

DD-ABD-822

ISA 45880

**CROSS-SECTORAL PARTICIPANT
TRAINING EVALUATION**

Under IQC PDC-0085-1-00-6098-00
Work Order No. 25

Conducted for:

**THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ASIA/NEAR EAST BUREAU/DP/E**

By:

**DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.
2924 COLUMBIA PIKE
ARLINGTON, VA. 22204
(703) 979-0100**

April 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	
I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
II. INTRODUCTION.....	4
1. General Purpose of Study.....	4
2. Scope of Work.....	5
3. Methodology.....	6
4. Organization of the Report.....	7
III. PARTICIPANT TRAINING IN USAID/YEMEN PROGRAM.....	8
Overview.....	8
1. General Participant Training.....	9
2. Project Related Participant Training.....	11
3. Participant Training Process.....	14
IV. ISSUES, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	17
1. Advantages of U.S. Versus Third Country Training...	17
2. Training Needs Assessment.....	22
3. Constraints to Participant Training.....	27
4. Impact of Training.....	33
a. Availability and Relevance of Jobs.....	34
b. Job Assimilation and Productivity.....	36
c. Critical Skills.....	37
d. Differences Between Projects.....	38
e. Supervisor's Perceptions of Training.....	39
f. Female Participation.....	40
g. Private Sector.....	44
5. Participant Perspectives of Training Programs.....	46
6. The Future.....	50
a. Coordination of Participant Training.....	50
b. Training Strategy.....	54
c. English Language Training.....	56
V. APPENDICES.....	59
1. List of Persons Interviewed	
a. Participants	
b. YARG Officials	
c. USAID and Other Contractors	
2. Findings/Conclusions/Recommendations Matrix	
3. Bibliography/References	
4. Copies of Questionnaires	
5. Scope of Work	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Development Associates and the team wish to express our appreciation to all of the USAID/Yemen staff who contributed their time and effort to the Cross-Sectoral Participant Training Evaluation. Without their cooperation and support it would have been extremely difficult to carry out the scope of work within the allotted schedule. Particular appreciation is owed to the Office of Education and Human Resources Development and to Mr. Mansour Shamiri, the mission Project Manager for the evaluation who provided guidance and support to the team throughout our stay.

No acknowledgement of support would be complete without mentioning the splendid cooperation of the Yemen Arab Republic (YAR) government officials who took time to be interviewed, often on very short notice. The officials of the YAR Central Planning Organization (CPO) are especially owed a debt of gratitude for the crucial role they played in coordinating the interview schedules among various government ministries, offices and officials. Their input to the evaluation was constructive and contributed some key insights for improving participant training programs.

ACRONYMS

AETR	Academic Enrollment and Term Report
AID/W	Agency for International Development, Washington
AUB	American University of Beirut
AUC	American University of Cairo
BA	Bachelor of Arts
BS	Bachelor of Science
COCA	Central Organization for Control and Auditing
CPO	Central Planning Organization
CPT	Coordinator for Participant Training
DP	Development Planning
EHR	Education and Human Resources
EMU	Eastern Michigan University
FY	Fiscal Year
HITS	Horticulture Improvement and Training Subproject
HRPD	Human Resources Planning Department, CPO
ISAI	Ibb Secondary Agricultural Institute
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
MA	Master of Arts
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
MCH	Maternal and Child Health
MOCSAR	Ministry of Civil Service and Administrative Reform
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOH	Ministry of Health
MOMH	Ministry of Municipalities and Housing
MOMR	Ministry of Oil and Mineral Resources
MPW	Ministry of Public Works
MS	Master of Science
NIPA	National Institute of Public Administration
NWASA	National Water and Sewerage Authority
ORT	Oral Rehydration Therapy
OSU	Oregon State University
PACD	Project Assistance Completion Date
PETS	Poultry Extension and Training Subproject
PhD	Doctor of Philosophy
PIL	Project Implementation Letter
PIO/P	Project Implementation Order/Participants
RWSD	Rural Water Supply Department
SIP	Social and Institutional Profile
ST	Short Term
TOEFL	Teaching of English as Foreign Language (Exam)
U.S.	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development in Yemen
USIS	United States Information Service
WID	Women in Development
YALI	Yemen-American Language Institute
YAR	Yemen Arab Republic
YARG	Yemen Arab Republic Government

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluation of the Cross Sectoral Participant Training Program in Yemen was conducted under IQC PDC-0085-1-00-6098-00, Work Order #25, for the USAID Mission in Yemen. Over 100 interviews were conducted including a sample of 45 returned participants.

The USAID participant training program is held in high regard by both Yemen Arab Republic Government (YARG) officials and participants. YARG officials expressed a preference and a need for more U.S. training and rated it higher in quality in comparison to Soviet Bloc and other European or third country training. The YARG officials who were interviewed were enthusiastic and very cooperative during the interviews. They provided significant input to various evaluation issues such as selection, placement, monitoring and follow-up, in addition to training needs assessment, policy and planning. It is clear that YARG officials view U.S. participant training as an important component of human resource development.

The participants also praised the USAID participant training program and had very positive experiences during their study at U.S. institutions. The majority of the sample participants had taken BS and MS degrees in Education, Engineering, Economics and Public Administration. Other fields of study included City Planning, Social Sciences, Health and the Physical Sciences. The dominant fields of study for most participants were Education and Engineering. Short-term technical training covered a variety of professional fields and also emphasized management and administration.

The participants were for the most part satisfied with their academic training with over 85% expressing a positive experience. Moreover, most said they would recommend their training program to other colleagues.

Participants who studied in the U.S. not only learned academic and technical skills but also felt they experienced attitudinal and behavioral changes which were critical to their personal development as well as job performance. For example, the majority of the participants said that one of the most important skills gained through their education and training was the ability to analyze problems and propose practical solutions. A second major skill learned was the ability to plan and organize as well as new attitudes toward thinking about and approaching problems. These abstract skills were seen by most participants as equal to or more important to bringing about change as their academic and technical training.

The question of U.S. training versus third country training is primarily a matter of cost, assuming that the quality of education programs is at least on a par with U.S. institutions. In certain cases where adequate training could be provided in Arabic-speaking countries, it would be more cost effective to place participants in Middle East programs in Egypt and Jordan, particularly for selected agricultural and public administration training.

Overall, the USAID participant training program is a good one which is meeting Yemen needs in various sectors including education, agriculture and in general participant programs (e.g., the National Institute for Public Administration (NIPA) and the National Water and Sewerage Authority (NWASA)).

However, there are critical areas in which improvement is needed, especially with regard to increased coordination and planning with YARG Ministries to identify national priorities. Another key area to examine is the provision of English language training to participants through the Yemen American Language Institute (YALI). Also, YARG officials differ somewhat with USAID on the focus of academic training in terms of B.S. and graduate degrees. YARG wishes to emphasize developing a "critical mass" of trained manpower

while much of USAID's strategy is to support upper level graduate training to strengthen Sanaa University. This difference involves both short-term and long-term planning considerations as well as efficient use of available resources.

The mission is well aware of the issues and problems in participant training and is moving ahead aggressively to resolve them. A major recommendation of the evaluation team is to centralize the authority and responsibility for participant training by the appointment of a Coordinator for Participant Training.

The purpose of identifying a key person is to establish high level dialogue with YARG officials on training policy, strategy, planning and operations. A major function of this position would be external coordination and planning. However, internal planning and coordination within USAID and the various development sectors would also be a major responsibility.

USAID has already begun to move in this direction and is looking at options to address participant training by developing a new major training policy and initiative.

II. INTRODUCTION

1. General Purpose of Study

This study was conducted under Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC) Number PDC-0085-1-00-6098-00, Work Order No. 25, for the Asia Near East Bureau, DP, Office of Evaluation. The overall study objective was to conduct a cross-sectoral analysis of the impact of USAID/Yemen's participant training programs and to identify factors associated with program success.

Specifically, the purpose of the study was to evaluate the management and impact of U.S. funded participant training over the last decade and assess the effectiveness of returned participants within various sectors of the Yemeni economy and government administration. In addition, USAID/Yemen is interested in determining to what extent returned participants strengthened the organizations or institutions for which they work and those factors which most affected their job performance. A key focus of the study evaluation was also to identify the different acquired skills (e.g., administrative, managerial, technical) and new attitudes or behavior which returned participants and their supervisors feel have been most critical to successful job performance. Finally, USAID/Yemen seeks to determine those human resource needs of the Yemen Arab Republic Government (YARG) which are currently not being addressed, as well as determine the relative advantages, including cost, of training in the U.S. and Arabic-speaking countries.

The principal outcome of this study is a series of recommendations and action steps to improve the participant training process and to provide guidelines on more effective and efficient project design of training programs.

2. Scope of Work

The scope of work entailed a review and assessment of both project related and non-project related or general participant training programs. Project related training included such subprojects as Basic Education Development (0053); Tihama Health (0065); Small Rural Water Systems (0044); and the Agricultural Development Support Program (0052). General participant training has been carried out through Development Training II (0040) and III (0080). It should be noted that for some of the above projects it was not possible to contact returned participants since they were in the U.S. at the time the evaluation was being performed. However, it was possible to review and assess other key components of the training process such as placement, monitoring and reporting.

The scope of work also included identifying a number of study variables, some of which could not be measured due to lack of adequate data and performance indicators. Examples of difficult to measure data are unit costs within and between projects and objective data on educational quality. Where absence of data precluded objective measurement, an attempt was made to obtain some assessment on preliminary performance or status through interviews confirmed by anecdotal information and general perceptions by relevant persons through informed judgements. Thus, most of the study items and data elements contained in the scope of work were assessed, albeit in different degrees.

The specific discussion of issues and findings related to the scope of work are found in Section IV, Issues, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations.

3. Methodology

The study methodology consisted of (1) document review of relevant reports, data, studies and papers; (2) interviews with appropriate mission staff; (3) interview and briefing with YARG officials at various government ministries; and (4) selected interviews with returned participants working in both the public and private sectors. Approximately 100 persons were interviewed during the evaluation.

The study was conducted by a three person team with a fourth person assigned by the mission to assist in document retrieval, scheduling and interviewing. The mission also assigned a project officer who was responsible for the evaluation on site and who provided guidance and assistance to the team in carrying out the evaluation.

Due to the nature of this study, all evaluation activities including scheduling of interviews and instrument development were developed on site in Sanaa, Yemen.

Development Associates developed four interview guides which were used to obtain information on participant training and related issues.

The instruments used in conducting interviews were:

1. Interview Guide for Returned Participants.
2. Interview Guide for YARG Officials/Selection Committee Members.
3. Interview Guide for Supervisors.
4. USAID Staff Interview Guide.

Copies of the interview guides are contained in the appendix.

4. Organization of the Report

The remainder of the report will cover the participant training process (Section III) as managed in Yemen including a discussion of general versus project related training, and the key components of recruitment, selection, orientation, follow-up and evaluation. The other key section comprising this report is Section IV which organizes the study variables and evaluation questions under Issues, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations. A major part of this section which was not in the scope of work but is added to assist USAID/Yemen to consider in taking action steps is the sub-section called The Future. This sub-section synthesizes much of the data, information and recommendations contained in the body of Section IV but also provides comments on direction of future participant training in such areas as strategy, types of training, training design and coordination between YARG and USAID on strategies and priorities.

Following Section IV are the appendices containing: (1) List of Persons Interviewed; (2) Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations Matrix; (3) Bibliography/References; (4) Copies of Questionnaires; and (5) Scope of Work.

III. PARTICIPANT TRAINING IN USAID/YEMEN PROGRAM

Overview

Following is a summary of the mission training strategy. It focuses on the processes within USAID and the YARG, while the implications will be discussed in further detail under the issues, findings and conclusions throughout the report.

The mission strategy for its training program is to increase the capacity of public, parastatal and private sector organizations to plan, administer and evaluate development programs in areas of Yemen's stated priority needs. The FY 1987 Action Plan states that emphasis will be focused on the five identified priority sectors which include: (a) Agriculture; (b) Education and human resource development; (c) Water resources; (d) Health; and (e) Macroeconomic planning and private sector development.

The YARG recognized the importance of manpower development in the second five-year plan, which states: "In a country of limited natural resources, the human element assumes major importance." The plan gave priority to three objectives: (1) optimizing the use of manpower; (2) meeting the needs in manpower, both in numbers and quality; and (3) reducing the country's dependence on expatriate labor. Some of these needs are defined by the YARG as: (a) engineers to staff national water and sewerage positions, and other engineering specialties to fill engineering and staff positions in a variety of facilities, ministries and parastatals; (b) public and business administration personnel to staff ministries; and (c) computer science degrees for personnel to assist in that aspect of management. In the third five-year plan USAID has given major emphasis to the expansion of teacher training to replace the large number of expensive expatriates on which Yemen is overly dependent and to vocational and technical training to build up the skilled workforce required for sustained development.

