

P.D - ABC-326
ISA 69975

FINAL REPORT

**EVALUATION OF LATIN AMERICAN
SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM OF
AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES (LASPAU)**

GRADUATE ECONOMICS TRAINING

Policy Analysis and Implementation Project
(522-0325)

Indefinite Quantity Contract
PDC-0085-I-20-9060-00
Delivery Order 20

Presented to:

USAID/Tegucigalpa
Honduras

Presented by:

Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc.
1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

January, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE NO.</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT	viii
I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1
II. THE PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS OF THE EVALUATION	4
A. Objective of Training	
B. Selection Criteria	
C. Recruitment Procedures	
D. Upgrading Training	
E. Placement Procedures	
F. Monitoring, Complementary Activities and Group Building	
G. Administrative	
III. LESSONS LEARNED AND COMMENTS ON DEVELOPMENT	33
Annex A: Project Identification Data Sheet	
Annex B: Draft A.I.D. Project Evaluation Summary Form	
Appendices	
1. The Scope of Work - Work Order #20	
2. Current Logical Framework	
3. List of Individuals Consulted - by Agency	
Part One: AID/W	
Part Two: USAID/Honduras (Tegucigalpa)	
Part Three: LASPAU - Cambridge, MA	
Part Four: San Diego State University Faculty Students (Interviewed and sent Questionnaires)	

4. List of Documents Reviewed

- Part One: AID Documents**
 - A: Documents Related to Project Administration**
 - B: Project Correspondence**
 - C: Participant Dossiers Reviewed**
- Part Two: LASPAU Documents**
- Part Three: Documents from San Diego State University**

5. Evaluative Instruments

- Part One: Cover Letter to Participants for Questionnaire**
- Part Two: LASPAU/Scholar Questionnaire**

6. Placement and Status of Selected Candidates, 1989-1990

7. "Aide Memoire" LASPAU, August 9, 1990

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This summary is organized to provide A) Objectives; B) Purpose; C) Methodology; D) Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations; E) Lessons Learned; and F) Comments on Development Impact of the Final Report/Evaluation of the LASPAU/Honduras Graduate Economics Training Program.

A. Objective

In support of the Policy Analysis and Implementation Project, (522-0325) the USAID Mission in Honduras provided the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU) a grant of \$2,307,160 on November 10, 1988. The grant provided funds for LASPAU to place selected Honduran candidates among the top 30 economics programs (as determined by the rankings of the American Economic Association) in U.S. universities. LASPAU committed itself to developing a group of thirty-five well-trained professionals (25 Masters' and 10 Ph.D.'s) who will constitute a technical corps to formulate and implement effective economic policy. The terminal date for this training is August 31, 1994.

B. Purpose

The Mission, after a semi-annual project review, decided to conduct an evaluation of this sub-component of the Project to determine the efficiency of LASPAU and assist the Mission in making further decisions with regard to this training program. The purpose of this evaluation was to assess LASPAU accomplishments to date and to make recommendations for resolving major constraints which threaten the success of the training program under the grant. Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc. under A.I.D. Indefinite Quantity Contract PDC 0085-I-0006097, (Work Order No. 20), with Hunter Fitzgerald as evaluator, was contracted to complete such an evaluation.

C. Methodology

The evaluation contractor reviewed documents from A.I.D., including the original project paper, the A.I.D. LASPAU grant document with LASPAU's unsolicited proposal, and student files at USAID/Tegucigalpa; documents from LASPAU in Cambridge, Massachusetts, including project management forms and student files; and documents from the American Language Institute (ALI) at San Diego State University (SDSU), including applications, grade forms, and selection information. Some 185 documents and files were reviewed. The contractor also made site visits to A.I.D./Washington offices in charge of graduate training in economics policy analysis, to LASPAU in Cambridge (on two separate occasions), and to ALI in San Diego. Prior to his field work, the contractor visited Honduras and met with the Project Officer and other USAID staff. A second trip to Honduras was made to provide USAID officials an opportunity to comment on evaluation findings and recommendations.

In the course of the evaluation the contractor interviewed over 48 individuals, including 3 participants, and he contacted the remaining participants by telephone. Through these and other appropriate information gathering methods, such as three as in-person student interviews and 20 student questionnaires sent of which 16 were returned, the evaluation contractor addressed a number of critical questions and issues, including, but not limited to:

- o Objectives of Training
- o Selection Criteria
- o Recruitment Procedures
- o Upgrading Training
- o Placement Procedures
- o Complementary Activities and Group Building
- o Comprehensive Progress Monitoring
- o Participation in Activities to Complement Core Program
- o Development of Policy Making and Policy Direction Skills through Special Seminars

D. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The evaluation arrived at the following findings, conclusions and recommendations:

1. Objective of training

FINDINGS: LASPAU realized from its previous project experience that some upgrading training for participants would be required for the project to achieve its goals. The evaluation found that there are excellent economics programs in Latin America suitable for training students before sending them on to the U.S.

CONCLUSIONS: The evaluation determined that the objective of 10 Ph.D.'s and 25 M.A.'s is realistic; the option to utilize Latin American universities for M.A. degrees is feasible.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The evaluation recommends that the Mission complete the training program as envisioned in the Project with the adjustment of sending a limited number of candidates to Latin American Universities for their M.A.'s first, and then on to the U.S. for placement in economics programs in top university graduate schools.

2. Selection Criteria

FINDING: LASPAU managed the selection process on its own, utilizing a project committee of "in-house" experts.

CONCLUSION: LASPAU did follow the established selection criteria but, particularly in the second group, a small number was selected with lower level language skills and/or analytical abilities.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The evaluation recommends the following modifications in the selection process: 1) the selection committee should conduct a part of the selection interview in English to help determine applicant English language proficiency; 2) LASPAU should raise the minimum range of acceptable test scores for the PAEG; 3) the Mission should implement a second phase of the selection in which the Mission and LASPAU will interview the finalists and the Mission will provide final approval; 4) LASPAU should contract with an eminent economist not affiliated with any LASPAU-sponsoring institution to serve on the selection committee.

3. Recruitment Procedures

FINDINGS: LASPAU sought out candidates with higher level analytical abilities, even those who were in disciplines outside of economics. Discounting cultural factors, the same opportunities were available to women as for men.

CONCLUSIONS: The evaluation found promotional activities to be adequate. Women had the same opportunities to apply to the program as men. Those entities targeted for recruitment, such as government ministries and agencies, private sector, and graduates of Mission scholarship programs, were appropriate.

RECOMMENDATION: Current promotional activities will have to be expanded and candidates recruited from other sources if more economists are to be recruited.

4. Upgrading Training

FINDINGS: LASPAU placed scholars in upgrading training on a case-by-case basis. Most scholars received a full six months' of orientation and/or English language training even if they were already proficient. Scholars placed in upgrading training experienced above-normal increases in average TOEFL scores. These scholars also received an organized but low-key introduction to U.S. education, customs, and culture. The Honduran scholars were mixed with other LASPAU programs at SDSU.

CONCLUSIONS: Based on student assessments, evaluation team reviews and observations, and the comments of the staffs of LASPAU and SDSU, the evaluation determined the preliminary upgrading training (at SDSU) and follow-up upgrading during academic programs were more than adequate. The evaluation found that the majority of LASPAU/Honduras Scholars have been placed (18 out of a total of 23) with four more to be placed in January of 1991. There appears to be one doubtful case. The evaluation recommends that LASPAU resolve the doubtful case on leave of absence and follow-up to insure that the other four are in academic training by January 1991. The evaluation determined that some upgrading training did continue on into academic programs, mainly in English as a Second Language, Freshman English, a writing class, and Undergraduate Economics. The effect of the additional demands of upgrading training on participant performance was minimal except in the cases where scholars could not meet minimal English language requirements on the TOEFL. The

evaluation concluded that the mixing of LASPAU/Honduras scholars with the other LASPAU programs had negative impacts.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Both the practice of mixing LASPAU/ Honduras scholars with programs from other countries as well as the form and content of the progress reports SDSU provides to the Mission and LASPAU for project management need to be addressed in subsequent upgrading programs. The practice of assigning all scholars to six months' of orientation and/or English language training, regardless of proficiency, ought to be reconsidered. The evaluation also recommends that any further upgrading agreements with other institutions and LASPAU be announced well in advance and awarded competitively. Furthermore, clear contractual language should provide for keeping Hondurans administratively separate, reporting requirements which define more useful reports, having catch up building activities, and giving more professional level participation such as field visits, lectures, and seminars in the economics field.

5. Placement Procedures

FINDINGS: Serious problems arose during placement procedures, mostly with the 1990 placements. The Mission and LASPAU clarified the situation, and on August 9, 1990 LASPAU issued a written policy statement which repeated what was included in the Grant agreement.

CONCLUSIONS: LASPAU's placement procedures were neither systematic nor consistent, and LASPAU did not encourage participation by scholars in the process. Moreover, the evaluation determined that the time between final selection and application is not adequate to contact the schools and process the necessary documentation.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The evaluation recommends that LASPAU proceed with future placements in accordance with its written policy statement and the Grant agreement. The evaluation further recommends that LASPAU should consider revising its selection procedure time schedule to an earlier period so that applications are submitted earlier to a wider variety of the top 30 economics programs.

6. Monitoring, Complementary Activities and Group Building

FINDINGS: LASPAU provided comprehensive monitoring of the progress of all participants. LASPAU is required to submit semi-annual reports as well as financial reports as specified by the Grant. The Mission has received only one out of the four required semi-annual reports and has not received copies of the financial reports from AID/W. The evaluation found no written plan or strategy for complementary activities, and LASPAU has not conducted any special seminars until now but plans a February 1991 Seminar for all scholars and three additional state-of-the-art workshops.

CONCLUSIONS: LASPAU has not met the requirements of the Grant for submission of semi-annual reports. The evaluation concluded that LASPAU-organized complementary activities were limited to some at the pre-academic phase (mainly at SDSU) with possibly four more programs, noted above, in the future. The implementation of this phase of the project was deficient. The implementation of the group building phase of the project has been delayed.

RECOMMENDATIONS: LASPAU should provide the Mission project officer with all future semi-annual reports on a timely basis. LASPAU should also provide a comprehensive report for the period November 1988 through December 1990 following the reporting requirements of the semi-annual report. Additionally, LASPAU should verify its compliance with financial reporting requirements vis-a-vis AID/W. The evaluation recommends that LASPAU proceed with planned group building and complementary activities and possibly add more based on scholar, GOH, Honduran private sector, and Mission suggestions. The evaluation recommends that LASPAU develop and implement carefully planned activities to begin earlier in the project or as each group arrives. This includes LASPAU written plans with descriptions of activities and timetables.

7. Administration

FINDINGS: The Mission utilized the grant mechanism and a non-competitive procurement in awarding this project to LASPAU. LASPAU conducted the project within its normal operating guidelines with minimal Mission involvement. LASPAU and its subcontractor SDSU provided the Mission with large amounts of raw data related to various aspects of the project. Participant tuition costs seem likely to exceed LASPAU's original projections because of an inability to obtain an sufficient number of tuition waivers.

CONCLUSIONS: The Mission and/or the GOH were not able to exercise sufficient management control over the training program because of the grant mode of contracting, which allows the grantee (LASPAU) to conduct the program under its own rules and regulations. The evaluation found that LASPAU has submitted valuable data but without synthesis and interpretation. The evaluation determined that, due to the special nature and requirements of the project, LASPAU has not been able to obtain the anticipated tuition waivers it normally obtains. LASPAU agreed to provide USAID/Tegucigalpa a detailed analysis including future requirements to meet project objectives.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The evaluation recommends that the Mission award any contract increases and extensions and new projects competitively and use the contract mode. The evaluation recommends that the grantee should prepare information in such a manner and format that it will be useful to Mission and GOH project managers. The evaluation recommends that LASPAU submit the financial analysis regarding tuition waivers as soon as possible for Mission review and consideration.

8. Summary

CONCLUSIONS: The evaluation presents a series of findings with recommendations for Mission consideration. For the future pre-academic upgrading training it recommends seeking a competitive proposals from other language institutes. It also suggests that on a limited basis some candidates be sent to Latin American University Economics training centers of excellence for a masters degree to be followed by a U.S. Ph.D. from a top U.S. university. More recommendations are made for the purpose of improving the Projects' future implementation.

RECOMMENDATION: The evaluation recommends that the Mission complete the Grant with LASPAU as programmed, implementing those contractor recommendations the Mission decides to utilize.

E. Lessons Learned

The Final Report lists six lessons learned which are:

1. With concerted effort it was possible to find very good to excellent Honduran candidates for graduate level training in top economics faculties.
2. The entity responsible for recruiting 10 Ph.D. and 25 M.A. candidates for graduate level training in top U.S. economics university graduate schools has to conduct long term and intensive recruitment campaigns, indicating the need for comprehensive programming.
3. Relatively low English language proficiency (as measured on the TOEFL) and lower test scores on analytical abilities (as measured on the PAEG) are both predictors of future problems and/or slow progress in upgrading and/or academic training.
4. A well-planned and executed initial upgrading program was beneficial to most scholars both in raising TOEFL scores an average of 77 points and for making up subject matter deficiencies. A secondary but still valuable benefit for those scholars requiring upgrading training was that this time also served as a "transition or settling-in period" for adjusting to U.S. academic life and to U.S. customs and culture. This was true even for scholars with excellent English language skills, though of course it cannot by itself justify sending such students to upgrading training if they do not have academic needs for this training.
5. Placement needs to be closely monitored by the contracting or granting institution to ensure the grantee puts candidates in the agreed upon institutions.

6. The preferred contractual methods are contract or cooperative agreement (over grant) which give more control to and involvement of the Mission.

F. Comments on Development Impact

This section is based on evaluation findings; scholar interviews and completed questionnaires from participants; and interviews and written comments of instructors, advisors, LASPAU, and SDSU staff members.

The academic and experience levels of the selected candidates were high. Their subsequent progress in the United States has been from very good to excellent. All those questioned demonstrated high motivational levels and said they planned to return to Honduras. Some do not have guaranteed employment but the evaluator thinks most will be positive contributors both in the public and private sectors in terms of economic analysis, planning, and policy development.

The grant under the Project has not been carried out exactly as stipulated in the Grant Agreement. This has been documented in the evaluation with suggested actions to adjust and improve implementation. The project was well conceived and designed. The scholars, when they return, will have a highly positive impact on the Honduran economy anticipated in the Project Paper.

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED IN THIS REPORT

A.I.D.	Agency for International Development
ALI	American Language Institute, San Diego, CA
GOH	Government of Honduras
LASPAU	Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities
PAEG	Prueba de Admision para Estudios Graduados
SDSU	San Diego State University, San Diego, CA
TOEFL	Test of English as a Foreign Language
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

A. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) Indefinite Quantity Contract PDC 0085-I0006097-00, (Work Order No. 20) with Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc. of 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036, as Contractor, this is the Final Report of the Evaluation of the LASPAU Program, which forms part of the USAID/Tegucigalpa Policy Analysis and Implementation Project.

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess LASPAU accomplishments to date and make recommendations for resolving major constraints which threatened the success of the training program under the LASPAU grant.

The evaluation contractor reviewed documents from A.I.D., including the project paper, the A.I.D. LASPAU grant document with LASPAU's unsolicited proposal, and student files at USAID/Tegucigalpa; documents from LASPAU in Cambridge, Massachusetts, including project management forms and student files; documents and from the American Language Institute (ALI) at San Diego State University (SDSU), including applications, grade forms, and selection information. Appendix 4 lists some 185 documents and files which were reviewed. The contractor also made on-site visits to A.I.D./Washington offices in charge of graduate training in economics policy analysis and visited the LASPAU office in Cambridge on two separate occasions. In addition he went to ALI in San Diego California to assess the institute's program for the Honduran scholars. Prior to his field work, the contractor visited Honduras and met with the Project Officer and other USAID staff (see Appendix 3). A second trip to Honduras was made to provide USAID officials an opportunity to comment on evaluation findings and recommendations.

Of the total of 23 scholars, three were interviewed in person in San Diego, California; 20 were contacted by telephone to request their cooperation in filling out survey instrument; and 16 completed and returned the questionnaire as requested. Through these and other appropriate information gathering methods, such as in-person student interviews and student questionnaires (to which all the students responded), the evaluation contractor addressed a number of critical questions and issues, which were refined as the evaluation developed. The study examined, but was not limited to, the following subject areas:

- o Objectives of Training
- o Selection Criteria
- o Recruitment Procedures
- o Upgrading Training
- o Placement Procedures
- o Complementary Activities and Group Building
- o Comprehensive Progress Monitoring

- o Participation in Activities to Complement Core Program
- o Development of Policy Making and Policy Direction Skills through Special Seminars

The six specific areas above were clearly defined in the scope of work and were discussed thoroughly with Mission management during the initial visit to Honduras. As the evaluation evolved, the contractor found some administrative areas of the grant that required discussion and recommendations for consideration by the Mission. It was felt that this minor deviation from the scope of work was justified in that it made a more useful document possible by identifying implementation issues which cut across the entire program.

The Checchi evaluator for this contract was Mr. Hunter Fitzgerald, a retired A.I.D. Human Resources Development Officer (20 years experience), who has successfully completed seven training evaluation assignments for the Company since 1986. He completed ten years of service in A.I.D.'s Bureau for Latin American and the Caribbean Development Resource Office. His prior experience in participant training and managing large training activities in a variety of disciplines were important factors for his nomination and selection.

