PD-ABY-973

AFRICAN TRAINING FOR LEADERSHIP AND ADVANCED SKILLS PROJECT

(ATLAS)

FORMATIVE EVALUATION

VOLUME 1

Creative Associates International, Inc.
Analysis and Information Management Division
5301 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20015
202-966-5804

December 30, 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE ATLAS PROJECT 1

II. ATLAS ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS 1
- A. Findings 2
- B. Conclusions 5
- C. Recommendations 6

III. ATLAS MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS 6
- A. Core Contractor 6
- B. Mission Management of ATLAS 10
- C. USAID Direct Hire Management of ATLAS 12
- D. RSSA Management of ATLAS 13
- E. Small Country Program Strategy 14
- F. Project Paper Amendment 15

IV. ATLAS DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT THROUGH 2006 16
- A. Findings 16
- B. Conclusions 18
- C. Recommendations 19

APPENDICES

A: SCOPE OF WORK 21

B: APPROACH, METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION 31

C: PROJECT DESCRIPTION 35

D: STATISTICAL TABULATIONS 41

E: ATLAS IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISMS 71

F: ATLAS FINANCIAL STATUS, FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING 85

G: FEEDBACK 93

H: COUNTRY PROFILE: GUINEA 133

I: COUNTRY PROFILE: TANZANIA 147

J: COUNTRY PROFILE: MADAGASCAR 155

K: COUNTRY PROFILE: CAPE VERDE 165

L: BIBLIOGRAPHY 171

M: MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS 175

N: ACRONYMS 187

O: INTERVIEW AND SURVEY INSTRUMENTS 189

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the formative evaluation of the African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills (ATLAS) project, conducted by a four-person team through an Indefinite Quantity Contract with Creative Associates International, Incorporated. A sixteen-year project with initial obligations on August 31, 1990, and scheduled to run through August 30, 2006, the ATLAS purpose is to strengthen leadership and technical abilities and enhance the professional excellence of individuals serving in African public and private sector entities, including universities, research centers and other key development institutions, contributing to the project's goal, to improve the performance of African institutions and organizations to plan and promote sustainable development in Africa.

ATLAS offers a panoply of services to achieve this purpose.

- Missions can use Operating Year Budget transfers to send Africans to the United States to study in graduate or undergraduate degree programs or to conduct short-term research or study activities. ATLAS mandates a professional enrichment component for participants in training calculated to provide management in addition to the technical skills acquired during the academic program.

- ATLAS offers professional enrichment activities, encompassing regional and national conferences and symposia under core funds or through Mission buy-ins for country-specific undertakings.

- Core funds are available as grants to African organizations.

- Core funds also provide for an information dissemination campaign calculated to maintain the communication and networks ATLAS alumni develop during scholarship or professional enhancement activities.

The total USAID contribution over the life of the project is expected at $140 million: $105 million in Mission OYB transfers and $35 million in core funds.

ATLAS is managed by the United States Agency for International Development. Direct hire management was provided by the Africa Bureau through October 1994, and, as of November 1994, by the Global Bureau. Direct hire management is supported by a team of professionals seconded by the United States Department of Agriculture under a Resources Support Services Agreement. A core management contract is held by the African-American Institute and is scheduled to expire on October 30, 1995.

This formative evaluation was mandated in the Project Paper. Given the relatively early stage in project implementation, according to the scope of work, the formative evaluation was not to be "exhaustive: the major focus of the first evaluation (was to be) on determining the effectiveness of the various mechanisms put in place by both USAID/W and the core contractor for project implementation, monitoring, data collection and evaluation." Since ATLAS is designed specifically for its impact on African institutions in education, training, research, public sector services and in the private sector, in addition to examining the mechanisms put into place to implement the participant training and professional enhancement activities, the evaluation team's approach was calculated to

gauge the effectiveness of ATLAS implementation so that recommendations can help affect mid-course correction and increase the likelihood of project impact.

This evaluation strove to be driven by data, and to document all findings by facts. The team relied on data supplied by USAID ATLAS management and the core contractor as well as data collected in field visits within the US and to 4 African countries. A broader perspective was solicited through visits to Africa's two Regional Economic Development Services Offices. All Missions participating in ATLAS were surveyed. The team administered a variety of evaluation instruments to an audience representing all players in ATLAS — ATLAS USAID/W management, Mission Training Office and leadership, host country nominators and employers, ATLAS participants and alumni, the US university community, and core contractor personnel — and performed statistical analyses on the participant data as supplied by the core contractor.

Our key findings can be summarized as follows:

- ***ATLAS has developed effective mechanisms to implement all aspects of the project.***
- ***ATLAS is ably managed by USAID and implemented by the core contractor.***
- ***Mission OYB transfers have increased steadily since project inception***, topping $35 million since FY90.

Major issues emerged as well.

- ***There is no systematic constituency for ATLAS among USAID policy-makers.*** USAID/W leadership views ATLAS as "peripheral," Missions are closing, and Mission OYB transfers may not remain constant in FY95.
- ***ATLAS as currently implemented does not provide the accurate, thorough data and reporting that are necessary to demonstrate project impact, to build a constituency and to manage the project.*** The current management contract does not require detailed reporting on the features that make ATLAS special and different from predecessor projects.
- ***The impact ball has been dropped under ATLAS.*** The project began with impact, specifying goals and mandating the development of an impact methodology. Yet the core contractor is not required to define, track or report on impact for scholarships or for professional enhancement activities, and there is virtually no linkage between ATLAS components — scholarships and professional enhancement — to contribute to the likelihood of project impact.
- ***Leadership is not reinforced under the project's current implementation mechanisms.*** Leadership is neither specified in the criteria for scholarship selection nor incorporated into any ATLAS feature such as professional enrichment or professional enhancement.
- ***The transition to ATLAS from predecessor projects has been difficult for all players.*** Greater Mission involvement and the OYB transfer process have created the need for greater sharing of functions which in earlier days had been handled almost exclusively by the core contractor, and initial strains still persist and cause dysfunction in the ATLAS implementation process.

Our recommendations to address these issues follow.

- ***We recommend that ATLAS be maintained with scholarship and professional enhancement components.***

- ***We recommend that USAID/W develop a system to report on ATLAS*** through formal annual reports and semi-annual presentations.

- ***We recommend that USAID begin to focus on ATLAS's impact*** by reviewing the methodologies and definitions available and by adopting a methodology for ATLAS.

- ***We recommend that the new core management contract mandate accurate reporting on all aspects of ATLAS so that the financial and programmatic analytical tools are available to manage and promote the project.***

- ***We recommend an enhanced informational campaign to encourage Missions to take advantage of the full panoply of ATLAS services.***

- ***We recommend that Missions consider focussing ATLAS on institutions that are key to achieving Mission strategic objectives.***

- ***We recommend that the Agency review its commitment to ATLAS as a leadership project.*** ATLAS management should emphasize, define and standardize leadership under ATLAS if the project is to contribute to providing African organizations with the human resources, technical abilities and personal authority necessary to gain institutional legitimacy, draw external resources and achieve results. Programmatically, this could mean stressing leadership in all ATLAS components, including in professional enrichment and professional enhancement, as well as in the selection of candidates for long-term training under ATLAS.

- ***We recommend that core funds be made available to provide services to Missions to implement an ATLAS strategy focussing on impact.*** Such services might include developing tracking tools, assisting Missions in identifying key organizations on which to focus, or working with Mission personnel to discuss the meaning of a strategy to develop change agents and to devise ways of implementing such strategies.

- ***We recommend that ATLAS management hold a retreat involving all players — USAID/W, Missions, contractor headquarters and field staff — to renegotiate the rules and procedures to make the project work better.*** ATLAS management should capitalize on the project's move to the Global Bureau to begin exercising "best practice" for this project now.

This evaluation is in two volumes for readability and ease of distribution.

- Volume 1, *ATLAS Evaluation*, provides the complete text as well as full appendices, including statistical tabulations, detailed analysis of the ATLAS implementation mechanisms and feedback from ATLAS players as well as individual profiles of the four countries which served as site visits. The scope of work, team approach, methodology and composition, bibliography, list of meetings and interviews, and interview and survey instruments are supplied with Volume 1.

- Volume 2, *Abridged ATLAS Evaluation*, provides the complete text and limits the appendices to the scope of work, team approach, methodology and composition and statistical analyses.

I. DESCRIPTION OF THE ATLAS PROJECT

The African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills (ATLAS) project was authorized on July 2, 1990, to run sixteen years from the date of initial obligation, August 31, 1990, through the Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD), August 30, 2006. A full description of the ATLAS project and its implementation process is supplied in Appendix C to the *ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 1.*

The ATLAS project's goal is *to improve the performance of African institutions and organizations to plan and promote sustainable development in Africa.* The project's purpose is *to strengthen leadership and technical abilities and enhance the professional excellence of individuals serving in African public and private sector entities, including universities, research centers and other key development institutions.*

ATLAS has three main components:

- A participant training scholarship component, with its attendant activities for selection, placement and management of degree students at US universities — all academic training is US-based;
- A post-training professional enhancement component which promotes professional competence among graduates of US funded training and reinforces their ability to contribute to African development;
- A comprehensive study to assess the impact of US participant training on capacity-building in Africa.

Administration of the scholarship and professional enhancement components is contracted to a core contractor, currently the African-American Institute, whose contract expires on October 30, 1995. The second ATLAS core management contract will be negotiated in 1995.

ATLAS calls for a total USAID contribution of $140 million, of which nearly $105 million is designated for training funded by USAID Missions and $35 million for core costs administered by the project contractor. Like its predecessor African Graduate Fellowship (AFGRAD) projects, a prominent feature of ATLAS is cost-sharing by US universities in the form of tuition scholarships, valued at an additional $26 million over the life of the project. ATLAS differs from predecessor projects in that Missions fund participant costs through transfers of funds from their annual Operating Year Budgets.

The total number of Africans ultimately expected to benefit from the ATLAS project will exceed 4,850.

- 1,500 people will participate in degree programs — 250 PhD degrees, 1000 Masters's degrees and 250 undergraduate degrees. At least 30 percent of the scholarships are targeted for women, and at least 10 percent of participant placements must be at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).
- 350 Africans will participate in postgraduate non-degree programs.
- 3,000 former USAID participants will participate in professional enhancement activities which include the organization of at least 30 symposia and seminars as well as assistance to at least 20 professional organizations in Africa.

II. ATLAS ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENTS

These findings are based on core contractor and USAID/W records provided to the evaluation team during the evaluation data collection period, September-November 1994. Complete country-by-country statistical tabulations are provided in an appendix.

A. ATLAS Achievements: Findings

- ***Mission OYB transfers for ATLAS have increased steadily from FY90 to FY94, exceeding $35 million as of FY94.***
  - 25 countries have participated in ATLAS to date, accounting for 56 percent of the 45 countries originally eligible to participate at project outset.
  - OYB transfers from FY90 to FY94 have exceeded $35 million.
  - Another $6.8 million in OYB transfers are projected for FY95 according to the FY95 Annual Budget Submission (ABS). This amount may rise or fall once actual OYB transfers are made.
  - 16 countries made OYB transfers in FY94, up from 7 countries in FY90.
  - 16 countries are projected to make OYB transfers to ATLAS in FY95.
  - Leaders in ATLAS OYB transfers FY90 through FY94 are Tanzania ($3.54 million), Benin ($3.35 million), Madagascar ($3.3 million) and Mozambique ($3.09 million). Projected leaders for FY95 are Benin, Mozambique ($1 million each), Tanzania ($.8 million) and Madagascar ($.7 million).

1. ATLAS Fellowships

- ***397 participants will have been awarded ATLAS Fellowships to date for long-term academic study in the US*** if all candidates currently pending placement are admitted, Missions accept the proposed training plans and all candidates accept fellowships.
  - 287 participants are currently in training, or 72 percent of fellowships awarded to date.
  - 40 participants have completed ATLAS training, or 10 percent of total awards.
  - 70 participants are pending placement or awaiting arrival in the US, representing 18 percent of ATLAS awards.

- ***ATLAS Fellowships are overwhelmingly for graduate degrees, accounting for 90 percent of scholarships granted to date***, reflecting Mission priorities for training.
  - 331 of the 397 ATLAS awards — 83 percent — are for masters degrees.
  - 27 of ATLAS awards, or 7 percent, are for doctorates.
  - The remaining 39 awards, or 10 percent, are for undergraduate degrees.

- ***ATLAS trains African government and university officials.***
  - 41 percent of ATLAS fellows plan to go into government service following training.
  - University teachers are the next largest cohort, representing 21 percent of current ATLAS trainees' anticipated employment.
  - The remainder will work in African non-profit or parastatal organizations (21 percent) or in the private sector (12 percent).

- ***ATLAS demonstrates an extraordinary academic success rate to date under the scholarship component.*** 2 percent of ATLAS Fellows, or 8 participants, have withdrawn from training prior to successful completion.

- ***ATLAS project-wide is meeting and exceeding the contractual target of 30 percent female participation under the US-based scholarships and postgraduate study and research components.***
  - ATLAS participation to date under both the scholarship and postgraduate study and research components has been 31 percent.

- Female participation in ATLAS scholarships has been steadily increasing. 22 percent of completed ATLAS fellows are women, as are 31 percent of current trainees and 36 percent of those pending placement or arrival: the proportion of scholarships granted to women is rising.

- ***ATLAS is not meeting immediate repatriation targets to date.***
  - 29 of the 40 participants who have completed training have returned home, accounting for 73 percent of completed training. The remaining 11 have not returned as yet: delayed repatriation represents 27 percent of completed training.
  - Six of the 11 — over half of the problem cases — are from Zaire, a country currently experiencing turbulence. Congo, Guinea, Mozambique, Togo and Zambia each sponsored one participant who has thus far failed to return home.

- ***ATLAS has achieved a 7 percent rate of HBCU utilization under the long-term scholarship component, not yet attaining the contractual mandate of 10 percent.***
  - The core contractor promotes the use of HBCUs through its subcontract with the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO). The NAFEO ATLAS Liaison Officer attends the annual meetings of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans during which final selection of ATLAS candidates is accomplished.
  - The core contractor solicits tuition scholarships from HBCUs in its annual survey of universities. 13 of the 105 accredited HBCUs have offered tuition scholarships to ATLAS.
  - Leading HBCUs in number of tuition scholarships committed to ATLAS are Central State University (12 slots), Florida A&M University (7) and Morgan State University (6).

- ***The lag in HBCU utilization is more due to placement difficulties than to a shortage of tuition scholarships at HBCUs.*** According to core contractor data, from 1991 through 1994 HBCUs have offered a total of 41 scholarships, exceeding the 27 successful HBCU placements to date.

- ***HBCU utilization to date is primarily for graduate degrees.***
  - Masters degrees account for 17 of the 27 HBCU scholarships under ATLAS, or 63 percent.
  - Undergraduate degrees account for the remaining 10 HBCU placements, or 37 percent.
  - Placement of women at HBCUs represents 37 percent of ATLAS HBCU utilization to date, slightly higher than women's overall participation in ATLAS.

- ***ATLAS to date is meeting contractual targets for duration of training: masters degrees average 22 person-months and undergraduate degrees, 10 person-months***, according to core contractor data.
  - These figures are calculated for those ATLAS scholars whose training is completed, successfully or unsuccessfully, because duration of training can only be accurately assessed once training is completed.
  - The figure for undergraduate duration of training comes from a single completed undergraduate training program.

- ***30 percent of ATLAS Fellows in the US have benefitted from professional enrichment activities during their training.***
  - 28 percent of men have undertaken enrichment activities.
  - 34 percent of women have benefitted from enrichment programs.
  - While there is no contractual target for professional enrichment activities, close to two thirds of ATLAS scholars have not taken part in enrichment activities to date.
  - Participation in professional enrichment is a function of where participants are in their academic program cycles and to Mission funding decisions.

- ***ATLAS is currently providing practical training to 35 percent of masters degree fellows who have completed training, to date exceeding the contractual target of 30 percent.*** Figures are not available for numbers or proportions of practical training experiences planned for the future.

2. *ATLAS Professional Enhancement Activities*

- ***ATLAS has implemented 7 of the 10 conferences, workshops or symposia required under the current management contract, and will reach its contractual target once the planned national and 3 regional conferences are implemented in FY95.***
  - ATLAS has implemented regional conferences in Uganda, Senegal, Tanzania, Ghana, Gabon, Namibia and Zimbabwe, and national conferences in Uganda and Senegal.
  - 507 Africans have participated in ATLAS conferences to date.
  - 17 percent of ATLAS conference participants are women.

- ***ATLAS has disbursed or obligated $250,077 in grant activities to 9 African organizations.***
  - Grants have been awarded or obligated to organizations in Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, Kenya, Niger, Senegal, South Africa and Zimbabwe.
  - Another $97,118 in grants is pending obligation or approval, bringing the total to $347,195.
  - Additional grant requests are anticipated for follow-on activities to the 1994 regional conference in Zimbabwe.
  - If these are approved and funding obligated, it is expected that ATLAS will have provided the $400,000 in grants to African organizations mandated in the current management contract.

- ***ATLAS's record in providing membership in professional societies and corresponding professional subscriptions cannot be assessed.*** The core contractor does not maintain these data although it is a contractual requirement that such membership and subscriptions be provided.

- ***ATLAS has developed and published two networking and informational vehicles: IROKO and ATLAS Alert, geared to provide communication and networking devices for different audiences.***
  - ATLAS has published 5 issues of *IROKO* as of Spring 1994. *IROKO* was developed for an audience of alumni of ATLAS and AFGRAD.
  - *IROKO*'s mailing list includes approximately 1900 alumni of prior projects administered by AAI, USAID/W and Mission staff, and other interested parties.
  - *ATLAS Alert* is a second newsletter designed for a wider audience. 5 issues have been published through Spring 1994.
  - Some 250 copies of *ATLAS Alert* are mailed to USAID -- Washington and field — US universities, core contractor field staff, foreign embassies, donor organizations, and other interested parties.

- ***AAI has complied with the contractual requirement to produce an annual Directory of Fellows.***
  - The *Directory* is a continuation of an endeavor initially funded under AFGRAD.
  - 2 issues of the *Directory* have been published to date under ATLAS funding, and AAI is currently completing the 1994 *Directory*.
  - Approximately 2200 copies of the *Directory* are mailed to AFGRAD/ATLAS alumni, ATLAS students in the US, donors, African regional organizations, core contractor field staff, US universities, and USAID in Washington and in the field.

- ***ATLAS has provided 13 awards for short-term postgraduate research or study in the US.***
  - Postgraduate awards have been made to Zambia (5), Cameroon (4), Madagascar (3) and the Comoros (1), according to core contractor records.

10

- Women represent 31 percent of ATLAS postgraduate study and research awards, the same proportion as under the ATLAS scholarship component. The four female postgraduate award recipients are from Cameroon (3 women, 75 percent of Cameroon's postgraduate participation) and Madagascar (1 woman, a third of Madagascar's total).

- ***ATLAS has provided five Distinguished Alumni Awards.***
  - Five Distinguished Alumni awards have been awarded in Liberia, Nigeria, Madagascar, Mali and Ghana.
  - All Distinguished Alumni Awards were nominated and approved in 1991 and 1992 and implemented by April 1994.
  - 100 percent of the Distinguished Alumni Award recipients are men.

B. ATLAS Achievements: Conclusions

- ***ATLAS is the US Agency for International Development's premier vehicle to provide advanced skills and support institutional capacity-building in Africa.*** No other USAID project offers the same scope and breadth.

- ***ATLAS is on its way to achieving project objectives.*** Mechanisms have been developed and implemented in Missions, within USAID/W and by the core contractor to implement all aspects of the ATLAS contract.

- ***The mechanisms put into place for recruiting, placing and managing long-term US-based participants are effective.*** The ATLAS academic success rate currently stands at an outstanding 98 percent.

- ***If prevailing trends hold, ATLAS is likely to achieve many of the goals spelled out under the present management contract.***
  - ATLAS will meet its current target for grant activities to African organizations: all $400,000 will be disbursed if current obligations, approved proposals, requests pending USAID/W approval and anticipated requests are authorized and implemented.
  - ATLAS has met its target of 5 Distinguished Alumni Awards.
  - ATLAS is meeting its information dissemination goals: two newsletters and an annual *Directory of Alumni* are regularly produced, distributed and judged useful by their readership.
  - ATLAS will meet its target for Africa-based conferences and symposia once the national and three regional conferences planned for 1995 are implemented.
  - ATLAS overall is meeting contractual goals for female participation, currently at 31 percent both of fellowships and of postgraduate study and research award recipients.
  - ATLAS is meeting its target for practical training: those who have completed masters degrees are eligible for practical training, with Mission approval. Of this pool, 35 percent have undertaken practical training programs, each lasting four months.

- ***ATLAS is not likely to meet other goals laid out in the current management contract.***
  - While ATLAS might achieve the goal of a total of 600 scholarships awarded during the current management contract, it is not likely to meet the contract's breakdown of 100 PhDs, 400 masters degrees and 100 undergraduate degrees. As of 10/25/1994, 397 fellowships had been awarded or were pending award: 39 undergraduate, 331 masters degrees, and 27 doctorates.
  - Doctorates in particular are unlikely to meet contractual stipulations if current trends persist.

- ATLAS is unlikely to meet the current contract's target of 100 postgraduate study and research awards since only 13 have been granted to date.
- These shortfalls in doctorates and in postgraduate research and study awards reflect Mission priorities and funding to date.

- ***Preliminary estimates indicate that the momentum achieved between FY90 and FY94 in securing Mission OYB transfers may not be sustained.***
  - 9 Missions have closed or are closing in the ATLAS region. Four of these (Cameroon, Cape Verde, Togo, Zaire) had bought in to ATLAS.
  - Buy-ins are projected to decrease by 22 percent in FY95 according to early AFR/ONI/TPPI 9/94 figures based on FY95 ABS submissions.
  - No new countries are projected to buy in to ATLAS in FY95 according to the ABS.
  - The USAID/W ATLAS management team states that actual OYB transfers have exceeded initial ABS projections in prior years, so the actual fluctuation in funding levels between FY94 and FY95 might change accordingly.

C. ATLAS Achievements: Recommendations

- ***The overall number of ATLAS scholarships should remain at 600, but should be adjusted to remove the breakdown for undergraduate, masters and doctoral programs.***

- ***Additional efforts should be undertaken to reach the project's target for HBCU participation.*** Since the contractual goal is 10 percent HBCU utilization, the core contractor should offer a higher proportion than that for placement at HBCUs.

- ***Additional efforts should be made to make sure that doctoral ATLAS fellows undertake their research at home so that their topics are relevant to their future employment and so that the countries participating in ATLAS are enriched by the data such research will develop.*** Missions should fund doctoral research in Africa and the core contractor and USAID/W should work to encourage Missions to do so.

- ***Missions should be encouraged to fund the full range of ATLAS opportunities, including practical training and other enrichment activities during long-term training as well as doctorates and short-term postgraduate research and study tours.*** USAID/W should communicate with Missions about the availability and value of these opportunities.

III. ATLAS MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS

A. Core Contractor

♦ ***Core Contractor Management Effectiveness: Findings***

- ***The core contractor has developed and implemented effective procedures and mechanisms to carry out all aspects of the current ATLAS management contract.***
  - Procedures and mechanisms are in place to recruit, select, place, monitor and repatriate long-term trainees and recipients of short-term research grants.
  - Procedures and mechanisms are in place to carry out the ATLAS professional enhancement activities: conferences, workshops and symposia; grants to African organizations; information

12

dissemination through newsletters and the *Alumni Directory*; and the Distinguished Alumni Award.

- Findings, conclusions and recommendations surrounding the ATLAS implementation mechanisms are fully spelled out in Appendix E to the *ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 1*.

- ***The core contractor is in compliance with all aspects of the contract regarding academic training.***
  - AAI coordinates with Missions regarding participant selection; secures tuition scholarships from US universities for graduate-level candidates; and has established a committee to assist in screening and selecting ATLAS long-term scholarship participants and short-term postgraduate study and research award recipients. Members of the ATLAS screening and selection committee and representatives of AAI staff travel annually to participate in in-country pre-selection of long-term participants and research award recipients. AAI's placement team secures admission for candidates at accredited US graduate schools, including securing tuition scholarships for graduate participants. AAI keeps Missions and the USAID/W Project Manager informed of "the status and results of placement efforts."
  - AAI issues call forward dates and Training Implementation Plans (TIPs) for each participant; arranges pre-departure orientation and orientation upon arrival in the US for most participants; places those participants requiring English language training in appropriate programs and monitors progress.
  - AAI monitors participant progress, including full academic courseloads and duration of training in accordance with contract stipulations; provides regular progress reports to Missions, the USAID/W Project Manager and to the participants' home country employers; provides all allowances authorized under USAID Handbook 10; prepares unfunded PIO/Ps and PDFs; enrolls participants in HAC; provides some professional enrichment activities during training; coordinates some doctoral scholars' research in their home countries; monitors the personal, social and academic welfare of each participant; and assists with repatriation upon completion of training.

- ***The core contractor is in compliance with all aspects of the current management contract regarding professional enhancement activities.***
  - AAI follows up on former AFGRAD participants; and develops and distributes a list of alumni to Missions, USAID, participating universities, and other interested entities.
  - AAI publishes two different newsletters to serve as informal networking and communication devices for the USAID and alumni audiences.
  - AAI has developed criteria for and, by the end of the current contract, will have administered approximately $400,000 in grants to African organizations.
  - AAI plans, designs and carries out a series of symposia on critical issues in development.
  - AAI makes cash awards of up to $500 to distinguished AFGRAD or ATLAS alumni who have made significant contributions to their country's development since returning home from training.

- ***The core contractor has not yet completed the Operations Manual that was to be "one of its first tasks," according to the contract.*** AAI ATLAS management says the *Operations Manual* is "90 percent completed in draft form" and should be finalized in January 1995.

- ***The core contractor meets all reporting requirements called for under the contract, including annual reports, annual statistical summaries, annual administrative budgets and workplans, and financial reports.***

- ***The core contractor's use of subcontractors has been spotty.***
  - The African Association of Sciences (AAS) appears to be performing well in supporting ATLAS professional enhancement activities after a slow start.
  - Arthur D. Little (ADL) undertook 2 management workshops (December 1991 and May 1993) for a total of 48 ATLAS participants. These occurred early in the project. ADL's contribution falls far short of expectations at the time the contract was awarded because of the difficulty in gathering a sufficient number of MBA participants at a single time.
  - Management Systems International (MSI) performed database development activities for ATLAS which have not been entirely satisfactory.
  - The National Association for Fairness in Educational Opportunities (NAFEO) has been contributing to enhancing the participation of HBCUs in ATLAS, though participation to date (7 percent) falls short of contractual requirements (10 percent).

- ***The core contractor has field-based staff in 9 of the 16 countries with ATLAS buy-ins in FY94.***
  - The 7 ATLAS countries where AAI is not represented accounted for $3.7 million — 42 percent — of the $8.7 million provided by Mission buy-ins.
  - An in-country core contractor presence is not a contractual requirement.
  - Core contractor field staff primarily play a role in recruitment, selection, and all facets of professional enhancement, with little or no part in placement or monitoring ATLAS participants.

- ***The ATLAS Executive Committee of Deans plays an important, appreciated and cost-effective role in screening and selecting candidates for long-term training under ATLAS.***
  - The Committee is composed of deans of graduate and undergraduate schools in the US and is chaired by the President of the Council of Graduate Schools in the US.
  - Members of the 13-person Committee travel to Africa to assist with in-country screening, to interview potential candidates, and to interpret US university requirements to host country officials, Mission personnel and candidates.
  - The Committee meets twice a year, once each at AAI headquarters in New York and in Washington, to perform the final selection of ATLAS candidates for long-term training and to discuss and contribute to policy issues governing the project.

- ***Most Missions receive financial reports from AAI and find them useful.***
  - 70 percent found the content of AAI financial reports to be very good or better.
  - About 20 percent of those surveyed complained that the financial data provided was inaccurate and not timely.
  - There is little evidence that Missions use ATLAS financial reports to monitor the project.

- ***The core contractor has developed and implemented three database management systems to manage ATLAS and to respond to ATLAS reporting requirements.***
  - The AAI Placement system tracks all aspects of selecting and placing long-term trainees and short-term research award grantees, from ATLAS Deans' Committee votes through English language training scores, tuition scholarships and placement in an appropriate program, including field of study, budget worksheet amounts, PIO/T budget range and PIO/P range.
  - Placement data is imported through an automated procedure into the Monitoring system, which allows ATLAS Program Officers to manage individual participants. For reasons of data integrity, ATLAS Program Officers cannot edit budget fields from the Monitoring database.
  - Data from the Monitoring system can be uploaded through an automated procedure into the Reduced Input Set Computing (RISC) system which houses AAI's financial data.

- Upon a scholarship or postgraduate study and research award participant's completion, data from the Monitoring system is exported to the Alumni database; this process is currently being automated.

- ***The core contractor's data management systems, while in compliance with the terms of the contract's reporting requirements, do not report specifically on all of the categories of interest in the ATLAS Project Paper.***
  - This evaluation's scope of work called for an analysis by country of participants' anticipated post-training assignments (Task 1). Yet AAI's data management system was designed so that this information is keyed in at the completion of a participant's training. This meant that AAI was forced to hire temporary staff to enter this data so that it was available to the evaluation team. More importantly, it also means that core contractor ATLAS administration staff cannot tie programming to the anticipated utilization of training which minimizes the likelihood of ATLAS impact.
  - Similarly, AAI does not account separately for professional enrichment activities undertaken during the course of a long-term trainee's program of study. AAI accounts for and made available to the evaluation team gender-disaggregated figures on domestic travel, perdiem, and fees. However, these figures might include transportation costs for a participant transferring from one university to another, to cite an example. For this reason, for instance, AAI's figures show expenditures of $3,876 for "professional enrichment" for Cameroon, even though there are no long-term ATLAS participants from Cameroon, and therefore no possible pool of candidates for enrichment. Similarly, AAI's figures on professional enrichment list a woman from Togo as participating in enrichment, but shows no dollars expended for enrichment for women from Togo.

- ***The core contractor's data management systems are not compatible with other USAID systems.***
  - Data from the AAI systems cannot be automatically uploaded into PTMS, Versions 6 and 7, the Mission-based Participant Training Management Systems used by USAID Missions in Africa.
  - Mission Training Office staff must therefore enter ATLAS-related data manually into their PTMS systems, as they do with training data under other projects.
  - AAI's code tables are designed to be compatible with two other USAID/W management information systems: the versions of PTMS used by USAID Missions in Africa and TIMS, the Training Information Management System, housed within the Africa Bureau until its November 1994 move to the Global Bureau.

- ***Core Contractor Management Effectiveness: Conclusions***

- ***The core contractor has developed systems to implement ATLAS to the general satisfaction of all players — USAID Missions, USAID/W, ATLAS participants, employers, and host country nominating officials.***

- ***The core contractor is in compliance with most aspects of the current management contract.*** Expected shortfalls are noted in previous sections.

- ***The core contractor could improve its communications with ATLAS players,*** from Missions to participants.

♦ ***Core Contractor Management Effectiveness: Recommendations***

- ***We recommend that the core contractor complete its Operations Manual and standardize its ATLAS implementation procedures*** among staff and Missions.

- ***We recommend that the gaps in the ATLAS data management system be filled in***, especially as regards the project's special features — professional enrichment and enhancement — and post-training utilization and impact, critical to meeting the ATLAS purpose.

- ***We recommend that the core contractor be linked with USAID's e-mail system to expedite and facilitate communications with USAID/W and the field.***

B. Mission Management of ATLAS

♦ ***Mission Management: Findings***

- ***Missions have instituted changes to respond to the switch between ATLAS and its predecessor projects.***
  - ATLAS enjoys open and transparent nominating procedures that encourage qualified individuals to apply for training.
  - Missions are transferring funds to participate in ATLAS.

- ***Missions are using ATLAS strategically.*** 81 percent of Missions responding to this evaluation survey say they link ATLAS scholarships to specific objectives.

- ***Missions are satisfied with the ATLAS implementation process.***
  - Three quarters of Mission respondents claim to be pleased with their relationships with the core contractor and with USAID/W.
  - The OYB transfer procedure avoids multiple obligation actions and has proven to be a wise exception to the Africa Bureau's move towards decentralization and greater Mission autonomy.
  - Missions have forged effecting working relationships with ATLAS management within USAID/W: a substantial majority of Mission personnel responding to this evaluation survey believe USAID/W is highly committed to ATLAS and that the Bureau has distinguished itself not just in planning and monitoring ATLAS training but also in "responding when Missions need help."

- ***Missions are generally taking the steps required to meet ATLAS targets for women.***
  - Missions are implementing special steps to recruit women for the ATLAS scholarship component and have played a great role in ATLAS achieving the goal of 30 percent female participation in scholarships.
  - Certain Missions are exceeding the project-wide target: USAID/Guinea, for instance, has set a goal of 50 percent women under both its major HRD projects.
  - Additional steps Missions are taking include making special provisions for women in sciences, engineering and other non-traditional fields.

- ***Missions are not taking sufficient steps to meet other ATLAS project targets.***
  - Missions are not requiring all US-based participants to undergo professional enrichment, including practical training.

- Missions are not universally requiring that doctoral participants under ATLAS undertake their dissertation research in Africa, even though home-based research can mean dissertation topics and data that are relevant to the alumni's post-training employment.

- ***One Mission has developed and implemented an extraordinary system to define and track the impact of ATLAS training.***
  - USAID/Guinea's Training Office has developed a series of five tools to track participant and employer intentions for change following training.
  - Impact definition begins at the planning stage, when participants and employers work together to define objectives for each training program.
  - Returning trainees immediately devise Action Plans for the changes they intend to implement in their professional environments.
  - The Training Office has developed and implements a mechanism to track these Action Plans, following up with both participants and their employers until the intended actions are all completed.

- ***Missions by and large recognize the importance of defining and tracking the impact of the ATLAS project but are not yet taking steps to do so.***
  - Virtually all Mission respondents to this evaluation survey claim that "more is needed" in defining and demonstrating ATLAS impact.
  - No Mission other than USAID/Guinea is implementing plans for the systematic assessment of the project's impact.

- ***Missions want more communication about ATLAS.*** Mission respondents to the evaluation survey repeatedly asked for "better reporting and communication," especially "accurate reporting of expenditures and commitments." It is possible that reports that are provided to Missions are not fully circulated once they reach the field.

- ***Mission PTMS systems do not capture complete records on ATLAS.***
  - Certain Missions use AAI's Quarterly Financial Reports as the basis for data entry on ATLAS participants, in addition to other sources of data such as TIPs and PIO/Ps.
  - While all Missions responding to the evaluation survey state that they enter ATLAS data into their PTMS systems, PTMS records on ATLAS are not complete and are not maintained.
  - The USAID/Washington Training Information Management System (TIMS) compiles PTMS data from the field. Yet TIMS records dated 11/7/1994 show a total of 222 participants. This falls short of the 327 active and completed participants known to be funded to date under ATLAS. TIMS's gender breakdowns are relatively accurate: TIMS shows ATLAS participation by women as 32 percent.

♦ *Mission Management: Conclusions*

- ***The transition to ATLAS from predecessor projects has not always been easy for Missions.***
  - While Missions express appreciation of their enhanced role in determining the project's course in-country, Missions are not always implementing the variety of opportunities that make ATLAS unique.
  - Consequently, Missions have generally concentrated on the ATLAS scholarships and have not been as active in other special ATLAS features — postgraduate research programs, in-training professional enrichment, or the full gamut of ATLAS professional enhancement activities.

- ***Mission "ownership" of ATLAS is inconsistent.***
  - The project appears well established when measured by the number of Missions participating in ATLAS and the amounts they are investing. Yet the project is not always seen as instrumental to Missions achieving strategic objectives, and the possibility of a change in OYB transfer levels in FY95 is cause for concern.
  - 80 percent of Missions responding to our evaluation survey said there was "no change" in how training is managed under ATLAS as compared to AFGRAD.

♦ ***Mission Management: Recommendations***

- ***We recommend that USAID/W enhance its campaign of information to Missions about ATLAS,*** especially as regards special ATLAS features that were not available under predecessor projects, and that Missions take full advantage of the whole range of ATLAS services.

- ***We recommend that Missions take a more active role in defining and tracking the impact of ATLAS activities.*** USAID/Guinea's mechanisms can serve as a practical, implementable model.

- ***We recommend that Missions consider, fund and require their participants to take advantage of the full panoply of ATLAS services.*** Enrichment activities such as practical training or in-training management courses contribute to the ultimate impact that alumni will have in the workplace upon return. Doctoral research at home means dissertation topics and data that are most relevant to alumnis' eventual utilization of their training.

- ***We recommend that Missions consider using ATLAS to focus on institutions that are key to delivering services in the sectors targeted by Missions' CPSPs.*** While this might mean a change from recruiting the "best and brightest" nation-wide, it might contribute to the likelihood of alumni impact upon return and it certainly responds to the project's stated purpose.

C. USAID Direct Hire Management of ATLAS

♦ ***USAID Direct Hire Management: Findings***

- ***ATLAS project management has been moved repeatedly since the project's inception.*** ATLAS has transferred within the Africa Bureau from TR/EHR to MDI to ONI to ARTS and to SD since 1991. The most recent move to USAID's new Global Bureau occurred midway through this evaluation.

- ***Concurrent with these shifts in management location have been changes in ATLAS Project Manager.***
  - Virtually all evaluation survey respondents involved in ATLAS management and implementation — Africa Bureau policy-makers, ATLAS RSSA managers, Mission managers, contractor staff — cited as a problem these frequent shifts in USDH management priorities.
  - As USDH priorities changed with these personnel shifts, leadership was not always provided to the core contractor and/or Missions on key elements of the project, including on impact.

- ***Washington players, including decision-makers, persons more directly related to ATLAS, and RSSA project managers consistently rated the most recent USDH project manager highly in terms of both consistency and oversight.***

- ***Within the Africa Bureau no formal basis for reporting on ATLAS has been standardized.***
  - Copies of *IROKO* and *ATLAS Alert* are routinely distributed.

18

- ATLAS management analyses and annual reports are not circulated in Washington beyond the USDH project manager.

- ***Africa Bureau personnel consistently voiced concern over the ATLAS move to Global and recognized the need to put strong reporting mechanisms in place between the Global and Africa Bureaus.***

- ***Mission ATLAS players generally voiced satisfaction with their relations with USAID/W.***
  - 80 percent of Mission respondents termed relations "very good" to "excellent."
  - USAID/W's commitment to ATLAS is judged "very good" or better by 76 percent of those surveyed in the Missions.
  - 72 percent expressed satisfaction with the OYB transfer procedure.

♦ ***USAID Direct Hire Management: Conclusions***

- ***Constant restructuring and change in USDH project managers have directly impacted ATLAS, depriving the project of consistent leadership, oversight, and institutional memory.***

- ***The ATLAS project management team as well as other Washington players agreed that the lack of formal mechanism for reporting on ATLAS within the Africa Bureau failed to build the needed ATLAS constituency.*** This is compounded by the absence of OE funds for USDH travel to the field.

- ***The USDH ATLAS Project Managers have not emphasized impact, a key element in the Project Paper.*** A focus on impact, demonstrating that ATLAS is key to DFA objectives, might enhance efforts to build an Agency constituency.

♦ ***USAID Direct Hire Management: Recommendations***

- ***It is strongly recommended that the Global Bureau provide for consistent and long-term tenured USDH leadership for ATLAS.***

- ***Both the Global Bureau and the Africa Bureau should invest time and thought to setting up strong and mutually satisfying mechanisms for ATLAS reporting and constituency-building.***

- ***USAID direct hire management should revisit the issue of desired ATLAS impact, capitalizing on the project's move to the Global Bureau and the new change agent strategy to redefine how ATLAS will achieve impact.***

D. RSSA Management of ATLAS

♦ ***RSSA Management: Findings***

- ***Substantial managerial and technical support prior to ATLAS inception has been provided by two professionals under a 1989 and more recently a 1994 Resource Service Support Agreement (RSSA) entered into between the Office of International Cooperation and Development (now the Foreign Agricultural Service) of the US Department of Agriculture and USAID.***

- ***The two RSSA professionals are in effect responsible for all aspects of day-to-day management and contractor liaison under supervision of the USDH Project Manager.***
  - The RSSA managers have heavy decision-making authority, though no power of signature.

- Among tasks assigned to the two RSSAs are technical assistance in defining issues, conducting analyses and designing ATLAS programs; tracking and monitoring ATLAS funding; maintaining systems to document pending and completed activities; and collaborating in the design and implementation of regional and national conferences, workshops and seminars, training programs and strategies, and preparing training materials, newsletters, evaluations and reports.
- The RSSAs also handle communication with the project's field clientele and with the core contractor using cables and e-mail as well as telephone calls and site visits.

■ ***The annual RSSA budget includes funds for travel and per diem covering international and domestic travel.*** Between the two of them the RSSAs have visited nearly all the countries in sub-Saharan Africa.

■ ***Specific tasks are spelled out in annual work plans developed with the USAID Project Manager.***

♦ ***RSSA Management: Conclusions***

■ ***The RSSA ATLAS managers have played an enormous role in keeping the ATLAS project moving.*** Their knowledge and experience contributes to the ongoing management of the project, and they have provided needed continuity to the project throughout the frequent changes in USAID direct hire project management.

■ ***The RSSA budget facilitates field technical assistance since travel is not funded by OE.***

♦ ***RSSA Management: Recommendations***

■ ***The RSSAs' information and education campaign to the Missions about ATLAS should be enhanced.*** For instance, Missions could be more sensitized to the value of funding doctoral research in Africa or additional professional enrichment activities, or could see ways that ATLAS postgraduate research opportunities can contribute to achieving Mission strategic objectives so as to contribute to those aspects of project activities.

■ ***Additional full-time resources should be devoted to managing the ATLAS project.***

E. Small Country Program Strategy

♦ ***Small Country Program Strategy: Findings***

■ ***The Africa Bureau's Small Country Program Strategy allows participating countries with no Mission presence to buy into a menu of six centrally or regionally-funded elements, of which the ATLAS project is one.***

- "Core programs" allow a choice of activities among the Peace Corps Small Project Assistance (SPA), Special Self-Help Fund (SSH), Human Rights Fund (116-E), PL-480 Title II Emergency and/or Humanitarian Food Aid and Disaster Assistance (OFDA), democracy and governance activities through the Africa Bureau's regional D/G project, and ATLAS.
- "Core-plus-one" programs provide for project assistance activities in a pre-determined area of interest or sector in addition to the standard core program options.

■ ***The Africa Small Country Program Strategy is managed out of USAID/W and REDSO/EA*** because there is no Mission presence in participating countries.

20

- USAID/W manages activities in Central African Republic, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Sao Tome/Principe, and Sierra Leone.
- REDSO/Nairobi manages activities for the Comoros, Djibouti, Mauritius, and Seychelles.

■ ***ATLAS has had a high profile in implementing the Small Country Program Strategy.***
- Two thirds of the Bureau's small countries have bought into ATLAS: 1 East African and all of the West African small countries have bought into ATLAS from FY90 through FY94.
- Small country participation in ATLAS to date has totalled close to $4 million from FY90 through FY94, or 11 percent of all ATLAS OYB transfers through FY94.

■ ***Small country participation in ATLAS may drop in FY95*** if Equatorial Guinea and Sao Tome/Principe do not buy in to ATLAS as anticipated in the FY95 ABS projections.

♦ ***Small Country Program Strategy: Conclusions***

■ ***ATLAS will continue to be a high profile activity in the Africa Bureau's small countries.***

■ ***The key issue surrounding ATLAS in small countries concerns management.***
- Managing in small countries without Mission presence generally falls to Embassy, USAID/W or REDSO staff.
- The current ATLAS contractor has field staff in only 2 of the 9 countries falling under the Africa Bureau's Small Country Program Strategy.

♦ ***Small Country Program Strategy: Recommendations***

■ ***We recommend that USAID continue to offer ATLAS participation to countries falling under the Small Country Program Strategy.***

F. Project Paper Amendment

♦ ***Project Paper Amendment: Findings***

■ ***The Project Paper was amended on July 23, 1993 to implement four key provisions.***
- Missions can now use ESF funds in countries without DFA for participation in ATLAS if such funds are available and Missions so choose.
- Missions can use OYB funds to provide travel for US-trained alumni to participate in ATLAS regional conferences.
- Contractor core funds can be used to provide travel for US-trained alumni to attend ATLAS conferences or workshops in countries without a USDH presence or, with USAID/W approval, to fund travel for participants to enable an equitable representation of women or ensure regional balance.
- AAI can now administer grant activities directly to African organizations.

■ ***Missions have used OYB funds to provide travel for US trained alumni to attend regional conferences.***

■ ***No analysis could be performed on Mission OYB expenditures for attendance at regional conferences*** because the core contractor is not required to track this category of expenditure.

- ***The Amendment has allowed an increase in women's participation in ATLAS conferences, up from less than a fifth to over a quarter of conference participants.*** Contractor core funding of women participants has increased the percentage of women participating in ATLAS conferences by 10 percent, from 17 percent prior to the amendment to 27 percent for the last three conferences (Gabon, Namibia, Zimbabwe).

- ***USAID/Senegal will be buying in to ATLAS to fund a National Colloquium for 250 participants in February, 1995.***

- ***ATLAS has administered 5 grant activities to date since the Amendment.***

♦ ***Project Paper Amendment: Conclusions***

- ***The Amendment has added flexibility to the ATLAS professional enhancement component.***

- ***The Amendment has allowed Missions more latitude in using their OYB funds in ATLAS professional enhancement activities.***

♦ ***Project Paper Amendment: Recommendations***

- ***We recommend that the Project Paper be amended to allow the use of core or Mission funds to assist Missions in implementing ATLAS.*** Services to Missions can include developing tools and procedures to define and track project impact as well as other Mission-specific requirements.

- ***We recommend that the Project Paper be amended to allow Missions to use ATLAS OYB transfers to hire staff to assist in implementing ATLAS*** so that Missions can take advantage of this flagship project's panoply of services with minimal management burden for themselves.

- ***We recommend that the Project Paper be amended to allow Missions to pay tuition*** if the core contractor ultimately cannot secure admission with tuition scholarship on behalf of candidates retained through the ATLAS selection process. This would change the question from *whether* a candidate will obtain an ATLAS scholarship to *when* the person's scholarship will be available.

- ***We recommend that the Project Paper be amended so that core funds can be used for ATLAS activities — particularly scholarships — in countries showing the greatest need,*** for instance, countries falling under USAID's Small Country Program Strategy.

IV. ATLAS DESIGN AND MANAGEMENT THROUGH 2006

A. ATLAS Design and Management: Findings

- ***ATLAS is a well-known and highly visible project.*** The combination of scholarships and professional enhancement opportunities are a valued means to support DFA objectives in Africa.

- ***The ATLAS project has inherent design contradictions.***
  - The project's stated purpose is to "strengthen leadership and technical abilities and enhance the professional excellence of individuals serving in African public and private sector entities." This is intended to support the project's goal: "to improve the performance of African institutions and organizations to plan and promote sustainable development in Africa.

22

- The project's focus on the "best and brightest" scholarship candidates means that alumni will be dispersed throughout African institutions. By design, therefore, institutions may not end up with the critical mass necessary to effectuate change.

- ***The Agency for International Development has changed since ATLAS was designed.***
  - ATLAS is no longer managed out of the Africa Bureau.
  - ATLAS design does not take current trends in training design and rationale into account, especially the Agency's focus on training change agents.

- ***Leadership is not reinforced under the current project implementation mechanism.***
  - Leadership is not included in any aspect of the current core contract.
  - Leadership is not part of selection criteria, nor was it cited by any USAID/W or Mission evaluation respondent as a criterion for individual candidacies.
  - Leadership is not stressed in ATLAS professional enrichment activities, and the current core contract does not require it to be.

- ***ATLAS impact is not defined or tracked.***
  - The core contractor is not required to define the impact of individual scholarships.
  - The core contractor's tracking of impact is limited to tracking post-training assignments, meaning changes in individual career paths.
  - Only one Mission — USAID/Guinea — is known to be defining the impact of individual scholarships and to be tracking the changes that ATLAS alumni institute in the workplace subsequent to training.
  - Responses from other Missions as to who is tracking impact indicated both Mission interest in impact and uncertainty as to how to go about it. Responses on a question as to who is tracking impact varied from "good question" to "much more is needed in this area."

- ***The cost-effectiveness of ATLAS cannot be measured under the current core management contract.***
  - The core contractor is not required to report on costs for professional enrichment activities, on exact costs of ATLAS conferences, or on the impact of training, to cite some examples.
  - This means that accurate data in these categories are simply not available.
  - The cost-effectiveness of key ATLAS components — such as professional enrichment or enhancement — can therefore not be assessed.

- ***The change from AFGRAD to ATLAS has been difficult for all players, from USAID/W leadership to Mission managers to core contractor ATLAS implementors.***
  - The project, once a regional, core-funded project, now funded through Mission OYB transfers, is still viewed as "peripheral," in one Africa Bureau leader's words.
  - While 100 percent of evaluation survey respondents from Missions say they link ATLAS scholarships to their strategic objectives, ATLAS is not perceived as central to achieving development objectives.
  - The project's move to the Global Bureau under USAID's recent re-engineering endeavor is an opportunity to raise the ATLAS profile, yet may also contribute to the project's "orphan" quality.

- ***There is virtually no linkage among ATLAS components*** to work towards achieving the project's purpose.
  - Scholarships and professional enhancement activities — conferences, grants, information dissemination — are discrete and separate under current ATLAS implementation mechanisms.

- While mechanisms are in place to achieve project goals such as female participation in scholarships, steps are not systematically taken to make sure, for example, that conference topics are relevant to women.

- ***ATLAS levels of activity may be affected by changes within USAID/W*** such as Mission closeouts.
  - 8 of Africa's Missions have closed or are closing since ATLAS began; 4 of these were ATLAS clients.
  - OYB transfers are projected to drop by 22 percent from FY94 (actual) to FY95 (projections), though actual FY95 transfers may vary from current projections.
  - No new country bought in to ATLAS for FY95 according to AFR/ONI/TPPI projections dated 9/21/1994, though new countries are expressing interest and might buy in to ATLAS.

B. ATLAS Design and Management: Conclusions

- ***There is no systematic constituency for the ATLAS project among USAID policy-makers.***
  - ATLAS is not incorporated into USAID's Assessment of Program Impact; Agency decision-makers view ATLAS as peripheral to development.
  - Human and institutional resource development are not specified as part of USAID's four pillars, though the Global Bureau's new change agent strategy clearly will depend on projects such as ATLAS.
  - Levels of ATLAS activity may be affected by Mission close-outs.

- ***Accurate, thorough data is necessary to demonstrate ATLAS impact, to build a constituency and to manage the project.***
  - The current management contract does not require detailed reporting on the features that make ATLAS special and different from predecessor projects, for example, professional enrichment or enhancement activities.
  - There are discrepancies between field Mission data and core contractor data.

- ***The impact ball has been dropped under ATLAS.***
  - ATLAS began with impact, specifying goals for impact and mandating the development of a methodology for defining and assessing impact.
  - Demonstrating impact requires defining and tracking impact and has implications for programming under all ATLAS components.
  - Demonstrating impact goes to the core of the rationale for this project and its relationship to DFA objectives.
  - The core contractor is not required to define, track or report on the impact of ATLAS scholarships or professional enhancement activities.

- ***The Project Paper's intentions surrounding leadership were not fully translated into the current core contract.***
  - The contractor is not required to define, incorporate or track leadership in any of the project's components.
  - Core contractor, USAID/W staff and ATLAS Deans travelling to Africa for ATLAS scholarship selection work with Missions, host country officials, employers and applicants to determine individual candidates' potential for academic excellence and success, with no specific concentration on leadership.

- ***The change to ATLAS from predecessor projects has been difficult for the principal players.***

24

- Greater Mission involvement and the OYB transfer process have created the need for greater sharing of functions which in earlier days had been handled almost exclusively by the core contractor.
  - Initial strains still exist which are causing dysfunction in many areas of the ATLAS implementation process.
  - This translates into a lack of ownership which leaves ATLAS vulnerable to staff turnover and to changes in Agency priorities.

C. ATLAS Design and Management: Recommendations

- ***We recommend that the ATLAS project be maintained with scholarship and professional enhancement components.***

- ***We recommend that USAID direct hire personnel and RSSAs managing ATLAS develop a formal system to report on ATLAS so as to develop the constituency the project deserves within the Agency.***
  - Such a reporting system should include formal annual reports and semi-annual presentations.
  - Informational materials should be developed on ATLAS to serve to market the project and generate support within Missions and USAID/W alike. The current ATLAS brochure is a good beginning on which to build.

- ***We recommend that USAID begin to focus on ATLAS impact by reviewing the methodologies and definitions available and by adopting a methodology for ATLAS.***
  - ATLAS leadership can capitalize on the project's move to the Global Bureau to review existing methodologies for defining and enhancing the likelihood of impact and by adopting the methodology most suited to the ATLAS scope of interventions.
  - This review of ATLAS impact should also address the disparity between key ATLAS components. Decisions on whether or how to reinforce project impact by linking ATLAS professional enhancement activities to ATLAS scholarships must be reflected in ATLAS programming. Any such programming requirements should be spelled out in the new core management contract.

- ***We recommend that the new core management contract mandate accurate reporting on all aspects of ATLAS so that the financial and programmatic analytical tools are available to manage and promote the project.*** The contractor should separately maintain, account for and report on professional enrichment and enhancement activities if these are to be a continued and unique feature of the ATLAS project.

- ***Missions should consider focussing ATLAS scholarships on institutions that are key to achieving Mission strategic objectives.***
  - Concentrating on key institutions in the sectors delivering services in Missions' strategic sectors of intervention may help focus ATLAS interventions so as to achieve the project's purpose.
  - We recommend this focus to increase the likelihood of the project's impact even though this implies a change in the project's selection mechanism.

- ***We recommend that the Agency review its commitment to ATLAS as a leadership project.***
  - If the project is to contribute to providing African organizations with the human resources — both technical abilities and personal authority — necessary to gain institutional legitimacy,

draw external resources and achieve results, then ATLAS management should place emphasis on leadership, and leadership should be defined and standardized under ATLAS.

- This definition should carry weight in the selection process for scholarships.
- Leadership skills and qualities should be incorporated as a focus of professional enrichment activities during ATLAS training and for ATLAS professional enhancement activities outside of the scholarship component.
- The vast experience with leadership and leadership training within the US university community should be tapped to support this role, both in selecting ATLAS scholarship candidates and in programming choices under all ATLAS components.
- Steps to incorporate leadership into all aspects of the project should be made part of the core management contract.

- ***We recommend that the core contract require services that go beyond processing to focus on the results of ATLAS interventions,*** both for scholarships and for professional enhancement activities. If impact is important to USAID, the contractor should be asked to define, track and report on the impact of scholarships and professional enhancement activities.

- ***We recommend that core funds be made available to provide services to Missions in implementing an ATLAS strategy focussing on its impact.*** Such services might include:
  - Developing tracking tools;
  - Assisting Missions in identifying key organizations on which to focus;
  - Conducting workshops on planning training so that it will contribute maximally to Mission strategic objectives;
  - Building on successful models in Africa to develop action plans and contracts to ensure that the utilization of ATLAS training matches the intentions expressed during the training planning phase;
  - Workshops with Mission personnel to discuss the meaning of a strategy to develop change agents and to devise ways for implementing such strategies in each country.

- ***We recommend that ATLAS management hold a retreat involving all players — USAID/W, Mission, contractor headquarters and field staff — to renegotiate the rules and procedures to make the project work better.*** ATLAS managers and administrators should capitalize on the project's move to the Global Bureau and begin exercising "best practice" for this project now, without waiting until a new management contract is awarded.

APPENDIX A:

SCOPE OF WORK

SCOPE OF WORK

First Formative Evaluation
African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills (ATLAS) Project
(698-0475)

I. Background

The African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills Project (ATLAS) is the fourth in a series of projects designed to address Africa's lack of trained human capital in order to create an enabling environment for sustainable growth. The ATLAS Project, like its predecessors AFGRAD I, II and III, promotes cooperation among U.S. universities, USAID missions and African countries to provide advanced academic and professional training. Specifically, the project provides 1) continued USAID support for enrolling highly qualified African students in U.S. universities; 2) professional enhancement to ATLAS-sponsored as well as other USAID-financed participants; and 3) a long-term study of the development impact of USAID-sponsored participant training in Africa.

The ATLAS Project was authorized on July 23, 1990 by USAID's Africa Bureau. An ATLAS Project Amendment was approved August 7, 1993. The goal of the project is to improve the performance of African institutions and organizations to plan and promote sustainable development in Africa. Its purpose is to strengthen leadership and technical abilities and enhance professional performance of individuals serving in African public and private sector entities, universities, research centers and other key development institutions. Over the sixteen-year life of the project, the following outputs are anticipated:

- An estimated 1,500 men and women will receive training in degree programs in a range of academic fields. At least 30 percent of those receiving degree training will be women.

- Professional enhancement, such as postgraduate study and research opportunities, will benefit approximately 350 individuals. At least 10 percent will receive training at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

- Approximately 30 symposia and seminars will benefit an estimated 3,000 former USAID participants;

- At least 20 professional organizations in Africa will receive project financial support for specific activities or programs.

- A study on the development impact of U.S. participant training will provide the basis for assessing AFGRAD and ATLAS training investments.

The total USAID contribution of $140,000,000 provides for training and for administrative costs. The funds, provided in large part through USAID mission OYB transfers in the amount of $104,500,000, are supplemented by core funds of $35,500,000 for administrative costs and for most professional enhancement activities. Additional contributions to the

project's costs include $26 million from U.S. universities in the form of tuition scholarships and $9.6 million from participating African countries to provide participant preparation and international travel costs.

On August 31, 1990, the African-American Institute (AAI) was awarded the contract for the first five-year segment of the implementation of the ATLAS Project. The expiration date of this contract is September 30, 1995. Future contracts will be awarded in 1995 and 2000 for the second and third segments of the project.

B. Objectives

The Project Paper calls for two types of evaluative activities:

- formative evaluations, concerned with the management, implementation and accomplishments of the project, will take place near the end of each five-year contracting period; and
- a study, to be completed in 1998, will assess the impact of ATLAS and AFGRAD training on the attainment of Development Fund for Africa (DFA) targets and objectives.

