

TU-VAL-772

79466

**EVALUATION OF THE AFRO-ASIAN
INSTITUTE OF HISTADRUT
TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SOUTH AFRICANS**

Submitted to: Dennis Barrett
Director,
USAID/South Africa
and
Cecily Mango
Project Manager
AAI/Histadrut Program
Pretoria, SA 0001

Submitted by: Devres, Inc.
7201 Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 500
Bethesda, MD 20814
Tel: (301) 951-5546
Cable: DEVRES WASHINGTON
Telex: 440184 DEVR U
Fax: (301) 652-5934

Contract No. PDC-0085-I-23-9089-00

August 30, 1991

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This evaluation was carried out during the period of July 29-August 30, 1991, in the United States, Israel and South Africa by Frank D. Correl and David Adler.

The field work of this evaluation required contact with a large number of people within a very short period of time, particularly in South Africa where the evaluation team interviewed, or otherwise were in contact with, over a hundred people. The work required a great deal of coordination and almost constant attention so that schedules could be maintained or quickly modified.

The team was gratified by the high degree of cooperation, frankness, thoughtfulness and striving for accuracy that marked its contacts throughout. The team was particularly impressed by the interest that people demonstrated in our work, their appreciation that an evaluation of the program was being undertaken, the myriad offers of help, and the time and personal convenience they sacrificed to meet with us and to help us establish other contacts.

The numerous courtesies, instances of considerateness and expressions of support and esteem for our task, were deeply appreciated by us. Thus, the evaluation not only became a matter of professional and personal challenge, but a deeply moving human experience.

While considerations of space make it impractical to acknowledge each individual who contributed to our work, the evaluators wish to pay particular tribute to the following :

1. Mrs. Lindiwe Myeza of the Womens' Informal Training Institute (WITI) who organized a three hour session of twelve former participants on a Sunday afternoon in Soweto, and who personally contributed many valuable insights to the team regarding the AAI program and its importance to the strivings and aspirations of disadvantaged South Africans.
2. Sister Patricia B. Y. Gelderbloem-Alfino, Health Care Services Manager of St. John Ambulance Foundation in Cape Town, who worked tirelessly to set up over thirty interviews

with returned participants and community leaders, and who shared with the team her voluminous knowledge of community organizations and activism in the Western Cape region.

3. Professor M.C. Mehl, Executive Director of the Independent Development Trust, whose experience and insights gained from leading and managing a far-ranging program in support of black empowerment and economic development helped the team to realize the crucial importance of strengthening the impact and overall value of the program by transforming what has been a useful development tool from outside South Africa into an institution with a strong South African identity and ownership stake.

4. Drs. Yehuda Paz and Shimshon Zelniker of AAI, whose knowledge, insights and candor contributed significantly to the team's understanding and critical appreciation of the Institute, its work with South Africans, and the international experience it represents. They both shared most generously their perspectives with the evaluators over many hours, literally at all hours of the day or night, and provided many occasions for spirited give-and-take discussions.

5. Finally, the evaluators wish to commend Ms. Jackie Storer of the Community-Based Development Programme for her tireless and prodigious efforts to provide logistic and secretarial support to the team. Her tenacity, dedication and resourcefulness resulted in sufficient interviews with ex-participants and community leaders and contributed materially to the team's work. She also assisted in the organization and editing of this report. Her impressive professional skills and cheerful, cooperative attitude were of immense help to the team and made her an invaluable asset in accomplishing this evaluation.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAI	Afro-American Institute of Histadrut. The organizations official name is the International Institute for Labor Development and Cooperative Studies (IILDC) but it is more generally known as AAI
AALC	African-American Labor Center
AFL/CIO	American Federation of Labor/Congress of Industrial Organizations
A.I.D.	Agency for International Development
AIDS	Acquired Immunity Deficiency Syndrome
ANC	African National Congress
AZAPO	Azanian Peoples' Organisation
CAAA	Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986
CFPO	Center for Foreign Policy Options
COSATU	Congress of South African Trade Unions
FTUI	Free Trade Union Institute
FY	U.S. Government Fiscal Year
GAO	General Accounting Office of the United States
IDT	Independent Development Trust (South Africa)
IILDC	International Institute for Labor Development and Cooperative Studies (more generally know as AAI)
NACTU	National Council of Trade Unions
NED	National Endowment for Democracy
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
PAC	Pan African Congress
PROTEC	A supplementary technical education programme in South Africa
SAAEP	Southern African Advanced Education Programme
SAETF	Southern African Education Trust Fund
SACHED	South African Committee for Higher Education

SACNET Southern African Cooperatives Network
USAID/SA United States Agency for International Development Mission to South Africa

USDI Ubuntu Social Development Institute
WITI Womens' Informal Training Institute
WITS University of the Witwatersrand
WFS Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF ANNEXES	ix
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	xi
A. Background and Scope	xi
B. The Program and its Impact	xi
C. Consistency with U.S. Assistance Strategy	xii
D. Cost Effectiveness	xiii
E. Management Issues	xiii
F. Conclusions	xiii
G. Recommendation	xiv
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background	1
1. Funding and responsibilities	1
2. Program activities	1
3. Program setting	2
4. A.I.D. enters the picture	4
B. Methodology of the Evaluation	4
C. Members of the Evaluation Team	6
II. THE PROGRAM	9
A. The Afro-Asian Institute (AAI) of Histadrut	9
B. The South Africa Program	10
C. Profile of Program Participants	10
D. Program Format and Content	14
E. Program Methodology and Tutors	14
F. Recruitment	17

G.	Participant Responses to the Program and its Recruitment and Selection Procedures	20
1.	Positive responses	20
2.	Negative responses	21
H.	Should the Program Continue?--Participants' Views	23
I.	Conclusions	25
III.	THE PROGRAM IN RELATION TO U.S. ASSISTANCE STRATEGY FOR SOUTH AFRICA	27
A.	U.S. Assistance Strategy	27
B.	Conclusion	29
IV.	MANAGEMENT ISSUES	31
A.	Institutional Mechanism	31
1.	Program management: the chain of responsibility	31
2.	Role of intermediaries	33
B.	Conclusions	37
V.	COST EFFECTIVENESS	39
A.	Administrative Costs vs Program Costs	39
B.	Cost per Student	41
C.	Cost Comparison of Training Programs	43
D.	Conclusions	44
VI.	IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM	45
A.	Discussion	45
B.	Conclusions	46
VII.	SHOULD THE PROGRAM CONTINUE: THE EVALUATORS' PERSPECTIVE	47
A.	Discussion	47
B.	Conclusion	50
C.	Recommendation	50

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Participants in AAI Program for South Africans: Breakdown by Gender and Age	9
2	Participants in AAI Program for South Africans: Sectoral Classification	11
3	Distribution of Contact Hours	13
4	Participants in AAI Program for South Africans: Area Distribution	16
5	Final Reported Costs for NED Grants in support of AAI Training Program for South Africans	39
6	AAI Program for South Africa: Cost per Student (U.S. dollars)	40

LIST OF ANNEXES

<u>Annex No.</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Scope of Work	1-1
2	Interview Guide for Returned Participants	2-1
3	Program Cycles Conducted by AAI/Histadrut 1986-1991	3-1
4	AAI-Related Participant Projects	4-1
5	(a) AAI: Workshop Programme Outline	5-1
	(b) AAI: Detailed Program of Activities	5-1
6	List of Key AAI Personnel	6-1
7	List of Individuals and Agencies Contacted	7-1
8	List of Returned Participants and Participants Interviewed	8-1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Background and Scope

The activity examined during this evaluation is a training program for disadvantaged South Africans carried out by The Afro-Asian Institute of Histadrut (AAI) in Israel. Originally planned and initiated by a private American organization, the Center for Foreign Policy Options (CFPO) in conjunction with the AAI, the program provides training in cooperatives, labor union and community development as part of an effort to develop democratic institutions, achieve broader participation and accelerate the process of empowerment of disadvantaged South Africans. A.I.D. funding commenced in FY 1987 and since that time \$1,010,000 has been committed through amendments of a grant made to the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) as part of a larger A.I.D. program to promote democracy in South Africa. 268 participants have been trained in a total of thirteen program cycles, of which ten, with a total of 196 participants, have received A.I.D. funding support.

The evaluation was carried out in the USA, Israel and South Africa during the period July 29 to August 30, 1991. The purpose of the evaluation was to determine whether: (1) the training program is consistent with the current interim US assistance strategy; (2) the program has contributed to building democratic institutions; and (3) it has been cost-effective in meeting its objectives. The evaluation's underlying purpose was to find an objective basis for considering possible future A.I.D. support for the program. This involved a review of documents and records in the three countries, observation of part of the last cycle of the training program, and a large number of interviews with program staff, former participants, community leaders in South Africa, and officials in A.I.D., AAI and organizations responsible for the process of channelling and accounting for the use of funds and for program monitoring, supervision and evaluation under the grant from A.I.D. to NED.

B. The Program and its Impact

The AAI program is a 26 day intensive mixture of lectures, case studies, site visits and project preparation of high substantive content that is appropriate for a South African clientele. A well led, dedicated, professionally qualified staff enjoys the confidence of the participants and successfully challenges them to perform. The impact of the course on the students themselves is

high, but vitiated somewhat by political considerations and by what is perceived as saturation coverage of background on Israel. The impact on activities and South African institutions and functions is somewhat more difficult to judge but there were a number of impressive examples of beneficial activities undertaken that are helping achieve the objectives of US assistance, the building of democratic institutions.

Former participants overwhelmingly gave the program very high marks. Virtually unanimously, they placed high value on substantive content, convincing examples of successful application of theory in Israel, and the ability to relate Israel's example and practice to South African conditions and challenges. While uncomfortable with aspects of the program dealing with background on Israel and the Palestinian issue, participants also strongly endorsed the location of the course in Israel in terms of providing opportunities to meet South Africans from differing organizational, community and geographic areas in an alternative environment. They also welcomed the opportunity to interact with participants from many third world countries attending other courses at the institute and thus overcome the feeling of isolation from the rest of the world. Participants were generally unaware that the program had received U.S. financial support.

The recruitment process is somewhat haphazard, reflecting practices more suited to earlier repressive times in South Africa when free access to the country and to individuals was not possible. Follow-up has been sketchy to non-existent. Participant opinion strongly supports the view that these aspects have been weak in the past.

C. Consistency with U.S. Assistance Strategy

The evaluators conclude that the program substantially complies with several key elements in the interim USAID/SA assistance strategy. The particular areas are: (1) the redistribution of educational resources; (2) expanding black participation to fight economic disempowerment; (3) black enterprise promotion; and (4) more economically-oriented community development programs. Moreover, in view of the high quality of instruction and the availability of relevant Israeli experience, the program is capable of making a greater contribution in the areas covered by the new initiatives contained in the interim strategy. However, in order to do this, the course will not be successful in the longer run unless the present clear AAI ownership of the course is transformed into a meaningful AAI-South African partnership.

D. Cost Effectiveness

In terms of cost effectiveness, the evaluation indicates that for an overseas course the program offers substantial benefit for reasonable cost. With some modification in the areas of learning reinforcement and application, development of a more carefully-crafted recruitment process, and attention to increasing the multiplier effect through greater emphasis on training of trainers, its cost effectiveness can be substantially enhanced. While administrative costs have not been particularly excessive, the involvement of the main intermediaries has not added strength to the program in the recent past.

E. Management Issues

Review of the management dimension of the program revealed a number of problems which neither the heavy layering of intermediaries in the earlier years nor some stream-lining later on helped address. Simply put, the key intermediaries--NED and CFPO--did not generate useful substantive information to permit A.I.D. a meaningful insight into the program. For its part, A.I.D. did not provide adequate guidance to these intermediaries or to AAI about its requirements as to program operations, accomplishments and impact, that would have been a mandate to them to make changes. In the absence of feedback from A.I.D., CFPO and AAI could with some reason assume that their program, which antedated A.I.D. financial support, was doing well and was entirely acceptable to A.I.D. Especially because of NED's vision of itself as a funding agency rather than as a substance-oriented agency, A.I.D. needed to keep better track of the program and articulate clearly its programmatic interests and concerns. Furthermore, achievement of a common understanding of the program and any endeavor to strengthen its direction and contribution were hampered by poor communication and some mutual exasperation.

F. Conclusion

The evaluators endorse the views expressed by community leaders and many thoughtful participants that the AAI program is capable of serving as a useful tool for future contribution to the new South Africa. While doing this, the program could also serve as a factor in enhancing Southern African regional efforts at promoting more effective cooperative development. However, some adaptation is necessary for increased effectiveness within the short- and medium-term social/political situation. Such adaptation is needed both at the strategic/conceptual plane and in some operational aspects.

The key consideration is to avoid the perception that the program is, like so many other internationally funded development projects, a self-perpetuating instrument of foreign origin and control with an agenda that is predetermined and contains hidden items. Instead, building on the perceived need for and relevance of the subject matter, AAI's impressive teaching qualities, and the near-indelible effect of the overseas experience in Israel, the program should become--in perception and reality--an increasingly South African undertaking capable of responding to changing conditions, with increasing South African planning and management input.

G. Recommendation

That A.I.D. consider a successor project to the present AAI program that contains provision for the following actions :

1. Develop a South African ownership stake in the program that will (a) create a system of joint responsibility for program planning, selection and follow-up; and (b) facilitate negotiation with major political and labor union actors to open up a larger representative constituency to the program;

2. Develop a more clearly defined relationship between the key partners--A.I.D. as the financing agency, AAI as the implementer and a South African entity as advocate for the ultimate beneficiaries: disadvantaged South Africans;

3. Approach the design of the AAI training course as one tool in a larger program process of project development, training and application, leading to the accomplishment of the strategic objective of democratization, and institution building and development. AAI thus is seen as a provider of the teaching resource and the Israeli location, not as the program itself;

4. Institutionalize the selection process and inclusion of a follow-up program in South Africa to permit early dovetailing of the course in Israel with specific needs of South African participants and to provide greater assurance that the momentum created in Israel is maintained;

5. Enhance the multiplier affect of the program through more selective recruitment and emphasis on training of trainers;

6. Explore the feasibility of collaboration with regional organizations in Southern Africa and with other overseas organizations engaged in training to strengthen community-based, labor and cooperative organizations;

7. Insofar as A.I.D. believes that an intermediary is required for financing and program planning, monitoring and evaluation, the only intermediary necessary should be on the scene in South Africa and be readily approachable and held accountable to A.I.D.; and

8. Ensure that A.I.D. financial support is made known to all parties, including participants, in any successor program.

I. INTRODUCTION

NOTE: The terms "disadvantaged" South Africans or "blacks" in this report are intended to encompass those South African communities and individuals who have been disadvantaged by the South African apartheid laws. Use of these terms is meant to connote African, Asian and so-called colored communities, organizations and individuals.

