

FD-ABN-629  
92676

FINAL REPORT  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING  
FOR  
THE PEOPLE'S ASSEMBLY AND SHURA COUNCIL

Submitted to:  
USAID/Cairo  
106, Kasr El Aini Street  
Cairo, Egypt

by:  
Dr. Christine Zaher  
Director, English Studies Division  
Center for Adult and Continuing Education  
The American University in Cairo  
28, Falaki Street  
Cairo, Egypt

Contract Number: 263-0231-C-00-5043-00  
Project Title: English Language Training for the People's  
and Shura Assemblies  
Project Officer: Ms. Nagla Moustafa, HRDC/IDS  
Cairo Center Building, 8th Floor  
106, Kasr El Aini Street  
Cairo, Egypt  
Contractor: Center for Adult and Continuing Education  
The American University in Cairo  
28, Falaki Street  
Cairo, Egypt  
Report Date: 5th January, 1997

## CONTENTS

1. Project Objectives .....	1
2. Selection and Placement Testing .....	1
3. Class Formation .....	2
4. Materials Selection .....	3
5. Project Reporting Systems .....	3
6. Training Schedules .....	4
7. Final Training Statistics .....	6
8. Trainee Attendance .....	6
9. Group Profiles .....	8
10. Participant Evaluation .....	10
11. Needs Assessment and Language Testing .....	13
12. Instructor Evaluation .....	14
13. Recommendations .....	14
14. Conclusions .....	15

FINAL REPORT  
ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING  
FOR  
THE PEOPLE'S ASSEMBLY AND SHURA COUNCIL

1. Project Objectives:

- 1.1 To provide 120 hours of English language instruction over a period of approximately 12 months for up to 60 Senior Administrative and Senior Technical Staff of the People's Assembly and the Shura Council (PA/SA) in order for them to benefit more fully from the planned activities of USAID's Decision Support Services Project (DSSP). The Senior Administrative Staff were to receive conversational English training, while the Senior Technical Staff were to receive pre-TOEFL training (i.e., a focus on grammar, vocabulary, reading and listening), in addition to an ESP reading component related to their professional context. Training dates were initially determined to be 8th February 1995 - 7th February 1996, but were altered as follows:

Phase One: 1995	Group A	26th Apr - 25th May
	Group B	24th May - 31st July
	Groups C-G	2nd July - 30th July

Phase Two: 1995	Group A	16th Oct - 15th Nov
	Group B	11th Sept - 30th Nov
	Groups C-G	10th Sept - 2nd Nov

Phase Three: 1996	Group A	Not re-activated
	Group B	Not re-activated
	Groups C-G	20th July - 30th July 1st Sept - 20th Oct

- 1.2 To conduct a needs assessment of PA/SA staff first by surveying the language project trainees to determine the number of additional personnel who will require future English language training in connection with the performance of their work within the context of the DSSP; second, by administering an English language proficiency test to approximately 100 PA/SA staffers who have not previously received language training.

2. Selection and Placement Testing:

- 2.1 The Educational Assessment Unit (EAU) was requested by USAID not to administer proficiency tests to the 7 Senior Administrative Staff.

2.2 A written language placement test was administered to 42 Senior Technical Staff selected by USAID in liaison with the PA/SA coordinator. The staff were subsequently placed in 5 groups, C through G, each group reflecting a different English language proficiency level as follows:

- C: Intermediate (60-62%);  
One Upper Intermediate trainee (80%)
- D: Lower Intermediate (44-56%)
- E: Elementary (28-41%)
- F: Basic A (21-27%)
- G: Basic B (5-14%)

### 3. Class Formation:

3.1 At USAID's request, the seven Senior Administrative Staff were placed in two groups, designated A and B, according to seniority. While the contract stipulates a minimum of 8 students per class, USAID requested that, in recognition of the special status of these participants, classes be formed as follows:

- A: 2 trainees
- B: 5 trainees

3.2 The Senior Technical Staff were initially placed in 5 groups, C through G, as detailed above, 2.2. With USAID approval, one member from Group B also attended Group E, making a total of 43 participants in Groups C through G, as follows:

- C: 6 trainees
- D: 8 trainees
- E: 9 trainees
- F: 11 trainees
- G: 9 trainees

3.3 Following the 8-month hiatus in the contract, (see below section 6), the groups were re-formed by the PA/SA coordinator for Phase Three of the training:

- A: not re-activated
- B: not re-activated
- C: 6 trainees
- D: 6 trainees
- E: 7 trainees
- F1: 6 trainees
- F2: 5 trainees
- G: 7 trainees

### 4. Materials Selection:

4.1 Final selection of materials was made after the instructors had met the trainees, informally assessed

their oral/aural proficiency and requested their input on their specific English language needs. Input from participants is a standard requirement of the English Studies Division (ESD) as it enhances motivation levels and ensures a more effective assignment of learning materials when used in conjunction with data from formal placement testing.

4.2 Text books, approved by USAID, were assigned to the groups as follows:

A: Getting Together: An ESL Conversation Book  
Dialogs for Everyday Use

B: Language in Use  
More True Stories: A Beginning Reader  
Trainees in this group requested reading material and a language book as a basis for their conversation practice since they acknowledged their language proficiency to be inadequate to engage in conversational practice as stipulated.

C: Reading on Purpose  
Grammar Dimensions Book Two

D: Finishing Touches  
Grammar Dimensions Book One

E: Essential Grammar in Use  
Reading Power

F: Intro to Interchange

G: Crossroads Book One  
Crossroads Book Two

4.3 Supplementary material in the form of handouts was used extensively during the contract. A copy of each handout was submitted to the USAID project officer and to the PA/SA coordinator. The handouts were essentially of three types: (1) reference sheets recording work achieved in class, (2) worksheets requiring trainees to solve language problems, for example, (3) reading passages related to both trainees' personal interests and, more importantly, to the context of their professional work.

## 5. Project Reporting Systems:

5.1 At the start of instruction for each group, the USAID project officer and the PA/SA coordinator were sent details of the class schedule (days and times), participant names, the instructor's name, and the approved text books issued to participants.

5.2 The USAID project officer and the PA/SA coordinator regularly received a Supervision Rota from the ESD, listing the names of the project supervisors, dates of supervisory duty and the relevant contact numbers.

5.3 A copy of the attendance records for each group of trainees was sent to the USAID project officer and to

the PA/SA coordinator mid-month and end of month whenever the contract was active.

- 5.4 At the end of each training month, the USAID project officer and the PA/SA coordinator received synopses of language instruction delivered during each 2-hour session with each group, and copies of all instructional materials, other than the approved text books. Copies of all the lesson synopses for each group are attached to this report in addition to a sample of the instructional materials.
- 5.5 In October 1995, the USAID project officer received copies of the Semi-Annual Progress Report.
- 5.6 In November 1995 (mid-contract, end of Phase Two) and November 1996 (contract termination, end of Phase Three) the USAID project officer received copies of the individual trainee progress reports prepared by the project instructors.
- 5.7 Less formally, the project manager had ad hoc meetings and telephone discussions with the USAID project officer and the PA/SA coordinator throughout the contract.

## 6. Training Schedules:

- 6.1 Groups A and B started in advance of the other groups as they did not require proficiency testing for placement purposes. However, even these two groups did not start in February 1995. Their first class sessions were held end of April/beginning of May 1995. An earlier date was not feasible for the PA/SA due to the occurrence of the Holy Month of Ramadan, which began in February and ended in March 1995, and which was followed by a spate of official governmental visits necessitating the presence of many of the trainees assigned to the two groups.
- 6.2 Due to difficulties encountered by the PA/SA coordinator in assembling the Senior Technical Staff for test administration, the start-up date for classes for Groups C through G was delayed until the beginning of July 1995.
- 6.3 Phase One of the contract ran until 31st July 1995. Group A, due to trainee work commitments, received training until the end of May only. The PA/SA coordinator informed the ESD that the two Secretary Generals would continue classes after the summer vacation, i.e., in September 1995. Groups B through G did work through until the end of July 1995. However, Groups C-G had only started classes in July, therefore Phase One of the training lasted only 4 weeks.

