

PN-ABP-493

154 13233

**Report to USAID/Nicaragua
General Development Office
on the visit to the United States
by the Legislative Development Committee
of the National Assembly of Nicaragua
July 19-25, 1992**

Sponsored by the Consortium for Legislative Development

The Center for Democracy

Florida International University

University at Albany, State University of New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| I. Introduction | 1 |
| II. Standard Evaluation Using Program Indicators | 1 |
| Category # 2: Promoting a Regional Emphasis | 2 |
| Category # 3: Developing Internal Capabilities | 6 |
| III. Analysis of Participant Evaluations | 8 |
| IV. Chronological Program Implementation Report | 12 |

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Consortium for Legislative Development Evaluation Criteria
- B. Program Schedule and Training Agenda
- C. Evaluations of Study Tour Components
- D. Program Participant Curricula

**Report to USAID/Nicaragua
General Development Office
on the visit to the United States
by the Legislative Development Committee
of the National Assembly
July 19-25, 1992**

I. INTRODUCTION

From July 19-25, five members of the Nicaraguan National Assembly participated in a training visit to the United States under the auspices of the Consortium for Legislative Development. This training activity was coordinated by The Center for Democracy. Training components were designed and implemented by Florida International University and the University at Albany, State University of New York's Center for Legislative Development. Four elected members of the Assembly participated in this program: Lic. Luis Sánchez Sancho, First Vice President of the Assembly, Lic. Reinaldo Antonio Téfel, Second Vice President of the Assembly, Dr. Luís Humberto Guzmán Chairman Finance and Budget Committee, and two staff members, Lic. Julio Ramón García Vélchez, Deputy Director, Legal Department, and Dr. Carlos Siles Levy, Executive Secretary of the Assembly.

It is important to note that the Nicaraguans were accompanied during their study visit by a delegation of four legislators and two staff members from the Legislative Assembly of Panama. They were joined in Albany by a larger delegation of twelve legislators and staff from the Brazilian Federal Congress and state legislatures. The Nicaraguan delegation made site visits to Florida International University's North Miami and Tamiami Campuses, to the State Capitals in Tallahassee and Albany and to the offices of the Center for Legislative Development located on the campus of the State University of New York at Albany. Planned visits to Cincinnati to participate in the Annual Meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures and to Washington for a training program organized by The Center for Democracy were suspended at the request of the President of the National Assembly in order to accommodate the National Assembly's working sessions. A detailed description of the implementation of this program can be found in Section IV of this report.

II. STANDARD EVALUATION USING PROGRAM INDICATORS

The study visit is a key component of the Consortium's Nicaragua legislative development project (financed under Cooperative Agreement No. LAC 0770-A-00-0034-00, Modification No. 5). The Nicaragua National Assembly has formed a bipartisan Legislative Development Committee to work with the Consortium in designing and implementing program activities under the buy-in project. Deputies and staff from this committee were targeted for training during this program in aspects of legislative development from a comparative perspective through site visits to legislatures and academic briefings. A major

goal of the training visit was to promote a shared philosophy of legislative development and effective working relationships among the members and staff of the Legislative Development Committee. The joint visit with the Panamanian Legislative Development Committee was intended to encourage comparative analysis, reinforce regional networking and maximize AID resources.

The following analysis measures the effectiveness and impact of this program activity undertaken on behalf of the Legislative Development Committee of the Nicaraguan National Assembly. The Center for Democracy has used the Evaluation Criteria developed by the Consortium for Legislative Development in cooperation with AID pursuant to Cooperative Agreement No. LAC 0770-A-00-0034-00 (See Attachment B). The Center has identified the most pertinent Categories, Objectives and Indicators (listed in bold) that can be applied to qualitatively and quantitatively analyze the impact of this program activity. Outputs and events specifically correlating to these evaluation criteria are listed in italics below the selected categories.

Category #2
Promoting a Regional Emphasis

A. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

◆ To Strengthen Legislature's Identity through Training, Networking and Identification on a Regional Basis to Ease Isolation

By simultaneously participating in this training event with the Panamanian delegation, the Nicaraguan participants had numerous opportunities to exchange information, discuss problems and share concerns about specific areas related to their respective legislative development processes. In addition, the site visits provided workshops and information sessions with appropriate members of the Florida and New York State Legislatures. By meeting with counterparts in these state legislatures, the delegation was able to broaden their legislative network in the United States while simultaneously strengthening ties previously established through ATELCA and the Encounters of Legislative Presidents to members of Panama's Legislative Assembly.

◆ To Improve the Professional Competence of Individual Legislators and their Staff through Conferences, Workshops and Study Tours

During the course of the study tour the Nicaraguan delegation participated in numerous sessions focusing on issues related to their general duties in the National Assembly and overall legislative development. Legislators and staff alike from the State Legislatures of New York and Florida presented explanations of budget

development, bill drafting and legislative information systems, specifically highlighting computer applications for such processes. Each session addressed the duties and responsibilities of individual legislators and staff while emphasizing their interrelations. A more detailed description of specific events pertaining to this objective can be found in Section IV of this report.

◆ To Identify and Document the Status of Legislative Institutions in the Region and Recommend Improvements/Needs

Needs assessments were conducted by the Consortium in Nicaragua which resulted in the formation of the Legislative Development Committee, among other benefits. The recommendations laid down by the needs assessment team have been incorporated into the Development Committee agenda which provide a common point of reference for establishing a framework within which the Consortium and the National Assembly are able to focus training and technical/commodities assistance.

B. PROGRAM INDICATORS

◆ Number and Diversity of Countries' Legislators and Staff Participating in Project-Supported Activities of Regional Organizations (e.g., Percent of Women Participating)

The multipartisan Nicaraguan delegation consisted of three members of the National Assembly and two staff members, the Executive Secretary and the Deputy Director in the Legal Department. Aside from their party differences (2 UNO, 1 FSLN), the members represent a wide range of committee membership and political factions and constitute a well rounded delegation. Although there were no women represented in the delegation, members and staff participated equally in all program components corresponding to issues relevant to the Legislative Development Committee.

◆ Number and Type of External Networks and Linkages Developed Between Legislatures and other institutions (Especially other Legislatures) both Within and Outside the Country

Participating jointly in the study tour, the Nicaraguan and Panamanian delegations were given the opportunity to solidify existing relationships between themselves while forging new ones with members and staff in two state legislatures. The participants were joined in Albany, NY by a third delegation of twelve legislators and staff from the Brazilian Federal Congress and Brazilian state legislatures, affording the Nicaraguans another opportunity to exchange ideas, concerns, and solutions to legislative problems. The Brazilian delegation's visit was coordinated by ANDAL, a professional staff organization similar to Central America's ATELCA.

In visiting the State legislatures of Florida and New York, the participants met with over two dozen state legislators and staff who volunteered to assist the Nicaraguans in their legislative development efforts. Staff members from the visiting delegations received valuable reference materials and examples of legislative tools used in both states to facilitate the bill drafting and tracking processes. The National Conference of State Legislators, which unfortunately the Nicaraguan delegation was unable to attend, also provided an excellent forum for meeting and interacting with dozens of state legislators from the United States either during programmed activities or social functions. The Panamanian members met and exchanged views with counterparts from all fifty states as well as the Executive Committee members of the NCSL itself during the course of the conference. In this sense, the conference provided highly focused access to the most important state legislative network in the United States.

C. PROGRAM OUTPUTS

◆ Provide Training, Networking and Identity to Legislatures as a group to ease isolation (i.e., a regional emphasis) and to Provide an Array of Opportunities such as Conferences and Workshops on a Regional Basis to Improve the Professional Competence of both Individual Legislators and their Staff

During the course of the week-long study tour the delegates attended over twenty training sessions, demonstrations and presentations which addressed various aspects of the legislative process. At F.I.U. the program focused on recent legislative trends in the United States and how they may affect our political relationship with Central American nations.

In Tallahassee there were two presentations which dealt with the organization of the State Assembly and the relationships between members, staff and lobbyists. One discussion focused on bill drafting while the rest were related to computer applications to legislative tasks and the information systems used to link the Capitol with district offices and other sources of information. In addition, the Clerk of the House demonstrated the new electronic voting system which is of particular interest to the Nicaraguan delegation as they are proceeding with the implementation of a similar system in their National Assembly.

In Albany the participants visited the State Capitol and the Center for Legislative Development. The Center program emphasized ongoing legislative development in the Nicaraguan Assembly while there were 8 training sessions, presentations and discussions at the Capitol similar in format to those in Tallahassee though presented from a different legislative standpoint. One session dealt with bill drafting, four others addressed the general organization of the Assembly and three more focused on the technical aspects of the legislative process.

The Nicaraguan and Panamanian delegations participated equally in these sessions, contrasting their own experiences with what they had heard and expressing other questions and concerns with other participants and hosts. In this way, the Nicaraguans developed a better understanding of the Panamanians' state of legislative development, and vice versa, which reinforced a sense of regional identity in discussing these issues with their American counterparts.

Category #3
Developing Internal Capabilities

A. PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

◆ **To Provide an Array of Opportunities to Improve the Professional Competence of both Legislators and their Staff**

The meetings and training sessions in Tallahassee and Albany, especially, addressed numerous practical aspects of the legislative process, among them the ways in which professional staff members assist legislators in researching, drafting, revising and tracking pieces of legislation. Delegates compared the non-partisan professional staff, which assists all members of the Florida Assembly regardless of party affiliation, with the partisan staff employed by members of the New York Assembly. In each case the participants witnessed first hand many of the information and communication tools which members and staff alike rely upon every day in serving the people of their state.

Throughout the study tour, participants observed the interdependency between staff and members. They were shown the practical side of the legislative process while witnessing the intrinsic features that have kept the Assemblies of Florida and New York functioning as professional institutions.

◆ **To Develop Among Legislators and Staff an Awareness of the Legislature as an Institution and Increase their Personal Identification with it**

In Tallahassee and Albany, delegates participated in several discussions on the role of the legislature as it relates to other branches of government. The interaction between the legislature and the executive was brought up repeatedly during the sessions at the prompting of the delegates. They cited their history of military dictatorships as a key factor in the executive's ability to dominate the political arena throughout their history. Through discussions with legislators and clerks from these assemblies, participants were presented a broad vision of the identity and role of the legislature as an institution and how it might, should, or does coexist with the executive and judicial branches in balancing political power.

