediate needs. In these cases, considering the opportunity cost of the individual's being away, the cost of transportation, and the maintenance cost, the actual cost of the training makes little difference in the total program cost. Therefore, in short-term training, savings will not be made so much by limiting the cost of each program as by weeding out unnecessary training. Certainly, the aforementioned discussion of short-term training in Section II indicated that much of the training was not meeting the Project purpose. Therefore, it is suggested that much more critical appraisal be made of short-term training requests thereby trying to reduce its volume.

Conclusions:

1. Cost containment guidance should be developed and consistently applied in the case of long-term participants.
2. Cost savings for short-term training should focus on trying to reduce the number of participants to an absolute minimum rather than seeking to limit the training cost for any individual participant. The focus of short-term training should be on outstanding targets of opportunity where highly specialized training can result in fairly immediate, significant returns.

VI. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

While the Project Paper was approved in August, 1985, substantive implementation activities did not get underway until April, 1986 as the Mission had no full-time Training Officer during this period. During 1987, 8 long-term and 30 short-term participants were sent to the U.S. By the end of 1987, another 8 long-term participants had been sent forward, meeting the Project's original target of 16. Due to its slow beginning, the Project's PACD was extended from June 30, 1989 until June 30, 1991. As mentioned earlier, the Project was amended on January 6, 1989 to: (1) increase the number of long-term participants from 16 to 25, (2) increase the number of short-term participants from 44 to 136, (3) discontinue the Democracy Awareness component, (4) discontinue the Seminars component, (5) add Ph.D. training, and (6) add Third Country training.

There has been a good bit of turnover in Project management since its beginning. At least six or seven people have worked on different aspects of the Project meaning that they were not always fully trained in Training Project implementation. This lack of continuity has also indicated a difference in Project management philosophy. Initially, for example, longer periods of U.S. English Language Training were permitted and the final choice of universities was made in the U.S. where students had more opportunity to avoid the application of cost containment guidance. In the absence of guidelines in the Project Paper concerning cost containment and income levels of participants, Project implementation has varied widely in these respects. As a result of this variance, especially in the early stages of Project implementation, one of the U.S. contractors also had difficulty trying to apply cost containment since students were using the examples of others who were being allowed essentially to select any university they desired. Hence, a period of misunderstanding and confusion arose between the contractor and the Mission. This is an example of how the absence of clear, consistently-applied guidelines impedes effective Project management.

Project management improved significantly by the time the second group of long-term participants went to the U.S. More consistent cost containment guidance was applied as well as a more consistent policy with respect to U.S. English Language Training. The relationship between the Mission and the U.S. contractors improved substantially. University placements were made prior to the participants' departure from Bolivia, eliminating an important source of confusion as to who was to be responsible for the placement process.

There are certain lessons which can be learned from the difficulties the Project had in getting started :

1. Training Officers require specialized training in not only the Project objectives and guidelines but also the Handbook 10 guidance for implementing training programs. Serious deviations from Handbook 10 occurred with respect to cost containment and English Language Training due perhaps to inadequate familiarity with these Handbook 10 provisions by the Training Office staff.

2. Personal relationships must be established between the Project Manager and the U.S. contractors. Serious difficulties arose initially between the Mission Training Office and one of the contractors, the Partners for International Education and Training (PIET), because an effective communication process never took place. Each side held the other responsible for Project deficiencies. There was never an opportunity, however, for a direct relationship to have been established which might have overcome the communication problem.

3. Mission Training Officers appear initially not to have understood U.S. graduate school professional training programs. Most candidates were sent to begin programs in January thereby missing the more efficient September starting dates designed to allow students to complete training in the shortest possible time. Again, no provision was made for allowing Project Managers to visit U.S. universities to better understand their operations.

4. The university placement facilities of the U.S. contractors were not fully exploited in making university placements while participants were still in Bolivia. If the contractors had more information on general Project goals, individual trainee responsibilities and interests and the cost containment targets of the Mission, better suggestions could have been made concerning high quality, lower cost training options.

Certainly, there are some examples of inefficiency on the part of the U.S. contractors. A review of the cable traffic shows that many upward adjustments were made in tuition cost estimates after decisions had already been made on student placements. Consequently, the Mission Training Office was not able to apply effective cost containment procedures. In some cases, PIET was slow in making tuition payments to universities thus causing some embarrassment to Project participants. However, there is general satisfaction with the performance of both U.S. contractors -- PIET and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School. Certainly, the Project Manager should have the opportunity to obtain more information on the facilities of these contractors and develop a personal relationship to facilitate Project implementation.