In selecting candidates for long-term U.S. based academic training, the mission has given priority to those who will staff key national education, agriculture and training institutions in order to build the national capacity to develop human resources or to those who can be expected to occupy positions of leadership in all sectors. In this regard, the bulk of the PhD candidates are from Sanaa University or the National Institute for Public Administration. The majority of undergraduate candidates have earned relatively high secondary school scores to qualify them to enter the YARG.

Most of USAID-sponsored Yemeni participants are male and have participated primarily in long-term academic training; i.e., 297 BA's, 245 MA's, and 18 PhD's. A total of 560 participants have been sent to the U.S. and other Arabic-speaking countries for long-term training. In recent years female participation has increased and now constitutes 5% of the overall training program. Below we describe specific projects under the cross-sectoral participant training evaluation for both general and project related training.

1. General Participant Training

Development Training III, Project (279-0080)

This project is USAID's general participant training project which is a follow-on project to 279-0040, which had a PACD of December 1988. Project 0080 started in 1985 with the stated purpose to increase the number of trained individuals from the public, semi-private and private sectors at the policy, planning, management, technical and administrative levels. The project emphasizes long-term graduate and undergraduate training in the U.S. and third countries.

In addition to financing participant training in various technical and management aspects, the project also has components for: (a) macro-micro level labor force planning to identify critical training needs; (b) support for the Yemen-American Language Institute (YALI) to conduct an

English-language training program in-country; (c) a contract with AMIDEAST to support USAID/Yemen's third country participant training program by AMIDEAST in Yemen, Amman and Cairo; and (d) obligation of funds for an organizational development/training design study for the Ministry of Oil and Mineral Resources and follow-up training consistent with results of the study, along with special in-country training courses.

In the education sector, resources have been directed toward long-term graduate training for the faculty of Sanaa University, with particular emphasis on the Faculties of Science and Education. In the area of Water Resources, short-term in-country training in pump operation and maintenance have been conducted. The project has been the vehicle for USAID's efforts to expand macroeconomic planning and development of the private sector and funds have been reserved to fund post-graduate work in fields such as economics, management and international finance. One training effort with the Federation of Chambers of Commerce has been terminated, but new initiatives in this area are currently being considered.

The following is a chart of participants funded under this project:

	In Training	Pending	Est. 1988	Returned
BA/BS	125	0	30	12
MA/MS	26	8	15	4
PhD	35	7	15	0
ST	8	0	50	18

Under the earlier Development Training II project, there remain 15 candidates seeking a BS degree.

2. Project Related Participant Training

Agriculture Development Support Program (279-0052)

The largest project related training is the Agricultural Development Support Program, which has four on-going subprojects, with the fifth recently terminated.

The subproject CORE was developed to assist the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) to improve its capacity to plan and implement a national agricultural development program. Training has focused on the professional staff at the MAF in areas of agricultural sciences. In FY 1988, it is planned that 18 individuals will receive long-term academic training in the U.S. and another 13 will receive similar training in Egypt. To date, no participants have returned.

The second subproject, ISAI (IBB Secondary Agricultural Institute) focuses on in-country training by establishment of a training center capable of serving governmental and rural sector needs for personnel with middle level agricultural skills. The center will provide skills necessary for the Yemenis to administer and staff the school as soon as possible. The entire faculty of the IBB School, as well as selected faculty of Surdud have received academic training in the U.S. and third countries (total trained: 10 MS and 15 BS).

The third subproject, the establishment of the Faculty of Agriculture at Sanaa University is to increase the supply of appropriately trained Yemenis to plan, manage, implement and evaluate development activities in the private and public agriculture sectors. Long-term academic training in the U.S. is planned for approximately 31 faculty members. Some faculty will also receive short-term technical training in the U.S.

The fourth subproject, HITS (Horticulture Improvement and Training), concentrates on technology transfer to introduce modern methods of fruit production by: (a) establishment of two horticulture training and improvement stations; (b) expansion and improvement of a Plant Protection Department within the MAF; and (c) an extension program, demonstration and media campaign to instruct farmers, nurserymen and private sector suppliers and fruit merchants in the proper techniques for fruit tree cultivation and fruit marketing. Four participants are currently studying in the U.S. for an MS in horticulture, one in agricultural science and another a BS in horticulture. Others have received short-term technical training in plant protection at the University of Jordan. Three more long-term academic participants are planned to begin study in 1988.

The fifth subproject, PETS (Poultry Extension and Training) was designed to increase egg production in the traditional sector to improve nutrition and increase farm income by establishment of an improved extension and training program within the MAF. This project has now terminated.

Basic Education Development Project (279-0053)

This education project was designed to accelerate the development of YARG human resources by assisting MOE to build an institutional capacity for the improvement of primary teacher training, increasing the quality and availability of primary education, and establishing a more efficient and effective primary education system (Primary Teachers Training Institute); to develop a Department of Primary Education within the Faculty of Education in order to improve science education in preparatory and secondary schools; and to improve administration, planning and implementation capability of the MOE.

The technical assistance contractor, Eastern Michigan University (EMU) completed nearly five years of in-country and U.S.-based activities in May 1985. During this time, the contractor granted M.Ed degrees to 118 primary teacher trainers, developed course offerings in primary education for the Faculty of Education, at Sanaa University, and installed science and mathematics laboratories and an audio-visual instruction center at the Faculty of Education. The only remaining activity on this project is the completion of participant training. This project has experienced a number of difficulties and problems and is viewed by both the YARG and the mission as failing to achieve some of its most basic objectives. The impact of the project on the YARG and participants is discussed in more detail in Section IV.

Tihama Primary Health Care (279-0065)

This project purpose was to support the development of primary health care services in the Tihama region of the YARG by strengthening the planning, management and administrative capabilities of the Ministry of Health. Training objectives included four long-term MPH degrees. All have been completed and participants are in-country. One is currently the Project Director, one is the director of a hospital in Hodeidah, one is director of the ORT Program and another is at Sanaa University. There have been 38 short-term technical courses completed in the U.S. and third countries. In addition, there have been in-country and in-service training which included traditional birth attendants, training supervisors, and male and female primary health workers.

Planned training includes one long-term MCH and other short-term technical and in-country training. The current training plan is now in the MOH awaiting approval.

Small Rural Water Systems Project (279-0044)

The purpose of this project was to improve the quality of life of Yemeni villagers by improving access to water for domestic use by construction of water systems in selected villages and improving the capacity of the Ministry of Public Works (MPW), Rural Water Supply Department (RWSD), to replicate these systems. The project provided long-term academic training at the outset of the project. However, after 1985, only short-term in-country training has been conducted for pump operation and maintenance.

3. Participant Training Process

The participant training process is operating under a number of constraints. These include the methods used to select and recruit candidates for U.S. training scholarships. The selection procedures for nomination of candidates are cumbersome and time consuming. They contain structural and operational constraints that restrict USAID's ability and flexibility to meet their priority training needs. These constraints are dealt with in detail in Section IV.3 of the report. With the passage of Law 19 in 1984 and the start-up of Development Training Project III, USAID delegated increasing responsibility for the selection of candidates to the YARG. Law 19 sets standards and procedures to be used for selection of candidates for fellowships and scholarship training offered by all foreign donors. Each Ministry and government organization should provide a detailed training needs plan for scholarships, grants and training courses prior to the end of March every year.

- (a) **Recruitment** - In the past (with exceptions in 1985 and 1988), U.S. scholarships were not publicized and recruitment of candidates was decided informally among the concerned ministries and the CPO. Many of the scholarships were used to "pick-up" students already in the U.S. studying at their own expense. This year, a system has been established which allowed for publication of available U.S. scholarships in

the newspaper, on radio and T.V., and in the government's guide to available foreign scholarships. Candidates must meet the requirements as established in Law 19: undergraduates must have a minimum score of 80% (75% for females) on the secondary school exam; field of study must be consistent with Yemen's development plans; a TOEFL minimum score of 500; and completion of military service. Candidates for graduate nominees must have a Bachelor's degree with a minimum score of "very good," study in a field consistent with Yemen's development plans, have a minimum TOEFL score of 500, and have completed military service. Criteria for short-term training in the U.S. and elsewhere will be established prior to each program and will be tailored to the requirements of the training. The selection committee responsible for reviewing graduate nominees will also review nominees for short-term training.

- (b) Selection - A Supreme Committee for Fellowships, Scholarships, Study Leave and Training Activities has been formed. It is composed of the following members: The Minister of Civil Service and Administrative Reform (Chairman); the Minister of Education; The Minister of Development and Chairman of the CPO; the Minister of Foreign Affairs; and the Deputy Minister of MOCSAR. The Committee's responsibilities include: preparing and approving overall policy of training and scholarship program; and endorsing the criteria and procedural steps necessary for utilizing the Scholarships.

The Committee has three subcommittees as follows.

1. Employees Qualification Subcommittee which is concerned with the selection of nominated employees from the government, public and semi-private sectors. Its members include representatives from MOCSAR (Deputy Minister, Chairman and 2 Under-Secretaries), Rector of Sanaa University, Deputy Director of NIPA, Under-Secretary of concerned Ministry, CPO and Director-General of Training and Scholarship of MOCSAR.
2. The General Qualification Subcommittee which is concerned with selecting students from secondary schools and similar educational institutes. Its members include the Minister of Education (Chairman); and the Rector of Sanaa University. To select undergraduate candidates, CPO has formed a committee consisting of representatives from CPO and the Ministry of Education. Graduate nominees will be selected by a committee composed of representatives from CPO, the MOCSAR, Sanaa University, Under-Secretary of the Ministry of Education, Under-Secretary of MOCSAR, Director-General of Cultural Relations at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Director General of Cultural Relations at MOE.

3. Teaching Faculty Subcommittee which is concerned with the selection of candidates from Sanaa University and other higher institutes and specialized centers. Its members include the Chairman of the University Council (Chairman), Rector of Sanaa University, Dean of NIPA, Under-Secretary of MOCSAR/Manpower Sector, Under-Secretary of CPO, the Dean of concerned college or Director of the recipient entity, and the General Registrar.

These committees are responsible for: (a) selection of nominees in conformity with overall selection policy and criteria as approved by the Supreme Committee; (b) proposing criteria and procedures necessary for appropriate utilization of scholarships and to submit them to the Supreme Committee in compliance with terms of Law 19; and (c) preparing periodical appropriate reports for the Supreme Committee every three months.

All nominations for undergraduate scholarships are submitted to the MOE subcommittee. Employees from other ministries submit their applications through their own Ministry. Applications from Sanaa University are submitted through the University. Once the subcommittee has selected candidates, they are recommended to the Supreme Committee, which, in turn notifies CPO by letter for its review and approval. The CPO then submits the list of approved candidates to USAID for approval. USAID notifies CPO of approval and then candidates are notified and, if necessary, entered into English Language Training at YALI.

Selection procedures for candidates from the private sector have not yet been formalized by USAID or YARG.

- (c) **Monitoring, Follow-up and Evaluation** - Once a candidate has been nominated, selected and achieved an acceptable TOEFL score, a PIO/P is written and sent to either International Training Office in AID/W or the responsible contractor. The contractor then conducts a placement search and develops a Training Implementation Plan. Once the participant has been accepted, the Training Office prepares the normal pre-departure documentation. Contractors are to notify USAID of any problems and to forward AETR's. The Technical Office, as well as CPO and the appropriate Ministry, review the AETR to ensure that the participant is proceeding with the planned program. Upon completion of the program, return tickets are issued and the mission is notified of the planned departure date. No formal follow-up is carried out on returned participants; however, if they return to projects, the Project Officer is aware of their progress. The Training Office also keeps informal contact and is aware of where most participants are located.

IV. ISSUES, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section deals with the key issues and findings derived from the study questions, variables and data elements described in the Scope of Work. There are six sub-sections which identify major study issues. These issues, however, embrace all of the relevant items in the statement of work.

The format for this section is discussion of each issue and related items followed by, where appropriate, a separate narrative titled: Recommendation. In this manner each issue is immediately succeeded by a conclusion leading to a specific action.

1. Advantages of U.S. Versus Third Country Training

There are clearly advantages and disadvantages to providing training in the U.S. and in Arabic-speaking third countries.

However, these advantages are relative and determined by a number of factors including type of training, the field of study and whether it is long or short term. The perceptions by both YARG officials and USAID on the distinctions of U.S. versus third country also are determined by both qualitative and quantitative factors. The relative merits of training and education involve quality, prestige or perceptions by Yemenis on the value of a degree obtained in the U.S. to their professional career, and the cost of training. One sentiment which emerged during interviews is that most YARG officials and participants felt that academic long-term training in the U.S is very important and is generally preferred to training in European or Eastern Bloc nations.