At the Center for Legislative Development, each delegation participated in a presentation and subsequent discussion on "The Role of the Legislature in Contemporary Democratic Societies and the Importance of Legislative Institution Building." This session, presented by Dr. Abdo Baaklini of the Center, helped both delegations redefine and clarify the objectives of their respective Legislative Development Committees and set forth a fresh course on which they can continue to

Baaklini concerning this issue to more effectively address the specific needs of their particular assembly. These discussions substantively focused the delegates' experiences during the visit and contributed significantly to the primary program goal of promoting a shared philosophy of legislative development among the members and staff of the Legislative Development Committee.

◆ To Create a Structure of Decision Making Within the Legislature with the Primary Function of Continuous Evaluation of Legislative Needs, Marshalling Necessary Resources (Including the Development of Legal and Programmatic Instruments) to Meet those Needs

During the visits to Tallahassee and Albany, the internal organization and structure of the assemblies were outlined to give the delegates a clear idea of the duties, responsibilities and powers of the clerk, the speaker, committee chairs and members. In both cases, the Clerk of the House stressed that each state has its own unique design, and that none is necessarily better than another, rather the design and organization of the legislature should cater to the individual needs and characteristics of the legislature rather than conforming to a set model.

The Clerks explained the way the legislatures presently function and the mechanisms that were employed in their own legislative development process. Due to the stability and longevity of both these institutions, there are no Legislative Development Committees, per se, in place to monitor the legislatures' changing needs. However, the Clerks discussed the various ways their legislatures' needs are addressed and how the participants might do so in their own assemblies in the future without the existence of a Development Committee by redirecting all or part of these responsibilities to other permanent committees.

B. PROGRAM INDICATORS

◆ Number of Legislative Development Committees Created by Legislatures and Scope of Work (Other Instruments could be Counted as well); Percent of Legislators Actively Attending and Participating in Committee's Meetings; Number and Type of Legislative Development Plans Adopted by the Legislatures/CLD.

Pursuant to the scope of work outlined in Cooperative Agreement # LAC 0770-A-00-0034-00, Modification No. 5 and the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the National Assembly and the Consortium, a Legislative Development Committee has been formed within the National Assembly of Nicaragua. Three of the four elected members of the Legislative Development Committee and both professional staff members participated in the study visit.

C. PROGRAM OUTPUTS

◆ Enhance Legislators' Capacity to Work Together

Although it is difficult to measure directly, an event such as this study tour brings legislative members and staff together in an atmosphere removed from their normal daily work. Spending time together allowed the program participants to strengthen personal bonds and enrich their understanding and respect of one another. In this way, the study tour will undoubtedly enhance the ability of the participants to work together to achieve common institutional goals.

More importantly, the members of each delegation now share a common experience and philosophy of legislative development which has given them the chance to examine the role of the legislature in a democracy. They all have a more clearly defined idea of their role as a special, bipartisan committee dedicated to strengthening their legislature as an institution. Sharing a common vision and working toward shared institutional goals should magnify the effectiveness of their efforts and foster the development process.

III. ANALYSIS OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS

The first segment of this section deals with evaluations of the Miami and Tallahassee portions of the study tour. The second part assesses the evaluations completed from the SUNY/Albany portion. Responses from the Panamanian participants have been included to provide a more complete analysis. Individual evaluations submitted by study tour participants can be found in Attachment C of this report.

SECTION I. FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY AND THE FLORIDA STATE LEGISLATURE IN TALLAHASSEE

In response to the first question concerning the overall organization of the Florida portion of the study tour, four participants felt it was 'excellent', five answered 'very good' and two responded with 'good'. The second question asked the participants how they rated the presentations, meetings and discussions. Five of the delegates responded with 'excellent', five with 'very good' and one with 'good'. The next question about the quality of the technical agenda received four 'excellent' responses, four 'very good' responses and three 'good' responses.

Question four asked the participants if the technical agenda had satisfied their expectations. Every one of the ten responses received was 'yes'. Question five, which asked if this type of event, i.e. the study tour, is beneficial to the legislative institution and the country of the

participants, was answered positively by everyone as well. The following are excerpts from additional comments written in response to this question (translated from Spanish):

"(The study tour) has greatly augmented the legislative capacity of members and staff, alike."

"The presentations and informative sessions provided during the tour will be extremely useful"

"(The study tour) has suggested ideas about how to attack the problems which we are suffering from in my country."

"(The study tour) has helped in broadening our knowledge.... indispensable at this moment in the case of Nicaragua"

"Positive"

Question six asked the participants if they felt that events such as the study tour should continue to be held and why. Again, all the participants answered 'yes' and many added comments, some which I have included below.

"...because in Nicaragua we are living through a democratic transition in which the legislature plays a role of primary importance."

"I believe that it ought to be divided in to two groups, one group composed only of the administrative personnel of the assembly, who should be given seminars on retrieval and codification of laws, and the organization of the assembly and the other group consisting solely of legislators, who should attend political, economic and budgetary seminars."

"It ought to be realized in two different ways, which are legislative and administrative."

The second two remarks above appear to indicate a feeling among some of the participants that legislators and legislative staff might benefit from following two distinct program agendas during activities such as this, one highlighting the administrative and organizational aspects of the legislature and the other addressing issues directly related to the legislators. If such a recommendation was implemented, it would be important to overlap the programs in certain areas in order to expose each side to the issues of the other. Aside from that recommendation, it appears that the participants found the F.I.U. and Tallahassee portions of the study tour very informative and valuable.

SECTION II. NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE AND THE CENTER FOR LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENT, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

Only evaluations from the Panamanian participants have been obtained and included in this analysis. Participants were asked to respond to statements on this evaluation with a number from one to five, one indicating a strong sense of agreement with the statement and five indicating a strong sense of disagreement. Half the delegates were in complete agreement that, "The presentations were clear and concise," while the other half rated the statement with a two, indicating less emphatic agreement. All but one agreed strongly that, "The general concepts are pertinent to my work in the legislature," and that, "The specific suggestions will be useful in my work." Four delegates strongly agreed to the following statements while two agreed less emphatically:

"The visual materials and others used were substantial,"

"The sessions were organized in a logical fashion."

"The facilities were appropriate for the program activities."

"The Center for Legislative Development staff were attentive to your needs."

Below is a sample of some additional comments made by the Panamanian participants at the end of the evaluation:

"We are very appreciative and the experience will be shared with other legislators in our Legislative Assembly in Panama."

"I feel that the meetings should be a little more organized, since time was regularly lost before starting."

"The session with Dr. Baaklini was very useful. More time should be scheduled to address these issues."

"Free afternoons should be scheduled to allow participants to rest and familiarize themselves with the various cities and their attractions."

These reactions suggest various improvements to the study tour experience as a whole. The separate sessions with Dr. Baaklini concerning past, current and future legislative development for both delegations generated very positive comments from the participants. Many of them seemed to benefit greatly from this experience and were eager to expand on the issues addressed by Dr. Baaklini.

After reviewing the evaluations we see a recurring indication that the participants felt a greater need to directly address legislative development issues. This seems appropriate since the delegations were primarily comprised of members of the Panamanian Legislative Development Committee.

Overall the responses to the study tour were positive. The participants seemed to have benefitted from the experience in a variety of ways and most expressed intentions of sharing their ideas and experiences from the trip with other members of the assembly.

IV. CHRONOLOGICAL PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

The following report was submitted by Center for Democracy Executive Assistant Peter Walter. Mr. Walter accompanied the delegation throughout the study visit to facilitate the logistical implementation of this program activity.

Sunday, July 19

After arriving in Miami around noon, I checked into the Park Central Hotel and rested. Later in the day Joanna Revelo of Florida International University (F.I.U.) picked me up at the hotel and we drove to the airport where we were met in the international arrival area by Gerald Reed and his assistant, Enrique Carrillo. The Nicaraguan delegation was the first to arrive, without Dr. Carlos Siles Levy, however. We were informed by his colleagues that he had been in Miami over the weekend visiting family and would join us the following day. Once the Panamanian delegation arrived and passed through customs, we formally welcomed both delegations and moved them and their baggage onto the bus F.I.U. had rented. On the way to the Park Central Gerald briefed them on the first two stops of the study tour while I followed behind in his car.

Upon arrival at the Park Central Hotel, all delegates were quickly checked into their rooms and the rooms paid for. Some of the Nicaraguans had dinner plans with friends in the Miami area, so the Panamanian delegation (including Sra. Aurelio Alba) and I walked around the beach area before stopping at a restaurant for dinner. After finishing we returned to the hotel for the evening.

Monday, July 20

I arrived at Miami Airport at 5:45 a.m. to greet Lic. Luís Sánchez Sancho, First Vice-President of the National Congress of Nicaragua who was scheduled to arrive on a 6:00 a.m. flight from Peru. After waiting there until 7:30 a.m. with no sign of Lic. Sánchez, I returned to the hotel to check everyone out. Soon after we were met by Gerald and Joanna and driven to F.I.U.'s North Campus where we were given a brief tour of the offices of the Dean of the School of Public Affairs and Services before moving into a conference room for a welcome and orientation session of events scheduled through Tallahassee. During this time Dean Allan Rosenbaum of F.I.U. discussed some current items of interest in the American legislative process.

On a national level, he talked about the unusually large turnover in Congress this year, due in part to the redistricting process which takes place every ten years. He also held accountable the check-bouncing scandal which has shaken voter confidence of Congress in the past year. On a state level, he highlighted budgetary discord as one of the major challenges facing legislative bodies, emphasizing that unlike the U.S. Congress, most state's require balanced budgets every year.

Dean Rosenbaum discussed some historical facts which led to the structuring of the Federal Budget, Authorizing and Appropriations Committees of the U.S. Congress and how they work together in dealing with national budgetary issues. In addition he talked about the various ways a bill may be introduced into Congress and the importance of having sponsors for a bill in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. Commenting on how the executive branch works with members of Congress in modifying existing bills or introducing new legislation, he emphasized that the latter must be done with the aid of a member of Congress. Throughout the presentation he stressed that the study tour was designed as a forum for exchanging ideas and a base from which the Consortium for Legislative Development would continue to assess the legislative needs of the assemblies in both countries.