A. Background

1. Funding and Responsibilities

USAID/SA has funded a grant of US\$ 2,726,866 with the National Endowment for Democracy (NED) since 1986. The grant primarily supports South African organizations with programs in community participation, promotion of democratic ideas, and mediation and reconciliation. Each South African organization is paired with a U.S. organization which is characterized by its commitment to supporting democracy worldwide. Under this instrument, NED has also provided a series of subgrants, totalling US\$ 1,010,000 as of August 1991, for a training program in cooperative, labor union and community development for disadvantaged South Africans carried out by the Afro-Asian Institute (AAI) of Histadrut, Israel's main labor federation. In the past, subgrants for the AAI program were channelled through several U.S. intermediaries, with the Center for Foreign Policy Options (CFPO) being directly responsible for administration and financial management of the AAI project. The CFPO, usually described as a small think-tank organization, inter alia conducts research and policy studies, especially on issues of interest to Jewish Americans. The Center is organized in an ad hoc manner and relies heavily on part-time service by a number of prominent individuals to pursue a variety of programmatic, policy research, fund raising and lobbying activities.

2. Program Activities

The AAI program consists of a three and a half week training program, held in Israel, designed to provide organizational and related skills necessary to help strengthen black community organizations and labor unions in South Africa. Each course brings together some twenty black community and trade union representatives for intensive training in program development, cooperatives, trade unionism, and community organization. The program emphasizes a conceptual approach to community organizing and provides some skills training.

The program is intensive, sometimes consisting of ten hours of lectures, group discussions, and workshops in a single day. It includes classroom work at the AAI facility in Tel Aviv and is supplemented by field study throughout Israel. Since its first course in April 1986, the Institute has trained 268 community activists from trade unions, womens' groups, church organizations, educational institutions, social welfare agencies, and youth groups throughout South Africa in thirteen cycles, of which ten have been supported with A.I.D. funding.

3. Program Setting

At the time of its beginning and in the early years in its operations, the AAI training program operated in an atmosphere of repression and great suspicion in South Africa. Repeated states of emergency and enforcement of apartheid severely limited legitimate political and economic opportunities among disadvantaged South Africans. A large number of oppositional organizations and leadership were either in jail, underground or in exile during this time. Surveillance and harassment by security forces were commonplace occurrences. There were widespread anti-U.S. feelings among blacks due to their perceptions of the U.S. foreign policy toward South Africa and in the region, notably Angola. Similarly, Israeli-South African collaboration on defense, security and other issues generated anti-Israeli feelings. The South African Government made it difficult for blacks to obtain travel documents and conversely for visitors to obtain visas. Low morale by blacks and their sense of total isolation led to a perceived need for the development of usable skills and organizations for coping within the repressive environment of apartheid.

In this atmosphere, CFPO took the initiative together with AAI to conceive and initiate the training program as a creative means of demonstrating empathy and support on the part of AAI and, indirectly, the people of Israel in the struggle against apartheid and to attenuate, in a private and unofficial way, anti-Israeli and anti-Jewish sentiment among disadvantaged South Africans.

Many of the conditions that complicated and colored the training program in the past several years no longer apply or are no longer seen as crucial. The change that is occurring in South Africa at present and the prospect of very far-reaching transformations of South Africa's political, economic and social order in the near future are undoubtedly the most important of the

various factors that have complicated a common understanding of this program by A.I.D. on the one hand and NED, CFPO and AAI on the other hand.

The unbanning of the major liberation movements who are now in a position to negotiate on their own behalf and contract with programs such as AAI is one major change. It is no longer required to relate to these organizations through intermediaries. Direct discussion, negotiation, compromise and contract are now possible.

A further fundamental change, which importantly influences the AAI program is the change of attitude commonly described as "the politics of transformation". While the politically dominated confrontational phase of "the liberation struggle" is not yet over--and will not be until the franchise and constitutional aspects are democratically resolved--there is, nevertheless, a more developmental approach emerging from community, worker and political organizations. Such organizations are squaring up to the challenge of the reconstruction of a society devastated by the ravages of the oppressive system which denied them economic, political and social access and, above all, taught them that they were inferior. This last mentioned degradation robbed black South Africans of that fundamental attribute required for all developmental growth--their self-esteem.

Democratically-oriented organizations are now looking to a new future and, aware of the many resource constraints, are seeking ways to change the political, social, economic and psychological distribution in South Africa. The new leadership is aware that it requires not only material but also human resources as well as a superhuman vision to achieve this. Organizations must develop this vision and the capacity to sustain it. The provision of training, motivational support and exposure to different development models will assist in meeting this need.

In this connection, while the atmosphere in South Africa has changed, important political and labor union organizations, such as the African National Congress (ANC) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU) have not modified their previously-expressed official position of opposition to relations between themselves and Israeli entities, such as Histadrut. In particular, the trade union movement in South Africa continues to be critical of the Histadrut's interaction with Palestinian workers. While individuals who happen to be members of such

organizations may establish links or even visit Israel as on the AAI training program, such individuals do so without the sponsorship (or sometimes even the knowledge) of their organization. Evidently, the official position of such organizations is not irrevocably fixed but contact, discussion and negotiations are required to explore further the subject of linkages, including training programs, between South African and Israeli entities.

4. A.I.D. Enters the Picture

An initial cycle of the program commenced in April 1986 with private funding emanating from the U.S. Jewish community. Two further cycles took place at the end of 1986 and in March-April 1987 without A.I.D. funding. During 1987, CFPO, with some political backing, approached A.I.D. for support on the basis that the program also served parallel U.S. assistance policy objectives and needed more resources to continue. A.I.D. responded positively. Given the widespread sensitivities about acceptance of U.S. funding by South African blacks and for management-related reasons, A.I.D. channelled its funds through the National Endowment for Democracy (NED), a privately chartered organization. This was done through an amendment of a grant provided by A.I.D. to NED in 1986 to support the development of democratic institutions in South Africa. The fourth cycle of the AAI program--the first with A.I.D. support--took place in November-December 1987. Through August 1991, a total of thirteen program cycles have been held.

B. Methodology of the Evaluation

The evaluation was carried out in accordance with the following methodology and procedures.

1. Interviews were conducted with personnel by the evaluators with representatives of the following institutions:

- A.I.D./Washington
- National Endowment for Democracy, Washington, DC
- General Accounting Office, Washington, DC
- The Center for Foreign Policy Options, Los Angeles, California,
(by telephone)
- Afro-Asian Institute of Histadrut, Tel Aviv, Israel
- American Embassy, Tel Aviv, Israel

- American Embassy and USAID Mission, Pretoria, South Africa
- The South African Cooperative Network (SACNET) in Gaborone, Botswana (by telephone)
- The Southern African Advanced Education Program (SAAEP), London, England.

2. A wide variety of documents and records were reviewed at the above-listed organizations.

3. A total of twenty participants in the thirteenth cycle of the AAI program were interviewed at the conclusion of the program in Tel Aviv, Israel.

4. A total of 53 returned participants were interviewed in depth in Johannesburg, Soweto and in Cape Town and vicinity, in the Republic of South Africa. An interview guide (see Annex 2) was developed. Most of the interviews were conducted individually, but some participants were interviewed in pairs or in small groups.

5. A selection of community leaders was interviewed in South Africa. After the evaluators obtained and reviewed confidential lists of former participants in Washington and Tel Aviv, they carefully selected participants to achieve a fair sample on the basis of factors such as gender, age, organizational affiliation and dates of attendance. An initial list was communicated from Tel Aviv to the evaluators' executive assistant in Johannesburg to set up necessary appointments. It soon developed that lists of addresses and contacts were only partially accurate. In addition, some appointments were cancelled or were no shows. Consequently, additional appointments were made whenever people could be contacted. A list of program participants including those interviewed by the evaluation team is available at USAID/SA and is included, without individual names, in Annex 8.

Using the interview guide shown in Annex 2, the evaluation team analyzed the results of the interviews to determine answers to broad topics, as follows:

- Reactions by participants to the program and the extent to which the program content had affected their employment and/or

community organizational work and their own attitudes and approaches:

- The extent to which participants were engaged in projects where the skills and information imparted by the program were helpful and relevant, including projects they developed during, or as a consequence of, their participation in the course;
- Recruitment and selection procedures;
- Participants' opinions and recommendations as to whether the program should be continued, whether any changes should be made in content or organization, and where the program should be held.

The evaluators also requested information from USAID/SA regarding cost figures of programs carried out under USAID program activities in South Africa and neighboring countries, and in the United States. In addition, figures were requested as to cost factors used to program short-term participants in the United States in order to put the question of cost effectiveness into a wider context of A.I.D. participant training expectations and experience. In addition, a comparative analysis of costs was made of the AAI program with community-oriented development training programs for South Africans that are carried out in South Africa.

C. Members of the Evaluation Team

1. Frank D. Correl, an American citizen, has been a program and management consultant in international development topics since retiring from A.I.D. in 1986. Formerly a senior executive during a 34 year career with the U.S. Government, his most significant assignments were as Director, USAID Mission to Sri Lanka (1984-86), Deputy Assistant Administrator for West and Central Africa (1982-83), Director, USAID Mission to Lesotho (1979-82), and consultant to the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Senators Hubert H. and Muriel Humphrey (1977-79), on detail from A.I.D.

2. David Adler, a South African, has a long and wide experience in the area of alternative education and community organization in South Africa. His current work involves the coordination of the Community-Based Development Programme, a joint venture of the Kagiso

Trust and the University of the Witwatersrand School of Management. This program trains the leadership of community, church, trade union and political as well as service organizations. He is chairman of the Open School and the Council of Khanya College (alternative university access) as well as on the Boards of the SACHED Trust (an alternative, national, distance learning methods program with community, labor and civic educational programs), PROTEC (a national program running a complementary technical education support course), the Community-Based Education Project and the Independent Examinations Board.

II. THE PROGRAM

A. The Afro-Asian Institute (AAI) of Histadrut

Although widely known and referred to as the Afro-Asian Institute (AAI), the Institute's real name is The International Institute for Labor Development and Cooperative Studies (IILDC) which is the name used on its stationery. Founded in 1958, the Institute was set up to train leadership for labor, cooperative, community, youth, women's, educational and developmental groups and institutions in African, Asian, Caribbean and Pacific countries.

An affiliate of the Histadrut, the General Federation of Labor of Israel, the AAI enjoys broad autonomy. Its status is an independent non-governmental organization (NGO), drawing its support from local and international like-minded public and private institutes.

The Director of the Institute, Dr. Yehuda Paz, was most emphatic about the independence of the AAI from the Israeli Government. The Institute obtains no funds from the Israeli Government. In certain cases, the Israeli Government acts as the conduit for designated donations from foreign Governments, such as scholarships.

The Institute conducts some 15 courses and seminars annually in Tel Aviv plus seminars in 10-14 Third World countries in cooperation with or at the invitation of local organizations. The breakdown of countries by geographic region which have sent participants to the courses is as follows :

Africa	36	Eastern and Central Europe	7
Asia	17	Mediterranean	2
Caribbean	19	Pacific	13
Other	12		

Dr. Paz observed that there has been a steady stream of participants from countries which do not maintain diplomatic relations with Israel, including some that maintain a hostile public posture vis-a-vis Israel.

Its graduates now total some 19,500 including a substantial number who have achieved prominence in their own countries:

- 44 as secretaries-general (or presidents) of national trade union federations,
- 450 as heads of national trade unions,
- 500 as leaders of major cooperatives,
- 290 as members of parliament,
- 80 as government ministers, and among these four have been prime ministers.

B. The South Africa Program

To give a tangible form to its "linkage with the struggle against apartheid and for full democracy," the AAI has been providing programs of approximately four weeks' duration in Israel for black South Africans. The first program cycle was held in April 1986 and thereafter twelve other courses have been held at the rate of two or three per year. (See Annex 3). In August 1987 and February 1989, short workshops were held in South Africa. The workshops took place only in Soweto, Cape Town and the Northern Transvaal, but exact numbers of attendees and topics covered have not been determined. By all accounts, both from participants and the Institute, these workshops were successful and plans were made for more South Africa located events to take place. These plans did not materialize seemingly for a range of reasons including financial stringency and the withholding of visas by the South African Government from AAI personnel.

C. Profile of Program Participants

The following data was taken off the participant lists provided by the AAI. In some instances the information is incomplete, hence some slight inconsistencies. We are unable to provide educational background since this information was not available for the last few years.

As Table 1 shows, a total of 268 persons have been trained under the AAI program. With the division of 54 percent male and 46 percent female, this program demonstrates an impressive male/female ratio. Even if the all-women third cycle is subtracted, the resultant split is still an impressive one. See also Annex 3.

TABLE I

Participants in AAI Program for South Africans :

Breakdown by Gender and Age

Age Group in years	Male	Female	Total	Percent
Under 30	54	32	86	32
31 - 50	73	63	136	51
Over 50	11	28	39	15
Uncertain or unaccounted for	6	1	7	2
TOTAL	144	124	268	
Percent	54	46		

The evaluation team noted the absence of any women in substantive positions on the AAI staff concerned with the South African participants. The director of Social and Cultural Activities who is concerned with recreation, welfare and personal support to participants and the Institute Director's secretary are the only female staff providing support to the participants. Given the consistently high proportion of women in the South African program, it would be helpful if at least one substantive staff member were available to provide perspective and insights from a female angle. This presumably is also true with respect to people from the Third World countries attending other courses and seminars at AAI.

With regard to age, the discernible pattern has been that more recent programs have contained a higher proportion of younger people. The initial programs comprised groups of more senior community and organization leaders.

The classification in Table 2 is given in full detail since the descriptions in the documentation from which it was drawn are often vague and do not give enough information for more inclusive collation. The Table also demonstrates the diversity of organizations involved. If, however, one attempted, with some license, to classify according to the three main emphases of the AAI one could classify as follows:

Trade Union related	= 74 (27%)
Cooperative/Womens organizations	= 14 (5%)
Community-Based/Political	= 186 (68%)

While there is an imbalance revealed, this does not reflect the very strong interest displayed by many participants at the potential and the practice of cooperatives. Given the few cooperatives in South Africa, it is not surprising to find the low percentage of people from that sector in the AAI program. However, those interviewed had been enthused by their experience in Israel and many of them were attempting to translate their experience into some form of cooperative endeavor.

TABLE 2

Participants in the AAI Program for South Africans :
Sectoral Classification

Sectoral Classification	No. of Participants	Percent
Community-Based Organizations	92	34
Church-related Organizations	21	8
Womens' Organizations	11	4
Youth Organizations	10	4
Trade Unions	37	14
Political Organizations	18	6
Cooperatives	3	1
Human Rights	2	0.8
Teachers Organizations	37	14
Education related Organizations	10	4
Adult Education Organizations	3	1
Cultural Organizations	1	0.4
Health Organizations	15	5
Welfare Organizations	11	4
Service Organizations	2	0.8
TOTAL	273*	100

* Difference due to possible double counting

The regional distribution, both in terms of geographical spread and rural/urban emphasis is clearly disproportionate. While there is considerable urban drift occurring presently in South Africa and it is anticipated that around the turn of the century about 70 percent of the population will be urban, this will still leave some 20 million people in the rural areas and these will be the most disadvantaged group. There is therefore a need to ensure that training is relevant to rural development that includes individuals from rural areas and is given high priority in any future scenario.

D. Program Format and Content

The program has, after some initial modifications and different emphasis, settled to a format similar to that given as Annex 5.

The students spend 26 days in Israel. This roughly translates to an available 200 hours of instruction and related time. Of this, some 100 hours is used for program contact (see Table 3). The remainder is used for ancillary activities made up of historical and other interest-related excursions, visits to Israeli families, contact with Israeli counterparts, viewing of films and some free time. The time is programmed so as to endeavor to meet participants' professional and community interests to the fullest extent practicable.

