

EVALUATION OF OECS/USAID REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT
TRAINING PROJECT 538-0014

by

Albert Gorvine

and

William W. Boyer

USAID/BARBADOS

April 30, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I - INTRODUCTION

	<u>Page</u>
Evaluation Purpose and Objectives	1
Evaluation Methodology	2
Project Environment	4
A Comment on Management Training	5
Project Design	6

PART II - PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Project Design - Balance Sheet	11
Reasons for Shortcomings	13
The Turnaround	15
Year Four	16

PART III - CONCLUDING ASSESSMENT

Curriculum and Materials	20
Staffing Arrangements	21
Country Support	22
Use of Consultants	23
Unanticipated Consequences	24

PART IV - RECOMMENDATIONS

Continuation of the Project	26
Modifications	26
Relations with Other Training Institutions	27
A Final Comment	28
Appendices	

PART I. Introduction

Evaluation Purpose and Objectives

The basic purpose of this evaluation is to assist the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to determine whether USAID shall continue to financially support the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Regional Development Training Project No. 538-0014 after July 31, 1983, the date the USAID grant is scheduled to terminate.

The objectives of this evaluation are to review the progress to date toward achievement of the Project purpose, outputs and inputs in relation to: (a) the original Project design and implementation schedule, (b) subsequent revision proposed by OECS, and (c) the current situation regarding management training for the public service of the OECS states (Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts/Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines).

Specifically, the evaluation attempts to:

1. Examine the Project's curriculum and materials development and the actual products developed for adequacy and relevance, taking into account current programs of other donors of a similar nature, such as the Caribbean Center for Development Administration (CARICAD), and the Project Administration Training Unit of the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB);
2. Examine current Project staffing arrangements in relation to (a) the original design, (b) adequacy, (c) rate of turnover, (d) status of the Project director position, (e) evaluation capability, and (f) how it fits within the overall OECS structure;
3. Determine the extent to which anticipated country support and contributions--e.g., provision of local trainers--have been made available or can be expected, and how shortcomings affect the Project;

4. Examine the work of consultants to date and future plans for their use in terms of (a) accomplishments, (b) changes in assumptions from the original Project design--e.g., the need for a Program Training Consultant as a repeat short-term counterpart to the Project director--and (c) actual needs at the present time;

5. Determine the extent to which an adequate and continuous evaluation process has been developed and is operational; and

6. Provide recommendations relating to the continuation and/or redesign of the Project.

Evaluation Methodology

To accomplish the purpose of this evaluation--namely, to consider whether the Project should continue after its original termination date--the USAID Mission/Barbados arranged for Dr. Albert Gorvine and Dr. William W. Boyer to act as consultants. USAID contracted directly with Dr. Gorvine, and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) contracted with Dr. Boyer by arrangement with USAID/Barbados.

The period during which this evaluation was undertaken, including the writing of this report, was April 4 to April 30, 1983. The evaluation methodology consisted of the following:

1. A briefing of the consultants by the Human Resources Development Officer (HRDO) of USAID/Barbados.

2. Thorough examination of the Project files, documents, correspondence, and reports at USAID/Barbados.

3. Continuing contact throughout the evaluation period, both at USAID/Barbados and at OECS offices in Antigua and St. Lucia, with the Training Officer of USAID/Barbados.

4. Visits to CARICAD and the Barbados Institute of Management and Productivity (BIMAP) in Barbados and study of relevant documents of these and similar training organizations operating in the region, including the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB).

5. Discussion of the Project with the Director-General of OECS in St. Lucia, and with the Director and the Training Adviser of the Economic Affairs Secretariat (EAS) of OECS in Antigua, including repeated and extensive discussions with the latter.

6. Discussions of the Project with the staff of the OECS Training Unit including its Trainers and Evaluation Officer.

7. Participant-observation of the one and one-half day evaluation meeting at OECS/Antigua of the heads of the training divisions of six of the seven OECS member states and discussion of the training programs with them.

8. Examination of all relevant curricula, training materials, and other documents at OECS/Antigua.

9. Observation of an OECS Middle Management Training Module 1 in session in Antigua.

10. Visit to the Government Training Center of Montserrat to observe an OECS Middle Management Training Module 2 in session, and to discuss the training program with His Excellency, the Governor of Montserrat, and with the Chief Training Officer of the Government of Montserrat.

