App 12A-1, Chp 12, HB 3
(TM 3:43) 9-30-82

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Participant Training Program	N/A	USAID/Haiti

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)

☐ 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 72	A. Total $ 600	From (month/yr.) 1972
B. Final Obligation Expected FY N/A	B. U.S. $ 600	To (month/yr.) 11/85
C. Final Input Delivery FY N/A		Date of Evaluation Review

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 enticipate 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
1. Provide an improved pre-departure briefing, stressing technical details and socio/cultural aspects of life in the country of training (especially targetted for long term trainees).	PVD:NJean-Mary	1/87
2. Explore feasibility of raising English Language Standards. Accomplished by raising ALIGU scores from 70 to 75.	PVD:NJean-Mary	6/86
3. Increased commitment from employees to reemploy participants upon their return.	PVD:NJean-Mary	1/87
4. Explore feasibility of establishing a returned participants alumni association.	PVD:NJean-Mary/ BNHeyman	2/87
5. Establish formalized monitoring and follow up system for all participants	PVD:NJean-Mary/ CWoolley	11/87
6. Increase sensitivity of USAID Project Officers to role of participant training.	PVD:NJean-Mary	3/87
7. Brief donor agencies on USAID training plans.	DIR:GZarr	
8. Add Participant Training Assistant to Training Office Staff.	PVD:BNHeyman	10/86

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) N/A
- ☐ 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)

Nicole Jean-Mary, Mission Training Officer, USAID/PVD
Barry N. Heyman, Chief, USAID/PVD
Robert Gilson, MEO, USAID/DRE
Daniel César, USAID/DRE

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: Gerald Zarr

Typed Name: Gerald Zarr, Director

Date: 9/30/86

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES)

Part II

The overall quality of the evaluation was adequate and largely served the purposes for which it was intended. It confirmed our overall impression that the training program was functioning reasonably well and made several recommendations which should improve the effectiveness of the program.

Due to significant time constraints, (largely related to tracking down participants) several items of the SOW were either not fully addressed or not addressed at all. For example, the contractor, with USAID concurrence, chose not to spend much time on other donor training programs and on how the training process was handled by Haitian institutions since these were of lower priority. Partial information on other donor training programs had been collected in conjunction with the preparation of the Mission's Country Training Plan.

As a result of the recommendations made we also plan to add an additional staff person to the Training Office. The addition of this person will permit the Training Officer to implement most of the recommendations.

The evaluation also indicated the extent to which the lack of an effective Civil Service limits the impact of public sector training programs. The current size and scope of the Mission's participant training program cannot by itself provide the necessary leverage to reform public administration in Haiti. However, other elements of the AID program, e.g. the Title III program, may offer the opportunity to support public sector reform. Until such time as significant changes are made in Haitian public administration, there will be clear limitations on the effectiveness of training programs for officials of the GOH. For these and other reasons, growing emphasis has been placed on private sector training.

The Mission largely concurs in the recommendations made by the contractor, although they were made in a somewhat tenuous fashion. Additionally, the contractor did not prioritize the recommendations. The development of the database and follow up questionnaire which were included in the evaluation will be useful to the Mission as it establishes a standardized monitoring system. The report would have benefitted from inclusion of comparative data from other evaluations of participant training programs. Additionally, the report would have been strengthened by greater inclusion of narrative examples from the data, rather than merely presenting the basic statistics.

Finally, the report could have been improved by attempting to provide a more aggregate picture of the overall quality and effectiveness of the program.

The Executive Summary of the report could have provided more information on the methodology and would also have benefitted from providing a clearer sense of the overall functioning and impact of the program. The lessons learned are essentially incorporated into the Summary of Findings section of the Summary. Finally, the Mission was not pleased by the Contractor's lengthy delays in submitting the final report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGY	4
A. Identification of Total Participant Population	4
B. Location of Participants and Selection of Sample	5
C. Research Instruments	8
D. Data Coding and Processing	8
E. Description of Total Population	16
III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: MAJOR ISSUES	19
A. Selection	19
B. Participation in Program Planning	20
C. Pre-departure Preparation	21
D. Language Problems	23
E. Orientation and Sociocultural Adjustment	24
F. Support Assistance During Training	26
G. Career Development - Job Status	27
H. Quality and Appropriateness of Training	28
I. Training Utilization	31
J. Professional Development	33
K. Transmission of Training	34
L. Alumni Association	35
IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR PRINCIPAL SUBGROUPS	36

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

PAGE

A. Contract/Non-contract Participants 36
B. Bilateral/Central 36
C. Short-term/Long-Term 37
D. Male/Female 37
E. Public/Private Sector 38
F. U.S./Third-Country 38
G. Field of Training 39
H. Time Lapsed Since Training 40

V. SUPERVISOR INTERVIEWS 42

VI. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT 45

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS 46

A. Identification of Training Needs 46
B. Selection, Monitoring, and Follow-up 46
C. Coordination of Training within the Mission 48
D. Contract vs. AID-Managed Training 50
E. Donor Coordination 51

APPENDICES

A. Summary of Findings: Statistical Tables 52
B. Participant Survey Questionnaire (French and English) 86
C. Participant Interview Guide (French and English) 87
D. Supervisor Interview Guide (French and English) 88
E. List of Training Institutions 89

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

PAGE

F. Letters to Participants and Supervisors 90
G. Other Correspondence 91
H. List of Surveyed Participants 92
I. List of Supervisors Interviewed 93
J. Proposed Participant Monitoring and Follow-Up Plan 94

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

1 Geographic Distribution of the Total Participant Population 7
1.1 Geographic Distribution of Survey Population 7

2. Contract/Non-contract 10

3. Central/Bilateral 10

4. Training Length 11

5. Gender 11

6.1 Employment Sector 12
6.2 Participant Job Changes 12
6.3 Current Employment Agency 13

7. Population Distribution by Training Location 14

8. Population Distribution by Training Field 15

9. Summary of Training Institutions 18

APPENDIX A 52

10.1 Selection (Nominated or Applied for Training) 53
10.2 Selection by Field of Training 54
10.3 Selection and Satisfaction 54

11.1 Involvement in Program Planning 55
11.2 Involvement in Program Planing by Field of Training 56
11.3 Involvement in Program Planning by Satisfaction & Application ... 56

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

PAGE

12.1 Pre-Departure Orientation 57
12.2 Pre-Departure Cultural Briefing by Adjustment Problems 58
12.3 Satisfaction with Pre-Departure Administrative Assistance 58
12.4 Advance Planning 59

13.1 Language Problems 60
13.2 Language Problems by Language Training 61
13.3 Satisfaction and Language Problems 62
13.4 Application and Language Problems 62

14.1 Kind of Orientation 62
14.2 Orientation in Country of Training 63
14.3 Orientation and Satisfaction 63
14.4 Orientation and Application 64
14.5 Sociocultural Adjustment Problems 64
14.6 Orientation and Adjustment Problems 65
14.7 Adjustment Problems and Satisfaction 65
14.8 Adjustment Problems and Application 65

15. Support During Training 66

16.1 Job Promotion 67
16.2 Job Responsibility 67
16.3 Knowledge of Post-Training Job 67

17.1 Satisfaction with Training Program 68
17.2 Satisfaction by Field of Training 69
17.3 Level of Training 70
17.4 Long-term Participants 70

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

PAGE

17.5 Short-term Participants 71
17.6 Benefits from Training 71

18.1 Training-Related Job 72
18.2 Application of Training in Job 73
18.3 Constraints to Applying Training 74
18.4 Success in Introducing New Ideas 75
18.5 Innovative Behavior 76

19.1 Correspondence with Training Site/Contact 77
19.2 Visited Training Institution 78
19.3 Joined Professional Association 79
19.4 Professional Association Membership by Field of Training 80
19.5 Receive Publication 80

20.1 Share Knowledge and Skills with Colleagues 81
20.2 Sharing Knowledge and Skills by Training Field 82
20.3 Contact with Other Participants 82

21. Major Sub-Groups by Field of Training 83

22.1 Time Elapsed Since Training by Gender and Length of Return from Training 84
22.2 Time Elapsed Since Training by Job Status 84
22.3 Time Elapsed Since Training by Training Application and Satisfaction Levels 85

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

USAID/Haiti has sponsored approximately 395 Haitians in technical and academic training programs in the United States and third-countries since 1972. In light of renewed emphasis on participant training by the Agency and anticipated increases in funding levels, the Mission undertook an evaluation of its participant training program in September-November 1985.

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess overall effectiveness of the Mission's participant training activities and to examine program management operations. A survey of returned participants was carried out which involved written questionnaires sent to all returned participants who could be located and personal interviews with a representative sample. In addition, a number of host government officials were interviewed for their views of the program and its impact on their institutions and participants' performance. Discussions with Mission personnel were also held to examine participant selection, monitoring, and follow-up procedures as well as coordination issues within the Mission and between the Mission and other donor agencies.

Of 395 known returned participants, 288 were located and sent questionnaires; 200 completed questionnaires were returned representing a 69.4 percent response rate. In addition, 62 returned participants were interviewed in Port-au-Prince and the provinces. Both survey groups were found to be fairly representative of the total population. The training experience of the survey population was analyzed according to mode of funding (bilateral vs. centrally-funded), management responsibility (contract vs. AID-managed), length of training (short-term vs. long-term), location of training (U.S. vs. third-country), sector of employment (public vs. private), gender, and field

of training. Trends in the total population were also examined in relation to the time elapsed since participants' return from training.

The following summary of the evaluation findings presents the basic characteristics of the Mission's training program and describes trends in the participant population in the areas of selection and program planning; orientation and sociocultural adaptation; language problems; administrative support prior to and during training; post-training job status; utilization and transmission of training; professional development; field of training; and trends over time. Program management issues are also noted.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Most AID participants come from the public sector, sponsored primarily by the Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Public Works, Education, Commerce, and Plan. Their training is usually managed directly by USAID instead of contracted out and funded under bilateral arrangements. The smaller percentage of centrally-funded training includes standard programs in management and health in addition to regional scholarship programs. Most of AID training in the past has been short-term in the United States primarily in the areas of health, management, and agriculture. Although most AID participants are males, the number of female participants has increased in recent years.

- Selection and Program Planning. Participants are generally not much involved in the selection process or in planning their programs, although long-term and private sector participants demonstrated more involvement in these areas.

- Orientation and Adjustment Problems. Most participants were well informed of the administrative aspects of their programs, but a considerable number were inadequately briefed on the technical details of their program or the social and cultural life in the country of training before

leaving Haiti. Contract, long-term, male, and third-country participants were less satisfied with the predeparture cultural briefing than other group and reported having more adjustment problems. Furthermore, less than half of U.S.-trained participants and only one third-country participant received an orientation upon arrival in the country of training.

Although certain groups seemed to experience adjustment problems more than others, the majority of participants did not experience any serious social or cultural adjustment problems. Comments by participants suggested that this was due to familiarity with U.S. life and customs through previous visits or contact with Americans.

- Language Problems. Very few participants had serious language problems with the majority reporting almost none. Long-term and male participants appeared to have had more language problems than other groups. Language problems did not seem to adversely affect participants's overall satisfaction with their training experience, although there was some indication that language problems may result in lower levels of using the knowledge and skills from training on the job. Many participants commented in the questionnaires and oral interviews, however, that they would have profited more from their training with a better knowledge of English.

- Administrative Support. No major problems were reported with assistance from AID prior to departure or with administrative support during training, with the possible exception of an insufficient amount of per diem and travel advance. A number of housing problems were reported, especially by females. The data suggest that contract, centrally-funded, long-term, and third-country participants had more problems with overall administrative support than other groups.

- Quality and Benefits of Training. Most participants are highly satisfied with the quality, relevance, and level of their training and agreed that acquiring specialized knowledge and skills was a major benefit from training. Planning, administration, and research skills and various learning strategies were listed as valuable techniques learned. In addition to specialized knowledge and skills, many participants also reported significant changes in their attitudes toward their professional roles and responsibilities. This was confirmed through interviews with participant supervisors who observed that returned participants are more disciplined and professionally motivated as a result of their training experience. The establishment of intercultural professional and social contacts was also mentioned by many as a benefit.

- Post-Training Job Status. While most long-term participants did not know what job they would be returning to, a surprisingly large number of short-term participants did not either. Most participants are in a training-related job, although contract, centrally-funded and third-country participants appear to have had more difficulty in finding suitable positions. Many participants have received job promotions or career advancements as a result of their training and report more job responsibility. Long-term training appears to have had a greater impact on promotion patterns than short-term training; and females reported proportionately fewer increases in job responsibility than males.

- Training Utilization. With the exception of participants in jobs unrelated to training, the majority of participants report high levels of utilizing their training in their jobs. However, many participants report that poor working conditions and lack of administrative support prevent them from more fully utilizing their training.

- Transmission of Training. Despite various constraints, almost half of the surveyed participants claim to be successful in introducing new ideas and changes in their jobs, with private sector and short-term participants reporting higher levels of success. Most participants are able to share their training experience with their colleagues either informally or on-the-job.

- Professional Development. Many participants are corresponding with their training institutions or with a professional contact made during their program. Males and long-term participants appear to be more active in maintaining contact with their training institution, including visits, and joining professional associations. While half of participants surveyed report professional and social contact among other returned participants, almost all participants welcomed the idea of establishing an alumni association for professional and social purposes.

- Field of Training. Satisfaction among fields of training varied somewhat, with management trainees reporting higher levels than other fields. Engineering participants were the least satisfied. Management programs were characterized by short-term training in the United States with a large percentage of female participants. Training in agriculture tended to have a greater proportion of long-term and male participants and involved more third-country training. Health training included high numbers of contract participants and centrally-funded programs prior to 1979.

- Time Elapsed Since Training. An analysis over time shows that the longer participants have been back, the less likely they will remain in training-related jobs. However, participants' job responsibility appears to increase in relation to the amount of time passed since training. Program satisfaction levels seem to fluctuate over the years, but remain high for those trained more than five years ago.

- Program Management. An examination of program management issues revealed that communication within the Mission is weak regarding information on the amount and kind of training opportunities available. Selection of participants was noted to be a problem in terms of finding suitably qualified candidates. It was also noted that Mission personnel responsible for planning training are not familiar with the type and extent of training sponsored by other donors, and are thus not aware of any overlap in proposed training activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the evaluation findings, the following recommendations are made for consideration by the Mission:

1. Orientation. All participants, including centrally-funded and contract, should be given a pre-departure orientation which includes more information on the technical details of their training program as well as more cross-cultural information. This is especially important in light of the low attendance at orientations in the United States and third-countries. It is suggested that the predeparture orientation include written materials on the social and cultural life and practical living conditions of the country of training.

2. Language Training. Proficiency standards should be reviewed and perhaps raised; and the in-country English language training program should also be strengthened.

3. Monitoring. The Training Office should consider establishing a standardized system for monitoring the status of all participants,

including centrally-funded, contract, and third-country participants. The database on all returned participants which was established for this evaluation could be maintained and refined. Information to be included in the database could be retrieved from a standardized participant application form as presented in Appendix I. Consideration could also be given to adapting this database to the Participant Training Management System being developed by S&T/IT when it becomes available. Plans are underway to implement this system in the Latin American region in the next few months.

4. Host Country Commitment. USAID should consider ways to secure a commitment by participants' employment agency to reintegrate returned trainees into appropriate positions which fully utilize their training. The PIO/P might serve this function in requiring such a statement and the sponsoring agency's signature. The Mission might also consider requiring a letter of reference from supervisors in the application process as a way of strengthening the sponsoring agency's commitment to reintegrate participants upon return. A sample reference letter is included in Appendix I.

5. Follow-Up. In order to monitor the status of returned participants, it is recommended that USAID administer a series of follow-up questionnaires in conjunction with the database. This would involve a debriefing questionnaire administered upon a participant's return, and another at least one year after training to track participant's job performance and career development. Together, these instruments should provide a useful rating of the program and its utilization as well as guidance for areas of improvement. Again, the Latin American Bureau is

in the process of standardizing a follow-up system which the Mission should consider when it becomes available.

6. Alumni Association. USAID should explore the possibility of establishing an alumni association. Most participants surveyed expressed their interest in participating in one and would be willing to pay an annual fee. Perhaps a summary of this evaluation's findings could be distributed to all returned participants with a request for proposals from participants interested in developing this idea.

7. Program Management. The Training Office should more fully brief Mission personnel on available training opportunities and procedures for implementing training, including different management options (i.e., programming participants through S&T/IT or contractors). Opportunities for training under the LAC II regional scholarship program should be more clearly communicated. The Mission's Technical Offices should also inform Host Country agencies of available training opportunities on a regular and timely basis.

8. Donor Coordination. Consideration should be given to presenting the major findings from this evaluation at the monthly donor's meeting. Thought might also be given to presenting the Country Training Plan projections in order to determine areas of overlap among donors.

PARTICIPANT TRAINING EVALUATION

USAID/HAITI

BY

LAUREL ELMER

AND

CHARLES TARDIEU-DEHOUX

JANUARY 1986

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent increases in the size of AID's Participant Training Program has prompted interest at different levels of the Agency in evaluating the status of the overall program as well as participant training activities at the regional and country levels. In particular, AID's Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination (PPC) recently carried out an extensive literature review of past AID-sponsored evaluative reports to understand the substance and effect of previous participant training evaluation activities. This is part of a larger effort by the Agency to develop an impact evaluation program for participant training. AID's Inspector General's Office also recently undertook an audit of the program to identify recurring participant training problems in need of attention. Both studies concluded that little information is available to assess the effectiveness and impact of the training program, and that follow-up and evaluation activities at the mission-level have been very limited.

To meet the challenge of an expanded program, S&T/IT is in the process of developing a participant management and evaluation system which should greatly facilitate follow-up and evaluation activities in the field when fully implemented. Using a microcomputer-based software package, the management system will allow monitoring of all mission training activities from the initial planning stage to the post-training phase. The evaluation system, being jointly developed by S&T/IT and PPC, will provide guidance on evaluation methodology including follow-up questionnaires and other survey instruments.

While the PPC study underscored the lack of past efforts to assess the impact of participant training, it revealed a small number of more recent country and regional follow-up studies (e.g., Portugal, The Gambia, Egypt, and

the AFGRAD Fellowship Program). Each study contained similar objectives of assessing the planning, implementation and effectiveness of their respective programs, but the methodologies employed varied greatly. Indeed, the PPC review confirmed that no standard monitoring or evaluation methodology exists, although the Portugal study came closest to developing a standardized approach.

PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

Since 1972, the USAID mission in Haiti has sponsored approximately 395 Haitians in technical and academic programs in the United States and third-countries, varying from conferences and short courses to academic degrees. In light of renewed emphasis on participant training by the Agency and anticipated increases in funding levels, USAID/Haiti decided to evaluate the status of its participant training activities to date. An evaluation team was contracted with to carry out this evaluation during September-November 1985.

SCOPE OF WORK

The objectives of the evaluation were to assess overall program effectiveness as well as management operations. Drawing on the experience of recent participant training follow-up studies, the evaluation was to include a survey of returned participants through written questionnaires and interviews with a representative sample in order to determine the usefulness of the training received and the extent to which participants have fulfilled their contractual agreements. The survey would treat such issues as English language competency, training relevancy, and the effects of U.S. training on

participant performance and career development. In addition to following up the status of returned participants in general, the evaluation was also to include an analysis of the total participant population by mode of funding (bilateral/central), locus of management (contract/AID-managed), length of training (long-term/short-term), male/female, location of training (U.S./third-country), sector of employment (public/private), and field of training. The survey population was also to be analyzed in relation to the time elapsed since training.

In reviewing program management, the evaluation team was to examine participant selection and monitoring procedures; compare the quality and costs of services between contract and AID-managed participants; and assist the Mission in developing an appropriate participant follow-up plan, including the possibility of establishing an association of returned participants. The scope of work also called for a survey of other donor training activities with recommendations for maximizing coordination. Because such a survey had recently been carried out in conjunction with the Mission's Country Training Plan, the evaluation team based its recommendations in this area on interviews with Mission Personnel.

II. METHODOLOGY

Three complementary approaches were used to gather the data for the evaluation. A questionnaire was developed and sent to all returned participants in programs of more than one week who were positively located; personal interviews were conducted with a representative sample of these participants in order to corroborate questionnaire responses as well as deepen an understanding of some of the major issues; and a number of participant supervisors were interviewed for their perspectives on the participant training program in general and participant performance in particular. In addition, division heads of the Mission's technical offices were interviewed for their views on management aspects of the program.

A. IDENTIFICATION OF TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

A total of 395 AID-sponsored participants was identified through an examination of the USAID Mission files. Several sources of information on returned participants were found to exist. While PIO/Ps were the main source of information for participants trained since 1976, index cards provided more limited information on participants between 1972 and 1981. In addition, a number of participants were trained under invitational travel arrangements, or centrally-funded programs for which there were other reporting forms. An initial listing of all AID-funded participants was developed from these records which was then cross-checked with a participant catalogue which the Mission has prepared over the years in conjunction with AID/Washington (S&T/IT) records. Neither the Mission files nor the annually-update catalogue was found by itself to be complete. Even the final list of 395 may not include all the centrally-funded participants trained over the years as these

programs may operate independently of the field training offices. Of this 395 total, 33 participants attended programs of less than one week (e.g., conferences and seminars) and were not included in the sample to be surveyed; 23 were reported to be out of Haiti of whom only two had remained in the United States without returning from their training program; and four participants were deceased.

B. LOCATION OF PARTICIPANTS AND SELECTION OF SAMPLES

In order to determine the current location and institutional affiliation of all participants, Department and/or Agency Heads were identified and sent lists of participants under their supervision at the time of training for confirmation. Affiliations for 288 were confirmed to whom questionnaires were sent along with stamped and addressed return envelopes. The majority of participants responded within three weeks of the initial mailing. Most hand delivered their completed questionnaires with a few using the postal system. 200 questionnaires were received for the analysis, although two were eliminated due to questionable AID-sponsorship, and two were received too late to be processed, leaving a questionnaire sample of 196. The high response rate of 69.4 percent reflects positively on participants' interest in the program.

A sample of 130 of the 288 surveyed participants was selected for personal interviews. In order to ensure an appropriate regional representation, a stratifed random sampling strategy was used: participants were divided according to work site into a Port-au-Prince group (the capital city) and a group from the provinces and then selected at random from each in numbers proportional to their representation in the total participant population. The Mission's Training Officer added to that list a small number of participants

whose experience and professional status could be of special interest. Port-au-Prince participants were called and invited to the Mission for the interview; the evaluation team traveled to Cap Haitien, Gonaives, Les Cayes, and Petit Goave for interviews. A total of 62 participants were interviewed during the field evaluation period.

Ten supervisors from five Ministries were also interviewed for their views of the program and its impact on their departments and participant performance. An attempt was made to select supervisors who had the greatest contact with returned participants. Supervisors were selected from the Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Education, Plan, and Mines which, together, represent employment agencies for 68.6 percent of the total participant population (see Table 6.3: Employment Institutions below). Eight of the interviewed supervisors were themselves USAID returned participants.

Table 1 below presents the geographic distribution of the total participant population. A similar profile of the questionnaire and interview samples in Table 1.1 shows that representation of surveyed participants in Port-au-Prince and in the provinces is proportionate to their respective numbers in the total participant population.

TABLE 1: GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF THE TOTAL PARTICIPANT POPULATION

Location	Number	Percent
Port-au-Prince	230	58.2
Provinces	79	20.0
Out of Haiti	23	5.8
Deceased	4	1.0
Unknown	59	15.0
Total	395	100.0%

TABLE 1.1: GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF SURVEY POPULATION

	Questionnaire Sent		Questionnaire Received		Interview Sample	
Location	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Port-au-Prince	217	75.3	142	71.0	47	75.8
Provinces	71	24.7	57	28.5	15	24.2
Unknown	0	0.0	1	0.5	0	0.0
TOTAL	288	100.0	200	100.0	62	100.0

C. RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

The participant questionnaire was intended to be the primary source for data collection and thus designed to be as comprehensive as possible, covering the planning, implementation and impact of participants' training experience. It was developed from questionnaires recently used in similar participant follow-up studies in other countries and adapted to Haitian conditions upon suggestions from Mission personnel. It was then translated into French, pre-tested, and modified accordingly. Both the final French and English versions appear in Appendix B.

The questionnaire comprised a total of 46 questions and numerous subquestions of which most were closed-ended. The following aspects of participants' training experience were included: biographic data; type of training program; job history; educational background; language training; selection and program planning; pre-departure preparation; orientation; administrative support during training; quality and appropriateness of training; training utilization; and professional development.

The participant interview guide included a number of open-ended questions which paralleled major areas of the written questionnaire but were designed to elicit illustrative information on different aspects of the training experience. The supervisor interviews also were conducted with a guide. Both guides in French and English appear respectively in Appendix C and D to the report.

D. DATA CODING AND PROCESSING

As Mission records on individual participants were found not to be uniform, basic statistics on the total population were supplemented by the Mission Training Officer based on her extensive knowledge of the program and

individual participants. A database was set up for all known participants and their current or last-known institutional affiliation. Information on management responsibility (USAID/contract), mode of funding (bilateral/central), length of training (short-term/long-term); gender; sector of employment (public/private); location of training (U.S./third-country); and field of training was entered into the database and used to compare the total population with the questionnaire and interview samples.

The questionnaires were coded at the Misssion and initially processed on a microcomputer locally. Due to time constraints and the lack of appropriate statistical analysis software, the data processing was completed at AID/Washington's Technical Resources Center. Using a statistical analysis package (SL Micro), cross tabulations were carried out on the major variables identified in the scope of work (i.e., contract/noncontract, bilateral/central, short-term/long-term, male/female, U.S./third-country, public/private sector, and field of training).

Tables 2 through 8 below present these comparisons and confirm that the survey and interview samples are indeed fairly representative of the total population. Although the 33 participants in programs of less than one week constitute part of the total population against which the questionnaires were compared, their training experience was not included and are therefore not represented by the survey findings.

TABLE 2: CONTRACT/NON-CONTRACT

	Total Population		Questionnaire Sample		Interview Sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Contract	106	26.8	49	24.9	13	21.0
Non-Contract	268	67.8	144	73.1	49	79.0
Unknown	21	5.3	3	2.0	0	0.0
TOTAL	395	100.0	196	100.0	62	100.0

TABLE 3: CENTRAL/BILATERAL

	Total Population		Questionnaire Sample		Interview Sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Central	149	37.7	79	40.1	26	41.9
Bilateral	235	59.5	115	58.4	36	58.1
Unknown	11	2.8	2	1.5	0	0.0
Total	395	100.0	196	100.0	62	100.0

TABLE 4: TRAINING LENGTH

	Total Population[1]		Questionnaire Sample[2]		Interview Sample[1]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 1 week	33	8.4	0	0		
Short-Term[3]	320	81.0	167	85.2	54	87.1
Long-Term[4]	42	10.6	27	13.8	8	12.9
Unknown	0		2	1.0		
Total	395	100.0	196	100.0	62	100.0

1. Source: Mission Files and Training Officer
2. Source: Returned questionnaires.
3. Short-Term: $<$ 24 weeks, $>$ 1 week
4. Long-Term: $\geq$ 24 weeks

TABLE 5: GENDER

	Total Population		Questionnaire Sample		Interview Sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Female	113	28.6	45	22.84	14	22.6
Male	282	71.4	148	75.13	48	77.4
Unreported			3	2.03		
Total	395	100.0	196	100.00	62	100.0

TABLE 6.1: EMPLOYMENT SECTOR

SECTOR	Total Population[1]		Questionnaire Sample[2]		Interview Sample[1]	
Public (includes Parastatal)	326	82.6	171	87.3	52	83.9
Private (includes PVO)	40	10.1	19	9.7	6	9.7
None	15	3.8	2	1.0	4	6.4
Unknown	14	3.5	4	2.0	0	0.0
Total	395	100.0	196	100.0	62	100.0

1. Data Source: Current Affiliation According to Mission Files
2. Source: Self-Reported Sector in Returned Questionnares

TABLE 6.2: PARTICIPANT JOB CHANGES

	Former Job		Current Job	
	Private	Public	Private	Public
		122 →		122
	3 →			3
	6 →		6	
		6 →	6	
Total (137)	9	128	12	125

TABLE 6.3: CURRENT EMPLOYMENT AGENCY

AGENCY	Total Population[1]		Questionnaire Sample[2]		Interview Sample[1]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Min. of Health	129	32.7	57	29.1	16	25.8
" " Agriculture	106	26.8	53	27.0	14	22.6
" " Mines	8	2.0	2	1.0	0	0.0
" " Commerce	15	3.8	3	1.5	2	3.2
" " Plan	12	3.0	10	5.1	6	9.7
" " Education	16	4.1	9	4.6	2	3.2
" " Transport & Public Works	17	4.3	11	5.7	4	6.4
" " Finance	2	0.5	3	1.5	1	1.6
" " Social Affairs	3	0.8	3	1.5	1	1.6
Other GOH	5	1.3	1	.5	0	0.0
Parastatal	13	3.3	8	4.1	6	9.7
Private	40	10.1	22	11.2	6	9.7
None	15	3.8	2	1.0	4	6.5
Unknown	14	3.5	12	6.2	0	0
Total	395	100.0	196	100.0	62	100.0

1. Source: Current Affiliation According to Mission Files.
2. Source: Current Affiliation Reported in Returned Questionnaires.

TABLE 7: POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY TRAINING LOCATION

Location	Total Population		Questionnaire Sample		Interview Sample	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
U.S.	304	77.0	170	86.7	52	83.9
Third Country	83	21.0	26	13.3	10	16.1
Unknown	8	2.0	--	0.0	--	0.0
Total	395	100.0	196	100.0	62	100.0

TABLE 8: POPULATION DISTRIBUTION BY TRAINING FIELD

	Total Population[1]		Question Sample[2]		Interview Sample[1]	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. Health	84	21.3	35	17.9	19	30.6
2. Agriculture	58	14.7	37	18.9	6	9.7
3. Management[3]	61	15.4	64	32.7	16	25.8
4. Engineering	20	5.1	12	6.1	4	6.5
5. Education	20	5.1	16	8.1	6	9.7
6. Economics	12	3.0	13	6.6	3	4.8
7. Marketing	10	2.5	0	0.0	2	3.2
8. Information[4]	10	2.5	2	1.0	0	0.0
9. Energy	7	1.8	3	1.5	1	1.6
10. Animal Husbandry	7	1.8	5	2.6	1	1.6
11. Electronics[5]	9	2.3	5	2.6	2	3.2
12. Other Fields	14	3.5	4	2.0	2	3.2
Unknown	83	21.0				
Total	395	100.0	196	100.0	62	100.0

1. Source: USAID/Haiti Files
2. Source: Returned Questionnaires
3. Includes Coop Management, Health/Family Planning
4. Includes Communication and Library Science
5. Includes Computer Science

E. DESCRIPTION OF TOTAL POPULATION

As indicated in Tables 2 and 3 above, most AID participants were managed through USAID instead of contractors and funded bilaterally rather than through AID central or regional arrangements (67.8 percent non-contract; 59.5 percent bilateral). Tables 4 and 5 show that the majority of participants are male (71.4 percent), and that the program has sponsored far more short-term participants in technical programs of less than six months (89.4 percent) than long-term participants in academic programs (10.6 percent).

As shown in Table 6.1, the bulk of participants are from the public and parastatal sectors (82.5 percent) with only 10.1 percent from the private sector. Although these statistics reflect participants' current or last-known employment agency, Table 6.2 suggests that not much movement has taken place between public or private sectors since participants' training experience. Of participants surveyed, 137 or 69.9 percent reported job changes upon their return from training, but only 9 participants (4.6 percent) changed sectors. Of this change, six left the public sector for private and three left the private sector for public with a net gain of three in the private sector. No comparable analysis was carried out for changes between specific employment agencies. In the process of locating returned participants, however, it was apparent that although many participants had changed departments, few had actually transferred from one Ministry to another. Table 6.3 shows that the majority of participants are concentrated in the Ministries of Health and Agriculture, followed by the Ministries of Transport and Public Works, Education, Commerce, and Plan.

Table 7 demonstrates that the majority of participants attended programs in the United States (77 percent) compared to 21 percent in third-countries. Third-country training tended to concentrate in the region (Costa Rica,

Mexico, Puerto Rico and Guatemala); but participants also attended programs in Canada, Tunisia, Nigeria, Cameroon, and Indonesia in addition to several conferences in Europe.

Of eleven major training fields identified in Table 8, health, management, agriculture, engineering, and education had the largest number of participants. It should be noted that some training programs had several content aspects, e.g., health and management, but were given a single training field classification. Discrepancies between total population and questionnaire sample figures, as in the case of the management field in Table 8, are attributable to differences among coders in classifying programs of this type.

Table 9 presents a summary of training institutions attended by participants with the majority being universities, colleges and other specialized training and research centers (80.3 percent). A smaller number of trainees participated in training sponsored directly by U.S. government agencies and other groups. A detailed list of training institutions and sponsors appears in Appendix E.

TABLE 9: SUMMARY OF TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

	Number of Institutions	Total Population			Questionnaire Sample	
		Number	Percent		Number	Percent
			Absolute	Adjusted		
Universities & Colleges	44	155	39.2	60.8	116	59.2
Specialized Training & Research Centers	21	68	17.2	26.7	46	23.5
U.S. Government Agencies	7	11	2.8	4.3	10	5.1
Other Training Sites and Sponsors	9	21	5.3	8.2	13	6.6
Unknown[1]	---	140	35.4	xxx	11	5.6
Total	81	395	100.0	100.0	196	100.0

[1] Includes "less than 1 week" participants attending conferences/seminars

III. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: MAJOR ISSUES

The following section summarizes the major findings from the evaluation in the areas of participant selection and program planning, pre-departure preparation, language problems, orientation and sociocultural adjustment, administrative support during training, post-training job status, quality and appropriateness of training, training utilization, professional development and transmission of training. Differences and apparent trends among principal sub-groups are also noted and discussed. Even where the differences or absolute numbers involved are too small to demonstrate statistical significance, inferences have been made in cases where such trends have also been suggested in the interview component of study. The following discussion is based on data presented in Tables 10 through 22 in Appendix A.

A. SELECTION

Most participants (81.7 percent) were nominated for training by their employers, supervisors or sponsoring agency, with 9.1 percent initiating their own application and another 6.1 percent being invited directly by sponsors (e.g., USAID, USIS, training institution).

Although the number of participants who applied for training is small (18 compared to 161 participants who were nominated), some groups appeared to take more initiative in their own selection than others. Table 10.1 suggests that long-term participants, private-sector participants, centrally-funded participants, and females were more active in their own selection than their respective counterparts. Table 10.2 further suggests that participants in economics, education, and management fields played a more active role. (It is

interesting to note that that private sector participants tend to be concentrated in the management, economics and education fields-see Table 21.)

Although a relationship has not been determined between a participant's involvement in the selection process and satisfaction with the training experience, Table 10.3 shows that the group who applied for training reported slightly more satisfaction with their training experience.

B. PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM PLANNING

GOH was training in mind?

Participants generally were not very much involved in the planning or design of their training programs. This was confirmed in the oral interviews. Almost half of the questionnaire respondents (47.2 percent) reported no involvement at all with only 9.1 percent participating a lot.

Long-term and private sector participants appear to have had higher levels of involvement in planning their programs than other groups. Table 11.1 shows that 40.7 percent of long-term participants reported high involvement compared to 19.2 percent of short-term participants; and 36.8 percent of private sector participants had higher levels of involvement compared to 21.6 percent of public sector participants. Participants in management, agriculture, and computer science reported higher levels of involvement than participants in other fields (see Table 11.2). Only 5.7 percent of health participants reported high involvement levels.

Table 11.3 suggests that participants with more involvement in planning their programs are more satisfied with their training experience and have higher levels of training utilization than those with less participation in the training design. Of those participants who had high involvement in planning their own programs, 81.8 percent reported high levels of satisfaction compared to 65.7 percent with low involvement. Also, a slightly higher

percentage of those with high involvement in program planning reported higher levels of training utilization (65.9 percent) than those with low involvement (58.8 percent).

C. PRE-DEPARTURE PREPARATION

88.2 percent of all participants claimed to be sufficiently informed of the administrative aspects of their programs before leaving Haiti (e.g., visa, travel arrangements, allowance, contacts at training site, health insurance); 80.1 percent reported being well enough informed of their program's technical aspects including content, schedule, and objectives; and 67.4 percent reported sufficient information on cultural aspects including values, living conditions, and education system in the country of training.

