

PDHAE 962

EVALUATION  
10/24/82

# 2-Way Memo

Subject: DAT II Evaluation

DATE OF MESSAGE
10/24/82
DATE OF REPLY
<b>INSTRUCTIONS</b>
Use routing symbols whenever possible.
<b>SENDER:</b> Forward original and one copy. Conserve space.
<b>RECEIVER:</b> Reply below the message, keep one copy, return one copy.

To: 

[ Ann Domidion  
NE/TECH/HRST  
AID/Washington  
D.C. 20523  
U.S.A. ]

5027-101

-FOLD- USE BRIEF, INFORMAL LANGUAGE -FOLD-

We are re-submitting the attached document (DAT II Evaluation). Please confirm receipt. Thanks.

November 3, 1082

Thank you for sending a duplicate copy. We have not received the original as yet. I'll let you know when I receive it for your info.

  
Ann M. Domidion  
NE/TECH/HRST  
6754 Main State  
AID/W

From:

[ Daniel L Leaty,  
Program Officer  
USAID/Jordan ]

1. TO BE RETAINED BY ADDRESSEE

# 2-Way Memo

Subject: DNT II Evaluation

DATE OF MESSAGE <b>10/6/1982</b>
DATE OF REPLY
<b>INSTRUCTIONS</b>
Use routing symbols whenever possible.
<b>SENDER:</b> Forward original and one copy. Conserve space.
<b>RECEIVER:</b> Reply below the message, keep one copy, return one copy.

To:  
→

Ann Domidion  
NE/TECH/HRST  
AID/Washington  
D.C. 20523

5027-101

USE BRIEF, INFORMAL LANGUAGE

Attached is a copy of a USAID/Jordan internal evaluation done in December, 1980. There is no record here that it was forwarded to AID/W. In our response to the PRC review of the DNT III PID reference is made to this report and we state it will be forwarded under separate cover. Our cable response to the PRC comments should depart here today or tomorrow. In any event here is the report we make reference to.

From:

Daniel L. Leaty  
Program Officer  
USAID/Jordan

3. TO BE RETAINED BY ORIGINATOR

OPTIONAL FORM 27  
OCTOBER 1962  
GSA. GEN. REG. NO. 27

THE DAT II PICTURE  
DECEMBER 80

The report to follow offers a brief evaluation of DAT II from its inception to September 30, 1980. The point of the exercise is to determine the extent to which project results to date are in accord with the objectives as outlined in official project documents, the PP and the Grant Agreement. Of course, at a fundamental level, DAT II simply perpetuates the spirit and intent of USAID/J's twenty-eight year venture into providing education and training opportunities for Jordanian nationals: that is, it seeks to assist the GOJ in meeting its needs for trained personnel in areas critical to the continued success of Jordan's economic and social development programs.

Where DAT II differs from its predecessor, which in fact was not grounded in a project paper at all, is an attempt to shift from informal to more rationalized methods, from ad hoc arrangements to carefully spelled-out procedures in the implementation of the project. In some cases, this simply meant putting in writing past practice, in other cases there was an attempt to introduce real modifications. Basic to the effort was defining with the NPC certain clearcut objectives both parties might work towards during the life of the project to the end of assuring optimum responsiveness to perceived training needs. The PP sought to clarify and improve three areas. First, in selection procedures, DAT II delineated the roles and responsibilities of USAID/J and the NPC as well as stipulating qualifications candidates must have in order to be offered a grant. Secondly, the PP designated priority categories of training and sought to underscore an on-going shift from long-term degree training to short-term practical. Finally, USAID/J and the NPC agreed upon the necessity of improving follow-up activities. At the very minimum, it was considered useful to effective decision making on future participants to keep a careful log of returned participants, their evaluation of the training experience and their current positions within the GOJ.

## Selection Process

Under the heading "selection process" three areas were emphasized. The first, evaluation of course/program offerings, highlighted a continuous exchange of information and ideas on training matters between the NPC and USAID/J. The USAID was to evaluate the numerous training announcements it receives and forward to the NPC those worthy of further consideration. The NPC, on its part, was to participate in periodic reviews with USAID/J staff to determine current training priorities.

A second subsection within the selection process category stipulated the criteria a candidate must meet in order to be chosen for a training grant. Meeting program prerequisites and demonstrating English language skills were givens. A new note was introduced in requiring, along with a candidate's cv, a statement detailing how the proposed training fits in with an overall ministry/agency staff training plan. The USAID Training Office developed a simple questionnaire, as a kind of interim measure, to encourage the ministries/agencies to view an individual participant's training as a part of a larger plan for staff development. Finally, two "suggested" factors in eligibility were mentioned. First, it was deemed preferable that a candidate had not received a previous participant training grant. Secondly, it was stated that "special consideration will be given to qualified women candidates".

The third area, the review of a candidate's qualifications leading to decisions to accept or reject, was again stipulated to be a joint process with equal inputs from both the NPC and USAID.