The evaluation for which this Scope of Work (SOW) is written will be the first formative evaluation of ATLAS and will be conducted in the fourth year of the 16-year Life of Project (LOP). Future formative evaluations will be conducted in 1999 and 2005.

Guidance for the formative evaluations from the Project Paper follows:

> Each evaluation will be carried out by a combination of IQC and/or PSC consultants[1]. The evaluation team will rely primarily on the comprehensive monitoring system that will be developed by the contractor, an updated AFGRAD data base system currently being re-designed and comprehensive data at the mission level entered under the participant training management system (PTMS)... They will also obtain comments and recommendations from a sample of all the project players[2]: students and graduates, missions, host country governments and sponsoring institutions, African professional organizations, U.S. universities, the ATLAS Deans' Committee, the contractor and USAID/W personnel. This process will involve limited travel to selected sites in Africa and to selected U.S. universities.

[1] Gray amendment entities should also be considered for performing this evaluation.

[2] The term "project players" will be used throughout this scope of work and is intended to include all those so described in the Project Paper.

C. Statement of Work

This is an interim evaluation carried out by a team of four Human Resource Development specialists. Although the external evaluators will work under the overall supervision of the ATLAS Project Manager in the Africa Bureau, they will be encouraged to arrive at independent conclusions. The evaluators will be asked to review the Africa Bureau's management of the ATLAS Project as well, including the use of RSSA personnel in ATLAS-funded Washington positions and oversight of the ATLAS core contractor (AAI, 1990-1995). The final report will include the views of USAID senior managers, mission officers and other USAID officials who have played an important role in the implementation of the ATLAS Project.

The Project Paper provides detailed guidance on the task requirements of these evaluations, but given this relatively early stage in project implementation, the initial evaluation will not be exhaustive; the major focus of the first evaluation will be on determining the effectiveness of the various mechanisms put in place by both USAID/W and the core contractor for project implementation, monitoring, data-collection and evaluation. The specific tasks for the evaluation follow:

TASK 1. A summary, by country, of the training accomplished, in progress, and planned and of the participants' anticipated post-training assignments in relation to the project's EOPS targets.

TASK 2. A review of the core contractor's adherence to the contract's performance standards for female participation, duration of studies, use of HBCUs, and repatriation of participants.

TASK 3. An examination of the financial status and fiscal management of the project, including a review of OYB transfer procedures, the core contractor's administrative/ overhead costs and the actual student costs.

TASK 4. An examination of the core contractor's data management and reporting systems for participants and graduates.

TASK 5. A review of professional enhancement activities undertaken in Africa by the core contractor, including, interviews with officers and members of African professional societies, and interviews with those alumni and others who have participated in these activities.

TASK 6. A sampling, based on interviews and questionnaires, of participants' comments on (a) their training programs and enrichment activities, (b) selection, placement, monitoring, and administrative services, and, where appropriate, (c)

repatriation procedures and satisfaction with their academic programs in relation to post-training employment.

TASK 7. A sampling of host country governments' and sponsoring institutions' comments and recommendations concerning the training programs and professional enhancement activities.

TASK 8. An assessment of missions' satisfaction with the core contractor's management (both participant and financial), selection, placement, reporting and other procedures and their general relations with the core contractor, including their satisfaction with the cost and benefits of the program.

TASK 9. An assessment, through interviews, with a sampling of international student advisors, admissions officers and faculty of U.S. universities and members of the ATLAS Deans' Committee, including their opinion of the implementation and value of the ATLAS scholarship program.

TASK 10. An assessment of USAID/W management effectiveness, including the use of RSSA and/or other contract staff not part of the AAI institutional contract, the effectiveness of the ATLAS Amendment facilitating implementation of enhancement activities and ATLAS involvement in the Small Country Strategy.

In order to complete the above tasks, the evaluation contractor will propose a detailed workplan describing each task:

- the level of effort and personnel requirements for each task, as well as recommendations about the level of USAID/W participation required to accomplish each task,
- a proposed methodology for accomplishing each task,
- travel requirements,
- data collection and analysis requirements, and
- interview and meeting requirements.

In its workplan, the evaluation contractor will propose work visits to no more than four African USAID missions participating in the ATLAS Project, including at least one mission which provides undergraduate training under ATLAS, one in a francophone country and one in a lusophone country. Given the size of the program and diversity of ATLAS activities, possible sites could be Madagascar, Guinea, Mozambique and Tanzania. In order to reach a wider audience of USAID missions participating in ATLAS, the evaluation contractor will

use a combination of techniques including telephone interviews and faxed questionnaires to key mission personnel, returnees or newly selected participants.

The contractor will also undertake work visits to at least four U.S. institutions actively involved in the ATLAS Project of which one should be an HBCU. Suggested institutions include Central State University, Southern Illinois University, Louisiana State University and The Economics Institute. The final selection of USAID missions and U.S. universities to be visited will be made in collaboration with the ATLAS Project Manager and Staff.

The evaluation activity will be completed in an eight-week timeframe, including site visits, data analysis, presentation of findings and recommendations, and delivery of the draft report.

The evaluation contractor's proposal will provide a draft schedule of all activities required to complete the tasks including, but not limited to, the following:

- Discussions with ATLAS Project Manager and Staff, evaluation team leader and core contractor representative to establish a preliminary work schedule, set dates for a team building session, list the principal documents to be reviewed and draft cables, letters and other correspondence for USAID/W to send to the project players announcing the evaluation.

- Develop an agenda and hold a team building session in Washington, D.C. for the evaluation team producing at least an evaluation outline. The team will utilize USAID/W staff, RSSA staff, core contractor staff and others as resource persons.

- The evaluation outline will be the framework for a workplan taking into account information gathered during the document review and team building session.

- The workplan will include a travel plan which will provide detailed information on visits to selected African countries and U.S. universities to conduct site interviews.

- Identify appropriate evaluation instruments to use with project players, submit drafts to USAID/W for comment, and make modifications as needed.

- Review a full range of documentation concerning ATLAS, including the following:

  - Project Paper, Project Amendment and other project documents;
  - Country Training Plans and other mission documents relating to ATLAS;
  - ATLAS Annual Reports and other reports submitted by the core contractor.

- Analyze the project's use of HBCUs and Gray Amendment entities to provide management and training services for the project.

D. Team Composition

The evaluation team will consist of not more than four IQC/PSC consultants. The following conditions apply to the entire team:

- none may have prior long-term professional association with the ATLAS contractor or sub-contractors;
- one or more must have significant work experience which involves promotion of women in developing countries;
- one or more must speak French and one or more must speak Portuguese fluently;
- all must have excellent speaking and writing ability in English;
- all must be familiar with computer wordprocessing;
- all must be able to withstand a rigorous travel schedule to several African countries with minimal local support.

The qualifications of the team members are detailed below:

Human Resources Development/Evaluation Specialist (Team Leader)

Duties: Overall coordination of evaluation and team responsibilities; writing major sections and editing entire report for consistencies; liaison with USAID and contractor;

Required: Five years' experience working in a developing country, preferably in Africa, on human resources development activities; knowledge of USAID internal training management issues; experience serving as Team Leader on at least one large project evaluation for USAID or an international donor agency; understanding of evaluation methodologies; ability to organize data, manage a team, write and edit a complex report in English; graduate degree in social sciences, management, organizational development or equivalent work experience;

Desired: Fluency in French and/or Portuguese, familiarity with American and African university systems and requirements.

Human Resources Development/Evaluation Specialist

Duties: Principal evaluator for Tasks 1, 5, 7, 9 and 10.

Required: Five years' experience working in a developing country, preferably in Africa, on human resources development activities; knowledge of USAID internal training management issues; experience serving on at least one large project evaluation for USAID or an international donor agency; understanding of evaluation methodologies; ability to organize data and possess excellent writing skills in English; a graduate degree in social sciences, management, organizational development or equivalent work experience;

Desired: Fluency in French and/or Portuguese, familiarity with American and African university systems and requirements.

Participant Training Specialist

Duties: Principal evaluator for Tasks 4, 6, and 8.

Required: Five years' experience working on participant training projects with African countries; in-depth knowledge of American and African university systems and admission and graduation requirements; experience designing and evaluating participant training components or projects, preferably in a USAID context; professional experience in the design or implementation of orientation, re-entry and professional enhancement features of participant training programs.

Desired: Fluency in French and/or Portuguese, experience using the Participant Training Management System (PTMS), or similar databases, to analyze data and generate reports.

Project Management/Financial Analysis Specialist

Duties: Principal evaluator for Tasks 2 and 3.

Required: Five years' experience working on African development projects, preferably USAID-funded, as a project manager or financial analyst; familiarity with USAID regulations and procedures in implementing training or managing development activities; knowledge of project evaluation methodology and design issues (logframes, outputs, measurable indicators, etc.); ability to analyze complex financial data from both central sources and from the field to assess the project's funding flows.

Desired: Direct management experience handling training programs in Africa and third-countries; familiarity with internal USAID contracting and implementation mechanisms; fluency in French and/or Portuguese, a graduate degree in economics, financial management or public administration.

E. Methodology and Schedule

The evaluation will be conducted in six phases, described below.

		Elapsed Time
Phase One:	*Preliminary Information Gathering (Washington, D.C.)*	(1 week)

The Team Leader will meet with key USAID officials to discuss overall expectations from the evaluation and begin gathering documents and information. This meeting will take place prior to convening the team in Washington. A draft cable (or other correspondence) will be submitted to the ATLAS Project Manager to send to missions and other project players to obtain preliminary information on ATLAS and prepare them for requests for detailed participant information needed by the evaluation team.

Phase Two:	*Team-Building, Preparation and Document Review (Washington, D.C./New York)*	(1 week)

Once the team assembles in Washington, D.C., a full-day team building session will be held to discuss in detail the objectives of the evaluation and the planning and management needs of the various USAID offices (in particular, those involved with project design and evaluation, participant training, education, private-sector development, the various technical areas receiving ATLAS-funded training, gender affairs, and Agency-wide policy). The session will clarify for the evaluation team the outcomes needed and anticipated by USAID and will underscore any problem areas in the SOW which need to be resolved before the team begins work. In addition, the evaluation team (four persons) will have a planning session of two days to discuss, plan and coordinate their individual and group responsibilities.

The remainder of the Washington/New York schedule will be taken up with the following activities:

- meetings with organizations (AAI, OIT, etc.) and individuals involved in ATLAS from its inception;
- review of documents and Agency files on individual countries and the collection of data;
- selection with USAID/W of countries and U.S. universities to be visited;
- drafting and testing of evaluation instruments for use with project players;
- preparation for Africa and U.S. travel.

A one-week pause can be scheduled prior to commencing U.S. and Africa travel to enable the contractor to arrange the team's individual itineraries and allow for missions and selected universities to collect data, prepare local schedules.

Phase Three: Field Visits and Data Collection (5 weeks)
(Africa and U.S., including the New York office of AAI)

Team members individually or, where appropriate in groups, will fan out throughout Africa and to selected U.S. sites on separate itineraries to cover at least four of the countries having participated in ATLAS and at least 4 U.S. universities, as well as to the main office of the African American Institute in New York.

Phase Four: Data Tabulation and Analysis (1 week)
(Washington, D.C.)

Team members will return to Washington to compile all the data and interview responses they collected and begin tabulation and analysis. They will begin writing their sections and formulating their findings and recommendations.

Phase Five: Presentation of Findings and Recommendations, and Completion of First Draft (Washington, D.C.) (1 week)

At the beginning of Phase Five, the team will present its findings and recommendations to key USAID officials (most of whom would have attended the team building session) and obtain input and criticism. The evaluation contractor will distribute to the invited USAID officials a summary of findings and recommendations one day prior to the presentation. Following the presentation, the team will complete the draft report, which will include all of the data tables. The draft report need not include the Executive Summary or appendices showing the documents reviewed and persons interviewed. The team's work as a group is now completed.

Phase Six: Completion of Final Draft (1 week)

Approximately two weeks will transpire between the submission of the draft report to USAID and the missions, and the completion of the final report The Team Leader will include comments and corrections from USAID and the field into the final version and ensure that all of the data tables and relevant appendices are in order.

F. Level of Effort

	Team Leader (1)	Team Members (3)	Total Days
Phase One:	5	0	5
Phase Two:	5	15	20
*Phase Three:**	23	69	92
Phase Four:	5	15	20
Phase Five:	5	15	20
Phase Six:	5	0	5
Totals	48	114	162

* Six-day weeks are authorized for the team during Africa travel. LOE includes travel days and work over a three-week travel period for Africa visits.

An additional eight days for evaluation contractor backstopping will be needed:

Sub-Total, Evaluation Team LOE	162
Contractor Corporate Monitor	2
Team Building Session Facilitator	1
Contractor Logistics Coordinator	5
Total LOE	170

G. Reports

- Draft Work Plan, Evaluation Schedule and Draft Correspondence for project players informing them of the impending evaluation at the end of Phase One.
- Agenda for Team Building Session by second day of Phase Two.
- Draft Evaluation Instruments by the end of Phase Two.
- Summary of Findings and Recommendations at the beginning of Phase Five (10 copies; NTE 30 pages).
- Draft of Report at the end of Phase Five (20 copies; NTE 25 pages).
- Final report by the end of Phase Six (50 copies; NTE 20 pages + appendices), with master copy submitted in Wordperfect format on 3 and 1/2 inch diskette.

APPENDIX B:

APPROACH, METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

APPENDIX B: APPROACH, METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team utilized the following approach and methodology to satisfy the scope of work within the level of effort allocated.

1. Approach

The scope of work for the formative evaluation of the ATLAS project was mandated in ATLAS design and PP. Given the relatively early stage in project implementation, according to the scope of work, the formative evaluation was not to be "exhaustive: the major focus of the first evaluation (was to be) on determining the effectiveness of the various mechanisms put in place by both USAID/W and the core contractor for project implementation, monitoring, data collection and evaluation."

ATLAS is designed specifically for its impact on African institutions in education, training, research, public sector services and in the private sector. Therefore, in addition to examining the mechanisms put into place to implement the participant training and professional enhancement activities, the evaluation team's approach was calculated to gauge the effectiveness of ATLAS implementation so that recommendations can help affect mid-course correction and increase the likelihood of project impact.

The evaluation team strongly felt that findings and recommendations must be driven by data, not by perceptions or beliefs. Consequently, our approach incorporated high levels of data analysis, data drawn from USAID and core contractor sources as well as from interviews and surveys conducted during the course of the evaluation.

2. Methodology

The complexity of the assignment and the restricted level of effort demanded a tight methodology for information gathering and communication among the team.

The team held a week-long Team Planning Meeting in order to review the background of the assignment and its current status; identify the client; agree on an approach to working with the client; analyze and reach a common understanding of individual and the team's scope of work; agree on the objectives and outcome of the assignment; develop a work plan to carry out the scope of work; plan how the team would work together; define and agree upon the role and responsibilities of the team leader; define and agree upon the roles and responsibilities of the team members; develop a schedule for each team member's data collection activities; and develop evaluation instruments. The team leader provided a draft work plan at the conclusion of the Team Planning Meeting.

The team drafted evaluation instruments according to the audience for each set of questions. Instruments were drawn up for the USAID/W and field audience, for the core contractor in New York and in the field, for the US university community, for ATLAS participants and alumni, and for host country nominators and employers. A total of 21 different instruments was applied in face-to-face interviews as well as in faxed and mailed surveys; the team's instruments are supplied Appendix O to the *ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 1*.

The evaluation was conducted both in the US and in the field. US interviews were held in Washington, at the contractor's headquarters in New York, and at two selected US universities, one a Historically Black College and University (HBCU), and the other, a large public university that has participated in a variety of ATLAS activities and whose graduate dean is a member of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans.

Interviews in Washington included the ATLAS project management team and policy-makers within the Africa Bureau while ATLAS was managed out of the Africa Bureau (AFR/SD/HRD), before its recent move to the Global Bureau.

Field visits were conducted at six sites: at the USAID Missions in Guinea, Tanzania, Madagascar and Cape Verde, and at the two African REDSO offices in Kenya and Côte d'Ivoire. These sites were selected by the USAID/W ATLAS project management team as a sample of ATLAS activities. The sample features linguistic diversity, differing levels of ATLAS buy-in, a variety of relationships with AAI field staff, and differing field approaches to defining and tracking impact.

To assure methodological consistency, the team split into two pairs, and the first countries were each visited by two members of the evaluation team. Each team member then continued on to either a Mission or a REDSO once the team had thus field-tested its approach and methodology.

The evaluation team combined face-to-face interviews with surveys of key players in ATLAS. Together our interviews encompassed representatives from the following groups; a list of persons interviewed is supplied as Appendix M to the *ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 1*.

♦ ***In the US***

- USAID/W policy-makers;
- USAID/W's ATLAS project management team;
- AAI/New York ATLAS staff and management;
- ATLAS subcontractors;
- members of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans;
- US university officials (admissions, international student advisors, participant academic advisors);
- ATLAS participants in the US.

♦ ***In the Field***

- core contractor field staff;
- Mission leadership;
- Mission Training Office staff;
- Mission sectoral project managers if the project provides long-term US training;
- Mission controllers;
- government officials responsible for nominating ATLAS candidates;
- officials from institutions and organizations responsible for private sector nominations;
- ATLAS candidates;
- ATLAS alumni;
- employers of ATLAS alumni;
- employers of ATLAS Fellows currently in training;

40

- alumni of ATLAS professional enhancement activities;
- employers of people who participated in ATLAS enhancement activities.

To supplement the information gleaned during interviews, we mailed or faxed surveys to:

- USAID Missions in the field;
- ATLAS participants in training in the US;
- the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans.

To assure a consistent approach in the field, the team wrote country profiles at the conclusion of each field site visit and shared these with the other team members mid-way through the field visits.

At the conclusion of the Africa-based site visits, the team reassembled in Washington for two weeks to achieve consensus on findings, recommendations and conclusions and to draft all sections of the report.

The draft report was presented to the USAID/W ATLAS project management team for comments which the evaluation team leader incorporated into the final report.

To keep the evaluation readable, it was decided in the Team Planning Meeting to produce the final evaluation in two volumes: one would capture the full text and appendices and serve as a complete record of the evaluation. The second, shorter version was later defined to encompass the Executive Summary and full text of the evaluation, limiting appendices to key items such as the scope of work, statistics and evaluation approach and methodology.

3. Composition of the Evaluation Team

The four-person evaluation team was comprised as follows:

- ***Team Leader and Evaluation Specialist Susan Votaw*** was responsible for overall coordination of the evaluation team and responsibilities; for providing structure and pacing to the research, analysis and drafting process; for conducting field work in the US and in Africa; for writing major sections and for editing the report for consistency and accuracy; and for liaison with USAID and the contractor.

  Ms. Votaw is a Senior Associate with Creative Associates International, Incorporated. She brought the evaluation team her 17 years of experience designing, managing, evaluating, developing management information systems and leading teams for human resource development projects; personal and professional experience in 25 African countries; and is bilingual (English and French).

- ***Evaluation Specialist/HRD and Gender Specialist Patricia Prunier, Evaluation Specialist/Participant Training Specialist Tom Moser and Evaluation Specialist/Project Management and Financial Analysis Specialist James Purcell*** were responsible for conducting field work in the US and in Africa; for analyzing data; and for drafting major sections of the report.

Ms. Prunier, consultant, offered 25 years of experience across a broad range of development issues and sectors, including skills in process consulting, institutional development, action research, and stand-up training; her background in community development; and fluency in French.

Mr. Moser, consultant, brought 10 years of consulting experience, primarily in designing and evaluating human resource development projects, in addition to his 33 years of experience with USAID, serving most recently as USAID Representative, The Gambia, and as Deputy Coordinator, Office of Country-Financed Technical Services.

Mr. Purcell, consultant, specializes in project design, implementation and evaluation, and provided 25 years of international development experience as program officer, project development officer and project manager for USAID, including extensive experience developing program requirements, designing and implementing project proposals, coordinating technical assistance teams, and collaborating with local officials and other donors; he is fluent in French and in Portuguese.

APPENDIX C:

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

APPENDIX C: PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Goal and Purpose

The ATLAS project's goal is *to improve the performance of African institutions and organizations to plan and promote sustainable development in Africa.*

The project's purpose is *to strengthen leadership and technical abilities and enhance the professional excellence of individuals serving in African public and private sector entities, including universities, research centers and other key development institutions.*

2. Description of the Project

The African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills (ATLAS) project was authorized July 2, 1990 to run sixteen years from the date of initial obligation, which was August 31, 1990. The Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD) is August 30, 2006. ATLAS is the successor to the three African Graduate Fellowship (AFGRAD) projects which began in 1963.

The project has three main components:

(1) the participant training scholarship program, with its attendant activities for selection, placement and management of degree students at US universities; all academic training is US-based;

(2) the post-training program, which promotes professional competence among graduates of US funded training and reinforces their ability to contribute to African development;

(3) a comprehensive study to assess the impact of US participant training on capacity-building in Africa.

a) Funding

The project calls for a total USAID contribution of $140 million, of which nearly $105 million is designated for training funded by USAID missions and $35 million for core costs administered by a project contractor. Like its predecessor African Graduate Fellowship (AFGRAD) projects, a prominent feature of ATLAS is cost-sharing by US universities in the form of tuition scholarships. These scholarships are valued at $26 million over the life of the project.

b) Targets

The total number of men and women ultimately expected to benefit from the project will exceed 4,850. Over the sixteen-year life of the project, an estimated 1,500 men and women will participate in degree programs (primarily graduate level), and 350 in post graduate non-degree programs. It is expected that 250 PhD degrees, 1000 Masters's degrees and 250 undergraduate degrees will be financed. At least 30 percent of the scholarships are targeted for women. In addition to the postgraduate study, professional enhancement includes the organization of at least 30 symposia and

seminars (reaching an estimated 3,000 former USAID participants), and assistance to at least 20 professional organizations in Africa.

Under ATLAS, the contractor is to make every effort to secure tuition scholarships from Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and to include HBCUs in follow-up activities. At least 10 per cent of participant placements must be in programs offered by HBCUs.

On August 7, 1993, the ATLAS project was amended to increase its flexibility to respond to Missions' needs and to improve the professional enhancement component. This included:

1) permitting Economic Support Funds (ESF) to be used for ATLAS in countries without Development Fund for Africa (DFA) funds;

2) permitting ATLAS funds to be used for more diverse professional enhancement activities; and

3) expanding opportunities for the core contractor to implement field activities or follow-on activities.

Now entering its sixth fiscal year of operation, ATLAS has expanded from 7 countries in FY 1990 to more than 16 countries in FY 1994. Funding by USAID Missions has increased from approximately $2.4 million in FY 1990 to more than $8.4 million in FY 1994.

c) Project Management

During its first four years, project management has shifted within the Africa Bureau from the Education and Human Resources Division in the Office of Technical Resources to the Office of New Initiatives, and now to the altogether new Global Bureau. Substantial training management support has been provided by two professionals supplied under a 1989 RSSA with the Office of International Cooperation and Development (now the Foreign Agricultural Service) of the US Department of Agriculture. To implement ATLAS during its first five years, USAID contracted for the services of the African-American Institute in New York. This initial five year contract was signed August 31, 1990 and expires October 30, 1995. Contractual services for the second and third five year segments are to be obtained through USAID's competitive procurement process.

d) Design Differences Between ATLAS and AFGRAD

ATLAS was conceived as a new project designed to focus on the second generation of African leaders in support of the objectives and strategies of the Development Fund for Africa (DFA). In the Action Plan for the DFA, ATLAS is intended to contribute to the achievement of strategic objectives in:

- improved management of African economies;
- increased efficiency and effectiveness of public sector management;
- expanded skills and productivity in the private sector;
- improved natural resource management; and
- accelerated development and transfer of agriculture technology.

1. Change in Mission Role

The new role of USAID field missions vis-à-vis ATLAS is twofold: a different funding responsibility implying increased field autonomy. The decision whether to participate in ATLAS and at what level is made by Missions in accordance with their training needs within their overall and sector strategies. Under AFGRAD, core funds provided three to five scholarships for most African countries. With ATLAS, Missions must set aside funds from their OYB when they wish to participate. All funding for student costs under ATLAS scholarships comes through transfers of Missions' bilateral funds to USAID/W.

2. Core Funds

Africa regional funds are provided to pay the core contractor's administrative costs to manage ATLAS project activities, including professional enhancement activities. The core contractor is required to undertake a number of activities: symposia in Africa, grants to African professional societies and organizations provided for under regional funding, re-entry workshops, and networking activities. To enhance the value of academic training among returnees, USAID is seeking fresh and cost-effective follow-on approaches and measures. No centrally funded scholarships are provided as they were under the AFGRAD projects.

3. Professional Enhancement Activities

ATLAS has added a post-training professional enhancement component which is intended to nurture the participants' professional development, advance and reinforce the formal training, and promote networking among African specialists once they return home from US training. These activities are designed to increase the impact of participant training and therefore, strengthen the contribution graduates make to development in Africa. ATLAS post-training activities are covered largely with core funds and include seminars, workshops and conferences held in Africa, production of occasional newsletters and bulletins, grant awards to African professional organizations, and provision of Distinguished Alumni Awards designed to recognize the contributions of outstanding AFGRAD and ATLAS alumni.

e) The ATLAS Process: Scholarships and Postgraduate Research Awards

The process of recruiting, selecting, nominating, placing and monitoring participants in ATLAS is fundamentally the same process AAI developed and refined over the thirty years it devoted to the implementation of the AFGRAD projects.

1. Determining Training Needs

USAID Missions determine their training needs for the following year in relation to their country and sector strategies. These needs are presented to USAID/Washington usually in the 2nd quarter in the form of the Country Training Plan (CTP). This document includes numbers of scholarships projected and financial requirements.

2. Budget Transfer and Obligations

Upon USAID/Washington approval of the CTP, the Mission - through its monthly obligation reporting cable - requests that funds for ATLAS be transferred out of its bilateral budget and made available to USAID/W. This most often occurs mid-way through the fiscal year.

With the funds of several Missions transferred, the ATLAS project manager in USAID/Washington prepares a PIO/T in the 3rd quarter, requesting amendment of the core contract to add these new funds. AAI's contract is modified in the 4th quarter.

3. ATLAS Recruitment

Employing a variety of methods — newspaper advertisements, radio broadcasts, direct mailings — the USAID Missions in July and August solicit applications for the ATLAS scholarships for placement the following year.

4. ATLAS Selection

Applications are screened, usually by the USAID Mission staff for eligibility and to assure that supporting documentation is provided. Dossiers are then reviewed by a formal selection committee that usually includes the local core contractor field staff representative, host government officials and USAID Mission staff. Either at this initial meeting or in a subsequent selection committee meeting in November, a Dean from a US University and a representative from AAI/New York (sometimes with a USAID/W staff member) join the review of the dossiers and interview the best qualified candidates. A written evaluation scoring sheet is prepared by each of those on the panel.

The USAID Mission lists the finalists, sometimes rank ordered, and sends them to New York by years' end. The ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Dean convenes at AAI/New York headquarters in January and June to choose candidates to be retained for placement.

The ATLAS contract mandates that 30 percent of long-term scholarships be provided to women.

5. ATLAS Placement

The process of placing ATLAS participants begins in February and usually takes several month: AAI works to gain admission with tuition scholarship on behalf of participants retained during the selection process described previously.

Placement is usually for the following term, or the fourth quarter of the fiscal year. The selection and placement process is estimated to take about sixteen months between the time a Mission makes its budget transfer and a participant enters the US.

The ATLAS contract stipulates that at least 10 per cent of academic participant placements are to be in programs offered by Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs).

Scholarship and postgraduate research awards are made once the core contractor provides a Training Implementation Plan (TIP) to the funding Mission and the Mission has approved the TIP and budget.

6. Monitoring ATLAS Participants

Once placements have been confirmed, the Educational Training Advisors (ETAs) assume responsibility for implementing the training programs selected. The ETAs are responsible for both administrative matters — travel arrangements, orientation, English Language Training, student payments — as well as the educational programs once the participants enter the university.

The ETAs are the core contractor's point of contact for participants and the USAID Missions. In addition to telephone and FAX communications, the ETAs provide USAID Missions with quarterly student progress reports, including grades and academic advisor comments. ETAs are responsible for monitoring all aspects of participants' well-being and academic progress and for assisting participants with repatriation.

7. Professional Enrichment During Training

The ATLAS contract specifies that professional enrichment activities are to be built into each participant's academic or postgraduate research program so that they are budgeted and approved by funding Missions. Supplements to enrich the educational experience for each participant may include orientation, English Language Training, mid-winter community seminars, meetings of professional societies, internships and other forms of short-term practical experience, and attendance at seminars on management.

f) Professional Enhancement Activities

The ATLAS post-training program is designed to nurture the alumni professional development, promote networking among African specialists and strengthen the contribution graduates will make to their assigned institutions. Activities include informational materials, professional journals, symposia, grants to African professional organizations, postgraduate study and research programs, alumni awards, and a Directory of ATLAS/AFGRAD graduates.

APPENDIX D:

STATISTICAL TABULATIONS

APPENDIX D: STATISTICAL TABULATIONS

This appendix contains 24 tables analyzing various aspects of the ATLAS project to date. Statistical tabulations cover:

- OYB transfers to date;
- overall ATLAS scholarships to date;
- HBCU utilization under ATLAS;
- success and repatriation rates;
- women and ATLAS;
- professional enrichment under ATLAS;
- English language training;
- additional ATLAS targets
- participants' employment prior to training;
- anticipated employment for participants following ATLAS training.

The evaluation team calculated these statistical breakdowns on the basis of the following sources of data:

- Financial data on OYB transfers: AFR/ONI/TPPI print-out dated 9/21/94.
- Participant data: AAI rosters dated 10/25/94.
- Enrichment activity data: financial data: AAI financial reports dated 10/26/94.
- Enrichment activities, participant numbers: AAI reports dated 10/27/94.
- HBCU data: AAI reports dated 10/26/94.
- Participant employment data: AAI reports dated 11/10/94.

Since our task is a formative evaluation of the ATLAS project, and not a data audit of contractor or ATLAS management records, we used the data as provided.

This appendix contains the following tables:

NUMBER	TITLE
OYB Transfers	
1	OYB Transfers: ATLAS OYB Transfers Increased Steadily From FY91 To FY94, Though Projections For FY95 Show A 22 Percent Drop
ATLAS Scholarships	
2	ATLAS Scholarships: Masters Degrees Account For The Lion's Share Of ATLAS Scholarships
3	ATLAS Scholarships: The Bulk Of ATLAS Participants Are Currently In Training
HBCU Utilization Under ATLAS Scholarships	
4	HBCU Utilization Under ATLAS Scholarships: HBCU Participation Is At 7 Percent
5	HBCU Utilization Under ATLAS Scholarships: Almost Two Thirds Of ATLAS Utilization Of HBCUs Are For Graduate Scholarships
Success and Repatriation Rates	
6	Success and Repatriation Rates: ATLAS To Date Shows A 2 Percent Academic Failure Rate
7	Success and Repatriation Rates: High Rates Of Delayed Repatriations From Mozambique And Zaire Influence the Overall ATLAS Repatriation Rate To Date
Women and ATLAS Scholarships	
8	Women and ATLAS Scholarships: ATLAS Overall Is Meeting Its Target Of 30 Percent Scholarships To Women — Female Participation Ranges From Half Of All Scholars To No Participation
9	Women and ATLAS Scholarships: The Share Of Training Allocated To Women Has Been Increasing Steadily
10	Women and ATLAS Scholarships: Women Receive A Third Each Of ATLAS Undergraduate Degrees And Masters Degrees And Less Than A Fifth Of ATLAS Doctorates
11	Women and ATLAS Scholarships: The Distribution Of Awards To Women Remains Constant Between The Scholarship And Postgraduate Research Components
Professional Enrichment Activities	
12	Professional Enrichment: Less Than A Third Of ATLAS Participants Have Benefitted From Enrichment Activities
13	Professional Enrichment: ATLAS Expenditures On Enrichment Activities Are Increasing Year By Year
14	Professional Enrichment: Women's Enrichment Activities Represent A Quarter Of All Expenditures, And Women's Programs Cost A Little Over Half Of Men's

51

NUMBER	TITLE
English Language Training	
15	English Language Training: Close To Two Thirds Of ATLAS Scholars Required English Language Training
16	English Language Training: Lusophone Participants Require The Lengthiest English Language Training (ELT), With No Real Differentiation By Gender
Additional Targets	
17	Additional Targets: A Mere Two Percent Of ATLAS Scholars Required A Change Of Institution During An Academic Program
18	Additional Targets: Only 8 Percent Of Doctoral Students Under ATLAS Have Undertaken Research In Africa Thus Far
19	Additional Targets: ATLAS Is Meeting Contractual Targets On Duration Of Training
20	Additional Targets: Over A Third Of Eligible Participants Have Received Practical Training To Date — Men Have Undertaken Four Fifths Of Practical Training
Employment Prior to Training	
21	Employment Prior to Training: ATLAS Participants' Employment Prior To Training: ATLAS Scholarships Primarily Support Governments
22	Employment Prior to Training: ATLAS Participants' Employment Prior to Training: Nearly Half Are From Government
Employment After Training	
23	Employment After Training: ATLAS Participants' Anticipated Employment Following Training: The Majority Plan To Work in Government
24	Employment After Training: ATLAS Participants' Expected Employment Following Training: Nearly Half Will Return To Government Service

TABLE 1: ATLAS OYB TRANSFERS INCREASED STEADILY FROM FY91 TO FY94, THOUGH PROJECTIONS FOR FY95 SHOW A 22 PERCENT DROP *

COUNTRY	ACTUAL					PROJECTED		ACTUAL	
	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	CHANGE FY94-FY95	TOTAL FY90-94	AVERAGE FY90-94
Benin	0	200,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,150,000	1,000,000	- 13 %	3,350,000	670,000
Botswana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Burkina Faso	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Burundi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Cameroon	0	100,000	0	0	0	0	0 %	100,000	20,000
Cape Verde	300,000	600,000	300,000	650,000	0	100,000	**	1,850,000	370,000
Centr.Afr.Rep.	0	0	600,000	200,000	196,304	200,000	+ 2 %	996,304	199,261
Chad	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Comoros	0	0	250,000	250,000	250,000	0	out	750,000	150,000
Congo	0	312,000	581,000	200,000	195,127	200,000	+ 2 %	1,288,127	257,625
Côte d'Ivoire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Djibouti	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Eq. Guinea	0	150,000	0	0	0	0	0 %	150,000	30,000
Ethiopia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Gambia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Ghana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Guinea	0	0	0	500,000	500,000	500,000	0 %	1,000,000	200,000
Guinea-Bissau	0	373,000	300,000	800,000	1,037,500	300,000	- 71 %	2,510,500	502,100
Kenya	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Lesotho	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Liberia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Madagascar	0	400,000	1,200,000	1,000,000	700,000	700,000	0 %	3,300,000	660,000
Malawi	0	0	0	300,000	498,812	300,000	- 40 %	798,812	159,762
Mali	200,000	510,000	400,000	400,000	0	0	0 %	1,510,000	302,000

COUNTRY	ACTUAL					PROJECTED		ACTUAL	
	FY 90	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	FY 95	CHANGE FY94-FY95	TOTAL FY90-94	AVERAGE FY90-94
Mauritania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Mauritius	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Mozambique	200,000	400,000	800,000	1,000,000	698,812	1,000,000	+ 43 %	3,098,812	619,762
Namibia	0	0	300,000	150,000	1,000,000	250,000	- 75 %	1,450,000	290,000
Niger	280,000	200,000	450,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	0 %	1,930,000	386,000
Nigeria	0	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	0 %	800,000	160,000
Rwanda	0	0	100,000	0	0	0	0 %	100,000	20,000
Sao Tome/Princ	0	120,000	300,000	0	0	0	0 %	420,000	84,000
Senegal	0	0	430,000	500,000	760,000	500,000	- 34 %	1,690,000	338,000
Seychelles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Sierra Leone	0	0	300,000	0	30,823	50,000	+ 62 %	330,823	66,165
Somalia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
South Africa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Sudan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Swaziland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
Tanzania	540,000	600,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	0 %	3,540,000	708,000
Togo	185,000	280,000	200,000	0	0	0	0 %	665,000	133,000
Uganda	0	100,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	0 %	700,000	140,000
Zaire	700,000	950,000	0	0	0	0	0 %	1,650,000	330,000
Zambia	0	1,114,000	0	0	0	0	0 %	1,114,000	222,800
Zimbabwe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 %	0	0
OYB TRANSFERS	2,405,000	6,609,000	8,711,000	8,650,000	8,717,378	6,800,000	- 22 %	35,092,378	7,018,476
CORE FUNDS	1,800,000	1,714,000	4,016,800	3,000,000	2,300,000	3,500,000	+ 52 %	12,830,800	2,566,160
GRAND TOTAL	4,205,000	8,323,000	12,727,800	11,650,000	11,017,378	10,300,000	- 7 %	47,923,178	9,584,636

* Source of data: AFR/ONI/TPPI 9/21/1994.

TABLE 2: MASTERS DEGREES ACCOUNT FOR THE LION'S SHARE OF ATLAS SCHOLARSHIPS *

COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS SCHOLARSHIPS					NUMBER OF SCHOLARSHIPS			PERCENTAGE OF SCHOLARSHIPS		
	TOTAL NUMBER	MALE (NUMBER)	FEMALE (NUMBER)	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	UND'GRAD	MASTERS	DOCT'L	UND'GRAD	MASTERS	DOCT'L
Benin	35	19	16	54 %	46 %		35			100 %	
Cameroon											
Cape Verde	27	20	7	74 %	26 %	9	18		33 %	67 %	
Centr.Afr.Rep.	6	5	1	83 %	17 %		5	1		83 %	17 %
Comoros	5	3	2	60 %	40 %	5			100 %		
Congo	16	13	3	81 %	19 %		15	1		94 %	6 %
Eq. Guinea	6	5	1	83 %	17 %	6			100 %		
Guinea	10	8	2	80 %	20 %	1	9		10 %	90 %	
Guinea-Bissau	18	16	2	89 %	11 %	4	14		22 %	78 %	
Madagascar	27	15	12	56 %	44 %	4	21	2	15 %	78 %	7 %
Malawi	8	5	3	63 %	37 %		8			100 %	
Mali	28	18	10	64 %	36 %		28			100 %	
Mozambique	35	21	14	60 %	40 %		32	3		91 %	9 %
Namibia	17	10	7	59 %	41 %		17			100 %	
Niger	24	18	6	75 %	25 %	2	16	6	8 %	67 %	25 %
Nigeria	8	4	4	50 %	50 %		8			100 %	
Rwanda	1	1		100 %				1			100 %
Sao Tome/Princ	7	7		100 %		7			100 %		
Senegal	28	21	7	75 %	25 %		28			100 %	
Tanzania	44	29	15	66 %	34 %	1	33	10	2 %	75 %	23 %
Togo	10	8	2	80 %	20 %		10			100 %	
Uganda	9	5	4	56 %	44 %		9			100 %	
Zaire	15	13	2	87 %	13 %		15			100 %	
Zambia	13	10	3	77 %	23 %		10	3		77 %	23 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	397	274	123	69 %	31 %	39	331	27	10 %	83 %	7 %

* These numbers include all planned, current and completed ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

TABLE 3: THE BULK OF ATLAS PARTICIPANTS ARE CURRENTLY IN TRAINING *

COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS SCHOLSHIPS	NUMBER OF SCHOLARSHIPS				PERCENTAGE OF SCHOLARSHIPS			
		CURRENT	PLANNED	COMPLETED (SUCCESS)	TERMINATED (UNSUCCESS.)	CURRENT	PLANNED	COMPLETED (SUCCESS)	TERMINATED (UNSUCCESS.)
Benin	35	32	3			91 %	9 %		
Cameroon									
Cape Verde	27	25	1	1		93 %	4 %	4 %	
Centr.Afr.Rep.	6	2	3	1		33 %	50 %	17 %	
Comoros	5	4	1			80 %	20 %		
Congo	16	9	2	3	2	56 %	13 %	19 %	12 %
Eq. Guinea	6	6				100 %			
Guinea	10	7	2	1		70 %	20 %	10 %	
Guinea-Bissau	18	13	2		3	72 %	11 %		17 %
Madagascar	27	18	8	1		67 %	30 %	4 %	
Malawi	8	6	2			75 %	25 %		
Mali	28	17	11			61 %	39 %		
Mozambique	35	25	7	2	1	71 %	20 %	6 %	3 %
Namibia	17	10	7			59 %	41 %		
Niger	24	20	4			83 %	17 %		
Nigeria	8	8				100 %			
Rwanda	1	1				100 %			
Sao Tome/Princ	7	4	2		1	57 %	29 %		14 %
Senegal	28	25		3		89 %		17 %	
Tanzania	44	24	14	6		55 %	32 %	14 %	
Togo	10	9		1		90 %		10 %	
Uganda	9	6		3		67 %		33 %	
Zaire	15	7		8		47 %		53 %	
Zambia	13	9	1	2	1	69 %	8 %	15 %	8 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	397	287	70	32	8	72 %	18 %	8 %	2 %

These numbers include all planned, current and completed ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

TABLE 4: HBCU PARTICIPATION UNDER ATLAS IS AT 7 PERCENT *							
COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS SCHOLARSHIPS			TOTAL HBCU SCHOLARSHIPS			PROPORTION OF ATLAS SCHOLARS AT HBCUS
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	
Benin	19	16	35	2		2	6 %
Cameroon							
Cape Verde	20	7	27	2	2	4	15 %
Centr.Afr.Rep.	5	1	6				
Comoros	3	2	4		2	2	40 %
Congo	13	3	16	1	1	2	13 %
Eq. Guinea	5	1	6	1		1	17 %
Guinea	8	2	10				
Guinea-Bissau	16	2	18		1	1	6 %
Madagascar	15	12	27	2		2	7 %
Malawi	5	3	8		1	1	13 %
Mali	18	10	28	2		2	7 %
Mozambique	21	14	35				
Namibia	10	7	17				
Niger	18	6	24		1	1	4 %
Nigeria	4	4	8				
Rwanda	1		1				
Sao Tome/Princ	7		7	2		2	29 %
Senegal	21	7	28		1	1	4 %
Tanzania	29	15	44	2	1	3	7 %
Togo	8	2	10	1		1	10 %
Uganda	5	4	9				
Zaire	13	2	15	1		1	7 %
Zambia	10	3	13	1		1	8 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	274	123	397	17	10	27	7 %

These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on HBCU participation dated 10/26/1994.

TABLE 6: ATLAS TO DATE SHOWS A 2 PERCENT ACADEMIC FAILURE RATE *

COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS SCHOLARSHIPS	NUMBER OF TERMINATIONS							
		UNDERGRADUATE		MASTERS DEGREES		DOCTORAL DEGREES		TOTAL	
		MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
Benin	35								
Cameroon									
Cape Verde	27								
Centr.Afr.Rep.	6								
Comoros	5								
Congo	16				2 13 %				2 13 %
Eq. Guinea	6								
Guinea	10								
Guinea-Bissau	18			3 17 %				3 17 %	
Madagascar	27								
Malawi	8								
Mali	28								
Mozambique	35				1 3 %				1 3 %
Namibia	17								
Niger	24								
Nigeria	8								
Rwanda	1								
Sao Tome/Princ	7	1 14 %						1 14 %	
Senegal	28								
Tanzania	44								
Togo	10								
Uganda	9								
Zaire	15								
Zambia	13					1 8 %		1 8 %	
ATLAS TOTALS:	397	1 1%	0	3 1 %	3 1 %	1 1 %	0	5 1 %	3 1 %

* Statistics are calculated as a percentage of all ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

58

TABLE 5: ALMOST TWO-THIRDS OF ATLAS UTILIZATION OF HBCUS ARE FOR GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIPS *

COUNTRY	NUMBER OF ATLAS SCHOLARS AT HBCUS									DISTRIBUTION AT HBCUS	
	UNDERGRADUATE			MASTERS DEGREES			TOTAL HBCU SCHOLARSHIPS			UNDERGRAD (PERCENT)	MASTERS (PERCENT)
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL		
Benin				2		2	2		2		100 %
Cameroon											
Cape Verde	2	2	4				2	2	4	100 %	
Centr.Afr.Rep.											
Comoros		2	2					2	2	100 %	
Congo				1	1	2	1	1	2		100 %
Eq. Guinea	1		1				1		1	100 %	
Guinea											
Guinea-Bissau		1	1					1	1	100 %	
Madagascar				2		2	2		2		100 %
Malawi					1	1		1	1		100 %
Mali				2		2	2		2		100 %
Mozambique											
Namibia											
Niger					1	1		1	1		100 %
Nigeria											
Rwanda											
Sao Tome/Princ	2		2				2		2	100 %	
Senegal					1	1		1	1		100 %
Tanzania				2	1	3	2	1	3		100 %
Togo				1		1	1		1		100 %
Uganda											
Zaire				1		1	1		1		100 %
Zambia				1		1	1		1		100 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	5	5	10	12	5	17	17	10	27	37 %	63 %

* These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on HBCU participation dated 10/26/1994.

TABLE 7: HIGH RATES OF DELAYED REPATRIATIONS FROM MOZAMBIQUE AND ZAIRE INFLUENCE ATLAS'S OVERALL REPATRIATION RATE TO DATE *

COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS SCHOLARSHIPS	POSSIBLE RETURNEES (COMPLETED FELLOWSHIPS)	SUCCESSFULLY REPATRIATED		REPATRIATION DELAYED	
			NUMBER	PERCENTAGE	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Benin	35					
Cameroon						
Cape Verde	27	1	1	100 %	0	0 %
Centr.Afr.Rep.	6	1	0	0 %	0	0 %
Comoros	5					
Congo	16	5	4	80 %	1	20 %
Eq. Guinea	6					
Guinea	10	1	0	0 %	1	100 %
Guinea-Bissau	18	3	3	100 %	0	0 %
Madagascar	27	1	1	100 %	0	0 %
Malawi	8					
Mali	28					
Mozambique	35	3	2	67 %	1	33 %
Namibia	17					
Niger	24					
Nigeria	8					
Rwanda	1					
Sao Tome/Princ	7	1	1	100 %	0	0 %
Senegal	28	3	3	100 %	0	0 %
Tanzania	44	6	6	100 %	0	0 %
Togo	10	1	0	0 %	1	100 %
Uganda	9	3	3	100 %	0	0 %
Zaire	15	8	2	25 %	6	75 %
Zambia	13	3	2	67 %	1	33 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	397	40	29	73 %	11	27 %

* Repatriation statistics are calculated as a percentage of all completed ATLAS training (both successful and unsuccessful) according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

TABLE 8: ATLAS OVERALL IS MEETING ITS TARGET OF 30 PERCENT SCHOLARSHIPS TO WOMEN — FEMALE PARTICIPATION RANGES FROM HALF OF ALL SCHOLARS TO NO PARTICIPATION *

COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS SCHOLARSHIPS				
	TOTAL	MALE (NUMBER)	FEMALE (NUMBER)	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE
Benin	35	19	16	54 %	46 %
Cameroon					
Cape Verde	27	20	7	74 %	26 %
Centr.Afr.Rep.	6	5	1	83 %	17 %
Comoros	5	3	2	60 %	40 %
Congo	16	13	3	81 %	19 %
Eq. Guinea	6	5	1	83 %	17 %
Guinea	10	8	2	80 %	20 %
Guinea-Bissau	18	16	2	89 %	11 %
Madagascar	27	15	12	56 %	44 %
Malawi	8	5	3	63 %	37 %
Mali	28	18	10	64 %	36 %
Mozambique	35	21	14	60 %	40 %
Namibia	17	10	7	59 %	41 %
Niger	24	18	6	75 %	25 %
Nigeria	8	4	4	50 %	50 %
Rwanda	1	1		100 %	
Sao Tome/Princ	7	7		100 %	
Senegal	28	21	7	75 %	25 %
Tanzania	44	29	15	66 %	34 %
Togo	10	8	2	80 %	20 %
Uganda	9	5	4	56 %	44 %
Zaire	15	13	2	87 %	13 %
Zambia	13	10	3	77 %	23 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	397	274	123	69 %	31 %

61

* These numbers include all planned, current and completed ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

TABLE 10: WOMEN RECEIVE A THIRD EACH OF ATLAS UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES AND MASTERS DEGREES AND LESS THAN A FIFTH OF ATLAS DOCTORATES *

COUNTRY	UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES				MASTERS DEGREES				DOCTORAL DEGREES			
	NUMBERS		PERCENTAGES		NUMBERS		PERCENTAGES		NUMBERS		PERCENTAGES	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
Benin					19	16	54 %	46 %				
Cameroon												
Cape Verde	6	3	67 %	33 %	14	4	78 %	22 %				
Centr.Afr.Rep.					4	1	80 %	20 %	1		100 %	
Comoros	3	2	60 %	40 %								
Congo					12	3	80 %	20 %	1		100 %	
Eq. Guinea	5	1	83 %	17 %								
Guinea	1		100 %		7	2	78 %	22 %				
Guinea-Bissau	3	1	75 %	25 %	13	1	93 %	7 %				
Madagascar		4		100 %	13	8	62 %	38 %	2		100 %	
Malawi					5	3	62 %	38 %				
Mali					18	10	64 %	36 %				
Mozambique					19	13	59 %	41 %	2	1	67 %	33 %
Namibia					10	7	59 %	41 %				
Niger		2		100 %	12	4	75 %	25 %	6		100 %	
Nigeria					4	4	50 %	50 %				
Rwanda									1		100 %	
Sao Tome/Princ	7		100 %									
Senegal					21	7	75 %	25 %				
Tanzania		1		100 %	21	12	64 %	36 %	8	2	80 %	20 %
Togo					8	2	80 %	20 %				
Uganda					5	4	56 %	44 %				
Zaire					13	2	87 %	13 %				
Zambia					8	2	80 %	20 %	2	1	67 %	33 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	25	14	64 %	36 %	226	105	68 %	32 %	23	4	85 %	15 %

* These numbers include all planned, current and completed training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

57

TABLE 9: THE SHARE OF TRAINING ALLOCATED TO WOMEN HAS BEEN INCREASING STEADILY *

COUNTRY	COMPLETED TRAINING				CURRENT TRAINING				PLANNED TRAINING			
	NUMBERS		PERCENTAGES		NUMBERS		PERCENTAGES		NUMBERS		PERCENTAGES	
	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
Benin					17	15	53 %	47 %	2	1	67 %	33 %
Cameroon												
Cape Verde	1		100 %		18	7	72 %	28 %	1		100 %	
Centr.Afr.Rep.	1		100 %		2		100 %		2	1	67 %	33 %
Comoros					2	2	50 %	50 %	1		100 %	
Congo	2	3	40 %	60 %	9		100 %		2		100 %	
Eq. Guinea					5	1	83 %	17 %				
Guinea	1		100 %		5	2	71 %	29 %	2		100 %	
Guinea-Bissau	3		100 %		12	1	92 %	8 %	1	1	50 %	50 %
Madagascar		1		100 %	11	7	61 %	39 %	4	4	50 %	50 %
Malawi					4	2	67 %	33 %	1	1	50 %	50 %
Mali					9	8	53 %	47 %	9	2	82 %	18 %
Mozambique	1	2	33 %	67 %	17	8	68 %	32 %	3	4	43 %	57 %
Namibia					7	3	70 %	30 %	3	4	43 %	57 %
Niger					14	6	70 %	30 %	4		100 %	
Nigeria					4	4	50 %	50 %				
Rwanda					1		100 %					
Sao Tome/Princ	1		100 %		4		100 %		2		100 %	
Senegal	3		100 %		18	7	72 %	28 %				
Tanzania	5	1	83 %	17 %	17	7	71 %	29 %	7	7	50 %	50 %
Togo	1		100 %		7	2	78 %	22 %				
Uganda	3		100 %		2	4	33 %	67 %				
Zaire	7	1	88 %	12 %	6	1	86 %	14 %				
Zambia	2	1	67 %	33 %	7	2	78 %	22 %	1		100 %	
ATLAS TOTALS:	31	9	78 %	22 %	198	89	69 %	31 %	45	25	64 %	36 %

* These numbers include all completed, current and planned ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

TABLE 12: LESS THAN A THIRD OF ATLAS PARTICIPANTS HAVE BENEFITTED FROM ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES *

COUNTRY	POSSIBLE PARTICIPANTS IN ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES (NUMBER)			ACTUAL PARTICIPANTS IN ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES (NUMBER)			PROPORTION PARTICIPATING IN ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES (PERCENTAGE)		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin	19	15	34	1	3	4	5 %	20 %	12 %
Cameroon									
Cape Verde	20	7	27						
Centr.Afr.Rep.	4		41	1		1	25 %		25 %
Comoros	2	2	4						
Congo	11	3	14	3		3	27 %		21 %
Eq. Guinea	5	1	6						
Guinea	21	3	24						
Guinea-Bissau	15	1	16	3		3	20 %		19 %
Madagascar	13	9	22	2	3	5	15 %	33 %	23 %
Malawi	4	2	6						
Mali	9	8	17	6	4	10	67 %	50 %	59 %
Mozambique	21	10	31	6	3	9	29 %	30 %	29 %
Namibia	8	3	11		2	2		67 %	18 %
Niger	17	11	28	7	1	8	41 %	5 %	29 %
Nigeria	4	4	8	4	4	8	100 %	100 %	100 %
Rwanda	1		1						
Sao Tome/Princ	5		5						
Senegal	21	7	28	7	4	11	33 %	57 %	39 %
Tanzania	22	8	30	12	4	16	55 %	50 %	53 %
Togo	8	1	9	1	1	2	13 %	100 %	22 %
Uganda	6	4	10	3	3	6	50 %	75 %	60 %
Zaire	13	2	15	7	2	9	54 %	100 %	60 %
Zambia	15	3	18	11	1	12	73 %	33 %	67 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	164	104	368	74	35	109	28 %	34 %	30 %

* These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on participant enrichment activities dated 10/26/1994 (financial data) and 10/27/1994 (participant numbers).

59

COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS SCHOLARSHIPS					TOTAL POSTGRADUATE AWARDS				
	TOTAL	MALE (NUMBER)	FEMALE (NUMBER)	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE
Benin	35	19	16	54 %	46 %					
Cameroon						4	1	3	25 %	75 %
Cape Verde	27	20	7	74 %	26 %					
Centr.Afr.Rep.	6	5	1	83 %	17 %					
Comoros	5	3	2	60 %	40 %	1	1		100 %	
Congo	16	13	3	81 %	19 %					
Eq. Guinea	6	5	1	83 %	17 %					
Guinea	10	8	2	80 %	20 %					
Guinea-Bissau	18	16	2	89 %	11 %					
Madagascar	27	15	12	56 %	44 %	3	2	1	67 %	33 %
Malawi	8	5	3	63 %	37 %					
Mali	28	18	10	64 %	36 %					
Mozambique	35	21	14	60 %	40 %					
Namibia	17	10	7	59 %	41 %					
Niger	24	18	6	75 %	25 %					
Nigeria	8	4	4	50 %	50 %					
Rwanda	1	1		100 %						
Sao Tome/Princ	7	7		100 %						
Senegal	28	21	7	75 %	25 %					
Tanzania	44	29	15	66 %	34 %					
Togo	10	8	2	80 %	20 %					
Uganda	9	5	4	56 %	44 %					
Zaire	15	13	2	87 %	13 %					
Zambia	13	10	3	77 %	23 %	5	5		100 %	
ATLAS TOTALS:	397	274	123	69 %	31 %	13	9	4	69 %	31 %

* These numbers include all planned, current and completed ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

TABLE 14: WOMEN'S ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES REPRESENT A QUARTER OF ALL EXPENDITURES, AND WOMEN'S PROGRAMS COST A LITTLE OVER HALF OF MEN'S *

COUNTRY	NUMBER IN ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES			TOTAL EXPENDITURES			EXPENDITURES BY GENDER		AVERAGE EXPENDED ON EACH PERSON	
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	MALE	FEMALE
Benin	1	3	4	$ 825	$ 1,066	$ 1,890	44 %	56 %	$ 825	$ 355
Cameroon				$ 2,754	$ 1,122	$ 3,876	71 %	29 %	**	**
Cape Verde				$ 2,150		$ 2,150	100 %		**	**
Centr.Afr.Rep.	1		1	$ 1,792		$ 1,792	100 %		$ 1,792	
Comoros				$ 1,992		$ 1,992	100 %		**	**
Congo	3		3	$ 3,922	$ 164	$ 4,086	96 %	4 %	$ 1,307	**
Eq. Guinea				$ 704		$ 704	100 %		**	**
Guinea										
Guinea-Bissau	3		3	$ 13,315		$ 13,315	100 %		$ 4,438	
Madagascar	2	3	5	$ 3,536	$ 3,347	$ 6,883	51 %	49 %	$ 1,768	$1,116
Malawi										
Mali	6	4	10	$ 4,305	$ 5,967	$ 10,271	42 %	58 %	$ 717	$ 1,492
Mozambique	6	3	9	$ 6,634	$1,127	$ 17,760	94 %	6 %	$ 2,772	$ 376
Namibia		2	2	$ 304	$ 1,127	$ 1,531	20 %	80 %	**	$ 614
Niger	7	1	8	$ 19,473	$ 3,388	$ 22,861	85 %	15 %	$ 2,784	$ 3,388
Nigeria	4	4	8	$ 8,316	$ 11,069	$ 19,384	43 %	57 %	$ 2,069	$ 2,767
Rwanda										
Sao Tome/Princ										
Senegal	7	4	11	$ 42,164	$ 8,089	$ 50,254	84 %	16 %	$ 6,023	$ 2,022
Tanzania	12	4	16	$ 36,870	$ 12,451	$ 49,322	75 %	25 %	$ 3,073	$ 3,113
Togo	1	1	2	$ 694		$ 694	100 %		$ 694	***
Uganda	3	3	6	$ 9,793	$ 2,502	$ 12,275	80 %	20 %	$ 3,264	$ 834
Zaire	7	2	9	$ 26,141	$ 5,127	$ 31,268	84 %	16 %	$ 3,734	$ 2,563
Zambia	11	1	12	$ 16,565	$ 1,563	$ 18,128	91 %	9 %	$ 1,506	$ 1,563
ATLAS TOTALS:	74	35	109	$ 212,247	$ 58,208	$ 270,455	78 %	22 %	$ 2,868	$ 1,663

* These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on participant enrichment activities dated 10/26/1994 (financial data) and 10/27/1994 (participant numbers).

