CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
African Manpower Development Project (AMDP)	698-0384	USAID/Kenya

4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) 615-81-05

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 77 B. Final Obligation Expected FY 77 C. Final Input Delivery FY 81	A. Total $ 1,431,985 B. U.S. $ 1,145,590	From (month/yr.) FY 77 To (month/yr.) FY 81 Date of Evaluation Review April, 1981

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
The African Manpower Development Project (AMDP) Report, copy attached hereto, was produced jointly by USAID/Kenya, REDSO in Nairobi, and the Government of Kenya (GOK). The report contains a comprehensive diagnosis and prognosis of the AMDP with specific attention to the program's activities in Kenya only. In this light, the report shows the program's strengths and weaknesses on the one hand (see pp. 29-30), and recommendations required to improve the program's future cost-effectiveness in Kenya, on the other (see pp. 31-33, and most especially ANNEX A, pp. 1-5).		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- ☐ Project Paper
- ☐ Financial Plan
- ☐ Logical Framework
- ☐ Project Agreement
- ☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- ☐ PIO/T
- ☐ PIO/C
- ☐ PIO/P
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____
- ☐ Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. ☐ Continue Project Without Change
- B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
- C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

Agola Auma-Osolo, Assistant Program Officer

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: ABHerrick

Typed Name: Allison B. Herrick

Date: Aug 17, 1981

AID 1330-15 (3-78)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

EVALUATION OF THE

AFRICAN MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

IN KENYA

(PROJECT NO. 698-0384.6)

DPM/USAID

June, 1981

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Acronyms	(i)
	List of Annexes	(ii)
I.	Summary	1
II.	Introduction	2
III.	Inception and Evolution of the Project	4
IV.	Characteristics of the Participants and their Supervisors	5
V.	Implementation Procedures	12
VI.	Appropriateness and Quality of AMDP Training	17
VII.	Utilization and Impact of AMDP Training	20
VIII.	Adequacy and Relevance of the AMDP Training	23
IX.	Summative Evaluation	29
X.	Formative Evaluation	31
XI.	Post-Script	Annex A Page 3

ACRONYMS

DPM	-	Directorate of Personnel Management
USAID	-	United States Agency for International Development
USAID/K	-	USAID/Kenya
USAID/W	-	USAID/Washington
AMDP	-	African Manpower Development Project
AMDP/PP	-	AMDP Project Paper
RP	-	Returned Participant
Sup	-	Supervisor
OIT	-	Office of International Training (USAID)
CBS	-	Central Bureau of Statistics (Kenya)
ISPC	-	International Statistics Program Center (U.S. Bureau of the Census)
ESAMI	-	East and Southern Africa Management Institute

LIST OF ANNEXES

A. Recommendations

B. List of Identified Participants

C. Tabulation of Selected Quantifiable Questions in the Returned Participant Questionnaire

D. Tabulations of Selected Quantifiable Questions in the Supervisor Questionnaire

E. Basic Source Materials (Bibliography)

F. Participant Questionnaire

G. Supervisor Questionnaire

H. Scope of Work — a proposed evaluation guide showing the rationale, objectives and research methodology

I. USAID/K Communique with the DPM soliciting DPM's formal concurrance on mutual evaluation dated January 26, 1981

J. USAID/K Communique with the DPM soliciting DPM's formal concurrance on a joint meeting to discuss AMDP Evaluation draft report dated April 6, 1981

I. Summary

The AMDP evaluation was carried out jointly by the Directorate of Personnel Management (DPM) of the Government of Kenya and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). The purpose of the evaluation was to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the general training project of the U.S. fiscal years 1977-1981, and to provide viable criteria for the preparation of a possible new general training project. The evaluation process involved the interview of 25 returned participants and 16 supervisors of those participants.

The general finding of the evaluation with respect to the terminating project is that its identified strengths have greater weight and significance than its identified weaknesses, and that the project has therefore achieved its original purpose. The strongest features of the project have been in the areas of collaboration between DPM and USAID, the appropriatenesses of programs for the individual participants, the quality of the training, and its utilization and impact. Although there were also identified weaknesses in these areas, most of these were comparatively minor and correctable. Thirteen specific corrective measures recommended by the Evaluation Team vis à vis these weaknesses are contained in Annex A.

The selection of participants and the adequacy and relevance of the AMDP training are the two major areas in which weaknesses appear to outweigh strengths. In view of the fact that there is no authoritative and universally accepted methodology for making manpower projections, or for establishing training priorities, it is, perhaps, not surprising that there are doubts about the adequacy of the ministry and parastatal five-year manpower/training projections. Moreover, training requests and programs do not appear to be adhering closely to these projections.

The report recommends that the basic purpose of a general training project be reconsidered before commitments are made to it. The common assumption that raising the knowledge and skill levels of an organization's staff will bring about improved organizational performance, and fuller attainment of the organization's social and economic objectives is questioned in the report. The desire of DPM leadership for more in-country training in order to reduce unit costs and achieve greater multiplier effects also raises broader issues concerning the financial feasibility of current policies for expanding the Kenyan education and training system.

II. Introduction

A. Origin of the Evaluation

The Directorate of Personnel Management (DPM) of the Government of Kenya and the United States Agency for International Development Mission in Kenya (USAID/Kenya) initiated a general manpower training project for the GOK Ministries in the U.S. fiscal year 1977 which will terminate in U.S. fiscal year 1981. DPM and USAID/Kenya agreed to carry out a joint evaluation of this project prior to its termination for the following two major reasons (purposes) indicated in II-B below.

B. Two Major Purposes of the Evaluation

1. The summative purpose of the evaluation of the African Manpower Development Project (AMDP) in Kenya is to provide a retrospective review of the project aimed at: (1) determining the extent to which the original purpose of the project has been achieved; (2) identifying the more important factors that contributed to, and that hindered the achievement of this purpose; (3) obtaining information about, and insight into, the inception and evolution of the project, the characteristics of the returned participants and their supervisors, the inputs and implementation procedures, the quality and appropriateness of training, the utilization and the impact of training, and the adequacy and relevance of the training to the Government of Kenya needs and policies of significance for the formative evaluation and the possible design of a new project.

2. The Formative Purpose

The formative purpose of the evaluation is prospective. It is aimed at identifying the desirable changes in the design and in the execution of the manpower activity. Some of the issues that will help focus or structure the formative evaluation are the following: a) the range and variety of factors and conditions for improving the performance of the civil service and parastatals in Kenya; b) the role and importance of training as one of these factors; c) limitation of funding and the increasing cost of U.S. training; d) the possible institutional multiplier effects in Kenya of in-country training, and the relative cost-effectiveness of in-country and third-country training; 4) a possible increase in the participation of women; f) adequacy of the Ministry and parastatal manpower and

training projections; g) the adequacy of current methodologies for making manpower projections; h) the role and function of the Directorate of Personnel Management (DPM) in improving civil service and parastatal performance and in coordinating donor activities.

C. Methodology and Scope

The evaluation is a collaborative undertaking of the Government of Kenya and the United States Agency for International Development. Ms. Wanjiru Getechah of DPM, Prof. Agola Auma-Osolo of Program Office of USAID/Kenya, and Mr. Brandon Robinson of USAID's Regional Economic Development Support Office (REDSO) constitute the evaluation team. The team reviewed the the documents related to the AMDP in Kenya (see Annex E) in the first week; prepared the returned participant questionnaire in the second week; interviewed returned participants and prepared a supervisor questionnaire in the third week; interviewed some more returned participants and their supervisors, and tabulated the questionnaires in the fourth week; and prepared the draf report in the fifth and sixth weeks. In addition to returned participants and supervisors, interviews were also given to Mr. F. Munge, Deputy Secretary, and Mrs. G. Wakhungu, Undersecretary in the DPM, and to Mr. Kevin O'Donnell, Chief of the Multisector and Engineering Division of USAID/Kenya and Mrs. Teresa Muraya, Training Assistant of USAID/Kenya.

With respect to scope, it was agreed that the evaluation would not include the African Graduate Scholarship Program (AFGRAD) which is independently administered.

Upon completing the draft report on March 20, 1981, the Evaluation Team circulated copies of the report to both DPM and USAID/K for their independent study and comments. After three weeks, i.e., after an independent review of the draft report by both DPM and USAID/K, a joint-meeting was held on April 13, 1981 at the USAID/K office by both parties (including the evaluation team) to discuss the findings and recommendations contained in the draft report with a view of preparing a way for this final AMDP Evaluation Report.

III. Inception and Evolution of the Project

The AMDP Project Paper (AMDP/PP), prepared by the Regional Affairs Division of the USAID African Bureau in Washington, D.C., and signed in June 14, 1976, is the basis of the AMDP/Kenya program. The Paper describes a region-wide African program that it to have the following purpose: "The project will meet critical requirements for managerially and technically skilled manpower in African countries in order to enhance their contribution to social and economic development." The Paper specified that the skills in question will be related to priority economic and social development. It goes on to say that each participating African government cooperating with AID will develop and submit an annual training proposal to the Africa Bureau. It also provides the following selection criteria: a) pre-project training; b) post-project training; c) training for sector objectives; d) training for trainers; e) training to upgrade the skills of individuals in specialized positions; f) training to fill positions.

The first Kenya participants who underwent training under AMDP in the U.S. fiscal year (FY) 1977 were funded from Washington, D.C. Beginning in 1978 funds were alloted to the country missions. Training grants provided by USAID/Kenya during fiscal years 1978, 1979 and 1980 were $213,000, $466,090 and $316,500, respectively, a total of $995,900. In FY 1977 and 1978 almost all the participants were long-term academic participants who enrolled in a university and spent at least one academic year in study there. In FY 1979 the Chief of the Multisector and Engineering Division of USAID/Kenya expanded the program by including the short-term, specilized training programs, announced by AID/W each year, in the offering of training programs to DPM. As will be seen below, the larger portion of FY 1979 and 1980 participants have attended the short-term specialized programs.

IV. Characteristics of the Participants and their Supervisors

A. Participants

The lack of a roster or register of paricipants in both USAID/Kenya and the DPM office places difficulties in the way of a complete listing and accounting of the participants.1/ Whereas

1/ Annex B is a list of 52 participants whose participant files were received by the evaluation team. This list includes participants who have returned to Kenya, and participants who are still studying in the U.S. Due to the lack of an up-to-date roster and other reasons, not all the participants who have returned were contacted by the evaluation team; nor was the team able to interview all those who were contacted. The statistics that appear below gives a picture of the evaluation status of the 52 identified participants.

Total number of identified participants = 52. Returned participants = 43. Still studying in the U.S. as AMDP participants = 9

the evaluation team was able to receive 52 participant names from the USAID/K Training Office, the records of AID's East African Accounting Center (EAAC) indicate that 63 PIO/Ps (Project Implementation Order for Participants) were obligated during FYs 1978, 1979 and 1980. These 63 PIO/Ps could palpably represent either a larger or smaller number of participants since some PIO/Ps are issued for more than two or more participants attending the same Training program and some individuals have been participants two time during this period. The same problem also holds true with respect to inter alia, other project training activities such as (1) training the Ministry of Energy (MOE) personnel in advance of expected USAID/MOE bilateral project, and (2) funding some trade union representatives . complementary to the African American Labor Center program; and other AMDP related training activities. For instance, during the DPM-USAID/K joint discussion on the first draft of this evaluation findings (April 13, 1981), the evaluation team learned from the USAID/K Training Office that the latter had, in fact, also administered various other AMDP-related training activities. Between 1979 and 1981, the Office had trained ten (10) labor union representatives in the U.S. in the area of trade union management: One (1) was fully funded by USAID/K, two (2) by both USAID/K and the Office of Labor/W, and seven (7) by the Office of Labor alone (as indicated in the Table below):

Trade Union Participants

In USAID/K AMDP Training Program
1979-1981

1.	Pius Odhiambo	- National Cooperative Officer COTU - fully funded by USAID/K
2.	John B. Mboga	- National Treasurer KNUT, partial OLAB Grant, USAID/K International Travel
3.	Rebecca Nyathogora	- Assistant Treasurer, General, Union of Commercial Food and Allied Workers Union. Partial OLAB Grant, USAID/K round trip.
4.	Samuel Jefwa	- National Treasurer, Union of Kenya Civil Servants - OLAB Grant
5.	Joseph Mugalla	- Deputy Secretary General Commercial Food & Allied Workers Union OLAB Grant
6.	Jeckoniah Bondi	- National Chairman, Chemical Workers Union OLAB Grant
7.	Ambrose Adongo	- Secretary General KNUT, OLAB Grant
8.	Phillip Mwangi	- General Secretary Agricultural Union OLB Grant
9.	Chadwick Adongo	- General Secretary, Union of Posts and Telecommunications Employees OLAB
10.	Samuel Oyongo	- Chairman, Kenya Amalgamated Metal Workers Union OLAB Grant

Key: 1 represents fully funded by USAID/K
2-3 represents funded by USAID/Kenya and OLAB
4-10 represents funded by OLAB
OLAB represents Office of Labor in AID/W

Source: USAID/K Training Office, Nairobi

In addition to these outside-country training activities, USAID/K had also administered the following in-country (Kenya) management training workshop, e.g., in Kisumu in 1979 at the total costs of US$10,661.66. However, like both academic and short-term training activities, all these activities also lacked a roster/register for quick reference, etc. -- a factor which consequently precipitated the Evaluation Team's oversight at the initial time the evaluation started. Thus, had there been this roster at the outset of this evaluation, all these activities and participants would easily have been identified and accounted for accordingly by the Evaluation Team.

