

Jane Hersée
President

Raja Klim (202) 797-0757

Much enjoyed our talk - here are the items I promised. Will call you next week. Jane.

RESULTS INCORPORATED
Management Counsel and Training

2006 17th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
U.S.A.

Cable: RESULTS
WASH DC

PCZ
*copy **

Raja Klim (E) 16

PN-AAS-789
ISN 40130

PARTICIPANT TRAINING IN
PROJECT DESIGN AND EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT

Presented to:

Dr. Dale Clark
SER/IT/PS
Department of State
Agency for International Development
Room 421, SA-8
Washington, D. C. 20523

February 28, 1977

Prepared by:

Practical Concepts Incorporated
1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., #200
Washington, D. C. 20036

Practical Concepts Incorporated, 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Suite 200, Washington, D.C. 20036, (202) 833-1040, Cable: Practicon

February 28, 1977

Dr. Dale Clark
SER/IT/PS
Department of State
Agency for International Development
Room 421, SA-8
Washington, D. C. 20523

Dear Dr. Clark:

With this letter, Practical Concepts Incorporated is pleased to submit its final report on the Project Design and Evaluation seminars provided to AID participants under Contract No. AID/otr-C-1377, Work Order #5.

PCI has appreciated the opportunity to work with AID in the development and conduct of these seminars. The participants proved to be interested in the subject matter and ready students of the concepts. The majority of the trainees both overseas and in Washington indicated to us that the techniques provided by the course had relevance for the projects that are developed and implemented in their home countries. As the report recommendations indicate, we at PCI consider the provision of this type of training to be both worthwhile and fully warranted, given the current needs for improved management procedures in many of the developing countries.

Should your office have any questions about the report, or should you wish to discuss further the recommendations provided therein, please feel free to call us.

Sincerely,

 
Molly Hageboeck
Director, Program
Evaluation and Analysis

MH:rh

Enclosure: Final Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
PREFACE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
SECTION ONE: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I-1
SECTION TWO: PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE	II-1
SECTION THREE: PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	III-1
SECTION FOUR: PROGRAM RESULTS	IV-1
SECTION FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	V-1
APPENDIX A: SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS	

TABLE OF TABLES

		<u>PAGE</u>
I-1	Summary: Overall Distribution of Participants by Region	I-2
I-2	Average Cost per Trained Participant by Geographic Region	I-2
III-1	Order in Which the Nine Seminars were Presented	III-7
III-2	Sample Agenda for the <u>Program Design and Evaluation</u> course for AID participants	III-9
III-3	Distribution of Participants by Country	III-12
III-4	Participant Representation by Region in the Washington Seminars	III-13
III-5	Participant Representation by Region in the Overseas Seminars	III-13
III-6	Summary: Overall Distribution of Participants by Region	III-13
III-7	Fields of Study of Washington Seminar Participants	III-14
IV-1	Summary of Incorrect Responses on True/False Tests for Five Seminars	IV-7
IV-2	Concepts that Proved Difficult for the Participants	IV-9
IV-3	Aspects of the Seminar Found Rewarding by Participants	IV-10
IV-4	Aspects of the Seminar Rated Negatively by Participants	IV-11

PREFACE

Practical Concepts Incorporated wishes to thank all of those individuals who provided us with assistance in planning and conducting the Project Design and Evaluation seminars for AID participants during this engagement: Mr. Dale Clark of AID/OIT, who monitored the contract; Mr. Robert Zeigler, who arranged for our use of the AID/Washington training facilities; the staffs of each of the USAID Missions that served as hosts for overseas training sessions; and the participants themselves. PCI's team appreciated the opportunity to assist AID in initiating a new direction in international training for project managers from the developing nations.

ABSTRACT

During 1976, Practical Concepts Incorporated, under contract to the Agency for International Development, provided a series of Project Design and Evaluation seminars for developing country personnel. 180 participants were trained in the Logical Framework approach used by AID during nine seminar sessions. Returned participants indicate in follow-up questionnaires that they are using the concepts to design projects in their home countries. In at least two cases the methods taught in the seminar are being used by organizations to which the seminars' participants returned.

SECTION ONE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. INTRODUCTION

During 1976, Practical Concepts Incorporated (PCI), under contract to the Agency for International Development, conducted a series of nine seminars in Project Design and Evaluation for AID-sponsored participants (Contract No. AID/otr/1377, W.O. #5). The seminar efforts undertaken by PCI during this engagement were global in concept. The seminar was taught on three continents, and in three languages. Each seminar was evaluated both in Washington and abroad.

The intent of the contract was not to provide seminars in each of the developing countries, or to reach all participants -- rather the contract was intended as a method of demonstrating Agency capability to provide this service should a demand for such training exist within the nations AID assists.

In undertaking this series of seminars, AID extended the opportunity to acquire and utilize these approaches to its participants, with the hope that application of these, or similar, logical design and evaluation concepts would extend the management reach of project and program planners in the developing nations.

B. PROGRAM RESULTS

A total of 184 participants registered for the seminars, and of those 180 completed the course. These participants represented 24 nations.

Four of the seminars were held in Washington, D. C., two were held in Africa and three were held in Latin America. Table I-1 shows the distribution of participants by geographic region.

REGION	TOTAL NUMBER TRAINED	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
LATIN AMERICA	86	47.8
AFRICA	74	41.1
NEAR EAST	7	3.9
ASIA	13	7.2
	180	100%

Table I-1. Summary: Overall Distribution of Participants by Region

The average cost per participant was \$349. Variations in the average cost per participant were a function of seminar site and of the number of trainees registered for the course. Because of the large enrollment for overseas sessions, the cost per participant overseas turned out to be lower than the cost per trainee in Washington as Table I-2 shows:

SITES	Average Cost of Seminar	Average No. of Trainees	Average Cost Per Trained Participant
Washington, D.C.	\$6,034.77	13.8	\$437.30
Latin America	6,401.65	26.0	246.21
Africa	8,290.44	23.5	352.78

Table I-2. Average Cost Per Trained Participant by Geographic Region

On seminar quizzes, participants consistently scored above 70% correct in their responses. The major difficulty participants encountered was with the time allotted to the seminar; some topics could not be covered in detail during the one-week program. Participants who completed the one-week seminar are familiar with the Logical Framework approach and have practice using it on teaching examples. They should not, however, be considered fully competent users of the approach. Course graduates are not generally prepared to teach the approach to others. Evaluation data from the project indicates that the participants responded positively to the methods taught in the seminar, and a follow-up evaluation of a small sample suggests that most of the trained participants have shared what they learned with their superiors and their colleagues.

Since the seminar series began, there have been at least two instances, that are directly traceable to the participant training seminar program, where the Logical Framework approach has been tried by organizations in developing countries.

C. CONCLUSIONS

Review of the results of the current series of seminars has led to the following conclusions:

1. Only a limited amount of training and skill development can be provided in a one-week seminar: participants who complete the course are familiar with the concepts but lack the depth of understanding and insights that only come from application of the concepts to a real project situation, and the breadth that comes from exposure to several real situations.

2. On-site evaluation will be required if AID is to fully assess the extent and quality of participants' use of the concepts and the degree to which host organizations have attempted to utilize them. The limited data available from follow-up on a small sample of participants and from information received informally suggests that:
 - The adoption of improved project design and evaluation practice by developing country organizations can be stimulated by training programs such as the type provided by AID under this contract;
 - Participant utilization of the concepts following the seminar appears to depend on participants' opportunities and diminishes with the amount of time that intervenes between completion of the course and the development of opportunities to use the concepts.
3. AID would be better able to serve its potential audiences for the project management training if it were prepared to adjust the length and coverage of the seminar to meet the objectives of the audience.
 - Overseas seminars are requested to serve a variety of objectives. Some requests require that both project design and evaluation be taught, others do not. In some requests the purpose is familiarization; while for others the intent is one of adopting the procedures. These varied requests should be met with seminars of appropriate length and coverage;
 - The Washington seminar would be improved either by reducing the number of concepts to be taught in a week or by lengthening the seminar to two weeks.

D. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on these conclusions, PCI recommends that AID:

1. Continue to make training in improved project management methods available to participants and to host government institutions;
2. Make its training program more flexible by allowing for the customization of the course to meet objectives of specific audiences. Increased flexibility in the training program could include:

- Separately listing and offering training in such areas as (1) project design, (2) project monitoring systems, (3) project evaluation, etc.
 - Encouraging requesting sites to identify the types of training and training depth required (e.g. graduates trained to a level of familiarization, or to a level of full competence) to meet local objectives, i.e. offer and recommend extended course (2-3 weeks) to include practical application as was done in Costa Rica with supplementary USAID/CR funds.
 - Customizing the case material to serve audiences in specific sectors. Depending on the nature of requests such customization could be achieved either by tailored selection of existing case materials or by using project examples from the trainees' organization or context.
 - Lengthening the basic course for Washington participants to allow both fuller coverage of basic material and time to pursue in depth those course areas in which specific training groups show particular interest.
3. Effect specific improvements in the course materials including: refinement of the training materials and manuals, and needed revisions in the second language translations;
 4. Refine the current approaches to scheduling of sessions including the timing of sessions for Washington participants, the AID commitment date for overseas sessions, and the advance preparation for all sessions of lists of registered trainees with their areas of specialization, and job responsibilities.
 5. Strengthen the evaluation regimes associated with the seminars and make provision for field follow-up evaluations that will allow AID to fully understand the extent and quality of participant and organization use of the concepts.

SECTION TWO

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

A. GENERAL

Practical Concepts Incorporated (PCI), under contract to the Agency for International Development, conducted a series of nine seminars in Project Design and Evaluation for AID-sponsored participants (Contract No. AID/otr/1377, W.O. #5). In addition to conducting seminars both in Washington and abroad, PCI has conducted evaluations of each of the training courses given during the contract period. This final report brings together descriptive and evaluative data on the seminars to provide AID with a summary of the effort and an assessment of its outcome. Additional detail on each seminar has been provided to the Agency in a series of interim reports that discussed the specific results of each seminar.

B. OBJECTIVES

In Washington, AID regularly provided Project Design and Evaluation seminars for its staff members. The Agency's Project Design and Evaluation approach is one that focuses on the logic of the development project, and provides an objective basis for assessing project performance. It is an Agency hypothesis that the application of rational project design and evaluation approaches will, over time, improve the quality and effectiveness of its social and economic development programs. In undertaking this series of seminars, AID has extended the opportunity to acquire and utilize these approaches to its participants, with the hope that application of these, or similar, logical design and evaluation concepts will extend the management reach of project and program planners in the developing nations.

The specific objectives of this engagement, as identified in the contract, are summarized in Figure II-1, a Logical Framework. As shown in the Logical Framework, the specific product, or "output", from this effort was to be measurable changes in participant understanding of, and ability to apply, the principles and procedures of the Logical Framework methodology.

The purpose of the contract, as shared by PCI and AID, was that participants would apply these principles and procedures to the planning and evaluation of their nation's development projects. While it was not expected that the limited number of seminars provided under this contract would be sufficient to develop a "critical mass" of knowledgeable participants from each of the developing nations represented -- it was however expected that in at least some countries, the impact of the seminar on participants would be sufficient to bring the approaches taught in the seminars to the attention of higher level management in the various ministries and departments of government. Ideally this process would result in a demand for further exposure to systematic design and evaluation procedures on the part of planning the adoption by these organizations of project management approaches that would increase the ability of the developing nations to predict and control the future course of their own development.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK
FOR
SUMMARIZING PROJECT DESIGN

Est. Project Completion Date 6/76
Date of this Summary 8/75

Project Title: Participant Training in LogFrame

Practical Concepts Incorporated

DEVELOPMENT HYPOTHESES
If Purpose, Then Goal
If Outputs, Then Purpose
If Inputs, Then Outputs
MANAGEABLE INTEREST

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
<p>Program Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes:</p> <p>LDC organizations formalize use of improved project design, management and evaluation techniques</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ministries, departments, divisions, etc., in developing countries formally adopt improved approaches being used by individuals or other organizations; 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow up of participants and review of organizations where they work. 	<p>Concerning long term value of program/project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Host countries will support improved or specially created design, management and evaluation units/divisions/organizations.
<p>Project Purpose:</p> <p>Participants in AID PDE training programs use LogFrame design and eval. concepts in their jobs on return to their countries.</p>	<p>Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 70% of participants effectively using Log Frame concepts 3/6 months after training (back in their own countries) 2. 30% of participants cause their colleagues to use the concepts 3/6 months after training. 3. Projects designed by or worked on by participants include provision for base-lines and evaluation appropriate to project 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Followup of participants (questionnaire) 2. " " " " " " 3. Review of project designs where possible 	<p>Affecting purpose to goal link:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LDCs place priority on improving design and evaluation practices. 2. Improved design and evaluation requirements are effectively implemented
<p>Outputs:</p> <p>Participants trained in Project Design and evaluation principles and procedures (LogFrame) in either English/French or Spanish.</p>	<p>Magnitude of Outputs necessary and sufficient to achieve purpose.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In 8 1-week training sessions, 168-192 participants trained by 6/76 2. 75% of participants per sessions show increased awareness of their roles & responsibilities for design, mngmt., & eval. 3. 65% of participants demonstrate increased knowledge of & skills in applying appropriate project design and evaluation techniques during seminar (linked hypotheses, EOPS, OVis, manageable interest, assumptions) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training records 2. Test to be designed and administered by PCI -- reviewed and monitored by AID/W 3. Test in 2 above. 	<p>Affecting output-to-purpose link:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants in position to affect project design & evaluation when they return home; 2. Concepts applicable to participants' frame of reference & environment; 3. Colleagues receptive to participants' new ideas; 4. 1 week training sufficient to ensure participants will be able to apply concepts effectively in own working environment.
<p>Inputs: Activities and Types of Resources</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop course content and supporting materials; evaluation & follow-up. 2. Select and enroll appropriate participants; arrange travel and PD and accommodation, etc. 3. Provide appropriate training facilities, equipment and supplies. 	<p>Level of Effort/Expenditure for each activity.</p> <p>PCI contract shows level of effort.</p> <p>SER/IT</p> <p>SER/IT</p>		<p>Affecting input-to-output link:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participants are available in sufficient quantities and interested in such trainings;

14

11-3

C. SCOPE

The seminar efforts undertaken by PCI during this engagement were global in concept. The seminar was taught on three continents, and in three languages. During the initial months of the contract, AID/OIT solicited requests for seminar sessions from all of AID's overseas missions. In its communications with the Missions, AID/OIT indicated that French and Spanish language seminars, as well as English sessions, were envisioned. Actual scheduling of seminar sessions was undertaken on a "first come - first serve" basis; seminar sites were thus selected by the Missions rather than in Washington. The intent of the contract was not to provide seminars in each of the developing countries, or to reach all participants--rather the contract was intended as a method of demonstrating Agency capability to provide this service should a demand for such training exist within the nations AID assists.

SECTION THREE

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

In the course of this engagement, PCI conducted nine Program Design and Evaluation seminars: four in Washington and five in Latin America and Africa. In this section of the report the program inputs are described: seminar preparations, and materials, as well as the seminar participants. The results of the program are the subject of the following section.

A. SEMINAR PREPARATIONS

Three tasks were included within the framework of seminar preparation:

- Development of materials, including seminar evaluation approaches;
- Scheduling and logistics;
- Pre-registration of participants.

Each of these preparatory tasks is reviewed below:

1. Development of Materials

As part of its preparation for the seminars, PCI undertook developmental activities in two areas: (a) training methods and materials, and (b) evaluation approaches.

a. Training Methods and Materials

As requested by AID, PCI's training program closely paralleled the Program Design and Evaluation course provided for AID's own staff. The AID training format: seminar lectures and workshops for the

trainees, used in the first session were, for the most part, AID slides and handouts. The only changes in course materials made prior to the first session related to the elimination of AID-specific "jargon" and procedural guidance. Following the completion of the first seminar, PCI reviewed the results of the effort*, and at that point modified the content and format of the seminar along the following lines:

1. Modular approach to teaching basic concepts:

Individual presentations were oriented more to a modular approach, wherein early presentations provided a condensed overview of key concepts which were explored in greater depth in subsequent workshops and presentations. For example, the early presentation on the Logical Framework Approach to Project Design and Evaluation briefly treated all important concepts, and was supported by follow-on presentations on Objectively Verifiable Indicators and a newly-developed presentation on Assumptions. Each presentation was developed to be self-sufficient, but linked with the other presentations. The modular approach permits greater flexibility in adapting the training course to the specific needs and interests of attendees without extensive modification.

2. Improvements to Handouts and Flip Charts:

The presentation flip charts and trainee handouts were modified to be more self-explanatory and "self-contained," facilitating review by trainees after the basic seminar. Previously the handouts had briefly summarized the key points and were designed more as speaking points for trainer verbal elaboration. More text, and more specific examples, were added to

*PCI reviewed the results of this first seminar together with evaluative data on a similar session it had conducted under a separate contract for Ministry officials in Thailand.

the handouts. Modifications to the flip charts would also facilitate greater "standardization" of presentations among different PCI presenters.