11. Discussion of the Project with eight former participants in the OECS Middle Management Training Modules 1 and 2, five department heads, the Permanent Secretary of Personnel, and with the Assistant Director of the Training Division -- all of the Government of St. Lucia.

Project Environment

Any attempt to analyze the OECS Management Training Project must first consider the administrative legacies operable in the OECS member states.

It is a paradox of history that the first area of the world to be colonized -- the West Indies -- would be the last to be decolonized. Whatever else colonialism may be, its main purpose is exploitation of one country for the benefit of another country, certainly not for the benefit of the country being colonized. It is therefore predominantly extractive as opposed to introducing inputs for uplift. Accordingly, British colonial administration in the Eastern Caribbean, as elsewhere, was marked chiefly by the executive functions of revenue collection and the maintenance of law and order based almost entirely on the monoculture of sugar.

Although these legacies were conducive to stability, they contribute little to development administration which is aimed at quite an opposite direction -- toward the uplift of the people, not their exploitation. Indeed, insofar as the legacies of colonial administration in the OECS member states emphasize office holding, paper passing, routine services, and control functions, they have proved unable to be adapted to the requirements imposed by change-oriented political leaders and by increasing public demand for more dynamic governmental performance.

In a still incomplete (March 1983) draft of an internal evaluation report of the OECS management training project, the OECS Training Adviser has identified the following "organizational patterns," among others, "on which this project was to impact": an overcentralized colonial system of administration in which local civil servants were relegated to subordinate positions and had no chance to develop; and a Westminster-Whitehall administrative system "irrelevant to the real life situations within the

territories," marked by the tendency to stick to administrative details, a widespread lack of consciousness of obstacles to change, strained relations between Ministers of Government and Public Officials, a paucity of skilled personnel and funds for development, and lack of experience in planning.

A Comment on Management Training

If one were to accept Robert L. Desatnick's definition of management development as "an individual process in the acquisition of new knowledge, skills and attitudes" (A Concise Guide to Management Development, 1970, p. 11), then the question arises as to how this process may be enhanced. The obvious answer is resort to some form of management training.

Developing countries are confronted with the critical problem of insufficient managerial capacity, the consequence of which has been a proliferation of public service management training programs. The results have been mixed, however, giving rise to opposing views of management effectiveness. One view suggests that management training is the only solution to development administration problems, whereas another view holds that management training is wholly useless. Neither view is supportable. The true value of management training is somewhere between these extremes, namely that public service training is just one approach among many approaches to problems of developing countries. According to Ali Beckman, training is no "panacea" nor does it immediately or automatically produce more productive and effective administrators. It is just one piece among other "pieces of the puzzle" that must be put in place to improve performance. (in Swerdlow and Ingle (eds.), Public Administration Training for Less Developed Countries, 1974, p. 169).

Much more can be said of management training, particularly concerning

methods. In his 1970 study, John P. Campbell concluded that "we do not know anything about the relative effectiveness of different training strategies for achieving particular objectives." ("Personnel Training and Development," Annual Review of Psychology, 1971, p. 593). Twelve years later, Dale C. Brandenburg wrote that "No universally accepted model for evaluating training exists, nor are there generally accepted modes of operation or behavior." ("Training Evaluation: What's the Current Status?" Training and Development Journal, August 1982, p. 14).

It is in the context of these general uncertainties about the effectiveness and methods of management training that this evaluation of the OECS Training Project is submitted.

Project Design

On May 23, 1979, the USAID Representative/Barbados approved an authorization of \$4.0 million for the Caribbean Regional Training Project Number 538-0014 of which \$1,550,000 was to be allotted to the Secretariat of the Eastern Caribbean Common Market (ECCM, now OECS) to design and implement a Public Services Training Program over a period of four years.

The Project Paper called for establishment of an ECCM Training Division comprised of a director and a staff of one senior trainer, three training specialists, and one evaluation specialist.* A training consultant, moreover, was to provide technical assistance to the ECCM unit at periodic intervals during the first three years of the Project. In addition, the Project Paper envisaged a central training unit in each of the seven member states

*Changed in July 1981 to a director, 4 trainers, an administrative assistant, an evaluation specialist, and 2 secretaries.

consisting of a training officer plus at least two additional middle level persons who would be trained as trainers and would commit at least 40%-50% of their time to the training function. The ECCM training unit was to be responsible for the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of the Public Services Training Program.