Recommendation No. 1: that USAID/Kenya, with the assistance of EAAC, establish an up-to-date register of Kenyan AMDP participants funded under USAID/Kenya funds, and that subsequent entry in the register be made immediately after preparation of the PIO/P containing: Nature of the program, place of training, dates of training, discipline, Ministry (place of work), age, sex, geographical area of origin, etc.

Fields of Study of the 52 Identified Participants

A. Long-Term (Academic) Programs

Field of Study	Number of Participants
1. Management Science	2
2. Vocational Education (Guidance and Counselling)	2
3. Agronomy	3
4. Agricultural Economics	3
5. Public Finance and Financial Administration	1
6. Educational Administration	2
7. Development Economics	2
8. Farm Management	1
9. Public Administration	1
10. Computer Data Systems	3
11. Social Science Administration	1
12. Nutrition	1
TOTAL	22

B. Short-Term Programs

Field of Study	Number of Participants
1. Human Resources Development	1
2. Aquaculture	1
3. Shelter Training	3
4. Technology for the People Fair	2
5. Measuring and Analyzing Prices, Income Distribution and Poverty	1
6. Investment Negotiation	3
7. Manpower Projections and Forecasting for Planning	3
8. Energy Management	2
9. Characteristics of Labour Force	1
10. Agricultural Projects Analysis	4

Field of Study	Number of Participants
11. Labour Statistics	4
12. Real Project Accounting	1
13. Study Tour of the American Agricultural Credit Organizations	2
14. Planning for 1980 Census	1
15. Trade Union (COTU)	1
TOTAL	30

Of the 52 identified participants, only 5 were women. The evaluation team does not know whether this constitutes an under-representation of women in terms of ministry and parastatal staffing. Moreover, the specializations of staff and the training programs offered by other donors must also be taken into account. The issue of equal opportunity for women first arises in education, then in hiring, staffing and promotion practices and finally in the provision of training to staff. Since it is the policy of both the Government of Kenya and AID to provide women with greater professional opportunities, consideration should be given to the preparation of a DPM study of the numbers of women in higher education, in the public service, and in training, both in-country and abroad.

Recommendation No. 2: that a study, such as the one mentioned above, be carried out by DPM, and that after the study DPM and USAID jointly determine what measures under their collaborative manpower activities would be appropriate for increasing professional opportunities for women.

Returned Participants: 43. Interviewed: 25. Short-term, specialized programs: 15. Long-term, academic programs: 10.

Returned Participants who were not interviewed: 18. Contact attempted 10. Contact not attempted: 8. (Of the 8 returned participants with whom contact was not attempted, apparently 3 are pursuing additional studies abroad.)

Of the 52 identified AMDP participants, 20 have undertaken long-term academic courses as follows: (a) 5 PhDs; (b) 15 MAs/MScs; (c) 2 BAs. (The two BA participants went on to get their Masters degrees.) The duration of the Master degree programs had ranged from nine to 24 months; and the Ph.D programs from 3 to 4 years.

Of the 52 identified AMDP participants, 32 have taken short-term specialized programs, the duration of which has ranged from one to five months, and most of which are about two-months long.

The information that follows refers only to the 25 interviewed participants, 15 of which attended short-term, specialized programs, and 10 of which attended long-term academic programs.

Age: The age of the 25 participants interviewed ranged from 27 to 49 years.

The average age was 35 years.

Geographical Distribution:

Provinces:	Nyanza	- 8
	Central	- 4
	Eastern	- 4
	Western	- 4
	Rift Valley	- 3
	Nairobi	- 1
	Coast	- 1
	North Eastern	- 0
	Total	25

Districts:	Siaya	- 6
	Nyeri	- 3
	Kericho	- 2
	Meru	- 2
	Kakamega	- 2
	Bugoma	- 2
	Kisii	- 1
	Nairobi	- 1
	Kiambu	- 1
	Embu	- 1
	Kilifi	- 1
	Machakos	- 1
		23

Obviously, the geographical distribution of the 25 participants is quite broad.

Civil Service Level or Job Group

Only 15 of the 25 returned participants are in the civil service. Eleven are faculty members of the University of Nairobi or officials of parastatals. The job group distribution of the civil service officials is shown below.

Job Group	No. of Participants
H	3
J	6
K	3
L	1
M	2
N	0

The professional and administrative level of the Kenya civil service can be viewed as constituted by a junior, middle and senior level. A recent university graduate that enters the civil service normally is employed at job group H. The junior level can be viewed as encompassing job groups H through J; middle level, K through L; senior level, M through Q. Based on this classification, of the 15 participants nine are in the junior level, four in the middle level, and two in the senior level. The selection of these participants would appear to conform to the original regional project paper purpose of training "middle level manpower." It should also be noted that of the 25 interviewed participants 18 hold supervisory positions.

B. Supervisors

The evaluation team was able to contact and interview 16 officials each of whom supervises at least one of the returned participants. Thirteen of these 16 supervisors are in the civil service. The job group classification of these supervisors appears below.

Job Group	No. of Supervisors
L	6
M	1
N	3
P	2
Q	1

Based on the classification previously specified, six of the interviewed supervisors are in the middle level of the professional and administrative civil service cadre, and seven (M through Q) are in the senior level.

On the average, the interviewed supervisors are roughly one step above the returned participants in terms of civil service level.

All 16 of the interviewed supervisors have received training abroad, as shown below.

Country of Training	Nos. Trained
Western Europe	7
United States	4
USSR	4
Australia	1

Of the 16 interviewed supervisors, two apparently do not have first degrees, seven have first degrees, and seven have a graduate degree.

V. Implementation Procedures

A. Collaboration of DPM and USAID/Kenya

DPM is the organization in the Government of Kenya that has the main responsibility for the provision of training. In determining training needs and selecting participants, DPM reviews Ministry and parastatal applications for training that are presumably based on that organization's manpower and training projections. Guided, in turn, by the AMDP regional project paper and by annual notification of funding availabilities, USAID/Kenya first comes to an agreement with DPM concerning the broad outlines of the annual program. This is reflected in the country training program (CTP) proposal cable to Washington which, after approval, serves as a general framework for the review of candidates by DPM and USAID.

The collaboration between the two entities has functioned quite smoothly. Both entities have made the major inputs expected of them in a responsible and opportune fashion. This effective collaborative relationship would appear to be a good basis for the execution of future activities.

B. Selection of Participants

There are different perspectives and analytical levels from which the process for selecting participants can be fruitfully examined. Since the manpower projections presumably guide these selections, assessment of the adequacy of the manpower and training projections should be the first step in assessing the selection process, and in section III some consideration will be given to this issue.

Viewing the projections as given, an attempt was made to determine the experiences had, and the view of the process held, by participants and their supervisors. In the case of the 15 short-term participants, 11 had been informed they had been selected, three had been asked if they wanted to go, and one had proposed himself. In the case of the 10 academic participants this distribution was quite different: three were informed they had been selected, three asked if they wanted to go, and as many as four proposed themselves. (Question 14 on the returned participant questionnaire.) The precise significance of these answers is not clear, but they may suggest that the relation between the manpower training projections and actual selections is fairly loose.

With respect to satisfaction with the selection process, the difference between participant and supervisor responses is noteworthy. In the case of the short-term program, almost one-half of the participants characterized the process as poor or fair; whereas almost all the supervisors characterized it as good or excellent. For the academic program, five of the responding participants characterized selection as poor or fair, four as good as excellent; whereas once again, all but one (who did not answer) of the supervisors characterized it as good or excellent. (Returned participant (RP) question, (Q) 18 and supervisor (Sup) question (Q) 18 in annexes C and D).

There appears to be general satisfaction with the selection process on the part of supervisors. One of the main reasons for favorable characterization (Sup. Q. 18) given by the supervisors is the careful committee review of the candidates, with emphasis on academic qualifications. The virtue of final approval by DPM is also mentioned.

There are two considerations that may temper or qualify acceptance of the supervisor's high ratings. The first is the fact that the supervisors play a key role in the selection process; and are, to a certain extent, judging their own performance. The second is that none of the replies to Sup. Q. 19 makes reference to the organization's manpower and training projections. Since this is the official basis for training that omission may be significant.

Returned participant characterization of the selection process is obviously less favorable (RP Q 19). There are some references to favoritism or unfairness. However, most of the critisism seems to be directed against poor communication: the participant's lack of informatiom concerning selection criteria, and the nature and timing of the selection process. It should also be kept in mind that this mixed rating of the selection was given by fairly recently returned participants - by individuals who were selected. Had the question about the adequacy of the selection process been posed to a random sample of ministry and parastatal staff (including officials who have not gone for training abroad) it seems likely that the results would have been more negative.

Indeed, 12 supervisors answered "yes" to the question: "In your experience, are there many officials who expect to go for training aborad but do not?" (Sup. Q. 26), and only three answered "no". When asked "Why?" 11 of these 12 supervisors made references to the shortage of money or to funding limitations, particularly with regard to donors.

Question 13 of the supervisor questionnaire was: "Are you familiar with your Ministry's Five-Year Manpower Training Projections?" Eight of the interviewed supervisors answered "yes"; five answered "no"; and three did not answer.

Question 14 was: "Did you consider these training projections realistic?" Five answered "yes"; five answered "no"; and six did not answer.

Three broad conclusions appear to be warranted in the light of these findings. First, application for training seems to be a fairly open process. Such a process may create both a demand for, and an expectation of, training that is larger than can be satisfied. Second, either selection for taining is not tightly linked to the manpower training projections, or those projections are so broad and all-inclusive, they are consonant with an applications process that is comparatively open. Third, the demand for training that is generated under this process represents a total cost that appears to be greater than the available funds that are provided by the Government of Kenya and the foreign assistance donors. Obviously, these are conclusions of significance for the design of a new program.

The limitations of the recent survey should not be lost from view. In terms of the manpower training needs and activities of the Government of Kenya, the survey may be more "indicative" than representative. (After all, only 25 returned participants and 16 supervisors have been interviewed.)

It does seem clear, however, that the issues listed under section II.B.2 "The Formative Process", are of importance to the two parties. These issues are: a) the range and variety of factors and conditions for improving the performance of the civil service and parastatals in Kenya; b) the role and importance of training as one of these factors; c) limitation of funding and the increasing cost of U.S. training; d) the possible institutional multiplier effects in Kenya of in-country training; e) a possible increase in the participation of women; f) adequacy of the Ministry and parastatal manpower and training projections; g) the adequacy of current methodologies for making manpower projections; h) the role and function of the Directorate of Personnel Management (DPM) in improving civil service and parastatal performance and in coordinating donor activities. These issues were identified in most part, during the survey, and as a result of the interviews with participants, supervisors, and Mr. F. Munge, Deputy Secretary, and Mrs. G. Wakhungu, Undersecretary of DPM. Some of the observations and suggestions made by these two officials will appear in the concluding sections IX and X.

Issues concerning the magnitude and composition of education and training that can and should be provided are among the most complex that are faced by a nation, developed or developing. Issues concerning the proper process of selection are related to the larger issues of relevance (considered in section VIII). Consequently, improvements in the selection process will depend greatly on improvements in the approach to manpower development. Once again, the difficulties facing the latter improvements should not be underestimated. There are major quarrels among so-called manpower experts concerning the proper way to proceed, and there is no commonly agreed-upon methodology for identifying and prioritizing manpower and training needs -- not even when this identification and prioritization is limited to government service.

Nevertheless, there are certain preliminary measures that can be taken, and that may contribute to a clarification of the Kenya government trained manpower problem. In his interview Mr. Munge said that DPM has a clearing house role and is responsible for preventing a piecemeal approach to training. On the other hand, he pointed out, skill needs and the selection of candidates should be left to the specilized ministry or parastatal.