- 6.4 The project was not active during the entire month of August 1995 because of the regular PA/SA summer vacation period.
- 6.5 Phase Two of the training was scheduled for the beginning of September, but did not in fact commence until mid-September. The PA/SA coordinator informed the ESD that this was due to the pressure of work following the summer recess. Group A did not re-start until mid-October, again due to trainee work commitments.
- 6.6 The training schedule during Phase Two was constantly interrupted. USAID informed the ESD that "the cancellation of classes [was] due to the staff involvement in the preparation for the new parliamentary session". Advance notice of cancellation was rarely given.
- 6.7 Phase Two was due to continue until February 1996, the original termination date for the contract. However, the ESD was requested by USAID to cease training Groups C through G during the first week of November 1995, and Groups A and B during the last week of November 1995 due to the Egyptian government elections for both the PA and SA, scheduled in early December 1995. The ESD complied with this request.
- 6.8 Following an official request from the PA/SA to USAID to temporarily withhold the delivery of the training, Phase Three of the training was then scheduled to run from the 1st June 1996 through mid-October 1996, with a break in August for the PA/SA summer recess. The reason given by the PA/SA for this mid-contract hiatus of 6 months was "the heavy involvement of the PA/SA senior staffers in the preparation and follow-up on the deliberations of the new parliamentary session 1996-2001 ... this intensive preparation in addition to the need for meeting the demands of new and reelected [sic] members will engage the senior staff for the upcoming months". The ESD was then requested by USAID to provide a no additional cost extension to the contract which, upon agreement, was subsequently amended to provide an estimated completion date of 7th November 1996, rather than 7th February 1996.
- 6.9 In June 1996, the ESD was informed that Groups A and B would not be re-activated for Phase Three due to pressure of work. Phase Three training for Groups C-G started up during the last week of July, not June, this being the earliest date by which trainees were notified to attend classes by the PA/SA training managers. Each group therefore had only three class sessions before the August summer recess began - a four-week hiatus. Classes were resumed at the start of September 1996. No further contract extension

being awarded, classes finished mid-October 1996 as requested by USAID.

7. Final Training Statistics:

Group A: 2 participants  
18 x 2-hour sessions: 36 hours  
Date of first session: 26 April, 1995  
Date of last session: 20 November, 1995

Group B: 5 participants  
41 x 2-hour sessions: 82 hours  
Date of first session: 24 May, 1995  
Date of last session: 30 November, 1995

Group C: 6 participants  
36 x 2-hour sessions: 72 hours  
Date of first session: 2 July, 1995  
Date of last session: 14 October, 1996

Group D: 8 participants; 6 participants Phase Three  
38 x 2-hour sessions: 76 hours  
Date of first session: 2 July, 1995  
Date of last session: 20 October, 1996

Group E: 9 participants; 7 participants Phase Three  
40 x 2-hour sessions: 80 hours  
Date of first session: 2 July, 1995  
Date of last session: 12 October, 1996

Group F: 11 participants; F1 and F2 for Phase Three  
40 x 2-hour sessions: 80 hours  
Date of first session: 3 July, 1995  
Date of last session: 14/16 October 1995

Group G: 9 participants; 7 participants Phase Three  
40 x 2-hour sessions: 80 hours  
Date of first session: 3 July, 1995  
Date of last session: 12 October, 1996

8. Trainee Attendance:

8.1 Participant attendance is a stated criterion for assessing the work of the project team. From the class schedule records for each group sent to the USAID project officer and the PA/SA coordinator, it is clear that attendance held to acceptable levels during Phase One and Two of the training. The absenteeism that did occur during these two phases was mainly due to a specific participant's work obligations, and/or to conflicting training schedules, e.g., Congress Research Center (CRC) workshops and a course in written Arabic for parliamentary legislation. Both these factors were out of ESD control. To minimize cancellation of

classes, the ESD provided a high degree of flexibility, and course meeting times were changed promptly upon PA/SA request even when this needed to be done on a session by session basis, which was the case with certain groups. For this reason, absenteeism was considerably lower than it would otherwise have been during these first two phases.