E. Program Methodology and Tutors

The program content is usually presented in the format of a lecture followed by a visit or case study and then discussion of the concept in terms of its relevance to South Africa.

A list of Institute personnel is attached. (See Annex 6) The staff is chosen according to the following criteria:

- appropriate academic or theoretical qualification;
- suitable and extended practical experience in development, cooperative, community or trade union activity;
- ability to teach the theoretical and practical elements of the program;

TABLE 3
Distribution of Contact Hours

Detail	Hours per subject	Total contact hours
<u>Introduction, summation and evaluation</u> About Israeli background, the Institute, Zionism etc. About South Africa in general Summation and Evaluation TOTAL	 10 3 2 15	 15
<u>Conceptual background to peoples organizations and the labor movement</u> Lectures Study visits South Africa relevant discussion TOTAL	 16 8.5 1.5 26	 26
<u>Community empowerment through cooperatives (principles and practices)</u> Lectures Visits South Africa relevant discussion TOTAL	 15 7 2 24	 24
<u>Specialization courses (cooperatives, education, trade unions)</u> Lectures and study visits	 15	 15
<u>From theory to practice--practical participant--relevant South African based project exercise</u> Preparation and public presentation of a project that the participant intends implementing on return to his/her organization in South Africa.	 20	 20
TOTAL CONTACT HOURS		100

- ability to interact effectively with Third World participants; and
- ability to communicate appropriately in French and English.

There are two program co-directors, Dr. Yehuda Paz, also Director of AAI and Dr. Shimshon Zelniker, also Professor at the Beit Berl College and Board member of both AAI and CFPO.

Dr. Paz is a dynamic, dedicated and enthusiastic leader of the program. Students response to him was one of high admiration, but also deep respect for his knowledge, wisdom and caring. A number of the trickier issues, particularly those dealing with the political situation in Israel, or those concerned with the participant group dynamic, were solved only by his intervention. During the evaluative discussion, there was a large majority of participants who expressed how much his communicative ability and knowledge had contributed to their changed understandings and values. The evaluators and the participants were impressed with Dr. Paz's commitment both to the program and to change towards a more democratic South Africa, confident that he would exercise his leadership in any direction aimed at achieving this.

In his capacity as program co-director, Dr. Zelniker is responsible for recruitment and selection of participants in South Africa. He has also been responsible for preparation of evaluation reports for the program which have been distributed to AAI, CFPO and NED. In addition, Dr. Zelniker has served as liaison and advocate for the program with U.S. individuals and groups, including members of Congress.

Dr. Zelniker's interaction with participants while a program is in progress has changed over the years to the point where in more recent programs, his intervention has been limited to giving one lecture, usually on Zionism. However, he has been a familiar figure to participants due to his recruitment activities and interviews in South Africa. He has also made himself available to discuss problems, although he has encouraged participants to take such matters up with Dr. Paz directly.

There is no doubt in the minds of the evaluators that a major share of credit for the continuation of the program over six years is due to Dr. Zelniker's dedication, energy,

innovativeness and aggressive advocacy. Simultaneously, the evaluators noted that his dual association with both CFPO and AAI and his assertive style, that at times has ruffled feathers, has generated rather than abated reservations about the program on the part of NED and A.I.D. staff.

F. Recruitment

The recruitment procedure was born out of the twin problems of limited time available for recruitment and limited access to organizations and individuals because of the prevailing state of emergency in South Africa and the negative perceptions of USAID and Israeli related programs by many radical community, worker and political groupings. In these circumstances, it was no mean task to find sufficient and appropriate participants and one should not be surprised at the whirlwindlike quality of the recruitment process.

Dr. Zelniker has served as the recruiter for the program. The recruitment process relies mainly on the establishment of a network of sympathetic individuals, some organizationally connected, who would recommend other individuals for consideration by Dr. Zelniker, during a two week visit to South Africa. In some cases, usually in the case of a very prominent person, the recommendation would be accepted without a further interview. In most cases, Dr. Zelniker would interview the prospective participants seemingly, according to their perceptions, to try and determine the community or worker base of the individual as well as his or her political credibility.

In most cases, time or organizational disapproval, did not permit a discussion with the organization from which the applicant came. In some cases, there was an automatic acceptance of an organizational nominee.

On occasions, the recruitment person also brought together individuals of significantly varied educational backgrounds and levels where some participants felt that they were held back by certain members of their group or conversely some participants felt that the material presented was over their heads. This was the case during the thirteenth cycle observed by the evaluators.

The short time available also forced two other unhappy circumstances: Firstly, there could only be personal recruitment and selection in the two main centers of the Witwatersrand and Cape Town. Through organizational links and recommendations, there have been participants from rural areas in the Transvaal, the Eastern Cape and Natal, but these--as can be seen from Table 4 below and Annex 9--are minimal.

Secondly, the rush to fill the shopping basket just prior to a program cycle meant that participants were often left with only one or two weeks (in rare cases three or four) in which to prepare themselves and their organizations and to obtain necessary travel documents. There were a significant number of dropouts who for some of these reasons could not take up offers to attend the program. Alternates were then offered places, but some cycles were not fully subscribed.

As noted above, the recruitment is a rushed visit by one person, using a personally constructed network. Many participants expressed admiration for the energy and political sensitivity shown by Dr. Zelniker, and it was the view of most, that given the prevailing political conditions, another process would have been unlikely to produce a more satisfactory result.

However, some disquiet was expressed by almost all participants about the lack of organizational accountability by the participants which resulted from the selection process. Not only were organizations not involved in the selection of candidates, but the candidates were not always able to consult their organizations about their acceptance of the award. In certain cases, organizations were deliberately avoided since it was believed that approval of a program in Israel would not be forthcoming.

There were concerns expressed that on almost every program there were some participants who were there only for the ride. These had claimed community and organizational involvement which proved dubious. The lack of sufficient time and resources for obtaining and checking adequate references made it possible for this to happen.

A further stated limitation of the process of personal recommendation within a network, created by operating within a tight time budget, is that the circle of contact can become closed

TABLE 4

Participants in the AAI Program for South Africans :Area Distribution

Area description	Number	Percent
Pretoria/Witwatersrand/Vereeniging (Urban)	158	59
Other Transvaal (Rural)	1	0.4
Orange Free State/Northern Cape (Rural)	3	1
Natal (Urban)	8	3
Eastern Cape (Urban)	12	5
Western Cape (Urban)	63	23
Unspecified	23	9
TOTAL	268	100

* Note : it is known that some participants came from rural areas but the numbers cannot be determined since the organizations sponsoring them tend to be urban.

and self-perpetuating. Any attempts by an individual recruiter to extend the circle might become threatening to those within the circle and hence counterproductive.

G. Participant Responses to the Program and its Recruitment and Selection Procedures

1. Positive responses

Without exception, every participant interviewed positively endorsed and was stimulated by the substantive aspect of the program. Even those who indicated strong ideological problems regarding Israel and its policies were unstintingly approving of the core program.

Particularly well received was the follow-up of theoretical lectures by visits to institutions which illustrated and gave positive reinforcement to classroom input.

Most participants appreciated the sections dealing with cooperatives, while others mentioned their own particular interest, e.g. trade union or education sections, which they found stimulating. The discussions and lectures on leadership were positively mentioned and approved by a substantial majority.

It is important to emphasize that the above-mentioned appreciation went much further than a nod that this was an interesting and informative theory cum case study intervention. Participants were clearly impressed not only at the potential that these aspects revealed to them, but also the new insights of concept and process that the Israeli experience was able to stimulate. More important however, seems to be the fact that the experience was a positive one. Israel was something that its people had made work, despite obstacles and setbacks and failures. The positive potential clearly made a mark on all participants who, even if in some cases with reservation, saw in the Israeli experience some reflection against which to measure themselves.

The evaluators found that time after time, interviewed participants said that the areas of their primary interest were the parts of the program they had found strongest. This fit of program with expectations and need was a strong positive signal for the program.

The reflected view by participants of cooperatives was also noteworthy. A critical assessment of previous soft attitudes towards cooperatives was revealed and the concept of cooperatives as a "business" was endorsed. The evaluators were interested to find this attitude

reflected in the recently formed Southern African Cooperative Network (SACNET). This is discussed further in Chapter VII.

The exercise aimed at developing an implementable project was also universally approved. Participants on the whole seemed to work hard and long to prepare their project proposals and believed that this gave the training program focus and meaning.

The communications aspect of the project presentation component was rated by most participants as one of the most useful activities of the program. Not only was it considered a necessary, if sometimes, painful learning process, but it was seen as the area in which a majority could see immediate changes in their own behavioral patterns.

2. Negative responses

While the "exotic" nature of the food was invariably commented upon, it was only a small minority who felt that this was a critical element. Its very mention as a non-appreciation of a cultural value, while often accompanied by embarrassed laughter, was however significant enough for it to be noted here, particularly since it continues to be mentioned despite attempts to meet this problem in the past.

Mentioned with the same frequency, but in a more serious vein was the persistent perception that the program was overtly trying to "sell Israel" and also prevent the participants from obtaining even-handed information about the Arab/Israeli/Palestinian situation. From the responses of all the participants interviewed, it became quite clear that even though a number had understood the Israeli situation more clearly as a result of their participation in the program and their visit to Israel, most had not been satisfied with the perceived biased explanations received and what they considered as prevention of access to information.

Most participants reflected an identification with the Palestinian cause. Their own political belief system, as well as pressures from their peers, causes a high premium to be placed on giving expression to solidarity with perceived "comrades in struggle" and they were frustrated by their inability to make a gesture towards this.

This frustration causes a distortion in the participants' reception of that part of the course aimed at giving an historical, economic, political and social background to Israel. A number of

participants were certain they spent up to a quarter of their program involved in being "informed" about Israel. An analysis of the program indicates that this is not formally so. It is how the program is presented and the interpretation of the reaction of program staff to Israeli political questions which is seen to block, rather than to inform, which encourages the view that there might be a hidden agenda. A substantial number agreed that after completing the program they had not felt as seriously concerned about this aspect as they had initially, but they recommended a more even-handed approach with possibly less direct lecturing input on Israel.

A number of other confrontations and misunderstandings have occurred in some of the programs. This in itself is obviously not a bad thing and in many ways should be encouraged and dealt with. The disturbing element, however, has been the need for the students to wait for directors to make interventions to solve the problems. The subject of these is known to the Institute so it is not necessary to mention it now. However, it might be illustrative to mention one such misunderstanding which the evaluators were drawn into.

On the second last day of the most recent program, the evaluators ran a discussion session with the full group. As part of the introduction, before the evaluation proper, we invited questions. The very first question asked whether it was true that the program was financed by the Israeli Government. The participants said that they had been shocked to learn this almost at the beginning of the program. They had not asked the question directly of AAI staff, but had asked questions as to the financing of the program and had been told about "American and European sources" which, we should add, they now did not believe. We feel that this misperception right at the start of the program clouded a number of the other perceptions which are mentioned above.

Many participants felt that the time allocated to the program was too short. This comment was usually associated with those students who wished to gain more theoretical groundwork from the lectures. They regretted having to specialize and would have preferred to have been able to attend all the courses.

A minority of participants responded negatively to the pressure of the program--long hours, tightly structured curriculum--which they found more difficult in particularly hot seasons.

This pressure was confirmed by other participants who had been able to take this up as a challenge, and felt that this had been a transforming learning discipline.

Some participants questioned the suitability of the prevalent lecture-mode used in the program. They agreed that there was bulk information requiring transmission, for which lecturing is appropriate. However, more understanding might have been gained if some of the concepts and issues had been presented in a workshop or seminar format.

The evaluators' observed, and certain participants' responses confirmed, that they found the program to be "above our heads". This is a consequence of the recruitment process which has been examined in Section F above. If the program needs to accommodate different educational levels, it might be necessary to consider varying the didactic methodology, e.g., by introduction of workshops.

It is noted that the weaknesses identified above were not overwhelmingly stated. Except for the food and the negative comments on political aspects, the other factors were not uniformly expressed, nor were they heavily emphasized. The average response to the question "What did you dislike in the program?" was initial hesitation. Probing was required to elicit the foregoing information.

H. Should the Program Continue? Under What Conditions? Where?--Participants' Views

The participants reflect an unequivocally positive response to the first question. A significant majority felt that the program should continue in the same format, in Israel. Most felt that the program would have far less impact if held in Africa. They cited the positive example of Israel and, in particular, the achievements of the cooperative movement as the context required to ensure the success of the program.

However, the positive response did have some caveats. The recruitment process was seriously questioned and the need for a more South African based, organizationally accountable process was highlighted.

A strong call was made for more time to be given in the recruitment process. Equally strong was the plea for a larger period between final selection and the departure date for the program. This time could be structured with orientation materials for participants to prepare themselves more adequately for the project they were planning during the program. A significant number suggested that more attention be paid to recruiting a complement of participants of appropriate educational and experience levels so that there would be fuller generalized participation as a group.

A wider geographical and sector spread amongst participants was also seen as necessary in the future. Many participants were concerned about the prevailing urban emphasis and stressed the need for greater participation of individuals from rural areas. Concern was also expressed regarding the continued lack of participation in the program by key political and trade union organizations.

There were no strong views on changes in the operation of the program, although it was suggested that less specialization or alternatively a longer program to accommodate both specialization, and the sharing of more topics with the whole group could be beneficial. There were also suggestions for more workshops and fewer lectures.

A small minority were implacably unreconciled to the program continuing to be conducted in Israel. The majority felt that this should not be a problem provided that some accommodations for a more even-handed approach to the Palestinian issue be made.

Discussion on the future of the program usually led to the suggestion of a follow-up program. Ideas in this regard included holding workshops by the Institute with participants in South Africa. There was overall agreement that the present situation was inadequate and that, if the program was to become more effective, a formal, structured follow-up system should be implemented.

I. Conclusions

1. Through a well-led and highly competent staff, the program content and methodology effectively transmits a body of substantive knowledge and related experience to participants which is highly valued by them as meeting their needs. This positive impact is reinforced by the vividness of the Israeli experience.

2. The impact of the application of the substantive knowledge is increased by an emphasis on communications and project presentation skills.

3. Given the disparity in the backgrounds of the people who have attended the program over its six year life, the program has been successful in raising the awareness and level of knowledge of all the participants. However, there is scope for improving the program further if attention is paid to the needs of participants with different educational levels and various specialized interests.

4. The recruitment process, while appropriate during earlier more repressive times, has contributed to the skewing of the participant profile in terms of geographic distribution, urban/rural mix and types of organizations represented.

5. The unresolved sensitivity of the Israeli association within the South African political arena and the unilateral nature of the recruitment process has prevented the program from accessing the major political and worker organizations.

6. The lack of a clear statement to participants on the source of funding has created needless suspicion as to the sponsorship and the motivation behind the program, thereby detracting from the positive impact of the program.

7. There is a good ratio of male and female participants and, in fact, is very high for A.I.D. financed training programs.

8. While there is an imbalance in the numbers of participants in the sectors normally served by AAI programs--cooperatives, trade unions and community organizations--this is to be expected given the South African situation. Nevertheless, a significant portion of participants claimed a strong interest in cooperatives which they felt the Israeli experience had consolidated and allowed them to develop further.