A comparison between the major subgroups revealed this same pattern of decreasing satisfaction with the administrative, technical and cultural aspects of the pre-departure briefing among all groups. According to the data in Table 12.1, it also appears that contract, long-term, and third-country participants were less satisfied in all these areas than their respective counterparts (non-contract, short-term, or US-trained participants). Male participants seemed to be less satisfied with the cultural briefing than females, although more satisfied with the technical aspects of the orientation. No notable difference between bilateral and centrally-funded participants is apparent.

Of the 31.6 percent who were not sufficiently informed of the cultural aspects in the country of training, 53.3 percent reported to have notable sociocultural adaptation problems (Table 12.2).

Assistance from the USAID office in Haiti with travel arrangements was rated highly by those who responded (Table 12.3). 69.9 percent of

participants reported high satisfaction with travel arrangements, 65.3 percent with obtaining a visa, and 50.5 percent for travel advance. The latter two categories received a larger number of nonresponses, which may be explained by the fact that many participants already possessed a visa, and that centrally-funded programs often donot provide a travel advance.

Long-term, centrally-funded, and contract participants seem to have had more problems with travel advances than their respective counterparts. Dissatisfaction by centrally-funded participants may be due to the fact that funds are not channeled through the Mission for centrally-funded programs. Comments from long-term participants suggest that their advances were not sufficient to cover start-up costs for such things as a housing rental deposit or training materials.

Although 79.6 percent of all participants reported being informed well enough in advance of plans concerning their programs, 18.9 percent were not (Table 12.4). Reasons given for the latter included lack of contact with USAID by participants working in the provinces; one participant replacing another at the last moment; and several participants learning of their training location only after arriving in the United States. Table 12.4 shows that a slightly larger percentage of contract and long-term participants had no advance planning which may explain why these groups reported being less well-informed in their pre-departure briefing as noted above.

Most participants in the oral interviews were satisfied with assistance from the AID office, although some did mention receiving inadequate notice for their actual departure. When asked what information they would have liked in advance, many mentioned program content, housing options, social life, and climate. A number of participants also said they would have liked an opportunity to meet with other former AID participants before departure.

D. LANGUAGE PROBLEMS

While 20.4 percent of all participants claimed to have some notable language problems, a majority (64.2 percent) reported almost no problems (see Table 13.1). Only two participants reporting serious problems. A comparison of groups suggests that long-term participants had more problems than short-term participants, and that males had more problems than females. Of those with problems, oral expression was the greatest difficulty (44.0 percent) followed by comprehension (23.8 percent).

Table 13.2 indicates that 27.0 percent of participants received language training. Reasons given by the 48 percent not participating in language training included a sufficient knowledge of the language of training, whether through previous study in English/Spanish, contact with English/Spanish speakers, or in the case of English, taking language classes at the Haitian-American Institute. Several participants explained that the program was simultaneously translated and no language training was needed. Language training for 25 percent of participants was not applicable as their programs were conducted in French.

Of those participants claiming some language problems, more than half (55 percent) had taken language training prior to their programs including the two participants with serious problems. This suggests that language training for those who needed it may have been insufficient. Of those participants who attended language training, more studied in Haiti (62 percent) than in the United States (38 percent).

The existence of language problems, however, does not seem to adversely affect participants' overall satisfaction with their training. Table 13.3 demonstrates that 92.5 percent of participants with some notable language problems reported to be satisfied with their training program; yet it appears

in Table 13.4 that participants with some language problems have lower utilization levels than those with almost no language problems.

Several participants commented in the questionnaire that in-country English language training was weak or insufficient, and standards used to test proficiency levels were too low. This was confirmed in the oral interviews in which many participants mentioned language as a weakness or wished they had had a better grasp of the language. Some participants in U.S. programs conducted entirely in French complained of non-native French-speaking instructors who were difficult to understand; and in cases where the program was simultaneously translated, others commented on the limited interaction with instructors and/or other participants.

E. ORIENTATION AND SOCIOCULTURAL ADJUSTMENT

41.3 percent of all participants reported attending at least one orientation session in the country of training. Table 14.1 shows that 17.9 percent attended the Washington International Center's orientation session, 30.6 percent attended orientation sessions at their training site, and 8.2 percent reported participating in other orientation sessions. The majority found these sessions useful.

A comparison between the different sub-groups as shown in Table 14.2 reveals that larger percentages of contract, long-term, and centrally-funded participants attended an orientation session in the country of training. Only one third-country participant reported receiving an orientation upon arrival. Although the impact of orientation on satisfaction or utilization levels is speculative, Tables 14.3 and 14.4 suggest a possible relationship in which participants with an orientation have greater levels of satisfaction with the training program and utilization of training on-the-job.

followed by technical and administrative program details, and the social and cultural life and educational system in the country of training.

Most participants interviewed reported not having many social or cultural adjustment problems in the United States. Many explained that they were familiar with U.S. life and customs either through previous visits or contact with Americans.

F. SUPPORT ASSISTANCE DURING TRAINING

Very few participants reported any serious problems with support services during training. Areas with some reported problems are as follows in descending order of most frequent mention (see Table 15):

32.7 percent indicated some problems in the amount of allowance received with five participants reporting serious problems. In addition to the complaint of the amount being generally insufficient, other comments included the need to cover family expenses during training; one participant's salary was reduced during training; confusion over what costs the allowance was intended to cover; costs of additional training materials; and differences in the amount of allowance for participants in the same program from different countries.

20.9 percent of participants claimed to have some difficulty with housing, although only three participants had serious problems. The most frequent complaint concerned the high cost of lodging leaving little allowance for other necessary expenses. The location of housing far from the training site was mentioned as a problem by some; and also lack of interaction with other program participants in cases where participants were lodged at various sites. Some participants complained of having no choice in their lodging; several noted difficulties in finding suitable

PREVIOUS PAGE MISSING

housing where it was not provided; and others mentioned roommate problems. The stigma of AIDS was mentioned several times by participants in relation to difficulties in finding housing and roommate problems.

10.2 percent reported problems in receiving their allowance which was sometimes delayed when the program took place at several different sites; field trips were reported to be insufficient or irrelevant by 9.2 percent of participants; assistance with personal matters was considered problematic by some (8.7 percent); while an equal number of participants (6.1 percent) were dissatisfied with assistance in program matters, and reported problems due to program changes.

Contract, long-term, and third-country trainees reported more problems with the amount of allowance than their counterparts; problems with housing were more apparent among female participants and bilateral participants; receipt of allowance seemed to be more of a problem for non-contract and male participants; long-term, centrally-funded, and contract participants reported more problems with field trips; and third-country, long-term, centrally-funded and contract participants had less support for personal counseling. Overall, it appears that contract, centrally-funded, long-term, and third-country participants had more problems with administrative support than their counterparts, although the sample of those with problems is so small that trends are difficult to determine.

G. CAREER DEVELOPMENT - JOB STATUS

71.6 percent of all participants claim that their training was linked in one way or another to a promotion or a career advancement (Table 16.1). 57.9 percent claim to have more responsibility in their current job position while 33 percent claim to have the same responsibilities. Only 4 percent reported having less responsibilities (see Table 16.2).

There do not seem to be any notable differences between the various sub-groups with regard to promotion patterns, with the possible exception of long-term training which appears to have had more of an impact on participants' career development than short-term training. As presented in Table 16, 81.5 percent of long-term participants reported promotions compared to 70.1 percent of short-term participants; and 74.1 percent of long-term participants claim more job responsibility compared with 55.7 percent of short-term participants. While promotion patterns between male and female participants are fairly even, a slightly larger percentage of males claim increased job responsibility since their training (59.5 percent compared to 51.1 percent), with a greater proportion of females reporting the same job responsibilities (44.4 percent compared to 30.4 percent for males).

60.7 percent of participants knew what position they would return to after training, whereas 34.7 percent did not. while 63 percent of long-term participants did not know what job they would be returning to, a surprisingly large number of short-term participants (30.5 percent) did not know. Some participants commented in the oral interviews that they worried about losing their positions during training and blamed job changes upon return on jealousy and suspicion by their superiors. One agriculture participant interviewed claimed to have been transferred nine times since training.

H. QUALITY AND APPROPRIATENESS OF TRAINING

Only seven participants (3.6 percent) expressed any degree of dissatisfaction with their training program. 71.5 percent reported high degrees of satisfaction with 43.4 percent very satisfied. As presented in Table 17.1, there were no major differences in levels of program satisfaction between the various sub-groups, with the possible exception of private sector participants who appear slightly more satisfied.

Levels of satisfaction among the different training fields varied somewhat, with proportionately more management participants reporting high satisfaction levels (82.8 percent), compared to health (74.3 percent), education (68.8 percent), and agriculture (67.5 percent). Engineering participants seemed to be the least satisfied with their training as a group with only 41.6 percent reporting high satisfaction (Table 17.2).

Most participants felt their training was at an appropriate level (80.6 percent). Of those who did not, more participants (15.8 percent) considered their programs too elementary rather than too difficult (1.5 percent), with the possible exception of long-term participants (Table 17.3).

Short-term and long-term participants were asked to comment separately on different aspects of their programs in light of their very different training experiences. These findings are presented respectively in Tables 17.4 and 17.5.

Long-term participants seemed to be more satisfied with the relevance of their training program, the quality of their courses, and the availability of academic resources than with practical experience or professors having knowledge of third world conditions. Indeed, levels of reported dissatisfaction were only in the areas of practical experience (12.5 percent); professors knowledgeable of third world conditions (23.1 percent); and only one participant was dissatisfied with the available academic resources.

Short-term participants appeared to judge their programs less positively than long-term participants, although more than half reported high levels of satisfaction with the quality of information presented in their programs (67.9 percent), practical experience (62.7 percent), amount of training resources (58.7 percent), and relevance of their programs to conditions prevailing in Haiti (55.2 percent). A substantial number were not satisfied (38.6 percent)

with the duration of their programs which was considered too short to absorb all the material presented or to practice skills learned.

Participants seemed to consider specialized knowledge and skills a more important benefit from training than general knowledge or the establishment of professional relations (see Table 17.6). Most participants listed at least three specific techniques or skills learned in their training program which primarily involved methodological approaches; planning and administration techniques; research and evaluation techniques; management principles; project design and management; objective setting and task analysis; problem solving; negotiation techniques; brainstorming; and learning strategies (e.g., experiential learning, case studies, simulations).

When asked what other benefits they had from training in the oral interviews, many participants replied that the interpersonal aspect was important. While some mentioned professional and social contacts, most commented on the cross-cultural element of sharing ideas and experiences with people from other countries on a professional level. Exposure to U.S. society and practices was also mentioned as a benefit. Overall, participants interviewed reported to be very satisfied with their training and would recommend similar programs to others.

Strengths and Weaknesses. In both the questionnaires and oral interviews, training methodology, techniques learned, and program content were most frequently mentioned by participants as strong points of their programs. Other strengths mentioned included competence of professors/instructors, field trips and practical experience, the establishment of professional contacts, exposure to the socio-political system and work practices in the United States, research methods, the training program's organization, and the availability of educational materials and facilities.

Weak Points. Duration of program was the most frequently cited weakness by short-term participants complaining of overloaded schedules with too much material to absorb; lack of practical experience and relevance were mentioned by some; organization and planning of the programs received some criticism; and language barriers were noted to detract from the quality of the program. Again, these points were made in both the questionnaires and interviews.

I. TRAINING UTILIZATION

Most participants (76.1 percent) are in a job which is related to their training. An examination of differences between sub-groups, however, reveals that a larger percentage of contract, centrally-funded, and third-country participants are in jobs unrelated to training than their respective counterparts (see Table 18.1)

Of those who occupied several positions since their initial AID training experience (142 participants), 73.2 percent reported these positions to be training-related. Reasons given by the 26.8 percent who held positions unrelated to training included switching jobs due to poor working conditions; no appropriate positions were available upon their return; and administrative considerations (e.g., changes or low priority given to area of training.).

61.7 percent report high levels of utilizing their training in carrying out their current job responsibilities, whereas 11.2 percent report lesser degrees of applying their training (this includes 7.1 percent who are not using their training at all). Table 18.2 reveals lower levels of training application among those groups with greater percentages in unrelated jobs, i.e., contract, central, and third-country participants. In addition, short-term participants seem to have higher levels of training utilization than long-term participants.

Table 18.3 shows that 21.4 percent of participants report many constraints to applying knowledge and skills from training in their jobs. Long-term participants report more constraints than short-term participants, as do private sector, third-country and male participants. The most frequently-cited constraint was the lack of resources--both material and financial, followed by lack of administrative support (i.e., resistence to new ideas, resentment of training by colleagues and superiors, indifferent and unmotivated personnel); lack of institutional support (i.e., infrastructure, bureaucracy, lack of trained personnel); and to a lesser degree, knowledge and methods learned in training inappropriate to conditions prevailing in Haiti.

These constraints were repeated in oral interviews. In addition to the common refrain concerning the lack of resources and poor working conditions, many participants commented on their administrative environment suggesting that more serious and objective management would help. The lack of qualified and trained superiors and staff in general was also frequently mentioned as an obstacle to more fully utilizing their training. A number of participants explained that administrative reorganization due to political considerations made it difficult to maintain any continuity in their work.

A number of participants in health and agricultural programs reported that their training was not wholly applicable because the technology learned was too advanced for conditions in Haiti, e.g., surgical sterilization, watershed management techniques. However, the exposure to these techniques and methods was generally considered valuable.

Despite these constraints, however, almost half of all participants (44.9 percent) reported more than average success in introducing new ideas and/or changes in their work environment. Only 9.2 percent of participants claimed almost no success. According to Table 18.4, private sector and short-term

participants appear to have higher success levels than public sector or long-term participants.

Table 18.5 indicates that a substantial number of participants are more involved in planning, developing new programs, improving existing programs and raising standards, and planning and facilitating workshops as a result of their training. New activities mentioned by participants in the interviews included developing training materials, using group exercises in workshops instead of theoretical discussions, and initiating continuing education programs for staff members. Many participants mentioned reorganizing their departments and introducing new management concepts such as planning by objectives, creating new positions and delegating more authority, and having regular staff meetings.

J. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

56.7 percent of all participants reported some degree of correspondence with their training institution or with a professional contact made during the training program. Table 19.1 shows that 18.4 percent of participants report high levels of contact, with male and third-country participants reporting more contact. 13.8 percent of respondents visited their training site since returning from training, with more male and long-term participants than females or short-term (Table 19.2). 20.9 percent of participants have joined a professional association since their training program, of which a greater percentage is male, long-term and private sector participants (Table 19.3). Table 19.4 shows that a larger percentage of agricultural participants belong to professional associations than participants in other fields, followed by education and economics. 54.6 percent of participants receive professional publications. Again, long-term and male participants report more than short-term or female participants (see Table 19.5).

Participants were asked in the oral interviews whether they experienced a change in attitude in their professional or personal lives as a result of their training experience. Many participants mentioned being more open-minded and flexible, less fatalistic, and more willing to take risks. Some also acknowledged new perspectives in their professional responsibilities, including higher standards and commitment to excellence with new approaches for better managing and organizing work. One participant commented on a change in leadership style from authoritarian to democratic. Another participant remarked that his workstyle changed from crisis management to crisis prevention as a result of his training experience.

K. TRANSMISSION OF TRAINING

Table 20.1 shows that 23 percent of participants claim to share their acquired knowledge and skills a lot with their colleagues since their training with only nine participants (or 4.6 percent) claiming not to at all. Short-term participants and non-contract participants appear to be more active in this category, as do female and private sector participants to a lesser degree. Participants in the health and computer science fields appear to share their knowledge and skills from training more actively than participants in other fields (Table 20.2). Informal discussion was the most frequently mentioned channel used to share this information, followed by on-the-job training, exchange of training materials, and formal presentations. Written reports were mentioned the least.

59.2 percent of all participants claim to be in contact with other AID-sponsored trainees on a professional or social basis. Females and long-term participants appear to have more contact than others (see Table 20.3). Most of the interviewed participants, however, reported little contact with other AID participants.

L. ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

87.2 percent of all participants were in favor of establishing an alumni association with 14 participants saying no. 6.1 percent of those in favor of such a group would be willing to pay up to $5 per year, 22.2 percent up to $10 per year, 22.2 percent up to $15 per year, and 46.7 percent would be willing to pay according to the needs of the association. Only three participants who were in favor of the association would not be willing to pay anything.

The following activities were suggested by the participants in the questionnaires and oral interviews as possible functions of an alumni association listed in order of the most frequently mentioned: conferences and workshops (and refresher courses) for technical and professional purposes; social and cultural activities to make and maintain contacts and exchange experiences; research activities; assistance to future participants including orientation, English language practice, and re-entry counseling; special interest sub-groups; publication activities; library functions including an information resource center; training for those who have not had the opportunity through workshops and on-the-job training; identification of training needs and assistance to AID in training design; and contact with similar associations in other countries.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR PRINCIPAL SUBGROUPS

A. CONTRACT/NON-CONTRACT PARTICIPANTS

Contract participants had less advance planning for their programs and seemed to be less satisfied with their pre-departure orientation than participants managed by USAID. Although a larger percentage of contract participants attended orientation sessions in the country of training, they appeared to have slightly more adjustment problems than non-contract participants. Contract participants also reported more problems with the amount of their allowance, field trips, and personal counseling during training. It appears that more contract participants are in jobs unrelated to their training than non-contract participants, report lower levels of training utilization, and seem to share their training less with their colleagues than non-contract participants. This might be explained by the fact that contract participants were trained under specific projects with which they may no longer be affiliated. A large number of contract participants were trained in agriculture and health. Lack of Mission major programs

B. BILATERAL/CENTRAL

A larger percentage of participants in centrally-funded or regional training programs seemed to be in jobs unrelated to their training with consequent lower levels of training utilization than bilaterally-funded participants. Selection of participants for central/regional training programs also seemed more independent of participants' employer or supervisor than bilateral participants. That is, more centrally-funded participants initiated their own application or were invited directly. Centrally-funded participants also seemed to have had more problems with administrative matters

(e.g., travel advances, field trips, and personal counseling) but reported fewer housing problems. They tended to be in management and health programs.

