

# Assessment of USAID Training

January 1999

**Submitted to:**

Center for Human Capacity Development  
USAID/G/HCD  
Washington, DC 20523

**Submitted by:**

Aguirre International  
4630 Montgomery Avenue  
Suite 600  
Bethesda, MD 20814-3410

This report was prepared for the Center for Human Capacity Development, Global Bureau, U.S. Agency for International Development by Aguirre International under HERNS Delivery Order 29, Contract No. FAO-I-00-93-00070-00.

# Table of Contents

Acknowledgments .....	iv
Executive Summary .....	v
<b>I. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
A. Focus of the Study.....	1
B. Methodology.....	1
C. Background .....	2
D. Organization of the Report.....	4
<b>II. Description of Current Mission Training Activities.....</b>	<b>5</b>
A. What type of training is being supported by USAID Missions? .....	5
B. How is training managed in USAID missions?.....	10
C. Training in the Strategic Objective Framework .....	12
D. Roles and Responsibilities of Training Officers.....	15
E. Roles and Responsibilities of Contractors (GTD and Technical Assistance).....	16
F. Review of Training Management Practices.....	19
G. What is the quality and impact of USAID training? .....	24
H. Use of ADS 253 and Best Practices .....	30
I. Use of G/HCD Technical Support.....	32
J. TraiNet and Mission Accountability.....	32
K. Summary of Findings.....	33
L. Notable Practices and Illustrative Programs .....	35
<b>III. Issues and Discussion.....</b>	<b>45</b>
A. What has been the impact of reengineering on USAID training systems? .....	45
B. How have the current training management systems affected the quality and impact of training?.....	50
C. Should USAID attempt to counter the decline in U.S. academic training? Has the emphasis on strategic objectives limited USAID's ability to contribute to long-term development?.....	52
D. What level of monitoring and evaluation is needed for accountability? ..	53
E. Have the revised policies and procedures in ADS 253 streamlined training activities sufficiently? How can they be improved?.....	56

Assessment of USAID Training

F. What are the implications of the changes for the implementation of TraiNet?.....	58
G. Is the GTD IQC mechanism meeting the needs of missions and partners? How can it be improved? .....	60
H. How can G/HCD services better support mission needs?.....	66
IV. Recommendations .....	71
Annex A—Mission Profiles Matrix.....	75
Annex B—Practices: Overview.....	87
Annex C—Synopsis of Recent Training Evaluations and Studies.....	99

## Acronyms

AAS	Associate of Arts Degree (2 years)
ADS 253	USAID's Automated Data System
ATLAS	Advanced Training for Leadership and Advanced Skills Project
CADERH	Centro Asesor para el Desarrollo de los Recursos Humanos (Honduran Advisory Council for Human Resources Development)
CASS	Cooperative Association of States for Scholarships (Georgetown University)
CLASP	Caribbean and Latin American Scholarships Program
CO	Contracting Officer
DO	Delivery Order
ECESP	East Central Europe Scholarship Program (Georgetown University)
ENI	Europe and New Independent States Bureau, USAID
FSN	USAID Foreign Service Nationals (local employees)
G	Global Bureau of USAID
GTD	Global Training for Development Project
G/HCD	Human Capacity Development Center, USAID Global Bureau
HERNS	Human and Educational Resources Network Support Activity
HRD	Human Resources Development
HRDA	Human Resources Development Assistance Project
INCAE	Instituto Centroamericano de Administracion de Empresas
ICT	In-country Training
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
IR	Intermediate Result
IVP	USIA's International Visitor Program
LAC	Latin America and Caribbean Bureau, USAID
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NET	New Independent States Exchanges and Training Project
OIT	USAID's Office of International Training (now G/HCD)
OJT	On-the-job Training
PIET	Partners for International Education and Training
PIO/P	Project Implementation Order/Participant
PTPE	Participant Training Project for Europe
R4	Results Review and Resources Request
SEC	U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission
SO	Strategic Objective
TA	Technical Assistance
TraiNet	USAID's Management Information System for Training
TCT	Third Country Training (conducted in countries other than the host country or the U.S.)
USAID	The United States Agency for International Development
USDH	U.S. Direct Hire employees of USAID
USG	United States Government
USIA	United States Information Agency

## Acknowledgments

Aguirre International wishes to thank the following members of the assessment team for their extraordinary efforts in data-gathering and presentation of this report: Nadine Dutcher, John Gillies, Archer Heinzen, Beryl Levinger, Carol Robles, Satish Shah, and Gerald Wein.

The Aguirre International assessment team conducted over 100 interviews with USAID officials, training contractors, technical assistance contractors, grantees, and participants in 12 USAID missions and three USAID/Washington bureaus. The team is much indebted to those people who took time out of their busy schedules to share their experience, perceptions, and insights.

The team also wishes to thank the staff of the G/HCD for their assistance in orienting the team and in articulating the key issues. We hope that this report is helpful to G/HCD in its continuing effort to strengthen USAID-financed training around the world.

# Executive Summary

This study was contracted by the Human Capacity Development (G/HCD) Center of the Global Bureau in USAID to conduct a general and systematic assessment of the status, trends, achievements, and needs for improvement of USAID training activities. The objectives of the study include:

- Assess relative changes in training programs of missions and bureaus in terms of nature, location, and length of training activities;
- Review the impacts and needs resulting from changed training policies and suggest further changes;
- Assess the current management of training systems;
- Evaluate the quality and outcomes of training systems;
- Identify and compare “best practices” in training and recommend ways to implement them;
- Assess efforts to achieve gender equity in training programs and to improve training access and utilization by persons with disabilities;
- Evaluate the status of systems of accountability, and to make recommendations for the full implementation of TraiNet.

The study was conducted by a team of seven individuals with a variety of experiences in education and training, including both the USAID perspective and outside perspectives. The team included two former USAID officers with senior management experience (Mission/Deputy Director), two individuals from outside USAID with extensive experience in designing, implementing, and evaluating USAID training programs, and three individuals from outside USAID with extensive experience in evaluation and international training.

The methodology consisted of a review of relevant strategy and policy documents, recent evaluations, R4 and other planning documents, and structured interviews with key informants in 12 field missions and three central bureau offices. Key informants included mission management, SO team members, training contractors, technical assistance contractors, local training providers, and returned participants. All interviews were conducted on the basis of confidentiality in order to elicit the most candid and extensive comments.

## Findings

*Training continues to be one of the most important activities in USAID development programs. However, the nature of the training has changed.*

## Assessment of USAID Training

- USAID has invested perhaps half of its annual budget in training which probably reaches well over a million individuals annually in developing countries.
- In-country training (ICT) represents the vast majority of all training activities supported by USAID missions. The range of ICT activities is very diverse, from short workshops and OJT to academic programs. The importance of ICT relative to mission objectives and OYB has probably not changed significantly in recent years—it has always been the dominant training activity by any order of magnitude.
- In almost every country, the amount of U.S. participant training has decreased substantially, and particularly the number of U.S. academic programs. Worldwide, U.S. training is one-third of what it was a decade ago.
- Third country training has probably increased in importance as a training option and the numbers have probably increased in absolute terms, although the statistics on such training are unreliable.
- G/HCD's guidance, services, and support mechanisms currently are more relevant and responsive to U.S. participant training and third country training than to the much larger in-country training.

***Training programs and training management systems have changed substantially in response to changing development needs, budget cuts, staffing reductions, and changing USAID policies such as reengineering. These changes include:***

- Mission staffs believe that workloads and stress have increased substantially in recent years, due to downsizing and reengineering. This has placed a premium on implementation mechanisms that are easy to understand and use.
- SO Teams have become important both in terms of decision making about resource use and in terms of mission organization and staffing.
- Mission staff and contractors universally welcomed and appreciated the support of training officers. However, training officer positions have been eliminated, downsized, and weakened in most missions.

***The decentralized environment of reengineering has allowed missions to develop a range of approaches to incorporating training into a strategic framework as well as in the management of training.***

- Training is being implemented in most missions in a very decentralized manner by training contractors, technical assistance contractors, other USG organizations, local universities and training centers, and NGO/PVOs.

- Few missions have a separate SO for human capacity development, although a number are now adopting basic education and higher education SOs. A few have a cross-cutting or special programs for training. Most of these programs include only U.S. and third country training activities.
- Virtually all training in all missions, regardless of whether funded and implemented through a cross-cutting training project or through a technical assistance project, is justified on the basis of its contribution to a technical SO results package.
- Training units have been eliminated, downsized, or weakened in most missions.
- Most missions have contracted some services through the GTD mechanism, ranging from full-service support with in-country offices to contracting for limited monitoring and placement services. In almost all cases, GTD services are highly focused on U.S. and third country training.
- In most missions, there is no single source of technical or administrative expertise and support to encourage better quality training programs. Training officers usually lack the technical skills, time, and mandate to fulfill the role of human capacity development managers.

***The management of gender equity concerns in training programs appears to have lower priority than in previous years.***

- Awareness of and application of gender goals are not common practices in many SO teams and contractors. The awareness and priority given to the issue by training officers is not necessarily carried over into SO teams.
- A perceived conflict exists between gender goals and strategic objectives. Some managers believe that selection of participants and trainees is predetermined by the objectives and the partner organization.

***G/HCD has made a strong effort to revise and simplify regulations and give more authority to missions. G/HCD has also tried to collect and disseminate best practices to encourage higher quality training programs.***

- ADS 253 has met with mixed success. Most USAID officials and contractors are completely unfamiliar with it. Of those who are familiar with it, the response ranges from seeing the new policies as being better and easier to use to being too rigid and more difficult to use.



- Despite the range of opinions, the majority view is that training policies and procedures are not adequately reengineered and continue to be overly directive and rigid.
- Familiarity with the Best Practices recommendations is limited to training officers and GTD or other training contractors. Most USAID officials and almost all technical assistance contractors are unaware of this element in ADS 253.
- GTD mechanisms are used by most missions in some way. This mechanism appears to be more useful for full-service buy-ins than for small value or limited scope buy-ins. Missions with limited needs consider GTD to be too expensive and difficult to administer.
- Little knowledge but considerable skepticism exists among mission and contractor personnel about the usefulness and appropriateness of TraiNet as a management tool at the mission level. Few mission personnel are aware of the range of TraiNet's capabilities and most do not plan to use the full range of planning and evaluation elements. Generally, TraiNet is viewed as a USAID/W requirement and a burden on staff and contractor time. The extent and detailed nature of the Agency's mandate to collect and report on this information is not widely understood by mission personnel.

## Recommendations

The assessment team made two broad recommendations to G/HCD about how to use the findings of the report. First, G/HCD should resist the temptation to translate the findings into new requirements and detailed guidance to fix the problems. Second, G/HCD should approach the recommendations with the perspective that the biggest challenge in reengineering is knowing when one is fine-tuning mechanisms that are no longer useful. The assessment did not permit a depth of analysis to make such a definitive statement about any of the current mechanisms. However, we believe that G/HCD can usefully consider this perspective in determining how to use these observations.

The primary recommendations of the study are:

***Review G/HCD's role and activities with a view toward making the center a more effective technical resource for improving the quality of training and related technical assistance activities aimed at human capacity development. G/HCD can be a knowledge and skills clearinghouse, raise awareness, and provide tools and information about these practices.***

- Assess and pursue opportunities to orient G/HCD support services more strongly toward in-country training and third country training.
- Develop programs to support and professionally strengthen the training officers or other individuals who can serve as key technical resource

personnel in missions. Promote and encourage models for achieving this goal.

- Improve communications about G/HCD services, policies, and mechanisms.
- Review opportunities for stronger linkages with the technology projects and actively encourage mission experimentation with new technologies.
- Provide technical assistance to missions and contractors in developing appropriate monitoring and evaluation measures for the contribution of training. Such systems should emphasize monitoring the quality of training activities in order to improve them.

***Assess opportunities to make G/HCD policies and procedures more responsive to mission needs:***

- Collaborate with procurement to develop a mechanism for agile, rapid response procedures for very short programs of 10 days or less, including reducing medical and insurance requirements.
- Clarify the required vs. mission discretionary policies of ADS 253. Provide greater guidance on the administration of third country training.
- Create a central clearinghouse on the Internet for training officers and other mission personnel to share information about successful technical and managerial practices and policies such as allowances, where missions now have latitude for decisions.
- Expand Best Practices guidance and support information to include more issues of direct relevance for third-country training and in-country training.
- Simplify administrative requirements of the GTD IQC and improve information dissemination about how to best access the GTD IQC, including guides for management and contracting. Encourage smaller countries to contract for GTD services jointly.
- Develop a simplified mechanism to provide as flexible and simplified access to participant placement and monitoring as was available with the PIO/P.
- Improve communication to mission management and technical personnel about the nature of the USAID requirement to collect and report on training information, and how this information is used in interagency negotiations. Do more and better training in support of TraiNet implementation. Expand G/HCD communications and training

## Assessment of USAID Training

to improve the focus on the use of TraiNet as a mission management tool, and assure that the appropriate management level staff participate in the training. Assure that sufficient resources are available to fully support TraiNet implementation in all missions and to resolve problems should they arise.

- Review the application of gender goals in an SO framework and assist USAID top management in developing renewed guidance on how to integrate these goals. Collaborate with the WID office in developing examples of ways that mission leadership has contributed to achievement of gender goals.

## I. Introduction

This study was contracted the Center for Human Capacity Development (HCD) of the Global Bureau (G) in the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). This study was conducted by Aguirre International between October 1998–January 1999.

### A. Focus of the Study

This study was intended to provide an assessment of the status, trends, achievements, and needs for improvement of USAID training activities. The objectives of the study include:

- Assess relative changes in training programs of missions and bureaus in terms of nature, location, and length of training activities;
- Review the impacts and needs resulting from changed training policies and suggest further changes;
- Assess the current management of training systems;
- Evaluate the quality and outcomes of training systems;
- Identify and compare “best practices” in training and recommend ways to implement them;
- Assess efforts to achieve gender equity in training programs and to improve training access and utilization by persons with disabilities; and
- Evaluate the status of systems of accountability, and make recommendations for the full implementation of TraiNet.

### B. Methodology

This study was conducted by a team of seven individuals from a variety of backgrounds and experience in education and training. The team included two former USAID officers with senior management experience (Mission/Deputy Director), two individuals from outside USAID with extensive experience in designing, implementing, and evaluating USAID training programs, and three individuals from outside USAID with extensive experience in evaluation and international training.

The methodology of the study consisted of a review of relevant documents and regulations, recent evaluations of training, R4 and other strategy documents from the missions visited, and structured interviews with key informants in 12 field missions and three central bureau offices. The selection of missions for field visits was intended to get a representative sample from each region. This was largely

achieved, although the final selection process was dictated by mission availability and interest as well as the time and financial constraints for completing the study. The twelve missions visited included three from each of the four regions.

The team developed, field tested, and implemented an interview protocol to assess the issues from the SOW and to identify and explore additional issues as appropriate. In the field, key informants included mission management, SO team leaders and in some cases the SO teams, training and technical assistance contractors, host government partners, returned participants, and others as identified by the mission personnel. All interviews were conducted on the basis of confidentiality in order to elicit the most candid and extensive comments.

The team made every effort to gain an accurate picture of training in each mission and bureau. However, given the time limitations of 2–3 days in each mission and the lack of standardized and centralized data on training, the statistical overview is necessarily less than comprehensive. However, the team believes that given the considerable number of missions and bureaus visited and interviews conducted, the overall view of the training activities is quite accurate.

### **C. Background**

Training has been one of the essential tools of development assistance from the beginning of the foreign assistance program with the Marshall Plan in 1949. There have been two primary branches of training activities: participant training, which includes activities in the United States and third countries; and in-country training.

Participant training is academic or technical training funded or sponsored by USAID for students or trainees from developing countries; this training may be conducted in the U.S. or in a third country (outside the host country, but not in the U.S.). In-country training is defined as those kinds of training activities, usually short-term, conducted within the participant's own country.

In participant training, an estimated 300,000 foreign nationals have received scholarships for training in the U.S. or third countries from USAID or its predecessor agency. In the immediate post WWII years, an average of 8,700 scholarships were awarded each year. In the 1960s and 1970s, the number of scholarships ranged from about 3,500 per year to over 6,000 per year, dropping again to around 4,000 per year by the late 1970s. In the 1980s and through the early 1990s, the number of U.S. scholarships began to increase again with the emphasis on large scale regional training programs such as the LAC Training Initiatives; CLASP and CLASP II programs in Latin America; HRDA and ATLAS in Africa; and the NET and PTPE programs in Europe and the Newly Independent States. By the mid 1990s, however, the scale of the participant training program had been substantially reduced.

The nature of participant training has also changed over time, from an early, almost exclusive emphasis on academic scholarships at the BS, MS, and Ph.D. levels, to an increasing emphasis on short-term, non-degree technical training, as

is discussed below. The emphasis on academic training in earlier years was appropriate because most newly independent states did not have sufficient facilities for post-high school education and because there was a great need for qualified personnel in the civil service and private sector.

In addition to the high profile participant training program, USAID has always sponsored far larger amounts of training in-country, both through training projects and through technical assistance projects that included training. The actual numbers of trainees assisted through these mechanisms is unknown, as the data on in-country training have never tracked and reported with the same rigor as participant training. However, anyone familiar with USAID activities in field missions immediately recognizes that in-country training represents the vast majority of training conducted under assistance programs. These activities include a wide array of seminars, workshops, and short courses for teachers, health workers, agricultural workers and farmers, as well as more formal management, technical, and public administration training.

In addition to the provision of training opportunities, USAID has also been instrumental in developing training and educational capacity in thousands of host country institutions, as well as creating new institutions for education and training. The list of such institutions supported in whole or in part by USAID is long and prestigious in every region. In Latin America, these institutions include INCAE in Nicaragua and Costa Rica, the Interamerican School of Agriculture (Zamorano) in Honduras, the EARTH school in Costa Rica GEMAH and CADERH in Honduras, and many others. In Africa, U.S.-financed construction and development of universities in Kenya, Tanzania, Swaziland, Botswana and Lesotho made significant contributions to national development. USAID also supported the Wild Life Training Institute in Zambia and several Rural Development Centers in Tanzania. In India, U.S. played a critical role in developing technology training centers. In Yemen, U.S. financed construction and development of an agricultural training institute. A complete listing of USAID achievements in the development of host country training capacity in public administration, universities, business and management education, private sector training, workforce development, and government training centers in agriculture, health, education, administration and other areas would provide an impressive view of USAID's contribution to world development.

USAID's Washington offices (formerly OIT, now greatly reduced in role and staff, forming one part of G/HCD) responsible for training policy, procedures, and support mechanisms have traditionally focused exclusively on participant training. With their leadership, the participant training program has matured substantially in the past 40 years. In each era, lessons have been learned and incorporated into the program to make it more effective. These lessons have included the logistics and management of international scholarships, language preparation and testing, medical management, cross cultural adaptation, effective reentry into a home country environment, alumni support groups, and many others. USAID made a determined effort to learn from experience in the 1980s and early 1990s through

the CAPS and CLASP programs in Latin America and the HRDA program in Africa. These large regional programs systematically established mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating both the process and impact of training introduced components such as structured follow-on programs. USAID's *Best Practices* guidelines, included in ADS 253, were a product of the HRDA program.

#### **D. Organization of the Report**

The Assessment of USAID Training Activities is organized in four sections. Section I is this introduction. Section II provides the *findings* of the fact-finding visits to USAID missions and bureaus. The purpose of this section is to *describe* the landscape of how training is currently being planned, managed, implemented, and evaluated in USAID under reengineering. This section establishes the factual basis for the study. The last part of this section provides a short description of seven different training programs, illustrating some of the diversity and creativity of training in USAID. Section III is devoted to *identification and discussion* of the issues and conclusions. Section IV briefly addresses some *recommendations* for support of the training function in a reengineered Agency.

The Annexes to the report include (A) a summary of findings in matrix form; (B) a copy of the interview protocol; and (C) a brief review of recent USAID reports on training. All data are presented anonymously and without attribution.

## II. Description of Current Mission Training Activities

### A. What type of training is being supported by USAID Missions?

Training continues to be one of the largest and most important components of USAID development programs in all regions of the world. Many USAID and contractor personnel interviewed for this assessment estimate that more 50 percent of all USAID expenditures are related to training activities. In concert with the closely related technical assistance activities, training is the core of USAID development programs.

As would be expected in the decentralized USAID systems established through reengineering, the management practices affecting training vary across missions. The 12 missions and 3 bureaus interviewed for this study manage training using a variety of mechanisms, some of which will be described below.

It is important to note that the training statistics included in this report are, at best, very rough approximations of actual numbers. Reliable statistics on the total annual numbers of U.S. are usually available, but reliable data on the number of third country participants are only partially available and data on in-country training (ICT) participants are almost never collected or aggregated. Similarly, estimates of the total proportion of mission financial resources devoted to training would be virtually impossible to estimate accurately. This is because funding for training is embedded in thousands of contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements and is not separately tracked. The only easily identifiable training activities in terms of funding and numbers of participants are those that are separately funded and managed through specialized training contractors and grantees. The assessment team's survey suggests that "training-only" contracts and grants, where they exist, typically represent only 3–10 percent of a mission's total OYB. Such programs thus represent only a small fraction of the actual training in terms of numbers of people trained and expenditures.

Some broad characterizations about the patterns of training that can be drawn from the countries visited are shown in Table 1.

Some basic facts about USAID training activities were clear.

- In-country training represents the vast majority of training supported by USAID missions. Although the statistics were unreliable and incomplete in most missions, mission personnel clearly stated that ICT was the dominant means of training by several orders of magnitude. Data from one mission indicated that ICT represented 99.8 percent of the USAID training as measured by numbers of trainees. The proportion of financed resources used for ICT would be somewhat lower, since ICT is often shorter and less costly than TCT or U.S.



training. However, no reliable statistics exist to compare USAID expenditures globally or in any mission by type of training.

- All missions surveyed are supporting some level of U.S. participant training, although generally at much lower levels than in the past.

**Table 1. Types and Illustrative Numbers of USAID Trainees per year in the Twelve Countries Visited, by Region**

Type of Training		LAC	AFR	ANE	ENI
U.S. Training	Academic	No new starts at graduate level. 10–20 AA level students/year.	20–50 graduate level participants in each country, including ATLAS	One country has large program, 1 has 2–3 participants, 1 has no new starts	None <sup>1</sup>
	Technical	1 country has 100/year, others have 10–40/yr	30–250	30–900. Significant range of commitment to U.S. training	80–120 in each mission
Third Country Training	Academic	None in missions visited, but known to be supported in other missions	Currently being supported in some missions, but numbers are unknown	Currently being supported in some missions, but numbers are unknown	None
	Technical	Active programs, but unknown numbers	Active programs, but unknown numbers	Active programs but unknown numbers	40–60/year in each country
In-country Training	Academic	None in missions visited	Up to 40 per year in each country <sup>2</sup>	Unknown	None <sup>3</sup>
	Technical	Large amounts of training included in all activities. Est. 70,000/year in one country.	Large amounts of training included in all activities	Large amounts of training included in all activities	Large amounts of training included in all activities

1. No mission funded academic programs. Georgetown University earmarked program sends about 20 participants from selected countries to U.S. for 6–18 month non-degree programs. Some of these participants eventually receive degrees.
2. At least one mission local graduate programs using distance education from a regional university, and supported with U.S. university faculty.
3. One mission supports a local university.

- Long-term academic training at the graduate level in the U.S. is being actively supported by only five of the 12 missions visited; the five were in the Africa and Asia/Near East regions. Two other missions had small numbers of academic participants completing programs, but no new starts were planned. In addition, academic and/or long-term non-degree training is also being implemented by Georgetown University earmarked programs in selected LAC and ENI countries and ATLAS in Africa.
- Third country training is an important and growing element in all of the missions visited. It is seen as being a lower cost and more relevant alternative to U.S. training. TCT may include academic degree programs as well as short term training and observational tours.

USAID/Washington bureaus are also supporting training in several ways:

- Training mechanisms, such as GTD and ATLAS, and the energy and environment training activities. Unlike previous years, core funding for such programs is low or non-existent, and they rely on mission buy-ins.
- The ATLAS program. The program is a partnership between G/HCD, USAID Missions, African countries and 200 U.S. universities. The purpose is to strengthen leadership and technical abilities and enhance professional excellence in African public and private sectors.
- Training projects which are allocated to field missions for implementation. The ENI Training Project is in this category, in which the bureau negotiates a single contract with a GTD contractor and each participating mission funds and manages the field activities.
- Training projects which are centrally funded and directed. Examples of this are the CASS and ECESP activities, which are earmarked programs managed by Georgetown university with varying degrees of coordination with missions. These activities and resources are not part of mission-level planning and are sometimes wholly unrelated to the mission objectives.