9. Given the demographic prospects for South Africa, there have been disturbingly few participants from rurally-based organizations.

III. THE PROGRAM IN RELATION TO U.S. ASSISTANCE STRATEGY FOR SOUTH AFRICA

A. U.S. Assistance Strategy

Both A.I.D./Washington and USAID/South Africa have emphasized that the U.S. assistance strategy for South Africa is in a state of flux. With momentous changes already having taken place, A.I.D. has acknowledged that its June 1988 strategy, based on the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 (CAAA) and centering on helping to hasten the demise of apartheid and prepare blacks for a leadership role in a non-racial, democratic South Africa, has been overtaken by the rapid pace of change including the dismantling of apartheid laws. USAID/SA took the lead in June 1991 to prepare a new "interim" strategy which emphasizes the need for a program evolution, namely, that as the political and economic environment shifts in South Africa, programs which focused solely on resistance to the apartheid state need to give way to a broader range of initiatives aimed at improving organizational effectiveness and addressing development needs in post-apartheid South Africa. Pending approval or modification, the interim strategy document is being used by USAID/SA as an informal broad guideline in planning and administering its program.

The interim strategy sensibly sets the end of FY 1993 as its horizon, declaring that "projecting beyond that date would be unrealistic" given the fluid state of South Africa's politics and society. While looking to a series of assessments to assist in the determination of a more definitive strategy, the Mission declares that, while embarking on several new initiatives of a more developmental than political character, its previous core programs will continue to focus on the areas cited in the CAAA: education, human rights, community development, labor, and private enterprise, albeit with a greater developmental focus. The new initiatives proposed by USAID/SA include several important new areas such as assistance to combat AIDS and to help ameliorate the desperate need for sufficient shelter. For purposes of this evaluation, USAID's delineation/modification of the continuing core program is of primary interest and concern.

The evaluators found that with regard to: (1) subject matter of the program curriculum; (2) its selection of participants; and (3) the interests expressed by interviewed participants, several aspects of the interim strategy were addressed as follows :

- In educational emphasis, the new strategy stresses programs such as alternative primary schools, preschool and early childhood education and teacher training;
- Expanded black participation to fight economic disempowerment;
- Black enterprise promotion, through cooperatives or other means.
- Community development, specifically :
 - to promote democratic processes and institutions;
 - to support training and counselling programs for alienated and disadvantaged black youth;
 - to meet self-defined needs of black women and enhancing their role in society and the economy;
 - to help rural communities in working toward their own development priorities; and
 - leadership training and other activities enhancing community development.

In their investigations, and supported by their interviews of some 70 ex-participants, including the 20 students completing the thirteenth cycle, the evaluators were struck with the frequency with which participants expressed their interest in the above topics, their involvement in the fields cited, and the degree to which the material presented in the course helped them understand their own role and ability to work as catalysts for change.

The evaluators were especially struck by the variety of programs in the above listed areas in which participants, both male and female, claimed to be active, such as alternative schools, the urgent need to assist school dropouts and early childhood learning.

With regard to the strengthening of community organizations, time after time, persons interviewed volunteered their vision of a wide variety of organizations with which they were associated focusing on longer-term development needs and seeking to initiate appropriate programs. Invariably they gave credit to AAI for sensitizing them to key substantive issues and

concerns and providing useful tools through emphasis on leadership and communication skills with which to accomplish their aims. The evaluators also noted that one or two highly motivated former participants were interested in starting rural programs.

Labor union objectives of the interim strategy were less adequately served for the reasons, largely political, cited in Chapter I: A.3. "Program Setting" above.

The evaluators were particularly impressed by the great majority of former participants who volunteered their appreciation of the course as having demonstrated to them the concepts of conciliation, negotiation and compromise--as opposed to confrontation--as the road to democratization and development.

With regard to participants' attitudes, the impact of the AAI program in support of the objectives and targets of the interim strategy, must be judged as highly successful. As discussed in Chapter VI, the impact on actual programs or organizations is considerably more difficult to discern and evaluate.

B. Conclusion

The evaluators are satisfied that the AAI program substantially complies with the priority areas as defined in the Interim USAID/SA program strategy as far as it goes. It seems evident that the program is capable of making greater potential contributions toward achieving stated USAID/SA objectives.

IV. MANAGEMENT ISSUES

A. Institutional Mechanism

Note : The institutional arrangements covering this program have been so complex and have led to so much confusion and contention that the topic is discussed at some length in an attempt to set the record straight.

1. Program management: the chain of responsibility

Since inception of A.I.D. support for the AAI program in FY 1987, the funding mechanism has undergone significant change.

In their 1987 proposal for A.I.D. funding, CFPO and AAI requested that NED serve as the direct recipient and administrator of A.I.D. funds. This was consistent with A.I.D.'s wish to distance itself from the program. Accordingly, in September 1987, A.I.D. amended its grant to NED covering activities in South Africa (Project No. 674-036) to include the AAI training program.

NED's policy, with rare exceptions, is to deal with foreign entities through an American intermediary. Given the character of AAI's parent body, Histadrut, as the preeminent labor union organization in Israel, NED looked to the African American Labor Center (AALC) of the AFL/CIO as the principal intermediary, rather than providing the grant directly to the actual American facilitating body, the CFPO. It was understood that while it would be an additional point of contact in the United States, AALC would not play any role in either the program's selection process or in the general management of the program. Its role was described as assisting in the forwarding of funds to the program. AALC did not request a portion of funds from the grant.

In order, however, to channel the NED subgrant through AALC to CFPO and eventually to AAI, the grant first had to pass through the Free Trade Union Institute (FTUI), the umbrella organization within the AFL/CIO encompassing the free trade union centers, including AALC.

Thus, an intermediary structure of no fewer than four organizations--NED, FTUI, AALC and CFPO--was created between the A.I.D. funds and AAI, the ultimate provider of the training program. Notwithstanding this layering, NED clearly considered that CFPO was the U.S. grantee directly responsible for the administration and financial management of the AAI project.

A review of pertinent files shows clearly that this arrangement proved frustrating to all of the parties involved. CFPO protested bitterly that the accounting and bureaucratic requirements were inconsistent, inconvenient and expensive, describing them as "a heavy burden". NED was dissatisfied by the slow submission and inadequate supporting material of the required financial reports.

The elimination of inconvenience, expense, tardy submission and incomplete documentation of reports was not facilitated by the necessity of channelling the paperwork through FTUI and AALC. Inevitably, NED had substantial parallel contact with CFPO. By the third year of the program, FTUI and AALC withdrew from the chain of intermediaries, and NED henceforth dealt solely with CFPO and AAI. The grants for FY 1989 and FY 1990 were made by NED to CFPO directly.

There is nothing in the files to indicate that either A.I.D./Washington or USAID/SA had any opinion or objection to the above arrangement, thus relying on NED to carry out the modalities of managing the grant according to its own rules and procedures.

After USAID's decision not to renew A.I.D. funding support to the AAI program beyond the twelfth cycle was challenged and the present evaluation was decided upon, a grant for US\$110,000 was made by NED directly to AAI, eliminating CFPO, the remaining intermediary. At first, both NED and AAI found the mechanics and requirements necessary to comply with the grant to be frustrating and burdensome. Apparently much of the trouble encountered is attributable to these factors :

- AAI, having been at arms length from meeting detailed U.S. Government requirements including financial scrutiny, was startled to have to provide details and assurances de novo for a program that had been operating basically the same for the previous four years;

- the decision to postpone the evaluation from the spring to the summer of 1991 required postponement of the thirteenth cycle and involved administrative and financial adjustments by AAI on very short notice and at some hardship.;
- NED, now dealing with an Israeli entity unfamiliar with US Government requirements rather than with an American organization, was frustrated by the delays encountered in getting the necessary financial data in usable form, for instance by AAI's initial financial report submission in Hebrew, the business and official language of the Institute.

From observations and discussions at AAI in Tel Aviv during early August 1991, the evaluators concluded that AAI, once it understood the requirements and procedures, could be relied upon to meet the conditions of the grant with necessary clarification provided by NED. Communication between NED and AAI have been satisfactory. Indeed, it appears that after this shake-down experience and with minimal guidance, AAI would be able to continue to be a direct funding recipient if it were decided to renew A.I.D. funding support for future program cycles.

2. Role of Intermediaries

a) National Endowment for Democracy (NED)

AAI is only one of a total of seven organizations whose activities are supported by the overall South Africa grant. Under the grant provisions, NED is responsible for channelling funds to CFPO and AAI, for general program oversight and monitoring and for maintenance of financial surveillance over the two organizations.

NED was further required to prepare an implementation plan and a long-term progress strategy for the AAI program. These documents were submitted to USAID/SA in 1988 by NED. USAID/SA informed NED in June 1988 that while the implementation plan was approved, the long-term strategy was under review. USAID/SA apparently never responded further. There was a specific provision for NED to carry out an implementation evaluation of program activities, tentatively scheduled for June 1988. NED reports to A.I.D. in April 1988 and April 1989 contained sections on evaluation for the FY 1987 and FY 1988 grants, respectively. These were summary accounts of participant ratings of individual courses and limited additional commentaries that provided little, if any, insights into program accomplishments and impact. As USAID/SA was

considering its future support to the program beyond the FY 1990 grant, the Mission requested NED to undertake a more comprehensive evaluation. However, eventually A.I.D. decided to commission the evaluation itself.

Besides ensuring that the various intermediaries channelled funds in one direction and the required reporting from CFPO in the other, a task that turned out to be a prodigious undertaking, an audit of CFPO was performed by NED in association with AALC in early 1989.

NED's monitoring of the program consisted of one visit to Israel to observe the AAI course in operation (1988) and annual visits to South Africa as part of monitoring of the overall grant. NED generally submitted semi-annual program reports which, in A.I.D.'s opinion, have not been meaningful in programmatic terms and usually have been submitted late. The files reveal that USAID/SA did remonstrate with NED about the quality and timeliness of its reports.

The NED role in programmatic oversight and evaluation of the AAI program was criticized in the February 1991 GAO audit report. Given the circumstances of NED's role as a funding agency, rather than a programming agency and the rather strained relations between NED and USAID/SA that have developed over the past year for various reasons, NED would not object if it were no longer involved as an intermediary in A.I.D. funding of the AAI program.

b) The role of FTUI and AALC

For the FY 1987 and FY 1988 grants in support of the AAI program, FTUI was the grantee of record. FTUI and AALC served as the channel of funding to CFPO and as the channel of reports and other paperwork between NED and CFPO. They made no program input into the operation nor were they under any obligation to do so.

FTUI was responsible for ensuring compliance by CFPO with financial reporting and accountability requirements. As related above, AALC joined NED in performing an audit of CFPO's operations with respect to the AAI program in 1989, with the AALC controller participating in the audit. The audit found a number of shortcomings mainly concerned with lack of documentation or expenses and outside contributions, in particular, lease and consultant

agreements, and lack of timely submission of required reports. FTUI and AALC withdrew from the arrangement at the expiration of the FY 1988 grant.

c) Center for Foreign Policy Options (CFPO)

In the grant agreement amendment between A.I.D. and NED, as per letter dated 29 September 1987, which established A.I.D. support for the AAI program, it stated that "...[CFPO] which has worked with Histadrut to design the South African Community Development program and has helped facilitate its implementation in the past, will be directly responsible for recording all financial transactions, collecting all receipts for expenditures, arranging travel and accommodations for participants and preparing all reports for submission to the granting organization." These activities were arranged for and supervised by Dr. Steven Spiegel, Chairman of CFPO's research committee until the conclusion of activities financed under the FY 1990 grant from NED to CFPO. According to NED's records, corroborated by information Dr. Spiegel included in various correspondence, under arrangements worked out between CFPO and AAI, the latter assumed responsibility for all aspects of carrying out the program in Israel, while CFPO assumed responsibility for all aspects of the course outside of Israel. Hence, CFPO paid for the cost of recruitment in South Africa, participants' air travel to Israel and accountant fees for preparation of reports to NED (through FTUI and AALC).

CFPO also paid a stipend per course to Dr. Shimshon Zelniker for recruitment and for duties as co-director of the course in Israel. Dr. Zelniker is affiliated with both the CFPO and AAI, being a member of the board of both organizations. Until the direct FY 1991 grant to AAI, Dr. Zelniker was paid by CFPO rather than by AAI. Dr. Zelniker has used the stationery of both AAI and CFPO in his communications. However, in the minds of the participants, his links are perceived as being with AAI.

To adequately understand the CFPO's role in this program, it must be understood and appreciated that CFPO, together with AAI, were the initiators and designers of the program well before the advent of A.I.D. funding support. Funding and intellectual capital had to be applied with great care and innovativeness to organize and operate the program under the repressive atmosphere in South Africa in the program's early years. Accordingly, both organizations developed a vision of the program, and, by their own criteria and concerns, the program has been

a great success. Administrative arrangements were developed years ago based on very personal relationships and understandings. A.I.D. funding was considered as an item of additional support to the program, in effect, a new partner joining the enterprise.

However, the picture changed because now the program became susceptible to scrutiny in terms of A.I.D. strategy, country and program goals and objectives, program guidance and the panoply of government regulations and procedures regarding accountability. Thus, with regard to the administrative and financial side of the operation, the situation now required the keeping of carefully detailed records supported by documentary evidence and clear contractual instruments.

In the case of the programmatic objectives and impact of the program, CFPO was under the impression that no modifications were required in the absence of feedback or guidance from A.I.D. or NED. It is apparent that such input was not provided by A.I.D. until the time came to consider renewal of funding support. A.I.D. had a very sketchy knowledge of the program. Agency personnel had never really monitored the program and had never been to Israel to see it in operation. Moreover, there was a problem in communications. For example, even as the decision was being reached not to renew funding, USAID/SA was sending a different signal when it broached the possibility of including entrepreneurial training in the program at a meeting in Pretoria in July 1990.

When interviewed on the telephone by one of the evaluators, Dr. Spiegel pointed out that CFPO had never been asked by A.I.D. nor had they ever received any feedback regarding the substantive aspects of the course--including specific questions regarding program impact and accomplishments--and that hence, he had perceived no incentive to change.

The NED/AALC 1989 internal audit of CFPO as well as the 1990 GAO audit of NED administration of the South Africa grant, indicated several problems with regard to CFPO record keeping and contracting practices, dealing with attribution of costs to A.I.D. financing vs private funding sources, documentation of consulting and leasing arrangements, etc.

Apparently CFPO did not keep U.S. Government funds in a segregated account but commingled them with privately-obtained funds. Hence, the GAO found that it has not been possible to get an accurate, documented picture as to which of CFPO's expenditures on behalf of the AAI program were properly chargeable to the A.I.D. grant. In its recent communications, including a briefing paper prepared in January 1991 and provided to the A.I.D. Administrator, CFPO stresses that the program has been a heavy burden financially and in terms of time and attention. It is evident that CFPO, like many other organizations, finds working with U.S. Government difficult.

Recent experience during the FY 1991 grant covering the thirteenth cycle indicates that AAI could operate the program effectively by itself without intermediaries, especially if it continues to have access to the services of its board member, Dr. Simonson Zelniker, with his invaluable experience and insights. As Dr. Spiegel of CFPO has pointed out, Dr. Zelniker's trips to South Africa also enabled the Center to keep well informed during the time when it was still associated with the project, when Dr. Spiegel himself did not visit South Africa. With the change to an increasingly open and accessible system in South Africa and a pattern of rising program costs (see Chapter V below), the extra administrative expense and layering of intermediary organizations--NED and CFPO--appear no longer necessary in the program and their removal could help reduce the upward pressure on costs.