** Averages cannot be calculated since no participants attended enrichment activities: the perdiem and transportation costs shown were for internal US travel, not for enrichment activities.

*** Statistics on Togo show one woman attending enrichment activities with no expenditures on women.

TABLE 13: ATLAS EXPENDITURES ON ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES ARE INCREASING YEAR BY YEAR *

COUNTRY	ACTUAL EXPENDITURES (FEES, PERDIEM, TRANSPORTATION IN US$)					PROPORTION OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES
	FY 91	FY 92	FY 93	FY 94	TOTAL EXPENDITURES	
Benin				1,890	1,890	1 %
Cameroon			3,876		3,876	1 %
Cape Verde			1,338	812	2,150	1 %
Centr.Afr.Rep.				1,792	1,792	1 %
Comoros			1,992		1,992	1 %
Congo		1,184	2,195	707	4,086	2 %
Eq. Guinea		704			704	1 %
Guinea						
Guinea-Bissau				13,315	13,315	5 %
Madagascar			2,064	4,819	6,883	3 %
Malawi						
Mali		1,179	2,820	6,272	10,271	4 %
Mozambique	334		2,010	15,416	17,760	7 %
Namibia			317	1,214	1,531	1 %
Niger		2,914	3,149	6,797	22,861	8 %
Nigeria		1,686	10,444	7,254	19,384	7 %
Rwanda						
Sao Tome/Princ						
Senegal		4,363	12,671	33,220	50,254	19 %
Tanzania	527	11,107	20,529	17,159	49,322	18 %
Togo			694		694	1 %
Uganda		719	10,694	901	12,275	5 %
Zaire	481	4,603	21,576	4,607	31,268	12 %
Zambia		840	10,629	6,663	18,128	7 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	1,341	29,301	106,974	132,839	270,455	100 %

* These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on participant enrichment activities dated 10/26/1994 (financial data) and 10/27/1994 (participant numbers).

TABLE 15: CLOSE TO TWO THIRDS OF ATLAS SCHOLARS REQUIRED ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING *

COUNTRY	TOTAL SCHOLARS (CURRENT AND COMPLETED)			TOTAL SCHOLARS UNDERTAKING OR HAVING COMPLETED ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING			PROPORTION OF ATLAS SCHOLARS REQUIRING ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING (PERCENTAGE)		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin	17	15	32	14	12	26	82 %	80 %	81 %
Cameroon									
Cape Verde	19	7	26	14	7	21	74 %	100 %	81 %
Centr.Afr.Rep.	3		3	3		3	100 %		100 %
Comoros	2	2	4	2	2	4	100 %	100 %	100 %
Congo	11	3	14	8	2	10	73 %	67 %	71 %
Eq. Guinea	5	1	6	2	1	3	40 %	100 %	50 %
Guinea	6	2	8	6	2	8	100 %	100 %	100 %
Guinea-Bissau	15	1	16	15	1	16	100 %	100 %	100 %
Madagascar	11	8	19	9	7	16	82 %	88 %	84 %
Malawi	4	2	6						
Mali	9	8	17	8	5	13	89 %	63 %	76 %
Mozambique	18	10	28	15	6	21	83 %	60 %	75 %
Namibia	7	3	10	1		1	14 %		10 %
Niger	14	6	20	10	3	13	71 %	50 %	65 %
Nigeria	4	4	8						
Rwanda	1		1						
Sao Tome/Princ	5		5	5		5	100 %		100 %
Senegal	21	7	28	21	7	28	100 %	100 %	100 %
Tanzania	22	8	30						
Togo	8	2	10	8	2	10	100 %	100 %	100 %
Uganda	5	4	9						
Zaire	13	2	15	9	2	11	69 %	100 %	73 %
Zambia	9	3	12						
ATLAS TOTALS:	229	98	327	150	59	209	66 %	60 %	64 %

* These numbers include all current, completed and planned ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994. Data on English language training (ELT) includes ELT institutes as well as training at the Economics Institute.

TABLE 16: LUSOPHONE PARTICIPANTS REQUIRE THE LENGTHIEST ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING (ELT), WITH NO REAL DIFFERENTIATION BY GENDER *

COUNTRY	CURRENT ELT (NUMBER OF ATLAS SCHOLARS)			COMPLETED ELT (NUMBER OF ATLAS SCHOLARS)			TOTAL PERSON-MONTHS OF ELT (COMPLETED ELT ONLY)			AVERAGE DURATION OF ELT PER PERSON		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin	8	6	14	6	6	12	55	39	94	9	7	8
Cameroon												
Cape Verde	8	3	11	6	4	10	49	43	92	8	11	9
Centr.Afr.Rep.				3		3	12		12	4		4
Comoros	2	2	4									
Congo	1	2	3	7		7	53		53	8		8
Eq. Guinea				2	1	3	20	12	32	10	12	11
Guinea	5	1	6	1	1	2	8	8	16	8	8	8
Guinea-Bissau	6		6	9	1	10	108	13	121	12	13	12
Madagascar	3	1	4	6	6	12	35	41	76	6	7	6
Malawi												
Mali				8	5	13	52	46	98	7	9	8
Mozambique	6	1	7	9	5	14	91	24	115	10	5	8
Namibia				1		1	3		3	3		3
Niger	2	1	3	8	2	10	56	9	65	7	5	7
Nigeria												
Rwanda												
Sao Tome/Princ	3		3	2		2	21		21	11		11
Senegal	7	2	9	14	5	19	71	25	96	5	5	5
Tanzania												
Togo				8	2	10	50	15	65	6	8	7
Uganda												
Zaire				9	2	11	80	28	108	9	14	10
Zambia												
ATLAS TOTALS:	51	19	70	99	40	139	764	303	1,067	8	8	8

* These numbers include all completed, current planned ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994. Data on English language training (ELT) includes ELT institutes as well as training at the Economics Institute.

TABLE 18: ONLY 8 PERCENT OF ATLAS DOCTORAL STUDENTS HAVE UNDERTAKEN RESEARCH IN AFRICA THUS FAR *

COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS DOCTORAL SCHOLARS (CURRENT AND COMPLETED)			TOTAL DOCTORAL SCHOLARS UNDERGOING DISSERTATION RESEARCH IN AFRICA			PROPORTION OF ATLAS DOCTORAL FELLOWS CONDUCTING RESEARCH IN AFRICA (PERCENTAGE)		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin									
Cameroon									
Cape Verde									
Centr.Afr.Rep.	1		1						
Comoros									
Congo	1		1						
Eq. Guinea									
Guinea									
Guinea-Bissau									
Madagascar	2		2						
Malawi									
Mali									
Mozambique	2	1	3						
Namibia									
Niger	6		6						
Nigeria									
Rwanda	1		1						
Sao Tome/Princ									
Senegal									
Tanzania	8	2	10	1		1	17 %		10 %
Togo									
Uganda									
Zaire									
Zambia	2	1	3						
ATLAS TOTALS:	23	4	27	1		1	4 %		8 %

* These numbers include all current, completed and planned ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

TABLE 17: A MERE TWO PERCENT OF ATLAS SCHOLARS REQUIRED A CHANGE OF INSTITUTION DURING AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM *

COUNTRY	TOTAL ATLAS SCHOLARS (CURRENT AND COMPLETED)			TOTAL SCHOLARS UNDERGOING A CHANGE OF INSTITUTION MID-WAY THROUGH AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM			PROPORTION OF ATLAS SCHOLARS REQUIRING A TRANSFER (PERCENTAGE)		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin	17	15	32						
Cameroon									
Cape Verde	19	7	26						
Centr.Afr.Rep.	3		3						
Comoros	2	2	4						
Congo	11	3	14						
Eq. Guinea	5	1	6						
Guinea	6	2	8						
Guinea-Bissau	15	1	16						
Madagascar	11	8	19	2		2	18 %		11 %
Malawi	4	2	6						
Mali	9	8	17		2	2		25 %	12 %
Mozambique	18	10	28						
Namibia	7	3	10						
Niger	14	6	20						
Nigeria	4	4	8		1	1		25 %	13 %
Rwanda	1		1						
Sao Tome/Princ	5		5						
Senegal	21	7	28						
Tanzania	22	8	30						
Togo	8	2	10						
Uganda	5	4	9						
Zaire	13	2	15						
Zambia	9	3	12						
ATLAS TOTALS:	229	98	327	2	3	5	1 %	3 %	2 %

* These numbers include all current, completed and planned ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.

TABLE 19: ATLAS IS MEETING CONTRACTUAL TARGETS ON DURATION OF TRAINING *

COUNTRY	NUMBER WHO HAVE SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED TRAINING			AVERAGE DURATION: UNDERGRADUATES (PERSON-MONTHS)			AVERAGE DURATION: MASTERS DEGREES (PERSON-MONTHS)		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin									
Cameroon									
Cape Verde	1		1				22		22
Centr.Afr.Rep.	1		1				17		17
Comoros									
Congo	2	1	3				6 **	12	8 **
Eq. Guinea									
Guinea	1		1	10		10			
Guinea-Bissau									
Madagascar		1	1					21	21
Malawi									
Mali									
Mozambique		2	2					27	27
Namibia									
Niger									
Nigeria									
Rwanda									
Sao Tome/Princ									
Senegal	3		3				26		26
Tanzania	5	1	6				19	25	20
Togo	1		1				26		26
Uganda	3		3				21		21
Zaire	7	1	8				30	24	29
Zambia	1	1	2				13	17	15
ATLAS TOTALS:	25	7	32	10		10	22	22	22

* These numbers are based on AAI statistics of successfully completed participants dated 10/25/1994. Duration of any practical training is not included in the calculations for length of time for masters degrees.
** Statistics from the Congo include one male listed in AAI statistics as completing an MBA in 2 months.

TABLE 20: OVER A THIRD OF ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS HAVE RECEIVED PRACTICAL TRAINING TO DATE – MEN HAVE UNDERTAKEN FOUR FIFTHS OF PRACTICAL TRAINING *

COUNTRY	TOTAL COMPLETED ATLAS MASTERS DEGREES (ELIGIBLE FOR PRACT. TNG.)			TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOLARS WHO UNDERWENT PRACTICAL TRAINING			PROPORTION OF ELIGIBLE SCHOLARS WHO UNDERTOOK PRACT. TNG.			DISTRIBUTION: PRACT. TNG. TRAINING BY GENDER	
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE
Benin											
Cameroon											
Cape Verde	1		1				0 %		0 %		
Centr.Afr.Rep.	1		1				0 %		0 %		
Comoros											
Congo	2	1	3				0 %	0 %	0 %		
Eq. Guinea											
Guinea											
Guinea-Bissau											
Madagascar		1	1					0 %	0 %		
Malawi											
Mali											
Mozambique		2	2					0 %	0 %		
Namibia											
Niger											
Nigeria		**			1	1		**	**		100 %
Rwanda											
Sao Tome/Princ											
Senegal	3		3				0 %		0 %		
Tanzania	5	1	6	2		2	40 %	0 %	33 %	100 %	
Togo	1		1				0 %		0 %		
Uganda	3		3	1		1	33 %		33 %	100 %	
Zaire	7	1	8	6	1	7	86 %	100 %	88 %	86 %	14 %
Zambia	1	1	2				0 %	0 %	0 %		
ATLAS TOTALS:	24	7	31	9	2	11	38 %	29 %	35 %	82 %	18 %

* These numbers include all current, completed and planned ATLAS training according to AAI records dated 10/25/1994.
** Core contractor statistics do not list the Nigerian woman as completed, although her practical training was completed in 9/94.

TABLE 22: ATLAS PARTICIPANTS' EMPLOYMENT PRIOR TO TRAINING: NEARLY HALF ARE FROM GOVERNMENT *

COUNTRY	GOVERNMENT			UNIVERSITY			PRIV. SECTOR/SELF-EMPL.			OTHER			TOTAL		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin	29 %	18 %	47 %	6 %	12 %	18 %	6 %	3 %	9 %	15 %	12 %	26 %	56 %	44 %	100 %
Cameroon															
Cape Verde	20 %	10 %	30 %				10 %		10 %	40 %	20 %	60 %	70 %	30 %	100 %
Centr.Afr.Rep.	100 %		100 %										100 %		100 %
Comoros										60 %	40 %	100 %	60 %	40 %	100 %
Congo	50 %	21 %	71 %							29 %		29 %	79 %	21 %	100 %
Eq. Guinea										100 %		100 %	100 %		100 %
Guinea	22 %	11 %	33 %	33 %		33 %	11 %	11 %	22 %	11 %		11 %	78 %	22 %	100 %
Guinea-Bissau	65 %	12 %	76 %							24 %		24 %	88 %	12 %	100 %
Madagascar	4 %	4 %	8 %	4 %	8 %	12 %	24 %		24 %	28 %	28 %	56 %	60 %	40 %	100 %
Malawi				17 %		17 %	50 %	33 %	83 %				67 %	33 %	100 %
Mali	18 %	29 %	47 %	12 %	6 %	18 %				24 %	12 %	35 %	53 %	47 %	100 %
Mozambique	24 %	10 %	34 %	14 %	10 %	24 %	14 %	7 %	21 %	10 %	10 %	21 %	62 %	38 %	100 %
Namibia	42 %	17 %	58 %	25 %	17 %	42 %							67 %	33 %	100 %
Niger	50 %	32 %	82 %	5 %		5 %	5 %	5 %	9 %	5 %		5 %	64 %	36 %	100 %
Nigeria	25 %	25 %	50 %		13 %	13 %	25 %		25 %		13 %	13 %	50 %	50 %	100 %
Rwanda	100 %		100 %										100 %		100 %
Sao Tome/Princ										100 %		100 %	100 %		100 %
Senegal	46 %	4 %	50 %		4 %	4 %		4 %	4 %	29 %	14 %	43 %	75 %	25 %	100 %
Tanzania	22 %	13 %	34 %	22 %	9 %	31 %	9 %		9 %	22 %	3 %	25 %	75 %	25 %	100 %
Togo	10 %	10 %	20 %	20 %		20 %	60 %		60 %				90 %	10 %	100 %
Uganda	22 %	22 %	44 %	11 %		11 %				33 %	11 %	44 %	67 %	33 %	100 %
Zaire	20 %		20 %	60 %	7 %	67 %	7 %	7 %	13 %				87 %	13 %	100 %
Zambia	9 %	27 %	36 %							64 %		64 %	73 %	27 %	100 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	28 %	13 %	41 %	11 %	5 %	16 %	9 %	3 %	12 %	24 %	8 %	32 %	71 %	29 %	100 %

* These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on participants' anticipated post-training assignments dated 11/10/1994. The "Other" category includes Students, Non-Profit, and Parastatals.

TABLE 21: ATLAS PARTICIPANTS' EMPLOYMENT PRIOR TO TRAINING: ATLAS SCHOLARSHIPS PRIMARILY SUPPORT GOVERNMENTS *

COUNTRY	GOVERNMENT			UNIVERSITY			PRIV. SECTOR/SELF-EMPL.			OTHER			TOTAL		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin	10	6	16	2	4	6	2	1	3	5	4	9	19	15	34
Cameroon															
Cape Verde	2	1	3				1		1	4	2	6	7	3	10
Centr.Afr.Rep.	4		4										4		4
Comoros										3	2	5	3	2	5
Congo	7	3	10							4		4	11	3	14
Eq. Guinea										12		12	12		12
Guinea	2	1	3	3		3	1	1	2	1		1	7	2	9
Guinea-Bissau	11	2	13							4		4	15	2	17
Madagascar	1	1	2	1	2	3	6		6	7	7	14	15	10	25
Malawi				1		1	3	2	5				4	2	6
Mali	3	5	8	2	1	3				4	2	6	9	8	17
Mozambique	7	3	10	4	3	7	4	2	6	3	3	6	18	11	29
Namibia	5	2	7	3	2	5							8	4	12
Niger	11	7	18	1		1	1	1	2	1		1	14	8	22
Nigeria	2	2	4		1	1	2		2		1	1	4	4	8
Rwanda	1		1										1		1
Sao Tome/Princ										6		6	6		6
Senegal	13	1	14		1	1		1	1	8	4	12	21	7	28
Tanzania	7	4	11	7	3	10	3		3	7	1	8	24	8	32
Togo	1	1	2	2		2	6		6				9	1	10
Uganda	2	2	4	1		1				3	1	4	6	3	9
Zaire	3		3	9	1	10	1	1	2				13	2	15
Zambia	1	3	4							7		7	8	3	11
ATLAS TOTALS:	93	44	137	36	18	54	30	9	39	79	27	106	238	98	336

* These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on participants' anticipated post-training assignments dated 11/10/1994. The "Other" category includes Students, Non-Profit, and Parastatals.

TABLE 24: ATLAS PARTICIPANTS' EXPECTED EMPLOYMENT FOLLOWING TRAINING: NEARLY HALF WILL RETURN TO GOVERNMENT SERVICE *

COUNTRY	GOVERNMENT			UNIVERSITY			PRIV. SECTOR/SELF-EMPL.			OTHER			TOTAL		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin	26 %	21 %	47 %	9 %	9 %	18 %	6 %	9 %	15 %	15 %	6 %	21 %	56 %	44 %	100 %
Cameroon															
Cape Verde	30 %	20 %	50 %	10 %		10 %	20 %	10 %	30 %	10 %		10 %	70 %	30 %	100 %
Centr.Afr.Rep.	75 %		75 %	25 %		25 %							100 %		100 %
Comoros				20 %		20 %	40 %	40 %	80 %				60 %	40 %	100 %
Congo	64 %	22 %	86 %							14 %		14 %	79 %	21 %	100 %
Eq. Guinea	33 %		33 %				33 %		33 %	33 %		33 %	100 %		100 %
Guinea	22 %	11 %	33 %	33 %		33 %	11 %	11 %	22 %	11 %		11 %	78 %	22 %	100 %
Guinea-Bissau	65 %		65 %				6 %	6 %	12 %	18 %	6 %	24 %	88 %	12 %	100 %
Madagascar	8 %	8 %	16 %	4 %	8 %	12 %	24 %	12 %	36 %	24 %	12 %	36 %	60 %	40 %	100 %
Malawi				17 %		17 %	50 %	33 %	83 %				67 %	33 %	100 %
Mali	18 %	29 %	47 %	12 %	6 %	18 %				24 %	12 %	36 %	53 %	47 %	100 %
Mozambique	17 %	10 %	28 %	24 %	10 %	34 %	10 %	7 %	17 %	10 %	10 %	21 %	62 %	38 %	100 %
Namibia	42 %	17 %	58 %	25 %	17 %	42 %							67 %	33 %	100 %
Niger	41 %	9 %	50 %	18 %	18 %	36 %	5 %	5 %	9 %		5 %	5 %	64 %	36 %	100 %
Nigeria	25 %	13 %	38 %	13 %	25 %	38 %				13 %	13 %	25 %	50 %	50 %	100 %
Rwanda	100 %		100 %										100 %		100 %
Sao Tome/Princ	83 %		83 %							17 %		17 %	100 %		100 %
Senegal	46 %	7 %	54 %		4 %	4 %	4 %	4 %	7 %	25 %	11 %	36 %	75 %	25 %	100 %
Tanzania	19 %	13 %	31 %	22 %	9 %	31 %	13 %		13 %	22 %	3 %	25 %	75 %	25 %	100 %
Togo	10 %	10 %	20 %	20 %		20 %	60 %		60 %				90 %	10 %	100 %
Uganda	22 %	22 %	44 %	11 %		11 %	11 %		11 %	22 %	11 %	33 %	67 %	33 %	100 %
Zaire	20 %		20 %	60 %	7 %	67 %	7 %	7 %	13 %				87 %	13 %	100 %
Zambia	9 %	27 %	36 %							64 %		64 %	73 %	27 %	100 %
ATLAS TOTALS:	29 %	12 %	41 %	14 %	7 %	21 %	11 %	5 %	17 %	16 %	5 %	21 %	71 %	29 %	100 %

* These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on participants' anticipated post-training assignments dated 11/10/1994. The "Other" category includes *Non-Profits* and *Parastatals*.

TABLE 23: ATLAS PARTICIPANTS' ANTICIPATED EMPLOYMENT FOLLOWING TRAINING: THE MAJORITY PLAN TO WORK IN GOVERNMENT *

COUNTRY	GOVERNMENT			UNIVERSITY			PRIV. SECTOR/SELF-EMPL.			OTHER			TOTAL		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin	9	7	16	3	3	6	2	3	5	5	2	7	19	15	34
Cameroon															
Cape Verde	3	2	5	1		1	2	1	3	1	1	2	7	3	10
Centr.Afr.Rep.	3		3	1		1							4		4
Comoros				1		1	2	2	4				3	2	5
Congo	9	3	12							2		2	11	3	14
Eq. Guinea	4		4				4		4	4		4	12		12
Guinea	2	1	3	3		3	1	1	2	1		2	7	2	9
Guinea-Bissau	11		11				1	1	2	3	1	4	15	2	17
Madagascar	2	2	4	1	2	3	6	3	9	6	3	9	15	10	25
Malawi				1		1	3	2	5				4	2	6
Mali	3	5	8	2	1	3				4	2	6	9	8	17
Mozambique	5	3	8	7	3	10	3	2	5	3	3	6	18	11	29
Namibia	5	2	7	3	2	5							8	4	12
Niger	9	2	11	4	4	8	1	1	2		1	1	14	8	22
Nigeria	2	1	3	1	2	3				1	1	2	4	4	8
Rwanda	1		1										1		1
Sao Tome/Princ	5		5							1		1	6		6
Senegal	13	2	15		1	1	1	1	2	7	3	10	21	7	28
Tanzania	6	4	10	7	3	10	4		4	7	1	8	24	8	32
Togo	1	1	2	2		2	6		6				9	1	10
Uganda	2	2	4	1		1	1		1	2	1	3	6	3	9
Zaire	3		3	9	1	10	1	1	2				13	2	15
Zambia	1	3	4							7		7	8	3	11
ATLAS TOTALS:	99	40	139	47	22	69	38	18	56	53	18	71	238	98	336

* These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on participants' anticipated post-training assignments dated 11/10/1994. The "Other" category includes Non-Profits and Parastatals.

TABLE 25: ATLAS'S POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS ARE SHARED BETWEEN AFRICAN GOVERNMENTS AND UNIVERSITIES *

COUNTRY	GOVERNMENT			UNIVERSITY			PRIV. SECTOR/SELF-EMPL.			OTHER			TOTAL		
	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Benin															
Cameroon		2	2	1		1							1	2	3
Cape Verde															
Centr.Afr.Rep.															
Comoros															
Congo															
Eq. Guinea															
Guinea															
Guinea-Bissau															
Madagascar				1		1				1		1	2		2
Malawi															
Mali															
Mozambique															
Namibia															
Niger															
Nigeria															
Rwanda															
Sao Tome/Princ															
Senegal															
Tanzania															
Togo															
Uganda															
Zaire															
Zambia	2		2	2		2	1		1				5		5
ATLAS TOTALS:	2	2	4	4		4	1		1	1		1	8	2	10

These calculations are based on AAI's statistics on participants' anticipated post-training assignments dated 11/10/1994. The "Other" category includes Non-Profits and Parastatals.

APPENDIX E:

ATLAS IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISMS

APPENDIX E: ATLAS IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISMS: FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Recruitment and Selection for Scholarships

a) Recruitment and Selection: Findings

- ***Each ATLAS country has developed an open, transparent and competitive process to recruit candidates for ATLAS.***
  - The recruitment process varies from country to country, reflecting differing local situations and Mission fields of training. Recruitment criteria are not standardized project-wide.
  - A wide range of media are used to advertise ATLAS scholarships: current participants in training report hearing of the scholarship opportunity through newspaper or radio advertisements (60 percent), from their employers (15 percent), or by word of mouth (14 percent).

- ***Recruitment is generally the responsibility of the Mission buying in to ATLAS, with assistance and support from the core contractor's field-based staff.*** The degree of involvement of in-country core contractor personnel in recruitment varies from Mission to Mission, and obviously depends on whether there is a contractor representative in-country.

- ***Missions say they are using ATLAS strategically.*** 100 percent of Missions responding to our evaluation survey state that they choose fields of study on the basis of the strategic objectives laid out in their CPSPs.

- ***Project-wide recruitment steps are efficient in reaching women: ATLAS overall is meeting its target of 30 percent female participation in the scholarship component. However, certain countries' participation is well below target.***
  - Gender-disaggregated information is not available on the number of applicants to ATLAS. At the same time, the evaluation team found in at least one country that the proportion of women succeeding in all the screening hurdles (applicant to candidate to fellowship award) is indicative of the proportion of women recruited to the project.
  - 11 of the 23 countries participating in ATLAS, or 48 percent, have individually surpassed the target of 30 percent female participation. Leaders in female representation are Nigeria (50 percent), Benin (46 percent), Madagascar and Uganda (44 percent each), Namibia (41 percent), Mozambique and the Comoros (40 percent each), Malawi (37 percent), Mali (36 percent) and Tanzania (34 percent).
  - The highest numbers of women come from Benin (16), Tanzania (15), Mozambique (14), Madagascar (14) and Mali (10). Nigeria, the country with the highest share of women, has funded 4 female ATLAS scholars (50 percent).
  - Two countries have sponsored no women under the project's scholarship component: Rwanda and Sao Tome/Principe. Central African Republic and Equatorial Guinea have one female scholar each. Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe and Equatorial Guinea currently have no USAID presence in-country, and that these countries' male participation in ATLAS varied: 1 man from Rwanda, 7 from Sao Tome/Principe, and 5 each from CAR and Equatorial Guinea.

- ***The ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans plays a unique, substantive and highly valued role in recruiting and selecting ATLAS candidates.***
  - Many of the 13 members of the ATLAS Deans Committee travel to Africa to assist Missions with recruitment and meet bi-annually at AAI/New York or in Washington to perform final selection of candidates for ATLAS scholarship and postgraduate study and research awards in addition to supporting the admission and training of ATLAS Fellows on their campuses.
  - The Deans bring particular skills in interpreting US academic criteria to the field — Mission and host country officials, scholarship and postgraduate study and research award candidates — and add what one respondent called "instant credibility" to the ATLAS selection process. The Deans are especially appropriate authority figures within the African context.
  - Mission survey respondents and core contractor staff expressed particular respect for the Deans' contribution to the process.

- ***The core contractor's field representatives' roles vary from country to country***, from virtually no role to high profile decision-making to providing facilitative services in implementing recruitment and selection for ATLAS depending on Mission requests.

- ***The separation of roles and responsibilities between Mission staff and core contractor field staff has generally not been clearly delineated.***

b) Recruitment and Selection: Conclusions

- ***The overall ATLAS recruitment process is sufficient to attract the caliber of candidates ATLAS strives to reach.***
  - Recruitment is generally more open and widely advertised than under AFGRAD. Greater numbers of Africans are hearing of the opportunity and are applying in vast numbers. Though our evaluation did not fully document all applicants to the project, Tanzania can be cited as an example of large volumes of applicants: 4,000 in 1993.

- ***The stringent ATLAS screening mechanisms are successful in limiting ATLAS to candidates with the highest academic potential.*** The ATLAS scholarship component boasts an outstanding 98 percent academic success rate to date.

- ***Leadership experience or potential are not criteria in recruiting ATLAS candidates.***
  - The word "leadership" is not incorporated in the ATLAS application form.
  - Leadership *per se*, while implicit, was not mentioned as a recruitment criterion by any Mission, core contractor or USAID/W official interviewed for this evaluation.
  - Leadership is not incorporated into any selection documents reviewed by the evaluation team.

c) Recruitment and Selection: Recommendations

- ***Missions should continue to use ATLAS strategically to support CPSP objectives by linking ATLAS fields of training to CPSP objectives.***

- ***Missions should continue to take steps to expand the recruitment process to attract as wide a pool of candidates as possible.***

- ***Missions should continue to link ATLAS candidacies to future employment upon return*** since the impact of ATLAS training will be measured in its utilization following training.

- ***While participation varies from country to country, overall, Missions should take steps to maintain or increase the number of female applicants to ATLAS.***
  - Written and verbal communiqués should clearly state Mission goals for female participation. Missions might revise ATLAS informational materials; more Missions might develop brochures describing ATLAS and its goals. All materials should clearly underline the Mission's gender priorities. Other steps that have proven successful in ATLAS countries include contacting all women's organizations in-country to advertise scholarship opportunities in addition to communicating with the official media.
  - While many Missions are already undertaking these and similar steps, we recommend that even greater emphasis be placed on such measures to increase the pool of female applicants before individual Missions consider other measures such as providing undergraduate scholarships to women, eliminating the professional experience requirement for women or funding an all-women wave under ATLAS: measures that are perceived as giving preferential treatment to women may cause a backlash.
  - Women and women's organizations should be thoroughly represented on ATLAS Selection Committees. Mission goals might be to work with the Committee Chairs to make sure that ministries and other groups on these Committees are equally represented by men and women.

- ***The roles and responsibilities of the Mission versus the core contractor field-based staff should be clearly negotiated and delineated in writing*** to allow these facilitative services to be of as much utility to the Missions as possible. There is one case where the AAI Representative has been effectively dealt out of the ATLAS process. If the Mission does not see a role for core contractor field staff's services, the position should not be funded under ATLAS.

- ***If USAID wants ATLAS to be a leadership training project, leadership should be incorporated into the ATLAS selection criteria and mechanisms.***

2. Placement

a) Placement: Findings

- ***The core contractor has developed and implemented procedures that successfully secure placement for ATLAS scholars in undergraduate, masters degree, doctoral and short-term research programs.***

- ***AAI's placement mechanisms secure tuition scholarships for all ATLAS scholars in graduate programs.*** Tuition contributions from universities total nearly $5.2 million to date for the 370 ATLAS scholars in graduate programs listed in the core contractor's HBCU reports.

- ***ATLAS has secured over an estimated $800,000 in tuition scholarships for undergraduate scholars, representing 16 percent of all tuition scholarships.***

- ***HBCUs have provided total tuition scholarships estimated at $346,000, or 7 percent of all university contributions.***

- ***AAI's placement procedures generate successful results.***
  - Missions responding to the evaluation survey by and large state satisfaction with ATLAS placement.
  - Participants responding to the evaluation survey overwhelmingly report satisfaction with their academic programs: 94 percent feel their academic programs are relevant to their stated objectives and future employment upon return home, though a few were concerned that their placement was governed more by cost savings than by excellence.
  - The US university community included in the evaluation data gathering process gave ATLAS scholars high marks, with 70 percent of US university respondents finding ATLAS scholars academically better than sponsored students under other scholarship programs.
  - Transfers during academic programs currently stand at 2 percent of ATLAS US training, another indicator of the success of initial placement decisions.

- HBCU participation in the long-term ATLAS scholarship component has reached 7 percent, short of the contract's goal of 10 percent HBCU participation.
  - 27 scholarships have been granted to date at HBCUs.
  - Male HBCU participants outnumber women 2 to 1 — 17 HBCU participants are male (63 percent); the remaining 10 scholarships (37 percent) are women.

- ***HBCU utilization is largely for graduate degrees.***
  - Masters degrees account for 17 of the 27 scholarships at HBCUs, or 63 percent.
  - Undergraduate degrees account for the remaining 10 HBCU scholarships to date, or 37 percent.

- ***Participants, alumni, candidates and Mission personnel all state that the ATLAS placement process is extremely time-consuming, with insufficient communication to support adequate personal and professional planning.***
  - Participant responses to the evaluation survey indicate that 42 percent waited over one year.
  - One Mission's PTMS system shows that the wait ranges from 240 to 741 days, and averages 353 days, or close to a year, from nomination to departure.
  - Most stakeholders — participants, alumni, candidates, Mission personnel, candidate employers — generally report that they are not aware of when US universities will communicate placement decisions to the core contractor, directly affecting when candidates can expect to depart for training. This lack of information precludes professional or personal planning and does not contribute to the strong relationship desired between ATLAS Fellows and USAID or AAI.

- ***Participants and their employers do not participate fully in selecting the academic institution.*** Although there is a slot in the ATLAS application requesting a choice of three institutions, only 14 percent of participants responding to the evaluation survey state that they were involved in the planning and selection process or that they received feedback during the pre-departure period regarding their preferences.

b) Placement: Conclusions

- ***The core contractor's placement mechanisms by and large generate successful results.*** While some participants feel that they are sent to "small, third rate universities whose quality of

training leaves a lot to desire — all to save money," to quote one respondent, ATLAS placements in general appear to have been effective.

c) Placement: Recommendations

- ***Improve communications between the core contractor, Missions and candidates about placement.***
  - We recommend that the core contractor notify the Mission and, where available, the in-country contractor representative as to when and where placement decisions are anticipated. Knowing when a decision can be expected allows candidates, their employers and their families to plan better for the upcoming absence and will contribute to the overall relationship with participants and alumni.
  - We further recommend that the ATLAS contract fund the development of information materials about the ATLAS placement process, US education system, and reasons for delays. These materials should be in English, French and Portuguese — and Spanish if Equatorial Guinea buys into the project once again.
  - We recommend that the core contractor provide a list of US universities offering tuition scholarships to ATLAS so that participants and their employers can be meaningfully incorporated into the selection process. If this is not practical, we recommend that the slot for choice of institutions be dropped from the ATLAS application form.

- ***Undertake multiple placements to speed up the placement process.*** The meticulous ATLAS screening process should result in candidacies that are close to 100 percent admissible to US academic programs. Although we recognize that this is not current policy because of the ATLAS tuition scholarship requirement, by submitting dossiers to more than one university at a time, candidates will not have to wait unusual periods of time if their application is rejected at the first university where placement is attempted.

- ***Guarantee a scholarship to anyone who is retained by the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans.*** The screening process works. For reasons of public relations, anyone the Deans deem admissible should ultimately receive an ATLAS Fellowship. The question would then become when a person departs for training, and no longer whether, a year or more after screening, the candidate will become an ATLAS Fellow.

3. Monitoring Participants in Training

a) Monitoring Participants in Training: Findings

- ***The ATLAS Mission clientele is generally satisfied with the current core contractor's services.***
  - Missions by and large express satisfaction with the core contractor's services and communication.
  - There is great confidence among the Missions that participants will return home after ATLAS training.
  - Of the Missions surveyed 90 percent anticipated no problems with repatriation.
  - 73 percent of the Mission personnel surveyed believe the core contractor is "very good" in assisting with repatriation.
  - Opinion regarding the core contractor's handling of extensions of training time or increases in funding are about evenly divided: nearly 65 percent of the Missions respondents

reported having more than one month advance notice, about one-third cited this as an area for improvement.

- While 63 percent of all Mission personnel surveyed thought the core contractor was doing a "very good" to "excellent" job monitoring participants in training, two out of twenty Missions — a tenth of respondents — rated contractor performance as "very poor."

- ***The core contractor's procedures for monitoring participants in training are generally satisfactory to ATLAS participants.***
  - AAI received the highest marks from participants for assisting in arranging travel to the participants' US universities and for promptness in providing monthly payments. Lowest participant ratings were for contractor handling of special requests from students and displeasure with the amount of monthly payments.
  - While four fifths of participants included in the evaluation survey expressed satisfaction with ATLAS monitoring services, 21 percent felt that the core contractor's management support was "not very useful" or that "they lose everything you send them," in one respondent's words.

- ***The US university community is satisfied with the core contractor's performance in monitoring ATLAS participants.*** AAI received high marks for cooperativeness, responsiveness and productivity from international student advisors, academic advisors, and university admissions personnel.

- ***ATLAS monitoring activities by and large concentrate on participants in training, with little involvement by home country employers or core contractor field staff.*** Only two core contractor field staff members responding to the evaluation survey instrument say they are involved with participants' employers during training. This means that only 12 percent of this important resource is tapped in this regard.

- ***11 ATLAS scholars have undertaken practical training to date, representing 35 percent of those eligible.***
  - The evaluation team defined eligibility for practical training as scholars who had completed masters degree training, totalling 31 according to core contractor records.
  - A mere 18 percent (2 out of 11) of those undertaking practical training to date are women.

- ***The utilization of professional enrichment activities for ATLAS scholars in training has been increasing since the project began.*** The number of different professional enrichment activities doubled from 1 in FY91 to 2 in FY92, rising to 16 in FY93 and to 63 activities in FY94.

- ***ATLAS expenditures on professional enrichment have been steadily increasing since the project's inception.***
  - Expenditures on fees, perdiem and transportation have risen from $1,341 in FY91 to $132,839 in FY94, an increase of two orders of magnitude.
  - Expenditures to date on professional enrichment have totalled $270,455, an average of $67,614 per year.

- ***Country-by-country participation in ATLAS professional enrichment activities has been uneven.***
  - Five countries together account for over half of ATLAS enrichment activities to date: Tanzania, Zambia, Senegal, Mali and Mozambique.

- Another eight countries with active ATLAS participants have had no enrichment activities whatsoever to date: Cape Verde, Comoros, Equatorial Guinea, Guinea, Malawi, Namibia, Rwanda, and Sao Tome/Principe — these include 3 small countries and 1 close-out Mission.

- ***Expenditures on ATLAS professional enrichment activities are not evenly apportioned by gender.***
  - Women account for 22 percent of expenditures on professional enrichment activities to date: $58,208 of the $270,455 spent between FY91 and FY94.
  - Expenditures on men total $212,247, or 78 percent of total expenses.
  - Average enrichment costs average $2,868 per person for men, as against $1,663 for women. ATLAS enrichment activities per woman cost barely over half of men's when comparing average expenditures per person.
  - Core contractor figures on professional enrichment include tuition, local travel, and perdiem. Less expensive programs are shorter and take place closer to home.

- ***There is virtually no linkage between ATLAS participant programming and the eventual utilization of training upon participant return home following training.***
  - 20 percent of core contractor staff interviewed did not know how Missions determine fields of study or the relationship of ATLAS training to field CPSP objectives.
  - 31 percent of participants surveyed claim they have no job to return to, and an percentage expect great difficulties finding employment upon return.
  - More than 70 percent of Mission personnel responding to the evaluation survey did not know who is tracking impact. Virtually all who said they knew who was tracking impact, also said it was an "ill-defined" area where "improvement is needed."
  - 85 percent of Mission personnel said that the core contractor does not communicate with them about ATLAS impact.

b) Monitoring Participants in Training: Conclusions

- ***The weak linkages between ATLAS programming and the ultimate impact of ATLAS training limits the core contractor's full contribution to the likelihood of the impact of returnees on their countries' development goals.*** This applies both to the scholarship activities themselves and to professional enrichment activities during training.

- ***While the core contractor is in compliance with its contract, more could be done to improve relations with participants in training to build the relationships USAID needs for the future.*** There is a vocal minority of at least 20 percent who are quite critical of how their programs are managed.

- ***The core contractor's field staff's minimal involvement with participants and their employers during training does not take full advantage of this important resource to build relationships and contribute to ATLAS impact following training.***

c) Monitoring Participants in Training: Recommendations

- ***The core contractor should examine its relationship with participants while in training to create a more "user-friendly" relationship than appears to be the case with a substantial minority of the present ATLAS administration team.*** University visits, regular communication, and face-to-face meetings at enrichment activities are all vehicles to improve relations.

- ***Missions should be encouraged to fund the full range of professional enrichment activities available under ATLAS.*** This includes practical training, attendance and professional conferences and participation in management courses.

- ***The network of ATLAS players should be more fully utilized during the period of training.*** Relations with employers, for instance, must be maintained if training is to have its intended impact on return. The distribution of semesterly grade reports is an ideal vehicle to keep up these relationships.

- ***The core contractor's field staff can play a more effective role during the period of training.*** AAI's field staff are a wealth of potential to contribute to ATLAS impact. Measures that involve field staff, employers, Missions, alumni and participants in-training should be devised to enhance alumni relations with USAID and to increase the likelihood of alumni impact upon return.

- ***USAID should consider whether leadership should play a role in ATLAS.*** If so, leadership should be made a standard feature of ATLAS enrichment activities.

4. Postgraduate Study and Research Awards

a) Postgraduate Study and Research Awards: Findings

- ***ATLAS has made 13 postgraduate study and research awards to date***, well below the average necessary to meet the current contract's goal of 100 awards.
  - 9 men and 4 woman have received postgraduate awards.
  - According to core contractor records, four countries have participated in the ATLAS postgraduate component: Zambia (5 awards), Cameroon (4), Madagascar (3) and the Comoros (1).
  - No applications are pending placement for postgraduate study or research fellowships according to the data the core contractor provided to the evaluation team.

- ***The ATLAS postgraduate study and research component uses similar implementation mechanisms to the scholarship component.***
  - Candidates are nominated through channels that vary from country to country but that generally are open, transparent, and include multiple government agencies and universities.
  - Candidacies are approved by Missions, then screened by the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans as a final hurdle prior to placement.
  - The same core contractor staff that are responsible for ATLAS scholarship component implement placement for research awards.

- ***The postgraduate study and research component is nonetheless different from the ATLAS scholarships.***
  - Missions do not necessarily tie postgraduate study and research nominees into their strategic objectives and do not necessarily choose candidates according to proposed field of study or research.
  - No tuition scholarship is required for postgraduate study or research under ATLAS.

- ***No postgraduate study or research projects have taken place at HBCUs.***

b) Postgraduate Study and Research Awards: Conclusions

- ***The postgraduate study and research component of ATLAS is an excellent vehicle to provide refresher courses or research opportunities that build on prior USAID investments in training.***

- ***Participation in the postgraduate study and research component has thus far been low,*** pointing to inadequate Mission awareness of or interest in this ATLAS feature.

- ***Leadership is not incorporated into the ATLAS postgraduate research and study component.***

c) Postgraduate Study and Research Awards: Recommendations

- ***The postgraduate study and research component should be maintained under the ATLAS project.***

- ***The total number of research awards required under the current contract should be adjusted downwards to a more realistic target.***

- ***USAID should conduct a campaign of information, education and communication about the ATLAS postgraduate research and study opportunities*** to encourage participation when Mission strategic objectives can be supported through such activities.

5. Professional Enhancement Activities: Conferences and Symposia

a) Conferences and Symposia: Findings

- ***The core contractor has administered 7 of the 10 conferences stipulated in the contract:***
  - Uganda [10/91] — *The African Family* (regional), followed by the *National Workshop on Project Design and Proposal Preparation*.
  - Senegal [4/92] — *Governance in Africa: Issues in Community Development and Local Participation* (regional), followed by the *National Colloquium: Governance and the Process of Socio-Economic Development: A Senegal Case Study*, funded through a Mission buy-in.
  - Tanzania [11-12/92] — *Export Marketing: Entry Strategies* (East Africa regional).
  - Ghana [12/92] — *Export Marketing: Entry Strategies*, (West Africa regional).
  - Gabon [10/93] — *Natural Resource Management in Africa: Issues in Conservation and Socio-Economic Development* (regional).
  - Namibia [5/94] — *Education in Africa: Resources and Linkages* (regional)
  - Zimbabwe [9/94] — *Managing Development: Experiences and Lessons from Africa* (regional).

- ***Four additional conferences are planned for 1995.*** These are:
  - National Colloquium, Senegal: *Natural Resource Management* — Mission buy-in;
  - Regional Workshop, Zimbabwe: *Professional Enhancement* — core funds;
  - Regional Conference, Côte d'Ivoire: *Agriculture and Agribusiness* — core funds; and
  - Regional Conference, Nigeria: *Maternal Child Health and Population* — core funds.

- ***When these planned conferences have been implemented, the ATLAS core management contractor will have complied with this aspect of its contract.***

- ***Conference topics correspond to general USAID areas of priority interest and are not linked with ATLAS activities or with leadership.*** USAID/W approves all conference topics with Mission concurrence.

- ***Missions are satisfied with the ATLAS conferences and symposia.*** 77 percent of Mission respondents to the evaluation survey judged the conferences as "excellent" and "very useful."

- ***The Project Paper Amendment has facilitated implementation of the ATLAS conference component and increased the proportion of women at ATLAS conferences from 15 to 17 percent.*** Female participation rose to 27 percent in the last three conferences in 1994.

- ***It is virtually impossible to report accurately on the cost of ATLAS conferences.***
  - The core contractor is not required to maintain data on Mission costs, authorized with the PP Amendment.
  - The current management contract requires "a review of professional enhancement activities" and does not require detailed gender-disaggregated financial information on ATLAS conferences.

- ***4 of the 7 conferences or symposia were evaluated.***
  - Evaluations were global. Instruments were administered at the end of conferences/workshops, some of which were five days long.
  - Only 13 out of 23 participants turned in their evaluation forms for one of the conferences.

b) Conferences and Symposia: Conclusions

- ***The ATLAS conferences and symposia are a valued mechanism for US-trained alumni from other USAID projects to build on their existing skills, develop new abilities, and to communicate and create networks with professionals and peers from other countries.*** At least one African organization has sprung up as a result of ATLAS conference activities: the African Education Association, created by participants at the May 1994 Regional Conference on Education in Africa in Namibia.

- ***The core contractor is not setting a standard of excellence in conference evaluation.*** Standard practice is to emphasize and administer evaluation instruments for (some) individual sessions/presenters, work groups, individual days as appropriate, as well as global evaluations.

- ***ATLAS conference topics are not linked to other ATLAS components or priorities or to the project's purpose.***
  - No special steps are taken to link ATLAS conferences to scholarships, grants or information dissemination, according to core contractor and USAID/W ATLAS management.
  - No special steps are taken to make sure that the conferences incorporate topics of special interest to women, according to core contractor and USAID/W ATLAS management.
  - Without adequate participant feedback the contractor cannot begin to improve conference content and delivery nor can the most important "felt need" conference topics be elicited.
  - Mission input and evaluation of conferences presented to date are essential if the contractor is to serve the client adequately.

- ***Conference reports, with one exception, tend to be lengthy summaries of conference proceedings.*** This may not be the most useful format, even for conference attendees. The

Executive Summary produced by the African Academy of Sciences for the ATLAS Conference on Education in Africa: Resources and Linkages, in Namibia, May 16-20, 1994 provides an excellent model in terms of small attractive format and concise content.

c) Conferences and Symposia: Recommendations

- ***We recommend that the conference component of ATLAS be maintained.***

- ***We recommend that USAID consider the purpose of these conferences and consider whether to link them more strongly to the project's purpose.***

- ***We recommend that the core contractor design, field-test and implement a conference evaluation component, including instruments for evaluating individual sessions and presenters, work groups, and individual days, and begin to emphasize its importance. Global evaluations should be considered an integral part of the conference experience; time within the conference schedule should be allocated to administering the instrument and care taken to detail why evaluations are considered critical.***

- ***The above global evaluation instrument also could solicit participant feedback on the "felt need" topics or "hot" topics as perceived by US-trained participants.***

- ***The African Academy of Sciences Executive Summary reporting format should be used for all future conferences.*** Mailing addresses and ideally telephone numbers should be added to the names and titles of participants.

- ***It is also recommended that the core contractor develop a Mission survey instrument to be administered prior to the end of the current contract.*** This instrument should solicit quantitative and qualitative judgements re ATLAS conferences to date and, as well, ask Missions to priority rank topics among a selected topic menu.

6. Professional Enhancement Activities: Grants to African Organizations

a) Grants: Findings

- ***ATLAS has administered $146,294 in grants to 5 African organizations.*** Grants have been awarded to the North American University Alumni Association of the Central African Republic ($26,294), the South African Association for the Advancement of Psychology ($30,000), the Zimbabwe Educational Administration Association ($30,000), the Comparative Education Society of Kenya ($30,000), and the African Educational Association, Côte d'Ivoire ($30,000, of which $10,000 has been disbursed).

- ***Grants totalling $103,783 have been obligated to another 4 organizations.*** Grants have been obligated to the West African Economic Association, Côte d'Ivoire ($30,000), the Association of African Women in Research and Development, Senegal ($30,000), the Foundation Makaranta, Niger ($13,783) and the Geological Society of Kenya ($30,000).

- ***The Africa Bureau has approved $97,118 in ATLAS grants to 4 additional African organizations.*** Grants were approved for the Zonta International Club of Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire ($15,618), Kenya Home Economics Association ($30,000), Women in Science and Technology (WIST),

Ghana ($21,500) and the African Women's Development and Communications Network (FEMNET), Kenya ($30,000).

- ***276 Africans have participated in grant-funded activities, 199 men and 77 women, representing 72 percent and 28 percent respectively.***

- ***Core contractor field representatives, program officers and professional enhancement staff participate in assessing grant applicants, and USAID/W approves all grants.*** Organizational strength, mission, status of organization as a player in host country, and degree to which activity supports both organizational goals and ATLAS objectives are criteria applied to grant proposals.

- ***The core contractor financially administers grants as provided for under the Project Paper Amendment.***

- ***The core contractor provides technical assistance with regard to costs and to planning appropriate activities targeting participant audiences.***

- ***Generally a core contractor staff member participates in grant-funded activities.***

- ***The core contractor places particular emphasis on dissemination of materials and reporting following grant-funded activities to participants, host country officials and Missions.***

b) Grants: Conclusions

- ***The grant component of ATLAS has added breadth to follow-on activities.***

- ***The ATLAS grants component operates independently of all other ATLAS activities.***

c) Grants: Recommendations

- ***We recommend that the grants component be maintained in ATLAS.***

- ***We recommend that core contractor technical assistance include and emphasize appropriate evaluation methodologies for activities funded under ATLAS grants.*** The same methodology developed for conference evaluation — which will set a standard of excellence to be emulated across the continent — should become an integral part of technical assistance efforts to ATLAS grantees.

- ***We recommend that USAID consider whether to use ATLAS grant activities to support other ATLAS activities.***

- ***We recommend that core contractor technical assistance include a standardized reporting format, if possible patterned after the African Academy of Science Executive Summary produced for the Namibia Conference on Education in Africa.***

7. Professional Enhancement Activities: Information Dissemination

a) Information Dissemination: Findings

- *The core contractor does not maintain data on provision of membership in professional societies and corresponding professional subscriptions.*
- *The core contractor has put the necessary mechanisms in place to both compile and distribute IROKO and ATLAS Alert to targeted audiences.*
- *The core contractor has produced and distributed two Annual Directories with ATLAS funding and is currently working on the 1994 edition.* The 1991 and 1992 editions of the Directory were covered under AFGRAD as no returned ATLAS scholars had returned home as yet.
- *Reports from Missions and participants as well as the evaluation team's field work in four representative countries profiled indicate that the Directory's usefulness is minimized by out-of-date information.*

b) Information Dissemination: Conclusions

- *The contractor is in compliance with the contract's information dissemination component.*
- *The Directory of Fellows could be more useful to Missions and AFGRAD/ATLAS alumni and current scholars if data can be kept more current.*

c) Information Dissemination: Recommendations

- *The ATLAS core contractor should make a concerted effort to update Directory entries, using AAI field staff or contracting with Alumni Associations for individual country updates.*

8. Professional Enhancement Activities: Distinguished Alumni Award

a) Distinguished Alumni Award: Findings

- *All 5 Distinguished Alumni Awards were approved in 1991 and 1992, implemented by April 1994, and included a monetary award of $500 each.*
- *While geographical balance is evident (Liberia, Nigeria, Madagascar, Mali and Ghana), all five awards were given to men.*

b) Distinguished Alumni Award: Conclusions

- *The Distinguished Alumni Awards add profile to ATLAS and AFGRAD activities in-country and provide a forum to recognize alumni achievements.*
- *The current core contract has implemented all 5 of its Distinguished Alumni Awards.*
- *Missions and AAI Representatives are apparently not nominating alumnae for this recognition.*

c) Distinguished Alumni Award: Recommendations

- ***We recommend that special efforts be made to locate and make awards to women.***
- ***We recommend that ATLAS increase its publicity of the Distinguished Alumni Award so that more Missions nominate outstanding alumni for recognition.***
- ***We recommend that additional Distinguished Alumni Awards be authorized if the volume of Mission nominations so warrants.***
- ***ATLAS may want to consider establishing a second category of awards — Distinguished Young Alumni — which would highlight development contributions of a younger generation and result in more gender-balanced representation.***

APPENDIX F:

FINANCIAL STATUS, FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING

APPENDIX F: ATLAS FINANCIAL STATUS, FISCAL MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING

1. Description of the ATLAS Financial System

a) Sources of Data

This analysis, as do all others in this evaluation, relies on data obtained during interviews and surveys as well as the printouts provided by the core contractor and AFR/ONI/TPPI.

Our task was to conduct a formative evaluation of the ATLAS project, not a data audit of contractor records. We therefore used the data as provided in performing our analyses, even when we believed that the data might be incomplete or in error. As examples, the core contractor's 10/25/1994 *Participant Trainee Roster* shows a non-degree participant from the Comoros who successfully completed training and returned home (completion code C1) on the day he arrived! This same report listed no gender for 8 participants. Other reports dated 10/26-27/1994 show professional enrichment activities accruing to one woman from Togo with no corresponding expenditures for her enrichment.

All documents reviewed are listed in Appendix L to the *ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 1*; our statistical tabulations of participant data are supplied in Appendix D to the *ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 1*, and in Appendix C to the *Abridged ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 2*. Sources of data and significant data discrepancies are noted at the foot of each table.

b) Mission Budget Transfer Procedure

USAID Missions present their training needs to USAID/W, usually by cable in the 2nd quarter of the fiscal year, in the Country Training Plan (CTP). This document, which includes numbers of scholarships projected and financial requirements for the following year, is based on the Mission's analysis of its training needs in relation to its country and sector strategies.

Upon USAID/W approval of the CTP, the Mission, through its monthly obligation reporting cable, requests that funds for ATLAS be transferred out of its bilateral budget and made available to the core contractor. This most often occurs in April-June.

With the funds of several Missions transferred in this manner, the ATLAS Project Manager in USAID/W prepares a PIO/T in the 3rd quarter, requesting amendment of the core contract to add to these new funds. The core contract is modified in the 4th quarter.

♦ ***Amounts and Trends***

Mission OYB transfers for ATLAS increased steadily from FY90 through FY94 and totaled over $35 million as of FY94. Leaders in transfers during this period were Tanzania ($3.54 million), Benin ($3.35 million), Madagascar ($3.3 million) and Mozambique ($3.09 million).

When ATLAS began in 1990, approximately 40 countries in Africa were eligible to participate in ATLAS. Despite concerns expressed in the project design, it appears that actual budget transfers

under ATLAS have been generally well-managed by USAID/W project management and the Office of Procurement/Africa. The budget transfer procedure has avoided multiple obligating actions each year and has proven to be a wise exception to the Bureau for Africa move toward decentralization and greater Mission autonomy.

The growth ATLAS achieved between FY90 and FY94 as measured by increasing levels of Mission budget transfers might be waning. Of the nine Missions that have closed or are closing in Africa, four (Cameroon, Cape Verde, Togo and Zaire) formerly participated in ATLAS. Moreover, projected budget transfers slumped by 22 percent in FY95, according to current planning. No new countries are projected to participate in ATLAS in FY95 as of USAID/W figures provided to the evaluation team.

The leveling off and subsequent decline in annual budget transfers does not bode well for building the ATLAS constituency. It also raises the possibility in future years that buy-ins may not be sufficiently high to sustain the ATLAS management implementation structure in place. This is all the more reason to assure that those attractive features of ATLAS that distinguish it from AFGRAD, namely professional enhancement activities, are fully implemented.

c) Core Funding

The ATLAS project design estimated that $21 million would be required to administer training programs for some 1,850 participants. Africa regional funds were chosen to cover the administrative costs of participant selection, placement and monitoring because they require up-front and continuous funding.

According to USAID/W, core funds, including overhead and subcontract costs, amounted to $1,800,000 in FY90, $1,714,000 in FY91, $4,016,800 in FY92, $3,000,000 in FY93, and $2,300,000 in FY94, with an additional $3,500,000 projected for FY95.

♦ *Administrative/Overhead Costs*

Core contractor data indicate that AAI administrative costs, overhead and subcontractor costs amounted to $757,702 in 1991, $1,664,518 in 1992, and $1,628,887 in 1993. Core contractor data for 1994 were not available during the evaluation.

♦ *Cost of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans*

ATLAS is getting excellent value for the modest cost: less than $100,000 annually supports the Deans' Committee. In the selection process, they interpret US academic criteria for local selection committees and bring "instant credibility" to the process.

Members of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans travel to Africa to assist Missions with recruitment and meet annually in January at core contractor headquarters in New York for final selection of ATLAS scholarship and postgraduate research candidates. A second Deans' meeting is held in Washington in late June to address policy issues and to perform additional selection of ATLAS candidates.

Apart from the perdiem, airfare and travel-related expenses paid by AAI, the Deans serve without compensation. The core contractor reports that expenditures for the Deans' Committee in 1993 totalled $76,733, of which $56,162 was for international costs and $20,571 was for domestic purposes. In 1994, expenditures increased to $98,420, including international expenditures of $74,800 and domestic expenditures of $23,620.

♦ ***Cost of Core Contractor Field Representatives***

According to AAI, there were 20 AAI Program Representatives in Africa during FY94, nine of whom were based in countries buying in to ATLAS. These included Representatives in Benin, Congo, Guinea, Madagascar, Mozambique, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, and Tanzania. AAI reports that field staff generally work part-time and receive a monthly salary ranging from $248 per month to $543 per month, with the average being $355 per month. Duties relate to ATLAS, AFGRAD and other AAI business.

The 7 ATLAS countries where AAI was not represented in FY94 (Central African Republic, Comoros, Guinea Bissau, Malawi, Namibia, Niger and Uganda) accounted for $3.7 million (42 percent) of the $8.7 million provided in Mission OYB transfers for ATLAS training. In several countries where AAI is represented, Missions expressed concerns about their effectiveness. USAID should examine the roles of the AAI Representatives to determine whether their participation in ATLAS warrants their cost.

d) Cost-Sharing

Continuing the practice begun under the AFGRAD projects, part of the ATLAS funding was to be obtained from graduate tuition scholarships from US universities. ATLAS also planned to seek partial or full scholarships for undergraduate students. The project design calls for US universities to contribute $26 million in tuition scholarships.

The ATLAS core contractor has secured tuition scholarships for all ATLAS participants in graduate programs to date. According to AAI data, tuition scholarships from universities total nearly $5.2 million to date for the 370 ATLAS scholars in graduate programs. AAI has also secured over $800,000 in tuition scholarships for undergraduate scholars, representing some 16 percent of all tuition scholarships.