The Final Report begins with an Executive Summary which is followed by Chapter I: Introduction and Background. This chapter provides the purpose of the evaluation, a brief description of the evaluation methodology, and background of the LASPAU grant from the USAID supported Policy Analysis and Implementation Project. Chapter II of the report describes and gives findings for the specific areas evaluated which were; (i) objective of training, (ii) selection criteria, (iii) recruitment procedures, (iv) upgrading training, (v) placement procedures, (vi) monitoring and group building, and (vii) administrative. The report concludes with Chapter III which gives six lessons learned and comments on development. Annexes include a Project Identification Data Sheet and a Draft A.I.D. Project Evaluation Summary Form. The six appendices are: A) Scope of Work (Work Order #20), B) Current Logical Framework, C) List of Individuals Consulted by Agency, D) List of Documents Reviewed, (E) Evaluative Instruments, (F) Placement and Status of Selected Candidates, and (G) Aide Memoire/LASPAU.

B. BACKGROUND

The USAID Mission in Honduras supported the Policy Analysis and Implementation Project (522-0325) which provided the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU) a grant of \$2,307,160 on November 10, 1988. The grant provided funds for LASPAU to place selected Honduran candidates among the top 30 economics programs in U.S. universities. The rankings of American Economic Association were to be followed. LASPAU committed itself to developing a group of thirty-five well-trained professionals (25 Master's and 10 Ph.D.'s) who will constitute a technical corps to formulate and implement effective economic policy. The terminal date for this training is August 31, 1994.

Apart from creating a core group of competent professionals, the program is expected to establish a sense of fraternity among these economists, some of whom are likely

to serve in the current administration of the Government of Honduras (GOH). LASPAU was requested to monitor the progress of trainees, provide guidance and bring together trainees during seminars and give other opportunities for seminars and conferences.

LASPAU has completed two rounds of recruitment of candidates and is now in the process of a third and final round. Eight participants from the first round (1989) have been placed in graduate studies. Of the fifteen candidates from the second round (1990), nine are in graduate studies, two are in English language training, one is taking academic subjects at San Diego State University, three have been conditionally accepted to graduate schools, one is on leave of absence at Mississippi State University pending acceptance at one of the top agriculture economics graduate schools, and, finally one individual who will be placed in January 1991 is currently enrolled in the Economics Institute in Boulder Colorado. LASPAU reported that of those enrolled, six have been placed in the doctoral programs and eleven are pursuing master's degrees. Twelve additional candidates were being selected during the period of the evaluation.

CHAPTER II

THE PURPOSE AND STUDY QUESTIONS OF THE EVALUATION

This chapter states the purpose of the evaluation and discusses each of the specific evaluative areas mentioned above. When **Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations** are presented for Mission consideration under each category, they appear in bold face type.

The Mission, after a semi-annual project review, decided to conduct an evaluation of this sub-component of the Project to assist LASPAU and USAID/Honduras to determine the efficiency of LASPAU and assist the Mission in making further decisions with regard to this training program.

A. OBJECTIVE OF TRAINING

A goal of 10 Ph.D.'s and 25 M.A.'s is to be achieved by August 31, 1994. LASPAU agreed that the advanced training in Economics is to be provided to Honduran participants from the top 30 graduate economics programs in U.S. universities in order to strengthen the country's human resource base with respect to policy analysis, design and implementation. The contractor was to determine if this objective is realistic and was also to identify limitations, if any, in the academic formation of Honduran economists at the undergraduate level.

In its "Proposal to Train Honduran Economic Policy Leaders" (May 20, 1988) in the section on "Understanding the Context in Honduras," LASPAU discussed its experiences with 143 Honduran participants it selected for other programs:

When compared with candidates from other countries of Latin America, Honduran participants in LASPAU administered programs reflect the educational infrastructure of the country. Candidates demonstrated less skill in traditional academic areas. Quantitative and verbal skills are below the average. And finally, the university structure is slow to innovate and respond to educational needs. Honduras, therefore, is a setting in which realistic expectations about academic success and abilities must shape recruitment and placement strategies.

Some of these anticipated problems surfaced in this project. LASPAU and SDSU staffs identified low English language skills and lower levels of analytical abilities as constraints for future success as a graduate student in economics. These observations were discussed with members of the selection committee for the third and final round of selection. The committee members interviewed (Ms. Maya Evans of LASPAU and Dr. Norris Clement of SDSU) expected that these factors would be considered during the selection of round three. The evaluation found the majority of candidates (20 out of 23 individuals) selected to date to be very good to excellent. The three or four persons with English language difficulties

or academic deficiencies will more than likely complete their degrees and will return to Honduras to make positive contributions in economics policy, planning and analysis.

FINDING:

Based on its previous experience with placing Honduran participants, LASPAU anticipated that the participants selected for this project would require additional training in English language skills and in analytical abilities for success in graduate studies in economics. LASPAU designed recruitment and placement strategies to take these constraints into account.

CONCLUSION:

The evaluation determined that the objective of training 10 Ph.D's and 25 M.A.'s is achievable in view of the current level of successful placement and the progress of those students who have been placed towards their degrees.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Mission should complete the training program as envisioned in the Project with the adjustment of sending a limited number of candidates first to Latin American economics training centers of excellence as suggested in the next recommendation.

As outlined in the Scope of Work (See Appendix 1) the evaluation reviewed the possibility of sending students for training in economics in top Latin American universities prior to sending students to the U.S. There are some excellent Latin American economics training centers which could provide high quality graduate degree level training prior to U.S. training. The Latin American and Caribbean Bureau already has a regional project with the Marroquin Foundation to utilize such sources. Nevertheless, the following considerations argue against exclusive reliance on this.

- o The Mission already has signed an agreement with the GOH committing itself to the U.S. graduate level economics training.
- o The reaction from the economics community, the government, the students in training, and private sector groups to the use of prestigious U.S. university economics training generally has been positive.
- o USAID/Tegucigalpa is still interested in achieving the purpose of the original project design, particularly a U.S. trained cadre of economics policy and analysis professionals.

However, since there are twelve open positions for the third and final round of participant selection, there is some opportunity for experimentation with the use of Latin American institutions consonant with project objectives. Both the Mission's Project Paper

and the LASPAU proposal incorporated in the grant envisioned some use of these institutions. The approach of encouraging some participants to study for an M.A. or even (for some exceptionally promising and well-motivated individuals) a B.A. in a prestigious Latin American university, followed by enrollment in a Ph.D. in a top U.S. university, is both viable and worth trying. Its success could indicate a valuable option to be included in future Mission projects that call for graduate level training.

FINDING:

There are some excellent economics programs in Latin American universities (already being utilized by AID for other programs) that are suitable for training students before sending them to the U.S. Yet important considerations weigh against an exclusive reliance on these programs. Nevertheless some opportunity exists to experiment with the use of these institutions during the final round of participant selection.

CONCLUSION:

The option of sending candidates to Latin American Universities for their M.A.'s to and then on to the U.S. for their Ph.D.'s was found to be a feasible alternative worthy of trial.

RECOMMENDATION:

On a pilot basis LASPAU should place a limited number of candidates in Latin American graduate schools in economics for completion of a Bachelor's or a master's degree to be followed by placement in Ph.D. programs in economics in top U.S. university graduate schools.

B. SELECTION CRITERIA

Based on LASPAU recommendations, selection criteria were established by the Project Committee, which was composed of GOH and USAID/Honduras representatives. The approved criteria were:

- o Application
- o Gender
- o GOH Nomination and Support
- o Grade Point Average
- o Prueba de Admisión para Estudios Graduados (PAEG) - Spanish Language Graduate Level Entrance Examination (developed by Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey) a 3-hour examination which measures verbal, quantitative, and reading and grammar skills.
- o Institutional TOEFL Scores
- o Academic Background

- o Undergraduate Grade Point Average
- o Graduate Record Examination (when available)

During the final debriefing, the Mission also indicated to the evaluator its interest in receiving additional information on the ages of the scholars selected and that LASPAU take age into account in the selection process. LASPAU provided to the contractor the following information, summarized below, which was forwarded to the Mission:

<u>Age</u>	<u>Number of Participants</u>	<u>Age</u>	<u>Number of Participants</u>
22	1	30	5
23	1	31	3
24	4	32	1
25	1	33	2
26	2	34	4
27	1	39	2
28	3	43	1

The Mission requested that LASPAU handle selection completely independently from the Mission. The first two rounds of nominees were not listed by name but by number and the Mission did not participate in the selection process. The evaluator was told that the USAID project manager at that time was concerned about Mission involvement and outside pressures. LASPAU continued this practice during the current third and final round of selection. The Mission did not participate in the selection process.

LASPAU used selection committees composed exclusively of "in-house" experts. While there is no reason to think that the selection committees did not perform their duties conscientiously, the evaluation considered that the inclusion of at least one outside expert would have enhanced the range, professionalism, and insight of the committee as a whole. An eminent economist from a university or research institution not affiliated with LASPAU could fulfill this role very well.

In our view of the records and our interviews with selection committee members we found that LASPAU did follow the established criteria. The committees did not set rigid numerical standards and attempted to view the applicant as a whole in predicting successful graduate studies in a high-level U.S. Economics graduate program. Many of the problems observed during the evaluation revolved around poor English language abilities and what LASPAU termed low analytical capabilities as tested in the PAEG. The majority of the interviews were conducted in Spanish. When asked why LASPAU did not use English more during selection interviews to screen out those who obviously had severe English language problems, LASPAU personnel said that generally LASPAU does the interviews in Spanish in order not to embarrass the applicant. It was felt that the use of Spanish gave the applicant the opportunity to present himself or herself in the best possible light.

LASPAU did not attempt to interview all applicants. The contractor studied a LASPAU form used to pre-screen large members of applicants in the first two groups (1989 and 1990) for which LASPAU reported to have received 100 applicants for each section. For example, 20 applicants were interviewed for the first group, out of which eight participants were selected.

FINDING:

Taking into account LASPAU's recommendations, the project committee established the selection criteria to be employed by LASPAU. At Mission request, LASPAU managed the selection process on its own, using "in-house" experts. LASPAU did follow the selection criteria, but did not attempt to interview all candidates.

CONCLUSIONS:

LASPAU followed the established selection criteria and conducted recruitment (as planned) without participation from USAID/Tegucigalpa or indeed any outside representative on its selection committees. A small number of the second group of scholars selected had a lower level of language skills and/or analytical abilities.

RECOMMENDATION:

The following modifications in the selection process are recommended:

- o The Selection Committee should conduct a standard part of the selection interview (say, one-fourth) in English and select out people who obviously do not have adequate English proficiency.
- o LASPAU should increase the minimum range of test scores for English language and analytical parts of the PAEG
- o LASPAU should continue the selection process as it has in the past with the modifications suggested above. Furthermore, the Mission should implement a second phase of the selection in which the Mission and LASPAU will interview the finalists and with the Mission provide a final approval.
- o LASPAU should contract with an eminent economist not affiliated with any LASPAU-sponsoring institution to serve on the selection committee along with LASPAU's "in-house" experts.

C. RECRUITMENT PROCEDURES

In its unsolicited proposal LASPAU said it would start the recruitment process by having the LASPAU team and USAID meet with ministry officials, department heads, project managers, and other institutional decision makers designated by USAID/Tegucigalpa to seek nominations of candidates.

LASPAU stated that:

An objective of the project is to create a team of highly trained Honduran economists educated in the United States who will contribute significantly to national development. Wide recruitment parameters have offered this possibility of including applicants from all disciplines interested in pursuing a degree in economics at Master's or Ph.D. level in the United States.

Another significant thrust of the project is to strengthen the public sector in Honduras, particularly by furnishing training opportunities to the five institutional co-signees of the agreement between USAID/Honduras and the government of Honduras. These five institutions, the Ministerio de Hacienda, the Ministerio de Finanzas, the Ministerio de Economía, SECPLAN, and the Banco Central de Honduras, together with USAID and LASPAU representatives, established in 1988 the selection criteria for the scholarship program. Participants' benefits and obligations were also delineated at that moment.

In order to achieve these goals and elect the full participation of the private sector, LASPAU contacted institutions such as the COHEP (the Consejo Hondureño de la Industria Privada), the Chamber of Commerce of Tegucigalpa, the Chamber of Commerce of Cortes, and the Honduran-American Chamber of Commerce. LASPAU worked with these institutions through presentations by LASPAU and through bulletins published by the institutions and distributed to its members.

It was found that during the second round of selection LASPAU also attempted to recruit suitable candidates from the rolls of Central American Peace scholars. LASPAU reported that those in undergraduate programs would not have graduated or be available in time for the first LASPAU selection process. No suitable applicants were found in the files of returned Central American Peace Scholars in USAID/Tegucigalpa. LASPAU reported that a returned Central American Peace Scholar is in the finals for the third round of selection. Other possible sources of candidates include USIS training, Fulbright and Hubert Humphrey graduates.

LASPAU's original plan, which was incorporated as an integral part of the grant, proposed to recruit and select as many candidates in project year one as possible. LASPAU recruited about 100 applicants and preselected 20 for interviews according to LASPAU's summary sheet. Of the twenty, eight were selected, six were rejected, and three were carried to year two.

As planned, LASPAU submitted schedules of annual visitations to selected institutions to the Mission, and it appeared they were completed. Furthermore, candidates were recruited from groups trained in other disciplines such as engineering and/or mathematics. LASPAU sought out candidates with higher level analytical abilities. The participants from this group have been some of the more successful students in the program.

The original Project Paper and LASPAU's proposal both implied that the trained and qualified human resource base was limited and the project should take care not to deplete what was already in place. Excessive recruitment would not be prudent, would raise expectations too high, and would be counter-productive if large numbers of applicants have to be turned down or rejected.

The LASPAU program manager reported that the third wave recruitment brought in 38 completed applications of which 21 were prescreened and 20 were interviewed by LASPAU in October 1990. The final number approved will depend on some further information gathering, LASPAU's review in Cambridge, and the Mission's final clearance. By November and/or December LASPAU probably will be only between one to five candidates short of reaching their ultimate goal of selecting 35 scholars.

The evaluation examined whether the same opportunities for men are open to women. Five of the twenty-three scholars (or about 22%) are females. Everyone questioned felt that women had the same opportunities but that certain cultural factors and social customs in the Honduran middle and upper classes do not encourage women to be so independent as to leave the home environment and pursue study in another country. These conclusions are based on LASPAU participants' help and interviews with certain Mission professional staff.

FINDING:

LASPAU's original plan incorporated into the grant was to recruit and select as many candidates as possible in the first year of the project. LASPAU submitted schedules of annual visitations to selected institutions to the Mission, and it appeared that they were completed. LASPAU sought out candidates with higher level analytical abilities, even those who were in disciplines outside of economics, yet took care not to conduct excessive recruitment, which would have been counterproductive. Discounting some basic cultural factors and social customs, the same opportunities were available to women as for men.

CONCLUSIONS:

The evaluation found promotional activities to be adequate. Those entities targeted for recruitment, such as government ministries and agencies, the private sector, and graduates of Mission scholarship programs were appropriate. The evaluation found that women had the same opportunities to apply to the program as men.

RECOMMENDATION:

If more economists are to be recruited and trained in the future, current promotional activities will need to be expanded and candidates recruited from other sources. LASPAU should expand promotional activities to include new geographic areas, other institutions, and different media.

D. UPGRADING TRAINING

The Scope of Work (See Appendix 1) calls for the evaluation to assess upgrading training, most of which was subcontracted to the American Language Institute (ALI) located at San Diego State University in San Diego, California. It provided for English language training as well as basic economics disciplines. LASPAU was to provide up to six months of upgrading training prior to formal education.

The contractor was to evaluate the following:

- (1) Criteria used by LASPAU to determine admission into upgrading training.
- (2) Determine the adequacy of the training and how it could be improved.
- (3) Determine whether or not students who have attended or are attending upgrading classes were/will be able to gain acceptance in the top 30 U.S. economics graduate programs.
- (4) Evaluate whether upgrading classes have continued along with formal training.
- (5) Ascertain the effect additional demand of upgrading had on participants' performance.

The evaluator interviewed LASPAU staff in Cambridge, ALI personnel in San Diego State University, and participants either in person or by questionnaire (See Appendices 3 and 6). Additionally, a large number of pertinent documents were reviewed and analyzed (See Appendix 4) and actual classes were observed.

1. Criteria used by LASPAU to Determine Admission into Upgrading Training:

LASPAU's prior experience with 39 USAID - funded Honduran university professors and ministry professionals seeking masters degrees was: 65% needed eight months or more of intensive U.S. based English training; 27% needed 5-6 months, and only 9% required 3 months or less. This group under study was better prepared and/or had better language learning capacities. SDSU training has shown an average gain of 77 points on the TOEFL for individuals in the six month program. ALI reported this is somewhat above the normal increase for the same time frame.

In its unsolicited proposal that was incorporated into the grant, LASPAU outlined a program of upgrading training designed to serve four groups of "players." LASPAU did not actually follow this complex plan. LASPAU sought to help scholars address any academic deficiencies, both at ALI and elsewhere. For example, engineers with limited background in economics had opportunities to make up this deficiency during upgrading and even on into their academic degree programs. ALI developed a practical economics course in the summer session designed to introduce the Hondurans to the theory, practices, vocabulary, and current trends of the economics profession in the U.S. This course was coordinated with the English language program and computer/word processing units in which the scholars completed reports, summaries, and homework with the supervision and assistance of computer science and English Language instructors.

The evaluator reviewed some of the actual products of the participants from the U.S. economics course (see Appendix 4, Part Three) which he judged to be well done and to meet graduate level standards of work.

