

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

PD-ABS-172

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

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office (ES# <u>FY94-4-D</u>) <u>USAID/HONDURS</u>	B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Slipped <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>94</u> <u>Q2</u>	C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--	---

D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated. If not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report.)					
Project No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent FACC (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
522-0296	Strengthening Democratic Institutions (SDI) - Component IV Democratic Leadership.	1987	8/95	*\$ 874	* \$865
* Totals for Component IV include only T.A. and Commodities. Does not include Project Management costs. Note: Total SDI Planned LOP Cost: \$21,800; Amount Obligated to Date: \$19,900					

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
Action(s) Required <u>Component IV-Democratic Leadership</u> 1. USAID should authorize the contractor to: (a) seek information from LAC/DI in USAID/Washington on the PARTICIPA program in Chile and other civic education for related programs that could offer ideas for consideration in Honduras and (b) initiate discussions with interested parties as a preliminary step to developing a strategy for this component and a work plan for 1991 for presentation to the GOH at a high level. 2. AIFLD subcontractor will take the necessary steps to improve teaching methodologies.	AIFLD Kotto	Completed
	AIFLD Kotto	Completed

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: _____ (Month) _____ (Day) _____ (Year)

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:				
Name (Typed)	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
	<i>Emily Leonard</i> EMILY C. LEONARD		LORRAINE SIMARD CARMEN ZAMBRANA	MARSHALL D. BROWN
Signature			<i>Lorraine Simard</i>	<i>Marshall D. Brown</i>
Date	8/3/94		8/11/94	

ABSTRACT

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

The goal of the Strengthening Democratic Institutions (SDI) (522-0296) Project is to strengthen Honduran democracy. The purpose is to improve the capability of key democratic institutions, improve local political leadership, and increase the knowledge and participation of the Honduran populace in the democratic process. Component IV of this project, Democratic Leadership, is not included in the Logical Framework. However the text of the Project Paper calls for a broad-based program of training conferences for locally elected officials and key individuals in organizations that participate in one way or another in the democratic process in Honduras. This component has been implemented primarily by the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD). In addition, the Central American Institute of Business Administration (INCAE) was subcontracted by Georgetown University to conduct national leadership conferences. In the project amendment, however, this component will be expanded to include the use of NGO/PVO groups for civic education and as watchdog groups. The midterm evaluation (8/87-9/90) was conducted by a Development Associates, Inc. team on the basis of: a review of project documents; interviews with project personnel in Honduras and Washington, D.C. and others conversant with project. The purpose of the evaluation was to measure progress made, examine design validity, and provide guidance for midcourse adjustments.

The major findings and conclusions are:

- * There were no training conferences of the type proposed in the Project Paper, but the project did fund some seminars on political theory and principles of economics for labor union members through a grant to the American Institute for Free Labor Development.

The evaluators noted the following "Lessons":

- * More systematic and regional sharing of information about programs and actions being taken would be of great assistance to deal with fairly common problems and issues in the process of strengthening democratic processes.
- * Given A.I.D.'s inexperience with this type of project, it would have been advisable to use more outside experts in the design and implementation of such projects. A multi discipline advisory committee should follow project progress and participate in deliberations on important project decisions.

C O S T S

1. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
	Development Associates Inc.		*	
James L. Roush	Team Leader	39	21,619	Project 522-0296
Mitchell Seligson	Lat.Am. Specialist	26	14,598	
James Rowles	Legal Specialist	26	14,598	
Joseph Alessandro	Training Specialist	26	12,805	
Carlos Ferro	Procurement Specialist	11	4,811	

*Costs are for entire project.

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff
Person-Days (Estimate) 80

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (Estimate) 12

SUMMARY

- J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)
- Address the following items:
- Purpose of evaluation and methodology used
 - Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
 - Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)
 - Principal recommendations
 - Lessons learned

Mission or Office:

USAID/HONDURAS

Date This Summary Prepared:

JULY, 1994

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

Strengthening Democratic Institutions Project
 IV-Democratic Leadership Summary of Evaluation
 January 29, 1991.