Due to the survey's limitations, the three conclusions stated above could do no more than suggest that there may be radical discrepancies between the demand for, and the expectation of training, on the one hand, and the supply on the other. To help quantify and clarify this problem area it might be useful for DPM and the foreign assistance agencies offering training programs

to have complete information concerning ministry and parastatal staff, the applications for training by individual officials, DPM rejections and approvals, acceptance by foreign assistance agencies, and total funding availabilities. The ability to quantify and compare the amounts and kinds of staff, training applications, DPM approvals, Government of Kenya and foreign assistance agency participants, and actual and projected funding, would help shed some light on the issues listed above.

Recommendation No. 3: that DPM help establish and then coordinate a recording and reporting process in each ministry, parastal, and in DPM, that will provide the Government of Kenya and the foreign assistance agencies with this manpower information.

C. Participant Placement and Support

Question 15 of the returned participant questionnaire is: "Were you advised of your training date of commencement sufficiently in advance to plan and put your personal affairs in order?" In the case of short-term participants, 12 answered "yes" and three answered "no". In the case of the academic, long-term participants, six answered "yes" and four answered "no". Of the total of seven who answered "no", four place the main blame on USAID, one on the government of Kenya, and two place the blame on both.

There may be some significance in the fact that a larger proportion of the academic participants felt that they were not given sufficient advance notice. In her interview Mrs. Teresa Muraya, the USAID Training Assistant, indicated that delays which could be considered excessive were occuring on both sides: in the processing of documents by supervisors and others in the Government of Kenya, and in AID/W and the U.S. universities. She also suggested that more complete screening in Kenya might reduce processing time in the U.S., particularly with respect to academic programs. She suggested that in a few cases in which a B.A. requirement should be waived, a pre-identification of U.S. universities and colleges that could be willing to waive it would help speed things up.

Recommendation No. 4: that original expected date of departure, the actual date of departure, and the date that the participant is notified of acceptance be information in the USAID/Kenya register of participants.

Apparently, the process of passports, visas, ticketing, medical examinations and health cards, which involves both parties has been functioning satisfactorily.

A significant amount of dissatisfaction with the maintenance allowance was expressed by the participants. Nine of the 15 short-term participants said the allowance was not sufficient. In the case of the academic participants, four declared it to be sufficient, five not sufficient, and one did not reply.

Recommendation No. 5: that the office of International Training in AID/W reassess the adequacy of the maintenance allowance in the light of living costs, particularly in university areas.

The returned participants view of their housing was more favorable. In the case of short-term participants nine declared it to be satisfactory, five unsatisfactory, and one did not reply. Nine of the ten academic participants said their housing was unsatisfactory, and only one said it was not.

A complaint that was received from various returned participants who occupy high-level positions was that they were obliged to share a room with students whose living habits (bedtime hours, music-playing, etc) were not compatible. These senior officials felt that they should have been singled out for special treatment with respect to living arrangements.

Recommendation No. 6: that USAID ask OIT if such special arrangements are possible, and that, if so, the conditions and precedures for the identification of these officials to be discussed with DPM.

VI. Appropriateness and Quality of AMDP Training

It may be useful to distinguish the "appropriateness of training" from the "relevance of training" which will be considered in a subsequent section. The "appropriateness of training" refers here to the relation of the training to the individual's background and needs; whereas an inquiry into "relevance" is concerned primarily with the relation of the training to national needs.

Question 21 for the returned participants is: "Were your courses or was your program in a subject-matter area in which you had previously been educated or trained?" Twelve of the short-term participants chose "yes", two chose "no"; and one chose "only partly". In the case of the long-term academic participants, five answered "yes" and five answered "only partly".

Twelve of the 15 short-term participants considered the content of the course to be on the "right level" for them; and two found them to be "repetitious". Seven of the 10 academic participants chose "right level" as their answers; one chose "repetitious"; one "too advanced", and one did not answer. (RP Question 22.)

From the responses to RP questions 21 and 22, it would appear correct to conclude that both the short-term and academic training provided under AMDP have been "appropriate".

RP questions 23-30 were an attempt to assess the quality of the training, as viewed by the participants. A quantitatively oriented question (RP Q. 23) was asked with respect to content, namely whether in view of the time spent on the program "a very large amount", "a fairly large amount", "a moderate amount" or "a small amount" of new knowledge and skills had been acquired. In the cases of both short-term and academic participants about 2/3 selected the upper range of "very large" or "fairly large" amounts.

The participants were even more complimentary concerning the "quality of the teaching and the institutional procedure generally". Of the 15 short-term participants, six chose "excellent" and seven chose "good"; of the 10 academic participants, three chose"excellent" and six chose "good" (RP Question 24).

To RP question 29, "Do you feel the program can be improved?" 13 of the 15 short-term participants and eight of the 10 academic participants replied "yes". Since almost any "program can be improved" this is a loaded question the purpose of which was to elicit "suggestions for improving it" (RP Question 30) which could be added to the answers to open-ended RP questions 25 and 26 (requesting specification of "strong aspects" and "weak aspects"). It was hoped that the answers to these three open-ended questions would give a fuller picture of strengths and weaknesses and provide criteria for improvements.

In general, the participants identified two major strengths in the programs which should be preserved. First, the cross-national character of the student body, particularly the representation of other developing countries, was viewed a good feature of the programs. The partipants enjoyed and benefited from a professional interaction with participants from other developing countries. This student body composition of officials from different countries and regions is a feature that should be preserved, whenever possible.

A second strong aspect mentioned by the returned participants is general quality of the organization, planning and presentation of the programs. Most of the participants were pleased with the instructional procedures and with the mix of theoretical and practical activities.

Three weaknesses were identified. In the case of the short-courses, various participants felt that too much material had been crammed into the available time, and that greater duration would have been desirable. Some of these participants also felt that some of the professors were too theoretical, insufficiently acquainted with Third World problems, and somewhat touchy and defensive about this. Finally, the most important complaint of the academic participants came from those who obtained a M.Sc. in data processing. These participants claimed that they were given too much statistics and economics in the Master's data processing program given by the International Statistics Program Center (ISPC) of the U.S. Bureau of Census, and that they were not properly informed in Kenya about the U.S. program. Morever, it is our understanding that complaints about excessive amounts of statistics and economics in the ISPC computer science master Sc. program have been made before.

Recommendation No. 7: that OIT hold discussions with ISPC in order to correct this imbalance and provide computer science specialists with the advanced systems analysis and data processing training expected, and that OIT advise all field missions of the results of these negotiations.

The recommendations for improvement tend to reinforce the statements about strengths and weaknesses. The following recommendations were made: (1) that participants should be more fully informed in Kenya about the program; (2) wherever possible the program should be offered in an LDC; (3) more time for reading; (4) more papers by participants on their areas and problems as a way of exchanging experiences among participants; (5) stricter adherence of programs to the announced content; (6) more tolerance and greater disposition for listening to adult participants from some professors; (7) greater concentration on Third World problems; (8) more prompt service from OIT in having ready the ticket of participants completing their study away from Washington and anxious to return to their homes and families.

Recommendation No. 8: that for each program, short-term or academic, a brochure or similar information (e.g., cabled Training Implementation Plan) describing the program be shared with each participant in Kenya; and that, prior to departure, the participant signs a statement that he has received the brochure, is familiar with its contents, and declares that this is the training he wishes to take.

The evaluation team had been told that the separation of family members constituted a major problem for the training of Kenyan overseas. RP question 27 asked the participant to choose from three characterizations regarding the seriouness of the

problem of having to leave his or her family in Kenya. In the case of the 15 short-term participants, only one declared it to be "a very serious problem"; six said it was "not a serious problem"; and eight did not reply (largely on the grounds that the question was not appropriate). Of the 10 academic participants, five chose "a very serious problem"; and one did not reply. It would seem reasonable to conclude that the problem is not serious for short-term participants (most of whom are away for two or three months), but is serious for academic participants. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the five academic participants who chose "a very serious problem" also replied "yes" to the question as to whether they would have preferred to have had their training program in Kenya. This family/training problem will be considered again in section X.

VII. Utilization and impact of the AMDP Training

Accurate measurement and thorough assessment of the utilization and impact of the AMDP training would require a prior identification and quantification of the needed changes in ministry and parastatal performance which would be compared with the identified and measured changes in performance resulting from the AMDP training. The data appearing in this section has a much more modest objective. It simply provides information concerning participant and supervisor views concerning the effects of the training on the participant's performance and career.

Perhaps the first obvious question is whether the participant has or has not returned to the organization to which he or she belonged before training. This was determined by comparing the reply to question 33 with the reply question 8 in the participant questionnaire. In the case of the 15 short-term participants, 13 were in the same organization and two were not. Of the 10 academic participants interviewed, eight were in the same organization and two were not. (The utilization impact of the four individuals who changed employers has not been measured separately.)

Two related issues will be briefly considered. A common concern about training abroad is the extent to which it may lead to a brain drain. In the examination of documents and in the interviews, the evaluation team has not seen evidence of brain drain. Moreover, both Mr. Munge and Mrs. Wakhungu declared that a brain drain is not a problem in Kenya.

The second related issue concerns the Central Bureau of Statistics. Only those government officials who are sent for study abroad for six months or more are bonded. Consequently,

it is only the returned academic participants who must remain for, say, three years in the sponsoring organization, or who must make a rather large payment. Interviews with returned participants working in CBS and with a CBS supervisor revealed the fact that the retention of trained computer science personnel by CBS is a very serious problem. As in other developing countries, well-trained systems analysts and programmers can obtain higher wages in the private sector, and tend to remain in the government only as long as required by the bonding arrangement. In CBS this phenomenon has placed great obstacles in the way of the collection, processing, analysis and the publication of data that is of such enormous importance for improving policy formulation and management. The drain of professionals from the government to the private sector also takes place in other entities and in other areas (engineering, for example). Nevertheless, obtaining accurate, detailed and comprehensive information for macroeconomic and sectoral (agriculture and health, for example) analysis and planning is of great urgency and importance, and justifies priority attention to CBS.

Recommendation No. 9: that DPM explores the real causal factors of CBS' recurrent brain-drainage (i.e., problem of retaining its best Kenyan personnel), and a possible prognosis.

One possible kind of impact of training is to improve the grade or position of the returned participant. Five of the 15 short-term, and five of the ten academic participants are now in a higher job group than they were before the training.

RP question 39 asked the participant if, after returning to professional work, he or she had found the training received to be "very useful", "quite useful", "somewhat useful" or "not useful at all." Five of the short-term participants chose "very useful"; four "quite useful", five "somewhat useful", one "not useful at all" -- nine in the upper range and six in the lower range. Three of the academic participants chose "very useful", four quite useful", three "somewhat useful", none "not useful at all" -- seven in the upper range and three in the lower range.

It is important to note that in responding to the subsequent RP question 40 "why" four of the short-term participants who ranked utility in the lower range said or clearly indicated that the course content was repetitious for them. (This short-term participant response is not in full accord with the short-term participant distribution of responses to question 22. In replying to question 22 only two of the short-term participants chose "repetitious" as the right characterization of course content, and one did not reply.)

The reason given by three academic participants for ranking "utility" in the lower level is also significant. One said that the course was not sufficiently advanced (data processing) and the other two made it clear that the training was not job-related.

The lesson drawn from these cases is clear. A mis-match between training needs and expectations (as defined by participants) and the content of the program is ocurring with sufficient frequency to be considered a problem. This underlines the importance of Recommendation No. 6 calling for an adequate written description of the program, and a pre-departure signature of the participant, acknowledging familiarity with and acceptance of the program.

Although "utility" of the training gets a similar rating by the academic and the short-term participants, the latter respond much more positively to RP question 46: "Do you feel that you have been given the opportunities needed to utilize the training you received?" Twelve of the 15 short-term participants answered "yes" to this question, and three answered "no"; whereas only four of the 10 academic participants answered "yes", four answered "no"; one answered "too soon to tell" and one did not answer.

In the case of the 10 academic participants there is a prima facie discrepancy between the pattern of responses to question 39 and 46. Although seven rated the "utility" of the training in the upper range, only four felt they had "been given the opportunities needed to utilize the training you received." It may be appropriate to remember here that five of the 10 academic participants are now in a higher job group than they were before the training. Perhaps, their promotions had something to do with their having given the "utility" of the training a higher rating than they gave to the "opportunities needed to utilize the training" received.

