



## PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) PART II

### SUMMARY:

The Caribbean Regional Development Training Project, a four year effort (1979-1983) to improve the productivity of public sector institutions and private sector enterprises in the Commonwealth Caribbean, has two components, two executing agencies, and incorporates twelve English-speaking countries in the Region.

Component one of the project is administered by the East Caribbean Common Market Secretariat (ECCM), a Sub-regional institution supported by the seven ECCM states.\*

Component two, the subject of the current evaluation, is administered by the Caribbean Community Secretariat (CARICOM), a Regional institution supported by all twelve territories. This component has as its emphasis, the awarding of Individual Training Grants (ITGs), sponsorship of Regional Special Focus Seminars for both the Public and Private sectors and sponsorship of Private sector Island Specific seminars. The latter are restricted to the seven ECCM states plus Belize.

The overall purpose of the CARICOM component of the project is to upgrade the managerial and technical skills of Civil Servants and small businessmen.

\* / Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Montserrat, St. Kitts/Nevis, St. Lucia and St. Vincent.

Implementation of project activities was delayed for six months in order to satisfy the conditions precedent of staff recruitment and development of workplans. However, despite this initial delay, activities have been propelled at a rate whereby the project for the most part is now on schedule.

Since the preparation of the Project Paper and the signing of the Grant Agreement, two factors have surfaced as possible impediments to the Project achieving its anticipated output of training 300 ITG participants. They are: (a) the increased cost of training, and (b) the mix between short and long-term training and U.S. versus Caribbean training. In order to meet this target, it will be necessary for CARICOM to request that participating territories undertake more short-term Caribbean training as opposed to long-term and U.S. training.

Besides the issue of numbers to be trained there is also a need for a careful review of the level of persons receiving ITGs to insure that the emphasis is on middle to senior level persons whose training can have the greatest impact/multiplier effect on the systems in which they work.

The mounting of public sector Regional Seminars is on schedule. Of the twelve seminars projected for the life of the Project, four have so far been held, with four each scheduled for the remaining two years. Attendance at these seminars has been averaging twenty participants.

Activities and goals set for the private sector seem less assured. The project calls for forty eight island specific and

twelve regional private sector seminars. Of these amounts, a total of twelve island specific seminars have so far been held (2 islands having not yet commenced activities in this area and another two islands having one each). Attendance at the earlier sessions of the island specific seminars was low averaging about ten participants, which conveys the feeling of the need for greater involvement of private sector organizations in the implementation of this portion of the project.

Although no private sector regional seminars have been organized to date, the CARICOM Secretariat has made contact with the Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce (CAIC) with an eye to having that organization assume a more active role in the planning and mounting of these seminars.

Because of the vastness of the area in which this project is being implemented (from Belize in Central America to Guyana in South America) and the number of countries involved, logistical problems were anticipated and have actually surfaced. For instance it takes a considerable amount of time for letters to pass back and forth from RDO/C to CARICOM. This has, at times, placed participants under stress in order to meet deadlines. This situation applies particularly to those attending courses in the U.S. Also, certain countries are late in submitting their annual workplans which either delays the overall selection of participants or bypasses the normal selection process.

Finally, the current provisions for ongoing evaluation need to be reviewed to insure that they are sufficiently comprehensive to point out areas in the program requiring modification.

20. BENEFICIARIES

The Project Paper states that the principal beneficiaries of the Project will be the eight LDCs and Barbados, and to this end, suggested the programming of 80% of participant training funds to benefit those countries. Of the 91 participants programmed for ITGs during the first cycle, ten participants, or 11% of the total went to the MDCs (Guyana and Jamaica).

All project activity relating to the private sector is for the exclusive benefit of the eight LDCs. Of the total of 48 Island Specific and 12 Regional seminars programmed for the project life, eight Island Specific Seminars with an average attendance of fifteen have so far been held.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

The Project has highlighted, principally among the LDCs, the difficulties faced by these Governments in being able to release senior and middle level personnel to attend training programs. On a number of occasions, nominations for selection have had to be withdrawn because nominees could not be released. The result has been that more junior individuals are entering the project than anticipated. This problem is likely to result in a diminution of the impact which this component is expected to make.

## 22. LESSONS LEARNED

The following lessons have been learned about the problems associated with the implementation of a Regional Development Training Project in a diverse group of small countries, such as the LDCs of the English speaking Commonwealth Caribbean.

a. Unless donors are more precise in their definition of what, according to their philosophies constitute development oriented areas, poor countries, in this instance CARICOM's LDCs can, and will legitimately claim that all areas suggested by them for training are obstacles to their development.

b. Despite the soundness of the idea of involving Regional Institutions in the implementation of Regional Programs (the CARICOM/USAID Regional Training Program in this instance), a point of critical importance as it relates to the Private sector component of this project, should be borne in mind when considering future programs of this nature. The CARICOM Secretariat, Manager of the Regional Training Project, is a quasi-government institution with an essentially Public sector orientation. The territorial training officers as Project Implementing agents are Public Servants. The Training Project however has a Public and Private sector component. Historically the Public and Private sectors have behaved complementary though progressing on separate courses. The Private sector has always viewed Public Servants with suspicion. It is therefore not difficult to understand the reason for the lagging status of the Private sector component of the Project.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

Whereas the Individual Training Grant (ITG) and the Regional Public Sector seminar component of the Project has so far been successfully implemented, the Private Sector component (Island Specific and Regional seminars) appears to be lagging. Issues related to this component, along with other general project implementation issues therefore need to be addressed.