LASPAU placed the Hondurans in English language training in accordance with each scholar's ability. This plan did not make allowance for a number of English speakers among the students who had lived in the U.S. before and did not need six months of additional English language training. The Mission has always intended that language training should last a maximum of six months on an "as needed" basis, but LASPAU interpreted this reference to the term of training to mean that all participants should be given a full six months of instruction prior to enrollment in graduate school.

FINDING:

LASPAU's unsolicited proposal incorporated into the grant proposed a tracking system for placement that was designed to serve four groups of "players." This was based on LASPAU's previous experience with remedying the deficiencies of Honduran university professors and ministry professionals seeking masters degrees in the U.S. Scholars actually placed by LASPAU in at least six months of upgrading training at SDSU for this project experienced above-normal increases in average TOEFL scores.

CONCLUSION:

LASPAU has abandoned its proposed tracking system for placement and has decided instead to place scholars in upgrading training on a case-by-case basis; it placed scholars individually in academic courses based on deficiencies observed; almost all scholars received orientation and/or English language training for the full six-month term.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

LASPAU should take account of any prior English-language abilities in its placement of scholars. Proficient English speakers ought to be exempted from this part of the upgrading training.

2. Adequacy of Training and How to Improve

It was observed for those individuals in the first group that an organized but low-key introduction to U.S. graduate level academic education and U.S. customs and culture was beneficial and facilitated a successful transition to U.S. graduate economics classes.

Student evaluations of the initial upgrading program, particularly those who had gone on to their academic graduate programs, were relatively high. The evaluator reviewed the student evaluations, observed actual classes, and reviewed instructional materials including textbooks. The evaluator found the program to be well managed and educationally sound.

Groups of foreign students presented a variety of learning needs. A program such as ALI offers requires constant internal evaluation and adjustments. The evaluator noted the following areas that could be improved:

- o Student evaluations (in agreement with ALI staff) reported two cases of weak instruction and another borderline instance of questionable instructor performance.
- o The LASPAU/Honduras program was administered together with a group of Indonesian graduate level business students - from a Harvard Institute of International Development (HIID) program. Management of both was part of SDSU's proposal to LASPAU, but it made it difficult to interpret records since it was not always clear where the line was kept between the two groups.
- o The SDSU proposal was of a "generic" nature and did not specify the exact nature of the services it was going to provide the Hondurans. LASPAU in the future should negotiate a specific scope of work for the Hondurans with whomever it subcontracts.

- o SDSU findings consisted of many individual reports which are voluminous and time consuming to review. There was also a mixing of people from the other program already mentioned in the one ALI summary report reviewed. The scope of work (suggested above) should include a well defined reporting requirements section.
- o The professional level field trips reported were excellent but were limited. SDSU should consider more of such activities.
- o The evaluation did not find a concerted effort on group building by SDSU. Such activities should have been part of SDSU's contract with LASPAU. LASPAU's unsolicited proposal on page 11 stated:

Since participants will study in a variety of universities, English training will be the best opportunity to begin the desired group-building activities.

FINDING:

Honduran students in the first group received an organized but low-key introduction to U.S. graduate level academic education and U.S. customs and culture. Student evaluations of this component of the program were relatively high, despite the variety of learning needs presented by these students.

CONCLUSION:

Based on student assessments, evaluation team reviews and observations, and the comments of the staff of LASPAU and SDSU, and most important of all, actual student performance in degree programs, the evaluation determined that the preliminary upgrading training (at SDSU) and follow-up upgrading during academic programs is more than adequate. However, the following areas need to be addressed in subsequent upgrading programs:

- o The mixing of LASPAU/Honduras scholars with programs from other countries.
- o The analyses and summaries of the progress reports which depict the information the Mission and LASPAU need for better project management.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that any further upgrading agreements with other institutions and LASPAU be announced well in advance and awarded competitively. Furthermore, clear contractual language should provide for keeping Hondurans administratively separate, reporting requirements which define more useful reports, having group building

activities, and giving more professional level participation such as field visits, lectures, and seminars in the economics field.

3. Determine whether or not students participating in upgrading were able to gain acceptance to the top 30 economics graduate programs.

The majority of the 23 participants have been placed in graduate programs already. Currently, there are 18 in graduate economics programs. LASPAU reports there are four still in upgrading (three in English and one taking academic courses) who have all been conditionally admitted to graduate schools. One individual is on "leave of absence" but has not been accepted at one of the top schools after three rejections. This latter situation is in direct conflict with the project's objectives as stated in the August "Aide Memoire".

One of the major problems seemed to be English language competence which severely slowed the placement of three participants. There have been other difficulties with placement procedures which are discussed below in Section E.

FINDING:

The majority of LASPAU/Honduras Scholars have been placed (18 out of a total of 23) with four more to be placed in January of 1991. There appears to be one doubtful case.

CONCLUSION:

Although the placement process is not yet complete, it would appear that nearly all of the 23 participants will soon be placed in U. S. graduate level economics programs.

RECOMMENDATION:

LASPAU resolve the doubtful case on leave of absence and follow-up to insure that the other four are in academic training by January 1991.

It was recommended that:

- o Any further upgrading agreements with other institutions and LASPAU be announced well in advance and awarded competitively.**
- o Clear contractual language should provide for:**
 - Keeping Hondurans administratively separate**
 - Reporting requirements which define more useful reports**
 - Having group building activities**
 - Giving more professional level participation such as field visits, lectures and seminars in the economics field.**

4. Continuation of Upgrading Classes along with Formal Training

LASPAU reported that all of the first group (1989) took graduate level courses, except for those who took English as follows:

Noemi Campos - 111 ESL
Elmer Cerrato - all graduate level courses
Pedro Curry - 205 ESL
Pedro Martel - all graduate level courses
Desiree Medrano - Freshman International English
Ada Ortiz - all graduate level courses
Jose Quan - all graduate level courses
Sergio Zelaya - all graduate level courses

For the 1990 placements at the writing of this Final Report, LASPAU had not received Percy Buck's and Sergio Membreños' programs. The remainder of the second group are as follows:

Julio Carcamo - all graduate level courses
Teresa Derás - 260 International Economics (undergraduate)
Carlos Espinoz - 260 International Economics (undergraduate)
Hugo Guillen - 109 ESL (not graduate)
Edgardo Maradiaga - English writing class (undergraduate)
Dante Mossi - all graduate level courses
Roxana Rivera - all graduate level courses
Roger Rodriguez - all graduate level courses

FINDING:

Among the first group (1989), three out of eight scholars continued with some upgrading training during their university academic programs; among the second group (1990), four out of eight scholars included some upgrading training in their academic programs.

CONCLUSION:

The evaluation determined that some upgrading training did continue on into academic programs mainly in English as a Second Language, Freshman English, a writing class, and Undergraduate Economics.

RECOMMENDATION:

None.

5. Effect Additional Demand had on Participant Performance

The additional demand of upgrading training has not had an adverse effect on most of the scholars. Only when they experienced difficulties being admitted to a top university did morale drop, affecting their performance adversely. Also the participants who have to spend additional time in English language training are necessarily under pressure, but this is natural.

FINDING:

The additional demand of continuing upgrading training was not as important a factor in student morale as failing to obtain admission to a top university program or concern about passing the minimal requirements of the TOEFL exam.

CONCLUSION:

The effect of the additional demand of upgrading training on participant performance was minimal except in the cases where scholars could not meet minimal English language requirements on the TOEFL.

RECOMMENDATION:

None.

E. PLACEMENT PROCEDURES

The goal of the program is to place those candidates selected among the top 30 economics programs in U.S. universities. LASPAU had the option to suggest other economics programs not in the top 30 if the candidates did not possess the academic prerequisites but who were otherwise acceptable to the goals of the project.

The Mission indicated that it was satisfied with LASPAU's announced results of the first group's placement. Shortly afterwards, one of the scholars in that group, Ada Ortiz, was transferred by LASPAU to Northeastern University, a non-top 30 school. In retrospect, this was the beginning of the variance of LASPAU's placement with prior commitments to and understandings with the Mission.

Eventually LASPAU was to exercise its option to suggest that three additional universities be added to the approved list of economics programs. The Mission agreed to allow LASPAU to add Vanderbilt University, University of Texas - Austin, and Boston University. LASPAU also attempted to place persons in these other three agreed upon schools. Furthermore, LASPAU did attempt to place persons in other non-approved graduate schools such as University of California, Riverside, Northeastern, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Mississippi State University, Louisiana State University, Kansas State, Iowa State, University of Tennessee, etc.

Mission project management notified LASPAU that only the top 30 plus the three pre-approved were acceptable and nominations to other graduate schools would not be accepted by the Mission. A crisis resulted with scholars uncertain about their future with the possibility of not being accepted into one of the top schools. All of this resulted in a visit of LASPAU's Program Office Chief to Honduras to meet with the Mission. This resulted in LASPAU submitting an "Aide Memoire" dated August 9, 1990 that discussed contractual obligations with regard to participant placement. This communication states that:

The top universities are unequivocally determined by the attached list of the conference Board of Associated Research Councils. The top ten institutions are to be considered optimal, although USAID/Honduras and LASPAU acknowledge that only two of the universities admit candidates to terminal master's programs. The top thirty are to be considered acceptable. Beyond the top thirty, there may be a few other acceptable institutions that distinguish themselves for particular reasons -- a special strength in Latin American or development economics, for example -- and those as of this date are Vanderbilt University, Boston University, and the University of Texas at Austin. (the names of Northeastern University, the University of Illinois at Chicago, the University of Colorado, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and the University of California at Riverside will not pass the lips of LASPAU with regard to this project ever again, except when mentioning Northeastern in reference to the site of study for a few among the first group of fellows.) LASPAU will make every attempt to place individuals among universities at the very top of this list, knowing the importance this has for USAID/Honduras.

The above quotation leaves no room for doubt regarding LASPAU's understanding of where to place future candidates.

It appears that placement is now back on-track with eighteen out of twenty-three placed, four scheduled for January 1991 placement, and one possible non-placement or return to Honduras. The evaluation found some scholars unhappy with placement procedures, particularly some still in upgrading training. Many felt the applications were submitted late and LASPAU did not keep them informed of their current status.

FINDINGS:

LASPAU engaged to place those candidates selected in the top 30 economics programs in U.S. universities. LASPAU could suggest other programs outside of these, subject to Mission approval. The first round of placement proceeded satisfactorily, then one student was transferred by LASPAU to a non-top 30 school. This was the beginning

of LASPAU placements at variance with prior commitments to the Mission. Although the Mission subsequently agreed to add three additional schools to the list of approved programs, LASPAU continued to make placements in unauthorized programs.

CONCLUSION:

Serious problems arose during placement procedures mostly with the 1990 placements. In August 1990 the Mission and LASPAU clarified the situation and on August 9, 1990 LASPAU issued a written policy statement which repeated what was included in the Grant agreement.

RECOMMENDATION:

LASPAU should proceed with future placements as stated in the LASPAU "Aide Memoire" of August 9 1990, following its own proposal which was incorporated into the grant agreement.

The placement procedures used by LASPAU were neither systematic nor consistent. Scholars, particularly those in the second round, complained that LASPAU was late making applications and that LASPAU filed only one application. In two of these cases they were made to non-"top 30" universities. Additionally, one of the three not encouraged by LASPAU wanted to become personally involved and claimed LASPAU rejected this initiative.

Appendix 4 (List of Documents Reviewed Part One: A.I.D. Documents, C. Participant Dossiers) shows fifteen participant dossiers (second 1990 group) which were reviewed by the contractor in Cambridge USAID/Tegucigalpa. The following table summarizes formal applications by category:

SUMMARY OF 1990 APPLICATIONS BY NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS

<u>No. of Universities Applied to</u>	<u>No. of Scholars</u>	<u>Total Applications</u>	<u>Applications to "Top 30 List"</u>	<u>Applications to Non "Top 30"</u>
3	4	12	3	9
2	6	12	5	7
1	5	5	3	2
	18	29	11	18

This summary indicates that for the 1990 group an average of about two applications were made per scholar, of which most by an almost two-to-one ratio, were to non "top 30" schools (plus the three USAID-approved schools). The majority of the correspondence in the files was during July which was late in the year for the application process.

The first group (1989) of eight was placed as follows:

SUMMARY TABLE 1989 LASPAU SCHOLARS/HONDURAS

Number Placed in "Top 30" Universities and 3 Other Approved Exceptions-	6
Number Placed in Other Non "Top 30" Universities	$\frac{2}{8}$

Mission records indicated that six out of seven originally selected candidates were placed in top 30 economics programs. Subsequently, LASPAU moved one participant into another university not in the top 30 and placed an eighth participant in this same university in the middle of the academic year.

Certain scheduling and administrative requirements under the Grant provoked constraints such as:

- o LASPAU followed its usual recruiting schedules which were probably too late in the year for placement.
- o The approved budget provided for LASPAU obtaining at least partial tuition waivers for most scholars which is normal LASPAU operating procedure. Therefore, for purposes of placement, LASPAU looked to universities it knew which would be agreeable to tuition waivers.

This budgetary problem will be addressed in Part G of this Chapter - Administrative.

FINDING:

Scholars raised complaints about LASPAU's handling of their university placements. LASPAU did not encourage individual initiatives or involvement by the scholars themselves in the placement process. The terms of the grant itself posed unanticipated scheduling difficulties and administrative requirements for LASPAU.

CONCLUSIONS: LASPAU's placement procedures were neither systematic nor consistent. Moreover, the evaluation determined that the time between final selection and application is not adequate to contact schools and process the required documentation.

RECOMMENDATION:

LASPAU should consider revising its selection procedure time schedule to an earlier period so that applications are submitted earlier to a wider variety of the "Top 30" economics programs.

F. MONITORING, COMPLEMENTARY ACTIVITIES AND GROUP BUILDING

1. Comprehensive Project Monitoring

LASPAU is responsible for providing comprehensive monitoring of the progress of all participants to ensure that completion of programs coincides with the needs and expectations of the project and home institutions. To this end, LASPAU has obtained programs of study from the students' academic advisors and copies of grades from university registrars.

LASPAU reported the following on the status of selection candidates, 1988-1989:

All the scholarship recipients who were placed in 1988-1989 are doing very well in their academic programs. In fact, of the eight who began their studies in the first year of the program, four are on track for pursuing the Ph.D. These four are Noemí Campos Varela (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign), Pedro Curry Zavala (Cornell University), Pedro Martel Lagos (Michigan State University), and José Quan Gómez (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign).

Elmer Cerrato Ramírez, Ada Duarte de Ortiz, and Désirée Medrano Mendoza are all advancing in their programs. Mr. Cerrato will be the first of the scholars to complete his academic program. He is due to graduate in December of 1990, and he intends to leave for Honduras on December 31. Ada Duarte de Ortiz will graduate from Northeastern University in March, 1991. The Department of Economics at Northeastern University is very pleased to have Désirée Medrano among their graduate students after her transfer from Boston University.

This first group of trained economists has fulfilled the expectations of the scholarship program and offers promise for the fulfillment of future project goals in Honduras.

The first group has done quite well as indicated in the Grade Point Average Chart provided by LASPAU to the contractor:

**GRADE POINT AVERAGES
LASPAU SCHOLARS HONDURAS
1989 - 1990 GROUP**

	<u>Grade Point Average</u>	<u>Scale</u>
Student #1	4.69	5
Student #2	3.02	4
Student #3	3.39	4.3 (where 4.3 = A+)
Student #4	3.32	4
Student #5	2.39	4
(with one incomplete due to illness)		
Student #6	3.5	4
Student #7	4.73	5

There is also a student at a university which does not calculate GPA's for graduate students. The following are this student's grades:

<u>Course Name</u>	<u>Credits</u>	<u>Grade</u>
<u>Fall 1989</u>		
ECO 301 Micro Analysis I	3	G-
ECO 320 Macro Analysis	3	S-
RES 0 Research	3	Ungraded
STA 213 Intro Statistical Meth	3	S
 <u>SPRING 1990</u>		
ECO 302 Micro Analysis II	3	S+
ECO 322 Macro Analysis II	3	G-
ECO 243 Econometrics I	3	G-
RES 0 Undirected Research	3	Ungraded

S = Satisfactory
G = Good

The contractor was not only impressed with the relatively high numerical grade point averages but was similarly impressed during his review of scholar files by the highly laudatory comments given to Honduran scholars by academic advisors and teachers. The contractor also called the majority of the scholars on the telephone to alert them to the questionnaire Checchi was mailing them and to solicit their cooperation. These conversations were completed in English and all the participants contacted did very well in English on the telephone which for many persons can be the "acid test".

As planned in their proposal, it was evident that LASPAU's project coordinator had each participant prepare an academic plan, then complete and return a detailed course outline. LASPAU reviewed these plans for completeness and timeliness.

For the 1990 group, twelve of the fifteen scholars selected are placed in economics departments of U.S. universities. The rest (three scholars) continue their English-language and Economics training at San Diego State University and the Economics Institute at the University of Colorado. They themselves will soon undertake graduate studies leading to either the master's or doctoral degree.

From this group, three of the candidates were placed in Ph.D. programs: Edgardo Maradiaga is at Vanderbilt University, Sergio Membreño was placed in the doctoral program at the University of Pennsylvania, and Dante Mossi is in the doctoral program at Duke University.

Up to now, the second group has not received grades nor progress reports since they have just been enrolled. Nevertheless, the evaluation did observe that professors, instructors' grades and comments during upgrading training were highly positive and generally predicted further academic success at the graduate level. Appendix 6 gives a narrative summary of the placement and status of 1989-1990 scholars.