1. PURPOSE OF THE PROJECT

Civilian rule returned to Honduras in the 1980s after an extended period of military dictatorship. Thus, in 1987 when the Strengthening Democratic Institutions (SDI) Project was designed, the democratic process was incipient and key support institutions were extremely fragile. The project purpose was "to improve the capability of key democratic institutions (the Judiciary, the Congress, and the National Elections Tribunal/National Registry of Persons), develop local leadership, and increase the knowledge and participation of the Honduran populace in the democratic process". Component IV of this project, Democratic Leadership, was not included in the Logical Framework. However, the text of the Project Paper calls for a broad-based program of training conferences for locally elected officials and key individuals in organizations that participate in one way or another in the democratic process in Honduras. To date most of the activities have been conducted by AIFLD. The use of NGO/PVO groups for civic education and as watchdog groups is planned under the Project Amendment.

2. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION AND METHODOLOGY USED

The purpose of the midterm evaluation was to assess the progress made and provide guidance for midcourse adjustments. This evaluation (8/87-9/90) was conducted by a Development Associates, Inc. team on the basis of: a review of project documents; interviews with project personnel and others conversant with the project in AID/Washington and USAID/Honduras; the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD), and with Georgetown University subcontractor, the Central American Institute of Business Administration (INCAE).

3. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

- (a) The only activity undertaken to date in the Democratic Leadership component has been seminars organized by the American Institute for Free Labor Development (AIFLD) for union members; six seminars on political theory and eight seminars on the principles of economics. The content of these seminars is only marginally related to the purpose of the project.

This component has been accorded a low priority. It is begging for a strategy, a plan, some thought. It could be used to promote discussion about, and possibly foster support for, some of the unfulfilled conditions precedent and covenants in the MOUs for the other components.

(b) Project Design validity:

Although this component was not included in the logframe, the concept laid out in the Grant Agreement appears appropriate. However, implementation emphasis appears to be weak in relation to the plan.

- (c) Weaknesses were identified in teaching methodologies such as student evaluations, a strategy for reaching the widespread abilities of the students, follow-up activities, a unit on pedagogy of teaching, and the development of instructional materials relative to the course.
- (d) It appears that an excellent teaching staff has been secured for the instructional phase of the project.

- (e) A total of 10 specialized national leadership conferences were to be sponsored by the project over a three-year period. No progress has been observed in this activity.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) USAID/Honduras should authorize the contractor to: (i) seek information from LAC/DI in the AID/Washington on the PARTICIPA program in Chile and other civic education or related programs that could offer ideas for consideration in Honduras, and (ii) initiate discussions with interested parties as a preliminary step to developing a strategy for this component and a work plan for 1991 for presentation to the Government of Honduras (GOH) at a high level.

Since the Municipal Development project trains local leaders, this element was reduced to labor leaders and a grant to support the development of a private prodemocratic reform groups when the project was amended in 1992.

- (b) Any further extension of funding for the AIFLD activity should be contingent upon: (i) the development of a curriculum for the principal seminars that is more closely related to project objectives; and (ii) attention by the AIFLD subcontractor to methodological issues.

The Mission disagrees with part (i) of this recommendation, believing that training in economic and political theory is essential to labor leaders' useful participation in the democratic restructuring of the economy. Part (ii) of this recommendation was complied with by November of 1991.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

- More systematic regional sharing of information about programs and actions being taken would be of great assistance to deal with fairly common problems and issues in the process of strengthening democratic processes.
- Given A.I.D.'s inexperience with this type of project, outside experts should be used more in the design and implementation of such projects. A multi discipline advisory committee should follow project progress and participate in deliberation on important project decisions.

ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary. Always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if it was submitted earlier. Attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

- Attachment I: Outline of Basic Project Identification
- Attachment II: Complete List of Recommendations
- Attachment III: Evaluation Report

Please note that the evaluation report titled Strengthening Democratic Institutions Project IV-Democratic Leadership - Summary of Evaluation was forwarded to USAID/W.

COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report

- * An additional lesson learned that came to light through this evaluation is that Democratic Initiatives projects need to be designed flexibly enough to allow project implementation to keep step with changes in the political environment.

BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

1. Country: Honduras
2. Project Title: Strengthening Democratic Institutions
Component IV- Democratic Leadership and Project
Management
3. Project Number: 522-0296
4. Project Date:
 - a. First Project Amendment: 8/10/87
 - b. Final Obligation Date: FY94
 - c. Most recent Project Assistance
Completion Date (PACD): 8/31/95
5. Project Funding: US\$21,800,000
 COMPONENT IV - Democratic Leadership and Project Management

a. USAID Bilateral Funding (grant and/or loan)	US\$	865,758
b. Other Major Donors	US\$	
c. Host Country Counterpart Funds	US\$	
Total	US\$	865,758
6. Mode of Implementation: USAID Direct Contracts
with Georgetown University, Operating Program Grant with the American
Institute for Free Labor Development.
7. Project Designers: USAID/Honduras and the
Government of Honduras
8. Responsible Mission Officials:
 - a. Mission Directors: John A. Sanbrailo (11/22/86 to 08/91)
Marshall D. Brown (08/91 to present)
 - b. Project Officers: Anthony Volbrecht (08/87-02/89)
John Fasullo (02/89-5/89)
Roberto Figueredo (05/89-11/90)
Emily Leonard (11/90 to 11/92)
Karen Otto (11/92 to 03/94)
Emily Leonard (04/94 to present)
9. Previous Evaluations: None

**COMPONENT: IV. DEMOCRATIC
LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND SUMMARY
OF EVALUATION**

RECOMMENDATIONS

**Component IV - Leadership
Training**

1. USAID should authorize the contractor to: (a) seek information from LAC/DI in USAID/Washington on the PARTICIPA program in Chile and other civic education for related programs that could offer ideas for consideration in Honduras and (b) initiate discussions with interested parties as a preliminary step to developing a strategy for this component and a work plan for 1991 for presentation to the GOH at a high level.

The "interested parties" to be contacted should include the three project counterpart organizations, the Law School, the Bar Association, political parties, representatives of labor unions and women's organizations, and private sector individuals (profit and nonprofit) who have an interest in promoting democracy in Honduras.

2. Any further extension of funding for the AIFLD activity should be contingent upon: (a) the development of a curriculum for the principal seminars that is more closely related to project objectives; and (b) attention by the AIFLD subcontractor to the methodological issues raised in Annex F.

**COMPONENT: IV. DEMOCRATIC
LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND SUMMARY
OF EVALUATION**

RESPONSE

**Component IV - Leadership
Training**

1.(a) PARTICIPA has provided assistance to a private pro-democratic reform group (FDDH) which in early 1994 has received grant funds from the project.
1.(b) This thrust was changed to focus on the private grantee in 1.a.

All interested parties will be contacted by this reform group.

2. (a) Seminar topics both support project objectives and are appropriate for labor leaders, because they enhance the ability of labor leaders to lead their memberships responsibly under the strain of economic adjustment e.g. to moderate labor demands. Without reasonable demands, labor could potentially be a destabilizing force for democratic processes.
2. (b) Completed 11/91
Instructional materials were developed for participants.

**COMPONENT: IV. DEMOCRATIC
LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND SUMMARY
OF EVALUATION**

RECOMMENDATIONS

**Component IV - Leadership
Training**

**COMPONENT: IV. DEMOCRATIC
LEADERSHIP TRAINING AND SUMMARY
OF EVALUATION (continued)**

RESPONSE

**Component IV - Leadership
Training**

In terms of selection of participants, the unions decide who to send to the seminars. The evaluation of the extent of mastery of concepts being taught is not feasible because participants do not have the same level of schooling, knowledge, etc.