C. SHORT-TERM/LONG-TERM

Long-term participants participated more in their selection and the planning of programs than short-term participants, although both groups appeared equally satisfied with their training. Long-term participants had proportionately less advance planning and were less satisfied with their pre-departure orientation than short-term participants. Although a larger percentage of long-term participants attended orientation sessions in the country of training, they had proportionately more social and cultural adjustment problems. Long-term participants also seemed to have more language difficulties and problems with their allowance, field trips, and personal counseling. Although long-term participants seemed to have more job promotion and increased responsibilities after training, short-term participants seemed to have higher levels of training utilization, greater success in introducing new ideas in their jobs, and less constraints. While short-term participants seem to share their training experience more with colleagues, long-term participants are in more contact with other AID participants and have visited their training site, joined professional associations, and receive publications proportionately more than short-term participants. A surprisingly large number of short-term participants reported not knowing what job they would be returning to.

D. MALE/FEMALE

Female participants demonstrated more initiative in their selection for training. Males had more language and social and cultural adjustment problems

than female participants, although females seemed to have had more problems with housing. While promotion patterns are fairly even, proportionately more males returned to increased job responsibility than females. Training utilization levels do not appear to differ between males and females, although males seem to encounter more constraints to applying their training. While more males have maintained contact with their training site (including visits), joined professional associations and receive journals, women seem to share their training experience more with colleagues and are in more contact with other AID participants.

E. PUBLIC/PRIVATE

These two groups were compared for selection and program planning behavior as well as job status. Private sector participants seemed to be more active in their selection as well as program planning, and they seemed to be proportionately more satisfied with their training experience than public sector participants. Although training utilization levels do not differ between these two groups, private sector participants reported slightly more success in introducing new ideas or changes in their work environment. They also seem to demonstrate more interest in joining professional associations.

F. U.S./THIRD-COUNTRY

Third-country participants were less satisfied with their pre-departure orientation and only one participant received orientation in the country of training. Understandably, third-country participants experienced proportionately more social and cultural problems than U.S.-trained participants. Third-country trainees also had problems with their allowance and personal counseling, and were less satisfied with the available training

resources or program organization than participants trained in the United States. A larger percentage of third-country participants are in jobs unrelated to training and report lower levels of training utilization. All third-country participants attended short-term programs which were mostly in agriculture and health.

G. FIELD OF TRAINING

Table 21 illustrates that the majority of surveyed participants were trained in management (32.6 percent), agriculture (18.9 percent), and health programs (17.9 percent), followed by education (8.2 percent), economics (6.6 percent), and engineering (6.1 percent). The remaining fields constitute only 9.7 percent of the surveyed population. Contract participants were primarily concentrated in health programs followed by agriculture; whereas centrally-funded participants were equally concentrated in management and health, followed by agriculture. While the bulk of long-term participants were trained in agriculture, proportionately more short-term participants were trained in management. A large proportion of females were trained in management, whereas males tended to be more evenly concentrated in management, agriculture, and health fields. Thus, management training appears to have had proportionately more short-term, female participants trained mostly in the United States. Agriculture programs have had more long-term, male participants from the public sector with a substantial amount of third-country training.* There do not appear to be any notable differences between sub-groups in engineering programs, but both education and economics training have had proportionately more participants from the private sector.

*Health training appears to have had more contract participants and centrally-funded programs prior to 1978.

H. TIME ELAPSED SINCE TRAINING

Table 22.1 shows that more than half of the surveyed participants have returned from training within the last two years. 85% of long-term participants returned within the last two years, with none trained more than five years ago. The majority of females have returned within the last two years (68.9 percent), reflecting more recent emphasis on including women in the development process.

Of those participants who returned within the last two years, 81 percent are in training-related jobs compared to a slightly smaller percentage of participants who returned between two and five years ago (76 percent). Only 52.2 percent of participants who returned more than five years ago are still in training-related jobs (see Table 22.2).

While promotion patterns appear fairly consistent over the years, a larger percentage of participants who returned over five years ago report having more job responsibility (73.9 percent), compared to 64.1 percent who returned between two and five years, and 51 percent for those who have returned within the last two years.

As demonstrated in Table 22.3, there do not appear to be any notable differences in levels of training application or success in introducing new ideas or change in participant's job environment. A slightly larger percentage of participants returning within the last year report many constraints to applying their training (26.9 percent) compared to 41 percent for the group returning between one and two years. This might reflect high expectations for participants just returning.

The pattern for satisfaction levels is of interest: while 84.6 percent of those most recently returned report high levels of satisfaction, only 62 percent of participants who returned between one and two years report similar

levels. The percentage of high satisfaction levels remain on the low side (65.6 percent) for the group returning between two and five years, but surges to 82.6 percent for participants trained more than five years ago.

V. SUPERVISOR INTERVIEWS

Ten host government officials were interviewed in their capacity as participant supervisors for their perspectives on the participant training program both in terms of participant performance and program management. Supervisors with substantial contact with returned participants were selected from the Ministries of Health, Agriculture, Education, Plan, and Mines which, together, represent 68.6% of the returned participant population.

All of the supervisors interviewed confirmed that AID's participant training program fills important gaps in the training of Haitian technicians. Specifically, the spokesman for the Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine--the only school of Agriculture in Haiti--reported that AID's training program has helped raise the academic level of many instructors and has created new interest for research within the Faculty. Representatives from the Ministry of Health stressed the positive role that AID's training has played in their family planning and community health training programs. Officials at the Ministry of Mines praised AID's intensive short-term training which has provided participants with relevant "hands on" practical experience.

Participant Performance

While all supervisors generally agreed that the participant training program is bringing a new dynamism within the corps of professionals in their respective departments, they also suggested that specific skills acquisition is second in importance to changes in participants' professional attitude. Several supervisors commented on how much more disciplined and professionally-motivated participants appear to be as a result of their training experience. Although not meant to undervalue the benefits of the technical knowledge from U.S. training, it was suggested that the program has the added value of

exposing participants to U.S. practices and work ethic which they claim has a positive impact.

With varying degree, supervisors reported that participants do utilize new skills and knowledge gained through training. However, it was clear from the interviews that some supervisors are more involved in the planning and reintegration process than others which may influence the extent to which participants are able to apply their training.

Each supervisor interviewed also mentioned the lack of facilities and resources as the major constraint preventing them and returned trainees from making better use of the training received. The most dramatic account of this came from a Nurse Head in one of the State Hospitals. She explained that the hospital has 700 beds but has an in-patient list of much more. The maternity ward, for example, has 100 beds but is usually forced to place two patients on one bed "as long as there is no risk of contamination." In addition to limited staff and facilities, the most basic materials are lacking. While hospital linen is scarce, each nurse is given one hospital gown to keep and maintain. Gloves were recently provided to nurses working with patients presenting contamination risks, but this was not easy and will certainly be a problem in the future. While some basic drugs and medicines are difficult to find due to limited resources, others such as insulin are stolen due to inadequate storage space. There is also limited access to cold chain equipment for drug storage. A lot of sterilizing equipment is out of order at any one time and is difficult to repair. The only ambulance serving the hospital is out of order most of the time. Finally, these working conditions coupled with low salaries forcing nurses to find additional employment result in a work force with low morale and little motivation.

Several supervisors cautioned that the changed attitudes which they welcome in returned trainess could be counter-productive in light of the generally poor working conditions to which participants return. A better-trained technician with expectations of a higher professional status with a commensurate salary increase and more opportunities to utilize the newly-acquired knowledge and skills may become frustrated by the type of conditions characterizing the Haitian work environment, especially the public sector, and may seek other work, further training, or lose interest.

USAID/Host Government Management Considerations

All supervisors expressed a need for more comprehensive and timely information on the training opportunities available from USAID. They commented that requests for candidates are often received without much lead-time. An English language proficiency requirement was also cited by most supervisors as a problem. The short lead-time and lack of English-speakers were two major constraints preventing them from taking full advantage of AID's training opportunities.

Several supervisors proposed closer cooperation with the Mission, especially in the planning stage which would ensure more relevant training and better utilization. This was emphasized by the officials interviewed from the Ministry of Plan's External Cooperation Section who are responsible for coordinating all overseas training offered by foreign governments and donor agencies. They felt their department should be more involved in AID's participant training program and would like to receive regular information on training opportunities.

VI. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Management of the training program is the responsibility of the Training Office in cooperation with the Mission's technical offices. In order to gain a better understanding of program management issues, especially relating to participant selection, monitoring and follow-up procedures, discussions were held with the Mission's personnel responsible for the training program. In addition, the Mission's technical offices were consulted for their views on management operations and how coordination with the Training Office could be improved.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. IDENTIFICATION OF TRAINING NEEDS

The Mission's training needs and projections are identified in annual training proposals developed by the Training Office with input from the technical offices. A Country Training Plan was recently developed to assist the technical offices in identifying their training needs over the next five years. As the main source of funding for participant training is the Mission's projects, the Training Office participates in the review of PID's and PP's which contain a participant training component and keeps informed of any overseas training activity being initiated in the Mission. In turn, the Training Office is responsible for informing the sector offices of training opportunities, academic requirements and eligibility, language requirements, and other selection criteria. Secondary sources for training include centrally-funded training and regional training/scholarship programs. Information on these supplemental training opportunities is forwarded to the Training Office by AID/Washington and circulated to each technical office.

While the Mission has trained approximately 42 long-term participants and 353 short-term participants over the past twelve years, a total of 200 new starts are anticipated for FY 1986 alone of whom 10 are long-term and the rest short-term. This reflects a rapid increase in the Mission's participant training level and will place a greater administrative burden on the Training Office. A half-time training assistant is expected to meet this need.

B. SELECTION, MONITORING, AND FOLLOW-UP PROCEDURES

Candidates for AID-training are nominated through the Mission's technical offices or a host country agency. Upon completion of a bio-data form candidates

are interviewed and their credentials are reviewed by the Training Office. Selection criteria include academic background and prior training, relevance of training to current position, language proficiency, professional responsibilities, and, in the case of regional LAC II funds, economic need. Although a Training Committee was recently organized in conjunction with the development of the Country Training Plan, it has not yet convened. It was set up primarily to review candidates for the regional scholarship training program.

The Training Officer is responsible for providing participants with a pre-departure orientation. While all participants receive an administrative briefing, long-term participants also have an opportunity to view a videotape on graduate life in the United States and if appropriate, one on agriculture in the United States. The Training Office monitors participants' progress through periodic grade and evaluation reports, and maintains participants' records which should include information on their post-training job status.

Follow-up guidelines in Handbook 10 recommend that participants be placed in positions which utilize their training; that they be given opportunities to reinforce, extend and transmit to others the knowledge and skills acquired through AID-training; and that bonds of friendship between Haitian trainees and Americans continue. In regard to the first provision, participants are required before leaving to sign a letter of agreement with the AID office on the conditions of training which states: "Acceptance of the scholarship money implies, and I do agree to, work in a position acceptable to my government for a period of one month for each month of training paid for under the scholarship." However, there is no similar agreement between the participant and the host government employment agency, although the GCH Ministry of Health obliged a group of participants to sign a contractual agreement in one

particular project. A Project Officer in the agency office commented that project-related contract participants are not automatically reabsorbed in a project- or even training-related position. He speculated that the Host Government does not consider the long-term benefits of returned trainees and is reluctant to retain returning participants due to the lack of resources to pay higher salaries.

The Mission has conducted little follow-up activities over the years. However, recent interest in taking a more active role in follow-up of participants is evident by virtue of this evaluation. Furthermore, the Mission co-sponsored a reception for all returned participants during the evaluation period and awarded Certificates of Achievement to former AID participants. This was a first step in exploring the possibility of establishing an alumni association of returned participants which the Mission is willing to assist.

C. COORDINATION OF TRAINING WITHIN THE MISSION

Personnel from the Mission's technical offices were consulted for their views on management operations, including their role in developing the Mission's Country Training Plan. Most of those interviewed regarded it as a bureaucratic exercise which was imposed on the technical offices at inconvenient times, and with short notice. While some of the officers regarded their own projections as somewhat arbitrary, other officers expressed hope that their projections would be taken seriously and that the exercise would bear some results.

Technical Officers generally felt that communication from the Training Office was weak, especially in regard to information on available training opportunities. Many of those interviewed also expressed the need for a review

of how the system works and how to take advantage of the available training opportunities. Nearly all the office representatives were not well-informed of the kind or amount of training available under the regional LAC II project. It was suggested that more personal communication is needed with the Training Office.

According to the Training Office, however, training announcements and other information on training opportunities are forwarded to the Mission's technical offices on a regular and timely basis. Several Mission Officers explained that training announcements sometimes come to their attention too late to take advantage of or cannot be immediately reacted to due to other daily priorities. Others mentioned not having enough suitable candidates for the proposed training.

The Head of the Office of Economic Analysis, for example, cited the case where two people were identified for INTAX training, but only after processing the PIO/P did the office learn that their candidates did not meet the necessary qualifications. He suggested that this situation could have been avoided with proper screening by the Training Office. The Project Manager of an agricultural project with a significant training element also reported a lack of candidates for project training due to a lack of English-speakers and too few people to work on the project. This situation has resulted in an underutilization of the training budget which was used for something else. Given the general lack of candidates, it was suggested that short-term courses given in French (e.g., ag Statistics, reforestation) would be more useful than the long-term training proposed in the project.

All technical offices expressed interest in conducting more training, given the proper match between opportunities and their respective sector needs. Both the Health Office and OPED mentioned possibilities of expanding

their training activities but had questions regarding management options and whether to solicit proposals from contractors to implement the training or go through the Training Office. Project Managers in the Agriculture office praised the Training Office in its handling of two contracts.

Personnel from the Division of Research and Evaluation were also interviewed for their views of the program as their role is to ensure that the training is in line with the Mission's major developmental objectives through a review of all PIO/P's. The Training Office also used to operate out of DRE until recently. The Head of DRE offfered to provide the Training Office with guidance in implementing future follow-up plans, especially in the design and use of follow-up questionnaires.

D. CONTRACT VS. AID-MANAGED TRAINING

While the Training Officer assists contract participants in securing a visa and provides an administrative briefing, contractor carry out the selection and placement functions. The survey findings suggested that contract participants were somewhat neglected in their pre-departure orientation and other administrative support during training compared to non-contract participants. As noted earlier, a larger percentage of contract participants also appears to be in positions unrelated to training and are not fully utilizing their training. This situation should be looked into by project officers responsible for participants training under contract arrangements. Given the funding arrangements made wih two of the Missions's contractors (Texas A&M and Arkansas University), it was not possible to compare costs. The contracts provide for a Federal Reserve Letter of Credit in which AID/Washington disburses the funds and forwards periodic vouchers to the Mission without itemizing actual participant training costs. AID costs

for long-term academic training are currently $1800/month or $21,600 per year per participant; the Arkansas contract budgeted approximately $19,651 for comparable training, but it is not known whether these projections are actual costs.

E. DONOR COORDINATION

The donor survey carried out in conjunction with the Country Training Plan identified twelve donor agencies, international organizations, and foreign governments involved in training Haitian technicians and summarized the major training focus for each. According to this survey, Canada, Germany, FAO, China and Japan all have agricultural training activities with the latter three also involved in fishing; the Interamerican Institute of Agricultural Cooperation (IICA) conducts local training in Animal Production (Pig Project); the French Government and WHO/PAHO are involved in health training; the IDB and IMF conduct some fiscal training; UNICEF is mostly involved in local child health and education training; and UNDP conducts in-country training in a number of areas.

Mission technical offices were vaguely aware of other donor training, but not specifically enough to know whether any duplication of effort exists.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS: STATISTICAL TABLES

NOTE: Where figures do not add to 100 percent in the following tables, non-responses and/or answers with no form opinion have not been included.