How has all this worked in actual practice? From the USAID side, the Project Committee has been the key element in the selection of participant trainees. The Committee has met for the most part once a month; over the past year anywhere from 5 to 22 applicants were reviewed at a single meeting. This process resulted in a total of 18 rejections and 50 acceptances. (Rejections = 36% of total) The most common reasons for turning down a candidate were 1) because

the request did not fit in with USAID/J program objectives and 2) because the candidate was a previous recipient of a training grant.

On 10/30/80 a meeting was held at the NPC with Salem Ghawi, Zain Bakheit, and Safwan Qasim (and on the USAID side Lois Ricahrds, Nasr Nasr and Paula Harrell) to review the mechanism of selection as well as to discuss how to go about conducting the required annual report on DAT II. On the first matter, Mr. Ghawi indicated a desire on the part of the NPC to participate more actively in the final decision making on candidates. He seemed to feel that in certain cases the NPC position was not sufficiently heard or heeded, that the NPC's disposition to send a candidate was simply overruled in the USAID/Project Committee's final meeting. The problem might be handled by adhering more strictly to the stipulations outlined in the project agreement (Annex I): "A final selection of candidates will be decided jointly by USAID and NPC personnel" and, on this basis, establishing a committee composed of representatives from the NPC and the USAID/J to make the final decisions on candidates. The function of the project committee, then, would be to formulate the position USAID would take at the joint meeting. A further responsibility the Project Committee might undertake is that of interviewing prospective participants. While not necessary or appropriate in some cases, a chance to meet and talk to the candidate might be the telling factor in others. An interview is stipulated in the Project Paper as being part of the standard selection process.

At the aforementioned meeting with Mr. Ghawi, a question was raised about the usefulness of the questionnaire on staff training accompanying each application. While Mr. Nasr cited one case where thoughtful, detailed replies were given, he said that, generally, responses were pro forma and of limited value. Mr. Ghawi concurred. The issue of how or whether to alter the questionnaire was left in abeyance. One suggestion might be to put a greater burden on the Ministry/Agency by asking such questions as how many staff members are currently on training programs abroad, how many are in-country upgrading programs, what are the projections on training for the following year, and what are the critical areas where training

is perceived necessary.

A major question for discussion at the October 30 meeting was how to proceed with the annual evaluation of DAT II. Mr. Ghawi suggested going beyond what was originally agreed to with USAID/J (see PP, p. 11): that is, simply to record the current position of the returned participant on an annual basis. Instead, he and his staff plan to develop a questionnaire and to conduct interviews with each of the 27 participants who are already back in Jordan after DAT II training grants. The questionnaire will be drawn up in consultation with USAID staff. It might be reasonable to consider this as a replacement for the follow-up questionnaire USAID currently has in use.

Who are receiving grants for what kind of training:

A total of 59 Jordanians received training under DAT II during the fiscal year 80.\* This included 9 extensions of previous AID grants and 50 "new starts". A breakdown by type of training shows 16 academic programs versus 43 in the practical category. The degree candidates included 11 for the M.A. or M.S., 4 Ph.D. aspirants and 1 seeking a B.S. in architecture. The vast majority of practical trainees were on programs of 1 month or less to 3 months duration (39). Only 2 were on 3-6 month programs and another two in the 6-12 month category.

---

\* The USAID/J Training Office arrived at the 59 total using the definition supplied by Washington in its CP guidance: "The number of participants shown on the CP table should reflect all those persons who are receiving training, both long term and short term, during a particular fiscal year, regardless of which year they are funded." In fact, a full accounting of participants to whom DAT II funds were committed ("subobligated") from July 1979 to date realistically might include: 1) 11 MOF participants and one from Jordan TV who were funded from DAT II but who completed their programs before the start of the fiscal year and 2) ten grantees with signed PIO/P's whose departure dates fall before the end of fiscal 1980.

The project agreement offered guidelines on broad categories of training consistent with GOJ development objectives and USAID/J program strategy. These were 1) manpower development 2) project planning, analysis, and management and 3) project maintenance. The actual training picture, September 1979-September, 1980 shows the great majority of trainees (45 or 76% out of the total 59) in the second category with particular emphasis on health, water management, public administration, and financial analysis. Both manpower development and project maintenance account for notably few trainees, 3 and 1 respectively. This is not an entirely accurate assessment of total USAID training, of course, because it does not consider trainees in these categories funded from the TA component of other USAID projects, example are the two VTC grantees funded last year from project 0238 and four JVA participants sent under project 0192. Nevertheless, the relative weight given to each category might be a worthwhile matter for the Project Committee to consider. For instance, there is a crying need for MOE personnel to be trained in guidance and counseling techniques, a possible entry to the manpower development category. Though a full 49 grantees are receiving training in areas appropriate to the above three categories, 10 participants, strictly speaking, fall outside these areas: Two Ph.D. candidates (University of Jordan and Yarmouk University) and two University of Jordan attendees of a summer course on epidemiology might come under a faculty upgrading heading. The rest, a candidate for an undergraduate degree, an M.A. candidate in international relations with the Ministry of Interior, and four grantees sent as part of the Jordanian delegation to the UN Conference are hard to categorise.

