

PD-ABP-135

**PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROJECT
FOR EUROPE (PTPE)
MONITORING AND EVALUATION CONTRACT**

FINAL REPORT

April, 1995

Submitted to:

Europe and Newly Independent States Bureau
Office of Development Resources
Education and Human Resources Division
U.S. Agency for International Development

Submitted by:

Aguirre International
1735 North Lynn Street
Suite 1000
Rosslyn, Virginia 22209-2019

and

John Gillies
Development Specialists International

This report was prepared under Contract Number EUR-0045-C-00-3027-00 for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Participant Training Project for Europe (Project Numbers 180-0002 and 180-0045) between the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and Aguirre International.

A

PTPE Monitoring and Evaluation Contract

Final Report

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	i
Chapter 1 – Project Description	
Introduction	1
Purpose	1
Scope	2
Responsibilities	2
USAID	2
Cooperative Agreements	3
Inter-Agency Agreements	5
Chapter 2 – Project Status	
Overall Project Status	7
Participation by Country	7
Training Status	8
Gender	8
Type of Training	8
Major Fields of Study	8
Training Institutions	9
Training Status by Country	10
Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic	10
Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania	11
Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Yugoslavia	12
Chapter 3 – Evaluation Findings	
Program Assessment	13
Limitations of the Evaluation Findings to Date	14
Responses to PTPE Evaluation Questions	15
Evaluation Questions	
1. Achievement of Program Outputs	17
2. The Implementation Process	20
3. Unanticipated Factors Affecting Quality, Costs, and Impact	25

4. Comparative Quality/Cost Values.	27
5. Levels of Impact on Fields of Training.	38
6. Usefulness of Skills to Changing Conditions	44
7. The Quantifiable Impact of Training	46
8. Changes Attributed to Training	51
9. The Multiplier Effect	52
10. The Impact of Training Plans/Country Strategies/ Needs Assessments on Effectiveness of Training	53

Chapter 4 – Assessment of Individual Program Components

Department of State (Inter-Agency Agreement)	57
Georgetown University–East Central European Scholarship Program (ECESP)	60
Institute for International Education (IIE)	65
Partners for International Education and Training (PIET)	69
Salzburg Seminar	73
United States Information Agency (USIA)	76
Cooperative Agreements—General	81
Cooperative Agreements—Individual	83
The Cooperative Housing Foundation (CHF)	83
The Council of International Programs (CIP)	86
Goodwill Industries of America	89
Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration	91
Home Builders Institute (HBI)	94
Johns Hopkins University	96
The Soros Foundation’s Management Training Program	99
SUNY–Farmingdale	102
Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (TJUH)	104
United States Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI)	107
William Davidson Institute	109

Chapter 5 – Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions	111
Recommendations	120

Appendices

A – Organizational Profiles of 1995–96 Cooperative Agreements	123
B – Country Profiles	135
C – Actual Training Costs	163
D – PTPE Success Stories	165

C

EXECUTIVE

SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

The Participant Training Project for Europe (PTPE) was initiated by USAID in 1991 to provide a flexible means to support academic education, short-term technical training, and internships in the U.S. or U.S. institutions abroad for participants from the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries. The project trains leaders who will participate in the economic and political transformation of the region. All training addresses the priority objectives of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act legislation: economic restructuring, democratic institutions, and quality of life. The training is also designed to meet specific needs in individual CEE countries as outlined in the Country Strategies.

This Monitoring and Evaluation Contract covers training conducted under Projects 180-0002 and 180-0045, which includes Inter-Agency Agreements (IAAs) with the Department of State and USIA, the 19 Cooperative Agreements awarded under an institutional competition, Georgetown University's legislative earmark [the East Central Europe Scholarship Program (ECESP)], and the contract with the Partners for International Education and Training (PIET).

The Executive Summary will address the main conclusions and recommendations of the report. Five chapters address the topics of Project Description, Project Status, Evaluation Findings, Assessment of Individual Program Components, and Conclusions and Recommendations. Profiles of the new Cooperative Agreements and Mission Profiles may be found in Appendices A and B, and Appendix D contains several Success Stories from the PTPE Project.

PROJECT STATUS

As of December 31, 1994, the PTPE project had a total of 1,587 participants, of which 1,259 had completed training, and 328 were currently in training. A total of 61.3 percent of the participants have been male and 38.7 percent have been female. The participants were from all 14 countries of the region. As shown in Table 1, the largest programs were in Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, the Slovak Republic, and Romania.

The large majority of PTPE participants (72%) are enrolled in technical training (non-degree) programs and the remaining 28 percent are enrolled in academic programs. The USIA program accounts for the majority of the academic participants, followed by Georgetown and Institute of International Education (IIE).

The PTPE participants are enrolled in 36 general fields of study, the largest of which are Business and Agriculture, with 588 and 23 participants respectively. The next three largest fields of study are Economics, Public Administration, and Political Science.

Table 1

PTPE TRAINEES BY COUNTRY AND CONTRACTOR
(Trainees who have completed or are in training as of December 31, 1994.)

Country	Contractors, Cooperative Agreements, Inter-Agency Agreements																		TOTAL
	CIT	CHF	CIP	DOS	ECESP	Good-will	Harvard	IIE	HBI	Hopkins	PIET	Salz-burg	Soros	TJUH	WDI	USIA	USTTI	City U.	
Albania			2	10							25			1		11	1		50
Bosnia												1				7			8
Bulgaria		6	1	10				2		1	94	4	7	3		82			210
Croatia											17	1				16			34
Czech Rep.			3		36	2	1	8		5	39	4			6	47			151
Estonia		2	3								20	5	4	2		18			54
Hungary		9	8		48	2	3	4		1	67	5		1	2	54			204
Latvia											30			1		13	3		47
Lithuania	10	3	6								25	1		2		16			63
Macedonia											8	1				9			18
Poland		6	8		154	1	3	5	22	6	193	3	5	3	5	28			442
Romania			13				6	1		3	57	3	7	3		38	12		143
Slovak Rep.			4		22			5	8	4	55	2	2	3	3	15	3	25	151
Slovenia											2	1				8			11
Yugoslavia																1			1
TOTALS	10	26	48	20	260	5	13	25	30	20	632	31	25	19	16	363	19	25	1,587

Sources: Quarterly Reports and EURIS Database as of December 31, 1994.

STATUS OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE PTPE PROJECT

The PTPE monitoring and evaluation activity, conducted by Aguirre International, maintains a participant data base for all PTPE contractors. The biographical and program data is collected through the Participant Data Form (PDF), the Europe Information Supplement (EURIS) Data Form, the PIET nomination form, and the ECESP participant information system for the Georgetown University participants. Participant assessment of program quality is collected through mid-term and exit questionnaires and supplemented by site visits, training provider questionnaires, and interviews. Mid-term and exit data is available for participants who completed training after September, 1991 (when the questionnaires were developed and implemented). Outcome and impact data are collected through multiple data sources and methods. A series of three returnee questionnaires are sent to returned participants, beginning six months after return to the home country. Country visits are used to complement the questionnaires through personal interviews with participants, program managers, USAID officials, employers, sponsors, and other informants. Three country visits have been completed to date in the countries with the largest programs (Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria). Returnee data from the first returnee questionnaire is as yet only available for the largest on-going programs (PIET, ECESP, and IIE). Returnee data is currently being collected for the cooperative agreement programs—most of which were completed in mid- to late-1994. Returnee data for the Department of State, Salzburg Seminars, and USIA is very limited. Therefore, adequate returnee data is not yet available for full comparisons of all programs.

This report should be considered a preliminary assessment of the programs based on the currently available data. A full assessment will require more complete programmatic, impact, and financial data.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Achievement of Outputs

- The PTPE project is largely achieving its stated outputs. The numerical training goals for the overall program are not fixed—they change with each annual budget addition. While the outputs on an annual basis were affected by long delays in the contracting process for cooperative agreements, the major part of the training has been completed on schedule.
- Training has occurred in all three of the SEED Act priority areas. Training in support of economic restructuring has constituted about 66 percent of the training, which is higher than the guidelines of 50 percent and training in support of democratic institutions and quality of life have been proportionately lower.

-
- A gender balance has been maintained in the project. About 61 percent of the participants have been men and 39 percent have been women.

Project Implementation

- In general the implementation process has been adequately managed both in-country and in the U.S. training institutions (based on participant satisfaction data on exit questionnaires).
- In-country preparation (recruitment, selection, orientation, planning) and Follow-on activities differ substantially among contractors. The programs with the greatest percentage of participants attending in-country predeparture orientation are Goodwill, William Davidson Institute, and PIET. The programs with the lowest percentages of participants attending predeparture orientation are IIE, USIA, and the Soros Foundation. Most programs provide more comprehensive orientation after participant arrival in the U.S. The programs with the lowest percentage of participants attending U.S. orientation were Soros and IIE.
- Overall, 80 percent of participants felt either prepared or very prepared for the program. The program with the fewest participants who felt prepared for the program was Soros (28%), followed by IIE, TJUH, and USTTI.
- Participants were least satisfied with aspects of orientation dealing with advance notice of travel, transportation arrangements, and stipends.
- Recruitment and selection was a problem for some cooperative agreement organizations, who were unable to recruit the anticipated number of participants or who required more assistance than anticipated from the USAIDs.
- In general, the logistical support provided by contractors has been adequate. Overall, areas of greatest concern were poor local transportation and the inadequate stipend. Local transportation issues were most problematical for ECESP, USIA, and IIE (the long-term programs). The level of dissatisfaction with the amount and timeliness of payment of stipends was most notable in the Soros program. Only the TJUH participants were significantly dissatisfied with the housing. Resolution of academic and personal problems was not a general problem except in SUNY, ECESP, and Soros.

Quality of Training Programs (Exit Questionnaires)

- Overall, the training provided in PTPE programs has been perceived by the participants as being of good quality, with participant satisfaction levels being 84 percent for program quality and 80 percent for content. However, the degree of satisfaction with various aspects of the program differs considerably among contractors.
- The programs with the most consistently high participant ratings for quality of instruction, content, and achievement of training objectives are Goodwill, Harvard, and USTTI. Other programs with generally above average ratings in these areas were the Cooperative Housing Foundation, Home Builders Institute, IIE, and USIA. The programs with the most consistently low ratings for quality, content, and program objectives were Soros and ECESP. Programs with generally low ratings also include SUNY and William Davidson.
- Overall, ratings for the relevance of the training were generally lower than for quality, with only 67 percent of the participants believing that the training was "completely" relevant or "a lot" relevant to the home country conditions. About 86 percent of participants believed that the training would be useful.
- The programs with the most consistently high ratings for relevance and anticipated usefulness were Goodwill, Harvard, and Johns Hopkins. Programs with relatively low ratings in these areas include Home Builders Institute, Cooperative Housing Foundation, Soros, and Council for International Programs.

Comparative Program Costs

The various components of the PTPE program differ very widely in terms of contractual responsibilities, cost-share requirements, type and length of training, and nature of support activities. This diversity makes direct comparison of programs inappropriate. This assessment calculates all training in terms of cost per participant month and distinguishes total program costs, direct USAID cost and cost-sharing, and administrative costs. These preliminary comparative assessments use the exit questionnaire data as a quality measure and program length as categories for comparison. As expenditure and total training month data is not yet available for all programs, this assessment is based on contract budget and proposed levels of training. The final cost-quality assessment should be based on comparable impact data from returnee questionnaires and country visits.

- Total program costs ranged from a low of \$791 (USIA) to a high of \$25,710 (William Davidson Institute) per participant training month

cost. The programs with total costs exceeding \$15,000 per participant training month were William Davidson, USTTI, Home Builders Institute, and Cooperative Housing Foundation. The second highest total cost, above \$10,000 per participant training month, were incurred by the direct cost programs—PIET, Salzburg Seminars, and the Department of State.

- In terms of direct cost to USAID, the highest cost programs offering short-term training were PIET, Salzburg Seminars, and the Department of State (the programs with no cost-sharing requirements). The programs with moderately high costs to USAID were Home Builders Institute, USTTI, William Davidson, and Cooperative Housing Foundation. The lowest cost short-term programs are Harvard, Hopkins, MCID, and Goodwill. PIET costs are expected to be high because it offers the broadest range of services as well as participant programming, including in-country representation in all CEE countries.
- Medium-term programs (3 to 6 months) ranged in cost from \$3,000 to \$830 per participant months in direct cost to USAID. The highest cost programs are New York University and Soros. The CIP program is a notably low cost program at \$830 per participant month.
- Among the long-term programs (over 9 months), the USIA "topping-off" program is the lowest cost. Among the full-cost programs, IIE has the lowest costs once the matching participants are included in the calculation.
- Administrative costs have a very considerable range and may reflect allocation problems as well as actual administrative costs. Not all programs have reported administrative costs. The lowest administrative costs per participant month are found the long-term programs (USIA, ECESP, and IIE) and Soros.
- The programs with the best overall value (quality and cost per participant month) appear to be Harvard, Goodwill, Johns Hopkins, and IIE. The program that appears to have the poorest balance of cost and quality is the Soros Foundation program. It should be noted that these rankings are necessarily preliminary and should be revised when adequate returnee data is available for all programs.

Quantifiable Impact of Training

As of the date of this report, there is not adequate impact (returnee) data from all contractors to make a reliable judgement. Returnees must be back in country six months

before receiving their first impact questionnaire. The existing data is primarily from PIET, ECESP, and (to a lesser degree) IIE. Adequate data is not yet available for the cooperative agreement organizations, Department of State, Salzburg Seminar or USIA.

The available data from 116 Returnee Questionnaires indicates that:

- *Ninety-three percent of returned participants are employed.*
- *Overall, about half of the returned participants work in the private sector and half in the public sector. PIET returnees are more likely to be government workers (67%) than are the ECESP returnees (31%) or IIE (22%).*
- *Returned participants work at relatively high levels. Over half of the returnees are working as executives, government officials, or middle managers.*
- *About 86 percent of the returnees are working in the same field as their training, but only 58 percent are working for the same employer as before the training.*
- *About 73 percent of the returnees have increased job responsibilities, and 55 percent are receiving a higher salary than before the training.*
- *Over half of the returnees are continuing their education in some way.*
- *The majority of the returned participants are satisfied with the program and consider it relevant to their needs. Overall, almost 67 percent of the returnees consider the training to be "very relevant" or "relevant." In general, the (relatively small group of) IIE returnees have found the training to be more relevant than have the PIET or ECESP returnees.*
- *Returned participants in Bulgaria (all PIET returnees) have found the training to be considerably more relevant and useful than have returnees in other countries with relatively large programs.*
- *To date, the impact of training is concentrated at the individual level (improved job performance) rather than organizational levels.*

CONCLUSIONS

- Overall, the PTPE Project is accomplishing its objectives.
- Changes in project design or priorities might reduce the management burden and enable a greater integrated strategic focus on country development objectives.

-
- Clear USAID training strategies and active USAID involvement in defining training priorities is a key factor in achieving high quality training programs.
 - The diverse range of components in the PTPE Project do not lend themselves to common management and evaluation standards. The program has 22 distinct activities, some of which represent a significant departure from "*traditional participant training*." In particular, distinct programs such as the USIA "topping-off" program should not be subject to standard management, data collection, or evaluation criteria.
 - The primary institutional support contract (PIET) has performed adequately. Increased cost-effectiveness will require a more effective partnership with the missions to develop training strategies.
 - The Institutional Competition (cooperative agreements) component of the project has been a mixed success. The management burden has been significant, and the program quality has ranged from very good to poor. The costs are lower than PIET's, but for a much more narrow range of activities and services. The program should evolve to build on identified strengths and develop closer linkages to mission strategies.
 - The ECESP program is meeting otherwise unmet training needs, but should be more closely integrated with USAID mission strategic objectives and priorities.
 - The USAID's needs for monitoring and evaluation information and services should be carefully defined and incorporated into the monitoring services contract.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Assist the USAIDs to develop coordinated training strategies that utilize all PTPE training resources in an integrated fashion to develop a critical mass focused on specific strategic objectives. This will eventually entail the application of a "focus and concentrate" process to bring all training activities into a common mission strategy framework with clearly defined anticipated results. It will require that all training activities by all contractors respond to mission priorities.
2. Expand the function of the PIET contract to support missions in the development of coordinated training strategies, to coordinate

activities, and to provide operational management for cooperative agreement organizations. Consider options for applying evaluation findings, in particular the relative cost-effectiveness of medium term training.

3. Identify the most cost-effective and relevant of the cooperative agreement organizations and negotiate on-going programs with them. This determination should be made after the first group of cooperative agreement returnee responses and country visits are completed. Promising candidates include Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Goodwill, and IIE. The program management should be coordinated through the PIET contract to assist with in-country activities, maximize operational responsiveness to USAID requirements and regulations, and to streamline reporting and management. The programs should be negotiated with the participating USAIDs to fit into the coordinated training strategy.
4. Bring the ECESP Program into the coordinated strategy as well. This will also require increased communication, coordination, and negotiation with the participating USAIDs.
5. The USIA Program should be administered as a "pass through." USAID should have on-going monitoring, evaluative, reporting, or regulatory responsibilities for this program. In arranging the interagency agreement, USAID should establish clear standards for student eligibility, anticipated length of training programs, and assurance of financial need. The program should be structured as a means of increasing the number of CEE students in U.S. universities rather than a subsidy to the U.S. schools.
6. The Monitoring and Evaluation activity should be structured to respond to the critical and clearly defined Bureau informational needs and schedules. The process should be structured to provide flexible and rapid response to evolving Bureau needs. Key evaluation questions should be reviewed and revised as necessary. Develop improved mechanisms to apply evaluation findings into project implementation.

CHAPTER 1

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION

The Participant Training Project for Europe (PTPE) was initiated by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in 1991 to provide a flexible means to support academic education, training, and internships in the United States or in U.S. institutions abroad for participants from the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries. The project will train leaders and potential leaders who can impact the development problems within the Central and Eastern European region. All training is done in accordance with Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act legislation. SEED Act development themes to be addressed through training are:

- Economic Restructuring: 50 percent (Economics, Business, Banking, etc.)
- Democratic Institutions: 25 percent (Political Science, Education, etc.)
- Quality of Life: 25 percent (Health, Housing, Labor, Medicine, etc.)

Training is provided primarily in the United States, emphasizing a rich experience of culture and society as well as exposure to a free-market system. Most of the training focuses on short-term technical training with little emphasis on degree programs. Kinds of training include classroom, short-courses, internships, and on-the-job experiences.

A major difference between participant training in the Central and Eastern Europe region and other USAID participant training programs is that the ENI Bureau does not have a training office, nor do the USAID Country Representatives (USAID Reps) have training specialists on their staffs. Instead, many of the functions normally performed by a Mission Training Office are in large part handled by a prime contractor under the direction of the ENI Bureau's Project Manager for Participant Training, with guidance provided by the Center for Human Capacity Development (HCD).

PURPOSE

The purpose is to equip a broad base of leaders and professionals in Central and Eastern Europe with specialized skills and practical knowledge, in order to develop and support economic restructuring, free enterprise, democratic processes, and an improved quality of life in the region.

SCOPE

PTPE anticipates a total of 1,200 to 1,300 trainees each year, from Projects 180-0002 and 180-0045, grant competition recipients (Cooperative Agreements), Inter-Agency Agreements (IAAs), Georgetown University's legislative earmark—the East Central Europe Scholarship Program (ECESP), and Bureau-wide Technical Assistance contract funded trainees.

At present, PTPE serves fourteen countries, which include Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and the three Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

RESPONSIBILITIES

USAID

USAID implements the PTPE program through its buy-in with the HCD contractor, Partners for International Education and Training (PIET), through Cooperative Agreements, and through Inter-Agency Agreements.

USAID responsibilities for training and services provided under the PIET contract are for short-term technical programs, usually non-degree and under one year. The Training and Exchange Office of the ENI Bureau's HR Division has arranged for PIET to perform participant training field support functions for Central and Eastern Europe participants. PIET established two primary field offices headed by Regional Coordinators in Warsaw and Budapest, and located satellite offices in the capitals of the other CEE countries in the region. These offices provide training and support services depending on the needs of the USAID Reps to include: recruitment, PIO/P preparation (Project 180-0045 only), medical examination scheduling, obtaining medical clearance, documentation, language testing, predeparture orientation, travel logistics, liaison services as needed, a participant tracking system, Follow-up, and overall guidance.

USAID Representatives with the assistance of the PTPE staff identify potential trainees. These individuals are submitted to ENI/HR/TE for funding under the project primarily through a nominating process from the USAID Reps, addressing the critical needs in each country.

PIET, funded under Project 180-0045, programs and monitors trainees in the U.S. For these direct placement and monitoring services PTPE also recruits potential trainees when necessary. PIET and PTPE staff consider individual interests, as well as seeking the highest quality programs available at the lowest cost. Attention is also given to placement at Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and placement at facilities with linkages to institutions in Central and Eastern Europe.

In order to provide appropriate and state-of-the-art training designs and activities for PTPE, the ENI Bureau solicited proposals from a broad spectrum of organizations. Under its contract with the ENI Bureau, PIET set up a mechanism for conducting a solicited competition for Training design and activities. This competition, held annually in November and December, was announced through the Commerce Business Daily, Chronicle for Higher Education, the MOLIS System, and the Federal Registry. Applicants were required to show a working knowledge of SEED Act legislation and goals, and/or have a relationship with counterpart institutions in countries covered under SEED Act legislation. Proposals are screened and evaluated for responsiveness. Criteria for selection included SEED Act priority training areas, quality of program offered, and contribution of cost-sharing from the proposing organization.

Cooperative Agreements

For 1993-1994, USAID signed Cooperative Agreements with 12 organizations (see Chapter 4 for a more detailed discussion of each Cooperative Agreement).

- Center for International Technological Cooperation, at SUNY–Farmingdale to train 10 Lithuanian participants in Banking and Finance;
- Cooperative Housing Foundation to train 24 participants from the Baltics, Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland in housing delivery;
- Council of International Programs/The Soros Foundation to train 65 participants from the region in Public Administration, Banking, Human Resources Management, Health Care Administration, Environmental Protection, Social Services Management, and Housing and Community Development;
- Goodwill Industries to train 8 participants from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Latvia, and the Slovak Republic in Vocational Rehabilitation, Job Training, and Small Business Development;
- Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration to train 25 participants from the region in Marketing and Competitive Analysis, Production-Technology-Operations Management; Strategic Management and Organizational Behavior, Capital Markets and Corporate Finance, and Managerial Accounting and Performance Evaluation;
- Home Builders Institute to train 30 participants from Poland and the Slovak Republic in the Administration of Building Standards and Testing;

-
- Institute of International Education (IIE) and Joseph E. Seagram & Sons to train 9 participants from the region in Business and Economics;
 - Johns Hopkins University to train 26 participants from the region in Local Government Administration and Non-governmental Organization (NGO);
 - The Soros Foundation's Management Training Program to train 30 participants from Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Romania, and the Slovak Republic in Business Management, Communications, Environmental Management, Public Administration, Banking and Financial Services;
 - Thomas Jefferson University Hospital to train 24 participants from the region in Diagnostic Ultrasound Training;
 - U.S. Telecommunications Training Institute to train 40 participants from the region in a variety of Communication fields; and
 - William Davidson Institute at the University of Michigan School of Business Administration to train 18 participants from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the Slovak Republic in Market Economics, Privatization, Sector Reform, and Public Administration.

The Georgetown University legislative earmark, the East Central Europe Scholarship Program (ECESP), began its program in 1990 and has trained nearly 255 participants which includes Rural Managers, Teachers, Senior Managers, and Public Administrators from the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, and the Slovak Republic.

In 1993, The Salzburg Seminar trained 31 participants from the region in Economics, Federalism, American Law and Legal Institutions.

In 1993 and 1994, the Institute for International Education, through its North American Consortium for Free Market Study, trained 16 participants from the region in Microeconomics, Macroeconomics, Accounting, International Economics, Marketing, Finance, Management Strategy, and Business Environment.

The Second Institutional Competition in 1994 identified seven organizations for USAID Cooperative Agreements (see Appendix A, *Organizational Profiles*, for a more detailed discussion of each new Cooperative Agreement):

- City University, Bellevue (WA) to train 25 participants from the Slovak Republic in Business Administration;

-
- Mississippi Consortium for International Development to train 50 participants from Poland, Lithuania, and Romania, in Public Administration, Taxation, Public Finance, Banking and Securities, Human Resource Management, and the Legal and Institutional Framework of Privatization;
 - New York University to train 30 participants from Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, the Slovak Republic in Public Administration;
 - Soros Foundation's Management Training Program to train 30 participants from Albania, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, and the Slovak Republic in Banking and Finance, Business Management, Communications, Education Administration, and Environmental Management;
 - Thomas Jefferson University Hospital to train 24 participants from Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, and the Slovak Republic in Diagnostic Ultrasound Techniques;
 - University of Hartford (CT) to train 20 participants from Poland and the Slovak Republic in Finance, Marketing, Management, Economics, and Public Administration; and the
 - University of Pittsburgh to train 35 participants from Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Slovak Republic in Business and Economics.

Inter-Agency Agreements

Central and Eastern Europe participants were also trained through Inter-Agency Agreements.

- The Department of State's Foreign Service Institute trained 20 participants from Albania and Bulgaria in Diplomatic Training. The program is completed and the participants have returned to their home countries.
- The United States Information Agency (USIA) is responsible for the administration and oversight of the long-term academic portion of the program. The USIA has selected the Association of International Educators (NAFSA) to implement the academic program. The academic grants are for up to two years of study with project funding not to exceed \$10,000 per student per year. Nearly

363 students from the region have participated through this program.

It should be noted that the USIA Top-Up Program is distinctly different from any other USAID participant training program. The academic training provided through USAID's Inter-Agency Agreement with USIA is basically a scholarship program unlike any other East European participant training program. It does not follow the traditional USAID model for training programs beginning with selection and continuing through to Follow-on. Examples of these differences are illustrated as follows:

- a. U.S. institutions identify and nominate participants. These nominees are individuals who qualify for admission to U.S. institutions and possess the requisite English language skills (as determined by those institutions) to succeed in the programs. They are individuals who are eligible for the final two years of an undergraduate degree or eligible for graduate level degrees. The nominees are sent to a NAFSA-appointed committee for selection.
- b. General guidelines for selection include: a field of study that loosely falls within one of the SEED Act Strategic Objectives; no quotas to ensure country representation, although every SEED Act country is represented; 60 percent goal for women; 60 percent goal for undergraduate students; and no particular goal for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) representation, although one HBCU has placed participants. In order to select the very best candidates, however, these general guidelines need not be strictly adhered to.
- c. Campus Coordinators are assigned to monitor and counsel participants at each institution.
- d. At the end of their program, participants and Campus Coordinators complete written narratives about their training experience, which are sent to NAFSA. When the students have completed their programs of one or two years, some return home directly. Many others, however, apply for graduate or post-graduate degrees or other programs in the U.S.

CHAPTER 2 PROJECT STATUS

OVERALL PROJECT STATUS

According to Quarterly Report data submitted to Aguirre International by the contracting organizations, supplemented with Europe Information System (EURIS) data, as of December 31, 1994, the PTPE Project has recruited, selected, and sent to training 1,587 participants. Of this number, 1,259 participants have completed training, and 328 participants are currently in training. Quarterly Report data do not reflect gender, training institution, nor field of training.

Participation by Country

Table 2.1 shows the number and percentage of PTPE participants by CEE country.

In order to report gender, field of training, type of training, and length of training, it is necessary to draw from data obtained from the Center for Human Capacity Development's Participant Training Information System (PTIS). Each implementing organization is required to submit basic data on the Participant Data Form (PDF) to HCD prior to the start of training, either through electronic transfer or hard copy.

It should be noted that the PTIS data lags behind the Quarterly Report data submitted by the contracting organizations. Regular

contact is maintained between Aguirre International and HCD to monitor, share, and insure the quality of the data. On-going reconciliation efforts with the Center for Human Capacity Development will continue to narrow the gap between the Quarterly and PTIS data. For this section of the report, data on gender, type of training, major fields of study, and training institutions, data is obtained from the PTIS.

Table 2.1 *Percentage of Participants by Country*

Country	Completed Training	In-Training	Total	Percentage
Albania	43	7	50	3.2
Bosnia	8	0	8	0.5
Bulgaria	164	46	210	13.2
Croatia	25	9	34	2.1
Czech Republic	116	35	151	9.5
Estonia	44	10	54	3.4
Hungary	162	42	204	12.8
Latvia	39	8	47	3.0
Lithuania	55	8	63	4.0
Macedonia	11	7	18	1.1
Poland	366	76	442	27.9
Romania	119	24	143	9.0
Slovak Republic	101	50	151	9.5
Slovenia	5	6	11	0.7
Yugoslavia	1	0	1	0.1
Totals	1,259	328	1,587	100.0

Source: PTPE Quarterly Reports and the EURIS database through 12/31/94

Training Status

As of December 31, 1994, the PTIS contained a total of 1,587 PTPE trainees, including USIA participants. Of this number, 1,259 had completed training and 328 were still in training.

Gender

Data generated from the PTIS show that 38.7 percent (614) of these 1,587 participants are women, and 61.3 percent (973) are men.

Type of Training

Nearly 28 percent of the PTPE participants (442) are entered into academic (degree-seeking) programs. Of this number, 352 are USIA participants. The largest degree field is the Bachelor's Degree with 178 participants, followed by the Master's Degree with 139, Associate Degree with 86, the Doctorate Degree with 36, and the LLM Degree with 3 participants.

Slightly more than 72 percent of the PTPE participants are enrolled in non-degree (technical) programs.

Major Fields of Study

The 1,587 PTPE Trainees are distributed among 36 general fields of study. The largest two fields of study are Business and Agriculture, with 588 and 237 participants, respectively. The next three largest fields of study are Economics, Public Administration, and Political Science.

Table 2.2 shows the 17 largest fields of study, which contain 93.6 percent (1,485) of the participants. The remaining 102 participants are divided among 19 other fields of study, with fewer than 10 participants in each field.

The fields of Business, Agriculture, Economics, Medicine, Computer Science, and Architecture have a large ratio of men to women, while women exceed men in the fields of the Education, Urban Studies, Humanities, and Public Health.

In the category of *Other*, 19 fields are represented, each containing fewer than ten participants. These are, for the most part, individual trainees in specific courses. However, students are being trained in Public Finances and Tax Authority, General Mathematics, Communications, Conservation, Diagnostic Radiology, International Trade, Money and Banking, and Telecommunications.

Training Institutions

PTPE training was conducted through 259 U.S. organizations and institutions as well as the Salzburg Seminar in Austria. Among institutions with the largest numbers of participants are: the University of Wisconsin (83), Modesto Junior College (57), Securities and Exchange Commission (51), SUNY-Cobleskill (33), Internal Revenue Service (33), the Salzburg Seminar (31), SUNY-Agricultural Technical Institute (26), City University of Bellevue (25), Intrados (25), Harvard University (25), Johns Hopkins University (23), Mississippi Consortium for International Training (22), Kings River Community College (20), Thomas Jefferson University (19), Georgetown University

(18), Harvard Business School (18), International Law Institute (18), North Central Technical College (17), World Trade Institute (17), University of Pittsburgh (16), William Davidson Institute (16), Center for Financial Eng. in Development (15), New York Institute of Finance (15), Cooperative Housing Foundation (14), Institute for Tax Administrators (13), University of Connecticut (13), Bluefield State College (13), Atlanta Management Institute (11), Iowa State University (11), Bard College (10), SUNY-Farmingdale (10), University of South Carolina (10), USDA Graduate School (10), and the Western Consortium-International Health (10). The remaining institutions trained fewer than 10 participants each. Two hundred seventeen (217) PIET participants had observational/study tours and were not assigned a designated training institution.

Table 2.2 *PTPE Fields of Study by Gender*

Field of Study	Women	Men	Total	Percentage
Business	217	371	588	37.0
Agriculture	63	174	237	14.9
Economics	37	88	125	7.9
Public Administration	45	51	96	6.0
Political Science	29	41	70	4.4
Education	29	25	54	3.4
Medicine	15	26	41	2.6
Law	20	20	40	2.5
Urban Studies	20	19	39	2.5
Humanities	32	4	36	2.3
Communications	15	18	33	2.1
Public Health	17	15	32	2.0
Computer Science	8	17	25	1.6
Environment/Conservation	9	13	22	1.4
Social Science	9	11	20	1.3
Engineering	4	13	17	1.1
Earth Sciences	7	3	10	0.6
Subtotal	576	909	1,485	93.6
Other (19 fields < 10 trainees)	38	64	102	6.4
Total	614	973	1,587	100.0

Source: PTIS database through 12/31/94

TRAINING STATUS BY COUNTRY

The following is a breakdown by country showing the amount of PTPE training by contracting organization, Cooperative Agreement, or Interagency Agreement according to Quarterly Report data submitted to Aguirre International (see Chapter 3, Table 3.3, *PTPE Trainees by Country and Contractor*). As discussed earlier, the number of participants reported in the Quarterly Report will, in most instances, exceed the number of participants found in the PTIS, which lags behind the actual counts. For a more detailed discussion to include summaries of the individual country strategies, please refer to Appendix B, *Country Profiles*.