Obtaining a new diploma or credential is not the same thing as improving one's job performance. The latter involves professional incentives and motivations and institutional arrangements, as well as the possession of increased knowledge and skills by the trainee Since the trainee's viewpoint may be partial, a similar question about the utility of the training was asked of the 16 interviewed supervisors (Sup. Question 33) in relation to "the work s/he has to perform." Nine of the supervisors said "very useful", four "quite useful, two "somewhat useful", none "not useful at all", and one did not reply. It should also be noted that the rating of the nine officials who supervise returned participants who had been enrolled in a long-term academic program. (Six "very useful" and one "quite useful" for the former, three "very useful", three

"quite useful", two "somewhat useful" and one "no answer" for the latter.) This rating of the utilization of training by supervisors is consistent with the rating for opportunities of utilization given by the returned participants (RP question 46).

It is generally assumed that the utilization of knowledge and skills increases job satisfaction, and that job satisfaction affects the decisions to remain in or to leave the organization. RP question 53 offered the participant three choices concerning the time s/he expected to be working for the present organization. In the case of the 15 short-term participants, none chose "less than one year"; two chose "one to three years", 10 chose "more than three years"; and three did not answer.

The responses of the 10 academic participants is somewhat less encouraging. One chose "less than one year"; four chose "one to three years"; and five chose "over three years". In other words, two-thirds of the short-term and one-half of the academic participants chose "more than three years."

Whereas a completely clear picture of the utilization and impact of the training has not emerged from the survey, more doubts and reservations in this area abound pertaining to the academic participants than to the short-term participants.

Recommendation No. 10: that DPM and USAID carry out an ongoing tracer of returned participants who have had long-term academic training in order to follow their careers and make fuller appraisals of the costs and benefits of academic training.

VIII. Adequacy and Relevance of the AMDP Training

Perhaps the greatest difficulty encountered in the design of a training program is the accurate identification of needs. Training specifications should be derived from previously identified institutional needs: more specifically, from the changes in procedures, organization and staffing needed for fuller attainment of the organization's objectives. Since training is not carried out for training's sake, and since training is not and end but a means, the design of a training program for a ministry or parastatal should be based on the identification of that organization's current needs for contributing more fully to the achievement of its social and economic objectives. For example, if the current principal objectives of a Ministry of

Agriculture are to help increase the national production of food and the income of farm families, better performance in achieving these objectives may require changes in procedures which would lead, in turn, to changes in organization and staffing, and to a fresh determination of training requirements.

A complete and accurate assessment of the relevance of the training provided under AMDP would require a prior assessment of the extent to which the ministry and parastatal manpower/training projections are being reflected in the training requests of the ministries and parastatals, and the resulting training programs of all donors, including AID. Although such an assessment would involve a major study that could not be carried out in the available time, its possible value should be kept in mind.

All training tends to be viewed as "good", and "good" it usually is -- in some sense or other. But funds are limited, and the great difficulty resides in establishing priorities, and in this area the evaluation team cannot pretend to make warranted judgments.

The present assessment of the adequacy and relevance of AMDP must be limited largely to the views of Government of Kenya officials, including participants, concerning the adequacy and the relevance of training, i.e., the total amount of training that needs to be provided, and the pattern of specilization or specific kinds of training. This would also appear to be the appropriate section in which to consider the issue of training (U.S., third-country or in-country) since the locus or site affects costs and, as a consequence, the total amount of training that can be provided.

Mr. F. Munge, Deputy Secretary in DPM, brought various of of these points together in his interview. He pointed out that the unit cost (for example, the person/month cost) of the short-term programs in U.S. is high, and suggested that consideration should be given to the possible reduction of unit costs through more third-country and in-country training. Mr. Munge's office later provided the evaluation team with some information concerning costs of education and training in Britain, U.S.A., Canada and India. In order to be able to compare in-country university training costs with the costs in the above four countries, the team telephoned the University of Nairobi's Department of Finance and the Registrar's office of the International University of Africa and obtained some preliminary information about current in-country university costs. The information provided by DPM and Nairobi University are consolidated in the table below.

OVERSEAS TRAINING COSTS FOR UNDER GRADUATE AND POST GRADUATE FROM KENYA

COUNTRY	INSTITUTION		AIR FARE RETURN JOURNEY	TUITION FEES P.A.	MAINTENANCE P.A.	INCIDENTALS	TOTAL P.A.
			KShs.	KShs.	KShs.	KShs.	KShs.
a) BRITAIN	1) Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine		15,170.00	51,377.00	53,613.00	-	120,160.00
	2) Reading University		"	45,900.00	"	-	114,683.00
	3) School of Librarianship		"	29,261.00	"	-	98,044.00
b) U.S.A.	1) Arthur D. Little		17,866.00	62,720.00	61,620.00	5,200.00	147,406.00
	2) St. Louis University		"	29,250.00	28,170.00	2,850.00	78,136.00
c) CANADA	1) McGill University		18,126.00	10,486.00	26,880.00	-	55,492.00
	2) University of New Brunswick		"	5,925.00	35,004.00	-	59,059.00
d) INDIA	Various University Colleges		8,310.00	(Tuition Fees, Maintenance and) (Incidentals - KShs. 20,000.00) (per annum)			28,310.00
e) KENYA	1) University of Nairobi	Undergraduate	-	29,000.00	6,840.00	11,000.00	46,840.00
		Postgraduate	-	6,000.00	30,000.00	4,700.00	40,000.00
	2) International University of Africa	Undergraduate	-	36,000.00	30,000.00	24,000.00	90,000.00
		Postgraduate	-	27,675.00	30,000.00	24,000.00	81,675.00

Source: a-d Figures from the GOK Directorate of Personnel Management Office of the President, Nairobi

e (1) Figures from the Finance Department - University of Nairobi

e (2) Figures from the Registrar, International University of Africa

The above are costs of long-term or academic training. Due to per diem expenses, higher per-day tuition costs, and the need to distribute the cost of international travel over a smaller amount of days, the unit costs for short-term training programs abroad are greater. Moreover, Mr. Munge expressed the view that the short-term training programs abroad are of less developmental value than the academic programs. He also observed that: (1) the number of academic participants under AMDP is extremely small in relation to needs; (2) it is DPM's policy to strengthen local and education training institutions whenever possible; (3) when Kenyans are sent for study abroad, plans for their future utilization should be aimed at achieving a multiplier effect.

Mr. Munge also stated two facts which have some bearing on the general issue of the adequacy and relevance of training: (1) last year about 50 Government of Kenya officials went for post-graduate training; (2) about 90% of the EEC's Kenya training funds is spent in Kenya.

It should be pointed out that the substitution of in-country training for training which is now provided in the U.S., when such substitution is feasible, could be expected to strengthen a Kenyan training institution and reduce unit costs, thereby facilitating more training at a given funding level. It is in the light of this fact that the following two recommendations are made.

Recommendation No. 11: That DPM and USAID collaborate in preparing a comprehensive report on the costs of training which would include actual costs of short-term and academic training in the U.S., and estimated costs of such training were it provided in Kenya and in other appropriate countries.

Recommendation No. 12: That USAID propose DS/OIT provide a full report of AID-financed short-term training programs held during the last five years, including costs and African participants by country. This would be the first step in exploring the possibility of transfering the locus of some of these programs to selected African countries.

Mrs. Wakhungu, undersecretary in DPM, made various observations that have bearing on the issues of costs, strengthening in-country institutions, and achieving multiplier effects. She said that: (1) USAID's request to DPM for a one-year forecast has been useful and should, perhaps, extended to two or three years; (2) if a course or program is for developing countries there is an advantage in

providing it in a developing country; (3) Kenya would be willing to train participants from other developing countries and has, in fact, already done so (Egerton College and School of Journalism, University of Nairobi, for example).

She also placed emphasis on the importance of assuring multiplier effects, and suggested that if Kenya were to provide a new short-term training program for Kenyan and other participants it might be advisable to follow the East and Southern Africa Management Institute (ESAMI) three-stage technique. In the first stage the U.S. professors, say, train the Kenyan trainers on a 1:3 basis. In the second stage the U.S. professor and the Kenyan understudies give the program together. In the theird stage the Kenyans give the program alone. The development of local materials should be a part of this activity.

As part of the broad effort to achieve multiplier effects and to institutionalize more effective procedures, Mrs. Wakhungu also believes that much more attention should be given to assuring that Kenyan counterparts are assigned to each and every foreign technician working in Kenya. She indicated that in certain institutions, expatriate technicians and advisors are being used as a "cushion" to prevent well trained Kenyans from rising, occupying high-placed positions, and possibly, challenging existing superiors. As was previously pointed out, training is only one of various factors needed to improve organizational effectiveness in contributing to the attainment of selected economic and social objectives. The counterpart issue suggests that the utilization of trained Kenyans is in need of systematic attention. Indeed, Mrs. Wakhungu stressed the fact that assuring counterparts is a joint responsibility of the Government of Kenya and the foreign assistance agencies, and that it will be necessary to do more forward planning, if this purpose is to be achieved.

Recommendation No. 13: That DPM draws up a list of all expatriates and foreign advisors who do not have a Kenyan counterpart or understudy, and that this list be reviewed together with all the foreign assistance agencies in order to identify potential Kenyan counterparts and Kenyan replacements.

The view of the relevance of the AMDP training that is obtained from responses of returned participants and their supervisors is necessarily limited to their personal experiences. Although the utilization of training is not the same as its relevance, the two factors are related, and the former previously considered. The only other RP questions bearing on relevance were questions 47-50. The participant was asked if, since his or her return, there had been any significant changes in policies or procedures (RP Question 47) and, if so, what they were, and whether and how the AMDP training had contributed to these changes (RP Question 48-50). Six of the 15 short-term

participants stated that there had been such changes, and five of these attributed the changes to the AMDP training. Although three of the 10 academic participants answered affirmatively a review of their answers to the follow-up questions indicates that only one was referring to changes which could be attributed to the training. It may be worth noting that, once again, the short-term specialized training seems to have more direct impact on work activities.

Two questions bearing on the adequacy of training or the amount of training needed were posed to the supervisors. Question 38 asked the supervisor if this or her division or department had some important remaining training needs, and question 39 asked what these were. It may be worth noting that 15 of the 16 interviewed supervisors (one did not reply) answered "yes" to question 38 concerning important remaining training needs. However, the question is a leading question that may invariably elicit an affirmative response in the kind of situation in which it was being asked.

IX. Summative Evaluation

It may be useful here to summarize what appear to be the strengths and weaknesses of the AMDP training. These will be presented in the same sequence as the preceding sections, and not in order of impertance.

(1) Strengths: 1. Broad geographic distribution of the 52 identified participants. 2. In the light of the responses to program and post-program developments, the mix of short-term participants (32) and academic participants (20) appears to have been a satisfactory distribution. 3. Participants were from a sufficiently high professional and administrative level, with 18 of the 25 interviewed holding supervisory posts (and most of the remainder in specialized work). 4. There were good working relationship between DPM and USAID. 5. Housing of participants in U.S. largely satisfactory. 6. AMDP training level was by and large "appropriate". i.e., at the right level. 7. Learning was satisfactory. Two-thirds of both short-term and academic participants ranked amount of knowledge and skills acquired in the upper range. 8. U.S. instructional procedures, including mix of theoretical and practical work was considered good by the participants. 9. Participants considered interaction with other developing country officials to be valuable. 10. Thirteen of the 15 short-term and eight of the 10 academic interviewed participants have returned to their organization -- an indication that the training received is being utilized as originally intended. 11. Five of the short-term and five of the academic participants interviewed are now in a higher job group -- an indication that training has been viewed positively by their organizations. 12. Nine of the 15 short-term, and seven of the 10 academic participants interviewed ranked the utility of the training in the upper range. 13. In the case of the short-term participants this ranking appears to be related to impacts on work activities. 14. Two-thirds of the short-term participants interviewed expect to stay in their organization more than three years — an indication that the training received is likely to be utilized for a considerable period. 15. High level of program formulation ability on the part of the Chief of the Multisector and Engineering Division (USAID/Kenya) to expand the program to include also short-term training component which, in turn, has significantly strengthened the entire program.

(2) Weaknesses: 1. The lack of a complete, up-to-date register of all participants. 2. The lack of a systematic, exhaustive selection process covering the entire six (6) selection criteria outlined in the AMDP/PP on June 14, 1976 (see III above). The training concentrated on only one criterion (e) with very little or no attention at all on other criteria (a-d and f). 3. Only five women were included in the 52 identified participants. 4. The process of selection appears to be fairly loose: though supervisors rate it favorably, the participants do not, even though they were selected for training. 5. Adequacy of

manpower/training projections and the extent to which they are followed do not appear to be satisfactory. One-half of the 16 interviewed supervisors did not affirm familiarity with the projections, and only five considered them "realistic". 6. The demand for, and the expectation of, training appears to be greater than is or can be satisfied. 7. There does not appear to be a complete picture of total government training needs, total supply (all donors), and total need and demand (all ministries and parastatals). This fuller picture would be useful to DPM and to each of the foreign assistance agencies for matching, planning and coordination purposes. 8. Advance notice to participants is often insufficient. 9. The maintenance allowance is insufficient. 10. High-level officials do not receive the special treatment with respect to housing that some of them expect. 11. Some of the short-term programs are overloaded. (Lighten the load or lengthen the time.) Some of these professors are too theoretical. 12. The ISPC MA computer science program is poor. 13. There is a continuous brain drain from CBS to the private sector. 14. There is too often a mis-match between the expected and the actual program. 15. Only half of the returned academic participants expect to stay in their organizations for more than three years.