8.2 Clearly attendance was a serious problem during Phase Three of the training. This occurred for various reasons:

- Not all SA trainees were informed of the 1996 start up date or the training schedule. (cf. PA trainees, who had a more effective communication system and therefore less absenteeism).

- In September 1996, language training conflicted with other training, e.g., training for political decision making, which was naturally perceived by some trainees to be the more important commitment. The PA training manager apologized to the instructor on six separate occasions during September, for removing the trainees from a language class session so that they could attend other training.

- Many individual trainees were prevented from starting or finishing Phase Three training because they were assigned conflicting work schedules, e.g., the trainee who was constantly summoned to the Arab League to translate for the Egyptian delegation, or the trainee assigned to accompany the Speaker on national and foreign trips.

- Five trainees were close to retirement and did not perceive the value of pursuing English language training. They informed the instructor that this was why they would not be continuing their training.

- Trainees reported that the timing of Phase Three was ill-advised. To many trainees, starting sessions after an 8-month hiatus just one week before the long summer recess seemed pointless, which is why they did not attend the July sessions. The early September start up was similarly affected due to the amount of work many of the trainees faced upon returning to their offices after the summer recess.

- Perhaps the single most important factor affecting attendance, however, was the constant stop-go-stop pattern of the training since the 1995 start. In informal talks, trainees stated that they found this highly demotivating, and that they felt progress was sometimes hardly discernible (Three in Group D declined to attend Phase Three of the training for this reason). Trainers can testify to the fact that many sessions had to consist of review of previous work for this very reason, especially for the lower

proficiency groups after the 8-month break. On hearing that the training would be stopped yet again mid-October 1996, some trainees simply stopped attending as they did not see the point in continuing their training, especially as there was no provision for follow-up, an essential element for any language learning, which is a "use it or lose it" skill.

## 9. Group Profiles:

- 9.1 Group A: The instructional content of class sessions was geared to the specific needs of the two senior participants in this group, and focused upon spoken communication in both social and professional contexts. As the syllabus topics were generated by the participants themselves, the level of interest and response during teaching sessions was particularly satisfactory. Despite high levels of motivation, this group met irregularly due to the work commitments of the two senior participants, and ceased to meet altogether after November 1995.
- 9.2 Group B: Two of the five participants rarely attended due to work commitments. The remaining three participants were at the advanced, intermediate and elementary levels of language proficiency respectively. This mixed ability grouping did not facilitate the training. The attendance record of these three participants, however, was excellent, attesting to the instructor's ability to meet their extremely diverse needs. As with Group A, language tasks for this group focused on oral communication strategies in professional and social contexts suggested by the participants themselves. This group was not re-activated by USAID in 1996 for Phase Three of the training. One member had retired and then died; one moved to Group E; two had hardly ever attended due to conflicting work schedules; this left only one trainee.
- 9.3 Group C: With the exception of one upper intermediate level participant, this group was at the intermediate proficiency level. In compliance with the contract, participants studied language skills related to the TOEFL and ESP reading skills. However, the group early requested an increased oral communication component as the TOEFL does not have a conversation section. The instructor complied with this request as it was seen to directly benefit the DSSP. The participants informed the instructor of topics they wished to discuss and/or read, detailed in the lesson materials submitted to USAID at the end of each training month. The group was particularly interested in acquiring content knowledge through the English language training sessions. They specifically requested information, in English, about other governments and parliamentary systems. They

frequently engaged in serious conversations about current problems and crises facing Egypt. Generally, it was a well motivated group.