After a short break, the chairperson of each department comprising the School of Public Affairs and Services gave a brief description of their respective programs. Questions were asked throughout the session about matters such as the origin of the recent freeze on U.S. foreign aid to Nicaragua: Was the decision made in Congress or had it been a measure taken by the State Department? A long response yielded the answer that it had been an initiative of Sen. Helms which Congress had passed. Dr. Salas of the Criminal Justice Department was asked about the future role of military force in Central America in combatting the flow of narco-trafficking and responded that he felt that this responsibility, among others, could be handled by a civil guard or police force rather than an organized army.

The School of Public Affairs and Services provided a catered lunch for both delegations, after which we went as a group to the South Campus of F.I.U. where Dr. Mark Rosenberg gave a presentation on the political and economic future of Central America relative to the United States and the rest of the world. At this point Dr. Siles joined up with the group and participated in the ensuing discussion. Dr. Rosenberg's presentation compared Central America's past and present trade relations with other developing nations, highlighting the impact of Japan's recent emergence a world trading power on these trends. He stressed the importance of improving education on a national level and recognizing the areas of commerce and economic growth most promising for the future. In addition, he discussed the worldwide trend of forming trade-blocks and where Central America fits into the big picture as trade barriers begin to lift in the western hemisphere.

This presentation was of great interest to members of both delegations. They were impressed, I think, not only by Dr. Rosenberg's ability to speak Spanish, but by his extensive knowledge of their region of the world. One member of the delegation asked a question which was repeated by others at various stages throughout the trip: Would the election of a Democratic president be beneficial or detrimental to the future of Central America? While Dr. Rosenberg answered from a trade standpoint, others throughout the tour would provide different perspectives to this very important question.

From there the bus took us to the airport where we checked in for our flight to Tallahassee. Alleviating concerns about his whereabouts, we were met at the gate by Lic. Sánchez. Due

to poor weather, however, our flight was delayed almost four hours so we had dinner as a group in the airport hotel's restaurant. The flight eventually got off the ground and we arrived in Tallahassee where another bus was waiting to take us to the Sheraton Hotel. Located 5 minutes (walking) from the State Capitol, this site proved to be ideal during the next two days of meetings and events there.

Tuesday, July 21

The day began with a walk to the State Capitol where we were greeted by John Phelps, Clerk of the Florida House of Representatives. After a brief tour of his staff offices we were escorted into the House Chamber and seated in the chairs the members sit in while in session. John gave a presentation explaining the organization of the Florida House, outlining the duties of the Clerk, the Speaker, other staff and their relationship with the members. He explained the responsibilities of various committees, how their members are appointed and the rules that govern their conduct. He described the path of a bill as it moves from its point of origin through the necessary channels and eventually to the House floor for a vote.

In response to some of the questions asked, he examined other rules that guide the conduct of the House. Finally, he gave a demonstration of the sophisticated electronic voting system used in the Florida House and how members can use touch sensitive monitors to access legislative information from their seat on the floor. This session was very interesting, especially to Rubén Arosemena, the Clerk of the Assembly in Panama, his assistant, Estela, and their counterpart from Nicaragua, Carlos Siles, because it presented the House from the perspective of the Clerk and focused on their responsibilities.

After a brief walking tour of the Speaker's office, the group listened to a discussion on the bill drafting process given by Jim Lowe, Director of Bill Drafting in the Florida House. He spoke about his staff and their non-partisan support of all members, and went on to give a demonstration on how computer networks have dramatically facilitated the entire drafting and tracking process.

We walked to the Sign of the Tree, a restaurant frequented by members of the Florida House and Senate while in session, and had lunch before returning to the House Chamber for a presentation by Sam Bell, a former long time member of the House who had served in almost every capacity except Speaker. Since his retirement from the House, he has been actively involved as a lobbyist in the Florida legislature. Using this experience as background, he discussed the role of a lobbyist, emphasizing the need for them to be advisers on issues outside of a legislator's field of expertise and stressing their need to uphold a high degree of integrity and to present both sides of an issue to legislators regardless of their own position on an issue.

Among the questions fielded by Mr. Bell were concerns about excessive campaign contributions from lobbying groups, relationships between legislators and those lobbying on behalf of the executive branch and most importantly, measures which the young legislative

bodies of Panama and Nicaragua need to take to regulate the lobbying process. Mr. Bell emphasized the need to register any paid lobbyist, to set and monitor spending limits for these activities and to develop a rigid code of ethics to govern the process. He also mentioned the role the press has recently come to play as a counterbalance in exposing unknown sides of issues not brought out in the legislative process.

Next on the afternoon's agenda was a tour of the Capitol's computing facilities led by Anra Mattson. She cited many examples of their applications in the legislative process and emphasized the professional yet non-partisan status of her staff concerning any issue, regardless of their personal slant. She specifically demonstrated various applications of IBM computer technology in the budgetary process, contrasting it with the MacIntosh equipment used for presentation and publishing needs. Finally, a member of her staff gave brief demonstration of intra and inter-office communication using electronic mail.

After this session we returned together to the hotel and rested before boarding the bus to Wakulla Springs Lodge and Conference Center. Located above the largest underground fresh-water source in the world, this beautiful park was brought alive by our tour guide as he pointed out the unique wildlife along the hour long boat ride. Upon returning to the lodge, we had a good dinner followed by pleasant return to Tallahassee. I think everyone enjoyed the trip very much, myself included.

Wednesday, July 22

The group started the morning in the office of Bill Leary of the Committee on Natural Resources. His presentation centered around the work of committee staff members in preparation for hearings. One important example, he explained, are the summaries written of each bill that passes through a committee that allow legislators to digest the bill's content at a glance. Mr. Leary explained how each committee's staff is divided into two areas: one focusing on substantive analyses of bills and the other on fiscal analyses. He continued detailing the duties of the committee staff, placing repeated emphasis on their professional yet non-partisan status.

Later in the morning we met with Becky Miller of the Legislative Information Division and she presented a summary of how bills are categorized and later tracked as they pass through legislative channels. She talked at length about how changes made to legislation are entered into the system as they occur, thus keeping it up to date in 'real time.' The Florida system is capable of cross-referencing legislation by topic, sponsor, companion bills and a number of other indices.

We then proceeded to a presentation on statutory codification given by Linda Jessen, Director of the Statutory Revision Division. This was primarily a visual demonstration of how past legislation can be quickly retrieved for research and other purposes using computer databases.

Following this meeting we ate lunch in the cafeteria located in the basement of the Capitol. At the request of Carlos Siles, Ms. Jessen sent down the 1990 and 1991 volumes of all statutes passed in the state of Florida for him to add to his reference materials.

After lunch we went to the final presentation of the day by Dick Langley and his staff in the Division of Systems and Data Processing. He spoke at length about the rapid changes in the legislature's communication and computing systems which have taken place in the last five years. Characterizing a member's district office in 1987 as a desk with a typewriter and a telephone, he explained how all 160 district offices in the state have since been equipped with at least one personal computer and a modem which provides a digital link to the Capitol. He also went through the ways he and his staff work to handle technical problems that arise, how journals and other publications are printed by his office, and how the system is set up to link into other government databases while remaining accessible to outside users on a subscription basis.

After finishing his presentation, Mr. Langley escorted us to the office of the Hon. Lawton Chiles, Governor of Florida, where we had an opportunity to exchange greetings and brief him on the objectives of the study tour while posing for a few pictures. This session was kept short and we returned to the hotel before checking out and boarding the bus for the airport.

Our flight to Albany appeared to be going according to schedule, however after boarding the plane, we were informed of a delay due to bad weather over our connecting city, Atlanta. Due to several more delays in both Tallahassee and Atlanta, we didn't arrive in Albany until well after 2:00 a.m. and were finally in our rooms by 3:00 a.m. I had phoned Charlie Dawson from Atlanta requesting that we postpone the morning's program to allow the delegates extra time to rest. He assured me that we would adjust the schedule accordingly to accommodate them and later left a message that we would begin with a short welcome session at The Center for Legislative Development late in the morning followed by the previously scheduled program.

Thursday, July 23

While the delegates rested, I went with Charlie Dawson and Jorge Bela to pick up two vans we had rented for the Albany portion of the study tour. After returning to the hotel I rounded everyone up and followed Staff Assistant Betsy Campisi to The Center for Legislative Development located on the campus of SUNY at Albany.

The original schedule had called for Dr. Abdo Baaklini and Dr. Dawson to give a presentation on "The Role of the Legislature in Contemporary Democratic Societies and the Importance of Legislative Institution Building" during the morning. Since the Brazilian delegation had arrived on time the previous night, they were given the presentation as scheduled. Dr. Baaklini, however, requested that the Nicaraguan delegation remain at the Center for a working lunch where he could give them the presentation. I went with the

Panamanian and Brazilian delegations to the Rockefeller Plaza in downtown Albany and had lunch at the Sign of the Tree.

Following lunch, our group rejoined the Nicaraguan delegation inside the New York State Assembly Chamber where Francine Misasi, Clerk of the Assembly, talked about her duties to the people of the state and the members of the Assembly. She then gave the floor to Rep. Ronald Canestrari who spoke about various legislative issues. Of special interest to the Panamanian and Nicaraguans delegations was the requirement that each member run for office every two years. Rep. Canestrari's opinion was that this stipulation is counterproductive since every member has to leave the capitol and return to their district to campaign, permitting less time for the assembly to devote to policy making.

Unlike the Florida legislature which has an Appropriations Committee to deal with the fiscal side of bills, the state of New York has a Ways and Means Committee which bears the additional burden of drawing up the calendar for the Assembly. Another contrast to the Florida system was illustrated as Rep. Canestrari discussed the role of the Speaker on a normal day in session. Speakers in both states are empowered to appoint committee chairs and members. Florida's speaker is almost always present when the House is in session while New York's is rarely on hand. In his place presides either the president pro-tempore or another designated member of the assembly. There are many other differences between comparable positions in every state legislature, however, the ones I mentioned here were discussed in some length in response to the interest of the delegates.

We left the Capitol together and drove to a reception hosted by University President, H. Patrick Swygert, at the University's Art Gallery. After dropping the delegates off, I went to the hotel to meet up with Charlie and Lic. Luís Sánchez. Together, we to the airport and before leaving him at the gate, I thanked him for participating in the study tour and said goodbye before returning to the reception.

