

PD-ABD-781
75813

**FINAL REPORT
EVALUATION OF THE CYPRUS-AMERICA
SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM (CASP)**

**Under Contract No. PDC-0085-I-00-6098-00
Delivery Order No. 19**

Submitted to:

**Office of Technical Resources
ASIA/Near East Bureau
Agency for International Development**

Submitted by:

**Development Associates, Inc.
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, VA 22204
(703) 979-0100**

January 27, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Study Purpose/Objectives/Background.....	1
B. Study Methodology.....	4
C. Organization of the Report.....	7
II. FINDINGS.....	9
A. CASP Administrative Procedures.....	9
1. Overall Operations.....	9
2. AMIDEAST U.S. Operations.....	11
3. Cyprus Operations	15
4. Program Costs	26
B. Mail Survey/Interviews.....	28
1. Background.....	29
2. Recruitment, Selection, and Orientation.....	30
3. Support Services and Academic Program.....	39
III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	52
APPENDICES:	
A. Summary Response to Specific Tasks	
B. List of Persons Contacted	
C. Questionnaires/Data Collection Instruments	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This project was carried out under Contract No. PDC-0085-1-00-6098-00, Delivery Order No. 19, titled Evaluation of the Cyprus-America Scholarship Program, (CASP). This evaluation is the first external effort of the CASP and focuses primarily on the performance of AMIDEAST (the AID contractor responsible for implementing CASP) and the Cyprus Fulbright Commission (CFC) which oversees the program in Cyprus.

The evaluation study involved (1) a mail survey of approximately 90 CASP participants studying at universities in the U.S; (2) on-site interviews with a sample of U.S. CASP participants on campus; (3) interviews with AID and AMIDEAST staff; (4) review of documents and records; (5) a field visit to Cyprus to interview program staff, U.S. embassy officials, Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities, and a sample of returned CASP participants. Over 100 interviews were conducted in Cyprus during the field visit.

The study results indicate that CASP is functioning at high levels of performance both in Cyprus regarding recruitment, selection, and counseling as well as in the U.S. where AMIDEAST places scholarship students and monitors their activities in addition to performing other administrative support activities. CASP participants are being selected in accordance with Cypriot planning priorities although scholarship students generally have wide latitude in choosing fields of study.

The CASP is very highly regarded by both Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities and students. It is also clear that U.S. colleges and universities were considered by many Cypriot authorities and educators as having higher standards than many European and Eastern Bloc educational institutions.

Thus, while Cyprus as a whole has a high number of college trained persons, according to officials of the planning bureau and the mayor's office, CASP graduates are usually the first to be absorbed into the economy and are highly considered for government jobs when opportunities are open.

The CASP also appears to provide a positive and constructive forum for bi-communal relations, albeit in a limited manner, between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. One recent CASP project which brought members of the two communities together to work on a master plan for restoration of Nicosia was viewed as a model project by all concerned parties, and similar projects should be encouraged in the future. Also, short-term training opportunities, because of their obvious impact on fostering Cypriot development, should be increased as it was evident that such projects had significant development impact on both Greek and Turkish communities.

While the program is functioning well in all aspects, there are several administrative issues which need to be addressed. These issues and possible resolutions were brought to the attention of AMIDEAST, the CFC, and the U.S. Embassy in Cyprus, and there appears to be agreement on steps which need to be taken to improve the situation and establish clear lines of administrative authority for CASP.

In summary, then, CASP by all accounts is an important program to Cyprus and to both Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. The result is not only progress toward achievement of Congressional goals for this program and AID objectives but a strong contribution towards a positive U.S. image in the views of Cypriot students, educators, and government officials.

3801D/12.87

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Study Purpose/Objectives/Background

The purpose of this study was to carry out the first external evaluation of the Cyprus-America Scholarship Program (CASP) under AID IQC No. PDC-0085-1-00-6098-00, Work Order No. 19, for the Asia/Near East (ANE) Regional Bureau.

The CASP was developed in response to U.S. Congressional interest in ameliorating the politically unsettled situation in Cyprus where the break away Turkish Cypriot "state" has strained relations between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. Congress approved funding for the CASP to be administered by AID. The Scholarship Program was designed to strengthen Cyprus' economic and social development and provides full and partial graduate and undergraduate academic scholarships for Cypriot students to attend U.S. colleges and universities. It also provides for short-term technical training for mid-level professionals in the public and private sectors. All scholarships and training are to be in development related fields as established by the Cyprus National Planning Bureau, the Scholarship Board and AID. The program is targeted at both Greek and Turkish Cypriots on a ratio of four Greek participants to every Turkish participant. This ratio is based on the estimated population distribution of Cyprus which is 80 percent Greek and 20 percent Turkish.

The CASP Program is administered under a joint arrangement in which AMIDEAST is a recipient of an AID cooperative agreement, but has a sub-recipient relationship with the Cyprus Fulbright Commission (CFC) which has oversight responsibilities for CASP staff and activities in Cyprus, and which leases space to CASP in the Fulbright Commission office in Cyprus. This arrangement with the Fulbright Commission in Cyprus was prompted in part by the Commission's bi-communal status which permits it to operate beyond the United Nation's controlled buffer zone or so-called Green Line into occupied Cyprus and to deal with both Greek and Turkish Cypriots throughout the island. AMIDEAST, as the prime AID contractor, has responsibility for the implementation of the CASP overall and is directly responsible for the placement of scholars in the U.S. and subsequent monitoring and support

activities. The CFC in Cyprus has certain oversight responsibilities through its Executive Director for the implementation of the program in Cyprus, including but not limited to recruitment, selection, orientation, and follow up. The day-to-day activities are the responsibility of the local CASP staff which is part of the administrative mechanism of the CFC. The specific responsibilities of the CASP Program Coordinator and the Executive Director of the CFC are listed as attachments I and II to the Letter of Understanding between the Cyprus Fulbright Commission and AMIDEAST. Parenthetically, because AID has no presence in Cyprus, the Letter of Understanding specifies that the functions of the recipient (AMIDEAST) and the sub-recipient (CFC) "are to be carried out collaboratively and consultatively with AID and the Department of State." The Letter of Understanding was signed by the Chairman of the Cyprus Fulbright Commission (A Public Affairs Officer of the United States Information Agency who is assigned to the U.S. Embassy) and the Senior Vice President of AMIDEAST.

The CASP procedures and operations were legally approved by the Republic of Cyprus as evidenced by a Note Verbal, executed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the U.S. Embassy in Nicosia, Cyprus, November 9, 1981, thus establishing legal status for CASP in the Republic of Cyprus.

The CASP began on October 1, 1981 and is currently programmed to continue through September 30, 1996. Funding approved to date (through FY 1986) is 35.8 million. An additional \$5 million is authorized for the program in FY 1987.

The total projected number of participants to be educated and trained through CASP are 354 full scholarships, 270 partial scholarships, and 120 short-term participants, for a total of 744 scholarships to be awarded over the length of the program. As of April 30, 1987, a total of 598 participants had received scholarships with 171 program completions. The number of scholars selected for the school year beginning September 1988 is 92 academic (62 full and 30 partial) and 20 short term participants.

The program as perceived by both current and past participants through individual interviews is very successful in meeting its goals and objectives. In addition, U.S. Government and Cypriot officials thought the program was not

only important to U.S. foreign policy interests in Cyprus but was successful in training and educating Cypriot scholars for Cyprus' economic and social objectives.

Some data which the evaluation team obtained from the Government of Cyprus reveal what may be a very significant impact of the Cyprus America Scholarship Program. During the 1979-1980 school year, before the CASP began, there were 600 Cypriot students studying at U.S. universities. This number constituted 4.9% of the total number of Cypriots studying abroad. During 1985-1986, the most recent period for which government figures are available, the number of Cypriots in U.S. institutions of higher education was 2,231, or 21.63% of the total. Thus, in a span of six years which included the first four years of the CASP, the U.S. share of Cypriots studying abroad grew from 4.9% to 21.6%.¹ Today, only Greece and Turkey rank ahead of the United States as the most popular destinations for university-bound Cypriots.

What is perhaps even more significant about these data is the apparent effect of CASP on non-CASP scholars in deciding what country they will go to for studies. It is the opinion of some of the Cypriot officials the team interviewed that CASP students have helped create a critical nucleus of Cypriots in the U.S. which has motivated those who do not need scholarship support to choose U.S. schools rather than those in Europe and elsewhere. Many examples were cited of cousins, siblings, and friends of CASP scholars deciding to go to the same U.S. school as their CASP scholar relative/friend. If these assumptions are correct, they would account for the magnitude of the growth in U.S. bound Cypriots during the first years of the CASP, since CASP itself accounted for only about 400 of 2,231 Cypriots in U.S. schools in 1985-86.

From all the interviews conducted with Greek and Turkish Cypriot officials, it was clearly evident in Cyprus that the CASP is extremely well known by government officials and students (both Greek and Turkish Cypriots) and is considered the most important scholarship program on the island in both quantitative and qualitative measures.

It also provides one of the few forums in Cyprus for bi-communal relations and activities which is also considered a critical factor in Cyprus' present situation. More specific information on the program's operations and impact is provided later in this report. Next we discuss study methodology and the manner in which the evaluation was carried out.

B. Study Methodology

This study was carried out by a two person team in two distinct phases. The first phase consisted of developing evaluation instruments and conducting interviews with U.S. program officials, AMIDEAST program staff, and current scholars attending U.S. colleges and universities.

The second phase involved a three week visit to Cyprus to review CASP operations and to interview former returned scholars as well as various persons associated with the program.

Part of the final evaluation report was written in Cyprus and completed on return to the U.S. Below is a detailed account of the study methodology and procedures followed by the evaluation team.

Phase I

Development Associates, during the initial phase of this study, conducted interviews with ANE Bureau staff to finalize the study approach and confer on data collection strategy and the development of the specific evaluation instruments. The meetings with AID staff resulted in agreement on the key issues as well the data collection approach. To address the specific evaluation questions and issues contained in the IQC scope of work, the framework of the evaluation design was based on the specific tasks outlined in the scope of work which are as follows:

- "A. Determine progress to date in meeting the objectives of the program as specified in the basic AID documents;
- B. Determine how the Cypriot authorities, both Greek and Turkish, view the CASP program and its implementation and usefulness;
- C. Determine if the fields approved for academic and short-term training meet the priority needs of Cyprus;

- D. Review and describe the recruitment, selection, counseling, and follow-up procedures carried out in Cyprus and the respective roles of the Cyprus Fulbright Commission, U.S. Embassy, AMIDEAST, and the Cypriot authorities. Determine whether procedures are effective, if the working relationships of all concerned parties are operating satisfactorily, and whether improvements can be made in existing procedures or relationships;
- E. Determine whether the most qualified and deserving applicants are being awarded scholarships;
- F. Determine whether the Cypriots selected are generally capable of meeting the scholarship demands of U.S. universities. Assess the academic performance of Cypriot students in U.S. universities and estimate the percentage of students who successfully complete their educational programs and return to Cyprus;
- G. Determine the adequacy of pre-departure training/orientation programs that are in place and assess whether the level of support provided to participants in the U.S. is appropriate;
- H. Assess the degree to which AID sponsorship of CASP is made known to Cypriot scholarship recipients and the Government of Cyprus;
- I. Review the post-training activities and determine if returned participants are able to find suitable public or private sector employment;
- J. Review and describe the U.S. placement and monitoring processes carried out by AMIDEAST;
- K. Comment on the impact of the program on bi-communal cooperation;
- L. Interview a representative number of students currently pursuing academic programs to obtain their views about AMIDEAST's administration of their training programs and the appropriateness of the schools selected for their educational programs;
- M. Review the basis for AMIDEAST's costs and compare AMIDEAST's administrative costs with other training contractors;
- N. Compare this CASP to other similar programs such as the AID program in Italy managed by LASPAU in terms of costs, support provided to students and administrative procedures and relationships;
- O. Make recommendations as needed for improving CASP administrative or other procedures."

Other issues and questions considered relevant to the study and the evaluation purpose included reviewing of the administrative lines of authority as addressed in the Letter of Understanding between AMIDEAST and The Cyprus Fulbright Commission and assessing the perception by participants on the

merits of developing a CASP alumni association in Cyprus in order to bring together CASP participants for professional and social gatherings. Finally, participants were asked to comment on developing a job bank in Cyprus for returned participants.

The above described tasks embraced several activities: (1) document review and analysis of both AMIDEAST and AID materials, memos, reports, and other data; (2) personal interviews conducted with AID, CASP administrators and participants; and (3) a mail survey of current participants.

Phase II

During Phase II the team spent three weeks in Cyprus reviewing CASP program organization, operations, and administration. The CASP program is attached to the Cyprus Fulbright Commission (CFC) and includes the Program Coordinator, two counselors, two secretaries, (half-time) whose salaries are paid by AID Funds through AMIDEAST but are nevertheless employees of CFC with the Executive Director acting as an advisor and responsible for exercising general oversight of the program. The team reviewed extensive materials and conducted 102 interviews including 34 returned participants and 21 persons comprising CASP and CFC Program staff in addition to both Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities.

In carrying out these activities, Development Associates developed four data collection instruments as follows:

1. A Mail Survey Questionnaire for CASP participants currently studying at U.S. colleges and universities. This instrument was mailed to ninety-five participants who were randomly selected from a list provided by AMIDEAST which identified current full and partial CASP participants. An Interview Guide adapted from the mail survey questionnaire was administered to participants at Georgetown University, George Washington University, Boston University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, UCLA, and University of Southern California. These universities were purposely selected based on geographical considerations, number of participants, proximity of schools, and logistical priorities in terms of travel and timing of visits.
2. A Field Survey Interview Guide for returned participants who had successfully completed their study program and returned to Cyprus. A total of 34 persons were interviewed (35 were scheduled but one participant was ill and could not meet the appointment). Interviews were

conducted with 27 Greek Cypriots and 7 Turkish Cypriots. Twenty-four of the participants were either full or partial undergraduate and graduate former scholars and 10 were short-term participants from both the public and private sectors.