- (a) Suggest (1) CARICOM senior staff explain Project to senior government officials, and (2) more persons be nominated than there are places, so that the selection committee does not just approve candidates, but is given a meaningful basis for selecting candidates.
- (b) CARICOM with RDO/C's assistance should be encouraged to seek the assistance of the Caribbean Association of Industry and Commerce (CAIC), an association specifically set up to assist the Private sector, in the mounting of both Island Specific and Regional Private Sector seminars as a means of propelling the implementation of the Private Sector component.
- (c) CARICOM and RDO/C need to review quarterly reporting requirements and other communications between them in an attempt to resolve problems which have developed in these areas during the first cycle of the implementation.
- (d) Procedures for approving and using the discretionary fund are needed so that more Regional institutions can benefit from that fund.
- (e) CARICOM should include information on attendees at Special Focus seminars in its Quarterly Reports, so as to provide RDO/C with a clearer picture of the level

of participants being exposed to training in this portion of the Project.

- (f) The new form "A" of "Systems" (External Evaluation Contractor) for evaluating seminars does not evaluate units of the program. This should be changed. Systems does not get information on objectives, design or material for seminars, so they cannot tell whether or not the seminar content is geared to objectives. There is no provision for Systems to visit courses. No bio-data on participants is provided to Systems, so they cannot determine the appropriateness of the seminar for them. Trainer's Report are not supplied to Systems. Systems is late in submitting Evaluation Reports because they get raw data late from CARICOM, if at all.

CARICOM/USAID  
CARIBBEAN  
REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT TRAINING  
PROJECT

Evaluation Report  
Project Period June 1980 - August 1981

Prepared By: THOMAS H. BALL  
CLARVIS J. H. JOSEPH

Dated: 27 August 1981

## INTRODUCTION

This is an interim evaluation report covering the first two years of the Caribbean Regional Training Project No. 538-0014. The evaluators, both of whom have prior experience with the project, received documents and held discussions with involved individuals in Barbados and Guyana during the week of August 24, 1981.

Due to travel and time constraints, the team was not able to visit any country training officers, except the one in Barbados, or individuals who had received training. The team regrets that also because of time limitations, no primary documents such as individual participant biodatas were examined with an eye to getting a better picture of exactly where those trained fit into their country's development effort. Neither were any primary financial documents or raw country plans examined.

At least some of this report will consist of subjective impressions based on individual responses to questions posed by the evaluators to RDO/C and members of the CARICOM Training Unit.

This is a very complex project funded by USAID, administered by CARICOM with USAID assistance, involving twelve countries of the CARICOM region and intended to provide short and long-term training in the U.S. as well as within the region. There is also provision for the sponsoring of country specific and regional seminars both for the public as well as the private sector.

The CARICOM training officer and the training officers in each of the participating countries are largely responsible for the operation of this project. Periodic meetings of these training officers allow for discussion of problem areas as well as the making of recommendations for changes and improvements.

Some of the training officers, rotated alphabetically by country, also gather periodically to approve individual country training plans which have been prepared and submitted by the training officers. These plans contain nominations of individuals to be trained, as well as suggested topics for Regional Public Sector seminars. For more details as to the overall intent and organization of this project, the reader is referred to the documents listed as Appendix A of this paper, particularly the project paper and the two activity reports covering the periods August 1979 - January 1981 and February 1981 - July 1981.

In view of the complexity of the project and the very short time available to the evaluators to complete their report, they were given a scope of work delineating the major areas of concern or, stated differently, those areas which suggest themselves as requiring review.

That scope of work is listed below. The body of the report will be organized to correspond to these scope-of-work categories. Each category was discussed in detail with RDO/C and CARICOM.

- A. Review project outputs to date in relation to the annual training implementation plans and the conditions cited in the logical framework of the Project Paper which will indicate by the end of the Project that the purpose has been achieved.
- B. Review participant selection, training and follow-up processes for both individual training grants and special focus seminars to determine extent to which they adhere to the design and intent of the Project Paper; courses/topics related to development, male/

female ratio, short-term/long-term course mix, job level of participants (indicating potential for multiplier effect) and private sector involvement in regional and island specific seminars.

- C. Review implementation procedures such as adequate and timely submission of individual application forms and country work plans by country training officers, purchase of air tickets, advances of maintenance allowances, provision of health insurance and processing of visas.
- D. Review actual use and future utility of discretionary fund.
- E. Review flow of communications, including timing factors, between (A) country training officers and CARICOM (B) CARICOM and RDO/C (C) CARICOM and regional training institutions and (D) RDO/C and OIT/W.
- F. Review provision for feedback and evaluation of both individual training grants and special focus seminars, and findings to date.

## TOPIC A - Review of Logical Framework

The team reviewed the logical framework contained in the Project Paper and compared the verifiable indicators listed in the log frame with the reported achievements of the Project to see if it was reasonable to expect that the purpose of the Project would be achieved by the end of the four-year Project period.

### Individual Training Grants:

Looking first at Individual Training Grants (ITGs) the team found that 300 ITGs had been projected during the life of the Project. It should be noted that the actual implementation of the project was late because certain country training officers were late in being appointed and because of other administrative reasons. Thus, only slightly more than three years are available for implementation and that period can be broken into three cycles, the first of which has been programed. A total of 91 individuals have been programed for training in this first third of available time which indicates a rate that could produce the full 300 ITGs by project completion.

Turning from numbers to funding, however, the team found that \$530,000 of the available \$1,238 million dollars for ITGs has been programed for these initial 91 participants. This makes an average of \$5380 per participant whereas the original projected average is \$4126 per participant. If programming continues at something like the \$5380 for the last two cycles of the Project, the approximately \$354,000 available for each remaining year will allow sixty participants each year for a Project total of around 220.