Another aspect of Project management which has been referred to before is the difficulty in working with outside agencies such as the Embassy, USIS and USAID Technical Offices. The prospect of

obtaining long or short-term training is a great incentive to try to benefit from the provisions of the Training for Development Project no matter what the nature of the request. The difficulty of dealing with these pressures seems to be responsible for the Training Office in the past to have been very defensive not welcoming outside participation in the implementation of its programs. Again, it bears repeating that the best way to resist outside pressures is to:

- A. Have clear, consistently-applied guidelines as to what long and short-term training programs qualify under the Project.
- B. Initiate resource allocation early in the year so as not to have unallocated funds laying around.
- C. Establish Selection Oversight Committees responsible for assuring that all training meets the Project purpose.

The Training Office is currently working more closely with Mission Technical Offices to encourage them to adequately provide for their own technical training needs. Having proper provisions for training within each Technical Office will permit a much more rational allocation of resources -- especially for short-term training. Also, reviewing the requests made by the Technical Offices for training under the Project may allow them to better understand what provisions they should be making for their own training needs. Better structured procedures for awarding short-term training opportunities will enable the Mission Training Office to work closely with the Embassy and USIS since the insecurities of taking advantage of open sources of training funds will have been removed.

Finally, there appears to be some problems with Project files. There is confusion as to how many participants have been sent for short-term training. Similarly, the number of Project-funded seminars is not clearly understood. These are indications that a more formal Management Information System should be used to better control Project activities. AID's Office of International Training has developed the Participant Training Management System (PTMS) for just this purpose. If it is thought to be too complicated, the Mission may wish to set up an abbreviated system. The Mission Training Office is currently seeking assistance from OIT in this area. It is important to have immediate access to Project summary information allowing deadlines to be met and information on outputs and costs to be made immediately available.

The Project files should also contain information on how each candidate was selected to prevent any negative impressions about the process. Minutes of the Selection Committee meeting should be kept in each long and short-term participant's file. Also, questionnaires related to each returned participant's experience with his/her training program should be in each file allowing the

Training Office and any evaluator to have an immediate understanding of the participant's experiences during training. Handbook 10 has models which the Mission can use.

Conclusions:

1. The Project Manager should have training in the provisions of Handbook 10 especially as they relate to cost containment and English Language Training. The Training Office should then develop consistent guidelines to deal with these two areas of Project implementation. Certainly, the quality of U.S. training must be kept at a high level and adequate procedures for quality in-country ELT must be included.
2. The Project Manager must have an opportunity to meet directly with the U.S. contractors, AID's Office of International Training, the LAC Bureau's Human Resources Office and representative long and short-term training options. This trip should only take place after the new selection of U.S. contractors takes place later this year.
3. Long and short-term candidate selection procedures should be developed which make selection criteria clear and include Candidate Selection Oversight Committees. Also, Project resources should be allocated early each year to avoid having an available "pot of training money" open to use by outsiders.
4. The Training Office should work more closely with Mission Technical Offices in developing Project-specific training programs so the needs of these Offices may be met by using their own resources.
5. A Project Management Information System should be established to guide Project management and maintain information about the Project files. Each participant file should contain a copy of the minutes of the Selection Committee meeting that resulted in the candidate's selection.
6. Training evaluation forms should be filled out and placed in the files for each returned participant. This will provide useful information for making improvements in the Project and will assist in future evaluations.
7. Special consideration should be given Project participants in the Mission's Follow-on Program. They occupy high level positions in the Bolivian public and private sector and could be highly useful to attaining Mission program objectives. Those who were interviewed during the evaluation appeared to be most appreciative for having had the training experience and seemed open to having a continued relationship with the Mission.

VII. EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of the evaluation was to determine if the Project continues to be relevant to the present development needs of Bolivia and what modifications or improvements should be made in the Project design or implementation if the Project is to be continued. A Project amendment has been programmed for later this year. The methodology used was to: (1) review files on project implementation and on each of the long and short-term participants, (2) meetings with organizations which have sponsored participants, (3) meetings with Embassy and USAID offices familiar with Bolivian economic development requirements, (4) Meetings with a sample of returned participants, (5) Meetings with USAID Training Office staff who participated in Project implementation, (6) Meetings with individuals and USAID Technical Offices which have recommended candidates for training under the Project, (7) Meetings with U.S. contractors, and (8) Meetings with persons responsible for programs which were in the original Project design. Notes on all file reviews and meetings have been left with the Mission Training Office.

The Project purpose is to expand the country's human resource base by increasing the number of U.S.-trained individuals who occupy policy level and leadership positions in the private sector, the government, the labor movement and in rural Bolivia. The questions to be answered by the evaluation are:

- A. Is Project performance demonstrating that long and short-term training can lead to policy formulation and private sector expansion?
- B. Do the participants meet the selection criteria and are these criteria identifying individuals who contribute to the Project purpose?
- C. Has the Project met its original training targets and have Project modifications affected the attainment of the Project purpose?
- D. Has the Project met original cost targets and have Handbook 10 cost containment guidelines been observed?
- E. Have USAID/Bolivia and the Project Contractors managed the Project adequately to meet Project outputs on a timely and efficient basis?