3. An Interview Guide for Cyprus Officials, Embassy Personnel, and Fulbright Staff. This instrument was used for those relevant persons in Cyprus who were associated with the program in one way or another, including Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities who participated in the CASP on the selection committee or on the Fulbright Commission Board, CASP Staff, CFC Staff, and Embassy Personnel.
4. An Administrative Questionnaire for AMIDEAST on CASP operations, administration, policy, and other program matters. In addition, figures were requested for program and administrative costs per participant month as well as total program costs.

Copies of the evaluation instruments and a list of persons interviewed in Cyprus are in the Appendix. However names of current CASP participants who took part in the mail survey and interviews in the U.S. are confidential and identifying them would serve no real purpose with regard to the evaluation findings and their relevance to the study.

C. Organization of the Report

The report is divided into three major sections which are: I. Introduction, II. Findings, and III. Conclusions and Recommendations. Each section is further divided into sub-sections dealing with specific content areas relevant to the section.

It should be noted that the report is organized according to key areas of inquiry regarding CASP administrative procedures, data collection and interview activities both in the U.S. and Cyprus, and other areas determined to be important components of the evaluation and/or CASP objectives. This approach permitted a more orderly treatment of the evaluation process and variables and allowed the evaluators to organize the study material into a logical sequence which identifies and describes the issues and objectives that then lead to conclusions and recommendations.

The list of areas in the scope of work described earlier in alphabetical order as A through O are all covered in the various sections of the evaluation report. However, if the reader wishes to find specific answers to each area or study topic as a separate finding, a summary response is provided for each key area in Appendix A. For several reasons, some of which may be obvious in terms of data analysis and flow, the report was not organized according to the individual topic areas A to O, as such an organization would have made it difficult to describe the characteristics of CASP within an overall evaluation framework. Moreover, merely responding to the aforementioned areas without a discussion of the program context as a whole would sacrifice some important descriptive detail.

Finally, a briefing of the field visit was provided to the U.S. Embassy Charge d' Affaires and acting Ambassador and the USIA Public Affairs Officer on the findings and recommendations with particular focus on the administrative lines of authority impinging on CASP operations in Cyprus. A briefing was also provided to the CASP Program Coordinator and CFC Executive Director on administration and management problems as well as specific program issues. On return to the U.S. a briefing was provided to AMIDEAST and a final briefing prepared for AID/Washington officials.

In the next section we discuss evaluation findings related to the entire program.

II. FINDINGS

This section deals with three areas of importance to the CASP which have a direct bearing on key policy and program matters. The areas are:

- A. CASP Administrative Procedures
- B. Mail Survey/Interview Results
- C. Post Training Activities/Impact

The findings cover both U.S. and Cyprus evaluation activities and address all of the areas delineated in the scope of work in sub-paragraphs A through O (see appendix A), in addition to other relevant topic areas and related issues which arose from discussions with persons regarding program operations, administration, and CASP impact.

A. CASP Administrative Procedures

1. Overall Operations

The arrangement under which the CASP operates is unique in that AMIDEAST, under contract with AID for program administration, has a sub-recipient relationship with the Cyprus Fulbright Commission which has specific program responsibilities in Cyprus. In addition, the State Department, ipso facto, assumes some program responsibility for two key reasons: (1) there is no AID presence in Cyprus so the U.S. Embassy is the U.S. Government representative for AID programs in Cyprus; and (2) the USIA Public Affairs Officer (PAO) attached to the Embassy is, by virtue of his position, the Chairman of the Cyprus Fulbright Commission and is therefore ultimately responsible for CFC activities and operations. Also he has supervisory responsibility over the Executive Director of the CFC. (The CFC Board of Directors also is included.) Thus, while AMIDEAST is responsible for program implementation of the CASP, there are other administrative layers with some measure of executive autonomy. Finally, while the CASP staff in Cyprus is budgeted and paid for by AMIDEAST through AID funds under the Cooperative Agreement, each staff member is technically an employee of the

CFC. (The Letter of Understanding between AMIDEAST and the CFC stipulates, however, that the CASP Program Coordinator be hired in consultation and approval of AMIDEAST. This has not always been followed.) This kind of arrangement has inherent problems regarding program authority and operations because of the fragmented nature of information requirements, reporting, responsibility, and decision-making. The Letter of Understanding between AMIDEAST and the CFC attempts to address these issues (e.g., responsibility and decision-making) and identifies some specific lines of authority relating to the CASP Program Coordinator and the Executive Director of CFC. However, specific lines of authority covering the various administrative levels are not covered in great detail or within an hierarchical program framework, especially with regard to final authority and "due process." While there are some clear statements on functions and activities of the Program Coordinator and CFC Executive Director in the Letter of Understanding, the absence of role clarification between the various parties involved with the CASP can be confusing. Understandably, this can create administrative ambiguity and misunderstandings and indeed this has occurred variously in the past. Also, the present program mechanism places a higher reliance on compatible personalities than do more clearly defined program organization structures. Parenthetically, it should be noted that CASP is a unique scholarship program and differs from other participant training in a number of ways, particularly the roles which the Embassy and CFC play in the program. However, while the Letter of Understanding does not address certain issues, it is essentially a strong, useful document which can form the basis for establishing efficient working relationships between the various management components. Therefore, a major recommendation of this study is to redraft the Letter of Understanding in greater detail as to lines of authority, coordination, and administrative autonomy.

Despite the different levels of authority involved in the CASP, it is evident to us that this has not affected the program operation per se. The scholarship program is functioning at very high levels of performance, has had significant impact in a number of key areas including student scholars and Cypriot authorities both Greek and Turkish, and is achieving some important accomplishments in U.S. foreign relations objectives. However,

the administrative issues regarding lines of authority need to be clarified in order to facilitate program management and provide for more effective, creative programming of participants and development objectives in Cyprus, as well as establish firmer relationships with AMIDEAST and U.S.-based administration.

2. AMIDEAST U.S. Operations

The major U.S. CASP operations conducted by AMIDEAST involve placement, support services, monitoring, follow up, and such other administrative activities as are required in the coordination and communication with CASP staff in Cyprus. AMIDEAST also participates in the Cyprus orientation of scholars and in the selection process by sending a staff person to Cyprus at the time those events occur.

The full-time professional staff persons supported by CASP in the U.S. consist of: (1) program director; (2) one program coordinator/advisor; (3) two senior educational specialists one of whom handles partial scholars and short-term training and the other handles full scholars; (4) one student record specialist/bookkeeper; and (5) two program assistants.

The placement process, which is the major AMIDEAST responsibility, by all accounts is functioning in a commendable fashion. AMIDEAST/CASP staff report no major problems in the placement of full scholars (AMIDEAST does not place partial scholars who obtain university or school entry on their own initiative). More importantly, the scholars themselves, both from the mail survey and field interview responses, indicated very high satisfaction with the placement process. The participant views on this subject are treated in more detail in Section B, Mail Survey/Field Interviews. The short-term technical participants (the majority of whom are mid-level professionals from government agencies plus a few from the private sector) are always relatively more difficult to place than academic scholars, but their individual satisfaction was high in terms of appropriate short-term training or other experiences such as observation tours which were arranged

for them. AMIDEAST did express, however, that placement of short-term technical participants "in medical fields can be problematical." Several factors account for this including high cost of malpractice insurance for training of medical doctors and difficulty in arranging proper medical supervision and oversight of training. Aside from the unique short-term problems associated with medical fields, the short-term training placements have been as equally creditable as the long-term training.

AMIDEAST reports that it monitors U.S. participants through a systematic procedure by which the staff advisors:

- review participant transcripts/grade reports after every semester or quarter;
- ascertain and confirm that participants are taking full academic courseloads unless recommended otherwise by their academic advisor;
- contact the participant to provide counsel when their academic performance is poor;
- respond to student telephone requests and assist in solving problems. Referrals to various local and campus services for problem assistance are also provided to participants;
- visit participants on campus at least once every two years while they are in the U.S.; and
- provide advice, information on program regulations on a regular basis through letters, telephone conversations, and a quarterly newsletter.

The monitoring function is generally viewed by participants as an extremely important part of the support services, especially in terms of AMIDEAST advisors' responding to requests for help or assistance in many areas including transportation, housing, and financial matters. Thus, all evidence indicates that the monitoring procedures of student scholars are very effective.

Follow up procedures have been recently developed and are either being implemented or are in the process of implementation. AMIDEAST, for example, has developed an evaluation questionnaire which is sent to students who are completing their programs. The specific purpose of the questionnaire is to help AMIDEAST "better understand the impact of U.S. educational programs"

as well as to ascertain student impressions of the U.S. and of Americans. The questionnaire is comprehensive covering most aspects of his/her student's stay in the U.S. and their academic program and objectives.

Other areas of inquiry are included such as students' perception of social and educational mores in the U.S. and Cyprus touching on sexual and racial discrimination as well as comparison of personal traits of Americans and Cypriots (e.g., open-minded, polite, hard working, materialistic). The questionnaire can provide some very useful information regarding both policy and program objectives of CASP in addition to being an obvious management tool for AMIDEAST in future planning, orientation, selection, placement, and other support services.

Two other follow up activities are in the process of formulation. These are the establishment of a CASP alumni association in Cyprus and the development of a job bank to assist returned CASP participants in finding employment in addition to providing the private sector in Cyprus with a convenient "bank" of recently trained college graduates and skilled professionals with baccalaureate, masters, and doctorate level training. Both of these proposed efforts are excellent ideas. While the job bank is a relatively easy system to develop since its primary product is updated information, it will require some effort to establish employer contacts in Cyprus and maintain communication with them and returned participants. The CASP Coordinator and one of the CASP counselors will be responsible for organizing the job bank under the direction of the AMIDEAST program director. The alumni association, however, presents some major problems which are not easily overcome. The most critical problem seems to be how to organize the association without aggravating the political sensitivities of both Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. Also, their differences concerning organization not surprisingly represent or are symbolic of the respective political positions at the national level. For example, the Greek Cypriot alumni want one organization with all members equal in which Greeks would be in the majority. The Turkish Cypriots want separate organizations or chapters with representatives of each meeting several times a year in the buffer zone to discuss mutual concerns, projects, efforts, etc.

It seems fairly obvious that the chapter concept is the only practical solution given the political circumstances in Cyprus. Also, the purpose of any organization involves meetings and frequent communication depending on particular planning events or other activities. Since Turkish Cypriots need a pass to enter the buffer zone and all meetings would have to be convened there, it would be difficult if not impossible to carry out normal organizational activities (i.e., meetings, telephone communication, mailings, etc.).

The potential for politicising the alumni association when and if it becomes formally organized is a key issue of concern, and in many respects this politization seems to be germinating. It is unknown at this time whether the organizers of the alumni association (i.e., returned Greek and Cypriot scholars) have agreed in general on the purpose and objectives of the association such as bi-communal health or education projects, professional exchange and communication, or merely to maintain contact to support CASP activities for future scholarships. However, it would seem that consideration of what the alumni association hopes to accomplish and its raison d'etre should take precedence over organizational structure which generally follows after goal clarification.

Other constraining factors are Cypriot legal requirements regarding registration of organizations like the alumni association, and the fact that any meeting which involves both Greek and Turkish Cypriots must be held in neutral United Nations territory, probably at the Ledra Palace which is the usual site for CASP and CFC bi-communal meetings. The Ledra was once a prominent hotel in Nicosia but since it lies in what is now the United Nations-controlled buffer zone, it is used by the U.N. as a neutral facility to conduct bi-communal functions. Whether legal issues can be resolved is highly problematical. Turkish Cypriots will not accept an organization sanctioned legally by Cyprus and it is doubtful that other avenues under Cypriot incorporation law can be found. One possible solution being explored is to incorporate the alumni association in the U.S.

In order to assist the CASP alumni in these efforts the CASP Coordinator and USIS staff attend organization meetings and provide support and counsel to the organizers when requested by them.

While there are significant barriers to establishing an alumni association the eventual success will depend to a great degree on how firm and resolved the organizers are in making the association work. This, in turn, however is directly related to what it is the organizers hope to accomplish.

Whatever the outcome, the idea of an alumni association has merit which transcends its basic idea, which is to develop a forum for Greek and Turkish Cypriots to communicate and exchange ideas. If this occurs and the alumni association is successfully organized, it could well be in our view one of the major outcomes of CASP and could stimulate communication between the two communities on a number of issues. The interest and will of former participant scholars to organize an alumni association seems positive as personal interviews and mail survey results indicate. There remains only to find a way despite some formidable barriers.

In the next section we discuss how the CASP is organized and administered in Cyprus.

3. Cyprus Operations

In this section we discuss Cyprus operations of CASP and how they relate to both long term academic training and short term technical training.

a. Academic Training

Academic Training consists of a number of discrete activities including recruitment and selection which are discussed below.

Recruitment

Announcements in both the principle Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot newspapers constitute the formal mechanism by which potential scholars are advised of CASP and invited to apply for scholarships. This process begins in January with the placement of newspaper announcements in approximately 15 newspapers (10 Greek and 5 Turkish) briefly describing

the program and indicating what tests are required (TOEFL, SAT/GRE, etc.) and where to obtain application forms. In late May or early June there is a second series of announcements containing substantially more detail regarding necessary qualifications of applicants and criteria for selection. These are placed in the same newspapers as the January notices and are issued as a series of three separate and distinct messages. The first provides information, including details on selection, qualifications, and application deadline for the full undergraduate scholarships (four years; tuition, fees, maintenance, and books). Several days later a second announcement is placed for the full graduate scholarships (two years). The third covers partial scholarships for both graduate and undergraduate candidates and appears about three days after the second announcement. Partial scholarships cover either tuition or maintenance; the choice is made by the student.