FINDING:

LASPAU records showed that the students not only achieved relatively high numerical grade point averages but also received highly laudatory comments from their academic advisors and teachers. LASPAU had each student prepare a detailed academic plan.

CONCLUSION:

LASPAU provided comprehensive monitoring of the progress of all participants.

RECOMMENDATION:

None.

As part of the monitoring process, LASPAU is required by Attachment No. 1, p. 2, Section 2, to the Grant to provide semi-annual performance reports with information regarding: a) a comparison of actual accomplishments with goals anticipated for the period; b) reasons why established goals were not met; c) names of the students selected for placement and brief descriptions of their performance to date.

Until the evaluation LASPAU had not prepared a single semi-annual report in accordance with the Grant Agreement. Large quantities of papers consisting of individual participant information and other raw data were made available to the Mission. A careful analytical semi-annual report was not produced between grant inception in late 1988 (November 10) and September 1990. LASPAU's first semi-annual report was submitted October 25, 1990. Reports were missing for (1) May 1989; (2) November 1989; and (3) May, 1990. It did not meet the reporting requirement as stipulated in the Grant Agreement. The evaluator found two written communications from the Mission to LASPAU requesting the submission of semi-annual reports. Copies of LASPAU's financial reimbursement requests as per standard provisions were also not arriving to Honduras as expected. The evaluator later found that the appropriate documents were to be forwarded but there was a misunderstanding as to whom they should be sent. This latter problem appears to have been solved since the last two such reports were received in the Mission.

LASPAU is also required to submit financial reports by Attachment No. 1, p. 2, Section 3 to the Grant. The forms required by the Standard Provisions section of the Grant are the "Financial Status Report (SF-269) and the "Federal Cash Transactions Report" (SF-272), which LASPAU is required to send on a regular basis to A.I.D./M/FM/PADF, Washington, D.C. Copies of these forms have not been received by the Mission. These should not be confused with the Public Vouchers 1034/1035 which LASPAU has sent to the Mission.

FINDING:

Under the Grant Agreement, LASPAU is required to provide the Mission with semi-annual progress reports and financial reports as a part of the monitoring process.

CONCLUSION:

LASPAU did not provide the required semi-annual reports. The Mission has received only one (dated October 25, 1990) out of the four required semi-annual reports. The Mission has also not received the usual copies of the financial reports LASPAU is obliged to send to AID/W.

RECOMMENDATION:

LASPAU should provide the semi-annual reports required by the Grant to the USAID project officer in the Mission on a timely basis for all future reporting periods. To correct the lack of past reporting, LASPAU should provide a comprehensive report for the period from November 10, 1988 to December 1990, which will include all of the information required by the Grant for the semi-annual reports. LASPAU should also verify its compliance with the financial reporting requirement vis-a-vis AID/W.

2. Opportunities to Participate in Complementary Activities

The evaluation found little evidence of LASPAU-organized complementary activities such as promotion of memberships in professional organizations or sponsored trips to professional meetings. The few activities that were observed occurred at the pre-academic phase, mainly at San Diego State University as part of the ALI program. LASPAU's own role appeared to be minimal. No written plan or strategy was found outlining LASPAU's approach to the promotion of such complementary activities.

FINDING:

There was no written plan or strategy for these activities. The few complementary activities observed occurred at the pre-academic phase, chiefly at San Diego State University as part of the ALI program.

CONCLUSION:

The implementation of this phase of the program is deficient.

RECOMMENDATION:

LASPAU needs to develop and implement carefully planned complementary activities earlier in the project or as each group arrives. LASPAU should draw up written plans with descriptions of these activities and timetables, with suggestions from the Mission, GOH, the Honduran private sector, and the scholars themselves.

3. Promotion of Group Building

The Project Paper and LASPAU's unsolicited proposal incorporated in the Grant Agreement both call for LASPAU to use seminars and state-of-the-art workshops to promote group building among the Honduran economics scholars. The Scope of Work requires the evaluator to examine the frequency and effectiveness of the group building activities, however, to date LASPAU has not completed any of these programs.

LASPAU has programmed a general enrichment seminar for all scholars to meet next February 1991 in Cambridge, Massachusetts. This seminar will include all LASPAU scholars from Honduras. LASPAU predicts that it will enhance their status as a team of future policy makers, as economics practitioners, and as part of a larger network of scholars and professionals. The LASPAU project manager informed the evaluator that additional state-of-the-art workshops are planned for management, leadership and environmental issues.

LASPAU needs to organize, plan and execute such group building activities, though with much care and extreme caution. If not carried out properly, such activities can lead to the development of unforeseen and uncontrollable pressure groups which can become counterproductive to Mission and GOH goals.

FINDING:

LASPAU has not conducted any group building activities such as seminars and state-of-the-art workshops until now but plans a February 1991 seminar for all scholars and three additional workshops.

CONCLUSION:

The implementation of this phase of the program has been delayed.

RECOMMENDATION:

LASPAU should develop and implement carefully planned group building activities earlier in the project, or as each group arrives. LASPAU should also proceed promptly but carefully with those activities already planned.

The contractor identified the following alternative approaches for LASPAU to utilize to remedy the deficiency:

- o Subcontract with the graduate schools where students are placed to arrange for a variety of substantive complementary activities.
- o Subcontract with possibly one or two of the top thirty universities and/or one of the distinguished economics professional organizations to carry out these important programs.
- o Identify economics seminars and conferences offered in the United States and make arrangements to send scholars to such events.

G. ADMINISTRATION

As explained in the introduction, the evaluation contractor added an analysis of the administrative aspects of the project with the purpose of examining ways in which to improve implementation. The following are discussed:

- o Contractual Mode
- o Reporting
- o Budgeting and Tuition Waivers

- o Relationship of Grant to Overall Project AND Remainder of Project

1. Contractual Mode

A.I.D. has a variety of contracting mechanisms for this type of project. They can utilize an organization such as LASPAU in the following ways:

- o Grant - Funds are granted to the entity to carry out the project or tasks within the organization's own rules and regulations. Grants are used with non-profit organizations, universities, charities, etc. This is the mechanism employed in the project.
- o Cooperative Agreement - is used with the same types of organizations as a grant but usually has a more specific scope of work of what A.I.D. requires. It involves A.I.D. or the Mission in closer supervisory and/or managerial roles.
- o Contract - uses very specific terms of reference and generally gives the Mission close managerial responsibilities.

LASPAU qualifies for all of the above contracting mechanisms.

In the Summary and Recommendations section of the Project Paper, dated October 20, 1987, the following issue was raised:

The Project Paper indicates that the Mission will directly manage this component. Would it not be more efficient to have a contractor do this, selected through formal competition? Is the Mission's approach appropriate for the program's objectives of ensuring cohesiveness and creation of a sense of fraternity among trainees?

The Mission response to this issue was:

This Project represents only one part of a major Mission thrust to strengthen Honduras' human resource base. Over the last year, for example, over 200 Hondurans received university-level training under the Central America Peace Scholarship Program and other efforts. Training efforts under this Project are geared to meeting more specific objectives, in particular increasing technical expertise in economics. Places in a relatively small number of institutions, the number of long-term trainees under the Project will have a significant impact on GOH economic analysis capabilities. Yet it is conservative enough to ensure that there will not be disruptions in GOH institutions that temporarily lose value talent to training.

The Mission has discussed numerous alternatives to management of the training component, including management by contractor. Given the level of training contemplated, however, A.I.D. direct management through the Bureau of Science and Technology's (S&T) Office of International Training appears to be the most cost effective means of implementing the program. The system will be further enhanced by a contract through a university or firm to provide advisory and follow-up service beyond those offered by S&T and special summer programs related to specific economic policy issues. This approach will ensure cohesiveness and the sense of fraternity among trainees that is desired by the program.

The Mission started as planned but did not place anyone.

Later as the project was implemented LASPAU submitted its unsolicited proposal and subsequently a grant was made to LASPAU. The training project has been carried out under LASPAU's normal operating guidelines with minimal Mission involvement. LASPAU has taken full responsibility for recruitment, selection, placement, monitoring, etc. The Mission and the GOH have not participated significantly in the program.

The norm for procurement by A.I.D. is to use competition. However, in certain situations non-competitive procedures are permitted. In this Project the justification for non-competitive procurement was to assure the availability to the Project of the experience of organizations and persons who have been associated with Honduras in the past or have skill which fit the needs of the Project closely. The concern was that such persons or organizations might not be included in proposals received in response to competitive procedures. However, to pre-select entities or persons to supply the inputs required by the Project in order to have more assurance concerning ultimate composition of the implementing organization carries risks as well. A.I.D. may, in fact, not be aware of all the resources which might be utilized in the Project or have the time to devote to discovering them and considering the various combinations of resources which would be best. This is particularly likely to be the case in a complex Project. Thus, for further activities it would seem preferable to use competitive procurement for obtaining the inputs to be provided. Of course, in following that approach it is in A.I.D.'s interest to encourage the broadest possible interest in participating in the Project in order to benefit from additional ideas and a wider breath of talent. Thus A.I.D. needs to encourage interested organizations to become knowledgeable about Honduran conditions and the key Honduran officials involved and to provide them with the benefit of the Mission's views through written and oral briefings on the Project and on the Mission's expectations. At a minimum a bidders conference in Tegucigalpa should be staged and attendance at that conference considered an indication of serious intent on the part of potential participating organizations.

At this point in the grant, which already has over half of the participants selected and in the U.S. and only twelve remaining scholars to be selected, more than likely, it

would be counter productive to compete a new contract.

The contractor considered alternatives to continuing as programmed and the negative results possible outweighed the benefits as follows:

- o The LASPAU monitoring and backstopping mechanisms are already in place and interrupting them would probably harm the scholars in the U.S.
- o A.I.D. contracting procedures require at least 60 days to announce and evaluate bids and award a contract.
- o LASPAU has started appropriate corrective measures.

Nevertheless, any future extensions or new projects can be awarded through competition.

FINDING:

The Mission utilized the grant mechanism and a non-competitive procurement in awarding this project to LASPAU. The training project was carried out under LASPAU's normal operating guidelines with minimal Mission involvement.

CONCLUSION:

The Mission and/or the GOH were not able to exercise sufficient management control over the training program because of the grant mode of contracting, which allows the grantee (LASPAU) to conduct the program under its own rules and regulations.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Mission award any contract increases and extensions and new projects competitively and use the contract mode.

2. Reporting

The lack of Semi-Annual Reports is described in detail above but another phenomenon was observed. LASPAU and its subcontractor, SDSU, prepared and sent large amounts of interesting and valuable information such as student grade reports, instructor comments, copies of correspondence, etc.

Mission staff members do not have time to analyze and synthesize such information. A valuable function of the grantee is to summarize, point out, and recommend solutions to project managers.

FINDING:

LASPAU and its subcontractor SDSU provided the Mission with large amounts of raw data related to various aspects of the project.

CONCLUSION:

The evaluation concluded that LASPAU has submitted to USAID/Honduras valuable data, but without providing the synthesis and interpretation necessary for making these materials useful to the Mission.

RECOMMENDATION:

The grantee prepare information in such a manner and format that it will be useful to Mission and GOH project managers.

3. Budgeting and Tuition Waivers

In financial areas LASPAU follows its established budgeting and accounting procedures which are familiar to the U.S.G., particularly A.I.D. and U.S.I.A. The following participant costs were projected as follows in its May 1988 budget.

PARTICIPANT TRAINING COSTS
LASPAU'S ORIGINAL BUDGET

<u>Cost Per Participant Month</u>	<u>Total No. Part. Mos</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>	<u>Cost Per Part Mo.</u>
Masters Degree	775	\$1,220,596	\$1,575
PhD Degree	<u>440</u>	<u>\$654,539</u>	<u>\$1,488</u>
Total	1,215	\$1,875,135	\$1,543

In the LASPAU budget, tuition and fees account for \$608,475 of the \$1,875,135 total training costs budgeted for the project. This line item was predicated on LASPAU obtaining 50 % tuition waivers for participants. Generally LASPAU members provide such partial tuition waivers. If tuition waivers were not available, LASPAU might have had to budget an additional \$600,000 for the tuition and fees line item.

LASPAU successfully placed some of the participants with tuition waivers. Many of the top 30 graduate schools in economics are private institutions and/or charge high tuition fees. Some of these universities as matters of policy will not provide the tuition

waivers that LASPAU counted on receiving when it developed its budget proposal for the project. Therefore LASPAU has found that success in meeting placement objectives in the top 30 economics programs has had adverse budgetary consequences.

Faced with higher tuition costs than it expected, LASPAU has considered making up the difference by cutting back on other activities such as seminars, support for attendance at conferences, and other related costs in an effort to bring the budget back into balance.

LASPAU informed the Mission in August 1990 of this waiver problem. The Mission requested that LASPAU submit a review of the situation showing actual expenditures, waivers obtained, project shortfalls, and effects on the program. This defines the type of financial analysis needed by the mission. To date LASPAU has not submitted this information for consideration by the Mission. This defines the type of financial analysis needed by the mission.

FINDING:

On-going participant tuition costs seem likely to exceed significantly LASPAU's original budget for this line item due to difficulty in obtaining the anticipated tuition waivers from the top 30 graduate schools. LASPAU has informed the Mission of this waiver problem, but has not responded to a Mission request for a detailed financial analysis of the problem.

CONCLUSION:

Due to the special nature and requirements of the project LASPAU has not been able to obtain all of the anticipated tuition waivers it normally obtains. LASPAU promised to provide USAID/Tegucigalpa a detailed analysis including future requirements to meet project objectives.

RECOMMENDATION:

LASPAU should submit the analysis regarding tuition waivers as soon as possible for Mission review and consideration.

4. Relationship of the LASPAU Grant to the Overall Project

The LASPAU grant is only a part of USAID's Policy Analysis and Implementation project. The evaluation found that LASPAU was not as well informed as would be desirable about the other components of this project. Better coordination between the components of this project, including LASPAU, especially in such key areas as selection criteria, recruitment procedures, upgrading training, and placement procedures, would benefit the implementation of both the LASPAU grant and the other components of the Policy Analysis and Implementation project.

FINDING:

The LASPAU training grant is only a part of USAID's Policy Analysis and Implementation project, but is being implemented independently.

CONCLUSION:

The evaluation found that LASPAU administered the grant without benefit of coordination with other components of the Mission's Policy Analysis and Implementation project.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Mission and LASPAU should explore ways of exchanging information and experience gained in all the components of the Policy Analysis and Implementation project. Specifically, the LASPAU project manager should be briefed on the entire project by the Mission in advance of LASPAU's planned February enrichment seminar. The LASPAU project manager should brief LASPAU project staff. Finally, LASPAU should make a presentation at the February enrichment seminar so that the participants themselves may be aware of the role and contributions to the larger project.

5. The Remainder of the Project

As briefly explained in the "Contracting Mode" section above, the evaluation recommends that the project be completed as designed.

CONCLUSION:

The evaluation has presented a series of findings with recommendations for Mission consideration. For the future pre-academic upgrading training it was recommended to seek a competitive proposal from another language institute. It was also suggested that on a limited basis some candidates be sent to Latin American University Economics training centers of excellence to be followed by a U.S. PhD from a top U.S. university. More recommendations were made to improve the Project's future implementation.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Mission complete the Grant with LASPAU as programmed, implementing those contractor recommendations the Mission decides to utilize.

CHAPTER III

LESSONS LEARNED AND COMMENTS ON DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

This final chapter outlines major lessons learned and provides some comments on development impact.

A. LESSONS LEARNED

The major lessons learned during the project as observed by the evaluation were:

1. With concerted effort it was possible to find very good to excellent Honduran candidates for graduate level training in top economics faculties.
2. The entity responsible for recruiting 10 PhD and 25 MA candidates for graduate level training in top U.S. economics university graduate schools has to conduct a long term and intensive recruitment campaign, indicating the need for comprehensive programming.
3. Relatively low English language proficiency (as measured on the TOEFL) and lower test scores on analytical abilities (as measured on the PAEG) are both predictors of future problems and/or slow progress in upgrading and/or academic training.
4. A well-planned and executed initial upgrading program was beneficial to most scholars both in raising TOEFL scores an average of 77 points and for making up subject matter deficiencies. A secondary but still valuable benefit for those scholars requiring upgrading training was that this time also served as a "transition or settling-in period" for adjusting to U.S. academic life and to U.S. customs and culture. This was true even for scholars with excellent English language skills, though of course it cannot by itself justify sending such students to upgrading training if they do not have academic needs for this training.
5. Placement needs to be closely monitored by the contracting or granting institution to ensure the grantee puts candidates in the agreed upon institutions.
6. The preferred contractual methods are contract or cooperative agreement (over grant) which give more control to and involvement of the Mission.

B. COMMENTS ON DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

The evaluator predicts that the group now in training will return to Honduras and have the impact anticipated in the Project Paper. This confidence is broadly based on the following: evaluation findings; interviews with the students, their instructors, their advisors, and LASPAU and SDSU staff members; and the written responses by the students to the questionnaire and the evaluator's long experience with similar type A.I.D. training programs.

The academic and experience levels of the selected candidates were high. Their subsequent progress in the United States has been from very good to excellent. All those questioned demonstrated high motivational levels and said they planned to return to Honduras. Some do not have guaranteed employment but the evaluator thinks most will be positive contributors both in the public and private sectors in terms of economic analysis, planning, and policy development.