Findings and Conclusions:

- A. The Project continues to be required to meet USAID objectives in Bolivia and the Project purpose remains valid. The organizations and the fields of study also continue to be

valid although two additions are suggested: (1) universities, and (2) selected agricultural fields of studies.

- B. Guidelines for implementing the Short-term Training Component must be made more precise so that training is more relevant to the attainment of the Project purpose.
- C. Project assumptions proved to be valid and relevant. The assumption related to Eastern Bloc training, however, should be investigated before it is included in the Project amendment. Also, an additional assumption is suggested: That public sector employment of returned participants is sufficiently stable to allow them to utilize and apply the skills they have acquired during training.
- D. Improved guidelines must be established for: (1) Participants who require in-country English Language Training prior to departing for the U.S., (2) Private Sector sponsoring agencies' responsibilities for salary payments to participants during training, (3) Candidates whose income levels permit them to contribute to covering part of their training costs, and (4) Attainment of a more equitable geographic and male/female distribution of training opportunities.
- E. The Democratic Awareness and the Seminars Components which were discontinued should be looked at once again to see if they are relevant to meeting the Project purpose.
- F. Cost containment guidance should be made more specific and applied more consistently for long-term participants while short-term training should be reviewed more carefully to eliminate those candidates who do not make significant contributions to meeting the Project objectives.
- G. Training and more exposure to U.S. contractors and U.S. long and short-term training opportunities should be made available to the Project Manager to introduce more efficient, cost effective management practices.
- H. A Project Management Information System should be introduced and Project files should be reviewed. Minutes of Selection Committee Meetings resulting in candidate selection should be placed in each participant's file. Returned participants should complete training evaluations and these too should be placed in the files.

Principal Recommendations:

- A. The Project should be continued with the same Project purpose and Project amendment activities should be initiated as soon as possible. These include:

1. An investigation of how the Project could most effectively be applied to universities.

2. Consideration of which fields of agricultural studies will contribute directly to the attainment of the Project purpose.

3. Development of guidelines for providing in-country English Language and other training for those candidates not qualified to leave immediately for the U.S.

4. Development of more realistic guidelines on how to deal with private sector firms which cannot provide 100% salary payments to participants during training.

5. Improved guidelines for affluent candidates who can contribute to paying for part of their training costs.

6. Development of guidelines to attain a more equitable distribution of training among geographic areas and for women.

7. Completion of a short study concerning the Democratic Awareness Component to determine if it merits reinstatement in the Project or in another USAID/Bolivia activity.

8. Investigation of the merits of reinstating the Seminars Component of the Project.

9. Development of effective cost containment guidelines which will not affect the quality of long-term training.

B. Procedures for implementing the Short-term Training Component of the Project should be developed which include:

1. Guidelines for the selection of outstanding targets of opportunity which contribute directly to the attainment of the Project purpose and offer immediate returns.

2. Establishment of an effective Oversight Selection Committee to assure that all candidates meet the selection guidelines.

3. Early allocation of short-term training resources to eliminate the enticement of a readily available, open source of training funds.

4. Development of close working relationships between the Training Office and the Mission Technical Offices to encourage them to develop adequate project-specific

training programs to meet their needs.

- c. An additional assumption should be added to the Project logframe -- That public sector employment of returned participants is sufficiently stable to allow them to utilize and apply the skills they have acquired in training.
 - 1. Candidates from the public sector must be carefully evaluated to determine their ability to withstand the frequent changes that occur in the public sector.
 - 2. Leverage should be applied on the public sector using Mission project and other assistance to assure the continued employment of participants upon their return.
 - 3. The current assumption related to Eastern Bloc training activities should be reviewed to determine if it is relevant for inclusion in the Project amendment.

- D. Adequate opportunities should be provided for the Project Manager to fully understand A.I.D. training requirements, to meet personally with the U.S. contractors and to investigate U.S. long and short-term training opportunities.
 - 1. Visits should be made to A.I.D.'s Office of International Training (OIT) and the LAC Bureau's Human Resource Office (LAC/DR/HRD).
 - 2. Visits should be made to the new U.S. Contractors once the competitive process is completed.
 - 3. Visits should be made to a representative group of U.S. English Language Training facilities and long and short-term training programs so the Project Manager is able to provide better information to participants prior to their departure from Bolivia.

- E. A Management Information System should be introduced into the Project's management, and safeguards should be initiated to document candidate selection procedures and participants' evaluations of training experiences.
 - 1. A Management Information System such as the PTMS should be applied to the management of the Project.
 - 2. All Project files should be centralized to assure they are complete and that they can be located easily.
 - 3. Selection Committee Meeting Minutes should be included in each participant's file.
 - 4. Participants should be given evaluation forms upon

their return to Bolivia related to their U.S. training. These forms should be kept in their files.