It should be noted that although the newspaper announcements continue to be an important method of communicating to the public about the availability of scholarships under CASP, many current applicants first hear of the program from friends, family, teachers, and co-workers who have participated in CASP or know someone who has. Since the program is now six years old, it is widely known throughout the island. In interviews with current and former CASP scholars, 45% indicated they first learned of the program from someone they knew whereas 35% became aware of CASP through the newspaper ads.

Overall, the recruitment process functions well, and the January/June announcement procedures seem to be appropriately timed to assure candidates' ability to meet testing and application deadlines. However, it is our view that the June announcements are unnecessarily detailed and could be substantially shortened without excluding essential facts with regard to selection criteria and application requirements. Any necessary additional detail could be incorporated into the application form or an information leaflet attached to it. This would also shorten the time necessary to clear the draft announcements with the Embassy and PAO. Additionally, there would be a reduction in staff time to translate the

announcements (they appear in English, Greek and Turkish) and reduce the possibility of factual errors creeping into the ads in one of the non-English versions.

Selection

The selection process begins with the receipt of the completed application forms. If students bring their applications to the Fulbright office in Nicosia, they are encouraged to go over it with one of the counselors to check for completeness of information, test scores, and appropriate field of study. If there are problems in any of these areas, advice is given on how to fully comply with the CASP qualification requirements.

When applications are mailed in or delivered by someone other than the applicant, the counselor who reviews it will follow up with a telephone call to the applicant if the application is not acceptable as submitted.

During the weeks following the application deadline, the CASP/Fulbright staff assess each application and record essential information such as family income, grades from secondary schools, TOEFL and SAT scores, and field of study on a master chart which is eventually used by the scholarship selection panels in their deliberations. Those applicants who fail to meet certain key criteria are relegated to a special group which the CASP Coordinator and Fulbright Director disqualify. However, the final decision on the acceptability of these applications is always left to the selection panels although they do not normally request a panel review of applicants in this group. The criteria for eliminating applicants during this pre-screening process are:

1. Family income above the cutoff level established by the Fulbright Commission based on Government of Cyprus guidelines.
2. Lack of TOEFL and/or SAT scores.
3. Dual citizenship (Cypriot-American).

Those applicants who meet the minimum requirements are sent a letter so indicating and inviting them to be interviewed by the appropriate selection panel.

The final step in the selection process consists of the selection panels who choose the winning candidates. There are three panels: full undergraduate scholarships, full graduate scholarships, and one for both graduate and undergraduate partial scholarships. These panels are convened consecutively during late October and take place in the Ledra Palace.

Each selection panel is comprised of six voting members plus the CASP coordinator who acts as a resource for candidate information and selection criteria but does not vote. Panel membership changes from year to year but always includes two Americans, the Fulbright Executive Director, two Greek Cypriots, and one Turkish Cypriot. The USIS Public Affairs Officer (who as noted is also the Chairman of the Fulbright Commission,) fills one of the designated slots for Americans. This year, the second U.S. panel member was an AMIDEAST staff person stationed in Jerusalem. Greek and Turkish Cypriot members are usually from government ministries or are former government officials. The Fulbright Director acts as chairman of the panel.

Following each interview the panel discusses the applicant and the qualifications as indicated on the master spreadsheet prepared by the CASP staff. The spreadsheet does not identify candidates by name in order to help insure objectivity. Of course, occasionally a candidate is known to a panel member through family or other connections. Each member of the panel is given a vote sheet to indicate his assessment of the candidate. If there is too wide a spread between the high and low scores, panel members are polled and asked to discuss their reasons for a particular score. This process usually contributes to a consensus about the suitability of the individual in question.

In general, criteria for selection are:

1. Citizen of Cyprus (cannot hold dual citizenship);
2. Economically disadvantaged (the maximum family income allowable varies according to number of family members and other factors such as financial assets and a limit of one sibling per family at one time);
3. English proficiency (generally, this means a minimum TOEFL score of 550, but occasional exceptions are made for those with slightly lower scores if their academic and other qualifications are outstanding);
4. Must have taken the SAT (for undergraduate) or an appropriate graduate level qualifying test (GMAT or GRE);
5. Must have at least a grade of "C" on five 0-level exams if attending a school that teaches on the English system (GCE's) and an average of 85 out of 100 on last secondary school report;
6. Undergraduates must be under 25 at the time they will enter their university; graduates must be under 30; and
7. Students already studying in the U.S. may not receive a full scholarship but may be considered for a partial.

The number of scholarships awarded each year is a function of both the total dollars (AID funds) available to the program and a decision by AMIDEAST as to how many of each kind should be awarded. Within the total funds available, the CFC has some flexibility to adjust the numbers in any particular category if the Commission and Coordinator feel it is necessary. This year there were 42 full undergraduate scholarships, 10 full graduate scholarships, and 40 partial (both graduate and undergraduate) scholarships. The panel will limit the number of scholars within a specific field of study if, in its judgment, this creates an imbalance of priorities.

Once the three selection panels have concluded their deliberations, the CASP staff send letters to all applicants to advise them of the selection decision.

Placement

In mid-October orientation sessions are scheduled for scholarship winners to help them fill out the standardized AMIDEAST university application form, prepare the short essay required for each scholar, and go over the

AID allowances they will receive. Separate sessions are held for Greek and Turkish Cypriots and for full and partial scholarship winners. During the remainder of the fall months each scholar is counseled by one of the CASP counselors to assist with research on possible schools to attend (the actual placement of students is handled by the AMIDEAST Washington staff, but student preferences are taken into account if the requested schools are academically appropriate and within the tuition ceiling established by AID).

The educational specialists at AMIDEAST are responsible for the actual placement of CASP students as described previously in Section II. Sub-Section A.2 of this report. During the placement period, there is frequent communication by memo and telephone between the CASP staff in Cyprus and the AMIDEAST placement officers regarding choices of schools, processing of application forms, application deadlines for various schools, and status of school acceptances. Placement appears to function well, and communication is good between U.S. and Cyprus.

Orientation

Orientation for CASP scholars in Cyprus consists of two phases. The first is a brief two-hour session described above which is conducted in the fall after the selection of new scholars is completed. The second phase occurs in July for participants who are scheduled to depart for the U.S. in September. This pre-departure orientation is a bi-communal event conducted in the Ledra Palace for all Greek and Turkish Cypriot scholarship recipients. The orientation takes place during the course of one day. Topics include discussions of academic life in the United States, AID participant training regulations and allowances, and AMIDEAST participant support services. Returned CASP graduates are invited to the orientation to provide commentary on their personal experiences studying in the United States and to answer questions about life in the U.S. The orientation is led by the AMIDEAST CASP Project Director who makes an annual trip to Cyprus during this period.

Summary

The CASP selection process may seem to the outside observer to be unnecessarily long and complex, given the much simpler selection procedures that characterize most other AID participant training programs. However, it is clear from observations and interviews in Cyprus that the present procedures comprise what has become a carefully and appropriately meticulous process which is highly respected by both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities. The integrity of the CASP, particularly with regard to selection, is universally praised by all parties. The work of the selection panels is the one true bi-communal activity of CASP in the sense of an active, cooperative joint participation by both communities. That they conduct their work harmoniously, effectively, and impartially is a tribute to the quality and dedication of the panel participants and to the guidance and assistance of the CASP/Fulbright staff.

b. Short-Term Training

Short term technical training is a strong feature of the CASP and has become an important, although secondary, component in the overall program. Currently, the AMIDEAST budget permits 20 short term participants per year. Their recruitment, selection, and placement are handled separately from those of the academic students.

The cycle for short term training begins in late November at which time the CASP Coordinator and Fulbright Director meet with the GOC Planning Board to review a detailed list of technical training priorities which the Board prepares for submission to CASP. The list is drawn from recommendations solicited by the Board from the various ministries of the GOC. AMIDEAST is not consulted on priority fields except as to feasibility of placement in certain cases.

In December the CFC places an advertisement announcing the availability of applications for short term training during the coming year. The ads

appear in the same Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot newspapers that publicize the academic scholarships. The deadline for applications is four weeks after the ads appears.

Applications are completed by those public sector officials whose ministries have already identified them as candidates for short term training prior to the November CFC-Planning Board Review meeting and any private sector persons who wish to participate in the program. Priority fields recommended by the Board during the current year have included industrial pollution control, telecommunications, consumer protection, and highway construction. The private sector has produced candidates in internal medicine, physical therapy, and export development. On the Turkish side there is no procedure which parallels the GOC Planning Board's priority list. Potential participants, from both the public and private sectors, submit applications in response to newspaper announcements.

Once the applications are received, they are reviewed by the CASP coordinator who checks them for completeness, degree of specificity with regard to type of training requested and training objectives, permission from candidate's supervisor or agency for leave of absence (government employees), and whether the field of training is considered a priority.

A selection panel is convened to select the candidates which is similar in composition to those for the academic scholarships. This year's panel included the CFC Executive Director, the USIS PAO, and a representative of the GOC Planning Bureau. As with the academic selection process, the CASP Coordinator acts as a staff advisor to the panel but casts no vote.

The criteria used in selection are those stated above. There are no quotas set for public vs. private sector participants although the majority have tended to come from government agencies among both the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot groups. There is some indication that the Planning Bureau would like to have its priority list govern the selection of both public and private sector candidates, but so far this

has not been made an issue. However, the selection panel does take the list into account in its deliberation of private sector candidates to the extent that the fields identified by the GOC for public employees/enterprises are relevant to private sector training.

Following selection, the candidates are notified by letter of the panel's decision, and the CASP coordinator begins the process of helping (when necessary) each winning candidate with refining or further defining the training needs and objectives, determining preferred training dates, and length of training. This information is then forwarded to AMIDEAST to provide the necessary programming and placement.

As with short-term training everywhere, especially the kind of individualized programs typical of CASP participants, there is a substantial effort required of AMIDEAST staff to design, develop, and finalize each person's training experience. Once this process is complete, the Cyprus CFC-CASP staff provides the participants with a brief orientation during which time they receive information on the U.S. program, a ticket, and an initial maintenance allowance check. Short term participants pass through Washington at the beginning of their U.S. training only in cases where some or all of their training is to take place there. When it does, AMIDEAST arranges a meeting with the CASP placement officer to review the program with the participant and answer any questions he or she may have. When Washington is not in the itinerary, the AMIDEAST placement officer discusses these issues by phone once the participant has arrived at the university or other training site.

At the end of training, the participant returns directly to Cyprus, and in some instances, is contacted by the CASP Coordinator to discuss and assess the quality and appropriateness of the training program.

Based on our interviews with returned participants and in our discussion with GOC and Turkish Cypriot officials, there is every indication that the CASP short term training component is a highly successful one. Participants are of high calibre and, especially on the government side,

generally in very key management and leadership positions. Training fields selected are appropriate to the country's development needs, and AMIDEAST has done an excellent job in designing individual training programs which focus on the specific training objectives of the participant.

Minor criticism on the part of some returned participants has focused on the lack of a Washington orientation to their programs and the study objectives and, in others, some misunderstanding on the part of CASP staff as to the trainees' specific training needs. Additionally, our review of participant files suggests that the CFC-CASP staff needs, in some cases, to give more attention to helping the candidate define very specifically what the training needs and objectives are so that AMIDEAST will have sufficient information to program an appropriately tailored training experience. Also, the evaluation team thinks that orientation and "experience America" components should be added, where feasible, to the program.

We also note that not all short term participants are debriefed in Cyprus by CFC-CASP upon their return. Such debriefings are specifically called for in the AMIDEAST-CFC Letter of Understanding. More importantly, they serve three very useful purposes:

1. They provide valuable feedback to CFC and AMIDEAST regarding the quality and appropriateness of the participant's training and information that could be useful in improving or modifying similar training for future participants.
2. They provide an opportunity to mitigate any negative impressions the participants might have about his experience by allowing an official channel for complaint and the reassurance that their criticisms and suggestions will be taken into account in trying to improve the program.
3. Finally, the post-training interview helps emphasize to the participant and his sponsoring agency CASP's interest in this program, and its impact on the development of Cyprus does not end when the training program is completed.

One of the functions which the evaluation team explored with GOC and Turkish Cypriot officials, as well as with CFC-CASP staff and USIA, is whether the number of short term participants ought to be increased. In general, there was considerable support for offering a larger number of training slots each year based on the number of good candidates who are currently not selected because of program limitation and the recognized urgency of upgrading the country's technical human resource base to help the country compete successfully in the fields of international trade, banking, high technology, and offshore business development. Of the 125 applications received this year, it is estimated that as many as 35 high quality candidates could have been selected (funds permitting) instead of the 20 which were AMIDEAST's quota. Further, there has been relatively little effort to recruit participants from the private sector through professional publications, company newsletters, announcements, and direct communication between CFC-CASP and key private enterprises and professional/business associations. Thus, more could be done to increase the number of short term training candidates if the annual quota were lifted.

A final observation on short term training concerns what the evaluation team views as the need to provide a more flexible and responsive mechanism for selecting participants. The current system of limiting selection to a one-time annual competition severely limits CASP's ability to meet training needs not identified in the annual selection or to take advantage of unique training opportunities whose existence was not known by CASP until after the selection process was completed. In the experience of AID participant training programs worldwide, an important factor in assuring the success of short term training is the ability of staff to respond quickly and flexibly to training needs and opportunities to achieve program objectives. While we are not suggesting that the current system be abandoned, we do see the need for an established procedure for handling short term training requests which fall outside GOC-CASP annual recruitment and selection cycle.