B. Conclusions

1. The system for channelling funds to AAI was very complex and tended to delay, rather than facilitate, the smoothness of communication and timely compliance with reporting requirements.

2. NED's status as a funding agency rather than as a programmatic agency has resulted in a lack of programmatic evaluation and guidance. Consequently, A.I.D. did not benefit from any information regarding program accomplishment and impact that would have enabled it to determine if intervention was necessary.

3. Conversely, A.I.D. did not initiate any effort to evaluate the programs' impact and accomplishments until a decision as to future funding was under consideration. In the absence of A.I.D. guidance, neither NED, CFPO nor AAI had any compelling incentive to examine the program with regard to impact or accomplishments. These organizations, with some justification, assumed that their vision of the program as reflected in their design and implementation record, complied with the objectives of the grant as perceived by A.I.D.

4. A.I.D.'s unfamiliarity with program operations and accomplishments, its limited contact with the program and its intermediaries and implementers, coupled with the sending of conflicting signals concerning its position regarding the utility and future of the project, contributed to misunderstandings and ill-feelings regarding the project and the parties to it and complicated attainment of a decision regarding future support acceptable to all parties. This situation has been aggravated by strained relations between A.I.D. and NED and by an unhelpful tone in communication among the various parties.

5. The dual association of Dr. Shimshon Zelniker with CFPO and AAI and his multi-duty role with regard to the program--as a recruiter, co-director and sometime lecturer, and as political contact--was incompletely understood and contributed to suspicions on the part of A.I.D. and NED regarding the program.

6. After considerable growing pains related to AAI's role as a direct grantee from NED for the thirteenth cycle, AAI appears to have familiarized itself well enough to be able to deal with US funding sources such as A.I.D. and/or NED in a competent manner. In addition, a more open and accessible system in South Africa and a need to contain rising program costs favor the elimination of the intermediaries.

V. COST EFFECTIVENESS

A. Administrative Costs vs. Program Costs

It is evident that cost patterns of the program and per participant have changed substantially since A.I.D. initially provided funding pursuant to the A.I.D.-NED Grant amendment No.1, dated September 29, 1987. The first three program cycles funded with A.I.D. support contained a much higher administrative cost factor (21 percent of program costs and 17.4 percent of total reported costs, including those funded from sources other than A.I.D.). By contrast, in the six program cycles (Nos. 7-12) funded under the FY 1988, 1989 and 1990 grants respectively, administrative costs were significantly lower, constituting 11.6 percent of program costs and 10.4 percent of total reported costs). (See Table 5).

In addition to the administrative costs shown in Table 5 below, a certain portion of US\$206,802 (out of a grant of US\$ 2,726,866) budgeted for administrative costs in the A.I.D.-NED umbrella grant for South African programs has been expended for the AAI program. This amounts to 8.2 percent of program funds under the total grant. No details are available as to how much has actually been spent by NED in administering the AAI grant. When the grant was amended in FY 1991 to add funds for AAI's thirteenth program cycle, no additional administrative funds were added since NED had not yet exhausted the US\$ 206,802 budget. Since AAI is only one of seven recipients under the grant, it is fair to assume that NED's administrative costs over five years add a very negligible amount to the program and per-student cost.

The evaluators noted the insistence of CFPO, reflected in its correspondence, that despite considerable administrative burden and costs, such costs to A.I.D. were minimal due to private contributions that augmented A.I.D. financing. The evaluators were not able to accept this reasoning because of the following:

1. The problem of disaggregating A.I.D. and private funding due to CFPO's practice of commingling the two sources of funds, which precluded accurate attribution of activities to A.I.D. funding.

TABLE 5

Final Reported Costs for NED Grants in support of CPFO/Histadrut Training
Program for South Africans

Grant No	87674P00260	88674P00287	89116	90100		
Effective Date Expiration Date	11/1/87 - 6/30/89	4/1/89 - 3/31/90	10/1/89 - 11/30/90	6/15/90 - 12/31/90	TOTAL ALL YEARS	TOTAL 4/1/89 - 12/31/90
No. of Programs	3	2	2	2	9	6
TOTAL PROGRAM COSTS	\$ 293,250	\$ 181,884	\$ 208,391	\$ 206,662	\$ 890,187	\$ 596,937
TOTAL ADMIN COSTS	61,730	20,713	26,412	22,291	131,146	69,416
TOTAL REPORTED COSTS	354,980	202,597	234,803	228,953	1,021,333	666,353
Less: Funds from other sources	(54,980)	(2,597)	(34,803)	(228,953)	(121,333)	(66,353)
TOTAL provided by NED/A.I.D.	300,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	900,000	600,000
Adm cost as a % of Program Cost	21.1				14.7	11.6
Adm cost as a % of A.I.D. funding	20.6				14.6	11.6
Adm costs as % of Total Reported Costs	17.4				12.8	10.4

2. The absence of a clear mutual agreement that the great bulk of administrative expenses and other non-program funds of CFPO would be met by non-A.I.D. funds.

3. A lack of distinction between funds used for administering the CFPO-assumed responsibilities for the AAI program, e.g. procurement of air travel, accounting services, etc., and funds used for activities such as publicity and fundraising undertaken on behalf of the AAI program in the United States that would in no instance qualify for funding by the United States Government.

4. The desire by CFPO, quite clearly expressed in its correspondence, to obtain additional A.I.D. funding both for program purposes and for administrative purposes.

To present data as objectively as possible, Table 5 shows administrative costs

- in terms of program funds--which the evaluators consider the most valid indicator--comparing, as it does, the relative proportion of all available funds for program and administrative reasons;
- as a percentage of total reported costs; and
- as a percentage of A.I.D. funding.

B. Cost per Student

Costs per student throughout the period of A.I.D. support to the program have not changed materially and are in the range of approximately US\$ 5,500 per course. Alternative measures of calculation of costs are shown in Table 6.

It should be noted that in the case of international travel, airfares have risen by some 30 percent over the past year so that both recruitment costs (increased also as a result of South African inflation and some revision in per diem rates) and travel costs of participants have added a significant additional burden on the budget. In the case of salaries, AAI, like the rest of Histadrut, although an NGO, is subject to Israeli Government-established compensation rates. This factor must be kept under review if future A.I.D. support to the program is considered.

TABLE 6.

AAI Program for South AfricaCost per student (U.S. dollars).

Course Cycle No.	No. of Participants	Cost per Participant Program Funds	Cost per Participant Total Reprtd Costs	Cost per Participant A.I.D. Funds
IV	21			
V	17	4807	5819	4918
VI	23			
VII	17			
VIII	19	5052	5628	5556
IX	19			
X	20	5343	6021	5128
XI	20			
XII	20	5166	5724	5000
XIII (Prelim)	20	5500	unknown	5500

C. Cost Comparison of Training Programs

An examination of various community-based development training programs indicates that, not surprisingly, training costs are lower if programs are carried out in South Africa. However, the evaluators consider this to be an irrelevant comparison for several reasons :

1. The success of the program in Israel is attributed to the experience of being outside of South Africa and in Israel in particular, and to the intensity of the positive message conveyed by the Israeli experience and example.

2. Since the program requires the participants to be in residence at the Institute, it is possible to achieve full-time attendance and programmability, in this instance resulting in a highly intensive program with up to 10 hours of contact time per day.

3. The ancillary activities, such as meeting with counterparts and private Israeli families, are difficult to value in terms of dollars, but they add certain reinforcement to the course and are appreciated by the participants.

4. Similarly, the experience of meeting other South Africans of different backgrounds, organizations and ideological positions and the opportunity to interact with the Third World participants in the other AAI courses, provides an expanding horizon that helps break down the isolation (also called "political claustrophobia") of most disadvantaged South Africans. Accordingly, the thrust of the program is reinforced by this experience and made more vivid and relevant to the participants.

In comparing the cost of the AAI program with other out-of-country training programs, including those involving participant training in the United States, the limited information available to the evaluators, including the cost factors in programming short-term participants to the U.S. at approximately US\$ 4,000 a participant month exclusive of international travel and per diem, makes the AAI program appear to be cost competitive and well within established A.I.D. guidelines.

D. Conclusions

1. The AAI program appears to be reasonably cost effective while providing a useful and much appreciated body of knowledge and techniques of application. While administrative costs have declined significantly from the levels during the early years of the program and have been moderate in recent years, program costs are on the increase and both types of costs require careful monitoring.

2. The costs of the AAI program, while obviously significantly higher than training costs in Southern Africa, fall well within A.I.D. programming guidelines for overseas short-term participants.

3. It is difficult to place a dollar value on the special impact that training in Israel appears to generate. There is a universally high opinion from the participants regarding the program as an effective combination of relevant substantive content and a vivid experience of the Israeli location. At the same time there are drawbacks, discussed in Chapter II above, attributable to circumscribed recruitment and lack of follow-up which detract from the program's impact. If these aspects were modified so as to increase the multiplier effect and broaden the constituency base of the program, both in terms of individuals and organizations, the additional impact would improve the program's cost effectiveness (see discussion in Chapter VII).

VI. IMPACT OF THE PROGRAM

A. Discussion

All participants reported changes in attitude, values, insights, and the gaining of new skills and techniques as a result of undergoing the program. The evaluators found some of the responses superficial, and probed in some depth for tangible evidence of the effects claimed.

It was to be expected that the program would make a deep impression on the participants. A program constructed as this one--in an environment of huge energy, creative striving, confidence and will to form society out of its members who are regarded as its assets rather than its problems--cannot fail to impress South African visitors, whose society reflects its history of rejection and exclusion of most of its members.

Notwithstanding the above, the evaluators found that this experience brings about a significant adjustment to the participants' world-view, and to their understanding and perceptions of their organizations and of development issues.

Participants consistently reflected how they had tried with varied success to transfer and implement the learning and experiences derived from the program in Israel. Particularly mentioned were those skills concerned with participatory organizational development, the planning and implementation of programs and the fundamental example of Israeli self-esteem.

Since we are looking at a sample covering six years, we did not necessarily expect the same degree of actual achievement of projects, ideas or skills among all participants. The present South African legal context is not supportive of community-based initiatives. Some participants reported Security Branch harassment after their attendance at the program. To change the perceptions of those with whom one works is a long process in community organizations and many of the participants reflected that they had experienced this. There is also a scarcity of resources available for the development of community-based programs.

Nevertheless, we were able to identify implementation of the project designed in Israel or skills learned, being put into effect in at least fifteen circumstances, including a rural community purchase of land, reorienting pre-school organizations, devising and setting-up of leadership courses in schools, the running of Saturday classes for out-of-school youth, the creation of a community resource center and the transforming of a works committee into a trade union. Others were able to demonstrate the use of communication and leadership skills, but it was difficult to quantify these (see Annex 4).

The GAO Report indicated that approximately one-third of the participants they had interviewed had demonstrable implementation of learnings. The present sample (fifteen out of 53 participants located) confirms this.

We feel that these implementations, while impressive, did not reflect the potential of the ideas, skills and motivation of those we interviewed. The level of follow-up support presently available from the program is low and seems limited to concerned but brief telephonic or social contact with Dr. Zelniker. Some form of structured support, encouragement and possibly further skills transfer would make the impact far more effective.

B. Conclusion

The program has made a strong impact on the participants, many of whom have been able to implement systems and structures within their own organizations and provide leadership for change. Others have actually been able to initiate projects based on their project planning exercise in Israel or ideas derived from the Israeli experience. This potential would be strengthened if a supportive follow-up system were created.

VII. SHOULD THE PROGRAM CONTINUE:
THE EVALUATORS' PERSPECTIVE

A. Discussion

It is clearly evident that the program enjoys support from its participants and their constituencies. Also clear is the professionalism and effectiveness of the Institute and its staff. We found that for funds expended, resources were effectively and efficiently used, in a concerned, well conceptualized and professional way.

The continuance of the program has to be assessed against two questions:

- what adjustments should be made to make it better?
- what adaptations are necessary to be effective within the short-medium term social/political situation in South Africa?

The thoughts and proposals discussed below reflect those of the evaluators, in consultation with community leaders (non-participants), with whom we were able to talk.

1. First and foremost, it is imperative that a successor program evolve into a South African institution, which will give it local status and credibility and allow it to negotiate with political and trade union organizations and implement a more effective recruitment program.

2. The successor program should ensure that it has a multiplier effect. To achieve this, two obvious criteria for recruitment are necessary :

- a) choosing people who are now responsible for project planning and implementation and who would use the course in Israel to develop their project; and
- b) people who are responsible for training other trainers.

In this way participants themselves will form the engine of growth for a South African program (based on the Israeli concept but replicated locally). Adequate institutions and expertise are currently largely absent in the country and leadership and community worker training on a grand scale are of high priority.

3. Such a continuation program has to construct a more clearly defined and understood relationship between the contracting parties--A.I.D. as the funders, AAI as the training resource, and a South African committee or board which devises and implements policy. Such a board could be formed from the existing pool of past participants whose range and quality were amply demonstrated during interviews. The AAI should facilitate the creation of the board mentioned above. This board would have, as part of its terms of reference, the devolution of program control to a South African base.

It is evident from the history of the present program that the administration of a successor program must involve close interaction among these three parties. With the changed circumstance in South Africa, the only intermediary that would be appropriate is one that would be in close contact with all the parties and be readily accountable to them, particularly to A.I.D. with regard to strategic, program and financial concerns.

4. The obstacles to the establishment of such a program in South Africa that have existed until now have been diminished by recent developments. The formation and constitution of a South African committee/board is intended to enable negotiation with major political and trade union actors, inter alia the ANC, PAC, AZAPO, COSATU and NACTU. Such negotiations will, in turn, open up a larger, more representative constituency to the program.

5. The program should have two sites:

a) in Israel, where the hands-on of experience relating to common issues is invaluable, particularly for South Africans coming out of a situation perceived to be unique,

b) in South Africa, where participants who have shared the common experience in Israel and have now taken up their roles in their own society, must continue to develop according to the process started in Israel. There exists in this process a real and positive opportunity for the nurturing of civil-society type relationships, so vital in the currently fractured and estranged South African community.

This follow-up phase of the program could well tie up with other training programs in South Africa and overseas as well as structures such as the SACNET which could take the program into a Southern African regional context.

Our discussions with the chairman of SACNET indicated that a Southern African structure, including coordinative bodies from within South Africa, had now been formed to take the experiences of successful cooperatives and make these insights available in the region. We were intrigued by the growth of a Southern African initiative as well as its resonance with the Israeli experience of "cooperatives as a business". The chairman could point to a number of successful ventures in Southern Africa on which he could make information available to graduates of the AAI program. When asked whether SACNET would be interested in a) sending members on the Israeli program and b) participating with AAI in Southern African workshops, the answer was strongly affirmative.

We were also able to establish the existence of a further number of programs involved in similar training and procedures to the AAI process. The Southern African Advanced Education Programme (SAAEP) in Oxford, U.K. and the Southern African Education Trust Fund (SAETF) in Ottawa, Canada, are part of a larger Commonwealth initiative which is interested in providing either courses or scholarships for South Africans who, inter alia wish to further their understanding and effectiveness in community-based organizations, trade unions and cooperatives. They recruit on a regular basis among South African organizations and could well share both experience and recruitment contact with AAI.