On the other hand, third country training is viewed by Yemeni officials as having distinct advantages based on other standards. Short-term training, for example, is viewed as either acceptable or preferred in Arabic-speaking countries because it is (a) cheaper and more cost effective; (b) easier to nominate and select participants because English language capability is not required; and (c) presents a more flexible and quicker approach to selecting a training institution and completing the training in a shorter time. It should also be noted that some YARG officials think that graduate training in certain fields (e.g., engineering, economics and public administration (as in Jordan)) are more suited for participants in Arabic-speaking countries.

In most cases the YARG has been satisfied with general training in the U.S. and third countries. The reasons for this appear to be grounded on the fact that general training provides a wider latitude in meeting professional needs of ministry personnel and human resource needs across the various government agencies. Short-term training in management, administration and technical fields for upgrading are particularly useful to many YARG officials.

General training seems to be popular with the government ministries. One reason for this is the extensive need for training in almost any number of professional and technical areas. Administrative and management training represent key training needs, but technical training is also seen as a high priority in agriculture, education, health and water resources. Agriculture lacks extension workers and health suffers from a short supply of trained field health workers, especially female primary health care field workers. Basic technical short courses in such areas as water resource management and equipment use and maintenance are seen as continued needs for the NWASA.

Many YARG officials see advantages in cost and programming (i.e., language preparation, placement) for third country training, but yet also feel that there should be some balance between short-term U.S. and third country training.

One of the major problems is that the process of selecting participants (as described earlier in Section III) often ignores the needs of ministries and smaller government organizations. This results in lack of training to meet human resource needs in specific fields. One government agency for example did not receive any USAID scholarships for the past two years and were put in the position of accepting Eastern Bloc training slots which were not wanted. Much of the problem, however, lies in the YARG selection process which can create problems in meeting various YARG human resource needs.

*without
state
proble*

Despite some selection problems associated with individual government ministries and agencies, the implications for future programming focus on the possibility of USAID closely coordinating with YARG on development of general training, This may be done through development of a YARG training plan for meeting professional and technical needs, particularly through possible increase in short-term training in third countries.

The use of third country training (Arabic-speaking) has been quite effective and has apparently met the needs of various ministries and government agencies. While there has been high praise by Yemenis for U.S. short-term (and academic) training because of advanced technology and rigorous training schedule, third country training which is less costly and achieves parity more or less with U.S. training in some fields is a relatively preferred option with many YARG officials. The point should be stressed, however, that under certain circumstances (i.e., special training needs in certain fields) U.S. short-term training is more highly regarded. Further, in many specialized

*Co-
the*

fields, training and education programs are only offered in the U.S. or are clearly superior in comparison to non-U.S. education resources.

The process of recruiting, selecting and placing participants in U.S. institutions or those in third countries reveals no comparative issues in terms of available candidates, utilization of returned participants or their subsequent promotion and earnings ratios. Exceptions to this are the obvious lack of English language skills which make selection of participants considerably easier for Arabic-speaking training programs. Also, generally speaking, U.S. degrees are held in higher regard than non-U.S. degrees and therefore career mobility is more enhanced with U.S. training and the accompanying advantage of English language capability. Outside of these two self-evident factors, there exist little if any issues regarding training equivalency or job performance between U.S. and non-U.S. trained participants.

The key issues of management and monitoring are somewhat crucial to tracing participant progress. There appear to be less problems in logistical issues (i.e., transportation, housing, visas, etc.) and monitoring for third country training than those for participants trained in the U.S. The distance and complexity of U.S. training generally pose more monitoring and logistical problems than third country training.

There is some disagreement between USAID staff on whether general training is more difficult and expensive to monitor than project related training. It would appear that the cost and difficulty of monitoring training programs depends more on idiosyncratic elements of projects than on the type of training being provided. However, most staff interviewed thought that general training is less difficult and expensive to monitor than project related training.

RECOMMENDATION: Selection of U.S. or third country training should continue to be based on the mission's current practice of examining the relative cost and educational benefits to be gained from training location and institutions.

*Short term
quit*

Training Costs in U.S. Versus Third Country

Both long-term and short-term training programs gain a distinct cost advantage when training is done in third countries versus training conducted in the U.S. However, again the advantages tend to be relative depending on the complexity of the training or education, the particular field of study and the special training required to suit a participant training program to participant needs. For example, one short term, highly specialized U.S. training program cost approximately \$4,300 per participant month. On the other hand, U.S. MA training averaged somewhat higher in program costs than similar training in Jordan, although for certain courses conducted in Egypt, the U.S. training is significantly higher. A recent hike in tuition costs for obtaining a Master's degree at Egyptian universities may make training costs equivalent or even more than sending a participant to the U.S. Tuition costs alone for foreign students have apparently been increased to \$6,000 per year for a MA degree at some Egyptian universities. Thus, it may be more cost effective to send participants to the U.S.

On the other hand, academic training in Jordan, as one example, is approximately one-third the program cost per participant month than U.S. training in obtaining a Master's degree in Education.

If the value of training is applied to cost in terms of potential career development or earnings, U.S. training, despite costing almost three times as much, may be a better long-term investment not only as to potential career mobility but in

acquisition of advanced technology. But this is not always the case as there are exceptions to this assumption for participants trained in third countries.

RECOMMENDATION: Where quality of education and technology in third countries is on a par or roughly equivalent to U.S. training, it is on the whole more cost effective to train participants in Arabic-speaking countries. However, as in the case of recent tuition hikes in Egyptian universities, it is probably more advantageous to send participants to the U.S., all other factors such as language skills and preparation considered. Each particular case should be examined on the relative tradeoffs in cost and quality, and comparisons analyzed for specific participant training programs and objectives with regard to participant needs.

2. Training Needs Assessment

USAID has long been aware of the need for detailed assessment of training needs in the YARG. Project 0040 included the development of the Human Resources Planning Department (HRPD) in CPO, which is charged with preparing an annual training plan showing needs of all YARG institutions. One of the activities of Project 0052 was an assessment of manpower and training needs in the MAF, including the assignment of a Training Advisor in the ministry. Other projects with various ministries have also emphasized the importance of needs assessment for the training components.

This section addresses the issue of training needs as a result of interviews with returned participants, YARG officials and USAID personnel. While the team is not in a position to recommend specific training needs for the mission to address, it does have findings and recommendations about the process of addressing specific training priorities.

a. Training Priorities

Participant training in past USAID projects in the YAR has been either as a component of a specific sector project (e.g., agriculture) or as a catch-all for nominations in development-related fields through projects 0040 and 0080. There has not been a specific mission policy establishing priorities for training as a result of cooperative analysis with CPO. As a result, YARG is unclear about USAID's training priorities and responds to scholarships as "slots" rather than part of a training plan. Without clearly defined priorities and criteria communicated to YARG on a continuing basis, USAID is in a vulnerable position whereby it becomes enmeshed in the debate between YARG institutions and is forced into responding to specific requests for scholarships based on family connections or other informal contacts.

RECOMMENDATION: EHR/USAID should coordinate the development of a mission strategy for participant training that specifies the objectives and concerns of the mission as a whole and individual programs (e.g., private sector training, female participants, fields where U.S. has special expertise, etc.). This strategy should also outline the process for dealing with CPO and relevant ministries on all aspects of participant training. This should be the basis for a continuing dialogue with HRPD in CPO for cooperative joint planning to ensure YARG needs, as perceived by officials, are addressed.

b. Skills Not Addressed

USAID has been operating in a situation where there has been an obvious need for practically all skills, as well as levels of training. It is important to identify those skills not currently addressed by YARG or other donors in order for USAID to develop long-range training plans and to avoid

having returnees unable to find employment in their fields. During the course of the interviews a number of skills and training needs were expressed. These are listed below, although the team is not in a position to judge the relative merits of these needs for USAID. Particular skills needed include:

- Education courses for participants trained in a specific field (e.g., chemistry) and returning to teach at Sanaa University. Some returnees have to pick up teaching skills on their own. Teaching skills and methodology are viewed as important areas in human resource training at Sanaa University.
- Managerial/administrative training for returnees with general degrees (e.g., economics, engineering) and who are now working in administrative positions in YARG or private business.
- Job related training seminars for EMU graduates under Project 0053. Those now working in the MOE do not have skills for specific duties (i.e., curriculum development, evaluation of instructional materials) because they were trained to be teacher trainers.
- Medical training in various health fields for women (e.g., Department of Environmental Health in MOMH).
- Selected subjects in science (e.g., physics) for postgraduate training of future professors at Sanaa University.
- Practical work experience to accompany degree training in the U.S. (e.g., engineering degrees).

RECOMMENDATION: There are many skills and training needs still to be adequately addressed. These should not be approached on an ad-hoc, project-by-project basis, but within an overall mission strategy for participant training. It is important that USAID coordinate through CPO in determining (a) what YARG considers critical needs still to be addressed, and (b) what other donors do or plan to address. The important thing is to develop a process for USAID and CPO (and through CPO to other relevant ministries) to consult on

the training issue and improve communication. However, it should be noted that CPO is a major player in the participant training process and any improvement in planning and implementation of strategy (both YARG and mission) will depend to a great degree on CPO's willingness and prediliction to plan cooperatively. USAID can initiate, support and follow through on coordination, but is limited in its options and authority to control the training process. This problem is also discussed in the next subsection.

c. Unresolved Issues

The fundamental unresolved issue in USAID-YARG relationships regarding training needs is the lack of coordination in developing training plans. Although CPO is the primary focus for the country's manpower needs, USAID also deals with specific ministries having their own training priorities and agendas. As a result, USAID is placed in a vulnerable position of YARG internal communications of which it is not able to control or help. USAID cannot afford to deal with CPO and the ministries on the basis of personalities and special cases as long as CPO is the official YARG institution for coordination of all donor activities. Training priorities for any project or for any ministry must be established through CPO involvement.

RECOMMENDATION: To avoid confusion between YARG and USAID, a concerted effort must be made to define the working relationship between USAID, CPO and various YARG ministries. For training needs assessment this must be coordinated with the HRPD as well as individual training departments in the ministries. The mission should consider a formal study of the USAID-CPO relationship before further development of training programs, because many of the problems in the training process result from confusion and misunderstanding about how USAID is to work with CPO and how the CPO, both

formally and informally, relates to the ministries both within Law 19 and outside of legislative guidelines in an informal policy dialogue.

An issue raised in CPO, MOE and MOCSAR is the need for USAID to provide information on the number of scholarships annually in a timely fashion. The Assistant Deputy Minister of CPO indicated that there are delays and difficulties with USAID scholarships more so than with other donors. The Deputy Minister of MOE complained that because MOE did not know the number of scholarships from year to year, it was difficult to advertise these as required by Law 19. USAID is aware of the problem and is looking for a way to provide a number or range of numbers to MOE rather than simply a dollar amount for scholarships.

The issue of pick-ups of Yemeni students already studying in the U.S. is still not resolved despite a PIL signed by CPO (dated 8/26/87) stating that USAID would follow normal selection procedures in Law 19. The Deputy Minister of MOCSAR indicated that providing U.S. scholarships to pick-ups would undermine the role of the selection committees, especially for the annual assessment of training needs and priorities. The Deputy Minister of MOMH argued that on a case-by-case basis some pick-ups would be well suited for USAID scholarships. This would especially be true for those with high grades and who otherwise could not afford to continue their education in the U.S.

RECOMMENDATION: Until CPO notifies USAID of a change in YAR law on pick-ups, USAID should abide by the rule. Ministries who wish to nominate Yemeni students already in the U.S. should be directed to confer with CPO.

3. Constraints to Participant Training Program

USAID has more than ten years experience in sending Yemeni students to the U.S. and third countries for participant training. Because of changes in mission policy and projects, some of the constraints have changed during the last decade. In general, however, the primary constraints for Yemeni participants are English language capabilities, secondary and university education preparation, and the long-standing cultural isolation of the country. Apart from the participants themselves, a major constraint has been the selection process and how USAID and contractors have dealt with this.

a. English Language Capabilities

Earlier participants under USAID sponsorship were often sent directly to the American University of Beirut (AUB) or to the U.S. without language preparation in the YAR. It appears that many of these participants were chosen in part because of their English skills, especially in the case of women. Until 1985 USIS, under AID PSC arrangements, operated a small-scale English language training program which included some but not all USAID participants. This program, known as YALI, had major problems in terms of staffing, curricula, continuity and success in training participants, as was noted in a mid-term evaluation of Project 0040 by Development Associates (1980).

Those students interviewed who studied at YALI before going to the U.S. identified a number of weaknesses in their English language training. These include:

- No training in practical study skills (e.g., research, note-taking) needed for U.S. academic life.
- Lack of intensive immersion in English (e.g., not able to use language outside classroom).
- Lack of courses emphasizing specialized vocabulary for participant's field.
- Need for more exposure to American idioms and pronunciation (e.g., tapes).
- Lack of rapport with teachers, many of whom were not qualified or motivated to interact with Yemeni students.
- Length of program too long in bringing student to necessary TOEFL level.