4. Program Costs

The training and administrative costs per participant month by AMIDEAST seem well within the average cost of AID participant training based on earlier cost studies. For example, academic training (program costs per participant month) as reported by AMIDEAST, are \$1,326 for full scholars in FY 1987 and \$645 per participant month for partial scholars. These costs fall within the range in costs in a previous study on a sample of AID training contractors.

This study, titled "Participant Training Contractor Cost Study" conducted in 1986, sampled a total of 45 contractors responsible for 3,814 participants during FY 84. Most of the major contractors which provide participant training services for AID were covered in the study including AMIDEAST which was sampled on one other contract with AID. In the 1986 study, 70% of the academic training costs per participant month fell between \$601 - \$1,400, with approximately 50% of this range falling within \$1,001 - \$1,400 per participant training month. The average cost is \$1,155 and 20% of the cases fell between \$1,401 - \$3,000 per month. The cost per participant training month for CASP is within the average range but, if both full and partial scholars are included, the average cost drops to \$986 per participant month. While these figures are not exactly comparable to other AID participant training programs (indeed the CASP Program requirements are stricter and therefore could potentially be more costly), they do provide representative figures for the types of training provided and therefore are sound benchmarks for comparing CASP costs with the costs of other major AID participant training programs. Moreover, the CASP figures do not account for an inflation factor of approximately 6% per year from FY 84 to FY87. If inflation is included, the average cost for CASP full scholars is below the study average of academic training costs for FY 1984.

Technical training for CASP was \$3,665 per participant month compared to an average cost of \$2,920 per month in the 1986 study; however, in that study technical training costs varied so greatly that the average was skewed downward. For example, 53% of the technical training costs per participant

month fell between \$2,801 - \$4,500 with approximately 50% of that range showing costs from \$3,501 - \$4,500. Thus, if an inflation factor is included, CASP technical training costs, while above the FY 1984 average, are well within the average range.

It should also be noted that technical training costs are particularly elusive of comparisons due to the highly individualized nature of the training. While certain comparisons are valid and serve useful purposes for analysis, technical training fluctuates greatly and is subject to extreme variation.

The administrative cost per participant month, again as reported by AMIDEAST, shows a highly efficient operation, especially since AMIDEAST supports both a headquarters office in Washington, D.C. as well as a CASP office in Nicosia, Cyprus. If we use the 1986 study for comparison, the average CASP cost per participant month is well below the average administrative cost of \$246 per month. The CASP cost is \$73 per participant month for the headquarters operation and \$109 per month for field office and headquarters.

In the 1986 study 27 contractors out of 39 fell between \$ 0 - \$100 to \$401 - \$500 for administrative cost per participant month. Of those 27 contractors there were 6 which had costs below \$100 per month and 14 or approximately 52% which had costs below \$200 per participant month. Thus, the administrative cost of the CASP is below the average administrative costs identified for the 1986 study sample. Parenthetically, AMIDEAST reported that administrative costs per participant month include both academic and technical training (AMIDEAST only programmed 24 technical trainees out of a total of 419 participants). Thus, the figures for administrative costs are primarily for academic training.

Overall, the program costs (as reported) are well within the average cost range of other AID contractors established from data gathered for the 1986 Participant Training Contractor Cost Study, and in some instances (e.g., academic training and administrative costs) are below the previously established norms for those training components.

B. Mail Survey/Interviews

A major part of this study was the mail survey conducted on a random sample of participants who were selected from a mailing list of both full and partial scholars. Technical trainees were not considered as part of the sample because of their short duration in training, their frequent movement in some cases from site to site, and the inherent difficulty of locating short term participants with a mailing address which would permit sufficient time for response. Since short term participants were included in the sample of returned trainees who were interviewed in Cyprus, it was considered sufficient to obtain information from them through field interviews.

The questionnaire which was designed to obtain information on participants' perceptions of the CASP and their level of satisfaction with their training and support services provided by AMIDEAST was mailed to 95 scholars. Five questionnaires were returned indicating incorrect address and 55 questionnaires were completed and returned to Development Associates. This figure of 55 responses represents a 61% return rate with no follow up which is very good considering many questionnaires may not have reached the addressee. Indeed, interviews with college and university officials confirmed that scholars had moved during the summer, and it was sometime before addresses were brought current. Regardless of whether addresses were correct the 61% response rate is considered high for a random mailing, especially with no follow-up to track down participants. This was not done because of the short time period for the study which did not allow for follow-up procedures on the mail survey.

Student scholars were invariably enthusiastic concerning the CASP and responded fully to the questionnaire. This was also true during the U.S. interviews on campus where students scholars exhibited a high degree of cooperation and were clearly interested in describing their thoughts and impressions of the CASP.

The questionnaire was divided into three general sections including:

1. Background, 2. Recruitment, Selection and Orientation, 3. Support Services and Academic Program.

Each of the sections will be discussed separately beginning with the background information of the participants.

1. Background

The profile of the participants revealed a median age of 22 with the ages ranging from 19 to 27 years. Male students were on the average older than females because military requirements were satisfied before scholarship selection. Females were generally in their late teens and constituted approximately 33% of the scholars with males comprising 67%. Approximately 41% of the participants were over 22 years of age at time of their response to the questionnaire. Most were pursuing Baccalaureate Degrees, with some participants doing M.A. work.

The sample of full and partial scholarship fields was distributed mainly among the sciences and business administration. The greatest number of participants were in the field of engineering (B.S. degree) followed by computer science or computer engineering.

The list of academic fields by percentage of participants pursuing study is as follows:

<u>Field</u>	<u>Percentage of Scholars</u>
Engineering	32
Computer Science	19
Business Administration	13
Education	7
Economics	6
Hotel Management	5
Architecture	5
Bio-Chemistry	3
Mathematics/Statistics	3
Sociology/Psychology	3
Physics	1
Chemistry	1
Journalism	1
Music	1
	<u>100%</u>

The percent distribution by academic field of study closely parallels the statistics published by AMIDEAST in the Quarterly Report for October 31, 1987. In that Report the distribution for full scholars only is:

<u>Field</u>	<u>Percentage of Scholars</u>
Engineering	42
Business	23
Computer Science	13
Science and Math	8*
Economics	4*
Architecture	4*
Health Fields	3*
Tourism	3
	<u>100%</u>

*Figures rounded to achieve 100%.

The small differences between the percentages acquired for this study and those of AMIDEAST can be attributed to: (1) the AMIDEAST statistics are based on all full scholars for FY 87 and not on a sample; (2) partial scholars are treated separately which, when combined with full scholars, will alter some numbers of study, and definition of fields differed somewhat. However, the sample confirms that the three largest fields of study for participants are (1) engineering, (2) business administration (excluding hotel management/tourism), and (3) computer science.

This is followed by science and math, with economics and architecture comprising other key areas of study as well as education, although not necessarily in that order.

This provides a general background of the CASP participants and their fields of study. In the next section we discuss how participants perceived the recruitment, selection, and orientation procedures.

2. Recruitment, Selection, and Orientation

Participants were asked how they learned about the CASP and how they were recruited for the program. Specifically, the participants were asked:

"How did you first learn about the Cyprus-America Scholarship Program:

Please Check One

Newspaper Announcement

Radio Program

Television Program

Friend or Family Member

Returned Scholarship Participant

A total of 45% of the respondents indicated they learned of the CASP through a Friend or Family Member; 35% said through a Newspaper Announcement; 14% indicated other, and 6% marked returned participant.

Friends or family members as a primary source of knowledge about the CASP seemed to reflect three things: (1) the extensive awareness in Cyprus by parents and young adults of the CASP; (2) the intense drive by parents to provide good higher education to children; and (3) the desire by young men and women for college education. These attitudes were reflected over and over again in our interviews with Cyprus officials as well as with CASP participants and ex-scholars. It is worth noting that Cyprus is second only to the U.S. and Canada in number of college graduates per capita.

Overall, the CASP recruitment process seems more than adequate although there are some issues in timing and placement of announcements concerning

the scholarship awards. For example, one announcement did not contain all the necessary information, and it was delayed by having a number of revisions before final approval.

Selection

Participants were asked whether they thought the selection process was fair since scholarships are supposed to be awarded based on financial need as well as academic merit.

Specifically, the question was:

1. In general, how would you rate the selection process by which you were chosen as a scholarship student?

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Very Good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Fair |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Poor |

A total of 86% of the participants thought the selection process was either excellent or that it was very good, with an additional 6% marking good. Thus 91% were satisfied overall with the process. A little less than 10% thought the selection process was only fair to poor, 6% thought it was fair while 2% thought it was poor.

The principal reason some participants did not rate the selection process as high as their peers is that they had friends or relatives who were more academically qualified and also in more financial need but who did not receive scholarships. While the question of financial need is always open to some debate, and inevitably some participants may be selected who may not demonstrate convincingly their need, the process generally seems to work well, notwithstanding occasional complaints.

In terms of the specific procedures such as provision of timely application forms and adequate instructions to apply for the scholarship program, all of the respondents indicated little if any problem in obtaining required information. Over 95% of respondents claimed they were provided with all of the necessary materials for application and that they had no difficulty in applying for the program.

For those who did experience some difficulty, it was generally a case of a respondent not being able to satisfy preliminary requirements. On the other hand, when participants were asked whether the selection criteria and process were made clear to them with regard to qualification and selection, a fair percentage of respondents experienced some difficulty. Specifically the question was asked:

Were the selection criteria and process made clear to you with regard to qualifying and being selected for a scholarship?

Yes

No

Not sure

Approximately 25% of the respondents indicated "not sure" while 75% marked "Yes" as to whether instructions were made clear. This suggests that both formal and informal procedures should be reviewed to ensure that applicants and candidates during the interview process understand the criteria and process for selection. While a response to "not sure" is not as definitive as a "no" response indicating possible lack of memory, nevertheless one out four respondents being unsure of instructions confirms that procedures should be reviewed and this issue addressed in the future.

Respondents were also asked if the selection process were fair and appropriate for the CASP and if there were anything about the selection process that created any serious problems for them. To the former question 88% replied the selection process was fair and 12% replied negatively. To the latter question 92% said they had no problems with the process while 8% indicated that they did. Problems ranged from dissatisfaction with the interview process (e.g., too many interviewers) to disagreement with particular interview members. The comments regarding problems seemed highly personalized and essentially insignificant. However, when respondents were asked if there were anything they would change or add to improve the selection process and criteria 31% indicated "Yes" and 69% marked "No". Of those who responded "Yes," the most common suggestion was to ensure that the selection process focused on financially needy students and poor refugees. (Eight out 16 or 59% who wished to improve the selection process expressed this opinion.) The other comments included such suggestions as lowering the TOEFL score, provide more precise information on selection, and provide scholarships to second family members. These latter suggestions were not representative and were very personal, but those who expressed concern about emphasizing more objectivity and financial need appeared to express some bias generally as well as personally (i.e., more poor refugees should be selected). The extent to which respondent comments reflect a bias in the selection process is not indicative of the large number of participants who are needy, and, while the number and percentage of respondents who suggested change in these areas represent approximately half of all those who expressed a need for change, it should be noted that 70% of the

respondents expressed no need for change. However, it is important to emphasize that there is a need to address the perception by some participants who feel the selection process should be more objective and focus on needy students. Other criteria besides academic achievement and family income are considered and may weigh more in some cases than comparative academic and financial needs. Also, it is CASP selection policy that final candidates are not advised of the reasons for acceptance or rejection and therefore they are not aware of other criteria which may influence scholarship decisions such as field of study, Cyprus development objectives, and priorities established by the National Planning Bureau.

In summary, the selection process and criteria as perceived by the majority of participants are fair and appropriate for the CASP with some areas that could be refined and improved but which are not serious problems to the program objectives or operations. Parenthetically, it should be mentioned that both Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities who participate in the CASP selection or who play some other role in recruitment and selection all expressed the opinion that criteria and process for selection were very fair and appropriate to the needs of Cyprus. The integrity of the selection process was praised by all parties who participated.

Orientation

Orientation for participant academic scholars represented a wide diversity of experience as the process varied greatly with most participants, particularly in the orientation provided by the college or university attended.

With one or two exceptions all participants had some orientation in Cyprus before departing for the U.S.; a small number also participated in orientation sessions upon arrival in the U.S. in addition to orientation when participants arrived on campus. However, most participants had two orientation sessions; one in Cyprus and one provided at their university.

Participants were asked in general how they would rate orientation sessions in terms of providing them with useful and important information about life in the United States. The respondents rated the usefulness of the orientation sessions in Cyprus and at their university or on campus in the following:

<u>Orientation in Cyprus</u>		<u>Percent Responses</u>	<u>Orientation on Campus</u>	
Excellent	23%		Excellent	23%
Very good	40%		Very Good	36%
Good	25%		Good	28%
Fair	8%		Fair	8
Poor	4%		Poor	5%
	<u>100%</u>			<u>100%</u>

As indicated above, the general orientation was rated excellent, very good or good by nearly 90% for both the Cyprus and campus sessions. There was very little difference that participants distinguished between the two sessions in terms of the orientation providing useful and important information about life in the U.S.

However, when participants were asked whether orientation provided adequate information on a number of other areas including cultural, political and social conditions, living conditions, and legal rights and responsibilities, there were more sharp distinctions on rating the adequacy of the orientation sessions. For example responses to three questions for both Cyprus and campus orientation were as follows:

"Do you think orientation sessions provided you with adequate information on the cultural, political and social conditions in the United States?"

<u>Orientation in Cyprus</u>		<u>Response Rates</u>	<u>Orientation on Campus</u>	
Yes	54%		Yes	63%
No	46%		No	37%

Most respondents who marked "No" explained that it was very difficult to cover so complex a subject in such a short time and that its content rather than presentation presented the major problem.

The second two key questions were:

"Do you think orientation provided you with adequate information on living conditions in the United States?"