Six components were to comprise the Public Services Training Program, according to the Project Paper, as follow:

1. A top management program aimed at the grades of permanent secretaries and the heads of divisions, public corporations, and specialized agencies, "to provide top management with effective training experiences early in the implementation phase to encourage them to publicly support the program and to release lower ecnelon staff for ensuing programs." A core program was anticipated divided into six three-day residential seminars, as follows: (a) organization behaviour and design; (b) management of change; (c) development planning and administration; (d) communications: (e) servicing international/inter-regional organizations; and (f) managing the personnel function. It was envisaged that all programs for top management would be conducted exclusively by the ECCM training unit staff and whatever consultant services it might require from time to time.

2. A middle level management program aimed at the grades of principal assistant secretary, assistant secretary, department heads, and equivalents, and comprised of a core program divided into two five-day non-residential seminars: (a) human resources development, and (b) organizational planning and budgeting. In order to accommodate all mid-level managers of the seven member states, a total of approximately 56 seminars, with an average of 20 participants in each, was anticipated. According to the Project Paper:

The ECCM training unit will be responsible for designing and implementing the mid-level program. However, seminars will be conducted with the assistance of island specific training staff,

and the responsibility for this program will gradually shift to the latter group in a systematic manner over the life of the project.

3. A junior level management program aimed at the first line supervisory grades, i.e. senior executive officers, executive officers and equivalents, and comprised of a core program divided into three five-day non-residential seminars: (a) human resources development, (b) organizational planning and budgeting, and (c) office management. A total of approximately 116 junior level seminars during the life of the Project was anticipated, to be designed and implemented primarily by the island trainers in each state, beginning about 15 months into the program.

4. A clerical and supportive grades skills program consisting of a two-week core program on the following areas: (a) accounting systems in the public service, (b) functions of public service departments and agencies, (c) attitudes toward work, (d) discipline, (e) communication systems in the public service, (f) role and structure of the public service, and (g) public relations. The Project Paper anticipated that the ECCM Training Unit would be responsible only for course design, materials development, and the teaching of pilot courses in each island, that local trainers in each territory would take responsibility for actually conducting all training for the approximately 2,900 workers at this level, and that such training would commence at the end of two years of the Project and would be completed by the end of the Project but would be continued indefinitely. The Project Paper states: "It is anticipated that Governments' commitment to this program be sought at the end of year two of the project. If it is not attained in terms of specific resources (two to three trainers per island) then this aspect of the project should be dropped."

5. A training for trainers program aimed at the training of three

trainers (the training officers and two part-time trainers) in each state by the ECCM training unit, and consisting of: (a) annual workshops for all 21 trainers, (b) intermittent two-day training meetings, (c) on-the-job training, for which the states' trainers will take increasing responsibility in the middle management program and complete responsibility under guidance of the ECCM trainers for the junior management and clerical/support training programs, and (d) inter-island exchange, in which local trainers may in time be asked to help train in seminars on islands other than their own.

6. An ECCM Secretariat development program aimed at internal staff development and consisting of two types: (a) over approximately four months of the life of the Project, the learning of new design, training, and evaluation skills from one another and/or from short term consultants plus the specialized technical assistance to be periodically provided by the program consultant during the first three years of the Project, and (b) over approximately two to four months, the strengthening of the ECCM Secretariat in management training workshops conducted by a mixture of training and consulting services.

In addition to the foregoing six components of the Public Service Training Program, the Project Paper anticipated the following special features:

- (a) An evaluation system for continuous monitoring and refinement of the training program, including the measurement of participant reaction;
- (b) The development of West Indian training materials, including case studies;
- (c) The establishment of libraries or training resource centers, including the acquisition of training equipment, in the seven member states and at the ECCM Secretariat;

(d) The utilization of non-project, local, or "resource" personnel from time to time to assist in teaching seminars;

(e) Regional or sub-regional special focus seminars (SFS) dealing with technical subject matter (e.g., in agriculture, health, education, etc.) or dealing with management and public administration for more selective audiences in the top and middle management levels of the public service (e.g., financial management);

(f) A reality-based training approach that emphasizes participatory, experiential, learning uncommon in the West Indies;

(g) Provision of organizational development technical assistance through the ECCM Secretariat by utilization of the advisory services of the Caribbean project of the Latin American Center for Development Administration (CLAD), and by utilization of consultants; and

(h) The gradual pick up of the costs of the Project activities after the first two years by the ECCM Secretariat and the member Governments, to continue those activities after the life of the Project.