The reception was pleasant and gave the delegates an opportunity to meet some important university faculty members tied in with the Center for Legislative Development. Upon leaving the reception we were separated from Charlie who had the Nicaraguans in his car, so they went directly to Charlie's house while the Panamanians, Brazilians, Jorge Bela and myself returned to the hotel to change clothes. Within a half hour we were back in the vans and on the way to Charlie's house. There we enjoyed a wonderful dinner, barbecue cooked specially by Carlos Silas, and some of the best weather we'd had since the beginning of the tour.

Friday, July 24

Upon arrival at the Capitol, we began the day with a tour of the Senate chamber hosted by Stephen Sloan, Secretary of the New York Senate. He spoke briefly about his role and duties as Secretary and fielded numerous questions on the same topic.

From there we proceeded to the Assembly's office automation and data processing center where director, Don Marilla, and John Ewashko, Secretary to the Speaker of the Assembly, demonstrated a wide variety of computer applications ranging from bill summaries and calendar displays to electronic mail and other administrative uses.

After this meeting we walked together through a quaint section of Albany on the way to the Rockefeller Institute where the Brazilian delegation, Abdo Baaklini and Charlie Dawson joined us for lunch. Frank Thompson, Associate Provost and Dean of the Rockefeller College, and the Institute's Deputy Director, Frank Mauro, hosted the luncheon and welcomed the delegates to the Institute. After briefly describing the Institute's work, he turned the floor over to Abdo Baaklini who proceeded to present each delegate with an award of accomplishment.

Once the luncheon ended, Abdo the Panamanian delegation to remain at the Institute so he could deliver his presentation on the role of the modern legislature and the process of legislative development. Since this was the first chance I had to listen to this presentation, I will give a brief synopsis here.

He began by encouraging the Panamanian delegation with the news that the assessment team had been very impressed with their progress thus far considering the short period of time in which they have worked and ranked their rapid progress among the top of the 50 or 60 legislatures he has studied. Amidst their achievements, however, he stressed that they forge ahead with new programs and not rest on their laurels. In beginning the formal portion of the presentation, he labeled the legislature as the 'shock absorber' of a democratic nation, often taking the blame from the public and the press for lack of national direction.

He talked about the role of the legislature in the budgetary process; it's increasing importance in the future and the current problems facing many legislatures. The Panamanians expressed a desire to meet with members of the international financial community concerning legislative budgetary issues. In the past representatives of these organizations have worked mostly with the executive branch rather than with the legislators themselves. I later learned that a similar request had been made by the Nicaraguans.

In closing, he emphasized that the goal of the Consortium for Legislative Development was to "...Create the fishermen, not the fish." In other words, we are working so that they not only know how to continue developing their legislature, but more importantly, that they be able to independently analyze, assess and act on future needs as they continue down the long road to legislative effectiveness and stability.

After leaving the Rockefeller Institute, we walked back to the Capitol for a meeting with David Keiper, Commissioner of the New York State Legislative Bill Drafting Commission. He spoke about the work of he and his staff in drafting all legislation for members of both chambers. In passing, he mentioned how the advent of computer technology has enabled his staff to almost double their legislative output without increasing staff size. After some

extensive questions and answers, I left with the Nicaraguans and Betsy Campisi, making a quick stop in a local mall before picking up their luggage at the hotel and taking them to the airport. Once they were checked in for their flights, I returned to the Sheraton, and thus ended the programmatic portion of our stay in Albany.

ATTACHMENT A.

CONSORTIUM FOR LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION CRITERIA



CONSORTIUM FOR LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENT
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO ♦ CONSÓRCIO PARA O DESENVOLVIMENTO LEGISLATIVO
♦ CONSORTIUM POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT LÉGISLATIF

Report on the

EVALUATION CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT MEETING

held at

The Center for Democracy
April 30, 1992

under the auspices of

The Consortium for Legislative Development

Submitted to:

The Agency for International Development
July 10, 1992

Updated August 1992

The Center for Democracy
1101 15th St. N.W.
Suite 505
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 429-9141
(202) 293-1768 (FAX)

Prof. Allen Weinstein
Consortium Chairman

Mr. Caleb McCarry
Consortium Coordinator

Florida International University
Office of the Dean
School of Public Affairs and Services
North Miami Campus
North Miami, Florida 33181
(305) 940-5840
(305) 940-5980 (FAX)

Dean Allan Rosenbaum
Consortium Principal

Mr. Gerald Reeg
Program Manager

University at Albany,
State University of New York
Graduate School of Public Affairs
Center for Legislative Development
121 Milne Hall
135 Western Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
(518) 442-5249
(518) 442-5710 (FAX)

Prof. Abdo Baaklini
Consortium Principal

Dr. Charles Dawson
Program Manager

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the results of a one-day meeting conducted by the Consortium for Legislative Development (CLD) at the offices of the Center for Democracy in Washington, D.C., on Thursday, April 30. The meeting was convened to achieve consensus on a set of evaluation criteria by which the progress of core and buy-in activities implemented under Cooperative Agreement LAC-0770-A-00-0034-00 can be qualitatively and quantitatively measured in the short term. Ten individuals associated with the Consortium for Legislative Development, the Center for Democracy, and the Agency for International Development were present and participated in the meeting; the names and institutional affiliations of the participants are shown in Appendix A. This meeting was structured in accordance with the Automated Decision Conferencing approach to decision making (see Appendix B) applying both computer technology and group discussion in the development of consensually derived evaluation factors - indicators and objectives.

During the course of the day, meeting participants proposed a large number of functional areas for the CLD and organized these into five categories:

- The Role of the CLD;
- Promoting a Regional Emphasis;
- Developing Internal Capabilities;
- Strengthening the Legislature's Role in Government; and
- The Legislature and Society.

Pairs of participants worked as small teams to draft a brief summary of each category. Considerable time was devoted to identifying possible indicators of performance for the five categories of objectives; seven to twelve indicators were suggested for each category. All indicators were considered with respect to such concerns as feasibility, cost, and validity. For each category of objectives, participants fully agreed on a "short list" of indicators that they believed would provide for the best measurement of overall project performance and progress. These indicators, as well as the statements of objectives, for each of the five categories are provided on the following pages.

Category #1
The Role of the CLD

The Consortium for Legislative Development (CLD) was formed to create joint organization that can provide effective short-term and medium-term assistance to legislatures in Latin America and the Caribbean to strengthen their institutional capacity to be an effective participant in democratic governance within an open political system. The CLD provides the management structure and resources to prioritize, plan, coordinate and implement this assistance.

OBJECTIVES:

- To provide effective technical assistance to legislative bodies in Latin America and the Caribbean
- To prioritize, plan, and coordinate activities to strengthen LAC legislatures institutional capacity to be effective participants in democratic governance within an open political system
- To develop an internal management organization to effectively and efficiently perform the overall legislative strengthening objectives of the Consortium

INDICATORS:

- Number of legislatures requesting external short-term assistance through AID; percent of requests where responses were received
- Number of legislators investing internal and external resources, making commitments to develop bilateral assistance projects
- Number of AID missions that say they use CLD needs assessment reports in program planning
- Timeliness and responsiveness of assistance from the CLD
- Number of deliverables delivered (e.g., needs assessments)

OUTPUTS:

- Create a joint organization that can provide effective assistance to legislative bodies in Latin America and the Caribbean
- Create an institution with the capability for short-term and medium-term response for legislative assistance
- Create a mechanism for program prioritization, planning, and administrative coordination
- Facilitate the management of the project

Category #2
Promoting a Regional Emphasis

The project fosters linkages between legislatures to promote the exchange of information and ideas in the region; to ease isolation by creating networks among democratically constituted legislatures, to broaden the vision of legislatures concerning their role in society, to be better informed in the execution of legislative actions, and to provide a common, regional context for U.S. government-funded assistance to legislatures.

OBJECTIVES:

- To strengthen legislatures' identification with each other through training and networking on a regional basis to ease isolation
- To improve the professional competence of individual legislators and their staff through regional conferences, workshops and study tours
- To identify and document the comparative status of legislative institutions in the region and recommend improvements/needs

INDICATORS:

- Number of regional contacts initiated by legislators or staff; percent of contacts where responses were received by contact initiators
- Amount of resources (time, infrastructure, money) invested by legislatures in regional activities
- Number and diversity of countries' legislators and staff participating in project-supported activities of regional organizations (e.g., percent of women participating)
- Number and type of external networks and linkages developed between legislatures and other institutions (especially other legislatures) both within and outside the country
- Number of requests for follow-on activities due to regional meetings
- Number of independent initiatives/activities due to regional meetings
- Expansion of support from other donors

OUTPUTS:

- Provide training, networking, and identity to legislatures as a group to ease isolation (i.e., a regional emphasis)
- Provide an array of opportunities such as conferences and workshops on a regional basis to improve the professional competence of both individual legislators and their staff
- Provide AID missions in the field with a plan for action that informs those in charge of the present conditions of legislative institutions in the region, including diagnosis of institutional needs

Category #3
Developing Internal Capabilities

By strengthening the internal capabilities of a legislature to reach agreement and improve cooperation, the project seeks to advance institutional awareness, develop individual competencies, and increase the legislature's permanent ability to diagnose and meet its needs.

OBJECTIVES:

- To provide an array of opportunities to improve the professional competence of both legislators and their staff
- To develop among legislators and staff an awareness of the legislature as institution and increase their personal identification with it
- To provide the legislature with information and support capabilities to allow discussion of public policies for the purpose of arriving at agreements within the legislative body
- To create a structure of decision making within the legislature with the primary function of continuous evaluation of legislative needs, marshalling necessary resources (including the development of legal and programmatic instruments) to meet those needs
- To create a capability within the cooperating country to generate, disseminate, and reproduce knowledge relevant to legislators, their work, and their needs

INDICATORS:

- Number of actions taken by legislatures independently to complement and facilitate program objectives (e.g., hiring library staff, acquiring technology, etc.)
- Development of appropriate literatures relevant to training and technical assistance inside the countries
- Development of appropriate programs relevant to training and technical assistance inside the countries
- Number of legislative development committees created by legislatures and scope of work (other instruments could be counted, as well); percent of legislators actively attending and participating in committees' meetings; number and type of legislative development plans adopted by the legislatures/CLD
- Number and type of training and technical activities from legislative development plans conducted by the legislatures/CLD
- Increase in the number of professional legislative staff
- Increase in the number of bills formally and completely analyzed and reported

OUTPUTS:

- Improve the functioning of the legislative body as an organization and social system
- Enhance legislators' capacity to work together

Category #4
Strengthening the Legislature's Role in Government

The project has a primary goal the strengthening of the legislature's institutional capability to be a more active participant in the national policy making process, through such activities as improving its accountability and oversight role.