<u>Orientation in Cyprus</u>		<u>Percent Response</u>	<u>Orientation on Campus</u>	
Yes	72%		Yes	81%
No	28%		No	19%

"Do you think orientation provided you with adequate information on your legal rights and responsibilities in the United States?"

<u>Orientation in Cyprus</u>		<u>Percent Response</u>	<u>Orientation on Campus</u>	
Yes	73%		Yes	65%
No	27%		No	35%

Information on living conditions appeared to be covered more to a participant's satisfaction through campus orientation. This is understandable as the campus advisors can address local conditions and issues more effectively than orientation in Cyprus.

The subject of legal rights and responsibilities appears to have satisfied more participants during the Cyprus evaluation. Again, this is understandable as it is more of a CASP concern with regard to rules, regulations, etc. Aside from these issues, orientation was viewed very positively. The participants were asked what they found most useful about orientation. Below is a list of subjects ranked by number of participants who thought them most useful.

MOST USEFUL SUBJECT IN ORIENTATION

<u>Subject</u>	<u>No. of Participants</u>
1. Academic Life and Requirements	11
2. Contact with Other Participants	9
3. Legal Matters/Taxes	5
4. Living Conditions	3
5. U.S. Culture/Life	3
6. Adjustment Advice	2
7. How to Contact People	1
● Communication with AMIDEAST	1
● Sexual Mores	1
● Community Life	1
● University System	1
	<u>38</u>

Clearly, academic information and opportunity to talk to other participants was high on the list of respondents although legal matters and life in the U.S. were also important issues. Finally, when participants were asked if they would add anything to orientation, 55% responded "Yes" and identified either certain subjects to cover or specific orientation procedures for participants. The list of subjects is ranked in descending order by number of participants who identified them.

THINGS TO ADD TO ORIENTATION

<u>Subject</u>	<u>No. of Participants</u>
1. Social and Living Conditions in U.S.	7
2. Opportunity to Talk to Experienced Participants	5
3. How to Get Around	4
4. Financial Matters	2
5. Research Writing	1
6. Climate	1
7. Small Group Orientation	1
8. Taxes	1
9. Visa, IAP66	1
10. Job Opportunities	1
11. Academic Requirements	1
12. Typical Day at a University	1
13. More Comprehensive	1
14. Transportation	1

While the suggested subjects are mainly a laundry list of individual preferences, there is a relatively common need for (1) opportunity to talk to former or "experienced" participants; (2) more knowledge of social and living conditions in the U.S.; and (3) information on how to get around either in the local community or the U.S. One area which participants mentioned fairly frequently regarding living conditions was dormitory life. More information would have been useful to a number of participants on dormitory living conditions which were not liked by many participants, especially those who were older and more mature.

Finally, it should be noted that some participants did not receive any orientation on campus, or, if they did, the general level of satisfaction was very low. The first exposure to U.S. academic life and U.S. social and cultural conditions is presented at the Cyprus orientation, and this is an opportunity to cover as many relevant areas as possible. The full scholarship orientation packet developed by AMIDEAST for participants is quite comprehensive. Included in this packet is an orientation handbook well designed and illustrated. The information includes many of those subjects which participants suggested should be included in orientation, so one may assume that some participants don't take advantage of the information provided to them. Finally, one subject the orientation handbook cannot cover is the sense of security derived from speaking to returned participants or upper class participants on campus. Although AMIDEAST has previously made arrangements for former scholars to participate in the orientation, it should be a regular routine in order to broaden the participants' horizons on U.S. Culture and living conditions in the U.S.

3. Support Services and Academic Program

One of the major objectives of this study was to determine whether support services provided by AMIDEAST are adequate or if improvements need to be made in existing procedures and relationships. To accomplish this, the questionnaire sent to students in the mail survey included a section on support services ranging from administering participants' maintenance allowances to counseling.

a. Support Services

The overall support services by AMIDEAST were given high marks by participants. For example, respondents were asked to answer the following questions:

"In general, how would you rate the support services provided by AMIDEAST during your study in the United States?"

- | | |
|--------------------------|-----------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Very Good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Fair |

Approximately 63% of the respondents rated support services excellent which is an exceptional rating for the varied administrative services performed by AMIDEAST. Moreover, a combined 92% of respondents thought the services either excellent or very good and 98% rated them either excellent, very good, or good. The support services were viewed by most participants as an extremely important part of their CASP experience. It was not uncommon during the personal interviews as well as on the returned questionnaire to note personal compliments to various AMIDEAST staff. Participants also responded that they received their maintenance allowance on time and over 98% indicated they received prompt answers to questions or problems which they requested assistance from AMIDEAST.

The various problems for which participants either sought or received assistance included but were not limited to the following areas:

- Transportation
- Housing
- Financial
- Academic
- Legal
- Health
- Personal
- AID Regulations

Participants were also asked what support services they found most helpful during their stay in the U.S. A total of 41 participants (75%) answered this question out of 55 responses.

The areas identified as most helpful are listed below with descending order of importance by percentage of participants.

<u>Areas Most Helpful</u>	<u>% of Participants</u>
Financial Matters	56%
Academic Matters	16%
Health	14%
Housing	7%
AID Regulations	7%
	<u>100%</u>

Financial matters are a matter of concern for most AID participants, and the CASP is no exception. The two next important matters which participants found support services most helpful were advice on academic and health problems. Coincidentally, when participants were asked which areas of support services needed to be improved, the small number which responded identified financial and academic matters.

In summary, participants appear to be extremely well supported and counseled by AMIDEAST staff as an overwhelming majority of respondents rated support services very high.

b. Academic Program

The academic program is of course the most significant feature for CASP as well as for AID in regard to meeting the goals and objectives of the program.

Many students begin preparing for the CASP in high school and prepare diligently for the scholarships. This again is a measure of how CASP has pervaded the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities and how highly it is regarded. The study shows a vast majority of participants being satisfied with their academic program. For example, the participants were asked the following question:

"In general, are you satisfied with your academic program?"

Yes

No

A full 98% of those respondents indicated they were satisfied with their academic program, and many participants indicated they were extremely satisfied. A second question asked how appropriate is the study program to the professional and educational needs and objectives of the participants, and all of the respondents indicated it was very appropriate (69%) or appropriate (31%) which closely parallels their satisfaction with the academic programs. Two comments here might be worth mentioning. The participants are an exceptional group with very high academic performance. In many cases it has been reported that they are far ahead of their U.S. college peers on entrance into study programs in mathematics and science, less so in the social sciences and humanities. Thus, participants often find themselves initially as academic standouts. Second, during interviews with foreign student advisors in U.S. colleges and universities, participants were praised as very bright, hard working, and cooperative.

While these comments represent only a sample, it is likely that these characteristics are fairly representative of the group as a whole. It also may account for their academic performance and satisfaction with their individual programs and also reflects favorably on the selection process and the general success of the participants.

c. Binational Relations

Some mention of how Greek and Turkish Cypriot participants get along when attending the same university or institution is in order. Generally speaking, information gathered through on-site field visits to U.S. colleges as well as information supplied through AMIDEAST and interviews in Cyprus indicates that, although the two groups do not mix freely, they get along fairly well and, there are instances where some friendships have developed, between Greek and Turkish scholars, although the study indicated it was confined to female participants. However, there have been some incidents on campus between the groups, and one occurred during our visit to Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (RPI) to interview participants. The Pakistani Student Association celebrated the fourth anniversary of the Republic of North Cyprus, with Turkish Cypriots. The Greek Student Association made a peaceful demonstration of disapproval and the incident was given headline banner in the school newspaper Polytechnic.

The celebration was a party hosted by the Pakistani Student Association. No serious incidents or escalation of the event occurred beyond the peaceful demonstration and rebuttal in the school paper by a Turkish Cypriot who claimed the group was only presenting cultural and geographic information to celebrants. All parties seemed to deal with the issues in a responsible and reasonable manner. On the other hand there have been incidents of cooperation on training projects between Greek and Turkish Cypriot participants such as the one which received recent notoriety in Cyprus. The project was a truly bi-communal restoration effort of a master plan for Nicosia, including such areas as water and sewer, and involved both the old section and new section of Nicosia.

Six participants; three Greek and three Turkish Cypriots, representing various disciplines in urban planning and restoration attended a technical training course in the U.S. on various technical instruction regarding the master plan. The project was a singular success, and all parties cooperated and coordinated on the training while they were in the U.S. This kind of

demonstration represents in a microcosm the kind of potential impact, cooperation, and joint coordination which similar projects can produce between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots, and it is suggested more such projects be authorized under CASP.

d. Employment/Job Plans

Related to each participant's academic program are the employment goals and job opportunities on return to Cyprus. Therefore, a number of questions were asked on job plans and indirectly how participants intended to make use of their studies. Specifically, participants were asked the following:

"Do you have any specific plans for employment when you finish your education and return to Cyprus?"

Yes

No

A little over 35% of the participants indicated they had either a specific job or specific plans for employment on return to Cyprus. Potential jobs included employment in both the public and private sectors as well as starting a new business. Of the 65% who indicated no employment plans, there were no remarks or comments to amplify their response.

A key feature which is directly tied into the job plans and opportunities is the current employment situation and job opportunities in Cyprus. Participants were asked:

"How would you rate the job opportunities in Cyprus for your field of study?"

- | | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Excellent |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Very Good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Very Good |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Not Good |

Only 8% rated job opportunities in Cyprus Excellent but a total of 51% rated them at least Good ranging from Very Good (12%) to Good (31%).

However, 49% of the participants rated job opportunities ranging from not Very Good (29%) to Not Good (20%). There seemed to be no relationship to field of study and either positive or negative response regarding job opportunity, although those in computer sciences seemed relatively more inclined to be positive concerning job potential. This question, however, should be tempered by the fact that there is a surplus of college trained talent in Cyprus, but CASP scholars (and others who receive U.S. higher education degrees) are the first to obtain jobs in comparison to those persons who obtained degrees from European or Eastern Bloc institutions. The economic and job situation will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

e. Post Training Activities/Impact

Extensive interviews were conducted in Cyprus with returned participants and with Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities on a number of CASP related issues. Two key points of discussion centered on: (1) the CASP contribution

to Cyprus' development; and (2) the job status of former scholars and their role in supporting the development strategy.

Before discussing these interrelated issues it will be useful to provide essential background information in order to gain an understanding of the relationship between them. Cyprus is a very small country whose economy is driven by the tourist industry. There is no heavy industry in Cyprus. Agriculture (formerly the largest revenue producing sector) and light industry and manufacturing are two other key economic areas. Tourism, however, brought in more revenue in 1986 (\$300 million) than agriculture and manufacturing combined (\$250 million). Cyprus also cannot compete with third world countries and their low labor costs; thus, capital intensive industries are necessary and light industry is also facing competition from developing countries. As a result, Cyprus is turning towards a service and technology oriented economy. This will require a well trained pool of professionals to establish the human resources to build service areas and expand expertise to meet the needs of off shore companies which are locating offices in Cyprus.

The lack of natural resources on the island has accentuated the necessity for an economic alternative to stimulate growth and development. Increased services including banking, investment, and technology are all critical to the future of Cyprus' economy. Therefore, the availability of trained professionals becomes an important factor in planning development. Since there is no national university in Cyprus, CASP has become a crucial factor in supplying the country with highly trained manpower. Prior to CASP, the socialist countries were training many Cypriots, but the quality of the education was not satisfying needs. Moreover, while Cyprus has achieved a high percentage of college trained persons, it is important to note that CASP graduates are considered a priority and that Cypriots view U.S. standards in education as higher or better than European and Eastern bloc nations. English is also extremely critical for employment in both the public and private sectors. Various persons who were interviewed indicated that CASP graduates were absorbed into the economy and job market quicker than non CASP graduates.

In particular, the mayor of Nicosia said that CASP filled a gap in providing trained persons for the public and private sectors and that CASP is a very important program. The standards of U.S. trained graduates provide high quality personnel who are the critical mass for building a service and technology oriented economy. Specifically, the mayor pointed out that:

1. Cyprus' economy is geared to rendering services.
2. Cyprus, contrary to outside impressions, is a very stable country.
3. Since there are limited resources, the service industry becomes a key sector, particularly as Nicosia is becoming a center for offshore companies.

Considering these factors, there is no real concern about too many CASP educated scholars as they can be quickly absorbed in both government and private industry. Moreover, CASP graduates, in addition to being perceived as better educated with higher standards than other European and Eastern bloc graduates, are not only forming the foundation for the service industry but becoming the potential core of leadership in government and the private sector. In addition, the mayor felt that the creative arts are very important to development and that painters and writers widen the horizons for development which should include graphic arts, fine arts, and other cultural fields.

The impact of CASP on development is viewed very favorably by both Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities. The Director General of Planning for the Cyprus Planning Bureau indicated that CASP has helped in a number of important ways. For example, CASP has helped to reorient students toward U.S. training institutions, and now there are over 21% of the total college educated population trained in the U.S. whereas prior to CASP that figure was under 5%. In addition, CASP has influenced other students to study in the U.S. besides the CASP scholars. The quality of CASP graduates are also sought out and, although there is full employment and the labor market is stabilized in some sectors, there is still opportunity for CASP scholars to step into jobs as the older (and less educated) population experiences turnover. Also, since most scholars are the "cream of the crop" from the

best schools in both Greek and Turkish communities, future Cypriot leaders are getting exposed to U.S. institutions and life. As one official pointed out, CASP has made America known and has influenced students to study at American universities.

The major point in these interviews is that there was overwhelming support and admiration for the CASP by Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities and officials. In addition, the CASP offers an additional opportunity for communication between the two communities and by all accounts the participation in CASP by representatives from both communities is harmonious, cooperative, and constructive.