- 9.4 Group D: Trainees in this group were all at the lower intermediate level of language proficiency. The lessons focused on the TOEFL components of listening, reading, vocabulary and grammar with one hour per week devoted to ESP reading as per contractual requirements. This was increased to two hours per week during Phase Three, at the trainees' request. Some ESP reading topics were initially suggested by the instructor, but the majority were chosen by the group. This group also requested an enhanced oral discussion component. A list of subjects to be discussed was therefore compiled by the group at the start of the course, and was adhered to by the instructor to further promote high levels of motivation. Members of this group, unlike those of Group C, were more interested in legal matters, and spent much time practising spoken English by discussing current controversial court cases.
- 9.5 Group E: Participants in this group were all at the elementary level of language proficiency. The TOEFL components were addressed but not the ESP reading component as this level of proficiency precludes the reading of authentic ESP texts. ESP reading was therefore replaced by the reading of simpler texts; a "reading box" of short passages proved particularly successful with this group. By the end of Phase Three, the participants had started to discuss current events and to report news items in simple English. They had extremely high levels of motivation throughout the training, and a real enthusiasm for learning. Their attendance record was exemplary, and they found time to do impressive quantities of out of class work. They wanted the training to continue.
- 9.6 Group F: These participants were all at the basic level of language proficiency. They had extreme difficulty writing English, but as the TOEFL does not require written prose, the instructor focused more on listening, reading, vocabulary and grammar. This group, like the other groups, also requested an enhanced oral component geared to simplified social and professional communication. The instructor complied with this request. Their attendance was stable during Phases One and Two of the training, which is crucial at this level of proficiency. When a member of the group missed a session, s/he invariably caught up from a colleague, indicative of high levels of motivation and commitment. For Phase Three, however, attendance became a problem. Many SA trainees (all of Group F1 and all bar one of Group F2) had not been adequately informed of the training,

which is why the majority did not show up until late September 1996. Those who did come to class had heard about the training from PA colleagues.

- 9.7 Group G: This group had almost no English language proficiency at all. Some Arabic was therefore necessary at the initial stages of instruction. By the end of Phase Three, however, basic classroom discourse had been mastered and Arabic was rarely used. The instructor achieved a high level of motivation in students who were essentially demotivated at the start of the course due to their perception of their level vis-a-vis that of their colleagues. They now comment on their progress, which is clear to them as well as to their instructor. Lessons focused on learning simple but useful dialogues, and role-playing social and professional situations using basic level (survival) discourse patterns. Letter formation tasks were a regular feature of class sessions, as were simple dictation exercises to enhance both handwriting and listening. Reading, though greatly improved, remains at the rudimentary level. Attendance during Phases One and Two was satisfactory, but poor during Phase Three. SA trainees had not been fully informed of the training arrangements and some trainees were demotivated by the fact that training was going to end yet again in mid-October 1996.

#### 10. Participant Evaluation:

- 10.1 Mid-contract evaluation of trainee progress was conducted during November 1995, i.e., at the end of Phases One and Two of the training. Instructors completed the "Instructor Evaluation of Participant" form, approved by USAID, a copy of which is attached to this report. The completed forms were sent to the USAID project officer.
- 10.2 The final evaluation of trainee progress was conducted at the end of Phase Three of the training, October 1996. The same instrument was used by the instructor, with USAID's approval, and completed forms were again sent to the USAID project officer.
- 10.3 A summary of the mid course (10.1) and final (10.2) instructor evaluations now follows. This can only give a general idea of group progress. The long and frequent breaks in instruction, the difference in class sizes between Phases One/Two (mid course) and Phase Three (final), and the special status of the trainees themselves clearly invalidates the data statistically.

The smaller sized classes during Phase Three, especially for Groups F and G, definitely promoted

better levels of trainee participation (Items 2, 3 and 6).

With the exception of Group C, trainees gained confidence in using lexis which was government-/politics-specific (Item 4). Group C's lower final average is due to the fact that two articulate trainees who scored 6.00 on the first evaluation were not present for Phase Three training.