COST SHARING UNDER ATLAS		
SOURCE OF FUNDS	AMOUNT PROVIDED FY90-FY94	PROPORTION
Mission OYB transfers	$ 35,000,000	65 %
Core funding	$ 13,000,000	24 %
US universities	$ 6,000,000	11 %
Total Funding	$ 54,000,000	100 %

e) Costs to USAID

♦ *Student Costs*

ATLAS project design estimated average annual total training costs for one ATLAS participant in FY91 to be $15,815. This cost, which was to be covered by Mission OYB transfers, included the administrative and overhead costs of the ATLAS contractor which was to be paid by Africa regional core funds.

The core contractor reports that it is not filing the quarterly *Training Cost Analysis (TCA)* reports which training contractors are required to submit to USAID (Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research). While this Handbook 10 requirement is not enforced, and reports that are submitted rarely are analyzed, they do offer a means, however imperfect, of comparing student costs among contractors.

The cost data AAI includes in its annual report are superficial and therefore not useful for the purpose of assessing in financial terms the value USAID is receiving for its ATLAS training dollar. In comments on the financial summary provided in the 1993 annual report, AAI states that "participant costs per month of ATLAS/AFGRAD participant training have increased only slightly compared with costs of AFGRAD training in 1989 of $1,403," or $16,836 per year. Moreover, AAI concludes that ATLAS/AFGRAD has continued to be an extraordinary value to USAID. It also acknowledges that administrative costs per student are higher than costs under AFGRAD and "administrative costs, as a percentage of participant training again declined significantly."

To be meaningful, for example, an analysis of AAI costs related to ATLAS would have to be disaggregated from those costs associated with AFGRAD. Likewise, to compare AAI's student costs with those of other contractors requires common definitions of costs. The evaluation scope of work did not call for such analysis or for the team to define cost items, verify data already accumulated in the AAI mainframe or conduct a student cost analysis for the past four years.

Conventional wisdom in USAID holds that training cost comparisons are nearly impossible because of the diverse ways contractors attribute costs. What constitutes a training month, for example, has never been clearly defined in Handbook 10. Despite these hurdles, systems have been developed elsewhere in USAID which could be readily adopted to provide a tool for those charged with monitoring ATLAS training costs. While such systems do not lend themselves to cost accounting, one can readily assess cost changes between years and between contractors. ATLAS project managers would have useful cumulative cost data to compare AAI contract costs to those of other training contractors.

ATLAS project managers are not in a position to ask the contractor for "cost savings" if data is not being captured. Such a requirement is consistent with AAI's contractual responsibility to comply with Handbook 10.

♦ *Cost of Professional Enrichment Activities*

As supplements to the academic training provided under ATLAS, the contract calls for AAI to provide a variety of enrichment activities: orientation, English Language Training, seminars and professional

societies, short-term practical programs, and seminars in management and re-entry. Mission funding for training includes the cost of these enrichment activities.

According to core contractor figures, ATLAS expenditures on professional enrichment have been steadily increasing since FY90, up from $1,341 in the project's infancy in FY90 to $132,839 in FY94, an increase of two orders of magnitude. Expenditures to date on professional enrichment have totalled $270,455, an average of $67,614 per year.

These figures, however, are not entirely reliable: the core contractor is not required to report independently on the exact cost of enrichment activities. The figures supplied to the evaluation team include all domestic travel, fees, and perdiem and therefore include, for instance, the cost of any airline ticket provided for participants to travel to their universities to begin training. Consequently, these are "ballpark" figures. If USAID is interested in the exact cost of enrichment activities, the core management contract should so specify and the core contractor should be required to maintain separate and accurate cost data.

f) Cost of Professional Enhancement Activities

The estimated life-of project-cost of professional enhancement activities is $14.8 million, or 11 percent of total USAID costs, to cover ATLAS conferences, grants to African organizations, information dissemination, postgraduate research activities, and awards to distinguished alumni.

Since the amendment of the ATLAS Project Paper, core funds can be used towards professional enhancement. At the same time, the core contractor is not required to maintain cost data on Mission-funded professional enhancement activities. Consequently, complete cost data on professional enhancement are not available.

Contractor costs on conferences were difficult to pin down: for example, communications from the core contractor dated 11/4/94 and 11/10/94 provided cost data that varied from $26,390 to $80,043 for the same activities. The evaluation team's final estimate is that $445,316 has been provided for 7 conferences under ATLAS, with 3 additional conferences planned through the expiration of the current core contract on October 30, 1995. This brings the ATLAS conference average to $875 for the conferences' 509 participants.

AAI has disbursed or obligated $250,077 in grants to 9 African organizations. With another $97,118 pending obligation or approval, ATLAS will have disbursed $347,195 in grants, leaving $52,805 available in grants under the current management contract which foresaw $400,000 for this component. It is expected that additional grant requests will be made during the life of the contract and that the $400,000 projected will be disbursed.

The scope of work for this evaluation did not request an analysis of exact costs of the ATLAS information dissemination campaign — publication of the *Alumni Directory* and of the two newsletters, *IROKO* and *ATLAS Alert* — or of the ATLAS postgraduate research component.

The core contractor has provided $2,500 in awards to distinguished alumni: 5 awards at $500 apiece, as mandated in the current management contract. Exact costs for these awards cannot be determined because the contractor was not required to track or report on the costs of AAI staff or members of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans travelling to administer these awards.

g) Training Payment Procedures

♦ ***Payments to Universities***

Over the years it has managed university training, the core contractor has developed an effective four-step procedure for payments to universities: 1) AAI provides a commitment or authorization for a training program to the institution; 2) the university responds with a bill for payment; 3) the Office of Student Finance reviews that bill against the established arrangement with that institution; and 4) a requisition is prepared by Student Finance and forwarded to AAI's central accounting for payment.

♦ ***Payments to Participants***

Payment procedures to students are similar to the basic procedures utilized for university payments. Payments for student stipends, books, typing, and other Handbook 10-authorized payments are processed monthly. The AAI accounting department reviews all student receipts before payments are made.

Closer attention is given to monitoring student finances under ATLAS than under AFGRAD. This is due to the necessity for the core contractor to work within individual ATLAS participant budgets. To manage this task, AAI created an additional Student Finance Program Officer position.

2. Financial Monitoring and Reporting

♦ ***USAID Financial Organization***

Given the nature of the OYB transfer mechanism, whereby Mission funds are de-allowed, re-allowed to USAID/W and obligated through USAID/W amendment of the AAI contract, financial monitoring and accountability is in the Office of Financial Management in Washington.

ATLAS funds are not tracked by the overseas Mission Accounting and Control System (MACS), nor do overseas Missions have responsibility for accounting and reporting on ATLAS. Missions must satisfy themselves that they are getting the services — ATLAS training and field services — that they are buying. Accordingly, Missions are totally dependent upon accurate and timely AAI financial reports.

♦ ***Core Contractor Financial Responsibility, Organization and Reporting***

AAI is meeting its contractual responsibilities "to track each Mission's financial participation in the project and periodically providing USAID/W and the Missions with a financial status report."

Core contractor ATLAS financial management is centered in the Office of Database Management and Student Finance. The two-person staff, strategically placed between the ATLAS implementation staff — Educational Training Advisors, Placement Officers and their teams — integrate the participant program database and the AAI accounting department.

AAI has developed and produces the combined quarterly *ATLAS Financial Report and Participant Roster* for each country participating in ATLAS since the project's inception. It provides concise, clear and potentially useful reports to Missions and USAID/W project managers.

The *Participant Roster* summarizes each Mission's OYB transfers to ATLAS and provides by PIO/P number the following information for each participant: university, degree objective, field of study, entry date, completion date and funds budgeted. Data is provided for participants in training, pending placement and those who have been cancelled.

The *ATLAS Financial Report* section provides data on cumulative expenses through the previous fiscal year, expenses by quarter, cumulative expenses to the report date and the unexpended balance remaining in the participant budget. Again, data is provided for participants in training, those pending placement and cancelled trainees.

The presentation and content of this two-part report should be adequate for the purpose of everyday project management at the Missions. While a systematic and detailed testing of the accuracy of the quarterly reports was not possible during this evaluation, it is apparent from Mission comments as summarized in Appendix G to the *ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 1*, that the usefulness of the report to Missions is diminished by its timing and by actual or perceived inaccuracies.

Since the quarterly reports are vital to ATLAS managers in Missions, it is in the interest of all parties that the core contractor be required to produce accurate and useful tools to manage ATLAS.

Given the uncertainty of diplomatic pouch service to many posts, consideration should be given to sending the quarterly reports via e-mail to assure their timely arrival.

USAID/W should launch a program to improve internal Mission communication. This education campaign should orient Mission staff as to how to read the *ATLAS Financial Report and Participant Roster* and should demonstrate how they should be distributed and used for improved project management.

Although they have produced an integrated database, including financial data on participants, reports of the more general accounting data of the project's financial flows, including core funding and enhancement activities, need to be improved for better project management. The *Annual Reports* which AAI submits to the ATLAS Project Officer at the end of each fiscal year are issued so late that they can only serve as a historical record: reports for the first three years were issued on average 9 months after the reporting periods. ATLAS project management should require the core contractor to issue annual reports no later than the close of the calendar year.

In addition to improving the timeliness of the annual reports, ATLAS annual reports should expand the financial summary information provided to include data on cumulative expenditures as well as expenditures for the reporting period.

3. Cost-Effectiveness

Under the current contract, AAI is not required track the impact of ATLAS activities or to report on costs for professional enrichment activities, on the exact costs of ATLAS conferences, to cite some examples. Without accurate data on impact (effectiveness) or on expenditures (cost), the cost-effectiveness of ATLAS cannot be determined.

4. Cost Comparisons: Men Versus Women

Exact gender-disaggregated cost data on scholarships was not available, and as seen above, the core contractor is not required to maintain gender-disaggregated cost data on professional enhancement activities.

Expenditures on ATLAS professional enrichment activities are not evenly apportioned by gender. Women account for 22 percent of expenditures on professional enrichment activities to date: $58,208 of the $270,455 spent between FY91 and FY94. Expenditures on men total $212,247, or 78 percent of total expenses. Enrichment costs average $2,868 per person for men as against $1,663 for women. In other words, ATLAS enrichment activities per woman cost barely over half of men's when comparing average expenditures per person.

The core contractor is maintaining those cost data required under the current management contract. Therefore, if additional cost analysis is of interest to USAID, the upcoming new management contract should so specify and the core contractor should be required to maintain and report on exact gender-disaggregated costs for scholarships, professional enrichment, and professional enhancement activities under ATLAS.

APPENDIX G:

FEEDBACK FROM ATLAS PLAYERS

APPENDIX G: FEEDBACK

This evaluation bases its findings on responses from surveys and face-to-face interviews conducted with a wide range of audiences that are stakeholders in the ATLAS project. Separate interview instruments and questionnaires were developed as tools to collect comparable information from this range of parties; these are provided in Appendix O to the *ATLAS Evaluation, Volume 1*.

This appendix contains some of the most significant data which have been aggregated and summarized, including responses from the following audiences:

- The USAID/W ATLAS management team
- USAID/W policy-makers
- USAID Missions
- Core contractor senior management
- Core contractor program officers
- Core contractor placement staff
- Core contractor field representatives
- The ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans
- The US university community
- Project subcontractors
- ATLAS participants
- Host country nominating agency personnel
- Participant and alumni employers.

1. The USAID/W ATLAS Management Team

The evaluation team interviewed the three principal members of the USAID/W ATLAS Management Team as of the date the evaluation began. One is a US Direct Hire employee, and the other two, RSSAs provided by the US Department of Agriculture. The two RSSA respondents have been with ATLAS since its beginning while the Direct Hire (DH) respondent had been serving as Project Officer for eighteen months (and left ATLAS mid-way through the evaluation). The two RSSAs serve as Senior and Associate Training Advisor and handle the bulk of the day-to-day management and operational issues. The Project Officer is responsible for overall ATLAS management and direction.

When asked what they considered to be the most important ATLAS achievements, two respondents indicated that the professional enhancement component deserves the most credit while other aspects such as the focus on women, cost sharing with Missions and the project's evolution from AFGRAD were also cited as important.

When asked what they would do to market ATLAS more effectively, the ATLAS management team responded:

- obtain senior African Bureau advocacy for training in general and ATLAS in particular;
- continue to place the most emphasis on countries that have already bought in.

♦ *ATLAS and Missions*

The respondents believe that USAID Missions have mixed views on ATLAS: some believe in long term training, and others do not. One respondent rates overall Mission "ownership" of ATLAS as quite low while the other two rate it as quite high.

Respondents are satisfied with how the OYB transfer process is working. They viewed the Mission role in professional enhancement activities as minimal. One member of the ATLAS management team does not believe the Missions' role is sufficient and would like to see them be more active in the grants process. The other two managers are more satisfied with the Mission role since the degree of involvement in professional enhancement activities is a Mission choice.

All respondents indicate that the Missions link ATLAS to their CPSP objectives. One respondent states that Missions submit formal Country Training Plans, while a second respondent indicates that such plans are not required under ATLAS.

♦ *ATLAS and Small Countries*

The USAID/W ATLAS management team believes that ATLAS has been very effective in implementing the Bureau's Small Country Strategy, the only constraints being the dwindling number of field missions, limited funds and lack of DH presence in these countries. When asked what changes they would make in how ATLAS is managed in small countries, they indicated:

- establish a field Mission;
- the core contractor and USAID/W should be more consistent with follow-up;
- there should be an assured core contractor presence rather than relying on State Department or Peace Corps support.

♦ *ATLAS and USAID/W Policy*

The ATLAS management team indicated that there is no formal system for informing USAID/W higher level management about ATLAS and would like this to be changed and formalized as part of the DH's responsibilities. The team suggested such measures as regular briefings of senior management and access to such senior officers as Mission Directors at strategic meetings. When asked about the impact the closeout of USAID Missions in Africa might have on ATLAS's future, one respondent indicated that it depends on how many more Missions will close out.

♦ *ATLAS and the Core Contractor*

The respondents believe that the core contractor is doing a good job implementing ATLAS but that the transition from AFGRAD to ATLAS has been "problematical." Respondents indicated that AAI's institutional stability has been a plus, though its internal management seems top-heavy. The ATLAS management team members were not aware of any problems with AAI's staffing pattern or level of effort but seem to have limited knowledge in these areas.

When asked if they were satisfied with how AAI was defining and tracking impact in preparing for an eventual impact evaluation, one respondent said "no," another did not know, and the third said "yes" inasmuch as AAI had done as much as required of them, inferring that the lack of progress in this

area was the Agency's responsibility, not the contractor's. This respondent stated that "AAI needs more direction from USAID" on how to approach impact assessment defining and tracking.

All three respondents believe that their relations with AAI are quite good and give them high marks in cooperativeness, responsiveness and productivity, with the lowest in the latter. One respondent indicated that relations with AAI staff were not as good as those with the Chief of Party.

All three respondents believe AAI is executing its contract satisfactorily. When asked if there were any areas in which the contractor could improve its performance, they indicated:

- faster and more timely reporting to the field;
- faster response to field inquiries;
- consistency of staff performance;
- better use of the core contractor's representatives in the field;
- improved staff development;
- greater delegation to staff by the Chief of Party;
- better project management when things fall through the cracks.

The evaluation team asked the USAID ATLAS management team to rate the core contractor's performance in forty-eight discrete areas of project activity. Respondents gave AAI satisfactory to very high marks in all but the following four areas:

- handling requests for extensions;
- assisting with participants re-entry;
- defining the impact of ATLAS training;
- tracking the impact of ATLAS training.

The three respondents rated AAI's overall administration of ATLAS as satisfactory to quite good. One indicated that it has improved over what it was with AFGRAD. Another indicated that AAI has taken steps to rectify some shortcomings in ATLAS by submitting more timely overall reports as well as taking steps to assure that requests for participant extensions come in sooner.

When asked if they thought that AAI's reputation after 30 years' experience in Africa was an advantage or disadvantage, one respondent indicated that it was both, while the other considered it more a disadvantage than an advantage stating that AAI "is perceived by many to be guaranteed a place at the USAID table, deserved or not."

The respondents were asked if they thought the core contractor's Africa-based field staff were effective. One indicated in the affirmative, another indicated that it varied from country to country while the third felt that the Representatives were not trained and don't understand "hands-on" responsibilities under ATLAS. When asked what changes they would make in how the Representatives function, the respondents suggested:

- the Representatives should be more proactive;
- AAI should have clear performance standards for the Representatives;
- The Representatives' new role should be defined as providing services;
- the Representatives should be respectful of Mission money.

♦ *ATLAS Financial Management*

The RSSA respondents had limited knowledge of various financial procedures such as costs related to obtaining tuition scholarships or how AAI makes payments to universities or students, stating that such matters are the core contractor's responsibility. One respondent indicated that AAI complies with standard Agency financial reporting systems and submits vouchers and reports as required by the contract. The two RSSA respondents indicate that all matters related to AAI financial management are the responsibility of the DH Project Officer.

♦ *USAID Management of ATLAS*

In a response to a question asking whether the turnover in project management had an effect on ATLAS implementation, all three respondents indicated yes and gave such reasons as:

- lack of institutional memory and continuity;
- overwhelming reliance on RSSAs for DH functions;
- loss of "big picture" such as impact;
- sloppier monitoring;
- lack of direction and consistency.

The entire USAID ATLAS management team felt the use of RSSAs has had an effect on project implementation, giving the following examples:

- "They (RSSAs) have saved it!"
- "A superb staff who understand diverse roles of USAID/W, Missions and the contractor."
- The RSSAs have provided "stability" and "good management."
- The RSSAs serve as brokers between the DH and the core contractor.

The respondents were next asked if they thought USAID's reorganization will have an effect on ATLAS implementation. All three replied in the affirmative, stating that they expected the effect to be largely adverse for such reasons as:

- the OYB transfer process will be more complicated;
- the African Bureau has "lost interest;"
- the Global Bureau Project Officer will have even less time (than the current DH) to devote to ATLAS;
- the Global Bureau has limited knowledge of ATLAS.

When asked to rate USAID/W's management of the project, two respondents gave the Agency a satisfactory rating while the third rated management performance as less than satisfactory. The respondents cited the following as major constraints affecting ATLAS implementation:

- lack of senior African Bureau advocacy;
- lack of continuity, consistency and historical memory;
- constant organizational changes within the Agency;
- the management burden on one DH and two RSSAs.

When asked what changes they would make in ATLAS if they could, the respondents indicated:

- increase the contact among USAID/W, AAI and the Missions;
- keep ATLAS in the Africa Bureau;
- provide core-funded scholarships to prime the pump;
- assign more DH staff to manage the project;
- retain the services of a Project Officer for an extended period;
- seek ways to involve all countries in ATLAS even if it means providing core funds;
- provide the core contractor with its own cable facilities.

♦ ***Observations***

The three-person USAID/W ATLAS management team provides the project with a conscientious, competent and enthusiastic capability. However, frequent turnover in the Project Officer's position has been a continuous problem since ATLAS began — there have been five different officers in less than five years! Indeed, the Project Officer interviewed in this study, who provided solid leadership over the past eighteen months, is no longer responsible for the project inasmuch as ATLAS was transferred to the Global Bureau while this evaluation was underway and the Project Officer remained in the Africa Bureau.

ATLAS has been fortunate in having two capable and dedicated RSSA employees assigned to it but they are by definition restricted in their authority and outside the USAID mainstream which impacts adversely on the profile of the project within the Agency.

A second major constraint affecting ATLAS is the reduction in USAID Missions in Africa and in available funds for overseas training in general and ATLAS in particular. ATLAS, as a USAID designed project, has not as yet succeeded in building a strong constituency despite the growth in Mission ownership fostered by the OYB process.

A third constraint is the recent transfer of ATLAS to the Global Bureau where the project is virtually unknown and stands to lose the limited constituency it previously had.

While total ATLAS funding levels may have peaked and might gradually decrease over the next several years, there is every indication that the project is sufficiently rooted and will continue despite the constraints described above.

2. USAID/W Policy-Makers

Washington decision-makers interviewed divide themselves into believers and skeptics about the value of human resource development. Of the five persons interviewed, only one was willing to answer quantitative questions. He described himself as "biased toward using education as tool to make friends" and rated highly the performance of both the ATLAS core contractor and USAID/W ATLAS management.

Skeptics cited their perception of low repatriation rates associated with academic training in general and stated their belief that impact on development was negative. Another opinion raised was the perceived impact of high AIDS infection rates on both Mission costs and development in general. The lack of Africa Bureau standard policy on AIDS testing prior to scholarships being awarded was considered to be a problem facing ATLAS along with other human resource development projects.

The AIDS pandemic was also cited as a reason to re-think key human resource development issues in general and ATLAS in specific: African universities may require innovative approaches from donors because of deaths among university faculty.

Among both believers and skeptics there was agreement that more reporting on ATLAS within the Africa Bureau was needed and that ATLAS to date has not demonstrated scholarship awards to be critical to the development process. AFGRAD and now ATLAS continue to be thought of as the "right thing to do" and remain peripheral to agency development theory.

Concerns about the project's lack of constituency within the Agency have been heightened by the ATLAS move to the Global Bureau. If reporting within the Africa Bureau has been lacking, if ATLAS continues to be viewed as peripheral to DFA objectives, what will the move to Global mean for the project?

3. USAID Missions

The evaluation survey of 25 Missions and 2 REDSOs elicited responses from 11 Missions and 1 REDSO, representing a 44 percent response rate. A total of 21 Mission employees responded formally to survey questionnaires; the evaluation team interviewed another 9 Mission officials.

♦ *ATLAS Recruitment and Selection*

Nearly 100 percent of Mission respondents noted two aspects of ATLAS that differ from AFGRAD: a much greater role for the USAID Mission and a more open, competitive selection process.

All respondents said that the choice of fields of study under ATLAS was based on the Mission's strategic objectives (or CPSP) and on the country's training needs.

81 percent of respondents reported that ATLAS scholarships were linked to specific strategic objectives.

There was unanimity that ATLAS was not and should not target specific employers or institutions. The most common reasons offered were the difficulty finding enough qualified candidates in targeted institutions, and the resulting compromise of the open selection process.

Of the 11 Missions responding to the survey, 7 Missions (64 percent) reported having a field-based core contractor staff member in-country. Of these, 43 percent reported that the core contractor's field staff played either no role or a marginal one in ATLAS recruitment and selection. More than one Mission complained that they had never seen the terms of reference explaining what the core contractor field staff was supposed to be doing.

Special steps to recruit women, such as giving priority to them in advertising ATLAS and direct contacts with women's groups, were deemed to be effective by 80 percent of the Mission personnel surveyed.

♦ *ATLAS Placement*

Overall, the ATLAS placement process was rated "good" to "very good" by 87 percent of respondents. The nearly universal complaint was that the process takes too long and that perhaps USAID should reassess the whole concept of requiring tuition scholarships from participating universities, if requiring scholarships is causing the delays.

Over 90 percent of the Mission respondents said that utilization of HBCUs was determined by the core contractor, and 60 percent thought that this was an effective way to determine how to use HBCUs.

67 percent of Mission personnel consider ATLAS placement at HBCUs to be "poor" to "good." Among the reasons Missions recognized for problems using HBCUs were the lack of tuition scholarships, lack of quality education in the fields required by the Missions, and inadequate library and research facilities for graduate study.

♦ *Monitoring ATLAS Participants*

80 percent of respondents see no change in how ATLAS participants are monitored compared to AFGRAD. Many did note that because the Missions were so involved in ATLAS compared to AFGRAD, they were seeing, for example, more academic progress reports for individual students.

While 63 percent of all Mission personnel surveyed thought AAI was doing a "very good" to "excellent" job monitoring participants in training, two out of twenty respondents rated AAI's performance as "very poor."

Nearly all Missions commented that there was considerable room for improvement in monitoring ATLAS participants. Better and more timely communications with the Missions, especially improved financial reports and academic reports, were recommended. Several respondents urged that the core contractor be authorized to use e-mail.

There is great confidence among the Missions that participants will return home after ATLAS training. Of the Missions surveyed, 90 percent anticipated no problems with repatriation, and 73 percent of the Mission personnel surveyed believe AAI is "very good" in assisting with repatriation.

Opinions regarding AAI's handling of extensions of training time or increases in funding are about evenly divided. While nearly 65 percent of Mission respondents reported having more than one month advance notice, about one-third cited this as an area for improvement.

♦ *ATLAS Professional Enhancement Activities*

When asked about participation in ATLAS professional enhancement activities, Mission respondents reported:

- 80 percent participated in conferences or symposia;
- 13 percent participated in grants to African organizations;
- 100 percent receive *IROKO*;
- 100 percent receive *ATLAS Alert*;

110

- 100 percent receive the annual *Directory of Fellows*;
- 50 percent participated in postgraduate fellowships;
- 13 percent participated in Distinguished Alumni Awards.

When asked to rate the usefulness of ATLAS professional enhancement activities:

- 77 percent found the conferences and symposia to be "excellent";
- 85 percent consider *IROKO* to be "good" to "very good";
- 92 percent found *ATLAS Alert* to be "good" or better;
- 64 percent consider the *Directory of Fellows* "very good" or better;
- 95 percent consider the ATLAS postgraduate research component to be "good" or better;
- 95 percent rate the Distinguished Alumni Award to be "good";
- 100 percent consider the core contractor's management of professional enhancement activities to be "very good" or better.

For most professional enhancement activities, the Missions have limited their roles to consultation, planning and to helping to identify and fund participants.

♦ *Relations with the ATLAS Core Contractor*

Mission respondents were about evenly divided in opinion as to whether relations between the ATLAS core contractor and Missions had changed since AFGRAD.

- 81 percent reported that they communicated with AAI/New York at least once a month;
- 50 percent have contact with AAI/New York more than once a month;
- 73 percent of Mission respondents believe that this is enough communication with AAI/New York.

60 percent of those surveyed said they were satisfied with their relations with the core contractor.

Nearly every respondent suggested areas for core contractor improvements. These included:

- improved and more timely monitoring reports of academic progress and of financial management;
- clarification of the role of core contractor field staff;
- a proposed workshop to introduce AAI/ATLAS to USAID staff;
- a procedures manual to help reduce problems resulting from personnel turnover in the Missions.

♦ *Relations with USAID/W*

Nearly 82 percent of Mission respondents said relations between USAID/W and the Missions had not changed since AFGRAD.

- 80 percent believe that overall relations with USAID/W are "very good" to "excellent."
- 72 percent expressed satisfaction with the OYB transfer procedure.

When asked to rate relations with USAID/W, survey results showed:

- 69 percent judged USAID/W to be "very good" or better in planning ATLAS training, while 31 percent considered them "poor" to "very poor" in this area;
- 54 percent found USAID/W "very good" or better in monitoring ATLAS trainees, and 31 percent considered them "poor" to "very poor" in this area;
- 73 percent found USAID/W to be "very good" or "excellent" in responding to special actions;
- USAID/W's commitment to ATLAS is judged "very good" or better by 76 percent of those surveyed in the Missions.

Despite generally favorable opinions of the USAID/W role in ATLAS, Mission respondents want "better reporting and communications," especially "accurate records of expenditures and commitments."

A majority of the Missions expressed concern in one form or another about moving ATLAS project management to the Global Bureau. "Keep the team together, and in the (Africa) Bureau," is a common sentiment.

♦ ***Financial Management***

All but one Mission acknowledged receiving financial reports and 70 percent found their content to be very good or better, yet there is little evidence that AAI's financial reports are being used by the Mission's to manage ATLAS. About 20 percent of respondents felt that the financial data provided was inaccurate or not timely.

The Missions offered numerous suggestions to change how data is gathered, maintained and reported on. More than one respondent urged that AAI's data be formatted in a way that will permit it to be downloaded directly into PTMS.

● ***ATLAS and Impact***

More than 70 percent of Mission personnel responding to the evaluation survey did not know who is tracking impact. Virtually all who said they knew who was tracking impact, also said it was an "ill-defined" area where "improvement is needed." 85 percent of Mission personnel said AAI was not communicating with them about ATLAS impact.

Mission personnel appear to understand how impact is defined for scholarships only in the most general way, mentioning changes in individual performance, organizational productivity, performance of the work unit and organization as a whole in the sector and changes in participant thinking and practices. Apart from the efforts of USAID/Guinea, none of the Missions reported plans for the systematic assessment of ATLAS impact.

Planning for impact should be given higher priority than it has to date. Files and institutional memory, important elements in trying to measure impact, may be lost forever when Missions close or when personnel turns over.

♦ *ATLAS Overall*

In their overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, Mission personnel were by and large satisfied.

- 86 percent rated AAI/New York's performance "very good" or better;
- 23 percent rated local core contractor field staff's performance "very good" or better;
- 79 percent rated their Mission's performance "very good" or better;
- 64 percent rated USAID/W performance "very good" or better;
- 79 percent rated ATLAS in general "very good" or better.

The AIDS epidemic, transfers of trained individuals and inadequate professional enhancement were mentioned as issues which might decrease the likelihood of ATLAS's or of individual alumni's impact. Remedies proposed included funding for alumni associations and professional enhancement for employers and colleagues because "research shows that participants are underutilized and have diminished impact when these players are not brought into the game."

When asked what changes in ATLAS they would make, Mission responses fell into four categories:

- *Decrease placement time.* Nearly every respondent urged that something be done, and soon, to reduce the extraordinary time required to place participants. Multiple simultaneous placement efforts by AAI were frequently suggested.
- *Financial accounting.* Better and more timely financial reports were recommended by several respondents. This is especially important because the Missions depend on the core contractor as the sole source of financial accounting information.
- *Planning for impact.* Missions commented that they are so focused on getting "the best and brightest" that they would welcome help learning how to measure impact. If Mission workshops are not possible, USAID should at least take up the conversation about impact under ATLAS.
- *Reduce training costs.* Missions revealed an undercurrent of dissatisfaction about the perceived high cost of ATLAS. More revealing financial reporting by AAI and better Mission utilization of existing reports would inform Missions about ATLAS student costs and how they compare to those of other projects.

4. Core Contractor Senior Management

Two senior ATLAS management staff at AAI completed a detailed questionnaire responding to a wide range of questions regarding their views of ATLAS. One of the two has been with AAI for 28 years, providing a very useful historic perspective especially in comparing ATLAS with AFGRAD. The other respondent has been with AAI for 3½ years. Both respondents believe that the initiation of professional enhancement activities is the most important ATLAS achievement to date.

♦ *ATLAS Recruitment and Selection*

Both respondents consider the increased involvement of the USAID Missions as the major difference between ATLAS and AFGRAD. One respondent states that Missions link ATLAS fields of study and the level of their buy-ins to their country strategies, the interest of the Mission Director in long-term training and the availability of funds. Neither respondent believes there is any linkage to specific

African employers. They share a similar view that selection criteria are fairly standardized from country to country and are based on such factors as the academic and work experience of the candidate along with test results and fields of study. They describe the role of the Deans as "interested" and "engaged" and that their chief functions are to interview candidates, participate in selection and interpret US academic standards to Missions in much the same fashion as they did under AFGRAD, except that some of them are now also involved in ATLAS professional enhancement activities. When asked if there are any particular issues with the Deans, they responded that the Deans are concerned over how ATLAS is evolving into a professional/vocational program and that there are not enough PhD scholars. They also indicated that they are looking for ways to become more involved. One of the senior management respondents thought that the Deans felt their role was not sufficiently recognized by USAID.

When asked what role the AAI Representatives play in recruitment and selection, one AAI senior management respondent indicated that it varied from country to country but generally included sending announcements, collecting candidate dossiers, pre-screening, tracking down missing data, and so on. With regard to increasing the participation of women, the respondents indicated that emphasis on women candidates is reflected in advertisements, women's organizations are encouraged to spread the word, and that Mission and REDSO WID officers assist in outreach. They believe these efforts to be effective inasmuch as the female percentage is gradually increasing. The respondents had a similar reaction when asked about private sector participation.

When asked what changes in recruitment would they make if they could, they suggested the following things:

- use core funds in countries where no ATLAS funds are available;
- increase Mission/AAI collaborative efforts in some countries;
- recruit candidates in broader categories.

The respondents rate the overall ATLAS recruitment and selection process as quite good to very good, with low ratings only in the categories of recruiting women and Missions' role in recruitment. The respondents see little difference in the ATLAS placement process as compared to AFGRAD. They indicated that both AAI and NAFEO are active in placing students in HBCUs and that these efforts are effective except for such constraints as the difficulty in obtaining tuition scholarships and the paucity of graduate level programs.

When asked the key constraints in placing ATLAS scholars, one of the respondents indicated:

- problems in placing MBA and MPH students;
- problems in placing students with Russian degrees — though the respondent might have meant a host of others including those from Cuban, South African and Eastern European institutions.

One of the respondents suggested that the "single shot" placement policy (one school at a time) was not the best way and results in ATLAS students not being placed in the most competitive schools. When asked to rate the ATLAS placement process, only one of the two senior managers responded by giving placement high marks in every area but in HBCU placements.

114

♦ *Monitoring ATLAS Participants*

When asked if there are any changes in how ATLAS participants are monitored as compared to AFGRAD, one senior manager indicated that the process is very similar except under ATLAS there are more standardized forms and usage, and greater emphasis on reporting to Missions. This same manager indicated that a participant's enrichment activities are defined by the participant and his/her academic adviser concerning professional meetings, and by AAI staff with regard to other types of enrichment activities such as re-entry workshops and management seminars. The respondents concluded that AAI's monitoring process is quite good overall but detected room for improvement in three areas:

- assisting with participants' re-entry;
- defining the impact of ATLAS training;
- tracking the impact of ATLAS training.

♦ *Professional Enhancement Activities*

One of the two respondents indicated that special steps are taken to ensure that ATLAS conferences and symposia cover topics of special interest to women — such as health as a women's issue — as well as satisfaction with the overall management of ATLAS conferences and symposia. The only suggested changes are:

- to make sure that they are not held in isolation but are linked to other aspects of ATLAS such as the grants program;
- to improve the reporting process in order for the results of professional enhancement activities to attract to and reach a wider audience.

One of the two respondents states that there are no written criteria for selecting African organizations to receive ATLAS grants, nor are any special steps taken to make sure that grants are provided to organizations whose membership or clientele are primarily women. These views were contradicted by the second respondent who claims that there are, indeed, written criteria and steps are taken by AAI to appeal to women to become involved in the grant process. Both respondents indicate satisfaction with the grants component and have no changes to suggest in this phase of professional enrichment.

With regard to the ATLAS postgraduate research component, one respondent rates the both advertising process and the recruitment of women as less effective than other aspects. The other respondent urges Missions to become more involved so that this component can expand.

The next element discussed was the Distinguished Alumni Award in which one respondent urged that more nominations be received from the field. The other respondent rated the Distinguished Award program as fairly effective but gave a relatively lower mark to its advertising and the lowest possible rating to its record in recruiting of women for recognition.

♦ *Relations with Missions*

Both core contractor senior management respondents believe that ATLAS has been effectively marketed but that more needs to be done especially in light of Mission closings. They would like to

increase AAI's role in all aspect of marketing ATLAS. With regard to overall relations between AAI and the Missions, one of the respondents indicated that relations have changed since AFGRAD days, with more frequent communication with USAID. Overall, the respondents are satisfied with their Mission relations and consider the reverse to be the case as well. One respondent did note less satisfaction with Mission involvement in professional enhancement activities.

With respect to relations with USAID/W, both respondents felt that relations have changed since AFGRAD, primarily due to greater USAID involvement in ATLAS. They feel their overall relations with USAID/W are good and indicate the only area that might be improved is USAID/W involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees. When asked if they could change anything in how they interact with USAID/W one raised the wish that ATLAS would remain in the Bureau for Africa to preserve its constituency.

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

When asked how the process for assessing AAI/New York's level of effort and staffing pattern works, senior managers referred to it as "fluid." One respondent suggested there could be more sharing of Program Assistants, and that tasks could be consolidated and standardized. The other respondent suggested that the caseload of other similar organizations be looked at for comparative purposes. With respect to the AAI Representatives' responsibilities, one senior manager stated that they have changed, especially in the areas of USAID Mission relations and ATLAS marketing but that, in general, the Representatives have adapted well to their new roles. When asked about the status of the proposed ATLAS Operations Manual, one of the senior managers stated that it was 98 percent complete. When asked if ATLAS was meeting its EOPS targets, the one senior manager indicated in the negative in the following areas:

- undergraduate scholarships;
- masters degree scholarships;
- PhD scholarships;
- use of HBCUs;
- number of postgraduate research awards;
- number of Distinguished Alumni awards.

When asked if they thought subcontractors have been effectively used, the manager who responded said the results were mixed: NAFEO has brought in some new schools but there could be more; AAS probably will be effective and develop into something bigger; MSI was not too useful; and ADL is not really a subcontractor.

As an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, the manager who responded thought that things are going well with ATLAS in general but found USAID Mission performance to vary from not too effective to very effective. When asked what changes in ATLAS one would make, the respondent suggested two items:

- have a centrally-funded component focussing on excellence;
- provide regional funds for countries with no buy-ins.

In conclusion, one respondent indicated that AAI should be more active in marketing ATLAS.

♦ *Observations*

It is obvious from reviewing the two questionnaires received from senior ATLAS management that one of the two is considerably more involved in day-to-day ATLAS operations and in a position to provide greater insight into the core contractor's management of the project. The views of senior management are for the most part harmonious with those expressed by AAI program and placement staff and the Field Representatives, reflecting a fairly coherent communication flow between the various staff levels and with the field.

From a substantive point of view, the major considerations emerging from this AAI senior management survey appear to be:

- concern over how ATLAS will fair organizationally in USAID/W;
- concern over how to most effectively market ATLAS in a period of shrinking budgets and fewer USAID countries.

5. Core Contractor Placement and Program Officers

The evaluation team interviewed the three AAI staff members primarily involved with ATLAS participant placement and programming matters. As a group, these three officers have twenty two years experience with AAI, one with fifteen, the second with five and the third with two years, and represent the entire senior ATLAS placement work force.

The evaluation team also interviewed all six AAI Program Officers, also referred to as Education and Training Advisors (ETAs). The average length of service with AAI of the respondents is twelve years with the span ranging from five to twenty-five years.

The first question the Program Officers were asked was what they thought were the most important ATLAS achievements to date. They singled out the publications: *IROKO*, *ATLAS Alert* and the improved *Directory*, as well as increased participation of women as the most important achievements. Others cited professional enhancement activities in general as the most important.

♦ *ATLAS Recruitment and Selection*

When asked in what ways is recruitment of ATLAS candidates different from AFGRAD, three of the respondents felt there was little difference except for greater involvement of the private sector, the addition of undergraduate studies, greater involvement of Missions and outreach to women. AAI staff believe that Missions determine the fields of study to sponsor and the size of the ATLAS program based on their country strategies and objectives and the extent to which ATLAS-type training meets a need. They do not believe that Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific African employers although most candidates are employed prior to selection. All three respondents share the same understanding of the selection criteria for ATLAS candidates as well as the important and active role of the ATLAS Deans in recruitment and selection which they think is quite similar to their earlier role under AFGRAD.

When asked what role they thought the AAI Representatives play in recruitment and selection, while one indicated that it varies from country to country, all respondents stated that the Representatives' role in general is to assist in and coordinate all aspects of in-country pre-departure activities.

However, they recognize that USAID Missions are far more involved than they were in AFGRAD which in some cases has marginalized the role of the AAI Representative.

AAI staff think that ATLAS is doing a good job in its steps to increase the participation of women in such areas as targeted advertising, and meeting with women's groups to encourage more female applicants. They also feel that efforts to increase private sector participation are effective but they are less sure of results in this area than with female participation. The only suggestion the respondents had regarding changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited concerned reducing the number of public sector candidates and reaching out further to the private sector, especially NGOs, to broaden the candidate pool. Overall, the respondents gave high marks to the ATLAS recruitment and selection process.

When asked what changes they would make in the recruitment process, AAI staff's general response was for AAI to be more involved in marketing ATLAS, reaching broader audiences, and extending knowledge to the countryside. They rated the overall recruitment and selection process in virtually all aspects to be satisfactory to very good, the only exceptions being one respondent who gave a low rating to recruiting women, another to the role of the ATLAS Deans and a third to USAID/W's role in recruitment and selection.

♦ ***ATLAS Placement***

The respondents believe that ATLAS placement is not too different from the AFGRAD process except that it is more disciplined and effective primarily because of the use of the database. They do indicate that there are more candidates arriving in the US for ELT prior to placement than under AFGRAD. Two of the three respondents state that the Missions are active in determining ATLAS study programs while the third states that they are not except for approving the TIP. With respect to utilization of HBCUs, the respondents indicated that undergraduate programs are more promising. They feel that in general ATLAS is effective with respect to determining how to use HBCUs, the major constraint being the difficulty in obtaining tuition scholarships from member institutions.

With respect to the constraints in placing ATLAS scholars, the respondents indicated certain fields of study were more difficult than others, citing veterinary sciences, forestry and public health. They also pointed out the problem of Missions calling forward candidates before placement has been secured as well as the difficulties placing non-anglophone participants with low GRE, GMAT or TOEFL scores. When asked what they would change in the placement process, they indicated:

- give AAI the right to veto call forwards;
- send multiple applications to various universities simultaneously to save time.

The respondents rated the ATLAS placement as quite high in all aspects: placing for undergraduate degrees, for masters degrees and for doctorates as well as placing students in HBCUs.

♦ ***Monitoring ATLAS Participants***

All respondents indicated that there were changes in how ATLAS participants are monitored as compared to AFGRAD, the main differences being in closer financial management — although several respondents indicated this was more in theory than practice — and the increase in the number of conditional admissions prior to acceptable TOEFL, GMAT or GRE scores.

The Program Officers indicated that they provide orientation for all arriving ATLAS scholars, generally of one week duration, and that they keep in touch with them thereafter normally once a month on average, depending on individual needs. With respect to a participant's enrichment activities, the respondents indicated that they are defined by a wide audience including AAI staff, academic advisors, AAI subcontractors and the participants themselves. When asked of their awareness of how AAI is tracking the impact of ATLAS training, three of the five respondents indicated they thought an impact study was undertaken, (probably referring to the recent AFGRAD evaluation which has not yet been released). One respondent thought it was too early to track ATLAS impact and the remaining two indicated no knowledge on the subject.

When the Program Officers were asked to rate AAI's monitoring process in various aspects of the program, they gave high marks to the following areas:

- providing orientation;
- monitoring participants in training;
- providing enrichment;
- assisting with repatriation;
- handling requests for extensions;
- handling difficult repatriations.

They rated the following areas at the low end of the scale:

- assisting with participants' re-entry;
- defining and tracking the impact of ATLAS training;
- monitoring English language training.

When asked what changes they would make in AAI's monitoring process, three made the following suggestions:

- AAI monitoring and placement staff should work more closely together;
- Program Officers and Program Assistants should work more as a team;
- USAID should establish clear policies on computers for participants;
- USAID Mission involvement should be reduced in such areas as participant orientation and monitoring;
- AAI should make better use of the database — "We now have access to data; let's use it."

♦ *Other ATLAS Components*

Two of the three Placement Officers had limited knowledge of the postgraduate research component: one indicated that this is handled almost exclusively by one AAI Officer. The one who is knowledgeable rates this component as quite successful but would improve the advertising process and consider extending the training period from six month to one year, as requested by some universities.

♦ *Relations with USAID*

The Placement Officers believe that USAID/W's steps to market ATLAS have been effective. One of the three contends that relations with USAID/W are much closer than they were under AFGRAD;

especially at the Chief of Party level. All three are satisfied with their relations with USAID/W and believe the converse is also true. They rate their overall relations with USAID/W as quite high although one of the three rates them low in the area of USAID/W involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees. The only change in relations suggested by the respondents was to have greater personal contact between the parties.

When asked if they thought relations between AAI and the Missions had changed since AFGRAD, the response was in the affirmative primarily due to greater Mission involvement in all aspects of the program. The Placement Officers indicated that they communicate with Missions on placement matters at least once a month, more often as necessary and that they are satisfied with their relations with the Missions except for the low level of English language proficiency of some candidates who Missions send forward prior to placements being secured. They think Missions are generally satisfied with AAI relations except where expectations might differ as it relates to degree completions — some Missions tend to question lack of progress mainly at PhD levels despite low TOEFLs. One respondent suggested that it would be helpful if Placement Officers could travel to Missions to establish personal relations with people there with whom they work in order to engender better mutual understanding.

Program Officers believe that relations between AAI and the Missions have changed since AFGRAD primarily because of the greatly expanded role of the latter in ATLAS, although one of the six respondents indicated that the only real change is the shift to the buy-in process.

Most Program Officers communicate with the Missions more than once a month. They are generally satisfied with their relationships and believe that the Missions feel the same way about AAI. Two of the respondents rate their relations with Missions as very good in all aspects while the remaining have concerns in the following areas:

- Mission involvement in professional enhancement activities;
- Mission involvement in planning ATLAS training;
- Mission response when special actions are required;
- Overall Mission commitment to ATLAS.

The major changes Program Officers would make in how they interact with USAID Missions include spending more time in Africa on ATLAS matters beyond selection, having USAID Training Officers visit their ATLAS students in the US every year, and providing modems to AAI Program Officers to facilitate communications with the Missions.

AAI staff believes that relations between AAI and USAID/W have changed since AFGRAD, primarily because of the greater role that USAID plays in ATLAS. Program Officers communicate with USAID/W staff as necessary which in most cases is more than once a month. Two of the six representatives are not satisfied with their relations with USAID/W, primarily because of the "bureaucratic layers that have been created on both sides in the monitoring process." Four of the Program Officers think that USAID/W is generally satisfied with its relations with AAI. One thinks not and the sixth respondent does not know. If they could change anything in their interaction with USAID/W it would be greater communication and understanding of each other's respective roles and more direct communication with Program Staff without involving the Chief of Party.

♦ *ATLAS Overall*

AAI staff felt that core funding was needed in countries that cannot participate in ATLAS for such reasons as no USAID presence. Staff is of the view that ATLAS is meeting most of its EOPS targets but several question whether there has been sufficient progress in the following areas:

- use of HBCUs;
- participation by women;
- grants to African organizations;
- PhD scholarships.

They also feel that for the most part AAI subcontractors have been effective in implementing ATLAS, although four of the Program Officers expressed concerns suggesting that there should be closer relationships with the subcontractors, more clearly defined roles and greater subcontractor involvement in ATLAS. One respondent suggests that there should be a mid-term review inasmuch as requirements for subcontractor participation and impact have changed from original expectations. The respondents gave a quite favorable overall rating to the performance of the three major actors in ATLAS, meaning AAI, USAID Missions and USAID/W as well as to ATLAS in general.

The Program Officers gave relatively high marks to how they thought ATLAS was progressing, although four of the six assessed ATLAS progress overall only as satisfactory.

When asked if there were any issues they think might decrease the likelihood of ATLAS's or of individual alumni's impact, they cited such matters as USAID Mission closings, decrease in buy-ins, and low repatriation rates in politically or economically troubled countries such as Liberia and Zaire.

In closing, the Program Officers were asked if they could make three changes in ATLAS, what would they be? A major theme in the response was that Program Officer staff morale is low. Several respondents felt they were too layered and restricted in scope, not sufficiently in the ATLAS loop, management was too centralized, there were few opportunities for staff development, and in general, they were not being utilized as effectively as they should be. There were several other specific suggestions including more Program Officer travel to Africa, adding an e-mail system with Missions, eliminating the tuition scholarship requirement for undergraduates and improving the database, especially for financial reporting.

When asked what three changes they could make in ATLAS, they suggested:

- eliminate the tuition fee scholarship requirement for HBCUs;
- give AAI veto power on participant call forwards in advance of placement;
- provide ELT in the US for anglophone women who have less than 550 in their TOEFLs;
- provide core funds to countries that cannot otherwise participate in ATLAS;
- reduce the number of forms and bureaucratic procedures.

♦ *Observation*

The Program Officers are a very seasoned staff with many years of experience managing African students in the US higher education system. As a group, they appear to have had some adjustment problems in the transition from AFGRAD to ATLAS. They feel more compartmentalized and restricted

in carrying out their duties which, in several cases at least, has affected their morale. The principal change from their perspective has been the increased roles of USAID/W and the USAID Missions in ATLAS as compared to AFGRAD with a resultant reduction in their autonomy and in the way they were used to doing business.

Other than this change in their roles, they seem to be carrying out their tasks effectively in much the same way they were functioning under AFGRAD — one does not believe that the AAI Program staff has approached ATLAS as something quite new and different than its predecessor. This might be an issue that merits further assessment. Perhaps USAID/W management staff should conduct a two or three day retreat with AAI staff (and possibly members of the Deans' Committee) to review just what has been taking place in ATLAS over the past four years in relation to the Project Paper and AAI contract. The findings in this evaluation would serve a useful purpose in setting the agenda for such a retreat.

The placement staff appears to be competently and enthusiastically performing its tasks in the ATLAS program. Interestingly, they do not seem to be suffering from low morale as is the case with the Program Officers. If this is true, there might be some lessons to be learned in how the placement staff does its work that could be adapted to the situation in the program area.

6. Core Contractor Field Representatives

At the annual AAI Field Representative's meeting in Namibia the week of October 15th, 1994, the Representatives were asked to complete anonymous questionnaires regarding their role in ATLAS. Sixteen of the twenty Representatives (80 percent) completed questionnaires, the highlights of which follow.

The AAI Representatives, most of whom are women, have been in their respective positions an average of eleven years constituting a wealth of experience in the US higher education system as it relates to African students. Included in the sixteen respondents are five in countries where ATLAS has no scholarship component; a sixth has only ATLAS postgraduate research activities.

♦ *Recruitment and Selection*

When asked their views of the most important ATLAS achievements to date, the predominant response was in the professional enhancement area, especially regional conferences, workshops and seminars. The respondents stated that the major difference between ATLAS and AFGRAD is the increased involvement of USAID Missions in all aspects of ATLAS and the resultant sharper focus on fields of study as well as the Missions strategic objectives. The Representatives were essentially unanimous in their understanding of selection criteria and in their recognition of the highly significant role played by the ATLAS Deans' Committee in terms of the pre-selection process: interviewing, interpreting criteria, similar to the role they played previously in AFGRAD. The role of AAI Representatives in recruitment and selection varies tremendously from at least one of them being virtually dealt out of the process to the other extreme where several Representatives claim that they exercise the full range of responsibilities from initial advertising to final candidate selection. One quarter of the Representatives claim to be involved in defining candidates' objectives and/or programs of study.

All but two Representatives believe that ATLAS is taking effective steps to increase female as well as private sector participation. Overall, virtually all the Representatives believe that ATLAS recruitment and selection is very good with the majority considering it outstanding, and have very few suggestions for improvement in this phase of the program.

♦ ***Activities During Training***

When asked about their relationships with participants while they are in training, all respondents indicated that they maintain contact with participants and 87 percent claim that they maintain contact with participants' employers as well. Only 19 percent of the Representatives indicated they had a role in defining enrichment activities during the period of training. With respect to suggesting changes in how ATLAS participants are monitored while in training, two Representatives indicated that the views of students should be taken more into account to maximize benefits from the training experience.

♦ ***Following Training***

All Representatives claim to maintain contact with alumni once their training is completed. Most of them say they maintain contact with employers of alumni as well.

♦ ***Professional Enhancement Activities***

Most Representatives indicate that they do not play a role in defining topics for ATLAS regional conferences and symposia nor in ensuring that topics of interest to women are included. However, half of those responding claim they take special steps to make sure that women attend by such means as directly inviting them or finding out what women want to discuss.

While respondents were satisfied with the management of ATLAS conferences and symposia, in general, they suggested a range of specific improvements including:

- frequency ;
- selection of more practical topics;
- have AAI Representatives attend/plan them more closely with Representatives;
- increase the lead time to attract greater participation;
- increase the use of African specialists as resource people.

With respect to the grants component, two respondents suggested removal of the requirement for a "substantial" number of former USAID sponsored participants in the grantee organization and broadening the range of organizations eligible to apply.

The Representatives appear satisfied with the ATLAS newsletters, *IROKO* and *ATLAS Alert* as well as the Alumni *Directory* and had few improvements to suggest.

Respondents felt favorably disposed toward the postgraduate research program although one third did not respond to the survey's questions which suggests limited familiarity, perhaps because that Mission has not used this component. There were several suggestions to increase numbers of research awards: lengthen their duration and fund them from core funds. The Representatives felt similarly well disposed toward the Distinguished Alumni Award component, although fewer of them have been

involved than with the postgraduate research awards. The calibre of Distinguished Alumni Award candidates was singled out as the most outstanding characteristic while at the lower end of the scale were the advertising process, recruitment of women, publicity, and USAID Mission support.

♦ ***Relations with Missions***

When asked if relations between AAI and the Missions had changed since AFGRAD, half of those responding indicated yes, while the other half felt there was no change. The most cited change was far greater USAID Mission involvement and control of the ATLAS program. Most respondents stressed that frequent and open communication was the major factor making for good relationships with Missions and claimed that they communicated at least monthly, and more often when necessary. The AAI Representative's principal contact in the Mission is either the Human Resource Development Officer, the Training Officer and/or Assistant, or the Program Officer.

Eleven of the thirteen who responded indicated that they were satisfied with their relationships with the Mission; two were not. The same results emerged when the Representatives were asked if they felt Missions were satisfied with their relationship to the AAI Representatives. When asked if they could change anything in how they interact with Missions, the only responses were "to be more involved in recruitment and selection", for "the Mission to have more respect for AAI's administrative role" and to get the Mission "more involved in the postgraduate research component."

♦ ***Relations with AAI/New York***

The Representatives were asked if their relations with AAI/NY had changed since AFGRAD. Four respondents claimed they had changed in such areas as: "working with different ETAs," "AAI/NY awareness that the Representative is under the control of the Mission," and "there is no longer any activity." Nine other respondents indicated no change in relations with AAI/NY while the remaining three did not reply to this question.

As in the case of dealing with USAID Missions, the Representatives stressed the importance of open, frequent and responsive communication with AAI/NY as the most important contributing factor to a good relationship between the field and New York. Nine Representatives claim that they communicate with AAI/NY more often than once a month, while nearly all the remaining claim at least monthly contact. All respondents indicate satisfaction with their overall relationships with AAI/NY and believe that the reverse is equally true. When asked to rate their relations with AAI/NY in several specific areas, their high degree of satisfaction was evenly divided among AAI/NY involvement in the planning process, in monitoring ATLAS trainees, in involvement with professional enhancement activities and in handling special requests, although ratings in this last area were somewhat lower than in the others.

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

All but two of the respondents indicated a belief that there is a tracking system in place to enable them to monitor applicants, trainees, alumni, employers and impact.

When respondents were asked to make an overall assessment of ATLAS, 80 percent indicated high satisfaction with AAI's performance, 89 percent with USAID Mission and USAID/W's performance, and 80 percent indicated an overall high satisfaction rate with ATLAS in general.

With respect to specific suggestions for improvements to increase the likelihood of ATLAS impact, responses included:

- encouraging USAID to be more responsive to host country needs;
- expanding professional enhancement opportunities;
- changing the buy-in process so that all countries can participate.

The last question asked if the respondent could make three changes in ATLAS or in their responsibilities, what would they be? While the responses do not lend themselves very well to clustering, the most frequent suggestions were, in order of frequency:

- provide awards to all countries from central funds;
- change the buy-in system grant 2 or 3 slots to countries that can't buy in;
- provide core finding for 2 to 3 scholarships in small countries;
- strengthen and expand professional enhancement activities and provide greater support to returnees;
- place more focus on institution-building;
- decrease the role for USAID and/or increase that of the AAI Representative;
- involve host governments and employers to improve credibility;
- lower criteria for women in order to reach more of them.

♦ ***Observations***

AAI's field-based Representatives are generally part-time employees whose responsibilities cover the range of AAI activities in-country. This can include assistance with ATLAS scholarships, ATLAS professional enhancement, AFGRAD, or other AAI business. The AAI Representatives' responses to the evaluation survey indicate satisfaction with virtually all aspects of the program including the planning and selection process, and Mission and AAI's respective roles and relationships, with few suggestions for improving the project in the future.

7. The ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans

Nine of the thirteen members (69 percent) of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans responded to a mailed questionnaire eliciting their views on the ATLAS project from their perspective. The respondents include six current (and one former) Deans of Graduate Schools, a Director of an International Student Office and the President of the Council of Graduate Schools. Their average length of service on the Deans' Committee is four years, with five of them indicating they were active in the AFGRAD era.

Two of those who had been involved in AFGRAD indicated that their role today is very similar, while the remaining three noted differences, particularly in regard to the far greater role played by the USAID Missions. One respondent also indicated that the fields of study are more restrictive under ATLAS than they were in the predecessor project.

When asked what they thought were ATLAS's most important achievements, their responses fell into the following clusters:

- Generating a significant number of successful degree recipients who are home contributing to their country's development;
- Encouraging the development of science and scholarship in Africa;
- Creating the Deans' Committee to optimize the selection process;
- Creating an effective partnership among USAID Missions, AAI and Deans to advance training and infrastructure development in Africa;
- Initiating professional enrichment including conferences and workshops for networking and advancing professional development in Africa.

In response to a question concerning their role in recruitment and selection, the respondents indicated overwhelmingly that their most important contribution was in the pre-screening, interviewing and selection process. Several also commented on the value of their advice to USAID Missions and host country officials on higher education in the US as it relates to ATLAS. The Deans feel that the USAID Missions are the major actors in determining the fields of study in ATLAS, which are based primarily on the Mission's strategic objectives in the particular country.

From the Deans' perspective, the criteria for selecting ATLAS participants are based primarily on:

- academic achievement;
- work experience;
- clear statement (oral and written) of training objectives and proposed outcomes;
- any other criteria generally applied to admitting graduate students to US universities.

Several respondents indicated that the core contractor field representatives play a critical role in ATLAS recruitment and selection although most respondents stated that this contribution varies significantly from country to country, depending on the relationship with the USAID Mission. When asked to compare the AAI Representatives' role in ATLAS to that under AFGRAD, five of the six who responded indicated that the AAI Representatives' role has diminished inasmuch as USAID "seems to have assumed control."