It is important to note that a number of these weaknesses have been corrected since the establishment of a new YALI program for USAID participants under contract with Oregon State University (OSU). However, since no students who have gone through the new YALI program have yet returned to Yemen from study in the U.S., they could not be interviewed.

RECOMMENDATION: The contract with OSU specifies a mid-term evaluation, which should be done immediately. It is important to evaluate what changes have been made and identify remaining problems and issues facing USAID in the use of YALI for training participants.

In the past USAID accepted TOEFL scores lower than 500, as in the case of Project 0053 with EMU. Students who participated in the project were given special language preparation in-country originally by EMU (later under YALI) as well as more language training at EMU. Participants and YARG officials involved in the project indicated that it was a mistake to send Yemeni students to the U.S. with such low scores and in a group. As a result some Yemeni students were able to obtain an MA in education without having adequate English skills. This has been a major criticism of the EMU

project from the MOE. In fact, one of the participants interviewed had to be questioned in Arabic despite having an MA from a U.S. university.

RECOMMENDATION: No Yemeni student or group of students should be sent to the U.S. with a TOEFL score below 500 unless arrangement is made to bring up the TOEFL score in the U.S. before starting academic coursework. Sending a Yemeni student to the U.S. when he or she does not have adequate English skills, defeats the purpose of training and raises cost of the training in the long term. Serious consideration should be given to raising the minimum TOEFL score to 520-530 before permitting graduation from YALI.

b. Secondary Education Preparation

The pool of potential candidates for USAID scholarships has been limited by the fact that a modern educational system is relatively recent. Secondary education is confined to a small percentage of the population. The only university is barely 15 years old and still heavily dependent on foreign teachers. The EHR Sector Assessment (1986) identifies the constraints in Yemeni education and offers recommendations for improvement at all levels. However, for the foreseeable future USAID will continue to face a problem of finding Yemenis as adequately prepared as students from other countries in the region. While many participants in the past were from families with previous educational experience outside the YAR, the mission is interested in focusing on students on the basis of merit rather than those with family or personal connections.

c. Long-Standing Cultural Isolation

Numerous mission documents, including the SIP (1984) and Institutional Development Assessment (1985), have noted the fact that Yemen was long isolated from the West and even

other Arab countries until about two decades ago. While certain segments of the population had more exposure to the West (e.g., through the Port of Aden), by and large Yemeni culture is more traditional than other Arab countries. As a result some Yemeni students may be at a comparative disadvantage in adapting to U.S. culture and academic lifestyle compared to most other participants from the region. The specific difficulties include lack of previous experience with other religions (YAR has no indigenous Christian population), lack of access to many aspects of modern technology, a social environment that rarely includes casual contacts between sexes, lack of experience with American social problems (i.e., drugs, racial prejudice, premarital sex, crime, etc.), and difficulty of living apart from the family (especially for married participants).

However, despite the claims of isolation, it is interesting to note that 70% of the participants interviewed indicated they did not have difficulties adjusting to American culture and academic life or that these were normal difficulties that anyone might face. Several participants said that the problem was essentially one of motivation, i.e., that students who came to focus on the education could overcome the cultural constraints, while those who came primarily to experience American culture would have difficulties. All of the participants indicated that some sort of orientation to American culture was important. Most participants received some orientation, although several thought it was not practical enough and did not adequately prepare them for U.S. exposure.

RECOMMENDATION: Orientation to American culture and academic life must be given both in the YAR and after arrival in the U.S. Orientation prior to leaving Yemen should be coordinated through YALI. It is recommended that YALI develop an orientation guide for Yemeni students based on

feedback from former participants, including some information specific for male participants and some specific for females. A complete orientation package should be developed which prepares participants for living in the U.S. Also, Yemen orientation should include former participants who can speak of their own experiences and answer questions participants may have on U.S. culture, customs, academic life and other interests.

d. Selection Process

The participant selection process, as noted earlier, poses a number of problems which need to be addressed. The most critical feature of the selection process is the nomination by the YARG of participants who do not always represent both YARG and mission priorities for training or those most financially disadvantaged in need of scholarships.

There is recurring pressure from various ministries to nominate individuals for training who do not meet the selection criteria. The mission is acutely aware of the problem and has recently taken positive steps to resist pressure for special interests. The key issue, however, is the fact that this problem exists at all and tends to hinder the selection of candidates for training to meet YARG and mission training goals and objectives. Another point is that internal procedures of the selection process (whereby the subcommittees nominate candidates for training, submit the names of those candidates to the Supreme Committee, which in turn transmit them to CPO for review and final determination before identifying final candidates to USAID), is largely unknown and only vaguely understood in terms of YARG bureaucratic workings. Further, various representatives of YARG ministries and agencies appear to not quite understand the process themselves. Some officials, for example, were

not aware that in order to meet their human resource needs it is necessary to identify specific training requests with at least a plan and justification to the appropriate subcommittee chairman.

The manner and extent to which training requests are prioritized and consistent with YARG training strategy and plans (and whether these exist) is not specifically as yet identified, although the general process and procedures are somewhat spelled out in Law 19. The result of the selection procedures, while posing some basic problems, is that mostly capable and effective participants have received training and returned to jobs in which many have utilized skills to increase their own productivity. However, the selection process, needs to be improved in order to meet YARG needs. Generally, most candidates are qualified but lacking in English language skills. (MAF has experienced difficulty in providing good candidates.) This is a problem as noted, not with the selection process per se, but with the English language training and preparation. Usually, contractors have had to adjust their program to accommodate lack of English language skills or other academic deficiencies, but apparently this has not created any unusual problem for the training contractors although it has in cases adversely affected participant placement and performance. Conversely, in some training programs the contractor has not been accountable in adjusting to participant needs and reporting to USAID adequately on participant problems and progress. The mission is taking steps to require contractors, where appropriate, to improve monitoring and reporting procedures to track participants in order to take necessary steps to improve participant performance in a timely fashion.

RECOMMENDATION: The mission should continue to establish dialogue with the CPO and various ministries in refining and developing specific training plans to meet the human resource

needs of each ministry. Law 19 stipulates that such training plans will be developed and if each ministry complies it would be possible to establish a more logical and consistent training process supported by a formal YARG training policy. The barriers and problems in developing these plans are by no means simply a matter of coordination and communication within the YARG and USAID. Substantial issues remain to be resolved, primarily within YARG as to administration of Law 19 and interpretation of its provisions. There are limits on the extent to which USAID can assist and influence the training needs assessment and subsequent training plans for each ministry. However, since the mission is working to establish policy dialogue on participant training, it would be useful to encourage and support a formal needs assessment and training plans for the different ministries. This can result in better selection of candidates and increased sensitivity to training needs and priorities of YARG agencies. It should be noted that in many cases mission staff, including the director, have established close working relationships on a policy dialogue level. These need to be reinforced and continued on a YARG-wide basis.

4. Impact of Training

A precise measure of the impact of USAID participants returned to the YAR would require a major analysis of both participants and supervisors across the board, including a sample from other country programs. The YARG, particularly CPO, does not yet have the capabilities for such a survey; nor is it feasible for one donor to undertake a systematic assessment. The following findings are based on a sample survey of available USAID returned participants in Sanaa, interviews with supervisors and YARG officials and previous donor experience. From this primarily qualitative data the relative impact of returnees can be addressed, specifically how USAID participants fare in the workplace and the identification of skills and especially attitudinal change resulting from U.S. training.

a. Availability and Relevance of Jobs

Given the lack of a critical mass of human resources in the YAR, a returned participant generally has no problem finding a job in some way related to the training. The issue becomes one of whether or not the participant will find a job for which he or she received specific training and if this job will meet expectations raised in the U.S. training experience. Most of the participants (63%) indicated that they were working in a job for which they had been trained. However, virtually all noted that there were certain job related skills for which they had not been trained. For example, a returned MS in Civil Engineering worked in an administrative and supervisory role in NWASA. Although his background in engineering was crucial for his job, he had not been prepared in evaluation and managerial skills needed for the job. Similarly, a returned BA in Civil Engineering at COCA worked as an inspector of construction sites, but he had no practical training on inspection or auditing techniques essential for his job.

From the participants surveyed there does not appear to be a major difference between general training and project related training in terms of job availability and relevance. The team notes that this may not be the case when those trained under Project 0052 return from U.S. training for positions in the MAF and agricultural sector. A participant is not really "tied" to a specific job or even ministry upon return. Although the participant is obligated to serve in the YARG, the determination is made by the MOCSAR, which appears to be able to overrule a particular ministry for job placement. Thus, a returned participant may be able to lobby for a particular position based on family or personal contacts. It should be noted that in some cases the individual responsible for nominating a participant has moved on to another job or ministry; thus, after two or four years the expected job may

no longer be there because the primary contact has moved. The MOE expressed a strong concern that it might lose current employees sent for advanced degrees to Sanaa University.

One of the major problems in finding a suitable job within YARG is the level of expectation created through U.S. training. Those who return with command of English and mastery of a field may find difficulties in adapting to jobs at lower levels in ministries. The chief constraint here is the problem of seniority, where supervisors may not have the training, language or attitude to accept the ideas and methods of the returnee. Several participants complained that it was difficult to work with co-workers who did not have adequate training or were unsuitable for the job. Given the nature of YARG civil service, where increases in grade and salary are based primarily on seniority, there is little opportunity for someone to advance on merit alone. Having seen the competitive environment of U.S. academics and business, the participant must lower expectations or else package skills in more traditional Yemeni terms.

Some of the participants indicated a dissatisfaction with their present jobs because of a perceived lack of upward mobility or underutilization of skills. This is especially true of those at the lower levels, where the workload may be minimal and vaguely defined. The returned EMU participants complained that for the most part they have been confined to the lower echelons of the MOE and not recognized for advancement because of the MOE's criticism of Project 0053. It is important to note that in general the problem is not with U.S. training (apart from the failures of 0053) but with the job environment (particularly in the public sector) in the YAR, which is still largely based on family and personal connections. Also, it is noteworthy that the private sector has not benefitted substantially from returnees since the majority have returned to public sector employment.

RECOMMENDATION: Although USAID cannot influence YARG civil service policy, the training program should include job counseling relevant to the job environment in the YAR. The participants should be alerted to the need for adapting skills and attitudes learned in the U.S. to succeed in and positively influence future jobs in Yemeni institutions. Also, counseling provided to potential participants or applicants for scholarships should avoid the problem of wrong choice of study for those participants who are counseled on realities of specific fields of study, academic requirements and occupational difficulties. Participants should be made to understand the academic and technical demands and requirements for specific professional fields.

b. Job Assimilation and Productivity

Participants were specifically asked during interviews if they had any difficulty in introducing new ideas and affecting change in their work environment as a result of their training. Almost 80% of the participants indicated they had developed new ideas and changes affecting work, but only 50% indicated they had no difficulty introducing those ideas to the workplace or applying skills learned in their job. On the other hand, 50% of those interviewed had experienced difficulty introducing new ideas or applying skills in their job. Part of the problem for those who did experience difficulty in this area was the lack of appropriate equipment and modern machinery to permit application of new skills. Another problem was the resistance of either co-workers and supervisors to introduction of new ideas or change, although the principal problem for most returned participants seemed to be lack of appropriate technology as opposed to attitudes which resisted application of new ideas or change.

c. Critical Skills

Both participants and supervisors were asked what were the most critical skills for improving their job performance as a result of the participant training program.

As expected, a variety of skills were identified as being most critical to the participant's personal and/or professional development. Technically, key skills acquired through training focused on knowledge in professional fields; however, most participants identified attributes which reflected attitudinal or behavior changes as the most critical to their job performance.

This is of paramount importance since it demonstrates convincingly the transfer of new ideas, values and perceptions which in turn can be transmitted to other participant co-workers, supervisors and acquaintances within a cultural context. The change in attitudes and behavior can have manifold impact on introducing new techniques and methods as well as different ways of perceiving problems and solutions related to participant's work and the development process. For example, over 55% of the returned participants cited essentially abstract skills related to professional attitude or behavior change.

Those skills learned through training which were mentioned most frequently as critical to job performance were: (1) how to approach problems and propose practical solutions; (2) ability to plan and organize; (3) new ways of thinking about problems; (4) how to communicate and interact with people; (5) analytical methods; and (6) management techniques.

Clearly, most returned participants brought new personal skills to their job in problem definition and solution as well as increased sensitivity to approaching issues and problems.

Supervisors who were interviewed also expressed attitudinal and behavior change as important skills participants acquired through training and education programs, but included such technical areas as computer sciences, technology and state of the art in certain fields.

While professional and technical advancements are major objectives of skill training and education, the positive changes or transfer of values in attitudes and behavior are certainly an integral part of participant training in a socio-cultural sense and instill in the participant what may be more enduring effects of training programs.

d. Differences Between Projects

In terms of introducing new ideas and application of training skills to affect change there appears to be no difference between project related and general training for individual projects. Returned participants generally feel productive either immediately or soon after returning to work. However, there have been instances and individual cases where participants have been reassigned to jobs which are not related to their training, and therefore they do not feel productive.