Lessons Learned:

- A. Long and short-term participant training can be used to influence the development of macro-economic policy and the strengthening of the private sector when: (1) outstanding participants are identified who are present or potential decision-makers, (2) the public and private sector positions of participants have sufficient stability to allow them to apply their newly acquired skills, and (3) well established guidelines limit the Project to only those who can truly contribute to meeting the Project purpose.
- B. Clear guidelines must be developed and consistently applied from the beginning of the project related to candidate selection, cost containment and fields of study. Otherwise, candidates will try to guide the Project to meet their other interests and outside pressures will develop from U.S. and host country institutions to favor candidates who do not meet project objectives. This will be particularly true for short-term training.
- C. Care must be taken from the very beginning to assure the continuity of employment of participants. During long-term training, others may try to enter the job vacancy left by the participant. Political or managerial changes may occur during training which affect the participants' ability to return to his/her job.

ATTACHMENT A
DRAFT PLAN FOR EVALUATION

DRAFT EVALUATION PLAN FOR THE TRAINING FOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
Project Number 511-0584

USAID/Bolivia
February 12, 1990

Prepared by Allan Broehl; Suarez and Associates, Inc.

1. BACKGROUND

The Training for Development Project was designed as part of USAID/Bolivia's response to the return of a democratically elected Congress and President which took place in October, 1982 after nearly eighteen years of military rule. Given the economic crisis of the time, it was USAID/Bolivia's immediate objective to support the future of democratic and constitutional government by assisting Bolivia to resolve its economic crisis while at the same time promoting the expansion of the private sector. The long period of economic crisis and political turmoil prior to 1982 had caused many of Bolivia's most skilled policy planners and private sector business and labor leaders to seek employment outside Bolivia -- especially those with U.S. training or those sympathetic to private sector expansion. These same years had been characterized by dramatic increases in Soviet Bloc training for Bolivians as well as an increasing leftist movement in Bolivian universities. In response to this situation, the Training for Development Project had as its purpose increasing the number of U.S. trained individuals who would occupy policy level and leadership positions in the private sector, the government, the labor movement and in rural Bolivia. These individuals were to participate in the development and implementation of more rational economic policies and programs and provide clearer orientation to the development of a free-market economy in a western-style democracy. The Project was to also expose the children of rural families to the operations of the U.S. economy, labor movement and political systems.

The Training for Development Project was a bold departure from traditional A.I.D. training programs oriented toward development. Earlier projects provided training in selected economic or service sectors where output and productivity could be related to additional or improved technical and management skills. Never had a training project been directed to promote democracy or expand the free enterprise system. Consequently very little previous experience was available to guide the Project's development. It is interesting to note that subsequently, the largest single training effort of the Latin American/Caribbean Bureau -- the Caribbean/Latin American Scholarship Program (CLASP) -- was developed with a similar purpose.

Best Available Document

21

Evaluating the Training for Development Project is a unique challenge. There are no other A.I.D. projects to use for comparisons. The relationship between training outputs and their impact on influencing macro-economic policy, private sector expansion and democracy awareness is not a short-term relationship which can be demonstrated in a few years. Only when participants have completed their training and have had sufficient time in their public private sector organizations to guide policy determinations can the impact of their training be adequately evaluated. Even such quantitative factors as training time and training costs escape easy comparison with other projects given the requirement that most participants be present or potential decision-makers. The evaluation criteria to be used therefore are directed to how well the project implementation has followed the Project Paper guidelines and how effective these guidelines have been to the attainment of the Project purpose. The findings and recommendations of this evaluation are designed to provide guidance for the development of a Training for Development Project amendment which is to be completed later this year.

This Evaluation Plan will focus primarily on the Long and Short-term Training components of the Project. The Democracy Awareness and Seminars components will be discussed separately under the section of the Evaluation Plan entitled Training Activities. These two components were discontinued in the Project Amendment dated January 6, 1989.

The Training for Development Evaluation Plan is to be divided into the following sections:

- A. Project's Anticipated Effectiveness in Fulfilling the Project Purpose: Is the Project design demonstrating that training can lead to influencing policy decisions which have an impact on private sector expansion and strengthening democratic constitutional government?
- B. Candidate Selection: Are the candidates meeting the selection criteria outlined in the Project Paper and do they exhibit qualities that indicate they will contribute to meeting the Project purpose?
- C. Training Activities: Is the Project meeting the revised targets and have Project modifications affected the attainment of the Project purpose?
- D. Training Costs: Has the Project met the original cost targets included in the Project Paper and the cost guidance provided in A.I.D. Handbook 10, and could any cost savings have been introduced without affecting the quality of the training?
- E. Project Management: Have USAID/Bolivia and the Project Contractors managed the Project adequately to ensure the attainment of the Project's purpose as well as meeting Project output targets on a timely and efficient basis?
- F. Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations: What problems were identified in the design and implementation of the Training for Development Project and what are the recommendations for overcoming these problems in an amended Project?