Albania

The ninth largest number of PTPE participants (50) come from Albania, where 6 U.S. organizations have recruited and selected participants for their respective programs. *PIET (25), USLA (11), the Department of State (10), the Council for International Programs (2), Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (1), and USTTI (1)*.

Bosnia

Fifteen Bosnian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by *PIET (7), USLA (7), and the Salzburg Seminar (1)*.

Bulgaria

The second largest group of PTPE participants (210) come from Bulgaria, where 7 U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their respective programs. *PIET (94), USLA (82), the Department of State (10), Soros (7), the Cooperative Housing Foundation (6), the Salzburg Seminar (4), Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (3), IIE (2, under two different project numbers), the Council for International Programs (1), and Johns Hopkins University (1)*.

Croatia

The 34 Croatian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by the *PIET (17), USLA (16), and the Salzburg Seminar (1)*.

Czech Republic

The fourth largest number of PTPE participants (151) is from the Czech Republic where 9 U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. *USLA (47), PIET (39), Georgetown University (36), IIE (8, under two different project numbers), the William Davidson Institute (6), Johns Hopkins University (5), the Salzburg Seminar (4), the Council for International Programs (3), Goodwill Industries (2), and Harvard University (1)*.

Estonia

The 54 Estonian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by *USLA (18)*, *the Salzburg Seminar (5)*, *PIET (20)*, and *Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (2)*.

Hungary

The third largest number of PTPE participants (204) is from Hungary, where 11 U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. *PIET (67)*, *USLA (54)*, *Georgetown University (48)*, *the Cooperative Housing Foundation (9)*, *the Council for International Programs (8)*, *the Salzburg Seminar (5)*, *IIE (4, under two different project numbers)*, *Harvard University (3)*, *Goodwill Industries (2)*, *the William Davidson Institute (2)*, and *Johns Hopkins University (1)*.

Latvia

The 47 Latvian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by *PIET (30)* and *USLA (13)*, *USTTI (3)*, *Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (1)*.

Lithuania

The seventh largest number of PTPE participants (63) is from Lithuania, where 6 U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their respective programs. *PIET (25)*, *USLA (16)*, *SUNY-Farmingdale (10)*, *the Council for International Programs (6)*, *the Cooperative Housing Foundation (3)*, *Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (2)*, and *the Salzburg Seminar (1)*.

Macedonia

The 18 Macedonian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by *USLA (9)*, *PIET (8)*, and *the Salzburg Seminar (1)*.

Poland

The largest number of PTPE participants (442) is from Poland, where 13 U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. *Georgetown University (154)*, *PIET (193)*, *USLA (28)*, *the Home Builders Institute (22)*, *the Council for International Programs (8)*, *the Cooperative Housing Foundation (6)*, *Johns Hopkins (6)*, *Soros (6)*, *IIE (5, under two different project numbers)*, *the William Davidson Institute (5)*, *Harvard University (3)*, *the Salzburg Seminar (3)*, *Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (3)*, and *Goodwill Industries (1)*.

Romania

The fifth largest number of PTPE participants (143) is from Romania, where 9 U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their

various programs. *USIA* (38), *PIET* (57), *the Council for International Programs* (13), *USTTI* (12), *Soros* (7), *Thomas Jefferson University Hospital* (3), *Harvard University* (6), *Johns Hopkins University* (3), *the Salzburg Seminar* (3), *Thomas Jefferson University Hospital* (3), and *IIE* (1).

Slovak Republic

The fourth largest group of PTPE participants (151) come from the Slovak Republic, where 12 U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. *PIET* (55), *City University* (25), *Georgetown University* (22), *USIA* (15), *the Home Builders Institute* (8), *IIE* (5, under two different project numbers), *the Council for International Programs* (4), *Johns Hopkins University* (4), *Thomas Jefferson University Hospital* (3), *USTTI* (3), *the William Davidson Institute* (3), *the Salzburg Seminar* (2), and *Soros* (2).

Slovenia

The 11 Slovenian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by *USIA* (8), *PIET* (2), and *the Salzburg Seminar* (1).

Yugoslavia

The country of origin of one PTPE participant recruited and selected by *USIA* is entered in the PTIS as Yugoslavia. This participant has completed her training through the *USIA* "topping-off" scholarship program.

CHAPTER 3

EVALUATION FINDINGS

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

The PTPE Monitoring and Evaluation process reviews both the process and impact of the various training activities funded by the project. The assessment of the training process is conducted through the maintenance and analysis of a comprehensive database on all participants during and after training. Biographical and basic program data is collected from the biographical and application forms. The participants' assessment of program management, procedures, and quality is gathered using mid-term and exit questionnaires and some site visits and interviews during the training program. Training providers and contractors are also interviewed about the process and training providers are asked to complete assessments of the program. To date, 283 mid-term questionnaires have been sent to long-term participants and 166 have been returned. A total of 918 exit questionnaires have been sent out and 655 have been returned and entered into the database. Exit questionnaires have been received from participants in all PTPE activities and all contractors, so comparative analysis is possible. Exit and mid-term data is not available for participants who completed their programs earlier than September 1993 because the monitoring and evaluation contract was not in operation prior to that date.

Outcome and impact data is collected through multiple data sources and methods. A series of three Returnee Questionnaires are sent to returned participants, beginning six months after the participants return to their home countries. Country visits are used to complement the questionnaires through personal interviews with returned participants, program managers, USAID officials, employers, and sponsors. Three country visits have been completed to date to the countries with the largest programs (Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria). A total of 116 returnee questionnaires have been returned and tabulated to date and approximately 500 more will be available over the next several months. This will include the second returnee questionnaire from some participants. The returnee data is available from participants in the PIET, ECESP, IIE, DOS, and Salzburg Seminar programs, but not from any of the cooperative agreement organizations or USIA. The limited response from the DOS (2) and Salzburg Seminar (1) participants greatly reduces the value of the data about these contractors. The outcome and impact data is less developed than the process data from the exit questionnaires for several reasons. First, the six month lag period prior to the first questionnaire and country visits has limited input from the cooperative agreement programs, as these programs were delayed until well into 1994 by contract delays. The country visits were unable to assess these programs for the same reason. The country visits have been scheduled around the need to have adequate numbers of returnees in country to justify the trip and have been limited by logistics and budget. The three country visits in 1994 greatly enhanced the ability to understand the program impact and interpret the data. The outcome and impact data will be much more comprehensive by mid-1995 when all of the first batch of cooperative agreement programs are included as well as the second set of questionnaires from many participants.

Assessment of the outcomes and impact of the program is measured on a progressive scale of increasingly important impacts and quality measures. The progression of evaluation measures is:

- Program outcome—number of participants successfully completing the program and percentage of non-completions, non-returnees, and dropouts.
- Participant satisfaction with training, perceived quality of program, achievement of training objectives.
- Personal impact on participants—new skills, confidence, perspective.
- Employment and career impact—new or improved job, salary, or changed career path.
- Impact on employing organization at different levels—improved job performance, impact on co-workers (multiplier effect), improved performance of the organizational unit, and changes in organizational structure, policy, or performance.
- Policy change at the sector or national level.

LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION FINDINGS TO DATE

In many ways, the utility and comprehensiveness of the evaluation data at this point in time is less than was anticipated at the beginning. This is due to a number of factors, including the slow implementation of the cooperative agreement portion of the project, the difficulty in collecting information from some contractors, and the short time period. Evaluation of the impact of changes in human capacity is necessarily a long-term activity. The expected longitudinal nature of the study, with three follow-up questionnaires and interviews in the home countries at six month intervals, could not be completed due to the timing of the training programs. There are obvious limitations in any longitudinal measurement in an 18 month time period when a six month lag is necessary after training is completed. Most of the training in the cooperative agreement component was not completed until the last six months of the evaluation contract. There were not adequate numbers of returnees in many countries until mid 1994 to justify in-country site visits. To date, site visits to the three countries with the largest programs (Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria) have been conducted. While the information from these visits is valid and useful, there are limitations in extrapolating the results to other countries with much smaller participant numbers, with different programs, and different management interests. The great majority of the returnee and site visit information is from the PIET and Georgetown programs (which are the largest individual programs). As more countries have more returned participants from a broader range of contractors, the range of data will increase.

The diverse structure of the PTPE program is a factor in the use and comparability of evaluation data. The comparability of the programs in terms of cost, impact, quality, and role of support activities such as orientation is hampered by the wide variety in programs and objectives and project design; PTPE is implemented in fourteen countries by seventeen contractors (not including the newest group of cooperative agreements). Each USAID office has a distinct country strategy and objectives and different ways of dealing with mission training. The program is managed from Washington with input from the missions. Each of the contractors is substantively different in terms of type and length of training, target group, training objectives, and procedures. Only one of the contractors—PIET—is structured to be directly responsive to the USAID strategy and priorities. Some of the contractors have only a few participants from many different countries—others have hundreds of participants. One contractor, USIA, has no direct contact with participants, the USAIDs, or the home country at all, but rather works through contacts with U.S. universities. All of these factors greatly complicate the search for a feasible basis for comparing programs and for establishing a set of objectives and standards of impact that apply equally to all programs.

Data collection has been a continuing challenge. Each of the contractors involved in the project has its own system of accounting and management. Significant time at the beginning of the project was devoted to developing an appropriate, acceptable system to identify the data required and to educate the contractors in collecting and transferring the data in a timely fashion. As many of the cooperative agreement organizations have little or no experience with USAID participant training, the data collection was a new experience and was thus difficult to manage. USIA is a separate government organization with established procedures and systems that have not always been compatible with the data needs of the project. Returnee data has been particularly difficult to collect from USIA participants because pertinent data is not routinely collected, and the USIA program does not track participants to find out if they return home after they leave the program.

Overall, the findings to date are limited by the limited amount of comparable longitudinal data for all programs. This is particularly important in answering questions relating to the impact of the programs and the adaptability of the training to different circumstances. This greater depth and breadth of data will become available in the next 12 to 24 months.

RESPONSES TO PTPE EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The PTPE Monitoring and Evaluation contract is intended to answer the following questions:

1. Is the PTPE training program in the ENI Bureau achieving its stated outputs?

-
2. Is the implementation process conducted adequately at both ends (in-country and in-U.S. training institutions)?
 3. What are the unanticipated factors or independent variables which affect the quality, costs, and impact of training programs (e.g., predeparture orientation, Follow-on, experiences in U.S., changes in employment status)?
 4. What are the comparative quality/cost values of training programs within the EUR bureau? List the programs which provide the best product in terms of cost and quality. Quality is defined as having the most lasting impact, multiplier effect, and appropriateness in terms of skills learned. Costs include both cost-sharing and program costs for both administrative and program costs, as well as relative inexpensiveness of the program.
 5. What are the levels of impact on the fields of training in each country, that were categories for trainee nomination by USAID rep offices. Include assessment of the levels of responsibility of trainees pre and post-training, cumulative critical mass of training in the field, and selective targeting of catalytic role players and substantive content/duration of training.
 6. Given the changing governments in the region, did the training provide skills broad enough for the individual to use them when/if they change positions?
 7. What is the quantifiably measurable impact of the training?
 8. What changes in area outputs, or improvements in overall political, social, or economic conditions can be attributed to the training they received?
 9. Did the training have a multiplier effect that was anticipated (if applicable)?
 10. What impact does the presence/absence of training implementation plans, country development strategy plans and training needs assessments really have on the overall effectiveness (both short-term and long-term) of training?

These questions are addressed below. It is important to recognize that the diversity of the PTPE program makes it difficult to generalize about any of these issues. Each of the programs addresses a different target group, has a different degree of integration with the USAID program and strategy, uses different implementation mechanisms, and provides a different type of training.

EVALUATION QUESTION #1

Is the PTPE training program achieving its stated outputs?

The numerical training goals for the overall PTPE program are not clearly fixed. Rather, they change and increase with each annual budget addition. The training opportunities are distributed among the CEE countries. The primary stated goals are to distribute training opportunities across the SEED Act objectives as follows: Economic Restructuring, 50 percent; Democratic Institutions, 25 percent; and Quality of Life, 25 percent. The program is expected to have a balance of men and women.

As of December 31, 1994, the PTPE program included 1,587 participants, of which 1,259 had completed training and 328 were currently in-training. The PIET program is the largest activity, with a total of 632 participants from all countries except for Bosnia. The USIA program is the next largest, with 364 participants from all CEE countries. The ECESP program operates in four countries and has 262 participants. The next largest program is the CIP Cooperative Agreement with 48 participants from 9 countries. The remaining programs are very diverse, with numbers of participants ranging from 5 to 30, representing between 1 and 9 countries.

The largest country program is in Poland with 442 participants, followed by Bulgaria with 210 participants and Hungary with 204 participants. Together, these three programs constitute almost 54 percent of the total. The next largest programs are the Czech and Slovak Republics and Romania, which collectively account for 37 percent of the total.

Overall, the PTPE program is achieving its stated outputs. The outputs and achievements on an annual basis have been affected by the long delays in completing the cooperative agreements for the competitive grant portion of the PTPE program. Most of the cooperative agreement activities that were submitted in the January 1993 competition were unable to start until 1994, and the grantees in the 1994 competition will begin participant programming in 1995. Some of the cooperative agreement organizations have had difficulties in meeting their numerical goals, including the Council for International Programs, Goodwill, Harvard, Home Builders Institute, The Soros Foundation, and USTTI. Many of these organizations have asked for extensions.

The PIET program has met or exceeded its training goals each year. The ECESP program has largely met its training goals, although the numbers planned for Cycle E were less than expected due to problems in language testing. The ECESP program manager expects to make up the difference by the end of the cycle.

The distribution of training activities across the SEED Act objective categories is difficult to estimate precisely because the fields of study are sometimes ambiguous. Public administration, for example, may be in general governance or it may be specifically in support of privatization and economic development. Some participant records do not

include the field of training. Table 3.1 indicates an arbitrary allocation of the fields of study into SEED Act categories.

This indicates that the Economic Restructuring goals are somewhat overrepresented and the others are underrepresented.

The gender breakdown of the overall program shows that a total of 962 men and 606 women have been trained. Therefore, men represent 61 percent of the total and women 39 percent.

Table 3.1 SEED Act Categories

	Number	Percentage
Economic Restructuring <i>(Categories: Business, Agriculture, Economics, Computer Science)</i>	975	66
Democratic Institutions <i>(Categories: Public Administration, Political Science, Education, Law, Social Science)</i>	280	19
Quality of Life <i>(Categories: Medicine, Urban Studies, Humanities, Communications, Public Health, Engineering, Architecture, Earth Science)</i>	220	15

Table 3.2 PTPE Fields of Study by Gender

Field of Study	Women	Men	Total	Percentage
Business	217	371	588	37.5
Agriculture	63	174	237	15.1
Economics	37	88	125	8.0
Public Administration	45	51	96	6.1
Political Science	29	41	70	4.5
Education	29	25	54	3.4
Medicine	15	26	41	2.6
Law	20	20	40	2.6
Urban Studies	20	19	39	2.5
Humanities	32	4	36	2.3
Communications	15	14	33	2.1
Public Health	17	15	32	2.0
Computer Science	8	17	25	1.6
Social Science	9	11	20	1.3
Engineering	4	13	17	1.1
Architecture	3	9	12	0.8
Earth Sciences	7	3	10	0.6
Subtotal	580	918	1,498	95.5
Other (19 fields <10 trainees)	26	44	70	4.5
Total	606	962	1,568	100.0

Source: PTIS database through 12/31/94

Table 3.3

PTPE TRAINEES BY COUNTRY AND CONTRACTOR
(Trainees who have completed or are in training as of December 31, 1994.)

Country	Contractors, Cooperative Agreements, Inter-Agency Agreements																		TOTAL
	CIT	CHF	CIP	DOS	ECESP	Good-will	Harvard	IIE	HBI	Hopkins	PIET	Salz-burg	Soros	TJUH	WDI	USIA	USTTI	City U.	
Albania			2	10							25			1		11	1		50
Bosnia											1					7			8
Bulgaria		6	1	10				2		1	94	4	7	3		82			210
Croatia											17	1				16			34
Czech Rep.			3		36	2	1	8		5	39	4			6	47			151
Estonia		2	3								20	5	4	2		18			54
Hungary		9	8		48	2	3	4		1	67	5		1	2	54			204
Latvia											30			1		13	3		47
Lithuania	10	3	6								25	1		2		16			63
Macedonia											8	1				9			18
Poland		6	8		154	1	3	5	22	6	193	3	5	3	5	28			442
Romania			13				6	1		3	57	3	7	3		38	12		143
Slovak Rep.			4		22			5	8	4	55	2	2	3	3	15	3	25	151
Slovenia											2	1				8			11
Yugoslavia																1			1
TOTALS	10	26	48	20	260	5	13	25	30	20	632	31	25	19	16	363	19	25	1,587

Sources: Quarterly Reports and EURIS Database as of December 31, 1994.

EVALUATION QUESTION #2

Is the implementation process conducted adequately at both ends (in-country and in-U.S. training institutions)?

In general, the implementation process has been adequately managed both in-country and in the U.S. training institutions. (Note: these measures are based on participant responses to the exit questionnaire, site visits by Aguirre International staff, and monitoring of documentation flows by Aguirre International staff. Training programs that ended before August 1993 are not represented in the exit data. No exit questionnaire data is available for DOS or Salzburg Seminars participants due to the timing and location of the programs. Therefore, they are not included in the assessment below. Other data, from their internal program evaluations and in-country interviews with returned participants, indicates that both are well organized, high quality training programs).

The in-country portion of the program (selection, recruitment, orientation, preparation, etc.) differs substantially among contractors. Some contractors (PIET, Georgetown, Soros) have either in-country presence or a substantial amount of short-term travel dedicated to the in-country process. Others, such as IIE, the Cooperative Agreements, and DOS, rely on local contacts and nominations. USIA recruiting is done through U.S. colleges and universities, and, therefore, has no in-country activities at all.

Orientation

Procedures for and degree of predeparture orientation of participants differ very significantly among contractors. All PIET offices provide some degree of predeparture orientation, although in some cases the orientation is only an hour or two. The Georgetown program also provides considerable orientation and preparation activities—particularly for those participants who are in language training. The orientation programs conducted under cooperative agreements are conducted by collaborating institutions, by PIET, or in some cases are minimal. Most contractors also provide orientation upon participant arrival in the U.S. The programs with the greatest percentage of participants attending predeparture orientation are Goodwill (100%, 4 participants), William Davidson Institute (100%, 16), and PIET (92%, 325). The programs with fewer than 60 percent of the participants attending predeparture orientation are IIE (11%, 1 participant), USIA (21%, 13), Soros (36%, 5), and CIP (57%, 8). The programs with the worst coverage for orientation upon arrival in the U.S. are Soros (64%, 9 participants) and IIE (67%, 6).

The programs with in-country presence, in general, did a better job of orienting the participants, with the exception of Soros. Participants were least satisfied with the aspects of orientation dealing with advance notice of travel and stipends. Overall, 80 percent of the participants felt either prepared or very prepared for the training program. The programs with the fewest participants who felt very prepared or prepared

for the program are Soros (28%, 4 participants), IIE (55%, 5), TJUH (57%, 13), and USTTI (63%, 9).

The in-country management of the cooperative agreement programs has been more problematical than expected from the point of view of the USAIDs. Lacking in-country presence, the grantees have not always been able to successfully manage the recruitment and preparation aspects of the program without help from the USAID. The relations and communications with the USAID offices have been uneven.

Logistical Support

For the most part, the logistical support and basic management of the U.S. portion of the training programs have been adequately managed, and participants have been satisfied with the support. The only areas in which more than 5 percent of the participants were dissatisfied were local transportation (12%) and the amount of the stipend (8%). The programs with the highest levels of dissatisfaction with transportation issues were ECESP (40% dissatisfied) and USIA (32% dissatisfied). Together, participants from these two contractors had 57 percent of the dissatisfied participants. This is not an unexpected response. Participants in longer-term programs are more likely to have unstructured time and a broader number of travel options than are participants in the more highly structured short-term programs. The dissatisfaction with stipends was more evenly shared by all programs except for the Soros program, in which 50 percent of the participants were dissatisfied with the stipends and the TJUH program, with 26 percent of the participants dissatisfied. (This may reflect either poor orientation or a group of high-level participants with high expectations. However, it can be noted that most participants in all of the programs are relatively high-level officials or managers.) Timeliness of stipend payment is not a problem except in the Soros program, in which 21 percent of the participants were dissatisfied. Resolution of academic or personal problems was not a general problem except in the SUNY program (20% dissatisfied, 2 participants), ECESP (8%, 4), and Soros (7%, 1).

Program Quality

Overall, the training provided in the PTPE program has been perceived by the participants as being of good quality. About 84 percent of the participants (533) have been either very satisfied or satisfied with the quality of instruction and 80 percent (508) have been very satisfied or satisfied with the content of the programs. However, the degree of satisfaction with the training differs considerably among contractors.

Table 3.4 ranks the contractors in terms of the reported degree of participant satisfaction with the quality of training, the content of training, and the degree to which they believe that the training objectives were achieved. The rankings reflect the percentages of participants who were "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with the training, and the relative weight of "very satisfied" and "satisfied" responses is shown in parentheses. This split is also significant as some well ranked programs have significantly higher degrees of "very satisfied," while others have more who are simply "satisfied."

Table 3.4 *Participant Assessment of Program Quality (Percentages)*

Relative Ranking	Training Objectives Achieved		Quality of Instruction			Content of Training			
	VS	S	VS	S	VS	S			
Above Average	Goodwill	100	0	Goodwill	100	0	Goodwill	75	25
	Harvard	75	17	Harvard	83	17	Harvard	75	25
	USTTI	71	29	USTTI	71	14	CHF	60	32
	HBI	59	33	CHF	68	24	TJUH	44	48
	MSU	50	38	HBI	59	33	HBI	37	56
	CIP	14	71	USIA	43	49	IIE	33	67
				CIP	36	57	USIA	33	56
			IIE	33	67				
			SUNY	0	100				
Average	Hopkins	58	25	TJUH	57	30	USTTI	64	14
	CHF	48	32	PIET	46	41	PIET	38	43
	PIET	47	29	Hopkins	25	58	Hopkins	29	46
	USIA	33	48						
	IIE	33	44						
Below Average	TJUH	44	26	MSU	50	12	MSU	31	31
	ECESP	35	33	ECESP	19	40	ECESP	25	37
	Soros	14	50	Soros	21	36	CIP	21	50
	SUNY	0	40				Soros	14	43
							SUNY	10	60

VS = Very Satisfied; S = Satisfied
 Source: PTPPE Exit Questionnaire Data

In the exit questionnaires, participants also assessed the relevance of the training to their home country situations and the degree to which they felt the skills would be useful (see Table 3.5). While the returnee data provides more experience based assessment of the relevance of the training, adequate numbers of returnee questionnaires from all contractors have not been received to date to make a valid comparison. The average ratings for the question on relevance of training are generally lower than for the measures of satisfaction with program quality shown above, with an average of only 35 percent of participants believing that the training was "completely" relevant to their home conditions and 32 percent finding "a lot" of relevance. The referenced table shows the participant assessment at the end of training.

The average overall satisfaction with the program, on the other hand, is quite high—98 percent of the participants were either "very satisfied" or "satisfied" with their training program. For more than half of the contractors, all of the participants (100%) were

either satisfied or very satisfied with the program. Only two contractors received overall satisfaction ratings of less than 90 percent: Soros (85%) and IIE (88%). The relative balance between "very satisfied" and "satisfied" rankings is also informative. The majority of the participants (over 50%) were "very satisfied" for all contractors except for SUNY (20% very satisfied, 80% satisfied), William Davidson Institute (44% very satisfied, 50% satisfied), and CIP (43% very satisfied, 57% satisfied). While the overall measures are high for all contractors, the differences among the contractors are indicative of quality differences in the programs.

Follow-on

The only PTPE program with clear expectations and some funding for Follow-on activities is the cooperative agreement program. It is still too early to assess the extent and success of these activities, because most of the first group of Cooperative Agreements has only completed training in mid-late 1994, and contracting of the second group is not yet complete. This assessment will be done in 1995 and 1996. The other program components, including PIET and Georgetown, have no funds for Follow-on programs.

Summary

In general, the PTPE program components have been adequately implemented both in-country and in the U.S. training programs. The programs with the most consistently high rankings on all categories of program implementation, quality, and relevance are Goodwill and Harvard. While the results for Goodwill are somewhat suspect given the very small population size (exit questionnaires from 4 participants), the participant responses were uniformly very high. The programs with generally above average rankings were IIE and Hopkins.

Table 3.5 *Participant Assessment of Relevance and Utility of Training*

Relative Ranking	Relevance of Training to Home Country		Anticipated Usefulness of Skills				
	VS	S	VS	S			
Above	Goodwill	75	25	Goodwill	100	0	
Average	Harvard	58	33	TJUH	74	22	
	IIE	33	56	Harvard	67	25	
	Hopkins	25	58	SUNY	60	40	
				Hopkins	50	46	
Average	USTTI	50	21	ECESP	58	32	
	PIET	41	30	USIA	58	31	
	USIA	37	33	IIE	56	33	
	Soros	36	36	MSU	56	31	
	ECESP	28	35	PIET	51	33	
	MSU	25	44	CIP	36	50	
				HBI	11	74	
Below	TJUH	39	22	USTTI	57	21	
	Average	CIP	21	36	Soros	50	29
		SUNY	10	40	CHF	28	48
		CHF	8	36			
		HBI	5	15			

VS = Very Satisfied; S = Satisfied
Source: PTPE Exit Questionnaire Data

Several programs were perceived by participants as having provided good quality programs that were not particularly well suited to their needs. In this category were HBI, USTTI, CIP, and CHF. The HBI and CHF programs are particularly notable for the wide gap between the high assessment of program quality and the extremely low participant expectations of relevance and, to a lesser degree, utility. The TJUH program was generally well regarded in terms of utility and quality, but participant expectations of the program were not completely consistent with what was actually offered.

The PIET program was generally in the average quality category—in large part because this program represents more than half of the total responses. Therefore, PIET establishes the norm against which others are judged. However, the statistical question of defining average performance is not, in this case, a particularly troublesome one. The absolute measures of participant satisfaction indicate that the PIET program is average. This is probably to be expected. PIET operates in all of the countries and responds to a wide variety of training requests. All of the other programs, by contrast, have a relatively narrow focus in terms of both areas of training and geographical coverage. The cooperative agreements in particular focus on specific areas of organizational expertise—and thus would be expected to achieve a relatively high level of program quality. The range of responses and quality measures within different PIET programs, however, indicates that improvements are possible.

The ECESP program—a long-term program primarily conducted in rural campuses of state university systems—received relatively low ratings for program quality and (low) average rankings for utility and relevance. These exit questionnaire responses reflect the more recent graduates of the program rather than the first cycle.

The SUNY program also received relatively low ratings on quality and relevance. The above average rating for quality of instruction is mitigated by the fact that none of the participants gave the highest ranking of "very satisfied." However, a solid majority of the SUNY participants did believe that the training would be useful.

The program with the most consistently low rankings in all categories is the Soros program, which was rated below average in every area except relevance, and which received the lowest overall satisfaction rating of any program. The very low program quality and content are particularly notable. It is also worth noting that the Soros participants felt less prepared for the program, and received less orientation, than did any other group.

EVALUATION QUESTION #3

What are the unanticipated factors or independent variables which affect the quality, costs, and impact of training programs (e.g., predeparture orientation, Follow-on, experiences in the U.S., changes in employment status?)

The considerable variety of program objectives and structures complicates the analysis of factors that affect training quality, costs, and impact. The available data is not yet adequate to assess the factors that influence impact across all of the programs, as returnee data is not yet available for many programs. However, some early conclusions can be drawn from existing data about the importance of orientation.

Orientation

Drawing from data in exit questionnaires, there appears to be a relationship between the pre-program orientation and the degree to which participants feel prepared for the program, and the overall satisfaction with the program. The relationship is particularly notable in the Soros program, in which only 28 percent of the participants (3) felt prepared for the program. (However, Soros' low ratings in all areas indicate that orientation was only one of many problems.) In other programs, relatively low numbers of participants who felt "very prepared" correspond to relatively low satisfaction and relevance rankings. In general, the greater the interaction with participants before the program, the more likely a program is to respond to their needs and expectations.

Participation

There also appears to be a correlation (albeit weak) between the perceived utility of the training and the degree to which the participant and his/her employer was involved in planning the training program. The programs with the highest degree of employer involvement in planning the program were William Davidson (81%, 13 participants), Harvard (58%, 84), and Goodwill (50%, 2)—two of which were above average in program quality measures. The programs with the lowest degree of employer participation in planning the program were IIE (0%), SUNY (0%), Soros (14%), HBI (15%), CHF (16%), TJUH (17%), and Johns Hopkins (17%). This group includes most of the programs with lower quality measures, but also includes IIE and Hopkins which received high quality ratings. The importance and nature of this involvement needs to be studied further as more data becomes available.

Cost

There are a large number of variables affecting program cost—both total program cost and the cost to USAID. The core variables that affect total costs are the length and type of training, the degree to which the training is customized to the needs of the participant, and the degree of involvement in selection and preparation. Each of the programs and USAIDs calculate costs in different ways. For the purposes of the Monitoring and

Evaluation Contract, costs are analyzed in terms of cost per participant training month, rather than overall costs per participant. This is consistent with HCD policy in order to compare Agency-wide programs.

Long-term academic programs are generally much lower cost on a participant month basis than are short-term technical programs because the initial selection and processing costs are amortized over a longer training period. Programs that have large in-country effort for selection and processing also have a higher cost per participant month than programs without this effort. The cost-sharing element also affects the total cost to USAID.

USAID Strategy and Program Focus

In each of the three countries visited to date, the USAID program managers have been involved in the program, particularly with the identification of training fields and selection of the PIET participants. In each case, the USAID coordinated with the other USG entities to identify training needs and to select participants. In each case, the USAID relied on PIET and the technical advisors to solicit nominations. However, each managed the program in slightly different ways. USAID/Bulgaria has had the most intensive program management and the most significant degree of involvement from the resident technical advisors. Bulgaria has also emphasized focused training to develop a critical mass and has pushed for broader participation in the program from outside of the capital city. As a result, the Bulgaria training program has several areas of training with relatively large numbers of participants—tax administration, banking, agricultural statistics, mayors and rural agriculture, and others. The resident technical advisors have also had a more active role in designing training programs for their counterparts and in some cases in arranging the training.

Some of this training has been well integrated into the on-going activities and has strengthened the effectiveness of the technical advisors.

The data on this is still preliminary and the samples still fairly small, but it is worth considering. In the three countries where the site visit data is available to understand the training strategy and context, there are significant differences in the perceived impact of the training. As Table 3.6 shows, the returned participants in Bulgaria are substantially more satisfied with the PIET training received than are those in Poland or Hungary.

Table 3.6 *Satisfaction Levels of PIET's Trainees (Percentages)*

Question	Poland	Bulgaria	Hungary
Relevance to country situation:			
HIGHLY relevant	33.3	60.0	37.5
Relevant	33.3	40.0	50.0
Usefulness in current job:			
VERY useful	33.3	80.0	25.0
Useful	33.3	20.0	75.0
Satisfaction with Training:			
VERY satisfied	53.3	80.0	62.5
Satisfied	46.7	20.0	37.5

Source: PTPE Returnee Questionnaires

EVALUATION QUESTION #4

What are the comparative quality/cost values of training programs within the Europe Bureau? List the programs which provide the best product in terms of cost and quality. Quality is defined as having the most lasting impact, multiplier effect, and appropriateness in terms of skills learned. Costs include both cost-sharing and program costs for both administrative and program costs, as well as relative inexpensiveness of the program.

Given the diverse nature of the PTPE activities, there is naturally a very considerable variation in program costs. This study uses cost per participant training month to establish a common basis for comparing programs. This method is useful for financial comparison of similar programs but it is not sufficient for comparing different types of programs. The programs with an in-country presence have higher costs than those without such presence. Highly customized individual programs will have higher administrative and planning costs than off-the-shelf group training programs. Short programs will have higher costs than long programs because development costs are not amortized and inexpensive housing may be more difficult to arrange. Academic programs at top private universities are more expensive than those at community colleges. In each case there is presumably a qualitative difference associated with the higher cost.