3. A Modified Approach to Treating Implementation--The first training session had one module on Networking, and another on Roles and Responsibilities in Design and Implementation. It was found that the time allotted to networking was insufficient for those with little previous exposure, and not useful to those with previous experience. In the second session, Networking was treated briefly in a new presentation entitled Project Implementation Overview--Tools Available to the Project Manager, which included networking along with other implementation tools. The Roles and Responsibilities module presented so few new concepts that it did not justify a presentation of its own, so key parts of it were combined into the Manageable Interest presentation. The agenda for the training session is shown in Appendix A.

4. Substitution of Major Workshop Case--In place of the Lothar Agricultural Project used in the first session for the set of evaluation workshops, PCI used the Africa Scholarship Project, an AID project during the 1960s which PCI evaluated. The case had been successfully used in Canadian training sessions, and PCI decided to use it in this training because of its richness from an evaluation perspective (the design of an evaluation plan, collection of data, analysis, etc.). Our analysis shows it to be equally as good (or better) as Lothar for conveying the required learning points concerning evaluation.

The content and format of the seminar, as amended following the first session, were utilized in the following eight sessions. A member of AID's Project Design and Evaluation training staff attended the second seminar. No recommendations for further changes in the course resulted from this review of PCI's modifications to the original curriculum. The training materials, in amended form, were translated into French and Spanish. Copies of these seminar materials and handouts in all three languages are provided, under separate cover, as part of this final report.

There are problems with both the French and Spanish translations of the training materials. The terms used in the Logical Framework approach can be used in several ways in the English language; within the Logical Framework approach these terms receive specific definitions. Translations of the system terminology to date has been quite literal. The translations were made by expert linguists; however, it appears that, for proper translations, a translator may have to actually learn the Logical Framework methods in order to develop appropriate second language terminology. While the effect of the translation difficulties was not so great as to impair the training sessions, equivalent terminology issues were a source of distraction to both trainers and participants. This was particularly true for the French version of the course and the sessions in Chad and Zaire. With the exception of the terminology issue, participants had no trouble with the training manuals or the associated reference materials. Participants regularly requested additional copies and supplementary written materials from PCI's trainers.

2. EVALUATION METHODS

Measuring changes in attitude and practice by participants in a one-week seminar is a complex task. One major problem is the development of valid and reliable instruments that accurately detect participant understanding of "good" design, management and

evaluation practice. A more difficult measurement problem is that of determining the degree to which participants are (1) able to apply the concepts they have learned, and (2) their "motivation" to actually apply these tools to real projects.

To address these evaluation issues, PCI during the course of the engagement, employed a total of six "measurement" procedures. Each of these procedures is briefly discussed below, and copies of the instruments are provided in the English version of the training manual. One of the procedures, the "pre- and post-test questionnaire" was determined to have little validity and was dropped after the first seminar.

1. Pre-and post-test: The objective of this questionnaire was to determine the level of familiarity participants had with basic management concepts prior to the seminar and the amount of change after the seminar. The test was a multiple choice form and contained eight basic questions. No Logical Framework terminology was used in that test.
2. True/False questionnaire: This questionnaire was developed by PCI and had been used with a variety of audiences. Its primary function is to focus on concepts which the majority of participants find most difficult. It serves as a rough guide to the degree of skills' acquisition. This questionnaire was administered on the final day of the seminar.

3. Participant Evaluation of the Seminar: On completion of the seminar, participants were asked to complete the Post-Program Questionnaire, which asked for general impressions of the seminar and the value of the concepts to the participants. This questionnaire also gathered some basic information about the participants to provide a participant profile and data for future follow-up and analysis. Participants were also asked for comments on the presentation at the end of each day.
4. Review of Participant Products: Participants were asked to complete two homework assignments, the objective being to assess individual progress and understanding of the concepts. PCI staff reviewed and critiqued these workshop products. The reviews permitted an on-going assessment of the level of skill in effective concepts' use and definition of problem areas for additional emphasis later in the same seminar and for future seminars.
5. General Observations: PCI trainers continuously monitored participant response to presentations and in workshops, noted the questions asked, and collected comments made during formal and informal discussions with participants. These observations were used for pacing and increasing emphasis on certain concepts as the seminar proceeded. In addition, PCI instructors provided feedback to each other on strong and weak points in presentations and workshops both for immediate and future action.
6. Daily Debriefings: PCI staff met at the end of each day to critique and improve the individual modules presented during the day. Areas of ambiguities were eliminated and the charts and handouts modified for use in future training sessions.

2. Schedule and Logistics

The schedule for the nine Program Design and Evaluation seminars was developed during the engagement. As an initial step in this process, AID/OIT issued a cable announcing that the seminars would be available in Washington and in the Missions. Mission responses were solicited concerning local interest in on-site seminars. Based on responses to this cable, and on AID/OIT's knowledge of the schedules of participants studying in the U.S., a tentative schedule for the sessions was prepared. This draft schedule was revised several times during the year. Table III-1 shows the order in which the training sessions actually took place.

SEMINAR SCHEDULE	
SITE	DATES
1. Washington, D. C.	September 15-19, 1975
2. Washington, D. C.	January 5-9, 1976
3. Alajuela, Costa Rica	February 23-28, 1976
4. Washington, D. C.	March 22-26, 1976
5. N'Djamena, Chad	April 20-24, 1976
6. Washington, D. C.	May 24-28, 1976
7. Managua, Nicaragua	November 1-5, 1976
8. Ljma, Peru	November 9-11, 1976
9. N'Sele, Zaire	November 29 - Dec. 3, 1976

Table III-1. Order in which the Nine seminars were presented.

-12

Seminars scheduled for Washington were all one week courses; all four Washington sessions were held in the AID training facility in Pomponio Plaza, Rosslyn, Virginia. The training rooms used were the same as those normally utilized by AID when the Program Design and Evaluation course is given to AID staff.

For the on-site seminars, local facilities were normally arranged by the Mission. While these facilities were not specifically designed for training purposes, in each case the arrangements that had been made proved to be adequate. The two seminars given in Africa were each one week in length. In Latin America the pattern of week long seminars was broken in two ways: in Costa Rica a second week was added to the seminar, (and paid for under a separate contract). The purpose of the second week in the Costa Rica seminar was to define an evaluation process for the country's "rural development program." In Peru the seminar was shortened, and given in a three day period. The adjustment made for the Peru seminar responded to local constraints on the time the participants could devote to seminar activities. The final Latin America seminar, held in Nicaragua, followed the normal one week pattern. Table III-2 provides a sample agenda for a normal one week seminar. (Shown here is the agenda used in the sixth seminar, May 24-28, 1976, in Washington, D. C.)

	MORNING SESSIONS		AFTERNOON SESSIONS
DAY ONE	8:45 Registration 9:10 Administrative Briefing 9:20 Seminar Overview 9:30 Introduction 9:45 Project Design & Evaluation: The Logical Framework Approach 10:40 Ground Rules for Workshop I: Puno Tourism Project 10:45 Coffee Break 11:00 Workshop I: Designing a Project Using the Logical Framework Concepts	LUNCH 12:00-1:00	1:00 Manageable Interest 1:45 Continue Workshop I Coffee Break when convenient 4:00 Review and Critique of Workshop I 4:50 Homework Assignment 5:00 End of Day One
DAY TWO	8:50 Hand in Homework Assignments 9:00 Day Two Objectives 9:05 Measuring Achievement: Objectively Verifiable Indicators and Means of Verification 9:55 Ground Rules for Workshop II 10:15 Coffee Break 10:30 Workshop II: Application of the Concepts to a Complex Project	LUNCH 12:00-1:00	1:00 Assumptions in Project Design 1:30 Workshop II continued: Clarifying Assumptions in Project Design 3:15 Coffee Break 3:30 Review of Project Designs 4:30 Homework Review 4:55 Homework Assignment: Review Project Design Developed in Workshop II 5:00 End of Day Two
DAY THREE	9:00 Day Three Objectives 9:05 Relation of Projects to Programs 9:35 Spot the Error(s): A Review of the Concepts 10:30 Coffee Break 10:45 Workshop III: Improving the Project Design	LUNCH 12:00-1:00	1:00 Evaluation Concepts 2:00 Continue Workshop III: Ensuring a Basis for Evaluation Coffee Break when convenient 5:00 Complete Workshop III: End of Day Three
	MORNING SESSIONS		AFTERNOON SESSIONS
DAY FOUR	9:00 Day Four Objectives 9:05 Evaluation Process 9:45 Workshop IV: a) Define Evaluative Issues 10:30 Coffee Break 10:45 Workshop IV: b) Develop Evaluation Plan	LUNCH 1:00-	(Afternoon free for personal appointments--visit AID advisors, embassies, finalize travel arrangements, etc.)
DAY FIVE	9:00 Day Five Objectives 9:05 Redesign the Project as a Result of Evaluation Planning 10:15 Coffee Break 10:30 Presentation of Revised Designs and Recommendations for Implementation	LUNCH 12:00-1:00	1:00 Review of Concepts 2:00 Discussion of Relevance of Concepts; Any Outstanding Issues 2:30 Coffee Break 2:45 Review of Seminar 3:15 Valedictory Remarks: Presentation of Certificates 3:30 End of Seminar