Grammatical gains were minimal for all groups (Item 5). The sustained practice needed for structural mastery could not be achieved during this contract for reasons noted in this report.

Many trainees experienced difficulty completing homework assignments (Item 7). This was mostly due to pressure of work, hence the relatively lower scores. (Group A were not assigned work out of class hours, as per the DSSP coordinator's request).

Progress in reading was satisfactory, particularly for the two lowest level groups, both of which worked hard in this skill area. Spoken fluency, to which all trainees gave high priority, did not progress as well as expected due to the constant interruptions in the training. Oral competency, more than the other language skills, requires regular practice.

Item 1: Participant's attendance at class sessions:

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	15.50	15.50	15.33	14.40	15.63	13.50	13.83
Final	---	---	15.67	16.00	15.71	13.50	14.20

Item 2: Participation in assigned classroom tasks:

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	16.00	15.50	15.83	15.40	15.75	12.90	13.67
Final	---	---	16.00	16.00	15.86	15.00	15.60

Item 3: Asking and answering questions:

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	16.00	15.50	15.67	15.60	15.25	13.20	13.33
Final	---	---	16.00	16.00	15.57	15.00	15.20

Item 4: Using new vocabulary/ESP terminology appropriate to trainee's level.

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	16.00	16.00	15.17	15.00	14.63	12.70	12.67
Final	---	---	15.00	16.00	15.29	14.25	14.40

Item 5: Using structures appropriate to trainee's level.

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	15.00	14.50	14.33	15.00	14.88	12.70	13.00
Final	---	---	15.00	15.00	15.29	14.00	14.00

Item 6: Making full use of class time:

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	16.00	15.50	16.00	15.80	15.50	13.11	13.33
Final	---	---	16.00	16.00	16.00	14.50	15.00

Item 7: Completing all out of class assignments:

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	---	14.50	15.83	15.40	15.75	13.30	13.17
Final	---	---	16.00	15.67	15.57	14.50	14.80

Item 8: Progress in reading comprehension:

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	16.00	15.50	14.83	15.20	14.50	12.80	13.17
Final	---	---	15.00	15.33	15.29	14.25	14.60

Item 9: Progress in spoken fluency:

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	16.00	16.00	15.17	14.80	14.75	12.50	12.67
Final	---	---	15.00	15.33	15.00	13.75	14.40

Item 10: Overall achievement:

Group	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Mid Course	6.00	6.00	15.30	15.00	14.88	13.10	13.33
Final	---	---	16.00	16.00	15.86	14.50	15.20

10.4 Achievement testing was not requested for Groups A and B, the Senior Administrative Staff. After the 8-month hiatus in training, it also ceased to be a viable option for the other groups, since, as stated above, instructors had to spend much time during Phase Three, reviewing and re-teaching what had been taught the previous year during Phases One and Two. Moreover, within each phase of the training, there were periods, sometimes of more than a month, when the ESD was requested to suspend training. This again contributed to the occasional "two steps forward, three back" perception of trainee progress. On a non-quantifiable level, trainees who were able to attend more or less regularly did improve in two major areas: the acquisition of new ESP content vocabulary related to their jobs and work environment, and their reading skills. This is indirectly attested to by the content of the instructional materials submitted to USAID each training month, and the synopses of each session.

11. Needs Assessment and Language Testing:

- 11.1 The needs assessment instrument was designed by the EAU and approved by USAID. It was translated into Arabic and copies made for distribution. A copy of the English and Arabic versions of the instrument are attached to this report. It had been agreed that all the English language project trainees should complete the questionnaire except those in the two lowest groups F and G, whose language proficiency was deemed inadequate to assess the language needs of others.
- 11.2 100 PA/SA staffers were to be identified from the needs assessment as potential language trainees. They would take the EAU's proficiency test (the same test administered to the project trainees at the start of the contract) to determine their levels of proficiency, and in order for an estimation to be made of the number of hours training required for them to attain the 300 TOEFL score.
- 11.3 At the end of Phase Three of the training, the EAU was requested by the PA/SA coordinator to liaise directly with the PA training manager to organize the distribution of the survey questionnaire. She was on vacation and, when reached, agreed to take delivery

10 November and to distribute the instrument to the trainees. This meant that the 7th November deadline for terminating project work could not be met. The EAU undertook to administer the needs assessment and conduct the proficiency testing after the 7th November and to complete the final report by 5th January, 1997, as stipulated. However, the necessary extension was not approved, and this section of the contract was not completed.