A further initiative which might well prove fruitful for investigation is the relationship between the Coady Institute in Nova Scotia and the Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre (WFS) on the Witwatersrand. The WFS runs an exchange with the Coady Institute whereby South Africans spend time in Nova Scotia learning about cooperatives and the cooperative movement and Coady lecturers spend time in South Africa running courses for the Ubuntu Social Development Institute (USDI) whose participants are members of community-based, trade union and cooperative organizations. The potential for networking and exchanging resources with such organizations is clearly of benefit to the AAI program.

6. The course in Israel, as part of the larger partnership of A.I.D., AAI and the South African program management entity to be developed, needs to be fine tuned to reduce the problems and irritants that have detracted from the impact and image of the course in the minds of the participants.

B. Conclusion

The evaluators endorse the views expressed by community leaders and many thoughtful participants that the AAI program is capable of serving as a useful tool for future contribution to the new South Africa. While doing this the program could also serve as a factor in enhancing Southern African regional efforts at promoting more effective cooperative development. However, some adaptation is necessary for increased effectiveness within the short- and medium-term social/political situation. Such adaptation is needed both at the strategic/conceptual plane and in some operational aspects.

The key consideration is to avoid the perception that the program is, like so many other internationally funded development projects, a self-perpetuating instrument of foreign origin and control with an agenda that is predetermined and contains hidden items. Instead, building on the perceived need for and relevance of the subject matter, AAI's impressive teaching qualities, and the near-indelible effect of the overseas experience in Israel, the program should become--in perception and reality--an increasingly South African undertaking capable of responding to changing conditions, with increasing South African planning and management input.

C. Recommendation

That A.I.D. consider a successor project to the present AAI program that contains provision for the following actions :

1. Develop a South African ownership stake in the program that will (a) create a system of joint responsibility for program planning, selection and follow-up, and (b) facilitate negotiation with major political and labor union actors to open up a larger representative constituency to the program;
2. Develop a more clearly defined relationship between the key partners--A.I.D. as the financing agency, AAI as the implementer and a South African entity as advocate for the ultimate beneficiaries: disadvantaged South Africans;

3. Regard the AAI training course as one tool in a larger program process of project development, training and application, leading to the accomplishment of the strategic objective of democratization, and institution building and development. AAI, thus, is seen as a provider of the teaching resource and the Israeli location, not as the program itself;

4. Institutionalize the selection process and inclusion of a follow-up program in South Africa to permit early dovetailing of the course in Israel with specific needs of South African participants and to provide greater assurance that the momentum created in Israel is maintained;

5. Enhance the multiplier affect of the program through more selective recruitment and emphasis on training of trainers;

6. Explore the feasibility of collaboration with regional organizations in Southern Africa and with other overseas organizations engaged in training to strengthen community-based, labor and cooperative organizations;

7. Insofar as A.I.D. believes that an intermediary is required for financing and program planning, monitoring and evaluation, the only intermediary necessary should be on the scene in South Africa and be readily approachable and held accountable to A.I.D.;

8. Ensure that A.I.D. financial support is made known to all parties, including participants, in any successor program.

HISTORIC

ANNEX 1

Scope of Work

ANNEX 1.

Delivery Order No. 23
PDC-0085-I-00-9089-00

SCOPE OF WORK

ARTICLE I - TITLE

Evaluation of the AFRO-ASIAN Institute of Histadrut Training Program for South Africans

(674-0510 Program Development and Support

ARTICLE II - PURPOSE

The purpose of the evaluation is to (1) determine whether the Histadrut training program in community and cooperative development is consistent with the past and/or recently revised USAID/SA strategy for South Africa; (2) determine whether the program has made a positive contribution to building democratic community and labor union organizations in South Africa; and (3) determine whether the program is cost effective in meeting its objectives in comparison to other training programs USAID/SA sponsors for disadvantaged South Africans. The evaluation findings will be used by A.I.D. and NED to determine whether funding for this program will continue. Key management issues to be addressed include the role and effectiveness of the Center for Foreign Policy Options.

ARTICLE III - STATEMENT OF WORK

The contractor shall evaluate the training courses for black South Africans conducted by the Afro-Asian Institute of Histadrut funded under the NED/USAID grant Agreement No. 674-03060/0301-G- SS-6025-04. The team shall evaluate the training courses in relation to the current USAID/SA strategy for South Africa. The evaluation will also examine the program's cost effectiveness in relation to other training programs for South Africans especially those supported by USAID; the cost effectiveness and efficiency of the administrative arrangements between NED, the Center for Foreign Policy Options and the Institute; and the impact the training courses have had on the South African participants and in building democratic structures in South Africa. Follow-up activities conducted by the Institute in South Africa will also be evaluated.

The contractor shall provide an evaluation report that will provide empirical data to answer the questions below, formulate conclusions based on the findings, and make recommendations based on an assessment of the results of the evaluation. The report will provide lessons learned that may emerge from the analysis.

A. Policy Issues

1. Does the Histadrut training program fit within the priority areas as defined in the Interim USAID/SA Program Strategy?
2. Where does cooperative development rank in terms of priority among the black community leadership in South Africa?
3. Has the program made a positive contribution to building democratic institutions in South Africa, and if so, in what way?

B. Program Content

1. What is the total number of South Africans trained thus far? What is the sectoral mix of participants (by gender, political affiliation, education background, organization representation, and geographic region of South Africa)?
2. What are the selection criteria for participants and how and by whom is the selection process administered?
3. What is the course content and how is the course conducted? What are the qualifications of the instructors?
4. What is the objective of the training and the primary focus, e.g., cooperative, community development, labor issues, etc.
5. Does the Institute evaluate its courses and the participants' experiences and reactions? If so, how is this done and how is the data collected used?

6. Based on interviews with a representative sample of participants, assess and describe the impact of the course on the individuals selected and the institutions which they represent. Questions should emphasize the impact of the course on their activities in South Africa. Would they recommend the training and, if so, for what type of people? How could the courses be improved? Do they believe training in South Africa, other African countries or some other location would be more beneficial? Are they involved in follow-up activities sponsored by the Institute. To what extent have the institutions which they represent benefited from the training received.
7. What kinds of follow-up activities has the Institute conducted in South Africa? How many people have participated? What is the impact of these programs?

C. Cost Effectiveness

1. What is the cost per participant? How does the unit cost compare to the unit cost of a representative selection of other participant training programs sponsored by USAID/SA?
2. What is the ratio of administrative costs to program costs? What percentage of the total cost per course pays for administration by NED, CFPO and Histadrut?
3. What efforts has Histadrut made to raise funds in Israel or from private sources in the U.S. for the program and to what extent have these efforts been successful?

D. Management

1. What is the institutional mechanism for funding Histadrut, i.e., describe how funds flow from NED through CFPO to Histadrut.
2. What are the respective programmatic and administrative responsibilities of the CFPO and the Institute? How are administrative responsibilities for the grant delineated?
3. Is this an effective arrangement, and if not, what alternative arrangements can be proposed?

E. Evaluation Methodology and Procedures

The Contractor shall conduct the evaluation using the methodology and procedures outlined below.

1. Conduct interviews with personnel at NED in Washington D.C., the Center for Foreign Policy Studies in California and Washington D.C., A.I.D. staff in Washington and South Africa, personnel of the Afro-Asian Institute of Histadrut in Israel and personnel from the General Accounting Office (GAO) who conducted the recent audit of NED.
2. Conduct interview with current program participants from South Africa in Israel and with a representative sample of past participants in South Africa (some 50).
3. Review pertinent documents on file at NED, the CFPO, AID/W, USAID/SA, the Institute in Israel and GAO including other internal and external evaluations of the Institute.

Evaluation methodology will be based on comparative analysis with other community training programs in South Africa; quantitative assessment of project outputs such as programs implemented; skills acquired, and objectives accomplished; and subjective judgement as to perceptions of the value of the course by participants.

The team will consist of one American and one South African (see Section VII below for team qualifications). The American member will conduct the U.S. portion of the evaluation (Washington D.C., California) and then proceed to Israel where he/she will join the South African member of the team. After conducting the Israel portion of the evaluation, both team members will proceed to South Africa. The South African member will be briefed by USAID/SA personnel prior to departing for Israel and will make initial contact with past program participants. Both team members will be briefed by USAID/SA personnel prior to starting the South African portion of the assignment (see VI. Reporting Requirements below). The length of time for the investigative and initial drafting phase of this evaluation is five weeks. An extra week is provided for final debriefings and finalization of the report.

ARTICLE IV - REPORTS

Prior to commencing the evaluation, the team members will be briefed on the program by A.I.D. personnel, the American by AFR/SA staff and the South African by the USAID/SA staff. Upon arrival in South Africa from Israel, both team members will present a verbal briefing to USAID/SA on initial findings and present a written outline of the evaluation report. Five working days prior to the completion of the work in South Africa, the team will present USAID/SA a draft of the evaluation for review. The USAID will then schedule a formal review of the evaluation with the team two days prior to the U.S. members departure from South Africa. Upon his/her return to the U.S., the American member of the team will conduct a formal briefing on the evaluation for AID/W and NED personnel. The final evaluation report will be submitted to USAID/SA and AID/W within 15 working days of receiving formal written comments on the draft from the USAID/SA, AID/W and NED.

The final evaluation report shall include an executive summary of no more than 5 double or space and a half spaced pages stating the major findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation. The body of the report shall include the following:

- purpose and study questions of the evaluation;
- economic, political and social context of the project;
- team composition and study methods;
- evidence/findings of the evaluation; and
- conclusions and recommendations drawn from the findings.

The length of the main body of the report shall not exceed 50 pages (double or space and a half spaced), excluding appendices. Appendices will include at a minimum, a copy of the evaluation scope of work, a copy of the survey instrument used in conducting interviews with past Histadrut participants, and a list of documents consulted and individuals and agencies contacted in the course of the evaluation. The report will be paginated and contain a table contents. Five copies of the final report shall be provided to USAID/SA, five to AFR/SA and five to NED.



ARTICLE V - TECHNICAL DIRECTIONS

Technical directions during the performance of this delivery order will be provided by Ms. Cecily Mango, Project Officer, USAID/South Africa, pursuant to Section F. 3 of the IQC contract.

ARTICLE VI - TERM OF PERFORMANCE

- A. The effective date of this delivery order is July 9, 1991 and the estimated completion date is October 31, 1991.
- B. Subject to the ceiling price established in this delivery order and with prior written approval of the Project Manager (see block 5 of the Cover Page), Contractor is authorized to extend the estimated completion date, provided that such extension does not cause the elapsed time for completion of the work, including furnishing of all deliverables, to extend beyond 30 calendar days from the original estimated completion date. The contractor shall attach a copy of the Project Manager's approval for any extension of the term of this order to the final voucher submitted for payment.
- C. It is the contractor's responsibility to ensure that Project Manager-approved adjustments to the original estimated completion date do not result in costs incurred which exceed the ceiling price of this delivery order. Under no circumstances shall such adjustments authorize the Contractor to be paid any sum in excess of the delivery order.
- D. Adjustments which will cause the elapsed time for completion of the work to exceed the original estimated completion date by more than 30 days must be approved in advance by the Contracting Officer.

ANNEX 2

Interview Guide for Returned Participants

ANNEX 2

AFRICAN-ASIAN INSTITUTE/USAID QUESTIONNAIRE (A GUIDE)

INTRODUCTORY POINTS

- a) This is an evaluation after the 13th course. It is more than just an evaluation of the course itself but a look at the context, usefulness and efficiency of the course. It has been commissioned by USAID which is the ultimate donor of 12 of the 13 courses.
- b) The evaluation has been carried out by 2 independent evaluators - one who has experience of South African Community-Based and progressively minded organisations - the other from the United States who has an experience of development work in the world and also an experience of how the institutional connections between donor organisations operate.
- c) The answers provided by the participants are treated as confidential and insofar as they are mentioned in the report, there will be no attribution to a particular person.

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. Full Name : _____

2. Which Course - Number : _____ Date : _____

3. Can you remember what you liked most about the course? (at least one thing - more if you like) _____

4. Can you remember what you disliked most about the course? (at least one thing - more if you like) _____

5. Did the course change YOU in any way? (please explain) _____

6. Did the course change the way you operate in your organisation in any way? (please explain) _____

7. Was there anything that you learned in the course that you were able to introduce into your organisation at :

a. Work _____

b. Your community/political/trade union or personal life. _____

8. Please cast your mind back to the course itself. Was the course relevant or useful to you? _____

9. What would you have liked to see changed in the CONTENT of the course?

Removed : _____

Added : _____

Given less emphasis : _____

Given more emphasis : _____

10. How were you recruited? (please give as much detail as possible) _____

11. On what basis do you believe you were selected and what was the procedure? _____

12. During the recruitment and selection period were you aware of where you were going, who was running the training course, and who the donor agencies were? (please give specific answers to these questions) _____

13. Have you participated in either recruitment or selection of further participants in the programme since your return? In what way? (please give details) _____

14. Do you think that the recruitment/selection process brings together an "appropriate" group for the course? Please discuss what you would consider an appropriate group.

15. What suggestions do you have to improve the recruitment/selection process? _____

16. Did you have any reservations about the programme before you left? _____

Were these sorted out during the course? (please explain) _____

Do you have any reservations now? (if yes please give details) _____

17. Was the course what you expected or were led to believe it would be? (Please elaborate)

18. As far as you know did the majority of the group find the course appropriate to their needs? Could you try and remember some of the reservations as well as compliments that the group expressed. _____

19. Please could you describe and comment on the teaching methodology of the course. Would you like to suggest any changes in this area? _____

20. What is your opinion of the organisation of the course? Could you also comment on the accommodation, food etc. _____

21. Could you think about the time available for extramural activities. What would you have liked to have done? _____

How could your suggestions have been fitted in the time constraints of the course?
(Would you have left something out of the course, rearranged the course to allow more time in the evening or during the day, extended the time for the course, or whatever?)

22. Do you think the course should be in Israel or in South Africa? (please indicate the strengths and weaknesses of your answer) _____

65

23. How could the course ensure that what is learnt does in fact have a carry through to the organisations of the participants? _____

Do you think such a consideration is necessary? _____

24. Would your organisation be prepared to contribute to the costs of such a course - either directly from its own funds or by raising money from either its organisations constituency or from one of your organisations donors? _____

25. Do you think the course should continue? (please give the reasons for your answer) _

26 If you think the course should continue, please indicate under what conditions (you may add anything that you haven't described above in terms of recruitment, selection, publicity, course content, course methodology, course appropriateness, course focus, extramural activity, course organisation and facilities). _____

27 Please describe the ideal institutional and accountability connections that you would like to set up between the courses donors, the training institute in Israel and the participants in South Africa. _____

28 Do you have any general or further comments? _____

Thank you very much.