The cost analysis is still incomplete for several reasons. Cost data has been particularly difficult to obtain from contractors in the form that is needed for comparative analysis. Many of the reports have been in different formats and many are still missing cost-sharing data or complete participant training months. Participant cost numbers—both budgeted and expenditures to date—must be considered provisional until the final numbers are in. The current expenditure data may have reporting lags in training months completed and/or expenditures. These lags can significantly affect estimated costs per participant month. At this report time, the only programs with final cost data are: Department of State, Home Builders Institute, IIE (0002 and 0045), the Salzburg Seminary, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital I, and the William Davidson Institute. Therefore, this analysis uses the original budgeted program cost as a baseline for assessing the relative magnitude of program costs (see Appendix C, *Actual Training Costs*, for actual expenditures through December 31, 1995 and final costs.)

The interpretation of the cost data in terms of program quality and impact is also very provisional. Most of the programs still lack adequate returnee data to draw conclusions about the relationship between cost and quality. Even when such data is available, however, the interpretation of the tradeoff of cost and quality is highly subjective given the large diversity of types of training and the lack of specificity in terms of training objectives. The core of the quality rankings in this study rely on data from the Exit Questionnaires—indicating an assessment of the training activity rather than the impact.

Despite these caveats, the initial data provides interesting insights into program designs and cost. All cost data is calculated as cost per participant month of training.

This chapter assesses the PTPE program costs from several different perspectives.

1. *Total cost.* This is a measure of the relative inexpensiveness of the program. This information is useful to place the cost-sharing information into perspective.
2. *Total cost to USAID and total cost sharing contribution.* In the final analysis, the program cost to USAID is the critical measurement. The cost sharing information is important, but caution must be exercised in comparing different components which have different cost-share requirements. The cooperative agreements were awarded on the requirement of a minimum 50 percent cost-sharing. Viewed in relation to the total cost data, this enables a determination as to whether the high degree of cost-sharing actually represents a value to USAID. IIE and ECESP also have established cost-sharing goals to track. The PIET program, on the other hand, is not structured as a cost-share agreement but rather as a performance contract with the requirement to negotiate cost-savings with the training providers. The measure for PIET indicates the success at negotiating low cost training programs. The Salzburg Seminar component also has no cost-sharing requirement, but rather is structured as a straight participant fee payment.
3. *Proportion of administrative and program costs.* This is a measure of relative efficiency of the program administration. These measures are useful, but can also be misleading. The determination of what is a program cost and what is administrative is not consistent across all contractors, particularly the cooperative agreements who have little experience with TCA.
4. *Relation of cost to quality and impact.* This is the most difficult relationship to establish. The questionnaire data provides participant assessment of program quality and the longitudinal returnee data also provides a means of estimating whether high cost programs appear to provide substantively greater value. As noted previously, however, the lack of established expectations of project impact require this to be a subjective assessment. At the time of this report, limited returnee data for most contractors limits the analysis to exit questionnaire data.

Total Program Cost

The total program cost (USAID and cost-sharing) varies considerably among contractors and programs. Not surprisingly, the lowest cost programs are generally those with long-term training in academic sites—Georgetown, USIA, SUNY, and IIE. Long-term programs are relatively low cost because the placement and travel costs are amortized over a longer period and the housing costs are considerably lower because they are staying in student housing rather than hotels.

The USIA and CIP programs are the least expensive programs by a considerable margin. The low costs of the USIA program is expected because it is a long-term program that provides only partial funding and does not incur any of the programming, preparation, or selection costs of the other programs. Therefore, the low USIA costs are not particularly useful as a basis for comparison with other programs. However, the very low costs of the Council for International Programs (CIP) activity are very notable given the nature of the program. With total costs of \$2,959 per participant month, CIP is less than half the cost of most other programs with comparable training types and lengths.

On the other end, some of the programs have exceptionally high total costs. The programs with total costs exceeding \$15,000 per participant month are: William Davidson (\$25,710), USTTI (\$17,708), Home Builders Institute (\$17,533), and the Cooperative Housing Foundation (\$16,025). These costs are notable in comparison with PIET because none of these programs involve even a fraction of the range of PIET activities (in-country offices, broad range of customized training, placement services, etc.)

The second tier of high cost programs, with total costs exceeding \$10,000 per participant month, includes the Department of State diplomatic training (\$13,200), PIET (\$12,870), and the Salzburg Seminars (\$11,436). Most of the other programs fall in a range of approximately \$5,000 to \$9,500 per participant month. The programs with the lowest total cost (under \$5,000 per participant month) include City University, Council for International Programs, ECESP, Harvard, SUNY, University of Hartford, University of Pittsburgh, and USIA.

The total cost data is only part of the total picture. Of more immediate interest is the balance of USAID costs and cost-sharing. This additional information allows an interpretation of the data to determine whether the training is a good value in terms of the USAID contribution. It also enables conclusions about whether the competitive approach with a high cost-sharing requirement results in a higher value to the U.S. Government. These analyses are shown below.

USAID Cost and Cost-sharing

The cost sharing requirements differ very considerably among programs and contractors. The most direct requirement is for the contractors in the cooperative agreement program, where a minimum of 50 percent cost sharing was required and the degree of cost-sharing was an important factor in the selection criteria. However, there is no

Table 3.7 Summary: PTPE Program Budgets by Contractor

Contractor	Total Budget Amount	Estimated Training Months	Training Costs Per Month	USAID Costs Per Month	Cost-sharing (Percentage of Total Budget)	Admin. Costs—USAID and Cost-share (%)*
City University	323,519	75	4,314	2,157	2,157 (50%)	794 (18%)
Coop. Housing	576,912	36	16,025	6,461	9,564 (60%)	5,396 (39%)
Council for Int'l Prog.	887,807	300	2,959	830	2,129 (72%)	744 (25%)
Dept of State ²	330,000	25	13,200	8,600	4,600 (35%)	?
Georgetown ³	12,318,970	5,238	2,352	2,093	259 (11%)	379 (16%)
Goodwill	173,182	18	9,621	4,785	4,836 (50%)	?
Harvard	439,466	73.5	5,979	2,943	3,037 (51%)	680 (11%)
Home Builders Inst.	613,661	35	17,533	7,139	10,394 (59%)	?
IIE - 0002 ⁴	1,252,738	192	6,525	2,083	4,442 (68%)	592 (9%)
IIE - 0045 ⁴	837,900	120	6,983*	2,083	4,900 (70%)	?
Johns Hopkins	493,476	64	7,711	3,855	3,856 (50%)	?
MCID	553,761	100	5,538	3,425	2,112 (38%)	1,686 (32%)
New York University	741,692	120	6,181	3,001	3,180 (51%)	2,229 (36%)
PIET	18,307,747	1305	12,870	12,870	N/A	4,636 (33%)
Salzburg Seminars	125,000	10.93	11,436	11,436	N/A	N/A
Soros Foundation I	510,781	90	5,675	2,777	2,898 (51%)	268 (5%)
Soros Foundation II	544,038	97.5	5,580	2,725	2,855 (51%)	(67%)
SUNY	364,038	100	3,640	1,764	1,876 (52%)	?
Thomas Jefferson I	496,876	72	6,901	2,189	4,708 (68%)	4,120 (60%)
Thomas Jefferson II	573,802	72	7,970	2,462	5,507 (69%)	2,611 (33%)
Univ. of Hartford	418,531	105	3,986	1,965	2,021 (51%)	1,164 (29%)
Univ. of Pittsburgh	668,537	180	3,714	1,844	1,870 (50%)	774 (21%)
USIA	3,625,000	?	791	?	?	(budgeted 14%)
USTTI	660,500	37.3	17,708	6,702	11,005 (62%)	11,005 (62%)
William Davidson	308,514	12	25,710	6,543	19,166 (75%)	?

Notes:

1. All costs are calculated as cost per participant month of training. Proposals and budgets are not uniform and in some cases are not specific as to the number of participants or length of training. Best estimates are used.
2. Dept. of State was originally budgeted at \$443,017. However, the program cost less than anticipated and was not extended to other trainees. The DOS was not anticipated to have cost sharing, but the DOS did not charge some staff, overtime, and other expenses.
3. ECESP budget reflects the totals prior to the new cooperative agreement.
4. IIE cost sharing arrangement is different than the other programs. IIE was to match the number of participants rather than share the cost of the USAID participants. However, these participants are not directly included in the USAID database (as they do not receive USAID funds), so the training months are not tracked. A fair assessment of the actual IIE costs per participant would be total costs of \$3,262 per participant month and total USAID costs of \$1,042 per participant month. Using this more appropriate measure, the IIE program is one of the lowest cost programs and is substantially less expensive to USAID than is Georgetown.
5. PIET contract total costs include approximately \$1.5 million administrative support of non-PTPE participants. These costs are not included in the costs per participant month.
6. USIA costs are estimated at \$7,125 per award for partial academic support.
7. No specific number of participants were indicated for William Davidson; the actual numbers are used.

Source: PTPE Corporate Agreements and Contracts

standard cost-share percentage—each organization negotiated a separate agreement. The USIA and Salzburg programs have no cost-share requirement. The Department of State did not have a cost-share requirement, but provided cost-share contributions anyway. The ECESP program has cost-share requirements that have changed since the beginning of the program. PIET works under a contract with no cost-share requirement, but rather a requirement to negotiate cost reduction and cost sharing among the training providers. The IIE programs have structured the cost-sharing in terms of additional participants rather than contributions to the USAID participants. Therefore, there are no common standards against which to judge the cost-share component and compliance. Nonetheless, the data is adequate to assess whether the programs offer value to USAID.

This cost analysis is based on the budgeted costs in the contracts or proposals rather than the expenditures and training to date. The actual costs will differ somewhat because some of the programs have not trained the anticipated numbers, or have changed the length of training, or have had to revise their budgets. As final financial and training reports are not yet available for all of the contractors, the best approach is to use budgeted costs for this analysis. The actual expenditures and training months through December 31, 1995 is included in Appendix C. While the expenditures to date are not exactly the same as the budgeted costs, they are generally in the same relative cost range. For example, although the CIP expenditures to date per participant month are higher than the budget estimates, they are still exceedingly low relative to the other programs.

The direct costs to USAID vary considerably among the programs—from a low of \$792 per participant month to a high of \$12,870 per participant month. For most of the programs, the USAID costs are considerably lower than the total costs of the program. The programs which were structured as direct cost payments with no required cost-share—PIET, Salzburg Seminars and Department of State—have the highest direct cost to USAID. The USAID portion represents the total program cost for the Salzburg Seminars and PIET. (Note: PIET estimates of cost containment through negotiated price reductions was not available at the time of this report.)

Overall, the average program cost to USAID per participant month of training is \$4,518. Given the large differences among the programs, it is useful to differentiate between long-term, medium-term, and short-term programs because length of the training program is a prime determinant of cost per month.

- The average cost of the long-term full-cost programs lasting nine months or longer (Georgetown, IIE, SUNY, and USIA) is \$1,422. Excluding USIA as an anomaly, the average cost is \$1,633 per participant month. The IIE average cost reflects the total number of people trained in the program, including the matching participants, rather than only the costs of the direct USAID participants.

-
- The medium-term programs, lasting three to six months, had an average cost of \$2,217 and generally clustered in the \$2,000 range. The highest cost medium-term programs are NYU and Soros. The CIP program is the lowest cost program by a significant margin. The Hartford and Pittsburgh programs are also low cost in this category (in the proposals).
 - The average direct cost to USAID of the short-term training programs (lasting three months or less) is, at \$6,797, more than three times as expensive as long-term programs per participant month. Within the short-term group, however, there is considerable variation. The lowest cost programs (Hopkins and Harvard) are slightly longer or have a mixture of short- and medium-term training. The highest cost programs—PIET, Salzburg, and DOS—were straight reimbursement programs. The short-term cooperative agreement programs with notably high total costs to USAID were HBI, USTTI, WDI, and CHF.

The program with the lowest direct costs to USAID is the USIA program. Although USIA does not have an established cost-share amount within the program, the partial funding nature of the program makes it a defacto cost-sharing program. However, the total costs of the educational programs are not reported, so the proportion of total costs represented by the USIA grant cannot be calculated. As noted above, the low costs of the USIA program are due to the fact that it does not incur any of the implementation costs (recruitment, selection, orientation, placement, monitoring) of the other programs and provides only partial funding.

The Council for International Programs is an anomaly—an extremely low-cost medium-term program with a budgeted direct cost to USAID of \$830 per person month. This is approximately one-third the cost of the other medium-term programs. These program costs are particularly striking because CIP has a full range of program planning and placement activities.

Two other cooperative agreement programs appeared to be particularly good values. The Harvard program is a 9- to 12-week program and falls between the categories of short- and medium-term training. In cost, Harvard was the lowest cost short-term program and a relatively high cost medium-term program. The Goodwill program is the lowest cost program among the short-term activities—with a total cost to USAID of \$1,700 to \$2,300 per participant month less than the other programs.

The PIET contract is the highest cost program providing short-term training. It is inevitable that this should be the case. The scope of work for the PIET contract is much broader and more comprehensive than for any of the other contractors, and in fact some of the PIET administrative functions support the other programs. PIET is the only contractor responsible for staffing support offices in every CEE country; responding to USAID training requests both in-country and in the U.S. in hundreds of fields of

Table 3.8 *Direct USAID Costs Per Participant Month, By Type of Program¹*

Short-term Programs (less than 3 months)		Medium-term Programs (3 to 6 months)		Long-term Programs (9 to 24 months)	
PIET	\$12,870	NYU	\$3,001	ECESP	\$2,093
Salzburg	11,436	Soros I	2,777	SUNY	1,764
DOS	8,600	Soros II	2,725	IIE	1,041
HBI	7,139	TJUH II	2,462	USIA	791
USTTI	6,702	TJUH I	2,189		
WDI	6,543	City Univ.	2,157		
CHF	6,461	Hartford ²	1,965		
Goodwill	4,785	Pittsburgh ²	1,844		
MCID	3,425	CIP	830		
Hopkins ²	3,855				
Harvard ²	2,943				

Notes:

1. All costs are calculated from the initial proposals and budgets submitted. Actual expenditures and training months completed through December 31, 1995 is included in Appendix C.
2. These programs are either slightly longer than the norm for the group (Hartford, Pittsburgh, Harvard) or have a mix of short- and long-term training (Hopkins). Therefore, these programs are on the border of the next group, and should have relatively low costs.

Source: Contracts and Cooperative Agreements

training; and providing in-country orientation and processing support for many of the other contractors. Therefore, some substantial cost difference is to be expected. The PIET program is roughly twice as expensive as four higher cost cooperative agreements and about three times as expensive as the lowest cost short-term programs. Again, recognizing that many of the cooperative agreement costs are hidden (PIET services, USAID management, etc.), the scale of the cost differential is high enough to warrant a continuing search for cost-saving opportunities and greater program efficiencies.

Some of the cooperative agreement programs appear to have relatively high costs in view of the limited scope of work. These include USTTI, William Davidson Institute, Home Builders Institute, and Cooperative Housing. Even after accounting for very substantial cost-sharing contributions, the USAID portion of the costs are high—\$6,500 or more. In all of these cases, the cost-sharing percentage was high—60 to 75 percent—and the total costs were very high. These costs are notable in comparison with PIET which has a considerably greater level of effort for placement, planning, and in-country support. In terms of cost, the completion did not result in particular value to USAID for these programs. The very high total costs (from \$13,000 to \$25,000 per participant month) and the high cost-sharing percentage of the total indicate either unusual program components or cases in which the cost sharing data does not reflect cash costs. For example, in the case of the William Davidson program, the high costs reflect a program design that sends U.S. students to Europe for two months in preparation for a three-week U.S. training program for the Eastern Europeans.

It should be noted that the high counterpart costs may reflect practices of valuing in-kind contributions that are common in university settings in dealing with foundation grants. For example, the in-kind cost of people's time reflects real cost to society or to the organization, but may not be the type of cost that would normally be charged. Government officials, for example, may routinely meet with groups such as this as part of their public responsibilities—whereas the expenditure of their time is quite real, the imputed cost contribution does not reflect a dollar cost saved. Therefore, this kind of cost might be hidden in a standard participant training contract, but might appear as a cost-sharing contribution in this type of program.

The strategy of using competitive institutional contracts with a required minimum of 50 percent cost sharing is useful for providing a narrow range of training services at a substantially reduced cost to USAID. Some of the cooperative agreement programs appear to be particularly excellent values for USAID. Among the short-term programs, Goodwill, MCID, Hopkins, and Harvard are all low cost programs. Among the medium-term programs, CIP is exceptionally low cost. Among the long-term programs, IIE is an exceptional value, and SUNY is relatively low cost. The scale of these programs is too small to serve as a replacement for a major institutional contractor, but they do offer a supplemental service at reasonable cost if the program quality is acceptable or equivalent and the training responds to USAID priorities.

Proportion of Administrative Costs to Total Costs

This is a measure of relative efficiency of training administration, but it may reflect different issues for different contractors. The factors that might affect the relative proportion of administrative costs include inflation of counterpart costs, inaccurate allocation of costs, more intensive program management requirements, or inefficiency. In general the cooperative agreement contractors would be expected to have relatively higher administrative costs because these are one-time programs and they have less experience with USAID training cost allocation issues. Administrative costs have not been provided to date by many of the contractors.

The data available shows a very considerable range for the administrative cost burden on the program. Both the absolute amount of administrative costs per participant training month and the percentage are instructive. The percentage of total costs is a common measure, but can be misleading because it reflects the total cost of the program as much as the administrative costs. A very high cost program can have high administrative costs per participant month that do not represent a large percentage of the total.

The highest administrative costs per participant training month were in the USTTI program (\$11,005), Cooperative Housing Program (\$5,396), PIET (\$4,636), Thomas Jefferson University Hospital I (\$4,120) and Thomas Jefferson University Hospital II (\$2,611), and New York University (\$2,220). Several of the high cost programs have not reported administrative costs. The programs with the lowest budgeted administrative costs per participant training month included Soros (\$268), Georgetown (\$379), IIE

(\$592), and Harvard (\$680). In percentage terms, the lowest administrative cost burden was on the IIE program, Harvard, Georgetown, and USIA.

It should be noted that the high administrative costs for some of the contractors are probably as much a problem of allocation of program and administrative costs as the actual costs incurred. The cooperative agreement contractors have no experience in dealing with the Training Cost Analysis (TCA) report format for allocating costs, and this system has challenged the large experienced USAID training contractors for years. Therefore, these numbers should be interpreted with caution.

It should also be noted that the administrative costs for PIET are not really comparable to any of the other contractors in view of the scope of services required under the contract.

Relationship of Cost to Quality—Preliminary

A precise measure of the relationship of program quality to cost is very difficult because much of the data is still incomplete, the returnee (impact) data is not yet available for most programs due to the timing of the training, and the fact that the programs are very different. Establishing a definitive standard for "quality" is difficult given the broad range of training offered in the program. The requirements and expectations are very different for one-week programs, three month programs, and one year academic programs.

In light of the data constraints, this preliminary assessment balances USAID cost per participant training month with exit questionnaire participant satisfaction to measure the relative value of each program. This should be interpreted as a tentative ranking based on incomplete information. The quality ratings of the programs, particularly those of the cooperative agreements, are only snapshots at an early point—immediately after the training. This data does not reflect actual impact, nor does it necessarily reflect the future possibilities of the programs. Many of these programs were conducted only once or twice, and implementation can be improved with time and experience. Many of these training providers have shown the capacity to learn from experience and improve the program through relatively small changes in planning, implementation, or content that can make a large difference in program quality. This ranking does not include any of the most recent group of cooperative agreements because no exit data is available for these programs. A more valuable assessment can be made when the impact data is available.

Best Value

Short-term Training—Harvard, Goodwill, and Johns Hopkins. Harvard and Goodwill consistently received the highest satisfaction ratings from the participants (exit questionnaire). Hopkins ratings were above average or average for all measures. In the short-term programs, Harvard is the lowest cost program, followed by Hopkins, and then Goodwill.

Long-term Training—IIE. The IIE participant satisfaction ratings were in the above average and average range and the cost, including the matching grant training of additional participants, was very low. These academic MBA programs were implemented in good schools, and the (limited) returnee data to date indicates that the participants hold very responsible mid- to upper-management jobs.

Average Values

USTTI. The quality measures for the USTTI programs are generally average or above average, but the program is the second most expensive program in the cooperative agreement component. The cost level would require good program impact to justify the costs.

CIP. The participant rankings of program quality, content, and relevance were decidedly mixed. Even in areas such as quality of instruction, with overall high levels of satisfaction, the proportion of "very satisfied" participants was relatively low. However, the exceptionally low costs of this program balance quality issues to make it an average—or possibly above average value.

TJUH. The quality measures for TJUH ranged from above average to below average for different measures. The TJUH costs were in the middle range for the group.

SUNY. This relatively low cost program also has relatively low satisfaction ratings for several key measures of program quality.

Georgetown—ECESP. The participant ratings of program quality for ECESP were generally below average but the ratings for relevance and usefulness were average or high average. The impact data available to date are mixed. The program costs were the highest of the long-term training group, but not excessive.

Questionable Values

CHF. The CHF program is a relatively high quality program that participants believed was not particularly relevant to their needs. The total cost was high, and the cost to USAID was among the most expensive in the cooperative agreement program. The impact data will be necessary to determine the real value of this program.

HBI. The HBI program was the most expensive among the cooperative agreements in terms of direct cost to USAID. Although the program quality was above average, the rankings for relevance and potential usefulness were low. The impact data will be necessary to determine the value of this program.

William Davidson Institute. The WDI program is the most expensive program in terms of overall costs and one of the three most expensive among the cooperative agreements in terms of direct costs to USAID. The participant ratings for program quality were

relatively low and the anticipated relevance was low to average. The impact data will be necessary to determine the value of this program.

PIET. The PIET program is overall an average quality program provided at relatively high cost. The impact data available to date are very mixed, and in any case no comparable data is available from other contractors. However, given the nature of the PIET program, with in-country representatives to directly tie training to country needs and USAID priorities, the quality of the programs should be notably higher in order to justify the cost. If a distinct difference in program impact is not found, the overall value of the program would have to be questioned. This assessment must wait until adequate impact data is available from the other contractors.

Poor Value

Soros Foundation. The Soros program has received the most consistently low ratings for quality, program management, and usefulness of the training among all of the PTPE contractors. This is also the second highest cost program among medium-length programs. The returnee impact data will have to offset these negative factors to justify the program in the future.

Special Category

USIA. This program is distinctly different than the others and has a much less direct relationship to USAID objectives. However, the very low costs make it a reasonable investment over the long-term.

DOS. This program provides special focus training at a comparatively high cost and has little direct relevance to the mission strategic objectives. The data available is not comparable to the other programs as no exit questionnaires were received. However, judged on its own terms as a diplomatic training program, it appears to be a good program.

Salzburg Seminar. This is a high cost program for the period of training, although relatively low cost in absolute terms (\$3,500 to \$4,500 per person). The data available is not comparable to the other programs as no exit questionnaires were received. Nonetheless, it appears to be a stimulating, intensive, and thought provoking seminar that can be a useful addition to the overall PTPE training framework, and is the only third-country training program in the PTPE portfolio.

Conclusions

The cost-quality measures at this time are only tentative and readers are cautioned against making final judgments about the programs. Given this caveat, however, it is clear that some programs are well designed and efficiently implemented and others must be improved.

EVALUATION QUESTION #5

What are the levels of impact on priority fields of training identified by USAID? What was the impact on the level of responsibility of the Trainees? Was a cumulative critical mass of training achieved in these fields and was the training effective in selective targeting of catalytic role players?

The definitive answers to this question will require more returnee data and a more complete assessment of the activities in each country through site visits. The basic field of training data collected through the PTIS and EURIS data system are at too broad a level to assess the cumulative mass of training for any given purpose. The data shows the categories of training in each country, but the categories of public administration or economics may include people scattered throughout the government. The field visits are the most effective means of placing the training numbers into a context of organizational or sector focus and impact. Three field visits have been completed to date, and assessment of these programs is illustrative of what may be happening across the region. In addition, some conclusions can be drawn from the overall data.

The question of program impact will be addressed in response to two evaluation questions. This section will address the issues of critical mass, fields of training, and targeting of key role players. The response to Question 7 will provide the quantitative current data and analysis on outcomes and impact of training.

Critical Mass—Background

First, it is useful to discuss the nature of a critical mass in training. This concept is frequently used in training, but is seldom specifically defined. Usually, the phrase serves as a general indicator that program managers recognize the need to train several people in a field. However, to be a useful planning and evaluation tool, a critical mass must be defined in more detail. The key aspects to defining a critical mass for any given program are:

- scale of program impact desired (nation, sector, profession, organization, behavior or beliefs, etc);
- the specific objectives to be achieved (behavior, skills, values); and
- the human resource constraints and factors that affect the objectives.

The scale of the anticipated impact has an obvious effect on the nature of a critical mass. Achieving changes in the behavior of a small business with five employees is very different from changing the way business is done in that industry (sector level) or the way business is done in all industries (national level). A clear definition in the anticipated impact of the program is essential for developing a critical mass.

The specific objective (changes in behavior) is also an essential element for identifying a critical mass. The overall objectives in the PTPE program are very ambitious, and include changes in behavior, in understanding of different systems, and in values and attitudes. The strategic objectives focus these changes in specific areas. Some objectives can be achieved by training a single key individual. For example, an objective to increase imports of U.S. products might be facilitated by training the key decisionmaker in a company in import laws and procedures and establishing contacts with American suppliers. If a sector level impact is anticipated, then a critical mass might consist of the key purchasing decisionmaker in each company in the sector. Other changes may require a very different training plan. A company or government policy might be changed by a single key individual (if knowledge was the real constraint to the change), but implementation of that policy change throughout a large organization or sector may require much more. Changes in large financial institutions or government bureaucracies can seldom be achieved by training a single person. In some highly specialized or technical areas, the total number of people working in a field in an entire country may be less than 10.

Determination of the training needed to accomplish the objective given the scale of anticipated impact requires a detailed understanding of the human resource constraints. This requires some form of training needs assessment—an understanding of where training fits into a change strategy. If the unit of analysis is an organization, it also requires an understanding of how that organization works.

The combination of this information can define an appropriate critical mass. In some cases, as discussed above, a critical mass may be one person (or one person per organization). In most cases dealing with large scale change, however, a critical mass will be a constellation of people from within an organization. This constellation may include top managers (for policy direction and support), middle managers (for making things happen), and technical people (for implementation). It may also be a combination of all people at a given level, or working on a given problem. It may be a vertical, or a horizontal slice of the organization. Equally important, the training needed to support substantive change may not be a one-time activity. Rather, it may require a sequence of training over time to address the different needs of top managers, middle managers, and technicians, and a degree of continuity to the training. The function of a USAID training plan linked to strategic objectives is to define the role of U.S. participant and in-country training in this process.

Training, as with any activity dealing with humans, is not linear. The value of creating capacity and skills is that people find creative ways to apply their knowledge. One of the goals of participant training programs is to identify the creative, action-oriented people who are likely to make good use of new ideas. At the same time, however, efficient planning for training requires an assumption of linear impact to provide skills or information that are directly useful for the job at hand. The achievement of the immediate objective of the training (linear relationship) is the basis for evaluating success. The creative extensions are extra.

Critical Mass in PTPE Fields of Training

The PTPE fields of training show that substantial numbers of people have been or are being trained across the region in some fields (588 in business, 237 in agriculture, 125 in economics, 96 in public administration). However, these numbers reflect the totals across all 14 PTPE countries, and there is considerable variety within these categories. The totals include training from all PTPE contractors—PIET, Salzburg Seminars, ECESP, etc. Therefore, the training includes the full range of PTPE activities: one-week seminars in Austria; two-week observational tours in the U.S.; short-courses; two-year AA programs; and long-term graduate study. There are inherent differences in the depth and quality of the training experience. The categories themselves are further subdivided into functional categories. Business, for example, includes accounting, marketing, management, human resource management, banking, investment, small business, and 14 other sub-categories. The sub-categories are the starting point for assessing critical mass. The focus on objectives and organizations within these sub-categories defines critical mass.

Within any given country, the range of training is generally very broad with a few areas of emphasis. For example, the 31 participants from Croatia are in 13 different training categories—but 15 of the participants are in one (public health—trauma victims). The 435 Polish participants are in 81 different training categories, of which 12 categories have more than 10 participants. The 189 Bulgarian participants are in 42 training categories, five of which have more than 10 participants. The pattern is similar for most of the countries—the majority of the training categories consist of one or two people.

This pattern is the direct result of the PTPE project structure, in which a number of autonomous contractors are providing training across the region. The cooperative agreement component consists of 14 individual contractors providing training in different fields, and recruiting participants from several different countries. Therefore, most of these programs will train only one or two people in any given country. The USIA program accepts participants from all countries, but the range of fields of study is broader than for any of the other programs.

This type of data reflects the range of training, but does not adequately capture the degree to which some programs focus on particular areas or achieve a critical mass within any given area. It does not show whether the 29 participants in public administration are scattered throughout a government or are concentrated in a single ministry—or a single unit within a ministry. The site visits and interviews have added considerably to the understanding of these numbers.

Selection and Targeting of Key Individuals

All of the PIET country programs visited to date have instituted selection procedures that have been successful in recruiting high level individuals from the government and private sector. Many of the PIET participants have been in very influential positions—more so than is common in other training programs. This focus on

individuals, rather than objectives, is a common characteristic of much of the training. The PIET recruitment is primarily focused on urban areas in many countries. Bulgaria is an exception, where the USAID has encouraged a much broader representation from outside the capital.

The other contractors have very different selection criteria and procedures. The ECESP program uses a participatory process involving local leaders to identify promising rural leaders. Many of these participants have been dynamic individuals, but they are from very different parts of society than PIET participants in most countries. They are not from the urban elite class.

The other contractors all have different recruitment and selection procedures. The Salzburg Seminar appears to have a very active recruitment and selection process, including personal interviews, that is effective in identifying the active, intelligent people who can benefit from that type of seminar. The USIA program is primarily tied to supporting training opportunities in U.S. universities, and therefore has the weakest link to key individuals. The cooperative agreement organizations each have different approaches and different target groups. As participants from these groups have not been interviewed in the field, the data is limited.

Estimating Impact—Country Examples

One of the core purposes of PTPE training is to expose CEE participants to the functioning of a free market, democratic society—to provide more understanding about how such a society functions. For the participants who have not travelled widely in the West, this is a very important activity. Some participants have said that simply watching U.S. bankers or stockbrokers at work helps them to appreciate the reality of the job and how much it is different from their own operations. The Bulgarian tax administrators uniformly and emphatically stressed that the training literally transformed their understanding of their profession. While not all examples are this dramatic, the great majority of the PTPE training has had this basic impact of increased understanding of some aspects of U.S. society. In some ways, this alone may be worth the price of a two week training program.

The purpose of the PTPE program includes more than just increased understanding, but also is intended to have an impact on the transformation of these societies. Some of this impact will happen over a long time—as a result of better understanding about how free market democracies function. In most cases, however, it is also anticipated that the technical aspects of the training will have an immediate impact on the behavior of participants and others. These examples gathered in the country visits illustrate the types of training impact and critical mass training, and the limitations to interpreting the impact.

Hungary. The PIET training program trained two members of a five member task force on privatizing the communications ministry. The training consisted of a short course followed by a week of interviewing investment bankers and other people familiar with

the issues. This training was well timed and focused on a current high priority activity for these people. In this case, two people formed a critical mass in the sense that they were able to influence directly the other members of the task force. Both participants found the training to be very helpful. Both also said that the training would have been more useful if it had included the entire task force and had allowed more detailed examination of key issues such as pricing and negotiation. The training was relevant and useful for the participants, but the impact on the privatization (speed, efficiency, terms of sale) is unclear.

Another high level Hungarian participant is the CEO of the Budapest Stock Exchange (BSE). The training he received was appropriate in that it addressed the broad issues of stock exchange management. The training enabled him to better plan out organizational development priorities for the exchange and make policy changes. This participant is exactly the kind of catalytic role player envisioned in the program. However, the training package for the BSE to date does not yet constitute a critical mass. The CEO is able to articulate priorities, but needs access to additional training for officials at different levels in the organization to implement new programs. A sequence of training aimed at organizational development of the stock exchange would have a broad impact.

Most other training programs have helped participants understand the requirements of their jobs or the market system better. In some cases, such as the export promotion participants, the resources (such as funds for promotional travel) are not adequate to enable them to apply the training.

Some of the ECESP participants have found good entry level management trainee or sales jobs in multinational companies such as Coca Cola, Pepsi, and Procter and Gamble as well as some Hungarian firms. A few have been promoted to middle management positions with possibilities for advancement.