(3) Net Balance/Prognosis: In the final analysis, the team feels that the above strengths are of more weight and significance than the above weaknesses and that, on balance, the project has been a success in such terms.

In terms of the purpose specified in the Regional Project Paper, it is clear that the project's outputs constitute a distinct contribution. However, the present evaluation cannot provide a succinct, tangible measurement of that contribution with a high degree of realiability and confidence. In other words, without a fairly complete and reliable specification of the kinds and amounts of training needed, there is no way to estimate with high degree of precision and satisfaction what portion of that need that has been filled by the 52 training programs provided to Kenyans under AMDP.

X. Formative Evaluation

Since a formative evaluation is prospective in nature, and concerned with the design or re-design of activities, an examination of the original project purpose at this point is equally essential.

As pointed out in Section III, the original project purpose was to "meet critical requirements for managerially and technically skilled manpower in African countires in order to enhance their contribution to social and economic development." The original and present adequacy of this purpose is the question that will now be considered.

It is significant that the phrase "in order to enhance their contribution to social and economic development" was included in the statement of purpose. The inclusion makes it clear that the "meeting of critical requirements" or the provision of skills was not meant to be viewed as an end-in-itself, or an accomplishment to be carried out for its own sake. Using the terminology of AID project design, the "goal" or final end or objective was social and economic in nature.

With the benefit of hindsight, it can now be asked whether, with the funds provided, the chosen manpower purpose was the purpose which could have made the greatest contribiton to the achievement of the goal. The intent here is not to attempt to settle this question, but to highlight its importance. A project purpose is invariably limited, and a reflection of what is viewed as a major problem. The implicit selection, definition and, possibly, "analysis" of a problem underlies the selection of the project purpose.

Since all the participants selected for training under AMDP were from government ministries or parastatals, it would appear that the implicit problem addressed by the project was the need to improve the performance of these organizations in solving selected social and economic problems (the "goal"). As has been pointed out in previous sections, the knowledge and skills of the staff are only two of the important factors that determine organizational performance. Two other equally important factors are the organization's procedures (for example the comprehensiveness and reliability of the social and economic information it receives, the way it makes decisions, the quality of its internal communications) and its system of professional incentives. Consequently, limitations of the project purpose to training entailed the assumption that knowledge and skills shortages was <u>the</u> major constraint to improve organizational performance. When the project was initiated this may have been so. However, such an assumption, when made, should be made explicit; and the assumption that <u>at present</u> the knowledge and skills constraint is <u>the</u> major impediment to improved organizational performance is, at most, a proposition that is open to contention.

The training provided by USAID under AMDP is a relatively limited part of the total amount of training that it has provided to Kenyans. Most USAID/Kenya training is provided under sector-specific projects (in the agriculture sector, above all) which provide other kinds of assistance as well, such as commodities and technical assistance. Consequently, these sector-specific projects have a greater potential for dealing with activities and problems (in the areas of data collection, analysis and planning, and in carrying out selected interventions) than a general or umbrella training project, such as AMDP. It does not necessarily follow that a general training project should be eliminated, or substituted by a sector-specific project. Nevertheless, the comparative limitations of a general training project should not be lost from view.

If DPM and USAID wish to initiate another general training project there are some broad suggestions that can be made as additions to the fairly specific recommendations that appear in Annex A. The summative evaluation has made it clear that any single foreign assistance agency can make only a very limited contribution to raising the knowledge and skill level of all the ministries and parastatals. In order to more fully coordinate the efforts of donors and more fully disseminate the priorities for the training that is not provided under sector-specific projects, two developments appear to be necessary. First, DMP will need to have a greater role in establishing or at least informing donors of priorities, and assuring minimum coordination among donors. Second, in order to carry out this responsibility satisfactorily, more information will be needed on: (1) in-country actual and potential training programs, costs, kinds and durations of programs (academic and short-term specialized programs) institutions, academic levels (first degree, masters, and in what fields); (2) ministry and parastatal manpower training priorities; (3) program offerings and costs of all donors; (4) the future financial and staffing outlook of Kenyan education and training institutions (the proposed second university, its future program and costs, the trade-offs with other levels in terms of their expansion, the estimated future profile of primary, secondary and higher education in the light of a 4% population growth rate and the extension of basic education to nine years, etc.). Obviously, the commitment by various donors to coordinate activities and, perhaps, to rely increasingly on in-country training in order to reduce unit costs, stengthen Kenyan training institutions, and achieve greater multiplier effects through the training of trainers, should have as a basis an acceptably reliable projection of the financial and staffing future of the organizations in question.

It should be understood that an attempt to get a clear and comprehensive picture of the cost structure and efficiency of the existing education and training system calls for considerable data collection, tabulation and analysis, and that utilization of this analysis as a basis for the planning,

financing and staffing (teacher training) of future education and training is another major effort. Nevertheless, the coordination of a large number of different foreign assistance agencies in the provision of the training in Kenya and abroad in accordance with a selection of priority manpower needs would call for such an approach.

Two possible alternatives have been suggested: (1) the alternative of not initiating another DPM/USAID general or umbrella training project; (2) the possibility of broadening such a project to include all the foreign assistance agencies that provide training or funds for training, and basing the project on a more detailed and comprehensive analysis and planning of Kenyan education and training than now exists.

There is, of course, a third option or alternative. This would be to design a new general or umbrella training project involving the two governments which would function, as in the past, in relative isolation from: (1) the training activities and support for training of other foreign assistance agencies; (2) a general analysis and longer-range plan of Kenyan education and training. The strengths and weaknesses of such a project should now be fairly clear; and implementation of the 13 recommendations that appear in Annex A should help remove some of the weaknesses. Such a project would necessarily be constituted mainly by training in the U.S., with the selection of programs made largely as they have been made in the past.

ANNEX A

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That USAID/Kenya, with the assistance of EAAC, establish an up-to-date register of Kenyan AMDP participants funded under USAID/Kenya funds, and that subsequent entry in the register be made immediately after preparation of the PIO/P.

2. That a study of the numbers of women in higher education, in the public service, and in training, both in-country and abroad, be carried out by DPM, and that after the study DMP and USAID jointly determine what measures under their collaborative manpower activities would be appropriate for increasing professional opportunities for women.

3. That DPM help establish and then coordinate a recording and reporting process in each ministry, parastatal, and in DPM, of the amount and kinds of staff, training applications, DPM approvals and training participants, as a basis for improving government manpower planning and the provision of training by foreign assistance agencies.

4. That the original expected date of departure, the actual date of departure, and the date that the participant is notified of acceptance be information in the USAID/Kenya register of participants.

5. That the Office of International Training (OIT) in AID/W reassess the adequacy of the maintenance allowance in the light of living costs, particularly in university areas.

6. That USAID ask OIT if such special housing arrangements for high-level participants are possible, and that if so, the conditions and procedures for the identification of these officials to be discussed with DPM.

7. That OIT enter into discussions with the International Statistics Program Center (ISPC) of the U.S. Bureau of Census in order to correct the present imbalance in the M.A. computer program so as to provide computer science specialists with the advanced systems analysis and data processing training expected; and that OIT advise all field mission of the results to these negotiations.

8. That for each program, short-term or academic, a brochure or some other similar document describing the program be provided to the participant in Kenya, and that, prior to departure, the participant sign a statement that he has received the brochure, is familiar with its contents, and declares that this is the training he wishes to take.

9. That DPM carry out a special analysis and prescription of CBS problems in retaining its best trained Kenyan personnel.

10: That DPM and USAID jointly or independently carry out an ongoing tracer-study of returned participants who have had long-term academic training in order for both parties to follow the participants' careers and make fuller appraisals of the costs and benefits of their academic training.

11. That DPM and USAID collaborate in preparing a comprehensive report on the comparative costs and quality of training which would include actual costs and quality of short-term and academic training in the U.S., and estimated costs of such training were it provided in Kenya and in other appropriate countries; and then utilize/adopt only that training site(s) or country(ies) with the least training costs.

12. That USAID propose to DS/OIT to provide a full report of AID-financed short-term costs of/and African participants by country. This would be the first step in exploring the possibility of transfering the locus of some of these programs to selected African countries.

13. That DPM draw up a comprehensive list of all expatriates and foreign advisors who do not have a Kenyan counterpart and understudy, (i.e., See p.2 of Annex A on apprenticeship and that this list be reviewed together with all the foreign assistance agencies in order to identify potential Kenyan counterparts and Kenyan replacements.

POST SCRIPT

On April 13, 1981, a joint meeting was held between USAID/Kenya and the DPM to review the rough draft report of the AMDP evaluation findings and recommendations. At that meeting, it was requested that the following points be included in the final report.

Mr. Kevin O'Donnell (USAID):

1. On Recommendation No. 8, Mr. O'Donnell pointed out that USAID has always shared brochures or similar information (e.g., cabled Training Implementation Plan) with participants before the latter departed for their training in the U.S. He emphasized that USAID/Kenya will from now on start asking each participant to acknowledge receipt and consent as part of the program's integral normal procedures.

2. On Recommendation No. 9, Mr. O'Donnell felt that whereas USAID/Kenya would be more than happy to assist DPM in carrying out a special analysis and prescription of the prevailing brain-drainage in the CBS, USAID/Kenya is jurisdictionally and resource-wise limited. It should, therefore, be solely up to DPM to initiate that interest and to invite USAID/Kenya only if DPM deems USAID's participation to be essential.

3. On Recommendation No. 10, Mr. O'Donnell felt that USAID was already carrying out an "ongoing tracer-study". However, on re-examining this tracer study, the Evaluation Team failed to find anything to that effect apart from a study ending in 1977. Succinctly, the argument was weak as there was no study related to AMDP -- a factor which, therefore, justifies the validity of Recommendation No. 10.

4. On Recommendation No. 13, Mr. O'Donnell expressed no objection on the part of USAID. USAID would be very happy joining DPM in drawing up a comprehensive list of all expatriates and foreign advisors who have neither a Kenyan counterpart nor a Kenyan apprenticeship so long as DPM is equally willing to do so, and wishes to have USAID's assistance.

5. On the list of "Program Strength", Mr. O'Donnell drew the attention of the meeting to the fact that apart from those listed indicators of AMDP's strength, USAID has also been able: (1) To train several Ministry of Energy personnel in advance of expected USAID/GOK bilateral project; and (2) To fund some trade union representatives in order to complement the African-American Labor Center Program. And that such achievements should also be accepted as significant indicators of AMDP's stength. The Evaluation Team verified and found the argument valid and sound.

Mr. F. Munge (GOK):

1. On Recommendation No. 2, Mr. Munge felt that there was little DPM can do now since GOK is already treating every male and female equally -- a fact which was very well taken by the Evaluation Team except that our evaluation findings do not support it.

2. On Recommendation No. 3, Mr. Munge indicated that DPM was already doing this. He referred the meeting to the GOK's recent official study (the Blue Book), Manpower Survey: A Study On Manpower Requirements Availability and Utilization in the Kenya Civil Service, published by the DPM in February 1980 -- a document which Mr. Munge contended contains all the answers to Recommendation No. 3. However, the Evaluation Team failed to find any satisfactory answer from the document. The latter contains no more than raw data only. Without synthesizing the data first, one would definitely find it hard to tell right away as to which Ministries are more deficient in skilled African manpower than others. Thus, one would have first to rank-order those ministries before one can know which Ministry needs emergency attention. In view of this problem, Recommendation No. 3 still holds.