### **What trends are evident in USAID training?**

**U.S. Training.** The charts below illustrate that the amount of training in the U.S. has decreased very substantially in the past ten years. The total number of U.S. participants during the 1987–1990 period averaged just under 18,000. That number declined about 22 percent to under 14,000 by 1993, then rose back to over 17,500 by 1993. Since 1995, U.S. training has fallen precipitously; in 1997 USAID sponsored only about one-third the number of U.S. participants that it did when the decade began.

**Table 2. USAID Training in U.S., 1987–1997**

	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997
<b>Academic</b>											
Female	1,632	1,982	2,348	2,471	2,176	1,714	1,430	1,325	1,207	1,013	633
Male	6,027	6,578	6,790	6,657	5,770	4,623	3,677	2,734	2,030	1,478	878
<b>Technical</b>											
Female	2,686	2,350	2,716	2,688	2,200	2,141	2,684	4,415	4,457	2,865	1,493
Male	7,072	6,196	6,608	6,850	5,810	5,544	6,270	9,060	9,248	5,142	2,357
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,420</b>	<b>17,107</b>	<b>18,462</b>	<b>18,666</b>	<b>15,956</b>	<b>14,023</b>	<b>14,069</b>	<b>17,538</b>	<b>16,950</b>	<b>10,506</b>	<b>6,362</b>

Source: TrainNet Website

Note: Minor summation errors due to small numbers of unknown trainees in latter years.

The decline in U.S. participant training over the past decade occurred in both academic and technical programs. The amount of U.S. academic training decreased by 83 percent, from a high of over 9,000 academic participants in 1989 to only 1,511 participants in 1997. Participants in short-term technical training programs dropped by 40 percent from the level of the late 1980s. The very large numbers of technical trainees in 1994–1995 represent an anomaly caused by USAID's massive training programs in Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States.

During this same decade-long period, USAID achieved substantial improvements in female participation rates. In U.S. academic programs, the percentage of female participants doubled, from 21 percent in 1987 to 42 percent in 1997. Women's share of U.S. technical training rose more modestly from 28 percent to 39 percent in this same period. A target of 50 percent women was established in 1995.

**Third Country Training.** The amount of third country training has probably increased substantially in this period, although the statistics on this are not wholly reliable nor easily available. A number of USAID staff and contractors reported that they are relying far more on third country training opportunities than was the case in the past. Some of the third country training has been for academic programs, although most in technical. Most third country training is managed under technical assistance contracts.

**In-country Training.** In-country training programs managed through technical assistance contractors and grantees have probably been the least effected by the upheavals of reengineering and budget cuts. As noted above, in-country training represents the preponderant element of the training that USAID supports, probably over 90 percent in terms of the numbers of trainees. This reflects a historical norm: the great bulk of USAID training has always been implemented in-country. There has been a preference for in-country training, compared to

participant training, because it is lower cost and does not require English language training. Moreover, there is a perception, whether true or not, that the cost of U.S. long-term academic training for USAID has gone up considerably over the past few years.

Reliable data on the structure and extent of in-country training are very limited. Virtually all in-country training is and has always been managed under technical assistance contracts. As such, this training has seldom been disaggregated from the project activity level. Therefore, the relative amounts of in-country training being supported in 1998, compared to previous years, is very difficult to estimate. However, there is no reason to believe that the amount of in-country training has changed substantially as a share of program budgets. It is likely that the absolute numbers have decreased because budgets have been cut and many missions have been closed. However, it can be reasonably assumed that in-country training now represents a greater proportion of mission training activities and expenditures because the relative investment in participant training has decreased more than proportionately to declining budgets. It is also likely that some training that would have been implemented in the U.S. in the past is now done in-country.

The nature of in-country training is considerably more diverse than participant training. Participant training has varied by locale, length, field of study, and learning objectives but has always in large part been focused on individual achievements and growth. In-country training, on the other hand, has included everything from institutional development of training capacity (in management institutes, universities, government and private sector training centers), to massive education and training activities in agricultural extension, health promotion, civic education, and population programs. In-country training includes workshops, short courses, and seminars as well as on-the-job training and informal interactions with resident technical advisors; it is often intertwined with technical assistance.

**Causes for the Trends.** There are four major reasons for these changes in the location of USAID training: changing needs; declining budgets; reengineering; and management convenience.

- *Changing needs.* The first factor reflects the changes in the developing world over the past four decades. The scarcity of university trained managers and technical specialists found in much of the developing world in the 1960s and 1970s does not exist anymore. Further, developing countries have greatly enhanced their national training capacity. In the late 1990s, all regions and most countries have excellent institutions of higher learning and many sources of effective technical training in a range of fields. In sum, development has occurred, and the need for overseas training is less compelling.
- *Declining funding levels.* Virtually all USAID missions have experienced substantial reductions in both program and OE funding. As a result, mission managers and SO team leaders have had to make

hard decisions on priorities. These decisions may be characterized as seeking more cost effective solutions, but may also be a case of not being able to afford certain types of higher cost activities regardless of effectiveness or appropriateness.

- *Reengineering.* USAID's reengineering, with its emphasis on measurable results, has directly and dramatically affected participant training activities. Mission managers and SO teams have found that they could not fit training projects and personnel into the SO structure. This was particularly true before the Strategic Objective for HCD was introduced. In one mission with a long standing commitment to participant training, the eight-person training office was dissolved early in the reengineering process because training simply did not appear in the results framework. The reengineering process also discourages standalone participant training activities because of the difficulty of linking expenditures in capacity development to intermediate results, and because the funding mechanism for cross-cutting objectives can be challenging.
- *Management burden.* The assessment team saw evidence that less participant training is being done because it is considered a relatively difficult and regulation-laden development activity. As one program officer put it, "it is a pain in the neck to send someone to the States." The time of mission staff is often considered to be the critical resource, so management burden is an important factor.

**Use of New Technologies.** The nature and potential of many new technologies for training, including computer-based training, Internet networking and training, video conferencing, and other new forms of distance education is rapidly evolving and not well understood. Judging by the team interviews, the total number of trainees, either in-country or in participant training programs who might be affected by the use of such technologies is small. A few interviewees expressed interest in learning more about the opportunities for creative use of technology for training or networking, and a very few have initiated such programs. In one country, a population/health activity has established a computer-assisted learning center for the government medical school and is facilitating Internet hookups for primary medical training sites. Another project is exploring the use of the Internet for an MPH degree from a U.S. university. Many training contractors encourage Internet accounts for returned participants to facilitate continuing linkages, contacts, and networking. Some missions are using traditional technologies and distance training methods, such as radio, printed materials, and video.

## **B. How is training managed in USAID missions?**

No aspect of training has been affected by the advent of reengineering more than the management systems for participant training. The systems and practices of in-

country training and participant training managed by technical assistance contractors may also have been affected, although to a lesser degree.

Prior to 1994, the participant training system was centrally managed through the Office of International Training (OIT). At one time, in the 1970s, over 250 staff members managed the system. As late as 1990, some 30 direct hires, RSSAs, and other staff worked in the administration of USAID training. Today, all G/HCD functions related to participant training are conducted by a staff of two USDH and three RSSAs. Allowances, insurance, travel regulations, and waivers for a wide range of activities were managed from Washington. OIT maintained a single worldwide contractor to program, support, and monitor participants in U.S. training programs. This training support mechanism was available to every mission simply by completing a single form, the PIO/P, following a relatively elaborate set of rules and regulations set out in the handbooks. The contractor primarily provided support services for trainees in the U.S., from programming and placement to monitoring. The great majority of participants were processed and supported by this OIT mechanism, whether they were funded through training projects or technical assistance projects. This contractor seldom provided either field support for pre-training activities or support for third country training. In the 1980s, a number of USAID missions extended this system with in-country support offices, either with the central OIT contractor or with other participant training contractors.

The OIT implementation mechanisms were supported in the field by a network of FSN training officers and some USDH training officers. Virtually every mission had a training office with experienced FSN training officers who provided all administrative support in-country and who were intimately familiar with the regulations about training. Mission training offices were solely concerned with the management of participant training. Neither the training officers nor OIT itself had any meaningful involvement with in-country training. Nor did the training officers have much responsibility for defining training needs, formulating follow-on support, coordinating with technical assistance, or evaluating program impact.

With the advent of reengineering, the nature of the USAID training support mechanisms was adapted to better support a decentralized, results-based training system. The regulations were revised into the ADS 253 policies and guidance, which transferred more decision authority and management responsibilities to the mission staff and added guidance to missions on ways to achieve measurable results. (A more detailed look at ADS 253 changes and issues is included below.)

In 1996, the centralized training implementation mechanism was replaced with a global IQC, Global Training for Development, with five implementing contractors, for which missions had to establish task orders to cover both core and program costs. The IQC included options for technical assistance and field support. At the mission level, the role of the training officer was revised and in many cases eliminated.

Training is embedded into mission management structures in different ways. The three major aspects of how training fits into the mission management system are:

- where training fits in the strategic objectives framework;
- the roles and responsibilities of the training officer; and
- the roles and responsibilities of the contractors.

Each of these distinct elements of the management systems for training will be reviewed, followed by a discussion of how these pieces fit together in different missions.

### **C. Training in the Strategic Objective Framework**

It is important to emphasize that this discussion applies almost exclusively to participant (i.e., overseas) training activities that are funded and implemented outside of the technical assistance contracts. For the most part, it applies to training funded under separate GTD contracts. As was noted above, the great majority of all types of training in all missions is implemented through mechanisms and contracts *other than* GTD or other training contracts. This training is considered to be simply an input into results packages. None of the missions visited treat all training, including all in-country training implemented through technical assistance contracts and grants, in any kind of distinct HCD framework. *This is a significant distinction, because it emphasizes that over 90 percent of the training is not treated separately or differently than technical assistance, commodities, or other inputs.*

The following paragraphs discuss three issues related to the inclusion of training into the SO/IR framework: how training fits into the Strategic Objective structure of the mission; through what SO mechanism the training is financed; and how the contribution of training is measured and reported.

#### **Relationship to the SO Structure**

All respondents agreed that training is essential to achieving the SO results and that all training managed under the current system is closely aligned to SOs. (The only exceptions were the centrally funded scholarship programs managed by Georgetown University [CASS and ECESP], which are not really part of the mission portfolio and its SO framework.) However, the assessment team observed that the rigor with which training is linked to SO and IR goals varies considerably among missions, from a rhetorical linkage of general “support” and “strengthening” of partner organizations to highly specific definitions of performance improvement at the individual and organizational levels.

Missions have incorporated training into SO structures in three main ways.

- No separate SO or special activity. Training is part of result packages and technical assistance contracts, including U.S. long-term academic training.
- Establishing a Human Capacity Development SO. Although some 20 Missions have Basic Education or Higher Education SOs, only one of the countries visited in this study had given particular emphasis to the HCD element of development.
- Establishing a cross-cutting SO or a special activity for training attached to an SO. This approach is managed in different ways. In one mission, the primary participant training activities are incorporated into an SO 1 goal of enhancing the roles of historically disadvantaged individuals. In this case, it is a standalone training activity. In two other missions, the training staff is under a single SO, but manages a training contract that can support all objectives, allocates some training funds to other SOs, and manages buy-ins from SO teams for training in all areas.

The importance of training in the program can be calculated by summing up the financial commitment for this input. In the years before reengineering, USAID financial resources were in fact analyzed and allocated in terms of inputs, including training. Currently, however, tracking by category of input is not considered important, and the proportion of funding directed toward training is difficult, if not impossible, to calculate accurately. The most direct measure currently available is the funding for participant training projects or contracts, such as for GTD contractors implementing a discrete, fully funded participant training project. This level of direct training support reached five percent or more of the OYB in a few missions. However, these activities represent only a fraction of the actual training being conducted in any mission. Training activities are so pervasive in USAID programs that they may well represent the majority of expenditures—some mission officials estimated up to 70 percent of SO funding was used for training. Aside from the difficulty of estimating this number, it is reasonable to question its utility. It is not clear that breaking out the proportion of funds dedicated to training is relevant to the management needs for implementing strategic objectives.

The achievement of any USAID SO requires that attention be given to sustainability. It is virtually a truism that all USAID development work is focused on sustainability and building local capacity. This is universally seen as one of the key goals of training. However, the term is used in different ways by different people, depending on the context. In some cases, sustainability means developing a local training capacity as either an end or a means to an end. In other contexts, sustainability refers to maintaining any local capacity to continue acceptable levels of technical or professional performance, in which case training is the universal input. However, few missions have established institutional



development indicators, for either local training capacity or for other types of institutional development, as key indicators for SO achievement. One mission director stated flatly that such indicators are difficult to include in the SO framework because they seem like “soft” objectives.

### **Financing Training Activities**

Training activities that fall under separate or cross-cutting programs are largely being implemented through a funded GTD contract. In the ENI region, which is unique, the mission sets aside funds for training which are allocated to the GTD contract without (initially) specifying which SO is to be supported. The Program Office then allocates these resources to SOs through a variety of mechanisms. In some missions, a highly structured competitive review system is in place to assure that the training is directly contributing to the objectives. Five of the missions visited (40 percent) have a specific, funded “training” activity which provides cross-cutting support to all SOs. These financing mechanisms may cover only participant training, or may also support in-country training.

In the other countries, all training, participant as well as in-country, is wholly funded from SO team and contractor resources. While the mechanism for implementing the training may vary, the responsibility for allocating funds for training belongs to each SO team. In these cases, the training officer or GTD contract functions as an administrative mechanism supporting the SO team activities, and the training has no separate function beyond being an input into the SO framework.

### **Training and Impact Indicators**

A question facing many missions is how to make training contribute to the SO indicators in tangible, measurable, and reportable ways. The question of how, and whether, to establish impact indicators for training was much discussed in the mission interviews.

In some missions, the link to impact is seen as an important conceptual hurdle for integrating training into the SO framework. As one SO team leader noted, “Among SO teams, there is enormous preoccupation with meeting indicators. The short term results-based orientation mitigates against such goals as training that don’t have hard quantifiable indicators on which to justify budgets.”

Only one of the missions visited in this study had clear and measurable indicators of accomplishment directly related to training. In this mission, an SO for Human Capacity Development (“Improved Human Capacity Development System Linked to Strategic Priority Areas”) covers all overseas and much in-country training. The two Intermediate Results linked to this SO are: (1) Strategically linked training plans developed; and (2) positive partner institution feedback on relevance and delivery of training institutions. The participating SOs measure the direct impact of training at the IR level with indicators such as “improvements in government policies and management.”

Apart from this unique centralized approach to training, none of the other missions visited in this study had established distinct indicators for training. It is fair to say that many if not all of the IR indicators in every mission cannot be achieved without effective training, in conjunction with technical assistance and commodities. The monitoring and evaluation aspects of this question are described elsewhere in the report, but it suffices to say that only a few missions had resolved to their satisfaction the question of what were appropriate and useful impact indicators for training. For some respondents, the question of how to link training activities to intermediate results was critical to the whole rationale of using training. In fact, the difficulties of doing so left some missions hesitant to commit resources to training.

For many of the individuals interviewed by the team, however, the issue of impact indicators for training was virtually a non-issue. They viewed training in more or less the same terms as technical assistance or commodity purchases in terms of the relationship to SO/IR level indicators. It is simply an input at too low a level to worry about reporting or attempting to draw cause and effect relationships to intermediate results. As they saw it, tracking the impact of individual training events would be equivalent to attempting to track the impact of each meeting between technical assistance contractors and their counterparts. These individuals simply do not see the utility of having SO teams develop training indicators, because SO teams are responsible for measuring program results rather than the isolated contribution of any given input. This school of thought leaves tracking and evaluation of training to the contractors as a process control issue rather than as an impact assessment issue.

#### **D. Roles and Responsibilities of Training Officers**

The range of mission responses to reengineering in terms of mission organization is considerable. All but one of the twelve field missions visited still has some form of FSN training officer, but the roles and responsibilities are defined differently in each mission. A brief summary of different configurations is illuminating.

- 11 of the 12 missions visited have either a full-time or part-time officer with some responsibilities for training.
- In four of the missions, training officers (sometimes in conjunction with GTD contractors) are formal and active members of all SO teams. In these missions, the TO provides professional assistance in identifying training needs and developing effective programs.
- In five of the missions, the training officer is an informal or periodic member of the SO teams, primarily attending on special occasions to provide administrative support or coordination services.

- In two of the missions, the training officers have little or no formal role in the SO teams. They do, however, provide administrative support for training to all SO areas.
- In one mission, the training office has been eliminated and secretaries in each SO area are responsible for providing all training administrative support and adherence to ADS policies and procedures.
- One mission has an established Human Capacity Development Management committee, headed by the Mission Director. Another mission has a training working group headed by the Program Officer to coordinate mission activities.

The functions of these training units vary considerably, from a fairly traditional function of administrative support for compliance with ADS regulations on participant training to a more comprehensive effort to provide a source of training expertise to all SO teams in the mission. In three missions, the training office, in conjunction with a GTD contractor, is unusually active in promoting effective training practices among the SO teams, technical assistance contractors, and local partners. Each of these missions have developed an approach to training that they consider to be the most effective way of achieving results, which are modeled on the Best Practices as well as direct mission experience in training. In one of these missions, the GTD mechanism is a required channel for all participant training and strongly recommended for all in-country training. In the other two missions, the GTD mechanism is marketed internally as an option available to the SO teams. The success of the offices with training as a technical specialty varies with the SO team and the individuals involved. In all cases, the task of providing specialist technical assistance in training to the rest of the mission is necessarily limited by personnel and time constraints. The ongoing cutbacks in overseas personnel positions constantly undermine the ability of a mission to provide such services.

#### **E. Roles and Responsibilities of Contractors (GTD and Technical Assistance)**

##### **Who are the training providers?**

A notable aspect of the training landscape in USAID missions today is the degree to which the function is decentralized. The primary point of management contact for training, as well as for all other inputs such as technical assistance and commodities, is the SO Team. This diffusion of management responsibilities is consistent with historical procedures for most in-country training—this has always been highly decentralized and managed by individual contractors and grantees. However, participant training, both in the U.S. and to a lesser degree in third countries, has always had some mechanisms for standardization of practice, for economies of scale, and for administrative support. This does not imply that the past standardization of administrative practice was complete—some technical assistance contractors have often managed some participant training (often

without full compliance with the regulations). However, the existence of a central entity responsible for training and a training office in each mission greatly facilitated the achievement of standard practices, adherence to regulations, and economies of scale.

The table below illustrates that many different actors are involved in managing and implementing training activities. Not all of these entities are active in all missions for all types of training. For example, not all missions are supporting U.S. academic training. However, for those missions that do support such training, there is, for the most part, no monopoly on the source of providers and no single source of training expertise.

**Table 3. Types of Training by Training Providers and Administrators**

	<b>Training Contractor (GTD or other)</b>	<b>TA Contractor</b>	<b>AID/W (global) contractor</b>	<b>Other USG entities (Census, Treasury)</b>	<b>Local universities and training centers</b>	<b>NGO/PVO and grantees</b>
<b>U.S. Training</b>						
Academic	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unknown	No	Unknown
Technical	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>Third Country Training</b>						
Academic	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Unknown
Technical	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
<b>In-country Training</b>						
Academic	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Technical	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Note: Findings based on data from a limited number of missions and programs.

**Roles and Responsibilities of GTD Contractors**

All but two of the missions visited are making some use of the GTD or a similar central training contractor mechanism. There is a range of responsibilities assigned to the GTD contractors, and there is a range of levels of satisfaction. The different contractor configurations are as follows:

- Five of the missions have a resident office for a training contractor who is providing a full range of services. These offices are financed by a mission-funded training program and are providing both professional and logistical support. Some of these contractors also provide logistical support for other contractors conducting participant training. In some cases, support to other contractors is on a fee-for-service basis, and in others is a requirement of the contract.

- In at least three missions, the resident GTD contractor implements some in-country training as well as participant training.
- In one mission, all contractors are required to use the GTD mechanism for all overseas training.
- Five missions are using GTD contractors on a non-resident basis, through task orders for specific training support services. These services range from only placement and monitoring of U.S. and third country participants to needs assessments and other technical support. For the most part, GTD is used as a “PIET replacement” to support U.S. participants. In-country preparation of training plans, objectives, and logistical support (i.e., visas, medical exams, language testing, etc.) are the responsibility of the training office.
- Two missions are not using the GTD mechanism in any way. One of these missions found that access to the GTD was simply too difficult and expensive for a small program. It was disappointed with this situation and was looking for ways to coordinate with other small missions and achieve a cost-effective GTD contract. The other mission did not see the need for GTD services and preferred to rely on technical assistance contractors to plan implement and evaluate their own training activities.

The experience with the GTD contract is mixed. The missions with resident, full service GTD contractors are generally happy with the arrangement. The missions that use GTD U.S. support (i.e., as a substitute for the PIET arrangement) are less satisfied, citing high cost and difficulty of use as problems.

### **Roles and Responsibilities of other Contractors and Institutions**

As noted in Table 3, the GTD or training specialist contractors are by no means the only or even the primary source for training management services or training programs. In all of the missions visited, technical assistance contractors are actively managing all types of training. This includes some participant training in the U.S. and third countries, although the primary involvement of technical assistance contractors and grantees is providing in-country training. A wide range of other entities provide training, including other USG institutions such as the Bureau of the Census, Treasury Department, the Security and Exchange Commission, and other organizations. All of these are implemented under contracts or inter-agency agreements supporting mission programs.

In addition, there are earmarked Georgetown University programs in the LAC and ENI regions. These programs are largely independent of mission SO goals, although they are sometimes coordinated in the selection of participants. These programs offer either AA degrees or “longish” training of 6–18 months of non-degree programs.

## **F. Review of Training Management Practices**

The discussions above review each element of mission management practices for training in terms of strategy, financing, administrative and technical support, and implementation services. The five short case studies below illustrate how the pieces fit together in four distinct models. Mission 1 and 2 models illustrate ways that missions have organized, using a resident central training contractor and a USAID training office. Mission 3 and 4 models illustrate ways that missions have reorganized using mission staff to access a GTD contractor as needed, without reliance on a resident training contractor. Mission 5 illustrates a training management model that is fully decentralized out to the SO teams and contractors. Examples of each of these training management structures were observed in the missions surveyed.

### **Mission 1—Fully Centralized Training Function**

**SO Structure:** Separate HCD SO

**Staffing:** Full time USDH HCD plus local staff. Resident training contractor with full staff.

**Financing:** Mission allocates resources directly to HCD SO, which finances contract for all overseas training and some in-country training. The only separately managed and funded overseas training are "grandfathered" in prior to the HCD SO. SO teams must participate with the HCD contract in order to do training.

**Training Officer Role:** The HCD Officer is the project manager for central training contract. The HCD officer is not a member of any core SO teams. The HCD project is based on a clear philosophy and methodology for achieving measurable performance improvement through training, and is promoted as the standard for all training.

**Contractor Role:** Contractor is responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating all overseas and most in-country training. This is arranged with each technical assistance contractor. The planning consists of a required training needs assessment that identifies specific organizational performance goals. This results in a 3 year training plan agreement. The contractor is responsible for all pre-training; support during training; and post-training activities. The contractor provides training to local partner organizations in effective training procedures.

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** Contractor is also responsible for all monitoring and evaluation, based on performance improvement goals.

**Assessment:** Mission has a consolidated, focused training system that effectively plans and implements training activities; cost effective because less administrative staff needed; standardized procedures for processing participants; central source of funds which enables start of training activities prior to Result Package approval to give a jump start to activities planned; Mission manages only one contractor with better assurance that USAID rules/regulations are followed; easier to program multi-sectoral training. Weaknesses are: a single, large contract may be too cumbersome to manage; the contractor has too many customers to satisfy at the same time; contractor's efforts are dispersed over many activities; fewer opportunities for innovations in management/procedures; standardized procedures have less flexibility, thus less respondent to client needs.

**Mission 2—Mission-Supported Training Program with Resident GTD Contractor**

**SO Structure and Organization:** No separate Strategic Objective for HCD, but rather a cross cutting special SO. The training office is located in the Program Office.