When asked what changes they would make in ATLAS if they had the opportunity, each respondent suggested a different change:

- have more dialogue between Missions and Deans regarding education experiences to meet host country needs;
- more interaction between Deans and African faculty;
- better contacts with African universities;
- more zeal by Missions and AAI Representatives in attracting women;
- a systemic short and long term plan for ATLAS recruitment agreed upon by USAID and AAI;
- use other channels than host governments to promote ATLAS;
- recruit more PhD candidates who in the long term can provide greater in-country training;
- stress "intellectual capital" rather than occupational orientation;
- stress access to under-represented groups in the society and/or widen ATLAS constituency.

When asked to rate the quality of ATLAS recruitment and selection, the Deans thought that the recruitment effort was satisfactory as well as efforts to recruit women. Most of the Deans also thought that the Missions and the AAI Representatives' role in recruitment was satisfactory, although two of the eight respondents to this question were not satisfied with either the AAI Representatives' or Missions' performance. Finally, two of the five who responded to an assessment of USAID/W's role rated it as poor.

The Deans were next asked what their role was in matching candidates with US academic programs. Their general response was that they facilitated the matching process and assisted AAI staff on placement issues when requested.

Six of seven who responded to the question indicated that relations between AAI and USAID/W have changed since AFGRAD, primarily because of far greater USAID/W involvement in ATLAS. Five of seven respondents indicated they were satisfied with AAI's relations with USAID/W while the other two were not. When asked if they believed USAID/W was satisfied with its relations with AAI, four thought so while the remaining five either thought not, didn't know or didn't respond.

The Deans were then asked what changes they would recommend in AAI's relationship with USAID/W. Similar to the response concerning proposed changes in ATLAS, those that responded to this question had varying ideas about changes they would make, although there was an underlying theme that USAID/W should defer more to AAI in carrying out all aspects of the program, including setting ATLAS policies and selecting participants.

The Deans gave AAI's overall ATLAS performance a very high rating, followed by a somewhat lower assessment of USAID/W's performance. Their lowest ratings were assigned to USAID Mission performance where only one of the seven respondents considered Mission performance to be above average and two rated it as unsatisfactory.

The next question was "If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would they be?" Two of the seven Deans who responded cited increased or USAID/W centralized funding as the principal change they would make. Other responses spread across a broad spectrum:

- change management at USAID/W and AAI to a more normal contractual relationship;
- don't drop old universities to get on with new ones;
- work more with African universities as partners;
- Deans' Committee should be more aware of USAID country plans in order to better understand USAID priorities;
- more emphasis on professional enhancement activities;
- Deans should be better informed of other donor activities;
- return direction/management to USAID/W;
- if Deans role is to be diminished, cancel the Deans' Committee and pay full tuition;
- eliminate the undergraduate committee if the number of undergraduates remains low;
- restore decision making to AAI/NY and the field Representatives;
- restore some of the longer term goals (PhDs);
- install mechanisms for more shared governance of ATLAS;
- broaden range of disciplines, especially where there are no universities in the country.

♦ ***Observation***

The Deans appear to be proud of ATLAS and their role in it. They seem somewhat concerned, however, over the expanded management role USAID has assumed in recent years, both in Washington and in the field, especially those Deans who had been involved earlier with AFGRAD. We recommend that USAID/W take the initiative in organizing a retreat in which the Deans along with other principal actors in ATLAS such as AAI and selected USAID Missions can exchange information regarding how to make ATLAS the innovative project it set out to be and to create a shared sense of purpose.

8. The US University Community

A member of the evaluation team met with ten members of faculty and administration in three universities participating in ATLAS and received completed questionnaires reflecting their views of the project. The group consisted of a Dean, three professors and academic advisors, five members of international student offices and a Director of an ELT Center. They all have responsibility in one fashion or other for ATLAS participants on their campuses and are generally knowledgeable of the ATLAS program.

When members of the University community were asked what were the key issues or difficulties ATLAS scholars face on their campus, the most frequently cited topic was the political or economic situation back home (50 percent), followed by the employment situation at home (35 percent). Other issues cited were the scholars' adaptation to US. life and culture and limited English language skills.

The respondents were asked how ATLAS scholars's performance compared to other foreign students. Seventy percent felt their performance was better than other foreign students while the balance considered it to be about the same.

With reference to relationships with AAI, the group was unanimous in its praise, indicating that relationships were "close and efficient," "very good," "excellent," "outstanding," "amiable" and "more enjoyable than with some others". Communications with AAI generally ranged from more than once a month to once every 3 to 6 months, in most cases similar in frequency to contacts with other sponsoring agencies. Respondents included the following factors in describing the key advantages to working with AAI, in order of frequency:

- calibre of ATLAS scholars;
- known procedures;
- knowledgeable AAI staff;
- responsiveness.

When asked what were the key constraints to working with AAI, the respondents had only scattered comments such as "AAI staff was becoming spread too thin, "the lack of regional offices," and "inadequate information on admissions." The majority of respondents was not aware of any constraints at all.

Respondents indicated a general familiarity with contractual regulations governing ATLAS students but expressed less familiarity in the following areas, in order of frequency:

128

- duration of ELT;
- students' family situation;
- changing universities;
- changing fields of study;
- financial allowances.

The respondents gave very high marks to AAI's management of ATLAS in terms of cooperativeness, responsiveness and productivity. Five of the ten who responded to the question concerning how AAI's management of ATLAS compared to other sponsoring agencies, indicated that AAI's management is better than others while the other five indicated it to be about the same.

The final section of the questionnaire dealt with any suggested changes the respondents would make in AAI or in the ATLAS project. There was very little clustering of suggestions except that four respondents encouraged expanding the size of ATLAS in one way or another and two urged greater emphasis on enrichment, seminars and workshops. Other suggestions included:

- AAI should have higher visibility;
- ATLAS needs better pre-departure orientation;
- support arrival of ATLAS scholars' dependents.

♦ ***Observation***

It is clear from these responses that the university community is highly supportive of ATLAS and AAI, and would like to see the project continue to flourish and expand.

9. Project Subcontractors

Information was gathered from the AAI's four subcontractors concerning their roles in ATLAS.

♦ ***Management Systems International Inc. (MSI)***

An MSI associate stated that the ATLAS subcontract was to serve in an advisory capacity in providing an information system to track project progress against EOPS objectives.

MSI assessed AAI's needs for information and laid out the foundations for the ATLAS MIS system. Actual programming was subcontracted out. MSI expressed satisfaction with its role in the project, stating that delays in implementing the MIS system came primarily from core contractor decision delays and uncertainty in defining the MIS system's objectives.

♦ ***Arthur D. Little (ADL)***

ADL was included in the project primarily to provide short-term management workshops to ATLAS students studying for business management degrees. The ADL respondent indicated that the original concept was for them to provide four workshops each year, two of four weeks' duration and two for one week. One two-week workshop was held in December 1991, shortly after the subcontract was signed. A second one was held in May 1993; none has been held since. According to the respondent, the workshops were successful in the eyes of the participants and the AAI observers. The respondent understands that the major constraint is assembling a critical mass — at least 20

participants at any one time — to justify the expense involved. However, she would be delighted if the concept could be reactivated and indicated that she would be pleased to do whatever she could to this end such as brainstorming with AAI.

♦ ***The National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO)***

The NAFEO role is to facilitate participation of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) in ATLAS. The NAFEO staff member responsible for working with the core contractor was not available for interviewing during the evaluation period.

♦ ***African Academy of Sciences (AAS)***

AAI contracted with AAS in 1990 primarily to provide a series of regional professional and technical symposia, workshops, colloquia and seminars. Three such events each year were contemplated originally but two have proved to be optimum in terms of available resources. Seven have been held to date. AAS has also assisted ATLAS marginally in the professional grants program. Under the contract, ATLAS funds a position for an ATLAS Program Officer. The incumbent's major function is to work with the professional enhancement staff at core contractor headquarters in arranging the symposia and serving as rapporteur during the meetings. She has recently designed a very attractive workshop summary report which is far more readable than the detailed proceedings of the meetings which are also prepared after each meeting.

The number of workshops is on target with respect to contractual requirements and the selected topics appear appropriate. What is less clear is whether there is sufficient linkage between these activities and the ATLAS alumni re-entry process. There also seems to be little in the way of evaluation of these workshops to determine their effectiveness and usefulness to the participants, their institutions and/or their countries in general.

The AAS contract is for a period of 3½ years with a budget of $247,000. Progress was slow originally but starting this year with a new cast of players in AAS, the situation has greatly improved and AAS looks forward to an expanding role in other professional enhancement activities in the future, possibly including a greater role in the grants program.

10. ATLAS Participants

Questionnaires were sent to all 287 participants currently in the US. One hundred twenty five responses (44 percent) were received from which a stratified random sample was drawn based on the participants' country of origin. Another 15 were received after the deadline and were not included in the selection of the sample. One of every three completed questionnaires or a total of 42 were selected in this fashion for analysis.

♦ *Characteristics of the Sample*

CATEGORY		NUMBER	PERCENTAGE
Status with ATLAS	In ELT	10	24 %
	In academic program	32	76 %
Degree objective	Undergraduate	4	10 %
	Masters	37	88 %
	PhD	1	2 %
Employment prior to ATLAS	Public sector	15	36 %
	Parastatals	7	16 %
	University	6	14 %
	NGO/Research Inst.	5	12 %
	Private Sector	4	10 %
	Student	3	7 %
	Unemployed	2	5 %
Age	Less than 27 years	4	10 %
	27 to 37 years	32	75 %
	Older than 37	4	10 %
	Not Indicated	2	5 %
TOTAL		42	100 %

In addition to this sample of participants currently in the US another eight ATLAS alumni were interviewed overseas, the results of which are described separately at the end of this section.

We have aggregated responses to major questions and conclude with our observations pertaining to the participants' perspective of ATLAS.

♦ *Planning Training Prior to Departure*

Sixty percent of the participants first learned of ATLAS from newspaper advertisements in their home countries followed by information from their employers (16 percent) and word of mouth (14 percent). Nearly half of the respondents indicated that their employers were involved in nominating them for ATLAS. When asked their view as to how they were selected, 66 percent indicated that the interview was the major factor while the balance thought their selection was based on a combination of essays, letters of reference and prior accomplishments in addition to the interview.

When respondents were asked if they participated in planning their programs and selecting universities, 14 percent indicated they had participated while 86 percent responded in the negative. Only 5 percent felt their employers played a role in the planning and placement process.

Two thirds of the respondents indicated they received pre-departure orientation while the remaining one third indicated they did not. Of those who did receive orientation, half of them indicated it was provided by the local core contractor field staff member in their country while the other half indicated that it was arranged by the USAID Mission.

One third of the participants received English language training prior to departure. A review of the latest TOEFL scores before departure of those who provided them on the questionnaires reflect that:

- 43 percent were below 500;
- 31 percent were below 450;
- 9 percent were below 400.

The participants were asked how long it took from the time of completing the ATLAS application to the US departure date:

Time Frame	Percent
Less than 3 months	—
3 to 6 months	7 %
6 months to 1 year	51 %
Over 1 year	42 %

When asked how long it took from the time they learned they had received an ATLAS fellowship until their US departure, the results were:

Time Frame	Percent
Less than 1 week	2 %
1 week to 1 month	19 %
1 to 3 months	23 %
Longer than 3 months	56 %

When asked how prepared they were to undertake their US training programs at the time of departure from their home countries, they responded that they felt most comfortable in such areas as possessing adequate academic prerequisites and in understanding their academic programs. They were less prepared in such areas as knowledge of ATLAS rules, financial regulations and allowances. A substantial number (36 percent) felt unprepared in English language skills doubtless related to the francophone and lusophone origins of some of the group. Overall, one half of the respondents felt fairly well prepared while the remaining half was evenly divided between those who felt ill prepared to those who felt well prepared.

♦ *Experience During Training in the US*

The participants were asked how their academic programs were progressing. Of those who responded, 94 percent felt they were doing satisfactorily or better and an equal portion gave good to very high ratings when asked about the quality and relevance of their academic programs.

Twenty percent of the respondents indicated that they have had problems related to gender in such areas as obtaining their ATLAS fellowships, being recognized as equals in the US, and in general adaptation to life in the US.

When asked how often they have been communicating with AAI since coming to the US, the participants responded:

Frequency	Percent
More than once a month	12 %
Once a month	30 %
Every 1 to 3 months	24 %
Every 3 to 6 months	17 %
Irregularly	12 %
Never	5 %

Participants were asked if they have had the opportunity, or plan in the future, to participate in any enrichment activities such as management seminars or workshops since beginning their training. Less than a half responded in the affirmative. Those that said yes, claimed that in most cases they acted on their own initiative. A smaller number were prompted by their universities, and even fewer by AAI, to pursue enrichment activities.

In response to a question regarding future employment at home after ATLAS training, 62 percent indicated they had jobs to return to while 31 percent claim that they do not have employment. The remaining 7 percent did not know or did not respond to the question.

The final question in this section dealt with the participants' anticipation of what is in store for them upon return home. They were asked to respond to the following issues:

Issue	Participant Response
Finding a job	69 percent expect little difficulty while 31 percent expect some to a great deal of difficulty in finding a job upon return.
Recognizing a US degree	80 percent felt little or no problem while 20 percent expect some to great degree difficulty in having their US degree recognized.
Applying news skills in the workplace	39 percent expect little or no problem while 61 percent expect some to a great deal of resistance.
Resistance from colleagues	44 percent expect little or no problem while 56 percent expect some to many difficulties with colleagues.
Readapting to life at home	63 percent expect little or no difficulty in readapting to life at home after training while 37 percent expect some to great difficulty.
Reintegrating with family	63 percent expect little or no difficulty in reintegrating into family life after training while 37 percent expect some to great difficulty.
Reintegrating with friends	79 percent expect little or no difficulty reintegrating with friends after training while 21 percent anticipate some to great problems.
Other	21 percent anticipate problems in such areas as the economic situation at home, poor facilities, resources, and political instability.

♦ *Management of the ATLAS Project*

The final block of questions dealt with the participants' relationships with AAI and the USAID Missions.

While 65 percent of respondents indicated that AAI support was useful to very useful from an overall point of view, another 14 percent felt it was satisfactory, while the remaining, 22 percent considered it not very useful.

With respect to specific functions, AAI received the highest ratings in:

- assistance in arranging initial travel to the participant's place of training;
- promptness in providing monthly living allowances.

At the lower end of the participant satisfaction scale with AAI support were:

- AAI's handling of special requests from students;
- displeasure with the amount of the monthly payments dictated by Handbook 10;

- administrative support provided in general during their academic programs.

The final question asked if the respondents believed that USAID plays a role in ATLAS. Eighty six percent indicated yes, but were less clear as to just what the role was. Half of the respondents thought it was financial, while a quarter thought it had to do more with setting policies and facilitating the training process. The remaining quarter did not know USAID's role.

11. ATLAS Alumni

♦ *Tanzania*

The evaluation team interviewed five of the eight ATLAS alumni in Tanzania. Two were working far distant from Dar-es-Salaam and a third had found a way to return to the US for further studies shortly after returning despite the two-year home residency rule. Of the five interviewed, all of whom received Masters Degrees and did very well academically, three appear to be in positions where they can make good use of their US training: one as the City Solicitor in Dar-es-Salaam, and effectively Deputy City Manager; the second, a woman, as a department head in the National Construction Council; and the third, as a tax examiner in the Income Tax Department in the Ministry of Finance.

The first two are in responsible positions where they have or will have ample opportunity to adapt their US experience to local needs and have significant impact in the process. The third, the tax examiner, appears to be technically sound and competent, but is not as yet in a position to have much impact on his department given the seemingly modest level of his post.

Regarding the remaining two, while both seem competent and ambitious, they are in moribund or non-jobs and have no clear idea what the future has in store for them in Tanzania's currently retrenching job environment. One worked for a parastatal which has recently been abolished and he is caretaking there until he can find another job. The other alumnus, a lecturer at a college which was the former think tank and political training center for the ruling party, is also without an active position. The college has been trying to find a new role for itself in the present multi-party situation in the country, but has been unable to obtain sufficient funds to reopen. Meanwhile, the ATLAS alumnus is having a difficult time maintaining morale as he struggles to support his family on a very low salary while he continues his work at the college and seeks other opportunities in the event the institution does not reopen.

Given the realities of limited employment opportunities in the developing world in general, the status of this first wave of returnees to Tanzania perhaps should not come as a total surprise but it is a concern. These are expensive overseas training programs and great effort should be placed on selecting candidates with the highest possible likelihood of successful utilization and impact upon return, such as the first two described above. One person interviewed believes that the calibre of candidates is not as good as in AFGRAD days primarily due to the deterioration in the local education system over the past decade. If this is true, it places even greater pressure on the care put in to the selection process, and might suggest another reason to more greatly involve leading Tanzanians in developing criteria and policies for selection of future candidates who most likely will have positive impact upon return regardless of economic conditions. Perhaps of even greater importance, interviews with several of the ATLAS alumni raise the question as to whether the selection process is

placing sufficient weight on identifying leadership qualities which is, after all, a major distinguishing feature of ATLAS.

♦ ***Madagascar***

Two alumni were interviewed, one having obtained a Masters degree from the American Graduate School of International Management (Thunderbird), and the other having undertaken a six months postgraduate research program at the University of Hawaii. Both claimed they participated in planning their programs although one was not placed in the university of choice. The long-term participant felt she was not well prepared in the pre-departure phase to undertake her US program while the short-term research participant felt well prepared.

While the long term participant considered the quality and relevance of her training to be good, she was less satisfied with the services and facilities of Thunderbird in relation to her country's needs. The research fellow was satisfied in all aspects of his training.

Both participants had jobs to return to after training which they started soon after return, one with a university and the other, with a private company. Both believe that their training has had a positive impact on them professionally. The participants have not encountered serious difficulties upon return in terms of professional or personal reintegration although the long-term participant indicates that it is too soon to be sure since she had returned within a month of the evaluation interview.

They rate AAI management as useful to very useful, although the long-term participant claimed to suffer from the lack of orientation at the beginning of her program and the lack of professional enrichment or a re-entry workshop at the end. The short-term alumnus states that he has had no contact with either core contractor local staff or USAID since returning home, while the long-term participant did not respond to this question.

In terms of improvements in ATLAS, the research alumnus suggests:

- advertise the ATLAS short-term research opportunities;
- USAID should work more closely with host country universities;
- USAID should facilitate linkages between academic expertise and USAID projects in country.

The long-term participant suggests:

- provide research and current materials on the home country while in training;
- provide more information on choices of universities prior to selection;
- provide at least one month ELT for those who have never been to the US, regardless of high GMAT and TOEFL scores.

♦ ***Cape Verde***

The evaluation team met with one ATLAS alumnus in Cape Verde, who returned in May 1994 with a Masters degree from Vanderbilt University. He felt he was quite well prepared for his US program prior to departure from his home country although he had little information on ATLAS rules and regulations or on financial arrangements. He rates the quality and relevance of his training as well as the quality of his US university services as quite good. He had a job to return to after training

although he decided to become self-employed. He claims that his US degree has improved his résumé substantially, thus raising his earning potential.

He rates AAI management of his program as quite useful but was not satisfied in two aspects: assistance with special requests and assistance with professional reintegration. He claims to have been in touch with USAID three or four times since return. His major suggestion for improvement in the program is to make it easier for participants to bring dependents. He also observed that public servants in Cape Verde who have earned ATLAS fellowships should be placed on paid leave for the duration of their training programs.

♦ ***Observations***

It appears that the Madagascar and Cape Verde alumni were good choices and are well positioned to make good use of their US training. AAI should take note of the specific suggestions and comments of the participants for whatever benefit they may be in future programming.

There are some troubling aspects to the above review, especially when one takes into account the narrative comments in the "open-ended" questions. Some of the negative comments in such areas as inadequate monthly allowances, prohibitions regarding use of automobiles and accompanying spouses are inevitable in such surveys, given the constraints of USAID's Handbook 10. The seemingly restrictive policies from the participants' point of view on such issues have been a source of contention for years, but from USAID's perspective, it has been prudent to stick with them. However, although it is not in our scope of work to evaluate Handbook 10, we feel compelled to question at least one of these constraints: the accompanying family restriction. In our view, ATLAS students should not be discouraged, indeed, they might even be encouraged to bring families after six months so long as they meet the financial and other requirements. This plea was echoed so frequently and fervently by the respondents that it should be given fresh consideration by USAID/W. The bad feelings generated when families are separated, especially in the family-centered African context, are a serious detriment to the relationships USAID strives to build through projects like ATLAS.

A related issue concerns the ability of participants to return at their own expense to their home countries periodically when it would not interfere with their academic progress. This request was repeatedly made by the respondents especially in view of their inability to have their families with them in the US. They question the fairness of having their allowances reduced if they leave the country, even for short periods. This is another issue which USAID/W should revisit from time to time, especially regarding long term students who are facing life without their families for extended periods.

There are several other specific issues needing AAI and/or USAID/W attention, cited in accordance with the sequence in the questionnaires:

♦ ***Planning Training: The Pre-Departure Phase***

More than a third of the respondents claimed they received no pre-departure orientation, several pointing out how this omission caused them problems later on. All participants should receive thorough orientation prior to departure. Another major concern was the long lead time, often more than one year, between first applying until departure for US. training. We recognize that it is not entirely in AAI's hands to ameliorate this situation. However, AAI is encouraged to carefully review

each step in the pre-departure process and to collaborate with USAID/W to see what can be streamlined and truncated. Even if it cannot be appreciably changed, AAI should keep candidates better informed during the pre-departure phase to minimize their and often their employers' frustrations.

♦ ***Since Arriving in the US***

The major concern in this phase is the limited experience, or even knowledge, of participants in enrichment activities, where more than one half claimed to be unaware of possibilities. AAI/NY is encouraged to make a special effort to promote and expand this highly important ATLAS innovation with the goal of providing at least two enrichment activities — such as management training workshops, professional society meetings, practical training — per year for each long-term participant.

It is also somewhat troubling to note that nearly one third of the respondents claim that they do not have jobs to return to. If this is true, it raises some questions about the selection process as well as underlining the importance of re-entry enhancement activities, especially when a majority of the respondents have indicated that they expect to encounter resistance to their new skills upon return home even if they are employed.

♦ ***Management of the ATLAS Project***

While a majority of participants indicated that overall AAI support was good, over twenty percent of the respondents claimed that AAI was not doing a satisfactory job. Criticism was especially pronounced in the area of handling special requests from participants. While many of the complaints are doubtless based on interpretations of Handbook 10 regulations which AAI is duty-bound to enforce, the nature and tone of some of the comments are so strong that there might be a deeper issue of attitudes involved. Several respondents refer to AAI as "bossy," "insensitive," "oppressive," "bureaucratic," "inflexible," and "unresponsive". Whether such descriptions are deserved or not, the perception is there from a sufficient minority of respondents to warrant examination.

As a start, it would appear that communication between participants and their Program Officers needs to be more frequent and of a more supportive nature. To this end, AAI might consider convening a series of one to two day regional workshops at appropriate times where students and AAI staff could gather together and review progress and problems as a group. This thought was supported by several respondents as a way to air and share concern with their colleagues as well as their program managers.

♦ ***Re-entry Issues***

It is of concern that two of the Tanzania alumni described above are not as gainfully employed as they should be in relation to their ATLAS training and raises the question as to whether the selection process focusses adequately on the re-entry environment. Furthermore, as cited in the Tanzania alumni report, there is virtually no emphasis on leadership qualities as a selection factor nor was there much in the way of discussion on leadership factors in the responses from participants in training as an element in the ATLAS program. AAI and USAID/W are encouraged to put more emphasis on re-entry and leadership matters and incorporate these into selection criteria as well as into professional enrichment programming during training.

12. Host Country Nominating Agency Personnel

The evaluation team interviewed seven nominating agency personnel in three countries. The following summarizes responses from three officials each from Tanzania and Madagascar and one from Guinea.

♦ *ATLAS Recruitment and Selection*

All respondents indicated that they participate in the screening and selection process generally as members of selection committees set up at the behest of the Missions. Several respondents indicated that the Mission determines the fields of study while the remaining four stated there is some participation by the employing agencies and/or the candidates.

All seven respondents shared similar understanding of the selection criteria. Respondents feel that women face particular constraints in being proposed for scholarships due to such factors as their more limited education and experience, shyness and lack of confidence, while the remaining respondents do not point out any particular constraints unique to women. The Tanzanians point to special steps that are somewhat effective in increasing women participation in such areas as preferential treatment by lowering criteria, providing more under-graduate degrees and short courses for women. The remaining respondents are not aware of any special steps being taken to increase the participation of women. Respondents indicated that more needs to be done in recruiting from the private sector. One respondent questioned the need to obtain employer endorsements.

Respondents stated that the Mission defines participants' training objectives while the other respondents indicated that the candidates or their employers perform this function. Nearly all respondents indicate that employment is assured for returning participants.

Certain nominating agency officials felt that ATLAS is different from other scholarship programs because it is very particular about its candidates and the selection process is transparent and competitive. The remaining respondents either saw little difference or did not know. Respondents made several specific suggestions for changes in the recruitment/selection process including:

- "Strengthen (the nominating agency's) role. We know very little about ATLAS. We are not in the loop except for screening and interviewing. USAID does it all, according to its rules."
- Consult employers regarding their training needs.
- "Share the short-listing process with us."

One of the remaining respondents suggested that USAID should inform them of the US universities involved so they can do a better job advising their candidates.

♦ *After Recruitment*

None of the respondents indicated that they had a role in determining where ATLAS scholars study nor do they maintain contact with students in training. Only one respondent claimed to receive reports on the status of students in training.

When asked if there were any reasons why ATLAS scholars might not promptly return home after training, the Tanzanians evinced little concern while the other four respondents voiced such concerns

as lack of job guarantees at home, and the temptation to better one's life by staying and working abroad.

♦ ***Professional Enhancement Activities***

The respondents indicated a very limited role in or awareness of ATLAS professional enhancement activities.

♦ ***Relations with the Core Contractor***

The respondents acknowledged the presence of AAI Representatives in their countries although they have very little direct contact with them or with AAI/NY. Respondents think that there is not enough contact and suggest regular meetings at least in relation to the advertising and interviewing process as well as upon the scholars return. Overall, the Tanzanians are not satisfied with their relations with AAI while the other respondents are satisfied. Specifically, the Tanzanians would like improvements in such areas as:

- dialogue with the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans so they could have a better idea of requirements before the selection process begins;
- a study tour to meet ATLAS students in training;
- progress reports from students;
- regular feedback on all aspects of the program;
- periodic symposia where views can be exchanged on ATLAS progress and problems.

Overall, the Tanzanians want more and improved communication with USAID in ATLAS whereas the remaining respondents consider the present arrangements to be satisfactory. All respondents believe that ATLAS will have overall positive impact in their countries.

When asked to make an overall assessment of ATLAS, those that responded indicated the following:

- AAI/New York's performance: fair to good;
- local AAI Representatives performance: unsatisfactory to outstanding;
- the USAID Mission's performance: satisfactory to good;
- their own performance: fair to good;
- ATLAS in general: fair to good.

Nominating agency respondents had several thoughts on what might decrease the likelihood of ATLAS impact:

- contact between ATLAS and the Selection Committee (of which they are members) that continues to be weak and irregular;
- the current approach to private sector participation: they suggested eliminating the requirement for employer endorsement;
- the selection process, which should be improved by involving the Selection Committee in all phases of ATLAS;
- employers and the Government who are not conversant with ATLAS and should be;
- the recruitment and placement process with a time lag that is too extended.

The remaining respondents had few suggestions except for one who urged that the numbers of scholars be increased, that the Mission assist more in repatriation matters and that scholarships be evenly divided between men and women.

♦ ***Observations***

It is evident that the nominating agency officials think that ATLAS is an important program in which they should play a far greater role. USAID might heed some of the suggestions made and explore ways in which "ownership" of ATLAS can be shared more broadly with representatives of both the public and private sectors in the country. There does not appear to be a need for basic changes in the present *modus operandi* in either of the other two countries covered in this survey.

13. Participant and Alumni Employers

The evaluation team interviewed six host country officials responsible in one way or another for ATLAS participants or alumni. Three of the interviews took place in Tanzania, two in Madagascar and one in Guinea. Three respondents were from the public sector, one from a private college which is considered an NGO and two were from the private sector.

♦ ***ATLAS Recruitment and Selection***

When asked their role in recruiting ATLAS candidates, those who responded indicated that the candidates applied directly and that their role was in endorsing applications. Three respondents indicated that they had a role in selecting the fields of study but only one of the six indicated any knowledge of selection criteria. All six stated that a job is reserved for ATLAS participants upon return.

When asked if they would make any changes in ATLAS recruitment, one respondent indicated that he would like to be more involved in selecting candidates and in developing academic programs. Another felt that if the goal was to develop institutions, the institutions should be more involved in the recruitment process. A third respondent requested that after alumni have worked at home for several years they should be allowed to return to the US for further professional development.

♦ ***After Recruitment***

None of the respondents played a role in determining where the ATLAS scholars study. Four of the six claim they maintain contact with the scholars during training and three of them state that they receive regular progress reports during training. Only two respondents indicated that they were notified when an ATLAS scholar was about to complete training; two said they were not notified and two did not respond. All respondents claim that there are plans for professional reintegration upon a scholar's return.

♦ ***Relations with AAI and USAID***

Only one respondent claimed to have relations with AAI in-country while all six have relations with the USAID Mission in their respective countries.

♦ *ATLAS Overall*

Employers by and large have a positive view of ATLAS in their countries: the kind of people being selected will be reintegrated at home after training, and US degrees are respected. One respondent indicated that it was too early in the program to really know about impact. Overall, the respondents give ATLAS very high marks and wish the program could be expanded. One wished that ATLAS could focus more on capacity-building. Another requested:

- more PhDs;
- management courses for all ATLAS participants regardless of fields of study.

♦ *Observation*

Participant and alumni employers clearly support ATLAS and would like to play a greater role in it if Missions so approve.

APPENDIX H:

COUNTRY PROFILE:

GUINEA

APPENDIX H: COUNTRY PROFILE: GUINEA

1. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The following is drawn from interviews conducted by two members of the ATLAS evaluation team during a week in Conakry. The team met with a representative sample of all ATLAS players in Guinea: Mission staff, nominating agency personnel, ATLAS candidates, participant and candidate employers, alumni of ATLAS professional enhancement activities, and the local core contractor field staff representative. Additional perspectives were offered by alumni of the AFGRAD Program in Guinea and by international and local organizations, including those working in gender and development.

a) Findings

Field work in Guinea revealed the following:

- ***The Mission has put superior mechanisms in place for effective implementation of the ATLAS project.***
  - The candidate recruitment process is open and transparent and reaches out to a broad constituency in Conakry, with some outreach to the interior.
  - The Mission offers a strong written and verbal pre-departure orientation program to assist participants with adaptation to the US.
  - The Mission is active in participants' re-entry, with a series of tools to track participants once they return.
  - There is a nascent Alumni Association which offers a wide range of expertise to support the implementation of Mission projects.

- ***The Government of Guinea (GOG) is taking significant steps to support ATLAS effectiveness.***
  - GOG has greatly broadened the candidate recruitment process: announcements are made country-wide using a variety of media to reach a broader pool of applicants than under projects such as AFGRAD.
  - GOG has enhanced the transparency and openness of the ATLAS selection process, incorporating numerous ministries, AFGRAD alumni and members of the private sector and NGO community into the selection process through an Ad Hoc Selection Committee for ATLAS.
  - GOG is providing innovative incentives to participants in training, including making visits to participants in training, supplying a stipend supplement ($50 per month), and implementing special preferential import tariffs for participants bringing goods back from training, including vehicles. GOG is also considering funding a roundtrip ticket home for any participant in long-term training.

- ***The Mission's Training Office has developed and implemented comprehensive mechanisms to increase the likelihood of the impact of Mission-funded training.***
  - ATLAS scholarships are used to provide the leadership training required to support Mission CPSP objectives.
  - The Training Office has developed a series of five tools to track participant and employer intentions for change following training.

- Impact definition begins at the planning stage, when participants and employers work together to define objectives for each training program.
- Returning trainees immediately devise Action Plans for the changes they intend to implement in their professional environments.
- The Training Office has developed and implements a mechanism to track these Action Plans, following up with both participants and their employers until the intended actions are all completed.

b) Conclusions

USAID/Guinea's work in developing and implementing mechanisms to track the impact of ATLAS training is exemplary. Mission innovations and commitment are bolstered by government commitment and openness. While it is too early to assess the impact of ATLAS training — participants are still in training, with no alumni in-country as yet — issues in implementing ATLAS in Guinea emerged according to the following groupings.

- ***Planning Issues: Recruitment, Selection, Pre-Departure Planning***
  - USAID/Guinea is not meeting project or Mission targets for participation by women. There are not enough women presenting themselves for scholarships, and it is not known among government or candidates that the Mission targets women under ATLAS.
  - Information about recruitment is not disseminated widely enough to assure the gender and geographic distribution needed to support Mission CPSP objectives.
  - Information about recruitment is not disseminated in as timely a manner as possible. Radio announcement are made at the normal time for communiqués, 1:00 pm, when many potential applicants are not listening to the radio. Lead times to assemble applications are not always sufficient: Wave I applicants say they had one week between announcement and deadline.
  - AAI's placement mechanisms are lengthy. During this period, the core contractor field staff member is not informed enough about criteria and the ATLAS process to give wise guidance to pending candidates who, with their supervisors, must make professional and familial decisions while awaiting departure.

- ***Impact Issues: The Utilization of ATLAS Training***
  - The momentum for impact developed when the objectives for individual training programs are designed and reinforced during pre-departure orientation is not sustained while participants are in training. Contact between participants, employers, AAI and the Mission is sporadic, through the government claims to send congratulations to participants progressing well and warnings ("avertissements") to those doing poorly.
  - There is no standardized mechanism in place for participants to conduct their research in Guinea, allowing for topics and the development of databases which might be relevant to participants' future employment.
  - The AFGRAD experience shows that professional reintegration differs markedly by sector: health professionals, for instance, have little difficulty finding jobs, followed, in order of difficulty, by the university and the private sector. Alumni returning to government jobs uniformly spent the longest time job-hunting, had the most difficult professional conditions, and demonstrated the least impact on individual careers as measured by salary increases, promotions, and increased responsibilities following training.

- There is no computerized tool for tracking the impact of individual training programs on participants and their employers. PTMS has not proven adaptable to the Mission's impact tracking needs.

- ***Structural Issues***
  - The official locus for gender and development activities for ATLAS has not received sufficient training to be truly effective.
  - The Training Office's impact tracking system has not been formalized and given an official structure.
  - The Alumni Association is not yet fully operational or registered with GOG or with USAID.

- ***Management Issues***
  - The core contractor field staff member plays a modest role. No one outside of GOG and the Training Office was aware of her existence: few employers or candidates knew of her, of the division of responsibilities between AAI and the Mission or of the support services she can provide.
  - The Mission Training Office is not always fully aware of who does what and when between the USAID/W ATLAS management team and AAI/New York.

- ***Communication Issues***
  - The Mission's goal of 50 percent participation by women has not been adequately communicated. While the Ad Hoc Selection Committee was aware of this target, no employers or candidates were so informed.
  - Candidates say they are in the dark about virtually all aspects of their ATLAS programs, including the rationale for their selection, the time required to place them, the length of time from dossier submission to departure, and the Mission's expectations of impact, despite briefings held by the USAID/W ATLAS management team and core contractor staff during pre-selection visits.
  - The core contractor field staff member is unaware of ATLAS objectives, selection criteria and procedures, including the placement mechanism — why it takes so long — and Mission expectations of ATLAS impact.

c) Recommendations

Recommendations to overcome the issues identified above follow.

- ***Recommendations for Planning Training***
  - Steps we suggest to increase the pool of female applicants begin with the announcement process. It is significant that the proportions of women's applications as compared to final candidacies are virtually constant. This suggests that if the pool of women applicants is increased, presumably scholarship awards to women will increase. Written and verbal communiqués should clearly state Mission goals for female participation. The Mission might revise its informational materials, perhaps developing a brochure describing ATLAS as it has done for HRDA. These materials should clearly underline the Mission's gender priorities. Other steps include contacting all women's organizations in Guinea to advertise scholarship opportunities in addition to communicating with the official media. We recommend that these steps to increase the pool of female applicants be implemented and

the results assessed before the Mission considers other measures such as providing undergraduate scholarships to women, eliminating the professional experience requirement for women or funding an all-women wave under ATLAS: measures that are perceived as giving preferential treatment to women might cause a backlash.

- Women and women's organizations should be thoroughly represented on the Ad Hoc Selection Committee. A Mission goal might be to work with the Committee Chair to make sure that GOG ministries on the Commission are equally represented by men and women.
- The Training Office should work with the Selection Committee and AAI to make sure that announcements of scholarship opportunities are transmitted and made in such a way as to provide applicants with sufficient time to assemble their dossiers.

- ***Recommendations for Impact***
  - The Mission should build on its excellent base in defining and tracking actual impact and implement actions while candidates await placement and while participants are in training. Letters congratulating outstanding performance or soliciting information on disappointing results are an example that can be formalized and produced through PTMS.
  - Similarly, the Training Office should work with employers while participants are in training to maintain the channels of communication initiated during the phase of planning for impact. This could take the form of regular letters, meetings, or the Alumni Association might be deployed for such assistance.
  - ATLAS fields of study are currently chosen to support the CPSP. A next step might be to focus on specific institutions which are key to achieving CPSP objectives. The choice of institutions could be based on a needs assessment or sector mapping process. ATLAS activities might then focus on those institutions which are key to providing CPSP-related services and where the likelihood of ATLAS impact can be shown to be maximized. Institutions chosen should demonstrate willingness to plan, manage and utilize ATLAS training effectively.
  - The Training Office should develop a tool to monitor the cumulative impact of ATLAS training on employing organizational capacity and performance if the Mission chooses to increase the likelihood of ATLAS impact by focussing on key institutions.

- ***Recommendations for Formalizing Structures***
  - The staff member responsible for gender under ATLAS should receive appropriate training in communication and gender incorporation methods which avoid backlash so that achievement of Mission objectives regarding gender are supported.
  - The Training Office should formalize its methodology for tracking impact by developing a Mission Order on impact.
  - The Alumni Association should be formalized and steps taken for its recognition with GOG.

- ***Recommendations for ATLAS Management***
  - AAI/New York should provide training to the local AAI Representative so that she fully understands the US-based process, especially final selection, placement and USAID regulations, so that she is in a position to provide accurate advice to candidates and alumni. Knowledge of how the Mission targets fields of study to support overall Mission objectives is also important to allow field staff to fully support ATLAS objectives in Guinea.

- The Alumni Association should be considered as a provider of services to the Mission, ranging from informational seminars on US training or ATLAS procedures to assistance in defining applicants' objectives, pre-departure orientation and impact tracking.
- A member of the Alumni Association should sit on the Ad Hoc Selection Committee for ATLAS to tap that expertise if confidentiality can be preserved.

- ***Recommendations for Communication***
  - AAI/New York should develop informational materials on selection criteria, from academic and professional backgrounds to global competitiveness, to provide to the Training Office for their use and for applicants and candidates.
  - AAI/New York should develop clear descriptions in French of the final selection and placement process to be distributed to candidates so that those awaiting news know what to expect as well as usual timelines for departure.
  - Training Office staff and the core contractor's field staff in-country should receive formal training in the US educational system and ATLAS-specific procedures and processes.
  - The Mission might consider holding informational seminars on the US system and on ATLAS to support the application process, perhaps tapping resources within the Alumni Association and USIS for expertise and assistance.
  - The AAI/New York Placement office should communicate its intentions clearly to the AAI Representative, including where each placement is pending, when an answer is expected, and, if the candidate is admitted, when the Fellow will be called forward so that this information is available so that candidates can make professional and personal plans while awaiting placement. Simple classification as "pending" is not enough.
  - Communication between employers and participants in training should be mandated in order to increase the likelihood of ATLAS impact upon participants' return.

2. ATLAS Achievements in Guinea

ATLAS is in its second year in Guinea. With annual buy-ins of $500,000 for FY93 and FY94, Guinea's overall ATLAS buy-in is among the project's top quarter, and its average annual buy-in among the top ten percent. There are currently 8 participants in training, with 17 pending placement. No ATLAS scholars have completed their training as yet.

USAID/Guinea's most remarkable achievement to date under ATLAS is the manual system the Training Office has devised and implemented to monitor the impact of ATLAS-funded training on individuals and their professional performance.

a) Summary of ATLAS Training

USAID/Guinea and GOG have collaboratively devised an open and transparent recruitment and selection process for ATLAS. Announcements of scholarship opportunities are made by radio in Conakry and in the interior. Applicants are first screened in-country by an inter-ministerial nominating committee, chaired by the Service National des Bourses Extérieures (National Service for External Scholarships) within the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. This Ad Hoc Selection Committee for ATLAS incorporates representatives from 11 ministries, from Guinea's private sector and from the NGO community, in particular, from three women's organizations. The Mission's

Training Office and the local core contractor staff member attend these sessions as non-voting members.

Applicants retained through this in-country pre-selection procedure are then screened by representatives of the ATLAS program travelling annually in Guinea for in-country selection, generally a representative from ATLAS management (USAID/W), a member of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans, and an AAI/New York staff member. Those accepted through this second hurdle are then submitted to the ATLAS Deans Committee for review. These AAI and USAID field visits incorporate a day-long information session on ATLAS for candidates retained in pre-selection.

b) Special Targets

The openness of the nomination process and overall interest in ATLAS scholarships can be measured by the volume of applications. Wave I saw 118 applications; Wave II more than doubled, to 270. 11 candidacies were retained for placement under Wave I, 14 under Wave II: the Mission stands to fund 25 ATLAS scholars if all candidates are offered and accept ATLAS fellowships.

Participation to date of women in ATLAS falls short of both the ATLAS project's goal of 30 percent and the Mission's own internal goal of 50 percent female participation. Furthermore, women's participation has decreased since AFGRAD.

Participation by women must be analyzed in terms of the number and proportion of women *applying* to the project, the number and proportion of women passing the selection process and retained as *candidates* for ATLAS, and lastly, the number and proportion of women achieving placement and accepting actual *scholarships*.

Two women are currently in training (25 percent of current trainees). One Wave I woman and two women under Wave II are still pending placement. If all Wave I and II candidates obtain and accept ATLAS scholarships, women will account for 4 of the 25 scholars, or 16 percent. This can be contrasted to female representation under AFGRAD: according to the Mission's PTMS data, women accounted for 8 of the 36 AFGRAD fellowships, or 22 percent.

The shortfall in female ATLAS scholars begins with recruitment: all other things being equal, in order to offer 35 percent of ATLAS fellowships to women, women would need to account for least a third of the applicant pool. However, women represented only 12 percent of applications under Wave I in Guinea (14 out of 118 applicants). While the number of female applicants almost tripled under Wave II (41 out of 270 applicants), the overall proportion of female applicants rose only slightly, to 15 percent: there was a large increase in applications from men.

Interestingly, the proportion of women applicants as compared to the proportion of women passing the screening hurdles to be selected as candidates remains almost constant. Under Wave I, women accounted for 12 percent of all applications and 18 percent of final candidates. Similarly, under Wave II, women represented 15 percent of applicants and 14 percent of final candidacies. This implies that women in Guinea are as competitive as men: women are not losing ground proportionally from one hurdle to the next. Assuming no favoritism towards women, their dossiers and interviews are as competitive as men's if the ratio remains constant from application to final candidacy.

There is a shortage of women managers in the public sector and a perception that historical and cultural factors inhibit qualified women from applying. However, there is an information dissemination problem as well. The evaluation team found that neither employers nor the candidates themselves knew that women were specifically targeted under ATLAS, and the communiqués to government and media do not state Mission goals for female participation. At the same time, everybody knew that the Mission targets the Guinean private sector, and private sector candidacies under ATLAS are at 16 percent. This is a significant jump from 3 percent private sector participation under AFGRAD. The general awareness of Mission goals demonstrates the effectiveness of the Mission's marketing campaign on behalf of private sector participation. Suggestions for ways to increase outreach to women through the ATLAS announcement procedure and through the composition of the selection committee are provided above under overall recommendations. These include marketing women's participation in ways similar to those already used for the private sector.

ATLAS is largely a public sector training project in Guinea, and the proportion of ATLAS training devoted to private sector development decreased from Wave I to Wave II. The number of private sector candidates has remained constant, at two per year, though the proportion is dropping: the private sector accounted for 18 percent of Wave I, falling to 14 percent for Wave II.

ATLAS's outreach to the private sector far outweighs AFGRAD's: according to the Mission's PTMS data, only one Guinean from the private sector benefitted from an AFGRAD fellowship, a mere 3 percent. This surge to 16 percent under both ATLAS Waves attests to the efficiency of the Mission's campaign to promote private sector participation in its training projects.

ATLAS is reaching a range of professionals. Candidates include doctors, professors, computer scientists, civil service directors, administrators and inspector generals, and, from the private sector, an engineer, an assistant auditor and a financial director.

Regional outreach is improving: 1 Wave I candidate is from the interior (9 percent). This number tripled for Wave II, bringing the proportion of candidates from outside of Conakry to 21 percent under Wave II.

Both the USAID/Guinea Training Office and GOG officials are deeply concerned about repatriation issues. The AFGRAD non-returnee rate currently stands at 17 percent. Both the Mission and GOG have taken steps to enhance the likelihood of alumni return. GOG measures include providing a $50 scholarship supplement per month, legislating preferential tariffs for returning alumni's personal effects, and considering providing return trips for Guineans mid-way through long-term training. Both government and Mission are committed to Guineans conducting graduate research in-country to increase the relevance of their training programs. Lastly, the Mission's impact tracking system begins during the candidate selection process, when intended individual and organizational impact is defined as an integral part of the process of defining objectives for individual training programs. Follow-up impact tracking steps are designed to support the alumni's ability to bring changes to the workplace as a result of ATLAS-funded training. However, it is still too early in the ATLAS process in Guinea to observe the effect of these steps on the overall ATLAS repatriation rate.

c) Professional Enhancement Activities

USAID/Guinea and AFGRAD Alumni receive the ATLAS newsletters (*ATLAS Alert* and *IROKO*, respectively) as well as the *Directory of AFGRAD and ATLAS Fellows*. In addition, two AFGRAD alumni attended an ATLAS Conference on Natural Resource Management, held in Gabon in 1993.

Participant satisfaction was high because of the opportunity for immediate use of what they learned. The element lacking was an opportunity to share what was learned upon return. Their hope was that the Mission would facilitate/sponsor information dissemination — extracts of content presented or in-country conferences or lectures, for example.

No ATLAS grants have been awarded in Guinea. The local core contractor staff member should be further informed about grant availability and take steps to solicit applications.

d) Tracking Impact

USAID/Guinea's singular achievement under ATLAS is the impact tracking system the Training Office has devised and implemented. Piloted under HRDA, USAID/Guinea's impact monitoring system relies on three key features:

- ***Impact is linked to the CPSP.*** The Training Office targets ATLAS fields of study to those that directly support CPSP objectives: agricultural marketing, health/population, basic education, democratization and governance, and natural resources management.

- ***Impact is planned for prior to departure.*** The Training Office includes employers and candidates in the process of planning for impact, working collaboratively to define not only specific academic objectives for training but the changes the participant expects to bring to the workplace upon return. The importance of impact is further reinforced during pre-departure orientation.

- ***Impact is tracked upon return.*** The Training Office has devised a series of devices to support alumni in developing specific Action Plans for change in the workplace upon their return as well as tools to track these changes and the overall implementation of the Plans, including colleague and supervisor experiences and the actual multiplier effect of training.

The Training Office has developed five instruments to track the impact of Mission-funded training on individuals and on their employing organizations.

1. Departing participants complete the Departing Trainees Questionnaire (DTQ), stating their objectives in terms of their professional and academic background, tools frequently used at work, concrete problems at work, training goals, type of training desired, and concrete, measurable professional goals.

2. Immediately upon return, participants are administered the Returned Trainees Questionnaire (RTQ), providing information on their program itself (orientation, management, program content, goals left unmet/reasons why, new skills acquired, suggestions for improvement) and on their goals upon return (immediate plans for applying new skills, expected measurable or observable results). This culminates in a detailed Action Plan with goals and deadlines for implementing professional change. At the same time, the Training Office circulates informational memos on returnees within

the Mission and projects to enhance the likelihood of immediate employment and use of special expertise where appropriate.

3. Three to six months after return, participants complete the Post-Training Questionnaire (PTQ) which tracks any multiplier effect, participant contributions to Guinea's development, and the ongoing level of supervisor interest in the participant.

4. The Follow-Up Assistant tracks participants' Action Plans, as provided in the participant's RTQ, through meetings with alumni, colleagues and employers. She tracks the Action Plans using her Follow-Up Tool ("Fiche de Suivi du Participant") where she captures meeting notes, summarizes impact, and schedules next steps, including further meetings' timing and purpose.

5. When all steps in a returned participant's Action Plan are completed, the Follow-Up Assistant administers the final tool, the Evaluation Questionnaire for Supervisors and Colleagues, which assesses the efficiency of the selection mechanism, benefits of the training to the individual and the organization, reasons for lack of benefits, multiplier effects from Mission-funded training, suggested improvements, and ongoing training needs.

In addition to the steps taken to track impact on individuals, the Training Office occasionally summarizes related information for distribution to project officers.

GOG's participation in supporting impact begins with the selection process. GOG requires that applicants sign three forms. One provides background information; another is a commitment to return home at the conclusion of training; the third is a commitment to remain in the field of study for which the fellowship is granted. The latter two forms are signed both by the candidate and the parent or guardian. These are legal, binding contracts: although this has never happened, GOG can sue the parent or guardian to recuperate any expenditures if the participant fails to return home or deviates from the fellowship.

The Mission involves the employer in its pre-departure contract. Participant, employer and Training Office jointly sign a contract specifying the specific training, individual and organizational objectives, and participant and employer obligations.

The participant contracts to respect the terms of the fellowship, to strive to attain the individual and organizational goals, to provide a training report within ten days of return, and to be available for Mission follow-on.

The supervisor contracts to support "harmonious professional reintegration" within "a reasonable time," to assist in realizing the objectives of training, to participate actively in formulating the Action Plans that are integral to the Mission's impact monitoring strategy, and to collaborate as well with any follow-on.

The Training Office takes few steps to enhance the likelihood of impact during participants' training programs. Both employers and the Mission are virtually uninvolved in communication with participants in training. Steps to track impact are emphasized once participants return home following training, as described above.

3. ATLAS Management

ATLAS in Guinea is managed by a four-person full-time Training Office team, including the Training Office Head, two Training Assistants (Public Sector and Private Sector), and a Training Assistant who is also responsible for the Mission's pioneering follow-on activities. All four are funded under another Mission project.

The Training Office team manages an estimated 150 trainees a year, the majority (roughly 140) under labor-intensive short-term training programs. In addition to two Training Office-managed human resource development projects (ATLAS and HRDA), the team administers training under six bilateral projects, including PD&S.

a) Financial Status and Fiscal Management

USAID/Guinea's buy-ins stand at $500,000 per year for FY93 and FY94. The Training Office relates that AAI/New York has recently begun supplying quarterly financial reports which are judged helpful, both for information and as the basis for entering ATLAS data into the PTMS system.

Budgeting for the overall level of buy-in is done on the basis of the number of scholarships desired. The Training Office has no AFGRAD cost data to support its estimated average costs of training, so the Mission relies on AAI/New York and USAID/W guidance to determine its level of buy-in.

b) AAI Management Effectiveness

It is clear that AAI is knowledgeable and experienced in processing participant training activities. More than adequate mechanisms are in place to screen applications at every step of the recruitment process, from final pre-selection in Guinea through to final selection in New York. AAI provides regular communication to the Mission about trainee progress as well as updates on the status of the Mission's PIO/Ts.

It is equally clear that the core contractor staff representative in Guinea provides few services to ATLAS. While she attends weekly USAID Training Office meetings, she knows far less than the Mission's Training Office staff about ATLAS objectives, selection criteria, desired impact, and the overall AAI implementation process. This limits her role to basic facilitation in the selection process.

This role is limited, however, since AAI/New York has not provided the Representative with sufficient training about ATLAS. Furthermore, AAI/New York does not communicate basic information such as anticipated dates for US university decisions on placement or probable departure dates. The Representative's insufficient understanding and knowledge mean that she is unable to answer applicant and candidate questions. This in turn means that candidates cannot make even tentative professional or familial plans. This was repeatedly said to be a harsh burden.

Lastly, there are major discrepancies between the Mission's data and AAI's: the Mission shows 25 ATLAS participants, including those in the pipeline. AAI's records list 10. This points to the need for better communication between the ATLAS core contractor and Missions.

c) GOG Management Effectiveness

GOG has taken significant steps to institutionalize an open, transparent and effective recruitment system. The system has dramatically improved since AFGRAD according to Mission, government and candidate feedback and as measured by the number of applicants. Furthermore, the ATLAS nomination system is different from that used under all other external donor-funded scholarships, for instance, incorporating NGOs involved in gender activities in the official ATLAS Ad Hoc Selection Committee. This attests to GOG's flexibility and willingness to work with the Mission to improve ATLAS and its impact in Guinea.

All GOG officials interviewed expressed great concern about limiting the potential for non-returnees under ATLAS, and GOG has taken important steps to reduce this risk, including the stipend supplement and preferential tariffs for those bringing goods back from training abroad. GOG officials have visited trainees in the US to reiterate government commitment to their academic success and prompt return following training.

GOG's role in utilizing trainees cannot be truly measured under ATLAS since no one has returned from training to date. If, however, the AFGRAD experience can be seen as the prototype for ATLAS, ATLAS alumni may face serious re-entry difficulties which will strongly and negatively affect the utilization and impact of their training. AFGRAD alumni repeatedly stressed the unreasonable length of time spent finding work, the poor working conditions, lack of professional incentives, and overall difficulty utilizing training, in particular within the government. Many are not doing what was intended when they were nominated for AFGRAD: over a third have left the government for jobs with donor agencies or in other countries.

While government regulations dictate hiring policies, salary ranges and criteria for promotion, GOG must take serious steps to assist with ATLAS professional reintegration if the impact of ATLAS training is to be achieved. Such steps must address the speed of reabsorption — AFGRAD alumni report waiting 4 months to 4 years for government jobs — as well as salaries, promotions, and overall HRD plans if training is to have the impact GOG and the Mission intend.

d) Mission Management Effectiveness

The mechanisms the Training Office uses to implement ATLAS are more than adequate. Mission involvement in recruitment has led to an Ad Hoc Selection Committee for ATLAS. In addition to the inter-ministerial nominating committee GOG uses for other scholarship programs, involving eleven ministries, the ATLAS procedure includes NGOs involved in gender activities in Guinea to reach out to potential applicants in a variety of sectors. The Mission plays a facilitative role in this open and transparent process; outreach can be measured by the increasing volume of applications each year.

Mission commitment to the impact of ATLAS in Guinea begins with the Mission's decision to use ATLAS to support CPSP objectives: ATLAS fields of study are in agricultural marketing, health/family planning, basic education, natural resource management, and democratization and governance. Annual ATLAS Training Plans are circulated among Mission project staff for clearance prior to transmission to ATLAS project management within USAID/W. In addition, the Training Office has designed and implemented an excellent manual system for monitoring and tracking the impact of ATLAS training on individual professional performance. This system gathers baseline data on the

basis of the intentions for impact expressed by participants and employers during the phase of defining objectives for individual training programs.

USAID/Guinea's impact definition and tracking system offers several excellent features. Both employers and participants are involved in defining the impact intended. The system kicks in prior to training, during the training planning phase, allowing the Mission to gather the baseline data against which impact can be assessed. Furthermore, the system tracks intentions for impact and actual changes implemented in the workplace at several points following a participant's return from training: a professional Action Plan is devised immediately upon return, and the Training Office follows up on this Action Plan until all aspects have been implemented. The final stage in the Mission's system for tracking impact allows employers and participants together to assess the overall benefits of ATLAS training to the organization.

The Mission is not yet meeting the project's or its own goals for female participation in ATLAS. The evaluation team recommends a series of steps on two fronts to address this issue. First, we have provided suggestions on ways to increase the pool of women applicants to ATLAS. Secondly, we have recommended that the Training Office staff member responsible for gender under ATLAS receive additional training in this matter. The Mission need not limit such training to the gender specialist under ATLAS: the Mission-wide gender specialist might benefit from additional training as well.

The Mission is actively involved in in-country recruitment and pre-selection, and again in pre-departure planning. The Training Office provides strong pre-departure briefings, and incorporates both participants and employers in drawing up pre-departure contracts for post-training performance which serve as the baseline data against which impact will be measured. Yet Training Office involvement shrinks dramatically when participants leave for training. The Mission might enhance the likelihood of the impact of ATLAS training and of ongoing alumni relationships with USAID if the Training Office communicated more with participants during training. PTMS can be used to generate mailing labels to participants in training about their academic progress, employment prospects, or matters concerning development in Guinea, to name a few examples.

The Mission's system for tracking the impact of ATLAS training has been piloted under HRDA and has not yet been implemented under ATLAS since no one has returned from long-term training to date. Nonetheless the evaluation team feels that the Mission's impact training system is detailed and thorough and should put the Mission in an excellent position to demonstrate the impact of its ATLAS training portfolio.

The evaluation team cannot point to difficulties in professional reabsorption under ATLAS which would diminish the likelihood of achieving the impact intended for each trainee upon return because no one has returned from training as yet. However, the AFGRAD experience shows that public servants in particular suffer severe obstacles in using their training. Barriers to impact include long professional reabsorption periods, poor working conditions, and little or no impact of training on individual salaries, to name a few deterrents. The Mission should strongly consider adding another feature to its impact definition and tracking system. In addition to using ATLAS to support CPSP objectives and to paying meticulous attention to defining impact prior to training and to tracking changes upon return, the Mission should investigate the possibility of linking ATLAS to specific key employing organizations involved in delivering services in the CPSP priority sectors. In such a case, training might have a greater likelihood of impact if it was granted to stable employers who show the

ability to absorb ATLAS returnees properly, and where a critical mass of ATLAS training might produce greater results.

e) USAID/W Management Effectiveness

The Training Office expressed satisfaction with USAID/W management of the ATLAS project.

f) Data Management and Reporting Systems

The Training Office enters ATLAS candidates into the PTMS system on the basis of AAI/New York's quarterly financial reports. The Training Office does not use PTMS to track applications or candidacies.