ANNEX 3

Program Cycles conducted by AAI Histadrut 1986 - 1991

ANNEX 3

Program Cycles conducted by AAi Histadrut 1986 - 1991

Cycle	Dates	Title of program	
1986			
I	3/30-4/24	Role of Peoples Organizations in Community and Nation Building	11F, 9M = 20
II	12/1-12/22	Community Building and National Development	3F, 18M = 21
1987			
III	3/23-4/13	Women in People's Organizations : Their Role in Community and Nation Building	31F = 31
IV	11/22-12/17	The Role of People's Organizations in Community and Nation Building	8F,13M = 21
1988			
V	4/11-5/7	Same	6F,11M = 17
VI	11/20-12/15	Same	12F,11M = 23
1989			
VII	4/30-5/25	Same	6F,11M = 17
VIII	9/1-9/27	Same	10F,9M = 19
IX	11/26-12/21	Same	7F,12M = 19

	1989		
X	4/24-5/21	Same	6F,14M = 20
XI	7/15-8/9	Same	9F,11M = 20
XII	11/25-12/20	Same	9F,11M = 20
	1991		
XIII	7/14-8/8	Same	6F,14M = 20

ANNEX 4

AAI-related Participant Projects

10

7

ANNEX 4

AAI-Program Related Participant Projects

The following projects were identified by the evaluators as having been implemented, improved or expanded as a direct result of the experience of the participant in Israel. (The participant is identified by initial).

1. JK
As a youth club manager has expanded the club activities both in size and range.
As a shop steward has negotiated a works committee into a trade union.
2. DN
Has organized women in a rural area into a brick building operation which is earning income.
3. DM
Has created an organization based on Christian values which undertakes house and community meetings to implement conciliation vs confrontation attitudes.
4. PK
Left a university post to establish a training organization for communities to encourage self-help projects.
5. LM
As a result of observing senior citizen programs in Israel has created a self-help group in Soweto.
6. CD
Has set the basis for a pre-school cooperative by doing the needs analysis, consultations and operative plan. The proposal is currently being considered by a funding group.

7. MF

Converted an ailing pre-school to a vibrant expanding one by using the leadership and participative techniques learnt at the program. This metamorphosis was mentioned corroboratively by a number of participants.

8. DJ

Used the leadership and negotiating skills to convert his ANC branch into supporting local cooperatives in his area.

9. FP

Has established a leadership course for mainly farm children. This runs three times a year.

10. ME

Reported back to his work situation and motivated a change from a workers committee to a trade union which is part COSATU

11. DM

As a member of the civic association in his area has created a resource center project within his community.

12. DJ

Has created a multi-purpose sports and community center in his area.

13. NN

Established supplementary Saturday classes for school drop-outs in 5 centers in Cape Town and Port Elizabeth.

14. GK

Cleared up, refurbished and expanded a creche with 37 children and 3 staff to 100 children and 8 staff.

15. VF

Has created a rural cooperative which raised sufficient capital to buy farm.

ANNEX 5A

AAI : Workshop Programme Outline

ANNEX 51

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT, COOPERATIVE AND LABOUR STUDIES
Afro-Asian Institute Histadrut Israel

The Twelfth Workshop on:

The Role of Peoples' Organisations in Community and Nation Building
25 November - 20 December, 1990

Workshop Programme - Outline

Please note: i) Each unit is equal to 1½ hours
 ii) The weekly schedule appears on the noticeboard
 iii) The programme is subject to change

A. Module one: Introduction

In the first days of the workshop, background information on Israel and the Institute will be presented to the participants. Similarly, they will be asked to introduce themselves and to outline the current situation in South Africa.

Lectures:

Israel: land and people
Israel in the Middle east
Israel today: economic and political aspects
South Africa today

Units

	1
	1
	2
	2
Total:	6

15

B. Module Two: Conceptual Background

This theme will introduce the basic concepts of the workshop programme. It will attempt to examine the characteristics and potentialities of peoples' organisations and labour movements for community and nation building both in general theoretical terms and in the specific context of South Africa today. The Israeli labour movement and its role in nation building will serve as a case study for this theme.

Units

Lectures

Peoples' organisations and their role in community and nation building	2
Approaches to community empowerment	3
Building self-reliant peoples' movements: The case study of the Israeli labour movement - Histadrut	1
Leadership and leadership development	2
Audio-visual presentation of the Histadrut	1

Study visits

Mishan old-age home	1
Kupat Holim clinic	1
Na'amat Womens' Movement	2
Community school	1

Discussion

Relating our experiences to South Africa today	1
--	---

Total: 15

C. Module Three: Community Empowerment through Cooperatives

This theme will look at the principles and practices of cooperatives and examine their potentiality for promoting community development through the greater satisfaction of human needs, both economic and social. The cooperative villages of Israel, namely the kibbutz and the moshav, will serve as case studies for this theme.

	<u>Units</u>
<u>Lectures</u>	
Cooperative principles and practices	2
Cooperative management	2
Factors contributing to the success of a cooperative	1
Financial structure of a cooperative	2
Cooperatives and the law	2
Introduction to the kibbutz and the moshav	1
<u>Visits</u>	
Kibbutz and moshav	4
<u>Discussions:</u>	
Relating our experiences to South Africa today	1
Total:	<u>15</u>

D. Module Four: Specialisation

(i) <u>Community Empowerment through Education</u>	<u>Units</u>
Lecture: Introduction	2
Visit: Shaar Hanegev Community College	4
Visit: Tel Aviv Labour Council and workers' committees	2
Lecture: Planning and management of community education	2
Total:	<u>10</u>

77

or/

<u>(ii) Trade Unions</u>	<u>Units</u>
Lecture: Trade union ideology	2
Lecture: Expanding our horizons	1
Lecture: Industrial relations	2
Lecture: Workers' education	1
Visit: National Labour Court	2
Visit: Tel Aviv Labour Council and workers' committees	2
Total	<u>10</u>

E. Module Five: From Theory to Practice

Theme Five will include an attempt to translate theoretical formulations relating to the role of peoples' organisations and trade unions in community and nation building into practical and operative suggestions for future activity. As part of this theme, practical project planning relevant to the South African situation will be undertaken.

	<u>Units</u>
<u>Lectures</u>	
Introduction to the project	1
Evaluating community projects	2
North-south; south-south self-reliance	1
<u>Workshops</u>	
Communication	3
<u>Project work and presentation</u>	6
Total:	<u>13</u>

F. Excursions

Tel Aviv	1 unit
Galilee	1 day
Jerusalem and Bethlehem	2 days
Dead Sea	1 day

G. Miscellaneous

Introduction to the Institute and workshop programmes, introduction of participants	2 units
Evaluation, summation and conclusions	1 unit
Meetings with Israeli counterparts	

..... and in addition, a wide variety of cultural and educational evening activities.

=====

ANNEX 5B

AAI : Detailed Program of Activities

ANNEX 5B

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR DEVELOPMENT, COOPERATIVE & LABOUR STUDIES
HISTADRUT TEL-AVIV ISRAEL

THE ROLE OF PEOPLES' ORGANISATIONS IN COMMUNITY AND NATION BUILDING

Twelfth Workshop

25 November - 20 December 1990

DETAILED PROGRAMME

OF
===

ACTIVITIES

THE ROLE OF PEOPLES' ORGANISATIONS IN COMMUNITY & NATION BUILDING
25 November - 20 December 1990

DETAILED PROGRAMME OF ACTIVITIES

SUNDAY 25 NOVEMBER 1990

Arrival,
registration,
interviews

MONDAY 26 NOVEMBER 1990

Module 1: Introduction

08.00 - 11.30

Introduction to the Institute
and the programme - M. LEVIN

13.00 - 14.30

Israel today: political aspects
- M. LEVIN

14.45 - 16.00

Israel: land and people
- Z. GALOR

TUESDAY 27 NOVEMBER 1990

08.00 - 09.30

South Africa today: historical
and political background (1)

09.30 - 10.00

Opening ceremony

10.00 - 11.30

Israel today: economic aspects
- M. CARMEL

13.00 - 14.30

South Africa today: community and
trade union action (2)

14.45 - 16.00

Israel in the Middle East
- S. ZELNIKER

19.30 - 21.00

Films about Israel

WEDNESDAY 28 NOVEMBER 1990

Module 2: Conceptual Background

08.00 - 11.30

The role of peoples' organisations
in community & nation building

- M. LEVIN

13.00 - 14.30

Case study: the Histadrut - B. EHRLICH

14.45 - 16.00

Audio-visual presentation of
the Histadrut

16.00 - 17.30

Tour of Tel Aviv

19.00 - 20.30

Video: The Arab-Israeli conflict

THURSDAY 29 NOVEMBER 1990

08.30 - 11.30

Study visit to Na'amat Working Womens'
Movement

14.30 - 17.30

Leadership and leadership development
(1) - A. SCHWARZBAUM

FRIDAY 30 NOVEMBER 1990

08.00 - 09.30

Approaches to community
empowerment: (1) -

A. GROSS

10.00 - 11.30

Approaches to community
empowerment: (2) -

A. GROSS

12.30 - 14.00

Approaches to community
empowerment: (3) -

A. GROSS

14.30 - 16.00

Sport

19.00 - 20.30

Film

SATURDAY 1 DECEMBER 1990
Evening

Excursion to the Galilee
Family visits

SUNDAY 2 DECEMBER 1990
Evening

Free
Family visits

MONDAY 3 DECEMBER 1990

Modul 3: Community Empowerment through
Cooperatives

08.00 - 09.30

Introduction - Y. PAZ

10.00 - 11.30

Cooperative principles and
practices (1) - Z. GALOR

13.00 - 11.30

Introduction to kibbutz and
moshav - Y. PAZ

14.45 - 16.00

Relating our experiences to
South Africa today - M. CARMEL

20.00 -

Israeli folklore evening

TUESDAY 4 DECEMBER 1990

08.00 - 09.30

Cooperatives in the world - Y. PAZ

10.00 - 11.30

Cooperative principles and
practices (2) - Z. GALOR

13.00 - 14.30

Introduction to the project - M. LEVIN

14.45 - 16.00

Factors contributing to the success
of a cooperative - A. HANADARI

16.15 - 17.30

Zionism: The National Liberation
Movement of the Jewish People

- S. ZELNIKER

WEDNESDAY 5 DECEMBER 1990

07.00 - 16.00

Study visit:
Moshav Lachish
and
Kibbutz Bror Chayil

16.15 - 17.30

The Israel Labour Party and
the Middle East conflict - I. GAT

20.00 -

Evening of Israeli songs

THURSDAY 6 DECEMBER 1990

08.00 - 11.30 Cooperative management - Z. GALOR
13.00 - 14.30 Cooperatives and the law (1) --
L. GOLDSTEIN
14.45 - 16.00 Cooperatives and the law (2) -
L. GOLDSTEIN
16.00 - 17.30 Study visit to Yisgav
Community School

FRIDAY 7 DECEMBER 1990

08.00 - 11.30 Financial structure of a
cooperative - Z. GALOR
12.30 - 14.00 Relating our experiences to
South Africa today - M. CARMEL
14.30 - 16.00 Sport
19.00 - 20.30 Film

SATURDAY 8 DECEMBER 1990

Full day Excursion to the Dead Sea
Evening Family visits

SUNDAY 9 DECEMBER 1990

08.00 - 16.00 Individual appointments with
counterparts
Evening Family visits

MONDAY 10 DECEMBER 1990

08.00 - 11.30 Visit to an Arab village

Module 4: Specialisation:-

Alternative A: Community Empowerment
through Education

Alternative B: Trade Unionism

13.00 - 15.45 Alternative A: Introduction - Y. PAZ
Alternative B: Trade union ideology - M. LEVIN
15.45 - 17.30 Ceremony to mark:
International Human Rights Day and

TUESDAY 11 DECEMBER 1990

Alternative A
Full day Study visit to Shaar Hanegv
Community College

Alternative B
08.00 - 11.30 Industrial relations
- M. CARMEL
12.00 - 16.00 Study visit to the National

Labour Court, Jerusalem
- M. CARMEL

All students
19.00 - 20.30

Prospects for Peace in the
Middle East - W.GAFNI/W.TZADEK

WEDNESDAY 12 DECEMBER 1990

All students
08.00 - 11.30

Study visit to Tel-Aviv
Labour Council and:
community activity
workers' committee

Alternative A:
Alternative B:

Alternative A
13.00 - 16.00

Planning and management of
community education
- A. GROSS

Alternative B
13.00 - 14.30

Expanding our horizons
- A. HANADARI

14.45 - 16.00
Evening

Workers' education - B. EHRLICH
Birthday party

THURSDAY 13 DECEMBER 1990

Full day
Evening

Excursion to Jerusalem
Films about Israel

FRIDAY 14 DECEMBER 1990

Module 5: From Theory to Practice

08.00 - 11.30

Evaluating community projects
- A. SCHWARZBAUM

12.30 - 14.00

Israel in the Middle East (cont.)
- S. ZELNIKER

14.30 - 16.00

Sport

19.00 - 20.30

Film

SATURDAY 15 DECEMBER 1990

Full day

Excursion to Jerusalem and
Bethlehem

SUNDAY 16 DECEMBER 1990

Counterparts meetings -
Individual appointments
during the day

MONDAY 17 DECEMBER 1990

08.00 - 09.30

The International Labour
Organisation and South Africa

- M. DIA

10.00 - 16.00

Communication workshop

- A. GROSS

TUESDAY 18 DECEMBER 1990

08.00 - 09.30

Project presentations (1)

10.00 - 11.30

North-south, south-south,
self-reliance - Y. PAZ

13.00 - 16.00

Project presentations (2,3)

16.15 - 17.30

Questions and answers about
Israel - Y. PAZ

WEDNESDAY 19 DECEMBER 1990

08.00 - 10.00

Meeting with the General Secretary
of the Histadrut, Israel Kessar, MK.

10.30 - 11.30

Project presentations (4)

13.00 - 14.30

Evaluation, summation.

Future cooperation with
the Institute

19.00 - 20.30

Closing ceremony

THURSDAY 20 DECEMBER 1990

Free

19.00

Departure for the airport

ANNEX 6

List of Key AAI Personnel

ANNEX 6

Key AAI Personnel

Dr Yehuda Paz

Director and Principal

B.Sc. (Econ); M.Sc. (Sociology); PhD. Hon (Social Philosophy). Studied at Columbia University; University of London; Jewish Teachers Institute. Long career in educational and cultural organizations. International consultant. Founding member (1951 to date) of Kibbutz and extensive service as kibbutz officer. Director, AAI since 1980.

Ben Ami Ehrlich

Deputy Director (Administration)

MA (Labor studies) Tel Aviv Univ. Deputy director AAI, since 1990. Member Exec Committee, Workers Council of Tel Aviv.

Michael Carmel

Tutor-Lecturer (English-French)

MA (Development Studies), Brunel Univ, London. On AAI staff since 1987. Staff economist, Consumer Protection Association.

Zvi Galor

Head of Division, French Language Studies

Senior Tutor-Lecturer

MA (African Studies), Hebrew Univ.; BA (Labor Studies), Tel Aviv Univ. Has worked for AAI for total of 12 years. Service in Togo, working with youth groups and educational cooperative and other production cooperatives.

Avraham Hanadari

Senior Tutor-Lecturer (English-French)

MA(Language and Asian Studies), Rutgers Univ. With AAI since 1985. Extensive career in teaching.

Mark Levin **Head of Division, English Language Studies**
Senior Tutor-Lecturer
MA (Development Studies and Economics) London School
of Economics. With AAI since 1982.