The increased cost of training since this Project was originally planned is a factor in this situation, but the mix between short

and long-term training and U.S. versus Caribbean training also figure strongly in these equations. It is possible, but there was no way of verifying, that a higher percentage of U.S. training as well as a higher percentage of long-term training has been requested by the participating countries early in the Project and that the requesting of short-term Caribbean training late in the Project will lower the average cost and allow greater numbers to be programed. If this does not prove to be the case, the Project will fall far short of its intended number of ITGs.

#### Public Sector Seminars:

The mounting of public sector regional seminars appears to be on schedule. Of the twelve projected for the life of the Project, four have been held, a fifth is underway at this writing leaving seven more to be done over the next two years; this seems a reasonable expectation. An average of twenty-two participants per seminar was reported.

#### Private Sector Seminars:

Achievement of the goals set for private sector seminars seem less assured. The Project calls for forty-eight island specific and twelve regional private sector seminars.

So far nine sessions, two of them double sessions, for a total of eleven island specific seminars have been held leaving at least thirty-seven still to be done. The earlier sessions were reportedly poorly attended and the average for all sessions is only ten or eleven participants. There was a general feeling that there needed to be greater involvement of private sector organizations in this aspect of the Project. The CARICOM Secretariat has been in communication with the Caribbean Association of Industry and

Commerce (CAIC) with an eye to having that organization assume a more active role in the planning and mounting of these seminars. The regional private sector seminars seem particularly to be languishing and none has so far been held. There is one private sector regional seminar being planned at CARICOM's initiative and varies from the planned mode of implementation in that the private sector will not be required to assume any expenses. CARICOM is involving GATT and UNCTAD personnel in this seminar. The feeling was expressed that the requirement that the private sector assume part of the cost of these seminars was a major obstacle and this may well be true to some degree. The team believes, however, that this aspect of the seminars should be re-examined only after the upcoming regional seminar is held where it is hoped some private sector views can be elicited, and after CAIC's views become better known. If design changes are indicated they should be made swiftly thereafter by agreement between RDO/C and CARICOM.

Funding did not appear to be a constraint to any of the seminar programs.

TOPIC B - Review of Participant Selection, Training  
and Follow-up Processes

Individual Training Grants: The team realized that there had been a great deal of urgency connected with arranging for the first individuals chosen for ITGs, and that this urgency may have caused the selection to be biased somewhat in the direction of those who might be available and spareable on short notice; it was felt nevertheless that a disproportionate number of ITGs had gone to relatively junior individuals. It was believed that a number of those trained could have problems putting their training to use, particularly if the training involved techniques or procedures which their superiors might not yet have been exposed to, and that they would have a limited chance to transfer their training by influencing those around them.

It was stressed to the team on a number of occasions by CARICOM that the training requested was for those skills which the governments perceived as the principal obstacles to their development and that, particularly in the smaller LDCs, simple skills even down to secretarial skills might be crucial. Despite these arguments, the team was still left with the feeling that governments may <sup>not</sup> have been affording this project a high priority compared to that afforded other sources of donor assistance. While realizing that the amount of money available to an individual country from this project might be small in comparison to that available from other donors, the team believes that smallness should not affect the level of individuals chosen for training.

At least part of the problem appears to stem from a lack of knowledge about this project by senior decision makers in respective governments. While it is understandable that the country training

officers must play a significant role in the operation of the project, it is felt that the senior level of the CARICOM Secretariat should take the initiative at this time to further publicize and explain the project at the highest reachable levels of their member governments in order to insure that those governments will look to the Caribbean Regional Training Project as a means of fulfilling the priority training needs of their highest ranking public sector employees.

While publicizing this training program to governments, the Secretariat may also wish to make representation to selected local or regional business groups and service clubs and women's organizations regarding their possible sponsorship of private sector individuals for ITGs as allowed for in paragraph (2) page 23 of the Project Paper. The team noted that to date no such private sector individuals have been granted ITGs and believes that this lack should be corrected.

Related to the level of those nominated for training is the subject matter in which they are to receive training. The team would have to be familiar with the development goals of each territory in order to state categorially that some training was not development-related. However, there were some subjects such as a diploma in Mass Communications and training for teaching of the deaf which appeared to bear only tangential relation to the development process.

The team feels that this is in part due to the system of selection for ITGs which has evolved. Under this procedure, countries, after extensive consultation with CTU, submit only a list of candidates of a type and number to fit what they believe will be their funding allocation. This has the

effect of making the selection committee more of an approving committee with the choice of approving or not approving, but not of being able to influence the direction of the project in any way. The multi-national aspect of this project may make such a course the only acceptable one, but the team believes very strongly that the submission of training requests by each country greater than their expected allocations would give the selection committee a more positive role and could alleviate some of the above-stated problems of both level and field of training.

Male/Female Ratio:

The team was informed that one-third of those so far selected were women but had no means of comparing this to the national workforce ratios. Selection of women to participate in this project does not, however, appear to be an issue.

Short-Term/Long-Term Course Mix:

The Project documentation does not contain any target ratio of short-term to long-term training. The team was told that 62% of the currently programed total was short-term which one must assume, in view of what has been said above about the selection process, indicates national preferences. The percentage of U.S. to Caribbean training was not given but appears from reports to be about 42% U.S. which tends to cost at least one and one-half times more than comparable Caribbean training. There is no way to assign a value to such ratios beyond stating, as was discussed in Section A, that the current average cost per participant will not allow for the full 300 projected ITGs. If all concerned agree that this figure is still a worthwhile goal, then future grants will have to be for shorter periods and/or more of them will have

to be for training in the Caribbean.