OBJECTIVES:

- To increase the institutional capacity of the legislature to carry out its constitutionally-mandated duties and functions through activities
- To provide the legislature with information and support capabilities to allow discussion public policies for the purpose of arriving at agreements between the legislature the executive
- To provide workshop activities aimed at strengthening the decision-making abilities of the legislative body through open discussion and consensus-building activities

INDICATORS:

- Number of bills written by members of the legislatures rather than by executive branch
- Frequency of meetings between high-ranking executive officials and legislators; increase in formal appearances of executive officials in the legislative processes (both plenaries and committees)
- Increase in amount of legislative oversight activity (e.g., number of oversight relations such as fiscal/budgetary explored between the legislatures and GAOs--participation of GAOs in budget tracking activities)
- Amount of time spent on budget deliberations and debates

OUTPUTS:

- Strengthen the legislature with respect to the other branches of government
- Improved accountability and oversight role of the legislature
- Strengthen the role of the legislature in national policy-making processes
- Enhanced legislators' capacity to work together

Category #5
The Legislature and Society

Strengthening the legislature to be an open, representative and accountable institution, capable of formulating, debating, influencing and shaping national public policy and insuring that major political actors represented in the legislature and society at large view the process as fair and have the capability and opportunity to participate in the democratic process.

OBJECTIVES:

- To help legislatures be more responsive to constituents and other institutions
- To facilitate the legislature's abilities to openly debate issues with the goal of influencing and shaping national public policy
- To encourage and support the active participation in debate and policy formulation of all members of the legislature regardless of political party
- To provide discrete support activities designed to strengthen external view of the legislative body as fair, accountable and representative of societies' concerns

INDICATORS:

- Number and type of issues of national concern on legislative agendas for deliberations and debates; number and type of instances in which the legislatures take action on a public policy issue
- Of all issues identified in the media as important, the percent and type that are on legislative agendas
- Number of requests from local leaders to legislators to intercede on behalf of municipalities (e.g., to secure resources)
- Increased plurality representation (e.g., number and type of political parties and organized groups with access to and representation in the legislatures)

OUTPUTS:

- Enhance the democratic qualities of the legislative body as a governing institution in society
- Enhance legitimacy of legislatures and their leaders as conducting an open and fair legislative process
- Enhance legislative capacity to address long-term needs as opposed to short-term needs
- Indirectly strengthen the roles of the political parties

APPENDIX A

Abdo Baaklini
Center for Legislative Development
University at Albany, State University of New York

Kristi Bessette
The Center for Democracy

Gary Hansen
Agency for International Development

Sharon Isralow
Agency for International Development

James Kent
Center for Legislative Development
University at Albany, State University of New York

Roma Knee
Agency for International Development (ret.)

Kelly McBride
Florida International University

Caleb McCarry
The Center for Democracy

Pat Martin
Agency for International Development

Allan Rosenbaum
School of Public Affairs and Services
Florida International University

APPENDIX B

Automated Decision Conferencing

Automated Decision Conferencing (ADC) is a new approach to organizational decision making. It is a process that helps executives reach practical solutions to major organizational problems. ADC relies upon state-of-the-art techniques in both the use of computer technology and group processes. The process takes into consideration both the expertise and experience of conference participants, as well as their goals and values.

Decision Techtronics Group (DTG) has applied the ADC approach to a wide variety of problems including resource allocations (e.g. budgeting), choices among alternative possibilities or proposals (e.g. site selection), and organizational policy formulation (e.g. establishing performance standards). DTG brings executive decision makers together for an intensive two-day conference. At the end, participants leave with a consensually derived, optimizing solution. The solution is not a theoretical model, but a practical strategy ready for implementation.

The Three Stages of an Automated Decision Conference

Stage 1: Structuring the Problem

Conferences are typically held in a specially designed conference room where the executive team is seated at a large table. In front of the room are several white boards. A staff member, using a variety of group process techniques, helps the participants begin to structure their problem on the white boards by having them identify all relevant information pertinent to the decision, e.g., alternative courses of action and criteria to evaluate these options are fully sketched out. On the left side of the room is a microcomputer. Here another staff member keys into the computer the various elements of the structure as they are developed on the white boards. Nearby a third staff member, working on another microcomputer, records the group's rationale for each step in the process of developing the structure for their problem. Later this information along with printouts will be combined into a document that describes the group's decision and recounts how it emerged. This report is prepared after the decision conference by DTG staff.

In structuring the problem each executive team brings its own decision style. Some groups are highly controlled by the chief executive officer while others are highly democratic. While DTG staff facilitate discussions, they do not try to intervene in or alter the group's existing style. The purpose of the conference is to lead to a decision that will be acted upon when conference participants return to their organization. New temporary authority structures may not produce decisions that will be implemented when the original authority structure reemerges the day after the conference.

Typically, the process of initially structuring the problem takes several hours. Specific procedures used by the facilitator introduce unusual ways of thinking and allow key issues and priorities to surface and be clarified. The facilitator employs group process skills to productively manage the resulting conflicts and tensions and works to keep the process moving efficiently. To model the problem, the group's values are represented numerically with respect to the various elements identified in the problem structure. The facilitator provides a variety of methods to make the numerical representation sensible. Additional conflict and clarification may emerge as conflicting values become explicit.

Stage 2: Modeling the Problem

While the problem is being fully modeled on the white boards, it is simultaneously modeled in the computer. The implications of alternative solutions can be immediately projected from the microcomputer to a large viewing screen. This is often a dramatic moment which brings all the detailed work of the group to a coherent focus. Immediately the question is raised: "What is wrong with the displayed analytical solution?" In answer, individuals may suggest that certain shifts in organizational priorities must be made if other alternatives are preferred or that certain assumptions must be placed under closer scrutiny. The group begins to develop consensus and commitment as the strengths and weaknesses of the initial model become better understood.

Stage 3: Refining the Solution

By the end of the first conference day the group usually has a sense of considerable accomplishment. However, between the time they leave the conference room and return the next morning, participants frequently have identified a number of concerns. These often include important variables that were forgotten, questions about priorities that are yet to be resolved, and key uncertainties in the decision environment. The second conference day focuses on such concerns.

The purpose of a decision conference is not to generate an elegant and technically perfect mathematical model nor to develop greater trust and empathy with a more cohesive executive team; the purpose is to make a decision that will be implemented. For this reason the model can now be adapted to these additional expressions of concern. The group is asked to look for omissions, challenge assumptions, express criticisms and ask "what if" questions. This process usually takes place in an open climate and often results in creative insights and new ideas. The computer becomes a useful servant, allowing the group to quickly explore various issues and concerns of legitimation.

A report is then produced which provides detailed documentation of the conference and summarizes the rationale of the decision.

ATTACHMENT B.
PROGRAM SCHEDULE AND TRAINING AGENDA

HORARIO

- 09:00 a.m. - 09:15 a.m. **BIENVENIDA E INTRODUCCION A LA REUNION**
Dr. Allan Rosenbaum, Decano
Escuela de Asuntos y Servicios Públicos
- 09:15 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. **EXPONENCIA:**
LA ORGANIZACION DE LOS CUERPOS LEGISLATIVOS DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS
Dr. Allan Rosenbaum
- 10:00 a.m. - 10:20 a.m. **COMENTARIOS SOBRE LA EXPONENCIA**
- 10:20 a.m. - 10:30 a.m. **DESCANSO**
- 10:30 a.m. - 12:00 a.m. **ORIENTACION A LA ESCUELA DE ASUNTOS Y SERVICIOS PUBLICOS: RECURSOS DISPONIBLES A LAS ASAMBLEAS LEGISLATIVAS PARA REFORTALECER A SUS INICIATIVAS EN EL CAMPO DE LA POLITICA PUBLICA**
Dr. Harvey Averch, Director
Departamento de Administración Pública
Prof. Madeline L. Dale
Departamento de Trabajo Social
Dr. Luis Salas, Director
Departamento de Justicia Criminal
Dr. David Bergwall, Director
Departamento de Administración de Servicios para la Salud
- 12:00 a.m. - 02:00 p.m. **ALMUERZO (Edificio ACI, Salón 240)**
- 02:00 P.M. - 03:00 p.m. **TRASLADO A LA SEDE SUR DE LA UNIVERSIDAD INTERNACIONAL DE LA FLORIDA**
- 03:00 p.m. - 05:00 p.m. **EXPONENCIA:**
AMERICA LATINA Y LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS EN EL SIGLO XXI: ¿HACIA DONDE VAMOS?
Dr. Mark B. Rosenberg, Director
Centro para la América Latina y el Caribe
- 05:00 p.m. - 05:30 p.m. **TRASLADO AL AEROPUERTO INTERNACIONAL DE MIAMI US AIR, Vuelo No. 1814**

Florida International University and the Consortium for Legislative Development

Nicaraguan/Panamanian Delegation Visit

July 20-22, 1992

MONDAY, JULY 20

7:48 PM Arrival - Tallahassee Regional Airport

Check-in at Sheraton Hotel

TUESDAY, JULY 21

Breakfast on your own

9:00 AM - Arrival at the Capitol

9:00 AM - 9:45 AM Introduction to the Florida Legislature - John Phelps, Clerk of the House
(House Chamber)

9:50 AM Visit Senate Chamber

10:00-10:30 AM - Tour of Clerk's Offices

10:45 -12:00 PM - Bill Drafting in the Florida Legislature - Jim Lowe, Director, House Bill Drafting
Office (Room 828 - Capitol)

12:00 - 1:15 PM - Lunch - Andrew's Upstairs

1:15 - 1:45 PM The Role of the Lobbyist - Sam Bell (House Chamber)

2:00 - 4:00 PM - Computer Applications in the Appropriations Process - Anna Mattson (Room
221 Capitol)

4:00 PM - Return to Hotel

6:00 PM Bus departs from hotel for Wakulla Springs

7:00 PM Dinner at Wakulla Springs Lodge and Conference Center

WEDNESDAY, JULY 22

Breakfast on your own

8:00 AM (OPTIONAL) Old Capitol Tour

8:45 AM - Committee Automation Applications - Bill Leary, Staff Director, Committee on Natural
Resources (Room - 418 House Office Building)

9:45 -10:00 AM Walk to Pepper Building

10:00 -11:00 AM Legislation Information System - Becky Miller, Legislative Information Division
(704 Pepper Bldg)

11:00 - 12:00 PM - Statutory Codification - Linda Jessen, Director, Statutory Revision Division &
Phil Herron (780 Pepper Bldg)

**Nicaraguan/Panamanian Delegation Visit
July 20-22, 1992
Page 2**

12:00 PM Luncheon New Capitol Cafeteria

1:30 - 3:00 PM Briefing by Data Center staff on current and future data processing support programs in the Florida Legislature - J. Richard Langley, Director of the Division of Systems and Data Processing.