Bulgaria. The Bulgaria program is intensively managed by the USAID project manager, who tries to tie the training into on-going programs and to concentrate on training or sectors in which the participants seem capable of having an impact. The training has supported several strategic areas, such as tax administration, national statistics, municipal administration, and central banking. These programs are characterized by group training of people with similar job requirements who are working closely with technical advisors. In many cases, the advisors have arranged or designed the training programs. One of the most promising of these programs is the tax administration program, in which the first several groups trained in a custom designed course were the upper tax administrators and directors at the central and regional levels. These key managers returned with a new vision of the structure and purpose of a tax system in a market economy, as well as some specific ideas about needed changes in Bulgaria. The technical advisor gained significant credibility when this group returned and supported him in reform efforts. With additional groups, the Bulgarian managers have been able to more explicitly define their training needs in terms of the organizational changes they hope to implement. This program achieves an exemplary degree of integrating training and technical assistance and of focusing training on organizational objectives. The training of central bankers

was also promoted and designed by the technical advisors and is planned as a continuing effort to create a critical mass to support banking reform.

Poland. The Polish returnees have also generally benefitted from the training. A number of ECESP returnees have started small businesses and several are employed in good middle management positions with multinational or Polish firms. The ECESP faculty program appears to be particularly effective as the returnees have developed and promoted new curriculum for teaching economics and business. Among the short term trainees, the programs in urban planning have stimulated very different ways of thinking about how decisions are made. In these types of programs, however, the idea of a critical mass is particularly important in order to implement new ideas. Other training programs in privatization, securities, and banking have helped participants to better understand the issues of economic transformation in their own sector.

EVALUATION QUESTION #6

Given the changing governments in the region, did the training provide skills broad enough for the individual to use them when/if they change positions?

The returnee data currently available is limited for most of the contractors, so a definitive answer to this question is not possible. However, a general answer based on existing information is possible.

The nature of the skills provided differs very substantially among the different providers and program components, and the broad applicability of the training also differs. The short-term training that is prevalent in the PIET program and some of the cooperative agreements is generally not well adapted to job changes—if short-term technical training is adequately general to be adaptable to either the public or private sector in any industry, it is probably not focused enough to develop tangible skills. Of course, attitudes and perspectives about western society are generally applicable in any position and are valuable results of the training.

The longer term general education programs—such as the ECESP, IIE, USIA, and SUNY programs—are most likely to transfer a range of skills and knowledge that can be used in a variety of job settings throughout one's life. The purpose of such programs is to build general capacity rather than job-specific skills. Of the participants who have been interviewed to date, most of the ECESP people did not have jobs prior to the program. The training they received was not intended to be applied in any given position, but rather was a means of obtaining a position in some business or government position. For the participants who have been able to find jobs in the private sector, this training has indeed been applicable. For all of the participants, the English skills are most widely applied—and are applicable to almost any job. Increased confidence is also a by-product of good training that is generally transferable. The participants who have been least able to apply the training after job changes are those whose training was directly focused on a current position—such as the teachers. Again, however, the English skills have been useful in any setting.

The general answer to this question is to emphasize that a direct tradeoff exists between immediate applicability of technical training for a particular position and general applicability over time with job changes. The short-term training that has been most effective—such as training of tax administrators in Bulgaria or a particular privatization task force in Hungary—would have the lowest degree of tangible transferability in different positions. But the general knowledge of how work is organized, managed, and accomplished in the West will become part of the way the participants look at problems in the future. Training that consists of general overviews or broad survey courses are more generally applicable, but have a relatively low yield in terms of specific actions.

This question perhaps can most appropriately be used to refine the understanding of the expected outcome of the PTPE program. The long-term academic training programs can

be expected to have a lifelong impact on the individuals, on their general skill base, and on how they view society in general and work problems in particular. The tradeoff for this profound general impact is a relatively low degree of specific accomplishments and specific applicability of the training in the short-run. A reasonable expectation for such programs is that the participants return home and get an appropriate job. Short-term, very job specific training can be expected to have the opposite type of effect.

The impact of the medium-term training programs (between three and nine months in length) will be particularly interesting to assess. Some of the cooperative agreement programs have training in the three to six month range. These returnees have not yet been interviewed. However this middle range of training programs may offer a useful balance of specific training and in-depth experience that is most widely applicable in different circumstances. This is a useful idea to pursue in future evaluations.

EVALUATION QUESTION #7

What is the quantifiably measurable impact of the training?

It is still too early in the project to assess a quantifiably measurable impact of the training—certainly at the national or sector level. For the majority of the participants, no returnee or impact data is yet available. The information that is available covers only a relatively short period of time. The returnee data is also not fully representative of all countries in the region. At the time of this report, only Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Czech Republic, and Slovakia had 10 or more returnee questionnaire responses. This small number of responses from the smaller program countries also limits the comparability of the data by country.

The assessment of quantifiable measures of impact of a diverse training program such as PTPE is greatly complicated by the scarcity of clear definitions or indicators of what impact is desired from the training—even within project components. The diversity of the PTPE program is the result of the diversity of the Mission programs and objectives. Therefore, the impact of the training is difficult to quantify on an aggregate level in a meaningful way. The range of possible activities resulting from human capacity building is almost infinite, and thus is difficult to capture and quantify in a coherent fashion. A program with a tighter focus on any particular goal—for example on business creation, or job creation, or financial policy, or even quality or efficiency of government services—is more amenable to quantifiable measurements of impact.

The current data available for the PTPE program can illustrate the outcomes and impact of training to date. The bulk of the current data represents only the PIET, Georgetown, and IIE programs in significant numbers. The data from DOS and Salzburg is too limited for use. No returnee data (other than from interviews) is available for the USIA participants because of lack of adequate addresses and inability to establish the date at which participants return home. (All of the USIA participants identified to date are still students, so few if any of the returnee questionnaires apply to them.) To date there are no returnee questionnaires from the cooperative agreement participants—most of whom have completed training in the past six to eight months. The data from the cooperative agreement participants included above represents the participants' perceptions of the relevance and usefulness of the training at the end of the training program. The returnee data currently being collected will assess the perceived relevance after having returned to their home countries.

The following represents the available quantifiable data on the PTPE returnees.

Most returned participants are employed.

About 93 percent (108) of the 116 returned participants responding to the questionnaire are currently employed. To date, 49 participants (87.5% of the 56 respondents) of the Georgetown ECESP are employed, and 44 of the 45 responding PIET returnees is

employed. All of the respondents from the (much smaller) samples of DOS and Salzburg and IIE are employed.

The relatively high percentage of unemployed Trainees (12.5%) from the Georgetown program reflects in part the nature of the rural leaders' program, which is a long-term program with participants who were not employed previous to the training. This data will be updated by the next returnee data run. Most of the unemployed participants are in Poland, which is the largest of the ECESP programs.

About half of the participants work in the public sector and half in the private sector.

The participants in the PIET program are most likely to be government workers (67% of the 45 responding returnees are in the government). Less than one-third (31%) of the 56 Georgetown respondents are in the public sector, and only 22 percent of the IIE returnees (2) are in the public sector. The individual data for Salzburg and DOS are not particularly relevant, as there is only one respondent from each.

Returned participants are much more likely to be working in the public sector in Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania and Slovakia than in the other countries. In particular, Poland has the lowest percentage of returnees working in the public sector.

Returned participants are working at relatively high levels.

Over half of the returned participants are working as government officials, executives, or middle managers and over 16 percent (19) are teachers. The majority of the teachers are from the ECESP program.

Most of the returned participants are working in the same field as the training, but not necessarily with the same employer.

Almost 86 percent of the returned participants (100) are working in the same field as their training. However, only 58 percent of the returned participants (68) are still working for the same organization as they were before the training. The ECESP program has the highest percentage of returned participants (10) working in fields other than the field of training (17%).

Of the countries with the largest training populations, Poland appears to have the highest degree of stability in this area with over 90 percent of the returned participants working in the same field. However, only 58 percent of the Polish participants were still working with the same employer as before. Participants in Hungary are most likely to have changed the occupational field to an area different from the training (less than 65% of the returnees were still in the same field), and they changed employers at about the same rate as did the Poles.

Many returned participants have better jobs than before the training.

Of those participants who remained with their original employer (68), over 61 percent (41) have a job that is about the same as the previous job and 37 percent (25) have a better job. Of all of the returned participants (including those with new employers), almost 73 percent (85) have increased responsibilities, and almost 55 percent (64) are receiving a higher salary than before.

Participants are continuing their education.

About 51 percent (59) of returned participants are continuing their education since returning to their home country. This includes over 57 percent of the PIET returnees and 49 percent of the ECESP returnees. Most of this continuing education is through seminars or short courses. However, about one third of the ECESP participants who are still in education are in formal education programs at the university or high school level, and three PIET returnees are studying in doctorate programs.

PTPE Training is useful and relevant.

PTPE training is useful and relevant. Only one participant to date (an ECESP returnee) has found the training to be "not relevant." However, 34 participants (32% of the total) consider the training only to be "helpful in a general way." The ECESP program has the largest number (21, or almost 40% of the total ECESP returnees) of participants who have found the training only generally helpful. The majority of the returned participants are satisfied with the training and have found it to be relevant to their jobs. Overall, almost 32 percent of the returned participants have found the training programs to be "highly relevant" and almost 35 percent consider it to be "relevant."

In related questions, participants were asked how "useful" the training was for their current jobs and the frequency of skill utilization in their jobs. Again, all of the rankings were reasonably high, with most responses in the "very useful/very often" or "useful/often" categories. As indicated in the table below, the IIE program appears to be most immediately relevant and useful, followed by PIET, and then ECESP.

What is most notable about this, however, is the relatively low rankings for the short-term PIET training compared to the long-term, academic oriented ECESP and IIE. The overriding value of short-term technical training is that it should be immediately and highly relevant to the participants as it is designed around the participants' current job. One would expect that the rankings for relevance and utility would be

Table 3.9 *Value of Training to Current Job (Percentages)*

Relevance	ECESP	IIE	PIET	Total
Highly Relevant	25	44	35	32
Relevant	34	44	35	35
Generally Useful	40	11	28	32

Source: Returnee Questionnaire (N = 116)

considerably higher for a short-term, job-focused program than for the more general long-term programs. However, this is not the case in the data to date. The fact that almost 28 percent of the PIET respondents found the training "helpful in a general way" indicates that the training objectives and/or needs assessments could be improved. Greater orientation to specific job requirements should improve this score. When the returnee data for the cooperative agreement programs is available, this issue should be revisited.

Compared to the responses in the exit questionnaire, the ECESP returnees found the training to be somewhat less relevant (5% points difference) and less useful (8% points difference) than they had anticipated. The PIET returnees found the relevance of the training to be about what they had expected but to be slightly less useful (5% points difference). The IIE training was about as relevant and useful as they had anticipated at the end of the program.

Table 3.10 *Usefulness of Training to Current Job (Percentages)*

Usefulness	ECESP	IIE	PIET	Total
Very Useful	42	44	42	42
Useful	42	44	37	39
Average	17	11	21	19

Source: Returnee Questionnaire (N = 116)

Bulgarian returned participants were more likely to find the training to be "highly relevant" (57%) than were participants from other countries. The Bulgaria program also registered the highest percentages of participants who ranked the program at the most favorable level—"very satisfied" with the program (86%), training was "very useful" (71%), and use the new skills "very often" (86%). The Bulgaria program is closely integrated into the ongoing programs, is more concentrated, and has a greater degree of continuity than do some other programs. The in-country technical advisors in Bulgaria are closely involved with the planning of the training programs.

Table 3.11 *Frequency of Skill Use in Current Job (Percentages)*

Frequency	ECESP	IIE	PIET	Total
Very Often	44	44	35	40
Often	32	44	42	37
Sometimes	24	11	23	23

Source: Returnee Questionnaire (N = 116)

Of the other countries with significant numbers of participants, Hungary has the lowest percentage of returned participants (18%) who have found the training to be highly relevant to their jobs. In Poland, the percentage was 29.

Training Impact to date is concentrated at individual, rather than organizational levels.

Returned participants were asked to describe the nature of their accomplishments after training. The training enabled the majority of the participants to perform their own job more effectively. However, the higher level impacts (improved office functioning, overall employer performance, company policy, government policy, national policy/economy) were not affected by the

majority of the participants as of the first returnee questionnaire. As shown in the table below, most of the participants used the training to perform their jobs better, although this was notably less true for PIET participants (76%) than for returnees from the other programs. Again, this is not consistent with what would be expected for a targeted short-term technical program, indicating that improved needs assessments and planning would be useful.

Slightly less than half of the participants (46%) were able to use the training to improve the working of the office and less than a third (31%) were able to have an impact at the organizational level.

Table 3.12 *Impacts of Training (Percentages)*

Level of Impact	ECESP	IIE	PIET	Overall
Improved:				
Job performance	90	100	76	86
Working in office unit	48	33	48	46
Performance of employer	33	33	26	31
Influenced change in:				
Company policy	21	33	14	20
Government policy	14	0	14	12
Economy	2	0	12	6

Source: Returnee Questionnaire (N = 116)

EVALUATION QUESTION #8

What changes in area outputs, or improvements in overall political, social, or economic conditions can be attributed to the training they received?

At this point, it is not possible to attribute significant changes in overall political, social, or economic conditions to the PTPE training programs. There are several reasons for this:

1. Relatively little time has passed. Training impact on this level takes a considerable amount of time to develop and surface. The program has not had enough time to adequately track progress and impact on a longitudinal basis.
2. The training programs in many countries are relatively small, and thus are unlikely to affect national level conditions, particularly in this short period of time. Moreover, the missions tend to train a wide variety of people from many different sectors and organizations. For the most part, they have not focused training on a few specific areas or organizations, nor have they maintained focus and continuity in such a way as to develop a critical mass within any given organization or sector. As noted, this reflects the multi-faceted design of the project. Much of the training is not particularly well integrated into the technical assistance programs in each sector.
3. Each of the components of the PTPE program is somewhat unique, with different target groups and different degrees of integration with the country strategy and priorities. While all of the PTPE training falls under the category of the SEED Act umbrella, the specific areas of focus differ considerably. National level impact will generally require either a lot of time, or considerable effort to focus programs on given objectives and to closely integrate this into the other forms of assistance. Even a relatively large program, such as the Poland PTPE program, is swallowed up in a large country.
4. Much of the training consists of very short-term (2 to 3 weeks) of training and tends to be of a survey nature rather than highly technical or specific training. Unless such training is closely integrated into either on-going local activities and technical assistance or is part of a larger framework of continuous, sequenced training with an organization, it is not likely to have a huge impact on a country.

For all of these reasons, it is not yet possible to identify overall social, political, or economic changes resulting from the PTPE training. Changes at this level may take decades to surface and develop. Given the nature and scale of this program, it will be more useful to attempt to measure intermediate level impacts that may eventually lead to social level changes.

EVALUATION QUESTION #9

Did the training have a multiplier effect that was anticipated (if applicable)?

A small portion of the PTPE training is explicitly designed to achieve a multiplier effect. Some of these programs target teachers and the training is directed toward developing skills or products, such as a curriculum or teaching materials, that will extend the training to others. These programs, such as the ECESP teachers activity in Poland, have been effective in achieving multiple levels of multiplier effect. The returned teachers develop a new curriculum on market economies, introduce it into their schools and train their co-workers in the curriculum, and then all of these new economics teachers go to class. The multiplier effect can be substantial in these programs. These programs also have the advantage of having a very clear training objective.

The focus of the training program is to provide the participants with experiences and skills with the expectation that they will share these experiences with others. However, most are not designed to develop training skills in the participants—they are not "training of trainers" programs.

The large majority of the returned participants who have completed the returnee questionnaire have reported training other people. The percentages of participants reporting a multiplier effect are large for all three major contractors who are represented in the current returnee questionnaires—ECESP (79%), PIET (88%), and IIE (78%). Returned participants have trained co-workers, students, community members, and others through meetings, seminars, on-the-job training, and classroom training. The ECESP returnees estimated that 5,258 students have received training related to the program, while the PIET returnees have trained 370 students. The ECESP participants have trained 634 co-workers and the PIET participants have trained 410 co-workers. By these measures, the multiplier effect has been very notable in the PTPE program.

The raw data on multiplier effects must be carefully interpreted. Much of the training is very valid indeed. The teachers, for example, have a clear objective to the training—to enable colleagues to teach the course. This is specific and measurable. The less formal multiplier interactions have a much broader range—from talking about the program with co-workers at lunch, to presenting structured seminars for the office, to organizing community meetings. The content, objectives, and multiplier impact of these types of interactions are highly varied. In some cases, this is sharing anecdotes, and in others it is transferring skills. In other words, the product of such multiplier training—a "trained person"—is not uniform: it ranges from extremely marginal to highly substantive. As with all aspects of training, the programs with clear objectives for training of trainers can be reliably assessed on their own terms, whereas assessment of programs where the multiplier effect is incidental to the program is much more subjective.

The completion of the returnee assessments, particularly for the cooperative agreement contractors, will allow this question to be answered in more detail.

EVALUATION QUESTION #10

What impact does the presence/absence of training implementation plans, country development strategy plan and training needs assessments really have on the overall effectiveness (both short-term and long-term) of training?

This question is difficult to answer decisively because neither the project nor the Missions have clearly delineated training strategies, the impact data is as yet fairly limited, clear comparative programs with strong and weak training plans are difficult to identify, and firm comparative data is scarce. The diversity of the PTPE program in structure, objective, management, and linkage to Mission objectives introduces many variables that also influence the effectiveness of training. In addition, there is no common accepted measure of "effectiveness" for this project. However, a subjective assessment based on observations of the PTPE experience to date can provide some guidance on this issue.

The PTPE program comprises a range of both academic and technical training. Academic programs are generally useful for developing capacity in the participant by instilling a broad range of skills and knowledge. Equally important, participation in an academic education is a formative process in which basic beliefs, worldviews, and values are developed along with the knowledge base. It is a unique life experience that helps to form the student. When this experience occurs in a foreign country, particularly one with a significantly different social, political, and economic foundation, the experience can have a lifelong impact on the individual. Scholarship programs have long recognized the potential of such programs for this kind of intercultural understanding as well as for the transfer of technical or management skills. The potential of such programs is generally long-term. Students must become reintegrated into their home societies, become employed, and work within an organizational context toward personal and social goals. The educational experience affects every decision and activity. The "success stories" of a scholarship program are accumulated over decades rather than quarters.

Short-term technical training programs, by contrast, are most useful in transferring immediately applicable skills, in stimulating new ideas, and in developing new contacts and relationships. Effective technical training is highly contextual—it relates specifically to the working environment of the individual participant. With a much shorter planning horizon, technical training requires several basic elements—a clear objective to be accomplished, a good analysis of the human resource constraints to that objective and how training might change those, and a good plan for implementing the required training.

Either or both types of training are appropriate for the PTPE project. However, the decision about the general type of training to offer, and the areas in which to offer training, must be based on very specific objectives and a clear understanding of what types of impact are reasonable to expect from different types of training. Analytical documents such as country development strategies, country training plans, and training

needs assessments are the basis for planning and executing such a training program. Such documents form the basis for identifying and implementing training to achieve the critical mass necessary to accomplish the objectives.

In the PTPE project, the first several elements in this sequence are generally weak. The training is conceived and implemented in categories of training (business, public administration, etc.) in support of broad objectives (free market economy, democracy, quality of life). While these serve as useful roadmaps for the general decisions about what sectors to focus training, they are less useful in establishing clear objectives. The linkage to the strategic objectives is primarily at the category level rather than the indicator level. There have been few conscious decisions to structure the overall training program in response to clearly identified needs.

Much of the PTPE project has been created not by design, but by default. Many of the activities have been initiated through outside influences—and apart from any strategic framework. This include the ECESP program, the Salzburg Seminars, Department of State Diplomatic Training, and the USIA program. Other components of the program, such as the competitive cooperative agreement program, have been management innovations rather than strategic initiatives. Only the core PIET component has been structured to respond directly to USAID interests. However, this response is limited by the lack of clearly articulated objectives and context for the training program. The relative paucity of training needs assessments, country training plans, specific objectives which the training is to support, and integration into the broader strategic goals of the mission have limited the relative impact.

As stated above, the data is not available for a statistical analysis of the impact and importance of detailed strategic planning for training. However, a review of the activities that have been most successful in developing a broader framework for the training and focusing on functional critical mass training is instructive. Not all of the programs have been reviewed in depth at this time, so this is probably not the only example of this type of planning. However, it is a compelling example of what is possible.

The Bulgaria mission strategy identifies participant training as a general resource across the portfolio for developing management skills and developing acceptance of new ways of approaching problems. While there is no specific training strategy, the USAID program officers have invested considerable time in focusing the program on some areas where training appears to make a difference. These include tax administration, banking, rural mayors and agriculture, and statistics. This training has been carefully integrated with and planned by the resident technical advisors—beyond simply soliciting participant nominations, and have been structured toward developing a critical mass.

The data on these programs is still in the initial stages. However, as shown above, the Bulgarian respondents to both the exit and returnee questionnaires are significantly more satisfied with the relevance and utility of training than are the participants from most other countries. The evaluation interviews with the returned Bulgarian participants were

notable in terms of the specificity with which they described the impact of the program on themselves and their jobs.

Define Effectiveness

As is discussed above, each of the contractors, and each of the missions, approaches the program slightly differently. All of the programs operate under the general guidance of the SEED Act objectives, but each focuses on a different aspect of the problem and defines the solution in different terms. The locus of responsibility and driving force for establishing strategy and priorities is not particularly clear.

The basic planning documentation that is used for the project includes:

Country Development Strategy (CDS)

These planning and strategy documents are developed by each mission. Each lays out the areas of priority mission involvement, and establishes the parameters for training, to a greater or lesser degree. The CDS is a reasonably effective guide to action for the training programs administered by PIET, because the mission involvement is quite direct for recruitment, selection and planning. However, the CDS, and the mission supervision, has a less direct impact for the other programs. The ECESP and cooperative agreement programs are designed and structured in isolation from the missions (except through the intermediation of the ENI Project Manager). The USIA program is even more divorced from the CDS planning process, as the focus is on students in the U.S. rather than impact in country.

The CDS documents generally treat training issues very broadly—training is planned in categories rather than for objectives.

Training Implementation Plans (TIP)

The TIP, which is a detailed plan for an individual or group training program, is developed by the home office of PIET for all of their participants, and equivalent planning documentation is developed for the other programs. Each of the missions has a country development strategy, with varying degrees of emphasis on training and varying degrees of management attention to training. The scale of training activities, and the perceived importance of training, is also different in each mission.

With the caveat of the limited data on some programs and some countries, a tentative conclusion from the existing information is that a greater degree of clarity of objectives and strategy for the use of training in the portfolio, and more precise training needs assessments, would greatly enhance both the short- and long-term effectiveness of the training. This is a difficult issue to recommend, given the small and overworked staffs in the CEE missions, the small or non-existent country staffs of the contractors, and the labor intensive nature of such assessments.

Nonetheless, with all of the appropriate caveats, the lack of specific strategies, objectives, and needs assessments affects aspects of all of the programs. The need for detailed training needs assessments—at the level of the organization, strategic objective, and/or the individual participant—can be seen in the numbers of participants who found the training to be only partly useful (32%). The in-country interviews often revealed that such participants were attending general information courses—survey courses—of which only portions of the program really pertained to their particular job. While this broad brush approach is inevitable, and useful, in a long-term academic preparation, it is more problematical for very short-term programs of 1 to 3 weeks.

The absence of focused country development strategies related to training is also evident in the range of training, and the range of target organizations and sectors, found in the countries with large numbers of trainees (the smaller countries may only have a dozen participants, all from the same field).

CHAPTER 4

ASSESSMENT OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Department of State (Inter-Agency Agreement)
The Foreign Service Institute
Participant Training-Diplomatic Training
Project Number: 180-0045-G-00-2483-00
PACD: 02/21/95

Project Coordinator:	Vladimir P. Sambaiew
CEE Countries:	Albania, Bulgaria
Number of Awards:	20 (10 Albanians; 10 Bulgarians)
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring, Democratization, Quality of Life</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Diplomatic Training
Length of Training:	5–6 weeks in U.S. and 2 weeks in Albania
Budgeted Cost of Project:	\$443,017
Actual Cost of Project:	\$213,000

Background

In 1993, the Department of State (DOS) conducted a participant training program for Albanian and Bulgarian diplomats. The program was aimed at new diplomats who had been recently hired to replace the former communist officials. The program was conducted in two parts. The first was a two-week session in January of 1993 for 30 Albanian diplomats. The second part consisted of a five week program for 20 officials, ten from each country, conducted by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI).

The U.S. training program was designed to introduce the participants to the U.S. worldview and system as well as to develop core skills needed in the diplomatic corps, such as communications, negotiation, embassy management, organization, and cultural adjustment. In addition to the extended training in technical areas, the participants met with numerous high ranking DOS officials involved in Eastern Europe affairs, staffers from the National Security Council, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, House Foreign Affairs Committee and Voice of America. The training program took place in Washington, with side trips to Philadelphia and New York to discuss trade, investment, and business issues with major U.S. firms.

Program Management

The program was designed, managed, and directed entirely by the Department of State. Selection of the participants was done by the participating countries. All logistics were handled by the FSI.

Participant Assessment

The DOS program was completed prior to the initiation of the Aguirre International Monitoring and Evaluation contract. After the start of the Aguirre International contract, exit questionnaires and returnee questionnaires were sent to all of the DOS returned participants but the response rate was low given the time lag between the course and the questionnaires. Therefore, the primary data available is from the DOS course evaluation. The DOS course evaluation contains questions dealing with overall satisfaction with the program, as well as the participant views on each individual session. The overall response is quite positive, and most individual sessions are rated as either excellent or very good by the large majority of the participants.

Returned participants have been difficult to contact because most of the individuals had been posted abroad in diplomatic posts, as is common in the diplomatic corps. Two returned participants were contacted in the site visit to Bulgaria, and two others were unwilling to be interviewed. Both interviewees were enthusiastic about the program, emphasizing that it had been very helpful to them personally. However, they indicated that the multiplier effect was minimal because there was no formalized mechanism for them to share their training with other career diplomats.

Program Cost

The total costs of the program were approximately \$330,000, of which the direct project costs amounted to \$215,000 according to the final report of the activity. The DOS cost sharing portion, in the form of uncosted staff, overtime, and other unreimbursed expenses, amounted to \$115,000. The costs were lower than budgeted because the DOS absorbed some staff costs and obtained free housing arrangements from the International Monetary Fund.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$13,750
USAID Cost	8,958
Cost-share	4,600 (35%)

Source: Inter-Agency Agreement

Even with the cost savings and unanticipated cost sharing, the cost to USAID for this program was much higher than average. This was the second most expensive program in the PTPE activities.

Summary

Since this program was a one-time opportunity, the lessons to be drawn are limited. It was an informative, professional introductory training program for young diplomats that should make them more effective diplomats, with a better understanding of the U.S., than they otherwise would have been. It is unclear whether such a program would serve to advance them in their careers.

While several questions about impact and value of this training cannot be adequately answered with the available information, it is probably not cost-effective to expend much effort to gather more information. Because the program was a unique response to a specific need and is not expected to be repeated, the cost of gathering additional information may exceed the value of such information.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Given the relatively limited information available about the impact of this program (only 2 returnee questionnaires have been received), very specific conclusions are difficult to make. The most important conclusion is that any future program should be carefully integrated into the overall diplomatic training system of the host country in order to maximize impact through a multiplier effect.

**Georgetown University—East Central European
Scholarship Program (ECESP)
Cooperative Agreement No. ANE-0002-A-00-0036-00
PACD: 06/10/97**

Director:	Dr. Maria Pryshlak
Academic Advisor:	Dr. Andrzej Kaminski
CEE Countries:	The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia
Number of Contract Awards:	255
Total Number of Awards:	246 (193 completed; 53 in training)
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring, Democratization, Quality of Life</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Rural Managers (Economics of Private Farming, Organization and Management of Small Rural Cooperatives, and Development of Small Agribusinesses); Teachers, Senior Managers and Public Administrators
Length of Training:	Rural Managers, 12–24 months; Teachers, 1 year; Senior Managers, 6–12 months
Budgeted Cost of Project:	\$12,318,970
USAID Amount:	\$10,962,000

The Congressional Appropriations Act of 1990 earmarked \$2.0 million for a three year "Poland/Hungary Scholarship Program" to be implemented by Georgetown University. This project was developed and modified as a subcategory of Section 402 of the SEED Act of 1989's International Student Exchange Program, already underway through Georgetown. A Cooperative Agreement (ANE-0002-A-00-0036-00) was signed on August 8, 1990, wherein the program components, specific goals, objectives, and evaluation criteria were agreed upon. The FY 1991 Authorization Amendment #1 authorized additional funding for a total of \$4,962,000. The FY 1991 Appropriations Act allocated an additional \$3.0 million from the Development Assistance/Education and Human Resources Account to include the Czech Republic and Slovakia. The 1992 Authorization Amendment #2 extended the project to June 10, 1997, and allocated another \$3 million, for a total 5-year project budget of \$10,962,000 with a total Cost-share amount of \$1,356,970.

Background

The ECESP is a Congressionally mandated program managed by the Center for Intercultural Education Development (CIED) at Georgetown University. The original appropriation of \$2.0 million in 1990 was amended with subsequent Cooperative Agreements in 1991 and 1992 for a total 5-year project budget of \$10,962,000. The program was extended again at the end of 1994 with an additional budget supplement.

The ECESP program offers long-term non-degree programs of study in business and public administration to support democratization and privatization. The program has three primary target groups: rural managers, teachers, and public administrators/senior managers. The rural managers program, the largest component, is a 12- to 24-month certificate program that is preceded by six months of in-country English Language Training for participants with poor language skills. The rural managers program has evolved over the past five years to emphasize participants with higher levels of education and experience. The Faculty program is a two semester program of classroom courses and internships, and the Public Administrator program is a four to five month program of seminars, workshops, and internships.

The program operates in Poland, Hungary, and the Czech and Slovak Republics, with the majority of the participants being from Poland. Seventy-two percent of the ECESP participants have been men and 28 percent have been women.

Program Management

ECESP is managed by a small staff in the CIED at Georgetown University with in-country representatives in each participating CEE country. University placements have been primarily in small rural campuses of state universities, and community colleges.

The ECESP program management has been the focus of USAID scrutiny for several years and was the subject of a separate program report prepared in late 1993. While the program has had some problems in reporting, planning, language preparation, and communications with USAIDs, these have not, for the most part, been serious problems that cannot be resolved. Moreover, the program has developed and adapted its procedures and focus based on experience and feedback from USAID.

Most participants receive orientation both in country and in the U.S. The majority of the participants were satisfied with the preparation, although significant levels of dissatisfaction were registered in the areas of information about travel (18%), advance notice of travel (25%), nature of stipends (24%), cultural orientation (11%), and USAID policies and regulations (15%). However, despite these criticisms, almost 88 percent of the participants were "very prepared" or "prepared" for the program. Participant feedback on the program implementation showed some dissatisfaction with housing (16%), local transportation (30%), the amount of the stipend (21%), medical insurance (11%), and resolution of academic or personal problems (9%). In every case, the majority of the participants were satisfied in these areas. However, the proportion of dissatisfied answers was nonetheless notable.

Georgetown does not submit quarterly reports, but rather semi-annual reports that correspond to the academic program schedule. Reports have been received through August 1994. All TCA reports have been received between three and 36 days late. Biographical and program information is submitted electronically on a quarterly basis. The PDF forms are submitted directly to USAID. The return rate for exit questionnaires from the ECESP program is 39 percent.

Possibly the most significant issue for the ECESP program is the degree to which it is isolated from the USAID strategic objectives. As a Congressionally mandated program, ECESP developed its own rationale and project design with minimal involvement from USAID. The design emphasizes the process and target groups (long-term non-degree academic training for rural managers), but lacks clarity in terms of desired outcomes and expected measures of achievement and impact of training. A greater degree of integration with overall USAID country objectives and a mutually agreed set of achievement indicators would strengthen this useful program.

Participant Assessment

Overall, the ECESP participants are satisfied with the program, but the rankings are low relative to most other PTPE contractors. About 54 percent of the participants responding on the exit questionnaire were "very satisfied" with the program and another 42 percent were "satisfied." In the retrospective questions on the returnee questionnaire, only 41 percent of respondents were "very satisfied" and 43 percent were "satisfied." While the total satisfaction levels in both questionnaires were acceptable, the proportion of participants who are "very satisfied" is low relative to the other major programs (PIET and USIA) and lower than all but five of the cooperative agreement programs. (Comparative data for the cooperative agreements is only available in the exit questionnaire at the present time.)

In program quality measures, (quality of instruction, achievement of training objectives, content of training), the ECESP program received below average assessments by participants in the exit questionnaire. As with the satisfaction levels, the proportion of participants who were "very satisfied" on these measures was among the lowest among all PTPE contractors.

Impact

The returnee assessment of the relevance of ECESP training is the lowest among the three organizations that are adequately represented in the returnee data (PIET, IIE, ECESP). However, on a question about the relative usefulness and frequency of use of the training in the current job, the ECESP participants' responses were equal to or better than the PIET responses.