Table III-2, Sample Agenda for the Program Design and Evaluation course for AID participants

3. Pre-Registration of Participants

Pre-registration of participants meant the identification by name of individuals who would attend the seminar sessions. The identification of participants for the five overseas seminars was generally undertaken by the Mission hosting the seminar. As a rule the participants for overseas seminars were individuals employed within one or more government ministries of the country where the seminar was given. Thus, these sessions required only that AID/W confirm the training session dates with the host Mission. Advance notice of approximately two months was required to schedule and set up an overseas session.

Pre-registration for the Washington seminars was a somewhat more complex operation. For these seminars the responsibility for identifying participants, and ensuring that they would be available to attend the seminar, fell on AID/OIT. Participants for the Washington seminars tended to be individuals who were in the United States undertaking a program of study. These participants were dispersed, for the majority of the year(s) of their study program, at universities across the country. In identifying participants for the Washington sessions, AID/OIT had to take into consideration such factors as university schedules, participants' planned port of departure from the U.S., and other short-term training sessions for which the individual participants were scheduled. Thus, for these sessions, participants had to be scheduled on an individual basis. The time required to pre-register participants as well as the uncertainty about their actual attendance, tended to be greater in Washington than appears to have been the case for overseas sessions.

C. SEMINAR PARTICIPANTS

The 184 participants who registered for the Program Design and Evaluation course provided under this contract represented 24 nations. Ninety-eight percent of all participants who were registered for the course actually attended and completed the training sessions. Table III-3 shows the distribution of participants by country and training site.

AID's African and Latin American regions were represented more strongly in the sessions than were the countries of Asia and the Near East. As Table III-4 shows, nearly half of all participants in the four Washington sessions were from Africa. In the overseas sessions only African and Latin American countries were represented, with Latin America providing the largest number of participants as Table III-5 indicates. A summary of all participants presented in Table III-6 shows that overall the strongest representation was from Latin America.

Lists of all participants by name, organizational affiliation, and position were kept for each session. These lists are presented as Appendix A of the report.

For the Washington training sessions records were kept of both the field of study and the type of training program in which individual participants were involved. Table III-7 shows the distribution of participants by field of study.

REGION/COUNTRY	NUMBER TRAINED IN WASHINGTON	NUMBER TRAINED ON-SITE	TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS TRAINED
<u>LATIN AMERICA:</u>			
Brazil	6		6
Chile	1		1
Costa Rica		22	22
Nicaragua		29 (1)	29
Panama	1		1
Peru		27	27
<u>AFRICA:</u>			
Ethiopia	11		11
Tchad		24 (2)	24
Kenya	5		5
Lesotho	1		1
Liberia	3		3
Sierra Leone	1		1
Swaziland	4		4
Upper Volta		1 in Zaire	1
Zaire	2	22	24
<u>NEAR EAST:</u>			
Afghanistan	2		2
Bangladesh	2 (1)*		2
Pakistan	2		2
Tunisia	1		1
<u>ASIA:</u>			
China, Republic of	3		3
Indonesia	2		2
Korea	3		3
Philippines	1		1
Thailand	4		4
TOTALS	55	125	GRAND TOTAL: 180

Table III-3. Distribution of Participants by Country

* Numbers in parentheses indicate additional individuals who began but did not complete the course.

27

REGION	NUMBER TRAINED IN WASHINGTON	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
LATIN AMERICA	8	14.6
AFRICA	27	49.1
NEAR EAST	7	12.7
ASIA	13	23.6
	<u>55</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table III-4 - Participant Representation by Region in the Washington Seminars

REGION	NUMBER TRAINED ON-SITE	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
LATIN AMERICA	78	62.4
AFRICA	47	37.6
	<u>125</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table III-5 - Participant Representation by Region in the Overseas Seminars

REGION	TOTAL NUMBER TRAINED	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
LATIN AMERICA	86	47.8
AFRICA	74	41.1
NEAR EAST	7	3.9
ASIA	13	7.2
	<u>180</u>	<u>100%</u>

Table III-6 - Summary: Overall Distribution of Participants by Region

28

FIELD	NO. OF PARTICIPANTS
Agriculture	31
Communication	1
Computer Science	2
Economics	3
Education	8
Geology	1
Planning	6
Public Health	1
Statistics	<u>2</u>
	55

Table III-7 - Fields of Study of Washington Session Participants

The records kept of the type of study programs in which the participants were involved show that of the 55 participants who took the seminar in Washington, 11 were in PhD programs, 28 were in Master's Degree programs, and 3 were taking Bachelor Degree programs. The remaining participants were distributed between other types of long term training programs (8 participants) and short term, non-academic training (5 participants).

In the overseas sessions records were kept of the number of organizations represented by the participants attending the seminars. A total of 61 different organizations were found to be represented by the 125 participants who attended the course overseas. In the Latin American sessions, 6 Costa Rican organizations were represented as well as 14 Nicaraguan and 14 Peruvian institutions. In Africa, some 13 Chadian organizations sent participants, and a total of 15 institutions in Zaire and 1 in Upper Volta were represented.

SECTION FOUR
PROGRAM RESULTS

The performance expectations for this project were set using the Logical Framework approach: project outputs identified the specific results expected from the seminars; project purpose defined the central reason for the program and the measures of project effectiveness; and, project goal identified the way in which this project contributed to higher level objectives. In this section of the report performance at each of these levels is described.

A. OUTPUT LEVEL PERFORMANCE

Two types of performance are of interest at this level: the effectiveness of the seminars, and the efficiency of the program, i.e. the cost per trained participant. In the discussion of this level these topics will be reviewed separately.

1. Seminar Effectiveness

Two types of products were expected from the project: trained participants, and a residual product for AID; copies of all of the training materials and evaluation regimes used during the program. In this section of the report PCI focuses its discussion on the quality of the training; copies of the materials, as required, are submitted with the report as attachments.

As measures of training effectiveness, PCI and AID identified three performance targets:

- 168-192 participants trained in a minimum of eight seminars by June 1976;
- 75% of the participants trained show increased "awareness" of their roles and responsibilities for design, management and evaluation;
- 65% of the participants trained demonstrated increased knowledge of, and skills in applying, appropriate project design and evaluation techniques during the seminar.

For two of these types of data the PCI team was able to acquire adequate information to judge performance, i.e., in the areas of numbers trained, and on participant knowledge and skills. However, no direct measures of "awareness" were developed. The data in this area is impressionistic and based in large part on PCI trainers' discussions with participants and on assessments of trainee work in class. Thus, in reporting the data, we have combined information on the last two indicators into an assessment of changes in trainee "capability"--including therein both the hard facts concerning knowledge and skill changes and the more subjective data relating to attitudes and awareness. In the following paragraphs actual performance is compared to the target levels.

a. Number of Participants Trained

A total of 184 participants registered for the seminars, and of those 180 completed the course. This number compares favorably with the estimate of 168-190 given in the project Logical Framework. However, while the project Logical Framework indicated that eight sessions would be held to achieve this number, a total of nine sessions were actually given. (The original contract specified a minimum of eight sessions: four in Washington and four overseas; and a maximum of twelve sessions. The additional seminars envisioned in the maximum of twelve included

four additional Washington sessions. As it turned out, there was more overseas demand for the sessions than there was in Washington, and a contract modification was undertaken to allow the provision of an additional overseas session.) The target date for the completion of the seminar sessions was June 1976. The last actual session was given in December 1976, some six months later than planned. The difference between the planned and actual timing of the full set of seminars was a function of two factors: AID ability to schedule the sessions at times that were appropriate for overseas Missions and/or consistent with U.S. academic schedules, and the availability of PCI training teams. Of the two, the development of schedules which were satisfactory for trainees tended to be the factor that caused an overall delay or extension of the planned schedule.