Part II. Project Implementation

Project Design: Balance Sheet

In terms of the above six components called for by the Project Paper, the following have been accomplished to date:

1. OECS/TU has conducted one top management seminar for St. Kitts-Nevis and one for St. Vincent and the Grenadines, but the Project Paper's format of six three-day residential seminars was not consistently followed. Instead, the St. Kitts program consisted of one three-day seminar for one group and five half-day non-residential seminars for another group, while the St. Vincent seminar also consisted of a program of five half-day non-residential seminars. Two three-day residential seminars are scheduled for Montserrat May 10-12 and 17-19, 1983. One three-day residential seminar is scheduled for Dominica for June 1983.

2. Since June 1982, almost all middle level managers of the seven OECS states have completed the two five-day non-residential seminars, the so-called Module 1 and Module 2, conducted by the two teams of OECS trainers of two trainers each. Only Antigua and St. Vincent middle managers remain to complete Module 2. Instead of 66 seminars anticipated by the Project Paper during the four-year life of the Project, 36 have been completed within the last or fourth year of the Project, with 5 more scheduled for Antigua between May 9 and June 24, 1983, and 2 for St. Vincent May 9-20, 1983. (See Appendix 1). Only in St. Lucia were local "trainers" involved in providing some of the training. This is to say that the Project Paper's anticipation of one training officer plus two part-time training assistants, who would devote 40%-50% of their time to training, has been realized only in St. Lucia.

3. Nothing has been accomplished concerning the training of junior level managers, as called for by the Project Paper.

4. Nothing has been accomplished concerning the training of clerical and supportive staff, as called for by the Project Paper.

5. With respect to the training of trainers program anticipated by the Project Paper, OECS/TU: (a) has completed one-time workshops for the trainers of all seven members states with the assistance of three management consultants; (b) has completed two two-day training meetings for local training officers; (c) has done nothing with respect to on-the-job training of local trainers, but some progress in this direction has been variously achieved concerning junior level managers and clerical/support staff in Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis, and St. Lucia; and (d) has yet to foster inter-island exchange of local trainers.

6. The anticipated OECS Secretariat development program: (a) has completed, over approximately four months of the Project, the learning of new design, training, and evaluation skills, with the assistance of the program consultant -- but not periodically over the first three Project years in the sense of a continuing relationship: and (b) has completed a needs assessment toward the strengthening of the OECS Secretariat in management and administration, and (c) has an ongoing program to increase the technical skills of the Secretariat's accountants.

With respect to the additional special features anticipated by the Project Paper: (a) the OECS/TU evaluation system is being developed; (b) a start has been made in developing West Indian training materials; (c) libraries or training resource centers in each of the seven states are in the process of being established; (d) some outside "resource" personnel have been utilized, especially in teaching Module 2 seminars; (e) OECS/TU has conducted

one special focus seminar in tax administration for the whole OECS region; (f) a reality-based experiential training approach has been institutionalized; (g) no organizational development technical assistance through OECS-TU has been undertaken; and (h) no costs of the Project have yet been picked up by the OECS Secretariat and/or the member Governments.

The foregoing balance sheet reveals a number of important disparities between Project Paper goals and actual performance. To summarize -- nothing has been done regarding training programs for junior level managers and clerical/support personnel; little has been accomplished with respect to programs for top management; and only partial success has been registered concerning a trainer for trainers program, an OECS Secretariat development program, and the special features called for by the Project Paper.

In addition, as the OECS/TU internal evaluation itself states:

The Unit has failed to adequately sensitize the Member Governments to their responsibilities to the Project. This is manifested in the fact that to date the nature of the Island-Specific Training Units has not really changed. In most cases the "postal" function is still the primary function of these Training Units. Enough transfer of training skills to identified island Trainers has not occurred, and in the case of some islands potential has not even been identified. No clear role has been established for OECS/TU in the Training Divisions of Member States

In the case of one Member State viz Antigua/Barbuda the Unit has failed to motivate that State to be more actively involved.