The Mission uses PTMS to track obligations as reported in AAI/New York's quarterly financial reports. According to both the Controller and the PTMS operator, PTMS is not used in Guinea to track MACS disbursements on training under any project.

PTMS cannot be used for tracking the impact of ATLAS training because PTMS associates each project to a single CPSP objective. This is a constraint in human resource development projects such as ATLAS which are used to support a range of CPSP objectives. Furthermore, PTMS does not include the data fields the Mission is using to track impact, so impact monitoring is still performed manually.

4. Feedback

The evaluation team's interviews yielded the following additional feedback from ATLAS candidates and their employers.

a) Candidate Feedback

Based on interviews with half the Guinean candidates still in country, candidates felt the overall application process was a "walk in the dark." They showed no understanding of how fields of study supported Mission objectives, little understanding of why they as individuals were selected, and considerable confusion about the placement process and anticipated departure dates. This poses problems for government workers and their supervisors who must make decisions about promotions and hiring strategies. Private sector candidates, entrepreneurs in particular, are seriously constrained since they must recruit and train staff to maintain their businesses. What information was known was generally by word of mouth from AFGRAD alumni to ATLAS applicants and candidates.

This information vacuum is due in part to candidates' lack of initiative in seeking information and in the inherent difficulties in communicating the nature of an experience like two years in the United States. At the same time, there are steps the core contractor could take to make things easier and to build the foundations for future relations between USAID, core contractor and alumni. Written information would be helpful, in particular about the recruitment process, criteria for success and placement delays and requirements. Both AAI/New York and the Alumni Association should be tapped to assist with this problem.

b) The View From Employers: Sponsoring Institutions' Feedback

Candidate and current participant employers were largely satisfied with the ATLAS program. Employers were marginally involved in defining objectives for training, and are by and large not in touch with participants in training. Employers were largely unaware of the presence of an AAI Representative in Guinea and were therefore not approaching her for communication or services.

APPENDIX I:

COUNTRY PROFILE:

TANZANIA

APPENDIX I: COUNTRY PROFILE: TANZANIA

Two members of the ATLAS evaluation team visited Tanzania and met with members of the USAID Mission, the Selection Advisory Committee, the core contractor representative in Tanzania, host country nominators, and ATLAS alumni and employers.

1. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

a) USAID Mission/Core Contractor Field Representative Relationship

Finding: The AAI Representative is not effectively utilized for ATLAS. Prior to 1991, the AAI Representative played the major role in managing the ATLAS predecessor project, AFGRAD. However, with the advent of ATLAS, the Mission assumed responsibility for virtually all aspects of planning and managing the program. There have been several attempts to rationalize the situation over the past several years, including discussions with the USAID Mission, and interventions of USAID/W and AAI/New York. The Training Officer was unfortunately out of town on other business so his insights in this matter could not be solicited.

Conclusion: The dysfunctional relationship described above clearly needs to be resolved. From our perspective, there would appear to be scope for the USAID Training Officer and the AAI Representative to share functions that would improve the effectiveness of the overall program. The AAI Representative has considerable overseas scholarship management experience which could be usefully adapted to ATLAS, in such areas as candidate selection and counselling, pre-departure orientation, dossier documentation and communication with AAI/New York, GRE, GMAT, TOEFL testing services, student monitoring and reporting to sponsors and professional enhancement activities in country.

Recommendation: The Program Officer should convene a series of meetings with the USAID Training Officer and the AAI Representative toward the goal of developing an effective modus vivendi. All phases of the ATLAS training cycle should be reviewed and the possibility of assigning, or sharing, discrete functions with the AAI Representative should be carefully considered. If this review proves fruitful, the responsibilities should be clearly delineated and the mutually agreed understanding recorded in a memorandum of agreement to guide future relationships and to avoid confusion.

For at least the first year, it is suggested that the Program Officer convene monthly meetings between the three parties to review progress and problems and to decide upon the following month's plan of action.

b) Functioning of the Selection Advisory Committee (SAC)

Finding: This USAID-organized committee generally meets twice a year to review the final short-list of candidates for ATLAS and HRDA training and to conduct interviews of the finalists. The Committee consists of members from USAID, the Government of Tanzania, the private sector and AAI/New York (including a member of the ATLAS Deans' Committee). Prior to the SAC meetings, the Mission greatly reduces the number of applications received from the annual newspaper advertisement through a pre-screening process. USAID instructs the government and private sector SAC members to

assign numerical ratings during the final reviewing and interviewing process based upon criteria and rating sheets that the Mission prepares in advance.

The ATLAS selection process is fair, open and very competitive and SAC members are pleased to be associated with it. However, they are concerned about their limited role. They would like to participate in, or at least be kept better informed on such matters as how the fields of training are selected, how many applicants respond to the advertisement, and how the short list presented to them for review is derived. For example, they did not seem to be aware that they were screening applications of other USAID training projects beyond ATLAS. They would also like information on matters after they have completed their interviews, including placement data, student progress, re-entry and impact. Overall, they would welcome a greater role in ATLAS and be more "in the loop" throughout the training process because they believe that a larger role will give them a greater sense of ownership and that ATLAS will benefit from their experience and advice.

One SAC member expressed concern over the limited advance notice USAID provides prior to the meetings, which makes it difficult to plan participation. The two private sector members also requested that special consideration be given to the criteria for attracting outstanding private sector candidates given the constraints in such areas as obtaining employer endorsements for long term overseas training.

There has been a fair degree of turnover in SAC membership since the Committee's inception, allowing SAC to benefit from a fresh perspective and keeping the Committee from becoming ingrown.

Conclusion: The SAC is performing its USAID-assigned tasks effectively. However, Tanzania government and private sector members would like to be more involved in ATLAS than they are at present, at least to be kept better informed of other aspects of the program beyond the screening and interviewing phase.

Recommendation: USAID should consider broadening the role of the SAC to enable its members to become more involved in other aspects of ATLAS, in addition to the selection process.

USAID should Also devise a means of keeping SAC members more aware of major ATLAS activities in all aspects of the training cycle from initial planning on numbers and fields of training to re-entry professional enhancement opportunities as well as impact and utilization issues.

c) Professional Enhancement

A major project design feature distinguishing ATLAS from AFGRAD is its emphasis on expanding professional enhancement activities of returned USAID participants to enable greater impact and utilization of US-acquired skills and ideas. The Mission has been instrumental in launching an alumni association and ATLAS undertook a regional seminar on "Export Market Entry Strategies" in Arusha last year under the professional enhancement aspect of ATLAS. Mission personnel interviewed were not aware of the ATLAS grant programs or other professional enhancement opportunities.

Conclusion: The Mission could take better advantage of the full range of ATLAS possibilities in Tanzania.

Recommendation: The USAID Program Officer should review the ATLAS project paper with the Training Office staff to ascertain if there might be other areas of professional enhancement to pursue in-country

for returned participants, including, but not limited to, ATLAS returnees. This may be an area for greater involvement of the AAI Representative, as well as the newly formed alumni association.

d) ATLAS Impact in Tanzania

Finding: The Mission has no specific plan or methodology to measure the impact of its ATLAS investment. Future programming would clearly benefit from data on current experience if it can be accurately and efficiently obtained and presented.

Of immediate concern is the status of the eight ATLAS alumni who have already completed their US experience. We were only able to interview five of them because two are working far from Dar-es-Salaam and a third has returned to the US for further studies. Of the five interviewed, all of whom received Masters Degrees in the US and did very well academically, three are in positions where they can make good use of their US training; one is the City Solicitor in Dar-es-Salaam, and effectively Deputy City Manager; the second, a woman, is a department head in the National Construction Council; and the third is a tax examiner in the Income Tax Department in the Ministry of Finance.

The first two seem to be in responsible positions where they have or will have ample opportunity to adapt their US experience to local needs and have significant impact on the process. The third, the tax examiner, appears to be technically sound and competent, but is not as yet in a position to have much impact on his department given the seemingly modest level of his post.

While both the remaining two alumni seem competent and ambitious, they are in moribund or non-jobs and have no clear idea what the future has in store for them in Tanzania's currently retrenching job environment. One worked for a parastatal, National Distributors, Ltd., which has recently been abolished and he is caretaking there until he can find another job. The other alumnus, a lecturer at Kivukoni College, the former think tank and political training center for the ruling party, is also without an active position. The college has been trying to find a new role for itself in the present multi-party situation in the country, but has been unable to obtain sufficient funds to reopen under its proposed new name, Kivukoni Academy of Social Sciences. Meanwhile, the ATLAS alumnus is having a difficult time maintaining morale as he struggles to support his family on a very low salary while he continues to seek other opportunities in the event that the Academy does not reopen.

Given the realities of limited employment opportunities in the developing world in general, the status of this first wave of returnees to Tanzania perhaps should not come as a surprise, but it is a concern. Great effort should be placed on selecting candidates and employing institutions with the highest possible likelihood of successful utilization and impact upon return, such as the first two described above. One person interviewed believes that the caliber of candidates is not as good as in AFGRAD days primarily due to the deterioration in the local education system over the past decade. If this is true, it places even greater pressure on the care put in to the selection process, and might suggest another reason to more greatly involve some leading Tanzanians, such as SAC members, in developing criteria and policies for selection of future candidates who most likely will have positive impact upon return regardless of economic conditions. These criteria might incorporate identifying leadership qualities which could be sought and given weight in the selection process.

Conclusion: It is suggested that USAID give greater consideration to the expected impact of ATLAS participants upon return to Tanzania. This might include devising a method for measuring impact and

feeding lessons learned on a rolling basis into ATLAS to improve future programs, while fine-tuning the selection, placement, enrichment and enhancement phases.

Recommendation: USAID/Tanzania should give serious attention to the anticipated impact of ATLAS alumni by developing methods for measuring impact of ATLAS on the participant, his or her institution and the country in general, and by feeding back lessons learned into future programs to ensure that ATLAS is obtaining the maximum benefits from its investment. The questions need to be continuously asked: Are we choosing the best fields of training? Are we choosing the most outstanding (leadership) candidates? Are we providing the best possible academic and enrichment experiences? Are we providing useful professional enhancement upon return?

2. The ATLAS Process in Tanzania

The Mission annually places an advertisement on its overseas training programs, which this past year included HRDA and Entrepreneurs International in addition to ATLAS. The response has been high — last year nearly four thousand applications were received. The Mission has developed a four-step process to sift through and short list applicants for its overseas programs, which they believe is working quite well. The fields of training to be included each year are selected by the Program Officer and are related to the Mission's strategic objectives as well as the country's push toward privatization. Emphasis is placed on enlarging the pool of women available for overseas training through such means as sponsoring undergraduate training for women and ATLAS.

Successful candidates require endorsement or sponsorship from employers or host government supervisors as part of the basic requirement package. Overall, USAID Mission staff interviewed are satisfied with the quality of ATLAS candidates that are generated through the selection process.

3. Participation by Women

Twenty percent of ATLAS participants to date have been women, about the same proportion achieved earlier under AFGRAD. Major emphasis has been placed on increasing this percentage by encouraging women to apply, urging sponsors to nominate them, including four-year undergraduate degree training for women only, and favoring women, other things being equal, in the selection process. Despite these efforts, ATLAS is not yet approaching the Mission's target of fifty percent female participation.

4. Professional Enhancement Activities

An alumni association has been established with the active participation of the USAID Training Officer and the Mission is using PTMS to track the whereabouts of ATLAS returnees. Exit interviews are scheduled with returnees who are encouraged to keep in periodic touch with the Mission.

Mission staff receive and distribute *IROKO* and *ATLAS Alert*. No Mission staff interviewed were aware of the ATLAS grants program, and the five ATLAS alumni interviewed were for the most part unaware of the opportunity for further professional enhancement under ATLAS, although these opportunities are regularly featured in the two ATLAS newsletters. There is clearly an opportunity for the Training Office to expand its activities in this area, especially with regard to the grants program.

5. ATLAS Management in Tanzania

As reflected in the Country Program Strategic Plan (1992-1997), USAID/Tanzania's program goal is to assist Tanzania's attainment of "real growth and improved human welfare." This program goal is being pursued through implementation of projects designed to accomplish three strategic objectives: (1) more effective infrastructure services delivered, (2) increased formal private sector participation in the economy, and (3) increased use of family planning and HIV/AIDS preventive measures. Each of these objectives is expected to benefit from, and is significantly promoted through, training provided under ATLAS and other training projects. The Mission participates in ATLAS to provide Tanzania's private and public sectors with the managerial and technical skills training necessary for achieving the goals and reforms addressed under the Economic Recovery Program agreed to with the donor community.

USAID/Tanzania's extensive training activities are managed by a four-person Training Office, directed by the Program Officer. Staffed by three Tanzanian professionals and a secretary, the office maintains and uses the PTMS system to assist them in managing some 500 participants annually.

There is no Human Resources Development Officer (HRDO) on staff. The Program Officer expresses satisfaction with his Training Office staff and delegates as much as possible to them. He recognizes a difficulty working with the AAI Representative who is effectively out of the ATLAS loop as the project is currently being managed and welcomes suggestions from the evaluation team to improve the situation. He, as well as the Training Office staff interviewed, believes there are sufficient challenges in the project to enable both the AAI Representative and the USAID Training Office to share responsibilities, but to date, this has not occurred. The Mission seems quite pleased with the services being provided both by USAID/W and AAI/New York in the conduct of ATLAS activities.

♦ *ATLAS Recruitment and Selection*

While USAID Mission staff interviewed generally believe that the selection process is effective, we have some concern in this area. The pre-selection screening process appears somewhat unwieldy, quite likely due to USAID's decision to combine the announcement of several USAID training opportunities — ATLAS, HRDA, Entrepreneurs International — into one advertisement each year. As a result, some 3,900 applications were received in 1993; the bulk were for short-term training. A Training Office analysis indicates that 639 applications from this pool were for long-term training, presumably either ATLAS or HRDA. This number was eventually reduced to 225 based upon a review of the applications. These were further reviewed and reduced to some 55 candidates who were interviewed for either ATLAS or HRDA scholarships. Eventually 25 were selected.

Annually announcing the various USAID scholarship programs in a single newspaper advertisement might be confusing to applicants and to SAC members who are not aware that they are interviewing for HRDA as well as ATLAS, and might also dilute the prestigious character of ATLAS. It is suggested that USAID review this practice to assure itself that the ATLAS reputation for quality is not being compromised.

♦ *ATLAS Placement*

The Mission expresses satisfaction with the training implementation plans for its ATLAS participants as well as with the limited role of employers and host country government officials in the placement

process. However, the Mission is not satisfied with its limited use of HBCUs in ATLAS which to date consists of 3 placements, according to AAI records. The Mission relies on the core contractor to remedy this situation.

♦ ***Pre-Departure Orientation***

Training Office staff and alumni claim that there is no formal USAID pre-departure orientation program under ATLAS. Several interviewees involved in ATLAS noted that it would be greatly beneficial to candidates if the lead time between interviewing and departure could be shortened. If this is not possible, perhaps candidates could be kept more frequently informed as to their status.

♦ ***Managing ATLAS After Participants Return***

Re-entry is handled by the Training Office, using PTMS to track the whereabouts of ATLAS participants including alumni. Training Office staff feel they are maintaining satisfactory relationships with alumni and there have been no reported problems concerning recognition of US degrees upon return home.

♦ ***Relations with the ATLAS Core Contractor***

Although the Mission recognizes that working relationships with the local AAI Representative are unsatisfactory and something needs to be done to correct the situation, Mission staff expressed satisfaction with relations with AAI/New York and with travelling AAI/New York staff and Deans.

6. Feedback from ATLAS Stakeholders in Tanzania

♦ ***Feedback From ATLAS Alumni***

Five alumni were interviewed in Tanzania: four men and one woman. All five received Masters Degrees in their respective fields, three in Public Administration, one in Development Administration and on in Engineering Management. They were in the US for programs ranging from eighteen to thirty months. All returned during the past year, some as recently as three months ago.

All five returnees rated the quality and relevance of their programs as very good to outstanding. They all excelled academically, maintaining or exceeding GPAs of 3.5 plus. They were unanimous in expressing their praise for the way their programs were managed by AAI, and made several suggestions for improvement in terms of closer attention to appropriate placement and assistance in arranging practical training. Of the five returnees, two received practical training at the end of their academic programs and three of them attended enrichment seminars. They all were naturally pleased with the ATLAS selection process because of their selection in a highly competitive and open environment. While as a group they were satisfied with their US training in relation to post-training employment, two of the returnees are for all intents and purposes without jobs at the moment and a third would have preferred a different emphasis in her degree in relation to her current job.

Our survey sample revealed good communication among alumni and employers in all aspects of the program which has facilitated the re-entry process. Two of the five alumni interviewed underwent practical training experiences and felt these contributed to program success. All five gave high marks to both the quality and relevance of their training, although one would have preferred another

university because her particular interest, construction management, was not available at the university in which she was placed. They all indicated that they received excellent support from AAI/New York and their universities and, overall, were very pleased with their ATLAS programs.

With regard to suggested changes to improve ATLAS programs, the alumni suggested:

- greater utilization of returnees' skills through Tanzanian government and USAID Mission encouragement and support;
- greater emphasis on networking among returnees by such means as the newly formed alumni association;
- permission for immediate family members to join participants while in training;
- greater assistance from AAI/New York in arranging practical training.

♦ *Feedback From Host Country Government Officials*

We interviewed two host country officials who have roles in ATLAS, one the Director, Human Resources Planning in the President's Office, and the other, the Director for Recruitment and Training, Civil Service Commission, who is also a member of the ATLAS Selection Advisory Committee. Both respondents are strong supporters of ATLAS and would like to be more involved in the overall training cycle than they are at present.

Host country officials in Tanzania would like more information and feedback on the program, whereby they might be able to suggest improvements in the process, in such areas as assuring the relevance of training programs to national development goals and linking scholarships to post-training employment opportunities. Other than their desire to become more in the ATLAS loop, they are satisfied with their relationship with USAID and with AAI.

♦ *Feedback From Sponsoring Institutions*

Three employers/supervisors of ATLAS alumni were interviewed. They all supported the scholarships of their employees and have a favorable impression of the training received. Progress reports were generally received and appreciated by sponsors during the training period. In all cases, the alumni have returned so recently that it is not possible for the employers to indicate much in the way of tangible impact, but all three noticed positive changes in attitudes and increased knowledge of their returnees and look forward to the contributions they expect will be forthcoming. There appears to be a conducive environment, especially in two of the three organizations, for the returnees to utilize their newly acquired skills and ideas. The three employers had no specific suggestions for improvements in the program, only that it keep going and expand, if possible, to cover more of their staff training needs.

APPENDIX J:

COUNTRY PROFILE:

MADAGASCAR

APPENDIX J: COUNTRY PROFILE: MADAGASCAR

1. Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

The following is drawn from interviews conducted by an ATLAS evaluation team member during eight days in Antananarivo. The team member met with a representative sample of all ATLAS players in Madagascar: Mission staff, nominating agency representative, private and public sector entities which play a recruitment/nominating role, alumni, candidates, employers, and the AAI Representative. Additional perspectives were offered by AFGRAD alumni.

a) Findings

- ***The Mission has put innovative mechanisms in place for recruiting candidates for the ATLAS project, reaching out to a broad constituency in Antananarivo, with some outreach to the provinces.***
  - More than 12 diverse associations and institutions serve as ATLAS recruiters. These include one private and several public professional universities, an NGO association, a businesswomen's association, and commercial associations, assuring that applicants meet ATLAS criteria before applications are submitted to the Mission. To date, 82 percent of applications have been processed through these recruiters, whereas the Ministry of Foreign Affairs accounts for only 18 percent of applications.
  - Announcement of ATLAS scholarships to be awarded — including a detailed description of criteria, fields of study, application process, pre-selection procedures including required exams, and contractual or financial obligations of sponsors — made through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as the above recruiters, providing information dissemination to both the private and public sector.
  - The Mission has constituted an internal Project Implementation Committee for ATLAS which pre-selects candidates for training. The AAI Representative sits on this Committee.
  - In 1994 Mission Training Office staff initiated informational seminars on ATLAS, advertised on local radio, in the provinces of Tamatave, Diego, Tulear. 61 persons in Tamatave, 13 in Diego, and 20 in Tulear attended the seminar; some attendees represented public or private sector institutions. Prior to these seminars, these inhabitants of these provinces were unaware of the availability of ATLAS scholarships. No informational seminars were held in Antananarivo; recruitment is handled in the capital through recruiter organizations and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

- ***The Mission disseminates information on the cost-sharing nature of ATLAS scholarships in announcements and insists that Malagasy sponsors assume a share of costs, making this a three-party contract and maximizing commitment on the part of sponsor and employee.***
  - Employer costs include local travel, lodging and maintenance when the candidate is enrolled in an intensive English course at the American Cultural Center in Antananarivo, costs of medical exam and visa, round trip ticket to the US, and salary while enrolled in ATLAS.
  - The Mission considers waiving travel costs for public sector candidates on a case-by-case basis.

- ***The Mission has been particularly successful in recruiting women as well as candidates from the private sector.***
  - Whereas women represented 10 percent of AFGRAD III awards, this proportion has swelled to 43 percent under ATLAS.
  - Private sector awards have grown from 30 percent of AFGRAD III to 46 percent under ATLAS.

- ***The Alumni Association, AAAA, has worked on an ad hoc basis with the Mission's Training Office to provide services which that office is hard-pressed to provide because of staff limitations.***
  - In 1993 AAAA created a brochure and participated in pre-departure orientation along with Training Office staff.
  - AAAA was active in working for GOM to accept US doctorates at the highest level of Malagasy Civil Service ranking and continues to work on ongoing issues of degree equivalency.
  - Association members network and maintain they are able to provide re-entry counseling and help with job placement for both AFGRAD and ATLAS alumni.

- ***The AAI Representative is highly regarded by the Mission.***
  - The AAI Representative has had considerable experience with AFGRAD and is Director of Special Programs at the USIS American Cultural Center.
  - The AAI Representative sits in on all ATLAS meetings and selection interviews.
  - The AAI Representative also counsels individual applicants and retained candidates.

b) Conclusions

USAID/Madagascar has taken significant steps to enlarge the ATLAS applicant pool, meet targets for women, and increase private sector participation, while at the same time faced with the Government of Madagascar's transition to democracy, the doubling of Mission USDH staff from 1991 to 1994, and a small Training Office staff. Mission innovations and commitment have created strong links with the private sector and strategic technical sectors.

Issues in implementing ATLAS in Madagascar emerged as follows:

- ***Planning Issues: Recruitment and Selection***
  - Information about ATLAS scholarships is not disseminated widely enough to assure the geographic distribution the Mission needs to support CPSP objectives. Newspaper or radio advertisements country-wide to recruit candidates for ATLAS may attract qualified candidates from among the 20 percent of salaried Malagasy who work outside the capital.
  - The procedure used to pre-select candidates for interviews, review by the Mission's Project Implementation Committee and the local AAI Representative — with no outside representatives participating — could be perceived as opaque rather than transparent.
  - The ATLAS Project Implementation Committee does not always adhere to criteria for selections detailed in ATLAS announcements. While this flexibility may appear reasonable, it can lead to the perception that the selection process is not equitable.

- ***Impact Issues: Utilization of ATLAS Training***

- To date the Mission's Training Office has not developed the necessary mechanisms to track and increase the likelihood of the impact of Mission-funded ATLAS training as called for in the Project Paper.
- The momentum for impact developed when the objectives for individual training programs are designed is not sustained while participants are in the US. Contact between participants, employers and the Mission is sporadic.
- There is no mechanism in place to allow or encourage participants to conduct their research in Madagascar, increasing the relevance of their training as well as assuring the development of corresponding databases.
- Information on ATLAS regional and national conferences and grants available under the field activities component is not widely disseminated.
- The AAI Representative plays virtually no role in defining the impact of training in ATLAS alumni workplaces.

- ***Communication Issues: A Hunger for Information***
  - Applicants, candidates and employers demonstrate a hunger for more information in every phase of the ATLAS process.
  - Candidates do not always understand the rationale for their selection, the time required to place them, the length of time from dossier submission to departure, or why employers are asked to bear a portion of costs.

- ***Management Issues: Staffing Constraints***
  - The Mission's Training Office staff is clearly competent and efficient; just as clearly the workload is such that only priority tasks get attention.
  - Planning for and increasing the likelihood of impact — including improved communications between participants, employers and the Mission and re-entry and follow on activities and data collection — is dependent on increased staffing.
  - Planning for and increasing the likelihood of impact is also dependent on a clearly defined and agreed-upon role for the AAI Representative.

c) Recommendations

Recommendations related to the issues identified above are as follows:

- ***Recommendations for Planning Training***
  - The Mission may want to consider using other media — newspaper and radio — to disseminate information on ATLAS to assure a wider geographical coverage. The larger volume of applications which would result could still be funneled through recruiters.
  - The pre-selection process could be made more transparent by asking several private and/or public sector representatives to serve on the ATLAS review committee/Project Implementation Committee as is done in other countries. This could be done on an ad hoc basis pending reorganization of a Private Sector Advisory Committee as recommended in the draft Country Training Strategy.
  - The ATLAS Review Committee should adhere strictly to announced ATLAS criteria. This may mean changing ATLAS criteria, particularly the age limitation.

- ***Recommendations for Impact***
  - It is strongly recommended that the Training Office focus on developing mechanisms to track and increase the likelihood of ATLAS impact as called for in the Project Paper. Impact in the alumni workplace following training should be planned for prior to departure, momentum maintained during training, action plans devised on return. Impact must be tracked to measure changes in the workplace.
  - It is important that communication be maintained with ATLAS scholars in the US. Letters congratulating outstanding performance or soliciting information on disappointing results can be formalized and produced through PTMS if mailing addresses are kept current.
  - The Training Office should also work with employers to maintain open channels of communication and report on ATLAS scholars' progress. This can build on the relationships the Training Office develops during the candidate selection process and is an important first step towards maximizing the likelihood of impact: working with employers to target increased organizational capacity and performance.
  - It is in the Mission's interest to support alumni endeavors, whether it be newsletter production, participation in pre-departure, or networking.
  - ATLAS fields of study are currently chosen to support the CPSP. A next step might be to focus on specific institutions which are key to achieving CPSP objectives. ATLAS activities could then be focused on institutions where impact would be maximized.
  - The Training Office and the local AAI Representative should explore in- country research possibilities with AAI/New York, targeting cooperation between US universities and Malagasy institutions so as to maximize the long-term impact of ATLAS interventions.

- ***Recommendations for Improved Communication***
  - A memo of understanding should be drawn up between the Mission's Training Office and the AAI Representative, clearly delineating the responsibilities of the AAI Representative. For example, if responsibility for disseminating progress reports to employers is the AAI Representative's job, it should be so stated.
  - AAI/New York should develop informational materials in French on selection criteria, from academic and professional backgrounds to global competitiveness, to provide to the Training Office for applicants and candidates.
  - AAI/New York should develop clear descriptions in French of the final selection and placement process, to be distributed to retained candidates so that those awaiting placement know what to expect as well as tentative timelines for departure.
  - The Mission and the AAI Representative should consider holding informational seminars on the US system and on ATLAS to support the application process, perhaps tapping resources within AAAA for expertise and assistance.
  - AAI/New York should communicate its implementation and placement efforts clearly to the AAI Representative, including where each placement is pending, when an answer is expected, and, if the candidate is admitted, when the Fellow will be called forward so that candidates can make professional and personal plans while awaiting placement. Classification as "pending" is not enough.
  - Communication between employers and participants during training should be mandated, managed and monitored in order to increase the likelihood of ATLAS impact on participant's return.

- ***Recommendations for Management***
  - Staffing should be increased by two positions, one a Training Manager, the other an Assistant, as recommended in the draft Country Training Strategy.
  - All of the recommendations listed above under Planning Training and Impact are dependent on an adequate staffing pattern.

2. ATLAS Achievements in Madagascar

ATLAS is in its fourth year in Madagascar. Mission annual buy-ins have ranged from $400,000 to $1,200,000 to $1,000,000 to $700,000. Madagascar's overall ATLAS buy-in totals $3.3 million to date and is among the project's top three participators.

There are currently 3 returned ATLAS alumni, 19 participants in training, with 9 pending placement. 17 scholarships are planned under Wave 5, five of which will be awarded to make up for withdrawals in previous waves. Interviews for Wave 5 were being held concurrently with the evaluation team's mission to Madagascar.

USAID/Madagascar's most important achievement to date under ATLAS has been in recruiting and awarding scholarships to large numbers of women (43 percent) and to the private sector (46 percent).

3. ATLAS Implementation in Madagascar

USAID/Madagascar for various strategic reasons has chosen not to work directly with CONABEX (Comité National de Bourses Extérieures, or National Committee for External Scholarships), and maintains a relationship exclusively with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs which forwards correspondence from CONABEX. While no formal agreement resulted from a 1992 meeting held with other scholarship donors regarding the nature of this relationship, other donors have also tried to limit their contact with the Committee and create parallel recruitment channels.

In the vacuum created by the 1991 general strike and consequent non-functioning or poorly functioning government, USAID/Madagascar began working through a variety of independent organizations to recruit and pre-screen ATLAS applications. To date, 82 percent of applicants have been processed through these independent "recruiters," resulting in 71 percent of actual scholarship awards. Applications forwarded through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs account for 18 percent of applications and 29 percent of scholarship awards.

ATLAS in Madagascar has a Project Implementation Committee, consisting of the Program Officer, who directly supervises the Training Office, Training Office staff, Population Coordinator, Project Design Officer, and the AAI Representative. This Internal Mission Review Committee is responsible for pre-selecting candidates to be interviewed by representatives of the AAI program traveling annually to Madagascar for in-country selection.

US-based officials generally include a representative from ATLAS project management (USAID/W), a member of the ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans, and an AAI/New York staff member. However, this year candidates were interviewed only by an AAI/New York staff member and the head of USAID/M Training Office; the local AAI Representative sat in on these interviews. Candidates

selected through this in-country process are then forwarded to the ATLAS Deans Committee for review in the US.

a) Special Targets

Both private sector and women participants have significantly increased since AFGRAD III. Whereas women represented only 10 percent of AFGRAD III scholarship awards, they represent 43 percent of ATLAS scholarship awards to date. Private sector participation came to 30 percent of AFGRAD III awards and has risen to 46 percent under ATLAS. These are significant increases and reflect an effort on the part of the Training Office and recruiting organizations to reach target audiences.

Women traditionally have excelled in Malagasy educational settings. However, in terms of employment, Malagasy women face considerable constraints both in the public and private sector according to university counselors, employers and AFGRAD alumni. Should the Training Office staff be increased as recommended herein and in the draft Country Training Strategy, efforts should be made to work with employers sponsoring women applicants to increase the likelihood of impact on return and to decrease the likelihood of underemployment.

Mission Training Office staff gave seminars on ATLAS in three different provinces this year, a significant effort at outreach beyond the capital. While 80 percent of salaried Malagasy work in the capital, the remaining 20 percent work in outlying provinces. Mission efforts to reach that 20 percent will likely pay off in terms of recruiting "new blood" into an ingrown island power structure, while at the same time providing a model for a "democratic" process as Malagasy private and public sector institutions move toward democracy after years of centralized control.

b) Professional Enhancement Activities

USAID/Madagascar and AFGRAD/ATLAS alumni receive the ATLAS newsletters (*ATLAS Alert* and *IROKO* respectively) as well as the *Directory of AFGRAD and ATLAS Alumni*. It should be noted, however, that the *Directory* is considered out of date; at one point the Training Office had discussed the possibility of AAAA undertaking the needed directory update. Updating the *Directory* may be an activity which the Mission will want to support with a small contract in order to encourage AAAA activism.

Neither of the two ATLAS alumni interviewed were receiving subscriptions to professional magazines.

One Malagasy attended the Harare, Zimbabwe Conference on Management and Development in September 1994. He is not an AFGRAD/ATLAS alumnus but does serve as an advisor to the Ministère de l'Economie and is Marketing Director of MAEVA-TV. He found the conference useful yet rated the conference overall as satisfactory because of time constraints. He felt strongly that the content covered could not be dealt with adequately in one week but rather needed two weeks.

c) ATLAS Impact

ATLAS in Madagascar is linked to the CPSP. The Training Office limits ATLAS fields of study to those that directly support CPSP objectives: economics, finance, accounting and computer systems, business management, agriculture and natural resource management, health and population, and civil engineering.

Recommendations emphasize the need for the Training Office to focus on developing the mechanisms necessary to track and increase the likelihood of ATLAS impact as called for in the Project Paper. A first step might be to request from USAID/Guinea information on how they have envisioned tracking of ATLAS impact and to request copies of the five forms the Training Office has developed as tools.

ATLAS project design included an impact tracking component for a number of reasons. Despite predecessor projects which represent a substantial USAID investment over the years in African human resource development, academic training remains peripheral to agency development theory: academic training has not demonstrated its critical relationship to overall sustainable development. If ATLAS is to remain a viable project and reach EOPS targets by 2006, it must demonstrate that it is an integral to host country sustainable development. The responsibility for defining and tracking impact falls to participating countries.

4. ATLAS Management

ATLAS in Madagascar is managed by a part time Training/Program Specialist with the help of a Training Assistant and a personal service contractor hired to manage HRDA private sector initiatives. The Training/Program Specialist and Training Assistant are funded under OE, while the personal service contractor is HRDA-funded. The Training/Program Specialist who heads the Training Office under the Program Support Officer's supervision is also responsible for tracking local currency generation, Mission budget and reporting of all Mission financial data to the Government and UNDP.

The Training Office in 1994 managed 251 trainees, the majority under labor-intensive short-term training programs. 10 of these 251 trainees were ATLAS. In addition to managing ATLAS and HRDA, the team helps 7 bilateral projects with their training components. While technical offices have contractors to implement their training, the Training Office is asked to give information on training courses available, reply to questions contractors may have concerning training regulations, process visas for US participants, and enter training data into PTMS.

a) Financial Status and Fiscal Management

USAID/Madagascar's buy-in from 1991 through 1994 averaged $850,000 a year for a total of $3,300,000. The Mission does not plan to buy in to ATLAS in FY95 because of a projected cut in OYB: at the time of the field visit estimates for FY95 ranged from $25,000,000 to $28,000,000, down from an expected $30,000,000.

The Training Office reports that they must ask AAI for financial reports every six months and they are not automatically provided each quarter. Budgeting for the overall level of buy-in is based on the number of scholarships to be awarded.

The Training Office has no AFGRAD cost data to support its estimates of average costs, so the Mission relies on AAI/New York for costs to determine its level of buy-in.

b) AAI Management Effectiveness

It is clear that AAI is knowledgeable and experienced in processing participant training activities. Adequate mechanisms are in place to screen applications at every step of the recruitment process, from final pre-selection in Madagascar to final selection in New York. AAI provides regular

communication to the Mission about trainee progress as well as updates on the status of the Mission's PIO/Ts.

The perception, however, of the Program Officer who supervises the Training Office is that communication between AAI/New York and the Mission is considerably more burdensome or voluminous than, for example, communication with PIET. The Mission Director and Deputy Director expressed a desire that AAI be more client-driven. This may have more to do with ATLAS design limitations than with the contractor. This issue is discussed further under Mission Feedback.

The relationship between the local AAI Representative and the Mission is cordial. The AAI Representative is both experienced and knowledgeable, having worked with AFGRAD, and understood the necessity for change under ATLAS.

As in other countries profiled, participants do not receive information on tentative AAI/New York placement efforts. It is difficult for both private and public sector candidates to make the necessary personal and professional decisions with the lead time now provided by ATLAS.

c) GOM Management Effectiveness

The Mission has chosen to relate solely with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs rather than directly with the National Committee on External Scholarships, although applications forwarded from the Ministry account for 18 percent of applications and 29 percent of ATLAS awards. The current Ministry of Foreign Affairs program officer responsible for US scholarships had been on the job only a week and was not able to give any perspective on ATLAS.

5. Feedback from Additional Stakeholders

The evaluator's interviews yielded additional feedback from ATLAS stakeholders.

a) Mission Feedback

The Mission faces a considerably smaller budget for FY95 and is concerned about a number of issues related to ATLAS. Decision-makers question whether ATLAS is the best use of their scholarship dollars: they would like to see more research done in-country, more informal and formal relationships fostered between host country university and US universities, and more follow-on by US universities hosting scholars. Because of the cost-sharing nature of ATLAS and its design, however, it is not possible, for example, to cluster all health scholars at Tulane University.

The Mission also voiced concern that hiring levels may inhibit its ability to recruit competent, well-prepared applicants for Training Office staff.

b) Employers Feedback

The one employer interviewed claimed to have received no progress reports from the Mission or the AAI Representative on the two employees the company had sponsored. Candidates had been in the US for almost a year.

c) Feedback from ATLAS Candidates

A group interview with five ATLAS candidates awaiting placement, intended to be brief, lasted over two hours. The first part of the interview elicited information the evaluator wanted with regard to the ATLAS process. The latter part demonstrated a hunger on the part of candidates for more information as discussed above.

APPENDIX K:

COUNTRY PROFILE:

CAPE VERDE

APPENDIX K: COUNTRY PROFILE: CAPE VERDE

The ATLAS project offers excellent training opportunities for small countries like Cape Verde. Such small countries have no universities, and much less any post-graduate level training programs. Bilateral projects with substantial participant training are also frequently limited. Training in US technology in the sciences, education and business management along with the cross-fertilization of ideas and exposure to different forms of organization, management, and technical approaches promotes creative leaders who develop a long standing affiliation with the United States.

1. USAID in Cape Verde

USAID/Cape Verde is staffed by two direct hire Americans: the USAID Representative and a Program Officer.

By any definition, Cape Verde is unique. An archipelago of ten islands plus a few barren islets, this small African Republic in many ways has more in common with Europe and the United States than with its West African neighbors. As a result of devastating droughts and famine, Cape Verdeans began a longstanding pattern of emigration which began during the early 19th century. The United States has one of the largest expatriate Cape Verdean communities, and of the one million Cape Verdean descendants worldwide, only one third live in the country. After 500 years of Portuguese colonization, followed by 16 years of a one-party moderate socialist regime, in 1990 Cape Verde opted for a democratic multi-party system of government. In January 1991, the country's first free and open elections were held which resulted in a peaceful transition of power from one form of government to another.

Cape Verdean economic development has historically been linked to fragile rainfed agriculture, foreign assistance, out-migration, and private transfers from emigrants. The dominance of official transfers as a source of growth is said to be declining. Economic growth is beginning to shift from agriculture and an import substitution-based industry to exportable services and light manufacturing.

The USAID program in Cape Verde began in 1977 and was initially managed from Guinea-Bissau. The Office of the USAID Representative was established in Cape Verde in 1979. USAID assistance through September 1993 has totalled $54.7 million in program support and $55.5 million in food assistance. Average annual development assistance has been approximately $7.8 million. The current program includes three bilateral projects, three regional projects and a Title II monetization program.

Major emphasis over the past ten years has been placed on the areas of natural resource management and sustainable agriculture. A few years ago, USAID changed its major program focus to emphasize export-led growth a private sector development in line with the government's new economic liberalization program.

USAID participates in two regional training projects, the ATLAS and HRDA projects. Both long and short term out-of-country and short term in-country training are supported. To date, over 1,500 Cape Verdeans have received training, including 300 enrolled for long-term academic training. As Cape Verde has no university, long-term academic training fills an extremely important gap in human resource development.

While by global standards the USAID program in Cape Verde is small, locally the US is a major donor both in terms of the size of the program and the leadership and innovation shown in the various sectors USAID supports. In training, USAID has worked for almost a year setting up an open and transparent participant selection process which, for the first time, includes local private sector participation.

The Mission was in the process of finalizing a new strategy for FY94-98 when the decision was made by USAID/W to phase out the US presence in Cape Verde. It was intended to propose that continued assistance be provided under the Africa Bureau's Small Country Program, for which Cape Verde seems to meet all the criteria.

2. ATLAS and the Mission Close-Out

The USAID program in Cape Verde will be phased out by the end of FY96. The Mission has already begun the orderly termination of the bilateral project portfolio and the elimination of all operating expenses and US personnel by September 30, 1996.

The termination of bilateral assistance to Cape Verde is part of a USAID plan to close 21 posts worldwide, approved by the Secretary of State on November 17, 1993. Although Cape Verde is considered one of the best performers in Sub-Saharan Africa in terms of its economic policy environment and democratic governance practice, its level of economic development and per capita income suggest a change in the type of US economic assistance relationship.

Terminating the in-country presence does not necessarily mean the end of all programs. The possibility of administering projects from Washington and regional offices is being explored. All participants currently programmed are expected to complete their programs by the end of FY98.

By the end of FY96 training under the Human Resource Development Assistance (HRDA) will be phased out. Beyond 1996, the Mission has proposed continuing modest assistance in family planning/HIV-AIDS prevention, PL 480 Title II and long-term participant training through ATLAS.

3. ATLAS Scholarship Achievements in Cape Verde

During the four years following adoption of the Country Training Strategy, the USAID/Cape Verde human resource strategy saw training in two regional training projects (ATLAS and HRDA) and two main bilateral projects (EDS and WARD), with some other assistance being provided to the regional population initiatives.

USAID/Cape Verde has been supporting training since 1977. To date, according to the Mission's PTMS system, some 1,561 Cape Verdeans have been trained to date:

Men	56 %
Women	44 %
In the US	229
In third countries	82
In-country	1,250

Priority fields of study have included agriculture, business and management, environment and forestry, energy, arts and sciences and education.

Under ATLAS, 25 participants are currently in the US, according to core contractor records. These students will return in 1996 and 1997. Another 10 participants were to be recruited in 1994 for training to begin in September 1995, but these plans were canceled as part of the close-out.

USAID/Cape Verde's proposal for additional funding for FY94-FY96 in order to continue training participants at a modest level of 6 to 8 per year was turned down. Those selected in 1996 would return in 1999. The Mission proposed that the program be monitored either by REDSO/WCA or USAID/W after the FY96 Mission close-out.

Cape Verde has a well-deserved reputation for one of the highest repatriation rates of USAID participants. Officials in and out of government, including former participants, offered a variety of explanations for this tradition, including the high value placed on education.

The government has begun a major divestiture of its state-owned holdings as part of its privatization effort. The resultant labor dislocation will add to the estimated national unemployment rate of 23 percent and underemployment estimated at almost 25 percent. There remains a shortage of skilled and managerial labor, especially to work in the expanding private sector.

♦ ***Approaching A Critical Mass***

With the return of the 25 ATLAS Fellows still in the US by 1997, along with the 8 AFGRAD participants due back, Cape Verde may be approaching the "critical mass" of trained personnel where extraordinary impact can be expected.

An estimated 165 Cape Verdeans have received USAID-funded university training, out of a total population of 380,000. On the heels of those who have already reached influential positions — including the Governor of Bank of Cape Verde, the Minister of Infrastructure and Transportation and the Minister of Culture — is a cadre of economists and MBAs just now coming into their own. For instance, the nation's two development projects with the most potential to drive economic change are being directed by four former USAID participants, including the World Bank's Privatization Technical Support project.

4. ATLAS Professional Enhancement Activities

Cape Verde has not widely participated in the professional enhancement activities available under ATLAS. Two former USAID participants attended the October 1993 regional Conference on Natural Resources Management in Gabon. A third alumnus was a recipient of a postgraduate research award at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1991.

The three AAI regional publications — *IROKO*, *ATLAS Alert*, and the *Directory of Fellows* — are considered marginally useful within the Mission and are unknown outside of it. In Cape Verde the *Directory of Fellows* is perceived as incomplete and inaccurate. It is unclear from those interviewed how many alumni are receiving the *Directory* directly from the core contractor. The Mission's ATLAS Project Administrator has no funds in his contract for postage to distribute the *Directory* himself.

5. ATLAS Management in Cape Verde

ATLAS in Cape Verde is managed by two full-time Cape Verdean USAID employees. Principal responsibility rests with the ATLAS Project Administrator, hired in 1991 under contract to and by AAI/New York. His three-year contract expired on November 3, 1994 and has not been renewed due to the upcoming Mission close-out. There is no AAI Representative in Cape Verde.

The ATLAS Project Administrator reports to the General Development Officer, whose many hats include HRDA Project Officer, Export Development Support Project Officer, Population Officer and Women in Development Officer. Mission-sponsored training averages 150 trainees annually, most of which attend management-intensive short-term training programs.

To a remarkable degree, ATLAS implementation from FY90 to FY93 has followed the November 1989 USAID/Cape Verde Country Training Strategy. This blueprint proposed that training be focused on agricultural and natural resources technical training objectives (especially watershed management and agricultural research), on export promotion and investment training and on improved management skills.

The four waves of ATLAS participants generally reflect these Mission priorities, although over the four years emphasis switched from all bachelor degrees in 1990 to all masters degrees in 1993. Likewise, fields of study have shifted from engineering and watershed management to economics and business administration. These changes occurred since the arrival of the current USAID Representative.

6. Financial Status and Fiscal Management

During the four years of its participation in ATLAS (FY90-FY93), USAID/Cape Verde obligated $1,850,000 for undergraduate and graduate training. As part of its proposed phase-out plan, the Mission recommended funding of $450,000 per year (FY94-FY96); USAID/W rejected this proposal.

Parallel with the Operational Year Budget transfer process, the Mission submits by cable its training plan for the use of ATLAS funds, specifying the number and levels of scholarships and preferred fields of study.

The Mission performs no real financial monitoring of ATLAS funds once they are made available through the AAI contract. Since ATLAS funds are no longer in USAID/Cape Verde's budget, the financial status of the fully funded PIO/Ps does not appear in the Mission's MACS reports. The ATLAS Project Administrator is responsible for ATLAS financial monitoring. He receives AAI's quarterly financial reports. This data is entered into the Mission's PTMS, but is not distributed to other Mission staff.

Funds for ATLAS are obligated annually through an OYB (Operational Year Budget) transfer of USAID/Cape Verde funds to USAID/Washington. This is effected by the Mission's monthly OYB reporting cable.

The USAID/W ATLAS Project Officer prepares a PIO/T, including funds from Cape Verde and those of other participating countries, requesting that the AAI contract be modified. It is not necessary for each Mission to issue a separate PIO/T as was the case in the first year (FY90).

7. Data Management and Reporting Systems

The ATLAS Project Administrator has devoted considerable time and effort to developing and maintaining the PTMS system, including largely successful work to include data on training conducted since the USAID program began. His efforts have extended to completing the editable list of employers and firms and to defining 128 local occupation codes.

The result is a highly accurate, up-to-date database of training information acclaimed by the PTMS contractor to be one of the best in Africa. At the touch of a button the ATLAS Project Administrator can perform instant analyses of the status of ATLAS in Cape Verde, including revealing looks at the Processing Execution Span and TOEFL Test Scores. Some 22 separate reports on ATLAS were generated from PTMS for the benefit of the evaluation team member visiting Praia.

The Project Administrator has also created a separate database which includes the value of university tuition scholarships and AAI costs for each participant in ATLAS in order to present a more comprehensive picture of ATLAS training costs.

Each quarter data provided by the AAI/New York financial report for Cape Verde is entered into the PTMS system. In compliance with Africa Bureau policy, PTMS data of ATLAS is downloaded on a disk pouched to USAID/W to be incorporated into the Bureau-based Training Information Management System (TIMS).

It is unclear if or how the information available from PTMS is actually used by the Mission to monitor participants during placement or training.

♦ *Pre-Departure Orientation*

The Mission has presented good pre-departure orientations for ATLAS participants, although it is quick to acknowledge that this is one area where they would like to make improvements if the program were to continue. Much of what was provided in Praia was governed by the fact that departing participants are incredibly busy with their jobs and family, and by the fact that travel to Praia from other islands can be difficult.

The ATLAS Project Administrator and the General Development Officer generally conduct these detailed pre-departure briefings only a day or so before the participants leave. They go beyond the usual logistics to include written materials (USAID Participant Guidebook, AAI's Manual de Orientacao for ATLAS Participants, and campus-specific information when AAI makes it available). It is assumed that further details are provided during the AAI/New York orientation.

Although no ATLAS participants have reported problems, the Mission sees room for improvements. They would like to include more information about USAID and its Cape Verde program and to involve alumni, according to fields of study and/or the university where departing participants are enrolled.

8. Host Country Government Feedback

Representatives of the Ministry of Education's Scholarship Division and of the Ministry of Cooperation are the Mission's principal counterparts for ATLAS implementation. Both had high praise for the

project. Resigned to the recently announced termination, they expressed dismay at the loss of yet another source of university training since the former Soviet Union, Eastern bloc and Cuba have recently ended their higher education training programs for Cape Verde.

The ATLAS recruitment and selection process, in particular the open solicitation of candidates and the use of objective evaluation criteria, were singled out for praise by the government.

APPENDIX L:

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDIX L: BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. The African-American Institute. *AFGRAD Student Status Report*, August 1982.

2. _____. *African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills: Application to the Graduate Study Program*, June, 1991.

3. _____. *African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills: Application to the Grants Program*, June, 1991.

4. _____. *African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills: Application to the Short-Term Postgraduate Study Program*, June, 1991.

5. _____. *Annual Report: African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills, Report Covering August 31, 1990 to September 30, 1991*, April, 1992.

6. _____. *Annual Report: African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills, Report Covering August 31, 1991 to September 30, 1992*, August, 1993.

7. _____. *Annual Report: African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills, Report Covering October 1, 1992 to September 30, 1993*, June, 1994.

8. _____. *ATLAS Alert: A News Bulletin on the ATLAS Project,* Volume 1, Number 2 (December 1991) through Number 5 (Spring 1994).

9. _____. *ATLAS Brochure*, 1994.

10. _____. *ATLAS Conference and Workshop on the African Family*, Conference Report, Kampala, Uganda, October 17-18, 1991.

11. _____. *ATLAS Grants Program*, successful applications for grants submitted through May 1994.

12. _____. *ATLAS Enrichment Report: Activity Lists*, October 26, 1994.

13. _____. *ATLAS Enrichment Report: Financial Data*, October 26, 1994.

14. _____. *ATLAS Enrichment Report: Participant Numbers*, October 27, 1994.

15. _____. *Tuition Waiver Commitments/Usage Per Year*, November 18, 1994.

16. _____. *Directory of Fellows, 1963-1993: African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills, African Graduate Fellowship Program, African Development Education Program, Development Education for Portuguese-Speaking Africa, and Postgraduate Training Program.*

17. _____. *Export Marketing Entry Strategies: Final Report*, conference held in Accra, Ghana, December 8-14, 1992.

18. _____. *Export Market Entry Strategies: Final Report*, conference held in Arusha, Tanzania, November 29-December 4, 1992.

19. _____. *Governance and the Process of Socio-Economic Development: A Senegal Case Study*, conference held in Dakar, Senegal, April 24-26, 1992.

20. _____. *Governance in Africa: Issues in Community Development and Local Participation: Final Report*, conference held in Dakar, Senegal, April 21-23, 1992.

21. _____. *HBCU Report*, October 26, 1994.

22. _____. *IROKO, A Networking Publication of the ATLAS Project*, Volume 1, Numbers 1 (Summer 1991) through 5 (February 1994).

23. _____. *Natural Resource Management in Africa: Issues in Conservation and Socio-Economic Development*, Conference Report, Libreville, Gabon, October 11-13, 1993.

24. _____. *Participant Rosters*, October 25, 1994.

25. _____. *PIO/T Buy-In Report*, November 10, 1994.

26. _____. *Position Descriptions: Education and Training Advisor; Program Assistant; Program Representative.*

27. _____. *Quarterly Financial Reports*, quarter ending 3/31/94.

28. Chemonics International, Inc. *An Assessment of the Organizational and Development Needs of the Private Sector in Cape Verde*, November 22, 1993.

29. Labat-Anderson, Inc. *Country Training Strategy: USAID/Cape Verde 1990-1994*, November, 1989.

30. Rossi, Peter, James Wright and Andy Anderson. *Handbook of Survey Research*, Academic Press, 1983.

31. Selznick, Philip. *Leadership in Administration: A Sociological Interpretation* (University of California Press, Berkeley), 1984.

32. The Services Group. *Assessment of the Tanzanian Private Sector Policy Framework*, June, 1992.

33. United States Agency for International Development. *Africa: Growth Renewed, Hope Rekindled*, 1993.

34. _____. *Africa Bureau: Compendium Assessments of Program Impact (API), FY 1993, (Vols. I and II)*, November 15, 1993.

35. _____. *Africa Bureau: Program and Budget Information: A Retrospective Through FY 1993*, June, 1994.

36. _____. *Africa Bureau Small Country Program Strategy*, 10 March 1992.

37. _____. *African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills (ATLAS), Project Paper*, Volumes I and II, July, 1990.

38. _____. *African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills (ATLAS), Request to Amend the Project Authorization (Amendment 1)*, 4 August 1993.

39. _____. *ATLAS Country Training Plans*, FY 1994.

40. _____. *Contract with the African-American Institute for Project 698-0475, African Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills (ATLAS) for the period 31 August 1990 through 31 October 1995*, 31 August 1990.

41. _____. *OYB Transfers, FY90-FY95*, September 1994.

42. _____. *Tanzania Private Sector Assessment*, Bureau for Private Enterprise, March, 1992.

43. USAID/Cape Verde. *Action Memo for the Assistant Administrator for Africa: Phase-Out of the USAID/Cape Verde Program*, March 14, 1994.

44. _____. *ATLAS FY92 Training Plan*, March 3, 1992.

45. _____. *ATLAS Training Plan for FY93*, March 12, 1993.

46. _____. *ATLAS Training Plan for FY94*, February 28, 1994.

47. _____. *Comprehensive Country Training Plan for 1993*, February 1993.

48. _____. *Proposed USAID/Cape Verde Program Strategy*, February 1994.

49. _____. *PTMS Management Reports: HBCU Analysis; Processing Execution Span; Test Scores; Post-Training Processing; Training Location Summary Report; Project Funding and Training Report; List of Local Occupations by Code; Participant Directory; Training Facility Report; Private Sector Analysis; Training Success Analysis; Major Field of Study Distribution Report; Private Sector Participation Report; Employers Training Activity Report; Women in Development Report; Training Location Analysis; Gender Disaggregated Analysis; List of Employers by Code; Training Type and Objective Analysis; Major Field of Study Analysis*, November 2, 1994.

50. USAID/Guinea. *Announcement of ATLAS Program (communiqué to Guinean media*, 1994.

51. _____. *FY93 ATLAS Training Plan*, February 25, 1993.

52. _____. *FY94 ATLAS Training Plan*, December 6, 1993.

53. _____. *Impact of USAID/G Pilot Training Project on Grass Roots Democratization Through Market Town Revenue Generation in Guinea*, March 19, 1992.

54. _____. *Government of Guinea: Minutes of the ATLAS Selection Meeting, Wave II*, April 28, 1994.

55. _____. *Mission Pre-Departure Orientation Materials:*
- *L'enseignement supérieur aux Etats-Unis: guide pratique à l'usage de l'étudiant étranger* (NAFSA).
- *Guide du voyageur vers les Etats-Unis à l'intention des boursiers de l'USAID/Guinée*, 1994.
- *Si vous voulez faire des études aux Etats-Unis: informations générales, études undergraduate* (Vol. 2); *études graduate* (Vol. 3); *conseils pratiques* (Vol. 5), 1986.
- *Participant Guidebook*, Organization for International Training, September, 1989.
- *Thomas Jefferson Fellows Program*, January, 1983.

56. _____. *Private Sector Training Advisory Board/Public Sector Selection Committee: Brainstorming Session on Impact Indicators*, February 1994.

57. _____. *Training Program Assessment: draft sub-contract to Alumni Association*, 1994.

58. USAID/Madagascar. *Draft Country Training Strategy*, September, 1994.

59. USAID/Tanzania. *Country Program Strategic Plan*, August, 1992.

60. United States Department of Agriculture, International Cooperation and Development. *Position Descriptions: Participant Training Advisor* and *Training Liaison Specialist.*

61. _____. *Portfolio Synopsis*, October 25, 1994.

62. World Bank. *Education for Development: Analysis of Investment Choices*, 1985.

63. _____. *Enseignement Supérieur et Recherche en Guinée: Etude Sectorielle* (Higher Education and Research in Guinea: Sector Study).

64. _____. *Enseignement Technique et Professionnelle en Guinée: Orientations Stratégiques* (Technical and Professional Education in Guinea: Strategic Orientations), July, 1994.

65. _____. *Republic of Guinea: Country Economic Memorandum: Main Report and Sectoral Analyses* (Vols. I and II).