19

needs were their relevance to USAID/Bolivia's strategy objectives of stabilizing the Bolivian economy, strengthening the nation's macro-economic policy framework and expanding the role of the private sector in the economy. As a result of these training programs, an increased number of GOB officials were to acquire the added expertise needed to analyze more effectively the Bolivian economy, identify its structural weaknesses and design workable macro-economic policies and programs to correct them. The training was to provide more private sector entrepreneurs with the technical and managerial skills necessary to allow them to direct their enterprises more efficiently and to compete more effectively in Bolivian and international markets.

Three areas affecting candidate selection were spelled out in detail to assure that the above cited objectives were attained:

A. Organizations to participate in the project:

1. Ministry of Planning and Coordination
2. Ministry of Finance
3. Ministry of Industry and Commerce
4. Central Bank
5. Congress
6. Labor Organizations
7. Private Sector Organizations (e.g. Chambers of Commerce the Confederation of Private Entrepreneurs)
8. Unidad de Desarrollo y Analisis de Politicas Economicas - UDAPE (added in the Project Amendment dated 1/6/89)
9. National Institute of Statistics (also added in Project Amendment)

B. Fields of Study Permitted by the Project:

1. Long-term Training (Master's and Ph. D. Degrees)
 - a. Business Administration
 - b. Public Administration
 - c. Economics
 - d. Agricultural Economics
 - e. Finance
 - f. Marketing
 - g. International Trade
2. Short-term Training
 - a. Finance
 - b. Business Management

- c. Development Banking
- d. Cooperative Management
- e. Public Administration
- f. Export Promotion
- g. Labor Relations
- h. International Trade
- i. Upgrade skills in technical specialties such as consumer demand analysis, cooperative organizations, marketing and export strategies, quality control, risk taking and risk management

C. Personal Characteristics -- Candidates must be present or potential decision-makers in the private or public sectors.

The evaluation will review the above selection criteria to determine if they were applied in candidate selection, if they proved useful in the attainment of the Project purpose and if they continue to provide appropriate guidance.

The following evaluation mechanisms will be used:

- A. Review of files to identify the participant's sponsoring organization and field of study.
- B. Meetings with those organizations which sponsor/employ the greatest number of participants to discuss participant's employment after completion of training.
- C. Meetings with U.S. Embassy Economic Office, USAID/Bolivia and representatives of International Organizations to determine policy making significance of the outlined organizations and fields of study.
- D. Meetings with some of the returned participants to find out what they are presently doing.

To the extent possible, comments will be made about the relative merits of long vs. short term training to the attainment of the Project purpose and objectives. Also, comments will be made concerning the addition of Ph. D. training to attain the Project purpose.

III. CANDIDATE SELECTION

The Project Paper lists detailed requirements for selecting both long and short-term training participants. They are:

- A. Long-term Master's and Ph. D. Degree Programs
 - 1. Citizen of Bolivia
 - 2. Currently employed
 - 3. Recommended by the employer
 - 4. Payment of participant's salary, family subsistence bonuses and related expenses by the employer

70.

5. Assurance of a job commensurate with level and nature of training
6. Successful completion of an undergraduate degree
7. Agreement in writing to return to Bolivia and work in field for twice the period of the training
8. Ability to speak English with no more than three months of additional training or agreement to pursue the degree in a Spanish language program

H. Short-term training

1. Recommended and sponsored by a government agency or private organization
2. Payment of salary, family subsistence bonuses or relative expenses by sponsoring organization

In addition, the Project Paper calls for the Mission Training Office to develop a network of contacts with key private sector and private voluntary organizations throughout the country to assist in candidate selection. Furthermore, the Training Office was to involve USIS and AIFLD in the candidate selection process. Finally, an Inter-Agency Selection Committee was to be responsible for making the final selection of individuals for all long and short-term training. The Committee consisted of representatives from the USG Mission in Bolivia (USAID; Political, Economic and Consular Sections; DEA; DAO and USIS). While the Project did not specifically address including women, the evaluation will look at the number and characteristics of female participants.

The evaluation will review the above candidate selection criteria and procedures to determine if they were applied as outlined above, if they were useful in identifying/processing the kinds of candidates required by the Project, and if improvements can be introduced. The following evaluation mechanisms will be used:

- A. Review of files to determine if appropriate certifications are included.
- B. Meetings with those organizations which sponsor/employ the the greatest number of participants.
- C. Meetings with USAID/Bolivia Training Office staff who participated in Project implementation.
- D. Meetings with some of the returned participants.
- E. Meetings with representatives of USIS, AIFLD and the private sector and private voluntary organizations which participated in candidate selection.
- F. Meetings with members of Inter-Agency Selection Committee.

IV. TRAINING ACTIVITIES

The Project initially provided for:

... which means 120 person-months of long term training ...