**Staffing:** One full-time FSN training officer. Resident GTD contractor with full local staff. TO and GTD representatives are official members of all SO teams

**Financing:** Regional GTD training project managed by TO has core funding for management and approximately 100 participant training opportunities per year. Allocation of the project funds is achieved with a structured competition in which SO teams define their training needs and develop proposals for funding. SO teams may use other SO funding to "buy-in" for additional training or may conduct training independently of the GTD contract.

**Training Officer Role:** Training Officer oversees the allocation of the core funds among the competing SO teams and management of training activities. Training officer is a core member of all SO teams and actively promotes "training for results" practices through workshops with teams and partners. GTD training funding allocation process is based on structured criteria which includes having a clearly defined training objective, clear organizational performance goals, links to IR's, strong integration into TA contractors in SO team, and multi-year training plans. Proposals are judged by the Human Capacity Development Committee, consisting of the mission director, program officer, training officer, and GTD contractor.

**Contractor Role:** GTD contractor attends SO team meetings along with the TO, and assists TO in conducting "training for results" workshops for teams and partners. Contractor is responsible for all pre-training support (processing, TIP, orientation) and training implementation (placement, monitoring, reentry) for all GTD participants. GTD contractor supports U.S. and TCT but not in-country training. GTD contractor may also provide pre-training support for non-GTD participants, upon request. Follow-on is not included in the functions of either the TO or the GTD contractor, but rather is the responsibility of TA contractors and SO teams.

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** Regional bureau funds a support contract that provides process and impact evaluation. Evaluation criteria are based on achievement of defined organizational objectives established in training plan.

**Assessment:** Mission personnel are very pleased with this system. The cross-cutting training project provides flexibility in finding training opportunities and it extends SO financing with additional GTD funds. At the same time, the SO teams are ultimately responsible for all activities and can opt to participate or not. Many other mission contractors are using the "training for results" system for their own training.



**Mission 3—Mission-Supported Training Project with Training Office**

**SO and Organizational Structure:** No HCD Strategic Objective. Training office for the entire mission is located within SO 1.

**Staffing:** Three full-time FSN training officers. Training contract with non-resident GTD contractor is managed by this SO team, but supports all other SO teams.

**Financing:** The mission allocates nominal amounts of core GTD funding to provide the contract mechanism and to fund activities that promote effective in-country training. All other training activities (e.g., sending participants to the U.S.) from SO teams require "buy-ins." Use of GTD by SO teams is encouraged but not mandated.

**Training Officer Role:** TOs are active members of all SO teams and serve as training specialists in planning, strategy, and implementation. The mission has a defined strategy for achieving impact through training ("high impact training") which the TOs actively promote in meetings and workshops with SO teams and local partners. TO has arranged for a series of workshops to improve the quality of training from local training providers. The TO staff manage these in-country activities, pre-training support functions (selection, orientation, processing, planning) and post-training follow-on for training falling under the cross-cutting training project.

**Contractor Role:** GTD contractor is non-resident and responds to requests. Contractor is responsible for implementation of training in U.S. and third countries (monitoring, placement, support). Contractor is also tasked with providing periodic workshops on effective training mechanisms and Best Practices for SO teams, TA contractors, and local partners.

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** The training team has a formal M&E system in place for participant training and would like to modify it for use with in-country training. It includes one debriefing instrument and another survey undertaken at six months. Three types of data from this instrument are input into a database: how training was applied, whether or not job responsibilities have increased, and percentage of the action plan that was implemented.

**Assessment:** Mission personnel are generally satisfied with the training management system and appreciate the support provided by the training unit, particularly assistance with ADS 253 compliance and pre-departure processes. There is on-going concern that planned staffing reduction will eliminate the position of the most experienced training officer.

**Mission 4—Fully Decentralized, with GTD**

**SO and Organizational Structure:** No HCD Strategic Objective. No training support office.

**Staffing:** Former large training office was disbanded in 1997. Training officer now works as deputy EXO. All training support functions are performed by secretaries in each SO area, who received a 2-hour training session in ADS requirements. A buy-in to a non-resident GTD contractor provides placement assistance for overseas training.

**Financing:** Training is wholly financed by SO team and TA contractor funds.

**Training Officer Role:** Not applicable. All training, including large in-country training activities, are managed by TA contractors and grantees.

**Contractor Role:** GTD contractor is non-resident and responds to requests. SO teams are responsible for all in-country planning and preparation. GTD contractor is responsible for implementation of training in U.S. and third countries, as requested, which has been limited to about 15 people/year. TA contractors also directly manage some participant training.

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** No special arrangements to monitor or evaluate training.

**Assessment:** Mission personnel and management are not satisfied with the lack of emphasis on HCD and training issues, but believe that the reengineering process leaves them no choice.

**Mission 5—Fully Decentralized, No GTD**

**SO and Organizational Structure:** No HCD Strategic Objective. Training function assigned to Program Office. Mission Training working group has representatives from each SO team.

**Staffing:** Half-time training officer. All training support functions are the responsibility of technical assistance contractors. No GTD contract is used or anticipated.

**Financing:** Training is wholly financed by SO and TA contractor funds.

**Training Officer Role:** Part-time position serves as advisor, catalyst, and quality control. Primarily coordinates activities and maintains database. Training is delegated to and managed by partner contractors and institutions.

**Contractor Role:** No GTD contractor. If the mission needs assistance with programming U.S. training, they believe that local TA contractors can handle the request effectively and efficiently.

**Monitoring and Evaluation:** No special arrangements to monitor or evaluate training. Some contractors are responsible for reporting on the number of people trained.

**Assessment:** Mission personnel and management are satisfied with the current system.

There is no single approach that meets all needs, nor are there any models that do not have their critics. A discussion of the implications of the different management processes on the quality and impact of training, and on establishing clear lines of accountability and control, are discussed in the next section.

**G. What is the quality and impact of USAID training?**

In terms of the quality and impact of the training activities themselves, the assessment team had an overall favorable impression of the training being sponsored by USAID programs, whether managed by training contractors, technical assistance contractors, or local partners. The team found examples of solid, well managed training programs for participant training and in-country training in every country. Programs that could be improved were also found. However, there was no sense of crisis nor of serious problems.

Needless to say, a comprehensive assessment of the quality and impact of USAID training activities was beyond the scope of this assessment. In the absence of established and functioning monitoring and evaluation systems for training, a two day visit to a mission is at best impressionistic. As a measure of the quality of training, the team asked respondents to describe selected training activities and to

rank the degree to which the programs implemented the Best Practices guidelines from ADS 253. Most USAID, grantee, and contractor personnel gave relatively high marks in assessing the degree to which the specific best practices were applied in their programs.

Although some of the ADS 253 best practices are being routinely practiced, the great majority of the individuals interviewed in this study were unaware of the Best Practices as a collection of “lessons learned” included in the ADS 253 guidance. The most consistent knowledge of and application of ADS 253 regulations and Best Practices was found among the GTD contractors, who are making an effort to implement them. Among this group, the lessons learned in terms of implementing overseas, cross cultural training programs have been well learned and are fully implemented. The aspects of the Best Practices that deal with planning training in terms of organizational or institutional performance are less rigorously applied. These aspects of the Best Practices require substantial coordination with TA contractors and SO teams, which is not a universal practice.

Among TA contractors, the knowledge and application of best practices dealing with adult learning methods is generally quite good. A review of the training materials and plans being used by technical assistance and in-country training organizations indicated that these were, for the most part, well organized, focused on clear learning objectives, and based on adult learning practices such as group exercises, role play and simulation, and active learning methods. Many of the individuals interviewed from these groups had benefited from workshops on effective training methods and encouraged USAID to provide more technical support in this area. The areas of best practice guidelines that are least commonly implemented by TA contractors and grantees were stakeholder agreements, action plans, follow-up training, and formal monitoring/evaluation.

In some regards, ADS 253 guidance and Best Practices appear to have been developed with participant training contractors (administering overseas training separately from TA contractors) in mind. Guidance about understanding the organizational context, identifying critical training needs, and providing follow-up assistance, for example, are not easy or automatic for training contractors but often are for technical assistance contractors serving a single organizational client. In other comments about best practices, several informants noted that the Best Practice guidance would need to be substantially expanded to address the needs of in-country training.

### **How do missions monitor and evaluate training?**

Monitoring and evaluating training impact is generally the area in which respondents report the most concerns, or the greatest lack of understanding of the options. In many missions, respondents reported that monitoring for training impact was at the wrong level—training is an input and USAID is monitoring for results from a combination of inputs. Several respondents indicated that it is virtually impossible to isolate the impact of training from that of the other inputs, i.e., that TA and training are so intertwined as to make this impossible. These are

important perspectives because they touch on the key issue of what needs to be tracked and measured in a results-based development program. A clear answer to this issue affects many of the questions of the study, including the use of TrainNet, Best Practices, and evaluation.

Monitoring and evaluation practices vary widely among the missions interviewed. Three of the missions are supported by a regional bureau training support contract that includes monitoring and evaluation services. These services apply only to the participant training in the U.S. and third countries and not to in-country training. In these missions, a process evaluation is conducted through an exit interview and impact is assessed after six months using a returnee interview protocol. In this region, the training program evaluation is part of an integrated planning and evaluation system that stresses the importance of having clearly defined learning objectives, individual performance objectives, and organizational performance objectives. The evaluation system measures the attainment of the defined objectives.

In only one mission is a rigorous planning and evaluation system used for both participant training and in-country training. In this situation, the central training contractor has a full-time evaluation specialist who collaborates with technical assistance contractors to measure each participant's performance after 90 days and the partner organization's performance after a year. The organizational performance improvement goals are related closely to Intermediate Results indicators, which are included in all SO frameworks. The evaluation measures are:

- trainee satisfaction and mastery of learning objectives;
- application of training within the beneficiary organization;
- institutional impact;
- contribution of training to Intermediate Result indicators; and
- development and implementation of Action Plans.

The data are utilized by the central training contractor, local training providers, and TA contractors for both process evaluation purposes, including assessing the quality of courses and for impact reporting in the R4 reports. While the mission is satisfied with the reporting, a concern was expressed that more information is provided than is needed.

One other mission has some form of structured follow-up interviews or questionnaires designed to assess impact. The assessment revealed, however, that many missions do not attempt to measure the impact of training separately from the broader intermediate results. Many training and technical assistance contractors monitor trainee satisfaction, but this information is used only at the contractor level to modify and improve future training. A few contractors are required to report on the number of people trained. In a few specific instances, the

nature of the technical activities is specific enough to enable contractors to establish distinct performance indicators that reflect the effectiveness of training. In the health sector, for example, the existence of established professional “Standards of Practice” facilitate impact evaluation for some types of training.

While this variation exists, the assessment found that the dominant view in most missions is that it is inappropriate to track training separately from other inputs, or to attempt to draw direct linkages between a training event and broad intermediate results. As one program officer explained, “We don’t do any M&E of training at the SO level. Training is the means to an end. We measure it indirectly through measurement of results. Training is tracked through tracking results.”

### **How are gender and disability issues managed?**

The management of gender equity in many missions appears to have changed considerably as a result of reengineering and results-based planning. It appears that gender considerations have been substantially downgraded in importance in many missions, reversing the trends of the past decade. While the actual impact in terms of the proportions of male and female participants is not yet clear, the attitudes of mission personnel have clearly changed.

The importance of gender equity in training programs has been increasingly emphasized in USAID policy and procedures since the mid-1980s. Virtually all of the major participant training programs of that period (CLASP, HRDA, NET, ENI) included specific targets for gender equity. Moreover, many of these programs developed strategies to target, attract, and train women. In many cases, the decisions on which sectors to emphasize in training programs were determined by gender considerations. The impact of this Agency-wide emphasis on equity was immediate and substantial. In 1987, only 20 percent of the participants in long-term academic programs and fewer than 28 percent of the participants in technical training programs were women. By 1997, these percentages of women in USAID training activities worldwide had increased to 42 percent and 39 percent respectively. This increased equity of opportunity reflected an Agency priority.

However, USAID’s reengineering processes and procedures have created a perceived conflict between the achievements of generic goals such as gender equity and the achievement of results-based objectives contained in the SO/IR framework at the mission level. SO/IR programs are much more focused than are traditional participant training programs that recruited individual participants into general skills training programs.

Traditional participant training opportunities were justified in terms of broad country strategies and targeted sectors, and the programs themselves dealt with individuals rather than organizations. For example, a program might offer scholarship opportunities in business administration or agricultural economics and

“We train the people who are in the jobs. If there are no women in the jobs, how can we train them?” Comment of a contractor who was unaware of the 50 percent gender goal, and considers it unrealistic.

candidates would compete for these advertised opportunities. In these types of programs, and particularly for academic programs, gender bias was a clear distortion of the development goals and relatively easily remedied by the selection process. Therefore, addressing gender inequity, while challenging, was primarily a function of establishing and enforcing targets.

In a reengineered USAID, however, the emphasis is not on training as a generic development activity, but rather on training as one input into accomplishing clearly defined objectives with quantifiable indicators of success. Under reengineering, therefore, the pool of candidates is not the entire society, but rather is restricted to certain levels of employees in certain partner organizations. Selection criteria are less often academic qualifications and personal qualities and are more often current employment positions. For example, a program in municipal development is less likely to offer general training in public administration to any qualified candidate, and is more likely to offer targeted training in civic participation to deputy mayors in ten selected municipalities. In the latter case, gender is not a determining or even secondary factor.

The activities found in the field missions reflect these changes. Only one mission was actively enforcing gender equity in the training program. The strategy in this mission was simple—a requirement that every participant training event in every SO area have 40–50 percent female participation. Achieving this goal was easier in some SOs than others, reflecting the nature of the workforce in each industry. Nonetheless, the mission achieved its gender goals with a 48 percent female participation rate. The application of this standard reflects the fact that equity is a mission priority; and possibly also that the mission program officer who manages the training activity was also the WID officer.

However, in the majority of the missions contacted in this study, gender issues have been relegated to a lower priority than was the case in the past. The dominant response to the assessment team's questions about gender equity was that USAID grantees and contractors select trainees on the basis of who needs to be trained to achieve the results rather than on gender, geographical, or other considerations. This is not to say that gender equity is no longer part of the management consciousness of the missions. On the contrary, mission management continues to discuss gender goal. However, at the operational level many SO teams have in effect reduced its priority. The most common reason cited for the relative downgrading of gender issues was that this kind of equity skewing of participant selection is not compatible with the reengineering emphasis on results.

Despite the apparent down-grading of gender equity as an objective in mission planning, the record on female participation in many missions appears to remain quite good. Several missions noted that the nature of the society, and/or the nature of the targeted sectors in which they work, was such that gender equity was achieved without any particular effort. For example, one training program in high level municipal finance and budgeting achieved better than an 80 percent female participation. This was not the result of a gender selection criterion, because the

only criterion was that trainees be budget officials of the participating towns. Rather, this achievement reflected a recent implementation of municipal decentralization, which transferred financial authority to the municipalities. Previously, the low level bookkeeping function had been held almost exclusively by women, who benefited from the new policy with an automatic promotion to budget director by virtue of incumbency. Therefore, in this case the targeted selection process benefited women. Obviously, it does not happen this way in all cases.

As data on gender participation are also less reliable than in the past (reflecting the current uncertain state of data collection in training) it is impossible to say to what extent the Agency's gender goal is being achieved. The team's interviews do suggest that concern with gender equity in training is probably greatest when USAID staff, who have been sensitized to this issue, play a role in the administration of training. Thus, gender is taken more seriously and tracked more closely in participant training than in in-country training.

Gender equity, of course, does not have to be a victim of a results orientation, and should not be considered an unattainable goal because of pressures to show results. A variety of strategies can be utilized to assure the participation of women in training to the greatest extent possible. One simple but frequently overlooked strategy is ensuring that women sit on selection committees. Adjustments can be made to program design, content and venue to be more inclusive of women. Training plans can be reviewed prior to implementation to ensure that they do not inadvertently minimize the participation of women, while retaining a focus on results.

**"Fine-Tuning" Training To Address Gender Concerns**

The contractor for a local governance activity is training mayors and deputy mayors in participatory budget preparation to give citizens greater input in municipal budget decisions. The contractor noted a lack of women's influence over municipal budget allocations. " It is difficult reaching women, the men in the community want the budget to be used for a soccer field, " stated the program manager. With G/WID assistance, the contractor created a program to strengthen women's associations, and modified the training curriculum in budget preparation to include more work in the process of exploring priorities and leading a dialogue with communities, where all voices are heard. In this case, addressing the gender gap was essential to achieving the objective.

Equity considerations for disabled participants was only mentioned in one mission as applicable to their programs, and that only in one instance.



## **How are G/HCD policies, procedures, and support meeting Mission needs?**

G/HCD is the entity responsible for establishing norms, policies, and procedures for training in USAID. G/HCD is also responsible for basic education, higher education, and information technology. G/HCD was created in 1994, during the reorganization that accompanied reengineering, replacing the Office for International Training (OIT), which functioned as a centralized management system for participant training.

In response to the decentralization objectives of reengineering, G/HCD has initiated a range of activities to enable missions and central bureaus to design, manage, and monitor their USAID-sponsored training programs. The key elements of this process that affect training in USAID missions are the development of ADS 253 policy and essential procedures guidance; creation of field support mechanisms such as Global Training for Development and HERNS; and the development of a new computerized management information system for training (TraiNet). The implementation of these elements is discussed below.

### **H. Use of ADS 253 and Best Practices**

ADS 253 contains the Agency policies, essential procedures, and recommended practices for training. The revisions of USAID policies to support reengineering efforts throughout the Agency were initiated in 1995, and have been further revised numerous times in the past three years. The innovations in ADS 253 were intended to streamline the training process, empower mission staff to directly manage training programs, and to provide guidance that captured the lessons learned over the years (Best Practices) for effective training in a reengineered USAID.

Mission and Bureau perceptions of ADS 253 guidance are decidedly mixed. The great majority of USAID personnel have no familiarity with ADS 253 policies, procedures, or Best Practices at all, leaving adherence to the regulations to the contractors or the training officer if there is one. Although this finding seems striking, it does not represent a significant change from the past. USAID officials have traditionally relied almost entirely on FSN training officers and/or training contractors to comply with the specialized regulations in this area. In itself, this is not problematic, because management systems can appropriately and efficiently delegate specialized knowledge requirements to specialists. The issue is that with the elimination of a central training function and with the downgrading or elimination of the training office, the application of this specialized knowledge is likely to become less certain, increasing Agency vulnerability to waste, fraud, and abuse.

Among the minority of respondents with a working knowledge of ADS 253, primarily training officers and training contractors, the perception is uneven and in some regards contradictory. Some individuals were enthusiastic about ADS 253 from the perspective of either form or substance or both. These respondents found

ADS to be better written than the old handbooks, more accessible using the CD ROM technology, and more useful with the inclusion of well regarded best practice recommendations. However, these responses were in the minority. Most of the individuals interviewed believed that the regulations dealing with training had not changed much at all. Representative statements include:

- ADS is more difficult to use than HB 10. The CD format is harder to use to find specific information, and the data is not well organized.
- ADS is still highly prescriptive and top down in its orientation. Alternatively, some officers find the new less structured process too difficult to follow.
- ADS is rigid and a step down from HB 10
- ADS is fine in terms of procedures, but presents little or nothing about key issues such as adult learning methods
- G/HCD requirements are burdensome on missions. Missions need simplified procedures because of the continuing staff cutbacks.
- ADS is not substantively different than HB 10, just organized differently.
- Participant training is still a “pain in the neck” to implement.

The dominant view in most missions was that participant training is not a highly reengineered part of USAID. This view was expressed by a large number of interviewees, including both those familiar and those unfamiliar with the specifics of the ADS guidelines. Significantly, when respondents were asked to identify the specific elements of ADS guidelines that were particularly burdensome, however, the list of problematic areas was surprisingly small. The main areas of complaint were:

- Medical exams and health insurance. Many missions find this requirement to be excessively burdensome, particularly for high-level individuals attending very short programs or conferences. In many cases, it is a determining factor in a decision not to use participant training as a resource.
- Costly and difficult contracting mechanism. This is discussed in the section below on the GTD contract.
- TraiNet and data collection burdens (discussed below).
- Lack of critical information and procedures that used to be included in HB 10, particularly such elements as maintenance allowance rates for third country training.
- Language requirements for short term programs.

- Stakeholder agreements. These are found to be difficult to implement in some countries. (It should be noted that other missions have consistently applied them for participant training and have found them useful.)
- Not all contractors follow ADS requirements (which is a local management issue).

Regarding the Best Practices, very few respondents outside of the training contractors and training officers had any familiarity at all with these lessons learned. With regard to in-country training, which as noted above represents the vast majority of the training taking place, virtually none of the technical assistance providers were familiar with the ADS guidance document.

### **I. Use of G/HCD Technical Support**

Many missions respondents had little or no contact with G/HCD and had not found it necessary to draw on its services. In fact, a lack of knowledge about G/HCD services, support, and contract mechanisms was noted in most missions.

However, a few missions reported regular interaction with the G/HCD technical and field support staff. In one instance, a G/HCD staffer had conducted seminars in best practices for the mission, and those had been well received. In other cases, technical assistance and support in the implementation of TraiNet had been reported. In every instance where missions had called on G/HCD for assistance, they reported that G/HCD staff were helpful and responsive.

### **J. TraiNet and Mission Accountability**

TraiNet is the new computerized information management system for training, which will replace the PTMS and related systems currently in place. TraiNet is an ambitious effort to address the full spectrum of training management needs, from planning through monitoring and evaluation, built around a basic database for reporting and tracking training numbers.

At the time of this study, few of the missions had direct experience with the full TraiNet program. However, the assessment team visited three of the pilot missions. Implementation strategies in those missions varied. In two of the missions, each technical assistance contractor is responsible for data input and database maintenance, with the GTD contractor responsible for aggregation and reporting. The third mission has assigned responsibility for all data input to the GTD contractor. These missions are in the early stages of implementation and do not have sufficient depth of experience to have fully informed opinions about its usefulness as a management tool. The emphasis in this first year has been on the logistical and technical steps to coordinate partners and to collect and input the data. The individuals most familiar with the program found it very user friendly.

Outside of these missions, the prevailing view about TraiNet could be characterized at best as strong skepticism. As an AID/Washington requirement that is perceived to impose a significant burden in terms of staff or contractor level of effort, it is often seen as the USAID equivalent to an “unfunded mandate,” i.e., a requirement without provision of resources to carry it out. In most missions, the single most precious resource is staff time, and management is resentful and suspicious of additional burdens. In the two pilot missions that have decided to decentralize the data input requirements, it is the technical assistance contractors who are wary of the additional burden that is not included in their contracts.

In addition to the perceived labor burden, it is fair to say that few mission personnel, including in the pilot missions, have a clear vision of how TraiNet will be useful for program management. The most optimistic view of the value of this information was that it would be “useful” for managers to know how much training is going on, as a general piece of program information. The more common opinion is that the level of information that TraiNet collects is not appropriate in a reengineered environment. Some sample opinions include:

- “This is just counting heads. Isn’t this what reengineering was supposed to get rid of?”
- We are responsible for tracking results, not training events or individual participants.”
- “It is the responsibility of contractors to manage their inputs. We don’t require them to report on technical assistance (i.e., there is no *TA-Net*) or the number of computers purchased (*ComputerNet*). USAID should be focused at the results level.”

Notable was the lack of any widespread mention or recognition that the data collection function that TraiNet provides for the Agency is a high level worldwide mandate. As G/HCD officials noted, USAID is required by the OMB and the InterAgency Working Group (IAWG) to collect and report on the number of participants and a range of other information. Mission and contractor personnel often have limited awareness of how this information is used in inter-agency negotiations and in budget discussions with Congress. The distinction between overall Agency accountability and reporting responsibilities and those that apply to SO teams at the mission level does not appear to be well understood.

## **K. Summary of Findings**

- Overall participant training levels (academic and technical) are much lower than in past years. This reflects a combination of changing needs and reduced budgets.
- The great majority of all training being conducted in USAID missions is in-country training, which is by and large outside of any direct

influence and support by G/HCD activities. Training is an essential element of all results packages, often representing an investment as large or larger than technical assistance.