The grant under the Project has not been carried out exactly as stipulated in the Grant Agreement. This has been documented in the evaluation with suggested actions to adjust and improve implementation. Based on the long experience of the evaluator with similar programs, the project appears to have been well conceived and designed. The scholars, when they return, will have a highly positive impact on the Honduran economy.

ANNEX A
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA SHEET

Delivery Order No. 20
PDC-0085-I-20-9060-00

OUTLINE OF BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: Honduras
2. Project Title: Policy Analysis and Implementation
3. Project Number: 522-0325
4. Project Dates:
 - a. First Project Agreement: November 10, 1988 (Grant Agreement)
 - b. Final Obligation Date: FY 92 (planned/actual)
 - c. Most recent Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD): August 31, 1994
5. Project Funding: (amounts obligated to date in dollars or dollars equivalents from the following sources)

a. A.I.D. Bilateral Funding (grant)	US\$2,307,160
b. Other Major Donors	US\$ -
c. Host Country Counterpart Funds	US\$ <u> </u>
TOTAL	US\$2,307,160
6. Mode of Implementation: A.I.D. grant to LASPAU
7. Project Designers: USAID/Tegucigalpa, government of Honduras
8. Responsible Mission Officials: (for the full life of the project)
 - a. Mission Director(s): - John Sanbrailo, Carl Leonard, (Acting Mission Director in 1987)
 - b. Project Officer(s): - Charles Richter
Vicente Diaz(current), Scott Thomas (departed post)
9. Previous Evaluation(s): - None

ANNEX B
DRAFT A.I.D. PROJECT EVALUATION
SUMMARY FORM

EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART

1. BEFORE FILING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS
2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT "DOT MATRIX" TYPE

IDENTIFICATION DATA					
A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office _____ (ES# _____)		B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Skipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY _____ Q _____		C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>	
D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, set title and date of the evaluation report.)					
Project No.	Project / Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACS (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
ACTIONS					
E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director Action(s) Required				Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
(ATTACH DATE SHEET IF NECESSARY)					
APPROVALS					
F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: _____			(Month)	(Day)	(Year)
G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:					
Name (Typed) Signature Date	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director	

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

As part of the Policy Analysis and Implementation Project, the USAID Mission in Honduras provided the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU) a grant (1988) for the placement of selected Hondurans in the top 30 economics programs in U.S. universities. After its semi-annual project review, the Mission decided to conduct an evaluation of this sub-component of the project to assess LASPAU's performance and to make recommendations for removing constraints on its success. The evaluator interviewed or contacted officials of A.I.D., LASPAU, its training subcontractor, and participants. The major findings and conclusions are:

- The objective of 10 Ph.D.'s and 25 M.A.'s is realistic and likely to be achieved; therefore the Mission should complete the training program as envisioned in the project.
- LASPAU's promotional activities were adequate and the entities targeted for recruitment were appropriate, but LASPAU's placement procedures were neither systematic nor consistent and serious problems arose, especially during 1990.
- LASPAU provided comprehensive monitoring of the progress of all participants. However, participant tuition costs seem likely to exceed projections because of an inability to obtain a sufficient number of tuition waivers.
- LASPAU has not met the requirements of the Grant for submission of semi-annual reports.
- The Mission was unable to exercise sufficient management control over the training program because of the grant mode of contracting.

The evaluator noted the following "lessons:"

- The Honduran candidates recruited by LASPAU have shown that they can perform well in the top U.S. graduate economics programs.
- Upgrading training was beneficial in raising TOEFL scores.
- Placement needs to be closely monitored to ensure the grantee places candidates in the agreed upon institutions.
- Any contract increases and extensions and new projects should be awarded competitively and use the contract mode.

COSTS

1. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff
Person-Days (Estimate) _____

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____

11

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

S U M M A R Y

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)
Address the following items:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| • Purpose of evaluation and methodology used | • Principal recommendations |
| • Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated | • Lessons learned |
| • Findings and conclusions (relate to questions) | |

Mission or Office:	Date This Summary Prepared:	Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:
---------------------------	------------------------------------	--

Evaluation of the LASPAU/Honduras Graduate Economics Training Program.

Objective: In support of the Policy Analysis and Implementation Project, the USAID Mission in Honduras provided the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU) a grant of \$2,307,160 on November 10, 1988 for the placement of selected Hondurans in the top 30 economics programs in U.S. universities. LASPAU was to develop a group of 35 well-trained professionals (25 Masters' and 10 Ph.D.'s) by the terminal date for this training, August 31, 1994.

Purpose: The Mission, after a semi-annual project review, decided to conduct an evaluation of this sub-component of the project to assess LASPAU's performance and to make recommendations for removing constraints on its success. Checchi and Company Consulting, Inc., was the evaluation contractor.

Methodology: The Checchi evaluator, Mr. Hunter Fitzgerald, reviewed some 185 documents and files from A.I.D., USAID/Tegucigalpa, LASPAU, and the American Language Institute (ALI) at San Diego State University (SDSU). He visited A.I.D./Washington, LASPAU (on two separate occasions), and ALI. Earlier, the evaluator visited Honduras to meet with the Project Officer and other USAID staff. A second trip to Honduras was made to allow USAID officials to comment on the draft evaluation.

The evaluator interviewed or contacted over 48 individuals, including officials of A.I.D., LASPAU, SDSU/ALI and also participants. He addressed these issues: 1) Objectives of Training, 2) Selection Criteria, 3) Recruitment Procedures, 4) Upgrading Training, 5) Placement Procedures, 6) Complementary Activities and Group Building, 7) Comprehensive Progress Monitoring, 8) Activities Complementing Core Program, and 9) Development of Policy Making and Policy Direction Skills.

Findings: LASPAU determined that some upgrading training for participants would be required for the project to achieve its goals. LASPAU managed the selection process essentially on its own, and sought out candidates with higher level analytical abilities. Discounting cultural factors, the same opportunities were available to women as for men.

LASPAU placed all scholars in upgrading training, and they experienced above-normal increases in average TOEFL scores. There are nevertheless some excellent economics programs in Latin America suitable for training students before sending them on to the U.S. Serious problems arose during placement procedures,

especially during 1990. To resolve them, LASPAU has issued a written policy statement reaffirming its undertakings in the Grant agreement.

LASPAU provided comprehensive monitoring of the progress of all participants. LASPAU is required to submit semi-annual reports as well as financial reports as specified by the Standard Provisions section of the Grant. The Mission has received only one out of the four required semi-annual reports and has not received copies of the financial reports from AID/W. The evaluation found no written plan or strategy for complementary activities, and LASPAU has not conducted any special seminars until now but plans a February 1991 Seminar for all scholars and three additional state-of-the-art workshops.

The Mission utilized the grant mechanism and a non-competitive procurement for this project. LASPAU conducted the project with minimal Mission involvement. Participant tuition costs seem likely to exceed LASPAU's original projections because of an inability to obtain an sufficient number of tuition waivers.

Conclusions: The evaluation determined that the objective of 10 Ph.D.'s and 25 M.A.'s is realistic; the option to utilize Latin American universities for M.A. degrees is feasible. LASPAU followed the established selection criteria but a small number of participants had lesser language skills and/or analytical abilities.

The evaluation found promotional activities to be adequate and the entities targeted for recruitment were appropriate. The preliminary upgrading training (at SDSU) and follow-up upgrading during academic programs were more than adequate. The majority of LASPAU/Honduras Scholars have been placed. Some upgrading training did continue on into academic programs, but the effect of the additional demands of upgrading training on participant performance was minimal.

LASPAU's placement procedures were neither systematic nor consistent, and did not encourage participation by scholars. Moreover, the time between final selection and application was adequate to process the documentation required for placement.

LASPAU has not met the requirements of the Grant for submission of semi-annual reports. Complementary activities were limited to a few at the pre-academic phase (mainly at SDSU). The implementation of the group building phase of the project has also been delayed.

The Mission was unable to exercise sufficient management control over the training program because of the grant mode of contracting. Due to the special nature and requirements of the project, LASPAU has not been able to obtain the anticipated tuition waivers it normally obtains; it has agreed to provide the Mission with a detailed financial analysis of the problem.

H

Recommendations: The Mission should complete the training program as envisioned in the Project with the adjustment of utilizing Latin American Universities for their M.A. degrees for a limited number of candidates.

The selection process should be modified by : 1) conducting a part of the selection interview in English to determine applicant proficiency; 2) raising the range of acceptable test scores; 3) having both the Mission and LASPAU interview the finalists, with the Mission providing final approval; 4) contracting with an eminent economist to serve on the selection committee. Current promotional activities and sources of recruitment will have to be expanded if more economists are to be recruited.

The form and content of the progress reports SDSU provides to the Mission and LASPAU for project management need to be improved. The practice of assigning all scholars to six months' of English language training, regardless of proficiency, and of mixing them in with programs from other countries ought to be reconsidered. Any further upgrading agreements with other institutions and LASPAU be announced well in advance and awarded competitively. LASPAU should make future placements in accordance with its written policy statement and the Grant agreement. LASPAU should consider revising its selection procedure time schedule so that applications can be submitted earlier to more of the top 30 economics programs.

LASPAU should provide the Mission project officer with all future semi-annual reports on a timely basis. LASPAU should also provide a comprehensive report for the period November 1988 through December 1990, and verify its compliance with financial reporting requirements. It should also proceed with planned group building and complementary activities and implement them earlier in the project.

Any contract increases and extensions and new projects competitively and use the contract mode. LASPAU should prepare reports in a format that it will be useful to Mission and Honduran government project managers and submit the financial analysis regarding tuition waivers for Mission review.

Lessons Learned: It was possible to find very good to excellent Honduran candidates for graduate level training in top economics faculties. Relatively low English language proficiency and lower test scores on analytical abilities are both predictors of future problems and/or slow progress in upgrading and/or academic training. The upgrading program was beneficial to most scholars in raising TOEFL scores and for making up subject matter deficiencies. Placement needs to be closely monitored to ensure the grantee places candidates in the agreed upon institutions. The preferred contractual methods are contract or cooperative agreement which give more control to and involvement of the Mission.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1
THE SCOPE OF WORK - WORK ORDER #20

Delivery Order No. 20
PDC-0085-I-20-9060-00
Page 2

ARTICLE I - TITLE:

EVALUATION OF LASPAU PROGRAM

ARTICLE II - BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:

A. BACKGROUND

The Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU) received from the USAID supported Policy Analysis and Implementation Project a grant of \$2,307,160 on November 10, 1988, to place selected Honduran candidates among the top 30 economics programs in U.S. universities (according to the American Economic Association rankings). LASPAU's commitment is to develop a consort of thirty-five (25 Master's and 10 Ph.D's) well-trained professionals who will form a technical corps to formulate and implement effective economic policy. The terminal date for this training is August 31, 1994.

The training will serve not only to create a core group of competent professionals, but to establish a sense of fraternity among the economists who are likely to serve in the current Government of Honduras (GOH) Administration. Therefore, and given the fact that training is likely to occur in various U.S. universities, the grantee was requested to monitor the progress of trainees, provide guidance and bring together trainees during summers and other opportunities for seminars and conferences.

LASPAU has completed two rounds of recruitment of candidates and is initiating a third and final round. Eight participants have been placed in graduate studies and fifteen more are taking preparatory studies in the United States prior to enrollment in economics programs.

In a recent Mission semi-annual project review, it was decided to conduct an evaluation of this sub-component to assist LASPAU and USAID/Honduras to determine the efficiency and effectiveness of LASPAU and assist the Mission in making future decisions with regard to this training program.

B. PURPOSE

The purpose of this contract will be to assess LASPAU accomplishments to date and make recommendations for resolving major constraints which threaten the success of the training program under the LASPAU grant.

45

Delivery Order No. 20
PDC-0085-I-20-9060-00
Page 3

ARTICLE III - STATEMENT OF WORK:

- A. **Description of Work:** To achieve the above purpose the contractor will make on site visits to A.I.D./Washington offices in charge of graduate training in economic policy analysis and visit LASPAU offices in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to interview program coordinators, as well as to review participant files and other relevant documentation, such as progress reports and requests for admissions to universities. The contractor will also interview selected students both from the group already admitted for graduate studies and the group attending upgrading studies at San Diego State University. Two short visits to Honduras are to be included, one prior to the field evaluation, and the other following the field evaluation, at which time the contractor will submit a draft report. The purpose of these visits will be to answer questions that the contractor may have regarding the program and provide USAID officials an opportunity to comment on evaluation findings.

The contractor will visit Honduras prior to his/her field work to meet with the Project Officer and other USAID staff to discuss the appropriate approach for carrying out the evaluation. The Project Officer will collect and organize pertinent documents and information and will review plans for the Evaluation Team Planning Meeting prior to the commencement date of the evaluation.

- B. **Tasks of the Evaluation:** The following, in order of priority, are specific areas to be evaluated by the team:

1. Objective of Training

Advanced degree training in Economics is to be provided to Honduran participants from the top 30 graduate economics programs in U.S. Universities in order to strengthen the country's human resource base with respect to policy analysis, design and implementation. A goal of 10 PhDs and 25 MAs is to be achieved by August 31, 1994.

The evaluation team will determine if this objective is realistic. Toward this end, the contractor will identify limitations, if any, in the academic formation of Honduran economists (those trained in Honduras as well as those trained in other countries) at the undergraduate level that impede their acceptance into top U.S. graduate economics programs. The contractor will advise A.I.D. if

Delivery Order No. 20
PDC-0085-I-20-9060-00
Page 4

graduate training in economics in top Latin American universities prior to sending students to the U.S. is advisable, or might serve as a substitute for training in the U.S. The contractor will propose other possible alternatives.

2. Selection Criteria

Selection criteria were established by the Project Committee, composed of GOH and USAID/Honduras representatives based on recommendations by LASPAU. According to this criteria, each candidate is subjected to a review process in order to identify those candidates more able to succeed in a rigorous graduate program in the U.S. The process includes aptitude and English examinations, as well as an assessment of each candidate's academic and professional background.

The evaluation team will review the criteria for selection of candidates to determine: 1) whether or not LASPAU is following the established criteria; and 2) the effectiveness of these criteria in ensuring the identification of those best suited for placement. The contractor will provide recommendations on the use of these criteria in future similar activities.

3. Recruitment Procedures

To preserve the objectivity of the training process and relieve the GOH and US Agency for International Development project staff from the day-to-day details associated with training, LASPAU functions autonomously in matters of recruitment, selection and placement. Several steps, including visiting institutions targeted for recruitment and interviews of candidates for selection, are taken annually by LASPAU from May to March of the following year, according to an annual calendar prepared by LASPAU.

The contractor will examine recruitment procedures to determine: 1) adequacy of promotion activities; 2) if same opportunities for men are open to women; and 3) if those entities targeted for recruitment (government ministries and agencies, private sector, graduates of mission scholarship programs) are appropriate.

4. Upgrading Training

Early in the program it was noted that several candidates were lacking adequate command of the English

language as well as basic economic disciplines. LASPAU has been providing up to six months of upgrading training prior to formal education.

The contractor will assess criteria used by LASPAU for determining which candidates require upgrading training prior to initiating formal education. The contractor will determine if the upgrading training has been adequate and how this training could be improved. Toward this end, the contractor will assess whether or not students that either have attended or are attending upgrading courses were/will be able to gain acceptance in the 30 top programs. The contractor will also evaluate whether upgrading classes have continued along with the formal training and, if so, the effect the additional demand of the upgrading training have had on the participant's performance in the regular academic program.

5. Placement Procedures

The goal of the program is to place selected candidates among the top 30 economics programs in U.S. Universities (according to American Economic Association rankings). If candidates do not appear to consistently possess the academic prerequisites to qualify for these programs but who are otherwise acceptable to the goals of the project, LASPAU will suggest other economics programs to be approved by USAID in advance of recruitment and selection.

The evaluation will examine placement procedures followed by grantees to ensure access by candidates to the 30 top economics programs in U.S. universities to determine the effectiveness of these procedures.

6. Monitoring and Group-Building

LASPAU is responsible for:

- a. providing comprehensive monitoring of the progress of all participants to ensure that the completion of programs coincide with the needs and expectations of the project and home institutions. To this end, LASPAU is required to provide semi-annual performance reports with information regarding: a) a comparison of actual accomplishments with the goals anticipated for the period; b) reasons why established goals were not met; and, c) names of the students selected for placement and brief descriptions of their performance to date.

b. offering all participants the opportunity to participate in activities that will complement their core study programs and strengthen their individual abilities as future policy makers and economic practitioners.

c. encouraging the development of policy-making and policy direction skills through special seminars. These seminars will provide the participants opportunities to experiment with varied technologies and strategies for effectively managing policy changes.

The contractor will assess monitoring and group-building activities by LASPAU and will make recommendations for improving reporting mechanisms. The contractor will critique with regard to frequency and effectiveness building activities. The contractor will identify alternative approaches.

ARTICLE IV - REPORTS

A. Reporting Format and Content: The contractor will provide a final report containing sections related to findings, conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learned. The report must be a stand alone piece which will present the reader with a comprehensive, in-depth overview and analysis of the LASPAU training program. The report will consist of the following:

I. Executive Summary:

1) objectives; 2) purpose; 3) methodology; 4) findings; 5) conclusions; 6) recommendations; 7) lessons learned; and 8) comments on development impact. The executive summary must be a self-contained document;

II. Project Identification Data Sheet (Annex A);

III. Table of Contents;

IV. The body of the report (approximately 30-40 pages) must include the purpose and study questions of the evaluation; the economic, political, and social context of the program; team composition, field of expertise and role it played in the evaluation, and study methods (one page maximum);

findings of the study concerning the evaluation questions (any deviation of the scope of work must be explained); conclusions; recommendations, in a separate section of the report; lessons learned and comments on development impact; and,

V. **Appendixes:** containing the scope of work, the most current logical framework, and lists of individuals and agencies contacted and documents consulted.