Reasons for Shortcomings

What are the reasons for these Project shortcomings?

One could, of course, assign in general Project failures to the lack of sufficient absorptive capacity of the host countries, and this is probably accurate, but more specific explanation is required. It is very clear that there were serious start-up problems in implementing the Project.

For the first two years, the conditions precedent had not been met and, therefore, no funds were released to ECCM. Indeed, no training unit existed to which funds could be released. When the training unit was finally established in July/August, 1981, and six member countries had agreed to participate (St. Vincent and the Grenadines did not join the Project until the fall of 1982), its beginning was difficult. The OECS/TU internal evaluation explains:

Unfortunately, the Unit got off to a slow start such that for the first six months of its existence no meaningful attempts were made to respond to the urgent needs of Member Countries for training. Internal conflicts and uncertainties caused the Unit to be incapable of determining a training approach.

Accordingly, no progress was experienced during the first two and one-half years of the four-year program called for by the Project Paper.

Evidence exists to suggest that the first director of the training unit was an unfortunate choice, who was responsible for many of the "internal conflicts and uncertainties" experienced by the training unit during its early months. It was apparent, for example, that he opposed needs assessments and the uncommon experiential approach to training as called for by the Project Paper.

Meanwhile, during the long hiatus of over two years between the approval of the Project in May 1979 and the establishment of the training unit in July/August 1981, the Caribbean Centre for Development Administration (CARICAD) attempted to fill the training void in the ECCM member countries by undertaking a number of training programs, particularly for top management. Indeed, in a remarkable "Brief on ECCM/USAID Public Service Training

Programme" of January 1981, CARICAD went so far as to candidly propose that ECCM/USAID subcontract to CARICAD these programs called for by the Project Paper: (1) team development, training of trainers, programming and program planning and development, (2) top management training for the first two years, (3) the strengthening of training units in the various countries, and (4) the program assessment and evaluation. CARICAD also proposed it be subcontracted "to assist in the overall control and direction of the programme." The "Brief" ended with this admonition: "Certainly it would be a less than optimum situation if the ECCM/USAID project would go off on its own without due regard to what already exists and what has already been done."

CARICAD rationalized its proposal as a means to help the ECCM/USAID training project "to get off the ground" and as a response to the following recommendation of an October 1980 Training of Trainers Workshop in which reportedly all of CARICAD's and ECCM's member states were represented:

Whereas countries in the region are anxious to derive the benefits from the ECCM Public Service Training Project and whereas the capacity to deliver this type of training exists within the region, the ECCM should be encouraged to explore avenues other than those prescribed to ensure early delivery of training that is much needed in the region.

The Turnaround

With the encouragement of USAID, a turnaround in the Project during the early months of 1982 was brought about in part by the influence of consultants. Although anticipated by the Project Paper, the training unit's director had opposed the use of consultants.

The first consultancy consisted primarily of the consultant working with the staff of the training unit to clarify goals, gather data, and plan a schedule dealing with such issues as the development of materials, the nature of experiential training, and the problem of the morale of the training

The second consultancy consisted of two consultants who assisted the training unit to mount a training of trainers program for the then six member states and for all members of the Secretariat's training unit.

Following immediately the second consultancy was a third consultancy whose purpose was to help develop a middle level managers training course, including the design and delivery of training materials, and to help conduct a needs assessment survey in two territories. The survey resulted in the design of a pilot program for St. Lucia that focused on "Leadership Skills Development," to which the director of the training unit objected.

A change of leadership was occasioned in April 1982 by the ECCM becoming the Economic Affairs Secretariat (EAS) of the OECS. The new EAS director immediately undertook an assessment of the functioning of OECS/TU which resulted in the resignation of its director and the appointment on June 1, 1982, of the Training Adviser to act as chief of OECS/TU.

Thus, the influence of the consultants and the changed of leadership combined to prepare OECS/TU to finally become productive, but not until the onset of the final or fourth year of the Project.

Year Four

With the leadership problems of OECS/TU resolved, at least for the time being, all of the all accomplishments of the Project goals as set forth in the foregoing "balance sheet" section of this paper -- except for the earlier staffing and the Training of Trainers workshop -- were realized during Year Four of the Project.