3:15 - Meeting with Governor Lawton Chiles

Return to Hotel

5:00 PM - Depart for Tallahassee Regional Airport

6:45 PM - Plane departs Tallahassee

~~TOP SECRET~~

Meeting with Speaker Wetherell



UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Center for Legislative Development

JULY 22, 1992

**Program in Albany, New York
for
The Distinguished Legislators & Staff
from
Brazil, Nicaragua and Panamá**

*Sponsored by
The Center for Legislative Development
University at Albany, State University of New York
&
The Consortium for Legislative Development*

July 22-July 26, 1992

Center for Legislative Development Staff

Director: Professor Abdo I. Baaklini
Deputy Director: Dr. Charles S. Dawson, Jr.
Deputy Director: Dr. James D. Kent

Spanish-speaking Staff:

Staff Associate: Licdo. Jorge Bela (Spain)
Staff Associate: Licda. Elizabeth Campisi (U.S.)
Center Scholar: Licda. Ana Fiorella Carvajal C. (Costa Rica)

Portuguese-speaking Staff:

Center Scholar: Licda. Beatriz Lacerda (Brasil)
Staff Associate: Licdo. Jorge Bela (Spain)

Wednesday, July 22

7:45 p.m. Brazilian delegation arrives on American Airlines #4908 (from JFK, Washington).

10:40 p.m. Nicaraguan & Panamanian delegation arrives on Delta #966 (from Atlanta).

Sheraton Airport Inn (518) 458-1000; 200 Wolf Road, Colonie.
Hotel provides transportation from Airport.

Center for Legislative Development
University at Albany, SUNY

Thursday July 23

- 8:30 a.m. Transportation from hotel to Center for Legislative Development, University at Albany.
- 9:00 Meet at the Levitt Conference Room, Draper Hall, 3rd Floor, downtown campus. Coffee. danish.
- 9:00-10:15 Welcome by Professor Abdo I. Baaklini & Dr. Charles S. Dawson.
- "The Role of the Legislature in Contemporary Democratic Societies and the Importance of Legislative Institution Building With Special Emphasis on the Role of the Legislative Development Committee."
- 10:15 Greeting by Rockefeller College Provost Richard Nathan (442-5289, Carol).
- 10:30 Break for coffee and donuts.
- 10:45 Resumption of discussion.
- 11:15-11:30 Question and answer period.
- 11:45 Depart for Empire State Plaza Government Complex.
- 12-12:30 p.m. Short Tour of the Empire State Plaza Government Complex (Tower Building), time permitting. Walk weather permitting.
- Nicaraguan legislative development committee will lunch separately with Professor Baaklini, Dr. Dawson, and Lic. Bela in order to discuss the project before Lic. Sánchez departs (and because of their overall shortened trip).
- 12:30-1:30 Lunch at the Sign of the Tree, Empire State Plaza (436-1022). Guests: Ms. Francine Misasi, Clerk of the Assembly and Ms. Natalie Trichilo of her staff. **CONFIRMED.**
- 2:00-4:00 Visit to the New York State Assembly Chamber hosted by Ms. Francine Misasi, Clerk of the Assembly (455-4242). Demonstration of the electronic voting and attendance system and computer bill status system. **CONFIRMED.**
- Greeting by Member of the Assembly Ronald J. Canestrari (Karen, 455-4474). **CONFIRMED.**
- 4:30 Short tour of the University Campus.
- 5:00-6:00 Reception at the University's Art Gallery, University at Albany uptown (main) campus.
- 6:00 Return briefly to hotel before departing to the Dawson's home.
- 6:07 p.m. **Lic. Luis Sánchez (Nicaragua) departs (AA#441).**

Center for Legislative Development
University at Albany, SUNY

- 6:45 Depart for the Dawson's home for barbecue.
7:00 Dinner (barbecue) at the Dawson's (Joann and Charlie) residence (475-0250).

Friday July 24

- 8:00 a.m. Depart from hotel for State Capitol.
8:30-9:00 Tour of the New York State Senate Chamber. Hosted by Dr. Stephen Sloan, Secretary of the Senate. **CONFIRMED.**
9:30-11:30 Meeting with Mr. John Ewashko, Secretary to the Speaker of the Assembly (455-4411, Sharri or Regina), and Mr. Don Marilla (455-3944), Director of Office Automation and Data Processing. Capitol (LOB Concourse Room 104). Discussion and demonstration of the New York Assembly's Member Information System. **CONFIRMED.**
12:00-1:30 Lunch at the Rockefeller Institute, State University of New York. 411 State Street. Greetings by Associate Provost and Dean of the Rockefeller College, Frank Thompson and Institute Deputy Director, Mr. Frank Mauro. **CONFIRMED.**
2:00-4:00 Meeting with Ing. David Keiper, Commissioner of the New York State Legislative Bill Drafting Commission. Capitol (Room 308; 455-7506). Discussion and demonstration of the legislature's computerized statutory retrieval and bill tracking systems. **CONFIRMED.**
6:55 p.m. Nicaraguan delegation departs (USAIR #223).
7:00 p.m. Depart from hotel for Lake George excursion (9:00-11:00 p.m. Moonlight Cruise on the Mini-Haha paddleboat with a Dixie Land Band -- \$8.50 per ticket).

Saturday July 25

- 12:00 Noon Depart from hotel for Saratoga (2:00-4:00 p.m. New York City ballet matinee performance at the Saratoga Performing Arts Center -- \$14.00 per ticket).

Sunday July 26

- 7:30 a.m. Panamá delegation departs for Cincinnati (Delta #4358).
9:55 a.m. Delegation departs for Cincinnati (American Airlines #1059).



UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

◆
Center for Legislative Development

Brazilian Legislative Delegation Members

Elected Members

Dep. Tônico Ramos
President of UPI
São Paulo

Dep. Gleno Scherer
Vice-President of UPI
Rio Grande do Sul

Dep. Salviano Guimarães
President of the
Legislative Chamber
Distrito Federal

Staff

Dr. Lourival Zagonel dos Santos
President of Andal
Federal Senate

Dr. Antônio Carlos Pojo do Rego
Advisor to the Committee on the Economy
Federal Senate

Dra. Ana Lúcia Rocha Studart
Advisor to the Chamber of Deputies

Dra. Rosineth Monteiro Soares
Advisor to leadership of PDS
Chamber of Deputies

Dr. Jorge Hélio Grecellé
Vice-President of Andal
Director of the Legislative Assembly
Rio Grande do Sul

ATTACHMENT C.
EVALUATIONS OF STUDY TOUR COMPONENTS

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....Mala ...BuenaMuy BuenaExcelente
2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....Malas ..BuenasMuy BuenasExcelentes
3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....Mala ...BuenaMuy BuenaExcelente
4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
...SíNo
5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
...SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

----- Porque ayudan mucho a la capacitación
 ----- de los miembros y funcionarios del parlamento
 ----- y facilitan la modernización del mismo

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

...SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

----- Para dar continuidad a la
 ----- modernización de los parlamentos

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente

2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenasMuy BuenasExcelentes

3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente

4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
.....SíNo

5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
.....SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Representa un beneficio práctico ya que sirve para hacer una comparación entre la asamblea de USA y los nuestros, dándonos nuevas ideas y permitiendo sus experiencias, lo cual nos facilita solucionar nuestros problemas.

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

......SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Para intercambiar opiniones sobre los cambios que hemos hecho y los que faltan por hacer, de manera que podamos estar preparados a los siguientes proyectos, con planes de negocios.

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

Gracias

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente

2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenasMuy BuenasExcelentes

3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente

4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
.....SíNo

5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
.....SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Su experiencia indica la necesidad de como abordar problemas que surgen en

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

.....SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Una forma de continuar aprendiendo

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente
2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenasMuy BuenasExcelentes
3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente
4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
..... SíNo
5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
..X...SiNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Porque la A.N. de Nicaragua se encuentra en proceso de modernización y de expansión institucional. Por tanto, el aprovechamiento de las exposiciones recibidas durante la gira será de primera utilidad para la Asamblea Nacional de Nicaragua.

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

..X...SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Porque en Nicaragua se está viviendo una Transición democrática, en la cual el Parlamento juega un rol de primera importancia. El estudio y aprovechamiento de las teorías y experiencias que se conocen en estos eventos nos ayudará a mejorar nuestro trabajo y nuestras metas.

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy Buena ✓Excelente
2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenasMuy Buenas ✓Excelentes
3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy Buena ✓Excelente
4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
...✓...SíNo
5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
...✓...SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Nuestro país se encuentra en un periodo de transformación político-social y de construcción del futuro; la gira me ha mostrado la persona como eje del Órgano Legislativo por medio que se traduce para nuestro país en una exigencia económica más asequible por los profesionales de este órgano estatal. Actualmente la recopilación de leyes en Panamá es obsoleta y casi inexistente, el evento nos muestra el proceso de recopilación de leyes.