The attendance at seminar sessions, once they were scheduled and begun, was nearly perfect. This fact was commented on particularly by the AID Missions. Mission personnel indicated to PCI staff that the high levels of consistent attendance at seminar sessions was unusual. To a degree this may be a function of the fact that PCI tried, where possible, to conduct the sessions at a place that was physically removed from the overseas participants' normal work environment. On the other hand, high attendance, taken together with the PCI trainers' observations that both in Washington* and overseas trainees were willing to work beyond the scheduled number of hours may well indicate a high degree of interest in the type of material that was presented.

* While overseas participants did in fact spend additional hours in their work groups, the Washington participants reported that they were not able to act as they wished in this regard because of transportation problems: in general these participants found that they had to stop work in order to take the last State Department bus back to the District from the Rosslyn training center.

32

While all the seminars were well attended once in progress, the Washington training seminars were not as well subscribed as the overseas sessions. For all seminars PCI had developed a target number of approximately 20 trainees. In Washington the actual number of trainees per session once dropped as low as eight, and for only the first session was the target of 20 reached. A final session that had been planned for Washington had to be dropped because of under-subscription. In contrast, all of the overseas sessions tended to be over-subscribed, with attendance at one seminar running as high as 29 participants. As far as PCI is able to estimate, given its review of the participation rates in Washington and overseas, as well as the level of interest expressed in cables from the field, it appears that the interest in the seminar is higher in the participants' home countries than it is among participants who are in the U.S. undertaking other types of study programs.

b. Changes in Participant Capabilities

The data on changes in participants' capabilities are of two types:

- Objective evidence concerning changes in knowledge and skills.
- Supporting evidence from reports by the participants concerning their knowledge and attitudes, and impressions gleaned by the PCI training staff.

1. The Objective Evidence

The objective evidence of changes in participant capability are found in the quizzes completed by seminar trainees. Two quizzes were used during the nine seminar sessions: a Pre/Post-Test that dealt with the general responsibilities of a project manager and basic project design issues, and secondly, a True/False Test that covered concepts taught in the seminar.

a. Pre/Post-Test Results

This test was used only during the first seminar. It was designed to provide information on changes in participant's general understanding

of project management issues. In the post-test given at the end of the first seminar only 44% of the participants achieved higher scores than they had received on the pre-test. Thirty-nine percent of the participants received post-test scores that were lower than their pre-test scores, and the remaining 17% scored the same on both tests. Eighty percent of the incorrect responses on the post-test were on questions that dealt with the logic of a project and with objective measurement of project performance. This test, upon review, was found to contain a number of ambiguities; it was not used further.

b. True/False Test Results

A True/False Test was used in a total of seven sessions. In the remaining two sessions it was not given for reasons specific to the seminar; e.g. it was not given in the three-day Peru seminar. In one of the sessions in which the test was given, Session 6 in Washington, only one participant took the quiz. The results for the six sessions where a large proportion of the trainees took the test are reported in the following paragraphs.

In the first session the True/False Test that was given consisted of 19 questions; following this session the test was expanded to a total of 28 questions. It was given in the 28 question version during all the remaining sessions.

In the first session the highest score achieved was 18 correct answers (or 97%); the lowest score received was 13 correct (or 67%). The average overall of the participants in this session was 84% correct. As these scores indicate, even the lowest scoring participants achieved the target of 65% correct in a quiz testing knowledge of the Logical Framework approach. The areas where participants frequently answered incorrectly on this first True/False Test included:

- The "manageable interest" of the Project Manager, and
- The requirement of the Logical Framework approach that independent measures of success be used to verify performance at each level of the project's hierarchy of objectives.

In the succeeding five sessions in which the True/False Test was administered the average scores of participants were: 95%, 80%, 85%, 70% and 71% respectively. Table IV-1 shows the distribution of incorrect answers for each of these five sessions. The most frequently missed questions for these sessions included those dealing with;

- Project management and the Project Manager's "manageable interest".
- The proper use of indicators to measure project performance at each level.
- The need for value of evaluative data and the relationship of evaluation to decision making.

As noted on the Table, the 27th question was found to be ambiguous and scores on this question were not included in computation of trainee grades. For one seminar group the 13th question was also considered ambiguous; and was not calculated in that group's scores.

2. The Supportive Evidence

The objective evidence indicated that the target of 65% increase in skills and knowledge, (based on a test where scores of 0 to 100% correct were possible), was met, and exceeded. This finding is further supported by participants' response on questionnaires in which they evaluated the seminar and by PCI staff observations.

A. PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENTS

All of the participants were asked to complete a questionnaire at the end of their seminar session. This questionnaire dealt with both what they had learned and their assessment of the seminar itself. In addition, the members of the first two seminar classes were sent a follow-up questionnaire approximately six months after they completed the course. Responses on each of these questionnaires are reviewed below.

ITFMS	NUMBER OF INCORRECT RESPONSES							Total Number of Participants Answering Question Incorrectly
	Session 2	Session 3	Session 4	Session 5	Session 7	Session 8	Session 9	
	No. Taking Test = 9	No. Taking Test = 21	No. Taking Test = 13	No. Taking Test = 16	No. Tak. Test=21	Not Given	Not Given	
1. We can prove achievement of purpose by measuring output level achievement.	3	5	3	16	7			34
All conditions necessary to the project's success must be fully under the control of the project manager.	1	4	0	13	3			21
Although the project manager shares responsibility for purpose level achievement, his "manageable interest" relates to his responsibility to produce-outputs.	2	0	0	3	2			7
Using OVIs permit us to compare actual accomplishments at a given project level against planned objectives.	2	1	1	2	1			7
End-of-project-status is measurable at the output level.	0	1	5	8	4			18
The LonFrame encourages us to be objective and analytical in preparing data that will be required for evaluation.	0	0	0	1	2			3
The usefulness of an indicator is related to the availability of reliable data to support and verify the indicator.	2	1	0	3	4			10
If an Assumption is found to have a low probability, the project manager should take corrective action.	1	5	3	4	7			20
To be most effective in project design, indicators should be set in general terms.	1	0	0	3	2			6
In the "Logical Framework," each level in the vertical logic is designed to contain the necessary and sufficient conditions to reach the next higher level.	1	2	1	0	5			9
The project manager is held accountable for goal level achievement.	1	2	4	2	3			12
The Means of Verification are the data sources and methods of collecting the data through which accomplishment at a given stage of a project can be objectively verified.	0	2	0	0	1			3
The principal value of the LonFrame is to clarify what we can accomplish and the important results we expect.	1	3	0	0	3			7
Objectively verifiable indicators are pre-established criteria useful in measuring project progress. They demonstrate "what" will be measured.	1	6	5	4	4			20
The Logical Framework guarantees that projects will be properly managed.	2	4	2	13	1			22
The purpose tells you what you must do in order to produce the project outputs.	1	4	1	5	2			13
The EOPS tells you how you will know when you have achieved project purpose.	0	5	1	1	0			7
In most cases more than one indicator is needed for indicating success at the goal or purpose level.	9	9	2	2	4			17
The development of objectively verifiable indicators permits us to have greater confidence in the linkages between Goal, Purpose, Outputs, and Inputs.	1	1	0	1	1			4
Assumptions are within the control of the project manager.	1	1	3	3	0			8
Evaluation determines whether and how we should replan the project.	2	6	3	2	1			14
A project design once established should not be altered.	0	1	0	3	3			7
All possible data should be collected for a project evaluation in the chance that some of it will prove useful.	0	15	4	10	8			37
If our project is successful on all levels we need not bother with causality.	2	4	1	12	5			24
An evaluation is more meaningful if we know what conditions existed before we started our project.	0	6	0	4	4			14
Evaluation should only occur after the project is completed.	1	1	1	2	1			6
Evaluation results will only be utilized in project replanning if they are forcefully followed up.		15	3		10			Not tallied
Decision-makers can take advantage of evaluation results whenever the results are made available.	7	0	0	8	2			17

Question found to be ambiguous.

TABLE IV-1. Summary of Incorrect Responses on True/False Tests for Five Seminars.