Representative viewpoints on the effectiveness of CASP and other direct and indirect benefits seemed consistent between Greek and Turkish Cypriots. CASP was seen first and foremost as a critical investment in human capital which created opportunities for talented and special students. Training is viewed as a foundation for the future which is contributing to the economic development of Cyprus now as well as for the future. In addition it was universally believed that CASP graduates will have better job opportunities than non-CASP graduates and in general that CASP is providing opportunities for scholars who would not otherwise be able to continue their education and who by virtue of their training contribute to the development of Cyprus.

f. Returned Participants

A total of 34 returned CASP graduates were interviewed in both the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. The participants included academic as well as short term training and all but one of the participants were employed. In general, the interviews confirmed what was said by public and private officials and representatives concerning the job market and relative opportunities for CASP graduates. Many CASP participants were working in basic entry level jobs although a fair number of graduates were in highly responsible positions, such as managers or supervisors (i.e., construction foreman of a new building). It is a tribute to the CASP participants that all showed up for evaluation interview appointments with some required to

drive from other cities to attend the interview. All were enthusiastic about the opportunities CASP opened up for them, and there were few complaints about job opportunities or career upward mobility. There were some cases where frustration about promotion was expressed as well as other issues (e.g., sex discrimination, lack of Cypriots in foreign companies). On the whole, however, most CASP participants were satisfied, but as many had only recently returned; there was not sufficient time to identify or measure any long term impact. Participants were all asked if they were working in a job which is directly relevant to their training, and 83% replied yes, with 17% (4 persons) saying no. Of the latter, these participants indicated they hoped to use their specific training in the future.

Impact of Short-Term Training

The short term participants were particularly satisfied with their training experiences, and perhaps the most important quick payoff from CASP can result from short term technical training. Two examples illustrate this point in a dramatic fashion.

The first involves a Greek Cypriot who was an executive with SEDIGEP, an agriproducts coop and marketing union for export of fruits and vegetables. His short term assignment involved visiting the largest coops in the U.S. (e.g., Sunkist) to learn about new marketing techniques and processing equipment. As a direct result of the training, SEDIGEP has made plans to purchase a new machine that was introduced to the participant during training and to incorporate new marketing plans for expanded exports. This kind of impact has manifold repercussions and demonstrates the high payoff which can result from a modest short term training investment.

The other example is the training of a Turkish Cypriot who works for the educational department in North Cyprus. His training involved attending several regional workshops in the U.S. on curriculum development. As a direct result of the training, new plans were developed for curriculum

reform and educational planning. Two other colleagues attended the curriculum workshops in the U.S., and the impact of this training has yielded plans for improving the secondary school system.

These two examples provide convincing evidence of how the short-term technical training can impact Cyprus' development and can have a ripple effect that goes beyond individual professional enhancement. It would seem that more short term training should be considered strongly for several reasons. The first is that often this type of training (especially with regard to institutionalization) can have an effect that is out of proportion to the investment. Medical technology for public and private practitioners is an area that might have sweeping impact. The second is that results are invariably immediate and highly visible or measurable so that planning and results are realized sooner. The third is that short term training is capable of creative, flexible, and innovative programming which permits a wide latitude in development projects.

A fourth consideration is that short term training could be used for more projects between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots as was the restoration project for the master plan of Nicosia. While long term academic training is crucial for building a critical mass of professionals to support Cyprus' plans for the technology and service sectors of the economy, short term technical training is a dynamic force for cooperation and development and should be explored by all CASP parties in planning for the future.

In summary, CASP is having a significant impact in Cyprus across a broad spectrum. It is perceived by Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities as the most important educational scholarship program. It has influenced other Cypriots who are not CASP scholars to attend U.S. universities. It has paved the way for integrating CASP graduates into potentially important government positions on both sides (i.e., Greek and Turkish Cypriot bureaucracies). Other impacts, such as the short term training examples cited earlier, and of which there are many, are also critically important to Cyprus and its present and future plans.

The academic training is also being widely felt, and perhaps the full impact of the small number of participants will be seen in more measurable terms as more graduates return and enough time has passed so that those returned will have been the cause for more far reaching changes. One key point in our opinion is that beyond the training of scholars for development, the psychological and perhaps political impact of CASP will be one of its more enduring legacies.

In the next section we discuss our conclusions and recommendations.

3705D/12.87

III. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall the CASP program is functioning at high levels of performance and is meeting the program's goals and objectives in most ways. It should also be emphasized that many of the recommendations are derived from the CASP successes which suggested other actions by virtue of the past impact and positive historical role of the program. For example, short-term training recommendations are derived from success stories which led to recommending increases and more innovative, creative programming. On the other hand, there are some serious administrative issues which although do not now adversely affect program performance, nevertheless need to be addressed in the future.

Recommendations will cover a number of areas. The first and most important focus is on administrative and management issues followed by program recommendations on other CASP aspects such as short-term technical training.

Administrative/Management Recommendations

1. The Letter of Understanding between the Cyprus Fulbright Commission and AMIDEAST should be examined and reviewed in order to clarify in more detail the administrative lines of authority. Suggestions made by the evaluation team appear to have provided one resolution to conflicting administrative procedures and were accepted in principle by the responsible parties associated with CASP. However, the letter needs to be drafted again spelling out specific roles. This formal clarification of authority and procedure will greatly facilitate present Cyprus operations and their relationship with AMIDEAST and U.S. operations. There should be no substitute for written rules and regulations with established hierarchy of control.

The general features guiding the new Letter of Understanding should be: (1) identifying the CFC as a legitimate subcontractor (or subrecipient) whose Executive Director and Chairman (Embassy/PAO), while not exercising day-to-day responsibility for the CASP Program Coordinator, nevertheless, have oversight responsibility and advisory roles to play and, therefore, need to be provided with periodic reports and kept advised of CASP issues. The CASP Program Coordinator (in Cyprus) should report to the AMIDEAST Project Director (in Washington) through the CFC Executive Director on all matters of policy and program content. To what extent and how the process of communication functions can be worked out at the local level on a collegial basis should be agreed to by the CASP Program Coordinator, the CFC Chairman, and Executive Director.

With regard to any CASP issue of U.S. Embassy concern, the Chairman of the CFC should communicate with AID/Washington (ANE Bureau) or have the Executive Director and CASP Program Coordinator communicate with AMIDEAST. Specific details on how the proposed administrative lines of authority function should be based on the current Letter of Understanding.

2. Specific reporting procedures should also be implemented by the CASP Coordinator which will provide all parties with information on the status of CASP along with any issues or problems and intended future action. The CFC Chairman and Executive Director should be the main recipients of the reports in Cyprus. Establishing reporting procedures should lessen the ambiguity of authority and facilitate day-to-day operations by the CASP Coordinator. If all parties are provided with timely, periodic information on CASP activities, there should be less confusion on assignment of responsibility and ultimate lines of authority. At a minimum, quarterly monthly reports should be prepared by the CASP Coordinator in collaboration with the CFC Executive Director for submission to the PAO and AMIDEAST.
3. A management plan should be developed each year beginning with the current year to establish goals and objectives of CASP as well as allocation of resources and program responsibilities. The plan should be developed jointly by the AMIDEAST Program Coordinator and the CFC Executive Director and approved by the Chairman of the CFC. The management plan should then be a document which determines and guides CASP operations and activities under the terms of the Letter of Understanding and which can be merely updated annually as appropriate. The plan should cover the remaining work of fiscal year '88 with a revised plan for fiscal year '89.

The plan, at a minimum, would contain the following:

- a. Detailed Workplan indicating all project tasks and subtasks, deadlines for completion, responsible staff and level of supervisory review. The plan should be drafted at the staff level by Nick Ferro with substantive input from Dan Hadjittofi, and it should be presented to the PAO for concurrence before forwarding to AMIDEAST for final approval. The draft plan, when submitted to the PAO, should reflect the full agreement of the CASP Coordinator and the CFC Director as to its priorities and schedule of activities. Once agreed to by all parties, the workplan should be the basis on which both the CASP Coordinator and the CFC Director operate the CASP program on a daily basis. Both the PAO and AMIDEAST would provide normal periodic monitoring of progress in plan implementation, as well as guidance when circumstances warrant changes in the plan's activities or schedule. Day-to-day management of the project in Cyprus, within the framework of the approved management plan and the established policies of AID, AMIDEAST, and the CFC, would be the responsibility of the CASP Coordinator and the CFC Director.
- b. Revised Budget: Subject to overall limitations of funds available in the AMIDEAST budget for project administration, the CASP Coordinator and CFC Director should carefully review the current year budget and expenditures to date. Areas of possible revision include:

- (1) Purchase of a microcomputer and printer for use by CASP staff in maintaining the participant data base, preparation of selection panel briefing materials, and project reports.
- (2) Review of the monthly rental fee to CFC to make sure that it adequately reflects the current real costs of services and space provided to CASP.

Once the budget is accepted and approved by AMIDEAST, CFC-CASP should have complete authority to disburse funds for the purposes stipulated in the budget, subject to the appropriate monitoring through monthly financial reports to AMIDEAST as is presently required.

c. Task and Workload Analysis for all CASP Staff: A thorough review should be made of current staff duties and responsibilities including:

- (1) Seasonal variations in staff workloads and their impact on both the full and part-time staff.
- (2) Particular tasks assigned to each staff member and the degree to which each task is appropriate to that person's level of responsibility. (For example, bookkeeping for office expenses should be delegated to clerical personnel).
- (3) Current lines of authority (in practice, not in theory) and the degree to which these lines are appropriate to the efficient management of the project and consistent with the CFC-AMIDEAST Letter of Understanding and AMIDEAST's contractual responsibility to AID.

From this analysis, there should be produced:

- (1) Written job descriptions for each staff member, including identification of each person's supervisor.
- (2) Recommendations to AMIDEAST for any appropriate changes in staffing composition or level of effort.
- (3) Recommendations for changes in the AMIDEAST-CFC Letter of Understanding to reflect any major modifications in staffing, staff relationships, and lines of authority which may be developed from the steps outlined above.

d. Assistance in Preparation of Workplan and Task and Workload Analysis: Recognizing that the implementation of the above steps, particularly the preparation of the workplan and the task/workload analysis, may be an excessive burden on the CASP and CFC staff, we recommend that AMIDEAST consider the possibility of hiring a short term consultant to work with CASP and CFC in these efforts. Ideally, such a person would be obtained locally to reduce costs and assure access on an intermittent basis as necessary until the work is completed.

Short-Term Training Recommendations

1. In recognition of the substantial impact which short-term training can achieve in support of economic and social development efforts, and the degree of unmet need expressed by a number of those interviewed by the evaluation team, we recommend that the annual quota of short-term participants be increased from 20 to 35.
2. The short-term training opportunities should be more extensively advertised in the private sector in order to reach more individuals who could benefit from technical training in the U.S. Methods used could include company newsletters, professional publications, letters to professional and business organizations requesting announcements to their membership.
3. Set aside a small number (5-10) of each year's quota of participants who would be selected outside the normal annual selection process by CASP and CFC. This would allow the CASP staff to take advantage of training opportunities not announced at the time of annual short-term selection and to respond to worthwhile ad hoc training requests from either the public or private sector (e.g., the Nicosia restoration project). This flexibility is necessary in any effective short-term training program in order to assure the most effective use of training dollars and training resources.
4. Make certain that all departing short-term participants are given an orientation in the Fulbright office to prepare them for life in the U.S., discuss objectives of their training program, and review details of their administrative support during training. If at all possible, this should be supplemented by a one-day stop in Washington prior to training so that AMIDEAST staff can provide additional orientation briefings on program details, agency contacts, and support services.
5. Debrief all returning short-term participants as soon as possible after they arrive back in Cyprus. This will provide useful training evaluation information for both CASP/Fulbright and for AMIDEAST programming staff. It will also give CASP/Fulbright, AMIDEAST, USIA, and the Embassy a good sense of the impact of the training on the businesses, agencies, and enterprises benefitting from the training.
6. Include a specifically planned "experience America" component in each participants training program so that each has an opportunity to meet and know Americans on an informal basis and receives exposure to U.S. family life, community, social and cultural activities, and places of interest that are uniquely American. In the interviews with returned CASP short-term participants, the evaluation team encountered some frustration that there were not more opportunities to know the U.S. beyond the professional contacts associated with their training programs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC TASKS

APPENDIX B: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN CYPRUS

APPENDIX C: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC TASKS

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY RESPONSE TO SPECIFIC TASKS

Following is a summary response to the specific tasks (A to O) outlined in the Scope of Work for this study. The responses are arranged in alphabetical order from A to O and are succinct statements condensing data and information in the narrative body of the report which discussed the tasks in a different format. The statements are presented first, followed by the summary response.

- A. Determine progress to date in meeting the objectives of the program as specified in the basic AID documents.

From all accounts the objectives of the program, as specified in the AID documents, are being met in an exemplary fashion. Cypriot officials think that the CASP is contributing to the development objectives of Cyprus, but it is difficult to move beyond anecdotal confirmation to measurable indicators due to the lag time between participants' return and time to measure impact.

- B. Determine how the Cypriot authorities, both Greek and Turkish, view the CASP program and its implementation and usefulness.

Both Greek and Turkish Cypriot authorities had nothing but the highest praise for the CASP Program and its implementation and usefulness. Many comments and recommendations were to continue the program and add other fields of study.

- C. Determine if the fields approved for academic and short-term training meet the priority needs of Cyprus.

According to government officials and other persons interviewed the academic and short-term training meet the priority needs of Cyprus. However, new training needs are continuing to evolve, such as medical technology, which need to be addressed in the future.