- There is increased mission interest in and support for third country training.
- U.S. participant training is still an important program element in most USAID missions, although at considerably reduced levels from the past. The reliance on U.S. training differs by region, reflecting need, budget, and program priorities.
- The most endangered element of participant training is long-term academic programs in the U.S., for reasons of cost, reengineering, and declining or changing needs in USAID countries. Some mission personnel believe that this will have a negative impact on U.S. interests and USAID effectiveness over the long term.
- Reengineering is being implemented in varying degrees in the field. The shift in decisionmaking authority to SO teams has a significant impact on training activities.
- Reengineering, budget, and staff cuts have resulted in severe pressure on USAID staff. The combination of less staff and more responsibility for results requires support that is agile, easy to use, and directly contributes to results. Staff shortages factor in most mission management decisions, including those related to level and types of training undertaken.
- Staffing support for training, as in all other areas, has decreased significantly. Mission expertise in participant training is weaker than in the past.
- Training management systems have significantly changed. The systems that provided relatively easy access to centralized training support in the U.S. no longer exist.
- Many missions are not fully reengineered in the sense that their SO teams do little more than share information about programs managed in the traditional USAID manner. Often training officers/specialists are not part of the SO teams.
- The USAID training regulations are perceived as burdensome, overly directive, and not very reengineered. Missions want more agile mechanisms.
- The GTD support mechanism is effective at meeting some types of mission needs, but is cumbersome and expensive for other types of activities.

- Gender equity is a casualty of the reengineering in some missions.
- Many of the issues addressed in the SOW of this study apply more to stand alone participant training programs than to other types of training inputs. This reflects the fact that OIT and G/HCD have traditionally focused on participant training rather than on in-country training. G/HCD policies, mechanisms, and guidance have little or no perceived impact on the +90 percent of training that is carried out in-country. This assessment seeks to expand the focus to address issues of training as a key development input, and increase the emphasis on issues relating to in-country training.

## **L. Notable Practices and Illustrative Programs**

The following practices and case studies are offered to illustrate the diversity and creativity of the training programs in USAID missions. They are not organized in any particular order or with reference to any particular issues raised in the assessment, although they do illustrate some of the issues. These programs were selected by the mission personnel as innovations they were proud of or programs that they consider particularly successful. As with the rest of this report, missions, programs, and locations are treated anonymously.

### **Building Local Training Capacity with Multi-Year, Multi-Level Training Programs**

**Strategic Plan:** The USAID/Mission X results framework includes the goal of building local capacity to design and deliver training to meet the needs of local government as follows:

**SO 2.3** Local governments are making responsive choices and acting on them effectively and accountably

**IR 2.3.4** Institutions are supporting local governments through training, advocacy, technical assistance and dissemination of local practices

**IR 2.3.4.2** Sustainable capacity of training institutions established

**Method—In-country Training:** Content-area specialists from intermediate support institutions (ISO's) and from local government departments are recruited to join in-country training teams. These teams include senior experts in the content area as well as professional trainers. The teams are charged with the design, organization, and delivery of training to meet the needs of local governments. The trainees attend short-term training-of-trainer retreats and design three training programs per year, tailored to meet the customers' needs.

**U.S. Training:** Ten of the best trainees are selected each year to be sent to the U.S. for concentrated work with U.S. trainers and training institutions. Their training programs include:

- 3 days with a U.S. training institution that does direct in-house and contract training;
- practice in designing and developing the entire training cycle;
- 5 days TOT sessions in experiential learning methodology. Also building variety into training design and multi-media approaches. The importance of analyzing audience, purpose, and style;
- 2 days to observe and review state of the art training and materials in content-areas (i.e., budgeting, organizational development, strategic planning, and so on); and
- 2 days of visits to municipal human resource departments where they focus on How are training needs determined? How is training used as a management tool? How can municipalities budget for staff training?

**Follow-on Support:** All U.S. trainees prepare **action plans** that include:

- A plan for taking leadership of one or more stages of the training cycle.
- A plan for sharing new methodologies at future TOT retreats.
- Design of a new training module in one content-area.
- Plan for joint design of a cross-cutting session on use of training as a management tool by local government administrators.

**Results:** Success of the local capacity “contract” training program is measured by (1) increased purchase of services by the municipalities (2) impact of the services provided by the trainees to the municipalities. For example, the Deputy Mayor of City X recently approved and submitted to the Ministry of Health for endorsement a three year strategic plan prepared by a local consultant who was trained in strategic planning under this program.

### **Integrating Training and Technical Assistance from Multiple Contractors and Grantees (The X Consortium)**

**Description:** The X Program represents a consortium of seven USAID funded organizations that provide technical assistance and training to private sector clients at the firm (company) level. Each of the participating contractors or grantees has a distinct scope of work and contractual arrangement with USAID in the area of private sector development. Some of the members are primarily training specialists, and others provide specialized technical assistance or experienced volunteers to work with clients. However, all of them are members of the same SO team and function as a team within a team rather than as individual contractors. The mission established a policy in 1996 that the team members would collaborate and coordinate work rather than compete with each other for the assistance funds and opportunities.

The consortium established a single point of contact for all private sector firm level assistance clients. Upon receipt of a request for assistance, the consortium convenes a task force composed of members of each organization to conduct an in depth needs assessment and develop an action plan for the client with an appropriate package of advisory services and training. Working as a team, each of the member organizations in effect functions as a marketer for all of the organizations.

The X Consortium model is interesting because it is a coalition of independent contractors working as equals rather than in a contractor/subcontractor relationship. The model is challenging to implement, and at least one of the member organizations will drop out this year to pursue an independent course. The consortium members note that the development of this collaborative approach required a lot of time to develop procedures, fair allocation of work, and trust. They also note that it would not have happened without the insistence of a determined Mission Director.

In addition to providing an unusual model of contractor collaboration, this program effectively integrates technical assistance and training, combining specialized knowledge in both content and process, within a focused performance-based assistance plan. The objectives of each client are defined in performance terms and are monitored to assure that the clients achieve their goals.

### **U.S. Academic Training through the Advanced Training for Leadership and Skills (ATLAS) Program**

**Description:** At a time when USAID Missions in many countries are moving away from long-term academic training in the United States, the ATLAS program in Country Y remains very strong, supporting about 20 new training participants each year. ATLAS is a USAID-funded project providing academic training to Africans in the U.S. in areas of specialization critical to the country's development.

The ATLAS program in this country primarily targets the public sector. At present there are 35 participants in the U.S.:

- 2 Ph.D. candidates,
- 21 Masters candidates, and
- 12 undergraduates.

The program is expensive, with average costs as follows:

- U.S.\$ 120,000 per individual per Ph.D.
- U.S.\$ 50,000 per individual per Masters Degree
- U.S.\$ 90,000 per individual per undergraduate program

The employer must pay for a round trip ticket to the U.S., and salary during the study leave. The receiving U.S. university provides scholarships. (One candidate



had to wait a year before leaving for study because the university where he was to study did not have sufficient scholarship funds this year.)

The Training Assistant who manages the ATLAS project, has identified a serious problem, that of rejection by the final selection group in the U.S. of candidates chosen by the Mission. She suggests as a solution pre-identification of institutions for candidates who may not be fully competitive because of the past history of discrimination. Another solution might be academic skills upgrading in-country to prepare candidates for U.S. training.

**Future:** Both the Mission Director and the ATLAS graduates have identified the importance of academic training for individuals working in the private sector. The Mission Director believes that small- and medium-sized firms will be the engine of economic growth in the future, but that individuals who work in these firms are lacking in mathematics and science knowledge and skills. ATLAS graduates also stressed the importance of the private sector, since many people will be moving from the bloated civil service to private sector jobs.

A major hurdle remains. At present the employer must support the employee in training, paying for a round-trip ticket to the U.S. and salary during the study leave. The ATLAS graduates believe that few firms in the country would be able to justify this expense to their "bottom line." Therefore, some adjustments would have to be made.

### **Teacher Training for Grades 1–4 in Disadvantaged Regions**

**Description:** This program provides intensive in-country training to a targeted 500 schools and 2,000 teachers in the most disadvantaged region of a country where there are severe inequities of the "inputs" to education: poor facilities, lack of supplies, and undertrained teachers, in contrast to the advantaged region with more resources and better trained teachers.

The program produced a new curriculum, teaching and learning materials in five local languages and English, and established an innovative method of training the teachers in the new methods and materials. Local teacher trainers, 90 in all, gave workshops at two levels for the teachers. In the classrooms, 100 U.S. Peace Corps Volunteers assisted the teachers, using the language of the area and helping with the new materials—the programmed teaching methodology of specially-designed posters and their accompanying workbooks.

In the beginning, the program had to resolve many organizational issues. Perhaps the most difficult was on the side of the U.S. Peace Corps which found itself with volunteers working in a resource-rich environment: four-wheel drive vehicles and plentiful classroom materials are not part of the expected Peace Corps experience. However, both were necessary if the PCVs were to be successful in their task of assisting far-flung schools in the disadvantaged areas.

**Results:** A new model of cooperation among the partners, including the U.S. institutions, has created multiple benefits for the disadvantaged children of this country. To further the work, staff from Peace Corps/Washington, the Africa Bureau, and the SO 2 team leader have produced a document which will serve as the basis for a follow-on project.

### **Empowerment of Women, A Unique Approach to Gender Equity**

**Description.** Mission Z has a unique program devoted to gender equity issues, through its SO 3, Increased Women's Empowerment. The activity is implemented by local NGOs in a three-year, \$10 million agreement with the government. This SO is the first of its kind in USAID and is regarded by the mission as an opportunity to shape global thinking on the role of empowerment of women in development. The Empowerment of Women SO was conceived as a means of integrating and strengthening existing programs in literacy, legal rights, advocacy, health, and other areas.

#### **Specific Objectives and Topics:**

IR 3.1. Increased Women's Literacy

IR 3.2 Increased Women's Legal Rights Awareness and Advocacy

IR 3.3 Strengthened Women's Economic Participation

**Training Activities:** The program targets 100,000 women members of established community-based economic groups in 22 districts for extensive in-country training and technical support. The program uses a systematic, iterative and integrated series of program components that reinforce new literacy skills by practicing them in other content areas. Each target group receives 15 or more months of formal training: six months of basic literacy classes; three to nine months of training in management of savings and credit activities, business skills, and marketing; and six months of training in legal rights and advocacy. As soon as the women are literate and possess sufficient expertise in savings and credit, the program provides technical assistance in micro-enterprise development.

Special materials have been or are being designed for all three program components. Empowerment messages are consistent among the three sets of materials and handbooks use active learning methodology including games and roleplays. Women pay approximately 10 cents a month to participate in the program. Initial literacy groups are taught by the most literate member or a related schoolgirl; NGO organizers ensure that there is a sufficiently literate woman or girl in each group. Using an unpaid community member as an instructor is empowering for the individual and cost-effective for the project.

The activity is implemented by two international PVOs and numerous local NGO partners. The implementing organizations share a common MIS, field office and set of practices for contracting with local NGOs. The two organizations are jointly responsible for success. This close collaboration has not come without cost. Other

international subcontractors were initially involved, but differences of opinion on implementation resulted in their withdrawal.

### **A Comprehensive, Multi-level Training Program—Forestry Partnership**

**Description.** The X Partnership Project seeks to increase local control over the management of natural resources in order to reduce environmental degradation and increase agricultural productivity. To this end it aims to hand over 101,000 hectares of community forest to 1,365 users' groups.

#### **Strategic Plan:**

SO 1: Increased Sustainable Production and Sales of Forest and High-Value Agricultural Products

IR 1.2 Sustainable Management of the Productive Resource Base

1.2.1 Community forest user groups formed with management plans in target areas

1.2.3 Land officially turned over to user groups

1.2.4 Change in abundance of keystone species in parks and protected areas

**Training Activities:** The objective is to improve the efficiency of government counterpart staff. The training program includes a range of related interventions for government employees, members of beneficiary groups and local NGOs. The training courses are designed to prepare community groups to assume management of government owned forest areas and to prepare government employees to supervise the community forest management.

This is an impressive, comprehensive training program design completely integrated with the SO it supports and using a variety of *best practices* for in-country training:

- **Training need identification**, defined through job analysis; description of job knowledge, skills and attitudes; and identification of performance gaps. Immediate and long-term objectives are established. An annual training needs assessment/reevaluation is conducted through a networking and planning workshop.
- **Selection:** Selection criteria are specified.
- **Monitoring and Evaluation/Follow-up** is performed through both informal interviews and written questionnaires. Field staff forward information on training success to the training office. Findings from monitoring are incorporated into future planning. When objectives are not being met, reasons for non-accomplishment are analyzed.

- **Training of trainers:** Government staff have been trained to prepare curricula and to facilitate courses. Selected community members are being trained as grassroots resource people. Using local resource people who can serve as experts in the absence of project or government staff is a move to cost effectiveness, as well as sustainability.
- **Cost effectiveness:** Costs are being reduced by conducting training in communities rather than in central locations that require paying, transportation, food, and lodging.
- **Gender equity:** The contractor tries to maintain 30–40 percent female participation in community forestry users groups (CFUGS), but a supervisor reports that due to the male majority and cultural norms against women speaking out, female participation is often token. He indicates that women are often ignored and demeaned by male members. “What can she do? She can’t even read and write.” To ameliorate these difficulties special workshops for women have been developed and delivered by female trainers.
- **Philosophy of flexibility:** The supervisor of this activity believes that flexibility of approach is essential in training programs that deal with both literate and illiterate trainees. He tries to adapt training to obstacles encountered. For example, members of CFUGS are encouraged to buy pruning shears after training, however when it became apparent that many were unable to purchase them, the training was adapted to cover pruning with the more commonly available bow saw.
- **Placement in overseas courses—coordination between the local and U.S. offices results in strong U.S. programming:** The local project nominates candidates for external training. The home office, with adequate technical expertise, provides appropriate placement for candidates.

### **A Comprehensive Health/Population Project Integrating Training, Community Participation, and Institutional Development**

**Description:** Program Z supports SO 4: *Reduced Fertility* and SO 5 *Sustainable Improvements in the Health of Women and Children*. Problems to be addressed by the comprehensive training program include: lack of adequate reproductive/health services and information in remote areas; weak referral systems; medical school graduates with poor clinical preparation; shortage of clinically trained nurses and midwives; uneven quality of private sector health services.

**Training Activities.** The objective is to improve the quality, effectiveness and use of reproductive and child health services in public and private health facilities and households, with emphasis on high-risk regions. A U.S. technical assistance

contractor is providing comprehensive assistance to health care workers at the national, country, district, and community levels. Most of the training is conducted in-country in conjunction with technical assistance.

A training of trainers program has been established at the national level within the Ministry of Health to provide trainers for the central, governorate and district levels. Clinical competence is strengthened by linking training to problems the health workers confront daily. Administrative abilities to plan, organize, and monitor service units are strengthened as well.

Clinical training takes place at medical institutions including universities and teaching hospitals. The Ministry of Health and the General Directorate for Human Resource Development are the sites for pre-service training. In-service medical training and training of governorates and district personnel in planning and management will take place in existing local training sites in the seven governorates that are the focus of the activity. Implementation is by the Ministry of Health but with the locus of control in the districts. Overseas training is limited to specialized areas in which in-county training is not available.

**Governorate Level:** Train staff in supervision, monitoring and planning

**National Level:** Build on the capacity of the MOH to provide pre-service and in-service training in clinical areas and in management and supervision, including modifying the current training program to include the project package, developing standards, manuals and teaching aids for the training of trainers, and strengthening linkages with medical universities.

**Other Program Components:** The project requires balancing objectives of community empowerment with qualitative results in mortality reduction. It requires a high degree of flexibility to adapt strategies as lessons are learned and assumes that the initial vision of the project will change over time. The activity mobilizes district level communities to take ownership of the health care systems within their jurisdictions, reorganize them and thereby improve their quality. The majority of project resources are directed to the district rather than the central level. Responsibility for quality control and supervision are delegated to local communities.

The program emphasizes local capacity building by using existing institutions to deliver a large amount of training. It strengthens the curricula of medical, nursing, and pharmacology schools and strengthens NGOs as training providers. A future activity will address gender equity issues by reforming policies and practices in medical schools that limit the recruitment of female teachers to the OB/GYN specialty and reduce their likelihood of graduation. The activity will also pursue the possibility of establishing non-residential nurse training programs in certain districts where resistance to sending young women out of the community is especially strong. It seeks to achieve a higher impact through educational programs directed to adolescent girls through the Health Insurance Organization that provides health screening and limited services to approximately 14 million

students under the school medical insurance program. The project strategy is an important experiment in decentralized administration, social mobilization, and coordination of health services. It requires considerable rethinking of administrative habits and change to a more participatory decisionmaking process.

### III. Issues and Discussion

The following discussion is organized around eight key issues that emerged from the study. The key questions that will be addressed are:

- What has been the impact of reengineering on USAID training systems?
- How have the current training management systems affected the quality and impact of training?
- How can G/HCD services better support mission needs?
- Have the revised policies and procedures in ADS 253 streamlined training activities sufficiently? How can they be improved?
- What are the implications for the implementation of TraiNet?
- What level of monitoring and evaluation is necessary for accountability?
- Is the GTD IQC mechanism meeting the needs of missions and partners? How can it be improved?
- How can gender targets be addressed?

#### **A. What has been the impact of reengineering on USAID training systems?**

There have been three major factors affecting USAID programs in recent years: reengineering; downsizing; and significant, continuing budget cuts. It is virtually impossible to separate the impact of one or the other of these factors, but the combined impact has significantly changed many aspects of USAID management, organization, and funding. Training programs have had to adapt.

These changes have had a much greater impact on participant training than on in-country training activities. Virtually all aspects of participant training programs have been affected: the total numbers of trainees are sharply reduced and the variability of management and administrative practices across missions is greatly increased. By contrast, the impact on the amount, management, and quality of in-country training activities may be negligible.

This discussion will highlight five areas in which the changes in the past few years have affected the environment within which USAID training activities are managed. These impacts are: (1) changes in staffing levels and responsibilities; (2) the establishment of SO teams as the central point for program decisionmaking; (3) staff reductions in mission training offices; (4) the perceived incompatibility between general policy goals such as gender equity and results-

based programs; and (5) the changing needs for G/HCD support. The specific implications of these changes for G/HCD policies, procedures, and mechanisms are the subject of the remaining parts of this chapter.

- **Staffing levels, responsibilities, and expertise.** The significant reductions in program and OE funds and the concomitant cutbacks in staffing have had a pervasive impact on all mission operations. At the same time, the reengineering process, while simplifying some processes, has created new work demands in terms of coordination, developing teams, and creating new systems. Virtually all mission staff interviewed for this study felt overburdened and under great stress. To some degree, this has always been the case, and perhaps is endemic to international development work or reflective of the dedication of USAID personnel. Nonetheless, the perception exists that the workload of those remaining after reengineering and downsizing has increased. A related implication is that technical expertise in USAID is stretched as thin as it has ever been. This is true even in sectors such as health and population where USAID continues to maintain a technical or sectoral expertise.

With staff time an increasingly severe constraint, missions value mechanisms and services that are agile and that reduce work burdens. Any policies, procedures, or requirements that create new burdens or are perceived as being difficult to learn and use will be resented and resisted. As one mission official stated, “staff time is the single most critical constraint—even more so than funding. I will pay more for a service that is quick and easy to use, because it saves time.”

Missions clearly assess ADS 253, the GTD mechanism, questions about the role and responsibilities of training officers, and decisions about cross-cutting training support programs from this perspective. The assessment team thus found, for example, that training officers and resident GTD contractors (where they exist) are universally valued—primarily because they eased the workload of mission, contractor, and grantee staff. U.S. training, on the other hand, which is labor intensive, is viewed in terms of the trade-off between benefits and management intensity.

- **SO Teams are the central point for decisions and operations in most Missions.** The importance of delegating program strategies and resource decisions to SO teams is difficult to overstate because it affects both the organization of the mission and the nature of program activities. As an organizing principle, this drives decisions about staff makeup and relationships. As a programming structure, it mitigates against cross-cutting activities and centralized functions. As a means of fixing accountability and responsibility, this clearly establishes the



SO team as the unit with the most important voice about activities and resource use.

This focus on SO teams is particularly relevant for training. Training is an input into all SO program areas, and, on the other hand, is a distinct area of technical expertise. As an input, it is decentralized but as an area of technical expertise it lends itself to a central specialist function.

SO teams offer the opportunity for uniquely effective collaboration between technical specialists and training specialists. Like effective education, effective training requires both pedagogic skills and technical knowledge. One of the conundrums of training activities is that training specialists are very good at imparting knowledge and skills, but cannot possibly be content specialists in all areas, nor can they understand the intricacies of all client organizations. Technical specialists work in client institutions and can have an insider's knowledge of real problems, needs, and technical solutions, but may lack the skills and understanding to turn that knowledge into effective organizational change. This challenge of turning technical knowledge into positive change is particularly daunting in the development context with the added dimensions of international and intercultural differences. Development literature has for years recognized the challenges of effective technical assistance in achieving social and institutional change in partner countries; the challenges and obstacles for training are very similar.

Many of the Best Practices are explicitly designed to address the gulf between the technical and training specialists. The key practices of involving the employing organization, developing training plans with the supervisor, having explicit organizational objectives and performance objectives, and creating stakeholder agreements are designed to assure that the training program is addressing real needs and is technically appropriate for the trainees' job. In the best examples of effective SO teams, the technical contractors and training consultants work closely together to develop an effective program of performance consulting for the partner organization. In the team's observation, the role of training officers in SO teams is frequently more limited.

- **Reduction in staffing and function of Mission Training Office.** One of the most direct results of the reengineering for the training program has been the elimination of the training office or a significant reduction in its staff and functions. This is ironic, because it is happening even as the ADS guidance is promoting an increased and more professional role for human capacity development staff, and the SO Team structure can better incorporate this type of technical specialist. With mission support mechanisms eroding, contractors and grantees are often more

on their own than ever before in handling technical and administrative training issues.

### **The Critical Role of the Training Officer**

The mission that has gone the farthest in offering HRD support to improve the quality of all training has done so largely through the efforts of a talented training officer. The officer gained technical knowledge through years of training program oversight, acted on the recommendations of reports and evaluations, and thus was prepared to view reengineering as an opportunity rather than a threat. She developed a full and appropriate scope for a GTD delivery order, actively marketed the training unit's services to SO teams, and offered well-received capacity building seminars in "high impact training" for local training providers. While high level mission support is very important, a proactive attitude among training officers and a willingness to "stretch" professionally are key to the improvement of the training support function in the field.

With the reduced staffing and changing functions, USAID is poised to lose many of the hard learned lessons of the past decades about the administrative and programmatic aspects of effective international and intercultural training. This is particularly disheartening, because the Agency has made a significant effort in the past decade to learn and apply these lessons. Many of the USAID evaluations of participant training in the 1970s and 1980s had specifically noted that there was a pattern of not learning and applying the lessons of the past in training programs. The response in OIT was to widely distribute some of the program reviews of training and to develop, under HRDA, a Best Practices manual to capture and elucidate these lessons. The guidance in ADS 253 is intended to extend these lessons to enable training to be an effective tool for achieving strategic objectives and intermediate results. It would be particularly ironic if in the process of decentralizing training in order to make it more effective, the progress of the past decade is lost. As the training offices are downsized (and even in some cases eliminated) and participant training is delegated to technical assistance contractors with little or no experience in the field, this is a distinct possibility. Just as the quality of technical assistance is monitored by mission technical specialists, who is there to monitor technical assistance contractors' training programs to assure that they are of high quality and cost effective?

- **Perceived conflict between results-based programming and broad policy goals such as gender equity.** The surprising finding that gender equity issues are, in some cases, being relegated to a low

priority in training programs created considerable discussion in the assessment team. This problem very likely is not limited to the training components of activities, but may be more visible in training because of the Agency's very specific percentage targets for female participation.

While the difficulty of incorporating gender equity may be more pronounced in the reengineered world, it is certainly not new. The efforts to introduce gender considerations throughout the development programs have not been implemented without effort. Concerns about whether gender considerations overrode other priority development goals were frequently voiced. Over the past number of years, the Agency has implemented extensive gender awareness training and has developed numerous strategies to assure that gender issues were appropriately incorporated into programs. These training activities raised awareness and understanding about the gender aspects of development.

Two points can be made about the finding that gender issues are not given sufficient attention in some SO teams. First, the point that the missions make is valid—the tradeoff is real. Program managers are being held accountable for directing a diminishing pool of resources toward well defined goals, and for achieving results. There are strong disincentives to conducting activities and spending resources that do not clearly contribute in measurable ways to relatively short term objectives.