The contractor is also to complete the abstract and narrative sections of the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary Form. (Annex B).

- B. **Draft Report:** Once the tasks of the evaluation have been completed, the contractor will again visit Honduras to submit a draft evaluation report and fully debrief the USAID Mission on findings and proposed recommendations. Upon receipt of the draft report, the Project Officer will coordinate with the Evaluation Specialist and other Mission personnel, as appropriate, a review of the draft report.
- C. **Final Report:** The Project Officer will provide a composite USAID response on the draft report to the contractor NLT two weeks after receipt. The contractor will submit the final evaluation report - a minimum of nineteen (19) copies, (fourteen (14) in English and five (5) in Spanish) - to the Project Officer no later than four (4) weeks after the Mission furnishes the contractor with comments on the draft evaluation report.

ARTICLE V - TECHNICAL DIRECTIONS:

Technical directions during the performance of this delivery order will be provided by the USAID/Honduras Project Officer V. Diaz .

ARTICLE VI - PERFORMANCE PERIOD:

A. The effective date of this delivery order is September 4 1990 and the estimated completion date is December 31, 1990. The evaluation will be initiated within fifteen days of signature of the contract. Twenty working days are estimated for field activities.

50

B. Subject to the ceiling price established in this delivery order and with prior written approval of the Project Manager (see block 5 of the Cover Page), Contractor is authorized to extend the estimated completion date, provided that such extension does not cause the elapsed time for completion of the work, including furnishing of all deliverables, to extend beyond 30 calendar days from the original estimated completion date. The contractor shall attach a copy of the Project Manager's approval for any extension of the term of this order to the final voucher submitted for payment.

C. It is the contractor's responsibility to ensure that Project Manager-approved adjustments to the original estimated completion date do not result in costs to the Government which exceed the total amount obligated for the performance of the work. Under no circumstances shall such adjustments authorize the Contractor to be paid any sum in excess of the total amount obligated in this order for the performance of the work.

D. Adjustments which will cause the elapsed time for completion of the work to exceed 30 calendar days beyond the original estimated completion date must be approved in advance by the Contracting Officer.

ARTICLE VII - WORK DAYS ORDERED

<u>A. Functional Labor Category</u>	<u>Units Ordered</u>	<u>Fixed Rate</u>	<u>Total</u>
Team Leader (Fitzgerald)	36.0	1.725	

B. Subject to the ceiling price established in this delivery order and with prior written approval of the Project Manager, the Contractor is authorized to adjust the number of days actually employed in the performance of the work by each position specified in this order. The Contractor shall attach copy of the Project Manager's approval to the final voucher submitted for payment.

C. It is the contractor's responsibility to ensure that Project Manager-approved adjustments to the work days ordered for each position do not result in costs incurred which exceed the ceiling price of this delivery order. Under no circumstances shall such adjustments authorize the contractor to be paid any sum in excess of the ceiling price.

Delivery Order No. 20
PDC-0085-I-20-9060-00
Page 9

ARTICLE VIII - CEILING PRICE

For Total Work Days Ordered
For Other Direct Costs
Ceiling Price

ARTICLE IX - USE OF GOVERNMENT FACILITIES OR PERSONNEL

A. The Contractor and any employee or consultant of the Contractor is prohibited from using U.S. Government facilities (such as office space or equipment) or U.S. Government clerical or technical personnel in the performance of the services specified in the Contract, unless the use of Government facilities or personnel is specifically authorized in the Contract, or is authorized in advance, in writing, by the Contracting Officer.

B. If at any time it is determined that the Contractor, or any of its employees or consultants have used U.S. Government facilities or personnel without authorization either in the Contract itself, or in advance, in writing, by the Contracting Officer, then the amount payable under the Contract shall be reduced by an amount equal to the value of the U.S. Government facilities or personnel used by the Contractor, as determined by the Contracting Officer.

C. If the parties fail to agree on an adjustment made pursuant to this clause, it shall be considered a "dispute" and shall be dealt with under the terms of the "Disputes" clause of the Contract.

ARTICLE X - EMERGENCY LOCATOR INFORMATION

The contractor agrees to provide the following information to the Mission Administrative Officer on or before the arrival in the host country of every contract employee or dependent.

A. The individual's full name, home address, and telephone number.

B. The name and number of the contract, and whether the individual is an employee or dependent.

C. The contractor's name, home office address, and telephone number, including any after-hours emergency number(s), and the name of the contractor's home office staff member having administrative responsibility for the contract.

D. The name, address, and telephone number(s) of each individual's next of kin.

52

E. Any special instructions pertaining to emergency situation such as power of attorney designees or alternate contact persons.

ARTICLE XI - DUTY POST

The duty post for this delivery order will be Honduras.

ARTICLE XII - ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Access to classified information is not required.

ARTICLE XIII - LOGISTIC SUPPORT

The contractor is responsible for all required logistic support items.

ARTICLE XIV - WORK WEEK

The Contractor is authorized a six-day work week with no premium pay.

57

APPENDIX 2
CURRENT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

ANNEX II
Exhibit A
Page 1 of 2

POLICY ANALYSIS AND IMPLEMENTATION
Logical Framework

Life of Project Funding
From FY87 to FY 94
Total U.S. Funding \$12 million

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
A.1 Goal	A.2 Measurement of Goal Achievement	A.3 (As related to goal)	A.4 (As related to goal)
To promote sustained economic growth and stability.	Improved economic and fiscal performance as measured by, <i>inter alia</i> : a. Higher real GDP growth rates over the medium-term. b. Lower fiscal deficit as a percentage of GDP. c. Lower current account deficit in balance of payments as a percentage of GDP.	- Central Bank - Project monitoring - GOH reports - IMF/IBRD reports - Economic indicators	- Continued economic, social political stability in Honduras and Central America - Productive policy dialogue between A.I.D. and GOH continues. - Political climate favorable to private sector investment.
B.1 Purpose	B.2 End of Project Status	B.3 (As related to purpose)	B.4 (As related to purpose)
To strengthen Honduran capacity to formulate and implement economic policies and administrative reforms.	Significantly increased capacity on the part of the GOH to undertake economic analysis and implement policies as evidenced by policy studies and policy changes in the areas of foreign trade, customs administration, public sector expenditures, and export competitiveness. Strengthened private sector organization, COHEP, with increased membership, increased financial support from members, development of professional economic research capacity, published information and conferences establishing COHEP's position on economic policy issues and visible efforts by COHEP to influence national economic policy.	- Project monitoring - Project evaluation - Consultants reports - Economic reports - Copies of Reports - Attendance at conferences	- Leadership stability within the GOH. - GOH continues to implement economic reform package. - Continued efforts by COHEP to revitalize its organization and construct private public dialogue on economic growth. - Continued private sector willingness to participate in policy reform process.

ANNEX II
Exhibit A
Page 2 of 2

POLICY ANALYSIS AND IMPLEMENTATION
Logical Framework

Life of Project Funding
From FY87 to FY94
Total U.S. Funding \$12 million

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
C.1 <u>Outputs</u>	C.2 <u>Output Indicators</u>	C.3 <u>(As related to outputs)</u>	C.4 <u>(As related to outputs)</u>
Enhanced human resource base	10 Ph.D.s in economics 25 MA/MS in economics/public admin. 15 international short-term training	- S&T/OIT progress reports - Project monitoring	- Trainee nomination, selection and placement proceeds in timely fashion.
Analyses of key problems affecting the private sector	3-4 studies per year	- Copies of analyses	- Continued private sector participation - Identification of key problems in a timely manner.
Analyses of key problems areas affecting the national economy	Policy studies in the areas of public sector finance, export competitiveness, customs administration, and foreign trade.	- Copies of studies	- Contracting of T.A. in timely fashion, good coordination between A.I.D., the GOH, and contractor team
Improvements in public sector operations	Reduction of expenditures in public sector operations, Increased productivity in public sector operations.	Independent annual audits of public sector agencies presentation of annual reports on efficiency of public sector. Semesterly production of financial operation statements by decentralized agencies in accordance with accounting standards used by IFIs.	- Continued GOH efforts to rationalize public sector operations
Public dissemination of information regarding the need for private savings and investment for economic growth, the role and meaning of private enterprise and private sector views on public policy	Conferences and published reports from COHEP on economic and fiscal policy, pamphlets, newspaper articles or radio coverage on the role of private enterprise in the economy.	- Copies of reports, - Attendance at conferences	- COHEP efforts to revitalize its organizations and lead public private dialogue on economic growth.
D.1 <u>Inputs</u>			

(See Project Budget page 37)

6/10

Table 3
ESTIMATED PROJECT BUDGET
(US \$000)

	SOURCE OF FINANCING				TOTAL
	A. I. D.		GOH	PRIVATE	
	FX	LC	LC	SECTOR LC	
I. PUBLIC SECTOR POLICY ANALYSIS AND IMPLEMENTATION					
A. Technical Advisors	3,000	-	1,000	-	4,000
B. Equipment and Commodities	100	-	100	-	200
C. Training	3,000	-	-	-	3,000
D. Salaries and Adm. Exp.	-	-	1,000	-	1,000
E. Project Management	450	100	300	-	850
F. Project Liaison Officer	250	-	-	-	250
G. Evaluations	100	-	-	-	100
H. Audits	-	-	50	-	50
SUBTOTAL	<u>6,900</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>2,450</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>9,450</u>
II. PRIVATE SECTOR INSTITUTIONAL AND POLICY ANALYSIS STRENGTHENING					
A. Technical Advisor	525	130	-	-	655
B. Policy and Economic Analysis Strengthening	835	145	-	230	1,210
C. Policy Dialogue, Consensus-Building & Public Education	600	750	-	184	1,534
D. Institutional Consolidation	600	808	-	375	1,783
E. Administrative Support	-	210	-	161	371
F. Project Management	-	160	-	-	160
G. Evaluation and Financial Reviews	150	27	-	-	177
H. Endowment Trust Fund *	-	-	(1,000)	(1,000)	(2,000)
I. Commodities	60	-	-	-	60
SUBTOTAL	<u>2,770</u>	<u>2,230</u>	<u>(1,000)</u>	<u>950</u>	<u>5,950</u>
TOTAL PROJECT COSTS	<u>9,670</u>	<u>2,330</u>			
	\$12,000		2,450	950	15,400
	=====		=====	===	=====

(*) will be obligated under separate Memorandum of Understanding with COHEP

91

APPENDIX 3
LISTS OF INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED - BY AGENCY

List of Individuals Consulted by Agency**Part One: AID/W**

Anthony Vollbrecht, former USAID/Honduras Training Officer

USAID/Honduras (Tegucigalpa)

Eugene Szepsey, Chief Development Programs Office

Charles Richter, Chief, Office of Economic Policy Analysis

**Vicente Diaz, Project Manager, Office of Economic Policy
Analysis**

Albertina Centeno, Local Training Officer

Scott Taylor, Project Development Officer

Sandra Pineda, Economics Division

Maria Isabel Martel, Local Mission Economist

Part Two: LASPAU - Cambridge, MA

Lewis A. Tyler, Executive Director

Ned D. Strong, Area Director

Peter Bryant, Director of Finance and Administration

Steven Bloomfield, Chief Program Officer

Maya Evans, Program Officer for LASPAU/Honduras Project

Julie F. Leitman, Senior Scholar Advisor

Cathy Richmond, Scholar Advisor for Honduras

Ronald Berg, Program Officer

**Janet Chumley, Program Officer/English Language Orientation and
Enrichment**

Paul V. Murphy, Program Officer

Jennifer Secrist, Staff Assistant for Scholar Advisors

Part Three: San Diego State University**Faculty**

William H. Gaskill, Director, American Language Institute

James P. Johnson, Associate Director, American Language Institute

Clifford Young, Program Coordinator

Simone Simonetti, Reading Class Teacher for Group I and Instructor

Roxane Nuhaily, Student Coordinator

Tina Silberman, Computer Science Instructor

Norris C. Clement, Professor of Economics

Students - Personal Interviews

Roberto E. Miselem Laca

Marco Salomon Hilsaca

Jose Enrique Luna

Students - Sent LASPAU/Scholar Questionnaires

Mr. Percy Armano Buck Mendoza
Ms. Noemi Campos Varela
Mr. Julio Antonio Carcamo Rodriguez
Mr. Elmer Leonel Cerrato Ramirez
Mr. Pedro Antonio Curry Zavala
Ms. Teresa María Deras Diaz
Mr. Carlos Enrique Espinoza Tejeda
Mr. Hugo Danilo Guillen Hernandez
Mr. Edgardo Maradiago Ortiz
Mr. Pedro V. Martel Lagos
Ms. Desirée Medrano Mendoza
Mr. Sergio Arturo Membreño Cedillo
Mr. Dante Ariel Mossi Reyes
Ms. Ada Duarte de Ortiz
Mr. Jose Alberto Quan Gomez
Ms. Roxana Rivera Leiva
Mr. Roger Roberto Rodriguez Duron
Mr. Sergio Alejandro Zelaya Bonilla
Mr. Marcio Sierra
Mr. Roberto Lovo Rivera

APPENDIX 4
LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

List of Documents Reviewed

Part One: AID Documents

A. Documents Related to Project Administration

1) AID Grant (dated November 10, 1988), with

Attachment #1: Schedule (3 pp.), including sections on Purpose of Grant, Period of Grant, Amount of Grant and Payment, Financial Plan, Reports, Special Provisions, and Establishment of Indirect Cost Rates.

Attachment #2: Program Description (1 p.) - identifies LASPAU proposal entitled "Proposal to Train Honduran Economic Policy Leaders" of 5/20/88, amended by Ned Strong 8/25/88, as the program description for this grant.

Attachment #3: Standard Provisions (42 pp.) - applicable to the grant.

Attachment #4: Letter (2 pp.) of Ned Strong, LASPAU Area Director, to Tony Volbrecht, Chief, Human Resources Division, USAID/Honduras, dated 8/25/90, making clarifications to the LASPAU proposal

2) Excerpts from the Project Paper, including the Project Data Sheet, Estimated Project Budget, and Summary Listing of Illustrative Areas Assisted.

3) USAID/LASPAU Honduras Economic Policy Fellowship Program - Status Report: 1989-1990 Participants (undated)

4) USAID/LASPAU Honduras Economic Policy Fellowship Program - Participants 1989-1990 (undated)

5) AID Otorga Becas de Politica Economia (description of the program)

6) Programa de becas AID/LASPAU para estudios avanzados en economia (12/19/88), signed by Scott Thomas (USAID) and Gonzalo Carias Pineda and Blanca Rivera De Paz (for GOH)

7) USAID/LASPAU Honduras Economic Policy Fellowship Program - Placement Status - Participants Selected 1989-1990 (dated 6/1/90)

8) Honduras Itinerary for Maya Evans (LASPAU) (dated 6/4/90)

9) LASPAU Materials describing the Honduras Economic Fellowship Program

10) LASPAU Academic Progress Reports for Summer 1989 and Fall 1989 terms

62

- 11) **LASPAU Finally Selected Scholars Roster**
- 12) **Honduras Trip Schedule, February 7-12, 1989**
- 13) **Tentative calendar (English and Spanish versions) for the AID/LASPAU Economics Scholarships**

B. Project Correspondence

- 1) Memorandum (6/8/88) from Scott Thomas and Vincente Diaz (USAID/Honduras) to an attached distribution list on discussion of the LASPAU unsolicited proposal.
- 2) Memorandum (6/20/88) from Scott Thomas to Charles Richter and Vincente Diaz with recommendations on training.
- 3) Memorandum (6/22/88) from Scott Thomas to Charles Richter with recommended measures to be taken related to the USAID training program.
- 4) Memorandum (8/15/88) from Patricia Miller (Director, Center for Applied Linguistics) to EPA Candidates and Coordinators announcing orientation session for EPA Project candidates.
- 5) Memorandum (8/19/88) from Patricia Miller (Director, CAL) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) on GRE and TOEFL registrations.
- 6) Letter (9/2/88) from John Sanbrailo (Mission Director) to GOH Minister of Finance and Public Credit to make a change in the method of nominating public sector candidates for training programs.
- 7) Letter (9/5/88) from John Sanbrailo (Mission Director) to GOH Minister of Finance and Public Credit on the use of funds for the AID Policy Analysis and Implementation Support project.
- 8) Memorandum (10/18/88) from Scott Thomas (EPA) to Stan Nevans (EXO) providing a summary of the purpose and intent of the training component of the Policy Project.
- 9) Memorandum (11/14/88) from Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) to candidates for graduate economics scholarships and GOH coordinators, announcing grant made to LASPAU.
- 10) Unsigned copy of letter (11/25/88) from Charles Richter to GOH Minister of Planning.
- 11) Memorandum (12/21/88) from Vicente Diaz (USAID Honduras) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) on suggested changes to LASPAU instructions for applications to USAID/LASPAU scholarships.