Seminars:

The team spent considerable less time on subject matter and background of attendees of the various seminars. The selection of topics for the public sector regional seminars are chosen by the selection committee from topics submitted by each country. There appears to have been a reasonable degree of commonality to these suggestions and agreement on a list of topics appears not to have been a problem. Since attendance is largely voluntary, the assumption can be made that those individuals attend who can best benefit from the subject matter. In the interest of confirming this assumption, however, the team recommends that the CTU include in its quarterly reports some statistics on attendees drawn from individual applications forms. The publication of such data would, it is believed, help guide those planning future seminars and aid in the latter evaluation of those already held.

Workplans:

There appears to be a continuing issue concerning submission of fully completed workplans by all countries in time for them to be considered by the Selection Committee. The timing of the first Selection Committee did allow countries only a minimum time to prepare workplans and many did not make the deadline. The timing of the second committee allowed ample lead time, and while there was improvement, the problem still persisted. While there is only one more Selection Committee scheduled for April or May of 1982, the team believes it would be beneficial to limit the awarding of ITGs by that committee only to nominees on workplans received prior to the committee sessions. It is recommended that this be jointly submitted by RDO/C and CTU as a proposal to the next scheduled meeting of training officers. Any allotments not going to a particular country because of failure to submit a complete workplan would be divided among other countries with decisions as to use being the responsibility of the Selection Committee. Such a procedure also reinforces the argument made elsewhere that countries should submit plans containing more requests than their expected allocation.

Should this procedure not be adopted, then the team believes there needs to be a modification in the procedure currently being followed for approving late submissions. The first Selection Committee agreed that the CTU should approve late submissions for that first cycle. When the situation reoccurred on the occasion of the second Selection Committee the decision of the first was interpreted to be binding for all time and not, as held by the RDO/C, a one-time-only expedient designed to cover an unusual situation. The effect of this has been to eliminate the RDO/C completely from any part in the selection process for late submissions and has become the cause of what the team views as unnecessary friction. The team does not accept the argument that the Selection Committee had the authority to set a procedure for authorizing late

submissions particularly when that procedure eliminated the RDO/C from the equation. The team recommends that, should this situation again arise, a procedure be agreed upon between RDO/C and CTU which will, at the very least, give RDO/C a chance to review applications prior to awards.

On a slightly different point, the team also felt that in the interest of consistency a procedure was required which would allow RDO/C to review applications from regional institutions for grants to be made from the discretionary funds.

Purchase of Air Tickets:

In the early months of the project's implementation, there was apparently a serious problem of getting airline tickets to participants, particularly in cases where lead times were short. The problem has been improved greatly by CTU's establishing relationships with travel agencies in at least six member territories while at the same time two member governments have agreed to arrange ticketing on a reimbursable basis. These efforts at improvement should certainly be continued by CTU.

Since at least some of the problem for U.S. training seems to stem from very late call forwards, even when documentation is submitted in ample time, the RDO/C might wish to address letters to the major programming agents in Washington, such as S&T/IT/PO, the USDA, SECID and Roy Littlejohn explaining the special problems of distance and poor communications faced by this project and urge that every effort be made to send call forwards as early as they can be established.

Advance Maintenance Allowance and Visa Procedure:

The periodic inability on the part of the CTU to provide participants bound for training in the U.S. with the proper maintenance advance seems to

There is at least some evidence that this, as well as several other procedural requirements dealing with U.S. training, including visa procedures, may not be properly understood by some of the local training officers and this lack of understanding contributes to the problem.

It is suggested that the RDO/C reproduce and distribute to each training officer those chapters of AID Handbook Ten which deal specifically with the preparation and dispatch of U.S. bound participants. Included with this material should be specially prepared guidelines on how and where U.S. visas can be obtained within the region. Such guidelines might even be prepared on an island-by-island basis to be most effective.

To return to the question of AMA, where there is ample lead time, the forwarding of a bank draft by CARICOM appears to be the most suitable. When this is not the case, however, some emergency fallback should be in place. Whether this is in the form of an agreement with the member government to supply an advance upon a cable request, an arrangement with a local bank, or even the establishment of a small account in favor of the local training officer, some way must be devised to handle this vital advance. For the future, in what is hoped will be those rare cases in which an advance is not given, there should be strict adherence to AID procedure whereby AID/W is informed by cable that no advance was given. Small emergency advances can be arranged in the U.S. on the basis of such cables but should never be considered a substitute for the full AMA paid before departure.

Provision of Health Insurance:

This is a problem unique to the Caribbean training portion of the project and for that reason affects mostly the LDCs. It stems largely from the fact that U.S. style short-term health coverage is not readily available in the area. CTU has advised all countries of the requirement that their participants be covered by health insurance to be paid for by the project. To date four have

indicated a willingness to provide this coverage and four have not yet responded. The team felt that progress had been made in the area, that the steps so far taken were proper and that the non-responding countries should be urged to comply. As a matter of record, however, the team did not find evidence that lack of insurance coverage had caused any particular participant a serious problem or that the issue had caused serious disruption to any aspect of the project.

## TOPIC D - Review of Discretionary Fund

The team reviewed the current use of the Discretionary Fund as established out of the first meeting of Training Officers. Our understanding is that the Discretionary Fund, which was set at 10% of the total monies available for the ITG under the Project, was intended to be used in the main for:

1. Providing training for persons from Regional Institutions in order to strengthen the capacities of those Regional Institutions;
2. Providing for the training of persons from individual territories where these territories had already used their allocated amounts but where the additional training need was critical.