Despite the real conflict between goals that may exist, the assessment team observed that a small number of missions that have continued to push aggressively for gender equity in training were more successful in achieving this goal. If there was a cost to doing so in term of less achievement of SOs, this was not mentioned in any of the interviews the team conducted. The approaches and strategies used in these missions can be shared and encouraged in all missions. In order to have a receptive audience, however, the Agency needs to clearly define and emphasize the place that broad development issues such as gender equity have in a reengineered environment. USAID policy needs to be effectively incorporated at the action level in SO teams.

- **The requirements and needs for G/HCD support have changed.** G/HCD has several broad mandates in the area of training—to set policies and procedures, to provide technical support related to human capacity development, to develop and disseminate tools, and perhaps to serve as a technical home for their areas of expertise. In the past, the functions of this office were to define policies and procedures and to manage a narrow range of centralized programs in participant training. This might even be characterized as a captive system, in the sense that

OIT established the policies and procedures, designed and required documentation, forms, and database software, trained personnel throughout the world in the procedures and tools, and enforced it all through a system of waivers and approvals. This was needed and appropriate during a period of high volume U.S. training.

With reengineering, G/HCD's role has expanded considerably, from the narrowly defined world of participant training to the universe of training as a technical specialty. The function has changed from being an enforcer of procedures to being a source of knowledge and technical support. The needs for providing technical support to all training implemented as a decentralized input are vastly different from the requirements for directly managing participant training activities.

This process of transformation is started, but as yet is incomplete. Much of the orientation toward in-country training is still limited to statements in the ADS documentation. Two types of issues will be addressed in specific sections below. First, the transformation of policies, procedures, and mechanisms are at a halfway point to being fully supportive of the reengineered USAID. These will be discussed below in sections about ADS 253, GTD, and TrainNet. Second, the broader issue is the need to refine and perhaps redefine the function and role of G/HCD in a way that recognizes and addresses the real constraints to more effective use of training at the SO team level. These issues are also discussed below in the section about G/HCD.

**B. How have the current training management systems affected the quality and impact of training?**

The nature and scope of this study were not sufficiently broad, or perhaps sufficiently in depth in any given country, to develop a definitive statement about the quality and impact of training in USAID. The baseline data on the historical levels of quality and impact are scanty, and the data collected in a short visit to each country are insufficient to draw a firm conclusion about the current status.

The team reviewed the support systems that are in place to promote and improve the quality and impact of the training. A notable element in this review of mission management practices is the degree to which the original vision of G/HCD and the ADS 253 guidance have failed to materialize in most missions. This vision was that missions would have a source of training expertise that would serve as a management, administrative, and technical resource for all SO teams. This resource was seen as a substantive upgrading of the traditional administrative support provided by a training officer (in most missions this position was filled by an FSN), ensuring that training considerations are given appropriate consideration in program strategy, organizational development planning, performance improvement, and results-oriented development programs. (The five mission case

studies described in Section II included some examples of different approaches to achieving this goal.)

In only two or perhaps three of the twelve missions visited is this vision even being partially realized. The more common result of reengineering and downsizing has been that even many of the benefits of the traditional FSN training office have been lost. The training office, the source for administrative expertise in participant training, has been weakened in most missions. In some cases, the hard learned lessons of implementing overseas training effectively and efficiently are forgotten. Most Mission TOs are overwhelmed with work. They either lack the time, the training, or the mandate needed to provide guidance to SO teams in areas such as needs assessment, monitoring, and follow-on. Moreover, a relatively easy and inexpensive (for missions) implementation mechanism for participant training has been replaced by what many missions views as a costly and cumbersome mechanism. Most missions are farther from having a single solid technical resource for training, organizational development, and HRD than ever before.

If these are the losses, what has been gained? There are, in effect, gains. Along with the overall reengineering reforms, training management has been wholly assigned to the individuals responsible for results. This focus on putting authority, responsibility, and accountability for defined results with SO teams has arguably achieved a fundamental objective of reengineering and the ADS 253 reforms, which was to more directly link training to defined intermediate results. With the SO/IR framework, the overall emphasis on results has largely eliminated unfocused, "objectiveless" generic training. From another perspective, however, the new system inhibits missions from taking advantage of targets of opportunity.

In the view of the assessment team, the tighter links of training to sectoral or institutional objectives, as defined by intermediate results, probably has made training more effective. When training is managed in the context of clear performance goals and in coordination with the technical advisors working with clients, it is necessarily more focused and more relevant.

The missions that have integrated the training specialists into a working relationship with technical advisors, whether through the SO team or some other mechanism, may have successfully blended technical and training expertise to achieve results. The vision incorporated into the ADS 253 guidance is not off base, but it is clearly much more difficult to implement in the current reality of downsized USAID missions than had been anticipated.

In the missions where this vision has been most nearly achieved, where training specialists have a strong relationship with SO teams and other contractors, the key element has been leadership of senior mission management. Effective mission directors have brought training specialists and technical advisors together in teams and insisted that they be held jointly responsible for achieving results. The common element was that these missions recognized that training is a critical element in the program and took concrete steps to improve the quality of training in all areas. All successful missions established a standard for effective, results-oriented training and promoted this standard in the mission.

**C. Should USAID attempt to counter the decline in U.S. academic training? Has the emphasis on strategic objectives limited USAID's ability to contribute to long-term development?**

The primary question raised is whether the reduced support for U.S. academic training is warranted or wise. This question goes beyond issues of training to the broader questions about what development assistance is and what role USAID can play in the process. The issue exceeds the scope for this study as well as the immediate responsibility of G/HCD. It touches on the rationale for a planning framework that emphasizes relatively short term, measurable impact and appears to preclude a commitment to interventions that take years, or decades, to come to fruition. The issue is included here as a factor that appears to influence choices about training, and to recognize an issue that was repeatedly raised in interviews with mission personnel.

The team found an intriguing paradox in discussing the value of the reengineering focus on strategic results and the impact on training for development with mission and contractor personnel. Some of these individuals expounded at length about the difficulties of justifying participant training, and in particular U.S. academic training, in terms of USAID's ability to quantify the effectiveness and contribution of training toward achieving intermediate results. At the same time, they often explicitly recognized their indebtedness to the academic training programs of the past in achieving their current objectives. Many respondents noted the value of having counterparts with U.S. training, and most could readily identify key counterparts in the government or private sector who were former participants. The same recognition was true for prior USAID investments in long term institution building, often with substantial overseas training activities, that resulted in effective counterpart groups. However, they also recognized that such investments are much more difficult to make today under the SO framework. They are grateful for the work of previous projects, but cannot make the same contribution to the future. As one mission director, noted, "Long term training and academic scholarships have formed the current leaders of many ministries, and

thus have probably had more positive impact in developing countries than any other USAID intervention.”

An experienced mission director made the forceful point that the results framework militates against making the kind of long term capacity building investments that may be USAID’s greatest contribution to development. His experience in the reengineering efforts in USAID/Washington had convinced him that it is much easier to sell congressmen and the public on programs with tangible results, such as vaccinating thousands of children or initiating sustainable agricultural practices in thousands of hectares, than on developing an institutional capacity to achieve those goals. Institution building is a “soft” indicator which does not fit easily in SO structures, despite being one of the most significant contributors to development. Informants were concerned that some types of important training are difficult to justify and support under the SO framework, including those that take advantage of targets of opportunity or contribute to leadership development, or support the mission’s preparation of new initiatives. Much of this concern centered on mission’s ability to support U.S. academic programs.

Is this a real problem and, if so, is this an issue that is appropriate for G/HCD to address? Are the long term interests of the U.S. served by developing the kinds of relationships and linkages with national leaders that have been established in the past through long term academic training? Is this an issue for each mission and SO team to address in developing their strategies, or does it transcend this level?

The issue is by no means one-sided. A few missions have successfully included long-term academic programs and leadership development activities in their strategic objectives. The observation was also made that while having a cadre of U.S. educated leaders throughout the world is an advantage, it may no longer be necessary for USAID to take action to assure that this happens. Some academic programs continue to be supported by the earmarked programs such as Georgetown University CASS and ECESP programs, ATLAS, and non-USAID programs such as USIA also support a limited number of academic scholarships to the U.S. It is also noteworthy that significant numbers of people from abroad attend higher education in the U.S. on private funds.

Taking these issues into account, G/HCD, and USAID, should assess, at policy making levels, whether the broad goals of development assistance continue to require these kinds of programs and, if so, whether USAID is the appropriate vehicle for such support. In the continuing discussions about the role of USAID, USIA, and the State Department, it would be useful to have a clearly delineated position (if indeed it does not already exist).

#### **D. What level of monitoring and evaluation is needed for accountability?**

The findings about monitoring and evaluation practices showed that there is little evaluation being done and considerable diversity of opinion about what should be

done. Only one mission has an extensive planning and evaluation system that tracks defined organizational performance improvements. Countries in one region have a bureau-supported evaluation mechanism that created a framework for planning and evaluation, which is seeking to establish clear linkages between training and intermediate results. A few countries conduct follow-on evaluations. The most common approach is to leave this level of implementation detail to the contractors, some of whom conduct course evaluations.

The issue of tracking the impact of training has been a particular challenge for USAID for many years. At times in the past forty years, internal and external critics, including the GAO, have questioned the participant training program, noting that USAID had virtually no information about the impact of this very significant investment. In many countries, USAID had virtually no information even about who the trainees had been, much less what they had accomplished. These issues led to numerous attempts to answer questions of "impact" using longitudinal surveys and exit questionnaires. In the 1960s and 1970s, USAID attempted to conduct worldwide evaluations of participant training, interviewing tens of thousands of returned participants. In the 1980s, several major evaluations were conducted for the CLASP, ATLAS, and HRDA programs to follow up on the activities of returned participants. The Participant Training Management System (PTMS), the predecessor of TraiNet, was developed as a mission management tool in part to maintain adequate records in each country to conduct evaluations if needed.

A particularly notable aspect of the history of USAID evaluations of training is that the prevailing approach has always been to try to aggregate the training impact data at a regional or global level, or at the minimum at the country level. Another observation is that the training evaluations were almost always conducted without reference to a particular program objective. Instead, evaluations sought to identify worthwhile achievements of the trainees and to attribute them to the training. Impact was defined as what was accomplished, rather than being a measure of advancement toward the achievement of pre-defined goals.

The challenge of evaluating training impact was dramatically increased with the advent of the strategic objectives framework. With the new emphasis on results-oriented programs, the training of individuals, even for short periods, was understood to need to show a measurable contribution to results and objectives articulated in terms of broad organizational, sectoral, or societal change. This had been a significant problem for many mission personnel.

Mission and contractor personnel tended to respond in two ways to questions about monitoring and evaluation. One was that training is an implementation detail that contractors should track. The other response was that they need assistance in developing appropriate indicators for training, or that the inability to develop such indicators is a real constraint to training.

In the view of the assessment team, the initiation of reengineering and the development of measurable strategic objectives and intermediate results largely



resolved any remaining questions about the appropriate way to evaluate training. Under this system, USAID establishes defined program goals and evaluates achievement of those goals. This defines impact for each SO.

Under this framework, training is one input. The evaluation of this or any input is done in the context of whether or not the intended result is achieved. The question at the SO/IR level is not to what extent training is contributing to the result, but rather whether the result is being achieved. Training is monitored and evaluated as an issue of contractor management—is the training being managed effectively and with adequate quality. Training is an implementation detail—an important detail, but a detail nonetheless. More importantly, it is not reasonable or feasible to evaluate training at a global, regional, or even country level, but rather in the context of specific intermediate results. Some level of monitoring, on the other hand, is still needed and appropriate at the national or Agency level.

In some particular cases, the nature of the objective and the nature of the training are such that the measurement of the training will directly measure progress towards the SO. For example, many health care and child welfare professions have established objectively measured standards of practice or standards of care that are achieved through training and technical assistance. For such activities, an intermediate result might well be articulated in terms of a target population of rural health care providers demonstrating mastery of given standards of practice. In such cases, the measure of impact is the proficiency of the target population—a training impact. This type of evaluation is clearly preferable for those objectives that lend themselves to such measurement.

It is useful to note two aspects of this approach to evaluation. First, the relevant unit of measure is not individual trainees, or even discrete training events (courses, workshops, etc.) but rather the progress of a training program, in which multiple training events are conducted, to accomplish the goals. Second, the determination of an appropriate measure of success is not a training function, but rather a responsibility of the SO team. The function of the training specialist is to assist the SO team in understanding the role that training plays in achieving the goals, to help develop effective measures, and to assist in developing a training program that will achieve the goals.

G/HCD can play a useful support role in assisting SO teams and contractors to develop appropriate assessment systems for training. In many cases, the training can most appropriately be assessed at a process level as a means of quality control. USAID has considerable experience with process evaluations using exit questionnaires, satisfaction measures for courses, and on a more formal level, achievement of learning objectives. Such evaluations, in the context of a carefully developed training or SO plan, can usefully contribute to an SO team's ability to monitor progress toward the desired results.

**E. Have the revised policies and procedures in ADS 253 streamlined training activities sufficiently? How can they be improved?**

As noted in Section II. F above, there are contradictory views expressed about ADS 253. To some extent, they can be correlated to the position of the informant. To many USAID officers, ADS 253 is perceived as regressive and unreengineered. Training contractors for the most part find ADS 253 simplified and easier to work with. Some training officers, accustomed to working with clearcut rules, are unsure how to handle their expanded discretionary authority regarding allowances and other policies.

The contradictory and lukewarm response is rather surprising, given that in the assessment team's judgment, the revised policies and procedures in ADS 253 represent a real improvement over the previous system codified in Handbook 10. The procedures are streamlined, far more decision authority is delegated to missions, many restrictions are eased and few waivers need to be presented to AID/Washington. ADS 253 guidance on Best Practices is specifically intended to help missions implement more effective training programs in support of strategic objectives. Taken as a whole, the ADS 253 represents a leap forward in thinking about effective training in USAID.

At heart are issues of timing and inclusiveness. As G/HCD was revising ADS 253 to move *traditional participant training* programs to a new level of effectiveness and link these programs to results and achievement of measurable impact, the process of reengineering in the field was already overtaking it and rendering much of the guidance irrelevant. The types of programs—participant training—envisioned and supported by ADS 253 and G/HCD mechanisms are rapidly disappearing. In reality, ADS is least relevant to the types of training that are most prevalent in most missions today—third country and in-country training.

Some of the ADS orientation toward training for results and best practices is more appropriate to standalone training projects trying to provide services to a wide range of organizational clients in many sectors and technical areas. It is also fair to note that some of the practices and expectations about more rigor in the training process anticipate a world with established, well-staffed training offices and resident training contractors. The demands of a highly decentralized system, managed by overworked SO teams with limited support from the training office, implemented by technical assistance contractors and focused on in-country or third country training, are not well met by the current structure. Such issues as effective adult learning methodologies and materials, organizational strengthening of training institutes, technology use in training, effective use of cascade training systems, integration of technical assistance and training, and other issues are not covered in G/HCD guidance.

Beyond the substance of ADS 253, some respondents still find the material difficult to access. In a few cases, this is an issue of physical access (availability of

CD ROMs, etc.), but usually it has to do with the ease of use and ability to find the needed information. To improve access, some missions have developed simplified versions of the ADS requirements as Mission Orders, condensing the critical issues down to 2–3 pages of simple charts. The ENI Bureau developed a training manual organized by each step in the training process. In some ways, the ENI manual is similar to the old Handbook 10, except that the procedures and documents are recommended templates for ease of use rather than required procedures. The goal is not only to simplify the procedures, but to assure that the procedures *appear* easy to use.

The *user-friendly* issue illustrates an interesting paradox about the older prescriptive training regulations and the newer decentralized ADS “empowerment” system. The prescriptive regulations of centralized management were resented because they imposed rigid requirements and forced everyone to jump through a lot of hoops. On the other hand, they were very easy to use, because each step was clearly described. The reengineered empowerment system, on the other hand, provides much greater latitude to program managers in the field, but at the cost of clarity about how to do it. Field personnel who see themselves as short-staffed and overworked do not want to take the time to work out a procedure or documentation. In these circumstances, flexibility and empowerment become burdens. *G/HCD needs to find a middle ground of providing very easy to use and easy to understand systems that facilitate the daily work while maintaining empowerment and flexibility.* It may be desirable to orient training officers and missions on the benefits of flexibility, while offering some examples of the appropriate use of decision making authority so that staff are not threatened by “not knowing the rules” (in other words, training in empowerment).

Only a few ADS 253 policies were raised in the study as being particularly burdensome. The most significant of these is the requirement for a medical exam. These exams are required for all U.S. participants, regardless of whether or not they have had a recent exam and regardless of the length of the program. This requirement is made even more burdensome by the policy of allowing only a limited number of approved physicians to perform the exam. The burden that this imposes is significant enough for some trainees that they simply will not accept the training program. Usually, these trainees are very high level officials who are being sponsored for a short observational tour or attendance at a conference. Horror stories given by mission personnel included the story of a senior government official sitting in a pediatrician’s waiting room for four hours, surrounded by sick children, trying to get an exam to attend a three day conference. Most missions had similar stories. It is interesting to note that some USIA programs do not require medical exams.

From the missions’ perspectives, USAID needs to create agile, streamlined procedures for very short-term U.S. training programs. Such procedures might apply to all programs of ten days or less. One individual referred to this as the “express checkout lane.” It should be noted that most mission personnel appreciate Washington’s interest in lowering the cost of insurance coverage and

lowering mission liability. Given the costs to the missions, however, they believe that it is worth the effort to find alternative procedures that will facilitate these very short programs:

It is the view of the assessment team that development of an agile process for very short programs would achieve an immediate and very positive response from all missions. This would go far to change the perception of the G/HCD procedures.

Other suggestions for additions or improvements to ADS 253 were:

- Provide guidance and more support for third-country training. This was noted as an area where more, rather than less, is needed. Missions need information about maintenance allowances in all receiving countries. While ADS stipulates that receiving missions should provide this guidance, this does not appear to be working. G/HCD should consider centralizing this information once more, or working with training officers to resolve how they are to support one another to ease the management burden.
- Provide technical support and advice about in-country training. As noted in this report, in-country training represents the vast majority of all USAID training, and yet ADS 253 does not address many of the concerns. Among the areas where the informational and technical support activities (rather than regulations) would be helpful are in training needs assessments, adult learning methods, building sustainability and quality monitoring.

#### **F. What are the implications of the changes for the implementation of TraiNet?**

The key issues that were raised about the implementation of TraiNet had little to do with the software program itself. Those few informants who were familiar with TraiNet found the system to be a comprehensive training management tool and relatively easy to use. The concerns expressed about the pending implementation of the system were:

- The utility of collecting this information was not evident to many of the informants. None of the missions currently attempts to collect and report on training in the aggregate. It is seen as primarily a USAID/Washington reporting requirement rather than a tool for mission management, although some missions are looking forward to having the information. As such, it is cited as evidence of the top down” nature of G/HCD activities.
- The concept of TraiNet, which separates and aggregates a single input in isolation from other inputs, is seen as being inconsistent with the intent of reengineering. There have not been similar requirements for reporting about technical assistance, computer purchases, or other

commodity purchases. Despite this mission perception, however, it should be noted that there appears to be increasing pressure on USAID/W to collect and report on data about international technical assistance flows.

- Only one of the missions visited, or its contractor, is intending to use the full range of the planning, data collection, monitoring, evaluation, and reporting functions of TraiNet. The majority of the missions stated that at this time they intend to use the program solely for collecting basic data and submitting it to G/HCD.
- Concern with duplication of effort. Many contractors already have developed systems that perform these tasks adequately, and also meet the contract or project specific information needs. The challenge of aggregating this data on a worldwide Agency level is not generally seen as a mission concern.
- Many missions are concerned about the burden on staff and contractors to manage the system. They are also concerned that the support costs, including training and technical assistance to resolve problems, must be borne by the missions. At this point in time, of course, the extent of this burden on mission resources is largely unknown, as the system has yet to be implemented worldwide.

In some ways, the development of the TraiNet system mirrors the evolution of the ADS 253. TraiNet is a much improved version of previous management systems: it is useful in collecting and providing data on U.S. and third country training. The Agency has shifted its interest from evaluating training globally to evaluating the impact of training and other inputs within the context of each SO. The responsibility for assessing the impact of training has thus shifted from Washington to mission SO teams. TraiNet is not a system that responds to a perceived need by program managers at the SO team level. G/HCD has developed a fine tool for which there may be no strong market demand at the mission level.

However, this focus on the utility of TraiNet as a management tool for SO teams is misleading. Whereas the shift of responsibility for results and of authority over resources has clearly moved to the mission SO teams, this shift is neither absolute nor all encompassing. The Agency-wide reporting requirement supported by TraiNet is mandated by OMB and responds to information requirements of Congress, the IG, the Inter-Agency Working Group Executive Order, and the public in general. This information responds to a different set of reporting demands than those directly involved in the re-engineering process. The fact that the nature of this requirement is not widely appreciated or understood in the field points to the need for improved communication. The core message regarding TraiNet is that it is an Agency requirement that requires full mission and contractor support to implement successfully.

However, G/HCD has a broader responsibility and mandate beyond communicating the simple fact that data collection is an Agency requirement and that TraiNet is the official mechanism. Mission managers are largely unaware of TraiNet's potential as a comprehensive management tool. This points to the need to expand efforts to train mission and contractor staff on the features and potential of TraiNet. Users at the management level will require more and better information to adequately understand the potential of this tool, so that they can make more informed decisions about whether it may meet their needs. It appears that the bulk of the training in TraiNet to date has either been in the form of worldwide communications, which are usually ineffective ways of transmitting complex ideas, or has been directed toward the technical support issues of installing and using the software. G/HCD should expand the amount of face-to-face training in the management use of information.

**G. Is the GTD IQC mechanism meeting the needs of missions and partners? How can it be improved?**

Now in its third year of operation, GTD has generated some lessons learned that give it a mixed review. In order to provide a complete picture and balanced set of recommendations, this section incorporates the views of the Washington-based GTD contractors. There are a series of operational issues as well as more philosophical concerns.

GTD was a creative idea. The GTD IQC was created after consultation among G/HCD partners, as the successor to the core funded PIET contract and G/HCD's response to training needs in a reengineered environment. It was designed to offer several advantages over the PIET system: a choice of five experienced training contractors; the flexibility of a comprehensive menu of HRD services that included training technical assistance; and an efficient and streamlined IQC mechanism that eliminated the need for full and open competition. It was also intended to standardize the use of Best Practices. Missions were strongly encouraged to buy-in to GTD for cross-cutting services to all SOs.

The timing of the GTD rollout was challenging. GTD was introduced at the same time that training units worldwide were being reduced by downsizing and reengineering, and the locus of control was transferred to SOs. Once the mechanism was in place, many missions no longer had the staff to manage nor the budgets to support what ultimately was a rather complicated mechanism. Some missions transferred the HRD support function to less experienced former training assistants who were unable to play a leadership role in promoting GTD to SO teams and lacked expertise to prepare and manage delivery orders. In short, missions were not prepared and knowledgeable about how to best access the mechanism.

Among the missions surveyed, satisfaction with the GTD mechanism appears to correlate with the volume of training and extent of the buy-in. The perspective of the assessment team is that GTD works best where there is sufficient training

activity to warrant an in-country presence. This gives contractors more opportunities to provide the broad array of services that were originally envisioned and have frequent and full collaboration with SOs and technical assistance contractors. In one of the missions visited, the GTD contractor is a central player in all SO teams. In these countries, more of the complete training cycle is in evidence—deliberate planning, established monitoring and evaluation systems, and complementarity between the training/TA carried out by contractors and GTD contractors. In some cases the GTD contractor also provides logistical support to TA contractors who are conducting participant training. In at least three missions, the GTD contractor implements some in-country training as well as participant training.

GTD is well regarded in these missions, primarily for carrying out training support activities, including helping to articulate specific training objectives, to select training providers, to complete predeparture activities, and to monitor and evaluate programs. In one mission visited, although the contractor does not have an in-country office, there is sufficient activity to justify periodic contractor visits, and a mandate for significant in-country support, ranging from logistical assistance, implementation of training, to capacity-building workshops for local training organizations. Of the sample of 12 missions, those which have selected a broader range of services from the GTD “menu” are the most satisfied. A local presence, or a scope of work that allows for periodic contractor TDYs, enhances the effectiveness of GTD services.

Missions with smaller or occasional training support needs are less satisfied, and cite cost and difficulty of use as problems. For these smaller programs, GTD has not fulfilled its potential to offer a full array of HRD services in support of Best Practices. In the smaller missions visited, the contract is used in a more piecemeal fashion for placement and monitoring services for overseas training. This is not necessarily negative if someone else is ensuring linkages to results; in most cases however, overworked training units are not providing these services.