Immediately upon assuming his post, the new Training Adviser designed a Proposed Work Plan 6/1982 - 6/1983. Of 61 items listed in the work plan to be accomplished through April 1983, 47 have been completed. Almost all remaining items have been rescheduled. (See Appendix C)

Most notable have been the needs assessment exercises conducted in all member states, followed by the designing and delivery of two five-day training modules for middle level managers of all member states.

The training unit has developed a materials section that has produced training manuals, a number of cases and role plays, and has identified relevant articles and papers on management theory. The training delivery teams have been the main outreach of OECS/TU for establishing a firm linkage with the island training divisions. The large number of participants in the program, and their high attendance level, reflect the support of the member states. All chief executives of these states, moreover, have publicly expressed their support for the program.

An evaluation process was initiated in January 1983, with the hiring of an evaluation specialist. This involved evaluation of individual units, course, and post-course application of individual "back-home plan" learning on the job. The responses of participants and their supervisors have been analyzed and directions for additional training identified. Evaluation sheets for each section of each module are administered each module day. (See Appendix 3). An End-of-Course evaluation is also carried out. (See Appendix 4). Finally, a personal visit to supervisors and participants is made three to four months after completion of the course to evaluate the supervisors' reactions to the performance changes of the participants. (See Appendices 5 and 6). Instruments for the evaluation of training officers of member states have yet to be developed.

OECS/TU has also undertaken late in Year Four planning for the future principally in terms of training, organizational development and structure, and staff development of OECS/TU.

Course and post-course evaluations to date indicate a strong desire for further training in planning, communications, job analysis, personnel management, budget control, cost control, and financial management. Although all of these areas were dealt with generally in the middle management program, future programming would focus more specifically on each of these areas requiring some departure from the approach envisaged in the Project Paper.

In addition, OECS/TU perceived a strong need to develop within the member states organizational diagnosis and structuring skills, including skills development in job evaluation techniques. In its internal evaluation paper, OECS/TU has stated that:

All of the Member States are attempting to respond to the challenges of the eighties by restructuring their public services so that they are less "administrative" and more "management" oriented. Attempts to do this have been sporadic and ineffective primarily because they have been dependent on donor/external agencies to provide the personnel for such activity. The time is now ripe for the OECS to create a pool of persons within the Region with the skills to perform such tasks.

OECS/TU also is planning "a concerted attempt" during the next year to activate a top management training program as envisaged by the Project Paper. Acknowledging in the OECS/TU internal evaluation paper that other "agencies" have been active in focusing on training top managers, these efforts have been termed "sporadic" by OECS/TU. Sectoral, or "functional", training of top managers on a regional basis is also planned by OECS/TU dealing with, for example, personnel administration, public financial policy formulation, information services, and industrial development.

It is interesting to note that CARICAD is not mentioned by name in the OECS/TU internal evaluation paper. In discussions with the EAS director and the OECS/TU training adviser, however, assurances of "cooperation" with CARICAD (e.g., team teaching, joint courses, etc.) were forthcoming. Evidence

suggests, moreover, that OECS/TU has already initiated a cooperative effort in this direction, during the course of and possibly in response to USAID's evaluation process.

Finally, OECS/TU plans to do more "to rationalize the role and performance of the training function" in its training of trainers efforts, and to program OECS/TU "to make departmental interventions as change agents," by developing its own "advisory" capabilities.

Part III - Concluding Assessment

Part I and II of this evaluation paper have focused principally on our findings concerning what has been done with respect to the Project. Now we turn our attention to our own conclusions about the Project in terms both of the assigned purpose and objectives (i.e., scope of work) for this evaluation and to several other conclusions we have reached.

Curriculum and Materials

Reference has already been ^{ade} ~~made~~ to the productivity of the materials section of OECS/TU. The case studies and role plays used in the training sessions of the middle management modules appear to us to be more pertinent to the experiential, reality-based, mode of training approach than do the academic-type articles and commentaries provided in each participant's resource notebook, because the former evoke the actual participation of the trainees in the learning process.