231

- B. Approximately 100 person/months of short-term training in the U.S.
- C. Approximately 100 person/months of seminar training in the U.S. and Bolivia.
- D. Approximately 100 person/months of Democracy Awareness training in the U.S. for Bolivian rural and semi-urban young people.

In January, 1989, the training outputs were amended as follows:

- A. 25 long-term training graduates in the U.S. and Third Countries (Ph. D. programs were added to the Master's programs)
- B. 136 short-term participants in programs in the U.S. and Third Countries
- C. 4 seminars in the U.S. and Bolivia
- D. 60 participants in Democracy Awareness training in the U.S.

The evaluation will review the revisions in training outputs, will measure actual outputs against revised target outputs and will analyze the impact of reducing the Seminars and the Democracy Awareness components on the attainment of the Project purpose. The following evaluation mechanisms will be used:

- A. Review of files to measure anticipated training outputs.
- B. Review of performance of the IDEA and APSP Projects to evaluate the impact of having modified the Seminars and Democracy Awareness components of the Project.

V. TRAINING COSTS

The Project was developed on the basis of the following cost estimates:

- A. Long-term training -- Approximately \$3,000 per person/month later modified to \$47,000 per participant.
- B. Short-term training -- Approximately \$5,000 per person/month later modified to \$5,000 per participant.
- C. Seminars -- Approximately \$720 per person/week later modified to \$7,200 per seminar.
- D. Democracy Awareness Program -- Approximately \$220 per person/month later modified to \$3,500 per participant.

A.1.D. Handbook 10 states that the costs of participant training are to be contained and that training programs and training components of projects are to be developed and managed to assure both quality and cost-effectiveness. Handbook 10, however, establishes no ceiling on tuition costs for graduate studies but it does establish the monthly maintenance rates for differing locations in the U.S. ranging from \$658 to \$909. The Mission, to apply the cost containment guidance, has five options that may be used. The first is to limit the duration of training by the efficient programming of English language and academic training to assure that training is completed in the shortest time possible. Scheduling arrivals in the U.S. to coincide with the availability of courses or the counseling of participants in the U.S.

selection may reduce training time. A second option is to limit the participant's choice of universities to those with lower tuition costs but with high academic standards. Third, the Mission may encourage participants to select universities in areas where maintenance costs are lower. A fourth option would be to encourage participants to live on-campus with meals provided which is generally cheaper than granting them the A.I.D. established maintenance allowances. Given the objective of the Training for Development Project to reach present and potential decision-makers, this cost containment option may not be relevant. Finally, participants with adequate incomes (no limitation was placed on participant's income levels by the Project) could be requested to pay a portion of their training costs.

The evaluation will, to the extent possible, estimate the actual training costs of long and short-term participants so they may be compared with the Project's initial cost targets. In addition, the evaluation will review to what extent the cost containment options available to the Mission and its contractors were applied. The following evaluation mechanisms will be used:

- A. Review of files to measure actual training costs.
- B. Meetings with those organizations which sponsor/employ the greatest number of participants.
- C. Meetings with USAID/Bolivia Training Office staff who participated in Project implementation.
- D. Meetings with some of the returned participants.
- E. Meetings with representatives of USIS, AIFLD and private sector and private voluntary organizations which participated in candidate selection.

VI. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Project Paper calls for the Project to be managed by the USAID/Bolivia Training Office. More specifically, the Training Office was to be responsible for the overall identification, nomination, recruitment, follow-up and all administrative monitoring of Project participants. The Training Office was to be assisted by A.I.D./Washington's Office of International Training (OIT) which has contracts with the Partners for International Education and Training (PIET) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School. Their responsibilities were to assist in the identification of U.S. training sites as required and the placement and monitoring of participants in the U.S.

The Project called for the use of training institutions which comply with the provisions of the Gray Amendment (especially those of Hispanic origin). While not specifically mentioned in the Project Paper, good management practices would call for the establishment and maintenance of a management information system. This would permit both the accurate tracking of Project activities and the constant evaluation of Project implementation.

The evaluation will review the performance of the Mission Training Office and the two U.S. contractors to determine if they did good adequate management. The following evaluation mechanisms will be used:

- C. Meetings with USAID/Bolivia Training Office staff who participate in Project implementation.
- D. Meetings with some of the returned participants.
- E. Meetings with the U.S. contractors responsible for providing Project support.

VII. EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Using the analysis and findings from the above sections, a summary will be prepared. This will contain the major evaluation findings related to both the design of the original Project with its subsequent amendment and the implementation of the Project. Given the unique, innovative character of the Project, special attention will focus on the relationship that has been demonstrated between the kind of training provided, the decision-maker character of the participants and the development of workable economic policies and programs encouraging private sector growth. At this point, the initial Project assumptions will also be reviewed to determine their influence on the Project and their present applicability. Conclusions will be drawn as to how effective the Project has been in attaining its purpose and how timely and efficiently it has been implemented.