Some missions, or USAID countries without a resident office, are not served at all by GTD. One of the missions visited found that access to the GTD was simply too difficult and expensive for a small program with few overseas training needs. It was disappointed with this situation and was looking for ways to coordinate with other small missions and achieve a cost-effective GTD contract. Missions with few overseas training needs have no alternative to negotiating a delivery order for a small or sometimes a single group of participants, and are unable to rationalize core support costs over a number of trainees. Contractors must respond with proposals and complete budgets; the effort expended in contract preparation can approach the programmatic level of effort. In cases such as this, the PIO/P was a more efficient mechanism. Missions in this category do not view GTD as a viable mechanism.

The administrative and contracting use of the IQC mechanism seems to be poorly understood by both technical and contract officers, negating some of the

“streamlined” elements. Despite the fact that GTD was pre-competed, several missions chose to compete delivery orders. At least one contracts officer questioned the fundamental structure of labor categories and sought to examine daily rate histories and personnel qualifications. Other COs have insisted on key personnel designation for all staff on the delivery order; designating all personnel as *key personnel* deprives contractors of badly needed flexibility to rotate staff among DOs and adjust to employee turnover. Developing scopes of work that were neither too rigid to accommodate inevitable program changes, nor too vague to justify budgets, proved to be a complicated task.

The principal issues are the following:

- *The perception that GTD is very expensive.* Missions believe that administrative costs are unreasonable and overall budgets are high. This is preventing GTD from being accessed at all or limiting the choice of services and amount of training taking place. To some extent this can be attributed to missions facing for the first time having to pay for all of the services. In some cases, mission “sticker shock” has meant that important pre and post training services such as needs assessment and follow-on are dropped from scopes of work. The lack of core funding is a real constraint to small missions.
- *Cumbersome management.* The IQC is management intensive for both missions and contractors. The IQC mechanism, coupled with the decentralization of functions at many missions, has put technical people more often in the position of dealing with administrative and contract issues, consequently reducing the amount of time that can be spent on important programmatic work. While this is more true of contractors, all of whom cite frustrations in this regard, missions are also affected. This is critical in the present environment which places pressure on everyone to work as efficiently as possible and streamline administration to the greatest extent possible.

Most of the mission management concerns are around contracting issues. One of the missions visited noted a very lengthy negotiation process for the delivery order. Another training officer was overwhelmed by the time it took to prepare the delivery order and MAARD. A third mission commented that modifications take an inordinate amount of time to get through and that the contracting mechanism is difficult. “The real cost in training is the management workload,” stated one SO team member.

One mission has chosen not to buy into GTD and does not perceive a need. This mission observed that if they needed training support they would go to a local TA contractor to achieve management savings, because they would probably end up doing most of the work anyway due to distance and communication problems with a D.C. -based contractor. Distance, communication and the feasibility of a local presence are certainly legitimate issues for some scopes of work, particularly if they involve in-country or third country training coordination. In one case, a



mission observed that it would probably be easier for them to do the work themselves than respond to the constant e-mails from the contractor.

Many of these difficulties can be attributed to the IQC mechanism, which does not lend itself to a long-term activity such as training. Delivery orders are effective for specific tasks, which is satisfactory when the activity is short-term, but unsatisfactory when activities are over a longer period of time. A system of fixed labor categories and work days can be efficient for a three-month activity but becomes untenable over a two or three year period. Contractors are hard pressed to provide continuity of staff and maintain core functions, which must be maintained regardless of the volume or missions' willingness to directly fund. And it has always been the nature of the best laid training plans to change, which means that staying within a fixed scope and budget is problematic and entails time consuming and complex modifications. An alternative mechanism allowing for more rational budgeting that provides flexibility over the long term would work better for a training activity.

- Although not a widely reported concern, two of the missions visited raised questions about the quality of programming under GTD. Some SO teams are watching this issue carefully and are aware of a tension between good pedagogical practices and depth of content. This brings up the issue of the value-added of a process rather than content specialist, and the challenges of training generalists to address a very broad spectrum of needs. One mission observed that TA contractors appeared more familiar with the locations of technically excellent training than GTD generalists. TA contractors exercise a great deal of influence over training, at times in direct implementation, frequently in design and built-in follow-on through continued TA with beneficiary organizations. TA contractors and training contractors offer complementary advantages. The challenge is to marry strong technical content and field experience to good HRD methodologies. For this to work under GTD, it entails responsibilities on the part of SO teams to prepare thoughtful and complete training requests and encourage communication between GTD and TA contractors, and a need for GTD to bring in the highest quality and most appropriate technical resources. GTD contractors are under continued scrutiny to prove the value-added of their services, and should recognize that some TA contractors have developed a complementary set of innovative training strategies that can contribute to the emerging model of best practices for development training.
- It is important to recognize that there will never be a single solution for all missions. As reported elsewhere in this document, there are benefits to be gained by delegating and decentralizing training oversight to the individuals most closely related to the achievement of results in the field. What then, is the value of a centralized training mechanism? The team concludes that there are large needs. Missions have lost the staff

needed to administer overseas training. There are needs as well for specialized services in needs assessments, design, monitoring systems, and follow-on. The model of a centralized resource, offering a comprehensive and flexible set of services for a cross-cutting input, is still a good one. The challenge is meeting those needs under strong cost pressures.

Recommendations fall under three areas: 1) fine-tuning the current GTD contract to improve access and agility; 2) instituting a separate instrument to better serve small missions; and 3) features of the GTD's successor contract.

*1. Improving access, agility and services of the current GTD IQC.*

- *Improve the flow of information about GTD to missions.* This might involve an education component to increase awareness of the importance of good training practice and the benefits of full service contracts. A second component might include managerial guidance and clarification for training and contracts officers on competition requirements, staffing, scopes of work and budgeting.
- *Provide guidance to training officers.* One contractor mentioned that some training officers would benefit from training in project/contract management. To clarify the cost issue once and for all, a cost comparison could be made between a training program run through GTD as opposed to a TA contract or traditional cost reimbursement mechanism.
- *Encourage contractors to localize GTD to the extent possible, by utilizing all and any local links they may have, particularly those linkages that will increase local capacity in HRD support and strengthen local institutions.* For example, technical assistance assignments can be undertaken with local consultants or partners. Encourage at a minimum a one-time TDY for an informal assessment of training needs and joint planning.
- *Encourage cost containment.* Look at localizing some functions for cost savings and other creative ways to lighten the burden on missions.
- *Simplify the administrative requirements of the GTD Contract.* Labor categories are one area in which simplification would be helpful.
- *Where feasible, encourage smaller missions to buy into GTD jointly to achieve cost savings through economies of scale.* There is at least one instance where two countries have partnered.

*2. Consider introducing an alternative mechanism to improve access to GTD for small missions or those missions only needing occasional, ad hoc overseas training support.*

- Develop a mechanism parallel to GTD that can provide flexible and simplified access to missions with low volume needs for overseas placement and monitoring. These missions might benefit from a vehicle that would allow them to put funds into a contract and draw down services from a standardized, unit-priced menu based on levels of placement and monitoring services, functioning similarly to fee for service arrangements now in place in the NIS and CEE regions. This would allow these missions to take advantage of legitimate “targets of opportunity” and avoid delivery order preparation and negotiation for only occasional or one-time programs. This mechanism would be limited in scope and would be complementary to the more comprehensive menu and longer-term nature of GTD services.

*3. GTD's successor training support mechanism*

- Offer core funding to cover certain technical support services that are critical to achieving results and are difficult for overstretched mission staff to adequately address. This might include needs assessment and training plan and design services to ensure linkages to strategic objectives and define measurable outcomes, and would be important elements of a performance-based contract. Core funding would also be beneficial for contractors to adequately cover key management functions such as finance, information systems/M&E and management oversight; these essential management services are difficult to cover in individual delivery orders.
- Since it is unlikely that U.S. (or third country) training will increase significantly from current levels, G/HCD should consider a smaller number of awardees, up to a maximum of three. This would allow the awardees to achieve better economies of scale across task orders while still allowing missions a choice of contractors.
- Expand the scope of work for in-country training services. The current GTD scope of work focuses on a range of services in support of participant training, but does not specifically address in-country training (although it does not preclude it, since GTD contractors are presently carrying out in-country training in a number of countries). G/HCD should confer with the present GTD contractors to collect information about current and potential in-country training activities and incorporate the findings into a new scope. These services might include coordination of in-country training, strengthening of local organizations to manage training, training of trainers, quality audits of in-country training programs, cross-cutting institutional strengthening

programs or other cross-cutting in-country programs that complement training carried out by technical assistance contractors.

## **H. How can G/HCD services better support mission needs?**

This is the central question of the study: how can G/HCD services better support training in USAID. The discussions about the previous issues touched on some specific elements of the ADS 253, GTD contract, and TraiNet that might be considered by G/HCD for review. The broader issue, however, is how G/HCD can become a more effective agent in addressing human capacity development issues in a way that recognizes and addresses the real constraints to more effective use of training at the SO team level.

The challenge of providing useful and relevant support in training and human capacity development should not be underestimated. The majority of all training activities are conducted in-country by a wide range of contractors, technical advisors, grantees, and local training organizations. The core area of training is one in which few missions have identifiable projects or activities anymore. Budget cuts and reengineering concepts combine to limit core funding and core services. The overall Global Bureau role as the Agency's repository of technical skills and a technical support home in key strategic areas is difficult to implement when there are very few technical staff left in the field with which to work.

On the other hand, the opportunities for and potential importance of G/HCD's role cannot be overemphasized. The other Centers of the Global Bureau focus on technical expertise in strategic areas which correspond to equivalent functional areas in mission programs, which facilitates the definition and justification for technical support services. G/HCD/Training is focused on a *process* which is at the center of all successful development—the transfer of skills, knowledge, and attitudes to develop the capacity of our implementing partners in other countries. This function is more difficult to fit into the reengineering framework, but is perhaps the most essential in assuring the success of the entire enterprise.

The significant fact that struck the assessment team was that the vast majority of all USAID program expenditures are focused on two activities—training and technical assistance. Most of these activities are conducted in-country. Many mission personnel have argued, appropriately in our view, that these are two basically inseparable activities that perform the same function in different ways. This function is to achieve a communication and transfer of skills, knowledge, and attitude in an effective and efficient manner so as to improve the performance of the individuals and organizations with which we work. If technical assistance and training are two sides of the same coin, the coin itself is development work.

In view of the critical importance of these two processes, it is striking that there is no function in USAID that is devoted solely to assuring that the quality of these processes is as good as it can be and that the synergies are effectively encouraged. All too often, training and technical assistance are treated as generic inputs for which it is assumed that the quality of the service is adequate. All USAID officers

seek good quality in procuring for these services, of course, based on the knowledge that they have available. Such measures as experience, academic qualifications, prior references, and such elements are used as proxy indicators of quality. Much of this process is in fact of good quality. However, anyone with working knowledge of the foreign aid program recognizes that the quality of these crucial inputs is highly variable. There is inconsistency in practice, and no way to assure quality across programs or disseminate information about innovative and successful practices.

The assessment team found little evidence of a major problem or crisis in training activities at the mission level. Many of the training activities were quite good. There is no reason to believe that a crisis exists. However, there is also no reason to believe that the quality of these key inputs is uniformly good, or as effective as it could be.

The assessment team concluded that a serious deficiency in G/HCD's services is that they skip over many issues of direct relevance to the most prevalent activity—in-country training. Moreover, there is no systematic means of focusing on the quality of training, of all types, and promoting cross-fertilization of the best practices in all areas. USAID is in a unique position of being able to draw from the experience of training activities in all parts of the world in order to facilitate the exchange and refinement of lessons learned. This exercise would create a knowledge base about the process that is at the heart of all foreign assistance activities—human capacity development. By actively disseminating this information, G/HCD could have a significant impact on making the best use of the Agency's huge investment in training.

G/HCD should consider a redefinition of its role and functions in improving the effectiveness and impact of human capacity development through training. G/HCD's mission would be to improve the quality of training by serving as a source and clearinghouse of knowledge of best practices. In doing so, G/HCD should also consider redefining the means through which this mission is accomplished, moving from an entity responsible for establishing norms and procedures for these processes in the Agency, toward becoming a service provider, providing field support for upgrading the quality of training provided by USAID grantees and contractors. Given the burden of work of field missions, simply issuing more guidelines about effective practices is unlikely to receive the attention and action required. Mission personnel often do not have time to read even technical materials directly related to their programs.

G/HCD might consider this mission in the broadest concept of technical communications that takes into account the technical assistance function. Technical assistance and training are tightly intertwined; at a certain point, they become virtually indistinguishable from one another. It is at the intersection or combination of these two functions where G/HCD can make a great contribution.

It is in this area where G/HCD can most effectively perform this facilitative role. The pervasiveness of training and technical assistance in the USAID program

makes this a particularly effective strategy for focusing on the quality of development programs. In terms of organizational development, this would be considered a highly leveraged point of entry into the management process. More effective practices in these areas would go a long way toward strengthening USAID programs.

The implications of this definition of roles need to be worked through. The crucial consideration is probably resources. The central challenge of providing central services in the reengineered USAID is establishing a sufficient core of services to build expertise and develop a supply of quality services that can respond to a growing demand. The inefficiencies of the system with no core and all buy-in were described above in the section about the GTD mechanism.

USAID needs to reconsider how to provide technical services efficiently, particularly those services which do not fall neatly into a single SO framework. This may require a degree of core funding of services. The concept of demand driven services is one that is generally supported by the assessment team as appropriate and effective. However, in some cases, the burden of procuring and paying for services that will improve the process rather than the content of SO work may prove to be a serious obstacle. Field staff require direct support and services more than additional ideas, however good, about how to implement training. Without sufficient core funding for providing technical support services, G/HCD may find it impossible to achieve efficiencies of scale and to develop effective response mechanisms. This is a big hurdle to overcome. To whatever degree it is possible, G/HCD should consider the following possible directions:

- Define G/HCD's role as knowledge broker for effective practices in training and technical communication of innovation. Focus on the broadest issues of communication of innovation, transfer of knowledge and skills, and intercultural consulting in the development context. Use this knowledge to provide guidance and assistance in enskilling USAID and partner personnel in key areas such as on-the-job training, workforce development, technical assistance, and training.
- Aggressively extend G/HCD's current expertise in participant training to improve third country and in-country training. Some needs identified in the field included facilitating administrative processes (third country maintenance allowances and insurance, for example), developing databases and tools for assessing and strengthening training providers in third countries and in host countries, developing models of institutional development of training providers, brokering partnerships to develop sustainable capacity, providing organizational strengthening training and technical assistance for training providers, and conducting training in effective practices. Substantially increased emphasis on issues of in-country training, reflecting the fact that this represents over 90 percent of USAID training *and* is the point of greatest integration with technical assistance.

- Expand and refine the Best Practices guidance to include issues about adult learning methods, teaching tools, financing of sustainable training services, and other issues appropriate to the in-country programs. Create user friendly guides for all areas. Recognize that much of this knowledge resides with a variety of experienced TA contractors and PVOs as well as G/HCD's traditional training contractor partners. Collect this information and market to an expanded audience.
- Expand the Best Practices guidance to include the broader issues of the training discipline, such as performance consulting, organizational development, and the unique aspects of training in an international development context.
- Extend the interaction of the G/HCD training staff and staff involved with new technologies such as Internet, distance education and training, and computer-based training. This is an area where missions need and demand assistance, and which may offer some of the greatest potential for new approaches and cost effective impact. Share current mission experiences in promoting Internet graduate education courses with U.S. and third country institutions. Provide a short course in innovation in technology around training.
- Improve the communications about all G/HCD activities. The lack of real knowledge about G/HCD mechanisms and services is a constraint to full utilization.
- Focus efforts on assisting missions to establish a local source of expertise in these areas. Emphasize the strengthening and enskilling of the remaining training officers. Alternatively, work with missions to identify local or contractor experts who could serve as resources for promoting good practices.
- Assist missions in developing streamlined monitoring or impact evaluation systems that measure quality and effectiveness of inputs.

## IV. Recommendations

The assessment team would like to preface the recommendations with two general thoughts that might usefully serve as guidance for G/HCD in utilizing this study.

First, in one of the many interesting and insightful interviews conducted in this study, a senior technical advisor in one country noted that this type of study often results in a profusion of new regulations and guidance to help missions fix the problems encountered. He strongly suggested that USAID resist the temptation to respond with a “fix.” We believe that this is useful advice.

Second, the assessment team can offer recommendations and observations in two categories. The first category revolves around the question of how the current system works and how to make it better. The SOW for this study tilted in this direction, and many of the specific observations and conclusions reflect this orientation. We hope that these observations are helpful. The second area is to encourage G/HCD to consider these findings as an opportunity to engage in internal, thoughtful discussions about the role of training in USAID and to challenge the existing assumptions. In this context, the assessment team does not have answers, as the issues themselves go to the heart of the objectives of foreign assistance, the purpose and structure of reengineering, and to what is practical and useful in the current reality of USAID. The core question in each area is not necessarily whether it can be done better, but whether it should be done at all. The biggest challenge in any reengineering is recognizing when one is inadvertently fine-tuning a mechanism that is no longer useful. We encourage G/HCD to explore these issues.

With this in mind, the following summarizes the suggestions of this study.

### **Strengthen G/HCD’s role in the following areas:**

- Review G/HCD’s role and activities with a view toward making the center an effective technical resource for improving the quality of training and technical communication of innovation.
- Pursue opportunities to make G/HCD a knowledge and skills clearinghouse for effective intercultural transfer of knowledge, skills, and attitudes through more effective training. Raise the level of awareness about the importance of improving the quality of these processes, and provide tools and information for missions to do so.
- Assess and pursue opportunities to orient G/HCD support services more strongly toward in-country and third country training.
- Develop programs to support and professionally strengthen the training officers or other individuals who can serve as key technical resource



personnel in missions. Promote and encourage models for achieving this goal.

- Encourage horizontal field-to-field sharing and communication to promote empowerment.
- Improve communications about G/HCD services, policies, and mechanisms.
- Review opportunities for stronger linkages with the technology projects and actively encourage mission experimentation with new technologies in their training activities.
- Provide technical assistance to missions and contractors in developing appropriate monitoring and evaluation measures for the contribution of training. Such systems should emphasize monitoring the quality of training activities in order to improve them.
- In any new contract for GTD-like services, explore the use of contracting modes currently in use within USAID that are easier and quicker to access.

**Consider changes in the ADS 253 regulations, including:**

- Create mechanisms for agile, rapid response procedures for very short programs of 10 days or less, including reducing medical and insurance requirements.
- Expand the informational elements of the ADS documentation to make implementation of training easier, including third country maintenance allowances, selecting TCT providers, etc. Where possible, consider more schematic, graphic formats for presenting the information and offer more examples and templates.
- Create a central clearinghouse on the Internet for missions to share information about allowances, practices on purchasing computers and extra clothing, follow-on allowances, and similar areas where mission now have latitude for decisions.
- Expand Best Practices guidance and support information to include more issues of direct relevance for third country training and in-country training.

**Review ways to make the GTD IQC mechanism more cost-effective and agile, including:**

- Information dissemination to improve the use and agility of the IQC, including education about the benefits of full service contracts and guides for management and contracting under the IQC.

- Develop a mechanism, either through GTD or an alternative, that will provide the same type of flexible and simplified access that was available through the PIO/P process with PIET
- Assess the relative cost of GTD and alternative mechanisms for implementing participant training.
- Encourage smaller countries to join together as GTD clients and achieve economies of scale.
- Encourage contractors to localize GTD to the extent possible, and encourage at least a one-time TDY for an informal assessment of training needs and joint planning
- Simplify the administrative requirements of the contract
- Assess alternative ways to provide core funding and enable contractors to achieve economies of scale.

**Review the Implementation Plans for TraiNet:**

- Improve communications about the Agency mandate to collect and report on training information. Emphasize the distinctive nature of the requirement and the importance of full mission and contractor support in the process.
- Provide better information and training support in the implementation and use of TraiNet. Additional emphasis should be placed on the management use of the tool at the mission management and SO team levels. Increase the amount of face-to-face training in the management issues.

**Review the application of gender goals:**

- Encourage a message from USAID top management reiterating the Agency objectives in gender and how they are to be managed consistent with the SO framework
- Collaborate with the WID office in developing examples of ways that mission leadership has contributed to achievement of gender goals. Offer best practice strategies to achieve gender goals in training.

## **Annex A—Mission Profiles Matrix**

The following table provides selected data which the assessment team collected during its 12 country visits. As the team promised confidentiality, names of the countries, programs, and individuals are not provided.

Assessment of USAID Training

	Mission A	Mission B	Mission C	Mission D
<b>Mission characteristics</b>	New Mission OYB \$30m Staff: U.S. FSN Partially reengineered	New Mission OYB \$20M Staff: U.S. FSN Strongly reengineered system, strong SO teams headed by FSNs.	New Mission OYB \$30m Staff: U.S., FSN Partial reengineering – some SO teams are strong, others not.	Existing mission OYB \$12m Staff: USDH 10 FSN – 50 Very reengineered mission.
<b>Description of training program and changes</b>	<b>Regional training project</b> \$1m U.S.: 136 TCT 78 U.S./TCT combined 214 Much of participant training is through this regional project. SO teams are not particularly strong and meetings between GTD, TA contractors, and SO teams are infrequent. TA contracts: unknown amount of training. Estimated that the GTD provides turnkey support for majority of these, and that the total numbers may exceed those managed directly by GTD.	<b>Regional training project, \$1.2m</b> U.S. 110 TCT 36 U.S./TCT combined 76 <b>TA Contracts:</b> About ½ of all participant training funded and managed through TA and grants. About 80 people per year participant training. Strong TOT orientation and local capacity development In country training: extensive in all SO's, all managed through TA contracts. AID/W contract with U.S. University 15-20 participants/yr in long term programs.	<b>Regional Training project</b> \$1m. Cross cutting SO. U.S. 91, TCT 40 In country 100-150 <b>Training in TA contracts:</b> No exact numbers, but 85% is in country and short term technical. About ¼ of all training is conducted this way. Often a TOT orientation. SO team leader estimates that some sort of training represents half of contract value. Grants: 2 cooperative agreements in democracy SO that send government leaders and media to U.S. and third countries. USAID/W grant to U.S. university trains 15-20 participants in long term programs.	U.S. training 6/yr TCT – yes, more than U.S., but no numbers ICT – included in all TA contracts. No data NGO co financing supports all SO teams. U.S. University has central funding to provide scholarships at the AA level. 10-20/yr.
<b>Management of training program</b>	GTD contractor with Resident office. Training attached to program office.	GTD contractor with resident office, HCDM committee headed by Mission Director.	GTD contractor with resident office. Program office is responsible.	FSN training officer, part time. No GTD contractor, TA contractors only.

Appendix A—Mission Profiles Matrix

	<b>Mission A</b>	<b>Mission B</b>	<b>Mission C</b>	<b>Mission D</b>
<b>Relation to SO</b>	SO structure relatively recent. Little communication between GTD and SO teams. GTD mainly serves as processor of participants. However, all respondents believe that training is linked to objectives.	GTD staff are members of all SO teams. HCDM review of training requests places strong emphasis on link to SO and results.  Strong SO structure in mission.	SO team effectiveness is variable. But training is generally seen to be an effective element of reengineering and to make contributions.  Two exceptions to SO impact. Mission uses training to start new initiatives that lead into new SOs. Also, the USAID/W training program is isolated from the mission program.	Mission is leader in reengineering, effective SO teams. So training is directed in this context
<b>Monitoring, evaluation, and indicators</b>	Regional monitoring and evaluation, no indicators for training.	Regional monitoring and evaluation. Contractor has conducted local impact assessments using students	Regional monitoring and evaluation. Contractor conducts some impact assessments.	Few formalized systems.
<b>Perception of G/HCD services and policies</b>	Little knowledge of G/HCD activities or services.  ADS 253 knowledge is limited to GTD contractor, who thinks it is a little clearer.	Little knowledge of HCD activities since bureau is main contact.  ADS 253 knowledge in program office and GTD contractor. Updated, mission specific mission order	Little knowledge of G/HCD activities – rely on bureau for information.  ADS 253 knowledge is in the GTD contractor.	Only FSN is aware of HCD. Little knowledge in mission about relationship to G/HCD.
<b>Gender Equity</b>	Program officer requires that each training activity have 50% female participation. Have achieved 48% participation.  Disabilities: not part of program.	Gender – good overall record, about 40%, although no specific mission strategy. The selection is driven by SO objectives.	Gender in GTD program – close to 50% goal. Data not available for other training programs. It is believed to vary widely, selection is driven by SO objectives.	Exceeds 50%, but no systematic data collection, so it is an estimate.