List of Documents Reviewed

- 12) Memorandum (3/30/89) from Charles Richter (USAID/EPA) to John Sanbrailo (Mission Director) on LASPAU recruitment for the 1989/90 academic year.
- 13) Fax (4/11/89) from Maya Evans (LASPAU) to Tony Vollbrecht and Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) regarding acceptance packages to be sent to eight Honduran participants.
- 14) Memorandum (4/18/89) from Claudia Bisaccia (LASPAU) to Diane Pascoe c/o Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) proposing a Pre-departure Orientation Outline.
- 15) Memorandum (4/20/90) from Claudia Bisaccia (LASPAU) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) on pre-departure information for participants, with cover letter from John Sanbrailo (Mission Director).
- 16) Memorandum (8/11/89) from Maya Evans (LASPAU) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) on SDSU American Language Institute Midterm Evaluations and updated grid for TOEFL scores for participants.
- 17) Memorandum (9/8/89) from Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) to Charles Richter (USAID/EPA) on participant recruitment.
- 18) Fax (9/13/89) from Maya Evans (LASPAU) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) with report on pool of applicants.
- 19) Fax (9/14/89) from Maya Evans (LASPAU) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) with CV of Dr. Norris Clement (SDSU).
- 20) Fax (10/13/90) from Maya Evans (LASPAU) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) with correction of #18 on pool of applicants.
- 21) Memorandum (10/23/89) from Janet Chumley (LASPAU) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) as cover sheet for academic status reports (attached) on participant performance in ELTO courses.
- 22) Fax (11/2/89) from Maya Evans and Claudia Bisaccia (LASPAU) to Scott Thomas (USAID/Honduras) with information grid on pre-selected candidates for the 1990-91 academic year, categorized according to socio-economic sector.
- 23) Letter (12/89) from Lewis Tyler (LASPAU) to Sierra Discua (participant).
- 24) Fax (1/9/90) from Maya Evans and Mary Ellen Hardy (LASPAU) to Vincente Diaz (USAID/Honduras) with information grid on candidates for the Honduras Economic Fellowship Program and a course of study proposal for the 1990 English Language Training and Orientation Program (ELTO)
- 25) Fax (1/11/90) from Claudia Bisaccia (LASPAU) to Albertina Centeno (USAID/Honduras) indicating the participants ready to start classes at the SDSU American Language Institute and a list of the

List of Documents Reviewed

Fellowship Program participants currently in academic programs in the U.S.

26) Fax (1/12/90) from Maya Evans and Mary Ellen Hardy (LASPAU) with revisions to information grid supplied previously in their fax of 1/9/90 (see #1 above).

27) Letter (4/2/90) from Julie Leitman (LASPAU) to Charles Richter (USAID/Honduras) containing Progress Reports for USAID participants from Honduras.

28) Unsigned copy of letter (4/26/90) from Paul Davis (AID Office of Economics and Program Analysis) to Julie Leitman (LASPAU) with reference to maintenance of contractual reporting requirements.

29) Unsigned copy of letter (7/5/90) from Vincente Diaz (USAID/Honduras Project Officer) to Maya Evans (LASPAU) confirming understandings on listing of "top 30 economic programs in U.S. universities" and on authorization for LASPAU to provide additional preparation for participants not yet ready for placement in same.

30) Fax (7/16/90) from Maya Evans (LASPAU) to Vincente Diaz (USAID/Honduras) on "Colocaciones becarios USAID/LASPAU" for the academic year 1990-91.

31) Fax (8/3/90) from Charles Richter (USAID/Honduras) to Lewis Tyler (LASPAU) requesting the former's presence in Tegucigalpa to discuss problems in the placement of program participants.

32) Letter (8/6/90) from Lewis Tyler (LASPAU) to Charles Richter (USAID/Honduras) designating Steven Bloomfield to represent LASPAU to discuss the matters raised in #31 above.

33) Letter (8/7/90) from Janet Chumley (LASPAU) to Charles Richter (USAID/Honduras) on performance of the SDSU American Language Institute in preparing participants.

34) Llamadas telefonicas desde San Diego CA Recibidas por J.V. Diaz (8/7/90).

35) Memorandum (8/8/90) from Norris Clement (SDSU) to Maya Evans (LASPAU) with observations on selection and training of Honduran students.

36) Asuntos a conversar con LASPAU (8/9/90).

37) Aide memoire between USAID/Honduras and LASPAU (8/9/90) to a meeting discussing contractual obligations with regard to participant placement.

65

List of Documents Reviewed

C. Participant Dossiers

Reviewed by the contractor (9/7/90) at USAID/Tegucigalpa

The items in the following dossiers were given to the Mission by Steven Bloomfield (LASPAU)

1) Ms. Teresa Deras Diaz, Masters in Economics, University of Illinois. Letter (7/20/90) to Inta Gowdy (International Admissions Office, University of Colorado - Boulder) from Maya Evans (LASPAU) transmitting participant's dossier. Letters to University of Maryland. Form to participant asking for university diploma.

2) Roger Roberto Rodriguez Duron, Ph.D. in Economics. Letter (6/22/90) transmitting dossier from Maya Evans (LASPAU). Form from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute asking for TOEFL scores (5/11/90). Rensselaer form offering financial assistance (4/20/90). Certificate of admission from Rensselaer (8/24/90). Letter of Maya Evans (LASPAU) to Rensselaer requesting admission. Rejection letter from University of Chicago.

3) Marco Saloman Hilsaca. Internal LASPAU memo (7/31/90) from Janet Chumley with detailed information on programs. LASPAU form asking for data and documentation. Rejection letter and two other letters from Northeastern University. Letter of Maya Evans (LASPAU) to University of Illinois.

4) Edgardo Maradiago Ortiz. Letter (8/7/90) from Paul Murphy (LASPAU) asking for Ph.D. application fee form for University of California, Riverside. Request to send GRE test scores to the University of Maryland. Form letter to the University of Illinois. LASPAU letter to University of Virginia and confirmation of receipt. Fax from Claudia Bisaccio to participant. Xeroxed list of courses from University of Illinois.

5) Jose Enrique Luna. Highly favorable assessment (7/24/90) of participant's academic performance from Clifford Young (SDSU) to Maya Evans (LASPAU). A second letter to participant critical of his trip to Costa Rica with discussion of poor performance. Letter to participant from U Cal Riverside discussing his English language deficiencies. LASPAU form letter to U Cal Riverside. Xeroxed list of U Cal Riverside course offerings in Economics.

6) Mario G. Sierra Discua, M.A. Form (7/27/90) adding TOEFL score to participant's dossier. LASPAU form letter (7/26/90). Federal Express of dossier to University of Illinois, Chicago. University of Virginia form adding GRE scores to dossier. LASPAU form letter to University of Virginia. Rejection letter to participant from University of Massachusetts, Amherst. LASPAU form letter to University of Massachusetts. LASPAU letter to participant asking for additional documentation.

66

List of Documents Reviewed

- 7) Roberto E. Miselem Laca. LASPAU interview report (7/20/90). Acceptance letter from Duke University, with scholarship. Terms of award from Duke University (2/20/90). LASPAU form letter to Duke University. GRE scores. Handwritten notes. Duke graduate school application with summary data sheet - Master's in Economics. Form letter to University of Illinois, Chicago. Form letter to University of Illinois, Urbana. Form letter from San Diego State University. LASPAU letter requesting admission to SDSU. Seven pages of completed forms.
- 8) Hugo Danilo Guillen Hernandez. Critical letter (6/14/90) from Clifford Young (SDSU) on participant's visit to Honduras. LASPAU form letter (6/5/90) to Northwestern University adding TOEFL scores to dossier. Denial of financial assistance from Northeastern University. Letter from Northeastern University recommending graduate school admission. Form letter to Northeastern. Partial scholarship offer from University of Illinois, Urbana. LASPAU form letter to University of Illinois. Two page application to University of Illinois. LASPAU form asking participant for additional documentation.
- 9) Percy Buck. Additions (7/12/90) of GRE and TOEFL scores to dossier. Letter from participant to Professor Stein thanking him for a letter of recommendation. LASPAU form letter to the University of Illinois, Urbana. University of Illinois application forms. Terms of award. Handwritten notes. LASPAU forms asking participant for additional documentation.
- 10) Julio Carcamo Rodriguez. Terms of award (7/20/90) for Master's in Agricultural Economics from Virginia Polytechnic Institute. From adding GRE scores to dossier. Welcome letter (7/9/90) from Virginia Polytechnic to participant. Virginia Polytechnic letter to LASPAU. Virginia Polytechnic letter to participant approving application. Buck slip 3/15. LASPAU form letter to Virginia Polytechnic. Receipt of application. LASPAU form letter to Kansas State University. Application form to Kansas State University. LASPAU form asking participant for documentation.
- 11) Carlos Espinoza Tejada. Master's Degree. Unsigned recommendation/interview form. Unaddressed LASPAU form letter with note (7/31/90). Note about GRE scores. LASPAU form letters to University of Illinois, Chicago, and University of Colorado, Boulder (7/31/90). Form adding GRE scores to dossier (7/12/90). Rejection letter from University of Maryland. LASPAU form letter to University of Maryland. LASPAU letter to University of North Carolina. Rejection letter from University of North Carolina. LASPAU form requesting documentation.
- 12) Roxana Rivera. University of Tennessee letter (7/31/90) of acceptance. LASPAU letter to University of Tennessee declining their offer. Form letter adding GRE scores. University of Tennessee form requesting transcripts. Letter from University of Tennessee stating inability to grant scholarship. LASPAU letter requesting reconsideration. Graduate school application form.

List of Documents Reviewed

LASPAU form letter to University of Tennessee. LASPAU letter to Northeastern University. LASPAU form asking for more documentation.

13) Roberto Rivera Lovo. Recommendation/interview report. LASPAU form letter (7/30/90) to Louisiana State University. Express Mail letter to Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Letter (7/2/90) indicating receipt of application. Form (7/12/90) adding GRE scores to dossier. LASPAU form letter (6/20/90) to Virginia Polytechnic. Application form for Kansas State University. Kansas State memo indicating little chance of admission. Rejection letter from Kansas State University (6/21/90). LASPAU letter requesting new review with GRE scores. LASPAU follow-up letter to Kansas State. LASPAU form letter (6/11/90) to Kansas State. Rejection letter from Iowa State University. LASPAU follow-up letter to Iowa State. LASPAU form letter to Iowa State. Acceptance letter (4/28/88) from Mississippi State for Department of Agriculture.

14) Dante Areil Mossi Reyes. Acceptance letter (7/31/90) from Duke University. LASPAU memo to Duke sending application and test scores. LASPAU form letter (7/12/90) to Duke. Duke application forms. Memo (7/9/90) from Maya Evans (LASPAU) to MIT. Rejection letter and returned application from MIT. MIT application form. LASPAU form letter to MIT. Form adding GRE scores to dossier. LASPAU letter to Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Terms of award. LASPAU memo to Rensselaer. Visa form. Request for documentation from Rensselaer Polytechnic.

15) Sergio Membreño. Fax (7/30/90) confirming admission to University of Pennsylvania. Memo (7/30/90) stating participant's choice of Pennsylvania over Georgetown University. Admittance letter (7/11/90) from University of Pennsylvania. University of Pennsylvania letter (7/5/90) recommending admission to the doctoral program. Form adding GRE scores to dossier. LASPAU form letter to Pennsylvania. Two forms (1/18/90) adding GRE scores. Notes to Maya Evans (LASPAU). LASPAU form letter to University of Maryland. University of Maryland application forms. Proposed program of studies. LASPAU letter (7/5/90) declining offer from University of Southern California. Letter (5/2/90) from USC offering admission to participant. USC letter (4/30/90) stating recommendation for admission. Handwritten notes (3/12/90) and telephone numbers. Two letters from USC on receipt of application and forwarding of application. LASPAU form letter (2/8/90) to USC. Handwritten notes (5/3/90). Letter of conditional acceptance from Georgetown University. LASPAU form letter (2/8/90) to Georgetown. Georgetown University application forms. Fax (7/11/90) of admission to University of Pennsylvania. Handwritten letter (3/12/90) of participant to Maya Evans (LASPAU) indicating requests. Another three-page letter proposing a three-year plan of study. LASPAU form requesting documentation from participant.

List of Documents Reviewed

Part Two: LASPAU Documents

- 1) **LASPAU Program Calendar**
- 2) **Information Packet (provided to participants), including:**
 - a) **Cover Letter**
 - b) **USAID-LASPAU Honduran Economics Policy Fellowship Program - Financial Terms**
 - c) **Orientation Letter**
 - d) **Scholar Information Sheet**
 - e) **Authorization for LASPAU to Request Student's Transcript**
 - f) **Program Outline for LASPAU Scholars**
- 3) **LASPAU Letter to Academic Advisor**
- 4) **Course Outline Approval Letters**
- 5) **Academic Progress Report**
- 6) **LASPAU Semi-Annual Report (Oct. 25, 1990)**
- 7) **LASPAU Letter on Planning for Summer Courses**
- 8) **Summer Planning Form for LASPAU Scholars**
- 9) **End-of-Program Evaluation Form**
- 10) **Alumni Questionnaire**
- 11) **Masters' Course Outline for LASPAU Scholars**
- 12) **LASPAU Proposal to train Honduran Economic Policy Leaders**
- 13) **List of Participants - 1989-90 - 8 Participants**
- 14) **List of Participants - 1990-91 - 15 Participants**
- 15) **Correspondence (2 letters) between Maya Evans (LASPAU) and Dr. Gregory Wassall (Northeastern University) on participant placement**
- 16) **List of names and addresses of 1990-91 academic year participants**
- 17) **Instrucciones para llenar la solicitud de beca USAID/LASPAU (Description of program objectives mailed by LASPAU to all participants)**
- 18) **List of "top thirty Economics Departments" offering the M.A. degree**
- 19) **Summer Semester 1990 Enrollment and Grades**
- 20) **Report on Performance of the American Language Institute in Preparing Honduran USAID Participants in English and Economics**
- 21) **ELTO Center Evaluation Questionnaire - 1989**
- 22) **Application Forms for USAID-LASPAU Honduran Economics Policy Fellowship Program**
- 23) **LASPAU Program Announcement for USAID LASPAU Honduran Economics Policy Fellowship Program**

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Part Three: Documents from San Diego State University

- 1) LASPAU Address List (6/1/90)
- 2) LASPAU Program Spring 1990 Schedule
- 3) LASPAU Summer Session 1990 Schedules (Groups A & B)
- 4) Special Pay Salary Form (for summer courses)
- 5) Participation/Response List
- 6) Participant Class Assignments
- 7) Summaries of Textbook Assignments
- 8) Syllabus for U.S. Econ. 486 (4 pp.)
- 9) Syllabus for Computer Lab-PC Orientation
- 10) Conceptual Framework - Growth and Market Reform in the Global Economy (with charts and tables)
- 11) Memos from Wayne Young requesting teacher assessment of LASPAU students
- 12) Handwritten schedule for presentations
- 13) Memo (7/27/90) from Dawne Press to teachers of HIID and LASPAU Students: Summer 1990 Grade Reports

14) Participant Term Papers (11):

- Paper (11 pp. with bibliography) on "Monetary Policy" by Teresa Maria Deras
- Paper (10 pp.) on "Schools of Thought on Monetary Theory" by Edgardo Maradiaga
- Paper (9 pp.) on "Managerial Economics" by Mariano Sierra, with references
- Paper (9 pp.) on "Managerial Economics" by Roberto Misalem Laca
- Paper (11 pp.) on "Econometrics" by Carlos Enrique Espinoza Lejada
- Paper (12 pp.) on "Effects of Production Control Programs on the Agricultural Sector of the United States" by Julio Antonio Carcamo
- Paper (19 pp.) on "Benefits of the Price Support System in the Farm Sector" by Roberto Rivera
- Paper (10 pp.) on "Nature and Scope of U.S. Transportation Policy on Deregulation" by Roxana Rivera Leiva (?), with bibliography
- Paper (9 pp.) on "Energy Economics" by Dante Ariel Mossi Reyes
- Paper (8 pp.) on "Energy Analysis: A Description of an Economic Model" by Roger Roberto Rodriguez
- Paper (11 pp.) on "The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade" by Guillermo Buceno, with references

Textbooks:

- 15) Robert L. Heilbroner and Aaron Singer, The Economic Transformation of America: 1600 to the Present (Harcourt Brace, 1977)
- 16) Gary Clayton and Martin Gresbrecht, A Guide to Economic Statistics (McGraw-Hill, 1990)

List of Documents Reviewed

Other Materials:

17) LASPAU 1990 TOEFL Scores for 15 Honduran and 1 Venezuelan students

18) LASPAU/SDSU Mid-Semester Progress Reports (1/29 through 3/30/90) for:

Teresa Maria Deras
Carlos Espinoza
Roberto Miselem
Dante Mossi
Roberto Rivera
Roxana Rivera

19) Final Report of the Harvard Institute for International Development (HIID)/LASPAU Program 1990 (37 pp.).

20) Detailed report (20 pp.) of the combined HIID (15 Indonesian participants) and LASPAU (15 Hondurans and 1 non-AID Venezuelan participant) on contents and goals for three program sessions (intersession, spring semester, and summer session).

21) SDSU Spring Semester Final Reports (1/29 though 5/25/90) for:

Guillermo Briceño (not LASPAU Honduras)
Percy Buck
Julio Carcamo
Teresa Maria Deras
Carlos Espinoza
Hugo Danilo Guillen
Jose Enrique Luna
Edgardo Maradiago
Sergio Membreno
Roberto Miselem
Dante Mossi
Roberto Rivera
Roxana Rivera
Marco Salomon
Marcio Sierra

22) SDSU Summer Session Final Reports (6/4 through 8/10) for:

Guillermo Briceño (not LASPAU Honduras)
Percy Buck
Teresa Maria Deras
Carlos Espinoza
Hugo Danielo Guillen
Jose Enrique Luna
Julio Carcamo
Edgardo Maradiaga
Sergio Membreno
Roberto Miselem
Dante Mossi
Roberto Rivera

List of Documents Reviewed

**Roxana Rivera
Rodger Rodriguez
Marco Saloman
Marcio Sierra**

23) Letter (11/7/89) from William Gaskill (SDSU) to Janet Chumley (LASPAU) outlining original American Language Institute proposal for cooperation with LASPAU training programs.