APPENDIX M:

MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS

APPENDIX M: MEETINGS AND INTERVIEWS

a) US Interviews

♦ *USAID/Washington*

Yvonne Andualem	Senior Training Advisor, Bureau for Africa, Sustainable Development, Human Resources and Democracy (AFR/SD/HRD); member, ATLAS management team
Glen Cauvin	Chief, Program Analysis and Budget Division, Office of Development Planning, Bureau for Africa (AFR/DP)
Ted Clarke	Associate Training Advisor, Bureau for Africa, Sustainable Development, Human Resources and Democracy (AFR/SD/HRD); member, ATLAS management team
Jerry Custer	Auditor, Office of the Inspector General
Dennis Diamond	Director, Office of Field Support and Technical Assistance, Bureau for Global Programs, Field Support and Research
Thomas Diedrich	Budget Team Leader, Project Accounting Branch, Office of Financial Management
Tom Golla	Audit Manager, Office of the Inspector General
Joseph Goodwin	Director, Bureau for Africa, Southern Africa
James Govan	Director, Development Planning, Bureau for Africa (AFR/DP)
JoAnne T. Hale	Deputy Director, Bureau for Africa, Southern Africa
Kathie P. Keel	Evaluation Specialist, Policy, Outreach, Strategy and Evaluation Division, Office of Development Planning, Bureau for Africa (AFR/DP)
Paul Knepp	ATLAS Project Manager, Bureau for Africa, Sustainable Development, Human Resources and Democracy (AFR/SD/HRD); member, ATLAS management team
Robert Leonard	Director, Operating Expenses Budget and Financial Management Division, Office of Development Planning, Bureau for Africa
Doris Martin	Senior Advisor to Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Africa
Carol Peasley	Deputy Director, Bureau for Africa

Sharon L. Zavestoski	Contracting Officer, Office of Procurement

- ***The African-American Institute***

Hazel Bush	Program Officer for Alumni Affairs
Robin Caldwell	ATLAS Program Officer
Ken Doucet	ATLAS Placement Officer
Bella Endeshaw	ATLAS Program Officer
David Hendricks	Director, Database Management and Student Finance
Denis Hynes	Director, ATLAS Field Services
Anita Johnson	ATLAS Programming Coordinator
Heather Monroe	ATLAS Chief of Party
Niamani Mutima	ATLAS Program Officer, Field Services
Michelle Roberts	ATLAS Program Officer
Jim Sabourin	ATLAS Program Officer
Carl Schieren	Vice President for Programs
Maura Smith	ATLAS Placement Officer
Elizabeth Ward	ATLAS Program Officer
Yolande Zahler	Director, Placement and Programming, ATLAS and AFGRAD

- ***African-American Institute Subcontractors and Consultants***

Martha Bayliss	Administrative Director, Management Education Institute, Arthur D. Little and Co. (ADL)
David Callahan	Program Associate, Management Systems International, Inc. (MSI)
Marc Sitonio	Computer Consultant

- ***Central State University (Xenia, Ohio)***

Ndege Fatou Ndiaye	Foreign Student Advisor, Institute for International Affairs and Development
Victor I. Obereke	Director, Water Resources Program
James Sangster	Executive Director, Institute for International Affairs and Development

- ***Southern Illinois University (Carbondale, Illinois)***

Carla Coppi	Assistant Director, International Programs and Services (IPS)
Richard Falvo	Associate Dean of the Graduate School
Joan Friedenberg	Director, Center for English as a Second Language (CESL)
Patricia McNeil	Assistant Dean of the Graduate School
Barbara Meier	Associate Director of Admissions, the Graduate School
Rita Moore	Academic Advisor, Center for English as a Second Language (CESL)
Oval Myers	Professor, Plant and Soil Sciences
Joe Pineau	Advisor, College of Business and Administration
James Quisenberry	Director, International Programs and Services (IPS)
Steven Thiesse	Program Administrative Assistant, International Programs and Services (IPS)
John H. Yopp	Dean of the Graduate School; member, ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans

- ***University of Dayton (Dayton, Ohio)***

Clara S. Delgado	Director, English Language and Multicultural Institute (ELMI)
David Titus	Assistant Director, ELMI

- ***US-Based ATLAS Participants***

3 ATLAS Participants	Central State University (Xenia, Ohio)

10 ATLAS Participants	Southern Illinois University (Carbondale, Illinois)
2 ATLAS Participants	University of Dayton (Dayton, Ohio)
1 ATLAS Participant	Wright State University (Dayton, Ohio)

♦ ***Other US-Based Interviews***

Allan Broehl	Project Director, Caribbean and Latin America Scholarship Program Evaluation, Aguirre International
Margaret Hively	Acting Program Leader, International Cooperation and Development, Foreign Agricultural Service, United States Department of Agriculture

b) Cape Verde

♦ ***USAID/Cape Verde***

Steve Dosh	Program Officer
Barbara Kennedy	USAID Representative
Pedro Moreira	ADP Systems Manager/Financial Officer
Carlos Resende	ATLAS Project Administrator
Antero Veiga	General Development Officer

♦ ***ATLAS Selection Committee***

Edna Mascarenhas	Director, Scholarship Program, Ministry of Education
Julia Ramos	Coordinator, Public Relations and Cooperation, Ministry of Education
Eduardo Jorge Silva	Director, Bilateral Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

♦ ***Employers of ATLAS Fellows***

Carla Brigham	Executive Vice-President, Commercial, Cape Verde Airlines
Jose Levy	President, National Institute of Agricultural Investigation and Development
Jorge Spender Lima	Executive Administrator, Cape Verde Construction

- ***ATLAS Scholarship Alumni***

Joao Pedro dos Santos	Independent Consultant

- ***ATLAS Alumni: Postgraduate Research Component***

Veronica Martins	Commercial Assistant, US Embassy; Alumna, Postgraduate Research Component; Alumna, Development Training for Portuguese-Speaking Africa (DTPSA)

- ***Beneficiaries of ATLAS Professional Enhancement Activities***

Pericles Barros	President, National Institute of Water Management
Ivone Fernandes	Director, Oceanographic and Aquaculture Department, National Institute of Technical Investigations

- ***AFGRAD Alumni***

Gilberto dos Barros	Manager, Privatization and Public Sector Development, Ministry of Economic Cooperation

c) Côte d'Ivoire

- ***REDSO/Abidjan***

Esther Addo	Deputy Human Resources Development Officer
Thierno Kane	Regional Training Advisor
Kate Jones-Patron	Director, Health and Human Resources
Willard Pearson	Director, REDSO/WA
Letitia Sam	Training Assistant

- ***Core Contractor Field Staff***

Cécile Imboua-Niava	AAI Field Representative

- ***Ivorian Alumni of ATLAS Conferences***

Djenebou Touré Condé	Administrator, Programming and Planning Division, Ministry of Agriculture; Alumnae, ATLAS Conference (Harare 1994); AFGRAD Alumnae

Tchonon Coulibaly	Civil Engineer, Direction et Contrôle des Grands Travaux; Alumnus, ATLAS Conference (Gabon 1993); AFGRAD Alumnus
John Prosper Seka	Principal Education Analyst, African Development Bank; Alumnus, ATLAS Conference (Windhoek 1994); AFGRAD Alumnus

d) Guinea

♦ ***USAID/Guinea***

Alpha Souleymane Diallo	Training Assistant: Private Sector
Hadja Diallo	Training Assistant: Public Sector
Moustapha Diallo	Chief, Training Office
Mohamed Kanté	Systems Administrator
S. Peter Kloskey	Controller
Françoise Montlouis	Training Assistant
Charles S. Morgan	Project Development Officer
Tom E. Parks	Acting Director
Wilbur Thomas	Mission Director

♦ ***Core Contractor Field Staff***

Nene Ousmane Sow	AAI Field Representative; Alumna, ATLAS Postgraduate Research Component

♦ ***Government of Guinea***

Djigui Camara	Director of Cooperation, Ministry of Cooperation
Mouctar Camara	Sub-Section Director, Requests and Supplies, Service National des Bourses Extérieures (National Service for Overseas Scholarships), Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Culture

Koumba Diakité	Direction Nationale de la Promotion Féminine (National Directorate for Promoting Women)
Ahmadou Tidiane Diallo	Assistant Director, Centre de Perfectionnement Administratif (Administrative Training Center), Ministry of Administrative Reform and Public Service
Moussa Koné	Director, Centre de Perfectionnement Administratif (Administrative Training Center), Ministry of Administrative Reform and Public Service; member, Ad Hoc Pre-Selection Commission for ATLAS; AFGRAD Alumnus; Treasurer, 4A (Guinean Alumni Association)
M'Balia Sangaré	Financial Director, Centre de Perfectionnement Administratif (Administrative Training Center), Ministry of Administrative Reform and Public Service
Ibrahima Sankhon	Director, Service National des Bourses Extérieures (National Service for Overseas Scholarships), Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Culture and Chairperson, Ad Hoc ATLAS Pre-Selection Commission for ATLAS
Mamadou Soumah	Chief, Research and Programming Section, Service National des Bourses Extérieures (National Service for Overseas Scholarships), Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Culture
Ibrahima Sylla	Section Chief, Inspections and Equivalencies, Service National des Bourses Extérieures (National Service for Overseas Scholarships), Ministry of Higher Education, Scientific Research and Culture
Isobel Waterschoot	Counsellor, Direction Nationale de la Promotion Féminine (National Directorate for Promoting Women)

♦ ***Guinean ATLAS Candidates***

Ahmadou Bah	Electrical Engineer, private sector
Housseynatou Barry	Doctor, Direction Nationale des Etablissements des Soins (National Health Directorate)
Ansoumane Yassima Camara	Obstetrician/Gynecologist, Ignace Deen Teaching Hospital
Rachel Gomez Camara	Assistant, Chemistry Department (Food Science), University of Conakry
Abdoul Latif Diallo	Electrical Engineer, private sector
Alpha Yaya Diallo	Director, National Cooperation for Europe, Ministry of Cooperation, and ATLAS candidate for an MBA

Thierno Moussa Diallo	Administrator, United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
Jean-Pierre Kamano	Professor and Head, Division of Manuals and Publications, Institut Pédagogique National (National Teaching Institute), Ministry of Pre-University Education and Professional Training

♦ ***Guinean Employers of ATLAS Candidates***

Barry Alpha Boubacar	Professor of Physics, Assistant Director of the Institut Pédagogique National (National Teaching Institute), Ministry of Pre-University Education and Professional Training and AFGRAD Alumnus
M. Saliou Diallo	Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology; Head, Department of obstetrics and gynecology, Ignace Deen Hospital

♦ ***Guinea: AFGRAD Alumni***

Abdoul Radiaye Bah	Administrator, United Nations Development Program; AFGRAD Alumnus; President, 4A (Guinean Alumni Association)
Ahmed Tidiane Baldé	Section Chief, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources; alumnus of ATLAS professional enhancement activities; AFGRAD Alumnus; Vice President, 4A (Guinean Alumni Association)
Oumar Dia	Auditor, Regional Inspector General (RIG), USAID/Dakar; AFGRAD Alumnus (Mauritania)
Alseyni Diallo	Unemployed AFGRAD Alumnus
Chérif Diallo	Deputy Resident Representative, World Bank; AFGRAD Alumnus
Maladho Diallo	Administrator, Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources, Pita; AFGRAD Alumnus
Laye Kourouma	Unemployed AFGRAD Alumnus

♦ ***Guinea: Other***

Anne Marie Blouin	Administrator, Canadian International Development Agency
Isabel Dillener	Human Resources Manager, USAID/Guinea Economic Policy Reform Support project
Robert Sample	Principal Consultant, Education Technology Specialists (in Guinea to establish in-country English Language Training Center)

Christine Soulier	Program Administrator, World Bank
Marylin Spezzati	Deputy Resident Representative, United Nations Development Program
Koumba Diakité Sylla	Coordination des ONG Féminines de Guinée (Coordination of Women's NGOs in Guinea)

e) Kenya

- ***USAID/Kenya***

Teresa Muraya	Former Training Officer
Aminah Salim	Training Officer

- ***REDSO/EA***

Dean Alter	Project Development Officer

- ***African Academy of Sciences***

John Kokwaro	Executive Director
Diana Opar	Programme Officer, ATLAS
Margaret Oriaro	Finance and Administration Officer

f) Madagascar

- ***USAID/Madagascar***

Robert Gilson	Program Officer, Program Support Division
Buff Mackenzie	Mission Director
William Hammink	Senior Program Development Officer and Chief, Program Development Assessment
Agnes Rakotomalala	Program and Training Specialist
Perline Rasoanoromalala	Training Assistant

♦ *Core Contractor Field Staff*

Roland Razafintsalama	AAI Field Representative

♦ *Government of Madagascar*

Roland Guy Razafimahefa	Chief, American Section, Office of Bilateral Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

♦ *Private Sector Recruiters*

Christian Ramamonjisoa	Secretary, Groupement des Entreprises de Madagascar (GEM), Association of Malagasy Businesses
Joana Ranaivoson	Secretary General, Institut Supérieur de la Communication des Affaires et du Management (ISCAM), University of Business Communication and Management (private business)
Voara Randrianasolo	Secretary, AAAA, Director, Ministry of Applied Developmental Research; AFGRAD Alumnus; Recipient, ATLAS Distinguished Alumni Award
Charles Ratsifaritana	Assistant Director, Nova Knits Madagascar, S.A.; President, AAAA; AFGRAD Alumnus
Olga Ratsisalovanina	Administrative Director, Institut Supérieur de la Communication des Affaires et du Management, University of Business Communication and Management (private business)
Zina Andrianarivelo Razafy	Principal Henri Fraise Fils & Cie.; AFGRAD Alumnus; President, MBA Association

♦ *ATLAS Alumni*

Nivo Andrianaivo-Rafehivola	Senior Auditor, Ramaholiminahaso and Associates; ATLAS Alumnus: MA, Thunderbird, American Graduate School of International Management, Phoenix, Arizona, 1994
Bakolimalala Rakouth-Ramamonjiarisoa	Assistant Professor, Science Department, University of Antananarivo; Postgraduate Research Alumna: Agricultural Biotechnology, University of Hawaii, NIFTAL Center, 1994

♦ *ATLAS Candidates*

Ellena Rabeson	Marketing and Public Relations, Société Ravandison

Thierry Rakotoarison	Director, ATW Marketing Consultants
Tianarisoa Rakotovelo	Auditor/Inspector, National Malagasy Bank for Rural Development
Jimmy Ramiandrison	Administrative and Financial Director, Electricité-Electronique-Equipement
Jean Patrice Randriamampionona	Chief, Computer Section, RNCF (Madagascar Railroad Company)

- ***ATLAS Conference Participant***

Henri Andriamanana	Director of Marketing, MAEVA TV; Secretary, MBA Association; Alumnus, ATLAS Conference (Harare 1994)

- ***Employers of ATLAS Fellows***

Mamy Rakotoarivelo	Partner, Ramaholiminahaso and Associates, Auditors

g) Tanzania

- ***USAID/Tanzania***

Magdalena Hiza	Assistant Training Officer
Flora Majabelle	Assistant Training Officer
Hedwiga Mbuya	Women in Development Officer
Kristos Minja	Training Officer
Paul Morris	Program Officer
Thomas Tengg	Private Sector Officer
Mark Wentling	Mission Director

- ***Core Contractor Field Staff***

Zainab Bakilana	AAI Field Representative

- ***Selection Advisory Committee***

Bruno Kwelukilwa	Director of Personnel, JV Group
Africanus Maenda	Executive Director, Association of Tanzanian Employers

- ***Government Nominators***

Silvery Balili Buberwa	Director, Human Resource Planning, Planning Commission, Office of the President
Patricia H. Magogo	Director, Training and Recruitment, Civil Service Department, Office of the President

- ***Employers of ATLAS Fellows and Alumni***

R.T. Kapella	Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax, Ministry of Finance
John M.J. Magotti	Principal, Kivukoni Academy of Social Sciences
B.C. Muhegi	Acting Executive Secretary, National Construction Council

- ***ATLAS Alumni***

Julius Caesar John	Income Tax Examiner, Ministry of Finance
Elisifa K. Kinasha	Civil Works Department, National Construction Council
Joseph Mbuna	City Solicitor, City of Dar-es-Salaam
Joseph F. Msaki	Lecturer, Kivukoni Academy of Social Sciences
Lui H. Shio	Director, Personnel and Administration, National Distributors, Ltd.

APPENDIX O:

INTERVIEW AND SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

APPENDIX O: INTERVIEW AND SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

The evaluation team used the following interview and survey instruments:

- ***USAID/Washington***

  1. Policy-level respondents
  2. ATLAS management team
  3. Small Country Program management

- ***AAI/New York***

  4. Senior ATLAS management
  5. ATLAS placement staff
  6. ATLAS monitoring staff
  7. Professional enhancement staff
  8. Student finance staff
  9. Database management staff

- ***AAI/Other***

  10. AAI Representatives
  11. ATLAS subcontractors
  12. ATLAS Executive Committee of Graduate Deans

- ***US University Community***

  13. Admissions staff
  14. US university staff and faculty (International Student Advisors, English Language Center staff, academic advisors to ATLAS participants, faculty)

- ***ATLAS Participants and Alumni***

  15. Current participants
  16. ATLAS alumni (scholarships/postgraduate research)
  17. Alumni of ATLAS professional enhancement activities

- ***USAID Missions***

  18. USAID Mission personnel

- ***Host Country Players in ATLAS***

  19. Host government nominating agency personnel
  20. Participant and alumni employers
  21. Grant recipients

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

1. USAID/W POLICY-LEVEL RESPONDENTS

_____
Name

_____
Title

1. What is your role with the ATLAS Project?

2. How long have you been familiar with ATLAS?
   - _____ Under 6 months
   - _____ 6 months - 1 year
   - _____ 1-2 years
   - _____ 2-5 years
   - _____ Over 5 years

3. Are you kept directly informed about ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, how?
   - _____ Direct line of supervision
   - _____ Formal briefings
   - _____ Informal discussions
   - _____ Other mechanism: Which?

4. What do you think ATLAS's most important achievements are?

5. What is your sense of how Missions perceive ATLAS?

6. Do you think Missions feel a sense of ownership? _____ Yes _____ No

7. How effective has ATLAS been in implementing the Bureau's Small Country Strategy?
   1 2 3 4 5

8. Are there any special constraints regarding ATLAS and the Small Country Program?
   _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, which?

9. Is ATLAS represented in CPSP reviews in Washington? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, by whom?

10. If you could rate AAI on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate AAI's management of ATLAS? 1 2 3 4 5

11. If you could compare AAI's performance on ATLAS to its record with AFGRAD, on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate how AAI managed AFGRAD? 1 2 3 4 5

12. What is different between AFGRAD and ATLAS?
    - _____ Design/project purpose
    - _____ Mission role
    - _____ AAI role
    - _____ Importance of impact
    - _____ Other difference: Which?

13. AAI is well known after 30 years in the field. Is this an advantage or a disadvantage? How?

14. USAID/W manages ATLAS with a USDH Project Manager and a team of RSSAs. If you could rate USAID/W's management of ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate USAID/W's management of ATLAS? 1 2 3 4 5

15. There have been four USDH ATLAS Project Managers since the project began in August 1990. Do you think this turnover has had an effect on the project's implementation?
    _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes, what effect?

16. Do you think the use of RSSAs has had an effect on the project's implementation?
    _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes, what effect?

17. Do you think the reorganization will have an effect on the ATLAS implementation?
    _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes, what effect?

18. What do you think are the major constraints affecting ATLAS's implementation today?

19. What are the key opportunities the ATLAS project faces today?

20. Are Mission closings and funding constraints likely to have an effect on ATLAS's EOPS (1500 scholarships by 2006)? _____ Yes _____ No

21. Are there ways that ATLAS's impact could be enhanced? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes, how?

22. If you could change ATLAS, what three changes would you make?
    a.

    b.

    c.

23. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

2. USAID/W ATLAS MANAGEMENT TEAM

_____
Name

_____
Title

♦ ***Situating the Interview***

1. What is your role with the ATLAS Project?

2. How long have you been working on ATLAS and AFGRAD? _____ Years

3. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements?

4. What do you do to market ATLAS to Missions?

5. How do you judge the effectiveness of your marketing attempts?

6. How effective have marketing efforts been?

7. What would you like to do to market ATLAS that you have not been able to do?

♦ ***ATLAS and Missions***

8. What is your sense of how Missions perceive ATLAS?

9. Do you think Missions feel a sense of ownership? _____ Yes _____ No

10. If you could rate overall Mission ownership of ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate Mission ownership of ATLAS?
1 2 3 4 5

11. Are you satisfied with how OYB transfers are working? _____ Yes _____ No

12. Are there aspects of the OYB (Operating Year Budget) transfer process that you would change if you could? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: which?

13. What are the key constraints to better operation of the OYB transfer process?

14. What roles do Missions play in the professional enhancement activities?

15. Are there special responsibilities for a Mission hosting an ATLAS professional enhancement activity? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: which?

16. Do Missions have a sufficient role in professional enhancement activities?

17. What role do the REDSOs play?

18. If you could change the REDSOs' role, what changes would you make?

♦ ***Planning ATLAS***

19. Do Missions link projected use of ATLAS scholarships to their CPSP objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

20. Is ATLAS represented in USAID/W CPSP reviews? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes, by whom?

21. Are there ways that you would like to see ATLAS incorporated into the CPSP definition or review process? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes, how?

22. Do Missions send in a formal Country Training Plan? _____ Yes _____ No

23. Have procedures been defined for developing the ATLAS CTP? _____ Yes _____ No

24. Are there ways that Missions' annual planning process for ATLAS can be improved? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

♦ ***ATLAS and Small Countries***

25. How effective has ATLAS been in implementing the Bureau's Small Country Strategy? 1 2 3 4 5

26. Are there any special constraints regarding ATLAS and the Small Country Program? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, which?

27. If you could change how ATLAS is managed for the Small Countries, what changes would you make?

♦ ***ATLAS and USAID/W Policy***

28. How do you keep USAID/W higher level management informed about ATLAS progress and problems?

29. Would you change this information process if you could? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

30. How do you think ATLAS is perceived among higher level management and policy-makers?

♦ ***ATLAS and AAI***

31. How is AAI doing with ATLAS?

32. Does AAI have a standardized Operations Manual for implementing ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

33. Are there written criteria for selecting candidates for training?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: obtain a copy.

34. How does the process for assessing AAI's level of effort and staffing pattern work?

35. Are there changes that you would make, if you could, to the process of defining AAI's LOE and staffing pattern?

36. Are you satisfied with how AAI is defining impact for the eventual impact assessment of ATLAS?
_____ Yes _____ No

37. Are you satisfied with how AAI is tracking impact for the eventual impact assessment of ATLAS?
_____ Yes _____ No

38. Are there changes you would make, if you could, to how AAI is defining and tracking impact?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

39. How are professional enhancement activities defined?

40. Who is the principal driver of ATLAS professional enhancement activities?

_____ Missions
_____ Local organizations
_____ Alumni
_____ AAI
_____ Other: who?

41. Are there written criteria for how to select an organization to receive a grant?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: obtain a copy.

42. How are your relations with AAI?

43. If you could rate your relations with AAI on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest, how would you relate your relations with AAI under the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Cooperativeness
1 2 3 4 5	Responsiveness
1 2 3 4 5	Productivity

44. How are your relations with AAI different under ATLAS as opposed to AFGRAD?

45. If you could rate your relations with AAI under AFGRAD on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest, how would you relate your relations with AAI under AFGRAD?
1 2 3 4 5

46. Let's move to the various aspects of AAI's contract. Is AAI executing all aspects of its contract satisfactorily? _____ Yes _____ No

47. What aspects are satisfactory?

48. Where could AAI improve its performance?

49. If you could rate AAI's performance on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being lowest and 5 being highest, how would you rate AAI's performance in the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Managing ATLAS scholarships
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women for scholarships
1 2 3 4 5	Placing ATLAS candidates
1 2 3 4 5	Placing ATLAS candidates at HBCUs
1 2 3 4 5	Providing orientations
1 2 3 4 5	Monitoring English language training
1 2 3 4 5	Monitoring participants in training
1 2 3 4 5	Providing enrichment activities
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with repatriation
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with participants' re-entry
1 2 3 4 5	Handling requests for extensions
1 2 3 4 5	Handling difficult repatriations
1 2 3 4 5	Defining the impact of ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5	Tracking the impact of ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5	Communicating with Missions regarding special participant requests or situations
1 2 3 4 5	Managing their relations with Missions
1 2 3 4 5	Making sure alumni are enrolled in professional societies
1 2 3 4 5	Advertising POSTAF
1 2 3 4 5	Screening POSTAF applications

1	2	3	4	5	Providing and managing POSTAF awards
1	2	3	4	5	Making sure women participate in POSTAF
1	2	3	4	5	Designing national or regional conferences or symposia
1	2	3	4	5	Selecting topics for conferences and symposia
1	2	3	4	5	Advertising conferences and symposia
1	2	3	4	5	Managing conferences and symposia
1	2	3	4	5	Making sure the conferences incorporate topics of special interest to African women
1	2	3	4	5	Making sure women participate in ATLAS conferences
1	2	3	4	5	Advertising the availability of grants for African organizations
1	2	3	4	5	Screening grant applications
1	2	3	4	5	Providing grants to local organizations
1	2	3	4	5	Making sure that organizations of African women receive ATLAS grants
1	2	3	4	5	Advertising Distinguished Alumni Awards
1	2	3	4	5	Screening applications for Distinguished Alumni Awards
1	2	3	4	5	Providing Distinguished Alumni Awards
1	2	3	4	5	Getting media coverage for Distinguished Alumni Awards
1	2	3	4	5	Making sure that women receive Distinguished Alumni Awards
1	2	3	4	5	Selecting topics for *IROKO*
1	2	3	4	5	Working with USAID/W on *IROKO*
1	2	3	4	5	Meeting *IROKO* publishing deadlines
1	2	3	4	5	Disseminating *IROKO*
1	2	3	4	5	Selecting topics for *ATLAS Alert*
1	2	3	4	5	Working with USAID/W on *ATLAS Alert*
1	2	3	4	5	Meeting *ATLAS Alert* publishing deadlines
1	2	3	4	5	Disseminating *ATLAS Alert*
1	2	3	4	5	Obtaining up-to-date information for the *AFGRAD/ATLAS Directory of Fellows*
1	2	3	4	5	Meeting *AFGRAD/ATLAS Directory* publishing deadlines
1	2	3	4	5	Disseminating the *AFGRAD/ATLAS Directory*
1	2	3	4	5	Reporting on ATLAS progress and activities

50. If you could rate AAI on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate AAI's management of ATLAS? 1 2 3 4 5

51. If you could compare AAI's performance on ATLAS to its record with AFGRAD, on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate how AAI managed AFGRAD? 1 2 3 4 5

52. Has AAI taken any steps to rectify any shortcomings in implementing ATLAS?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: In what areas? What have they done?

53. AAI is well known after 30 years in the field. Is this an advantage or a disadvantage? How?

54. Are the AAI in-country Representatives effective? _____ Yes _____ No

55. Are there job descriptions for Representatives' roles and responsibilities under ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

56. Are there mechanisms to take corrective measures if a Representative is not effective? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how does this work?

57. Are there changes you would make, if you could, in how the Representatives function in the field? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

♦ ***ATLAS Financial Management***

58. What is the procedure for USAID Missions to buy-in to the ATLAS project?

59. How do the actual buy-ins to date compare with those projected in the PP?

60. Does AAI play a role in seeing that buy-ins occur in a timely fashion? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what role?

61. What impact on the future of the project do you foresee as a result of the closeout of Africa Missions?

62. Has the core funding provided under ATLAS provided adequate resources to achieve project objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

63. How much has been made available to the AAI contract and its subcontracts?

64. Have adequate funds been provided in a timely fashion for successful project implementation?

_____ Yes _____ No

65. By fiscal year, how much has been obligated/expended for administrative/overhead costs?

66. When averaged by year, what percentage of an ATLAS trainee's total costs go to administrative/overhead costs?

67. Is this comparable to the administrative/overhead costs of AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If not, why not?

68. Does AAI receive a flat fee or percentage fee for each trainee it processes?

69. What have been the costs to date (overall and by fiscal year) of support to the Dean's Committee?

70. What is included in this expense?

71. How do these actual costs compare with those projected in the PP?

72. What have been the costs to date (overall and by fiscal year) of maintaining local AAI representatives?

73. What financial support is provided by the local USAID Missions?

74. How do these actual costs compare with those projected in the PP?

75. To what extent is cost sharing included in ATLAS?

76. What is the value of university tuition waivers?

77. What trends have appeared in the overall number of universities and amounts waived since implementation began?

78. What trends have appeared in the number of HBCUs and the amounts of tuition waivers?

79. What does it cost AAI to obtain these tuition waivers?

80. What procedures does AAI follow in making payments to universities?

81. Have any problems arisen been encountered with the procedures for making payments to universities? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: which?

82. What procedures are followed in making student payments?

83. Have any problems arisen been encountered with the procedures for making student payments? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: which?

84. What financial management structure has AAI put in place to ensure effective financial management of ATLAS?

85. How does this organization interface with USAID/Washington's financial and/or program offices?

86. How does it interface with the USAID Missions?

87. How does it interface with the local AAI representatives?

88. What financial reporting systems and procedures have been established to support ATLAS?

89. How was the system developed and by whom?

90. Who receives these reports?

91. How are these reports utilized?

92. What are the average costs of ATLAS long and short-term academic training?

93. How do these costs vary between public and private universities and HBCUs?

94. How do these costs compare to those of AFGRAD and cost projections of the PP?

95. What enrichment activities have been funded to date?

96. Are these costs consistent with those projected in the PP? _____ Yes _____ No

If no: why not?

97. Has there been a difference between the cost of enrichment activities spent on male trainees and those spent on females? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what difference?

98. Have there been cases where enrichment activities were not programmed due to lack of funds? _____ Yes _____ No

99. What expenditures have been made on national and regional professional enhancement activities?

100. By category, what do professional enhancement activities cost?

_____ POSTAF awards
_____ Conferences and symposia
_____ Grants to African organizations
_____ Distinguished Alumni Awards
_____ Newsletters
_____ *Directory of Fellows*

101. How do these costs compare with those estimated in the PP?

102. Has the level of expenditures for enhancement activities benefitting females been different from those benefitting males? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

♦ ***USAID/W Management of ATLAS***

103. Has the turnover in project management had an effect on the project's implementation? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, what effect?

104. Do you think the use of RSSAs has had an effect on the project's implementation? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, what effect?

105. Do you think the reorganization will have an effect on the ATLAS implementation? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, what effect?

106. If you could rate USAID/W's management of ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate USAID/W's management of ATLAS?
1 2 3 4 5

107. What do you think are the major constraints affecting ATLAS's implementation today?

108. What are the key opportunities the ATLAS project faces today?

109. Are Mission closings and funding constraints likely to have an effect on ATLAS's EOPS (1500 scholarships by 2006)? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

110. Are there ways that ATLAS's impact could be enhanced? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, how?

111. If you could change ATLAS, what three changes would you make?
a.

b.

c.

112. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

3. USAID/W SMALL COUNTRY PROGRAM RESPONDENTS

_____
Name

_____
Title

1. What is your role with the ATLAS Project?

2. How long have you been familiar with ATLAS?
   _____ Under 6 months
   _____ 6 months - 1 year
   _____ 1-2 years
   _____ 2-5 years
   _____ Over 5 years

3. Are you kept directly informed about ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, how?
   _____ Direct line of supervision
   _____ Formal briefings
   _____ Informal discussions
   _____ Other mechanism: Which?

4. What is your impression of how ATLAS is progressing?

5. How effective has ATLAS been in implementing the Bureau's Small Country Strategy?
   1 2 3 4 5

6. Are there any special constraints regarding ATLAS and the Small Country Program?
   _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, which?

7. How are objectives and targets set for ATLAS for a Small Country in relation to USAID's development objectives for that country?

8. How are annual plans established for ATLAS in a Small Country?

9. How is this process working?

10. Are there ways you would improve this process, if you could? _____ Yes _____ No
if yes: how?

11. If you could rate AAI on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate AAI's management of ATLAS? 1 2 3 4 5

12. If you could compare AAI's performance on ATLAS to its record with AFGRAD, on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate how AAI managed AFGRAD? 1 2 3 4 5

13. What is different between AFGRAD and ATLAS?
_____ Different design
_____ Different role for Missions
_____ Different responsibilities for AAI
_____ Other difference: Which?

14. AAI is well known after 30 years in the field. Is this an advantage or a disadvantage? How?

15. USAID/W manages ATLAS with a USDH Project Manager and a team of RSSAs. If you could rate USAID/W's management of ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest rating, how would you rate USAID/W management of ATLAS?
1 2 3 4 5

16. There have been four USDH ATLAS Project Managers since the project began in August 1990. Do you think this turnover has had an effect on the project's implementation?
_____ Yes _____ No
If yes, what effect?

17. Do you think the use of RSSAs has had an effect on the project's implementation?
_____ Yes _____ No
If yes, what effect?

18. Do you think the reorganization will have an effect on the ATLAS implementation?
_____ Yes _____ No
If yes, what effect?

19. What do you think are the major constraints affecting ATLAS's implementation today?

20. What are the key opportunities the ATLAS project faces today?

21. Are Mission closings and funding constraints likely to have an effect on ATLAS's EOPS (1500 scholarships by 2006)? _____ Yes _____ No

22. Are there ways that ATLAS's impact could be enhanced? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes, how?

23. If you could change ATLAS, what three changes would you make?
    a.

    b.

    c.

24. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

4. AAI NEW YORK: SENIOR ATLAS MANAGEMENT

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Years with AAI

1. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***ATLAS Recruitment and Selection***

2. In what ways is recruitment of ATLAS candidates different from the AFGRAD process?

3. How do Missions determine what fields of study to fund?

4. How do Missions determine their level of ATLAS buy-in?

5. Do Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific strategic objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

6. Do Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific African employers? _____ Yes _____ No

7. How do you handle applicants who are not employed at the time they are applying for an ATLAS scholarship?

8. What are the criteria for selecting ATLAS candidates?

9. What role do the ATLAS Deans play in recruitment and selection?

10. How is this different from the AFGRAD Deans Committee's responsibilities?

11. Are there any particular issues with the Deans?

_____ Insufficient number of Deans who speak French
_____ Insufficient number of Deans who speak Portuguese
_____ Scheduling difficulties: travel to Africa
_____ Scheduling difficulties: meetings in New York
_____ Other issues: which?

12. What role do the AAI Representatives play in recruitment and selection?

13. How is this different from the Representatives' roles under AFGRAD?

14. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of women?

15. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

16. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of the private sector in ATLAS?

17. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

18. According to the *ATLAS Annual Reports*, certain countries have higher proportions of women represented in ATLAS (Tanzania, Mozambique, Zaire). Why is that?

19. If you could make changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited, what would those changes be?

20. If you could rate the ATLAS recruitment and selection process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women
1 2 3 4 5	Missions' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	AAI Representatives' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS Deans' role in recruitment and selection
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's role in recruitment and selection

♦ ***ATLAS Placement***

21. How is the ATLAS placement process different from AFGRAD's?

22. How is utilization of HBCUs determined?

23. Is this an effective way of determining how to use HBCUs? _____ Yes _____ No

24. What are the key constraints to using HBCUs?

25. What are the key constraints in placing ATLAS scholars?

_____ Insufficient number of tuition waivers
_____ Problems with certain fields of study: which?
_____ Problems with candidates from certain countries: which?
_____ Problems placing undergraduates
_____ Problems placing in masters degree programs
_____ Problems placing in doctoral programs
_____ Other problems: which?

26. If you could change the ATLAS placement process, what changes would you make?

27. If you could rate the ATLAS placement process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1	2	3	4	5	ATLAS placement
1	2	3	4	5	Placing women
1	2	3	4	5	Placing undergraduates
1	2	3	4	5	Placing masters degrees
1	2	3	4	5	Placing doctoral scholars
1	2	3	4	5	Placing at HBCUs

♦ ***Monitoring ATLAS Participants***

28. Are there changes in how ATLAS participants are monitored as compared to AFGRAD?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

29. How much advance notice do you estimate that you generally give a Mission when an extension of time is required?

_____ Less than 1 month
_____ 1 month
_____ 1-3 months

_____ 3-6 months

30. How much advance notice do you estimate that you generally give a Mission when more funding is needed for a given program?

_____ Less than 1 month
_____ 1 month
_____ 1-3 months
_____ 3-6 months

31. What are the key constraints in providing advance notice to Missions when extensions or increased funding are needed?

32. Who defines a participant's enrichment activities?

_____ USAID/W
_____ Mission
_____ participant
_____ academic advisor
_____ other faculty
_____ AAI staff
_____ AAI subcontractor/ADL
_____ participant's anticipated post-training employer
_____ Other: who?

33. Do participants generally conduct their thesis research in their home countries?

_____ Yes _____ No

34. How is repatriation handled under ATLAS?

35. What are the key constraints to prompt repatriation after training?

36. If you could rate AAI's process for monitoring ATLAS participants on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Providing orientations
1 2 3 4 5	Monitoring English language training
1 2 3 4 5	Monitoring participants in training
1 2 3 4 5	Providing enrichment activities
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with repatriation
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with participants' re-entry
1 2 3 4 5	Handling requests for extensions
1 2 3 4 5	Handling difficult repatriations

1 2 3 4 5 Defining the impact of ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 Tracking the impact of ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 Communicating with Missions regarding special participant requests or situations

37. If you could make changes in AAI's process for monitoring ATLAS participants, what changes would you make?

♦ ***Field Services***

38. How are the topics for ATLAS conferences and symposia determined?

_____ USAID/W
_____ Missions
_____ AAI/NY staff
_____ AAI Representatives
_____ Alumni
_____ Participants
_____ Employers
_____ Host country government officials
_____ Other: who?

39. Do you take any special steps to make sure that ATLAS conferences and symposia cover topics of special interest to women? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

40. Do you take any special steps to make sure that women attend ATLAS conferences and symposia? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

41. Are you satisfied with how ATLAS conferences and symposia have been managed? _____ Yes _____ No

42. If you could change anything about the ATLAS conferences and symposia, what would you change?

43. Are there written criteria for selecting African organizations to receive ATLAS grants? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how where these developed?

44. Do you take any special steps to make sure that grants are provided to organizations whose membership or clientele are primarily women? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

45. Are you satisfied with how the ATLAS grants component has been managed? _____ Yes _____ No

46. If you could change anything about the ATLAS grants component, what would you change?

47. How are topics selected for *IROKO* and *ATLAS Alert*?

48. Is newsletter publication adhering to the established deadlines? _____ Yes _____ No

49. If you could change anything about ATLAS's newsletters, what would you change?

50. Is the *Directory of Fellows* being published according to the established deadlines? _____ Yes _____ No

51. Is the *Directory* disseminated to the appropriate audience?_____ Yes _____ No

52. Are there any particular constraints or opportunities involved in the *Directory of Fellows*? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

53. Is there anything you would change about the *Directory*?

♦ ***Other ATLAS Components***

54. Are there any major differences between the ATLAS scholarship candidates and candidates for POSTAF awards? _____ Yes _____ No

55. Are there major differences in placing POSTAF candidates as compared to ATLAS candidates? _____ Yes _____ No

56. If you could rate the POSTAF component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5	Caliber of POSTAF candidates
1 2 3 4 5	POSTAF advertisement process
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women for POSTAF
1 2 3 4 5	POSTAF placement process
1 2 3 4 5	Management of POSTAF

57. Are there any aspects to POSTAF that you would change if you could? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what changes would you make?

58. Are there major constraints or opportunities in implementing the Distinguished Alumni Award component? _____ Yes _____ No

59. If you could rate the Distinguished Alumni Award component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5	Caliber of Distinguished Alumni Award candidates
1 2 3 4 5	Advertisement process
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women for recognition
1 2 3 4 5	Getting publicity in-country for the awards
1 2 3 4 5	Mission support of award process
1 2 3 4 5	Management of Distinguished Alumni Award

♦ ***Relations with Missions***

60. How is ATLAS marketed?

61. Who is responsible for marketing ATLAS?

62. Has marketing ATLAS been effective? _____ Yes _____ No

Why/why not?

63. If you could change how ATLAS is marketed, what changes would you make?

64. Have relations between AAI and the Missions changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

65. What factors make for a good relationship with a Mission?

66. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with a Mission?

67. How frequently do you communicate with Missions?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

68. Are you satisfied with AAI's relations with Missions? _____ Yes _____ No

69. Do you believe that the Missions are satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

70. If you could rate AAI's relations with the Missions on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5 Mission response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Overall Mission commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with Missions

71. If you could change anything in how you interact with the field Missions, what would you change?

♦ ***Relations with USAID/W***

72. Have USAID/W steps to market ATLAS been effective? _____ Yes _____ No

Why/why not?

73. Have relations between AAI and USAID/W changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

74. What factors make for a good relationship with USAID/W?

75. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with USAID/W?

76. How frequently do you communicate with USAID/W?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

77. Are you satisfied with your relations with USAID/W? _____ Yes _____ No

78. Do you believe that USAID/W is satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

79. If you could rate your relations with USAID/W on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Overall USAID/W commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with USAID/W

80. If you could change anything in how you interact with USAID/W, what would you change?

♦ ***Financial Management***

81. What is the procedure for USAID Missions to buy-in to the ATLAS project?

82. How do the actual buy-ins to date compare with those projected in the PP?

83. Does AAI play a role in seeing that buy-ins occur in a timely fashion? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what role?

84. What impact on the future of the project do you foresee as a result of the closeout of Africa Missions?

85. Has the core funding provided under ATLAS provided adequate resources to achieve project objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

86. How much has been made available to the AAI contract and its subcontracts?

87. Have adequate funds been provided in a timely fashion for successful project implementation? _____ Yes _____ No

88. By fiscal year, how much has been obligated/expended for administrative/overhead costs?

89. When averaged by year, what percentage of an ATLAS trainee's total costs go to administrative/overhead costs?

90. Is this comparable to the administrative/overhead costs of AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If not, why not?

91. Does AAI receive a flat fee or percentage fee for each trainee it processes?

92. What have been the costs to date (overall and by fiscal year) of support to the Dean's Committee?

93. What is included in this expense?

94. How do these actual costs compare with those projected in the PP?

95. What have been the costs to date (overall and by fiscal year) of maintaining local AAI representatives?

96. What financial support is provided by the local USAID Missions?

97. How do these actual costs compare with those projected in the PP?

98. To what extent is cost sharing included in ATLAS?

99. What is the value of university tuition waivers?

100. What trends have appeared in the overall number of universities and amounts waived since implementation began?

101. What trends have appeared in the number of HBCUs and the amounts of tuition waivers?

102. What does it cost AAI to obtain these tuition waivers?

103. What procedures does AAI follow in making payments to universities?

104. Have any problems arisen been encountered with the procedures for making payments to universities? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

105. What procedures are followed in making student payments?

106. Have any problems arisen been encountered with the procedures for making student payments? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

107. What financial management structure has AAI put in place to ensure effective financial management of ATLAS?

108. How does this organization interface with USAID/Washington's financial and/or program offices?

109. How does it interface with the USAID Missions?

110. How does it interface with the local AAI representatives?

111. What financial reporting systems and procedures have been established to support ATLAS?

112. How was the system developed and by whom?

113. Who receives these reports?

114. How are these reports utilized?

115. What are the average costs of ATLAS long and short-term academic training?

116. How do these costs vary between public and private universities and HBCUs?

117. How do these costs compare to those of AFGRAD and cost projections of the PP?

118. What enrichment activities have been funded to date?

119. Are these costs consistent with those projected in the PP?

_____ Yes _____ No

If no: why not?

120. Has there been a difference between the cost of enrichment activities spent on male trainees and those spent on females?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what difference?

121. Have there been cases where enrichment activities were not programmed due to lack of funds?

122. What expenditures have been made on national and regional professional enhancement activities?

123. By category, what do professional enhancement activities cost?

_____ POSTAF awards
_____ Conferences and symposia
_____ Grants to African organizations
_____ Distinguished Alumni Awards
_____ Newsletters

233

_____ *Directory of Fellows*

124. How do these costs compare with those estimated in the PP?

125. Has the level of expenditures for enhancement activities benefitting females been different from those benefitting males? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

♦ ***Database Management***

126. How is AAI tracking ATLAS's impact?

127. How is impact defined for scholarships?

128. How is impact defined for professional enhancement activities?

129. How does AAI communicate about impact with the field?

130. Do you take steps to make sure that ATLAS participants are entered into Mission PTMS systems? _____ Yes _____ No

131. If you could change anything in how you track impact or report to the field, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

132. How does the process for assessing AAI/New York's level of effort and staffing pattern work?

133. Are there changes you would make, if you could, to the process of defining AAI's LOE and staffing pattern?

134. Are the AAI Field Representatives' responsibilities any different under ATLAS as compared to AFGRAD?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

135. Are the Representatives adapting well to any changes in responsibilities? _____ Yes _____ No

136. Is there a written Operations Manual for ATLAS procedures? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: obtain copy.

137. To your knowledge is ATLAS meeting its EOPS targets?

_____ Yes	_____ No	Undergraduate scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	Masters degree scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	PhD scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	Participation by women
_____ Yes	_____ No	Using HBCUs
_____ Yes	_____ No	POSTAF awards
_____ Yes	_____ No	Conferences and symposia
_____ Yes	_____ No	Grants to African organizations
_____ Yes	_____ No	Distinguished Alumni Awards
_____ Yes	_____ No	Newsletters
_____ Yes	_____ No	*Directory of Fellows*

138. Has the use of subcontractors been effective in implementing ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

139. Is there anything you wished you had done differently with the ATLAS subcontractors?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what?

140. Did the PP Amendment make it easier to implement ATLAS's field services?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

141. What other steps would make it easier to implement ATLAS's field services?

142. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	AAI's performance
1 2 3 4 5	Mission performance

235

1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W's performance
1 2 3 4 5 ATLAS in general

143. Are there any issues that you think might decrease the likelihood of ATLAS's or of individual alumni's impact? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

144. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

145. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

5. AAI NEW YORK: ATLAS PLACEMENT

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Years with AAI

1. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***ATLAS Recruitment and Selection***

2. In what ways is recruitment of ATLAS candidates different from the AFGRAD process?

3. How do Missions determine what fields of study to fund?

4. How do Missions determine their level of ATLAS buy-in?

5. Do Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific strategic objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

6. Do Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific African employers? _____ Yes _____ No

7. How do you handle applicants who are not employed at the time they are applying for an ATLAS scholarship?

8. What are the criteria for selecting ATLAS candidates?

9. What role do the ATLAS Deans play in recruitment and selection?

10. How is this different from the AFGRAD Deans Committee's responsibilities?

237

11. What role do the AAI Representatives play in recruitment and selection?

12. How is this different from the Representatives' roles under AFGRAD?

13. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of women?

14. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

15. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of the private sector in ATLAS?

16. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

17. According to the *ATLAS Annual Reports*, certain countries have higher proportions of women represented in ATLAS (Tanzania, Mozambique, Zaire). Why is that?

18. If you could make changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited, what would those changes be?

19. If you could rate the ATLAS recruitment and selection process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women
1 2 3 4 5	Missions' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	AAI Representatives' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS Deans' role in recruitment and selection
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's role in recruitment and selection

♦ ***ATLAS Placement***

20. How is the ATLAS placement process different from AFGRAD's?

21. Are candidates' employers active in determining their program of study?
_____ Yes _____ No

22. Are the funding Missions active in determining an ATLAS program of study?

_____ Yes _____ No

23. How is utilization of HBCUs determined?

24. Is this an effective way of determining how to use HBCUs? _____ Yes _____ No

25. What are the key constraints to using HBCUs?

26. What are the key constraints in placing ATLAS scholars?

_____ Insufficient number of tuition waivers
_____ Problems with certain fields of study: which?
_____ Problems with candidates from certain countries: which?
_____ Problems placing undergraduates
_____ Problems placing in masters degree programs
_____ Problems placing in doctoral programs
_____ Other problems: which?

27. If you could change the ATLAS placement process, what changes would you make?

28. If you could rate the ATLAS placement process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS placement
1 2 3 4 5	Placing women
1 2 3 4 5	Placing undergraduates
1 2 3 4 5	Placing masters degrees
1 2 3 4 5	Placing doctoral scholars
1 2 3 4 5	Placing at HBCUs

♦ ***Other ATLAS Components***

29. Are there any major differences between the ATLAS scholarship candidates and candidates for POSTAF awards? _____ Yes _____ No

30. Are there major differences in placing POSTAF candidates as compared to ATLAS candidates? _____ Yes _____ No

31. If you could rate the POSTAF component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1	2	3	4	5	Caliber of POSTAF candidates
1	2	3	4	5	POSTAF advertisement process
1	2	3	4	5	Recruiting women for POSTAF
1	2	3	4	5	POSTAF placement process
1	2	3	4	5	Management of POSTAF

32. Are there any aspects to POSTAF that you would change if you could? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what changes would you make?

♦ ***Relations with Missions***

33. How is ATLAS marketed?

34. Who is responsible for marketing ATLAS?

35. Has marketing ATLAS been effective? _____ Yes _____ No

Why/why not?

36. If you could change how ATLAS is marketed, what changes would you make?

37. Have relations between AAI and the Missions changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

38. What factors make for a good relationship with a Mission?

39. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with a Mission?

40. How frequently do you communicate with Missions?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

41. Are you satisfied with your relations with the Missions you work with? _____ Yes _____ No

42. Do you believe that the Missions you work with are satisfied with your relations?
_____ Yes _____ No

43. If you could rate your relations with the Missions on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Mission involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5	Mission involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5	Mission response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5	Mission involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5	Overall Mission commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5	Overall relations with Missions

44. If you could change anything in how you interact with the field Missions, what would you change?

♦ ***Relations with USAID/W***

45. Have USAID/W steps to market ATLAS been effective? _____ Yes _____ No

Why/why not?

46. Have relations between AAI and USAID/W changed since AFGRAD?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

47. What factors make for a good relationship with USAID/W?

48. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with USAID/W?

49. How frequently do you communicate with USAID/W?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

50. Are you satisfied with your relations with USAID/W? _____ Yes _____ No

51. Do you believe that USAID/W is satisfied with your relations?
_____ Yes _____ No

52. If you could rate your relations with USAID/W on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1	2	3	4	5	USAID/W involvement in planning ATLAS training
1	2	3	4	5	USAID/W involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1	2	3	4	5	USAID/W response when special actions are required
1	2	3	4	5	USAID/W involvement in professional enhancement activities
1	2	3	4	5	Overall USAID/W commitment to ATLAS
1	2	3	4	5	Overall relations with USAID/W

53. If you could change anything in how you interact with USAID/W, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

54. Are the AAI Field Representatives' responsibilities any different under ATLAS as compared to AFGRAD?
_____ Yes _____ N

If yes: how?

55. Are the Representatives adapting well to any changes in responsibilities? _____ Yes _____ No

56. Is there a written Operations Manual for ATLAS procedures? _____ Yes _____ No

57. To your knowledge is ATLAS meeting its EOPS targets?

_____ Yes	_____ No	Undergraduate scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	Masters degree scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	PhD scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	Participation by women
_____ Yes	_____ No	Using HBCUs
_____ Yes	_____ No	POSTAF awards
_____ Yes	_____ No	Conferences and symposia
_____ Yes	_____ No	Grants to African organizations
_____ Yes	_____ No	Distinguished Alumni Awards
_____ Yes	_____ No	Newsletters
_____ Yes	_____ No	*Directory of Fellows*

58. Has the use of subcontractors been effective in implementing ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

59. Is there anything you wished AAI had done differently with the ATLAS subcontractors?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what?

60. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	AAI's performance
1 2 3 4 5	Mission performance
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's performance
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS in general

61. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

62. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

6. AAI NEW YORK: MONITORING PROGRAM OFFICERS

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Years with AAI

1. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***ATLAS Recruitment and Selection***

2. In what ways is recruitment of ATLAS candidates different from the AFGRAD process?

3. How do Missions determine what fields of study to fund?

4. How do Missions determine their level of ATLAS buy-in?

5. Do Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific strategic objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

6. Do Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific African employers? _____ Yes _____ No

7. How do you handle applicants who are not employed at the time they are applying for an ATLAS scholarship?

8. What are the criteria for selecting ATLAS candidates?

9. What role do the ATLAS Deans play in recruitment and selection?

10. How is this different from the AFGRAD Deans Committee's responsibilities?

11. What role do the AAI Representatives play in recruitment and selection?

12. How is this different from the Representatives' roles under AFGRAD?

13. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of women?

14. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

15. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of the private sector in ATLAS?

16. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

17. According to the *ATLAS Annual Reports*, certain countries have higher proportions of women represented in ATLAS (Tanzania, Mozambique, Zaire). Why is that?

18. If you could make changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited, what would those changes be?

19. If you could rate the ATLAS recruitment and selection process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women
1 2 3 4 5	Missions' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	AAI Representatives' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS Deans' role in recruitment and selection
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's role in recruitment and selection

♦ ***Monitoring ATLAS Participants***

20. Are there changes in how ATLAS participants are monitored as compared to AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

21. Do you provide orientations for all arriving ATLAS scholars? _____ Yes _____ No

245

22. How long is the standard orientation?

_____ Group
_____ Individual

23. How do you maintain contact with participants in English language training?

_____ Written correspondence with participants
_____ Phone calls to participants
_____ Written correspondence with ELT administration
_____ Phone calls with ELT administration
_____ Site visits
_____ Other: what?

24. How do you maintain contact with participants in their academic programs?

_____ Written correspondence with participants
_____ Phone calls to participants
_____ Written correspondence with academic advisor
_____ Phone calls with academic advisor
_____ Written correspondence with other faculty
_____ Phone calls with other faculty
_____ Site visits
_____ Other: what?

25. How often are you in contact with participants?

_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 3 months
_____ Every 3 to 6 months
_____ Other

26. How much advance notice do you estimate that you generally give a Mission when an extension of time is required?

_____ Less than 1 month
_____ 1 month
_____ 1-3 months
_____ 3-6 months

27. How much advance notice do you estimate that you generally give a Mission when more funding is needed for a given program?

_____ Less than 1 month
_____ 1 month
_____ 1-3 months
_____ 3-6 months

28. What are the key constraints in providing advance notice to Missions when extensions or increased funding are needed?

29. Who defines a participant's enrichment activities?

_____ USAID/W
_____ Mission
_____ participant
_____ academic advisor
_____ other faculty
_____ AAI staff
_____ AAI subcontractor/ADL
_____ participant's anticipated post-training employer
_____ Other: who?

30. Do participants generally conduct their thesis research in their home countries?

_____ Yes _____ No

31. How is repatriation handled under ATLAS?

32. What are the key constraints to prompt repatriation after training?

33. Are you aware of how AAI is tracking the impact of ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

34. If you could rate AAI's process for monitoring ATLAS participants on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Providing orientations
1 2 3 4 5	Monitoring English language training
1 2 3 4 5	Monitoring participants in training
1 2 3 4 5	Providing enrichment activities
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with repatriation
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with participants' re-entry
1 2 3 4 5	Handling requests for extensions
1 2 3 4 5	Handling difficult repatriations
1 2 3 4 5	Defining the impact of ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5	Tracking the impact of ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5	Communicating with Missions regarding special participant requests or situations

35. If you could make changes in AAI's process for monitoring ATLAS participants, what changes would you make?

247

♦ ***Other ATLAS Components***

36. Are there any major differences between the ATLAS scholarship candidates and candidates for POSTAF awards? _____ Yes _____ No

37. Are there major differences in placing POSTAF candidates as compared to ATLAS candidates? _____ Yes _____ No

38. If you could rate the POSTAF component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1	2	3	4	5	Caliber of POSTAF candidates
1	2	3	4	5	POSTAF advertisement process
1	2	3	4	5	Recruiting women for POSTAF
1	2	3	4	5	POSTAF placement process
1	2	3	4	5	Management of POSTAF

39. Are there any aspects to POSTAF that you would change if you could? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what changes would you make?

40. Are there major constraints or opportunities in implementing the Distinguished Alumni Award component? _____ Yes _____ No

41. If you could rate the Distinguished Alumni Award component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1	2	3	4	5	Caliber of Distinguished Alumni Award candidates
1	2	3	4	5	Advertisement process
1	2	3	4	5	Recruiting women for recognition
1	2	3	4	5	Getting publicity in-country for the awards
1	2	3	4	5	Mission support of award process
1	2	3	4	5	Management of Distinguished Alumni Award

♦ ***Relations with Missions***

42. How is ATLAS marketed?

43. Who is responsible for marketing ATLAS?

44. Has marketing ATLAS been effective? _____ Yes _____ No

Why/why not?

45. If you could change how ATLAS is marketed, what changes would you make?

46. Have relations between AAI and the Missions changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

47. What factors make for a good relationship with a Mission?

48. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with a Mission?

49. How frequently do you communicate with Missions?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

50. Are you satisfied with your relations with the Missions you work with? _____ Yes _____ No

51. Do you believe that the Missions you work with are satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

52. If you could rate your relations with the Missions on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5 Mission response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Overall Mission commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with Missions

53. If you could change anything in how you interact with the field Missions, what would you change?

249

♦ ***Relations with USAID/W***

54. Have USAID/W steps to market ATLAS been effective? _____ Yes _____ No

Why/why not?

55. Have relations between AAI and USAID/W changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

56. What factors make for a good relationship with USAID/W?

57. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with USAID/W?

58. How frequently do you communicate with USAID/W?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

59. Are you satisfied with your relations with USAID/W? _____ Yes _____ No

60. Do you believe that USAID/W is satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

61. If you could rate your relations with USAID/W on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Overall USAID/W commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with USAID/W

62. If you could change anything in how you interact with USAID/W, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

250

63. Are the AAI Field Representatives' responsibilities any different under ATLAS as compared to AFGRAD?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

64. Are the Representatives adapting well to any changes in responsibilities? _____ Yes _____ No

65. Is there a written Operations Manual for ATLAS procedures? _____ Yes _____ No

66. To your knowledge is ATLAS meeting its EOPS targets?

_____ Yes	_____ No	Undergraduate scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	Masters degree scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	PhD scholarships
_____ Yes	_____ No	Participation by women
_____ Yes	_____ No	Using HBCUs
_____ Yes	_____ No	POSTAF awards
_____ Yes	_____ No	Conferences and symposia
_____ Yes	_____ No	Grants to African organizations
_____ Yes	_____ No	Distinguished Alumni Awards
_____ Yes	_____ No	Newsletters
_____ Yes	_____ No	*Directory of Fellows*

67. Has the use of subcontractors been effective in implementing ATLAS?

_____ Yes _____ No

68. Is there anything you wished AAI had done differently with the ATLAS subcontractors?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what?

69. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	AAI's performance
1 2 3 4 5	Mission performance
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's performance
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS in general

70. Are there any issues that you think might decrease the likelihood of ATLAS's or of individual alumni's impact? _____ Yes _____ No

251

If yes: which?

71. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

72. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

7. AAI NEW YORK: FIELD SERVICES TEAM

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Years with AAI

1. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***Field Services***

2. How are the topics for ATLAS conferences and symposia determined?

_____ USAID/W
_____ Missions
_____ AAI/NY staff
_____ AAI Representatives
_____ Alumni
_____ Participants
_____ Employers
_____ Host country government officials
_____ Other: who?

3. Do you take any special steps to make sure that ATLAS conferences and symposia cover topics of special interest to women? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: which?

4. Do you take any special steps to make sure that women attend ATLAS conferences and symposia? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: which?

5. Are you satisfied with how ATLAS conferences and symposia have been managed? _____ Yes _____ No

6. If you could change anything about the ATLAS conferences and symposia, what would you change?

7. Are there written criteria for selecting African organizations to receive ATLAS grants? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: how where these developed?

   If yes: obtain a copy.

8. Do you take any special steps to make sure that grants are provided to organizations whose membership or clientele are primarily women? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: which?