Assessment of USAID Training

	<b>Mission A</b>	<b>Mission B</b>	<b>Mission C</b>	<b>Mission D</b>
<b>Notable programs</b>		<p>Multi-year and multi-level training programs in which each training activity leads to another. Year one train the top leaders, year two train the specialists in each office.</p> <p>Formal HCDM process to link training to SO results. GTD and TO provide training to SO teams and contractors.</p>	<p>Often combine U.S., third country, and in country training in a single program.</p> <p>Some U.S. training programs include leaders on same problem from different institutions to develop teams and contacts.</p>	<p>Mission has had a major program to strengthen NGOs that worked largely through training. It also helps 35+ targeted NGO to do better training.</p>
<b>Issues</b>	<p>Concern about transfer of GTD contract management to HCD.</p>	<p>Concern about transfer of GTD contract management to HCD.</p>	<p>Concern about transfer of GTD contract management to HCD.</p>	<p>Medical exams and insurance are major constraint for short-term programs for high level participants.</p>
<b>TraiNet</b>	<p>Isn't the idea of reengineering to get rid of this level of reporting? Considerable skepticism about value of TraiNet – seen as burden.</p>	<p>As a pilot mission, they have started use. Each contractor is responsible for data input. Generally positive about having the information, although the management use is unclear beyond knowing the numbers.</p>	<p>Little knowledge of TraiNet. Would find general knowledge of what training is being done valuable, but not sure how to use it.</p>	<p>No enthusiasm for TraiNet. Benefits are not clear.</p>

Appendix A—Mission Profiles Matrix

	<b>Mission E</b>	<b>Mission F</b>	<b>Mission G</b>	<b>Mission H</b>
<b>Mission characteristics</b>	<p>Large, growing mission.</p> <p>OYB \$85m, DA \$32m</p> <p>Staff 142 after significant downsizing.</p> <p>Strongly reengineered</p>	<p>Former large Mission</p> <p>OYB \$36m</p> <p>One of largest staffs in world, now in downsizing phase.</p> <p>Strong reengineered system.</p>	<p>Large Mission</p> <p>OYB \$150m</p> <p>Staff: 11 USDH, 36 FSN</p>	<p>Large mission since 1970s.</p> <p>OYB – 850m</p> <p>Staff: approx 75 USDH</p>
<b>Description of training program and changes</b>	<p>No firm trainee numbers available.</p> <p>Large-scale in-country training across all SOs</p> <p>U.S.: est. 15/yr. s-t</p> <p>Third country: est. 15/yr. s-t.</p> <p>No U.S. academic</p> <p>Formerly had large U.S. training program; U.S. numbers dramatically lower</p> <p>GTD contract; TA contractors also handle overseas training.</p>	<p>FY '97 figures:</p> <p>In –country: 69,000</p> <p>Third-country: 131</p> <p>U.S.: 4</p> <p>FY '98: in-country est. at similar level to '97</p> <p>U.S./TCT short-term: 108</p> <p>Academic: 30 AA per yr.</p> <p>Formerly had large U.S. training program; U.S. numbers dramatically lower.</p> <p>GTD contract, all SOs encouraged but not required to use.</p>	<p>Reliable figures not available.</p> <p>U.S./TCT – 15% or so, mostly in region.</p> <p>2 PhD candidates still in U.S. but no future LTA training anticipated.</p> <p>In-country, substantial</p> <p>Previously supported a large fellowship program, but eliminated due to budget, changing needs, reengineering. Brain drain</p>	<p>Mission training project trained 765 people in 97-98.</p> <p>65% U.S.,</p> <p>10% TCT,</p> <p>25% in country (GTD only)</p> <p>Academic programs included 5 PhD and MS</p>

Assessment of USAID Training

	<b>Mission E</b>	<b>Mission F</b>	<b>Mission G</b>	<b>Mission H</b>
<b>Management of training program</b>	<p>No training officer or unit;</p> <p>Training mgmt. Completely decentralized to SO teams; SO secretaries responsible for training support.</p> <p>GTD buy-in handles small amount of placement and monitoring; RCO serves as COTR, there is no single technical GTD backstop.</p> <p>TA contractors manage large amounts of principally in-country but some overseas training as well.</p>	<p>HRD activity under mgmt. of 3 person training unit provides core funding and a variety of buy-in services to SOs, including GTD, in-country training and local capacity-building. Training staff is housed in SO 1 but participates on all SO teams.</p> <p>Strong mission emphasis on training; training is cross cutting and mission supported, but under SOs.</p> <p>GTD contractor with no resident office provides wide array of services, including in-country training.</p>	<p>Program office has a program assistant assigned half-time to coordinate training. There is a Mission Training Working Group (TWG) with representatives from each SO and relevant offices.</p> <p>Contractors deliver all training and deliver project training plans for USAID approval</p>	<p>USAID has HCD office and USDH HCD officer managing a centralized training contractor (CTC). Responsible for all participant training and much of the in country training .</p> <p>TA contractors can implement in country or can channel through the CTC</p>
<b>Mission orders and training plans</b>	<p>Draft mission order being prepared in simple format. No annual planning.</p>	<p>Mission Order has been updated with specific mission guidelines, simplified guidance.</p>	<p>Updated mission order assigns training to SO teams. a Mission Training Working Group reviews training. Training plans are done for each activity.</p>	<p>A comprehensive Mission Order for Training is in place</p>
<b>Relation to SO</b>	<p>Role of HRD in SO plans varies greatly.</p> <p>Awareness of function is greater in contractors than in SO teams.</p> <p>Link to impact is the key conceptual block.</p>	<p>All training is initiated and directed by SO teams. Linkage to SO goals is direct.</p> <p>High awareness of training as key input to SOs.</p>	<p>All training is part of SO goals and managed by SO teams.</p>	<p>Mission has a special objective for human capacity development</p>



	<b>Mission E</b>	<b>Mission F</b>	<b>Mission G</b>	<b>Mission H</b>
<b>Monitoring, evaluation, and indicators</b>	None under current system.	Formal monitoring and evaluation system with exit interviews and 6 month follow-on.	Training is not monitored or evaluated at the SO level – only by the contractors at the activity level. Some contractors monitor training, others do not.  SO team focus is tracking results, not inputs, and training is considered an input.	Monitoring and evaluation is a responsibility of the GTD contractor, which tracks performance improvement results. A 90 day participant performance review and work unit performance review after one year.
<b>Perception of G/HCD services and policies</b>	<p>Little knowledge of G/HCD activities or services.</p> <p>ADS 253 knowledge resided in former training officer, who trained SO secretaries in essential procedures.</p> <p>ADS and G/HCD perceived as regulation driven – not reengineered. Lack of awareness and mistrust of G.</p> <p>GTD's advantages not evident to SO teams; perceived high cost and management burden on SO teams.</p>	<p>Training unit draws on best practices and extends them with own experience.</p> <p>Varied mission perceptions of ADS: 1) ADS is not reengineered, regulations regarding medical exams criticized; 2) ADS is less process oriented than HB10, and concept of single source of training expertise is good.</p> <p>GTD given mixed review, positive for assistance with regs. and logistics; concerns with cost and loss of technical depth resulting from hand-off to a training generalist rather than TA contractor.</p> <p>One SO team is buying into USIA for invitational travel, Rather than using GTD.</p>	<p>Have received training from G/HCD which was well received, in part because it was no cost. G/HCD is seen as more flexible than OIT was.</p> <p>Some SO team leaders have little contact with G/HCD, and see training regulations as regressive, pre-reengineering, rigid, obstacles.</p> <p>Compliance issues and ADS 253 are seen as a contractor responsibility.</p>	<p>Minimal interaction with G/HCD staff – primary emphasis is using the GTD contractor.</p> <p>Contractor has full knowledge of ADS, but SO's feel that it is too inflexible, too many rules.</p> <p>Perception that ADS is totally incomprehensible and a step down from HB10.</p>

Assessment of USAID Training

	<b>Mission E</b>	<b>Mission F</b>	<b>Mission G</b>	<b>Mission H</b>
<b>Gender Equity</b>	Former, strong commitment to equity. Currently, not aware of gender balance in training. In some SO areas, candidate pool is largely male, in others, largely female.	Mixed success. Gender equity is not the foremost issue in determining training activities. Focus is on results and driven by SO considerations.	Not seen as something that can or necessarily should be influenced. Appropriate trainees are those occupying the key jobs.  Disability - NA	The CTC reported 32 percent were female trainees.
<b>Issues noted and recommendations</b>	<p>Despite extensive training activity, there is generalized lack of awareness of importance of training as input and resulting lack of management attention.</p> <p>Budget constraints and concern with cost of GTD in some SO offices.</p> <p>Lack of mission support for training support and logistics is noted by some SO members.</p> <p>Key issue where assistance is needed is monitoring and evaluating impact.</p>	<p>Several staff recommend simplification of medical exams and insurance regs. to increase agility and responsiveness to their needs.</p> <p>Questions about value of TraiNet.</p> <p>Training unit has been very successful in utilizing acquired HRD expertise and lessons learned to redefine its role and services in a re-engineered environment. TO could be of assistance to other TOs and missions.</p>	<p>ADS 253 is confusing. It should be organized by the three types of training and provide more specific guidance.</p> <p>Focus on training of trainers should be a Best Practice</p> <p>The separate treatment of training as distinct from technical assistance is inappropriate</p>	<p>ADS 253 and Best Practices should be reviewed to make them more comprehensible and user friendly. The change from a prescriptive approach in Handbook 10 to generalities in ADS 253 have discouraged use of ADS 253.</p> <p>Capabilities of local providers should be improved. Local Training providers should be interviewed, particularly trainers, before selecting them</p>
<b>TraiNet</b>	<p>Mission technology staff are familiar with TraiNet and ready for it.</p> <p>Other staff doubt that the system will be used. SO teams are not enthusiastic.</p>	<p>Concern about the labor requirements to manage TraiNet. Are looking forward to capacity to include training agreements and goals into the system and easily generate reports.</p>	<p>Mission is familiar with TraiNet and believes that it will be useful as a database. Staff are very skeptical about use for planning and evaluation.</p>	<p>The CTC has provided training to TA contractors. The CTC and the TA contractor are responsible for data input and the Mission's HCD has the overall responsibility for maintaining TraiNet.</p>

Appendix A—Mission Profiles Matrix

	<b>Mission I</b>	<b>Mission J</b>	<b>Mission K</b>	<b>Mission L</b>
<b>Mission characteristics</b>	<p>Small mission OYB \$26m Staff: USDH 8 PSC 5 FSN 34</p>	<p>Traditional Medium sized field mission, but with most programs dating only from 1993. For almost 20 years activities were restricted by civil unrest.</p>	<p>Small Mission Traditional country OYB \$20m Staff 9 USDH 4 SO</p>	<p>Medium sized in a new country. Will close in 2005 OYB: Staff: Four Sos. Estimate that 70% of OYB is invested in education and training.</p>
<b>Description of training program and changes</b>	<p>U.S. 30/yr TCT – about 70/yr Academic – 2 MPH  The number of participants to U.S./TCT has not been reduced in recent years.</p>	<p>Overall Mission statistics not available. Available data: Since 1993, 139 U.S., 105 in country (21 long term academic and 223 short term). 1998 – Health 7 U.S. MS participants 30 long and short-term U.S. participants, 75 TCT, at least 500 in country. Note: some double counting may be included.</p>	<p>Relatively traditional training program, in terms of focus on individuals 19 U.S. long-term academic; 30 short-term technical In-country training—no reliable data, but thousands Less emphasis on long term academic training, more on incountry Local providers used as much as possible Some PVO activities focus on TOT ATLAS program about 5/yr</p>	<p>Overall statistics not available. HRDA ended in 1998, contractors were GTD and a PVO. Statistics: U.S. 43, TCT 92, in country 289. PVO stats: 28 U.S., 19 TCT, 323 in country. Follow-on project being designed. ATLAS, a G project for long term U.S. scholarships, places about 20/yr. Basic education: 34 grad degrees with LT distance ed program with TCT and U.S. affiliation. (includes 5 PhD) ICT – 2,000 teachers trained with Peace Corps assistance</p>

Assessment of USAID Training

	<b>Mission I</b>	<b>Mission J</b>	<b>Mission K</b>	<b>Mission L</b>
<b>Management of training program</b>	<p>The training office is located in the Program Office and is staffed by one FSN, reduced from 4 in 1997.</p> <p>The GTD contract is used for U.S. and TCT does not have a local presence.</p>	<p>Training Unit and GTD contractor, non resident, handles U.S. training. However, there is no system for management of training, other teams do not have to work through the training unit, and many manage directly.</p> <p>All of the programs have an emphasis on capacity building and increasingly the mission is promoting development of local training capacity.</p>	<p>Training officer, long time staffer, moved from program office to SO 2, and is responsible for programming all overseas training.</p> <p>GTD contractor handles U.S. TO handles TCT. Contractors handle in country. When contractors manage participant training, they must work through TO</p> <p>The TO is on all SO teams.</p>	<p>Various. SO 1 team leader and 2 assistants are responsible for GTD. And ATLAS. Other SO teams responsible for own training. Turf battles.</p>
<b>Mission Order and training plans</b>	<p>New Mission Order incorporating "reengineered" training concepts is in draft.</p>	<p>Mission Order exists, but predates ADS253. Training plans are prepared annually.</p>	<p>Mission order is outdated, but is being redrafted.</p>	<p>Best practices followed, but not emphasis on institutional performance and stakeholder agreements</p>
<b>Relation to SO</b>	<p>Training is not a separate SO. It is an integral part of all SO activities.</p>	<p>Training is not a separate SO, but the mission is considering making it one as part of an HCD strategy.</p> <p>The training unit is not part of the SO teams.</p>	<p>Training is key to all RPs and all have training funds apart from contracts, mostly for overseas training</p> <p>No training or HCD SO</p>	<p>Each SO team responsible for own training.</p>
<b>Monitoring, evaluation, and indicators</b>	<p>Some IRs are stated in terms of training outcomes. Follow-up and evaluation are primarily satisfaction measures except in health/pop where there is some 10-15% follow-up in some projects.</p>	<p>Training is measured in terms of intermediate results, such as improved diagnosis of AIDS and improved quality of primary school education.</p> <p>There has been some impact assessment of U.S. training activities, but it is limited.</p>	<p>GTD contractor monitors in U.S. No evaluation.</p>	<p>Different in each SO. SO 3 has M&amp;E person, tracking satisfaction, application, impact, IR.</p>

Appendix A—Mission Profiles Matrix

	<b>Mission I</b>	<b>Mission J</b>	<b>Mission K</b>	<b>Mission L</b>
<b>Perception of G/HCD services and policies</b>	G/HCD is perceived as helpful when called upon. ADS is seen as too much of a departure from Handbook 10 in that it does not cover TCT sufficiently. Training unit knows and follows ADS. Cannot comply with Best Practices due to time constraints.	Training unit is familiar with Best Practices, but does not believe that they are consistently applied. Stakeholders agreement shave been difficult  Training unit is familiar with ADS 253 and applies for the participants who are managed directly.	Have had good response from G/HCD  ADS seen as not user friendly. Some grantee and contractors not aware and do not follow ADS	Mission has used G/HCD for technical assistance in education, trianing, and trainnet.  ADS 253 – difficult to find answers, mainly for U.S.  TraiNet – has received substantial G/HCD assistance.
<b>GTD and services</b>	Mission is frustrated with the GTD mechanism –time consuming contracting and disruption to training schedules, too much work required by the contractor, the high cost and the poor quality of programming.	The RCO and Mission like the GTD mechanism.  The RCO wants to be able to negotiate direct costs, like salaries.	GTD mechanism is time consuming and difficult.  Rigid, MAARDs are more complex than PIOP. The PIET system was more efficient.	GTD mechanism is awkward, delivery orders are difficult to use for long term activities.
<b>Issues</b>	Want help with allowances for TCT.	Mission is very concerned about non returnees from U.S. training – lost 10 last year		Needs help with ATLAS deans committee, which rejects candidates
<b>Gender Equity</b>	The cultural position of women and their lower education status mean that they are poorly represented in external training and training that requires a high educational level. The mission has an innovative Empowerment of Women SO that covers literacy, legal rights/advocacy and microenterprise training.	Cultural barriers make this difficult, but the mission was to include more women. Data does not exist on current status. No women are on selection committee.	Meets 50% target for both overseas and in country. Active advertising for women.  Had one disabled person trained under ATLAS	Not seen as a problem, but the proportion was only about 25% even in GTD contract Some SO areas are easy. Some were not aware of gender equity issues

Assessment of USAID Training

	<b>Mission I</b>	<b>Mission J</b>	<b>Mission K</b>	<b>Mission L</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>		Send us your people and money. Make training and education a priority for USAID. Tell us the plan for TraiNet.	<p>Help find health insurance for TCT</p> <p>Faster response to mission queries</p> <p>Simple guidelines for ADS</p> <p>Guidebooks for predeparture orientation</p> <p>Better references – Petersons</p> <p>Update training course info</p> <p>ELT testing should be mission responsibility</p> <p>Better training in GTD mgt</p> <p>Focus on improving local training capacity</p> <p>CO should require contractors to follow ADS</p>	<p>Deans committee for ATLAS rejects candidates.</p> <p>GTD is awkward mechanism, delivery orders for tasks are awkward for longer term activities.</p>
<b>TraiNet</b>	Time constraints have prevented switching. Frustrated by the obligation to learn a new system	Training unit is not aware of G/HCD plans for TraiNet. They believe it will be better than PTMS.	Do not have TraiNet but are expecting that it will be useful for R4 reporting. Need training and assistance in it.	Has received G/HCD assistance. GTD contractor will input all data. Mixed views in Mission about utility and relevance.

## Annex B—Practices: Overview

The Interview Guide is structured by topic to allow ease of application. The topics move from the general, mission level concerns to the more specific, technical issues of particular training activities. However, not all of the questions listed may necessarily be asked of all respondents, nor must the questions be followed sequentially. Team members should use judgment and flexibility in determining the appropriate sequence and selection of questions depending on the person being interviewed.

*Team members may, of course, augment the topic list. A section entitled "other themes, topics and findings," is provided at the end of each guide to accommodate these discussions. In particular, feel free to expand recommendations/suggestions as well as formulate additional questions to specify success factors in the most successful programs.*

At the conclusion of each team's field work, a report will be prepared presenting the team's findings. The information gathered during interviews will be consolidated into a country report for each mission visited, consisting of two parts: one, a narrative of the status of the Missions overall training portfolio, in terms of management processes, changes, and recommendations, in a common format. The other will consist of a minimum of three detailed case studies describing the elements of successful individual programs: one U.S., one third country and one in-country.

The protocol consists of the following elements:

- Interview guide structured from general to specific issues. Not all questions are appropriate for all respondents, but all issues should be answered to complete the profile of the country program.
- Additional specific questions for training officers and training contractors.
- Matrix to map the current training program by type, location, and provider. This data should reflect the 1998 program unless otherwise stated.
- Case study format for more in-depth review of at least three specific training activities (workshop, course, seminar, etc.).

## Introduction to the Interview

**Purpose:** to understand how Missions are managing training activities since reengineering and how Agency support systems are contributing or can contribute to more effective training programs.

*This is not an evaluation of the training programs of this mission. Rather, we are seeking general trends, issues, policies, practices and illustrative stories that can frame future discussions and policies governing USAID training.*

**Scope:** The assessment covers all U.S., third country, and in-country training conducted within training projects, technical assistance contracts, NGO/PVO activities, or other mechanisms that contribute to Mission strategic objectives. We are seeking information on several levels: management perspectives on how training is being used as a strategic input; SO team perspectives on how training is planned, managed, and evaluated to achieve results; training contractor and TA contractor perspectives on implementing effective training; and some case studies of training activities.

**Training:** A planned intervention by organizational or independent professionals to solve identified performance gaps through the acquisition and application of new skills, knowledge, or attitudes (SKAs). These are acquired either via structured learning and follow-up activities, or via less structured means. Training can consist of long-term academic degree programs, short- or long-term non-degree technical courses in academic settings, non-academic seminars, workshops, on-the-job learning experiences, or observational study tours. (Chapter 253)

**Methodology:** The G/HCD Assessment will include a selection of 10-12 missions from all regions and at least two USAID/W Bureaus. This is a rapid assessment, based on literature review, key informant interviews, and analysis by a multi-disciplinary team. *All interviews are confidential and Mission Profiles are anonymous.*

**Products:** Written assessment submitted to G/HCD before January 26, 1999.



# Interview Cover Sheet

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Mission or Bureau where interview is being conducted:

\_\_\_\_\_

Name of interviewer(s):

\_\_\_\_\_

Name of interviewee(s):

\_\_\_\_\_

Title(s) of interviewee(s):

\_\_\_\_\_

- Mission Management
- SO Team
- Training Contractor
- TA Contractor
- PVO
- Host Country Official
- Participant

Brief description of training-related job responsibilities held by interviewee(s):

Length of service in current post/position: \_\_\_\_\_

## INTERVIEW GUIDE

### I. Current Training Activities

1. **Overview:** Volume, Types and Total Cost: What training was conducted in 1998?
2. **Changes/Trends:** How has the training program changed over the past several years?
  - Type (academic/technical)
  - Location (U.S., TCT, in-country)
  - Time (long term short term)
  - Type of short-term (study tours, courses, customized programs)
  - Profile of participants
  - Number of participants
3. **Causes of Trends:** To what do you attribute these changes? (i.e., reengineering, budgets, country needs)
4. **Technology:** Is distance learning or technology used? Do you consider this a viable training mechanism for your needs?
5. **Local Providers:** Does the Mission utilize local training providers? To what extent is quality an issue?
6. **Local Training Capacity:** Is institutional strengthening of host country training providers a goal? If so, what is done? Are there linkages with host country or regional partners?

### II. Role of Training in SO

7. **Significance to SO:** How significant is training to each SO in terms of volume, cost, and impact contribution? How are training activities linked to intermediate results?
8. **Training/HCD SO:** Does the Mission have a Training or HCD SO? For what is it used, e.g., to supplement and support existing SOs, to do training that cuts across SOs, to develop new SOs, to respond to political needs.

9. **Indicators:** What types of training-related impact indicators are included in the R4?

### III. Management of Training

10. **Mission Management Mechanisms:** How is training managed in the Mission? (USAID office, contractor, PVO, TA contractors?)

- Is there one source of support and technical expertise available for all mission training (U.S., third country, in country)?
- Contractors – what training management services do you provide? (training plans, strategy, articulating training objectives, establishing success indicators, assistance in trainee selection, identifying the provider(s), evaluation)?

11. **Assess Mechanisms:** Are these mechanisms useful and easy to use? If GTD, what are the pros and cons and how can it be improved? Is it better or worse than in the past?

12. **Changes in Mechanisms:** How has this training management system changed since 1990? What caused these changes (budget, reengineering, needs?)

*Are these changes for the better or worse? What aspect of training has been most affected by reengineering?*

13. **Roles and Responsibilities:** What is the responsibility of the SO teams for training?

*How do SO teams and contractors work together in planning, implementing and evaluating training?*

*How does the USAID training officer relate to SO teams and contractors?*

*If there is a GTD contractor, what role (if any) does it play on SO teams?*

14. **Training Plan:** Is there an overall training plan for the mission or each SO? How are decisions made (by whom) in developing this plan?

15. **Mission Order:** Is there a Mission Order for Training? Does it apply to all training? Is Mission staff familiar with it?

*Ask for a copy!*

## IV. Monitoring/Evaluation

16. **Monitoring and Evaluation:** How is training monitored and evaluated? Are IR related training objectives and indicators developed for each SO?
17. **Evaluation:** To what extent are the following measured, and by whom?
- trainee satisfaction and mastery of learning objectives
  - application of training within the beneficiary organization
  - institutional impact
  - contribution of training to IRs.
  - development and implementation of Action Plans
18. **Use of Evaluations:** How is training evaluation data utilized?
19. **Assess Reporting:** Is the mission satisfied with the quality of reporting on training? How could this be improved?
- What is the most useful way to measure and report on training impact?