3. On Recommendation No. 9, Mr. Munge felt that ipso facto CBS was losing its trained personnel to private firms, the loss was not that too sensitive to GOK; i.e., there was no real loss on GOK from a socio-economic stand-point. To him, wherever these trained chaps go within Kenya, they are still functionally contributive to the development and growth of Kenya's entire socio-economic system. The Evaluation Team considers Mr. Munge's argument sound and founded. It is plausible that there exists no agreement between USAID/K and GOK to create a skilled manpower pool for private firms too. However, in the AMDP Project Paper prepared by the Regional Affairs Division of the USAID Africa Bureau in Washington, D.C., and signed on June 14, 1976 -- a Paper which later also became the basis of AMDP/Kenya training program -- the Evaluation Team finds the description of the purpose of AMDP very loose, vague and obtuse and, therefore, misleading. The description is not succinct, explicit nor specific. The provision that "the project will meet critical requirements for managerially and technically skilled manpower in African countries in order to enhance their contribution to social and economic development" as stated in the Project Paper, definitely does not specifically tell us whether the training will be catered for the public sector alone or for both public and private sectors. It is due to this lack of specificity and explicity in the purpose statement which, in turn, creates a technical loop-hole in support of Mr. Munge's argument. It is the same loop-hole which the Evaluation Team also found to be one of the basic sources of the most critical constraints against the AMDP's cost-effectiveness; and which the Team, therefore, recommends to be rectified at once in order to improve future ADMP cost-effectiveness, etc.

Recommendation:

In view of this ambiguity in the original purpose provision of the existing AMDP, it is here recommended that the provision be thoroughly delineated into some specific measurable purposes of AMDP, the source of AMDP participants (trainees), and where returned participants will be expected to practice their profession. Thus, there ought to be clarity as to whether AMDP training will be for GOK ministries and parastatal alone or for both public and private sectors. In case of the latter, then it will also be necessary for the provision to show direct/clear participatory linkages of both sectors in the training-selection process ecc. in order to avoid the confusion of "who is training who for whom and for what purpose(s)?"

4. On Recommendation No. 10, Mr. Munge, like Mr. O'Donnell (above), contended that DPM was already carrying out an on-going tracer-study of AMDP returned participants. However, the Evaluation Team failed to find any. Hence, Recommendation No. 10 still holds.

5. On Recommendation No. 13, Mr. Munge felt that he was not aware of such a problem. Recognizing the fact that his lack of this awareness could be due to a deliberate entropy between his office and the Ministry heads (who may not like Mr. Munge to know much of ministries' deviant acts), Mr. Munge had no objection to the Recommendation in the event that the problem genuinely exists.

6. On behalf of the DPM, Mr. Munge recommended:

(a) That USAID/Kenya reconsider expanding the AMDP into a more comprehensive and extensive scale in order to overcome the existing skilled manpower training shortages in the GOK.

(b) That foreign training should be shifted to Kenya in order to encourage and enhance Kenya's self-reliance in domestic training facilities.

IDENTIFIED PARTICIPANTS FUNDED FROM FY 1978, 1979 AND 1980 ALLOTMENT UNDER THE AFRICAN MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME

I RETURNED PARTICIPANT - SHORT TERM

A/ INTERVIEWED

NAME	ORGANIZATION	COURSE
1 - Njage Nthiga	DPM	Human Resources Development
2 - Rita Gitu (Ms)	Local Government	Shelter Training Workshop
3 - Mwange Mathenge	Min. of Energy	Technology for the People Fair
4 - George Odenyo	Min. of Labor	BLS Seminar on Techniques of Measuring and Analysing Prices Incomes Distr., etc.
5 - Barrack Odour Otieno	Min. of Labor	Seminar on Manpower Projections and Forecasting for Planning
6 - Oloo Ojuka	Min. of Energy	Energy Management Training
7 - J.K. Kirui	VOK	Shelter Training Workshop
8 - John Barasa	CBS	Manpower Projections & Planning
9 - Jamin Amata Endekwa	CBS	Characteristics of Labor Force
10 - Gibson Maina	Min. of Housing & Urban Development.	Shelter Training Workshop
11 - Rose Maina (Ms)	Industrial & Commercial Development Corp.	Investment Negotiation
12 - Charles Wangia	Min. of Labor	BLS Seminar on Statistics of Labor Force
13 - D. Arnede	Min. of Co-op Development	Study Tour of the US
14 - James Walimbwa	Agri. Finance Corporation	Capital Projects Analysis
15 - Johnstone Otenyo	Min. of Labor	Analysis of Labor Statistics Seminar

ANNEX B

II RETURNED PARTICIPANTS - ACADEMIC COURSES (LONG-TERM)

A/ INTERVIEWED

NAMES	ORGANIZATION	COURSE
1 - James Midianga	Min. of Labor	Computer Data Systems
2 - Hannah Cheroigin	CBS	Computer Data Systems
3 - Semeon Rutto	Min. of Higher Education.	MSc Educational Administration
4 - Stephen Kinoti	Min. of Health	Masters in Professional Studies, International Nutrition
5 - Wilson Kinyua	CBS	M.A. in Development Economics
6 - Jacob Ochieng	K.I.A.	MSc in Management Education
7 - Deborah Ongewe	Dept. of Adual Education	MA. in Vocational Education
8 - Ngure Mwaniki	Masters in Public Admin.	Development Finance Company of Kenya
9 - Japhet Masha	MSc in Vet. Epidemiology & Preventive Medicine	University of Nairobi
10 - Simon Kambo	Min. of Agriculture	BSc, MSc in Agriculture Science & Farm Management

B/ NOT INTERVIEWED

I/ CONTACT ATTEMPTED

1 - Jopley Oyienge'	CBS	Computer Data Systems
2 - Peter Mwangi	Min. of Industry	PhD in Economic Growth Dev. & Planning
3 - George Karanja	Min. of Agriculture	BSc in Plant Science, Agriculture & Agricultural Economics

B/ NOT INTERVIEWED

I/ CONTACT ATTEMPTED

NAME	ORGANIZATION	COURSE
1 - Francis Mayieka	Min. of Energy	Technology for the People Fair
2 - Booker Odour	Fisheries	Aquaculture Training
3 - Peter Kairu	Development Finance Company of Kenya	Investment Negotiation
4 - Aleke Dondo	Min. of Energy	Energy Management Training Programme
5 - Mbera Orwomba	Min. of Labor	BLS Seminar on Manpower Proj. & Forecasting for Planning
6 - James Ngarua	Agricultural Finance Corporation	Agricultural Projects Analysis
7 - Humphrey Muriuki	Min. of Labor	Labor Statistics

II/ CONTACT NOT ATTEMPTED

1 - G. Okeyo	Min. of Co-op	Study Tour of US
2 - A. N. Diege	Min. of Labor	Management of Labor Statistics
3 - J. A. Mwaniki	CBS	Planning for 1980 Census
4 - Z. N. Nyarango	Min. of Finance	Investment Negotiation
5 - P. Odhiambo	COTU	Shelter Policies Seminar
6 - K. Munsad	CBS	Real Product Accounting
7 - J. M. Mubugu	Min. of Co-op.	Agricultural Project Analysis
8 - S. Kirugi	Min. of Co-op.	Agricultural Project Analysis

III/ PARTICIPANTS STILL IN THE U.S.

NAME	ORGANIZATION	COURSE
1 - Lily Nguithi	DPM	MSc Management Science
2 - A.N. Chege	Min. of Labor	MSc in Vocational Guidance & Counselling
3 - K. Joseph Keter	University of Nairobi	PhD in Soil Science
4 - Edward Mutahi	University of Nairobi	PhD in Agricultural Economics
5 - C. Akello-Ogutu	University of Nairobi	PhD in Agricultural Economics
6 - Richard Cheruitot	Min. of Housing	MSc in Social Science Administration
7 - M. O. Odhiambo	University of Nairobi	PhD in Agricultural Economics
8 - H. K. Njoroge	V-C Office & Min. of Finance	MSc in Public Finance
9 - F. K. Gachui	Min. of Education	MSc Education Administration

1. Some of these individuals were abroad, others on vacation, others apparently reluctant to be interviewed
2. Not included in original list provided to the evaluation team.

Tabulations of Selected Quantifiable Questions in the Returned Participant Questionnaire.

Q. 11. Whether Participant supervised any employees.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	10	8
No	5	2
No Answer	0	0

Q. 14. How respondent's participation in the training program came about.

	Short Term	Academic
I proposed myself	1	4
I was asked if I wanted to go	3	3
I was informed I had been selected	11	3
No Answer	0	0

Q. 15. Whether participant was advised of training date of commencement in advance of plan and put one's personal affairs in order.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	12	6
No	3	4
No Answer	0	0

Q. 17. Whether participant's maintenance allowance was

	Short Term	Academic
Ample	0	0
Sufficient	6	4
Not sufficient	9	5
No Answer	0	1

Q. 18. Participant's view anent selection process.

	Short Term	Academic
Excellent	3	2
Good	2	4
Fair	2	1
Poor	2	2
No Answer	1	1

Q. 20. Participant's feelings vis à vis housing.

	Short Term	Academic
Satisfactory	9	9
Unsatisfactory	5	1
No Answer	1	0

Q. 21. Whether program courses were in a subject matter area of paricipant's previous education or training.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	7	5
No	2	0
Only partly	1	5
No Answer	0	0

Q. 22. Participant's feelings about content of courses

	Short Term	Academic
Repetitious	2	1
Too advanced	0	1
Right on level	12	7
No Answer	1	1

Q. 23. Participant's rating of amount of new knowledge and skills acquired.

	Short Term	Academic
A very large amount	3	3
A fairly large amount	6	4
A modertate amount	4	2
A small amount	2	1
No answer	0	0

Q. 24. Participant's rating of quality of teaching and instructional procedure generally.

	Short Term	Academic
Excellent	6	3
Good	7	6
Fair	1	1
Poor	0	0
No answer	1	0

Q. 27. Having to leave one's family in Kenya is a

	Short Term	Academic
Very serious problem	1	5
Fairly serious problem	0	2
Not serious problem	6	2
No Answer	8	1

Q. 28. Whether participant would prefer having this training program in Kenya to avoid family separation.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	1	5
No.	1	2
No Answer	13	3

Q. 29. Whether participant feels the program can be improved.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	13	8
No	2	1
No Answer	0	1

Q. 33. Whether participant's employer after training was same as before training.

	Short Term	Academic
Same	13	8
Not same	2	2
No answer	0	0

Q. 34. Whether return participant's present job group was same as prior training.

	Short Term	Academic
Same	9	4
Not same	5	5
Not Answer	1	1

Q. 36. Whether return participant now supervises any employees.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	12	5
No	3	5
No Answer	0	0

Q. 39. Usefulness of training for professional work as viewed by participant.

	Short Term	Academic
Very Useful	5	3
Quite Useful	4	4
Somewhat Useful	5	3
Not useful at all	1	0
No Answer	0	0

Q. 40. Whether trainee is ever told by supervisor to expect reward for completion of training program abroad.

	Short term	Academic
Yes	2	7
No	4	2
No Answer	1	0

Q. 46. Return participant's feeling whether he/she has been given opportunities needed to utilize training training he/she received.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	12	4
No	3	4
Too soon to tell	0	1
No Answer	0	1

Q. 51. Whether training program should be provided in Kenya rather than in the US in spite of the possible benefits inherent in foreign travel and residence.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	10	6
No	5	3
No Answer	0	1

Q. 53. Duration participant expects to work for his/her Ministry.

	Short Term	Academic
Less than one year	0	1
One to 3 years	2	4
More than 3 years	10	5
No Answer	3	0

Tabulations of Selected Quantifiable Questions in the Supervisor Questionnaire

Q. 3. Job group, grade of classification.

	Short Term	Long Term
L	4	3
Q	1	1
M	0	1
N	2	2
P	0	2
No answer	0	0

Tabulations of Selected Quantifiable Questions in the Supervisor Questionnaire

Q. 5. Whether Supervisor received any training abroad.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	7	9
No	0	0
No Answer	0	0

Q. 6. Where Supervisor received his/her training.

	Short Term	Academic
USA	0	4
Canada	0	0
Western Europe	3	4
Eastern Europe	0	0
Africa	0	0
USSR	4	0
Other	0	1
No Answer	0	0

Q. 13. Whether Supervisor was familiar with his/her Ministry's Five-year Manpower Training Projections.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	3	5
No	2	3
No Answer	2	1

Q. 14. Whether supervisor considers his/her Ministry's Five-year Manpower Training Projections realistic.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	3	2
No	2	3
No Answer	2	4

Q. 16. The extent to which the ministry is obliged to depart from ministerial projections in selecting candidates for training.

	Short Term	Academic
To a great extent	1	1
To a moderate extent	3	3
To a small extent	0	4
No Answer	3	1

Q. 18.. Supervisor's view of the selection process.

	Term	Academic
Excellent	3	3
Good	3	5
Fair	0	0
Poor	0	0
No Answer	1	1

Q. 21 Supervisor's Opinion about the need of trainee to leave family in Kenya.

	Short Term	Academic
A very serious problem	1	4
A fairly serious problem	3	3
Not a serious problem	1	2
No Answer	2	2

Q. 22. Whether Supvervisor would prefer this training program conducted in Kenya.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	3	4
No	0	1
No Answer	4	4

Q. 23. Supervisor's feeling about the importance of a comprehensive training program in improving Ministry's performance.