The topics comprising Modules 1 and 2 were determined by a needs assessment in each member state. The curriculum, therefore, is not the same in each state, and we think this is a rational way to construct curricula. In general, however, Module 1 deals with the colonial background of the civil service in the West Indies, roles of the supervisor, and communications and leadership, whereas Module 2 concerns the process of change, the budget process, planning, performance appraisal, and organizational diagnosis.

We conclude that the curriculum and training materials are both adequate and relevant to the middle management level and are utilized in a manner whereby the participants themselves are induced to gear the subject matter to their level based on their own experiences. Although CARICAD deals

with some of the same subjects in its top management training, they are more comprehensively treated on a government-wide, as distinguished from an agency, context. The CDB management training program deals solely with assisting individuals in the preparation of projects and their implementation. Accordingly, we judge that the OECS/TU approach is sufficiently differentiated from other current training programs in the region.

Staffing Arrangements

We perceive that current staffing arrangements of OECS/TU are adequate in terms of the concentration to date of offering the middle management modules, although the two two-person training teams may have been overworked in trying to accomplish so much over the past Year Four. All four training officers have bachelor's degrees and two have masters degrees, and are well qualified for training at this level. Should OECS/TU take on new programs as planned for the future, however, then staff must be augmented accordingly. Moreover, there are no back-up personnel other than the Training Adviser to replace these key staff should resignation or illness occur. No turnover in staff has taken place in Year Four.

We have been very much impressed with the quality of the training offered by the training teams. They have been eminently successful in eliciting the participation of the trainees in the experiential learning process and in maintaining their interest. The recruitment of the evaluation specialist, moreover, appears to be an appointment of major importance. Having both bachelor's and a master's degrees in adult education, she has established herself as a first-class professional within OECS/TU.

The Training Adviser has been successful in exercising much needed leadership effectively to overcome the low morale of the staff experienced

under the previous director, and in molding them into a dynamic and highly productive team with an evident *esprit de corps* and program loyalty. Upon inquiry whether the title of Training Adviser, as distinguished from OECS/TU director or chief, implied responsibility without commensurate authority, we were assured by both the EAS Director and the Training Adviser that such an implication is without foundation in fact. Indeed, the title appears simply for salary purposes; the incumbent Training Adviser could not have received a salary sufficient to attract him to the post, had he been appointed as director. The only shortcoming discovered in the performance of the Training Adviser was his failure to involve Antigua/Barbuda earlier in Year Four.

So far as the training unit's fit within the overall structure of OECS is concerned, we are assured that OECS/TU enjoys the full support of both the EAS director and the OECS Director-General.

Country Support

Although local training officers are in place in each member state, and all member states are now committed to the middle-level programs, no funding of the Project has been contributed by the member states. Such funding does not appear imminent, nor are we able to speculate when it will be forthcoming. Should the Project be continued, and Year Four would be counted as Year One, some country funding might be anticipated. It should be emphasized, however, that member states could contribute financially to Project goals by strengthening their own training divisions' capacity to assume responsibilities for training now performed by OECS/TU, as envisaged in the Project Paper. Indeed, the Training Adviser's long-range goal for OECS/TU is to scale down its training functions as member states develop such capacities. This will take much more time than the single productive year the Project has allowed.

Some member states have made more progress than others in strengthening their training capabilities, while all chief executives are committed to training to achieve development goals. The Governor of Montserrat, for example, has recently promoted his training adviser to Permanent Secretary over all personnel matters. Interviews with five St. Lucia department heads, and with eight St. Lucia middle level managers who participated in the training modules, indicated strong support of training will be forthcoming in that state. Grenada seems to have done more than any other member state in planning its training effort. Overall, however, all member countries are still fragile, infant states and apparently will need more time to develop training infrastructure, programs, and personnel than that anticipated in the Project Paper. Meanwhile, OECS/TU has developed to the point--within one year only--where it now enjoys the full endorsement of all member states.

Use of Consultants

With regard to the future use of consultants, should the Project be continued, we have detected some trepidation on the part of OECS/TU as witness this statement from its internal evaluation paper:

One problem which surfaces directly as a result of the narrow range of natural resources in the region is the lack of sufficient funds for development programmes. As a result, there is heavy reliance on external funding - the donors of which stipulate and make the decisions as to how the funds must be utilized. In some respects, this external decision-making stifles local technological innovations and encourages complacency among some administrators. They tend to rely too heavily on planning generated from external agencies and are not sufficiently vocal to demand that they have some input in the planning of schemes and programmes. When implementation of externally imposed plans are unsuccessful, civil servants are often blamed by both external and local critics.