Country interviews with returned participants show a variety of experience for returned participants. In both Poland and Hungary, many of the returned rural manager participants have found good jobs, mostly in international companies, and a small minority have started small businesses. Some others are teaching English, using the language skills they developed in the U.S. A significant minority have been unable to find jobs appropriate to their training. The teacher programs in Poland have been very successful in introducing new curriculum for economics education while the Hungarian teachers have been less successful.

Program Cost

The total budget for the ECESP cooperative agreement is \$12,318,970 (prior to the FY 95 amendment), for an estimated 5,238 person months of training.

As a long-term program, the overall cost level is not unreasonable. However, the high degree of cost sharing in the other programs reduces their cost to the point that ECESP is the highest cost program in terms of USAID expenditures. The ECESP program is the highest cost program in terms of direct cost to USAID.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$2,352
USAID Cost	2,093
Cost-share	259 (11%)
Administrative Cost	366 (16%)

Source: Cooperative Agreement

The comparison to the other long-term programs is difficult because each program is structured differently. ECESP has a substantially higher level of in-country activity than the other long-term programs, including language training and intensive recruitment and selection procedures. The closest comparable program is the SUNY program, which does not have an extensive in-country program. However, SUNY does offer a comparable training program of nine months in a rural campus of a state university system. The SUNY program has a higher overall program cost per participant month (at \$3,640), but the high degree of cost sharing brings the USAID portion of the costs down to \$1,764. The IIE programs are generally in higher cost campuses and have a higher total cost of training. However, with the significant cost sharing component, the IIE program ends up costing less than half of the cost of the ECESP.

Summary

The ECESP program offers long-term training opportunities to rural managers and teachers—target groups that are not addressed in other programs. The assessment of the impact of this educational experience on these participants will require a longer period of monitoring. Whatever the eventual impact on career prospects and accomplishments, however, the ECESP experience has given the participants an in-depth experience and knowledge of the U.S. and its institutions and systems.

Conclusion and Recommendation

The ECESP program is a useful and reasonably well managed component of the PTPE umbrella program. It provides a type and depth of training to a group not otherwise served in the program. However, the program can be strengthened by:

- closer integration with USAID country strategies;
- more explicit training objectives and success indicators;

-
- improvements in the internship activities;
 - greater emphasis on cost-sharing to bring the overall costs down to more competitive levels; and
 - greater equality in program quality for participants from all countries.

Institute for International Education (IIE)
North American Consortium for Free Market Study
Contract No. EUR-0002-G-00-2049-00
PACD: 12/31/93

Manager, Scholarship and Training Programs Division: Helene Mantell

CEE Countries: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the Slovak Republic

Number of Awards: 16 from Bulgaria (1), the Czech Republic (6), Hungary (3), Poland (3), the Slovak Republic (3)

SEED Act Priorities: *Economic Restructuring*

Sectors or Fields of Training: Microeconomics, Macroeconomics, Accounting International Economics, Marketing, Finance, Management/Strategy, Business Environment

Length of Training: 1 year (9-month academic program and a 3-month internship)

Total Cost of Project: \$1,252,738 USAID Amount: \$400,000 (31.93%)

Institute for International Education (IIE) and
Joseph E. Seagram & Sons
North American Consortium for Free Market Study
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-3045-00
PACD: 12/31/94

Executive Vice President: Richard Dye

Assistant Director: Susan Karp

Manager, Scholarships & Training: Helene Mantell

CEE Countries: Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic

Number of Awards: 9 from Bulgaria (1), the Czech Republic (2), Hungary (1), Poland (2), Romania (1), the Slovak Republic (2)

SEED Act Priorities: *Democratic Institution Building (primarily), Economic Restructuring and Quality of Life*

Sector or Field of Training: Business and Economics (graduate level)

Length of Training: 1 year (9-month academic, 3-month internship)

Total Cost of Project: \$837,900 USAID Amount: \$250,000 (29.84%)

Background

The IIE-Seagrams program was initiated in 1992 with a grant from USAID to train mid-career professionals with a minimum of two years work experience. Participants are placed in a nine-month graduate business program, attend career seminars, and seek to arrange summer internships with U.S. companies.

The initial grant placed 16 participants and the second grant, which was part of the cooperative agreement competition, placed nine participants. A total of 40 percent of the participants were women. All of the participants have completed the training.

Program Management

The program is managed by IIE in New York in conjunction with the foreign student advisors in the cooperating colleges. Recruitment for the program has relied on in-country partner organizations such as the International Management Center in Budapest, the University of Economics in Prague, and the U.S. Fulbright Commission in Poland. The students recruited through the IMC completed the first year of an MBA in Hungary and the second year in either University of Pittsburgh, Tulane, or University of South Carolina. Other participating U.S. universities include Princeton, University of Illinois at Champaign/Urbana, the University of Minnesota, and the University of Wisconsin/Madison.

The IIE program had one of the lowest percentages of participants attending orientation activities (either in country or in the U.S.), and it received the second lowest ranking in the percentage of participants who felt prepared for the training experience. It should be noted that the IIE program was initiated before the PIET contract was in place to provide in-country orientation. Only 11 percent of the IIE participants received orientation prior to departure and about two-thirds received orientation upon arrival in the U.S. Significant proportions of participants were dissatisfied with some aspects of the preparation, including course content (22%), information on travel (22%), advance notice of travel (44%), and USAID policies (44%). In the actual implementation of the program in the U.S., the only area of notable dissatisfaction was local transportation (22%). The participant concerns about program management and the responsiveness of IIE management to their needs was also emphasized by returned participants in in-country interviews. This indicates a need for improved management procedures.

A previous ad hoc assessment of the internship program indicated that some of the participants did not have any internships and others were involved in class projects rather than true internships. Some of the IIE participants did arrange working internships in U.S. organizations.

All quarterly reports and TCA reports have been received for both grants, some were 4 to 25 days late. The final reports were received prior to the due date. All PDF and EURIS supplemental data forms were received in a timely manner. Only 36 percent of the exit questionnaires have been received from IIE participants. This is partially due to

the fact that several IIE participants had already completed the training when the questionnaire was developed.

Participant Assessment

The IIE participants who completed the returnee questionnaire were generally satisfied with the program. These participants had a higher level of "very satisfied" responses than most other programs (67%). However, the level of "satisfied" responses is not as high, leaving the overall satisfaction rankings comparable to the other programs. In interviews with the returned participants, it was clear that the academic content of the programs has been good.

The exit questionnaire responses to questions about program quality, content, and relevance were either above average or average. However, the proportion of IIE participants who gave the program the highest ranking ("very satisfied," "very relevant," etc.) was relatively low in view of the quality of the training institutions. Generally only about one-third of the participants gave the program the highest ranking.

In returnee interviews, the participants have perceived the value of the training and overall experience, but all raised issues about the program management. All of the returnees identified to date have mid to high level managerial positions—some with international companies but most with their previous (local) employer. The managers who are still working in CEE-owned firms believe that the MBA degree is too advanced for the needs of the countries at this time. This in part reflects the ingrained resistance of the top level managers to introducing new (Western) management techniques and perspectives. This problem has been found in these types of programs in many countries over the years. In some cases, the development of a critical mass of acceptance within the firm can help facilitate acceptance of new ideas. Often this will require complementing the long-term MBA training with short-term observation tours or training for the top managers.

As of this date, only a limited number of returnee questionnaires have been received from the IIE group, and only three participants have been interviewed in country. The definitive assessment of this program should wait until adequate returnee data is available because many of the returnees are in influential managerial positions in their home countries.

Program Cost

The IIE program is the lowest cost long-term academic program that covers the entire cost of training. The IIE program is structured as a matching grant in that the USAID sponsorship of 10 participants is matched by the private Consortium sponsorship of an additional 10 participants. This slightly complicates the assessment of program costs because the privately sponsored participants are not included in the USAID database. This evaluation estimates the actual costs by doubling the number of training months

used by the USAID participants—assuming that the non-USAID participants studied for approximately the same period.

The initial IIE contract (0002) was budgeted at \$1,252,738 for an estimated 192 participant training months and the cooperative agreement (0045) was budgeted at \$837,900 for an estimated 120 participant training months.

Using the second estimate, the total costs of the IIE program are slightly less than the overall SUNY costs and about 50 percent more expensive than the ECESP program. However, the costs to USAID are only \$1,042 per participant month—about half of the cost of the ECESP program. The administrative costs are approximately 9 percent of the total costs—about \$296 per participant training month—also less expensive than ECESP. The comparison to the ECESP program is not exact, because Georgetown has a much higher level of activity in Europe for recruitment, selection, orientation, and English Language training and more intensive internship planning in the U.S. On the other hand, the IIE placements are placed in higher quality schools in the U.S.

Cost Per Participant Month		
USAID Participants Only		
Total Program Costs:	0002	\$6,525
	0045	6,983
USAID Costs (0002 & 0045):		2,083
Cost-share:	0002	4,442
	0045	4,900
Administrative Costs:	0002	592
Including non-USAID funded Cost-share Participants		
Total Program Costs:	0002	\$3,263
	0045	3,492
USAID Costs (0002 & 0045):		1,042
Cost-share:	0002	2,221
	0045	2,450
Administrative Costs:	0002	296
Source: Contract (0002) & Cooperative Agreement (0045)		

Conclusions and Recommendations

The public-private partnership of the IIE program offers a relatively low cost mechanism for providing high quality graduate education opportunities for CEE students and managers. The program management can be improved in terms of responsiveness to participant concerns and monitoring of participant progress. Given the purpose of the program, the internship component of the program should also be strengthened.

Partners for International Education and Training (PIET)
Buy-in to existing Contract No. DHR-0000-Z-00-00-9079-00, "Placement,
Programming, Management and Field Support Services for
USAID Participant Training," managed by the
USAID Center for Human Capacity Development
EUR-0045-3-262-2481
PACD: 02/21/95

Project Director:	Colin J. A. Davies
Program Director:	Lisa Posner
Overseas Coordinator:	Anita Blevins
Regional Coordinator:	Gerald Martin (in Europe)
CEE Countries:	Northern Tier: the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, the Slovak Republic; and Southern Tier: Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Romania
Number of Contract Awards:	763 from Albania (28), Bulgaria (141), Croatia (50), the Czech Republic (61), Estonia (22), Hungary (65), Latvia (30), Lithuania (24), Macedonia (16), Poland (198), Romania (62), the Slovak Republic (62), and Slovenia (4)
Total Number of Awards:	651 (completed)
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring (50%), Democratic Institution Strengthening (25%), Quality of Life (25%)</i>
Sectors or Fields of Training:	Economic Restructuring: Economics, Business, Commercial Law, Banking, Energy, Small Business Development, Marketing, Trade and Investment; Democratic Institutions: Political Science, History Education, Journalism, Natural Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences; and Quality of Life: Health, Medicine, Housing, Labor
Length of Training:	Individual programs may mix academic training and on-the-job training. Private sector training and internships are a priority for all sectors.
Cost of Project:	\$18,307,747

Background

The PIET contract provides the core support services for PTPE technical training in all CEE countries. The contract includes resident offices in each country for all predeparture activities (recruitment, selection, orientation, testing, training plans, etc.) and placement and monitoring services in the U.S. The in-country support services are

also available to participants from other mission training activities, including the PTPE cooperative agreements. Training under the PIET program is closely coordinated with the USAID project managers to identify training priorities and to select key counterparts. The program consists primarily of short courses and technical training programs.

The goals of the project are to address through training the substantive areas of SEED priorities: a) Economic Restructuring—by assisting in transforming centrally planned economies into market based economies led by the private sector and integrated into the world economy; b) Democratic Institutions—by developing and building democratic, pluralistic societies based on valued human rights and individual freedoms; and c) Quality of Life—by providing education and training in the areas of health, medicine, housing, and labor.

An estimated 1,305 participants are expected to be trained under the PIET contract through the end of the contract.

Program Management

The PIET program is administered by a staff in Washington, DC, and is supported by field offices in all of the CEE countries. The field offices are managed by regional offices in Poland and Hungary. The management and operations of each office are somewhat different, reflecting the priorities of the mission.

PIET provides a high quality orientation to all participants, including participants from other programs. Overall, 86 percent of the participants felt prepared or very prepared for the training program. The participants were generally satisfied with the administrative and logistical support provided by PIET.

PIET has submitted all quarterly progress reports and TCA reports, although all have been submitted between two and nine months late. All relevant participant data is provided through the PIET nomination form. The data is generally provided in a timely manner. However, since the PIET programs are generally very short in length and the participants often attend more than one training institution, PIET distributes the exit questionnaires directly. The return rate for exit questionnaires for PIET participants is 92 percent.

Participant Assessment

The PIET participants were generally satisfied with the training. The responses to the exit questionnaire were in the average range for program quality, content, and relevance. In light of the broad range of training and conditions of the large number of PIET participants, the satisfaction levels are very acceptable. A total of 71 percent believed that the training will be relevant to their jobs, and 84 percent believe that the training will be useful. The returnee questionnaire findings were essentially equivalent to those in the exit questionnaire.

A total of 76 percent of the returnees found that the training improved their job performance and 26 percent believed that the training improved the organizational performance of their employers. These responses are not problematical, but they are lower than those from the other two organizations with returnee questionnaire results—Georgetown and PIET. It should be noted, however, that the other two programs offer long-term training rather than short-term technical training. No comparable short-term technical responses to the returnee questionnaires are available.

The returnee questionnaires and in-country interviews in three countries (Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria) offer a mixed view of the program results. For some participants, the programs have been interesting and informative, but too general to be particularly useful upon return. This is always an issue with very short-term training. However, as was discussed above, the results are very different in other countries. The degree to which the training has been highly relevant and very useful for the participants is dramatically higher in Bulgaria than in Poland and Hungary. The Bulgaria program is very actively managed by the USAID mission and has a more specific training strategy and greater degree of focus than the other programs. This indicates that opportunities exist to make these programs more effective.

Program Cost

The PIET contract is necessarily a high cost program relative to the others in the PTPE program for several reasons. PIET is the only contractor with full service offices in every country to provide predeparture support services to the missions. These predeparture services are provided to participants from other contractors as well as for the PIET participants. PIET is also unique in the breadth and range of training programs offered and the degree to which the training is uniquely designed in response to participant needs and interests. Unlike the short-term training provided in the cooperative agreements, PIET's training is not limited to a single type of training by a single provider. Finally, PIET is directly contracted to arrange these services and is not a cost-sharing cooperative agreement. The cost-share portion of the PIET activities is limited to negotiating lower cost training from the providers. For all of these structural reasons, PIET would be expected to be a relatively high cost training provider.

The PIET contract for the first three years totals \$18,307,747 to place and train an estimated 1,305 participants for approximately 4 weeks each. The administrative portion of the contract costs total \$7,564,045 (adjusted for the first year's administrative fees

Cost Per Participant Month	
Total Program Costs	\$14,029
Total PTPE Costs	12,879
Training Cost	8,243
Total USAID Costs	14,029
Total USAID PTPE Costs	12,879
Training Cost	8,243
Total Administrative Cost	5,796
PTPE U.S. Placement	2,318
PTPE Field Services	2,318

Source: Contract

charged), a figure which includes the costs of maintaining both field offices and the U.S. placement staff. Of this amount, approximately \$3,025,618 represents the cost of the monitoring and placement services in the U.S. and an equal amount represents the cost of field office support for PTPE participants. The remaining \$1,512,809 is for field office support for other (non-PTPE) participants. The training costs are \$10,743,702 for the three-year period. The costs in this analysis are using the estimated costs from the contract rather than actual expenditures because current expenditures and participant training months completed are not complete at the time of this report. The training costs are separated for the PIET program because the nature of the contract with field offices must be differentiated from the other contracts.

By these cost estimates, the PIET program is overall the highest cost short-term training program. This is not unexpected, as the PIET program offers a uniquely broad range of in-country and U.S. support services for all CEE countries. It also offers a uniquely broad range of training opportunities that are often customized to meet the participants' needs. No other program is comparable to PIET in the administrative and management burden.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The PIET contract offers an average quality program at a relatively high cost. While it is clear that the challenge and scope of the PIET activities is considerably greater than for the other programs and, therefore, justifies a higher cost, the overall cost—quality balance can probably be improved. Costs and management efficiency should be reviewed for possible savings.

No exit questionnaires were distributed or collected from the Salzburg participants because of the timing and location of the program.

Participant Assessment

The data collected from Salzburg Seminar participants is largely limited to in-country interviews of returned participants. As the program was conducted in Europe, the exit questionnaires were difficult to apply and the return rate from returnee questionnaires has been poor. In addition, the Salzburg Seminar conducts internal assessments of the programs. From the interviews, a clear impression is given of high quality, stimulating sessions. The programs are organized around expert presentations in the morning followed by small group discussions and workshops in the afternoons and evenings. All of the returned participants interviewed emphasized the rigor of the study regime as well as the satisfying depth of review of key issues. They also identified the richness given to the experience provided by the variety and quality of the people involved—both presenters and participants.

Program Cost

The Salzburg Seminars is the most expensive program for USAID in terms of participant training months. The Salzburg Seminars is relatively unique in the PTPE program in that there is no cost-sharing requirement—USAID directly reimburses the participant fees of \$3,500 for a one-week program and \$4,500 per person for a two-week program. All of this is direct cost to USAID. The total Salzburg contract budget was \$125,000.

Cost Per Participant Month	
Total Program Costs	\$11,436
USAID Cost	11,436
Cost-share	0

Source: Contract

This is the highest cost program to USAID among the PTPE project contractors, largely due to the lack of cost-sharing. The cost of the program is striking because this is the only program in PTPE that does not incur the high costs of transatlantic travel. In absolute terms, the program costs of \$3,500 and \$4,500 per person are not exorbitant for a high quality, intensive program. However, relative to the other programs in terms of cost per day charged to USAID, this is a very high cost program.

Impact

The eventual impact of the Salzburg Seminar will depend on the ability of the participants to effectively apply the insights gained in their daily work and to create working networks in the region of thoughtful reformers. To date, only a limited amount of returnee data is available for this group, so a definitive assessment must wait.

Summary

In absolute terms, the Salzburg Seminar provides a good quality training experience for less money than other programs. However, the program provides no direct exposure to the U.S., and the costs per participant training month relative to the other activities are very high.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The Salzburg Seminars is a unique program in the PTPE project in that it focuses on the interaction of a carefully selected group of professionals around key issues of common interest. The development of shared perspectives and intraregional networks is as important as any particular transfer of knowledge. Unlike the other programs, the Salzburg Seminar does not include any aspect of exposure to Western approaches to problems.

If future returnee assessments continue to be positive as those currently available, the Salzburg Seminars is a useful addition to the range of programs offered by the PTPE project. The relatively high costs are an issue, although in absolute terms the costs are not excessive.

United States Information Agency (USIA)
Participant Training "Top-Up" Project
Inter-Agency Agreement, Project Number: 180-0045
PACD: 02/21/95

Coordinator:	Rosalind Swenson
Program Officer:	Allison Crocker Portnoy
Special Projects Officer/Budget:	Kim Havenner
Program Assistant:	Carole Reb
NAFSA Program Officer:	Martin Pittman
CEE Countries:	Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Yugoslavia
Number of Awards:	258 — Albania (8), Bosnia-Herzegovina (1), Bulgaria (63), Croatia (10), the Czech Republic (37), Estonia (13), Hungary (41), Latvia (8), Lithuania (10), Macedonia (6), Poland (22), Romania (28), the Slovak Republic (5), Slovenia (5), Yugoslavia (1)
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring, Democratization, Quality of Life</i>
Sectors or Fields of Training:	Humanities, Social Sciences, Economics, Political Science, Earth Sciences, Mathematics, Computer Science, Business, Small Business Development, Banking, Marketing, Architecture, Communications, Journalism, Law, Medicine, Public Administration, Theory of Public Administration, Education, Agriculture, Conservation, Urban Planning and Development
Length of Training:	1 year with option for a second
Total Cost of Project: \$1,787,745	(Top-Up Scholarships 4/92–6/93)

Background

The objective of the Interagency Agreement with USIA is to "provide grants to undergraduate and graduate students to undertake a two-year term of study at U.S. universities." The program consists of grants of \$10,000 or less to supplement financial assistance from other sources. A total of 98 students received support in the 92–93 school year and 153 awards were made in the 93–94 school year. In the 1994–1995 school year, 96 renewals, 79 Fall semester, and 15 Spring semester students entered training.

Program Management

The USIA program is administered by the National Foreign Student Association (NAFSA) through a direct grant. NAFSA maintains a part time staff to implement the program, conduct publicity campaigns, organize the selection committee, and manage the program. The USIA project manager provides oversight to the program.

Aguirre International has received copies of USIA quarterly reports only through March, 1994. Cost data has been received through October 1994. PDF and EURIS data forms have been received for previous years, but not for the participants starting training in the Fall or Spring of the 1994-95 school year.

Participant Assessment

Participant data on the USIA program, and particularly for returnees, is relatively limited. A total of 61 USIA participants have completed the exit questionnaire but no returnee questionnaires are available. Gathering returnee data has been limited to a few in-country interviews because the USIA program does not routinely collect adequate address information. The program also does not follow-up on participants after the support for the academic year is over, so no definitive data exists as to whether the participants return home or stay in the U.S.

From the exit questionnaires, it is clear that the participants are generally positive about their educational opportunities at U.S. universities. Because the program is based in the U.S. and deals directly with colleges rather than participants, the orientation and linkage to USAID program objectives is very limited. The participant responses fall into the average range of satisfaction about the quality of instruction, the content and relevance of the programs, and the overall satisfaction levels. Recognizing that many of the participants are undergraduates on a "year abroad" activity, some of the questions dealing with employment and usefulness of the training are difficult for them to answer.

The participants' views of the USIA/NAFSA role in the program are limited because the program is administered primarily through the colleges and universities. None of the participants interviewed to date was even aware of the grant program until the end of their program when they had to complete tax forms. The first time that many of the participants knew anything about the USIA grant administered by NAFSA was when they were asked to fill out U.S. tax forms upon completion of the program. Because the program is administered directly with the colleges, the participants are largely unaware of the process.

Program Cost

As a supplementary financial support program, the cost of the USIA activity is very low. This program is unlike the others in that it does not support the full cost of the training, nor does it require in-country participant selection, orientation, or placement. The average student grant was \$7,775 in the 1992-93 school year and \$8,767 in the 1993-94

school year. This is an average of approximately \$919 per participant month. For the 1993–1994 year, administrative costs for the NAFSA staff and expenses were approximately \$138,750 (about 10% of the total) and administrative costs within USIA were estimated at \$61,250.

Impact

The potential impact of this type of program is difficult to assess. The participants are college students in the middle or late part of their studies. Therefore, most of the beneficiaries are either still in school or are recent graduates. The most significant accomplishment for people at this stage of life is finding a job. While a continuing follow-up assessment can be made for these students, it is unreasonable to expect significant accomplishments in the implementation period of the PTPE program.

Over the long term, this type of training opportunity will undoubtedly have a significant impact on the individuals involved, their knowledge and understanding of the U.S. and its institutions, and their attitudes toward the U.S. throughout their lives. This impact will be manifested in a wide variety of ways in their personal and professional lives.

However, it is not clear that this program substantially increases the number of people who have the training opportunity. Some of these participants—perhaps the majority—would have attended these educational programs in the U.S. even if the USIA scholarship program did not exist. Given the management structure of the program dealing directly with the colleges, it is difficult to determine the degree to which the PTPE funding creates new opportunities for U.S. educational experiences.

Issues

1. USIA and USAID are fundamentally different organizations with different structures, procedures, objectives, and interests. The differences can be found in everything from the types of data available to the process for selection, monitoring, and Follow-on. The USIA focus is on the distribution of the grants and facilitating the U.S. training experience for its own sake. The program is primarily oriented toward U.S. colleges and universities, which serve as the primary point of contact. The orientation for USAID programs is on target country objectives, sector needs, and the participants. This critical difference in orientation affects virtually all aspects of the program, including implementation and evaluation.

Possibly the most significant aspect of the different agendas of the two organizations is that the USIA program interests begin and end with the academic year and all interaction is with the U.S. colleges. The USIA program implementation does not involve participants or their employers in any way. USIA interests do not extend to the post-training period, so routine collection of post training data such as new addresses, occupation, or the date of return to the home country is not done. In many cases, it is not possible to determine whether

the participants have returned to their home countries. This lack of data severely constrains evaluation of the program.

In the USAID perspective, on the other hand, the academic year is only a means to an end, and interaction with U.S. colleges is an implementation detail rather than the centerpiece of the program. The focus for development impact is necessarily on the stages *before* and *after* the actual training—the careful selection of key individuals, the development of training programs that address real needs, and the tracking and support of participants after they return home and attempt to apply the training.

These differences in organizational goals, priorities, and structures have made the joining of USAID and USIA systems challenging and frustrating to both sides. The nature and level of information about participants needed by USAID is seen as an unnecessary burden by USIA. The USIA management of the program is seen as isolated and unrelated to strategic concerns by the USAIDs, who have no direct involvement in the program. While both organizations have made a good faith effort to work together and recognize each other's needs, the lack of a common goal is very problematical.

2. The bulk of the questions and concerns about the PTPE program addressed in the monitoring and evaluation activity are relevant to all program contractors except for USIA. A specialized data collection process would be needed for the USIA program and would be entirely directed toward the degree of satisfaction with the education received.

These differences make a meaningful evaluation of the USIA program on terms comparable to the other PTPE activities virtually impossible.

3. Some of the programs are not degree-seeking, or even full year. Although a complete assessment of the program is limited by the lack of information and limited opportunity to interview returned participants, the in-country interviews completed to date are informative. Of the students interviewed in Hungary, none were planning a two-year program. Three attended the equivalent of a junior year abroad, as part of the standard university fare in architecture. One attended only one semester in the U.S. (All of the three students identified in Bulgaria were still in school, but none were available for interviews.) While there is nothing inherently inappropriate with support for junior year abroad type programs, it is not the type of activity that was anticipated in the interagency agreement, nor is it the understanding of the USAID Project Manager.
4. The USIA program may have only a marginal impact on increasing the number of people who have the opportunity for a U.S. education. The data on this is very limited and is not conclusive. However, discussions with participants and USAID officials in Hungary and Bulgaria indicate that the "topping off" grants are not a deciding factor in enabling some participants to attend the U.S. college. For

these people, the educational program would have happened with or without the USIA grant. In these cases, the program did not enable more CEE students to attend U.S. universities, but rather provided a subsidy for the college international programs. At this point, the data is not sufficient to allow a definitive conclusion about the proportion of the "topping off" grants that fall into this category. However, the evidence indicates that it is true in at least some cases.

Summary

The USIA topping-off program is a financial support program for CEE students in U.S. colleges. It has a minimal degree of shared structure, objectives, or interests with the other participant training activities funded by PTPE. This program has a long-term impact in the attitudes and capacities of these students. However, this type of program cannot be usefully integrated or evaluated in comparison with other PTPE activities that are more development oriented.

Recommendation and Conclusions

The artificial inclusion of the USIA program into the overall framework of the PTPE program should be eliminated. USAID funds for this USIA activity should be directly channeled to USIA, with all management, monitoring, and oversight responsibilities wholly delegated to USIA under standard USIA procedures and regulations.

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS—GENERAL

Background

USAID has conducted two national competitions for the provision of technical training services for the CEE countries. In the 1993 competition, twelve organizations were selected. Most of the training was completed by the fall of 1994. In the 1994 competition, seven organizations were selected, with training starting in 1995.

The intent of the cooperative agreement program was to open opportunities to new training providers, to stimulate creative new approaches to training, and to achieve greater cost efficiencies. The key parameters of the program have been:

- training must support the SEED act priorities;
- a minimum of 50 percent of cost-sharing is required; and
- the programs should be self-implementing (i.e., require minimal assistance from USAID or its contractors.)

Each cooperating organization is responsible for all aspects of the program. USAID representatives provide orientation to the organizations in the USAID regulations and reporting requirements. The organizations were allowed to send the participants to PIET for in-country processing, but all other activities—including recruitment, selection, and Follow-on, were to be the responsibility of the organization.

General Assessment

The cooperative agreement component encompasses a very broad range of programs in terms of activities, quality, and cost. Some of the training lasts for only a few weeks, while others encompass a full academic year. The quality of the programs has also varied from relatively poor to exceptionally good. The costs also vary from extremely low cost to very high cost.

The data on the cooperative agreements available at this time is limited to exit questionnaires. Due to the timing of the programs and locations of the returnees, no returnee data is yet available either from the questionnaires or from the in-country interviews. This data will be available within a few months. Any conclusive determination of relative cost-effectiveness must await this data.

Program management has been generally satisfactory. Some management concerns that apply to most of the cooperative agreement organizations include in-country recruitment and selection, compliance with *Handbook 10* requirements, data collection and reporting, and relations with USAID missions. As few of these organizations have had previous experience with this type of USAID financed training program, the learning curve has been fairly steep. One of the significant management challenges for this type of program

is to train a number of organizations in the details of U.S. Government participant training regulations. In general, contractors to USAID in this area have learned through years of experience—a luxury not available to organizations with a one year contract for a small number of participants.

This component is highly management intensive. The project design of having a large number of inexperienced contractors providing relatively small training programs makes the management burden almost unavoidable. In order to justify this management burden, the cooperative agreement component should have a clear advantage in terms of impact and cost-effectiveness.

Program Cost

The expectation that the competitive grant process would result in notably lower cost programs for USAID was not achieved. The costs per participant month varied widely on a participant training month basis. While the lower cost programs are very competitive with any alternative program, the high cost programs clearly do not offset the management burden of the component.

Summary

Adequate data is not yet available to make a definitive conclusion about the program as a whole. Based on the information to date, some of the individual contractors have provided excellent training services at a very low cost—fully justifying this innovative approach to selecting training providers. Others have not demonstrated either cost or quality advantages over traditional training mechanisms. Perhaps the competitive mechanism can be useful as a means of identifying new good quality, low cost programs that should receive continuing funding.

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS—INDIVIDUAL

The Cooperative Housing Foundation (CHF) Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4008-00 PACD: 02/21/95

Executive Vice President, International Programs:	Dr. Judith A. Hermanson
Program Director:	Barbara Czachorska-Jones
Program Development Specialist:	Rebecca Bailey
CEE Countries:	Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland
Number of Contract Awards:	24
Total Number of Awards:	26
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring, Quality of Life</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Engineering, Public Administration, Urban Studies
Length of Training:	6.5 weeks (4 groups of 6 participants)
Total Cost of Project: \$576,912	USAID Amount: \$232,600 (44.28%)

Background

CHF was awarded a cooperative agreement in the first institutional competition in 1993. The training program was completed in late 1994. The purpose of the program is to expose public administrators in CEE countries to U.S. approaches to housing delivery. The training internship program consisted of

- skills training in strategic approach to housing issue;
- exposure to a variety of approaches used in the U.S.; and
- creating linkages to U.S. organizations working in housing.

Each country-based session was to produce specific Action Plans for the participant to implement upon return. The training approach was to place participants in a series of internships and workshops in different parts of the country to deal with such issues as resource mobilization, involving private sector organizations, and privatization of communal housing projects.

Project Management

The program was managed directly by staff at the Cooperative Housing Foundation and supported by officials in the regional housing authorities where the participants completed their internships. CHF was able to include an additional three participants during the last cohort at no additional cost to the project (one of whom left early due to medical reasons). The CHF participants were satisfied with the management of the program.

CHF has submitted all required reports and participant data. The Participant Data Form (PDF) and EURIS Supplemental Data Form were submitted to Aguirre International in adequate time to allow exit questionnaires to be sent to the participants. All CHF participants have completed and returned the exit questionnaire. The quarterly progress reports and TCA reports have also been submitted, although all such reports were submitted after the due dates. These reports were submitted between 20 days and 6 months late.

Participant Assessment

Participants who responded to the exit questionnaire consistently gave the program above average ratings for program quality, content, and objectives. The program clearly provided exposure to a range of different approaches and ideas about housing solutions. However, the ratings for the relevance of the training to home country conditions and the degree to which the training provided useful skills were notably lower than the program quality rankings. The participants apparently were not able to visualize the opportunities for applying these approaches in the very different context of their home countries. The overall satisfaction with the program was quite high.

Given the participant doubts about the relevance of training, the data from returnee questionnaires and in-country visits will be particularly important in assessing this program. It is possible that participants will find many opportunities to apply new ideas once they return to their country, and the assessment from the perspective of six months working at home will be very different. If the exit questionnaires accurately reflect the relevance of the program, the impact may be very limited.

Program Cost

The CHF program was budgeted at a total cost of \$576,912 for an estimated 36 person training months.

The total costs of this program were very high—it is one of the four highest cost programs. The direct costs to USAID are at the median level for short-term programs in the PTPE project. While expensive, these

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$16,025
USAID Cost	6,461
Cost-share	9,564 (60%)
Administrative Cost	5,396 (39%)
Source: Cooperative Agreement	

program costs reflect the cost of additional travel and internships in different parts of the country. However, the budgeted administrative costs are notably high—both as a percentage of the total and as an absolute figure.