This was highlighted by the situation of two women participants who could not find employment related to their training either in the public or private sector; but most participants did indicate they were productive on return to their job. In this regard, return and retention rates for the most part do not yet constitute a problem. Where problems do exist is in the area of education where some returned participants have left the Ministry of Education for employment at Sanaa University. The numbers though are small and the job market is constricted so that opportunity for job mobility in other employment sectors is generally restrictive.

e. Supervisor's Perceptions of Training

Most supervisors and government officials who were interviewed focused on the quality and kinds of technical and professional training which were needed to meet their operational and human resource requirements.

Training in the U.S. was considered to be of higher quality than training elsewhere because of the variety and depth of experience for participants. Many officials indicated that Yemenis wanted to stay in the U.S. for particular fields of graduate work. While Arabic-speaking countries were held in high regard for certain subjects, it was generally felt that U.S. training presented more opportunity and advantages for participants in their career development and job performance than training in Arabic-speaking countries.

Those supervisors and officials who commented on attitudinal and behavioral attributes associated with overseas training (particularly in the U.S.) stressed organizational, planning and analytical skills gained by returned participants.

The specific skills which supervisors felt are critical to their organizations and training needs which could be met through USAID participant training programs can be grouped under two general categories.

With the exception of Sanaa University, where advanced degrees are critical to developing and upgrading faculty staff for MA and PhD training, most government officials expressed the need for developing a critical mass of trained professions at the BA level in education, agriculture and public health.

In addition, supervisors and officials also expressed a critical need for more short-term training in management and technical fields for mid- to senior-level administrators. Thus, the YARG emphasized two key areas of participant training needs which are:

- (1) more undergraduate training across all sectors; and
- (2) more short-term management and technical training.

RECOMMENDATION: This emphasis on YARG needs should be balanced with the present focus on participant training in graduate fields and the strategy of strengthening the faculty and programs at Sanaa University.

f. Female Participation

The development of a strategy and implementation plan for increasing the role of women in development will require a well thought out and carefully conceived approach to develop relevant participant training programs. There are considerable cultural and traditional constraints in Yemen society which present barriers to assimilating women into professional positions and responsible jobs, especially in non-traditional occupations. As a consequence, few women have been able to take advantage of USAID and other scholarships.

The number of female participants trained in the U.S. has been a fraction of the total number of Yemenis sent for degrees. The team interviewed four female returned participants, only one of whom was working in a field for which she had been trained. Two of the returnees are currently employed by AMIDEAST in Sanaa. One has a BA in Electrical Engineering and is working as a program assistant; the other has a BA in Computer Engineering and is working as a receptionist. Both had worked in YARG previously, but

found it too difficult to apply their training. The primary qualification of both for the current jobs is English language ability.

It is not yet possible to determine the impact of U.S. training on female participants in the YAR workplace, because so few have returned to work in YARG or the private sector. There are a number of obstacles in traditional Yemeni society which hinder the participation of women in the workforce. While the government has a policy of integrating women more fully into the society, individual YARG officials may prevent or hinder females from jobs in the government. On the other hand, family or personal contacts may be helpful in obtaining a good position in the YARG. Because there are unequal opportunities at present in the YAR between females and males, it is important that more attention be paid to the selection of female participants and to the relevance of their training. U.S. training is no guarantee in and of itself that a woman will find a job, although this tends to be the case for returned male participants. Particular attention should be paid to what kinds of jobs are available for women, especially in terms of their mobility and societal norms. One female returnee was turned down in the private sector for a job in her field because it was assumed she would not be able to deal in public or travel in the context of her job.

The USAID Mission has sponsored a number of WID studies, as have most of the other major donors in the YAR. However, the mission does not have a specific strategy for integrating female participants into the overall training program. The fundamental problem is how to deal with constraints on women in Yemeni society while at the same time responding to female aspirations for a greater or redefined role in the workplace. It is important not to view societal constraints

as static and unchanging, but rather to provide opportunities for Yemeni women to help resolve these constraints in a suitable way.

Female participants require more specific selection criteria and orientation in order to allow them to take full advantage of U.S. training. First, there is a more limited pool to choose from, since far less females are enrolled in Yemeni secondary education. Second, females may be constrained by family obligations that may interfere with the opportunity to go abroad for study. Third, females grow up in a more sheltered environment than Yemeni males. Fourth, it appears the females in Yemeni schools are less prepared in the sciences and math than males.

RECOMMENDATION: An informal dialogue should be started with the CPO and, where appropriate, other ministry officials, on ways to begin increasing the number of female participants in training programs. The few women who were interviewed as returnees all expressed the need for more women to be trained.

However, the key to achieving more female participation is to reduce the social barriers to permit entry of women in the public sector. (The private sector is also important, but USAID lacks exposure in this area to effect change as compared to the public sector.) It would appear essential that USAID propose efforts in opening up training opportunities for women with the CPO and other appropriate YARG officials in order to establish, first and foremost, YARG's attitudes and ideas on the extent to which this can be done. Second, there should be some agreement and concurrence by the CPO in developing a strategy or plan to incorporate the nomination of women into the selection process at both the subcommittee and Supreme Committee levels. Cooperative effort and mutual understanding by the CPO (or other YARG

ministries) and USAID should promote a good working relationship to increase the number of women in participant training programs.

If the recommendation on creating a Coordinator for Participant Training (CPT) is seen as feasible and is implemented, the coordination with CPO on female participation in training and the role of women in general might be greatly facilitated. The CPT could act as official spokesman and liaison in promoting female participation. This also may provide an ideal mechanism and conduit for supporting the idea in a unified manner with the YARG and USAID.

USAID may need to work with Yemeni women and women's organizations in defining training needs and job opportunities for women. It is important to identify constraints and potential in order to maximize the effectiveness of the small number of scholarships for Yemeni women. It is recommended that USAID or YALI consider conducting a workshop on how to improve participant training for Yemeni women. This workshop should develop an action plan and set of guidelines for improving the selection process and orienting women to the potential problems of training abroad and finding jobs in the YAR. Since many of the social constraints are sensitive issues, it is necessary that Yemeni women be actively involved in defining these and ways to improve the role of women in the workplace. Potential participants might include former female returnees, YARG representatives and civic groups.

The female participants interviewed indicated that there is a need for more guidance on choice of major and career counseling before they go to the U.S. (This is also a key study recommendation.) Certain fields, i.e., medicine and teaching, are acknowledged as respectable fields for women,

while others are more problematic in Yemeni society at present. It was also suggested that special care be taken in placing female participants in the U.S., especially when they are on their own. Given their sheltered upbringing, it is important to choose an academic environment or city which is not threatening. One participant, who knew nothing about the U.S., was assigned to a school in Brooklyn, but her advisor suggested she be placed in Washington, D.C. instead. At the time she was unaware of some of the cultural difficulties she would have faced in Brooklyn, but now she is glad the advisor suggested the change.

g. Private Sector

The USAID participant training program in the YAR has thus far not included degree training for individuals in the private sector. Although funding has been set aside in Project 0080 for private sector training, this will be used for in-country needs rather than sending Yemenis for BAs or advanced degrees. Several participants interviewed expressed an interest for further education or short seminars to improve their job related skills in the private and semi-private sectors. Given the present selection process through the committees established by Law 19, there does not appear to be a way at present in which a Yemeni can be nominated for a USAID scholarship directly from the private sector.

Four of the participants interviewed work in the private sector and three in the semi-private. Although it is not possible from this limited sample to assess the overall impact of U.S. training on the Yemeni business community, all of those interviewed indicated that their training helped in obtaining jobs and in certain job activities more participants stressed advantages in the private than the public sector. However, the primary skill appears to be

English, as this is a critical language for most dealings with foreign businessmen in the YAR. Since a U.S. academic education is well respected in the YAR, participants are able in some cases to replace foreigners in administrative business positions. It appears that a BA is sufficient for most jobs now available. In fact some participants indicated that an MA might be over qualified for most positions.

Among the skills that participants in the private and semi-private sectors find most important in their jobs are those that resulted directly from U.S. training. Apart from English language abilities, participants stressed certain practical skills such as exposure to Western business and advertising systems, ways of interacting with Americans and other foreigners, preparation for jobs that require travel to foreign countries, and certain technical skills acquired during the training. On the other hand, one participant noted that his general degree in business did not prepare him for certain practical skills such as using the telex, translation of formal documents and agreements, public relations and interview skills.

One of the reasons cited for choosing to work in the private sector is the difficulty the participant found when returning to a job in YARG. In general the salaries are higher for participants outside the government, and there is greater freedom and flexibility in the job. Several of the participants noted that their supervisors in business were very supportive of suggestions for increasing efficiency or reducing costs.

However, two female participants noted that discrimination against hiring women is greater for many businesses, especially when the job requires traveling or extensive contacts with other businessmen.

It is worth noting that a number of participants take jobs with USAID or American contractors in Sanaa. Currently there are four former participants employed at USAID, at least two by CID and three in AMIDEAST and USIS. The U.S. training is advantageous for these positions for obvious reasons. In some cases Yemeni participants are replacing foreigners in these positions because of their English and abilities to operate more effectively with YARG.

RECOMMENDATION: USAID should determine the appropriate use of Project 0080 funding for participant training in the private sector. YARG should be consulted as to how Yemenis working in the private sector should apply for USAID training in the selection process. In addition, USAID should consider the merits of continued coordination with the Federation Chambers of Commerce in identifying short-term technical training for the private sector and using Project 0080 private sector funding for addressing training needs in commerce, industry and agri-business.

5. Participant Perspectives of Training Programs

The team conducted interviews with 45 former USAID participants including several YARG officials who also underwent U.S. training. This represents a sample of about 8% of the total number of participants (ca. 550) sent since 1974 by USAID for degree training. The sample was drawn through consultation with USAID/Sanaa and the CPO and represented participants from a variety of projects. The sample includes participants now working in the YARG, Sanaa University, private and semi-private companies. Female participants accounted for about 10% of the sample. The participants interviewed ranged from those recently returned to some who had returned over ten years ago. In several cases the participant had studied both in the Middle East (e.g., AUB) and in the U.S. under USAID sponsorship.

A profile of the major fields of study of the participants is provided below:

Arts	1
Accounting	1
Business Administration	6
Chemistry	1
City Planning	1
Economics	5
Education	11
Engineering	7
Geology	2
Mathematics	1
Public Administration	4
Public Health	1
Social Science	1

The interview guide was designed to elicit participant responses on their experience and recommendations concerning the USAID training program. When asked if they considered the support services adequate, 85% (34 participants) said yes. While minor problems were mentioned, these appear to have been related to poor contractor performance now rectified or problems with a particular academic institution. Some 86% (37) of the participants were satisfied with their academic training and all of the participants were enthusiastic about U.S. training in general. When asked if they were adequately prepared in English before going to study, 70% said yes. It should be noted, however, that some participants had good English skills before being nominated and some did not go through the YALI program in the YAR. Seventy percent of the sample also indicated that they did not experience any major cultural, academic or financial problems in the U.S. While most identified some small problems, these were considered to be normal for third-world students.

As noted earlier in the report, only 63% (26) of the participants were currently working in a job for which they had been specifically trained. Many of those who were working in such a job also noted certain skills which they had not been trained in or prepared for. Ninety-three percent (38) of the

participants responding said they had been able to apply skills acquired through training in their jobs. However, 50% (20) stated that there were problems in applying new ideas gained in training to their current jobs and job environments.

Almost all (98%) of the participants said they were able to be productive immediately upon returning from their training, even though many had to pick up certain skills on the job.

Fifty-seven percent (25) of the participants had changed jobs since returning from their training, including some who had left the public for the private sector. When asked about salary increases and promotions, 56% (24) responded that salary had increased because of U.S. training and 50% (20) said they had received promotions. It is important to note, however, that in YARG salary and promotion schedules are fixed and not based on where one has received training. Seventy-nine percent (33) of the participants noted that they had developed new ideas or changed their thinking or behavior on job related activities as a result of their U.S. training. Similarly, 87% (35) stated that their training had helped them cope better with work problems or issues.

The participants were quite articulate in discussing both the strengths and weaknesses of their training. Although these points have been covered where relevant in the report, the responses are enumerated below:

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM

Strengths

- U.S. has the best quality education (5 participants)
- Cultural exposure (2)
- Changed behavior toward study habits (2)
- Access to modern labs and facilities (2)
- High education standards (2)
- High-level skills and knowledge of U.S. professors (2)

- U.S. deals well with foreign students (1)
- Statistics courses (1)
- Applied science (1)
- Learned good leadership skills (1)
- High quality of English language teaching in U.S. (1)

Weaknesses

- Not enough practical training (8)
- No orientation (3)
- Poor integration of students into academic program (2)
- Too many fellow Yemenis in classes (2)
- Difficulty in adjusting to U.S. education methods (e.g., pedagogy) (2)
- U.S. system too flexible and hard to understand (1)
- U.S. not knowledgeable about Middle East problems and application of training to Middle East context (1)
- Class time wasted because students did not know English (1)
- Not enough math or statistics (1)
- Lack of guidance on academic program (1)

Despite the weaknesses and specific problems with their training, 72% (23) of the respondents would recommend to another Yemeni the same training program as appropriate.