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

...✓...SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Es necesario que se continúe efectuando. Concretamente que debe dividirse en dos grupos: Un grupo conformado únicamente por personal administrativo de la Asamblea a quien se le debe dar detalles de recopilación de leyes, codificación, archivo, organización de Parlamento y otro grupo de diputados que deben recibir seminarios políticos económicos, sobre parlamentos (régimen parlamentario), electoral etc.

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:

.....MalaBuena ..✓...Muy BuenaExcelente

2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:

.....MalasBuenas ..✓...Muy BuenasExcelentes

3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:

.....MalaBuena ..✓...Muy BuenaExcelente

4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?

..✓...SíNo

5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?

...✓...SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

..✓...SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

- 1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuena .Muy BuenaExcelente
- 2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenas .Muy BuenasExcelentes
- 3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy Buena .Excelente
- 4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
.SíNo
- 5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
.SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

HEMOS VISITADO LAS INSTITUCIONES AFINEZ CON NUESTRAS FUNCIONES
LAS EXPOSICIONES HAN SIDO DADAS POR FUNCIONARIOS EXPERTOS
LA MATERIA LA AGENDA INFORMATIVA FUE EN BASE A LA UTILIDAD
ADELANTO MODERNOS COMPUTARIZADOS Y EL BENEFICIO PARA NOSOTROS
LA VERDA QUE PODAMOS ADQUIRIR EQUIPO SIMILAR.

- 6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?
.SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

NO SOLOAMENTE POR QUE PODEMOS MODERNIZAR NUESTRO
PAISES TAMBIEN POR QUE ADQUIRIAMOS IDEAS DE COMO
CONDUCIR NUESTRAS POLITICAS PARA EL FUTURO
BASANDONOS EN LAS PROYECCIONES DE LOS PAISES CABEZAJ
DE QUE SON COMO U.S.A.

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente

2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenasMuy BuenasExcelentes

3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente

4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
......SíNo

5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
........SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

presenta nuevos enfoques, transmite conocimiento, ayuda fortalece al consorcio para el caso de este momento en el país.

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deber de continuar realizándose?

......SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Es una fuente muy importante de información y experiencia que ayuda al desarrollo de personal involucrado en el asunto legislativo.

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuena Muy BuenaExcelente
2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenasMuy BuenasExcelentes
3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....Mala BuenaMuy BuenaExcelente
4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
SíNo
5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Nos permite avanzar en cuanto el funcionamiento y
manejo de nuestra Asamblea.

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Debe capacitarse en varios campos que son
Legislativo y Administrativo.

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente
2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenasMuy BuenasExcelentes
3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente
4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
....SíNo
5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
....SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Estoy seguro que Si - En el caso de Panamá, nuestro sistema está bastante actualizado a nivel legislativo - nuestro sistema de informática de archivo recientan modernizado y Florida que está muy actualizada en este campo, es el lugar ideal -

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

....SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

Seguro que Si - Los legisladores y el personal de la Asamblea son los más interesados en que se modernice la Asamblea Legislativa. Esta oportunidad de comparar los dos sistemas de Panamá y Florida, es impactante - Positivo -

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.

EVALUACION

DE LA GIRA DE ESTUDIO DE FIU EN MIAMI Y TALLAHASSEE DEL
CONSORCIO PARA EL DESARROLLO LEGISLATIVO
Julio 1992

1. Considera Usted que la organización de la gira de estudio ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente

2. Considera Usted que las exposiciones de la gira han sido:
.....MalasBuenasMuy BuenasExcelentes

3. Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha sido:
.....MalaBuenaMuy BuenaExcelente

4. ¿Considera Usted que la agenda informativa ha satisfecho sus expectativas?
....SíNo

5. ¿Considera Usted que la realización de este tipo de evento es de beneficio para la institución y el país que Usted representa?
....SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

*Permite hacer comparaciones y visualizar el
nivel de las alternativas en el desarrollo
legislativo en su momento, lo que nuestro país
está su estado mejorado.*

6. ¿Considera Usted que este tipo de eventos deben de continuar realizándose?

....SíNo

Favor explique el por qué de su respuesta:

*Para seguir actualizándonos y comparando
los sistemas y adelantos en otras legis-
laturas e intercambio de información.*

FIU le agradece profundamente su participación en esta actividad, le desea una placentera estadía en los Estados Unidos de América y un agradable regreso a su país.



UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Center for Legislative Development

EVALUACIÓN

**Seminario de Desarrollo Legislativo
para los Legisladores y Personal
de Nicaragua y Panamá
Albany, Nueva York
23-26 julio, 1992**

Le agradeceríamos que respondiera a las siguientes preguntas. Están ordenadas en una escala de 1 a 4. El número 1 significa acuerdo completo y el número 4 significa desacuerdo completo. Sus comentarios nos ayudaran a mejorar los programas.

| | Acuerdo | | Desacuerdo | |
|---|---------|---|------------|---|
| 1. Las presentaciones fueron claras y concisas. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Los conceptos generales son pertinentes para mi trabajo en la legislatura. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Las sugerencias específicas serán útiles para mi trabajo. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Los materiales visuales y otros utilizados fueron adecuados. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Las sesiones fueron organizadas de una manera lógica. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Las facilidades físicas fueron propios para las actividades. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. El personal del Centro fué atento. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Por favor, ocupe el espacio abajo y el otro lado de esta hoja para hacer comentarios adicionales que sean específicos. Muchas gracias.

Como que se atendieron nuestras preguntas así
porque algunas parecían cubris. Tomos un

-52-

necesariamente relacionadas con lo que se discutía y lo que publicaba el tema de que se trataba en ese momento —

Estamos (Panamá) muy agradecidos y la experiencia será compartida con otros legisladores de nuestra Asamblea Legislativa en Panamá —

- 53 -

Graduate School of Public Affairs
Nelson A. Rockefeller College
of Public Affairs and Policy



135 Western Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

518/442-5249
FAX: 518/442-5710

UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Center for Legislative Development

EVALUACIÓN

**Seminario de Desarrollo Legislativo
para los Legisladores y Personal
de Nicaragua y Panamá
Albany, Nueva York
23-26 julio, 1992**

Le agradeceríamos que respondiera a las siguientes preguntas. Están ordenadas en una escala de 1 a 4. El número 1 significa acuerdo completo y el número 4 significa desacuerdo completo. Sus comentarios nos ayudaran a mejorar los programas.

| | Acuerdo | Desacuerdo | | |
|---|---------|------------|---|---|
| 1. Las presentaciones fueron claras y concisas. | ① | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Los conceptos generales son pertinentes para mi trabajo en la legislatura. | ① | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Las sugerencias específicas serán útiles para mi trabajo. | ① | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Los materiales visuales y otros utilizados fueron adecuados. | ① | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Las sesiones fueron organizadas de una manera lógica. | ① | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Las facilidades físicas fueron propios para las actividades. | ① | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. El personal del Centro fué atento. | ① | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Por favor, ocupe el espacio abajo y el otro lado de esta hoja para hacer comentarios adicionales que sean específicos. Muchas gracias.

En las giras se deben programar tardes libres para poder descansar y conocer la ciudad y sus atracciones

-54-

Graduate School of Public Affairs
Nelson A. Rockefeller College
Public Affairs and Policy



135 Western Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

518/442-5249
Fax: 518/442-5710

UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Center for Legislative Development

EVALUACIÓN

**Seminario de Desarrollo Legislativo
para los Legisladores y Personal
de Nicaragua y Panamá
Albany, Nueva York
23-26 julio, 1992**

Le agradeceríamos que respondiera a las siguientes preguntas. Están ordenadas en una escala de 1 a 4. El número 1 significa acuerdo completo y el número 4 significa desacuerdo completo. Sus comentarios nos ayudaran a mejorar los programas.

| | Acuerdo | | Desacuerdo | |
|---|---------|-----|------------|---|
| 1. Las presentaciones fueron claras y concisas. | 1 | (2) | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Los conceptos generales son pertinentes para mi trabajo en la legislatura. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Las sugerencias específicas serán útiles para mi trabajo. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Los materiales visuales y otros utilizados fueron adecuados. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Las sesiones fueron organizadas de una manera lógica. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Las facilidades físicas fueron propias para las actividades. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. El personal del Centro fué atento. | (1) | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Por favor, ocupe el espacio abajo y el otro lado de esta hoja para hacer comentarios adicionales que sean específicos. Muchas gracias.

En términos generales hemos recibido muy buena retroalimentación sobre los temas tratados, éstos serán de aprovechamiento en nuestros labores.

55-

Graduate School of Public Affairs
Nelson A. Rockefeller College
of Public Affairs and Policy



135 Western Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

518/442-5249
Fax: 518/442-5710

UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Center for Legislative Development

EVALUACIÓN

**Seminario de Desarrollo Legislativo
para los Legisladores y Personal
de Nicaragua y Panamá
Albany, Nueva York
23-26 julio, 1992**

Le agradeceríamos que respondiera a las siguientes preguntas. Están ordenadas en una escala de 1 a 4. El número 1 significa acuerdo completo y el número 4 significa desacuerdo completo. Sus comentarios nos ayudaran a mejorar los programas.

| | Acuerdo | | Desacuerdo | |
|---|---------|---|------------|---|
| 1. Las presentaciones fueron claras y concisas. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Los conceptos generales son pertinentes para mi trabajo en la legislatura. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Las sugerencias específicas serán útiles para mi trabajo. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Los materiales visuales y otros utilizados fueron adecuados. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Las sesiones fueron organizadas de una manera lógica. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Las facilidades físicas fueron propias para las actividades. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. El personal del Centro fué atento. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Por favor, ocupa el espacio abajo y el otro lado de esta hoja para hacer comentarios adicionales que sean específicos. Muchas gracias.

MAYOR COMUNICACIÓN CON LOS PARLAMENTOS
QUESTION EN LOS PERIODO VIGENTES ESPECIAL
AL INICIO PARA MEJOR DE EFICIA DE NUESTRA
LEGISLATURA.