	Short Term	Academic
Very important	5	7
Quite important	2	0
Slightly important	0	0
Not important	0	0
No Answer	0	2

Q. 25. Supervisor's feeling about importance attached to training at the policy level.

	Short Term	Academic
Very important	6	5
Quite important	0	1
Slightly important	1	0
Not important	0	1
No answer		

Q. 26. Supervisor's knowledge of GOK officials who expect to go abroad for training but do not go.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	5	7
No	2	1
No Answer	0	1

Q. 30. Whether supervisor received a report from trainee after trainee returned to Kenya.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	3	5
No	3	3
No Answer	1	1

Q. 33. Supervisor's rating of usefulness of training to the work participant has to perform now.

	Short Term	Academic
Very useful	6	3
Quite useful	1	3
Somewhat useful	0	2
Not useful at all	0	0
No answer	0	1

Q. 35. Whether supervisor feels that present assignments and responsibilities of the trainee are the same as those before training.

	Short Term	Academic
Same	3	0
Different	4	8
No answer	0	1

Q. 38. Whether supervisor thinks that his division or department has some important remaining training needs.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	7	8
No	0	0
No answer	0	1

Q. 40. Whether trainee is ever told by supervisor to expect reward for completion of training program abroad.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	2	7
No	4	2
No Answer	1	0

Q. 43. Whether supervisor has noticed any change in trainee's attitude as a result of training.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	6	4
No	1	1
No Answer	0	4

Q. 45. Whether this training program should be offered in Kenya rather than in the US in spite of benefits inherent in foreign travel and residence abroad.

	Short Term	Academic
Yes	1	6
No	3	3
No Answer	3	0

Q. 46. Supervisor's rating of the Ministry's/Department's training priority needs.

	Short Term	Academic
Highest	3	6
Not the Highest	3	1
No Answer	1	2

ANNEX E

Basic Source Material

1. "African Manpower Development Project Paper (698-0384)" signed by E. Dennis Conroy on June 14, 1976, USAID/K, Nairobi.

2. "USAID Country Training Proposals" - 76 Nairobi 7492; 77 Nairobi 14295; 78 Nairobi 17421; 79 Nairobi 20656; 80 Nairobi 24191; 81 Nairobi 24191, cables in USAID/K office, Nairobi

3. "USAID/GOK Limited Scope Grant Project Agreement" dated February 27, 1980.

4. 52 Project Implementation Order for Participants (PIO/Ps) in individual participant files, USAID/K, Nairobi.

5. The African Manpower Development Project, an Evaluation by the Overseas Liaison Committee of the American Counsil on Education, August, 1980.

6. African Universities Yearbook, 1980, published by the Association of African Universities Documentation Center, Accra, Ghana.

7. Organization and Functions of the Directorate of Personnel Management, Office of the President, Nairobi, Kenya, April, 1978.

8. Manpower Survey: A Study on Manpower Requirements Availability and Utilization in the Kenya Civil Service, Directorate of Personnel Management, Nairobi, February, 1980.

9. Report of the Civil Service Review Committee: 1979-1980, Republic of Kenya, Nairobi, September, 1980.

ANNEX E

Basic Source Material

1. "African Manpower Development Project Paper (698-0384)" signed by E. Dennis Conroy on June 14, 1976, USAID/K, Nairobi.

2. "USAID Country Training Proposals" - 76 Nairobi 7492; 77 Nairobi 14295; 78 Nairobi 17421; 79 Nairobi 20656; 80 Nairobi 24191; 81 Nairobi 24191, cables in USAID/K office, Nairobi

3. "USAID/GOK Limited Scope Grant Project Agreement" dated February 27, 1980.

4. 52 Project Implementation Order for Participants (PIO/Ps) in individual participant files, USAID/K, Nairobi.

5. The African Manpower Development Project, an Evaluation by the Overseas Liaison Committee of the American Counsil on Education, August, 1980.

6. African Universities Yearbook, 1980, published by the Association of African Universities Documentation Center, Accra, Ghana.

7. Organization and Functions of the Directorate of Personnel Management, Office of the President, Nairobi, Kenya, April, 1978.

8. Manpower Survey: A Study on Manpower Requirements Availability and Utilization in the Kenya Civil Service, Directorate of Personnel Management, Nairobi, February, 1980.

9. Report of the Civil Service Review Committee: 1979-1980, Republic of Kenya, Nairobi, September, 1980.

Africa Manpower Development Program Evaluation

Returned Participant (RP) Questionnaire

1. Training Program: _____

2. Training Began: _____

3. Training Ended: _____

4. Sex of RP: _____ 5. Age of RP: _____

6. Home District: _____ 7. Home Province: _____

Prior to Training

8. Employer: a) Organization: _____

   b) Division or Department: _____

9. Title or Position: _____

10. Grade or Classification: _____

11. Did you supervise any employees? _____ Yes _____ No

12. If yes, how many: _____

13. Responsibilities: _____

_____

_____

_____

Selection, Placement & Support

14. How did your training program come about?

_____ I proposed myself _____ I was asked if I wanted to go

_____ I was informed I had been selected

15. Were you advised of your training date of commencement sufficiently in advance to plan and put your personal affairs in order?

_____ Yes _____ No

16. If not, what prevented your being given sufficient advance notice?

_____

_____

_____

17. Was your maintenance allowance: _____ Ample _____ Sufficient

_____ Not Sufficient

18. What is your view of the selection process?

_____ Excellent _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor

19. Why? _____

_____

_____

20. Was your housing: _____ Satisfactory _____ Unsatisfactory

Training Program

21. Were your courses or was your program in a subject-matter area in which you had previously been educated or trained?

_____ Yes _____ No _____ Only partly

22. Which of these phrases best describes the content of these courses?

_____ Repetitious _____ Too Advanced

_____ Right level: expanded on previous knowledge

23. In view of the time spent on the program how would you rate the amount of new knowledge and skills acquired? _____ A very large amount _____ A fairly large amount _____ A moderate amount

_____ A small amount

24. How would you rate the quality of the teaching and the instructional procedure generally? _____ Excellent _____ Good

_____ Fair _____ Poor

25. In your judgment what were the strong aspects or elements of the training program? _____

_____

26. In your judgment what were the weak aspects or elements of the training program? _____

_____

27. Most participants cannot afford to take their families to the United States. From your experience of having to leave the family in Kenya was that _____ A very serious problem? _____ A fairly serious problem? _____ Not a serious problem?

28. If a serious problem, would you have preferred to have had this training program in Kenya? _____ Yes _____ No

29. Do you feel the program can be improved? _____ Yes _____ No

30. If you do, what are your suggestions for improving it?

_____

_____

_____

31. Did you receive a degree title or certificate of some sort?

_____ Yes _____ No

32. If you did, what was it? _____

After Training

33. Present Employer: _____

34. Present Title or Position: _____

35. Present Grade or Classification: _____

36. Do you supervise any employees? _____ Yes _____ No

37. If yes, how many: _____

38. Responsibilities: _____

_____

_____

39. After returning to your professional work, have you found the training you received to be: _____ Very Useful _____ Quite Useful _____ Somewhat Useful _____ Not Useful at All

40. Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

41. Did you write a report on your training program after you returned to Kenya? _____ Yes _____ No

42. Why? _____

_____

_____

43. To whom did you submit this report? _____

44. What kind of response did you receive? _____

_____

_____

45. Does your supervisor consider the training received to be: _____ Very Useful _____ Quite Useful _____ Somewhat Useful _____ Not Useful at All

46. Do you feel that you have been given the opportunities needed to utilize the training you received? _____ Yes _____ No _____ Too Soon to Tell

47. Since your return have there been any significant changes in policies or procedures? _____ Yes _____ No

48. If yes, what changes? _____

_____

_____

_____

49. If yes, do you think your training has contributed to these changes?

_____ Yes _____ No

50. How? _____

_____

_____

_____

Future Program

51. Leaving aside the possible benefits of travel and residence abroad, do you think that in the future your training program should be provided in Kenya, rather than in the United States?

_____ Yes _____ No

52. Why? _____

_____

_____

_____

53. Do you expect to be working for your present Ministry:

_____ Less than one year _____ One to three years

_____ More than three years

54. Why? _____

_____

_____

Date of Interview: _____

Interviewer: _____

Africa Manpower Development Program Evaluation

Supervisor Questionnaire

1. Employer: a) Organization: _____

   b) Division or Department: _____

2. Title or Position: _____

3. Job Group, Grade or Classification: _____

4. Number of People Supervised: _____

5. Have you received any training abroad? _____ Yes _____ No

6. If yes, where? _____

7. What was the program? _____

   _____

8. What was your formal training and academic area of specialization?

   _____

   _____

9. Trainee: _____

10. Title or Position of Trainee: _____

11. Training Program: _____

12. Beginning and Ending Dates: _____

Ministry Manpower Training

13. Are you familiar with your Ministry's Five-Year Manpower/Training Projections? _____ Yes _____ No

14. Do you consider these training projections realistic? _____ Yes _____ No

15. Why? _____

    _____

    _____

15. How are the training needs in these projections identified?

_____

_____

_____

16. To what extent is the Ministry obliged to depart from these projections in selecting candidates for training?

_____ To a great extent _____ To a moderate extent

_____ To a small extent

17. Why? _____

_____

_____

Selection Process

18. What is your view of the selection process?

____ Excellent _____ Good _____ Fair _____ Poor

19. Why? _____

_____

_____

20. What would be your recommendations in this area?

_____

_____

_____

21. Most participants cannot afford to take their families to the United States. In your opinion is the need of the trainee to leave the family in Kenya _____ A very serious problem? _____ A fairly serious problem? _____ Not a serious problem?

22. If a serious problem, would you prefer to have this training program

in Kenya? _____ Yes _____ No

23. How important do you think a comprehensive training program is for improving the performance of the Ministry?

_____ very important _____ Quite important

_____ slightly important _____ not important

24. Why? _____

_____

_____

25. Would you characterize the importance that is attached to training at the policy-making level as

_____ very important? _____ Quite important?

_____ slightly important? _____ not important?

26. In your experience, are there many officials who expect to go abroad for training but do not? _____ Yes _____ No

27. Why? _____

_____

_____

28. If so, what effect does this have on staff morale?

_____

_____

Effects of the Training

29. To what extent has this training program contributed to meeting the manpower needs of your department?

Less than 25% _____

26% - 50% _____

51% - 75% _____

More than 75% _____

30. Did you receive a report on the training program from the trainee after s/he returned to Kenya? _____ Yes _____ No

31. If no, why? _____

_____

32. If yes what was your view of the report? _____

_____

_____

33. For the work s/he has to perform do you consider the training by the trainee to have been _____ Very Useful _____ Quite Useful _____ Somewhat Useful _____ Not Useful at All

34. Why? _____

_____

_____

35. Are the present assignments and responsibilities of the trainee the same as those before training? _____ the same _____ different

36. Why? _____

_____

_____

37. Were training to be provided now, instead of before, to the same trainee, what changes, if any, would you make in the training program?

_____

_____

_____

38. Do you think that your division or department has some important remaining training needs? _____ Yes _____ No

39. If you do, what are these? _____

_____

_____

40. Is it understood that there will be some kind of reward for the completion of a training program abroad? _____ Yes _____ No

41. If yes, what kind? _____

_____

_____

42. With respect to the trainee in question, what reward has the trainee received or is expected to receive? _____

_____

_____

43. Have you noticed any change in attitude on the part of the trainee, as a result of the training? _____ Yes _____ No

44. If yes, what change have you noticed? _____

_____

_____

_____

Future Program

45. Leaving aside the possible benefits of travel and residence abroad, do you think that in the future these kinds of training programs should be provided in Kenya, rather than in the United States?

_____ Yes _____ No

45. Why? _____

_____

_____

46. Would you rate training as the highest or not the highest priority need for your Ministry? _____ Highest _____ Not the Highest

47. If not the highest, what do you feel are higher priority needs?

_____

_____

_____

Date of Interview: _____

Interviewer: _____

ANNEX H

Evaluation of African Manpower Development Project/AID Project No. 698-0384.6/Scope of Work and Methodology

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Approach	1
III.	Major Evaluation Areas	2
	A. Verification of Inputs	2
	B. Review of Implementation Procedures	3
	C. Quality and Appropriateness of the Training	3
	D. Assessment of Effectiveness	4
	1. Relevance of the training to GOK needs and policies	4
	2. Utilization and impact of the training	4
IV.	Procedures	5
V.	Conclusions and Recommendations	6
VI.	Duration	8
VII.	Basic Source Material	8

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

I. Introduction

This evaluation is to be carried out in accordance with the terms of the mutual agreement between the Agency for International Development Mission to Kenya (USAID/Kenya) and the Government of Kenya (GOK) under Section 6 (H) of the Manpower Development Project Agreement No. 698-0384.6 effective February 27, 1980 which inter alia provides that "AID and the Grantee (GOK) shall each furnish the other with such information as may be needed to determine the nature and scope of operation under this Agreement and to evaluate the effectiveness of such operations" (emphasis added).