Responsibility for the selection of persons to be funded through this medium was delegated to the CARICOM Training Unit (CTU). It is unclear to the team whether this selection activity was intended to have an RDO/C concurrence. The team is of the view that in order for this activity to be consistent within the other activity components of the Project as executed to date, there should be some provision for RDO/C concurrence. Our impression is that to date there has been no such concurrence.

We also reviewed the actual grants that have been made. Of the five (5) ITGs awarded four (4) have gone to CARICOM and one (1) to the U.W.I. Whereas the team recognizes that there is a tremendous need to strengthen CARICOM's institutional capability, we also recognize that there is a similar need to strengthen the capability of the other approx. eight (8) (e.g., ECCM, CARDI, ECCA, ECIAF) institutions in the Region.

allocating the total amount to these organizations would not be unreasonable.

It is therefore critical that clear procedures be laid out for the determination of the persons to be granted awards under the Discretionary Fund.

The team has been apprised of the fact that there have been a number of requests coming from Regional Institutions for ITGs to be made for Third Country Training, and that these requests have had to be rejected because of the limited interpretation of the terms of the Grant Agreement. There seems to be a need to clarify the capacity of the Project to respond to this type of request given that the training required is of a highly specialized nature and the institutions concerned, e.g., Rice Institute - Philippines, and the Institute of Tropical Agriculture in Nigeria, are the leading institutions in the world.

It was drawn to the team's attention that ITGs have been awarded out of the Discretionary Fund to persons from individual islands even though these have not been listed as same in the appended reports. Whereas this action does not violate the intention of the use of the Discretionary Fund, it is the view of the team that some decision needs to be made about the percentage of the Discretionary Fund that should be utilized in this way. Given that there is available only \$53,000 in year one, and \$35,000 in each of the ensuing years, and given the number of Regional Institutions to be serviced, it seems important that the guidelines for use of the Fund be more specific. The team was informed by the CTU that during the period under review, the utilization has been \$35,000 for Regional Institutions and \$18,000 for individual island participants. It is our view that the need to strengthen Regional Organizations is so great and the amounts available in the Discretionary Fund so small that

## TOPIC E - Review of Flow of Communications

The team reviewed the communication process utilized in this project using the guidelines set out in the Scope of Work.

### (a) Country Training Officers/CARICOM

The main communication vehicle used has been letters and telexes. This has posed a problem given the mail flow situation in the Caribbean. Our information is that mail delivery between Guyana and the territories ranges from two (2) weeks to Antigua to two (2) months to Belize. Moreover CARICOM's perceived requirement to route mail through the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, creates even further delays. The use of the telephone has been restricted because of the high costs involved.

The impact of the above situation has been that country work plans have not been submitted on time and the information flow between CARICOM and the territories is problematic. This has caused a disruption in the process of selecting person for ITGs such that the "Selection Committee" has had to delegate some of its functions to the CTU.

In the team's view there seems to be a need for greater interfacing between the CTU and the Island-Training Officers. It would seem desirable that the CARICOM Project Manager should undertake at least one "Swing-Through" all the territories in any given year. The timing of this field trip would be critical. It is our view that it should be made at such a point that Island Training Officers could receive assistance in the preparation of their annual work plans, in promoting the Project among the highest levels of the Public Sector, and in promoting the Project to the Private Sector and other Non-Governmental National Organiz-

ations. This visitation would allow the CTU the kind of visibility which would enhance the implementation of the Project.

(b) CARICOM/RDO/C

The Project demands that Quarterly Reports on Project Status and Activities be submitted by the CTU to RDO/C. This has not been done. Two (2) Project Reports have been submitted. The first covered the initial eighteen (18) months and the second the ensuing six (6) months. Given the reporting requirements, this situation is highly unsatisfactory. It is the team's view that there needs to be a review of the reporting requirements and some agreement reached on the frequency with which Reports will be submitted. Our impression is that the CTU is not convinced that Reports covering less than six (6) months is necessary, given that a shorter period does not produce sufficient activity to warrant a formal Report. Whatever the merits or demerits are of this position, the team contends that it is untenable unless there is agreement on it between the CTU and RDO/C. The team was informed that the CTU is unclear as to the purpose of the Reports, and is unable to see any justification for the frequency requirement.

It is the impression of the team that there is a high degree of concern within the RDO/C for the untimely response by CARICOM to RDO/C's requests for information. RDO/C cites as examples.

- (1) Its request for an analysis of expenses for ITGs on a country by country basis. This request was formally made as early as May and has not been satisfied to date;
- (2) The fact that seminars were being conducted and that no prior information of these seminars was

reaching RDO/C. RDO/C's request for a tentative schedule of future seminars has not been satisfied. The team was unable to fully explore with CARICOM, RDO/C's concern. We are of the view that the concern is sufficiently important to the smooth running of the Project to warrant some immediate activity on the part of both RDO/C and CARICOM to improve the situation. It is the team's view that nothing will be as detrimental to the efficient execution of the Project as a communications breakdown which causes the principals of the Project to assume defensive postures.

(c) CARICOM/Regional Training Institutions

The team is of the impression that the level of information flow between these Agencies is satisfactory. CTU is soliciting and is receiving adequate information on the programs and capacities of Regional Training Institutions to impact on this Project. Consequently the CTU has made excellent use of the Regional Training Institutions' facilities.

(d) RDO/C and OIT/W

It is the team's view that the communications process between these two units has operated quite satisfactorily.