- 56 -

Graduate School of Public Affairs
 Nelson A. Rockefeller College
 Public Affairs and Policy



135 Western Avenue
 Albany, New York 12222

518/442-5249
 Fax: 518/442-5710

UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
 STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Center for Legislative Development

EVALUACIÓN

**Seminario de Desarrollo Legislativo
 para los Legisladores y Personal
 de Nicaragua y Panamá
 Albany, Nueva York
 23-26 julio, 1992**

Le agradeceríamos que respondiera a las siguientes preguntas. Están ordenadas en una escala de 1 a 4. El número 1 significa acuerdo completo y el número 4 significa desacuerdo completo. Sus comentarios nos ayudaran a mejorar los programas.

| | Acuerdo | | Desacuerdo |
|---|---------|-----|------------|
| 1. Las presentaciones fueron claras y concisas. | 1 | (2) | 3 4 |
| 2. Los conceptos generales son pertinentes para mi trabajo en la legislatura. | 1 | (2) | 3 4 |
| 3. Las sugerencias específicas serán útiles para mi trabajo. | 1 | (2) | 3 4 |
| 4. Los materiales visuales y otros utilizados fueron adecuados. | 1 | (2) | 3 4 |
| 5. Las sesiones fueron organizadas de una manera lógica. | 1 | (2) | 3 4 |
| 6. Las facilidades físicas fueron propias para las actividades. | 1 | (2) | 3 4 |
| 7. El personal del Centro fue atento. | 1 | (2) | 3 4 |

Por favor, ocupe el espacio abajo y el otro lado de esta hoja para hacer comentarios adicionales que sean específicos. Muchas gracias.

Quiero que las reuniones debieran estar un poco más organizadas ya que regularmente se perdía mucho tiempo antes de comenzar.

-57-

Graduate School of Public Affairs
Nelson A. Rockefeller College
of Public Affairs and Policy



135 Western Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

518/442-5249
Fax: 518/442-5710

UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Center for Legislative Development

*Please
Fill in Peter
etc.*

EVALUACIÓN

**Seminario de Desarrollo Legislativo
para los Legisladores y Personal
de Nicaragua y Panamá
Albany, Nueva York
23-26 julio, 1992**

Le agradeceríamos que respondiera a las siguientes preguntas. Están ordenadas en una escala de 1 a 4. El número 1 significa acuerdo completo y el número 4 significa desacuerdo completo. Sus comentarios nos ayudaran a mejorar los programas.

| | Acuerdo | | Desacuerdo | |
|---|----------|---|------------|---|
| 1. Las presentaciones fueron claras y concisas. | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Los conceptos generales son pertinentes para mi trabajo en la legislatura. | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. Las sugerencias específicas serán útiles para mi trabajo. | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Los materiales visuales y otros utilizados fueron adecuados. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Las sesiones fueron organizadas de una manera lógica. | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. Las facilidades físicas fueron propios para las actividades. | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. El personal del Centro fué atento. | <u>1</u> | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Por favor, ocupe el espacio abajo y el otro lado de esta hoja para hacer comentarios adicionales que sean específicos. Muchas gracias.

*Se continuaron las actividades de muy buena
manera con algunos detalles específicos de los programas
masse más tiempo*

ATTACHMENT D.
PROGRAM PARTICIPANT CURRICULA

CURRICULUM VITAE

DATOS:

NOMBRE : REINALDO ANTONIO TEFEL VELEZ
NACIDO : MANAGUA, SEPTIEMBRE 1925
ESTADO CIVIL : CASADO Y CON TRES HIJOS

ESTUDIOS:

- UNIVERSIDAD DE FORDHAM (NUEVA YORK): CIENCIAS SOCIALES
- UNIVERSIDAD CENTRAL (MANAGUA): CIENCIAS JURIDICAS Y SOCIALES
- UNIVERSIDAD DE MADRID (ESPAÑA): CIENCIAS POLITICAS Y ECONOMICAS
- PARTICIPACION EN NUMEROSOS SEMINARIOS, CURSOS, CONGRESOS Y CONFERENCIAS INTERNACIONALES.

OBRAS:

- "LA REVOLUCION SANDINISTA" (ensayo).
- "EL INFIERNO DE LOS POBRES" (diagnóstico sociológico de los barrios marginales de Managua).
- "SOCIALIZACION EN LA LIBERTAD".
- "HACIA UNA NUEVA REPUBLICA".
- ENSAYOS, ARTICULOS PERIODISTICOS E INVESTIGACIONES SOCIO-ECONOMICAS.

POSICION ACTUAL:

- MINISTRO PRESIDENTE DEL INSTITUTO NICARAGUENSE DE SEGURIDAD SOCIAL Y BIENESTAR (INSSBI)
- VICE PRESIDENTE DE LA CONFERENCIA INTERAMERICANA DE SEGURIDAD SOCIAL (CISS).
- PRESIDENTE DE LA ASOCIACION DE INSTITUCIONES DE SEGURIDAD SOCIAL DEL CARIBE, CENTROAMERICA Y PANAMA (AISSCCAP).

- COORDINADOR DEL COMITE NACIONAL DE EMERGENCIA.
- FUNDADOR Y PRESIDENTE DEL INSTITUTO NICARAGUENSE DE PROMOCION HUMANA (INPRHU).

POSICIONES ANTERIORES:

- COORDINADOR DE LA COMISION NACIONAL DE APOYO A LOS COMBATIENTES.
- Catedrático de Teoría del Estado, Sociología de Latinoamérica, Seminario de Grado sobre Marginalidad Jurídica, Sico sociología Industrial, Dinámica de Grupo y Sociología del Cambio.
- Vice-Presidente de la Confederación Latinoamericana para la Educación Fundamental Integral.
- Co-Director de "Editorial Nicaraguense".
- Director del Suplemento "Fin de Semana", de La Prensa.
- Fundador y Director del Instituto Social Nicaraguense.

PRINCIPALES ACTIVIDADES POLITICAS ANTERIORES:

- Miembro del "Grupo de Los Doce".
- Secretario Técnico de Unión Democrática de Liberación (UDEL).
- Largo historial de lucha contra la dictadura somocista, habiendo caído prisionero en muchas ocasiones, siendo golpeado y torturado.
- Secretario de Organización del Partido Social Cristiano Nicaraguense, del cual salí por diferencias ideológicas.
- Presidente de la Juventud Conservadora Demócrata Cristiana, del cual salí en busca de un instrumento popular verdaderamente revolucionario.
- 1959: Comandante de Columna en la expedición revolucionaria de Olama y Mollayones.
- 1948: Fundador de la Unión Nacional de Acción Popular (UNAP).

- 1946: Fundador y Director del periódico estudiantil "El Universitario", primer periódico sandinista en Nicaragua.
- Exilado político por haber dedicado un número de "El Universitario", a la memoria de Sandino.

Agosto de 1987.

ASAMBLEA NACIONAL

C U R R I C U L U M V I T A E

DATOS PERSONALES

APELLIDOS Y NOMBRE : Sánchez Sancho, Luis Domingo
NACIONALIDAD : Nicaragüense
FECHA DE NACIMIENTO : 21 de Junio de 1,942.-

ESTUDIOS REALIZADOS

Licenciado en Ciencias Políticas. Universidad Sverlov, Moscú 1,962
Licenciado en Ciencias de la Comunicación. Universidad Centroamericana, Managua, 1985.-

EXPERIENCIA PROFESIONAL

Miembro del Partido Socialista Nicaragüense (PSN) desde 1,960.-
Secretario General de la Juventud Socialista Nicaragüense (1963-1965)
Secretario General del Partido Socialista Nicaragüense (1969-1986)
Miembro del Consejo Ejecutivo de Unión Democrática de Liberación (UDEL), 1974-1979

ASAMBLEA NACIONAL

Viene.....

EXPERIENCIA PROFESIONAL

Miembro de la Comisión Política del Frente Amplio Opositor (FAO). 1978-1979

Diputado al Consejo de Estado de Nicaragua, 1980-1982.

Secretario Político del Partido Socialista Nicaragüense, 1986

Director del Departamento de Información y Prensa en la Campaña de la UNO, 1989.-

Miembro del Equipo de Transición de gobierno. Febrero-Abril, 1990.

Diputado a la Asamblea Nacional de Nicaragua y Primer Vicepresidente de su Junta Directiva, 1990.

Primer vicepresidente de la Junta Directiva de la Asamblea Nacional de Nicaragua, durante el período 1991-1992.-

Vicepresidente del Parlamento Latinoamericano (PARLATINO)

CURRICULUM VITAE:

Nombres y Apellidos:

JULIO RAMON GARCIA VILCHEZ

BACHILLER EN CIENCIAS Y LETRAS

INSTITUTO PEDAGOGICO DE MANAGUA

DR. EN CIENCIAS JURIDICAS Y SOCIALES

UNIVERSIDAD CENTROAMERICANA.

REPRESENTANTE ANTE EL CONSEJO DE ESTADO

1980-1984

SECRETARIO DE LA COMISION DE JUSTICIA

DEL CONSEJO DE ESTADO 1983-1984

FUNDADOR DEL CENTRO NICARAGUENSE DE

INVESTIGACIONES, ANALISIS Y PROYECTOS

(CENIAP)

SECRETARIO DE LA ASOCIACION DE TECNICOS

LEGISLATIVOS DE NICARAGUA (ATELNIC)

MIEMBRO DE LA ASOCIACION DE TECNICOS

LEGISLATIVOS DE CENTROAMERICA (ATELCA)

SUB DIRECTOR GENERAL DE ASESORIA JURIDICA

DE LA ASAMBLEA NACIONAL DE LA REPUBLICA

DE NICARAGUA.-

NOMBRE : LUIS HUMBERTO GUZMAN

POLITOLOGO Y JURISTA.

Realizó sus estudios de Post-Grado en la Universidad Libre de Berlín (Alemania Occidental).

Fué Director del Semanario La Crónica.

Ha participado en la política nacional como uno de los líderes de la Democracia Cristiana y de la UNO.

Actualmente preside la Comisión de Economía y Finanzas de la Asamblea Nacional.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NOMBRE : CARLOS SILES LEVY
FECHA DE NACIMIENTO : 16 DE MARZO DE 1943
ESTADO CIVIL : CASADO

ESTUDIOS

UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTONOMA DE NICARAGUA

- Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales
Facultad de Leyes

Grado : Doctor en Derecho

INSTITUTO CENTROAMERICANO DE ADMINISTRACION DE EMPRESAS

Grado : Maestría, Administración de
Empresas

POSICION ACTUAL

Secretario Ejecutivo de la Asamblea Nacional
Enero 1990 a la fecha