Recommendations will be made on how the Project can be improved in anticipation of an amendment that has been proposed for later this year. These will include suggestions on how the Project design might be altered to more adequately attain the Project purpose. Also suggestions will be made as to how management and cost containment provisions can improve Project implementation. Given the innovative character of the Project's orientation to supporting democracy and expanding the private sector, a section on "Lessons Learned" will be prepared for other Missions which may have interest in developing a similar activity. The Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations Section will be prepared so that it can provide the information required for the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary.

Annex A-1: Participant Specific Information - Long and Short Term

- A. Name MANUEL ARMA 511-0584-1-00206
- B. Location in Bolivia LAPA2
- C. Present Age 47
- D. Marital Status: Unmarried _____ Married _____
- E. Sponsoring/Employing Organization _____
- F. Position in Organization Economic Advisor
- G. Field of Study _____
- H. U. S. Training

*Thunderbolt Mt
Glenview, Ill*

- 1. Long-term _____ Short-term X
- 2. Private sector _____ Public sector _____
- 3. Duration of Training

Original Actual

ELT _____

Academic _____

Short-term 2 WEEKS 2 WEEKS

Departure Date 11/89 Target Return Date 11/89

- 4. Name of ELT Training Institution (Long term training)
- 5. Tuition Cost _____
- 6. Location of Training _____
- 7. Maintenance Costs _____
- 8. Name of Academic Institution (Long-term)
- 9. Tuition Cost _____
- 10. Location _____
- 11. Maintenance Costs _____
- 12. Nature of Short-term Training
- 13. Administrative Costs _____
- 14. Maintenance Costs _____

INFORMATION IN FILES

I. Candidate Selection Requirements

1. Long-term Trainees (Certifications in File)

- a. Citizen of Bolivia _____
- b. Currently Employed _____
- c. Recommended by Employer _____
- d. Payment of Participant's Salary, Bonuses and Related Expenses _____
- e. Assurance of Job Upon Completion of Training _____
- f. Completion of Undergraduate Degree _____
- g. Agreement in Writing to Return to Bolivia _____
- h. English Language Requirement Not To Exceed Three Months Or Agreement To Enter Spanish Language Program _____

2. Short-term Training (Certification In File)

- a. Recommended by Sponsoring Organization _____
- b. Payment of Participant's Salary, Bonuses and Related Expenses _____

J. Project Management

1. Timely Processing of Candidates to Meet Project Targets:

2. Timely Processing of Candidates to Assure Entry into English Language (EL) and Academic Training:

3. Adequate Predeparture Measurement/Counseling of Candidates to Meet ELI and Academic targets:

4. Adequate Predeparture Information for Participants:

5. Adequate Predeparture Information for Contractors:

Annex A-2: Program Specific Information Concerning Seminars
and Democracy Awareness Training

- A. Name of Program _____
- B. Purpose _____
- C. Duration _____
- D. Location _____
- E. Number of Participants _____
- F. Summary of Participants' Characteristics: _____

- G. Contractor or USAID Office Responsible for Development/Implementation of the Program _____
- H. Cost of Program _____
- I. Evaluation Summary: _____

- J. Indicators of the Quality of Project Management: _____

Annex B: Organizations Which Sponsor/Employ Greatest Number
of Participants

Annex B-1: Information Concerning the Organization

- A. Name of Organization _____
- B. Public Sector _____ Private Sector _____
- C. Summary of Major Responsibilities of the Organization:
- D. Organization's Awareness of Project Purpose:
- E. Organization's Satisfaction With Assistance Provided by Project:
- F. Organization's Recommendations for Improving the Project:

Annex B-2: Information Concerning Each Participant

- A. Name _____
- B. Location in Bolivia _____
- C. Marital Status: Married _____ Unmarried _____
Family in the U.S. During Training _____
- D. Position in the Organization _____
- E. Job to Occupy upon Return _____
- F. Training Institution _____
- G. Field of Study _____
- H. Duration of Training _____
- I. Nature of Training in the U.S.:

- J. Payment of Salary, Bonuses and Related Expenses _____
- K. Evaluation of Participant's Potential Influence on Analysis and Formulation of Policies (Public Sector) or on Expansion/Efficiency of Private Sector:

- L. Reports from Participants on Their Experience With Project:

Annex C: USAID/Bolivia: U.S. Embassy Economic Office: International Organizations

Evaluation of Organizations and Fields of Study Included in the Project With Respect to Project Purpose

A. Are the organizations included in the Project the most relevant organizations to attain the Project purpose and objectives:

1. What additions would be suggested?
2. What organizations should be eliminated?

B. Are the fields of study included in the Project the most relevant to attain the Project purpose and objectives:

1. What additions would be suggested?
2. What fields of study should be added:

Annex D: Returned Participants

- A. Name _____
- B. Location in Bolivia _____
- C. Information on Project and Project Purpose: _____
- D. Sponsoring Organization _____
- E. Position Prior to Training _____
- F. Current Position _____
- G. Field of Study in U.S. _____
- H. English Language Training in U.S.
1. Institution _____
 2. Original Duration of Training _____
 3. Actual Duration of Training _____
 4. Quality of Program _____
 5. Experience with ELT _____
 6. Suggestions for Improvement _____
- I. Academic Training in the U.S.
1. Institution _____
 2. How Was the Institution Selected _____
 3. Original Duration _____
 4. Actual Duration _____
 5. Reason for Extension of Training _____
 6. Quality of Instruction _____
 7. Experience with Academic Training _____
 8. Suggestions for Improving Academic Training _____
- J. Completion of Administrative Requirements:
1. Was maintenance/tuition and other payments made on a timely basis _____

2. Were tuition/maintenance limitations placed on selection of U.S. training institution _____

3. Did U.S. Contractor (PIET or Dept. of Agriculture) provide assistance as required _____

4. Recommendations for improving the management of the Project:

a. USAID/Bolivia:

b. U.S. Contractor:

Annex E: USAID/Bolivia Training Office Staff Who Have
Participated in Project Implementation

- A. Nature and Purpose of Project:
- B. Role in Project Implementation:
- C. Summary of How Candidates Were Identified and Selected:
- D. Role of Inter-Agency Selection Committee:
- E. Were There Difficulties With Candidates Meeting Selection Criteria:
- F. Do You Have Suggestions On How to Improve the Candidate Selection Process:
- G. Did You Have Specific Difficulties With the Implementation of the Project:
 - 1. Working With Outside Agencies:
 - 2. Working With USAID Offices:
 - 3. Working With U.S. Contractors:
- H. Period of Time You Were Associated With the Project: _____:
 - 1. Was This the Only Training Activity That You Had: _____:
 - 2. Were You Able to Dedicate Sufficient Time to the Project: _____

3. Were You Adequately Prepared/Trained to Carry Out Activities: _____

H. Was Guidance Provided to Participants With Respect to Tuition/Maintenance Limitations Or To Ways To Complete Program in Shortest Time Period:

I. Were Participants' Income Levels Investigated And Was There An Effort To Have More Affluent Participants Contribute To Training Costs:

J. Do You Have Any Suggestions On How the Project Design Could Be Improved:

K. Do You Have Any Suggestions On How Project Implementation Could Be Improved:

L. Do You Have Any Suggestions As To How Your Role In Project Implementation Could Be Improved Or Made More Effective:

Annex F: USIS, AIFLD, and the Private Sector and
Private Voluntary Organizations Which Assisted in
Identifying/Selecting Project Candidates

- A. Nature and Purpose of Project:
- B. Actual Role in Project Implementation:
- C. Summary of How Candidates Were Identified/Selected:
- D. Suggestions for Improvements in the Candidate Selection Process:
- E. Feedback from Participants on the Project and Comments Which Could Improve the Design or Implementation of the Project:

Annex G: Inter-Agency Selection Committee
USAID/Bolivia: Political, Economic and Consular Sections;
DEA; DAO and USIS

- A. Nature and Purpose of the Project:
- B. Actual Role in Project Implementation:
- C. Are the Organizations Included in the Project the Most Relevant Organizations to Attain the Project Purpose and Objectives:
1. What Additions Would You Suggest:
 2. What Organizations Should Be Eliminated:
- D. Are the Fields of Study Included in the Project the Most Relevant to Attain the Project Purpose and Objectives:
1. What Additions Would You Suggest:
 2. What Fields of Study Should Be Eliminated:
- F. How Effective Was the Inter-Agency Selection Committee in the Project Selection Process:
- G. Suggestions for Improving the Inter-Agency Selection Committee:

D. Suggestions for Improving the Project Design:

E. Suggestions for Improving Project Implementation:

SCOPE OF WORK - IQC

A. BACKGROUND

The Training For Development Project will be amended to add US\$ 4 million and extend the PACD to 6/30/94.

The project needs to be evaluated and a project paper amendment prepared by (at the latest) March 30, 1990.

The TFD project started in 1985 with a PACD of 6/30/91. The initial budget for the project was US\$ 2.5 million.

B. SCOPE OF WORK

1. EVALUATION - Training for Development

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine if the project has followed project paper guidelines; applied cost containment measures and has fulfilled its goal to date to train participants for development.

The evaluation of the project must have, at a minimum, the following components for long and short term:

- Training activity: targets vs. actual
- Costs: targets vs. actual
- Fields of training: targets vs. actual
- Contractor Performance (PIET and USDA)
- Identification of Problems
- Recommendations

40

ATTACHMENT B
SCOPE OF WORK