9. Are you satisfied with how the ATLAS grants component has been managed? _____ Yes _____ No

10. If you could change anything about the ATLAS grants component, what would you change?

11. How are topics selected for *IROKO* and *ATLAS Alert*?

12. Is newsletter publication adhering to the established deadlines? _____ Yes _____ No

13. If you could change anything about ATLAS's newsletters, what would you change?

14. Is the *Directory of Fellows* being published according to the established deadlines? _____ Yes _____ No

15. Is the *Directory* disseminated to the appropriate audience? _____ Yes _____ No

16. Are there any particular constraints or opportunities involved in the *Directory of Fellows*? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: which?

17. Is there anything you would change about the *Directory*?

18. Do you work on POSTAF? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: are there any major differences between the ATLAS scholarship candidates and candidates for POSTAF awards? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: are there major differences in placing POSTAF candidates as compared to ATLAS candidates? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: if you could rate the POSTAF component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5 Caliber of POSTAF candidates
1 2 3 4 5 POSTAF advertisement process
1 2 3 4 5 Recruiting women for POSTAF
1 2 3 4 5 POSTAF placement process
1 2 3 4 5 Management of POSTAF

If yes: are there any aspects to POSTAF that you would change if you could? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what changes would you make?

19. Do you work on the Distinguished Alumni Award component? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: are there major constraints or opportunities in implementing the Distinguished Alumni Award component? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: if you could rate the Distinguished Alumni Award component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5 Caliber of Distinguished Alumni Award candidates
1 2 3 4 5 Advertisement process
1 2 3 4 5 Recruiting women for recognition
1 2 3 4 5 Getting publicity in-country for the awards
1 2 3 4 5 Mission support of award process
1 2 3 4 5 Management of Distinguished Alumni Award

♦ ***Marketing Field Services***

20. How are ATLAS field services marketed?

21. Who is responsible for marketing ATLAS field services?

22. Has marketing ATLAS field services been effective? _____ Yes _____ No

Why/why not?

23. If you could change how ATLAS field services are marketed, what changes would you make?

♦ ***ATLAS and Field Missions***

24. Have relations between AAI and the Missions changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

25. What factors make for a good relationship with a Mission?

26. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with a Mission?

27. How frequently do you communicate with Missions?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

28. Are you satisfied with your relations with the Missions? _____ Yes _____ No

29. Do you believe that Missions are satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

30. If you could rate your relations with the Missions on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in planning ATLAS professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Mission response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 Overall Mission commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with Missions

31. If you could change anything in how you interact with the field Missions, what would you change?

♦ ***Relations with USAID/W***

32. Have USAID/W steps to market ATLAS been effective? _____ Yes _____ No

Why/why not?

33. Have relations between AAI and USAID/W changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

34. What factors make for a good relationship with USAID/W?

35. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with USAID/W?

36. How frequently do you communicate with USAID/W?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

37. Are you satisfied with your relations with USAID/W? _____ Yes _____ No

38. Do you believe that USAID/W is satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

39. If you could rate your relations with USAID/W on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in planning ATLAS professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in monitoring ATLAS professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 Overall USAID/W commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with USAID/W

40. If you could change anything in how you interact with USAID/W, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

41. Are the AAI Field Representatives' responsibilities any different under ATLAS as compared to AFGRAD?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

42. Are the Representatives adapting well to any changes in responsibilities? _____ Yes _____ No

43. Is there a written Operations Manual for ATLAS procedures? _____ Yes _____ No

44. To your knowledge is ATLAS meeting its EOPS targets?

_____ Yes _____ No Undergraduate scholarships
_____ Yes _____ No Masters degree scholarships
_____ Yes _____ No PhD scholarships
_____ Yes _____ No Participation by women
_____ Yes _____ No Using HBCUs
_____ Yes _____ No POSTAF awards
_____ Yes _____ No Conferences and symposia
_____ Yes _____ No Grants to African organizations
_____ Yes _____ No Distinguished Alumni Awards
_____ Yes _____ No Newsletters
_____ Yes _____ No *Directory of Fellows*

45. Has the use of subcontractors been effective in implementing ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

46. Is there anything you wished you had done differently with the ATLAS subcontractors?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what?

47. Did the PP Amendment make it easier to implement ATLAS's field services?

_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

48. What other steps would make it easier to implement ATLAS's field services?

49. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 AAI's performance
1 2 3 4 5 Mission performance
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W's performance

1 2 3 4 5 ATLAS in general

50. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

51. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

8. AAI NEW YORK: STUDENT FINANCE

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Years with AAI

1. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***Relations with Missions***

2. Have relations between AAI and the Missions changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: in what ways?

3. What factors make for a good relationship with a Mission?

4. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with a Mission?

5. How frequently do you communicate with Missions?
   - _____ More than once a month
   - _____ Once a month
   - _____ Once every 1-3 months
   - _____ Once every 3-6 months
   - _____ Other: how often?

6. Are you satisfied with your relations with the Missions? _____ Yes _____ No

7. Do you believe that the Missions are satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

8. If you could rate your relations with the Missions on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in OYB transfers
1 2 3 4 5 Mission response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 Mission financial obligations concerning professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Overall Mission commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with Missions

9. If you could change anything in how you interact with the field Missions, what would you change?

♦ ***Relations with USAID/W***

10. Have relations between AAI and USAID/W changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

11. What factors make for a good relationship with USAID/W?

12. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with USAID/W?

13. How frequently do you communicate with USAID/W?
_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

14. Are you satisfied with your relations with USAID/W? _____ Yes _____ No

15. Do you believe that USAID/W is satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

16. If you could rate your relations with USAID/W on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Overall USAID/W commitment to ATLAS

1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with USAID/W

17. If you could change anything in how you interact with USAID/W, what would you change?

- ***Financial Management***

18. What is the procedure for USAID Missions to buy-in to the ATLAS project?

19. How do the actual buy-ins to date compare with those projected in the PP?

20. Does AAI play a role in seeing that buy-ins occur in a timely fashion? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: what role?

21. What impact on the future of the project do you foresee as a result of the closeout of Africa Missions?

22. Has the core funding provided under ATLAS provided adequate resources to achieve project objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

23. How much has been made available to the AAI contract and its subcontracts?

24. Have adequate funds been provided in a timely fashion for successful project implementation? _____ Yes _____ No

25. By fiscal year, how much has been obligated/expended for administrative/overhead costs?

26. When averaged by year, what percentage of an ATLAS trainee's total costs go to administrative/overhead costs?

27. Is this comparable to the administrative/overhead costs of AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

    If not, why not?

28. Does AAI receive a flat fee or percentage fee for each trainee it processes?

29. What have been the costs to date (overall and by fiscal year) of support to the Dean's Committee?

30. What is included in this expense?

31. How do these actual costs compare with those projected in the PP?

32. What have been the costs to date (overall and by fiscal year) of maintaining local AAI representatives?

33. What financial support is provided by the local USAID Missions?

34. How do these actual costs compare with those projected in the PP?

35. To what extent is cost sharing included in ATLAS?

36. What is the value of university tuition waivers?

37. What trends have appeared in the overall number of universities and amounts waived since implementation began?

38. What trends have appeared in the number of HBCUs and the amounts of tuition waivers?

39. What does it cost AAI to obtain these tuition waivers?

40. What procedures does AAI follow in making payments to universities?

41. Have any problems arisen been encountered with the procedures for making payments to universities? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

42. What procedures are followed in making student payments?

43. Have any problems arisen been encountered with the procedures foı making student payments? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

44. What financial management structure has AAI put in place to ensure effective financial management of ATLAS?

45. How does this organization interface with USAID/Washington's financial and/or program offices?

46. How does it interface with the USAID Missions?

47. How does it interface with the local AAI representatives?

48. What financial reporting systems and procedures have been established to support ATLAS?

49. How was the system developed and by whom?

50. Who receives these reports?

51. How are these reports utilized?

52. What are the average costs of ATLAS long and short-term academic training?

53. How do these costs vary between public and private universities and HBCUs?

54. How do these costs compare to those of AFGRAD and cost projections of the PP?

55. What enrichment activities have been funded to date?

56. Are these costs consistent with those projected in the PP? _____ Yes _____ No

If no: why not?

57. Has there been a difference between the cost of enrichment activities spent on male trainees and those spent on females? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what difference?

58. Have there been cases where enrichment activities were not programmed due to lack of funds? _____ Yes _____ No

59. What expenditures have been made on national and regional professional enhancement activities?

60. By category, what do professional enhancement activities cost?

_____ POSTAF awards
_____ Conferences and symposia
_____ Grants to African organizations
_____ Distinguished Alumni Awards
_____ Newsletters
_____ *Directory of Fellows*

61. How do these costs compare with those estimated in the PP?

62. Has the level of expenditures for enhancement activities benefitting females been different from those benefitting males? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

63. Are the AAI Field Representatives' responsibilities any different under ATLAS as compared to AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how?

64. Are the Representatives adapting well to any changes in responsibilities? _____ Yes _____ No

65. Is there a written Operations Manual for ATLAS procedures? _____ Yes _____ No

66. To your knowledge is ATLAS meeting its EOPS targets?

_____ Yes _____ No Undergraduate scholarships
_____ Yes _____ No Masters degree scholarships
_____ Yes _____ No PhD scholarships
_____ Yes _____ No Participation by women
_____ Yes _____ No Using HBCUs
_____ Yes _____ No POSTAF awards
_____ Yes _____ No Conferences and symposia
_____ Yes _____ No Grants to African organizations
_____ Yes _____ No Distinguished Alumni Awards
_____ Yes _____ No Newsletters
_____ Yes _____ No *Directory of Fellows*

67. Has the use of subcontractors been effective in implementing ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

68. Is there anything you wished AAI had done differently with the ATLAS subcontractors? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what?

69. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 AAI's performance
1 2 3 4 5 Mission performance
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W's performance
1 2 3 4 5 ATLAS in general

70. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

71. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

9. AAI NEW YORK: DATABASE MANAGEMENT TEAM

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Years with AAI

1. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***Database Management***

2. How is AAI tracking ATLAS's impact?

3. How is impact defined for scholarships?

4. How is impact defined for professional enhancement activities?

5. How does AAI communicate about impact with the field?

6. Do you take steps to make sure that ATLAS participants are entered into Mission PTMS systems? _____ Yes _____ No

7. If you could change anything in how you track impact or report to the field, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

8. Are the AAI Field Representatives' responsibilities any different in tracking impact under ATLAS as compared to AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: how?

9. Are the Representatives adapting well to any changes in responsibilities?
_____ Yes _____ No

10. Has the use of subcontractors been effective in implementing ATLAS?
_____ Yes _____ No

11. Is there anything you wished AAI had done differently with the ATLAS subcontractors?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what?

12. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

13. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

10. AAI REPRESENTATIVE

This questionnaire is anonymous to encourage your frank response.

1. How long have you been an AAI Representative?

2. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***ATLAS Recruitment and Selection***

3. In what ways is recruitment of ATLAS candidates different from the AFGRAD process?

4. How does the Mission determine what fields of study to fund?

5. How does the Mission determine its level of ATLAS buy-in?

6. Does the Mission link ATLAS scholarships to specific strategic objectives?
_____ Yes _____ No

7. Does the Mission link ATLAS scholarships to specific African employers?
_____ Yes _____ No

8. How do you handle applicants who are not employed at the time they are applying for an ATLAS scholarship?

9. What are the criteria for selecting ATLAS candidates?

10. What role do the ATLAS Deans play in recruitment and selection?

11. How is this different from the AFGRAD Deans Committee's responsibilities?

12. What role do you play in recruitment and selection?

269

13. What role do you play with host country nominating agencies?

14. What role do you play with applicants' employers?

15. Do you play a role in defining candidates' objectives or programs of study? _____ Yes _____ No

16. How is this different from your roles under AFGRAD?

17. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of women?

18. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

19. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of the private sector in ATLAS?

20. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

21. According to the *ATLAS Annual Reports*, certain countries have higher proportions of women represented in ATLAS (Tanzania, Mozambique, Zaire). Why is that?

22. If you could rate the ATLAS recruitment and selection process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women
1 2 3 4 5	Missions' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	Your (AAI Representatives') role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	AAI/NY staff role in recruitment and selection
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS Deans' role in recruitment and selection
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's role in recruitment and selection

23. If you could make changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited, what would those changes be?

♦ ***During Training***

24. Do you maintain contact with ATLAS participants while they are in training?
_____ Yes _____ No

25. Do participants' employers maintain contact with ATLAS participants while they are in training? _____ Yes _____ No

26. Do you communicate with participants' employers during the period of training?
_____ Yes _____ No

27. Do you play a role in defining enrichment activities for participants in training?
_____ Yes _____ No

28. Do you assist in any way with a participant's repatriation? _____ Yes _____ No

29. Do you play a role in defining the impact of ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

30. Do you play any other role in monitoring participants while they are in training?
_____ Yes _____ No

31. If you could make any changes in how ATLAS participants are monitored while they are in training, what would those changes be?

♦ ***Following Training***

32. Do you maintain contact with alumni once their training is completed? _____ Yes _____ No

33. Do you maintain contact with the employers of alumni once ATLAS training is completed?
_____ Yes _____ No

♦ ***Professional Enhancement Activities***

34. Do you play a role in defining topics for ATLAS conferences and symposia?
_____ Yes _____ No

35. Do you take any special steps to make sure that ATLAS conferences and symposia cover topics of special interest to women? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

271

36. Do you take any special steps to make sure that women attend ATLAS conferences and symposia? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

37. Are you satisfied with how ATLAS conferences and symposia have been managed? _____ Yes _____ No

38. If you could change anything about the ATLAS conferences and symposia, what would you change?

39. If you could change anything about the ATLAS grants component, what would you change?

40. Do you have a role in selecting topics for *IROKO* or *ATLAS Alert*? _____ Yes _____ No

41. If you could change anything about ATLAS's newsletters, what would you change?

42. Is the *Directory* disseminated to the appropriate audience? _____ Yes _____ No

43. Are there any particular constraints or opportunities involved in the *Directory of Fellows*? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

44. Is there anything you would change about the *Directory*?

♦ ***Other ATLAS Components***

45. Are there any major differences between the ATLAS scholarship candidates and candidates for POSTAF awards? _____ Yes _____ No

46. If you could rate the POSTAF component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5	Caliber of POSTAF candidates
1 2 3 4 5	POSTAF advertisement process
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women for POSTAF
1 2 3 4 5	POSTAF placement process
1 2 3 4 5	Management of POSTAF

47. Are there any aspects to POSTAF that you would change if you could? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what changes would you make?

48. Are there major constraints or opportunities in implementing the Distinguished Alumni Award component? _____ Yes _____ No

49. If you could rate the Distinguished Alumni Award component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5	Caliber of Distinguished Alumni Award candidates
1 2 3 4 5	Advertisement process
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women for recognition
1 2 3 4 5	Getting publicity in-country for the awards
1 2 3 4 5	Mission support of award process
1 2 3 4 5	Management of Distinguished Alumni Award

♦ ***Relations with Missions***

50. Have relations between AAI and the Missions changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

51. What factors make for a good relationship with a Mission?

52. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with a Mission?

53. How frequently do you communicate with the Mission?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

54. What office or officer in USAID is your principal counterpart?

55. Are you satisfied with your relations with the Missions? _____ Yes _____ No

56. Do you believe that the Mission is satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

57. If you could rate your relations with the Missions on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5 Mission response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 Mission involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Overall Mission commitment to ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with Missions

58. If you could change anything in how you interact with the field Missions, what would you change?

♦ ***Relations with AAI/New York***

59. Have relations between you and AAI/New York changed since AFGRAD?_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

60. What factors make for a good relationship with AAI/New York?

61. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with AAI/New York?

62. How frequently do you communicate with AAI/New York?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

63. Are you satisfied with your relations with AAI/NY? _____ Yes _____ No

64. Do you believe that AAI/New York is satisfied with your relations? _____ Yes _____ No

65. If you could rate your relations with AAI/NY on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 AAI/NY involvement in planning ATLAS training

1 2 3 4 5 AAI/NY involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5 AAI/NY actions when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5 AAI/NY involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with AAI/NY

66. If you could change anything in how you interact with AAI/NY, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

67. Is there a tracking system in place which enables you to monitor applicants, trainees, alumni, or employers? _____ Yes _____ No

68. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?
1 2 3 4 5 AAI's performance
1 2 3 4 5 Mission performance
1 2 3 4 5 USAID/W's performance
1 2 3 4 5 ATLAS in general

69. Are there any steps you would recommend to increase the likelihood of the impact of ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

70. If you could make three changes in ATLAS or your responsibilities, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

71. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

11. ATLAS SUBCONTRACTORS

_____
Name

_____
Title

_____
Organization

♦ ***All ATLAS Subcontractors***

1. Please describe briefly your understanding of the ATLAS project and of your organization's role in it.

2. Please indicate specifically and quantifiably your organization's activities and accomplishments — inputs and outputs — in ATLAS to date.

3. What do you think have been ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

4. Do you play a role in any aspect of planning the ATLAS program in host countries or in the US? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: what roles?

5. Do you play a role in any aspect of monitoring ATLAS participants once they are in the US undertaking their academic programs? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: what roles?

6. Do you play a role with ATLAS participants once they have returned home? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: what roles?

7. Do you feel that AAI is effectively utilizing your organization in terms of ATLAS achieving its objective of preparing Africans for leadership positions in their home countries?

_____ Yes _____ No

If no: how could your role be improved?

- ***NAFEO***

8. Have you been able to increase HBCU participation in ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

9. Has HBCU involvement in ATLAS been different as compared to in AFGRAD?
_____ Yes _____ No

10. To what do you attribute this?

11. What are the key constraints to HBCU participation in ATLAS?

12. What are the key opportunities for ATLAS and HBCUs today?

13. Are there other steps AAI or NAFEO could take to increase HBCU participation in ATLAS?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what steps?

14. If you could rate ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest assessment, 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Your activities under ATLAS
1 2 3 4 5	Your relationship with AAI
1 2 3 4 5	The ATLAS project as a whole

15. If you could make three changes in the ATLAS program, what would they be?

a.

b.

c.

16. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

- ***Arthur D. Little (ADL)***

17. Who defines a participant's enrichment activities?

_____ USAID/W
_____ Mission
_____ participant
_____ academic advisor
_____ other faculty
_____ AAI staff
_____ AAI subcontractor/ADL
_____ participant's anticipated post-training employer
_____ Other: who?

18. How do your responsibilities on ATLAS work?

19. What are the key constraints to your activities under ATLAS?

20. What are the major opportunities you face with ATLAS today?

21. If you could rate ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest assessment, 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1	2	3	4	5	Your activities under ATLAS
1	2	3	4	5	Your relationship with AAI
1	2	3	4	5	The ATLAS project as a whole

22. If you could make three changes in the ATLAS program, what would they be?

a.

b.

c.

23. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

♦ ***African Academy of Sciences (AAS)***

24. Who defines the content of an ATLAS conference?

_____ USAID/W
_____ Mission
_____ participant
_____ academic advisor
_____ other faculty

_____ AAI staff
_____ AAS
_____ participant's anticipated post-training employer
_____ Other: who?

25. How do your responsibilities on ATLAS work?

26. What are the key constraints to your activities under ATLAS?

27. What are the major opportunities you face with ATLAS today?

28. If you could rate ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest assessment, 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1	2	3	4	5	Your activities under ATLAS
1	2	3	4	5	Your relationship with AAI
1	2	3	4	5	The ATLAS project as a whole

29. If you could make three changes in the ATLAS program, what would they be?

a.

b.

c.

30. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

♦ ***Management Systems International (MSI)***

31. Who defined how ATLAS would track impact?

_____ USAID/W
_____ Missions
_____ AAI staff
_____ MSI
_____ Participant's anticipated post-training employer
_____ Other: who?

32. How did your responsibilities on ATLAS work?

33. How were the impact tracking data elements defined?

34. How is impact defined for scholarships?

35. How is impact defined for professional enhancement activities?

36. Who was to be the audience for the ATLAS impact reports?

37. Did you take steps to ensure that the ATLAS impact tracking database would be compatible with the Mission-based PTMS systems? _____ Yes _____ No

38. What were the key constraints to your activities under ATLAS?

39. What were the major opportunities you faced with ATLAS?

40. If you could rate ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest assessment, 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1	2	3	4	5	Your activities under ATLAS
1	2	3	4	5	Your relationship with AAI
1	2	3	4	5	The ATLAS project as a whole

41. If you could make three changes in the ATLAS program, what would they have been?

a.

b.

c.

42. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

12. ATLAS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF GRADUATE DEANS

_____
Name (optional)

_____
Title

_____
Years with AFGRAD Deans Committee

_____
Years with ATLAS Deans Committee

1. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***Recruitment and Selection***

2. What role do the ATLAS Deans play in recruitment and selection?

3. Did you participate on the AFGRAD Deans Committee? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: in what ways is recruitment of ATLAS candidates different from the AFGRAD process?

4. What role do you personally play in recruiting and selecting ATLAS candidates?
   - _____ Advise AAI staff on recruitment and selection
   - _____ Travel to Africa to assist with in-country screening: which countries?
   - _____ Review ATLAS dossiers
   - _____ Attend ATLAS Deans Meetings
   - _____ Provide special services: which?
   - _____ No role in recruitment or selection
   - _____ Other: what?

5. How does ATLAS determine what fields of study to fund in a given country?

6. How do USAID Missions in Africa determine their level of ATLAS funding?

281

7. Do Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific strategic objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

8. Do Missions link ATLAS scholarships to specific African employers? _____ Yes _____ No

9. What are the criteria for selecting ATLAS candidates?

10. What role do the AAI Representatives play in recruitment and selection?

11. How is this different from the Representatives' roles under AFGRAD?

12. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of women?

13. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

14. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of the private sector in ATLAS?

15. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

16. According to the *ATLAS Annual Reports*, certain countries have higher proportions of women represented in ATLAS (Tanzania, Mozambique, Zaire). Why is that?

17. If you could make changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited, what would those changes be?

18. If you could rate the ATLAS recruitment and selection process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women
1 2 3 4 5	Missions' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	AAI Representatives' role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS Deans' role in recruitment and selection
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's role in recruitment and selection

♦ ***POSTAF Awards***

19. Are there any major differences between the ATLAS scholarship candidates and candidates for POSTAF awards? _____ Yes _____ No

20. Are there major differences in placing POSTAF candidates as compared to ATLAS candidates?
_____ Yes _____ No

21. If you could rate the POSTAF component on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following:

1 2 3 4 5	Caliber of POSTAF candidates
1 2 3 4 5	POSTAF advertisement process
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women for POSTAF
1 2 3 4 5	POSTAF placement process
1 2 3 4 5	Management of POSTAF

♦ ***ATLAS Scholars in US Universities***

22. What role do the ATLAS Deans play in matching candidates with academic programs in the US?

23. What role do you play in placing ATLAS or POSTAF scholars?

_____ Promoting ATLAS to the US university community
_____ Securing tuition waivers at your university
_____ Securing tuition waivers at other universities
_____ Providing advice on placement to ATLAS placement office
_____ No role in placement
_____ Other roles: which?

24. What role do you play with ATLAS or POSTAF scholars in the US?

_____ Academic advice to ATLAS scholars on my campus
_____ Social role with ATLAS scholars on my campus
_____ No role with ATLAS scholars in the US
_____ Other roles: which?

♦ ***The ATLAS Client***

25. Have relations between AAI and USAID/W changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

26. What factors make for a good relationship with USAID/W?

27. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with USAID/W?

283

28. Are you satisfied with AAI's relations with USAID/W? _____ Yes _____ No

29. Do you believe that USAID/W is satisfied with its relations with AAI? _____ Yes _____ No

30. What changes would you recommend in AAI's relationship with USAID/W?

♦ ***ATLAS Management***

31. Has the use of subcontractors been effective in implementing ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

32. Is there anything you wished AAI had done differently with the ATLAS subcontractors?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what?

33. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1	2	3	4	5	AAI's performance
1	2	3	4	5	Mission performance
1	2	3	4	5	USAID/W's performance
1	2	3	4	5	ATLAS in general

34. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

35. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

13. US UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY: ADMISSIONS PERSONNEL

_____
Name

_____
University

_____
Title

1. Approximately how many foreign student applications do you review each year?

2. How much experience do you have with the ATLAS project?

♦ ***ATLAS Candidates for Admissions***

3. Approximately how many ATLAS applications do you consider each year?

4. What are the key constraints in placing ATLAS scholars?

_____ Insufficient number of tuition waivers
_____ Problems with certain fields of study: which?
_____ Problems with candidates from certain countries: which?
_____ Problems placing undergraduates
_____ Problems placing in masters degree programs
_____ Problems placing in doctoral programs
_____ Other problems: which?

5. If you could rate ATLAS candidates for admission on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1	2	3	4	5	ATLAS candidates for admission
1	2	3	4	5	Female candidates
1	2	3	4	5	Male candidates
1	2	3	4	5	Undergraduate candidates
1	2	3	4	5	Masters degree candidates
1	2	3	4	5	Doctoral candidates

285

6. How do ATLAS candidates for admission compare to other foreign student applications?
   _____ ATLAS candidates are better than other foreign applicants
   _____ ... worse
   _____ ... about the same

♦ ***ATLAS Management***

7. How would you describe your relationship with AAI?

8. How often do you and AAI communicate about admissions matters?
   _____ More than once a month
   _____ Once a month
   _____ Once every 1-3 months
   _____ Once every 3-6 months
   _____ Other: how often?

9. How often do you communicate about admissions matters with other sponsoring agencies?
   _____ More than once a month
   _____ Once a month
   _____ Once every 1-3 months
   _____ Once every 3-6 months
   _____ Other: how often?
   _____ Don't work with any other sponsoring agencies

10. What factors make for a good relationship with a sponsoring agency?

11. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with a sponsoring agency?

12. What are the key advantages to working with AAI?
   _____ Pre-screening of candidates
   _____ Credentials complete before they are submitted for admissions
   _____ Credentials translated before dossier is submitted for placement
   _____ Knowledgeable staff
   _____ Responsive staff
   _____ Other advantages: which?

13. What are the key constraints to working with AAI?

14. Are you familiar with the contractual regulations governing ATLAS scholars?
   _____ Yes _____ No Duration of English language training

286

_____ Yes _____ No Duration of studies
_____ Yes _____ No Change in degree objective
_____ Yes _____ No Change in field of study
_____ Yes _____ No Changing universities
_____ Yes _____ No Financial allowances
_____ Yes _____ No Students' family
_____ Yes _____ No Other regulations: which?

15. If you could rate AAI's management of the ATLAS admissions process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 AAI's cooperativeness
1 2 3 4 5 AAI's responsiveness
1 2 3 4 5 AAI's productivity

16. How does AAI's management of ATLAS compare to other sponsoring agencies' management of similar programs?

_____ AAI's management is better than others
_____ ... worse
_____ ... about the same
_____ Don't work with any other sponsoring agencies

17. If you could make three changes in AAI or in the ATLAS placement process, what changes would you make?

a.

b.

c.

18. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

14. US UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

- ☐ International Student Advisors
- ☐ English Language Training Center personnel
- ☐ Academic Advisors to ATLAS participants
- ☐ US University faculty working with ATLAS participants

_____
Name

_____
University

_____
Title

1. Approximately how many foreign students do you have?

2. How much experience do you have with the ATLAS project?

♦ ***ATLAS Scholars***

3. Approximately how many ATLAS students do you have?
   - _____ Currently
   - _____ On average

4. What are the key issues or difficulties that ATLAS scholars face on your campus?
   - _____ Academic performance does not meet university standards
   - _____ Insufficient facility in written or spoken American English
   - _____ Adaptation to US life and culture
   - _____ Family difficulties
   - _____ Difficulties managing money
   - _____ Difficulties managing time
   - _____ Issues with employment situation back home
   - _____ Issues with political or economic situation back home
   - _____ Complaints about AAI administrative support services
   - _____ Other problems: which?

5. How do ATLAS scholars' performance and adaptation compare to other foreign students?
   _____ ATLAS scholars are better than other foreign students
   _____ ... worse
   _____ ... about the same

♦ ***ATLAS Management***

6. How would you describe your relationship with AAI?

7. How often do you and AAI communicate about student progress or issues?
   _____ More than once a month
   _____ Once a month
   _____ Once every 1-3 months
   _____ Once every 3-6 months
   _____ Other: how often?

8. How often do you communicate about student progress or issues with other sponsoring agencies?
   _____ More than once a month
   _____ Once a month
   _____ Once every 1-3 months
   _____ Once every 3-6 months
   _____ Other: how often?
   _____ Don't work with any other sponsoring agencies

9. What factors make for a good relationship with a sponsoring agency?

10. What factors make for an unsatisfactory relationship with a sponsoring agency?

11. What are the key advantages to working with AAI?
    _____ Caliber of scholars
    _____ Known procedures
    _____ Knowledgeable staff
    _____ Responsive staff
    _____ Other advantages: which?

12. What are the key constraints to working with AAI?

13. Are you familiar with the contractual regulations governing ATLAS scholars?
    _____ Yes _____ No Duration of English language training

_____ Yes _____ No Duration of studies
_____ Yes _____ No Change in degree objective
_____ Yes _____ No Change in field of study
_____ Yes _____ No Changing universities
_____ Yes _____ No Financial allowances
_____ Yes _____ No Students' family
_____ Yes _____ No Other regulations: which?

14. If you could rate AAI's management of the ATLAS project on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 AAI's cooperativeness
1 2 3 4 5 AAI's responsiveness
1 2 3 4 5 AAI's productivity

15. How does AAI's management of ATLAS compare to other sponsoring agencies' management of similar programs?

_____ AAI's management is better than others
_____ ... worse
_____ ... about the same
_____ Don't work with any other sponsoring agencies

16. If you could make three changes in AAI or in the ATLAS project, what changes would you make?

a.

b.

c.

17. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

15. CURRENT PARTICIPANTS

This survey is anonymous to encourage you to respond frankly.

♦ ***Background Information***

1. What is your nationality?

2. Which US university are you attending?

3. Are you in English language training? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: will your academic program be at the same university as your English language training? _____ Yes _____ No

4. When did your ATLAS Fellowship begin? Date _____

5. When will you complete your studies? Date _____

6. How old were you when your ATLAS fellowship began? Age in years _____

7. What degree are you studying for?
   - _____ Bachelors degree
   - _____ Masters degree
   - _____ PhD
   - _____ POSTAF short-term research fellowship
   - _____ Other: what?

8. Who was your employer just prior to your ATLAS fellowship?
   - _____ Government
   - _____ Parastatal
   - _____ Private company
   - _____ University
   - _____ Research institution
   - _____ Non-governmental organization
   - _____ Student
   - _____ Unemployed
   - _____ Other: which?

9. What was your position?

291

♦ *Planning Your Training Prior to Your Departure*

10. How did you first learn of the ATLAS project?
    - _____ Employer
    - _____ Advertisement
    - _____ Word of mouth
    - _____ Other: how?

11. How did you apply for your ATLAS fellowship?

12. Did your employer play a role in nominating you for ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: what role?

13. Did your government play a role in nominating you for ATLAS? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: what role?

14. How were you selected for ATLAS?
    - _____ By interview
    - _____ By my employer
    - _____ By my government
    - _____ Combination
    - _____ Don't know

15. Did you participate in planning your US program and in selecting your university prior to your departure? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: how?

16. Did your employer play a role in planning your US program and in selecting your university prior to your departure? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: how?

17. Did you request any supplemental training such as management seminars prior to your departure? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: what training?

18. Did you receive an orientation to your program of study and to life in the US prior to leaving home? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: from whom?

_____ AAI Representative
_____ USAID Mission
_____ Your employer
_____ Government
_____ Other: who?

19. Did you receive English language training prior to leaving home for the US?

_____ Yes _____ No

20. What was your TOEFL score prior to departure?

21. How long did it take, from the time you first completed your application, to the time you left home?

_____ Less than 3 months
_____ 3 to 6 months
_____ 6 months to 1 year
_____ Longer than 1 year

22. How long did it take, from the time you learned that you had received at ATLAS Fellowship, to the time you left home?

_____ Less than 1 week
_____ 1 week to 1 month
_____ 1 to 3 months
_____ Longer than 3 months

23. How well were you prepared to undertake your US program at the time of your departure? If you could rate your preparation prior to your departure for the US on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not well prepared) and 5 being the highest (very well prepared), how would you rate your preparation in the following areas?

1 2 3 4 5 English language proficiency
1 2 3 4 5 Academic prerequisites
1 2 3 4 5 Understanding of my academic program
1 2 3 4 5 Knowledge of ATLAS rules and regulations
1 2 3 4 5 Knowledge of ATLAS financial regulations and allowances
1 2 3 4 5 Prepared to leave family
1 2 3 4 5 Overall level of preparedness

♦ ***Since Arriving in the US***

24. Did you receive English language training upon arrival in the US? _____ Yes _____ No

293

If yes: for how long (number of months)?

If yes: how helpful was your language training to your academic program? If you could rate the helpfulness of your English language training on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (least helpful) and 5 being the highest (most helpful), how would you rate your English language training? 1 2 3 4 5

25. How is your academic program progressing? If you could rate how your academic program is progressing on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not very well) and 5 being the highest (very well), how would you rate your academic progress to date? 1 2 3 4 5

26. How would you rate the quality of your training? If you could rate the quality of your training on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (low quality) and 5 being the highest (excellent), how would you rate your academic program? 1 2 3 4 5

27. How relevant is your training to your home country situation? If you could rate the relevance of your training on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not relevant) and 5 being the highest (very relevant), how would you rate your academic program? 1 2 3 4 5

28. Have you had specific problems since coming to the US? If you could rate your level of difficulties in the following areas on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (little difficulty) and 5 being the highest (many difficulties), how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties maintaining an academic performance that meets my university's standards
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties with written or spoken American English
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties adapting to US life and culture
1 2 3 4 5	Family difficulties
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties managing money
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties managing time
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties with employment situation back home
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties with the political or economic situation back home
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties with AAI administrative support services
1 2 3 4 5	Other difficulties: which?

29. As a male or a female, have you had any special problems relating to your gender? If you could rate your level of difficulties in the following areas on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (little difficulty) and 5 being the highest (many difficulties), how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties obtaining the ATLAS scholarship
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties being recognized as an equal in the US
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulties adapting to life in the US
1 2 3 4 5	Other difficulties: which?

30. Are you receiving adequate support from your US university? If you could rate the services your US university provides on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not very useful services) and 5 being the highest (very useful services), how would you rate your US university's services to you? 1 2 3 4 5

31. How often do you communicate with your employer since you came to the US?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ I do not communicate with my employer
_____ Other: how often?

32. How often do you communicate with AAI since you came to the US?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ I do not communicate with AAI
_____ Other: how often?

33. In addition to your academic training, have you had the opportunity or do you plan to participate in any enrichment activities such as management seminars or workshops since starting your training? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how did you become involved in such enrichment activities?

_____ AAI proposed them
_____ My employer requested them
_____ My university/professors proposed them
_____ I proposed them
_____ Other: who?

♦ ***After Your ATLAS Training***

34. Do you have a job to return to after your ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: is it with the same employer as before your ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

35. Do you think you will encounter any difficulties when you return home? If you could rate the difficulties you anticipate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (little difficulty)

295

and 5 being the highest (many difficulties), how would you rate the level of difficulty you anticipate in the following areas?

1	2	3	4	5	Difficulty finding a job
1	2	3	4	5	Difficulty having my US degree recognized
1	2	3	4	5	Difficulty having the opportunity to apply my new ideas and skills back home
1	2	3	4	5	Difficulty with colleagues who did not receive US training
1	2	3	4	5	Difficulty readapting to life at home
1	2	3	4	5	Difficulty reintegrating myself into my family back home
1	2	3	4	5	Difficulty reintegrating myself with my friends back home
1	2	3	4	5	Other anticipated difficulties: which?

♦ ***Management of the ATLAS Project***

36. Are you receiving adequate support from AAI? If you could rate the services AAI provides on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not very useful services) and 5 being the highest (very useful services), how would you rate the following AAI services?

1	2	3	4	5	Orientation upon arrival
1	2	3	4	5	Assistance with travel/arrival at my US university
1	2	3	4	5	Administrative support during English language training
1	2	3	4	5	Administrative support during my academic program
1	2	3	4	5	Assistance with special requests
1	2	3	4	5	Timing of monthly payments
1	2	3	4	5	Amount of payments
1	2	3	4	5	Overall rating of AAI's services

37. Are there any steps you would recommend that AAI take to increase the likelihood of impact of your training? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what steps?

38. Do you believe that USAID plays a role in your ATLAS fellowship? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what role?

39. If you could make three changes in the ATLAS project, what changes would you make?

a.

b.

c.

40. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

16. ATLAS ALUMNI: SCHOLARSHIPS/POSTAF

_____
Name

_____
Country

♦ ***Planning Your Training Prior to Your Departure***

1. How did you first learn of the ATLAS project?
   - _____ Employer
   - _____ Advertisement
   - _____ Word of mouth
   - _____ Other: how?

2. Did you participate in planning your US program and in selecting your university prior to your departure? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: how?

3. Did your employer play a role in planning your US program and in selecting your university prior to your departure? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: how?

4. How well were you prepared to undertake your US program at the time of your departure? If you could rate your preparation prior to your departure for the US on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not well prepared) and 5 being the highest (very well prepared), how would you rate your preparation in the following areas?

1 2 3 4 5	English language proficiency
1 2 3 4 5	Academic prerequisites
1 2 3 4 5	Understanding of my academic program
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledge of ATLAS rules and regulations
1 2 3 4 5	Knowledge of ATLAS financial regulations and allowances
1 2 3 4 5	Prepared to leave family
1 2 3 4 5	Overall level of preparedness

♦ *Your Academic Program*

5. Which US university did you attend?

6. When did your ATLAS Fellowship begin? Date _____

7. When did you complete your studies? Date _____

8. What degree did you study for under ATLAS?
   - _____ Bachelors degree
   - _____ Masters degree
   - _____ PhD
   - _____ POSTAF short-term research fellowship
   - _____ Other: what?

9. Were you successful in obtaining this degree? _____ Yes _____ No

10. How would you rate your ATLAS program? If you could rate the quality of your training on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?
    - 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of your academic program
    - 1 2 3 4 5 Relevance of academic program to employment upon return home
    - 1 2 3 4 5 Quality of US university services

11. How often did you communicate with your employer while you were in the US?
    - _____ More than once a month
    - _____ Once a month
    - _____ Once every 1-3 months
    - _____ Once every 3-6 months
    - _____ I did not communicate with my employer while I was in the US
    - _____ Other: how often?

♦ *Using Your ATLAS Training*

12. Did you have a job to return to after your ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: was it with the same employer as before your ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

    If yes: was it the same position as before your ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

13. How long did it take from the time you returned home to the time you began work?
    - _____ 1 week
    - _____ Less than 1 month
    - _____ 1-3 months

_____ Over 3 months
_____ Still unemployed

14. Who was your employer just prior to your ATLAS fellowship?
_____ Government
_____ Parastatal
_____ Private company
_____ University
_____ Research institution
_____ Non-governmental organization
_____ Student
_____ Unemployed
_____ Other: which?

15. Who is your employer now?
_____ Government
_____ Parastatal
_____ Private company
_____ University
_____ Research institution
_____ Non-governmental organization
_____ <Student>
_____ Unemployed
_____ Other: which?

16. What is your position or title now?

17. Did you have assistance in getting your job? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: from whom?
_____ AAI/New York
_____ AAI Representative in your country
_____ USAID Mission
_____ No one helped me
_____ Other assistance: from whom?

18. What effect has your ATLAS training had on you professionally?
_____ Promotion
_____ Increased responsibilities
_____ Higher salary
_____ Greater respect from colleagues
_____ Other: what?

19. Did you encounter any difficulties when you returned home? If you could rate the difficulties you anticipate on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (little difficulty) and 5 being the highest (many difficulties), how would you rate the level of difficulty you encountered in the following areas?

1 2 3 4 5	Difficulty finding a job
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulty having my US degree recognized
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulty having the opportunity to apply my new ideas and skills back home
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulty with colleagues who did not receive US training
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulty readapting to life at home
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulty reintegrating myself into my family back home
1 2 3 4 5	Difficulty reintegrating myself with my friends back home
1 2 3 4 5	Other difficulties: which?

♦ ***Management of the ATLAS Project***

20. Did you receiving adequate support from AAI? If you could rate the services AAI provided on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not very useful services) and 5 being the highest (very useful services), how would you rate the following AAI services?

1 2 3 4 5	Orientation upon arrival
1 2 3 4 5	Assistance with travel/arrival at my US university
1 2 3 4 5	Administrative support during English language training
1 2 3 4 5	Administrative support during my academic program
1 2 3 4 5	Assistance with special requests
1 2 3 4 5	Timing of monthly payments
1 2 3 4 5	Amount of payments
1 2 3 4 5	Assistance with repatriation
1 2 3 4 5	Assistance with professional reintegration
1 2 3 4 5	Overall rating of AAI's services

21. Do you believe that USAID played a role in your ATLAS fellowship? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what role?

22. How often do you communicate with AAI/New York since you returned home?

_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with AAI/New York
_____ Other: how often?

23. How often do you communicate with the AAI Representative in your country since you returned home?

_____ Once a month

301

_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with the AAI Representative
_____ Other: how often?

24. How often do you communicate with USAID in your country since you returned home?
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with USAID
_____ Other: how often?

25. Do you receive the AAI newsletter for alumni, *IROKO*? _____ Yes _____ No

26. Do you receive the AAI *Directory of AFGRAD/ATLAS Alumni*? _____ Yes _____ No

27. Are there any steps you would recommend that AAI take to increase the likelihood of the impact of your ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what steps?

28. If you could make three changes in the ATLAS project, what changes would you make?

a.

b.

c.

29. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

17. ATLAS ALUMNI: PROFESSIONAL ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES

_____
Name

_____
Title/Organization

_____
Country

_____
Activity

1. How did you first learn of the ATLAS activity?
   - _____ Employer
   - _____ Advertisement
   - _____ Word of mouth
   - _____ Other: how?

2. Did your employer play a role in proposing your participation in this activity? Yes _____ No

   If yes: how?

3. Has the ATLAS activity had an effect on you professionally? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: what effect?
   - _____ Promotion
   - _____ Increased responsibilities
   - _____ Higher salary
   - _____ Greater respect from colleagues
   - _____ Other: what?

4. How was the activity managed? If you could rate the services AAI provided on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not very useful services) and 5 being the highest (very useful services), how would you rate the following AAI services?

   1 2 3 4 5 Content of program

303

1 2 3 4 5 Logistical support
1 2 3 4 5 Overall rating of AAI's services

5. Do you believe that USAID played a role in your ATLAS activity? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what role?

6. Do you communicate with AAI/New York since your ATLAS activity? _____ Yes _____ No

_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with AAI/New York
_____ Other: how often?

7. Is there a local AAI Representative in your country? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: do you communicate with the AAI Representative?

_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with the AAI Representative
_____ Other: how often?

8. Do you communicate with USAID since the ATLAS activity? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how often?

_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with USAID
_____ Other: how often?

9. Do you receive the AAI newsletter for alumni, *IROKO*? _____ Yes _____ No

10. Do you receive the AAI *Directory of AFGRAD/ATLAS Alumni*? _____ Yes _____ No

11. Are there any steps you would recommend that AAI take to increase the likelihood of the impact of your ATLAS activity? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what steps?

12. If you could make three changes in the ATLAS project, what changes would you make?

    a.

    b.

    c.

13. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

18. USAID MISSION PERSONNEL

This survey is anonymous to encourage your frank response.

_____
Title

_____
Years with ATLAS

1. What do you think are ATLAS's most important achievements to date?

♦ ***ATLAS Recruitment and Selection***

2. In what ways is recruitment of ATLAS candidates different from the AFGRAD process?

3. How do you determine what fields of study to fund?

4. How do you determine your level of ATLAS buy-in?

5. Do you link ATLAS scholarships to specific strategic objectives? _____ Yes _____ No

6. Do you link ATLAS scholarships to specific employers? _____ Yes _____ No

7. How does ATLAS relate to your bilateral projects?

8. What are the criteria for selecting ATLAS candidates?

9. Do you have an AAI Program Representative in-country? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes, what role does the AAI Representative play in recruitment and selection?

10. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of women?

11. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

12. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of the private sector in ATLAS?

13. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

14. Which of the following define a participant's objectives for training?

_____ The candidate
_____ The employer
_____ The Mission
_____ AAI staff/Representative/ATLAS Dean
_____ Other: who?

15. If you could make changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited, what would those changes be?

16. If you could rate the ATLAS recruitment and selection process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	Openness of recruitment process
1 2 3 4 5	Recruiting women
1 2 3 4 5	Mission's role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	AAI Representative's role in recruitment
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS Deans' role in recruitment and selection
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's role in recruitment and selection

♦ ***ATLAS Placement***

17. How is utilization of HBCUs determined?

18. Is this an effective way of determining how to use HBCUs? _____ Yes _____ No

19. What are the key constraints to using HBCUs?

20. If you could change the ATLAS placement process, what changes would you make?

21. If you could rate the ATLAS placement process on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest ranking, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS placement
1 2 3 4 5	Placing women
1 2 3 4 5	Placing undergraduates
1 2 3 4 5	Placing masters degrees
1 2 3 4 5	Placing doctoral scholars
1 2 3 4 5	Placing at HBCUs

♦ ***Monitoring ATLAS Participants***

22. Are there changes in how ATLAS participants are monitored as compared to AFGRAD?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

23. How much advance notice do you estimate that AAI generally provides when an extension of time or an increase in funding is required?

_____ Less than 1 month
_____ 1 month
_____ 1-3 months
_____ 3-6 months

24. Do/will your Mission's participants generally conduct their thesis research at home?
_____ Yes _____ No

25. Do you envisage any constraints to prompt repatriation after ATLAS training?

26. Do you yourself routinely communicate directly with participants while they are in training?
_____ Yes _____ No

27. Do participants' employers communicate directly with participants while they are in training?
_____ Yes _____ No

28. If you could rate AAI's process for monitoring ATLAS participants on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest possible rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	Monitoring participants in training
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with repatriation
1 2 3 4 5	Assisting with participants' re-entry
1 2 3 4 5	Handling requests for extensions

308

1 2 3 4 5 Handling difficult repatriations
1 2 3 4 5 Communicating with Missions

29. If you could make changes in AAI's process for monitoring ATLAS participants, what changes would you make?

♦ ***Field Services***

30. Has your Mission participated in any of the following ATLAS field services activities?

_____ Yes _____ No Conferences or symposia
_____ Yes _____ No ATLAS grants to African organizations
_____ Yes _____ No Receive *IROKO*
_____ Yes _____ No Receive *ATLAS Alert*
_____ Yes _____ No Receive the annual *AFGRAD/ATLAS Directory of Fellows*
_____ Yes _____ No Postgraduate fellowships (POSTAF)
_____ Yes _____ No Distinguished Alumni Award

31. What has been your role in ATLAS field service activities?

32. If you could rate the ATLAS field services on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 Usefulness of ATLAS conferences and symposia
1 2 3 4 5 Usefulness of *IROKO*
1 2 3 4 5 Usefulness of *ATLAS Alert*
1 2 3 4 5 Usefulness of *Directory of Fellows*
1 2 3 4 5 Usefulness of POSTAF
1 2 3 4 5 Distinguished Alumni Award
1 2 3 4 5 AAI's management of field service activities

♦ ***Relations with AAI***

33. Have relations between AAI and your Mission changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

34. How frequently does AAI/New York communicate with you?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months

309

_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

35. Is this enough communication with AAI/New York? _____ Yes _____ No

36. How frequently does your local AAI Representative communicate with you?
_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

37. Is this enough communication with the local AAI Representative? _____ Yes _____ No

38. Are you satisfied with your relations with AAI? _____ Yes _____ No

39. If you could change anything in how you interact with AAI, what would you change?

♦ ***Relations with USAID/W***

40. Have relations between USAID/W and you changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

41. How frequently do you communicate with USAID/W about ATLAS?
_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

42. If you could rate your relations with USAID/W on a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W involvement in planning ATLAS training
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W involvement in monitoring ATLAS trainees
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W response when special actions are required
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W involvement in professional enhancement activities
1 2 3 4 5	Overall USAID/W commitment to ATLAS

310

1 2 3 4 5 Overall relations with USAID/W

43. If you could change anything in how USAID/W interacts with you, what would you change?

♦ ***Financial Management***

44. Are you satisfied with how the OYB transfer procedure works in your Mission? Yes _____ No

45. Is ATLAS a cost-sharing project? _____ Yes _____ No

46. Does your Mission receive financial reports from AAI? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes, who receives them?

47. If you could rate the financial management of ATLAS on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating and 5 being the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 OYB transfer process
1 2 3 4 5 Content of AAI financial reports
1 2 3 4 5 Timeliness of AAI financial reports
1 2 3 4 5 Overall ATLAS financial management

♦ ***ATLAS and Impact***

48. Who is tracking ATLAS's impact?

49. How is impact defined for scholarships?

50. How is impact defined for professional enhancement activities?

51. Does AAI communicate with you about impact? _____ Yes _____ No

52. Are ATLAS participants entered into Mission PTMS system? _____ Yes _____ No

53. If you could change anything about how data is gathered, maintained and reported on, either by AAI or at your Mission, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

54. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	AAI/New York's performance
1 2 3 4 5	Local AAI Representative's performance
1 2 3 4 5	Your Mission's performance
1 2 3 4 5	USAID/W's performance
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS in general

55. Are there any issues that you think might decrease the likelihood of ATLAS's or of individual alumni's impact? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

56. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

57. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

312

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

19. NOMINATING AGENCY PERSONNEL

_____
Name

_____
Title/Ministry/Country

_____
Years with ATLAS

♦ ***ATLAS Recruitment and Selection***

1. What is your role in recruiting ATLAS candidates?
   - _____ Central coordination of all government nominations
   - _____ Central coordination of all nominations (government and private sector)
   - _____ Nominate for my ministry
   - _____ Other role: which?

2. How do you determine what fields of study to recruit for?
   - _____ Employing agencies tell me what they need
   - _____ I discuss/negotiate with Mission
   - _____ I request certain fields of Mission
   - _____ Mission tells me what is available
   - _____ Other: how?

3. How do you determine which employers can apply for ATLAS scholarships?

4. What are the criteria for selecting ATLAS candidates?

5. Do women face any particular constraints here in being proposed for scholarship programs or in following a career path? _____ Yes _____ No

6. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of women?

313

7. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

8. What special steps are taken to increase the participation of the private sector in ATLAS?

9. Are these recruitment steps effective? _____ Yes _____ No

10. Which of the following define a participant's objectives for training?

_____ The candidate
_____ The employer
_____ The central nominating agency
_____ The Mission
_____ AAI staff/Representative/ATLAS Dean
_____ Other: who?

11. When people are nominated for ATLAS training, is a specific job reserved for them?

_____ Yes _____ No Specific employer
_____ Yes _____ No Specific job

12. Is there anything different about ATLAS as compared to other scholarship programs you work with? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what is different?

13. If you could make changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited, what would those changes be?

♦ ***After Recruitment***

14. Do you play a role in determining where ATLAS scholars study? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what role?

15. Do you maintain contact with ATLAS scholars when they are in training? _____ Yes _____ No

16. Do you receive regular reports on the status of ATLAS scholars in training? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: from whom? How often?

17. Are there any reasons that an ATLAS scholar might not return home promptly after ATLAS training? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what reasons?

♦ ***Field Services***

18. Do you play a role in any of the following ATLAS field services activities?

_____ Yes _____ No Conferences or symposia
_____ Yes _____ No ATLAS grants to African organizations
_____ Yes _____ No Receive *IROKO*
_____ Yes _____ No Receive *ATLAS Alert*
_____ Yes _____ No Receive the annual *AFGRAD/ATLAS Directory of Fellows*
_____ Yes _____ No Postgraduate fellowships (POSTAF)
_____ Yes _____ No Distinguished Alumni Award

19. What has been your role in ATLAS field service activities?

♦ ***Relations with The African-American Institute (AAI)***

20. Have relations between AAI and you changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

21. Is there a local AAI Representative in your country? _____ Yes _____ No

22. How frequently does AAI (New York or Representative) communicate with you?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

23. Is this enough communication? _____ Yes _____ No

24. Are you satisfied with your relations with AAI? _____ Yes _____ No

25. If you could change anything in how you interact with AAI, what would you change?

♦ ***Relations with USAID***

26. Have relations between the USAID Mission and you changed since AFGRAD? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: in what ways?

27. How frequently do you communicate with USAID about ATLAS?

_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

28. Is this enough communication? _____ Yes _____ No

29. If you could change anything in how the USAID Mission interacts with you, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

30. What do you believe will be the ATLAS project's impact in your country?

31. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5 AAI/New York's performance
1 2 3 4 5 Local AAI Representative's performance
1 2 3 4 5 The USAID Mission's performance
1 2 3 4 5 Your performance
1 2 3 4 5 ATLAS in general

32. Are there any issues that you think might decrease the likelihood of ATLAS's or of individual alumni's impact? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

33. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

34. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

20. PARTICIPANT AND ALUMNI EMPLOYERS

_____
Name

_____
Title/Organization/Country

_____ Government
_____ Parastatal
_____ NGO
_____ Private company
_____ University
_____ Research organization

♦ ***ATLAS Recruitment and Selection***

1. How many ATLAS activities has your organization been involved in (number of people)?

_____ Fellowships: _____ Current _____ Alumni
_____ Conferences: _____ Current _____ Alumni
_____ POSTAFs: _____ Current _____ Alumni

2. Does your organization have its own human resource development process?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how does it work? What is your role in it?

3. What is/was your role in recruiting the ATLAS candidate(s)?

4. How did you determine what field(s) of study to propose?
_____ We/I performed a needs assessment
_____ I requested the field of study from the central nominating agency
_____ I requested the field of study from the USAID Mission
_____ I picked from a list of available fields of study
_____ Other: how?

5. What were the criteria for selecting ATLAS candidates?

6. Who defined the specific objectives for the ATLAS training?

_____ The candidate
_____ The employer
_____ The central nominating agency
_____ The Mission
_____ AAI staff/Representative/ATLAS Dean
_____ Other: who?

7. When your people are nominated for ATLAS training, is a specific job reserved for them?
_____ Yes _____ No

8. If you could make changes in how ATLAS candidates are recruited, what would those changes be?

♦ ***After Recruitment***

9. Do you/did you play a role in determining where the ATLAS scholar studies/studied?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what role?

10. Do you/did you maintain contact with the ATLAS scholar during training?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how often?

11. Do you receive regular reports on the status of ATLAS scholars in training?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: from whom? How often?

12. Are there any reasons that an ATLAS scholar might not return home promptly after ATLAS training?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what reasons?

13. Are you notified when an ATLAS scholar is about to complete the program of studies?
_____ Yes _____ No

If yes: by whom? How long in advance?

14. What are/have been your plans for professionally reintegrating ATLAS scholars when they return?

♦ ***Relations with The African-American Institute (AAI)***

15. Do you have relations with AAI? _____ Yes _____ No

16. Is there a local AAI Representative in your country? _____ Yes _____ No

17. How frequently does AAI (New York or Representative) communicate with you?
_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months
_____ Other: how often?

18. Is this enough communication? _____ Yes _____ No

19. Are you satisfied with your relations with AAI? _____ Yes _____ No

20. If you could change anything in how you interact with AAI, what would you change?

♦ ***Relations with USAID***

21. Do you have relations with the USAID Mission here? _____ Yes _____ No

22. How frequently does USAID communicate with you about ATLAS?
_____ More than once a month
_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1-3 months
_____ Once every 3-6 months

_____ Other: how often?

23. Is this enough communication? _____ Yes _____ No

24. If you could change anything in how the USAID Mission interacts with you, what would you change?

♦ ***ATLAS Overall***

25. What do you believe will be the ATLAS project's impact in your country?

26. If you could give an overall assessment of how ATLAS is progressing, using a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest assessment and 5 the highest, how would you rate the following?

1 2 3 4 5	AAI/New York's performance
1 2 3 4 5	Local AAI Representative's performance
1 2 3 4 5	The USAID Mission's performance
1 2 3 4 5	Your performance
1 2 3 4 5	ATLAS in general

27. Are there any issues that you think might decrease the likelihood of ATLAS's or of individual alumni's impact? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: which?

28. If you could make three changes in ATLAS, what would those changes be?

a.

b.

c.

29. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!

ATLAS FORMATIVE EVALUATION — INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT

21. ATLAS GRANT RECIPIENTS

_____
Name

_____
Title/Organization

_____
Country

1. Can you describe your organization's purpose, mandate, size?

2. How did you first learn of the ATLAS grant activity?
   - _____ Employer
   - _____ Advertisement
   - _____ USAID Mission
   - _____ Local AAI Representative
   - _____ Word of mouth
   - _____ Other: how?

3. How much was your grant?

4. What effect has the ATLAS grant had on your organization?

5. How was the grant managed? If you could rate the services AAI provided on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being the lowest rating (not very useful services) and 5 being the highest (very useful services), how would you rate the following AAI services?
   - 1 2 3 4 5 Assistance with grant application
   - 1 2 3 4 5 Speed of response
   - 1 2 3 4 5 Overall rating of AAI's services

6. Do you believe that USAID played a role in your ATLAS grant? _____ Yes _____ No

   If yes: what role?

7. Do you communicate with AAI/New York since your ATLAS grant? _____ Yes _____ No

_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with AAI/New York
_____ Other: how often?

8. Is there a local AAI Representative in your country? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: do you communicate with the AAI Representative? _____ Yes _____ No

_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with the AAI Representative
_____ Other: how often?

9. Do you communicate with USAID since the ATLAS grant? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: how often?

_____ Once a month
_____ Once every 1 to 3 months
_____ Twice a year
_____ I never communicate with USAID
_____ Other: how often?

10. Do you receive the AAI newsletter, *IROKO*? _____ Yes _____ No

11. Do you receive the AAI *Directory of AFGRAD/ATLAS Alumni*? _____ Yes _____ No

12. Are there any steps you would recommend that AAI take to increase the likelihood of the impact of your ATLAS grant? _____ Yes _____ No

If yes: what steps?

13. If you could make three changes in the ATLAS project, what changes would you make?

a.

b.

c.

14. Is there anything else you would like to share with the Evaluation Team?

Thank you!