Raymonde Kan **Student Welfare**
Social and Cultural Activities

Haim Shulam **Chief Accountant**

Librarians

Leah Kornbluth **Chief Librarian**

Armand Cohen **Librarian**

Secretariat

Deborah Gelbard **English language secretary, programme schedule,**
Assistant Registrar

Yvette Gelobter **Registrar, in charge of programme schedule, French**
language secretary

Nira Garty **Hebrew language secretary, Assistant to the Director.**

ANNEX 7

List of Individuals and Agencies Contacted



ANNEX 7

List of Individuals and Agencies Contacted

1. Afro-Asian Institute of Histadrut (AAI)

(7 Nehardea Street POB 16201, TEL AVIV 64235, ISRAEL,

Tel: (03) 22195/6)

Paz, Yehuda Director of Institute and Co-ordinator of South African Program

Hanadari, Avraham Lecturer

Levin, Mark Course Co-ordinator

2. AAI/CFPO

Zelniker, Shimshon Co-director of South African Program, also member of Executive Board, AAI and member of Executive Board, CFPO

Plus 20 participants on program cycle XIII

3. Agency for International Development (AID/Washington)

(21st and C Streets, NW, Washington, DC20523)

Adler, Michael Assistant to Administrator AID, formerly on detail to USAID/South Africa

Bork, Timothy J., Formerly Director, USAID/Pretoria, now Director, AFR/PD

Brown, Keith Deputy Director, Office of Southern Africa Affairs

Connolly, Jock Formerly South Africa Desk Officer, AFR/DA, now Evaluation Programme Officer, AID/CL'E

Dean, Leslie A. Director, Office of Southern Africa Affairs (AFR/SA)

Frederick, Joseph Congressional Liaison Officer, AID/XRL/LEG

Mailloux, Laurie South Africa Desk Officer, AFR/SA

4. American Embassy South Africa

Swing, William Lacy Ambassador

5. American Embassy Israel

Brown, William Ambassador

6. Center for Foreign Policy Options, Los Angeles, (by telephone)
(11355 W, Olympic Boulevard, Suite 500, Los Angeles, CA90064)

Spiegel, Steven L. Chairman, Research Committee

7. General Accounting Office, Washington DC
(c/o Department of State, Washington, DC20520)

Fong, Jason Evaluator-in-Charge
National Security and International Affairs Div.
General Accounting Office

8. National Endowment for Democracy (NED) Washington DC
(4404 45th Street, NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20005, Tel: (202) 293-9072)

Bass, Tresa A. Grants Officer
Haig, Barbara Director of Program
Peterson, Dave Program Officer, Africa

9. South African Community Leaders

Alexander, Neville Dr	Secretary General, Workers Organization of South Africa (in private conversation)
Mehl, Mervin C. Prof.	Education Director, Independent Development Trust
Ncube, Bernard, Sr	Coordinator, Womens' Ministries, Institute for Contextual Theology
Thlagale, Buti Rev	Executive Director, Education Opportunities Council
Tutu, Desmond Rt Rev.	Archbishop of the Church of England in South Africa (in private conversation)
Zabala, Griffiths.	Independent Consultant, Ex-Director of Wilgespruit Fellowship Centre

10. USAID Mission to South Africa

(P O Box 1882 Pretoria, 0001, Tel: (012) 217212)

Barrett, Dennis	Director
Johnson, Mark	Program Officer
Mangera, Farooq	Mission Evaluation Officer
Mango, Cecily	Project Manager, AID-NED Grant
Webber, Janice	Assistant Director

ANNEX 8

List of returned participants and participants interviewed

ANNEX 8

List of Returned Participants and participants interviewed

Key to Codes Used in Annex 8

A. Column 1 - reflects student numbers in place of names for reasons of confidentiality. The full list of names and addresses is lodged with USAID/SA in Pretoria.

B. Column 2 - indicates those interviewed

SA = interviewed in South Africa
IS = interviewed in Israel
SI = interviewed in South Africa & Israel

C. Column 3 - gender breakdown.

D. Column 4 - age of the participant when attending the program in Israel. The information on this section is incomplete.

E. Column 5 - organizational affiliation of the participant. The following abbreviations apply:

AdE	=	Adult Educational organization
Comm	=	Community organization
Con	=	Consumer organization
Cho	=	Church organization
Coop	=	Cooperative
Co	=	Commercial organization
Cul	=	Cultural organization
Eo	=	Educational organization
Ho	=	Health organization
Hr	=	Human Rights organization
NGO	=	Service organization
Pol	=	Political organization
Ro	=	Research organization
So	=	Sports organization
To	=	Teachers organization
TU	=	Trade Union/Workers organization
Wel	=	Welfare organization
Wo	=	Womens' organization
Y	=	Youth organization

F. Column 6 - reflects geographical region.

Pn	=	North of Pretoria
P	=	Pretoria
WW	=	West Witwatersrand (Soweto)
WE	=	East Witwatersrand
J	=	Johannesburg
V	=	Vereeniging
WT	=	Transvaal other
OF	=	Orange Free State
ND	=	Natal Durban
NN	=	Natal other
EC	=	Eastern Cape
WC	=	Western Cape

AFRO ASIAN INSTITUTE
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED IN
ISRAEL (IS), SOUTH AFRICA (SA),
ISRAEL & SOUTH AFRICA (SI)

NUMBER	INTERVIEW	GENDER	AGE AT COURSE	NGO CLASSIFICATION	NGO REGION
1		F	30	ChO	ww
2		M	41	EO	wc
3		M	?	?	?
4		M	?	TO	wc
5	SA	F	41	HO	wc
6		M	?	?	?
7	SA	F	45	Comm	ww
8		F	37	Wel	pn
9		M	52	TU	j
10		F	?	Pol	wc
11		F	49	ChO	ww
12	SA	F	56	Coop	wc
13	SA	F	?	Comm	ww
14		F	?	TO	wc
15	SA	M	30	?	j
16		F	33	Wel	we
17		M	45	TO	ec
18		M	23	Youth	ww
19	SA	F	47	WO	ww
20		M	35	TU	ec
21	SA	M	52	Comm	wc
22		F	33	EO	wc
23		M	36	TU	ww
24		M	31	TO	wc
25	SA	F	41	Comm	ww
26	SA	M	36	Wel	wc
27		M	44	TO	wc
28		M	33	Coop	ww
29		M	36	Youth	ww
30		M	27	Comm	ww
31		M	46	Wel	nd
32		F	41	EO	ww
33		M	49	TO	wc
34		F	53	TO	wc
35	SA	M	23	Comm	wc
36		M	23	Youth	wc
37	SA	M	43	SO	ec
38		M	25	TU	wc
39	SA	F	39	WO	ww
40	SA	M	36	TO	wc
41	IS	M	38	TU	wc
42		F	23	Coop	j
43		M	36	?	ec
44		M	?	TO	wc
45		M	39	?	ww
46		M	41	ChO	ec
47		M	48	EO	wc
48		M	32	Comm	ww
49		M	20	HO	wc
50		M	29	Coop	ww
51	IS	M	31	Pol	ec
52		M	34	TU	wt
		F	?	Comm	ww

91

09/04/91

AFRO ASIAN INSTITUTE
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED IN
ISRAEL (IS), SOUTH AFRICA (SA),
ISRAEL & SOUTH AFRICA (SI)

NUMBER	INTERVIEW	GENDER	AGE AT COURSE	NGO CLASSIFICATION	NGO REGION
54	SA	M	38	TU	j
55		M	43	TU	we
56		M	?	Pol	wc
57		M	43	TO	wc
58	SA	f	28	TO	wc
59	SA	f	29	TO	wc
60	SA	M	?	TO	wc
61	SA	M	31	?	wc
62		f	25	HR	wc
63		M	37	TO	wc
64	SA	f	51	ChO	wc
65	SA	M	29	SO	wc
66	SA	f	41	Comm	ww
67		M	?	?	ww
68		M	61	TU	nd
69	IS	M	24	Pol	ww
70		f	48	WO	ww
71	SA	M	36	TU	j
72		f	68	WO	ww
73		M	40	Comm	?
74	IS	M	35	TO	wc
75		f	41	WO	ww
76	SA	M	42	TO	wc
77	IS	f	?	Comm	ww
78	SA	M	51	Wel	ww
79	SA	f	?	Comm	ww
88		M	?	TU	ww
81	SA	M	39	TU	?
82		f	27	ChO	?
83		M	40	TO	ww
84		M	?	Comm	ww
85		f	42	Wel	ww
86		f	39	EO	ec
87		f	22	Youth	wc
88		M	50	TO	ww
89		M	44	TU	we
90	IS	f	24	Pol	wc
91		M	21	Youth	ww
92		M	32	TU	ww
93		M	30	TU	j
94		f	32	Comm	ww
95		M	24	EO	ww
96		f	58	ChO	?
97		M	25	Youth	ww
98		f	39	TU	ww
99		f	40	TU	ww
100		f	37	Comm	ww
101		M	?	?	p
102		f	32	Comm	ww
103	SA	f	29	TU	j
104		f	39	Comm	p
105		f	48	Wel	ww
106		M	34	?	we

98

09/22/91

AFRO ASIAN INSTITUTE
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED IN
ISRAEL (IS), SOUTH AFRICA (SA),
ISRAEL & SOUTH AFRICA (SI)

NUMBER	INTERVIEW	GENDER	AGE AT COURSE	NGO CLASSI- FICATION	NGO REGION
107		H	29	AdE	ww
108		F	58	ChO	ww
109		H	?	ChO	ww
110		F	28	WO	we
111	SA	H	29	TU	ww
112		F	39	TO	pn
113		F	50	Comm	ww
114		H	?	Comm	p
115	SA	F	47	HO	wc
116		F	38	WO	ww
117		H	23	Youth	wc
118		H	41	TO	wc
119		F	?	TO	wc
120		H	51	TO	wc
121	IS	H	39	TU	ww
122		F	49	Comm	ww
123		F	52	TO	pn
124		F	43	ChO	ww
125	SA	H	61	TO	ww
126		H	28	Coop	j
127		H	31	HO	we
128		H	44	ChO	ww
129		H	42	TU	ww
130		F	35	Comm	ww
131	SA	F	52	HO	ww
132		F	45	?	ww
133	SA	F	?	Comm	we
134	IS	H	32	Pol	ww
135		F	?	Comm	ww
136	IS	H	40	Pol	ww
137	SA	H	32	Pol	wc
138		F	49	TU	ww
139		H	31	HO	ww
140		F	?	Comm	nd
141		F	52	Pol	ww
142		H	37	TU	p
143	SA	F	32	EdO	we
144		H	58	TU	ww
145		F	78?	HO	p
146		H	25	?	ww
147		F	53	HO	ww
148		F	60	Comm	ww
149		F	38	?	ww
150		F	31	Comm	pn
151		H	49	ChO	ww
152		F	48	Comm	?
153		H	31	?	?
154		H	?	TU	?
155		F	22	ChO	ww
156		F	24	Comm	j
157		F	44	HO	ww
158	SA	F	46	ChO	ww
159		H	54	TO	?

99

09/04/91

AFRO ASIAN INSTITUTE
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED IN
ISRAEL (IS), SOUTH AFRICA (SA),
ISRAEL & SOUTH AFRICA (SI)

NUMBER	INTERVIEW	GENDER	AGE AT COURSE	NGO CLASSI- FICATION	NGO REGION
160		f	32	Comm	?
161		m	42	Youth	wv
162		f	?	Comm	pn
163		f	31	Wel	of
164		m	?	Youth	wc
165		m	30	TU	wv
166		f	39	Wel	we
167	SA	f	59	Comm	wv
168	SA	f	32	Cul	wv
169		m	50	TO	nc
170	IS	m	24	?	wc
171		f	52	?	?
172		f	50	ChO	wv
173		f	60	?	wv
174		m	37	?	ec
175		f	?	Comm	nn
176	SI	f	43	Comm	we
177	SA	f	39	Comm	wv
178		m	34	Comm	j
179		f	47	Wel	wv
180	SI	f	56	WO	wv
181		f	51	Coop	wv
182		m	31	?	p
183	SI	m	28	EO	?
184		m	49	TU	nd
185	SI	m	34	Pol	wc
186	SA	f	35	HR	wc
187	SA	m	41	NGO	wc
188		f	46	?	?
189		f	43	ChO	?
190		f	52	HO	we
191		m	34	Comm	?
192	IS	m	30	Pol	ec
193		f	56	TO	wv
194		f	33	TU	wv
195	SA	m	?	TU	wv
196	IS	f	35	Pol	wv
197		f	54	?	wv
198		m	50	ChO	wv
199	SA	m	47	?	wv
200	SA	f	?	ChO	wv
201		f	37	ChO	wv
202		m	26	HO	wc
203		f	54	Comm	p
204	SA	m	?	Pol	wc
205		m	38	Comm	j
206		f	61	ChO	nn
207		m	27	TU	nd
208		m	48	TU	nd
209	SA	f	43	WO	j
210		f	42	WO	wv
211	SA	m	48	TO	wc
212		m	45	TO	wc

700

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED IN
ISRAEL (IS), SOUTH AFRICA (SA),
ISRAEL & SOUTH AFRICA (SI)

NUMBER	INTERVIEW	GENDER	AGE AT COURSE	NGO CLASSI- FICATION	NGO REGION
213		M	24	Pol	wc
214		M	28	?	p
215		M	46	TO	wc
216		M	37	TO	wc
217	IS	f	46	HO	wc
218		f	40	WO	ww
219	SA	f	36	Comm	ww
220		M	33	TU	pn
221		f	?	HO	ww
222		M	?	ChO	ww
223		f	60	?	?
224		M	48	EO	ww
225		f	?	Comm	?
226		M	33	Comm	we
227		M	36	TO	?
228		M	?	TO	wc
229		f	44	Comm	ww
230	SA	f	?	TU	j
231		M	?	Pol	nc
232		M	?	TO	ec
233		f	34	Comm	wc
234		M	28	Coop	we
235		M	?	Comm	pn
236		f	41	Comm	ww
237	IS	M	36	Pol	ww
238	IS	M	36	Pol	ww
239		f	34	Comm	?
240		f	58	TU	ww
241	IS	M	45	Pol	wc
242		f	31	HO	?
243		f	56	ChO	pn
244		M	62	?	ww
245		f	51	Wel	j
246		f	56	Youth	tv1
247		f	23	TU	ww
248		f	37	Comm	ww
249		f	52	Comm	pn
250		M	33	?	wc
251		M	40	ChO	we
252		M	60	TO	ec
253		f	?	EdO	ww
254		M	?	TU	pn
255		M	27	AdE	v
256		f	23	Comm	ww
257		M	42	?	ww
258		f	48	?	ww
259		f	27	ChO	?
260		M	70?	TU	?
261		M	35	TO	wc
262		M	35	?	wc
263		M	38	TO	ec
264		M	33	TU	wc
265	SA	M	29	Comm	wc

AFRO ASIAN INSTITUTE
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS INTERVIEWED IN
ISRAEL (IS), SOUTH AFRICA (SA),
ISRAEL & SOUTH AFRICA (SI)

NUMBER	INTERVIEW	GENDER	AGE AT COURSE	NGO CLASSI- FICATION	NGO REGION
266		H	33	TO	WC
267		H	28	TU	PW
268		H	30	?	WW

102