It is useful to note that most of the participants were forthright and open in their responses to the questions. Several commented on how pleased they were that their feedback was being sought on the training program. Many took the opportunity to ask about possibilities for further USAID training or resolving issues raised in their previous training. The team wishes to stress the overwhelmingly favorable response of the participants about their training experience.

RECOMMENDATION: Given the wide distribution of former USAID participants in the YARG and Yemeni society, it is important that USAID identify specific ways in which there can be follow-up of returned participants. These participants who wish to maintain contacts with their academic institutions or the U.S. in order to enhance their jobs and development should be encouraged. This is particularly important for future

short-term training courses in the U.S. and seminars. Access to professional journals and subscriptions should be monitored in order to identify problems of keeping up with the state of the art.

6. The Future

The Future Section is in part designed to complement the other major findings and recommendations of the evaluation study but its major purpose is to provide USAID with some action steps which can address participant training issues and concerns. Of particular note here is the focus on staff deployment and centralizing responsibility for participant training.

The section deals with three key issues: (1) coordination of participant training; (2) training strategy; and (3) English language training. These issues represent in the team's view those areas which the mission can focus on, if appropriate, in the near future.

a. Coordination of Participant Training

One of the major findings of the team is the lack of coordination regarding participant training within USAID, between USAID and YARG, and between USAID and other donors. The mission does not have a formal strategy for participant training, although a draft directive has been written. There is also no single person identified for dealing with participant training in general. In the past various technical offices have had to deal both with the technical aspects as well as some of the routine process issues. For example, the Agriculture office did not receive AETRs in a timely fashion from a contractor, and when these were received they were only partially filled out and virtually unusable. The Agriculture office had to deal with this matter by itself.

Officials in the CPO, MOE and MOCSAR indicated they were often confused about USAID policy and procedures regarding participant training. The Director General of Teacher Training in the MOE stated that he has to deal with several individuals in USAID according to the specific training projects, but there is no one person he can contact regarding problems with participants or to receive information. He indicated there was a need for consultation several times a week with USAID. The Assistant Deputy Minister of CPO complained that he was not aware of certain USAID scholarships because USAID had dealt directly with ministries and had not informed CPO of the negotiations for scholarships. The Deputy Minister of MAF said that there were so many individuals from USAID and the contractor dealing with participant training, that he received conflicting information and sometimes did not know who was making decisions in USAID. There was also a common complaint that USAID was not providing CPO and various ministries with information on scholarships needed by them for planning.

A further problem recognized in the mission is the general lack of coordination between donors resulting in needless overlap in some training programs. The team recognizes the sensitive issue of donor coordination in the YAR, but notes that contacts are made on an informal and ad hoc basis. There is at present no focus within the mission for finding out what other donors are planning for training. As a result, one member of the team found that a few days after he had discussed training issues in the MOMR, a consultant from UNDP met with the same people to discuss similar training needs. He only knew of this because both were staying at the same hotel.

RECOMMENDATION: USAID should appoint a Coordinator of Participant Training (CPT) to be the USAID focus for all participant training activities and handle or supervise the routine matters of processing, monitoring and evaluation. ↙

The role of the CPT will be to: (1) coordinate participant training within USAID; (2) act as the primary spokesperson in the mission for dealing with YARG, especially CPO, on negotiation, provision of information, processing and monitoring of participants; (3) collect information on participant training plans of other donors; (4) provide input as relevant into project planning involving participant training within the mission. It is important that the CPT work closely with technical offices in USAID on participant training. This will not lessen the authority and responsibility of technical offices for project-related training, but will free these offices of procedural problems they do not have the background or time to deal with effectively.

It is recommended that the mission identify a CPT on a pilot project basis for a year. First, mission staff should meet to discuss the objectives and responsibilities of the CPT and how this individual will coordinate with various technical offices. Second, the CPT should be chosen and establish contacts with CPO and the relevant training offices in various ministries. Third, the CPT should participate in defining mission strategy for participant training. Fourth, the CPT should be in contact with other donors involved in participant training in the YAR and act as a focus within the mission for meeting consultants and representatives of other donors on an informal basis.

The anticipated results of the pilot project will be: (1) improve communications with CPO and other ministries on all aspects of participant training; (2) realization of new responsibilities and issues learned in the first year; (3) redefining of certain responsibilities not necessary or better done in the technical offices; (4) better coordination and monitoring of contractor performance regarding participant training; and (5) feedback and input for future project planning involving training.

In defining the role and responsibilities of the CPT, it is important to address specific problems the mission has faced in coordination of participant training. First, there has been a problem with AETRs, both in terms of contractors not providing these in a timely and appropriate manner and in the failure to provide these to YARG for their information and use in planning. The CPT should take steps to ensure that contractors take the AETRs seriously and that the CPO and ministries receive these as soon as possible. Second, there is a problem with USAID's relationship to CPO and relevant ministries regarding training. The CPT will be responsible for keeping CPO informed of training plans and scholarships, so that CPO does not find its formal role ignored as USAID personnel are seen to deal directly with various ministries. Third, the CPT will take steps to ensure that USAID receives proper credit for its participant training. For example, scholarships provided through the Agriculture program should not be presented as being provided by a particular contractor or university. Some media coverage of the FOA project has emphasized the cooperation of Sanaa University and OSU with USAID's role left out of the picture. Having a CPT in USAID will better communicate to YARG that USAID is in control of the participant training program rather than implementing contractors. Fourth, the CPT should take the lead role in shaping mission policy on participant training, in concert with the CPO and YARG, specifically in addressing key concerns regarding female participation, fair selection criteria, private sector involvement and identification of training priorities.

RECOMMENDATION: Donor Cooperation - The Team understands that a Donor Committee exists for general purposes of exchanging information between various donors working in Yemen. It is suggested that USAID explore using the committee structure to develop informal procedures and a process for exchanging information on cross-sectoral participant training programs.

It would be useful if USAID could obtain information on possible coordination of training projects and use of resources. In addition, such information might be useful in liaison with the CPO and other YARG officials for planning purposes and project development. The exchange of information could consist of annual or other appropriate periodic plans for participant training including evaluation and follow-up so that utilization of cross-sector participants through multi-donor input could be assessed and reviewed. The CPT could act as the liaison with other donors in coordinating exchange of information for possible cooperation in training programs.

b. Training Strategy

There are several areas relating to training strategy which both government officials and participants emphasized most frequently. In addition, comments on training needs expressed by YARG officials prompted recommendations on training strategy for USAID's consideration. It should be noted, however, that in some cases USAID staff are aware of YARG issues on training strategy and are responding within project limits to accommodate requests by officials on training needs and stated priorities. Also, USAID Agriculture staff are taking positive steps to improve management of training programs as evidenced by a recently held training meeting designed to address major issues such as contractor oversight, cost and monitoring of participant training programs.

A major finding of the team was the expressed need for more effective coordination and cooperation in planning and project design. While it is difficult to pinpoint specific instances of this, a key concern of several ministry officials was the lack of YARG input and consideration for particular human resource needs (e.g., Ministry of

Education). USAID is attempting to address this issue by developing closer coordination with YARG officials through meetings and establishment of a dialogue on participant training priorities. In addition, it is critical to conduct a needs assessment of major YARG ministries in order to establish human resource requirements for development in priority areas.

A second issue on training strategy derives in part from the first issue of more coordination and planning with the YARG. Both the CPO and Ministry of Education indicated that one of Yemen's major needs is to build a "critical mass" of trained persons for carrying out the day-to-day operations of government activities in such areas of education, agriculture, health, public works (e.g., water resource management), sector planning/research and other development activities. The critical need is for more undergraduate training and less graduate training which, aside from the strategy of strengthening Sanaa University through post graduate support of faculty, is seen as not crucial to Yemen's development needs.

The third key training strategy issue involves more short-term technical training in special fields but including management and administration. In addition, it might be useful to consider more training for private sector particularly in agri-business, which was seen as a critical need in small business development.

It should be emphasized that USAID is aware of this and addressing many of these ideas.

RECOMMENDATION: USAID should continue to coordinate and expand its efforts at coordinating with YARG officials and ministries on participant training priorities and in addition increase the number of undergraduate and short-term technical

training. Examples of expressed need for more short-term technical training are management and planning requirements for the Ministry of Oil and Mineral Resources and the National Water and Sewerage Authority, two strategically important government planning components for development.

c. English Language Training

The team found that the most critical constraint on the USAID participant training program in the YAR has been English language capabilities. An adequate preparation is of major importance because a sizeable number of nominees are unable to achieve necessary TOEFL scores and those Yemenis who have studied in the states generally experience problems adjusting to language skills. USAID recognized this problem by upgrading the language program run by USIS at YALI in 1985, when OSU was hired to develop a program to meet the needs of Yemeni students. Since the contract with OSU for YALI ends in 1990, it is important to evaluate the performance thus far and to plan for arrangements after 1990.

Most of the problems cited by the participants who were interviewed refer to YALI prior to 1985, but several YARG officials expressed dissatisfaction with aspects of the present program. On the positive side, YALI now has a standardized curriculum, a wide variety of instructional materials and a full-time staff that focuses exclusively on USAID participants. While the team was not asked to evaluate the current YALI program, several issues emerged in the interview process and these need to be brought to the attention of the mission.

Particular problems that were raised include:

- High costs for training. The Vice-Rector of Sanaa University complained in strong terms that the costs at YALI were about \$20,000 per student per year and that some

students were still unable to achieve adequate capabilities after two years of training. The Deputy Minister of MOCSAR, Assistant Deputy Minister of CPO and the Director General of Teacher Training of MOE all complained that these costs were far too high for in-country language training. The point was made that it may be less expensive to send a student to the U.S. for intensive training, and that in the U.S. the student would probably complete the training far sooner. There are several reasons for the current high costs, including the fact YALI is not operating at capacity and that most students appear to repeat courses in the program.

RECOMMENDATION: USAID should determine actual costs for training at YALI based on the capacity status and drop-out rate and review the contract budget with OSU.

- **Staffing.** Although the purpose of the YALI program is to prepare Yemeni students for training in the U.S., some of the teachers are not native American speakers. Some students have complained that one teacher has a difficult British accent. Another part-time teacher is not a native speaker of English. OSU has also not been able to replace the former director (who was removed from the position) in a period of ten months.
- **Training Focus.** An informal assessment of the OSU YALI program in early 1987 noted that there were concerns about the program being a "TOEFL prep mill." Recommendations were made for more emphasis on language skills, study skills and cultural orientation. This concern was also raised by several YARG officials, who wanted more of a focus on practical skills such as translation, document analysis and study techniques.
- Although there is a wide variety of supplementary instructional materials (books, tapes, videos, computer programs) available at YALI, it is unclear how access has been provided to the students or to other YALI students in the afternoon program. The Deputy Minister of MOCSAR expressed interest in taking greater advantage of the facilities and materials at YALI for non-USAID participants.
- A YARG official in the MOMH raised the issue of using some PCVs in the YALI program. It was suggested that this would reduce costs and that in some cases PCVs would be better than other expatriate staff in helping students with practical skills and cultural orientation.

RECOMMENDATION: An external evaluation of the OSU YALI program is called for at mid-term, and this should be done immediately. The evaluation team should focus on the issues raised above and make recommendations about USAID options for in-country language training after 1990.

The problems with in-country language training were raised in a number of earlier evaluations (e.g., the Development Associates Report on Project 0040 in 1980), and USAID responded by assigning the YALI program for USAID participants to a contractor outside USIS in 1985. It is important for USAID to examine the role of YALI in future planning. The YALI concept is a stopgap measure due to the previous poor English language training in virtually all institutions of YARG. Given the needs for enhancement of English language training in YARG's education sector and stated concerns of YARG officials with the costs and in some cases quality of the YALI program, it is vital that the mission devise a long-term strategy to review the need for YALI and to institutionalize English language training within YARG, particularly programs at Sanaa University.