- D. Review and describe the recruitment, selection, counseling, and follow-up procedures carried out in Cyprus and the respective roles of the Cyprus Fulbright Commission, U.S. Embassy, AMIDEAST, and the Cypriot authorities. Determine whether procedures are effective; if the working relationships of all concerned parties are operating satisfactorily and whether improvements can be made in existing procedures or relationships.**

The recruitment, selection, counseling, and follow-up procedures carried out in Cyprus are functioning at high levels of performance. There are some minor recommendations to improve the program, but overall the procedures and implementation are effective.

The working relationship of all concerned parties has been clouded in the past by different perceptions of authority and chain of command. However, administrative lines of authority and actions to improve working relationships appear to be resolved, but, specific action needs to be taken in order to improve the relationships. This action in the form of recommendations is to clarify contractual arrangements and define specific roles and responsibilities.

- E. Determine whether the most qualified and deserving applicants are being awarded scholarships.**

Generally, the study indicates the most qualified and deserving applicants are being awarded scholarships. However, there have been complaints by participants that (in their subjective judgment) some comparatively needier applicants were not selected for the program. Since no one but the selection board is aware of reasons for disqualifying applicants, it is difficult to verify complaints. The key point is that all persons interviewed concerning the selection process (including current and past participants as well as members of the selection committee) thought the process was appropriate and fair.

- F. Determine whether the Cypriots selected are generally capable of meeting the scholarship demands of U.S. universities. Assess the academic performance of Cypriot students in U.S. universities and estimate the percentage of students who successfully complete their educational programs and return to Cyprus.**

The Cypriots selected for the CASP are extremely well qualified (sometimes described as the cream of the crop) and perform very well at U.S. universities. Except for an occasional exception due to personal reasons, the overwhelming majority successfully complete their educational programs and return to Cyprus (92%).

- G. Determine the adequacy of pre-departure training/orientation programs that are in place and assess whether the level of support provided to participants in the U.S. is appropriate.

Pre-departure orientation was rated by the majority of CASP participants as either an excellent or very good program. Most participants thought orientation provided adequate information to prepare them for their stay in the U.S. On the other hand many participants (55%) would like to see subject matter added to the orientation, but these were in most cases usually highly personal.

Support services provided by AMIDEAST were rated either excellent or very good by 92% of the participants who were asked to comment. The level of support services and the manner in which they are being administered is of excellent quality.

- H. Assess the degree to which AID sponsorship of CASP is made known to Cypriot scholarship recipients and the Government of Cyprus.

Sooner or later all participants and most Cypriots are aware that CASP is an AID sponsored program. However, several persons expressed confusion at various times during recruitment and selection as to who sponsors the scholarships. This seems in part due to the fact that AID has no presence in Cyprus and that the Cyprus Fulbright Commission is the organization which is identified as the source of materials and application forms. Also, one Turkish Cypriot official thought that AID was not receiving enough credit on refugee relief and development programs.

- I. Review the post-training activities and determine if returned participants are able to find suitable public or private sector employment.

Most returned participants have succeeded in obtaining jobs which are relevant to their training and education. This is particularly true in the public sector. It should be emphasized that CASP participants are absorbed into the job market quicker than Non-CASP graduates.

J. Review and describe the U.S. placement and monitoring processes carried out by AMIDEAST.

U.S. placement and monitoring processes are very effective, and the majority of participants were highly satisfied. AMIDEAST receives a dossier on each participant which in some cases has listed preferences for U.S. universities. AMIDEAST will review the study objectives, participant qualifications, and select a number of schools to submit applications (e.g., five universities for mechanical engineering). If more than one university accepts the applicant, the selection is made on the basis of student preference and academic program.

The monitoring function is effective, and campus visits are made at least once to each participant. Also, frequent telephone responses to participant's questions is a routine part of the monitoring process by AMIDEAST.

K. Comment on the impact of the program on bi-communal cooperation.

The CASP provides one of the few opportunities for promoting bi-communal relations and while definitive impact is difficult to measure, the CASP is having an undeniable influence on bi-communal cooperation through coordination of CASP activities. A potentially important impact are the discussions taking place between Greek and Turkish Cypriot alumni on the organization of a CASP Alumni Association.

A steering committee composed of CASP alumni, the Cyprus CASP Coordinator, and members of the U.S. Embassy have held several meetings to develop guidelines for organizing the association. While there remain numerous problems to resolve, the alumni association represents a significant new mode of potential cooperation between the growing young leadership in the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities.

- L. Interview a representative number of students currently pursuing academic programs to obtain their views about AMIDEAST's administration of their training programs and the appropriateness of the schools selected for their educational programs.

Students were interviewed at (1) Georgetown University, (2) George Washington University, (3) University of Southern California, (4) UCLA, (5) Boston University, and (6) Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. These schools were selected because they enrolled a relatively large number of CASP participants and because of logistical advantages to staff who visited the campus sites to interview students.

Virtually all those interviewed indicated they were highly satisfied with their training (98%) and the schools selected for their educational program. Also, as indicated earlier, students were extremely satisfied with AMIDEAST's administration of their training program and support services.

- M. Review the basis for AMIDEAST's costs and compare AMIDEAST's administrative costs with other training contractors.

AMIDEAST was requested to provide information on the program and administrative cost of CASP per participant month. The cost figures as reported by the program director are within the average range of such costs for other training organizations based on a previous cost study of other AID contractors. The program cost of \$1,326 per participant month is well within the average range of other contractor costs and when adjusted for inflation the average cost for all contractors is below that in the previous study. Technical training, while higher in cost per participant month than those contractors previously studied, is still within the average range.

Administrative costs of CASP are below the average cost per participant month of other training contractors in the previous cost study.

- N. Compare this CASP to other similar programs such as the AID program in Italy managed by LASPAU in terms of costs, support provided to students, and administrative procedures and relationships.

CASP was compared to many participant training programs in terms of cost, support services, and administrative relationships. Cost comparisons were discussed in paragraph M and found to be within the average range on program components and below the average on administrative operations.

AMIDEAST is providing excellent support services which are appropriate for CASP participants. However, in terms of administrative relationships CASP is so unique that comparisons would prove misleading and essentially irrelevant.

0. Make recommendations as needed for improving CASP administrative or other procedures.

Recommendations were proposed in two key areas which are administration and short term training. Various other conclusions or findings which suggest changes, but which are not necessarily recommended, are found in the text.

APPENDIX B: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN CYPRUS

APPENDIX B

LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED IN CYPRUS

1. Mr. John Nix
Charge d' Affairs
Deputy Chief of Mission
U.S. Embassy
2. Mr. Lane Cubstead
Political Affairs Officer
USIS, U.S. Embassy
3. Mr. Stephen B. Morisseau
Assistant Public Affairs Officer
USIS, U.S. Embassy
4. Mr. Robert Friel
Economic and Commercial Officer
U.S. Embassy
5. Mr. Walter Plaumer
Political Officer
U.S. Embassy
6. Mr. Dan Hadjittofi
Executive Director
Cyprus Fulbright Commission
7. Mr. Nicholas Ferro
Coordinator
Cyprus American Scholarship Program (CASP)
8. Mrs. Cathy Hadjittofi
Counselor
Cyprus American Scholarship Program (CASP)
9. Mrs. Laina Swiney
Counselor
Cyprus American Scholarship Program (CASP)
10. Mr. Doghan Tahsin
Political Section
U.S. Embassy; Foreign Employee
11. Mrs. Suhela Vashar
Librarian
USIS
12. Dr. Cemal Ashkin
Vice-President
Eastern Mediterranean University
North Cyprus
13. Mr. Niyazi Alioglu
Education Office
North Cyprus
14. Mr. Shinası Tekman
Headmaster
Turk Maarif Koleji (TMK)
North Cyprus
15. Mr. Vural Asicioglu
Deputy Headmaster
Turk Maarif Koleji (TMK)
North Cyprus

APPENDIX B (Cont.)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 16. Mr. Lellos Demetriades | Mayor of Nicosia |
| 17. Dr. Jacovos Aristidov | Director General
Planning Bureau
Government of Cyprus |
| 18. Mr. Simeon Matsis | Director of Planning
Planning Bureau
Government of Cyprus |
| 19. Mr. Panayiotis Hadjipavlou | Planning Bureau
Government of Cyprus |
| 20. Mr. George Christodoulides | Director of Technical Education
Ministry of Education
Government of Cyprus |
| 21. Dr. George Stavrinakis | Chairman
Cyprus Scholarship Board |
| 22. Ms. Vicky Christodoulou | CASP Graduate |
| 23. Mr. Constantinos Katsavras | CASP Graduate |
| 24. Ms. Theroula Louca | CASP Graduate |
| 25. Mr. George Pavlides | CASP Graduate |
| 26. Mr. Leonitos Hadjiparaskevas | CASP Graduate |
| 27. Ms. Lenia Serghi | CASP Graduate |
| 28. Mr. Michael Tsialis | CASP Graduate |
| 29. Mr. Andreas Demetriades | CASP Graduate |
| 30. Ms. Panayiota Koronidou | CASP Graduate |
| 31. Mr. Soteris Soteriou | CASP Graduate |
| 32. Mr. George Limisis | CASP Graduate |
| 33. Mr. Iacovos Yiakoumis | CASP Graduate |
| 34. Mr. Louis Neophytou | CASP Graduate |
| 35. Ms. Theophano Chimonidou | CASP Graduate |
| 36. Mr. Leontios Pericleous | CASP Graduate |
| 37. Ms. Eleni Michaelidou | CASP Graduate |

APPENDIX B (Cont.)

38. Mr. Christis Loizides	CASP Graduate
39. Mr. Petros Kareklas	CASP Graduate
40. Ms. Frances Williams	CASP Graduate
41. Mr. Tryfon Andreou	CASP Graduate
42. Mr. Petros Appios	CASP Graduate
43. Mr. Zach Hadjigeorgiou	CASP Graduate
44. Mr. Nicholas Xyttas	CASP Graduate
45. Mr. Stelios Georgallides	CASP Graduate
46. Ms. Anita Verma	CASP Graduate
47. Mr. George Georgiou	CASP Graduate
48. Mr. John Kountouriotis	CASP Graduate
49. Mr. Yasuf Hocanin	CASP Graduate
50. Mr. Imren Ferioun	CASP Graduate
51. Mr. Necmi Avkiran	CASP Graduate
52. Ms. Olcay Gultekin	CASP Graduate
53. Ms. Ruya Saffet	CASP Graduate
54. Ms. Asli Giray	CASP Graduate
55. Ms. Sonuc Dimililer	CASP Graduate

APPENDIX C: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.
MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTANTS
2924 COLUMBIA PIKE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22204-4399
U.S.A.
703/978-0100

TELEX 197821 DAWASH

Dear Scholar:

The Agency for International Development (AID) which sponsors the Cyprus-America Scholarship Program (CASP) is conducting an evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the scholarship program and to obtain your impressions and thoughts on the support services provided by AMIDEAST and the Cyprus Fullbright Commission. We are also interested in knowing whether the academic training is appropriate to your needs. Any comments you wish to make on the Scholarship Program will be very useful for the evaluation.

Development Associates has been contracted by AID to conduct this evaluation and we are sending this letter to a sample of scholarship students. We hope you will take the time to complete the attached questionnaire and return it to Development Associates. Your cooperation will be extremely important in improving the Cyprus-America Scholarship Program for both present and future Cyprus scholars.

A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Thank you.

BACKGROUND (PLEASE COMPLETE THE BASIC BACKGROUND INFORMATION)

AGE _____

SEX _____

MARITAL STATUS _____

FIELD OF STUDY _____

JOB OBJECTIVE _____

69

I. RECRUITMENT, SELECTION AND ORIENTATION

A. Recruitment

1. How did you first learn about the Cyprus-America Scholarship Program?

Please check one

- Newspaper Announcement
- Radio Program
- Television Program
- Friend or Family Member
- Returned Scholarship Participant
- Other

B. Selection

1. In general, how would you rate the selection process by which you were chosen as a scholarship student?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

2. Were you provided with the appropriate forms and instructions to apply for the scholarship program?

Yes

No

3. Were the application forms provided to you in a timely fashion?

Yes

No

4. Did you have any difficulty in applying for the program?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe _____

5. Were the selection criteria and process made clear to you with regard to qualifying and being selected for a scholarship?

Yes

No

Not sure

If yes, please describe: _____

6. In your opinion, are the selection criteria fair and appropriate for this program?

Yes

No

If no, please describe: _____

7. Was there anything about the selection process that created any serious problem for you?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe: _____

8. Is there anything you would change or add to improve the selection process and criteria?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe _____

9. Please make any other comments you wish concerning the selection process.

C. Orientation

1. Which of the following kinds of orientation sessions did you participate in? (Please check space for all that you attended)

- a. In Cyprus prior to your departure for the U.S.
- b. In the U.S. upon your arrival
- c. On campus during the start of your academic program.