TABLE 10.1: SELECTION (NOMINATED OR APPLIED FOR TRAINING)

	Nominated	Applied	Other
Total (196)	81.7%	9.1%	6.1
Contract (49)	77.6	8.2	10.2
Non-contract (144)	83.3	9.7	4.2
Bilateral (115)	89.6	5.2	2.6
Central (79)	70.9	15.2	10.1
Short-Term (167)	85.0	7.2	5.4
Long-Term (27)	63.0	22.2	7.4
Male (148)	83.1	7.4	6.8
Female (45)	77.8	15.6	2.2
Public (171)	86.0	8.2	4.1
Private (19)	63.2	21.1	10.5

TABLE 10.2: SELECTION BY FIELD OF TRAINING

	Nominated	Applied	Other
Management (64)	84.4	10.9	3.1
Agriculture (37)	89.2	5.4	2.7
Health (35)	88.6	0.0	8.6
Education (16)	62.5	18.8	12.5
Economics (13)	76.9	23.1	0.0
Engineering (12)	75.0	8.3	8.3
Computer Science (5)	100.0	0.0	0.0
Animal Husbandry (5)	100.0	0.0	0.0
Energy (3)	100.0	0.0	0.0
Information (2)	0.0	0.0	50.0
Other (4)	25.0	50.0	25.0

TABLE 10.3: SELECTION AND SATISFACTION

	Low Satisfaction	High Satisfaction
Nominated (161)	31.1	71.4
Applied (18)	0.0	83.3

TABLE 11.2: INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAM PLANNING BY FIELD OF TRAINING

	(1-2) Low Involvement	(4-5) High Involvement
Management (64)	46.9	31.3
Agriculture (37)	40.5	29.7
Health (35)	71.4	5.7
Education (16)	43.8	18.8
Economics (13)	53.8	15.4
Engineering (12)	66.6	8.3
Computer Science (5)	40.0	60.0
Animal Husbandry (5)	40.0	20.0
Energy (3)	33.3	33.3
Information (2)	0.0	50.0
Other (4)	75.0	0.0

TABLE 11.3: INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAM PLANNING BY SATISFACTION AND APPLICATION

	Satisfaction		Application	
	Low	High	Low	High
Low Involvement (102)	5.9	65.7	17.6	58.8
High Involvement (44)	2.3	81.8	6.8	65.9

PREVIOUS PAGE BLANK

TABLE 12.1: PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION

	ADMINSTRATIVE		TECHNICAL		CULTURAL	
	Not Well Informed	Well Informed	Not Well Informed	Well Informed	Not Well Informed	Well Informed
Contract(49)	16.3	49.0	24.5	44.9	44.9	20.4
Noncontract (144)	8.3	64.6	16.7	49.3	27.1	45.8
Bilateral (115)	10.4	63.5	20.0	47.0	30.4	42.6
Central (79)	10.1	57.0	16.5	50.6	32.9	34.2
Short-term (167)	8.4	61.0	16.2	50.3	29.9	41.9
Long-term (27)	22.2	59.3	33.3	33.3	44.4	18.5
Male (148)	12.2	62.2	17.6	50.0	33.1	37.8
Female (45)	4.4	60.0	20.0	44.4	26.7	44.4
US trained (170)	10.0	61.8	17.6	49.4	29.4	39.4
3rd Country (26)	11.5	57.7	23.1	42.3	46.2	34.6

	ADMINISTRATIVE			TECHNICAL			CULTURAL		
	Not Well Informed	Sufficiently Informed	Well Informed	Not Well Informed	Sufficiently Informed	Well Informed	Not Well Informed	Sufficiently Informed	Well Informed
Total (196)	10.2	27.0	61.2	18.4	31.6	48.5	31.6	28.6	38.8

TABLE 12.2: PRE-DEPARTURE CULTURAL BRIEFING BY ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS

	Not Well Informed	Sufficiently Informed	Well Informed
Some Problems (30)	53.3	23.3	20.0
Almost None (147)	256.6	32.7	40.8

TABLE 12.3: SATISFACTION WITH PRE-DEPARTURE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE

	Travel Arrangements			Visa			Travel Advance		
	Low	High	NR	Low	High	NR	Low	High	NR
Total (196)	4.6	69.9	1.5	3.1	65.3	14.3	11.2	50.5	13.3
Contract (49)	0.0	63.3	4.1	6.1	63.3	10.2	30.6	16.3	28.6
Non-contract (144)	6.3	71.5	0.7	2.1	66.0	16.0	4.9	61.8	8.3
Bilateral (115)	5.2	73.1	0.0	2.6	65.3	13.0	5.2	61.8	7.8
Central (79)	3.8	64.6	3.8	3.8	64.5	17.7	20.3	34.2	21.5
Short-term (167)	4.2	70.1	1.8	3.6	63.5	15.6	9.6	53.9	9.0
Long-term (27)	7.4	66.7	0.0	0.0	74.1	11.1	22.2	29.6	37.0
Male (148)	5.4	69.6	1.4	3.4	68.2	10.1	12.2	46.6	13.5
Female (45)	2.2	73.3	2.2	2.2	55.6	28.9	8.9	64.4	11.1

TABLE 12.4: ADVANCE PLANNING

	Advance Planning	No Advance Planning
Total (196)	79.6	18.9
Contract (49)	67.3	32.7
Non-contract (144)	83.3	14.6
Bilateral (115)	80.0	18.3
Central (79)	78.5	20.3
Short-term (167)	81.4	17.
Long-term (27)	66.7	33.3
Male (148)	81.1	17.6
Female (45)	75.6	22.2
U.S. (170)	78.8	19.4
Third Country (26)	84.6	15.4

TABLE 13.1: LANGUAGE PROBLEMS

	1 Serious	2	3 Some	4	5 None
Total (196)	1.0	0.5	18.9	21.9	42.3

	(1-2-3) Some Problems	(4-5) Almost No Problems
Contract (49)	22.4	67.3
Non-contract (144)	18.1	64.6
Short-Term (167)	18.6	64.7
Long-Term (27)	33.3	59.3
Male (148)	23.6	63.5
Female (45)	6.7	68.9

TABLE 13.2: LANGUAGE PROBLEMS BY LANGUAGE TRAINING

Language Problems	Language Training	No Training	Not Applicable
Total (196)	27.0	48.0	25.0
Some Problems (40)	55.0	42.5	2.5
Almost None (126)	23.0	58.7	18.3
No Response (30)	6.7	10.0	83.3

Language Problems	# of Participants		
	Language Training	No Training	No Response
1. Serious	2	0	0
2.	1	0	0
3. Some	19	17	1
4.	19	22	2
5. None	10	52	21

TABLE 13.3: SATISFACTION AND LANGUAGE PROBLEMS

	Dissastified	Satisfied
Some (40)	2.5%	92.5%
Almost None (126)	4.8	91.6

TABLE 13.4: APPLICATION AND LANGUAGE PROBLEMS

	Low Application	High Application
Some (40)	22.5	40.0
Almost None (126)	10.3	66.7

TABLE 14.1: KIND OF ORIENTATION

	Attended	Useful	Not Useful
WIC Orientation	17.9	100	0
Training Site Orientation	30.6	98.3	1.7
Other Orientation	8.2	93.8	6.2

TABLE 14.2: ORIENTATION IN COUNTRY OF TRAINING

	YES	NO
Total (196)	41.3%	58.7%
Contract (49)	46.9	53.1
Non-contract (144)	38.2	61.8
Bilateral (115)	36.5	63.5
Central (79)	46.8	53.2
Short-Term (167)	37.7	62.3
Long-Term (27)	66.7	33.3
U.S. - Trained (170)	47.1	52.9
Third Country (26)	3.8	96.2

TABLE 14.3: ORIENTATION AND SATISFACTION

	Low Satis.	High Satis.
Orientation (81)	1.2%	75.3%
No Orientation (115)	5.2	68.7

TABLE 14.4: ORIENTATION AND APPLICATION

	Low Applic.	High Applic.
Orientation (81)	4.9	69.1
No Orientation (115)	15.7	56.5

TABLE 14.5: SOCIOCULTURAL ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS

	1 Serious	2	3 Some	4	5 No Problems
Total (196)	5.	2.0	12.8	15.3	59.7

	(1-2-3) Some Problems	(4-5) Almost None
Contract (49)	22.4	69.4
Non-contract (144)	12.5	77.0
Bilateral (115)	13.9	75.6
Central (79)	16.5	74.7
Short-Term (167)	12.0	77.2
Long-Term (27)	37.0	59.3
Male (148)	18.9	72.3
Female (45)	0	86.7
U.S. - Trained (170)	14.7	78.2
3rd Country (26)	19.2	53.8

TABLE 14.6: ORIENTATION AND ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS

Orientation	Some Problems (30)	Almost No Problems (117)
Yes (81)	22.2%	77.8%
No (115)	10.4	73.0

TABLE 14.7: ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS AND SATISFACTION

	Satisfaction	
	Low	High
Some Problems (30)	3.3%	66.7
Almost No Problems (147)	4.1	71.4

TABLE 14.8: ADJUSTMENT PROBLEMS AND APPLICATION

	Application Of Training	
	Low	High
Some Problems (30)	13.3%	56.7%
Almost No Problem (147)	7.5	65.3

TABLE 15: SUPPORT DURING TRAINING

	Allowance Receipt		Allowance Amount		Lodging		Program Changes		Field Trips		Personal Counseling		Program Guidance	
	Some Problems	No Problems	Some Problems	No Problems	Some	None	Some	None	Some	None	Some	None	Some	None
Total (196)	10.2	78.6	32.7	44.4	20.9	56.6	6.1	70.4	9.2	69.9	8.7	67.9	6.1	75.0
Contract (49)	6.1	81.6	38.8	40.8	16.3	59.2	8.2	67.3	12.3	65.3	14.3	63.3	16.3	63.3
Noncontract (144)	11.8	77.1	29.9	45.8	22.2	55.6	5.6	71.5	7.6	72.2	6.3	70.8	2.8	79.2
Bilateral (115)	10.4	77.4	32.2	47.8	24.3	57.4	3.5	74.8	5.2	73.0	5.2	70.4	2.6	78.3
Central (79)	10.1	79.7	31.6	40.5	15.2	55.7	10.1	63.3	13.9	65.8	12.7	65.8	11.4	69.6
Short-term (167)	10.8	77.3	30.5	47.9	20.4	60.5	4.8	72.5	7.8	73.0	6.6	70.7	4.8	77.2
Long-term (27)	7.4	88.9	48.1	22.2	25.9	33.3	14.8	59.3	18.5	51.9	22.2	51.9	14.8	63.0
US-trained (170)	10.6	80.0	30.6	45.9	21.8	55.3	6.5	68.8	9.4	70.0	7.1	69.4	5.9	75.3
3rd Country (26)	7.7	69.2	46.2	34.6	15.4	65.4	3.8	80.8	7.7	69.2	19.2	57.7	7.7	73.1
Male (148)	12.1	75.7	32.4	42.6	17.6	58.8	6.1	70.9	8.8	70.9	10.1	64.9	6.1	70.9
Female (45)	4.4	86.7	28.9	53.3	31.1	48.9	4.4	68.9	8.9	66.7	2.2	80.0	4.4	91.1

TABLE 16.1: JOB PROMOTION

	Promotion	
	Yes	No
Total (196)	71.6%	22.3%
Contract (49)	73.5	22.4
Non-contract (144)	70.8	22.9
Bilateral (115)	73.9	20.0
Central (79)	68.4	26.6
Short-term (167)	70.1	24.6
Long-term (27)	81.5	11.1
Male (148)	71.6	23.0
Female (45)	71.1	22.2
Public (171)	74.3	20.5
Private (19)	68.4	26.3

TABLE 16.2 JOB RESPONSIBILITY

	Job Responsibility		
	Same	More	Less
Total (196)	33.0%	57.9%	4
Contract (49)	14.3	30.6	0.0
Non-contract (144)	16.7	22.9	2.1
Bilateral (115)	36.5	59.1	.9
Central (79)	29.1	55.7	0.0
Short-term (167)	37.7	55.7	1.8
Long-term (27)	7.4	74.1	0.0
Male (148)	30.4	59.5	1.4
Female (45)	44.4	51.1	2.2
Public (171)	33.9	59.1	1.2
Private (19)	31.6	63.2	5.3

TABLE 16.3: KNOWLEDGE OF POST-TRAINING JOB

	Knew Job	Did Not Know
Short Term (167)	64.1	30.5
Long Term (27)	37.0	63.0
Total (196)	60.7%	34.7

TABLE 17.1: SATISFACTION WITH TRAINING PROGRAM

	SATISFACTION				
	1 Not At All	2	3 Satisfied	4	5 Very
Total	2.6	1.0	21.4	28.1	43.4

	Low	High
Contract (49)	4.1	69.4
Non-contract (144)	3.5	71.5
Bilateral (115)	3.5	68.7
Central (79)	3.8	74.7
Short Term (167)	3.6	70.1
Long Term (27)	3.7	77.8
Male (148)	4.1	70.3
Female (45)	2.2	75.6
Public (171)	3.5	70.2
Private (19)	0	84.2
US-trained (170)	3.5	70.6
3rd Country (26)	3.8	76.9

TABLE 17.2: SATISFACTION BY FIELD OF TRAINING

	Low Satisfaction	High Satisfaction
Management (64)	3.1	82.8
Agriculture (37)	5.4	67.5
Health (35)	2.9	74.3
Education (16)	0.0	68.8
Economics (13)	0.0	61.6
Engineering (12)	8.3	41.6
Computer Science (5)	0.0	60.0
Animal Husbandry (5)	0.0	60.0
Energy (3)	0.0	66.7
Information (2)	50.0	50.0
Other (4)	0.0	75.0

TABLE 17.3: LEVEL OF TRAINING

	More Difficult	Adequate	More Elementary
Total (196)	1.5	80.6	15.8
Short Term (167)	.6	80.2	17.4
Long-Term (27)	7.4	85.2	3.7

TABLE 17.4: LONG-TERM PARTICIPANTS

	Low Satisfaction	High Satisfaction
(N = 41) Course Quality	0.0	78.0
(N = 42) Relevance	0.0	78.6
(N = 40) Practical Experience	12.5	55.0
(N = 39) *Professors with Developmental Experience	23.1	43.6
(N = 41) Academic Resources	2.4	87.8

TABLE 17.5: SHORT-TERM PARTICIPANTS

	Low Satisfaction	High Satisfaction
(N = 100) Length of Programs	38.6	33.1
(N = 165) Quality of Information	3.0	67.9
(163) Relevance	8.0	55.2
(161) Practical Experience	12.4	62.7
(150) Training Resources	12.0	58.7

TABLE 17.6: BENEFITS FROM TRAINING

	Low Benefit	High Benefit
Specialized Knowledge & Skills	20.4	73.0
General Knowledge	5.6	64.3
Professional Relations	10.7	58.2

TABLE 18.1: TRAINING-RELATED JOB

	Yes	No
Total (196)	76.1	20.8
Contract (49)	59.2	32.7
Non-contract (144)	81.9	17.4
Bilateral (115)	85.2	13.9
Central (79)	63.3	31.6
Short-Term (167)	77.3	21.6
Long-Term (27)	70.4	18.5
Male (148)	74.3	22.3
Female (45)	82.2	17.8
Public (171)	79.5	18.7
Private (19)	73.7	26.3
US-trained (170)	78.8	18.2
3rd Country (26)	61.5	38.5

TABLE 18.2: APPLICATION OF TRAINING IN JOB

	1 Not at all	2	3 Average	4	5 A lot
Total (196)	7.1	4.1	21.4	31.6	30.1

	LOW APPLICATION	HIGH APPLICATION
Contract (49)	20.4	55.1
Non-contract (144)	8.3	63.8
Bilateral (115)	5.2	64.3
Central (79)	20.3	58.2
Short-term (167)	10.8	64.7
Long-term (27)	14.8	44.4
Male (148)	12.2	61.5
Female (45)	8.9	64.4
Public (171)	9.4	63.7
Private (19)	10.5	63.2
US-trained (170)	10.0	61.8
3rd Country (26)	19.2	61.5

TABLE 18.3: CONSTRAINTS TO APPLYING TRAINING

	1 None	2	3 Some	4	5 A lot
Total (196)	20.4	15.8	31.1	11.2	9.2

	(1-2) Very Few	(4-5) Many
Contract (49)	30.6	22.5
Non-contract (144)	38.9	18.8
Bilateral (115)	38.3	22.6
Central (79)	34.2	16.5
Short-term (167)	38.3	19.2
Long-term (27)	18.5	29.6
Male (148)	33.8	23.0
Female (45)	46.7	11.1
Public (171)	36.3	19.3
Private (19)	36.8	26.3
US-trained (170)	37.7	18.8
3rd Country (26)	26.9	30.8

TABLE 18.4: SUCCESS IN INTRODUCING NEW IDEAS

	1 None	2	3 Some	4	5 A lot
Total	4.6	4.6	35.7	26.5	18.4

	Low Success	High Success
Contract (49)	8.1	38.8
Non-contract (144)	9.8	47.9
Bilateral (115)	8.7	47.0
Central (79)	10.1	43.0
Short-term (167)	9.0	47.9
Long-term (27)	11.1	25.9
Male (148)	8.8	45.9
Female (45)	11.1	42.2
Public (171)	9.4	43.9
Private (19)	5.3	52.6
US-trained (170)	8.8	44.7
3rd Country (26)	11.5	46.2

TABLE 18.5: INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOR

	Some Involvement	More Involvement	Not Applicable
Develop/Revise Policy	17.4	35.2	47.4
Revise Administrative Procedures	21.4	34.7	43.9
Inter-agency Planning	21.4	48.5	30.1
Develop New Programs/Services	23.0	42.3	34.7
Improve Existing Programs/Services	19.4	52.5	28.1
Raise Standards	19.9	47.4	32.7
Plan Workshops	17.9	45.4	36.7
Facilitate Workshops	24.0	41.3	34.7
Research	22.4	26.6	51.0
Publish	0.5	15.3	84.2

TABLE 19.1: CORRESPONDENCE WITH TRAINING SITE/CONTACT

	1 Not at all	2	3 Some	4	5 Alot
Total (196)	39.8	10.2	28.1	12.8	5.6

	(1-2) Low Contact	(4-5) High Contact
Contract (49)	44.9	18.4
Non-contract (144)	50.7	18.8
Bilateral (115)	53.9	15.7
Central (79)	43.0	22.8
Short-term (167)	49.1	17.4
Long-term (27)	55.6	22.2
Male (148)	48.0	21.6
Female (45)	55.6	8.9
Public (171)	50.3	17.5
Private (19)	52.6	21.1
US-trained (170)	51.2	15.9
3rd Country (26)	42.3	34.6

TABLE 19.2 VISITED TRAINING INSTITUTION

	Yes	No.
Total (196)	13.8	85.7
Short-term (167)	11.4	88.1
Long-term (27)	29.6	70.4
Male (148)	15.5	83.8
Female (45)	8.9	91.1

TABLE 19.3: JOINED PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION

	Yes	No
Total (196)	20.9	77.6
Contract (49)	24.5	75.5
Non-contract (144)	18.8	79.2
Bilateral (115)	18.3	80.0
Central (79)	22.8	75.9
Short-term (167)	16.1	82.0
Long-term (27)	51.9	48.2
Male (148)	23.0	75.0
Female (45)	11.1	88.9
Public (171)	20.5	78.4
Private (19)	31.6	68.4

TABLE 19.4: PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION MEMEBERSHIP BY FIELD OF TRAINING

	Yes	No
Management (64)	17.2	81.3
Agriculture (37)	32.4	67.6
Health (35)	17.1	80.0
Education (16)	25.0	68.8
Economics (13)	23.1	76.9
Engineering (12)	8.3	91.7
Computer Science (5)	20.0	80.0
Animal Husbandry (5)	0.0	100.0
Energy (3)	33.3	66.7
Information (2)	0.0	100.0
Other (4)	50.0	50.0

TABLE 19.5 RECEIVE PUBLICATION

	Yes	No
Total (196)	54.6	43.4
Short-term (167)	51.5	46.1
Long-term (27)	70.4	29.6
Male (148)	56.1	43.2
Female (45)	48.9	44.4

TABLE 20.1: SHARE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS WITH COLLEAGUES

	1 Not at all	2	3 Some	4	5 A lot
Total (196)	4.6	3.6	39.3	27.6	23.0

	(1-2) Not Much	(4-5) A lot
Contract (49)	6.1	36.7
Non-contract (144)	9.1	54.9
Short-term (167)	7.8	52.7
Long-term (27)	11.1	33.3
Male (148)	8.8	49.3
Female (45)	6.7	55.6
Public (171)	8.2	50.9
Private (19)	5.3	57.9

TABLE 20.2: SHARING KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS BY TRAINING FIELD