TOPIC F - Review of Evaluation of ITG and SFS

The task of conducting on-going evaluation of the training has been subcontracted to the Systems Group of Companies - a Barbadian Consulting firm. The Scope of Work incorporated in Systems contract and the activities undertaken to date by the firm has been reviewed by the team. We are of the view that in the main, Systems has satisfied the conditions of its contract, details of which are included in this Report as Appendix 'B'.

At the commencement of the Project, Systems was requested to design three (3) forms - 'A', 'B', 'C'. Form "A" should evaluate each unit of the program, form "B" the total program and form "C" the impact of the training on participants' ability to perform in their jobs.

Subsequently forms "A" and "B" were combined into a new form "A" and form "C" has become the new form "B".

In addition, Systems has designed a "Register of Participants" which it is the responsibility of the trainer to maintain. The Register provides a section for the listing of the topics covered during the course. All of the above forms constitute Appendix 'C'.

The team is of the view that an evaluation should have the capacity to determine not only the feelings/perceptions of the participants to the methods of presentation, likes or dislikes of the course materials, but also whether the course as executed meets the objectives as conceived, whether the materials used and the topics selected were appropriate to the level of the participants on the program, whether the learning experienced is transferrable to the job situation and in fact is being transferred.

(a) Special Focus Seminars:

To date of the eleven (11) Private Sector SFS and the four (4) Public Sector Regional SFS conducted, Systems has completed the Evaluation of six (6) Private Sector SFS and two (2) Public Sector Regional SFS. They are currently doing the Analysis on one (1) other program and they understand that completed Questionnaires from two (2) other seminars are enroute to them.

The new Form 'A' does not fully satisfy the original purposes as set out in the original Forms 'A' & 'B' in that there is currently no provision for evaluation of each unit of the program. The team believes that with the removal of this provision a vital opportunity is lost to test participant's reaction and receptibility to the total conduct of a specific unit so that the probability of the redesign of the materials, method etc. of the unit based on Real Data is removed. The team feels the need for some instrument to evaluate specific units of the course.

Systems' process is handicapped by the fact that they receive no information on the objectives and the design of, and the materials used in the courses. They are therefore not in a position to determine whether the program content and design are geared to meeting the objectives. Moreover, there is no provision in the budget for Systems personnel to 'sit-in' in any of the courses. This limits Systems to relying exclusively on data obtained from completed forms.

Given that Systems received no bio-data on the participants in each program it is also impossible for them to determine whether the course content is appropriate to the level of the participants. If this were done then Systems would be in a better position to determine the transferability of the knowledge gained to the

job situation. Systems would also have the capability of designing an instrument capable of more accurately determining whether knowledge transfer occurred in the participants' job situation. The current instrument used (Form 'C') seems somewhat inadequate.

The team has been informed by CTU that there has been recently introduced a requirement that trainers on the program submit a Trainers Report. This Report is supposed to review the program outlining level and receptibility of participants, difficulties encountered, an assessment of the adequate performance of program logistics, and any other points that the trainer perceives to be worth mentioning. The team further understood that the information gathered from these reports have been used by the CTU to brief trainers on other programs.

None of the above reports were made available to the team for review so that we are not in a position to comment on them. Systems did indicate that where they were able to get a report from the trainer on a program, it was a considerable help in allowing them to better evaluate the course. The team believes that this reporting requirement can be very useful and should be mandatory.

(b) Individual Training Grants:

To evaluate this segment of the Project, Systems uses two (2) questionnaires. One is completed by the trainee and one (1) by the trainee's supervisor. It is the responsibility of CARICOM to distribute and collect these questionnaires and send same to Systems for analysis. To date Systems has had returned to them, forms from only 33% of the trainees and less than 2% of the supervisors. It is hardly necessary to mention that this type of return rate demands a re-examination of the process

formulated for the evaluation of this component of the project. Systems is expected to submit a report in November 1981 and July 1983. Their capacity to make these reports meaningful will be dependent on the CTU's questionnaire collection process.

#### General

Under the terms of Systems contract, they are required to submit an Evaluation Report on the total project in July 1981. Since this report is still being prepared the team was not in a position to review it.

## CONCLUSION

On the whole, the team was impressed with the achievements of CARICOM and the involved countries toward implementing this rather complex project in the period since the first Training Officers Meeting in February, 1980. It was felt that, quite apart from the benefits gained from the training and the subject matter of the seminars, the implementing process had been a learning experience in its own right and had caused progress to be made toward better cooperation and understanding within the region. Despite this general impression that the project was on track, the team nevertheless saw several broad areas which it feels can and should be improved upon.

The team saw the need for:

1. More effective communications between RDO/C and CTU.
2. Wider publication and understanding of Project goals.
3. More direct involvement of Private Sector Organizations in Project activities determination.
4. More efficient and effective use of Island-Specific Training Officers in the Project process.
5. More efficient use of the evaluative machinery in-built in the Project.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Caribbean Regional Development Training Project Number 538-0014, AID Project Paper, September 1979.
2. Report of the Meeting of Representatives of the Caribbean Community Secretariat and the USAID, Georgetown, Guyana, 11-12 February 1980.
3. Report of the Caribbean Regional Training Project Selection Committee Meeting, Georgetown, Guyana, 2 May 1980.
4. Report of the Second Meeting of Regional Training Officers, Georgetown, Guyana, 8-9 January 1981.
5. Report on the Activities of the Caribbean Regional Training Project for the Period August 1979 - January 1981. Submitted February 1981.
6. Report of the Second Meeting of the Selection Committee of the Caribbean Regional Training Project, Georgetown, Guyana, 5 May 1981.
7. Report on the Activities of the Caribbean Regional Training Project for the Period February 1981 - July 1981. Submitted July 1981.
8. Caribbean Community/Systems Evaluation Contract, 31 July 1981.
9. Selected correspondence RDO/C - CARICOM, June - August 1981.
10. Two "Systems" evaluations of Public Sector Regional Seminars.
11. Six "Systems" evaluations of Special Focus Seminars.