Summary

The CHF program provided the participants with considerable and diverse exposure to housing solutions in the U.S., but the training may not be appropriate or relevant to the conditions in CEE countries. The pending data from returnee questionnaires and country visits will provide the necessary information to make a final assessment about the impact of this program.

The Council of International Programs (CIP)
co-funded by The Soros Foundation
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-3047-00
PACD: 05/31/95

Project Manager:	Dr. Glenn Shive
Program Officer:	Soeurette Grammont
Program Officer (Soros):	Amanda Leness
CEE Countries:	Albania, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic
Number of Contract Awards:	65 (down from 75)
Total Number of Awards:	47 (46 completed, 1 in training)
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring, Quality of Life</i>
Sectors or Fields of Training:	Economic Restructuring (Public Administration, Taxation and Public Finance, Banking and Securities, Personnel and Human Resources Management), and Quality of Life (Health Care Administration, Environmental Protection, Social Services Management, and Housing and Community Development); 30 percent will be in Public Administration, and 10 percent in each of the other 7 fields
Length of Training:	4 months (in 2 groups)
Total Cost of Project: \$887,802	USAID Amount: \$249,102 (28.06%)

Background

The CIP program, co-funded by the Soros Foundation, is a medium-term (4 month) training program designed to assist key institutions in the CEE to rebuild themselves in the context of open societies with free market economies and to promote long-term linkages between these institutions and their U.S. counterparts. The program targets young leaders from both public and private sector organizations in ten CEE countries for training in a range of fields relevant to economic restructuring and quality of life. Approximately 30 percent were expected to be trained in Public Administration. The participants are to learn practical managerial skills while discovering how public organizations work in a market economy. The original proposal planned to train 75 participants, but this total was later reduced to 65, and then further reduced to 60 due to the increased HAC premiums.

Program Management

The overall program management is based in the CIP offices in the District of Columbia. Field support for the training is provided by the twelve CIP affiliate offices in other U.S. cities, each of which is associated with a local university. The local affiliates were responsible for providing participants with a one to two-week orientation on the regional economic issues and for arranging internships, homestays, academic coursework, and monitoring progress on each individual participant's project. CIP was unable to accommodate all of the planned 60 participants into two cohorts and received a no-cost extension from USAID to begin a third cohort in January, 1995.

Participants were generally satisfied with the program management and orientation. The only area in which a notable number of participants were dissatisfied was orientation to USAID policies and regulations (21%).

CIP had difficulties in the timely submission of participant data and reports throughout the contract period. Submission of the PDF and EURIS Supplemental Data Forms were regularly very late. Data for one cohort of 29 participants was not submitted until two months after the participants had completed the training and returned home. This resulted in the need to send exit questionnaires and certificates of achievement to the participants in their home country. The exit questionnaire return rate for CIP participants is very low—at 47 percent.

Participant Assessment

Overall participant assessment of the CIP program was mixed. The total levels of satisfaction ("very satisfied" and "satisfied") for achievement of objectives and instructional quality were relatively high, but the proportion of "very satisfied" participants was notably lower than for most other programs. Moreover, the participants rated the content and expected relevance of the training as well below average. Fifteen percent of the respondents were "dissatisfied" with the course content (few programs had participants who responded as being "dissatisfied" with substantive aspects of the program). The expected usefulness of the training was low average.

The evaluation data available to date does not allow for assessing impact (i.e., returnee questionnaires and home country interviews have not been completed), nor is the data adequate to compare experiences in different CIP affiliates. Since the program was being separately managed in twelve different sites, the quality of program might have varied considerably. A definitive assessment of this program should await the availability of returnee data.

Program Cost

Based on the original budget information, the CIP program is a remarkably low cost program. At a total program cost of \$887,807, CIP had projected 300 person months of training. While the reduction in total number of person months is likely to increase the

training cost per participant, the final TCA data is not yet available. The current TCA data indicates that the program is more costly than expected, but is still the lowest cost training program by a considerable margin.

Overall, the CIP is an exceptionally low cost training program.

Summary

Final assessment of the CIP program will have to await availability of returnee and home country interview information. While the exit questionnaire data indicated some weaknesses in the program, the very low costs warrant a close look at the impact of the training after return. If the training is proving to be reasonably useful, and the factors affecting the mediocre ratings of quality can be identified and remedied, the program might be usefully continued.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$2,959
USAID Cost	830
Cost-share	2,129 (72%)
Administrative Cost	744 (25%)
Source: Cooperative Agreement	

Goodwill Industries of America
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4002-00
PACD: 02/21/95

Director of International Affairs:	Elizabeth Scott
Assistant:	Suzanne M. Yuskiw
Financial Advisor:	Joanne Mozynski
CEE Countries:	The Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, the Slovak Republic
Number of Contract Awards:	8
Total Number of Awards:	5 (4 completed; 1 in training)
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring, Quality of Life</i>
Sectors or Fields of Training:	Vocational Rehabilitation, Job Training, Small Enterprise Development
Length of Training:	2 months
Total Cost of Project: \$173,182	USAID Amount: \$86,127 (49.73%)

Background

The objective of this cooperative agreement is to develop a corps of NGO executives and professional managers in the field of vocational rehabilitation in Poland, Hungary, Latvia, and the Czech and Slovak Republics. The NGOs will develop job training and employment facilities for people with disabilities.

Participants are given two months of training in the techniques of operating and staffing the traditional Goodwill vocational/rehabilitation/contracting and retail sales organizations through a step by step curriculum at local Goodwill sites in the U.S. After completion of the program, the participants will be prepared to set up and operate a minimum of three full-scale job training and production centers.

The original proposal was to train eight CEE professionals. A total of five participants were trained in the program. Goodwill states that the stringent selection criteria and nature of the program inhibited recruitment in the time period allowed.

Program Management

The training program is managed by the Director of International Affairs for Goodwill and implemented at local sites throughout the country. Although the program was not able to recruit and train the anticipated number of participants, the overall management of the program was good.

All of the participants were either very satisfied or satisfied with the program management, orientation, and support.

All quarterly and TCA reports have been submitted. Although the reports were submitted a few days late (most between one and four days late, one 15 days late), this record of compliance was good in comparison with the group of cooperative agreement organizations as a whole. The PDF and EURIS data forms were received in a timely manner, and all exit questionnaires from the Goodwill participants have been received.

Participant Assessment

With the caveat that the Goodwill sample size is very small (only five people), this program received the best rankings of all PTPE activities in the exit questionnaires. The participants were very satisfied with the Goodwill program. The participants consistently gave the Goodwill program the highest ratings ("very satisfied" or "completely relevant," etc.) in measures of relevance, content, quality, relevance, and usefulness of the training. A follow-up assessment in the returnee questionnaires and in-country visits will provide interesting information as to whether the participants have been able to apply the training in their home countries. If the returnee assessments are as positive as the assessment of the training experience, this program will have a significant impact.

The very positive participant rankings for the Goodwill program provide some useful perspective on the program's inability to recruit the anticipated number of people. One of the key elements of recruitment and selection is to carefully match the participants with the right training program. The results of the exit questionnaire indicate that Goodwill has been very successful in finding participants who would benefit from this particular training program. These results may justify the lower than expected numbers.

Program Cost

The Goodwill program was budgeted at \$173,182 for 18 person months of training.

The Goodwill program was one of the four lowest cost short-term programs in terms of direct costs to USAID. In comparison with the other short-term programs, the Goodwill training program was low cost.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$9,621
USAID Cost	4,785
Cost-share	4,836 (50%)

Source: Cooperative Agreement

Summary

The Goodwill program is one of the most cost-effective programs in the PTPE project, based on the exit questionnaire data.

Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration
Central and Eastern European Teachers Program (CEETP)
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4006-00
PACD: 02/21/95

Assistant Dean, Business School:	Kathryn F. Venne
Assistant Director:	Constance Galanis
Administrative Director:	Joanne F. Segal
CEE Countries:	Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic
Number of Contract Awards:	25 USAID-sponsored (5 others)
Total Number of Awards:	13
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring, Quality of Life</i>
Sectors or Fields of Training:	Marketing and Competitive Analysis, Production/ Technology/Operations Management, Strategic Management and Organizational Behavior, Capital Markets and Corporate Finance, Managerial Accounting and Performance Evaluation
Length of Training:	9–12 weeks
Total Cost of Project: \$439,466	USAID Amount: \$216,271 (49.21%)

Background

The Harvard program is designed to train up to 30 participants from 7 CEE countries in the U.S. for 9 to 12 weeks of training that will assist in the development of management education institutions and their teachers. An additional five participants were to be trained as part of the cost-sharing contribution. The teachers attend existing executive education programs at Harvard Business School (HBS) and similar programs in other consortium schools such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Wharton.

The program gives teachers an exposure to how business and economies function in free markets by providing:

- a broad understanding of the main functional areas of business and of the challenges encountered in integrating these functions into an effective strategic and operating plan of action;
- an increased awareness of the workings of a market economic in competitive, political, and managerial terms;

-
- a managerial perspective, oriented strongly toward action;
 - an understanding of an educational process that focuses on the development of judgement and of the skills of problem identification, decision-making, and action planning; and
 - a command of business terminology.

Program Management

The program is under the overall direction of the Assistant Dean of the HBS and is administered directly by HBS staff. Harvard trained 13 of the proposed number of USAID participants, as well as 2 participants supported as cost-share contribution. Harvard states that the participants were drawn from a carefully selected pool, which had a limited number of replacement candidates. When some candidates were unable to attend for personal reasons or limited language proficiency, they were unable to find additional qualified candidates in the time available.

Participants were generally satisfied with the management of the program. The areas in which participants expressed dissatisfaction were in the advance notice for travel (25%), medical insurance (8%), and stipends (8%).

HBS has submitted all required quarterly reports and TCA reports within 10 to 17 days of the due date. Although the reports were late, the compliance was more timely than the majority of the other cooperative agreement organizations. Participant data forms and the EURIS supplemental form were all received in a relatively timely manner that allowed for distribution of the exit questionnaire and data reporting. About 92 percent of the HBS exit questionnaires have been returned.

Participant Assessment

The Harvard program received consistently high ratings from the participants in all questions about program quality, relevance, management, and usefulness. By the measures of the exit questionnaire, the program is one of the two best in the PTPE project. The data from returnee questionnaires and in-country interviews, when available, will be necessary to determine the impact of the program.

Program Cost

The budgeted total cost of the Harvard program was \$439,466 for approximately 73.5 person months of training. This was the lowest cost short-term program in terms of direct USAID costs.

By all of these measures, the HBS program was among the least cost, most efficient programs in the PTPE project.

It should be noted that the HBS program was designed to last between 9 and 12 weeks, which is longer than any other short-term programs and is close to the length of programs in the medium-term category. If this program is compared to the medium-term programs, the costs would be among the highest in that group. Therefore, the costs per training month are appropriate to the length and nature of training.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$5,979
USAID Cost	2,943
Cost-share	3,037 (51%)
Administrative Cost	680 (11%)

Source: Cooperative Agreement

Summary

The HBS program appears to be a well-designed training program offering high quality instruction appropriate to a well selected group of trainees. The training needs of the participants were well defined and addressed in the program content. Harvard's inability to train more people should be seen in the context of assuring that the right people are selected and trained.

If the impact data collected from the returnee questionnaire and the in-country interviews reflect the same level of quality as does the exit questionnaire data, the HBS program will be one of the most cost-effective programs in the PTPE project.

HBS originally estimated a higher number of participants. However, because potential participants were drawn from a carefully selected pool, participants who were not able to participate for language proficiency or due to other professional commitments could not always be replaced by suitable alternates. In some cases HBS was able to bring participants for later program components, after additional language training, for instance; but this was not possible in every instance.

Home Builders Institute (HBI)
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4003-00
PACD: 10/31/94

President and CEO:	Phillip Polivchak
Project Director:	Dr. Michael McIntyre
Project Manager:	Robert Erwin
Training Manager:	Judith Becker
CEE Countries:	Poland and the Slovak Republic
Number of Contract Awards:	30 — Poland (22); the Slovak Republic (8)
Total Number of Awards:	28
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Democratic Institution Building (primarily), Economic Restructuring and Quality of Life</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Administration of Building Standards and Testing
Length of Training:	4 weeks (originally 6 weeks in-U.S.)
Total Cost of Project: \$613,661	USAID Amount: \$249,865 (40.71%)

Background

The Home Builders Institute program is designed to provide CEE building officials with the public administration skills necessary to regulate and support the development of a private sector housing industry. The program was to train 30 Polish and Slovak participants in the administration of building standards and testing for 4 to 6 weeks in the U.S. The purpose of the program is to promote the adoption of fair, democratic, and efficient procedures for building code administration in East Europe and to train participants to protect the public health and safety while accommodating needed improvements in building technology. The focus of the training is on professional and managerial skills, field inspection procedures, and materials approval methodology.

The program consists of an intensive six week training program followed by a monitored three-month practicum in the home country, culminating in a group reunion for review and assessment of results. The U.S. portion of the program is divided into two weeks of classroom orientation, two weeks of visits to building code institutions, and two weeks of field placements with local building code officials. The program took place in September–October, 1994.

Program Management

The program is administered by the HBI staff in Washington, DC, and supported by affiliated organizations in sites throughout the United States. HBI completed training

for 28 or the proposed 30 participants. Two participants canceled at the last moment due to visa and health problems. Participants had no significant complaints about HBI program management.

HBI was fully responsive to all reporting and data requirements. HBI has submitted all quarterly reports and TCA reports within a week of the due dates. The final report was submitted, although it was received 31 days after the due date. The PDF and EURIS supplemental data forms were received before the participants' arrival in the U.S.

A total of 27 of the 28 exit questionnaires have been received, for a return rate of 96 percent.

Participant Assessment

The HBI participants were generally very satisfied with the program quality, content, and the degree to which the training objectives were achieved. The program was above average in all of these measures. However, the participants were much less satisfied with the relevance of the program to the conditions in their home countries, and with the expected usefulness of the training to their jobs. The program was ranked below average in these measures.

Program Cost

The HBI program was among the highest cost programs in the PTPE project. The total budgeted cost of the HBI program was \$613,661 for an anticipated 35 participant training months.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$17,533
USAID Cost	7,139
Cost-share	10,394 (59%)
Source: Cooperative Agreement	

The exceptionally high cost of this program is due to several factors. First, the fact that participants were travelling and in temporary quarters for the full training period contributed to the high cost. More importantly, however, was the manner in which cost-share was calculated. The bulk of the cost-sharing expenses was in-kind contributions of time from local building officials meeting with the participants. While these costs undoubtedly represent economic opportunity costs, they would not necessarily be financial costs (i.e., training programs would not normally reimburse the employers for their time).

Summary

The HBI program combines a high cost, high quality training program with a very low perceived relevance of the training. The key to determining whether the program was worth the costs will be found in the returnee data and in-country interviews. If at that time the participants have been able to utilize the training effectively, the impact may justify the high costs. Given the information currently available, however, the program does not appear to justify the costs.

implementation, including local transportation, the stipend, medical care and insurance. While these are relatively small numbers of people who registered dissatisfaction with program management, they are notable in that "very dissatisfied" and "dissatisfied" ratings were relatively rare among PTPE contractors.

Johns Hopkins failed to pay any HAC insurance premiums until the first quarter of FY 95. All insurance payments have now been made.

The Johns Hopkins program has been seriously delinquent in submitting program reports. Although all required quarterly and TCA reports have been received, the submissions have not been timely. All FY 94 quarterly reports were submitted on December 20, 1994 (the end of the first quarter of FY 95), and all 1994 TCA reports were not received until January 13, 1995. The report for the first quarter of FY 95 was received 17 days after the due date.

Submission of PDF and EURIS supplemental data forms was also very late, in many cases not being submitted until after the participants had returned home. Twenty-four of the 26 exit questionnaires have been received.

Participant Assessment

The Johns Hopkins participants were generally satisfied with the program, with satisfaction measures in the low average range for issues such as quality and content of training. However, the relatively small proportion of the Johns Hopkins participants who were "very satisfied" with the quality and content of the program was notable in view of Johns Hopkins' reputation as a university. The participants rating of the relevance of the training and the expected usefulness of the skills was above average for the PTPE contractors, although again the relative proportion of "very satisfied" participants was low.

Program Cost

The total budgeted program cost for the Johns Hopkins program was \$493,476 for an estimated 64 person months of training.

The Johns Hopkins program is the second lowest cost short-term program. It should be noted that this program has a mix of short and medium-term training activities, so the cost comparison is not entirely valid. Overall, the Johns Hopkins program cost to USAID is very low.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$7,711
USAID Cost	3,855
Cost-share	3,856 (50%)

Source: Cooperative Agreement

Summary

The Johns Hopkins program appears to be an above average program in terms of the cost-quality tradeoffs. However, given the ambivalence in the exit questionnaire data, the impact assessment from the returnee questionnaires and the in-country interviews will be critical for determining the overall value of the program.

**The Soros Foundation's Management Training Program
Training Internship Program through the
Business Higher Education Forum—American Council on Education
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4007-00
PACD: 06/30/95**

Project Officer:	Amanda Leness
Director:	Susanna Khavul
Chairperson:	Mrs. Herta Seidman
CEE Countries:	Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic
Number of Contracts Awards:	30
Total Number of Awards:	25
SEED Act Priority:	<i>Economic Restructuring</i>
Sectors or Fields of Training:	Business Management, Communications, Environmental Management, Public Administration, Banking and Financial Services
Length of Training:	3 months
Total Cost of Project: \$510,781	USAID Amount: \$249,964 (48.93%)

Background

The Soros Foundation program was to sponsor 30 participants from five CEE countries for three months of training in fields such as business management, communications, and public administration. The program is intended to provide hands-on experience in professional specialties through a combination of internships and structured academic training. All participants were to be grouped into training clusters with representatives from different countries which would form a core professional network. The training takes place in academic-corporate partnerships between major universities and private industry.

The first participants arrived in August of 1994. By the end of 1994, 23 of the proposed 30 participants had been brought to the U.S. for training. The anticipated number of participants was not achieved within the planned time period because of personal and professional conflicts among the group selected. Soros was granted a no-cost extension to train the remaining participants.

Program Management

The central project management is the responsibility of the Soros Foundation. Each training cluster is managed by the respective university in each area. The Soros program management was subject to an unusual amount of participant criticism in the exit questionnaires. The program provided less orientation than any of the other programs and participant dissatisfaction with various aspects of the preparation (advance notice, stipends, content, objectives, and travel) ranged from 7 to 21 percent. The Soros program had the lowest proportion of participants (28%) who were "very prepared" or "prepared" for the training of all of the PTPE contractors.

Participant dissatisfaction was also notable for the program implementation, including for housing, travel, medical care, and resolution of problems. Of particular concern is the fact that fully half (50%) of the participants were dissatisfied with the amount of the stipend, and 21 percent were dissatisfied with the timeliness of the payment. It is unclear whether this represents poor orientation and inflated expectations or other problems.

Soros has been responsive in the reporting requirements of the cooperative agreement. All quarterly reports and TCA reports have been received within eleven days of the due date. PDF forms and the EURIS supplemental data forms have been submitted in a timely manner. Eighty-two percent of the exit questionnaires have been received.

Participant Assessment

The Soros program received the most consistently low marks of all of the programs in the PTPE project. Participant assessment of the quality of instruction, program content, and degree to which the training objectives were achieved were either the lowest or second lowest among all contractors. Although the relevance of the program to home country conditions was average, the participants' expectations of the usefulness of the skills was below average. The Soros program had the lowest overall satisfaction with the program among all contractors.

The poor assessment of program quality is striking but difficult to interpret. The in-country interviews with participants will provide a great deal of needed perspective and additional information about the program and its shortcomings. The returnee questionnaire will also allow the participants to reassess the program with the benefit of time and hindsight.

Program Cost

The Soros program was budgeted at \$510,781 for an estimated 90 person months of training.

The USAID portion of the cost was one of the more expensive in the medium-term category. The administrative costs are estimated at a very low five percent of the total costs.

Summary

The Soros Foundation Management Training Program is a problematical program in many ways. It is a relatively high cost program that has, to date, received relatively poor reviews from the participants. At this point in the program assessment, it appears to be among the worst managed programs in the PTPE project.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$5,675
USAID Cost	2,777
Cost-share	2,898 (51%)
Administrative Cost	268 (5%)

Source: Cooperative Agreement

SUNY—Farmingdale
Center for International Technological Cooperation (CITC)
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-3048-00
PACD: 02/21/95

Director:	Dr. Eleanor Fapohunda
Professor:	Gary Rupp
Assistant to the Provost:	Margaret Baglivio
CEE Country:	Lithuania
Number of Contract Awards:	10
Total Number of Awards:	10
SEED Act Priority:	<i>Economic Restructuring with special emphasis on the banking sector</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Banking and Finance
Length of Training:	12 months (2 semesters and a 3-month internship)
Total Cost of Project: \$364,038	USAID Amount: \$176,404 (48.46%)

Background

The SUNY program is a closely focused training program for ten Lithuanian students and professors from the Kaunas University in Vilnius in the banking and finance sectors. The objective of the program is to introduce the participants to the core concepts and practices of banking in a market system and to establish a supportive network that includes SUNY faculty, business and banking leaders. The program consists of two academic semesters of classroom instruction at SUNY-Farmingdale, a seminar series, and short-term internships at financial institutions. The program also has a significant element of cultural activities in the New York City area.

Program Management

The program was managed entirely by the SUNY staff at the campus, with the active assistance of the Lithuanian-American community in New York. The full planned contingent of 10 participants was trained, although the program start was delayed until January 1994 due to delays in the USAID contracting process.

Although participants received orientation both in Lithuania and upon arrival in the U.S., about 10 to 20 percent of the participants were dissatisfied with aspects of the preparation, including advance notice of travel, medical insurance, information on travel, and aspects of the U.S. culture and institutions. During implementation of the program,

30 percent of the participants were dissatisfied with the local transportation arrangements, and 20 percent were dissatisfied with the resolution of academic or personal problems.

SUNY submitted all quarterly reports and TCA reports within 2 to 51 days of the due dates. The PDF and EURIS Supplemental Data Forms were received in a timely manner. All 10 exit questionnaires have been received.

Participant Assessment

The SUNY program received the lowest rankings from the participants in questions about the degree to which objectives were achieved and the content of training. The rankings for the relevance of the training to home country conditions were the third lowest among all contractors. Although all of the participants were satisfied with the quality of instruction, not a single participant responded that he or she was "very satisfied." This is the only program to have no participants who gave the program the highest ranking. The program also received the lowest percentage of "very satisfied" responses to the question about overall satisfaction with the program.

It is not clear why the program was received by the participants with so little enthusiasm. In part, the mix of different types of participants with different needs contributed to the problem. The program included faculty, students, and practicing bankers—all of whom had slightly different training needs.

Program Cost

The total budget for the SUNY program was \$364,038 with an estimated 100 person months of training. The actual training months completed was only 87.53 because a winter-summer academic cycle was substituted for the standard fall-winter cycle.

This is a low cost program for this type of training.

	Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)
Total Program Costs	\$3,640
USAID Cost	1,764
Cost-share	1,876 (52%)
Source: Cooperative Agreement	

Summary

The SUNY program is a low cost program that had difficulties in the initial year of the program. With limited experience in this type of training, the program made some of the basic mistakes of group training that more experienced programs have learned to avoid. The data from returnee questionnaires and in-country interviews will help determine whether the program has enough strong points to warrant continuing with a revised version of the program.

Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (TJUH)
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4004-00
PACD: 12/31/94

Project Director:	Barry B. Goldberg, M.D., Professor Radiology, Director Division of Ultrasound
Coordinator:	Janice Bogen Field
Soros Foundation (co-founder) Program Officer:	Sara Klaus
CEE Countries:	Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic
Number of Contract Awards:	24 — Albania (2), Bulgaria (3), Estonia (2), Hungary (3), Latvia (2), Lithuania (2), Poland (4), Romania (2), and the Slovak Republic (3)
Total Number of Awards:	24
SEED Act Priority:	<i>Quality of Life</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Diagnostic Ultrasound Training
Length of Training:	3 months
Total Cost of Project: \$496,876	USAID Amount: \$157,965 (31.79%)

Background

The Thomas Jefferson University Hospital program provides specialized training in diagnostic ultrasound procedures to 24 participants from 9 CEE countries. The objective of the three month program is to provide training in the use of diagnostic ultrasound, providing both theoretical and practical training with the objective of preparing participants to introduce the use of ultrasound in general medical care. The program consists of a one-week introduction to the program, a four week didactic program with hands-on training, a five-week clinical tutorial, and two weeks of special procedures in ultrasound evaluation and resource assessment. The TJUH is a renowned teaching leader in this technology.

Program Management

The program is managed by the director of the ultrasound division of this teaching hospital. TJUH has trained all of the planned participants on schedule.

The TJUH participants received predeparture and in-U.S. orientation. While about half of the participants felt "prepared" for the program, participants felt that some important issues were not adequately covered, including medical insurance, information on U.S. culture, U.S. educational systems, and details about the stipends. During program

implementation, over 39 percent of the participants were dissatisfied with the housing and 26 percent were dissatisfied with the stipend amount. This indicates that the orientation needed to be more explicit about the living conditions that the participants should expect.

TJUH has submitted all of the required quarterly reports and TCA reports, although they have been received between seven days and seven months late. The reports for the first quarter of FY 94 has not yet been submitted. All PDF and EURIS supplemental data forms have been submitted on a timely basis except for the first group of participants, which was provided on the last day of training. Twenty-three of the 24 exit questionnaires have been received.

Participant Assessment

The TJUH participant responses to the exit questionnaire show no clear pattern. The participants rated the program below average in terms of the achievement of training objectives and the relevance of the training to the home country, but the quality and content of the training was rated either high average or above average. The anticipated usefulness of the skills was rated the second best among all of the contractors. To some degree, the variability of the participant assessment reflects the background and expectations of some of the participants, who had expected to conduct direct examinations of patients. Some of the training groups included participants with quite different levels of experience—recent medical graduates and senior members of a department. The assessment partially reflects the difficulty in meeting the training needs of such a diverse group.

Program Cost

The TJUH program was budgeted at \$496,876 for an estimated 72 person months of training.

The TJUH program is in the median range in terms of USAID cost per training month. The administrative portion of the costs is exceptionally high, although it must be noted that in the second cooperative agreement budget this number is almost halved. This indicates that the issue is as much allocation of costs as the actual costs.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$6,901
USAID Cost	2,189
Cost-share	4,708 (68%)
Administrative Cost	4,120 (60%)
Source: Cooperative Agreement	

Summary

The TJUH ultrasound training program is a program of good technical quality at reasonable cost. The program needs to improve selection, group composition, and orientation to assure that the groups are trainable and that the training needs and expectations of the participants are met. The final assessment of this program must wait

until the returnee questionnaires and interviews are completed. TJUH has planned an innovative Follow-on activity that would allow considerable sharing of knowledge, diagnostic support, and professional development if it is implemented as planned.

United States Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI)

Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4001-00

PACD: 02/21/95

Special Projects Coordinator:	Antoinette Sacks
Curriculum Coordinator:	Michael Deegan
Curriculum Coordinator:	Pat Kennard
CEE Countries:	Albania, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic
Number of Contract Awards:	40
Total Number of Awards:	20
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring, Democratic Institution-building, Quality of Life</i>
Sectors or Fields of Training:	Communications training, including privatization concepts for telephone and broadcasting, spectrum management, telephone network management, broadcast studio design, satellite communications, and regulatory structure
Length of Training:	4-week courses
Total Cost of Project: \$660,500	USAID Amount: \$250,000 (37.85%)

Background

The USTTI proposed to train 40 participants from 10 different CEE countries in technical management of advanced communications systems and privatization issues affecting telephone and broadcasting. The four-week courses were designed to train participants in the skills necessary to operate, maintain, update, and expand their telephone and broadcast facilities and to meet their domestic communications requirements. All USTTI courses begin with a three-day orientation in Washington prior to sending the participants to the training facilities of the corporate or federal sponsor offering the course. The courses are offered in numerous organizations throughout the U.S. that offer one or more of the 74 courses in the USTTI curriculum.

Program Management

The program is managed through the Washington offices of the USTTI, and the training is provided in multiple sites of the federal or corporate sponsors of the training. To date, USTTI has trained 20 of the 40 proposed participants. USAID granted an extension to complete the training.

The participants had no criticisms with the orientation or implementation of the program.

USTTI has submitted all Quarterly Narrative reports on time with the exception of the first quarter of FY 95, which was 17 days late. TCA reports have been submitted for the first quarter of FY 95 (17 days late) and the fourth quarter of FY 94 (44 days late). TCA reports for the first three quarters of FY 94 were submitted on March 30, 1995. The TCA report was not submitted in the TCA format as required by *Handbook 10*. Timely submission of the PDF and EURIS supplemental data forms has been a problem for USTTI since the beginning of the project. In many cases, the data was submitted up to two months after the participants had completed training and returned home. Due to the very short-term nature of the USTTI training, the exit questionnaires were distributed directly by USTTI. Fourteen of the 20 exit questionnaires have been received.

Participant Assessment

The USTTI participants were in general very satisfied with the program. The program received above average ratings for the quality of instruction and achievement of their training objectives and high average ratings for content and relevance. The pending data from returnee questionnaires and interviews will be particularly interesting for this program which works in such a highly technical and regulated industry.

Program Cost

The USTTI program was budgeted at \$660,500 for an estimated total of 37.3 training months.

The administrative costs, estimated to be equivalent to the cost-share amount, are extraordinarily high. However, the assignment of all cost-sharing to the administrative line item may be as much a problem with allocation as with actual costs.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$17,708
USAID Cost	6,702
Cost-share	11,005 (62%)
Administrative Cost	11,005 (62%)
Source: Cooperative Agreement	

The USTTI is the second most expensive short-term program among the cooperative agreement contractors. The only programs more expensive were HBI and the two programs that had no cost sharing—Salzburg Seminar and DOS.

Summary

The USTTI training program offers very short, good quality, but relatively expensive training programs for telecommunications officials. The eventual assessment of the cost-effectiveness of this training will be very dependent upon the impact data collected by the returnee questionnaires and in country interviews. The potential value of improved management in the highly visible and critical field of telecommunications is quite high, although the training may be too short to have much practical impact.

**William Davidson Institute, University of Michigan,
School of Business Administration
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-3040-00
PACD: 11/30/94**

Director of Operations:	Hans Brechbuhl
Coordinators:	Ted Snider, Suzanna Heike, Martha Lee, Julie Martin, Maureen Deegan
CEE Countries:	The Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, the Slovak Republic
Number of Contract Awards:	18
Total Number of Awards:	16
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring</i>
Sectors or Fields of Training:	Market Economics, Privatization, Sector Reform and Public Administration
Length of Training:	23 days
Total Cost of Project: \$308,514	USAID Amount: \$78,519 (25.45%)

Background

The William Davidson Institute (WDI) program provides training in market economics, privatization, sector reform, and public administration to 18 participants from four CEE countries. The 23-day program in the U.S. is preceded by a 2-month program in Europe in which Master's level students work with the participants to assess their business enterprises. This information is used in the course design. The program objectives are to provide participants with a set of principles to guide decision making in core business functions such as marketing and finance and to develop their leadership skills and capacity to manage change.

Program Management

The WDI program is directed and managed by the Institute staff in Michigan. The participants had no significant problems with the WDI management of the program. All of the participants received orientation. The only areas in which dissatisfaction was expressed were in the preparation about USAID policies and regulations (25%), information about U.S. culture (13%), and information about U.S. political and economic systems (13%). Participants had no complaints about the implementation of the program.

All quarterly reports and TCA reports have been submitted, although they were submitted between 23 and 37 days late. The final report was submitted 21 days after the due date. All PDF and EURIS supplemental data forms were submitted in a timely fashion. All 16 exit questionnaires from the WDI program have been received.

Participant Assessment

Participants were generally satisfied with the WDI program although the ratings were not particularly strong nor consistent. The program was rated above average in the degree to which the training objectives were achieved, but the ratings for the quality and content were below average. The participants' assessment of the relevance and anticipated usefulness of the training were both average. This relatively mediocre assessment is somewhat surprising in light of the extensive pre-program work in country to better understand the challenges facing the participants and to design the program.

Program Cost

In terms of total (combined USAID and cost-share) cost, the WDI program is the highest cost program in the PTPE project by a considerable margin. The program was budgeted at \$308,514 for an estimated 12 person months of training.

Cost Per Participant Month (Percentage of Total Budget)	
Total Program Costs	\$25,710
USAID Cost	6,543
Cost-share	19,166 (75%)

Source: Cooperative Agreement

The total program costs for this activity are extraordinarily high—46 percent more expensive than the next most costly program and 220 percent higher than the average program cost. The USAID portion of this cost is in the upper middle range for short-term programs.