	Not Much	Alot
Management (64)	10.9	46.9
Agriculture (37)	5.4	45.9
Health (35)	0.0	62.9
Education (16)	12.6	56.3
Economics (13)	15.4	46.2
Engineering (12)	16.6	33.3
Computer Science (5)	0.0	80.0
Animal Husbandry (5)	0.0	60.0
Energy (3)	33.3	66.7
Information (2)	0.0	50.0
Other (4)	0.0	25.0

TABLE 20.3 CONTACT WITH OTHER PARTICIPANTS

	Yes	No
Total (196)	59.2	39.8
Short-term (167)	57.5	40.7
Long-term (27)	63.0	37.0
Male (148)	53.4	45.3
Female (45)	77.8	22.2

TABLE 21: MAJOR SUB-GROUPS BY FIELD OF TRAINING

	No.	%	Con	Non	Bill	Cen	Short	Long	Male	Female	Pub	Pri	US	TC
Management	64	32.6	12.2	39.6	36.5	26.6	35.9	11.1	27.7	51.1	32.2	31.6	34.7	19.2
Agriculture	37	18.9	20.4	18.1	23.5	11.4	16.2	37.0	22.3	4.4	20.5	10.5	14.7	46.2
Health	35	17.9	38.8	11.1	13.0	23.5	18.0	14.8	18.2	17.8	18.7	10.5	16.5	26.9
Education	16	8.2	2.0	20.4	9.6	6.3	8.4	7.4	7.4	11.1	6.4	21.1	9.4	0.0
Economics	13	6.6	4.1	7.6	6.1	7.6	7.8	0.0	6.8	6.7	5.3	21.1	7.1	3.8
Engineering	12	6.1	4.1	6.9	7.8	3.8	5.4	11.1	6.8	4.4	6.4	0.0	6.5	3.8
Computer Science	5	2.6	4.1	1.4	2.6	2.5	3.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	2.9	0.0	2.9	0.0
Animal Husbandry	5	2.6	2.0	2.8	0.0	6.3	1.8	7.4	2.7	0.0	2.3	5.3	2.9	0.0
Energy	3	1.5	6.1	0.0	0.0	3.8	1.2	3.7	2.0	0.0	1.8	0.0	1.8	0.0
Information	2	1.0	4.1	0.0	0.0	2.5	0.6	3.7	1.4	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.0
Other	4	2.0	2.0	1.4	0.9	3.8	1.8	3.7	1.4	4.4	2.3	0.0	2.4	0.0
Total	196	100.0												

TABLE 22.1: TIME ELAPSED SINCE TRAINING BY GENDER AND LENGTH OF RETURN FROM TRAINING

	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	2-5 years	More than 5 years
Total (196)	26.4	25.4	32.5	11.7
Short-Term (167)	22.2	24.6	35.3	13.8
Long-Term (27)	55.6	29.6	14.8	0.0
Male (148)	20.9	25.0	37.2	12.8
Female (45)	42.2	26.7	20.0	8.9

TABLE 22.2: TIME ELAPSED SINCE TRAINING BY JOB STATUS

	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	2-5 years	More than 5 years
In Training-Related Job	86.5	76.0	76.6	52.2
Job Not Related	11.5	20.0	20.3	47.8
Promotion	76.9	68.0	71.9	69.6
No Promotion	13.5	22.0	26.6	30.4
More Job Responsibility	51.9	50.0	64.1	73.9
Some Job Responsibility	46.2	40.0	25.0	13.0
Less Job Resposibility	0.0	4.0	7.8	4.3

TABLE 22.3: TIME ELAPSED SINCE TRAINING BY TRAINING APPLICATION AND SATISFACTION LEVELS

	Less than 1 year	1-2 years	2-5 years	More than 5 years
Low Training Application	7.7	10.0	15.7	13.0
High Training Application	53.8	68.0	57.8	69.6
Low Success in Introducing New Ideas	9.6	12.0	10.9	0.0
High Success in Introducing New Ideas	30.8	48.0	50.0	47.8
Few Constraints	32.7	40.0	35.9	39.1
Many Constraints	26.9	14.0	20.3	21.7
Low Satisfaction	1.9	0.0	7.8	4.3
Moderate Satisfaction	11.5	34.0	23.4	8.7
High Satisfaction	84.6	62.0	65.6	82.6

APPENDIX B: PARTICIPANT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

(FRENCH AND ENGLISH)

APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT INTERVIEW GUIDE (FRENCH AND ENGLISH)

APPENDIX D: SUPERVISOR INTERVIEW GUIDE

(FRENCH AND ENGLISH)

****

A RETOURNER AVANT LE 8 OCTOBRE

****

ENQUETE SUR LE PROGRAMME DE FORMATION A L'ETRANGER DE L'USAID EN HAITI

QUESTIONNAIRE POUR LES ANCIENS BOURSIERS

Enquête menée pour

l'Agence Américaine pour le Developpement International (USAID)

Par Creative Associates: Laurel Elmer et Charles Tardieu, Consultants

Port-au-Prince, Haiti

Septembre 1985

INSTRUCTIONS POUR LE QUESTIONNAIRE

- Veuillez indiquer aux endroits prévus vos nom et adresse. Ces informations nous permettront de mettre nos dossiers à jour et ne seront utilisées qu'à cet effet. Nous pouvons vous assurer que vos réponses seront traitées de façon absolument confidentielle. Les données recueillies seront analysées de façon globale et votre nom ne sera aucunement associé aux réponses.

- Utilisez une plume plutôt qu'un crayon pour remplir le questionnaire et tâchez d'écrire le plus lisiblement que possible. Lisez chaque question entièrement avant d'y répondre. Ensuite répondez-y le plus complètement que possible.

- Nous sommes intéressés à votre expérience personnelle avec l'USAID. Si vous avez participé à plus d'un programme de formation financé par l'USAID, vous êtes invité à choisir celui que vous jugez être d'une plus grande importance dans le développement de votre carrière professionnelle.

- Si vous avez d'autres commentaires concernant les questions ou tout autre aspect qui vous semble important, veuillez utiliser l'espace au verso et/ou ajouter des feuilles supplémentaires.

Selon le cas, vous aurez à répondre de l'une des deux façons suivantes:

1. Ou bien vous devrez encercler un (ou plusieurs) chiffre(s) correspondant à votre (vos) choix. Dans ce cas veuillez encercler distinctement chacun ou le seul des chiffres choisis, en ayant soin de ne pas toucher aux autres possibilités offertes.

   - Réponses acceptables:

     a. (1) 2 3 b. 1 2 (3) 4 5

   - Réponses non-acceptables:

     a. (1 2 3) b. 1 2✓ 3 c. 1 2✓ 3 4 5

     d. 1 (2 3) 4 5 e. 1 2 3 4 X 5

   - En cas d'erreur: Si vous encerclez le mauvais chiffre, veuillez faire une croix sur la mauvaise réponse et encercler le bon choix.

     Exemple: 1 ~~(2)~~ 3 (4) 5

2. Ou bien vous devez écrire votre réponse en fournissant une brève explication ou commentaire. Tâchez d'utiliser un style simple et concis. Si l'espace prévu est insuffisant, continuez à la fin du questionnaire ou ajoutez des pages supplémentaires en ayant soin d'indiquer à quelles questions et sous-questions correspond(ent) le (ou les) ajout(s).

VEUILLEZ S'IL VOUS PLAIT, RETOURNER VOTRE QUESTIONNAIRE REMPLI AUSSITOT QUE POSSIBLE MAIS AVANT LE 8 OCTOBRE 1985. UTILISEZ L'ENVELOPPE PRE-ADRESSEE ET TIMBREE CI-INCLUSE, SOIT POUR NOUS L'ENVOYER PAR LA POSTE, SOIT POUR LE LIVRER DIRECTEMENT AU SIEGE DE LA MISSION USAID, BOULEVARD HARRY TRUMAN (ANCIEN LOCAL HOTEL BEAU RIVAGE).

NOM: _____ DATE: _____

SEXE: 1 - Homme 2 - Femme

I. INFORMATIONS GENERALES

A. Type de Formation

Court-Terme (moins de six mois)

1 - Observation
2 - Séminaire/Atelier
3 - Cours spécialisé
4 - Autre _____

Long-Terme (plus de six mois)

5 - Niveau licence (BA, BS)
6 - Niveau maîtrise/doctorat (MA, MS, PhD)
7 - Etudes niveau avancé sans diplôme

Nombre de Semaines _____ Nombre de Mois _____

Institution où a eu lieu la formation _____

Lieu de la formation (ville et pays) _____

Discipline de la formation _____

B. Expérience de Travail

Poste actuel _____

Département/Agence _____

1 - Gouvernement
2 - Institution semi-autonome du gouvernement
3 - Secteur Privé
4 - A votre compte

Poste Précédent (si différent avant la formation) _____

1 - Gouvernement
2 - Institution semi-autonome du gouvernement
3 - Secteur Privé
4 - A votre compte

* * * * * * * * * * * * * *

1. Avant de partir pour le programme de formation, saviez-vous quel poste vous occuperiez à votre retour?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

2. Votre poste actuel a-t-il un lien direct avec la formation que vous avez reçue dans le cadre du programme de bourses de l'USAID?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

3. Si vous avez occupé d'autres postes depuis votre retour de la formation financée par l'USAID, étaient-ils dans la discipline de la formation reçue?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

Si non, indiquez lequel (lesquels) et expliquez: _____

_____

_____

4. A votre avis, la formation reçue dans le cadre du programme de bourses de l'USAID est-elle liée d'une façon ou d'une autre à une promotion ou à un avancement dans votre carrière?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

5. Comparée à votre niveau de responsabilités avant la formation, votre position actuelle a-t-elle:

Moins de Responsabilités	les Mêmes Responsabilités	Plus de Responsablités
1	2	3

C. Etudes

6. Indiquez le diplôme le plus élevé obtenu:

Diplôme _____ Pays _____

7. Si vous avez participé à plus d'un programme de formation financé par l'USAID, donnez-en la liste complète en précisant la discipline, la durée, le niveau, le pays et l'année:

Discipline	Durée et Niveau	Pays	Année

8. Indiquez les sources de subventions, la discipline, la durée, le pays et l'année pour les plus importantes bourses à l'étranger dont vous avez bénéficiées:

Source de Financement	Discipline	Durée	Pays	Année

9. Depuis combien de temps avez-vous terminé votre plus récent programme de formation financé par l'USAID?

1 - Moins d'une année
2 - Entre 1 et 2 ans
3 - Entre 2 et 5 ans
4 - Plus de 5 ans

II. PREPARATION AVANT VOTRE DEPART * * * * * * * * *

A. Formation en langue

10. Dans quelle langue s'est déroulé le programme de formation dans le pays d'accueil?

1 - Anglais 2 - Français 3 - Espagnol

11. Si la langue de formation était l'anglais ou l'espagnol, aviez-vous suivi un cours de langue en préparation à votre programme de formation à l'étranger?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

Si non, pourquoi _____

_____

12. Si vous avez répondu oui à la question 11, indiquez où a eu lieu le cours de langue:

1 - EUA 2 - Haiti 3 - Ailleurs (précisez) _____

13. Jusqu'à quel point la langue a-t-elle constitué un problème pour vous durant la formation?

Sérieux problèmes		Un peu		Pas de problème
1	2	3	4	5

14. Si vous avez eu des difficultés liées à la langue, indiquez-en la nature (encerclez autant de choix qui s'appliquent à vous):

1 - Compréhension orale
2 - Expression orale
3 - Compréhension de textes
4 - Expression écrite

B. Sélection/Planification du programme

15. Comment avez-vous été sélectionné pour le programme de formation?

1 - Désigné par mon superviseur/employeur
2 - Démarche personnelle
3 - Autre (précisez) _____

16. Jusqu'à quel point avez-vous participé à la planification de votre programme (choix de l'institution, agences à visiter, personnes à contacter, ou formulation des objectifs du programme)?

Pas du tout		Un peu		Beaucoup
1	2	3	4	5

C. Support administratif

17. Avant votre départ d'Haiti, dans quelle mesure avez-vous été informé sur les aspects suivants:

	Pas bien Informé		Suffisamment Informé		Très Bien Informé
a - Aspects administratifs (visa, voyage, allocation, contacts, assurance)	1	2	3	4	5
b - Aspects techniques (contenu du programme, horaire, objectifs)	1	2	3	4	5
c - Aspects culturels (moeurs et valeurs, conditions de vie, système éducatif)	1	2	3	4	5

Si vous n'avez pas été bien informé, expliquez ou commentez: _____

_____

_____

18. Jusqu'à quel point êtes vous satisfait de l'aide fournie par le Bureau de l'USAID en Haiti concernant les points suivants:

	Pas Satisfait		Satisfait		Très Satisfait
a - Coordination de voyage	1	2	3	4	5
b - Obtention de visa	1	2	3	4	5
c - Obtention d'une avance pour le voyage	1	2	3	4	5
d - Cours de langue	1	2	3	4	5

Si vous n'étiez pas satisfait d'un quelconque des points ci-dessus, veuillez expliquer pourquoi: _____

_____

_____

19. Avez-vous été informé suffisamment à l'avance des plans concernant votre programme de formation?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

Si non, expliquez pourquoi: _____

_____

III. REALISATION * * * * * * * * * * * *

A. Orientation

20. Avez-vous assisté à une ou plusieurs des sessions d'orientation offertes par les institutions énumérées ci-dessous? Si oui, évaluez leur utilité:

	Non Applicable	Pas utile du Tout		Utile		Très Utile
a - Washington International Center (WIC)	0	1	2	3	4	5
b - Lieu de formation	0	1	2	3	4	5
c - Autre (précisez) _____		1	2	3	4	5

21. Dans quelle mesure avez-vous eu des problèmes d'adaptation aux conditions de vie sociale et culturelle au pays d'accueil?

Sérieux Problèmes		Un peu		Pas de Problème
1	2	3	4	5

Si vous avez eu des problèmes, veuillez expliquer: _____

_____

22. Quelles informations supplémentaires auriez-vous souhaité avoir reçues durant votre session d'orientation, soit en Haiti soit au pays d'accueil?

_____

_____

B. Aide Durant la Formation

23. Indiquez dans quelle mesure vous avez eu des difficultés concernant les aspects administratifs suivants, durant votre formation:

	Sérieux Problèmes		Un peu		Pas de Problème
a = Réception de l'allocation	1	2	3	4	5
b = Montant de l'allocation	1	2	3	4	5
c = Logement	1	2	3	4	5
d = Changements au programme	1	2	3	4	5
d = Voyage à l'intérieur du pays de formation ("field trips")	1	2	3	4	5
e = Aide pour les questions personnelles	1	2	3	4	5
f = Aide pour les questions relatives au programme	1	2	3	4	5

Si vous avez eu des problèmes avec un ou plusieurs des points ci-dessus, veuillez expliquer: _____

_____

IV. RETOUR ET SUIVI * * * * * * * * * * *

A. Qualité de la formation financée par l'USAID

24. Dans quelle mesure êtes-vous généralement satisfait de votre programme de formation?

Pas satisfait		Satisfait		Très satisfait
1	2	3	4	5

25. Donnez votre appréciation générale quant aux aspects suivants:

(Si vous avez participé à un programme de courte durée, passez à la question 26.)

Programme de longue durée	Pas Satisfait		Satisfait		Très Satisfait
a = Qualité des cours	1	2	3	4	5
b = Pertinence des cours	1	2	3	4	5
c = Expérience pratique	1	2	3	4	5
d = Professeurs ayant une connaissance des pays en voie de développement	1	2	3	4	5
e = Disponibilité des ressources académiques (laboratoire, bibliothèque, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5

Si vous n'êtes pas satisfait d'un des aspects ci-dessus, veuillez expliquer:

_____

_____

Passez maintenant à la question 27

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

36. Avez-vous eu des problèmes concernant les sujets suivants à votre retour de la formation:

	Beaucoup de Problèmes		Un peu		Pas de Problèmes
a - Ressources pour exécuter des tâches	1	2	3	4	5
b - Acceptation par collègues et supérieurs	1	2	3	4	5
c - Réadaptation aux procédures bureaucratiques	1	2	3	4	5
d - Réadaptation aux normes culturelles et style de vie	1	2	3	4	5
e - Autre (précisez) _____ _____	1	2	3	4	5

C. Développement professionnel

37. Depuis que vous avez terminé votre programme, dans quelle mesure avez-vous eu une correspondance avec une agence visitée ou un contact professionnel établi au cours du programme?

Pas du tout		Un peu		Beaucoup
1	2	3	4	5

38. Avez-vous visité l'institution ou l'organisation où a eu lieu votre formation depuis votre retour en Haïti?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

39. Depuis que vous avez terminé votre programme, avez-vous adhéré à une association professionnelle liée à la formation?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

Si oui, en êtes-vous encore membre?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

40. Recevez-vous des journaux ou des publications spécialisés?

1 - Oui 2 - Non

41. Depuis votre retour en Haïti, dans quelle mesure avez-vous partagé avec vos collègues professionnels les connaissances acquises?

Pas du tout		Un peu		Beaucoup
1	2	3	4	5

Pages 7 and 8 are MISSING

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SUPERVISORS

NAME: _____ Ministry/Dept: _____

A. Experience with Participant Training

1. Are you informed of USAID's Participant Training opportunities on a regular or timely basis? (i.e., who is eligible, nomination procedures, what type of training is considered) or have you ever requested training programs or information from the USAID office?

2. How many of your employees attended a USAID Participant Training Program?

3. How many technical and administrative personnel report to you?

4. Have you participated in a USAID program yourself?

B. Selection of Participants

5. How are participants generally selected? (Specify procedures and who determines nomination and selection, e.g., supervisor/management, donors, other). Did you have any role in selecting these participants?

6. Do you believe these procedures are appropriate?

C. Program Planning

7. Did you have any role in planning the programs for these participants? (i.e., selecting training institution, places to be visited, level and duration of program, program content and objectives)

D. Appropriateness and Relevancy of Training Program

8. How many of your employees who participated in AID training are not working in jobs related to their training?

9. Who fills the gap when participants leave for training (both short-term and long-term)

10. Was the training generally relevant to the needs of your department? If training was not generally relevant, did it still result in better performance, innovative ideas, etc.?

11. Do you think USAID programs are generally appropriate to the work environment, duties, and responsibilities of your employees?

12. Which of your participants have made more of an impact on the department's activities, long-term or short-term participants?