APPENDIX B

SYSTEMS STATEMENT OF WORK

In order to achieve the objective specified in Clause 2 of this Agreement, the Consultant shall:

(1) In relation to seventy-two (72) Special Focus Seminars -

(a) Design three (3) instruments to be referred to as Form A, Form B and Form C on the lines indicated in the Annex to this Agreement in order to obtain data on:

- (i) participants' reactions to the seminars; and
- (ii) the impact of training.

Instruments shall consist of both scales and open-ended questions.

(b) Analyse and interpret data received from the instruments mentioned in paragraph (1)(a) above;

(c) Submit to the Community at the end of each seminar a short computer print out which gives the following information:

- (i) mean average ratings for each session, on the dimensions under Form A;
- (ii) the distribution of scatter of the ratings under Forms A and B;
- (iii) a summary of responses to the open-ended questions under Forms A and B.

(d) In relation to Form C, submit to the Community an average of the rank ordering of topics and summary of open-ended questions; and

(e) Prepare an interpretation of all the data which

...draws attention to key points in the evaluations indicating the weaknesses and strengths of the programmes.

- (2) In relation to Individual Training Grants -
  - (a) Design two instruments to obtain data on:
    - (i) trainees' perception of opportunity given them to make use of new knowledge gained; and
    - (ii) supervisors' rating of performance of trainees on the job.
  - (b) Analyse and interpret data received.
- (3) Use the first two seminars as a pilot test and refine instruments if necessary to ensure their reliability.

CARIBBEAN REGIONAL TRAINING PROJECT

Course Evaluation Form

Guidelines for use

Objective

The purpose of this form is to obtain participants' reactions to the entire course.

The following guidelines should be followed:

- 1) The evaluation is confidential and need not be signed.

As a result, you are urged to be frank and to answer thoughtfully.

- 2) Read each question carefully and then circle the number on the scale which best represents your opinion.

The scales should be used as follows:

	<b>Very Little</b>		<b>Satisfactory</b>		<b>Almost completely</b>
Example: My expectations of the course were fulfilled .....	1	2	3	4	5

If you were almost completely fulfilled circle 5

If you were fulfilled but not almost completely, circle 4

If you were satisfactorily fulfilled, circle 3

If you are uncertain if you had satisfaction or very little fulfillment, circle 2

If you had little fulfillment, circle 1

- 3) Regarding questions numbers 10 – 14, the organisers are not the trainers of the courses. The trainers were not responsible for making the physical arrangements, e.g. venue, timing, etc., for the course.

CARIBBEAN REGIONAL TRAINING PROJECT

COURSE EVALUATION FORM

Name of Trainer/Organising Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title \_\_\_\_\_

Location of Course \_\_\_\_\_

Age Range of Participant: Under 20 \_\_\_\_; 21-30 \_\_\_\_; 31-40 \_\_\_\_; 41-50 \_\_\_\_;  
Over 50 \_\_\_\_.

**A. Achievement of Objectives**

1. My expectations of the course were fulfilled .....	Very Little		Satisfactory		Almost completely
	1	2	3	4	5
2. What is your opinion of the content of the course as it relates to the stated objectives of the course?	Poor		Satisfactory		Excellent
	1	2	3	4	5
3. How interested and/or fascinated were you by the course prior to your attending?	Very Little Interest		Satisfactory		Great Degree of Interest
	1	2	3	4	5
4. To what extent would you recommend this course to others in similar positions?	Wouldn't recommend		Some recommendation		Strongly Recommend
	1	2	3	4	5

**B. Relevance of Course to Job Situation**

5. How would you rate the relevance and usefulness of the course to your job situation?	Very Little		Moderate		Great Degree
	1	2	3	4	5

6. To what extent has the course equipped you to make improvements on the job?

Very Little			Satisfactory		To a great extent
1	2	3	4	5	

C. Clarity and usefulness of materials

7. To what extent were teaching aids useful to the practical local situation in which the course was conducted?

Very Little			Moderate		To a great extent
1	2	3	4	5	

D. Teaching Methods

8. How would you rate the teaching methods utilised in relationship to the content of the course?

Poor			Satisfactory		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

9. To what extent were participants allowed to be involved in the course discussion

Very Little			Moderate		To a great extent
1	2	3	4	5	

E. Organisation and Administration

10. How would you rate the venue where the course was held – as it relates to being convenient for you as well as being a relatively comfortable learning environment?

Poor			Satisfactory		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	

11. How would you evaluate the length of the course?

(N.B. For this purpose "too short" is interpreted as having received satisfaction from the course. It is complimentary.)

Too long		Too short		Just right
1	2	3	4	5

12. Did you receive sufficient advance notice on the course

Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

13. Did you receive prior information on the content of the course?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

14. For Small Businessmen – Island Specific Seminars only

a. Were you satisfied with the timing of the course?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
No \_\_\_\_\_

b. If no, what time was your preference?

\_\_\_\_\_

General Questions

15. What is your overall rating of the course?

Poor		Satis- factory		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

16. List three topics (whether or not treated on this course), in order of preference, which you would like further training in.