2. In general, how would you rate the orientation sessions in terms of providing you with useful and important information about life in the United States?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>		<u>Orientation in U.S. on Arrival</u>		<u>Orientation On Campus</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good
<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair
<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor

3. Do you think orientation sessions provided you with adequate information on the cultural, political and social conditions in the United States?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>		<u>Orientation in the U.S. on Arrival</u>		<u>Orientation On Campus</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No

If no, please explain: _____

4. Do you think orientation provided you with adequate information on living conditions in the United States?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>		<u>Orientation in the U.S. on Arrival</u>		<u>Orientation On Campus</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No

If no please, explain: _____

5. Do you think orientation provided you with adequate information on your legal rights and responsibilities in the United States?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>		<u>Orientation in the U.S. on Arrival</u>		<u>Orientation On Campus</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No

If, no, please explain: _____

6. Do you think orientation provided you with adequate information on academic life and requirements at United States Colleges and Universities?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>	<u>Orientation in the U.S. on Arrival</u>	<u>Orientation On Campus</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> No

If No, please explain: _____

7. What did you find most helpful and useful about orientation? _____

What did you find least helpful and useful? _____

8. Is there any subject you would like to add to orientation?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe: _____

II. SUPPORT SERVICES AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM

A. Support Services

1. In general, how would you rate the support services provided by AMIDEAST during your study in the United States?

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

2. Do you receive your maintenance allowance on time?

Yes

No

If no, please explain: _____

3. Do you generally receive prompt answers to questions or problems which you submit to AMIDEAST staff?

Yes

No

If no, please explain: _____

4. Has AMIDEAST staff helped you with any problems in the following areas?

	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE DID NOT REQUEST ASSISTANCE
(1)Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(2)Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(3)Financial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(4)Academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(5)Legal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(6)Health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(7)Personal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(8)Family	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(9)AID/U.S. Govt. Regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

5. What support services have been the most helpful to you during your stay in the United States. _____

What services have been the least helpful, if any? _____

6. Are there any areas of support services you think need to be improved?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: _____

B. Academic Program

1. In general, are you satisfied with your academic program?

Yes

No

If no, please explain: _____

2. How appropriate is your study program to your education and professional needs and objectives?

Very Appropriate

Appropriate

Not Very Appropriate

Not Appropriate

3. Have you had any difficulty in enrolling in the course of study you preferred?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: _____

4. Do you have any specific plans for employment when you finish your education and return to Cyprus?

Yes

No

80

If yes, please explain: _____

5. How would you rate the job opportunities in Cyprus for your field of study?

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Not very Good

Not Good

6. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the academic part of your training?

Yes

No

21

If yes, please explain: _____

7. Do you have any suggestions for improving the Cyprus-America scholarship program?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: _____

8. Would you join an alumni association if one were organized in order to get scholars together in Cyprus for social or professional gatherings?

Yes

No

Not Sure

If no, please comment: _____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire which will be very important in improving the scholarship program. Would you please place the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope and mail it to Development Associates as soon as you can? We appreciate your cooperation.

FIELD SURVEY INTERVIEW GUIDE

Former Participant _____ Current Participant _____

1. Name of Participant _____
Male _____ Female _____
 2. Field of Study _____
 3. University/College Attended _____
 4. Nationality _____
 5. Marital Status _____
 6. Study Objective _____

 7. Current Employment (duly ask if person is a former participant) _____

- Position _____

This survey interview guide should be used for personal interviews with participants in both the U.S. and Cyprus. If questions apply only to former or current participants, the specific question has appropriate instructions.

The interview guide asks a number of questions similar to those contained in the mail survey. However, the responses for field interviews should be more open-ended and allow for more personal observations as well as probing by the interviewer on more sensitive issues. It is important to try and find out how the participant views this program as improving relations between Greek and Turkish Cypriots and how well the Greek and Turkish Cypriot scholars get along. Try to obtain a response to these issues by not asking a confrontational, direct question but through indirect approaches (e.g. selection process, 4-1 ratio of Greeks to Turks, associations and interactions with other Cypriot Scholars, etc.).

Also, on all of the questions, probe to get full answers on how respondent really feels as opposed to replying to what he or she may think you want to hear.

I. RECRUITMENT, SELECTION AND ORIENTATION

A. Recruitment

1. How did you first learn about the Cyprus-America Scholarship Program?

Please check one

- Newspaper Announcement
- Radio Program
- Television Program
- Friend or Family Member
- Returned Scholarship Participant
- Other

B. Selection

1. In general, how would you rate the selection process by which you were chosen as a scholarship student?

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

2. Were you provided with the appropriate forms and instructions to apply for the scholarship program?

Yes

No

3. Were the application forms provided to you in a timely fashion?

Yes

No

4. Did you have any difficulty in applying for the program?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe _____

5. Were the selection criteria and process made clear to you with regard to qualifying and being selected for a scholarship?

Yes

No

Not sure

If yes, please describe: _____

6. In your opinion, are the selection criteria fair and appropriate for this program?

Yes

No

If no, please describe: _____

7. Was there anything about the selection process that created any serious problem for you?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe: _____

8. Is there anything you would change or add to improve the selection process and criteria?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe _____

86

9. Please make any other comments you wish concerning the selection process.

C. Orientation

1. Which of the following kinds of orientation sessions did you participate in? (Please check space for all that you attended)

- a. In Cyprus prior to your departure for the U.S.
- b. In the U.S. upon your arrival
- c. On campus during the start of your academic program.

2. In general, how would you rate the orientation sessions in terms of providing you with useful and important information about life in the United States?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>		<u>Orientation in U.S. on Arrival</u>		<u>Orientation On Campus</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/>	Excellent
<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Very Good
<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good	<input type="checkbox"/>	Good
<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fair
<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poor

3. Do you think orientation sessions provided you with adequate information on the cultural, political and social conditions in the United States?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>		<u>Orientation in the U.S. on Arrival</u>		<u>Orientation On Campus</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No

If no, please explain: _____

4. Do you think orientation provided you with adequate information on living conditions in the United States?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>		<u>Orientation in the U.S. on Arrival</u>		<u>Orientation On Campus</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No

If no please, explain: _____

5. Do you think orientation provided you with adequate information on your legal rights and responsibilities in the United States?

<u>Orientation In Cyprus</u>		<u>Orientation in the U.S. on Arrival</u>		<u>Orientation On Campus</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>	No

If, no, please explain: _____

6. Do you think orientation provided you with adequate information on academic life and requirements at United States Colleges and Universities?

Orientation
In Cyprus

Orientation
in the U.S.
on Arrival

Orientation
On Campus

Yes

Yes

Yes

No

No

No

If No, please explain: _____

7. What did you find most helpful and useful about orientation? _____

What did you find least helpful and useful? _____

8. Is there any subject you would like to add to orientation?

Yes

No

If yes, please describe: _____

II. SUPPORT SERVICES AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM

A. Support Services

1. In general, how would you rate the support services provided by AMIDEAST during your study in the United States?

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

2. Did you receive your maintenance allowance on time?

Yes

No

If no, please explain: _____

3. Did you generally receive prompt answers to questions or problems which you submit to AMIDEAST staff?

Yes

No

If no, please explain: _____

4. Has AMIDEAST staff helped you with any problems in the following areas?

	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE DID NOT REQUEST ASSISTANCE
(1)Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(2)Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(3)Financial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(4)Academic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(5)Legal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(6)Health	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(7)Personal	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(8)Family	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
(9)AID/U.S. Govt. Regulations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

5. What support services have been the most helpful to you during your stay in the United States. _____

What services have been the least helpful, if any? _____

6. Are there any areas of support services you think need to be improved?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: _____

For Returned Participants Only

7. Did you seek any support or assistance from the Fulbright Commission when you returned to CYPRUS?

Yes

No

a. If Yes, in what specific areas did you seek support or assistance?
(e.g., job, further education, counsel)

b. Did the Fulbright commission staff provide you with adequate support or assistance?

Yes

No

If no, please explain: _____

al

8. Do you maintain communication or correspondence with the Fulbright Commission for any other reason?

Yes

No

If yes please describe: _____

B. Academic Program

1. In general, are (were) you satisfied with your academic program?

Yes

No

If no, please explain: _____

2. How appropriate is (was) your study program to your education and professional needs and objectives?

Very Appropriate

Appropriate

Not Very Appropriate

Not Appropriate

3. Have you had any difficulty in enrolling in the course of study you preferred?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: _____

4. Do you have any specific plans for employment when you finish your education and return to Cyprus? (Change this to past tense for returned participants.)

Yes

No

a. Are you currently employed?

Yes

No

For Returned Participants Only

b. Are you working in a job which is directly relevant to your education and training?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: _____

c. Do you feel your training and education under the scholarship program helped you in your work or to get a job?

Yes

No

Please explain or elaborate: _____

5. How would you rate the job opportunities in Cyprus for your field of study?

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Not very Good

Not Good

6. Do you have any suggestions on how to improve the academic part of your training?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: _____

7. Do you have any suggestions for improving the Cyprus-America scholarship program?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain: _____

8. Would you join an alumni association if one were organized in order to get scholars together in Cyprus for social or professional gatherings?

Yes

No

Not Sure

If no, please comment: _____

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR CYPRUS OFFICIALS, EMBASSY PERSONNEL AND FULBRIGHT STAFF

Name: _____

Address: _____

Position/Title: _____

Affiliation: _____

This interview guide is intended to provide information on key areas of the Cyprus-America Scholarship Program (CASP) carried out in Cyprus. In addition, it is important to determine how Cypriot authorities, both Greek and Turkish, view the CASP and whether the program has had any impact on bi-communal cooperation. The nature of some questions, particularly those regarding how the program affects cooperation between the north and south, require sensitive handling and probing to elicit true responses and to capture important nuances of the program. For example, a straightforward question on the fairness or effectiveness of the selection process contains some loaded implications on the Greek-Turkish ratio as determined by the population. Try to amplify responses which go beyond a simple "yes" or "no" response to those which expand in depth on the "why" and "how" of an issue. Two major areas of focus are how the CASP is enhancing social and economic development through strengthening of trained manpower and whether there is improvement in Greek and Turkish relationships. While some questions may require closed ended responses, conduct probing of each response as the situation permits provided that the respondent is comfortable in amplifying answers. Finally, you may encounter a situation where either the question and/or probing is inappropriate. In this case, use your judgment on how best to complete the interview such as skipping questions or changing direction of the interview.

1. In your opinion is the CASP meeting its objectives in strengthening the pool of trained manpower in order to enhance Cyprus' economic and social development?

Yes

No

Don't know

97

Comments _____

2. In your opinion is the CASP providing other benefits to Cyprus and to Cypriots participating in the program?

Yes

No

Don't know

Comments _____

3. How well do you think the CASP is being implemented?

Very well

Well

Not very well

Not well

Comments _____

4. In your opinion are the most deserving and qualified applicants being selected for training?

Yes

No

Some yes, others no

Comments _____

5. Do you think the selection process is fair?

Yes

No

Comments _____

6. Is there anything you would change or recommend to improve the selection process?

Yes

No

Comments _____

JA

7. In your opinion are the academic training programs appropriate to the development needs and priorities of Cyprus?

Yes

No

Not sure

Comments _____

8. In your opinion are the short-term training programs appropriate to the development needs and priorities of Cyprus?

Yes

No

Not sure

Comments _____

9. In your opinion, how useful is the CASP to Cyprus' economic and social development?

Very useful

Useful

Not very useful

Not useful

Comments _____

10. In your opinion, does the recruitment and selection process sufficiently identify AID as the sponsor of CASP?

Yes

No

Not sure

Comments _____

11. In your opinion, do Cypriot scholars and the Cyprus Government understand the relationship between AID, the Cyprus Fulbright Commission and Amideast?

Yes

No

Not sure

Comments _____

12. In your opinion, are the working relationships between all concerned parties in the CASP satisfactory?

Yes

No

Don't know

Comments _____

13. Would you suggest any changes or recommendations to improve the working relationship of all CASP concerned parties?

Yes

No

Not sure at this time

Comments _____

14. Would you suggest any changes or recommendations to improve the existing procedures or operations of CASP?

In Cyprus

In the U.S.

Yes

Yes

No

No

Not sure

Not sure

Comments _____

15. Do you have any other comments regarding the CASP program and the relationship between the U.S. and Cyprus?

Yes

No

Comments

QUESTIONS FOR AMIDEAST ON CASP PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

ORGANIZATION

1. How many staff persons in the following categories does CASP support in the U.S.?

Professional _____ Clerical _____

Comments: _____

2. How many staff persons in the following categories does CASP support in Cyprus?

Professional _____ Clerical _____

Comments: _____

3. How would you generally characterize the working relationship between Amideast U.S. staff and the CASP staff in Cyprus (CFC)?

4. Is there anything you would change to improve the working relationship?

5. How would you rate the reporting and communication from the CASP staff in Cyprus (CFC)?

ADMINISTRATION

1. How do you generally assign U.S. CASP staff for placement of scholars in full scholarship programs?

If CASP staff have a caseload of scholars, does the individual staff member have general or overall responsibility for the participants throughout the academic program?

2. Have you experienced any problems in the placement of scholars, either in full or partial scholarship programs?

- 2a. Have you experienced any problems in the placement of short-term participants?

3. Please briefly describe your activities with regard to the following participant support services:

- o Participant Monitoring and Counseling: _____

4. How frequently do you contact participants, academic advisors, and/or foreign student advisors to routinely monitor each participant's academic progress, determine if there are any academic or personal problems that need attention, etc.? Do Amideast staff members visit students on campus for monitoring or other purposes?

5. What system do you have in place to handle participant emergencies?

6. Please describe the U.S. orientation you provide for participants upon arrival in the U.S. If possible, include a schedule of a typical orientation. Do students receive an additional orientation once they get to their university? Does Amideast play a role in this orientation or provide materials or guidance to university staff who conduct it?

6a. Are there any special programs such as WIC activities or mid-winter seminars which are provided for participants and scholars?

7. Would you describe the general range of support services provided to full and partial scholars?

Are the same services provided for all scholars? _____

8. What are your current (average during the past year) costs for the following:

- o Program (participant) costs per participant month of training; and
- o Administrative costs per participant month of training. If you have separate cost figures for academic and technical training (participant and/or administrative costs), please indicate.

9. Do you conduct any kind of an exit interview with scholars before they return to Cyprus? _____

10. In your opinion, have the Greek and Turkish Cypriot scholars improved Community relations through this program? _____

In your opinion, how well do Greek and Turkish scholars get along together in the program? _____

11. What kinds of services are provided to participants once they return to Cyprus (e.g., debriefing on arrival, job counseling/placement, alumni association, social events). After describing current services, please indicate what, if any, additional support is planned for the future.

12. How would you describe the overall success of the CASP in meeting its objectives?

13. Is there anything you would change or recommend to improve the program?