Despite this statement, the Training Adviser disclosed that he might request the use of consultants in the future should occasions arise.

However, both he and the EAS director informed us that consultants were not utilized during Year Four because OECS/TU had "something to prove" given the late start-up of the Project. No needs for consultants at the present time were expressed. It is our impression, nevertheless, that OECS/TU will request consultants to help launch programs planned for the future should the Project be extended.

Unanticipated Consequences

Certain consequences of the Project's implementation, particularly in Year Four, have resulted which were unanticipated in the Project Paper.

1. Participation in the middle management training programs has fostered lateral coordination within the administrative systems of member states. We observed this phenomenon in both Montserrat and St. Lucia. Evidence exists that former participants have maintained friendships and collegiality fostered during their training, and an "old-boys" network of sorts appears to have developed. Instead of the colonial administrative legacy, marked by rigid compartmentalized hierarchies characterizing middle management levels, information is now shared laterally to overcome development problems.

2. OECS/TU's focus on middle management, rather than on top management, training has had the unanticipated consequence of tapping the well-springs of hope, enthusiasm, and creativity among middle managers of the member states far beyond that anticipated in the Project Paper.

There is no question in our minds that a new sense of dignity and self-worth has been imparted to middle managers that can only have a democratizing effect on their public services. Had the training effort concentrated on top management early in the Project, as called for ^{by} the Project _^

Paper, the result might well have been a fostering of elitism in already highly elite administrative systems, as experienced in other countries such as Pakistan. Paradoxically, OECS/TU's initial training concentration on middle managers can only have "grass roots" effects that will help breakdown some of the most onerous of colonial administrative legacies.

Part IV - Recommendations

Continuation of the Project

We recommend that Project No. 538-0014 be continued.

To date, approximately \$400,000, or roughly one-fourth of the authorization of \$1,550,000 for the four years of the Project, has been expended. We recommend that USAID authorize OECS to expend the balance over a period of time to be negotiated.

This recommendation is made on the basis of significant OECS/TU progress during Year Four, and the momentum it has established for the future.

The original Project Paper acknowledges the possible dropping of the clerical/support training component of the Project, and OECS/TU has no plans at present to activate this component. Its accomplishments over Year Four, together with its plans for the future, evoke confidence that OECS/TU will be able to make substantial progress toward achieving most other goals of the Project Plan.

Accordingly, we do not believe that the Project Paper must be redesigned, but a reordering of Project priorities should be permitted; program and budget modification should be authorized.

Modifications

One modification we recommend be authorized is the strengthening of OECS/TU staff through participant training and observation in the United States at training programs such as those offered by the National Training Laboratory.

We recommend, moreover, that the Training Adviser be authorized to visit selected training institutions in the United States, Canada, Europe, Africa, and/or Asia.

Finally, we recommend that OECS/TU be authorized to add research officers to its staff to develop training materials and to be trained as back-up trainers to the current four trainers of the training unit.

One addendum is in order here, and that is USAID should consider giving local training officers opportunities for brief training exposures abroad under Regional Training Project II.

Relations with Other Training Institutions

We recommend, given the proliferation of various training institutions in the region, that a mechanism be established to facilitate collaboration among them.

The paucity of resources in the region, both human and financial, ordains that they be brought together to rationalize their activities in relation to the islands' training needs. Perhaps an overall committee should be formed to do this. We believe that the initiative should come from OECS/TU because it is now the most ^{structured} ~~significant~~ of the various training institutions in the region.

A Final Comment

As we commented in Part I of this paper, training is no "panacea". There is nothing finite about it. Training must be a continuous, never-ending, process--constantly changing in ^sresponse to changing environmental conditions. This is especially true in the OECS member states. These are infant, fragile, mini-states still wrestling with the legacies of their colonial ~~past~~s and the harsh realities of development.

The USAID mission here has recognized these constraints, and has exercised extraordinary patience and prodding that has salvaged this very worthwhile project after such an unpromising beginning. The consequence of USAID's supportive patience is the rapid and successful development of OECS/TU.