USAID/Kenya has contributed approximately U.S. $793,000 to the project which began in the U.S. fiscal year 1977; and USAID/Kenya and the GOK are considering the possibility of broadening and extending the activity. A central purpose of the evaluation will be to identify ways of improving the project in the event that it is extended.

II. Approach

Internal efficiency and the external effectiveness are the two specific dimensions of the project to be evaluated. Assessment of efficiency will include an examination of inputs and procedures prior to the return of the trainee, and the quality of the provided training. Assessment of effectiveness will include consideration of the relevance of the training to GOK needs and subsequent utilization in Kenya of the completed training. The evaluation will investigate the nature, direction and degree of improvement the project has made on middle-level manpower development in the public sector.

Among the general questions to be addressed by the assessment will be the following:

A. The extent to which the original objectives and hypotheses contained in the Agreement were valid?

B. The degree of success or failure in providing the inputs, attaining the outputs and the purpose and contributing to the goal, as originally specified in the African Manpower Development Project Paper signed June 14, 1976.

C. The fundamental contributing factors to success or failure.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

D. The consequent strategic alternatives or options the project should now follow.

III. Major Evaluation Areas

A. Verification of Inputs

1. The evaluation will determine whether or not the implementation was in agreement with the original requirements and guidelines established for the two parties, i.e., whether both Grantor and Grantee honored their respective responsibilities for inputs, e.g.,

a. Did the Grantor (the U.S. Government):

(1) Remit its contributions to project implementation agents for academic and non-academic training and in-country training for the Kenyan participating trainees as agreed upon under Sec. 4 of the Project Agreement?

(2) Pay its 50% share of the international round trip air travel expenses for every participant in training outside Kenya as agreed upon?

b. In turn, did the Grantee (GOK):

(1) Provide the local costs for visas, passports, medical examinations, and standard family support or salary maintenance normally provided for Grantee's employees for the full duration of all training as agreed upon in the Project Agreement?

(2) Bond all academic participants to ensure their continued employment by the GOK:

- in designated positions, or

- in positions of equal or greater usefulness to government after completion of their training?

(3) Pay its 50% share of the international round-trip air costs of each participant in training outside Kenya as agreed upon?

B. Review of Implementation Procedures

1. Was nomination of trainees a bilateral process between the Grantor and the Grantee?

2. Has the Directorate of Personnel Management handled trainee nominations on behalf of Government? If not what procedures have been followed?

3. Were all participants bona fide candidates for the M.Sc. or MA degree program or other program(s)?

4. Was the planned in-country workshop created under Sec. 6(B-b) of the contract? If so,

- Where?
- When?
- For how much?
- Who runs it?
- With what result(s)?

5. Are all trainee's expenses settled? If not, what are the amounts outstanding and why?

6. Did any part of the training funded under this program take outside the United States and Kenya? If so, where? And, did it have prior approval by both parties (Grantor and Grantee)?

7. Did the Grantee maintain complete, up-to-date records on each employee trained under this program with respect to:

- The trainee's pre-training job position?
- The trainee's post-training job position?
- The trainee's current job position?

C. Quality and Appropriateness of Training

1. Was the training received by the trainee appropriate to his past education and training, and to the position he occupied at the time he was selected for training or would occupy upon its completion?

2. Was the content of this training at the right level, i.e., neither too difficult nor too elementary?

3. Were the content and topics covered during the training period insufficient, excessive or adequate? Were new and significant skills acquired? Were the instructions and procedures satisfactory?

4. What is the returned trainee's attitude toward the training and the involved subject matter? Is it negative or positive?

5. Does the trainee consider the training relevant or irrelevant, useful or useless to his or her profession?

6. If irrelevant and useless, what are the trainee's recommendations or suggestions toward improving future selection?

7. How many resigned from the program? And why? At what stage of the program?

D. Assessment of Effectiveness

1. Relevance of the training to GOK needs and policies.

The evaluation will determine whether and to what degree the disciplines selected for the training relate to the GOK's development priorities. And, how effectively the training has been used to complement or anticipate USAID funded activities, e.g., in the renewable energy sector.

2. Utilization and Impact of the Training

Returned trainees will be divided into four classes depending upon the nature of their post-training positions, e.g.,

a. Those who returned to their respective (original) positions in the ministry or department following the training.

b. Those who were promoted to higher positions in same ministry or department following the training.

c. Those who resigned from their positions and ministries or departments upon their return from training.

d. Those who were transferred to other departments or ministries upon their return from training.

As well as coming to general conclusions about all the returned participants, answers to the three questions that follow will be tabulated for each of the above groups to see if there are differences between them.

a. To what extent has the training been useful to those trainees who participated in that program upon their return to their respective office work?

b. Are those post-training positions occupied by returned trainees?

c. Has application of the new skills improved job performance? Has it brought about changes in policies and/or procedures?

IV. Procedures

A. Review the official record of the project: i.e., papers and cables available in the USAID Kenya Training Office from FY 1976 onward; Country Training Programs (CTPs) submitted by GOK's Directorate of Personnel Management (DPM); USAID/Kenya recommendations to AID/W for funding levels; and, AID/W responses to those recommendations. (See Basic Materials, VII below.)

B. Discuss with the Deputy Secretary and Directorate of Personnel Management (DPM) how the CTP priorities were determined; and, finally verify with the USAID/Kenya staff, e.g., the Training Assistant, and Assistant Director for Multisector and Engineering, USAID's purposes, criteria, and procedures involved in reviewing CPT and formulating recommendations for AID/W.

C. Trainee Interview Sample:

All returned trainees (both academic and short-term):

Due to the small number of returned trainees, the interview will include to the extent practical all cases from both academic and short-term training programs in each of the four categories (a)-(d) indicated above.

D. Other Interviewees:

In conjunction with the data received from the returned trainees about the training program, the evaluation team will need to talk to the implementors of the program, most especially:

1. Individuals in B above,

2. Immediate supervisors of those interviewed returned trainees, and

3. Heads of workshops attended by those interviewed trainees (in Kenya only).

E. Interview Location:

Interviews will be conducted in the interviewee's respective offices, or in some other appropriate location. Gathering returned trainees in one central site for interview will be unnecessary since the evaluation team will also need to interview each trainee's immediate supervisor(s) to assess the trainee's post-training competence relative to that trainee's pretraining performance.

F. Issues to be Addressed:

1. Whether the training made any difference in their professional performance after training. If so, to what degree?

2. Whether the returned trainee's post-training position and work are relevant to the newly acquired skills.

3. Whether the returned trainee was satisfied with the post-training performance. If so, to what extent? And why?

4. Why the returned trainee resigned?

5. Where they are employed and whether what they are doing is equally relevant to their newly acquired training skills.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

Section V will bring together all the major findings in order to arrive at general conclusions and recommendations. Major strengths and weaknesses for each of the major areas will

be specificed. In addition, there will be a "summative evaluation" or conclusion which attempts to assess the relative total weights of strengths and of weaknesses and the resulting net balance or outcome; and a "formative evaluation" or recommendations which draws the lessons from past experience for the proposed broadened and extended project. The conclusions and recommendations in each of the areas will be summarized, in turn, in a concluding section of the final report. The outline appears below:

A. Design

1. Strengths
2. Weaknesses
3. Conclusions
4. Recommendations

B. Inputs and Implementation Procedures

1. Strengths
2. Weaknesses
3. Conclusions
4. Recommendations

C. Quality and Appropriateness of the Training

1. Strengths
2. Weaknesses
3. Conclusions
4. Recommendations

D. Assessment of Effectiveness

1. Strengths
2. Weaknesses
3. Conclusions
4. Recommendations

E. Summative Evaluation

F. Recommendations

The recommendations should specify how and why the hypothesis and assumptions set forth in the logical framework

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

could be improved to effect maximum progress toward the goal under an extension of the project. They should also provide justification as to why the evaluation team believes that such changes would alter the existing situation (i.e., remove the remaining obstacles) significantly.

VI. Duration

The length of the evaluation effort will be determined after the evaluators have ascertained where the interviewees are located and how much time it will take to meet and interview them and their supervisors. Three calendar weeks seems a fair approximation.

VII. Basic Source Material

A. African Manpower Development Project Paper (698-0384) signed by E. Dennis Conroy on June 14, 1976.

B. Country Training Proposals - 76 Nairobi 7492; 77 Nairobi 14295; 78 Nairobi 17421; 79 Nairobi 20656; 80 Nairobi 24191.

C. Limited Scope Grant Project Agreement dated February 27, 1980.

D. 31 PIO/Ps on individual participants' files.

E. AID/W In-Depth AMDP Evaluation.

Jan. 26, 1981

ANNEX I

January 26, 1981

Permanent Secretary/Director
Directorate of Personnel
Management
P. O. Box 30050
Nairobi

Attention: Mr. F. Munge

Dear Sir:

Subject: African Manpower Development Project (AMDP)

You will recall that some weeks ago we discussed the desirability of an evaluation of the subject project. Such an evaluation would serve both to review what has been accomplished to date, and also to focus consideration on how AID-funded activities with the Government of Kenya, in the human resources development category, might be made more cost-effective. In this latter regard, we are hopeful that the upcoming AMDP evaluation will provide a basis, assuming AID funds prove available for the purpose, to develop with Government a significantly expanded training program, to commence in U.S. Fiscal Year 1982.

I am pleased to transmit herewith for your consideration a draft Scope of Work for the evaluation of AMDP. Please let me have your concurrence in, or comments on this document as soon as possible. Once mutual agreement has been reached, this document would of course serve as the evaluators' Terms of Reference.

AID is prepared to make two officers available to work with the Directorate on this evaluation. They are:

a. Mr. Brandon Robinson, Chief of the Analysis Division of AID's Regional Office in Nairobi. Mr. Robinson is a human resources and education specialist with experience in project evaluation.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

b. Professor Agola Auma-Osolo, of the USAID/Kenya Program Office. Professor Auma-Osolo is a social scientist who has served most recently on the faculty of the University of Maryland. He is a trained social scientist whose specialty is Third World development issues. He too is experienced in project evaluation.

We would welcome the appointment by the Directorate of an officer to work directly, and preferably on a full-time basis, with Dr. Robinson and Dr. Auma-Osolo in the conduct of the AMDP evaluation. Such participation would undoubtedly facilitate the evaluation process and would also ensure that areas of concern to the Directorate are given full attention. Please let us know if you can make an officer available and, if so, his/her name, title and telephone number.

We are hopeful that this evaluation can commence in the immediate future, preferably in early February. Depending on the Scope of Work as ultimately agreed, the total evaluation effort should not exceed two calendar weeks, excluding time for report writing.

We look forward to hearing from you on the above matters at your early convenience.

Sincerely,

Kevin F. O'Donnell
Assistant Director
for Multisector and
Engineering

Enclosure:
a/s

M&E:KO'Donnell:aos:1/26/81

DIST: C&R (3), PROG (2), M&E (2), DIR, REDSO

CLEARANCES:
DIR:AMerrick (substance)
PROG:MSLefler (draft)
M&E:Training:Thuraya (draft)
PROG:PLCrist (draft)
REDSO:BRobinson (draft)

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

ANNEX J

April 6, 1981

Directorate of Personnel
Management
P.O. Box 30050
Nairobi, Kenya

Attention: Mr. F. Munga

Subject: African Manpower Development Project

Dear Sir:

The African Manpower Development Project Evaluation has now been completed. Attached is a copy of the draft report for your review.

We are proposing a USAID/MPI joint meeting on April 13, 1981 at 2:00 P.M., in the USAID Conference Room (12th Floor, Union Towers Building) to go over this report before it is put in final form and distributed.

Please let us know if you are available for such a meeting at that time and place. Please feel free to bring with you any MPI officers you wish.

Sincerely yours,

Kevin F. O'Donnell
Assistant Director
Multisector & Engineering

Attachment: As Stated

Drafted:M&E:KFO'Donnell/TMuraya:
kma:4-3-81

Cleared:PRMSO:MRobinson (Subst.)
PROG:AAOsolo (Draft)

Distribution: RDMSO, PROG, M&E-2
TRG, CAR-2

BEST AVAILABLE COPY