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX 1. List of Persons Interviewed**
- APPENDIX 2. Findings/Conclusions/Recommendations Matrix**
- APPENDIX 3. Bibliography/References**
- APPENDIX 4. Copies of Questionnaires**
- APPENDIX 5. Scope of Work**

APPENDIX 1.
List of Persons Interviewed

PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AGENCY</u>
1. Izzf Mansub	CPO
2. Abd Al-Malek Sharafuddin	CPO
3. Mahmud Al Iryani	CPO
4. Abd Al-Malek Al Iryani	CPO
5. Mansur Ismail	NWASA
6. Abdul-Rahman S. Nadji	NWASA
7. Yassin Ismail	NWASA
8. Ali Manshalin	NWASA
9. Mutahar Al-Huthfi	CID
10. Abdul Hakim Al-Iryani	MAF
11. Hussein M. Al-Ansi	NWASA
12. Faysal Ali Emran	Yemenia Airways
13. Yahya Muhammed Al-Yari	Yemenia Airways
14. Ahmed M. Shugaa	Sanaa University
15. Abdullah Babaqi	Sanaa University
16. Ahmed Al Samawi	MOE
17. Ahmed Shabba	Private Businessman
18. Abdullah Al-Lowthai	MOE
19. Abdullah Al Muhader	MOE
20. Mahmud Al Adimi	MOE
21. Mohammed Sabry	YALI Student
22. Abdullah Mansour	National Tobacco & Matches Factory
23. Abdullah Al Shaibani	NIPA
24. Mansur Ahmed Said	MOE
25. Dr. Ali Shekeif	Sanaa University
26. Abdullah Bar Issa	Sanaa University
27. Ali Muhammed Qasim	Teacher Shawkani Institute
28. Khalid Abdullah	Teacher Shawkani Institute
29. Muhammed Hamud	Teacher Shawkani Institute
30. Leila Al Wadie	NIPA
31. Mohammed Al Sargi	NIPA
32. Abdullah Al Shamiri	NIPA
33. Sailan G. Al-Abidy	Sanaa University
34. Abdu Ali Hadi	MOMH
35. Ali Aish Hassan	MOMR
36. Radman Al Kubati	National Tobacco & Matches Factory
37. Eiman Saddik	AMIDEAST
38. Samia Nasher	AMIDEAST
39. Dr. Savah Al-Khirbash	Sanaa University
40. Mohammed Al Saidi	MOMR
41. Najwa Zabara	MOMH, Dept of Environmental Health
42. Muhammad Shugaa	COCA
43. Amin Aklan	COCA
44. Dr. Adel Barakat	MOH
45. Ahmed Al Harazi	MPW, Parks and Beautification

YARG OFFICIALS INTERVIEWED

Abd al-Wali al-Aquil
Abd al-Hamid Muhsin

Ahmed Al-Iryani

Abd al-Malek al-Iryani
Abd Rabbu al-Jarada
Abdu Ali al-Kobati

Abd al-Qudus al-Masri
Dr. Abu Bakr al-Qirby
Mohammed Abu Bakr
Ali al-Kobati

Dr. Ali El Shekeil
Abdul-Rahman S. Nadji
Hussein al-Ahjuri
Sayyid Nasher

Muqbil Ali Muqbil
Lutf al-Ansi

Abd al-Malek al-Thawr

Mutahar al-Kibsi
Sailen G. al-Abidy

Mohammed al-Tayyib
Najwa Yahia Zabara

Yasin Ismael
Ahmed al-Harazi

Dr. Adel Barakat

Asst. Deputy Minister, CPO
Director General, Technical
Cooperation, CPO
Technical Cooperation Dept.,
CPO
Director of Training, CPO
Deputy Minister, MOE
Dir. Gen. of Teacher Training
MOE
Vice-Rector, Sanaa University
Training Advisor, Sanaa Univ.
Director of Scholarships,
Sanaa University
Dean of Sciences, Sanaa Univ.
Technical Director, NWSA
Deputy Minister, MOCSAR
Dir. Gen. of Training,
MOCSAR
Deputy Minister, MAF
Dir. Gen. of Planning and
Statistics, MAF
Dep. Dir. Gen. of Planning,
MAF
Vice-Dean, NIPA
Asst. Vice-Rector, Sanaa
University
Deputy Minister, MOMH
Director of Environmental
Health Education, MOMH
Director of Training, NWSA
Director of Parks and
Beautification, MPW
Director, Unit of Diarrhael
and Nutritional Diseases,
MOH

USAID AND OTHER CONTRACTORS

Kenneth Sherper	Director
Michael Lukomski	Deputy Director
Samir Zoghby	Human Resources Dev. Officer
John Swanson	Agri. Dev. Officer
John Rifembark	Agri. Dev. Officer
Robert Mitchell	General Dev. Officer
Curt Wolters	Dep. Program Officer
Mansour Shamiri	Program Assistant
Mohammed Abd eal-Kader	Program Assistant
Hamood Hamdani	Program Assistant
Abd Al-Hamid al-Ajami	Program Assistant
Ali Hugairi	Program Specialist
Abdul-Lateef Numan	Admin. Assistant
Ferial Sulaili	Part. Training Assistant
Dr. Emma Hooper	Consultant, WID
Dr. William Shaner	Team Leader, CORE
Duncas McInnes	Director, USIS
Donna Ives	Director, AMIDEAST/Sanaa
Dr. Jim Fitch	Consultant
Dr. Wes Wedeman	Consultant
Marta Zafir	Oxfam
Dr. Jeffrey Meissner	American Institute for Yemeni Studies
Dave van Hammen	Acting Director, YALI
Michael Witbeck	Academic Coordinator, YALI

APPENDIX 2.

Findings/Conclusions/Recommendations Matrix

64

FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS MATRIX

FINDINGS	CONCLUSIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS
1. Lack of coordination regarding participant training within USAID and between USAID and YARG.	1a. Communication channels between USAID and YARG need to be improved. 1b. There is a need within the mission for coordination of all participant training activities.	1. USAID should appoint a Coordinator of Participant Training (CPT) to be the USAID focus for all participant training activity and handle the routine matters of processing, monitoring and evaluation.
2. Lack of a formal mission strategy for participant training.	2. The existing draft mission directive in participant training needs to be formalized.	2. The CPT should take the lead role in shaping mission policy on participant training in concert with the CPO and YARG.
3. USAID has little information on activities of other donors in participant training, although USAID plays only a minor role in overall YARG training.	3. There is a need for exchange of information about participant training between donors.	3. The CPT should act as the liaison with other donors in coordinating exchange of information for possible cooperation in training programs.
4. YARG, especially the CPO and MOE, stress the need for a "critical mass" of trained Yemenis, especially at the undergraduate level.	4. The mission needs to address YARG concerns in light of the emphasis on post-graduate training in project 0080.	4. USAID should continue to coordinate and expand its efforts in this regard with YARG officials, including an increased emphasis on undergraduates and short-term technical training.

FINDINGS

CONCLUSIONS**RECOMMENDATIONS**

5. YARG raised concerns about the cost and quality of English language training in Yemen for USAID sponsored participants.

5. The current YALI program is costing more per student than anticipated.

5. USAID should conduct the planned external, mid-project evaluation of the YALI program and review the contract budget with the contractor (OSU). The evaluation team should make recommendations about USAID options for in-country language training after 1990.

6. YARG is enthusiastic about general training in both the U.S. and third countries, but recognized the value of third country training in Arabic for those with limited English skills.

6. The use of third-country training has been effective in meeting YARG's needs, especially in areas where the training achieves parity, more or less, with U.S. training.

6. Selection of U.S. or third-country training should continue to be based on the mission's current practice of examining the relative cost and educational benefits to be gained from training location and institutions.

7. There are many skills and training needs in YARG still to be adequately addressed.

7. USAID should coordinate with YARG in identifying training needs.

7. Training needs assessment should be coordinated by USAID with the HRPD in the CPO. The mission should consider a formal study of the USAID-CPO relationship before further development of training programs.

8. Law 19 of YARG calls for equal opportunity in application for scholarships and discourages "pick-ups" of students already in U.S. ministries.

8. For the past USAID has received considerable requests for "pick-ups" of students in the U.S., often because of family ties to officials.

8. Until CPO notifies USAID of a change in Law 19, USAID should abide by the rule and not accept "pick-ups" which bypass the established selection process.

FINDINGS**CONCLUSIONS****RECOMMENDATIONS**

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| 9. In the past, USAID accepted TOEFL scores lower than 500, as in the case of project 0053 with EMU. | 9. The Yemen students with low TOEFL scores were unable to function in a normal academic program in the U.S. | 9. USAID should continue its present policy of not sending participants to the U.S. with TOEFL scores less than 500 unless arrangement is made to bring up the TOEFL score in the U.S. before starting academic coursework. |
| 10. Yemen students have encountered more difficulties than other students from the Middle East in adjusting to U.S. academic life. | 10. In general, Yemen has been more isolated than most other Middle East countries with less adequate secondary education preparation. | 10. Cultural orientation to U.S. academic life should be conducted in Yemen as well as the U.S. It is recommended that YALI develop an orientation guide for Yemen students. |
| 11. U.S. trained graduates are well-received in Yemen and generally have little difficulty finding a job. | 11. There are some problems in applying skills and knowledge in the YARG and Yemen private sector, but these are not peculiar to U.S.-trained returnees. | 11. Although USAID cannot influence YARG civil service policy, the training program should include job counseling and more courses relevant to the job environment in Yemen. |
| 12. Few Yemen women have been sent to the U.S. or third-country on USAID scholarships. | 12. As a consequence of cultural constraints in Yemen society, few women have been able to take advantage of USAID and other scholarships. However, there are interested and qualified women who want to study in the U.S. | 12. It is recommended that USAID consider conducting a workshop on how to improve participant training for Yemen women. It is necessary that Yemen women be actively involved in defining the issues and recommendations. |
-

FINDINGS**CONCLUSIONS****RECOMMENDATIONS**

13. Among the skills that participants in the private and semi-private sectors find most important in their job are those that resulted directly from U.S. training.

13. U.S. training is highly valued and sought after in the YAR's private sector.

13. USAID should determine the appropriate use of 0080 funding for participant training in the YAR private sector.

14. Participants interviewed were very favorable in their assessment of training in the U.S.

14. Most participants wish to maintain contact with U.S. institutions or return for further training.

14. Given the distribution of former USAID participants in the YARG and Yemen society, it is important that USAID identify specific ways in which there can be follow-up of returned participants, especially those who wish to maintain contact with U.S. institutions.

APPENDIX 3.
Bibliography/References

BIBLIOGRAPHY/REFERENCES

- Amann, V.F., G.F., Jack Law, and Ahmed Al Akwa (November, 1986) An Assessment of the Manpower Development Needs for the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries During the Third Five Year Plan of the Yemen Arab Republic. CID.
- Law, G.R. Jack (December, 1986) End of Tour Report. ADSP. CID.
- Adams, Don et al. (December, 1983) Basic Education Development Project, Report of the Second External Evaluation Team. Wu P'i, Inc.
- EMU, (July, 1979) Basic Education Development Project No. 279-0-053. Education Sector Study. Eastern Michigan University.
- AMIDEAST (August, 1981) USAID/Yemen Arab Republic Development Training Programs in the Hachimite Kingdom of Jordan. AMIDEAST/Amman.
- I.F.E.S. (January 1986) Yemen Arab Republic. Education and Human Resources Sector Assessment.
- USAID (1980) Yemen: Project 279-0053. Basic Education Development Grant.
- Development Associates (November, 1987) Country Training Plan Yemen Arab Republic. Draft.
- Cassam, Mohamed and D. Miller (1984) Private Sector Assessment. Yemen Arab Republic.
- Varisco, Daniel M. et al (1984) Social and Institutional Profile of Yemen. Sanaa: American Institute for Yemeni Studies.
- Development Associates, (August 1980) Evaluation and Field Review of the Development Training II Project (279-0040).
- The Law No. 19, The Constitutional Resolution (1984) Yemen Arab Republic (YARG).
- Ministerial Ordinance No. 59/1986, Prime Minister's Office, YARG.
- Mission Order, Participant Training, Draft, Sept 1985, Revision 1987.
- FY 1987 Action Plan, USAID Yemen.
- Second Annual Evaluation of the Basic Education Development Grant, (USAID Project No. 279-0053), Eastern Michigan University, November 1981.

Mission Economic, Financial and Social Data Base, USAID/Yemen,
January 1988.

Zoghby, Samir, (February 1988) Trip Report, USAID/Sanaa. CID.
(February, 1987) Phase II of the Core Subproject - Yemen
Agricultural Development Support Program. Colorado State
University.

Sanaa University. Business and Management Skills Training Program
for the Private Sector. Faculty of Commerce, Sanaa University.

USAID/Sanaa. Project Evaluation Summary. Basic Education
Development Project.

Labat-Anderson Inc. (1987) Horticulture Improvement and Training
Subproject Evaluation. Arlington.

APPENDIX 4.
Copies of Questionnaires

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

1. What was the specific field of study in which you were trained?
2. Did you receive adequate support services during your stay in the U.S.? (AMIDEAST)

Yes
 No

3. In general, were you satisfied with your academic or short-term training?

Yes
 No

4. Do you feel you were adequately prepared in English before you started training?

Yes
 No

If no, how much time did you spend in learning English?