E. Participants' Performance and Training Utilization

13. Compared to performance before training, how would you rate your employees' overall job performance after training? (poor, the same, superior--elicit examples of superior or poor performance)

14. Compared to other employees, how would you rate USAID-trained employees? (more, equally or less efficient, productive, capable, cooperative)

15. Have these participants intitiated any changes or introduced new ideas and techniques learned from their training? (elicit examples)

16. Have they had difficulty in introducing these new ideas or changes to their colleagues or in their work environment? If so, why?

17. Have these participants had any adjustment problems in their work environment since returning from training? (what kinds of problems)

18. After returning from training, have these participants: received a promotion or advancement within one year; have they remained within your department or moved elsewhere--if so, why:)

19. Would you recommend similar training programs for other employees within your department? Why or why not?

20. Is there a follow-up and/or monitoring system for determining whether your employees who have been or are participating in overseas training are receiving appropriate training, and whether they are utilizing the knowledge and skills gained from their training experience?

21. Do you have any suggestions regarding the overall USAID participant training program?

22. Based on your experience, what is your assessment of overseas development training in general and its impact on your department and organization (e.g., improving productivity, increasing skills, etc.)?

GUIDE D'ENTREVUE POUR SUPERVISEURS

Nom du superviseur:_____ Institution:_____

A. Experience avec la formation à l'étranger

1. Pensez vous être informé des possibilités de bourses de formation à l'étranger offertes par l'USAID (Agence Américaine pour le développement international)? Recevez-vous ces informations de façon régulière et aux moments voulus (Ex. Qui est éligible, procédures de nomination, le type de formation considéré)?

Avez vous jamais presenté une demande d'information ou encore une demande de bourse à l'USAID?

2. Combien de vos employés ont déjà participé à un programme de formatin financé par l'USAID?

3. Combien d'employes avez vous sous votre supervision (tant des services techniques qu'administratifs)?

4. Avez vous jamais bénéficié d'une bourse de l'USAID?

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

8. Selection des boursiers

5. D une façon générale, sur quelle base et comment sont choisis les boursiers dans votre service? (Spécifiez les critères et les procédures, indiquez ceux qui font les nominations et la sélection, est-ce la direction, le superviseur, les donneurs, etc.). Avez vous joué un role dans la sélection des participants de votre service?

6. Pensez vous que ces criteres et ces procédures sont adequates?

9. Planification du programme

7. Avez vous joué un rôle quelconque dans la planification des programmes (selection des institutions de formation, sites à visiter, niveau et durée du programme)?

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

D. Application de la formation

8. Parmis vos employés ayant bénéficié d'une bourse de l'USAID, combien occupent des positions qui ne sont pas liées à la formation reçue dans le cadre du programme de l'USAID?

9. Quand vos employés partent en formation (pour une courte période ou pour une période plus longue) sont-ils remplacés à leurs postes de travail?

10. D une façon générale, la formation reçue est-elle en rapport avec les besoins de votre département? Si la formation n'était pas directement liée au travail en est-il résulté quand même une meilleure performance, des idées nouvelles, etc.?

11. Pensez vous que les programmes de formation de l'USAID sont généralement en rapport avec l environnement du travail, les fonctions, tâches et responsabilités de vos employés?

12. Dans quel domaine et sur quel plan pensez vous que la formation offerte par l'USAID est la plus profitable?
(a) 3 domaines: institutionnel, personnel, social; 3 de plan: [illegible] professionnels, ouverture d'horizons nouveaux, idées [illegible], etc.).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

13. Lesquels ont un impact plus important sur les activites de votre département: les bourses de long terme ou celles de courte durée?

E. Performance des boursiers et utilisation de la formation

14. Comparé à la situation avant la formation, comment evaluez vous la performance générale de vos employes apres cette formation? (pauvre, la même, supérieure -- tirer des exemples des performances pauvres et supérieures)

15. Comparé aux autres employés comment evaluez vous ceux qui ont bénéficié d'une bourse de l'USAID?

16. Les participants ont-ils introduits des changements, des techniques ou des idées nouvelles apprises sur-le leur formation?

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

17. Ont-ils rencontré des difficultés venant de leurs collègues ou de l'environnement du travail quand ils ont voulu introduire ces nouvelles idées ou ces changements?

18. Ces boursiers ont-ils eu des difficultés de réajustement à leur environnement de travail à lkeur retour de la formation? (Si oui, quelles sortes de difficultes)

19. Dans l'année qui a suivi leur retour de la formation ces boursiers ont-ils benméficié d'une promotion ou d'autres avantages? Sont-ils restés avec votre service ou ont-ils été ailleurs? Si oui, pourquoi?

20. Recommanderiez vous un programme de formation similaire à d'autres employés de votre service? Pourquoi?

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

11. Y-a-t-il un système de suivi et de monitoring permettant de déterminer si la formation donnée à l'étranger est appropriée et si les boursiers utilisent les connaissances acquises?

12. Si un tel système existe quelles sont ses fonctions?

13. Avez vous des suggestions concernant le programme de bourses de l'USAID?

14. En vous référant à votre expérience personnelle, quelle est votre opinion globale sur les programmes de bourses à l'étranger en général? Ont-ils un impact sur votre service, votre organisation, la vie sociale (Exemples si possible).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

6. Avez-vous eu des difficultés à vous réajuster au milieu culturel depuis votre retour du programme de formation? (Seulement pour les participants à long terme)

7. L'expérience acquise au cours de la formation, vous-a-t-elle aidé à avoir de plus grandes responsabilités dans votre emploi? Veuillez spécifier. Si oui, avez-vous reçu aussi une compensation salariale?

8. Utilisez-vous les connaissance acquises dans votre travail actuel? Si non, pourquoi?

9. Qu'est ce qui faciliterait une plus grande application, dans votre emploi actuel, des connaissances et des qualifications que vous avez acquises au cours de la formation?

10. Si votre formation n'a pas de rapport avec votre emploi actuel, vos cours de formation ont-ils été bénéfiques d'une autre manière dans l'exécution des responsabilités de votre emploi? Veuillez donner des détails.

11. Avez-vous entrepris de nouvelles activités dans votre emploi du fait de la formation reçue? Veuillez spécifier:

PREVIOUS PAGE BLANK

12. Avez-vous introduit des idées nouvelles dans votre emploi/milieu de travail du fait de la formation reçue? Veuillez spécifier:

13. Vos collègues et vos superviseurs ont-ils été réceptifs a ces nouvelles idées et techniques acquises au cours de la formation? Si non, pourquoi:

14. Est-ce que vous avez eu des problèmes à adapter votre formation aux conditions d'Haiti?

15. Outre les nouvelles connaissances et les qualifications acquises, avez-vous tiré d'autres bénéfices de votre formation (par exemple, échange culturel, établissement de relations, contact avec la vie/culture du pays d'acceuil)?

16. Est-ce que votre attitude a changé depuis votre formation, tant dans vos activités professionnelles que dans votre vie personelle (par exemple, votre philosophie de la vie, du monde, etc.)?

17. Depuis votre retour, quel genre de contact avez-vous eu avec l'USAID/Haiti? Quelle sorte de contact vous aurait été approprié et utile?

18. Depuis votre retour, quel genre de contact avez-vous eu avec d'autres participants des programmes de formation de l'AID? Quel genre de contact vous serait approprié et utile? (c'est à dire association d'anciens boursiers)

19. Dans l'ensemble, jusqu'à quel point avez-vous été satisfait de l'expérience faite lors de la formation patronnée par l'AID?

20. Quels étaient les points forts de votre programme?

21. Quels étaient les points faibles de votre programme?

22. Quelles sont vos suggestions pour améliorer les programmes de formation de l'USAID?

23. Recommenderiez vous votre programme de formation à d'autres personnes?

24. D'autres commentaires:

ORAL INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

Some of these questions may have been asked in different ways in the written questionnaire, but we are interested in having more detail in some of the areas covered by the questionnaire.

1. Overall, how satisfied were you with your AID-training experience?

2. What were the major strengths, if any, of your particular program?

3. What were the major weaknesses, if any, of your program?

4. What role did you have in developing your program? (e.g., selecting training location, content, objectives, etc.)

5. How satisfied were you with assistance in preparing for your training program in Haiti? (e.g., ample notice, orientation, assistance from AID office with travel arrangements)

6. Had you been to the United States prior to your training?

7. Did you have any social or cultural adjustment difficulties in the United States during the course of your training program?

8. What advice would you give departing participants before leaving Haiti for a training program in the United States? What are some things you wish you had been told ahead of time?

9. Did you encounter any difficulties in re-adjusting to your family or social life since returning from your training program? (especially for long-term participants)

10. What kind of assistance would have helped prepare you for your return home? (especially for long-term participants)

11. Did your training experience help you to advance in your profession or to take greater responsibility in your job? Please specify.

12. Was your training relevant to your current job responsibilies? If not, why not?

13. If your training is not related to your current job, has your training experience been beneficial in other ways in carrying out your job responsibilities? Please elaborate:

14. Besides acquiring new knowledge and skills, were there any other benefits from your training experience in the United States? (e.g., cross-cultural experience, establishing contacts, exposure to American life, etc.)

15. In what ways, if any, have your attitudes changed since your training experience, both in your professional activities and social views, e.g., philosophy of life, worldview, etc.

16. Have you undertaken new activities in your job as a result of training? Please specify:

17. Have you initiated any changes in your job/work enviornment as a result of your training? Please specify:

18. What would facilitate a greater application of the knowledge and skills you acquired from training in your current job?

19. Have your colleagues and supervisors been receptive to the new ideas and techniques gained from your training experience? If not, why not?

20. Since returning, what kinds of contact have you had with the USAID mission in Haiti? What kinds of contact would be appropriate and useful to you?

21. Since returning, what kinds of contacts have you had with other AID-trained participants? What kinds of contact would be appropriate and useful to you? (i.e., alumni association)

22. Have you received sufficient recognition for your AID-sponsoring training or degree?

23. Compared to overseas degree training by other donors, does your degree (where applicable) have less, more, or the same prestige?

24. What suggestions do you have for improving the management of USAID training programs?

25. Are there any other issues or highlights which have not been covered by this interview or the written questionnaire?

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

GUIDE POUR l'ENTREVUE DES BOURSIERS

Nom: _____ Pays de formation: _____

Date et durée du programme de formation: _____

Certaines de ses questions peuvent avoir été posées de manière différente dans le questionnaire écrit, main nous aimerions avoir plus de détails sur certains des points qui y sont présentés.

1. Quel rôle avez-vous eu dans d'élaboration de votre programme? (par exemple, le choix du lieu de la formation, son contenu, ses objectifs, etc.)

2. Jusqu'à quel point avez vous été satisfait de l'assistance reçue en Haiti dans la préparation de votre programme de formation (par exemple, amples directives, orientation, assistance du bureau de l'USAID pour les préparatifs de votre voyage)?

3. Aviez-vous séjourné dans le pays d'acceuil avant votre séjour de formation?

4. Avez-vous eu des difficultés d'ajustement social ou culturel au pays d'acceuil au cours de votre programme de formation?

5. Quels conseils donneriez-vous aux participants avant leur départ d'Haiti pour un programme de formation dans le même pays d'acceuil? Qu'auriez-vous aimé savoir d'avance?

INSTRUCTIONS FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Please be assured of the confidentiality with which your completed questionnaire will be treated. We would appreciate your providing your name and current mailing address on the facesheet so that we may update our records. However, your individual responses to the questionnaire will be analyzed as part of the aggregate data and your name will NOT be associated with individual responses.

- Please use any pen (not pencil) to fill out the questionnaire and write as legibly as possible.

- Please read each question carefully and answer all questions as candidly and completely as you can.

- Unless otherwise specified, all questions are related to the most recent training completed under USAID sponsorship.

- If your answer is longer than the space provided on the questionnaire, please continue it in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire. Be sure to indicate the number of the item for which the addendum is a continuation.

- If you wish to comment on any question or aspect, feel free to do so using the "comments" page at the end of the questionnaire.

Please return your completed questionnaire using the attached stamped envelope as soon as possible and no later than October 8, 1985; OR you may hand deliver your completed questionnaire to the attention of:

M. Barry Heyman, Chef du Bureau pour
le developpement par les Agences Benevoles
USAID Mission, P.O. Box 1634
Beau Rivage
Port-au-Prince, Haiti

PARTICIPANT FACESHEET

Interview Date: _____

NAME: _____ MALE - 1 FEMALE - 2

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Type of Training

Short-term	Long-Term
1 - Observation/Field Tour	4 - Non-degree
2 - Workshop/Seminar	5 - Undergraduate
3 - Short Course	6 - Graduate
Number of weeks _____	Number of Months _____

Training Institution: _____

Location of Training: _____

Field of Training: _____

B. Job History

Present Position: _____

Department/Agency: _____

Government - 1 Private Sector - 2

Former Position _____
(if different prior to training)

List other full-time jobs (position and agency) held since your return from AID training if different from present position:

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

1. Before leaving for training, did you know what job you would be returning to? 1 - yes 2 - no

2. Is your current job in the same field for which you were trained under the AID program? 1 - yes 2 - no

3. Have you received any training-related advancement or promotion?
1 - yes 2 - no

4. Compared to your level of responsibility before training, does your present job have:

1 - less responsibility
2 - same responsibility
3 - more responsibility

C. Educational Background

5. List all degrees obtained:

DEGREE	PLACE

6. Please indicate the sponsor and location of other overseas training programs in which you have participated (AID or other donors):

Sponsor	Type of Program	Country

7. How long since completing your most recent AID-sponsored training?

1 - less than one year
2 - between 1 and 2 years
3 - between 2 and 5 years
4 - more than 5 years

* * * * * * * *

II. PRE-DEPARTURE PREPARATION

A. English Language Training

8. Indicate the language of training:

1 - English 2 - French 3 - Spanish

9. If English, did you have any language training in preparation of your training program? 1 - yes 2 - no

If not, why? _____

10. Please indicate the location of your language training?

1 - United States 2 - Haiti

11. To what extent did you have problems with language in your training program

No Problems		Some Problems		Serious Problems
1	2	3	4	5

12. Please indicate if you had any language difficulties in the following areas:

1 - comprehension
2 - conversation
3 - reading
4 - writing

B. Selection/Program Planning

13. How were you selected for your training program:

1 - nominated by supervisor
2 - applied for training

14. To what extent did you participate in planning your program? (i.e., selecting training institution, agency to be visited, persons to be contacted, or setting program objectives)

Not at all		Somewhat		A Great Deal
1	2	3	4	5

C. Administrative Support

How well informed were you with the following before departing Haiti for your training program?

15. Administrative aspects (visa, allowance, travel, contacts in country of training, health insurance)

Not well informed		Sufficiently Informed		Well Informed
1	2	3	4	5

If you were not well informed, why? _____

_____

16. Technical aspects (program content, schedule, objectives)

Not Well Informed		Sufficiently Informed		Well Informed
1	2	3	4	5

If you were not well-informed, why? _____

_____

17. Cross-Cultural aspects (norms and values, living conditions, and educational system in country of training)

Not Well Informed		Sufficiently Informed		Well Informed
1	2	3	4	5

If you were not well informed, why? _____

_____

18. How satisfied were you with the assistance given by the AID office with the following:

	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Not Satisfied
1 - Coordination of Travel	1	2	3	4	5
2 - Obtaining Visa	1	2	3	4	5
3 - Obtaining Travel Advance	1	2	3	4	5
4 - Language Training arrangements	1	2	3	4	5

If you were not satisfied with any of the above, please explain: _____

_____

19. How long had you known about plans for your AID training program?

_____ days _____ weeks _____ months

20. How much notice were you given regarding your departure date?

_____ days _____ weeks

* * * * * * * * *

III. IMPLEMENTATION

A. Orientation

21. If applicable, please indicate whether you attended one or more of the following orientation programs and rate its usefulness:

	Didn't Attend	Not Useful	Somewhat Useful			Very Useful
1 - Washington International Center	0	1	2	3	4	5
2 - Training Site	0	1	2	3	4	5
3 - Other _____	-	1	2	3	4	5

22. To what extent did you have problems adjusting to the social and cultural living conditions at your training site:

No Problems		Some Problems		Serious Problems
1	2	3	4	5

If you had problems, please explain: _____

_____

23. What additional information would have been useful in an orientation program? _____

_____

B. Support Services During Training

24. During the period of training, to what extent did you have problems with the following administrative matters:

	No Problems		Some Problems		Serious Problems
1 - Receipt of Allowance	1	2	3	4	5
2 - Amount of Allowance					
3 - Accommodations					
4 - Changes in Program					
5 - U.S. Travel					

If you had problems with any of the above, please explain: _____

_____

_____

25. How satisfied were you with the following support services of the AID contractor or Program Agent?

	Not Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Very Satisfied
1 - Availability of Staff			
2 - Assistance with Personal Matters			
3 - Assistance with Program Matters			

C. Program Completion

26. Did you fulfill all your program requirements? 1 - Yes 1 - No

If not, please explain: _____

_____

* * * * * * * * *

IV. RE-ENTRY & FOLLOW-UP

A. Quality and Appropriateness of Training

27. How satisfied are you with your training program as a whole?

Not Satisfied		Satisfied		Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5

28. Please rate your overall satisfaction with the following aspects of your program:

a) LONG-TERM PROGRAM EXPERIENCE	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Very Satisfied
1 - Quality of Courses	1	2	3	4	5
2 - Relevance of Courses	1	2	3	4	5
3 - Practical Experience	1	2	3	4	5
4 - Faculty awareness of developing country conditions	1	2	3	4	5
5 - Academic and Personal Counseling Services	1	2	3	4	5
6 - Facilities (e.g., library, equipment, etc)	1	2	3	4	5

b) SHORT-TERM PROGRAM EXPERIENCE	Not Satisfied		Somewhat Satisfied		Very Satisfied
1. Quality of Information Presented	1	2	3	4	5
2. Duration of Program	1	2	3	4	5
3. Amount of Information Presented	1	2	3	4	5
4. Relevance of Program to Home Country Conditions	1	2	3	4	5
5. Practical Experience	1	2	3	4	5
6. Responsiveness of Contacts	1	2	3	4	5

If you were not satisfied with any of the above aspects, please explain:

_____

_____

29. What do you consider major strengths, if any, of your program?

_____

_____

30. What do you consider major weaknesses, if any, of your program?

_____

_____

31. Given your professional and/or academic experience, were you placed in a program that was:

1 - too difficult
2 - at appropriate level

32. What amount of new techniques and skills was acquired through your training program?

None	Small Amount	Moderate Amount		Large Amount
1	2	3	4	5

Please list several of the most important skills or techniques learned during training: _____

_____

33. How important were each of the following factors in your particular program?

	None		Moderate Amount		Large Amount
1 - Specific Knowledge and Skills	1	2	3	4	5
2 - General Knowledge	1	2	3	4	5
3 - Establishment of Professional Relations	1	2	3	4	5

34. What particular skills do you now wish you had given more time to developing in light of your present job responsibilities?