1. End of Seminar Evaluation Questionnaires

On the final day of the seminar participants were asked to complete a 21 item evaluation questionnaire that requested information in three categories: biographical information on the participant, an assessment of the course, and an evaluation of their own learning and the probability that they would utilize the material from the course. The responses in two key areas are summarized below:

a. Participant Evaluation of Skills and Knowledge Acquired

The evaluative questions in this area dealt with an individual's confidence concerning his knowledge of the concepts presented during the seminar. The results on key questions are summarized below:

- 134, or 74% of all participants answered a question concerning their familiarity with the concepts. 92 participants, (69%) of those answering the question indicated that they were somewhat knowledgeable concerning the terms and concepts taught in the seminar, but were inexperienced in actual evaluation. 15 participants, (11% of those responding), felt their knowledge was inadequate in all areas. The remaining 27 respondents, (20%), felt that at the end of the seminar they were sufficiently familiar with the terms and experienced in the use of the concepts to meet their needs.
- 153 participants, or 85% of all participants, responded on a question concerning their ability to use the Logical Framework approach. 88% of those responding were confident that they could use the approach; 1% was not confident, and the remaining 11% were uncertain.

- 152 participants responded on a question concerning their ability to teach the Logical Framework to others. 67% of those responding were confident that they could teach the approach; 9% were not confident, and the remaining 24% were uncertain.
- 156 participants answered a question concerning their ability to use the concepts they had learned to conduct a project evaluation. 80% answered that they felt they could do so; 3% indicated that they could not and the remaining 17% were uncertain.
- In the questionnaire participants were asked to identify the aspects of the Logical Framework approach that caused them the greatest difficulty. 124 participants responded and indicated that the concepts identified in Table IV-2 caused difficulty.

CONCEPT	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IDENTIFYING THIS CONCEPT
Objectively verifiable indicators	23
Determining purpose and goal	22
Assumptions	18
Causal Linkages	17
Evaluation Concepts	9
Establishing indicators	7
Establishing outputs	5
Inputs	2
Means of verification	1
Other, e.g., application of the concepts to complex projects.	20

Table IV-2. Concepts that proved difficult for the participants.

- On a final question in this area participants indicated their expectations concerning applying the Logical Framework to a project during the six weeks following the seminar. 148 participants responded to this question. Of these respondents 60% indicated that they would use the concepts during the upcoming six-week period, 18% indicated that they would not, and 22% were uncertain.

b. Participant Assessment of Seminar Effectiveness

In addition to questions concerning their own growth in knowledge and skills, the participants provided the following information concerning their estimation of the seminar's effectiveness:

- Although biographical data indicated that the majority of participants had appropriate, i.e., management-related backgrounds and worked in, or were studying, areas in which the seminar concepts had been used in the past, a number of participants indicated that they did not know why or how they had been selected, or what was expected from them following the course.
- Table IV-3 summarizes participant views as to the aspects of the seminar that were most personally rewarding. 128 participants responded on this question.

ASPECT	NUMBER OF TIMES CITED
The Logical Framework as a Design and Evaluation Approach	58
The seminar workshops	16
Causal linkages as used by the training approach	12
Evaluation techniques	11
Design techniques	11
Other	20

Table IV-3. Aspects of the Seminar Found Rewarding by Participants

- 105 participants responded to a question concerning the most negative aspects of the seminar. These responses are tabulated in Table IV-4.

ASPECT	NUMBER OF TIMES CITED
Time allotted	68
Case Materials	8
Weak presentations	7
The Logical Framework	2
Other Participants	1
Other factors ^o	19

Table IV-4. Aspects of the Seminar Rated Negatively by Participants

- 92% of 138 responding participants indicated that they had adequate opportunity during the seminar to express their views. The remaining 8% indicated that such time was not sufficiently available.
- 97% of 154 responding participants indicated that they found the workshop method to be an effective aid to learning.
- 80% of 112 responding participants found that the rotation of moderators was a desirable approach to managing the workshop activity. The remaining 20% felt it would be more effective for a single moderator to remain with one group for the entire week.
- 85% of 140 responding participants indicated that they would have welcomed the opportunity to work on their own projects at some time during the seminar.

(In addition to these questionnaire assessments of the course, a special assessment was made during the first training session. A form that listed each training module, i.e. each lecture or workshop, was distributed, and participants were asked to score each module. The responses on this questionnaire were uniformly high. The uniformly high responses did not serve to assist the training staff in defining where the course warranted improvement as well as did the participants' scores on tests and responses on the questionnaires, hence this instrument was dropped after the first session.)

2. Follow-up Questionnaire

The second key source of participant feedback on the seminars and on participant learning was a follow-up questionnaire sent to the trainees from the first two seminar sessions. While the responses on this questionnaire represent only a fraction of the total trainees it is probable that these responses are representative for at least the larger number of individuals who were trained in Washington. The situation for trainees from the on-site sessions may be slightly different, since in some cases a number of individuals from a single organization, or office were trained together. Where this was the case we would expect clusters of individuals to assist each other in applying the concepts learned in the seminar. Thus, the worst case situation, the trainee who leaves the seminar and has no further contact with other individuals trained in the same approach, is the case represented by the majority of individuals who responded in this follow-up questionnaire.

A total of 27 follow-up questionnaires were sent to the participants from the first two seminars. Fourteen individuals, or 52%, returned the questionnaires. Of these respondents a total of 9 were still in the United States; 5 had returned to their home countries. The majority of those who returned the questionnaire claimed to recall over 50% of

the material from the seminar after the six-month interval. Two who indicated that they recalled less than 50% of the material were from the first seminar, and were still in the United States. As with the post seminar evaluation questionnaire, respondents to the follow-up questionnaire indicated that the problem of the amount of time allotted for the seminar was the most negative aspect of the training program. In responding to a question as to how the seminar could be improved, participants generally indicated that more time should be allowed--a seminar length of two weeks was the most frequently offered suggestion. In a final question concerning the seminar itself, participants recommended that the seminar be held at the end of an academic study period when it was held in the U.S.. The second preference cited was for the course to be held at the beginning of an academic study period. Sessions during the middle of such a stay in the U.S. were not recommended by the participants.

B. PCI STAFF OBSERVATIONS

During each of the seminars, PCI training staff members recorded observations and quotes from the participants. For the most part the data developed by this method duplicates data already presented through the quizzes and in participants' questionnaire responses. However, four observations recorded in this manner are found nowhere else and hence are summarized below:

- The course title may have been misleading. Whereas the course did cover design and evaluation "planning" it did not fully cover the conduct of an evaluation. Some participants in Latin America were particularly conscious of this omission from the curriculum.
- While participants understood the concept of "manageable interest" they were doubtful concerning their ability to utilize this concept, or have it adopted, in the types of centralized organizations for which they tended to work; they reported that in these organizations all control is maintained by the organization's top levels.

- Direct observation and feedback from the participants suggests that participant motivation and interest is highest when participants can work on projects in which they are directly involved, e.g., the participants in Costa Rica had this opportunity and compared favorably with participants in other sessions.
- PCI staff assessments indicate that while participants learned a great deal in the one-week seminar, they lacked the type of in-depth insights that are gained through practical application of the concepts to real projects.

1. Seminar Efficiency

In this section the costs of the seminar are reviewed to determine the efficiency of the training process. Both average cost per participant, and average costs in various geographic regions are presented.

The average cost per participant was calculated using the total figure spent on training sessions (\$62,826.63)* and a total of 180 trained participants. At these rates the average cost per trained participant was found to be \$349. Table IV-5 shows the costs for each session, and the regional average cost per trained participant. As the table shows the lowest cost per trainee was incurred in Latin America, the highest in Washington, D. C. That is, while Latin American and African sessions appear to cost more because of the travel factor, the consistently larger number of participants in the overseas sessions served to reduce the per student cost to less than that incurred in Washington. As the table shows, in one seminar in Washington the cost per student reached \$910 each where only eight participants attended.**

C. PURPOSE LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT

In the project Logical Framework covering these seminars, three indicators of purpose level success were defined:

* The remaining contract expenditures covered materials preparation, follow-up and evaluation of the seminars.

** PCI's contract with AID allowed AID to cancel course on one week notice, this discouraged PCI from shipping materials early. With a longer period of firm commitment, i.e., three weeks, PCI could have saved additional money on overseas seminars by shipping materials in advance at lower rates

	Cost of Each Session	Number of Trainees	Cost per Trainee	
WASHINGTON, D.C.	Session 1 D.C. Sept.	\$ 6,051.37	20	\$ 302.56
	2 D.C. Jan.	7,281.58	8	910.19
	4 D.C. March	8,400.12	15	560.00
	6 D.C. May	2,406.04	12	200.05
	Average costs in Washington, D.C.	$\bar{x} = 6,034.77$	$\bar{x} = 13.8$	$\bar{x} = 437.30$
LATIN AMERICA	Session 3 Costa Rica	7,210.25	22	327.73
	7 Nicaragua	5,342.85	29	184.23
	8 Peru	6,651.87	27	246.36
	Average costs in Latin America	$\bar{x} = 6,401.65$	$\bar{x} = 26.0$	$\bar{x} = 246.21$
AFRICA	Session 5 Tchad	8,488.29	24	353.67
	9 Zaire	10,994.26	23	478.01
	Average costs in Africa	9,741.27	23.5	414.52
TOTAL FOR ALL SESSIONS		\$ 62,826.63	180	Overall average cost per trainee $\bar{x} = \$349.03$

TABLE IV-5. Total and Average Cost of Training Sessions in Washington and Overseas

- 70% of all participants effectively using the Logical Framework approach three to six months after the seminar;
- 30% of all participants cause their colleagues to become familiar with the Logical Framework approach within three to six months after the seminar;
- Projects designed by the participants include provision for baseline and evaluative data collection as appropriate.