## G/HCD Support and Policies

20. **Use of G/HCD:** How does the Mission draw on G/HCD support? What is useful? Do you have any suggestions for how G/HCD can assist the mission in managing its training and achieving better results?
21. **ADS 253—Awareness and Utility:** Is the guidance in ADS 253 applicable and applied to all mission training? Is it helpful? How might it be improved to be a more useful working tool for the mission?
22. **Record Keeping:** How do you currently maintain records of U.S., third country, and in country training?
23. **TraiNet:**
- Are you familiar with the TraiNet system that will replace the PTMS next year?
  - How useful will it be to you?
  - Does a central training information system serve your needs? Is/could TraiNet be used to improve management?

## V. Quality and Impact (Best Practices)

24. **“Best Practices”—Awareness and Utility:** What is your impression of the Best Practices as outlined in ADS 253? To what extent is Best Practice guidance useful and used?

Do you use these to guide and monitor training impact?

25. **Complementary Inputs:** In your opinion and in the context of your country—what factors most contribute to a trainee’s ability to apply the skills and knowledge acquired through training?

26. **Availability of Complementary Inputs:** To what degree are these factors present in the Mission’s current training portfolio? How are they monitored and evaluated?

27. **Assess Use of Selected Practices:** With regard to Mission training, rate the *relative attention* paid to each of the following elements of training with a scale of 1-4, where:

1 is never or almost never (0–10%); 2 is fairly often (11–50%); 3 is usually (51–80%); and 4 is almost always (81–100% of the time).

- collaboration with beneficiary institution in planning, design and post-training application;
- training focuses on institutional performance issues;
- formal trainee selection procedures are in place to ensure the right people are selected;
- training objectives are known and agreed to among all stakeholders, including the trainees;
- “stakeholder agreements” used
- training methodology is application-oriented, dynamic and participatory;
- systems to monitor the quality of training;
- trainees going overseas receive a predeparture orientation;
- trainees prepare Action Plans;
- post-training follow-on activities, to include assessment of whether and how training is applied;

- post-training assessment of institutional impact;
- sharing and utilization of evaluation data among stakeholders;
- participation of women in training programs;
- cost monitoring measures and cost effectiveness;

## VI. Concern About Cost

28. **Cost Effectiveness:** Does your mission have any strategies for improving cost effectiveness of training?
29. **Cost Containment:** What does the Mission do to control training costs?
30. **Importance of Cost:** How do cost considerations affect decisions about training?

## VII. Issues of Gender and Disability

31. **Importance of Gender Issue:** How are you addressing the issue of gender equity? What steps are taken to ensure compliance with Agency goals and ADS 253 targets (50%)?
32. **Difficulty of Addressing Gender:** What difficulties are experienced in meeting these goals and how does the Mission address them?
33. **The Disabled:** Are there any measures to ensure the participation of the disabled in training programs? What issues and obstacles does the Mission face in making training opportunities available to the disabled ?

## VIII. Trends and Recommendations

34. **Trends:** What trends you do see in training in the future?
35. **Recommendations:** Overall, what recommendations do you have for improving training? What additional support or resources might be necessary to improve the quality and impact of training?

36. **Lessons Learned:** Are there particular methods, strategies, or management practices in your Mission that you feel are particularly innovative and worthy of replication?
37. **Other Questions we Should Have Asked:** Other themes, topics and findings.

## **Training Provider and Contractor Extra Issues**

1. To what extent do you believe that the training methodologies of the Mission's programs overall reflect good adult pedagogical practice: i.e. they are action-oriented, dynamic, participatory and democratic rather than traditional lecture-based, teacher dominant, and theoretical? If this is an issue, what suggestions do you have for improving training methods?  
  
Can you identify specific training activities that best illustrate one or more of these effective training practices for adults?
2. How does your training address institutional sustainability issues, capacity building, or empowerment of local institutions?

## **Training Officer Extra Issues**

1. How do you relate to the SO Teams and TA Contractors?
2. What role, if any, do you play in managing in-country training?
3. How has your role changed with reengineering?
4. What has been the impact of the change from OIT/PIET to the new decentralized system? What has been the impact of the change in ADS from a prescriptive, procedure oriented system to devolving decisions to the field? Is ADS 253 easier or harder to use than the previous documentation (HB 10) for managing training?

## Case Study Questionnaire

Criteria for selection:

- Venue: one U.S., one third country, one in-country
- Time: having taken place within last three years
- Select programs that are in a “mature” stage and have had time to apply a learning curve
- Select, if possible, a program that has created or increased in-country training capacity

### Elicit Information on Each of the Following

#### I. Program Description

- A. Title of training activity
- B. Context of training: SO or systemic problem(s) that training addressed
- C. Specific training objectives and topics
- D. Dates of training
- E. Number of trainees and trainee profile
- F. Venue of training, training activities and methodology (ex: “over the 3 week period the trainees observed court proceedings and interviewed American counterpart judges and prosecutors in Illinois and Massachusetts to learn arbitration and oral argument procedures....”)
- G. Training provider and names of collaborating organizations
- H. Other program components or features if present (i.e., follow on visits, distance learning etc.)



**II. Program Impact and How Measured (include specific impact indicators if available)**

**III. Noteworthy success factors: what elements made this program particularly successful?**

- A.** perceptions of greatest strengths/weaknesses/most significant contributions to SO's/greatest opportunities to improve training
- B.** Stories/anecdotes that illustrate some significant features of the training activity

**IV. Lessons learned and implications for replication to other programs**

## **Annex C—Synopsis of Recent Training Evaluations and Studies**

This section is a review of recent evaluations and studies about training in USAID to determine how they have addressed the questions of the G/HCD Worldwide Assessment of training. The issues reviewed are the following:

- Description of the training involved (objectives and scope, participant, in country, third country, project related training, long term/short term)
- Application of “best practices” from ADS 253, G/HCD, and other sources
- Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation
- Achievement of Strategic Objectives
- Reengineering impact on roles and responsibilities in Mission
- What policies and procedures can the Agency implement to support training

The documents reviewed are the following:

- Training as a Development Tool, Cecilia Otero USAID, 1997
- Participant Training Project for Europe (PTPE), Final Report, Aguirre International
- Human Resource Development for Africa (HRDA) Evaluation, AED
- Strengthening the Human Capacity Development Strategy of USAID/El Salvador, Aguirre International
- Development Training II Project, USAID/Egypt: Monitoring and Evaluation System, Aguirre International
- Training for Development: Review of Experience, John Gillies, Academy for Educational Development

## **Training as a Development Tool, Cecilia Otero, Research and Reference Services, USAID, 1997**

**Purpose:** To serve as a guide to USAID strategic objective teams as they seek to reengineer training activities and contribute to SOs. It is to help field staff to clarify their function in SO teams and examine useful strategies to adapt to their programs.

**Content and Focus:** The study includes a section on theory of training for results, summarizes three key evaluation models (Kirkpatrick, Brinkerhoff, and HERNS), and presents five case studies of integrated training programs supporting different strategic objectives. While the focus is primarily directed at participant (overseas) training, the content and case studies also are relevant to in-country training. There is no distinction between training-only projects and training that is conducted as part of technical assistance activities.

**Main points:** The central point to the paper is that training should be planned, implemented, and evaluated to accomplish specific results. A comparison is made between traditional participant training and reengineered training which emphasizes the shift from training that centers on individual growth to training that contributes to improved performance on the job or in partner organizations. This shift of focus affects planning, definition of objectives, selection, design, evaluation, and the role of training specialists in missions.

The three evaluation models presented are all similar in that they seek to assess all stages from the quality of the training program through results and impact. The Kirkpatrick model, which is the grandfather of them all, is the only one which does not explicitly address the planning side of the equation. The paper also discusses establishing indicators of impact that are direct, objective, adequate, quantitative and qualitative, and practical.

**Case Studies:** Five case studies are presented for training activities in support of economic growth, democracy, health, education, and training. All five of these case studies focus primarily on a limited number of training activities and seek to assess their impact. Each of these case studies is assessed in terms of the points of interest of the G/HCD study.

### **USAID/Central Asia**

*SO:* Support a competitive market oriented economy.

*IR:* Improved, more sustainable business operations.

*Description of Training Program:* Three U.S. based economic restructuring training programs, lasting five to six weeks each. The groups were senior executives and government officials from a cross section of ministries. The

learning objectives were general knowledge about market economies and the government role in supporting them, leadership skills, and the advantages of privatization.

*Application of Best Practices:* These training programs were implemented prior to the issuance of ADS 253, but reflect the best implementation practices learned by the contractor. The programs are not substantially different from previous training programs in that the objectives focused on skills rather than performance change.

*Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation:* The NET project included a full evaluation component, with arrival, exit, and follow-on questionnaires as well as debriefing interviews. The evaluation focus was on tracking the activities of the returned participants and general reported levels of impact such as “effecting policy decisions that support free market development”. The M&E process also tracked multiplier effect as participants trained others.

*Contribution to SO.* The M&E success stories showed a broad contribution to development in terms of specific business ventures of the participants and general reports of influencing policy decisions. In addition, a number of follow-on seminars were conducted in Tajikistan on economic reform and privatization.

*Reengineering Organization:* No specific changes were noted. The USAID mission contracted with a U.S. firm for all aspects of program management.

## **USAID/Bolivia**

*SO:* Social base of democracy broadened and governance strengthened

- IR:*
1. Key elements of rule of law become more transparent, efficient, effective, accountable, and accessible.
  2. National representation becomes more responsive to constituent needs.
  3. Local governments effectively respond to citizen needs and demands.

*Description of Training Program:* Short-term training programs in the U.S. to follow up and support prior AOJ training in Bolivia. The programs had very specific training objectives: 1) learn and practice oral prosecutorial skills, including jury selection, evidence collection, interrogation, and public defense; and 2) hands-on skill and knowledge development in alternative dispute resolution (ADR), such as conciliation, mediation, and arbitration techniques. In both programs, participants were expected to introduce these approaches into their institutions. The group consisted of judges, prosecutors, public defenders and mediators who actively advocate reform.

*Application of Best Practices:* Training model developed for CLASP program was used with five key elements: (1) training objectives defined with focus on results by SO teams and partners; (2) candidates are selected for role as change agent in support of the results; (3) action plans and team building start in predeparture orientation; (4) Intense, tailormade, short-term training programs built around

carefully selected groups; and (5) follow-on programs facilitate multiplier impact, results achievement, and networking.

*Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation:* Not discussed.

*Contribution to SO:* The defined objectives of the program were accomplished. Legislation on arbitration was approved in 1997, a conciliators manual was developed and distributed, support committees were formed to promote ADR, judges applied oral prosecutorial skills and increased pace of case resolution, and returned participants conducted workshops and seminars and published articles and manuals to achieve multiplier effect.

*Reengineering Organization:* Not discussed specifically. The case study does mention that SO teams are working with partners to define objectives and select participants.

### **USAID/EI Salvador**

*SO:* Sustainable improvements in health of women and children achieved.

- IR:*
1. Increased use of appropriate child survival practices and services
  2. Increased use of appropriate reproductive health practices.
  3. Enhanced policy environment.

*Description of Training Program:* A comprehensive U.S. training program designed for 110 participants from the health ministry, Social Security Institute, and NGOs in five separate groups. Participants were primarily mid-level managers and the objective was to provide them with technical skills necessary to design and implement health delivery programs. They were exposed to different models of health care administration dealing with role of NGOs, decentralization, HR management, financial management, health economics, MIS systems, and other topics.

*Application of Best Practices:* The USAID/Salvador mission has established eight steps for implementing training: strategic planning, needs assessment, specific purpose, training design, selection of participants, training, follow-on, and monitoring/evaluation. These steps are shared responsibilities of the training unit and SO teams, and heavily reflect the best practices and HERNS project recommendations on training. The USAID training strategy was developed with the assistance of HERNS consultants to draw on the lessons of the CLASP program.

*Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation:* A M&E system is established in the USAID, but the nature and process of this system is not described in the case study.

*Contribution to SO:* The Mission reports a range of specific improvements in the system, from the improved performance of individual administrators and doctors to improve feedback systems, public relations and feedback, linkages with NGOs, and joint working arrangements. Many of the individual participants have

benefited through promotion. The social security institute initiated internal training and a decentralization of authority program. The broad impact is that a new vision for health care delivery is being created that addresses not only administrative procedures, but also service strategies. The lynchpins of this system are a client-centered approach; emphasis on preventative medicine, and an increased emphasis on collaboration with NGOs.

*Reengineering Organization:* The implementation of the program is dependent on a close collaboration between the training office and the SO teams. The lessons of the past have been built into the Mission SO/IR packages and emphasize three main training indicators: 1) training applying elements of training in the workplace (percentage); 2) training with increased responsibilities (percentage); and 3) training action contracts executed within six months of training (percentage).

### **USAID/Morocco**

*SO:* Increased basic educational attainment among girls.

*IR:*

1. Increased responsiveness to girls educational needs
2. Increased community involvement in girls' education
3. Reduced operational constraints to girls' participation in primary school.

*Description of Training Program:* In support of the girls education project, the Training for Development project developed a training plan to improve the teaching methodology in rural areas and make the system more responsive to the needs of the regions. The program consists of a series of in-country training interventions that take place over a two year period to provide educators with the skills to develop teaching objectives, adapt relevant curriculum, and manage multigrade classrooms. The training group consists of primary school teachers, inspectors, directors, and faculty at the teacher training college. In effect, this is a large scale in-country training of trainers program for the educational sector.

*Application of Best Practices:* The training strategy have five components that reflect Best Practices, which are: 1) assessment of HR constraints and performance gaps; 2) identification of skills and knowledge needed to fill the gaps; 3) identification of training results and impact indicators; 4) establishment of Witness Schools to serve as control groups; and 5) development of a mechanism to collect educational data.

*Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation:* USAID/Morocco established a series of indicators that measure the skills, knowledge and attitudes of the participants as well as the broader impact on educational quality through the number of schools offering an improved multigrade curriculum. The indicators include: evaluation strategies to identify pedagogical objectives adapted by teachers; management skills of inspectors and ministry staff; creative and practical action plans developed; quality and quantity of managing training increased; improved specific skills, and awareness of gender sensitive issues. The program also established a

control group of schools that will not receive any assistance as part of the M&E system. Data is collected using the ED\* Assist educational statistics system.

*Contribution to SO:* The linkage to the SO is very direct as the training is fully integrated into an SO package. The results are not included in the review.

*Reengineering Organization:* This is not specifically addressed in the case study. However, it appears that the USAID has contracted specialist training services that support participant and in-country training as needed.

## **USAID/Namibia**

*SO:* Enhanced roles for historically disadvantaged Namibians in public and private sector and NGOs.

- IR:*
1. Increased number of disadvantaged Namibians acquiring enhanced managerial and technical skills.
  2. Improved access for trained disadvantaged Namibians to technical, managerial, and leadership positions.

*Description of Training Program:* The Reaching Out with Education to Adults in Development (READ) program is a combination of grants, training, and TA to NGOs to deliver services and education to disadvantaged adults. The training component of this program has provided training to over 400 participants in a workshop series, sectoral workshops, conferences and seminars. The primary focus of the training has been to increase the technical qualifications of NGO personnel and to train them as trainers. The two main workshop series were for institution building and training of trainers. They were both built on an institutional assessment, action plans based on the results of the assessment data, and project development. There was also a Master Trainer program to strengthen the NGO's abilities to continue offering the seminars, and the support of a trainers network.

*Application of Best Practices:* The READ program incorporates many of the best practices, including a focus on specific organizational performance gaps and training needs, and development of specific organizational and training objectives. It was also particularly interesting in that the objective of developing an on-going training capacity was explicit and built into the program.

*Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation:* The M&E system is not directly discussed in the case study. Impact reporting included tracking of promotions and increased responsibilities for the participants, as well as specific training activities that they have accomplished.

*Contribution to SO:* The tracking of improved positions and increased responsibilities responds directly to the IR measures. More directly, the sub-IR goal of developing the local training capacity is well documented.

*Reengineering Organization:* Organizational structure is not directly discussed.

## **Participant Training Project for Europe (PTPE) Final Report, Aguirre International, January 1998**

**Purpose:** To respond to monitoring and evaluation concerns of ENI Bureau about the implementation and impact of the various activities under the PTPE project from 1994–1997. PTPE was a centrally funded and managed training program that provided CEE countries with participant training resources through various mechanisms. The major mechanisms included implementation contracts with PIET with in-country offices (short-term U.S. training), Georgetown University (medium and long-term non-degree U.S. training), USIA (long term undergraduate training), cooperative agreements with 17 U.S. organizations, and other activities.

**Content and Focus:** The PTPE program trained over 4,000 individuals from all of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe in a wide range of areas supporting SEED Act goals. Much of this training was focused on individuals or types of skills needed by countries in transition. Only the PIET programs were jointly managed with the USAID Missions. The goals were defined in broad terms of supporting economic restructuring and democratization.

**Main Points:** The final report included all quantitative measures of program accomplishment and a number of success stories from different missions. The major recommendations were in support of the program changes already underway in the ENI Bureau, which would make the transition to results oriented training that directly supported strategic objectives. This would require changes in the way that both the training and training support contracts are conceptualized and implemented, including: increased coordination and collaboration with resident technical advisory contracts; increased emphasis on defined organizational or sectoral objectives; and increased use of contractor technical personnel as a resource for strategic planning of training activities, as well as for administrative support.

*Description of the Training:* All of the training was U.S. participant training. The training was in all sectors and ranged from two weeks in length to over two years. Although generally intended to be non-academic, some participants did receive degrees.

*Application of Best Practices:* Best practice application varied considerably among the different contractors. The contractors with lengthy experience with USAID participant training programs, such as PIET and IIE, had very well managed programs that reflected the lessons of previous years. Many of the other contractors had little experience with participant training and did less well. The Best Practice aspect that was least well applied in all programs was the emphasis



on defined results, organizational needs assessments, and links to strategic objectives.

*Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation:* The PTPE program had a strong M&E element built into the project that sought to answer a range of questions about the quantity and quality of training. The evaluation process focused on two aspects of the program: implementation of the training process and achievement of development impact. The process evaluation was managed through mid-term and exit questionnaires and review of contractor operations. The impact assessment was conducted using follow-up questionnaires and selected in-country interviews. In view of the wide variety of training activities (in all sectors, ranging from 2 weeks to 2 years) and the variety of goals, the evaluation was structured to measure generic levels of impact (individual, workplace, organization, sector, national).

*Achievement of Strategic Objectives:* The program evaluation and reporting did not directly relate back to strategic objectives, which were only gradually introduced into the CEE missions during the implementation of the program. Also, since the majority of the training activities were contracted and managed from USAID/W, the linkages to mission objectives were indirect

*Reengineering Impact on Roles and Responsibilities:* This was not specifically addressed in the report.

## Human Development Resource Assistance Project (HRDA) Evaluation, Academy for Education Development, 1995

**Purpose:** The HRDA evaluation was conducted as a pre-design document for the HRDA II program under development. This is an interesting program to assess, because the Best Practices series originated with the HRDA program. The goal of the evaluation was to assess progress to date, provide suggestions for improving the management, and provide insights for the successor project.

**Content and Scope:** HRDA provided support for participant and in country training in all USAID missions in Africa, as well as technical assistance for needs assessments, training strategies, and other planning tools. The training was in support of all program objectives. HRDA started in 1987 and pre-dated the strategic objectives planning system.

**Main Points:** The evaluation report recommended developing stronger linkages to mission strategic objectives, establish more explicit institutional strengthening objectives, and increase host country participation. The report also proposed a management structure for HRDA that provided technical expertise more directly to the missions, and established the training officer as a professional technical position rather than a logistical support position. The paper also recommended that missions develop a country training strategy that is integrated into the country strategy and would guide implementation of training in all projects. A primary recommendation was that the goal of strengthening African institutions be explicit both as an implementation strategy as well as a program objective.

*Description of Training:* The HRDA project estimated that over 42,000 people would be trained by the end of the project, over 90% of them in short-term in country training activities.

*Application of Best Practices:* The Best Practices review grew out of the experience in HRDA, and therefore were found in various country programs. While the experience varied from country to country, the research to identify best practices and the distribution of the lessons learned was an important step in improving program implementation.

*Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation:* The HRDA program supported on-going evaluation at all levels, as well as the mid-term and final program evaluations. This evaluation involved questionnaires to all USAID missions in sub-Saharan Africa, interviews and focus group meetings in Washington and ten African countries, and a literature review.

*Achievement of Strategic Objectives:* This report did not attempt to measure achievement of strategic objectives at either the mission or bureau level. It did

## Assessment of USAID Training

promote a stronger linkage of the new project activities to mission level objectives.

*Reengineering Roles and Responsibilities:* This report pre-dated the development of Strategic Objective teams and the reengineering management structures and practices.

## **Strengthening the Human Capacity Development Strategy of USAID/EI Salvador, HERNS, Aguirre International, 1994**

**Purpose:** The study was conducted to research Mission experience in implementing participant training in traditional and CLASP programs, to determine the most effective practices, and to incorporate these into a strategy for the new mission strategic objectives.

**Content and Scope:** The study conducted a review of international training, an assessment of traditional participants, an assessment of CLASP participants, and a review of the comparative costs of training.

**Main Points:** CLASP type training has greater impact than does traditional training activities and is less costly. Effective training must be built on relevance to the trainee's responsibilities at work, must involve multiplier training, must be appropriate for the technical and cultural environment, and must include continuing professional development and support. The report recommended that U.S. and third country training be combined with in-country training for more impact, and that very short participant programs are usually more costly than bringing in an expert for in-country training.

*Description of the Training Involved:* The research was focused entirely on participant training, primarily in the U.S.

*Application of "Best Practices:"* The best practices addressed in this study were from the CLASP program, which had an on-going monitoring and evaluation system designed to improve implementation of the program. The lessons drawn from the study emphasized using a total learning experience to develop change agents, by using an integrated approach (combining technical and administrative skills), a participatory approach, and by building a sustainable program by involving stakeholders.

*Approach to Monitoring and Evaluation:* The study insists that regular monitoring and evaluation involving a range of stakeholders is critical to ensuring that training expectations are met.

*Achievement of Strategic Objectives:* This study was completed before the strategic objective management structure was finalized.

*Reengineering Impact on Roles and Responsibilities:* This study was completed prior to the reengineering emphasis in USAID.

## **Development Training II Project, USAID/Egypt: Monitoring and Evaluation System, HERNS, Aguirre International, 1995**

**Purpose:** To develop a conceptual and operational plan for an M&E system for the Development Training II Project.

**Content and Scope:** The M&E plan combines a process for planning results oriented training and evaluating the accomplishment of the intended results. This system can be used for participant, third country, or in-country training as needed by the mission. The Mission would determine the extent to which this system would be only used in the DT II project or would be a support service available to other mission contractors. The M&E staff would serve as in-house technical assistance on planning and implementing results oriented training. The report also includes sample procedures, reporting formats, and evaluation instruments.

**Main Points:** Planning and evaluation are part of the same process. The effective use of training depends on a clear connection between the training activities and the program outcomes desired. The key events that link training to outcomes are planning, implementing the training, applying new skills, achieving individual performance improvement, and achieving institutional performance improvement.

The other aspects of the G/HCD study are not directly addressed in the proposal. The implications of the project design for M&E illustrates a way of structuring mission-wide technical assistance to training for all contractors.

## **Training for Development: Review of Experience, John Gillies, Academy for Educational Development, 1992**

**Purpose:** To share experience and lessons related to the design, implementation, and evaluation of training programs in USAID and other donors since 1960. The study seeks to identify design and implementation measures that increase the broader development impact of training.

**Content and Scope:** The study reviews over 100 evaluations, reports, and studies about participant training to draw lessons from experience. The paper presents a conceptual model for training for results and reviews lessons in program planning, project design, implementation, evaluation, and mission management of training. The primary focus is on participant training in the U.S. and third countries.

**Main Points:** A wide range of specific lessons and experiences are shared in each section, the majority of which deal with conducting more effective training. The common theme throughout is the importance of having clearly defined objectives at the organizational, institutional, and project levels in order to focus the training efforts. The study also notes that many of the lessons are not new, but management systems are often not adequate to apply what is known about effective training on a consistent basis in all projects. In order to achieve these improvements, training staff need to contribute to project design and implementation as well as logistical support.

The other aspects of the G/HCD study are not directly addressed in this report. This study predates the reengineering program by about four years and the Best Practices report by several years as well. The Best Practices exercise drew on many of the lessons in this report.