The spread of trainees by ministry agency shows a remarkable 27 receiving training funds with one representative from the private sector (one of the participants sent to the UN forum). By numbers of persons financed, the MOH came out ahead (7) followed by the MOE and NPC each with 5, and the University of Jordan (4) The picture shifts slightly if one considers instead the amount of funds committed. Here the MOE is first (\$41,044) then the DOS (\$33,646), and the NPC (\$31,415) and the RSS (\$28,859 or 6%). However, neither by number of persons financed nor by amount of

funds are there significant variations; that is, no agencies have a monopoly on training grants. Certainly, overall, one must conclude that the NPC and USAID/J are doing an effective job of making DAT II funds broadly available.

A total of \$29,000 was expended on two third-country programs. The first sent four participants from the MOH on a month-long tour to the Sudan to observe a schistosomiasis eradication program (\$12,200). The second funded four representatives to the UN women's Conference two-week session (\$16,800). No monies were applied to in-country programs. While programs like the one in Sudan which make use of regional resources are attractive because of their relatively lower cost and greater compatibility of conditions, the options at present are severely limited due to political unrest within the region. However, the in-country option might be one to seriously consider. For example, DAT II funds might be used to arrange for a U.S. guidance and counseling specialist to conduct a seminar for administrators/teachers in the new community colleges (MOE). Or again, an expert in repair and maintenance of electronic equipment might come out to Jordan to instruct at the NRA.

A breakdown of participants by sex offers a somewhat disappointing picture. Of the total 59 receiving training grants over the past year only 9 (or 15%) were women. Four of these, moreover, were not trainees at all but delegates to the Women's Conference. Approximately 16% of total funds under DAT II were applied to women. Whether this 16% figure realistically reflects the percentage of women in GOJ civil service positions mid-level and above would be interesting to consider further.

The current DAT II financial picture shows project spending going beyond the \$400,000/year noted in the estimated budget. Using PIO/P worksheet figures, the Training Office has calculated a total of \$584,308 committed during the last fiscal year. By contract, the recently issued status-of-project report from the USAID Controller's Office records \$533,454 under the heading "obligations"; the lower figure reflects adjustments in PIO/P's made on the Washington end.

Actual expenditures are listed as \$329,750. In the case of our group under scrutiny the 59 participants who have received or are receiving training during fiscal 1980, we find, (according to original PTO/P's) a total of \$447,848 committed to their programs. 47% of this amount was applied to academic (degree) training (for 27% of the participants). This is somewhat at various with the 35% recorded in the estimated project budget. A sampling of monthly costs for various programs seems to bear out the PP caveat (p. 16) " that these monthly cost estimates are merely illustrative and that actual costs vary greatly." For example, a 12 month course in electronic equipment repair at the U.S. Geological Survey (for an NRA official) was budgeted at \$1479/month/, a Bureau of Labor Statistics two month seminar on ~~R~~rice indices came to \$2,503 monthly; a 1 month health management seminar (University of North Carolina)=\$2,620/month; a 4 week international procurement seminar came to \$3,580; the two week NGO Conference in Copenhagen was \$16,800 for four or \$2100 perweek. Though there is quite a range here, generally monthly costs compare well with the estimated \$2,350/month for short term training. For long term, degree training the range appears to be between \$1,250 and \$1,650 per month as compared with a \$1,285 figure in the estimated budget.

#### Follow-Up

As noted above, the NPC has announced its intention to conduct a survey of DAT II returnees (27) to date for the purpose of assessing the usefulness of the training experience. A draft questionnaire is to be sent to USAID for comments and suggestions before NPC staff proceed with interviews. The launching of follow-up activities from the GOJ side is a welcome development. The USAID Training Office at present does not have the staff to handle both the processing of participants, a demanding task in itself, and a regular routine of tracking returnees.

#### Conclusion

DAT II is clearly an active, healthy project. USAID and the NPC have continued their very positive working relationship on training; the Project Committee is functioning effectively; trainees are being selected from a wide range of ministries/agencies in areas appropriate

to NPC and USAID development concerns. The few suggestions for improvements that derive from the above review evaluation are as follows: 1) revision of the training plan questionnaire to include more precise questions on staff development, 2) inauguration of periodic meetings with the NPC for the purpose of final review and decision on candidates, 3) greater vigilance regarding selection of women candidates, 4) more attention given to training programs that fall in the manpower development and project maintenance categories and 5) consideration of in-country training possibilities. On the all-important follow-up side, USAID anticipates with interest the results of the NPC's upcoming survey of DAT II returnees.