While fairly complete data is available concerning output level performance under this contract, there is relatively little data concerning purpose achievement. What data is available comes from the follow-up questionnaires completed by members of the first two seminar classes, and from random reports received by the PCI staff. This data, while it indicates a tendency to use the Logical Framework on the part of those who responded to the follow-up questionnaire, tells us nothing about those who did not respond. The purpose level data that has been collected is summarized below; it represents a small sample of the total number trained.

Data concerning the use of the Logical Framework approach by the participants indicated that:

- The majority of those who had returned to their home country, and had answered the follow-up questionnaire, had used the concepts; those who had not yet used the concepts for projects indicated that they intended to use them in the near future;
- Most of the participants who are still in the U.S. (five out of nine) indicated that they had not used the concepts. These respondents further indicated that the concepts were not relevant to the type of work being done in their study programs.
- Specific examples of uses of the Logical Framework included:
 - Preparation of a chemistry curriculum design;
 - Three logical frameworks for grazing management projects;
 - Design of a feasibility study on a simulation of a family owned rice farm;
 - Design for a low income housing project.

Participants also reported on the degree to which they had shared the concepts with their colleagues:

- The majority of all participants had shared the concepts they learned with others; those who had not shared the concepts with others were still in the United States;
- Of those participants who had returned home most had shared the concepts with their superiors. Participants who had shared the concepts with their superiors tended to report that the supervisors' response to the concepts were positive.
- Participants had also shared the concepts with their peers--at least five of the participants had shared the concepts with up to 30 people in their organization. One participant further reported that he had shared the concepts with people in other organizations.
- Only one participant who had returned home had found someone there who was already familiar with the concepts. This individual reports that he uses the concepts more when working with the knowledgeable individual than when not.
- Participants in the U.S. who had shared the concepts tended to share them with their professors.

There is no data available that would allow us to determine whether participants' post-seminar Logical Frameworks adequately provide information for baseline and evaluative data collection.

While the data available on purpose level achievement is for only a small sample, and thus requires conservative interpretation, it does appear that participants, upon leaving the seminar, are highly likely to share the concepts they have learned with others. We would hypothesize that a full-scale evaluation of the trained participants would indicate that the percentage who do so runs well over the 30% target. On the other hand, reports to date indicate that the expectation that 70% of the participants would use the concepts to design projects may be an overly optimistic target. Two factors would appear to be critical if participants are to actually apply the concepts to projects at a 70% rate:

- Participants must be in an organizational position where they can do so, i.e., they must have project design or design review responsibilities that provide the opportunity to use the concepts.
- They must have that opportunity before they forget what they have learned.

Of these, only the second factor is clearly within the control of those who conduct the seminar. That is, given that the participants report some loss of concepts after six months, and further that participants who are still in the U.S. six months after the training infrequently have an opportunity to use the concepts, it would be possible to improve the probability of utilization simply by arranging for seminar participation at a time closer to the participants' date of departure from the U.S. Even with this modification, the target of 70% personally using the approach for design and evaluation may be high.

D. CONTRIBUTION TO GOAL

The target for goal level performance resulting from these seminars was that:

- Ministries, departments, divisions, etc., in developing nations formally adopt improved approaches for project design and evaluation.

As a direct result of this seminar there is at least one case of such formal adoption of the Logical Framework approach. That case is within a geographic division of the Government of Oman. In this case, a participant from one of the Washington seminars shared the concepts with his Omani superiors and has successfully managed the adoption of the approach by the government in one region of Oman.

In the five overseas training sites there is strong evidence that one or more organizations in each site is seriously considering adoption of the approach. Of these sites the strongest case for adoption is in Costa Rica where a second week was added to the course specifically to allow the development of Logical Frameworks for "live" projects in one sector. PCI's interim reports show the data for each of the five overseas sites and fully discuss the interest/intent of government organizations to adopt the approach.

For the remaining Washington participants there is little data concerning their impact on the organizations in their home countries.

Review of the goal level data together with purpose level achievement may suggest that the process by which the approach will be adopted by organizations is slightly different than that envisioned in the Logical Framework for this project. That is, the Logical Framework's hypothesis was that if trained participants applied the Logical Framework approach, then (by example) their organizations would adopt the approach. The data developed to date from these seminars suggest that there are at least two alternative routes for achieving organizational adoption of the approach--both of which may be more effective than the one hypothesized at the start of these sessions. The two alternative routes suggested by the data are:

- (1) Adoption by the organization following from explanation of the system to decision-makers by trained participants, (the Oman case);
- (2) Adoption of the system following from situations where decision-makers, via any of a number of routes, become familiar with the system and decide to experiment with the concepts. And where one step in that experimentation is organizational support for an on-site seminar which can be attended by a sizable number of the organization's key project design and evaluation personnel. (The Costa Rica case.)

SECTION FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this section PCI presents the conclusions it has reached upon completing nine Project Design and Evaluation seminars for AID participants.

A. CONCLUSIONS

While there are numerous detailed conclusions presented in this section, three stand out as being central to an assessment of the value and effectiveness of the effort to provide AID participants with project design and evaluation skills:

1. Only a limited amount of training and skill development can be provided in a one-week seminar: participants who complete the course are familiar with the concepts but lack the depth of understanding and insights that only come from application of the concepts to a real project situation and the breadth that comes from exposure to several real situations.
2. On-site evaluation will be required if AID is to fully assess the extent and quality of participants' use of the concepts and the degree to which most organizations have attempted to use these concepts. The limited data available from follow-up on a small sample of participants and from informally received information suggests that:

- The adoption of improved project design and evaluation practice by developing country organizations can be stimulated by training programs such as the type provided by AID under this contract.
 - Participant utilization of the concepts following the seminar appears to depend on participants' opportunities and diminishes with the amount of time that intervenes between completion of the course and the development of opportunities to use the concepts.
3. AID would be better able to serve its potential audiences for the project management training if it were prepared to adjust the length and coverage of the seminar to meet the objectives of the audience:
- Overseas seminars are requested to serve a variety of objectives. Some requests require that both project design and evaluation be taught; others do not. In some requests the purpose is familiarization; while for others the intent is one of adopting the procedures. These varied requests should be met with seminars of appropriate length and coverage.
 - The Washington seminar would be improved either by reducing the number of concepts to be taught in a week or by lengthening the seminar to two weeks.

1. Goal Level

The data at this level, while scarce, suggest that the training of participants in project design and evaluation can lead to the adoption by developing nations' ministries, departments and divisions of improved project development and evaluation practice. Specifically this can occur when:

- A participant who has been trained in an AID Project Design and Evaluation Seminar is in a position within his home country organization to either make decisions about the organization's design and evaluation procedures, or to influence those who do make such decisions.
- A host government organization sends a number of its staff to an AID Project Design and Evaluation seminar for the purpose of bringing skills in this area into the organization.

Based on the data developed by the PCI team we are not able to conclude whether individual trained participants, using the concepts in a department or division, will be able to bring about organizational change simply by example. From AID's own experience, and from other PCI experience, we do know that for the project design and evaluation procedures to change dramatically a "critical mass" of individuals must be developed who know the procedures that are to be instituted. In both of the situations identified above there exists the possibility for the development of such cadres of trained individuals. The probability of organizational change where only one individual is trained and using new methods should generally be considered lower than in situations where a significant number received adequate training.

2. Purpose Level

At the purpose level, PCI concludes that trained participants have a strong tendency to share the knowledge they gain from the Project Design and Evaluation Seminar. Normally they are able to apply the methods to specific projects, and to inform others concerning the procedures they are following. However, we are not able to conclude that after one week of training the AID participants are fully competent to "teach" these concepts to others.