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
3. \_\_\_\_\_

17. Please comment on any changes you would like to see made in future courses:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

CARIBBEAN REGIONAL TRAINING PROJECT

APPLICATION OF COURSE LEARNING ON THE JOB

Participant's Name \_\_\_\_\_

Organisation \_\_\_\_\_

Course Attended \_\_\_\_\_

Sessions: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Objectives of this evaluation:

The purpose of this evaluation is to assist the course organisers in assessing how helpful each aspect of the course you attended 4 –6 weeks ago has been in assisting you to make practical improvements back on the job.

Instructions:

Please respond to the following questions frankly and thoroughly.

Objective of the Course

The general objective of the course you attended 4 – 6 weeks ago was “to upgrade the managerial and technical skills of public servants and businessmen.”

1. List those areas of your job (managerial and/or technical skills) in which you feel you have improved as a result of attending the course.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

---

---

---

3. How do you rate the impact of your improvements on your organisation/company?

Very Little		Satisfactory		A great deal
1	2	3	4	5

4. List any factors which you consider have inhibited applications that you would have liked to make on the job since completion of the course?

---

---

---

---

5. Please list the three most helpful sessions of the course which have assisted you in making improvements on the job.

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_

6. Do you believe that your managerial and/or technical skills have been enhanced as a result of attending the course?

Yes  No

CARIBBEAN REGIONAL TRAINING PROJECT

INDIVIDUAL TRAINING GRANTS - TRAINEES

Instructions: Please complete the following questionnaire and mail to:

Caribbean Regional Training Project  
CARIBBEAN COMMUNITY SECRETARIAT  
Bank of Guyana Building  
Avenue of the Republic  
Georgetown  
GUYANA

Name: ..... Country: .....

Course: .....

Duration: From ..... To .....

Venue: A. Institution ..... (CATI)

B. Country where located .....

1. Main subjects covered in training

(a) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) \_\_\_\_\_

(c) \_\_\_\_\_

(d) \_\_\_\_\_

(e) \_\_\_\_\_

(f) \_\_\_\_\_

(Other) \_\_\_\_\_

2. How much of your training do you believe you will be able to apply immediately on the job? (Tick one of the boxes).

Nearly all of it - (80 - 100%)

Most of it - (60 - 80%)

About half of it - (40 - 60%)

Not much of it - (Below 40%)

3. What position did you hold before receiving your training?

---

---

4. What position do you hold now?

---

---

5. Have you received any reward in terms of promotion, salary increase, added responsibility/authority, since returning to your job?

YES

NO

6. If the response to No. 5 was 'Yes' please indicate the specific gain and explain.

---

---

7. How much scope do you have in your job situation to implement new ideas acquired?

Very Little

Moderate

A Lot

8. What are some of the factors in your work situation which hinder application of new ideas? Be specific.

---

---

---

---

(a) Teaching methods

3

(b) Relevance of course material to Caribbean situations

(c) Usefulness of material covered to the work you do

(d) Administration of the programme

(e) Other

10. What are the major weaknesses of the programme?

---

---

---

---

11. (a) Would you recommend this type of training for colleagues?

YES

NO

(b) If no, why not?

---

---

---

---

12. What were some of the difficulties you encountered during training? (These may be either administrative or academic).

---

---

---

---



4. To what extent did you discuss with the trainee his/her plans to integrate the new ideas he/she received from training with the present job?

Very little		Satisfactory		To a great extent
1	2	3	4	5

5. To what extent does the trainee share his new ideas with his peers and/or supervisor(s)?

Not at all		Somewhat		To a great extent
1	2	3	4	5

6. What is your perception of the trainees' ability to integrate the newly acquired knowledge with the existing job situation?

Poor		Satisfactory		Good
1	2	3	4	5

7. How would you rate the impact the trainee has made on his/her department and/or the organisation since returning from training?

Very Little		Moderate		Very High
1	2	3	4	5

8. What is your assessment of the trainee's job satisfaction/fulfillment as a result of any change he/she has made since returning from training?

Little Fulfillment		Moderate Fulfillment		Almost Complete
1	2	3	4	5

9. Do you consider that the trainee's overall job performance has changed since his/her return from training?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

10. How would you rate the trainee's overall job performance since his/her return from training?

Poor

Satisfactory

Very High

1

2

3

4

5

11. What are some of the areas that you would have liked the trainee to receive training in that he did not receive?

---

---

---

---

12. Are there any present factors which you feel hinders the trainees' application of new ideas? If so, please explain.

---

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your cooperation.

REGISTER OF PARTICIPANTS

The trainers should complete this Register. Attendance should be recorded at the beginning of each course day. \*The Register must be included with the course evaluations that are being sent to the Project Evaluation Centre for Processing. \*\*[Topics covered should be listed in the space provided on page of this Register.]

Title of Course: \_\_\_\_\_

Country: \_\_\_\_\_ Dates: \_\_\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Organiser/Leader: \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Days: \_\_\_\_\_

Names of Participants	SEX		Company/ Organisation	Job* Class	Sector** of Em- ployment	Attendance Days 1-10										Total		
	M	F				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10			
1																		
2																		
3																		
4																		
5																		
6																		
7																		
8																		
9																		
10																		
11																		
12																		
13																		
14																		
15																		
16																		
17																		
18																		
19																		
20																		
21																		
22																		
23																		
24																		

- \* Job Classification: Please ask the participants to identify the category in which their jobs may be classified. In the space provided above, insert the letter which represents the category identified.
- A: Manager/Director/Senior Civil Servant. e.g. Principal Ass't Secy.; Permanent Secy.
- B: Senior Management/Middle Level Civil Servants
- C: Junior Management, e.g. First Line Supervisors, Sales Representatives, Etc.
- \*\* Place U - If Public Sector employee  
           R - If Private Sector employee  
           P - If Parastatal - e.g. Statutory Corporations