## 12. Instructor Evaluation:

- 12.1 The USAID project officer and the PA/SA coordinator approved the use of the ESD's standard instrument for evaluating the performance of its contract instructors. A copy of the instrument is appended to this report.
- 12.2 The instrument was to be administered at the end of Phase Three of the training by the EAU, but at a meeting held 23rd October 1996, the project manager was informed that USAID would not require trainee evaluation of instructional performance.

## 13. Recommendations:

Should English language training for PA/SA members be re-activated, the following recommendations should be taken into consideration:

- 13.1 A training schedule needs to be worked out in advance by all parties, taking into account elections, summer recess, Ramadan, the opening of parliament, and other known dates. The schedule should be published so that trainees know in advance when the training is and is not operative. This will be much less demotivating than ad hoc cancellations and suspensions.
- 13.2 Trainees should be given official release time to attend language training. This should be written down in schedule form and agreed upon by their supervisors. This release time should be granted during normal working hours so that trainees can take the transport to/from work provided by the PA/SA.
- 13.3 The location of the training should be removed from the trainees' workplace. This will pre-empt class disruptions caused by telephone calls, sudden meetings, summons for assistance etc.
- 13.4 Attendance problems were predicted by the ESD for training in this environment, which is why the ESD's original proposal had "catch-up" sessions built in each week. These were not approved, but we strongly urge their inclusion in any subsequent project.

- 13.5 A full-time training manager position is needed for the SA similar to the one at the PA. Currently, this is only a small part of one person's work.
- 13.6 Training managers need to coordinate training sessions to ensure that no time conflicts occur between different training projects. This should ideally be the responsibility of one person in the PA and one in the SA, who liaise with each other on a regular basis.
- 13.7 There should be an age limit of 45-50 years for trainees. After 55, there is little or no hope of promotion or advancement in the PA or SA, and therefore little or no motivation to acquire new skills.
- 13.8 The needs assessment instrument should be used, and the language testing carried out. Instructors report that there is a willingness among technical staffers to learn English and a clear understanding of the doors that increased English language proficiency will open. However, the obstacles that many trainees faced in their attempts to get to class on time, and the on again-off again nature of the training schedule created problems for them. If the above recommendations are acted upon many of these obstacles will be removed.
- 13.9 The trainees do not appear to want TOEFL preparation training per se. In all the groups, over the past year and a half, it has been clear that trainees want to learn English through their work context - a request addressed by their instructors. The trainees want discussions, readings, listening passages, language functions and vocabulary which will directly assist them in their work. We therefore make a final recommendation that any subsequent training should meet these requirements, allowing instructors to prepare interesting, topical lessons rather than training the participants to take the TOEFL or Pre-TOEFL.

#### 14. Conclusions:

The ESD acknowledges with gratitude USAID's commendation of "its flexibility and understanding to try to accommodate this complex task, and to try to deliver its services as stipulated in the contract." It also appreciates the PA/SA DSSP coordinator's accolade that "Every senior staffer that I met or talked to expressed genuine interest in attending these classes and emphasized the benefits that he or she obtained ... The performance of the AUC teachers was outstanding and left an excellent impression among student staffers".

The ESD is already on record as being willing to continue language training for PA/SA staffers, especially given the role that the English language plays in information dissemination, multinational personal and professional communications and relations, and subsequent decision making. If key recommendations detailed in section 13 can be met, there is no reason why future training projects should not be completed in a timely manner.