There is virtually no data available which would allow PCI to draw conclusions concerning the quality of the Logical Frameworks now being produced by trained participants. To make such judgments, a follow-up evaluation that allows for review of Logical Frameworks developed by participants on their jobs is needed. We do know, however, that some participants, once in their home countries are taking advantage of the opportunities they have to use the Logical Framework to structure projects. What we do not know is how many of the participants have such an opportunity before they begin to lose the benefits of training, i.e., to forget the basic approaches they learned and practiced in the seminar.

From AID, and from other PCI, experiences we know that retention of the concepts diminishes with time unless trainees continue to use them. Many AID project officers have taken the Project Design and Evaluation Seminar before beginning a tour of duty. Later they have reported that they did not need to use the concepts for six or eight months following the course, and that they have forgotten much of what they learned in the course. This fact is confirmed by some of the participant seminars' follow-up questionnaires. PCI thus concludes that if maximum benefit from the course is to be achieved, the course should be provided at a time which is proximate to participants' opportunities to apply the concepts. While we cannot discern this time relationship for

overseas situations with any accuracy, we can control the timing of the course for participants in the U.S.

3. Output Level

The seminars given to date allow PCI to conclude that the concepts taught are readily learned by participants from a wide variety of nations and types of organizations and fields of specialty. The seminars both reconfirm the general utility of the concepts and demonstrate a perception by participants that the concepts are useful in their work environments.

As long as there is a demand for this type of training, and as long as AID continues to lead the donor organizations in state-of-the-art skills in this area, continued training for participants appears to be both warranted and worthwhile.

Another basic conclusion at the output level is that participants are learning the basic concepts taught in the seminar, but that only a limited amount of training and skills development can be provided in a week. For some trainees this level was reported to be sub-optimum--they wanted more from the seminar, and indicated that they were interested enough to continue the training for a longer period in order to achieve what they considered an optimum level. The time period for the seminar, and the amount of material that could have ideally been covered given more time, was the major complaint voiced by the participants.

While the data suggests a conclusion that a longer seminar is needed, this conclusion must be considered in the light of AID's purpose and goal level objectives. The length and depth of the seminar should be a function of what AID is trying to achieve by providing the course to participants. The type of training provided in the seminars

is of interest to developing country personnel for a variety of reasons. AID has the capability to provide training courses that meet this variety of demands, e.g.,

- For training requests where institutional change is the central objective:
 - (1) AID might train participants in Washington at a level where they can use the basic concepts and inform others; and, where requested, AID could provide follow-up seminars for larger numbers of individuals in organizations that display an interest. This target could be met with one-week sessions.
 - (2) AID might train individuals as groups, with the support of the institutions in which they are employed. From this type of training both a cadre of knowledgeable individuals and a significant number of skilled individuals would be developed. The length of this type of training depends on the specific objectives of the organization and on the depth of training expected.
- For training requests where individual skill development is the central objective:
 - (1) AID might train participants to be fully competent users of the design and evaluation approaches in a somewhat longer session, e.g., two to three weeks, depending on the depth of the design and/or evaluation training expected.
 - (2) AID might train participants in Washington who would serve as trainers within their home country organizations. Meeting this target would require a longer seminar, e.g., one month, plus some on-site assistance.

4. Inputs

A number of input level factors can be improved if AID continues the participant training seminars. These factors include:

(a) Facilities:

- A better arrangement for Washington seminars can be developed that will allow trainees to work as long as they wish and not be constrained to stop because of bus schedules. Special transportation, or lodging in Rosslyn, or another training site might be considered.
- Overseas training would be improved if an advance person arrived prior to the full training team. This individual would bear the responsibility for ensuring that local facilities, including blackboards and other material needed by the seminar group were ready on the first day.

(b) Scheduling and Selection:

- Changes can be made in the approach to scheduling participants that will result in fuller, i.e., more cost-effective seminars in Washington should these be continued.
- An earlier AID commitment, i.e., a three, rather than one week, prior to seminar commitment, would allow for more cost-effective shipment of materials for overseas sites.
- Lists of participants and their fields could be developed earlier; this would allow a "tailored" selection of case materials; thus enhancing the value of the seminar for specific groups of participants.
- Better information concerning the objectives of the course, perhaps including a summary of the material to be covered, could be provided to trainees before the seminar, thus avoiding any confusion over what purpose the training served.
- Training proceeds better with relatively homogeneous groups of individuals--homogeneity in terms of jobs, fields of specialty and nationality. While development of homogeneous groups is relatively natural overseas, an attempt to better simulate this condition could be developed for such Washington sessions as AID holds in the future.

(c) Course Materials

- The translations of the seminar materials need review and revision, particularly with regard to Logical Framework terms and their second language equivalents.
- The training manuals need to be re-examined with an eye to reducing their bulk and increasing the volume of narrative description, including examples of concept application, e.g., case study materials.
- Training presentations in several areas need to be re-examined, e.g., the project manager's role may need to be revised for presentation with participant groups, and examples of project management in developing country situations and organizations provided. Such re-examination is warranted for all areas where participants frequently missed questions on their True/False Tests.

(d) Evaluation

- Additional time should be devoted to the preparation and conduct of seminar evaluations. The instruments themselves can be improved to better discern areas of participant strength and weakness.
- As it currently is constructed the True/False Test serves more as a guide for the training teams than for the trainees. As such it would be more valuable if given in parts during the seminar rather than at the end. If given during the seminar both the trainers and trainees could learn early where participants were weak and corrections could be made during the remaining days. As it is now used, its results only have value for the subsequent groups of trainees, and the trainees who missed questions in specific areas never receive corrective guidance.

- If AID continues these seminars it should at some time in the near future invest in an overseas follow-up evaluation that would allow for the collection of data on a larger number of trainees and would also provide the opportunity to assess the Logical Frameworks developed by participants on their jobs and the impact of the participant's training on his organizational unit.

(e) Follow-up

- Follow-up is a desirable but hard to achieve element of this type of training. In the first place there is no "trade association" that deals with the area of project design and evaluation, nor is there an appropriate journal that could be sent to trainees on a regular basis. Secondly, there is little in the way of evidence to suggest that newsletters or "clubs" of past participants are an effective follow-up device for ensuring continued application of specific techniques.
- What trainees need is contact with others who use the same or similar approaches. One method that AID might consider using for keeping participants aware of who, in their country, has taken the Project Design and Evaluation Seminar is to have trainees complete the form AID is planning to enter into AID's Data Management computer file and from which it will be able to generate rosters of past participants. Graduates from this particular seminar could be given a special code and their names could be printed in a special section of such rosters as AID regularly produces.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

The provision of training in improved project design and evaluation procedures by AID to developing country personnel and organizations is consistent with AID's overall mandate to assist these countries. Indeed, the development of valid and effective project design and evaluation procedures within developing country organizations may be one of the most appropriate avenues for fostering rational development policies and projects available to the Agency. Certainly AID is in a strong position to take the lead in this type of training for developing nations:

- In the donor community AID is generally considered to be the most advanced donor agency in this area.
- A number of governments have contracted through AID for this type of training for specific government departments.*

And finally,

- AID has demonstrated through this engagement that there is a demand for training in Project Design and Evaluation among participants and host organizations, and that AID is capable of responding to this demand.

Based on the results of the current series of seminars, PCI recommends that AID:

1. Continue to make training in improved project management methods available to participants and to host government institutions;
2. Make its training program more flexible by allowing for the customization of the course to meet objectives of specific audiences. Increased flexibility in the training program could include:

* At least eight developing countries have contracted with PCI for these services, as has one donor country: Canada.

specific audiences. Increased flexibility in in the training program could include:

- Separately listing and offering training in such areas as (1) project design, (2) project monitoring systems, (3) project evaluation, etc.
 - Encouraging requesting sites to identify the types of training and training depth required (e.g., graduates trained to a level of full competence) to meet local objectives, i.e., offer and recommend extended course (two-three weeks) to include practical application as was done in Costa Rica with supplementary USAID/CR funds.
 - Customizing the case material to serve audiences in specific sectors. Depending on the nature of requests such customization could be achieved either by tailored selection of existing case materials or by using project examples from the trainees' organization or context.
 - Lengthening the basic course for Washington participants to allow both fuller coverage of basic material and time to pursue in-depth those course areas in which specific training groups show particular interest.
3. Effect specific improvements in the course materials including: refinement of the training materials and manuals, and needed revisions in the second language translations.
 4. Refine the current approaches to scheduling of sessions including the timing of sessions for Washington participants, the commitment date for overseas sessions, and the advance preparation for all sessions of lists to registered trainees with their areas of specialization, and job responsibilities.

5. Strengthen the evaluation regimes associated with the seminars and make provision for field follow-up evaluations that will allow AID to fully understand the extent and quality of participant and organization use of the concepts.