5. Did you experience any problems while you were staying in the U.S.? (social, cultural, academic, financial)

Yes
 No

6. Do you have any recommendations on how your training could have been improved?

7. Are you working in a job for which you were specifically trained?

Yes
 No

8. Have you been able to use the skills acquired through training in your present job?

Yes
 No

9. Did you have any problems in applying the knowledge and skills gained in training to your job and job environment?

Yes
 No

10. What skills learned in training do you feel have been most critical to your job performance?

11. How long do you think it has taken to be productive after you returned to work from training? (distinguish, if possible, between types of training)

12. Have you changed jobs since your return from training?

Yes
 No

13. Have you received a salary increase as a result of your training?

Yes
 No

14. Have you received a promotion as a result of your training?

Yes
 No

15. Have you developed any new ideas or changed the way you think about your job or other behavioral changes as a result of your training?

Yes
 No

16. As a result of your training has it helped you to cope better with work problems or issues?

Yes
 No

p. 4

17. What do you feel were the strengths of your training program?

17a. What were the weaknesses?

18. Would you recommend the training you received to other participants where appropriate?

Yes
 No

19. How do you think the participant training program can be improved?

to

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SUPERVISORS

1. How useful has long-term training been to the job for which participants are assigned?

2. In general, have returned participants introduced any new ideas, technology or application of training skills to the job?

3. Were former participants immediately productive on return to their jobs or did it take awhile before they became productive?

4. Have you experienced any difficulty in keeping returned participants on the job after they return?

5. Do you evaluate the performance of returned participants?

6. Are most returned participants working in a specific job for which they have been trained?

p. 2

7. What do you think have been the most important skills acquired by participants from their training? (e.g., administrative, technical, managerial)

8. Do you notice any behavioral or attitudinal changes in participants as a result of their training? (any difference between U.S. and Arabic-country training?)

9. Where do you think training should preferably take place, in the U.S. or in third countries?

10. Do you feel that AID-sponsored training is having an impact on Yemen's institutional development? (key organizations?)

11. Do you have any recommendations on how to improve AID's participant training program?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR YARG OFFICIALS/SELECTION COMMITTEE MEMBERS

1. What advantages do you think general U.S. academic education has for Yemenis compared with education in Arabic-speaking countries?

What disadvantages do you think U.S. education has compared with education in Arabic-speaking countries?

2. How important do you think general training is for providing Yemen with trained/skilled professionals?

Very Important
 Important
 Not very important
 not important

3. How important do you think specific project-related training is for providing Yemen with trained/skilled professionals?

Very Important
 Important
 Not Very Important
 Not important

4. Does the Ministry have any mechanism to assess the usefulness and impact of long-term training?

Yes
 No

Do you have any suggestions for improving follow-up and evaluation of returned participants?

p. 2

5. Is there any difference in the usefulness of long-term training to the ministry between general and project-related training?

6. What kind of training/skills do you feel are especially important to the human resource needs of the ministry?

7. Do you think that academic training has generally met the needs of the ministry? (i.e., are there urgent skills required in Yemen's public sector which current AID-funded training is not addressing?)
 _____ Yes
 _____ No

8. Do you have any suggestions for improving the USAID participant training program?

9. How can USAID assist the ministry in meeting its objectives in developing human resources at present? (i.e., kinds of training and skill development)

- 9a. In the future?

40

USAID Staff Interview Guide

Most of the following questions can be asked of YARG officials as well as AID.

1. Why has general training been more difficult and expensive to monitor? Has it entailed greater logistical/management problems (as compared with training under multi-input, institution-building related training)?
2. Are improved selection procedures being adhered to in Law 19? How are "special cases" being handled?
3. With regard to the growth and development of USAID/Sanaa. can an estimated time frame be established during which AID can phase out of funding general undergraduate training abroad?
4. Have adequate follow-up and evaluation efforts been undertaken by the mission and the YARG on returned participants in order to assess effectiveness, appropriateness and impact of long-term training? What have been the constraints (political, tactical, manpower, informational)? How can these be reduced in the future?
5. Concerning the relationships between project-related training activities and progress toward achievement of overall project objectives, how relevant and appropriate was U.S.-based training compared with training in Arabic-speaking countries? How effectively was the training element timed and integrated with other project elements?
6. What has been the extent of selection problems, such as limited availability of qualified candidates in particular sectors/organizations, language skills constraints, improper selection procedures? How have various contractors addressed these? With what success?
7. Is there evidence that numbers of qualified candidates available for training during project implementation frequently fall short of numbers proposed in the PP or training plan? If so, can this be ascribed to: (1) faulty design (e.g., MS/MA training where BS/BA would have sufficed); (2) changed conditions; (3) competition for qualified candidates between donors/contractors; (4) other? What are the implications for future design of projects including participant training?

8. What have been female participation rates under different types of training offered; against established targets? To what was this attributable? Were females programmed for traditionally "female" occupations (nursing, home economics extension, etc.)? Are established numerical targets and different professional/technical skills priorities for females appropriate? If not, should they be increased?
9. Have "training equivalency" issues or controversies arisen with regard to training in the U.S. versus training elsewhere, such as. (1) availability of candidates; (2) subsequent utilization of returnees; (3) subsequent promotions, earnings' and, (4) other?
10. How effective (including cost-effective, internally/externally efficient, appropriate/relevant) has been" (1) the use of third-country training; and (2) the management of third-country training? Did this type of training create greater or lesser monitoring and logistical problems?
11. Are there any outstanding, unresolved issues between AID and the YARG regarding participant training in general? If so, what are these? HOW can they best be resolved?
12. What skills are most urgently required in Yemen's public sector and in the private sector, which current AID-funded training elements are not addressing? How should these needs be most effectively addressed?
13. What specific actions can the mission incorporate within its management of both general and project-specific participant training to improve the effectiveness of each type of training approach?
14. What are the major constraints to human resources development in USAID/Sanaa funded projects?

-92'

APPENDIX 5.
Scope of Work

III. Statement of Work

Date of Commencement is on or about February, 1988.

The contractor is expected to provide consultants qualified to assess the impact of the USAID/Sanaa participant training program across sectors and within organizations and to identify factors related to the organizational impact of returned participants. To this end, it is expected that the consultants will address the following questions:

A. Non-Project Related General Training Element (279-0040, 0080)

1. What are the advantages and disadvantages of general U.S. academic education for Yemenis, as compared with education in Arabic-speaking countries?
2. Has this type of general training been popular with the YARG? If so, why; if not, why not?
3. What are the implications for future general participant programming or the reasons for popularity (or lack thereof) with the YARG?
4. Until very recently, it was not possible to assess manpower training needs with precision; thus, training priorities have not been particularly well established. Is it better now to establish priorities and focus training (e.g., x BAs in Economics, y MSCs in Engineering, for a particular future graduation year), or should the general pattern of the past be continued because the need for graduates at all levels and in all disciplines is so great?
5. How have language problems and participant qualifications tended to complicate and prolong training programs (i.e., cost over-runs and mortgages on subsequent years' training funds, causing long AID/YARG arguments on nominees)? How can these issues be addressed in the future?

6. Have adequate follow-up and evaluation efforts been undertaken by the mission and the YARG on returned participants, in order to assess effectiveness, appropriateness and impact of long-term training? What have been the constraints (political, tactical, manpower, informational)? How can these be reduced in the future?
7. Was the application of knowledge and skills after the participants' return more problematic for trainees under general training projects than for those receiving project-related training, because participants were generally not "tied" to particular YARG institutions prior to departure? Has the private sector benefitted as a result of returned participants not being immediately placeable in the public sector?
8. To what extent have junior returnees, with initially little influence, experienced difficulty in introducing new ideas/applications and effecting change? How long does it take, on the average, before returnees feel productive? What do their supervisors think of their impact on the organizations?
9. Why has this type of training been more difficult and expensive to monitor? Has it entailed greater logistical/management problems (as compared with training under multi-input, institutional-building-related training)?
10. Are improved selection procedures being adhered to (Law 19)? How are "special cases" handled?
11. With regard to the growth and development of USAID/Sanaa, can an estimated time frame be established during which AID can phase-out of funding general undergraduate training abroad?
12. What skills (administrative, technical, communicative, managerial) do returned participants feel have been most critical to their performance in their current capacity? What skills do their supervisors feel have been most critical in the returnees' current capacity?

B. Participant Training Elements Within Multi-Input Projects (279-0052 subprojects, 0053, 0065, 0044)

1. Relationships between project-related participant training activities and progress toward achievement of overall project objectives should be examined. How relevant and appropriate was U.S.-based training compared with training in Arabic-speaking countries? How effectively was the training element timed and integrated with other project elements?
2. To what extent have returnees experienced difficulty in introducing new ideas, applications and affecting change? How long does it take, on the average, before returnees feel productive? What do their supervisors think? Is there a marked difference between individual projects in this respect? If so, to what is this attributable?
3. To what extent have return and retention rates been affected by: non-competitive public sector salaries in sponsoring institutions/organizations; lack of local institutional interest in or support for returnees' ideas; or better opportunities elsewhere (from the perspective of returnees; from the perspective of their supervisors)?
4. What has been the extent of selection problems, such as limited availability of qualified candidates in particular sectors/organizations, language skills constraints, improper selection procedures? How have various contractors addressed these? With what success?
5. Are standard and improved selection procedures being adhered to? How are "special cases" handled?

6. Is there evidence that numbers of qualified candidates available for training during project implementation frequently fell short of numbers proposed in the PP or training plan? If so, can this be ascribed to: (1) faulty design (e.g., MSc/MA training where BSc/BA would have sufficed); (2) changed conditions; (3) competition for qualified candidates between donors/contractors; (4) other? What are the implications for future design of projects including participant training?
7. Have the institutions/organizations being assisted under the auspices of multi-input projects which include training: (1) developed systems ensuring the appropriate placement of returned participants; and (2) developed follow-up and evaluation procedures to determine how training was being utilized? To the extent that this has not been accomplished, what is the best method for encouraging these systems?
8. Is there evidence of significant "misuse" of returned participants (e.g., situations where participants were trained for certain specific technical or professional skills, who shortly after their return were promoted, on the basis of higher academic qualifications, to managerial/administrative functions for which they then again lacked special skills; mismatched skills and jobs, etc.)?
9. What skills (administrative, technical, communicative, managerial) do returned participants feel have been most critical to their performance in their current capacity in sponsoring organizations? What skills do their supervisors feel have been most critical in the returnees' current capacity?

C. General Issues

1. What attitudinal and behavioral changes do returned participants most frequently cite as resulting from their overseas training? Do they feel these changes enable them to better cope?

8.7

with their work environments or do they feel frustrated as a result of their jobs? Are there significant differences in responses from U.S.-trained individuals and those trained in Arabic-speaking countries?

2. What attitudinal and behavioral attributes, both positive and negative, do supervisors most frequently associate with the overseas training experience of returnees? Are there significant differences in supervisors' responses concerning U.S.-trained returnees versus those trained in Arabic-speaking countries?
3. What types of training/skills needs do supervisors feel are especially critical in their organizations, both for colleagues and subordinates, which could be met through USAID-funded participant training programs? (Differentiate, where possible, between current needs and needs in the immediate future.) Where (U.S. and third countries) should such training preferably take place?
4. What have been female participation rates under different types of training offered, against established targets? To what was the attributable? Were females programmed for traditionally "female" occupations (nursing, economics extension, etc.)? Are established numerical targets and different professional/technical skills priorities for females appropriate? If not, should they be increased?
5. How effective (including cost-effective, internally/externally efficient, appropriate/relevant) has been: (1) the use of third-country training; and (2) the management of third-country training? Did this type of training create greater/lesser monitoring and logistical problems?
6. Have "training equivalency" issues/controversies arisen with regard to training in the U.S. versus training elsewhere, such as: (1) availability of candidates; (2) subsequent utilization of returnees; (3) subsequent promotions, earnings; and (4) other?

7. Are there any outstanding, unresolved issues between AID and the YARG regarding participant training in general? If so, what are these? How can they best be resolved?
 8. What skills are most urgently required in Yemen's public sector and in the private sector, which current AID-funded training elements are not addressing? How should these needs be most effectively addressed?
- A. The survey team should provide mission management with recommendations on the following aspects of long-term participant training:
- o U.S. versus third country training;
 - o Levels of academic training and focus;
 - o Participant training concentration (general training versus training components in multi-input projects);
 - o Improved monitoring of returned participants;
 - o Improved selection criteria and management of participant training.
- B. What are the comparative advantages of participant training in the U.S. versus training in Arabic-speaking countries? Compare the following aspects:
1. Unit cost issues;
 2. Educational quality;
 3. Changes in job related attitudes and behavior;
 4. English language as a learning capacity constraint and as a useful required skill;
 5. Management/monitoring of participants and programs of study;
 6. Development of improved bilateral cooperation as a function of returned participants professional and personal contributions;
 7. Comparative popularity among Yemenis (U.S. versus third country);
 8. Fields of study and degree levels; and
 9. Other aspects (as appropriate).