24) Letter (2/23/90) of thanks from Isabel Alvarez of the World Council of San Diego to Teresa Deras, Dante Mossi, Roxana Rivera, and Carlos Espinoza, for volunteering to take care of registration at the recent World Council event.

25) List of 1989-1990 LASPAU Participants from the Economic Policy Fellowship Program

26) List of LASPAU Participants in the English for Academic Purposes Program

27) Announcement (10/22/90) by Patty Anderson to all EAP Instructors of a Simulated TOEFL Test

28) SDSU Informational Packet - containing:

General letter on SDSU American Language Institute
Letter on ALI English Language Programs
SDSU/American Language Institute (brochure)
Management and Business English (brochure)
Pre-MBA Programs (brochure)
Seminar for International Teachers of English (pamphlet)
Campus Recreation (magazine)
Handouts (3) on history of SDSU and its programs, housing, and welcome kit

72

APPENDIX 5
EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENTS

NAME:.....

QUESTIONS FOR LASPAU SCHOLARS

GENERAL

1. Where do you live in Honduras? Where are you or were you employed?

.....
.....
.....

2. Degree objective?

3. What school will you or are you attending? What is your grade point average?

.....
.....
.....

4. Who is your sponsor in Honduras?

.....
.....

5. What is your overall opinion of the LASPAU/Honduras program?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

SELECTION

6. In your opinion what qualified you to be selected? Based on what criteria? (List)

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

14

RECRUITMENT

7. How were you recruited?

.....
.....
.....

8. Were women given the same opportunities as men?

.....
.....
.....

UPGRADING PROGRAM (English language training and/or Economics and academic classes)

9. Did you participate in an Upgrading Program (six months)? Why were you selected to attend?

.....
.....
.....

10. Was your upgrading training adequate? If not, why? Please explain.

.....
.....
.....

11. Did your upgrading training help you to get accepted in a top economics program?

.....
.....
.....

12. How was your English language training? Quality of instruction? Materials? What point gain did you make on the TOEFL?

.....
.....
.....

75

13. **What basic courses in economics did you attend? Please evaluate them.**

.....
.....
.....

14. **How could the upgrading training be improved?**

.....
.....
.....

15. **During your program did you have a home stay with a U.S. family?**

.....
.....
.....

PLACEMENT

16. **How do the LASPAU placement procedures work? How were you placed? Any problems?**

.....
.....
.....

MONITORING AND GROUP BUILDING

17. **Has LASPAU monitored your progress? Has LASPAU assisted you when you have had academic problems?**

.....
.....
.....

18. **What activities have you had which complement your core study program? What have you done to strengthen your skills and abilities as a future economist in Honduras?**

.....
.....
.....

19. What special seminars have you attended or will you attend?

.....
.....
.....

20. What group building activities (such as the Honduran Economists in the LASPAU program) have you experienced? Suggestions for the future?

.....
.....
.....

OVERALL OPINIONS

21. Please rate your LASPAU/Honduras economics training program.

Excellent.....Very Good.....Good.....Satisfactory.....Deficient.....

22. Have you had contact with LASPAU? With whom in LASPAU?

.....
.....
.....

The USAID/Tegucigalpa?

.....

Your sponsoring institution?

.....

Any others? (List)

.....
.....
.....
.....

77

Please fill out the form and return it to us immediately in the enclosed stamped envelope.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours

Hunter A. Fitzgerald
Hunter A. Fitzgerald
Senior Associate

B

APPENDIX 6

**PLACEMENT AND STATUS OF SELECTED CANDIDATES
1989-1990**

Placement and Status of Selected Candidates, 1989-1990

Following is the status of those USAID scholars who have begun their studies in the fall of 1990:

Buck, Percy: Sponsored by the Empresa Nacional de Energía Eléctrica. Mr. Buck was admitted to the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, where he began his studies in September. He will pursue a Master's degree.

Cárcamo, Julio: Sponsored by the Escuela Agrícola Panamericana. Mr. Cárcamo just began his studies in September for the Master's degree in Agricultural Economics at Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

Deras, Teresa Maria: Ms. Deras began her Master's program in the department of Economics at Vanderbilt University in September. At this time her studies seem to be progressing smoothly.

Espinoza Tejada, Carlos: Mr. Espinoza is sponsored by the Banco Central and concentrates in Econometrics. He began his studies for the Master's degree in the Department of Economics at Vanderbilt University in September.

Gullién, Hugo: Mr. Gullién was admitted to the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. He is in the Master's degree program.

Maradiaga, Edgardo: Mr. Maradiaga is a professor of statistics at the UNAH. He is presently beginning his studies for the PhD. at Vanderbilt University.

Membreño, Sergio: Mr. Membreño was admitted to the Department of Economics at the University of Pennsylvania as a doctoral candidate. He began those studies in September.

Miselém, Roberto: Mr. Miselém has been admitted to the Master's program in Economics at Duke University. Those studies will begin in January of 1991.

Mossi, Dante: Mr. Mossi is now pursuing a PhD. in Economics at Duke University. Those studies began in September.

Rivera, Leiva Roxana: Ms. Rivera is beginning her studies at Northwestern University. She was admitted to the Master's program.

Rodriguez Duron, Roger: Mr. Rodriguez, an electrical engineer, has begun his studies for the Master's degree at the University of Virginia.

Placement and Status of Selected Candidates, 1989-1990

Salomon, Marco: Mr. Salomon, of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, will begin his Master's program in Economics at Boston University in January of 1991.

Three candidates are presently preparing to enter a formal program for a degree in Economics.

Luna Soto, José: Mr. Luna continues his English language program at San Diego State University for this semester. At this time his application for graduate studies has been accepted by Vanderbilt University, with the understanding that his doctoral status will begin once he has proven his ability with a semester of graduate work.

Rivera Lovo, Roberto: Mr. Rivera is sponsored by UNAH-CURLA. At this time he is preparing himself for doctoral studies while on a leave of absence from the program at his alma mater, Mississippi State University. We are confident that his status will be clarified in a short time.

Sierra Discua, Marcio: Mr. Sierra continues his preparations in English and economics at the Economic Institute in Boulder, Colorado. His application is pending at Vanderbilt University. He will pursue a Master's degree.



APPENDIX 7

AIDE MEMOIRE BETWEEN USAID/HONDURAS AND LASPAU



AIDE MEMOIRE BETWEEN USAID/HONDURAS AND LASPAU

9 August 1990

For the further implementation of the Economic Policy Fellowship program, USAID/Honduras and LASPAU have agreed on the following points:

1. Candidate selection will proceed with utmost attention given to the ability of fellowship recipients to be admitted into top-ranking departments of economics. LASPAU acknowledges that it would be best for LASPAU to avoid all ambiguity about the quality of potential universities where the Honduran students will carry out their graduate work. Thus LASPAU will endeavor to place individuals where there will be no need for discussion with USAID/Honduras about the merits of the placements, and LASPAU will make certain to select candidates who will be admissible to top programs.

2. The top universities are unequivocally determined by the attached list of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. The top ten institutions are to be considered optimal, although USAID/Honduras and LASPAU acknowledge that only two of the universities admit candidates to terminal master's programs. The top thirty are to be considered acceptable. Beyond the top thirty, there may be a few other acceptable institutions that distinguish themselves for particular reasons -- a special strength in Latin American or development economics, for example -- and those as of this date are Vanderbilt University, Boston University, and the University of Texas at Austin. (The names of Northeastern University, the University of Illinois at Chicago, the University of Colorado, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and the University of California at Riverside will not pass the lips of LASPAU with regard to this project ever again, except when mentioning Northeastern in reference to the site of study for a few among the first group of fellows.) LASPAU will make every attempt to place individuals among universities at the very top of this list, knowing the importance this has for USAID/Honduras.

For placements in agricultural economics -- which are allowable to a limited extent under the goals of the project -- the previously mentioned list for economics departments will serve as a general guide, as will a list devised by Jack Gourman that has been considered of low scholarly quality by USAID/Honduras and LASPAU but which seems to compile a recognizable list of institutions to aim for within this field.

3. In the absence of acceptable placements in U.S. institutions, LASPAU may consider sending individuals to "centers of excellence" in economics in Latin American. USAID/Honduras would approve:

67

-2-

- o el Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México (ITAM)
- o el Centro de Estudios Macroeconómicos de Argentina (CEMA)
- o la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Facultad de Economía y Ciencias Administrativas, and
- o la Universidad de Tucumán (Argentina).

Other Latin American institutions that LASPAU may find to be strong placements can be brought before USAID/Honduras for discussion and approval or rejection.

4. LASPAU will carefully consider the future use of San Diego State University as a center for English-language training and academic preparation in economics. Despite the excellent improvement in the English of the Honduran economists, as indicated by their progress on the TOEFL, their doubts about the program, and the doubts planted in the minds of USAID/Honduras personnel could mean that the program be abandoned in favor of a program at either the State University of New York at Buffalo, the University of South Carolina, or the Economics Institute, affiliated with the University of Colorado at Boulder, for the next group of admitted candidates.

5. LASPAU and USAID/Honduras commit themselves to improved communication between the institutions so that neither misunderstandings, nor misperceptions, nor a lack of mutual confidence undermine the common goal of both institutions to train the best economists available to Honduras in the next generation. LASPAU makes a renewed commitment to provide, in accordance with Attachment #1 of the grant contract, semi-annual reports on program accomplishments, goals that have not been met, and the names and statuses of the individual participants.

6. At the same time, LASPAU will endeavor to win back the shaken confidence of the Honduran fellows by means of contact with them by phone, prompt answers to their questions and worries, and a visit to San Diego State University within the next ten days to clarify as concretely as possible the status of the individuals still not satisfactorily placed within the program, laying out the options that they have before them and the expectations held for them by USAID/Honduras and LASPAU. USAID/Honduras will refer the fellows' inquiries about their status directly to Maya Evans, Senior Program Officer, or Steven Bloomfield, Program Director, LASPAU. USAID/Honduras will direct that the fellows' comments about the general quality of the implementation of the program by LASPAU be put in writing and directed to USAID/Honduras for future discussion and resolution by USAID/Honduras and LASPAU.

5/11

-3-

7. Regarding the sixteen individuals chosen in the 1989 selection of fellows, USAID/Honduras and LASPAU agree that the following eight individuals are satisfactorily placed:

o	BUCK, Percy	U. of Illinois at Urbana- Champaign
o	CARCAMO, Julio	Virginia Polytechnic Inst.
o	MEMBREÑO, Sergio	U. of Pennsylvania
o	MISELEM, Roberto	Duke U.
o	MOSSI, Dante	Duke U.
o	RIVERA, Roxana	Northwestern U.
o	RODRIGUEZ, Roger	U. of Virginia
o	SALOMON, Marco	Boston U.

The following eight individuals still need to be placed successfully in top economics departments, and LASPAU will make certain that they be provided with the English-language courses, the preparatory work in economics, and the hard work by LASPAU on challenging placements that they deserve. USAID/Honduras recognizes that the training may need to take place beyond September 1990, and may not necessarily take place at San Diego State University:

o	DERAS, Teresa Maria
o	ESPINOZA, Carlos
o	GUILLEN, Hugo
o	LUNA, José
o	MARADIAGA, Edgardo
o	NUÑEZ, Gabriela
o	RIVERA, Roberto
o	SIERRA, Marcio

It is recognized both by USAID/Honduras and by LASPAU that individuals may be sent back to Honduras if and only if their English proficiency or economics aptitude is severely lacking -- as defined by the top economics institutions -- even after LASPAU provides extensive opportunities for pre-academic training. Work toward a second master's -- at a top-ranking university -- can be contemplated for individuals initially selected for doctoral work who are found not to be admissible at the doctoral level.

LASPAU will make every endeavor on behalf of the Honduran fellows to secure success as defined by USAID/Honduras and the fellows' Honduran peers.

Table 5 CONFERENCE BOARD OF ASSOCIATED RESEARCH COUNCILS
 Quality of ~~economic faculty~~ ~~opinion surveys~~

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Massachusetts Institute of Technology D | 47. Claremont Graduate School |
| 2. Chicago, University of M, D | 47. Iowa, University of |
| 2. Harvard University D | 47. Pittsburgh, University of |
| 2. Stanford University D | 50. Pennsylvania State University |
| 5. Princeton University D | 50. N Carolina State University (Bus & Econ) |
| 5. Yale University D | 52. Boston College |
| 7. Minnesota, University of (M), D | 52. Indiana University |
| 8. Pennsylvania, University of D | 52. S Methodist University |
| 9. Columbia University M, D | 52. Wayne State University |
| 10. California, University of, Berkeley D | 56. George Washington University |
| 10. California, University of, Los Angeles D | 56. Oregon, University of |
| 10. Northwestern University M, D | 56. Rice University |
| - 10. Rutgers University M, D | 56. Syracuse University |
| 14. Wisconsin, University of, Madison D | 56. Tulane University |
| + 15. Rochester, University of D | 61. Colorado, University of, Boulder |
| 16. Michigan, University of (M), D | 61. Kentucky, University of |
| 17. New York University (M), D | 62. State U of New York, Binghamton |
| 18. Brown University D | 65. Connecticut, University of |
| 19. California, University of, San Diego D | 65. Florida State University |
| + 19. Maryland, University of, College Park M, D | 65. Oklahoma State University |
| 21. Carnegie-Mellon University (Inc. Admin.) D | 65. Wisconsin, University of, Milwaukee |
| 21. Cornell University D | 69. American University |
| 21. Johns Hopkins University D | 69. Kansas, University of |
| 24. California Institute of Technology D | 69. Missouri, University of |
| 24. Duke University, M, D | 69. New School for Social Research |
| 24. Virginia, University of (M), D | 69. Oklahoma State University (Agl Econ) |
| 27. Michigan State University M, D | 69. S Carolina, University of |
| 27. Virginia Polytech Institute and State U M, D | 69. Utah, University of |
| 27. Washington, University of, Seattle M, D | 76. Colorado State University |
| 30. Illinois, University of, Urbana-Champ M, D | 76. Georgia State University |
| 30. N Carolina, University of, Chapel Hill M, D | 78. California, University of, Riverside |
| 30. S Carolina, University of (M), D | 78. Nebraska, University of |
| 33. California, University of, Davis-Agl Econ | 78. State U of New York, Albany |
| 33. Washington University, Saint Louis | 81. Cincinnati, University of |
| 35. Texas A & M University | 81. Georgetown University |
| 36. California, University of, Davis | 81. Hawaii, University of |
| 36. Purdue University | 81. Washington State University |
| 36. Iowa State University | 81. W Virginia University (Bus & Econ) |
| 36. Vanderbilt University | 86. Notre Dame University |
| 40. Massachusetts, University of, Amherst | 88. Oklahoma, University of |
| 40. Ohio State University | 88. Arkansas, University of |
| 40. Boston University | 88. Clark University |
| 40. State U of New York, Stony Brook | 88. N Illinois University |
| 44. California, University of, Santa Barbara | 91. Case Western Reserve University |
| 44. Florida, University of | 92. Fordham University |
| 44. Texas, University of, Austin | 93. S Illinois, University of |

Source: Extracted with permission from An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States Social and Behavioral Sciences, ©1982 by the National Academy of Sciences.

76

23. **What are your suggestions to improve the program? (List.)**

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

24. **Please list any serious problems you have had during the program.**

.....
.....
.....

25. **What are your plans when you finish your program and degree?**

.....
.....
.....

Thank you for your cooperation!

CHECCHI AND COMPANY CONSULTING, INC.

1730 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036-3193

TELEPHONE
202-452-9700
FAX: 202-466-9070

CABLE ADDRESS
"CHECCHI"
TELEX 440157

November 1, 1990

Mr. Carlos Enrique Espinoza Tejeda
c/o Economics
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, TN 37240

Dear Mr. Tejeda:

The Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) has contracted a Washington D.C. based consulting firm, Checchi and Company Consulting Inc., located at 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, North West, Telephone 202-452-9700 to evaluate the Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities (LASPAU). The purpose of this contract is to assess LASPAU accomplishments to date and to make recommendations for improving the training program under the LASPAU grant. Mr. Hunter Fitzgerald is the evaluation's team leader. He has already met with USAID/Tegucigalpa staff, LASPAU personnel in Cambridge, Massachusetts and visited the American Language Institute in San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Some interviews have been conducted with individual participants in person or by telephone. However, we are very interested in having your inputs and ideas about the program. Filling out the attached questionnaire is not a requirement of your program. Nevertheless, your voluntary answers will help in assuring a complete and fair analysis.

The questionnaire is organized around the evaluative areas in the contractor's scope of work. They are the following:

- o Objective of training
- o Selection criteria (of participants)
- o Recruitment procedures
- o Upgrading training (English language and economics training prior to placement)
- o Placement Procedures (Into 30 top U.S. Economics Universities).

If you have any questions or problems with the questionnaire, please call either Hunter Fitzgerald or Lauren Rubley collect at (202) 452-9700 from 9.00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. (Eastern time zone) Monday through Friday.

28