The very high total costs of this program may reflect the high costs of sending MSU Master's students to Eastern Europe for two months of company study rather than the direct costs of the training itself. The TCA reports were not detailed enough to determine the exact reasons for the high cost.

Summary

At first view, the WDI program appears to be the least cost-effective program in the PTPE project. It appears to be a very high cost program of mediocre quality. More specifically, it appears that most of the value of this program was derived by the U.S. graduate students rather than the CEE participants. However, WDI intends to maintain a working relationship with the foreign partners to assist in solving business problems. If the training impact is shown to be particularly good in the returnee questionnaires and interviews, it is possible that this assessment could be changed.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the program is still on-going, and information about results and impact is limited to date, this evaluation of the PTPE project is only partially complete. The findings presented in this report includes only information on process and implementation for most, but not all, of the PTPE contractors. All findings and conclusions are tentative to date because longitudinal studies are not completed. Therefore, an overall conclusion is that the evaluation process should continue until adequate returnee data is available to accurately and adequately assess the programs.

The comments in this chapter represent an effort to provide perspective and direction to the project based on the best information currently available.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the PTPE project is accomplishing its objectives.

The PTPE project has implemented a multi-faceted training program through multiple contractors and is meeting its training outputs. The project is achieving its basic function, which is to provide a mechanism for managing participant training in Central and Eastern Europe. The majority of the individuals participating in the program hold high level jobs in the public or private sector.

The ENI Bureau should attempt to simplify the PTPE project design to reduce the management burden and enable a greater integrated strategic focus on country development objectives.

The PTPE project is designed to be the core mechanism for implementing participant training in the CEE countries. In addition to the core activity, the PIET buy-in for institutional in-country and placement support, the project has numerous other components that were added to meet various agency needs. These include a range of Congressional requirements and administrative conveniences, such as the Georgetown program, the first IIE grant, Department of State diplomatic training, the USIA "topping off" program, and the Salzburg Seminars. The project also included the institutional competition to deal with the high levels of interest in the program among training providers. This design allowed a wide range of training to get started relatively quickly.

From a management perspective, this design is burdensome. With Bureau management responsibilities for 22 different contractors, the project design created a structure that complicates even the most basic management activities. Each of the implementing organizations must be trained in USAID participant training regulations and documentation requirements. The lack of experience of many of these contractors increases this burden. Even more important is the relative lack of experience in implementing development oriented training programs. Many common mistakes that

more experienced training providers have learned to avoid, such as the composition of group training, were found among the cooperative agreement organizations.

From a strategy perspective, the program lacks a consistent and coherent set of implementable objectives. The combination of activities is driven primarily by innovations and accommodations in process rather than an overriding strategic vision of the proposed development impact on strategic objectives. The coordination of project activities is difficult if not impossible from the individual country missions. The proliferation of contractors and types of activities affects the missions' ability to coordinate, direct, or even keep track of training activities in their countries. In some cases (e.g., USIA, IIE) the participants may not even be recruited from within the country. In others, such as the cooperative agreements, the determination of the type and length of training and the identification of collaborating organizations is outside of the effective control of the missions. Of the 22 different contractors, only the PIET contract is directly responsive to the USAID priorities.

The PTPE project structure can be reviewed to clarify the relationship of the project design to the implementation of country development strategies. Each component that is directly managed should be responsive to the identified training needs of each country. In turn, the missions should be assisted in developing clear training strategies that are integrated into the broader assistance programs and that have clearly defined "critical mass" necessary to achieve objectives. This "critical mass" may consist of the products of a single program or of the integrated combination of types of training from several components.

The simplification of the program might have several stages. Some of these changes have occurred through the evolution of the project. The first stage is management simplification by reducing the number of organizations that require management attention. This can be accomplished by treating interagency agreements of peripheral training as pass through arrangements with no USAID management or monitoring function. This would affect the USIA program and the DOS program (which is already completed) and any future similar activities. The other stages would include simplification of the management of the cooperative agreements and increasing the level of control and strategic direction from the country missions over all of these activities. Once the management burden has been reduced, the ENI program managers can focus their efforts on assisting the Missions in developing country training strategies and defining operational approaches to develop a critical mass in each area.

Clear USAID training strategies and active USAID involvement in defining training priorities is a key factor in achieving higher quality training programs. In general, the greater the degree of specificity in terms of desired training outcomes, and the greater the degree of USAID involvement, the better the training program.

This is necessarily a tentative conclusion based on limited review of USAID programs to date. However, it is consistent with the previous lessons learned about training. Of the

three programs reviewed in detail to date, the one with the most direct and energetic USAID management has a notably higher level of participant satisfaction and relevance.

The single most important aspect of any training program is that the participant, the sponsor, the employer, and the training provider share a clear vision of what results are expected. This applies both to the individual training activity and to the program as a whole. When the strategy, objectives, and end result are not particularly clear, training has a broad focus in a general area (such as privatization) rather than a specific focus on tangible skills needed to effect specific changes in an organization or sector or to enable the participant to accomplish defined activities.

The most specific and strategically focused training activities assessed to date have been some areas of the Bulgaria PIET program in which the resident advisors have worked very closely in developing training programs that directly support on-going organizational objectives. Some of the cooperative agreement programs, such as the ultrasound training, have provided skills training that is highly specific to the target group jobs. The Salzburg Seminars and the DOS training are also highly specific in terms of the relationship of the training to the target group. Some of the other programs have tended toward introductory survey courses to a sector which may be too general to be very useful.

The diverse PTPE project, with its multiple training mechanisms, contractors, and types of training across an entire region of 14 countries does not easily permit a tight focus on objectives. In the individual missions, the country strategies are not always clear about the role of training and, in any case, only the PIET component is within the missions' direct control. The development of clear, operational definitions of how training contributes to strategic objectives or what constitutes a critical mass of training and technical assistance is still in the early stages of conceptual development in the region. The concept of "critical mass" needs to be more fully developed in relating training to strategic objectives. This observation is not unique to the CEE countries or to the PTPE project. Some aspects of the PTPE project have achieved a notable degree of focus and can be expected to have a discernable, measurable impact on the development objectives. The challenge for the project is to build on these strengths and expand them to as many areas of CEE training as possible. The small CEE missions will probably require technical assistance to continue to develop training strategies.

The structure and design of the PTPE project does not lend itself to a "one size fits all" style of management and evaluation. Elements such as the USIA should be operationally separate from the more standard components.

The PTPE project has 22 distinct programs, some of which represent a significant departure from "traditional" participant training. An effort has been made to apply the same management and evaluation standards to all activities. However, the differences in the programs make this very difficult. The non-standard components of the PTPE project cannot be usefully managed or evaluated in the same way as the standard components. The diversity of project activities, structures, and rationale requires different approaches.

This observation applies with particular relevance to the USIA "topping off" program and the DOS diplomatic training components of the project. Both of these activities were grafted on to the project for administrative rather than conceptual design reasons. Both have very distinct target groups and objectives that are not closely aligned with the USAID country strategies or parallel with the other project components. Both are also subject to very different bureaucratic standards and regulations for management and evaluation. If administrative simplicity requires that such programs be funded through the PTPE project, they should be treated strictly as a "pass through." They should not be subject to the same implementation regulations or monitoring and evaluation standards as the other activities. This is a moot point for the DOS program, which will not be continued in the future, but it applies to the on-going USIA activities.

The culture and organizational interests of USIA are fundamentally different from those of USAID, although the training may appear similar. The emphasis and interest of USIA is on the activities in U.S. colleges and universities rather than on the participant or the host country. There is no discernable benefit to either USAID or USIA in attempting to force-fit two such different organizations and systems. The most productive relationship would be a straight "pass through" of funds with no further monitoring or evaluative responsibility for USAID. This financial arrangement, however, should carefully define the parameters for appropriate funding of participants, including a profile of an appropriate candidates and a requirement that the financial support enable additional training rather than only subsidize U.S. colleges. In particular, the program requirements should specify whether such activities as a "junior year abroad" or "semester abroad" should be funded. Some standard should also be set to determine whether the USIA grant is a deciding factor that enables the student to attend the school.

The primary institutional support contract (PIET) has performed adequately under the circumstances. Improved cost-effectiveness of this contract will require a more effective partnership with the missions to develop training strategies and improved cost containment.

PIET forms the primary mechanism for responding to mission training priorities and development strategies. PIET has adequately met the basic requirements of the project in terms of providing in-country support and U.S. monitoring and placement services for a broad range of participants from all countries and managing the grant competition. This was a challenging contract, and these accomplishments are not insignificant.

However, the utility and cost-effectiveness of the contract is limited by weaknesses in the training strategies and overall integration of training. The value of having a significant in-country contractor presence is not limited to reducing the implementation burden on the mission, but rather it should increase the effectiveness by tailoring training to specific anticipated results. In addition, the impact of the training program can and should be seen in terms of the whole—the cumulative impact of all training on key objectives. This requires that training opportunities transcend the individual level to be conceptualized and planned on an aggregate level. In other words, each training activity

should be part of an overall plan for continuity and sequencing of training opportunities leading to a defined outcome. The current process of allocating "training slots" to each mission encourages focus on individual opportunities rather than on the whole.

To date, most of the training opportunities are identified through committee meetings with representatives from all USG agencies. Participants are selected through standardized recruitment and selection procedures, or through nomination by key individuals such as technical advisors or Peace Corps volunteers. They are selected on the basis of personal characteristics and employment in a strategic field. This approach of selecting good people is important, and for the most part has been implemented effectively. The resulting training program, however, can be spread fairly thin across organizations, sectors, and priority areas. Training programs tend to be generalized survey courses and observational tours that stimulate the individual's thinking.

These programs are necessary but not sufficient to justify the high cost of the resident institutional contract. The justification of this level of effort and expense must be found in particularly strong measures of program quality, relevance, and eventual impact. This should be found in both in the responses from individual participants in terms of the relevance and usefulness of the training, exemplified with specific accomplishments, and in the cumulative contribution to broader organizational or mission objectives.

Particularly for short-term training programs, the large majority of participants should find the training to be "highly relevant" and "very useful" for their job needs. The number of participants who find the training to be "helpful in a general way" should be very small indeed. (About 28% of the PIET returnees to date find the training only generally helpful.) The immediate relevance of longer-term training programs, particularly academic programs, will usually be lower. However, the cumulative impact of a coordinated program of short, medium, and long-term training should be considerable.

This conclusion is closely related to the previous conclusions about program strategies and project management mechanisms. The PIET contract must be fully utilized to maximize strategic coordination and operational efficiency of the program. This will require a more effective partnership with USAIDs and a broader role in coordinating and supporting other aspects of the program, such as the cooperative agreements, ECESP, and the Salzburg Seminars.

The Institutional Competition (cooperative agreement) component of the project has been a mixed success. The program should evolve to build on the identified strengths and develop closer linkages to mission strategies.

This component had several purposes and objectives. The stimulus for the component was that USAID was receiving many unsolicited proposals to conduct training in the CEE region and needed a mechanism for responding to these proposals. Once initiated, however, the opportunities provided by this type of program were recognized and incorporated. Ideally, an open competition would attract a broad range of non-traditional training providers, including NGOs, private firms, and non-profit groups, who

could identify unforeseen training needs in their areas of expertise. The cost-sharing requirement would leverage additional resources into the program, thus enabling USAID budgets to go farther. Finally, the requirement that the training providers be responsible for establishing in-country linkages for recruitment and follow-on offered the potential for high quality programming with sustainable results at a lower cost in terms of the USAID management burden.

This has been a useful and interesting experiment in alternative operational mechanisms for which the Europe Bureau should be commended. Much has been learned from the program. The major lessons learned to date fall into five categories: non-traditional programs, program management, program quality, relationship to strategic objectives, and cost.

- 1. The component has indeed been successful in broadening participation by attracting interest and proposals from a range of non-traditional training providers.** The proposals have come from many very different types of organizations—city governments, women's organizations, housing foundations, and many others that have had little or no experience with USAID programs in the past. Proposals have also come from some organizations with traditional ties to USAID training, such as IIE, Harvard, and Johns Hopkins. The proposals have also been notable in that offerors were able to structure programs creatively to meet their needs. Thus, proposals included mixtures of short, medium, and long-term training, integration with graduate student research in CEE companies, and even training programs conducted on an aircraft. The majority of the very non-traditional providers lacked the familiarity with USAID interests and development orientation as well as well developed proposal skills to be truly competitive and responsive. The proposals also lacked uniformity and consistency in format and presentation that made the review, selection, and ultimate contracting more difficult. Nonetheless, a broad range of responses was solicited in these competitions.
- 2. The management burden of the program has been much greater than anticipated.** The very first step of selecting, negotiating with, and contracting with 12 different organizations was a challenge for the thinly staffed Bureau. As a result, proposals that were submitted and first reviewed in January 1993 were not finally contracted until late in the year or even 1994. Many of the first group of proposals were implemented six months to a year later than anticipated. For those who were successful in winning a contract, the lack of familiarity with the complex USAID training regulations, data needs, and reporting requirements also created an on-going management burden on both the Bureau and the monitoring and evaluation contractor. With no established systems

or staff experienced in USAID contracts to rely on, the institutional contractor required a lot of support and follow-up to collect the data and assure compliance with regulations. By the time that the organizations fully understood the rules and requirements, the training was completed. Traditional training providers and experienced placement organizations have been able to develop systems and learn the requirements through experience over time. The cooperative agreement organizations had only one time to learn.

The "turnkey" nature of training implementation was not as smooth as had been hoped. Some contractors were unable to recruit and select the proposed number of trainees and others required more assistance from the USAID missions and PIET staff than had been anticipated. In some instances, the USAID managers were unhappy with the burden imposed by these contractors.

The management burden imposed by this component is a hidden cost that is not calculated but should be recognized in measuring the costs and benefits of this approach. Much of this management burden would be carried by a placement contractor in a traditional training design.

3. **The quality of the training programs and contractor implementation varied from excellent to poor.** While variability in quality is a factor in any program, the lack of a centralized management in the form of a planning and placement contractor eliminated the possibility of consistency in planning, orientation, and participant support in the U.S. Therefore, the lack of a core unit with competence in USAID participant training was probably a factor in the variability in implementation quality.

However, to some extent the variability in quality is the price of experimentation and learning. The accomplishments and gains of the program could not have been achieved without the costs.

4. **The impact on achievement of strategic objectives is still unknown because little returnee data is yet available.** However, the design of the component is that it responds to the *supply* of training (proposals) rather than being driven by the *demand* for training established in the strategic objectives. While all of the proposals were required to respond to the general guidelines of the SEED Act objectives and mission input was solicited prior to award, the parameters of these objectives are quite broad. Therefore, the missions could only respond to others' views of training priorities in the proposals rather than initiating specific requests for training.

While all of the training did fall into categories supportive of the SEED Act objectives and most were in areas in which the mission was conducting other training, the training designs were not necessarily what the missions would have selected. (It should be noted that the PIET contract was the primary mechanism for mission definition of training needs). The nature of the region and proposals was also such that most training programs selected only a small number of people from any given country, thus calling into question the potential for achieving a critical mass in that area.

5. **Considerable variation was found in the cost of the cooperative agreement training programs and the impact of the cost-sharing requirement on total USAID expenditures.** In the best programs, the total program costs were low and effective cost-sharing resulted in very low cost training for USAID. In others, the total program costs were so extraordinarily high that even after a minimum of 50 percent cost sharing the costs to USAID were not substantively lower than the directly contracted training from PIET (if the PIET administrative costs are excluded).

No data on program results or impact is yet available. This information, when available, will be necessary to put these observations into appropriate perspective. The ultimate test of program quality is whether the participants apply the training in their work.

The tradeoffs in this type of program are between program cost and responsiveness to mission needs and priorities. In order to justify the relative lack of mission control over the program, the cost and quality should be clearly superior to the training services provided by a placement contractor. In all cases, the direct costs of the cooperative agreements to USAID (not counting the hidden management costs) were lower than the cost of the PIET contract. In some cases, the costs were strikingly lower for notably good quality programs. In others, the cost difference was minimal in light of the much reduced scope and level of effort and the program quality was not high.

The Institutional Competition component has served as a useful mechanism to identify promising programs that are good candidates for future training activities. It is an intriguing complement to the technical assistance and placement contractor model exemplified by PIET. However, it is probably not viable as a replacement for the large placement contractor because of the management burden, the relationship to mission priorities and initiative, and the relatively small numbers of trainees involved in each contract.

The ECESP program addresses some otherwise unmet training needs, but should be more closely integrated into the USAID mission strategic objectives and priorities.

The ECESP program is the second largest component of the PTPE project. The project focus has evolved over the past three years, focusing on rural managers, public administrators, and teachers. The general parameters of the program are consistent with USAID objectives, but the specific areas of support could be better coordinated with the USAIDs. This will require a greater degree of communication and coordination with the USAID missions.

The Bureau's needs for monitoring and evaluation information and support need to be carefully defined and implementation mechanisms must be flexible to respond to evolving needs.

The information and evaluation needs of the Bureau need to be clearly established, and/or the evaluation contract needs to be flexible enough to respond to changing and ad hoc data needs. Over the 18 month period of the M&E contract, the information and data needs of the Bureau evolved and developed faster than did the ability of the evaluation contract to respond. Ad hoc requests or unanticipated information needs (more site visits than anticipated, emergency visits to U.S. training sites, regular reporting of "success story" anecdotes, etc.) create challenges for timely response. The level of effort necessary to collect and process the biographical data turned out to be much greater than anticipated in view of the inexperience of the cooperative agreements and the different systems used by each contractor. Periodic needs for intensive assistance for data entry or other services were also difficult to implement in a timely fashion in view of the overworked USAID contracts offices. For example, the request to hire a part time data entry person was in process for months, which delayed the work considerably.

The type of information required by the Bureau has also evolved. The contract reflects the initial Bureau interest in longitudinal studies and comparative cost-impact assessments. These necessarily are long-term endeavors. Over time, however, the need for immediate and frequent data on a range of issues became apparent. Future monitoring and support contracts should build on the experience of the first stage and try to anticipate information needs based on this experience.

Finally, the monitoring and evaluation activity will require enough time to complete the data collection necessary for longitudinal study of impact and comparison of the alternative modalities.

Continue the evaluation research into program impact and adjust the program accordingly.

The preliminary evaluation findings indicate that the medium-term training programs offer the best mixture of cost and quality. Based on the exit questionnaire data, the best medium-term training programs (2 to 4 months) are so much less costly than short-term

training that participants can be trained for three months rather than three weeks for about the same cost. While returnee data is not yet available for the medium-term cooperative agreement programs, this finding would be consistent with experience in other projects. If the future impact and returnee data supports the effectiveness of this type of training, some effort can be made to increase training in this mode.

Another focus for continuing evaluation research is to determine effective means of developing a "critical mass" in any given area or for a particular objective. Experimentation in continuity and sequencing of training over time within a given organization or section can help all missions better understand how to develop effective training strategies.

Follow-on to training is an important element that has to date not received much attention in the various PTPE programs. Several cooperative agreements have some interesting Follow-on activities planned, but it is not a requirement of most programs. It would be useful if organized Follow-on Programs were established to stay in touch with returned participants to see if they need further training, encouragement, or attention in applying the skills they have acquired.

Experience with USAID participant training programs shows that Follow-on is an important element in furthering training's impact on both the individual's performance and the organization to which he or she returns. Employers' attitudes depend equally on how they benefit from the product of participant training and on their personal degree of ownership as stakeholders in the training activity. If the employer or stakeholder organization is brought into the process at the time of training design, Follow-on activities can be developed that build on the needs and opportunities presented by the individual Trainee, the Trainee's supervisor, and the worksetting. An organized Follow-on Program would extend and enhance the PTPE training experience and further the impact goals of the program. As one program planner put it, "knowledge, planted by U.S. training programs, seldom matures unless cultivated back home, and cultivation—applied, consistent, and progressive—is what a Follow-on program is all about."

RECOMMENDATIONS

Simplify the project in the following ways:

1. Assist the USAIDs to develop coordinated training strategies that utilize all PTPE training resources in an integrated fashion to develop a critical mass focused on specific strategic objectives. This will eventually entail the application of a "focus and concentrate" process to bring all training activities into a common mission strategy framework with clearly defined anticipated results. It will require that all training activities respond to the mission priorities.

-
2. Expand the function of the PIET contract to support missions in the development of coordinated training strategies, to coordinate activities, and to provide operational management for cooperative agreement organizations. Consider options for applying evaluation findings, in particular the relative cost-effectiveness of medium-term training.
 3. Identify the most cost-effective of the cooperative agreement organizations and negotiate on-going programs with them. This determination should be made after the first group of cooperative agreement returnee responses and country visits are completed. Promising candidates include Harvard, Hopkins, Goodwill, and IIE. The program management should be coordinated through the PIET contract to assist with in-country activities, maximize operational responsiveness to USAID requirements and regulations, and to streamline reporting and management. The programs should be negotiated with the participating USAIDs to fit into the coordinated training strategy.
 4. Bring the ECESP program into the coordinated strategy as well. This will also require increased communication, coordination, and negotiation with the participating USAIDs.
 5. The USIA program should be administered as a "pass through." USAID should have no on-going monitoring, evaluative, reporting, or regulatory responsibilities for this program. In arranging the interagency agreement, USAID should establish clear standards for student eligibility, anticipated length of training programs, and assurance of financial need. The program should be structured as a means of increasing the number of CEE students in U.S. universities rather than as a subsidy to the U.S. schools.
 6. The Monitoring and Evaluation activity should be structured to respond to the critical and clearly defined Bureau informational needs and schedules. The process should be structured to provide flexible and rapid response to evolving Bureau needs. Key evaluation questions should be reviewed and revised as necessary. Develop improved mechanisms to apply evaluation findings into project implementation.

APPENDIX A

Organizational Profiles: New Cooperative Agreements

City University of Bellevue Washington
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4077-00
PACD: June 30, 1995

Special Assistant to the President and Managing Director of Eastern European Programs:	Dr. Helmut Hofmann
Special Assistant to the President:	Dr. Geoffrey Needler
Assistant to the President and Institutional Liaison for Eastern Europe:	Ms. Eva Milligan
CEE Country:	Slovak Republic
Number of Awards:	25
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Quality of Life (primary), Democratic Institution Building (secondary)</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Business Administration
Length of Training:	3 months (92 days)
Total Cost of Project: \$323,519	USAID Amount: \$161,759

Purpose: The purpose of this Cooperative Agreement is to provide financial support for the recipient's program in the Slovak Republic. Twenty-five Slovak students from the area of Trencin will spend three months in academic instruction at the City University (CU) campus in Bellevue, Washington.

Goals: The project is designed to achieve 11 major goals and objectives:

1. Provide for 25 Slovak students to live in Bellevue, Washington, for six months, and to study in the baccalaureate programs of City University.
2. Integrate the study sequences in Bellevue with the baccalaureate studies of these 25 students at the Slovak Independent University, the development of which is sponsored by City University.
3. Provide for a well-rounded cultural, recreational, and community-based enrichment program for the participants during their U.S. stay.
4. Cooperate fully with the selection process of PIET to insure appropriate pools of applicants of leaders and potential leaders for the program.

-
5. Establish appropriate predeparture orientation meetings which will address information and adjustment needs of the participants before their departure, and regular orientation meetings in the U.S.
 6. Use Slovak MBA students at the Bellevue campus as mentors and companions for the participant group.
 7. Relate this training program to the Bellevue community through short-term internships which will be jointly operated by CU and the Bellevue city government.
 8. Use the network of 5,000 alumni of CU to provide for weekend excursions, picnics, and other nature and cultural experiences for the participants.
 9. Incorporate appropriate procedures to evaluate program quality and effectiveness.
 10. Establish follow-up activities designed to strengthen existing linkages between CU Bellevue and the emerging Slovak Independent University of Trencin.
 11. Strengthen the international orientation and competence of City University to conduct similar training programs in the future.

Summary: The program will be organized in four parts: 1) participant selection and orientation in The Slovak Republic; 2) orientation and academic activities in Bellevue; 3) field visits, internships, visits to offices in the state of Washington, and concluding activities in Washington, DC; and 4) Follow-up activities with students after their return to The Slovak Republic.

Participants in Training: 25 participants from the Slovak Republic.

Mississippi Consortium for International Development
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-[TO BE ASSIGNED]
PACD: September 30, 1995

Executive Director:	Dr. Ally Mack
Program Coordinator and Lead Trainer:	Dr. Adam K. Prokopowicz
Logistics and Cultural Activities Coordinator:	Dr. Hillman Frazier
CEE Countries:	Lithuania, Poland, Romania
Number of Awards:	50
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Economic Restructuring</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Public Administration, Taxation and Public Finance, Banking and Securities, Human Resource Management, and Legal and Institutional Framework of Privatization
Length of Training:	6 weeks or 2 months
Total Cost of Project: \$553,761	USAID Amount: \$244,534

Purpose: To provide in-depth practical skill enhancement training in the free market system through U.S. internships Fifty Polish, Lithuanian, and Romanian professionals in the public and private sectors in five professional disciplines will engage in two-month internships in the Jackson Mississippi area.

Goals: To enable the participants to develop the capacity to successfully manage the economic reform process in their respective countries. In addition to the goal, specific objectives are to: 1) provide the public managers and entrepreneurs from the CEE countries with internship opportunities in the Jackson-Vicksburg area; 2) promote joint ventures and trade by establishing at least 10 business links and relationships between the CEE countries and American entrepreneurs; and 3) further mutual understanding of cultural life between the CEE countries and the U.S.

Summary: Training activities of the program include the following components: internships, seminars, forums, community-learning activities, individual projects, and cultural-civic activities. Internships are the critical element of the program. Each individual is matched with an appropriate business in terms of size, nature of business, and desired goals and objectives. A series of seminars will insure that participants fully comprehend all elements of the free market system, develop leadership skills, and skills to train others. The participants will have opportunities for two-week homestays with families in the Jackson metropolitan area.

Participants to be Trained: Three groups of 15 to 17 participants each in each six-week cycle: April-May, June-August, and September-October.

-
5. To increase the participants' knowledge of specific ideas, concepts, skills, and techniques used in public administration and policy, applied to their Eastern and Central European settings.
 6. To demonstrate to the participants the value in taking a cross-country, regional approach to issues that have both generic and country-specific dimensions.
 7. To develop the participants' understanding and abilities to function effectively in a public sector that will require new concepts that were not developed in totalitarian regimes including team work, ethics, problem solving, and delegation of responsibilities.
 8. To establish a network of individuals who have both knowledge and concern about the development of effective democratic government and a professional public service.
 9. To give the participants a sense of the American system of markets and democracy to include its great advantages and accomplishments as well as some of its disappointments and unmet objectives.

Summary: The program will provide education and training to six people in each country (two each with national, regional, and local government perspectives) who will be prepared to examine the entire structure and functions of sub-national governments in their respective countries. The proposed program will blend classroom and experiential learning and is broken down into four phases over a twelve month period. The first phase (recruitment and selection) will last three and one-half months. This will be followed by the first education phase, a three month visit to the Wagner School at New York University, composed of a two month classroom component and a one-month internship. Phase three is a three and one-half month period when the participants will return to their home countries and positions; during this phase they will participate in a five-day education session in Central and Eastern Europe. Phase four is a one month education visit to the Wagner School at New York University, followed by a return to their home countries and positions.

Participants to be Trained: 30 (16 women; 14 men) from Albania (6), Estonia (9), Romania (6), Slovenia (3), and the Slovak Republic (6). The training program is scheduled to begin on February 15, 1995.

The Soros Foundation
Management Training Program
Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4087-00
PACD: May 31, 1996

Soros Program Coordinator:	Amanda Leness
Soros Program Assistant:	Jennifer Kelleher
CEE Countries:	Albania, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic
Number of Awards:	30
SEED Act Priorities:	<i>Democratic Institution Building, Quality of Life, and Economic Restructuring</i>
Sector or Field of Training:	Banking and Finance, Business Management, Communications, Education Administration, and Environmental Management
Length of Training:	3 months
Total Cost of Project: \$544,038	USAID Amount: \$265,654

Purpose: To develop and implement a thorough, targeted, high-quality Training Internship Program (TIP) to serve the educational and training needs of Central and Eastern Europe as address by the SEED Act.

Goals: In Banking and Finance—to develop a cadre of professional bankers. In Business Management—to permit the intern to observe, test, and experience directly the function and practice of the market economy. In Communications—to bring teams of people to the U.S. for hands-on education and training in the communications field. In Education Administration—to strengthen educational institutions at the university level. In Environmental Management—to bring key interns to the U.S. for practical and educational experience.

Summary: Each U.S. internship will last approximately three months, preceded by a three-day orientation session and concluding with a debriefing, both in Washington, D.C. The participants will receive on-the-job and academic training at leading U.S. companies and business schools. Interns are grouped in five clusters to create cross-national ties and clusters of professional excellence. Whenever possible, interns will participate in a custom-designed, work-study program involving both a corporate and university member of the Business-Higher Education Forum; when joint business-university placements are not possible, the interns will be placed in a corporate setting.

administration theory and practice. During the tenure of the program six seminars or field trips will be organized in which the participants have the opportunity to discuss current topics with experts in select fields, to meet with practitioners, and to see American business in operation. Each student will have approximately 45 hours of direct work exposure within his or her area of interest through collaboration with Connecticut companies and firms. Each student will be assigned a host family whose responsibilities would include planning weekend, holiday, and vacation activities designed to help the participant understand the social and cultural aspects of life in a free market society.

-
3. a customized fourteen-week program of classroom courses, seminars, workshops, field trips, or mentor relationships, and application of network relationships;
 4. a one-week summary program at Pittsburgh (group discussions on American culture, society and politics; business organizations and management; organization and management in the non-profit sector; university organization and management; research progress reports, and network consolidation); and
 5. a one-week debriefing at CERGE-EI and CMC and return home.

There will be three cycles of application processes in the one-year grant period. Two cycles will be for Economics and MBA students for the terms beginning in January and April; 32 candidates will be selected in these first two cycles. The third cycle will include managers for the partner institutions selected for training in the Management Program for Executives (MPE) at the Katz Graduate School of Business; two candidates will be selected for this cycle.

APPENDIX B

Country Profiles

USAID Representative: Dianne M. Blane
 PIET Regional Coordinator: Mada McGill
 PIET Training Coordinator: Stan Nowakowski

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The goal of U.S. assistance policy in Albania is to support the historic political and economic transformation now underway. This transformation seeks to restructure the economy based on the principles of a free market and a democratic system of governance. The U.S. assistance strategy to help Albania move towards achieving this goal gives highest priority to the following objectives:

- promoting agricultural development;
- developing a market economy;
- fostering democratic institutions; and
- at least within the three-year timeframe of this strategy (1993-95), improving the quality of life through the provision of humanitarian assistance.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 50 Albanian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Humanities, Economics, Politics; and the specific fields of Public Accounting, Agriculture, and Urban Development.

The following table provides a breakdown of Albanian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

ALBANIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
Council for Int'l Programs	2	0	2
Dept. of State	10	0	10
PIET	25	0	25
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	1	0	1
USIA	4	7	11
USTTI	1	0	1
Total	43	7	25

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

USAID Representative: Michael S. Zak
USAID Training Officer: Slavica Radosevic

PIET Regional Coordinator: Gerald Martin

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

Policy paper forthcoming.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 8 Bosnian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Social Sciences, Business Management, Medicine.

The following table provides a breakdown of Bosnian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
PIET	7	0	7
Salzburg Seminar	1	0	1
USIA	0	0	0
Total	8	0	8

USAID Representative:	John Tennant
USAID Project Development Officer:	Brad Fujimoto
USAID Program Specialists:	Evgenia Georgieva, John Babylon
PIET Regional Coordinator:	Gerald Martin
PIET Country Director:	Sandy McCollum
PIET Program Manager:	Penka Nikolova

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

During FYs 1993 through 1995, the U.S. assistance strategy for Bulgaria will continue to consist of regional programs, predominantly of technical assistance and training. Progressively, though, a unique Bulgaria country program will be planned within the regional parameters established by Washington. In the country strategy, stress has been placed upon managerial burdens and pay-offs. A core program consisting of seven activities has been developed:

- complete key legal reforms;
- privatize, restructure, and deepen financial services;
- privatize and restructure industry;
- restructure agriculture to support private farmers;
- strengthen municipal governance;
- support the private sector; and
- help institutionalize two U.S.-sponsored educational institutions.

The program seeks to assist development of democratic, free market reforms and to spread the impact of reforms to the general populace. Geographically, emphasis will be placed upon activities centered outside the larger cities of Sofia, Varna, and Plovdiv. Ethnic minority areas will receive particular attention. A general training program will continue to buttress activities in the core areas, although genuine, "targets of opportunity" may be funded in individual training cases.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 210 Bulgarian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Agriculture, Architecture, Communication, Conservation, Education, Humanities, Law, Medicine, Public Accounting, Social Sciences, Economics, Earth Science, Computer, Business, Marketing; and the specific fields of Public Finance, State and Local

Government, Business Management, Small Business Development, Investments and Security, Banking, Diagnostic Radiology, Ophthalmology, Teaching English, Urban Development, Hotel and Resort Administration.

The following table provides a breakdown of Bulgarian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

BULGARIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
Corporate Housing Foundation	6	0	6
Council for Int'l Programs	1	0	1
Dept. of State	10	0	10
Johns Hopkins University	1	0	1
IIE (EUR-0002)	1	0	1
IIE (EUR-0045)	1	0	1
PIET	94	0	94
Salzburg Seminar	4	0	4
Soros Foundation	7	0	7
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	3	0	3
USIA	36	46	87
Total	164	46	210

USAID Representative: Michael S. Zak
 USAID Training Officer: Slavica Radosevic

PIET Regional Coordinator: Gerald Martin
 PIET Training Coordinator: E.J. Ashbourne

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

Policy paper forthcoming.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 34 Croatian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Agriculture, Humanities, Social Sciences, Economics, Education, Politics, Earth Sciences, Mathematics, Medicine, Computers; and the specific field of Business Management.

The following table provides a breakdown of Croatian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

CROATIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
PIET	17	0	17
Salzburg Seminar	1	0	1
USIA	7	9	16
Total	25	9	34

CZECH REPUBLIC

USAID Representative:	Lee D. Roussel
USAID Training Officers:	Bob Posner, Jan Duskocil
PIET Regional Coordinator:	Mada McGill
PIET Training Coordinator:	Mari Novak
PIET Training Manager:	Ivana Hospodaror
PIET Administrator:	Karel Dvorak

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The overall U.S. policy goal is to support the continuation of the economic and institutional reforms to the point that they are irreversible and Czech citizens are once again incorporated into the economic and political mainstream of the West. The Country Team believes U.S. support can gradually be phased from its present aid format to one more characteristic of that for an Advanced Developing Country. Such an arrangement would permit Embassy/USAID response to specific, short-term requests from the Czech government and private sector for help in completing the transformation process, while continuing to strengthen U.S. business and commercial ties. In the interim, the U.S. program will increasingly be focused on support four Czech initiatives:

- complete the major portions of the privatization program and establish the basic infrastructure needed for the financial sector and capital markets;
- broaden participation at the regional and local level in addressing key issues, strengthen municipalities' administrative and financial capabilities, and support small and medium-sized business development;
- foster the development of efficient energy production and use, which concurrently improves the environment; and
- further bolster media, legal, and educational institutions essential to broadening public participation in economic and political reform.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 151 Czech participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Architecture, Communications, Conservation, Education, Humanities, Social Sciences,

Economics, Politics, Earth Sciences, Finance, Marketing, Mathematics, Computers, Business, Business Management; and the specific fields of Banking, Banking and Finance, Theory of Public Administration, Teaching-secondary level, Education of the physically handicapped, Secondary School Administration, Agricultural Business, Agribusiness Management, Agricultural Development.

The following table provides a breakdown of Czech PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

CZECH REPUBLIC			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
Council for Int'l Programs	3	0	3
PIET	39	0	39
Georgetown ECESP	18	18	36
Goodwill Industries	2	0	2
Harvard University	1	0	1
Johns Hopkins University	5	0	5
IIE (EUR-0002)	6	0	6
IIE (EUR-0045)	0	2	2
Salzburg Seminar	4	0	4
USIA	32	15	47
William Davidson Institute	6	0	6
Total	116	35	151

USAID Representative: Adrian L. deGraffenreid
 USAID Training Officer: Marika Tomberg
 PIET Regional Coordinator: Mada McGill

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The U.S. development program can assist Estonia in meeting its priorities, particularly in completing its open market economic reforms, and assisting selectively in democratic reforms. U.S. assistance will ensure that U.S. business has an equal opportunity to participate in local and regional markets and can stimulate U.S. private investment in the region by linking U.S. firms with Estonian development opportunities. U.S. assistance should focus only on those program areas which will: have the greatest impact; provide long-term solutions; strengthen government institutions and local systems, and promote the self-sustaining development process. This strategy assigns priority to three major program goals:

- strengthen pluralistic democracy;
- support economic reforms and growth; and
- support environmental protection.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 54 Estonian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Business, Business Management, Communications, Computers, Conservation, Economics, Humanities, Law, Politics, Social Sciences; and the specific fields of Public Finance and Tax Policy, Diagnostic Radiology, Agricultural Business.

ESTONIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
Corporate Housing Foundation	2	0	2
Council for Int'l Programs	3	0	3
PIET	20	0	20
Salzburg Seminar	5	0	5
Soros Foundation	4	0	4
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	2	0	2
USIA	8	10	18
Total	44	10	54

The preceding table provides a breakdown of Estonian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

USAID Representative:	David L. Cowles
USAID Training Officers:	Nedra Huggins Williams David Molnar
PIET Regional Coordinator:	Gerald Martin
PIET Program Manager:	Annamaria Kekesi

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

Hungary's progress toward becoming a stable and prosperous democratic nation can be measured by its success in meeting a series of related strategic objectives in the next five to seven years. These successes will be predicated on progress in meeting strategic objectives in the four mutually reinforcing areas of:

- macroeconomic stabilization and structural reform;
- democratic institutions and processes;
- economic transformation; and
- quality of life.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 204 Hungarian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Architecture, Communications, Humanities, Social Sciences, Business, Computers, Earth Science, Economics, Finance, Law, Marketing, Mathematics, Politics, Public Administration, Theory of Public Administration; and the specific fields of Government Organization and Management, Public Finance and Tax Policy, Business Management, Management Training, Business Statistics, Banking, Investments and Securities, International Trade, International Law, Observation-U.S. Legal System, Teaching-secondary level, Teaching-agriculture, Agricultural Development, Agricultural Business, Agribusiness Management, and Urban Development.

The following table provides a breakdown of Hungarian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

HUNGARY			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
Corporate Housing Foundation	9	0	9
Council for Int'l Programs	8	0	8
Georgetown ECESP	31	17	48
Goodwill Industries	2	0	2
Harvard University	3	0	3
Johns Hopkins University	0	1	1
IIE (EUR-0002)	3	0	3
IIE (EUR-0045)	1	0	1
PIET	67	0	67
Salzburg Seminar	5	0	5
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	1	0	1
USIA	30	24	54
William Davidson Institute	2	0	2
Total	162	42	204

USAID Representative:	Baudouin F. de Marcken
USAID Training Officer:	Elita Sproge
PIET Regional Coordinator:	Mada McGill
PIET Training Coordinator:	Astrida Levensteins

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

U.S. assistance to Latvia focuses only on those program areas which will have the greatest impact, provide long-term solutions, strengthen key government institutions and local systems, and promote a self-sustaining development process. The assistance program to Latvia places a priority on:

- a multi-faceted program to further develop and consolidate open-market reforms;
- technical assistance and training to enhance private sector business development and managerial skills; and
- support for democratic pluralism.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 47 Latvian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Humanities, Economics, Marketing, Mathematics; and the specific fields of International Economics, Industrial Relations, Management Training, and Business.

LATVIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
PIET	30	0	30
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	1	0	1
USIA	5	8	13
USTTI	3	0	3
Total	39	8	47

The table above provides a breakdown of Latvian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

USAID Representative:	John J. Cloutier
USAID Training Officer:	Reda Bagusinskiene
PIET Regional Coordinator:	Mada McGill
PIET Training Coordinator:	Cristina Bucher

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The U.S. Government assistance program has concentrated on flexible delivery mechanisms that respond rapidly to new and unanticipated demands, in a few, well-chosen areas. The effectiveness and impact of the program depends on continuing with this approach and improving coordination among other donors as well as among U.S.G. agencies receiving SEED Act funds. The U.S.G. has worked closely with the Government of Lithuania to identify priority areas where we have the clearest comparative advantage over other donors:

- private sector development;
- energy sector reform; and
- democratic initiatives.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 63 Lithuanian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Economics, Politics, Energy, Business, Communications, Computers, Education; and the specific fields of Business Management, Banking, and Public Relations.

The following table provides a breakdown of Lithuanian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

LITHUANIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
Corporate Housing Foundation	3	0	3
Council for Int'l Programs	6	0	6
PIET	25	0	25
Salzburg Seminar	1	0	1
SUNY-Farmingdale	10	0	10
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	2	0	2
USIA	8	8	16
Total	55	8	63

MACEDONIA

USAID Representative: Linda R. Gregory
USAID Training Officer: Rajna Cemerska

PIET Regional Coordinator: Gerald Martin

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

Policy paper forthcoming.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 18 Macedonian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Business, Computers, Humanities, Politics; and the specific fields of Business Management and Urban Development.

The table provides a breakdown of Macedonian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

MACEDONIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
PIET	8	0	8
Salzburg Seminar	1	0	1
USIA	2	7	9
Total	11	7	18

USAID Representative:	Donald L. Pressley
USAID Training Officers:	Charles Aaenson Anna Jozefowicz
PIET Regional Coordinator:	Mada McGill
PIET Program Manager:	Agnieszka Nowakowska
PIET Administrative Officer:	Krzysztof Lato

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The over-riding U.S. assistance policy goal is to support achievement by Poland of sustainable broad-based economic growth with an open market and democratic system. Over the next three years (1993-95), the U.S. assistance strategy to help Poland achieve this goal gives highest priority to the following interrelated and mutually reinforcing objectives:

- supporting private sector development;
- assisting development of the financial sector;
- helping transform the public sector to better support democratic development and a market economy; and
- strengthening institutions essential for sustainable democracy.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 442 Polish participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Humanities, Social Sciences, Politics, Energy, Business, Computers, Finance, Marketing, Architecture, Law, Public Administration, Teacher Training, and Conservation; and the specific fields of Economic Planning, Economic Development, Public Finance and Tax Policy, Banking and Finance, Business and Commercial Training, Transportation Economics, Municipal Government, State and Local Government, Observation-U.S. Government, Telecommunications, Business Management, Cost and Financial Management, Business Policy, Management Training, Accounting, Investments and Securities, Banking, International Trade, Sanitation, Theory of Public Administration, Secondary School Administration, Vocational/Technical School Administration, Agricultural Business, Agribusiness Management, Extension Services, Urban Development, and Hotel and Resort Administration.

The following table gives a breakdown of Polish PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

POLAND			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
Cooperative Housing Foundation	6	0	6
Council for Int'l Housing	8	0	8
Georgetown ECESP	87	67	154
Goodwill Industries	1	0	1
Harvard University	3	0	3
Home Builders Institute	22	0	22
Johns Hopkins University	6	0	6
IIE (EUR-0002)	3	0	3
IIE (EUR-0045)	2	0	2
PIET	193	0	193
Salzburg Seminar	3	0	3
Soros Foundation	5	0	5
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	3	0	3
USIA	19	9	28
William Davidson Institute	5	0	5
Total	366	76	442

USAID Representative:	Richard J. Hough
USAID Training Officers:	Mary Ann Micka Rodica Furnica
PIET Regional Coordinator:	Gerald Martin
PIET Training Coordinator:	Mary Frances Doyle
PIET Program Manager:	Cristian Andriciu

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The U.S. anticipates providing assistance programs to Romania for the next seven to ten years. U.S. assistance has moved from emergency and humanitarian assistance at the beginning to technical assistance in most sectors currently. In the future, the bilateral relationship is expected to be based more on trade, investment, and commercial ties rather than traditional assistance activities.

The overall goals of the U.S. assistance program in Romania are to support:

- the development of democratic attitudes and institutions;
- the creation of free market policies and processes; and
- the improvements in the quality of life of the Romanian people.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 143 Romanian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Business, Computers, Energy, Humanities, Economics, Law, Marketing, Politics, Earth Sciences; and the specific fields of Money and Banking, Statistics, Bioengr/biomedical Engineering, Business Management, Management Training, Journalism, Public Health, Diagnostic Radiology, Theory of Public Administration, Agricultural Business, Natural Resources, and Urban Development.

The following table gives a breakdown of Romanian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

ROMANIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
Council for Int'l Programs	13	0	13
Harvard University	6	0	6
Johns Hopkins University	3	0	3
IIE (EUR-0045)	1	0	1
PIET	57	0	57
Salzburg Seminar	3	0	3
Soros Foundation	7	0	7
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	3	0	3
USIA	14	24	38
USTTI	12	0	12
Total	119	24	143

SLOVAK REPUBLIC

USAID Representative:	Patricia Lerner
USAID Training Officer:	Hana Mociarikova
PIET Regional Coordinator:	Mada McGill
PIET Training Coordinator:	Mari Novak
PIET Training Manager:	Anna Cermáková

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The goal of U.S. policy is to help root Slovakia firmly in the Western economic and political community and to accelerate its transformation toward a market economy and healthy democracy. The Core Program has two principal elements:

- transformation to a market economy, including privatization of State-owned assets, restructuring of major industry, and development of the financial sector (strengthening key institutions and development of capital markets); and
- bolster the forces which make for diversity and pluralism in Slovak Society (in part by continued progress in decentralizing decision-making to elected officials).

There also is a role in minimizing the human travail associated with the abrupt shift from a centrally-planned command economy and shrinking of the social safety net. There are two areas in particular where the U.S.G. has a comparative advantage and where targeted U.S. support can make a critical difference: in the health sector and in housing allowances.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 151 Slovak participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Architecture, Humanities, Politics, Earth Sciences, Marketing, Public Administration; and the specific fields of Business Management, Cost and Financial Management, Business Policy, Investments and Securities, Teaching-secondary level, Secondary School Administration, Agricultural Policy, and Agricultural Business, and Diagnostic Radiology.

The following table gives a breakdown of Slovak PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

SLOVAK REPUBLIC			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
City University	0	25	25
Council for Int'l Programs	4	0	4
Home Builders Institute	8	0	8
Georgetown ECESP	7	14	21
Johns Hopkins University	4	0	4
IIE (EUR-0002)	3	0	3
IIE (EUR-0045)	2	0	2
PIET	55	0	55
Salzburg Seminar	2	0	2
Soros Foundation	2	0	2
Thomas Jefferson Univ. Hospital	3	0	3
USIA	4	11	15
USTTI	3	0	3
William Davidson Institute	3	0	3
Total	101	50	151

SLOVENIA

USAID Representative: Michael S. Zak
USAID Training Officer: Slavica Radosevic

PIET Regional Coordinator: Gerald Martin

U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

Policy paper forthcoming.

Training Activities

As of December 31, 1994, the first quarter of FY 1995, 11 Slovenian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Economics, Law, Mathematics, Politics, Social Sciences; and the specific fields of Business Management and Urban Development.

SLOVENIA			
Contractor/ Grantee/IAA	Completed	In- Training	Total
PIET	2	0	2
Salzburg	1	0	1
USIA	2	6	8
Total	5	6	11

The table above gives a breakdown of Slovenian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of December 31, 1994.

APPENDIX C

Actual Training Costs

PTPE ACTUAL TRAINING COSTS
Through December 31, 1994

Grantee/ Contractor	Total Project Costs										
	USAID and Cost-Share/In-Kind Contributions					Total USAID Budget/Expenses			Cost-Share/In-Kind Budget/Expenses		
	Total Trained	Months* Completed	Cost Per Month	Total Budgeted Amount	Expended To Date	Cost Per Month	Budget Amount	Expended To Date	Cost Per Month	Budget Amount	Expended To Date
City Univ.	0	0.00	0.00	323,519.00	45,855.21	0.00	161,759.00	39,750.00	0.00	161,760.00	6,105.21
CHF	26	39.75	13,938.98	576,912.00	554,074.41	5,594.86	232,600.00	222,395.75	8,344.12	344,312.00	331,678.66
CIP	47	166.15	3,818.79	887,802.00	634,492.00	1,276.75	249,102.00	212,132.00	2,542.04	638,700.00	422,360.00
DOS (Final)	20	24.00	13,750.00	443,017.00	330,000.00	8,958.33	443,017.00	215,000.00	4,791.67	0.00	115,000.00
Georgetown Univ.	246	4,450.00	2,002.35	12,318,970.00	8,910,443.00	2,002.35	10,962,000.00	8,910,443.00	0.00	1,356,970.00	0.00
Goodwill	5	9.33	9,130.66	173,182.00	85,189.04	3,822.00	86,127.00	35,659.23	5,308.66	87,055.00	49,529.81
Harvard Univ.	13	33.61	2,689.25	439,466.00	90,385.83	2,689.25	216,271.00	90,385.83	0.00	223,195.00	0.00
HBI (Final)	28	24.36	16,422.50	613,661.00	400,052.00	8,182.80	249,865.00	199,333.00	8,239.70	363,796.00	200,719.00
IIE 0002 (Final)	16	183.96	1,941.53	1,252,738.00	357,164.18	1,941.53	400,000.00	357,164.18	0.00	852,738.00	0.00
IIE 0045 (Final)	9	109.56	2,078.93	837,900.00	227,767.30	2,078.93	250,000.00	227,767.30	0.00	587,900.00	0.00
Johns Hopkins Univ.	26	47.05	4,060.70	493,476.00	191,056.00	4,060.70	246,695.00	191,056.00	0.00	246,781.00	0.00
New York Univ.	0	0.00	0.00	741,692.00	15,807.00	0.00	360,100.00	0.00	0.00	381,592.00	15,807.00
PIET **	651	Not Avail.		18,307,747.00	6,981,897.58		18,307,747.00	6,981,897.58		Not Applicable	
Salzburg (Final)	31	10.93	11,436.41	125,000.00	125,000.00	11,436.41	125,000.00	125,000.00		Not Applicable	
Soros I	25	69.87	2,406.22	510,781.00	168,122.86	2,406.22	249,964.00	168,122.86	0.00	260,817.00	0.00
Soros II	0	0.00	0.00	544,038.00	32,332.00	0.00	265,654.00	32,332.00	0.00	278,384.00	0.00
SUNY	10	87.53	1,479.48	364,038.00	129,498.47	1,479.48	176,404.00	129,498.47	0.00	187,634.00	0.00
TJUH I	24	67.91	2,326.09	496,876.00	157,965.00	2,326.09	157,965.00	157,965.00	0.00	338,911.00	0.00
TJUH II	0	0.00	0.00	573,802.00	5,040.00	0.00	177,272.00	5,040.00	0.00	396,530.00	0.00
Univ. Hartford	0	0.00	0.00	418,531.00	2,999.05	0.00	206,308.00	2,999.05	0.00	212,223.00	0.00
Univ. Pittsburgh	0	0.00	0.00	668,537.00	3,637.00	0.00	331,857.00	0.00	0.00	336,680.00	3,637.00
USIA	270	3,766.79	562.23	1,787,745.00	2,117,808.00	562.23	3,625,000.00	2,117,808.00		Not Applicable	
USTTI	20	15.95	21,886.15	660,500.00	349,084.17	8,245.40	250,000.00	131,514.17	13,640.75	410,500.00	217,570.00
WDI (Final)	16	10.72	31,395.06	308,514.00	336,555.00	7,324.53	78,519.00	78,519.00	24,070.52	229,995.00	258,036.00
TOTAL	1483	9,117.47	\$2,377.38	\$45,382,180.00	\$21,675,650.89	\$2,234.94	\$37,647,467.00	\$20,377,032.42	\$142.43	\$7,734,713.00	\$1,298,618.47

* A standard calculation, based on a 30-day training mo., is used to yield the total training mos. The training dates are reported by the Grantee/Contractor/PTIS.

** Training Months can not be determined and were not reported.

PTPE ACTUAL TRAINING COSTS
Through December 31, 1994

Grantee/ Contractor	Total Training Costs				Total Administrative Costs			
	USAID Funds		Cost-Share/In-Kind		USAID Funds		Cost-Share/In-Kind	
	Cost Per Month	Expended To Date	Cost Per Month	Expended To Date	Cost Per Month	Expended To Date	Cost Per Month	Expended To Date
City Univ.	0.00	39,750.00	0.00	2,665.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,440.21
CHF	3,498.28	139,056.75	5,044.65	200,524.95	2,096.58	83,339.00	3,299.46	131,153.71
CIP	188.26	31,280.00	2,312.91	384,290.00	1,088.49	180,852.00	229.13	38,070.00
DOS (Final)	0.00	0.00	Not Applicable		0.00	0.00	Not Applicable	
Georgetown Univ.	1,625.93	7,235,397.00	0.00	0.00	376.41	1,675,046.00	0.00	0.00
Goodwill	3,822.00	35,659.23	1,024.57	9,559.23	0.00	0.00	4,284.09	39,970.58
Harvard Univ.	2,612.94	87,820.83	0.00	0.00	76.32	2,565.00	0.00	0.00
HBI (Final)	5,673.28	138,201.00	0.00	0.00	2,509.52	61,132.00	0.00	0.00
IIE 0002 (Final)	1,569.61	288,744.59	0.00	0.00	371.93	68,419.59	0.00	0.00
IIE 0045 (Final)	1,636.66	179,312.24	0.00	0.00	442.27	48,455.06	0.00	0.00
Johns Hopkins Univ.	1,822.83	85,764.00	0.00	0.00	2,237.87	105,292.00	0.00	0.00
New York Univ.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15,807.00
PIET **		4,490,086.98	Not Applicable			2,491,810.60	Not Applicable	
Salzburg (Final)	11,436.41	125,000.00	Not Applicable		0.00		Not Applicable	
Soros I	1,721.54	120,284.00	0.00	0.00	684.68	47,838.86	0.00	0.00
Soros II	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	32,332.00	0.00	0.00
SUNY	1,479.48	129,498.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
TJUH I	1,536.50	104,343.65	0.00	0.00	789.59	53,621.35	0.00	0.00
TJUH II	0.00	5,040.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Univ. Hartford	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,999.05	0.00	0.00
Univ. Pittsburgh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3,637.00
USIA	562.23	2,117,808.00	Not Applicable		0.00	0.00	Not Applicable	
USTTI	7,082.39	112,964.17	0.00	0.00	1,163.01	18,550.00	13,640.75	217,570.00
WDI (Final)	5,122.67	54,915.00	17,702.71	189,773.00	2,201.87	23,604.00	6,367.82	68,263.00
TOTAL	\$1,697.97	\$15,481,175.91	\$86.00	\$784,147.18	\$536.98	\$4,895,856.51	\$56.43	\$514,471.29

* A standard calculation, based on a 30-day training mo., is used to yield the total training mos. The training dates are reported by the Grantee/Contractor/PTIS.

** Training Months can not be determined and were not reported.

APPENDIX D

PTPE Success Stories

BULGARIA: Tax Administrators (PIET)

In July and August 1994, 26 Bulgarian tax officials received three weeks of training in the U.S. Their program addressed the problems of tax administration and collection that developed in the transition from a centrally-planned economy to a market economy. Upon their return home, with their newly acquired skills, they implemented a nationwide system for collection of Value Added Tax (VAT). Within three months of their return, their new system had raised \$100 million in revenue.

CZECH REPUBLIC: Local Government (Johns Hopkins University)

A young city councilman/deputy mayor spent six weeks in the mayor's office in Baltimore learning about local finances, budgeting, service delivery, and citizen participation. Upon return to the Czech Republic, he stood for re-election and was not only re-elected to the city council, but also was elected mayor. He now gives lectures to other small town mayors in his region about budgeting, decision-making, city finances, citizen participation, and other issues he learned about as part of his USAID training. His experience interning in the Baltimore mayor's office, discussing these issues at Johns Hopkins, and being housed by a former state representative had a profound professional effect on him which he is transmitting to his local government colleagues in the Czech Republic.

CZECH REPUBLIC: Retail Operations (Goodwill)

Following their two months of training at Goodwill organizations in the U.S., two participants returned to their home country to oversee retail operations and training of employees at a newly-opened Goodwill store, the first of its kind in the Czech Republic. The participants immediately prepared to process a load of 30,000 pounds of used clothing, moving it from sorting bins to crisp items on the selling floor. One manages the store and all commercial aspects of the operation, while the other has become the director of rehabilitation and training services for people with disabilities at the new Goodwill organization. Since opening, the store's revenue has averaged 10,232 (Kc) or \$411 (U.S.) per day, creating one of the most successful, self-sustaining, not-for-profit organizations in the region. In addition, the Czech Goodwill store has outstripped its local competition because of its attractive, contemporary store design and the continuous supply of used clothing from North American partner Goodwills. The participants attribute much of their success to their U.S. training program.

ESTONIA: Computer Systems (Soros Foundation)

An executive director of the Baltic Computer Systems (BCS) in Estonia participated in a Training Internship Program at Ohio State University and Ashland Chemical Corporation. Because of contracts made through his hosts and his physical presence in the U.S., he was able to contract with Smartware Associates, Inc. (Washington, DC) to represent BCS in the U.S., and to sign a contract with Information Dimensions, Inc. (Columbus, Ohio) for BCS to act as a representative of their wordprocessing software in Estonia.

ESTONIA: Finance and Investment (CIP/Soros)

As a result of training received at Founders Asset Incorporated (Denver, Colorado) and the University of Denver, a recently returned participant learned about financial markets and investment funds. As a direct result of his training, he has been able to:

- propose amendments to the Securities Board of Estonia in the area of regulation of investment funds and fund management companies;
- make improvements in the operations of the company he directs; and
- be elected Chairman of the Board of the Large-Scale Privatization Fund, a new investment fund in Estonia.

HUNGARY: Executive Development Program (William Davidson Institute)

After attending the Executive Development Program at the William Davidson Institute (University of Michigan), managers of a glass manufacturing and processing company developed an action plan to form a Commercial Department that operates efficiently and is adaptable to changing organizational structures and to develop responsibilities that closely follow the goals and objective of the factory. The CEO feels that his company has benefitted directly from its relationship with William Davidson. Using techniques and skills acquired in the U.S. training, the company has been able to implement the following:

- setting up two divisions (Architectural Glass and Auto Glass) and sell them to private investors;
- defining the functions of the Commercial Department as finance, human resources, purchasing, and marketing;
- communicating the responsibilities and duties of the Commercial Department to the Divisions, monitoring customer feedback, and handling complaints;

-
- defining the functions of the Divisions as quality assurance, sales, and production;
 - defining the functions of the Sales Departments;
 - installing new computer programs to improve product costing; and
 - adding incentives to the Architectural Division for the managers to meet sales objectives.

LATVIA: Legal Translator (PIET)

A legal translator at the national government level in the Latvian Department of Records trained at the U.S. Library of Congress. Upon return from training, she received a salary increase, and, while maintaining her job, has continued her studies. She found the U.S. training helpful in a general way, but has found it especially useful in her current job. She uses the skills acquired through her U.S. training program very often. She became familiar with the American legal system which helps her translation of U.S. legislative acts into Latvia. She regrets not having the authority to implement all that she learned in the U.S. She has shared her training with four colleagues and co-workers.

LATVIA: Securities Market Development (PIET)

An executive in the public sector, the Latvian Department of State, received increased responsibilities and a salary increase since return from U.S. training. He found his U.S. training program in Securities Marketing Development helpful to him in a general way, but has been able to influence change in government policy in his sector. Since his return and as a result of his training, he established a secondary market for the government securities (T-Bills), which has significantly increased (9-10 times) the amount of T-Bills sold. He has shared his training with co-workers and colleagues as well as community members and friends.

LITHUANIA: Banking (SUNY—Farmingdale)

Following her U.S. training in Banking and Finance, a professor of economics at Kaunas University of Technology (KU) returned to her institution and has revised curricula to reflect Western Banking practices and principles. Her services have also been sought by another university in Lithuania, where she is also teaching and helping to revise curricula. In addition, she is working with the former Prime Minister creating business plans to encourage foreign investment.

POLAND: Building Supervision and Inspection (HBI)

This manager of the Department of Architecture and Building Supervision in Kutno, Poland, was interested to find creative ways to work within her staff and budgetary constraints to accomplish the required number of building inspections in Kutno. In her U.S. training, she gained first hand experience with a multi-disciplinary code inspection process (building code inspectors are cross-trained in code inspection and enforcement). This means that one cross-trained inspector making one inspection visit can now do the work that had previously required several separate inspections from other code enforcement officers. As a result of her U.S. experience, her project is now being implemented in Kutno and provides for a more efficient building inspection department.

POLAND: Executive Management Training (PIET)

An executive with a public organization found his training at the U.S. Executive Management Training Program highly relevant to his current job, and often uses the skills he acquired in the U.S. He has been able to do his own job better and has influenced changes in company policy. As a result of his training, he has been able to improve his company's methodology of strategic studies, and extend his company's services. He has shared his training with 15 colleagues and workers and 60 other participants in a seminar he conducted on Business Planning.

POLAND: Housing Policy for the Aging (HBI)

During her U.S. training, an employee of the Department of Housing Policy within the Ministry of Physical Planning and Construction, acquired information and reference materials from the Building Officials and Code Administrators (BOCA) Association on housing facilities for the aging. She also visited Action Housing, a United Way agency specializing in the construction of public housing, as well as the Presbyterian Agency on Aging. For her action plan upon returning to Poland, she prepared a proposal for national governmental action to develop building codes for public housing specifically targeted for the aging, to include acute care facilities, nursing facilities, and private condominiums for independent/assisted or independent living. If the legislature supports her proposal, her next step will be to work with appropriate national agencies to write the specialized codes and start an education and enforcement process.

POLAND: Public Administration in Housing Delivery (CHF)

Following his U.S. training in public administration (housing delivery), a local Deputy Mayor of Swinoujscie, Poland, created a design for a housing project and generated confidence in an efficient, but novel, building method based on wooden frame construction technology. Through his exposure to U.S. methods of mortgage financing, the former participant has incorporated a relatively new method of financing for the

Polish home buyer, inviting a Polish-American Bank to participate in the project as a financier of individual mortgage loans for potential buyers. The project, already underway, will produce approximately 68 units of more affordable housing to meet a great demand in the Polish economy, and as an added benefit, will produce consumer confidence in non-traditional building and financing methods.

POLAND: TESOL Summer Institute and Educational Management (PIET)

A public school principal received seven weeks of training at Iowa State University and Northern Arizona University in Teaching of English as a Second Language and Educational Management. Upon completion of her program and return to her home country, she was able to conduct a faculty evaluation, a program evaluation, and in-service training in faculty development. She also developed curriculum and wrote policy papers. She shared her newly acquired computer knowledge and leadership strategies. She estimates that she has trained approximately 33 colleagues and co-workers in on-the-job training situations, 218 students through the classes she conducts, and 10 community members and friends through the normal conduct of her job.

REGION: Diagnostic Ultrasound Technology (Thomas Jefferson University Hospital)

With the support of an intensive three-month training program in diagnostic medical sonography, 24 physicians from Central and Eastern European countries have returned to their countries to practice and teach the new techniques learned in the U.S. In selected countries, graduates of the program are assisted in establishing affiliate training centers. Affiliate sites have been already designated in Hungary and Romania. A major American ultrasound equipment manufacturer has announced donation of ultrasound scanners to these sites, and Thomas Jefferson University Hospital will support both sites with donations of books, video tapes, slides, and other teaching materials. These affiliate sites will greatly leverage USAID's initial investment in the program as the sites will teach many more physicians to use ultrasound for medical diagnosis. The affiliate sites will quickly become self-sustaining and will continue to remain closely linked with the Jefferson Ultrasound Research and Education Institute through an oversight program.

ROMANIA: Community Health and Family Practice (PIET)

In the summer of 1994, a Romanian epidemiologist came to the U.S. for six weeks of training at three university hospitals. Since his return, he has established a Community Health Department at his university—the first of its kind in Romania. For the first time, Romanian medical students and general practitioners are able to benefit from a new coordinated curriculum that includes fields such as Primary Health Care, Family Practice, and Environmental Health.

ROMANIA: Regional Planning (Soros Foundation)

A participant in a U.S. Training Internship Program returned to Romania on December 13, 1994. She was immediately assigned to develop new projects within the Ministry of Public Works and Regional Planning to change Romanian laws on regional and urban planning.

ROMANIA: Telecommunications (Soros Foundation)

A participant in the Training Internship Program at the Harris Corporation returned to his position as technical director of Romtelecom, the state-owned telecommunications company in Romania, in December 1994. As a direct result of his training, he received approval to work on two feasibility studies on using microwave technology to improve telephone service in remote areas. If successful, they will be used across Romania.

SLOVAK REPUBLIC: Economic Development (IIE)

A former electrical engineer with experience in computer science received training at the North American Consortium for Free Market Study in macro and microeconomics, statistics, finance, strategic management, international business, and computer applications. Upon completion of his academic program and return to Slovakia, he was promoted, as a result of his U.S. training, by his company from commercial director of the company, supervising 32 employees, to plant manager, overseeing 1,000 employees.