_____

B. Utilization of Training

35. How useful have the knowledge and skills acquired in training been in the implementation of your present positition?

Not Useful		Somewhat Useful		Very Useful
1	2	3	4	5

If not useful, please explain: _____

_____

36. What share of the knowledge and skills acquired through training are you able to apply in carrying out your current job responsibilities? (Please circle the answer)

None		Medium Amount		Large amount
1	2	3	4	5

37. Where applicable, indicate whether you are involved to a greater degree in the following activities as a result of your training, or about the same as you would have been without the training:

	Not Applicable	Same Involvement	Greater Involvement
1 - Develop or revise policy	0	1	2
2 - Develop or revise operating procedures	0	1	2
3 - Develop proposals for funding	0	1	2
4 - Participate in agency planning committee(s)	0	1	2
5 - Initiate new programs or services	0	1	2
6 - Improve or expand existing programs/services	0	1	2
7 - Raise standards of products or services provided	0	1	2
8 - Plan or coordinate workshops/seminars	0	1	2
9 - Present at workshops/seminars	0	1	2
10 - Participate in research activities	0	1	2
11 - Publish works inprofessional journals	0	1	2

38. How successful have you been in introducing new ideas or techniques learned from your training program in your environment?

Not Successful		Somewhat Successful		Very Successful
1	2	3	4	5

If not successful, please explain: _____

_____

39. Since completing your program, indicate the extent to which you have experienced any constraints in applying the knowledge or skills acquired in training to the performance of your present position?

No Constraints		Some Constraints		Many Constraints
1	2	3	4	5

If you have encountered constraints to applying your training, please specify: _____

_____

C. Professional Development

40. Since completing your program, to what extent have you been in correspondence with an agency visited or person met during training:

Not at All		Somewhat		Much
1	2	3	4	5

*> insert

42. Since completing your program, have you joined a training-related professional association? 1 - Yes 2 - No

If yes, are you still a member?

43. Do you receive any professional journals or publications?

1 - Yes 2 - No

44. Since returning to your country, to what degree have you shared the knowledge acquired in training with your professional colleagues?

Not at All		Somewhat		Much
1	2	3	4	5

45. If applicable, indicate the extent to which you used the following channels in sharing this knowledge with your colleagues:

	None	Some	Much
1 - informal discussion	1	2	3
2 - formal presentations	1	2	3
3 - written reports	1	2	3
4 - on-the-job training	1	2	3
5 - exchange of training materials	1	2	3
6 - other _____	1	2	3

*

INSERT 41. Have you returned to your training institution/organization since finishing your program? 1 - Yes 2 - No

46. Are you in contact with other AID-sponsored participants?
1 - Yes 2 - No

If so, please specify the nature of these contacts:

1 - professional 2 - social

47. Would a formalized group like an Alumni Association of Returned Participants be desirable? 1 - Yes 2 - No

48. If you are interested in participating in such a group, what kinds of activities would be most valuable? _____

_____

49. Would you be willing to pay an annual fee to support such an association? 1 - Yes 2 - No If so, how much? $_____

50. Indicate the degree to which you may have encountered any of the following problems since returning from training:

	No Problems		Some Problems		Serious Problems
1 - Resources to carry out job duties	1	2	3	4	5
2 - Acceptance by colleagues or supervisors	1	2	3	4	5
3 - Readjusting to bureaucratic procedures	1	2	3	4	5
4 - Readjusting to tempo and style of life	1	2	3	4	5
5 - Readjusting to cultural norms	1	2	3	4	5
6 - Readjusting to family expectations	1	2	3	4	5
7 - Other _____	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX E: LIST OF TRAINING INSTITUTIONS

TRAINING INSTITUTIONS/SPONSORS

	Total Pop.		Questionaire	
	#	%	#	%
AID/WASHINGTON TRAINING CENTER	1	0.3	0	0
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF BANKING	2	0.5	2	1.0
APRROFAM, GUATEMALA	1	0.3	1	0.5
AUBURN UNIVERSITY	2	0.5	2	1.0
BOSTON COLLEGE	3	0.8	3	1.5
BOULDER ECONOMIC INSTITUTE	2	0.5	2	1.0
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS	1	0.3	1	0.5
CENTER FOR DEVELOPMENT AND POPULATION ACTIVITIES	7	1.8	6	3.0
CENTER FOR DISEASE CONTROL	2	0.5	2	1.0
CIAT: CENTRO INTERNATIONAL AGRICULTURA TROPICA	2	0.5	0	0
CIMMYT	5	1.3	3	1.5
COFFEE INSTITUTE COSTA-RICA	1	0.3	4	2.0
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	4	1.0	0	0
COMMUNITY AND FAMILY CENTER, CHICAGO	2	0.5	0	0
CONTROL DATA INSTITUTE	3	0.8	3	1.5
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.5
DEPARTMENT OF STATE	1	0.3	1	0.5
EAST-WEST CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII	2	0.5	2	1.0
ERROS CENTER	1	0.3	1	0.5
FAMILY PLANNING INSTITUTE, TUNISIA	4	1.0	4	2.0
FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE D'ACTION FAMILIALE*	2	0.5	2	1.0
FLORIDA UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	0	0
GADJAH MADA UNIVERSITY INDONESIA	2	0.5	0	0
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	4	1.0	1	0.5
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	4	1.0	0	1.5
GEORGIA UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.5
GRAND MOTOR HOTEL, MONTREAL	1	0.3	1	0.5

*Conferences in Europe.

I TRAINING INSTITUTIONS LISTED (Cont'd)

	Total Pop.		Questionaire	
	#	%	#	%
UNIVERSITY OF INDIANA-BLOOMINGTON	4	0	4	2.0
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE, NIGERIA	2	0.5	2	0.5
INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION	1	0.3	0	0
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE	2	0.5	2	1.0
INTERNATIONAL MARKETING INSTITUTE	1	0.3	0	0
INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL PROGRAMS CENTER	3	0.8	0	0
JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY	9	2.3	6	3.0
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.5
LAVAL UNIVERSITY, QUEBEC	1	0.3	1	0.5
MANAGEMENT SCIENCE FOR HEALTH TRAINING CENTER	5	1.3	2	1.0
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.5
METROPOLITAN HOSPITAL CENTER	2	0.5	1	0.5
MIAMI DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	2	0.5	2	1.0
MAYER ASSOCIATES	1	0.3	1	0.5
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE COSTA-RICA	17	4.3	11	5.6
MULTIPLE SITES	5	1.3	5	8.5
NATIONAL STATISTICAL INSTITUTE, CAMEROUN	1	0	1	2.5
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY	2	0	2	9.0
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA	6	0	6	0
NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	0	0
OPERATION CROSSROADS AFRICA	3	0.8	1	0.5
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH	24	6.1	22	10.3
QUAIL ROOST CONFERENCE CENTER	5	0.3	1	0.5
RENSSELE AR POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE	3	0.8	3	0.5
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.5
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.5
SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	0	0
STATE UNIVERSITY OF COSTA-RICA	1	0.3	0	0
STONY BROOK UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.5

I TRAINING INSTITUTIONS LISTED (Cont'd)

	Total Pop.		Questionaire	
	#	%	#	%
TEXAS A AND M UNIVERSITY	16	4.1	13	6.6
THE FUTURES GROUP	1	0.3	1	0.5
TULANE UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	1	0.5
TUNISIA CENTRAL PHARMACY	1	0.3	1	0.5
U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISION	2	0.5	2	1.0
UNITED STATES DEPT OF AGRICULTURE	2	0.5	2	1.0
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	2	0.5	2	1.0
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES	2	0.5	1	0.5
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO	4	1.0	1	0.5
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT SANTA CRUZ	7	1.8	7	3.6
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO	4	1.0	4	2.0
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO	1	0.3	1	0.5
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	9	2.3	6	3.0
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS	2	0.5	1	0.5
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS	1	0.3	0	0
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI	8	2.0	5	2.5
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA	5	1.3	4	2.0
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON	1	0.3	1	0.5
UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	2	0.5	0	0
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA	2	0.5	0	0
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY	6	1.5	3	1.5
VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1	0.3	1	0.5
VITA	2	0.5	1	0.5
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	1	0.3	0	0
WORLD TRADE INSTITUTE	3	0.8	3	1.5
TOTAL (81 Institutions)	255		185	

NUMBER OF TRAINEES BY UNIVERSITY

1. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

	Total Pop. #	Questionaire Respondents #
INDIANA UNIVERSITY	4	4
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH	24	22
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY-RALEIGH	2	2
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA-CHAPEL HILL	6	6
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO	4	1
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SANTA CRUZ	7	7
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	1	1
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY	1	1
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY AND U. Texas Austin	16	13
SOUTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	1	0
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI	8	5
TULANE UNIVERSITY	1	1
UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	9	6
UNIVERSITY OF PUERTO RICO	2	0
NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY	1	0
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES	2	1
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS	1	0
UNIVERSITY NEBRASKA	5	4
FLORIDA UNIVERSITY	1	0
UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY	6	3
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	2	2
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS	2	1
CORNELL UNIVERSITY	1	1
STATE UNIVERSITY OF COSTA-RICA	1	0
GADJAH MADA UNIVERSITY INDONESIA	2	0

2. UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES (Cont'd)

	Total Pop. #	Questionaire Respondents #
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY	4	4
WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY	1	0
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO	4	4
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO	1	1
LAVAL UNIVERSITY	1	1
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	4	3
GEORGIA UNIVERSITY	1	1
UNIVERSITY OF CAROLINA, SOUTH	2	0
JOHN HOPKINS UNIVERSITY	9	6
AUBURN UNIVERSITY	2	2
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON	1	1
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY	1	1
STONY. BROOK UNIVERSITY	1	1
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	1	1
GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	2	8
EAST WEST CENTER/UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII	2	2
BOSTON COLLEGE	3	3
MIAMI DADE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	2	2
VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1	1
TOTAL (44 UNIVERSITIES)	149	110

SPECIALIZED TRAINING AND RESEARCH CENTERS

	Total Pop.	Questionaire Sample
Ministry of Agriculture, Costa Rica (6)	17	11
CIAT: Centro International de Agricultura Tropical (18)	2	0
World Trade Institute (19)	3	3
Metropolitan Hospital Center (29)	2	1
Control Data Institute (30)	3	3
International Statistical Programs Center (33)	3	0
Coffee Institute, Costa Rica (38)	1	0
Management Science for Health Training Center (43)	5	2
Family Planning Institute, Tunisia (47)	4	4
National Statistical Institute, Cameroon (53)	1	1
Community and Family Center, Chicago (55)	2	0
Tunisia Central Pharmacy (62)	1	1
Erros Center (74)	1	1
International Marketing Institute (78)	1	0
National Institute of Agriculture, Nigeria (81)	2	2
American Institute of Banking (65)	2	2
APPROFAM*, Guatemala (70)	1	1
Mayer Associates (83)	1	1
Boulder Economic Institute (77)	2	3
Rensselear Polytechnical Institute (61)	3	3
Center for Development and Population Activities (23-59)	7	6
CIMMYT (15) Mexico	5	3
TOTAL	68	46

*Association Pro Bien Estar La Familia

4. US GVT AGENCIES AND RELATED INSTITUTIONS

	Total Pop.	Questionaire Sample
Bureau of Labor Statistics (68)	1	1
Department of State (45)	1	1
Internal Revenue Service (11)	2	2
U.S. Civil Service Commission (32)	2	2
Center for Disease Control (66)	2	2
AID/Washington Training Center (69)	1	0
United States Dept. of Agriculture (63)	2	2
TOTAL (7 US Government Agencies)	11	10

5. OTHER TRAINING SITES AND SPONSORS

	Total Pop.	Questionair Sample
Operation Crossroads Africa	3	1
Institute of International Education	1	0
The Futures Group	1	1
Mayer Associates	1	1
Quail Roost Conference Center	5	1
Grand Motor Hotel, Montreal	1	1
Federation Internationale d'Action Familiale	2	2
Multiple Sites (24)	5	5
VITA	2	1
TOTAL	21	13

APPENDIX F: LETTERS TO PARTICIPANTS AND SUPERVISORS

Questionnaire Cover Letter

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MISSION TO HAITI

For U.S. MAIL:
USAID / HAITI
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

For INTERNATIONAL MAIL:
USAID / HAITI
P.O. Box 1634
Port-au-Prince, Haiti, W.I.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

September 27, 1985

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) is very interested in providing future participants in its training program with the best possible training experience. To do this, we need information from returned participants such as yourself regarding your AID-sponsored training program and how it has helped you in your career.

The attached questionnaire has been designed to gather this information and includes questions about preparation for your training program, the quality of your training, and how your training relates to your present job.

Although the questionnaire may seem long, we would greatly appreciate your taking the time to fill it out and return it as soon as possible in order to guide us in planning future training activities. Please answer each question as completely and candidly as possible as it relates to your particular training experience following the instructions given on the first page of the questionnaire. Feel free to provide additional comments on your training experience and/or this exercise. In addition, we would like to interview a number of you in more depth about your training experience. Ms. Laurel Elmer and Mr. Charles Tardieu who are conducting this study for USAID will be calling some of you this week to see about a personal interview.

Mrs. Nicole Jean-Mary, USAID Training Officer, hopes to present the findings from this study at a reception sometime in October hosted by the American Ambassador for all AID-sponsored participants. For those of you not participating in personal interviews, you will have an opportunity to talk with Ms. Elmer and Mr. Tardieu about this study at the reception. This occasion will also include awarding Certificates of Achievement to Returned Participants in recognition of your training experience. An invitation will be sent to you under separate cover with details on the date and location.

We would greatly appreciate receiving your completed questionnaire by October 8. Thank you for your cooperation in this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

Jerome T. French
Director

Enclosure

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

MISSION TO HAITI

For U.S. MAIL:
USAID / HAITI
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

For INTERNATIONAL MAIL:
USAID / HAITI
P.O. Box 1634
Port-au-Prince, Haiti, W.I.

September 20, 1985

Dear

I would like to inform you of our plans to undertake an assessment of the United States Agency for International Development's Participant Training (AID) Program in Haiti. For more than three decades, AID has emphasized the training of developing country scientists, technicians, administrators, and managers as well as the improvement of specialized training capacities in developing countries. Such training is an essential component of AID's development strategies in all sectors, completing other forms of assistance and continuing to have an impact long after other investments of capital, commodities or technical assistance have been expended. As you may know, "Participant Training" refers to AID-sponsored academic and technical training of selected individuals in the United States or other countries. The program is intended to develop staff for AID-assisted projects and to strengthen key development institutions.

Since the inception of participant training activities in Haiti, the Mission has not had the opportunity to evaluate the program as a whole which has sponsored more than 350 Haitians on long-term academic and short-term technical training programs. We feel it is a propitious time to undertake such an evaluation, given current plans to optimize the contributions of this program to overall efforts in Haiti. The objectives of this evaluation are to assess USAID management of the program, to assess program effectiveness through a mailed questionnaire and oral interviews with Haitians who have participated in the program, and to survey the overseas training activities of other donors to recommend ways of maximizing coordination among all agencies involved in this activity. We have identified a two-member team to carry out this work in the next several weeks: Laurel Elmer and Charles Tardieu.

For this purpose, we are in the process of identifying the current positions and location of all Haitians who have participated in AID-sponsored training. The enclosed list of individuals within your organization reflects our most recent records which we would like to confirm before mailing out the questionnaire. We would be most grateful for assistance from your organization to Mrs. Elmer and Mr. Tardieu who will be calling the appropriate Division Head and/or Project Director sometime this week in order to locate these individuals for the purpose of this evaluation.

Your cooperation in this matter is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Jerome French
Director

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MISSION TO HAITI

For U.S. MAIL:
USAID / HAITI
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520
For INTERNATIONAL MAIL:
USAID / HAITI
P.O. Box 1634
Port-au-Prince, Haiti, W.I.

BUREAU DU DIRECTEUR

TRADUCTION DE COURTOISIE

le 27 septembre 1985

L'Agence Américaine pour le Développement International (USAID) aimerait fournir aux futurs participants à ses programmes de formation organisés à l'étranger la meilleure expérience possible. Pour ce faire, il lui faut des informations concernant les dits programmes et leur influence sur la carrière des anciens boursiers.

Le questionnaire ci-joint a été élaboré à cet effet et comprend des questions au sujet de la préparation de votre programme de formation, de la qualité des cours et leurs relations avec votre poste actuel.

Nous vous saurions gré de prendre le temps de remplir ce questionnaire et de nous le retourner au plus tôt afin de nous permettre de planifier nos activités ultérieures. Nous vous prions de répondre à chaque question le plus complètement et le plus franchement possible en vous basant sur votre propre expérience, suivant les instructions contenues dans la première page. N'hésitez pas à nous faire part de vos commentaires sur votre expérience et/ou cette enquête. En outre, dans le but d'approfondir les données recueillies, Madame Laurel Elmer et Monsieur Charles Tardieu qui sont chargés de cette étude pour l'USAID se proposent d'appeler certains d'entre vous pour fixer des entrevues personnelles.

En dernier lieu, l'Ambassadeur Américain offrira, en octobre prochain, une réception pour tous les bénéficiaires des programmes de formation financés par l'USAID au cours de laquelle des certificats vous seront remis en reconnaissance de votre participation à ces programmes. Vous aurez ainsi l'occasion de prendre contact avec d'autres anciens boursiers et d'échanger vos impressions. Ceux qui n'auront pas eu d'entrevues avec Mme. Elmer et M. Tardieu pourront les rencontrer et leur parler ce jour-là. Madame Nicole Jean-Mary, responsable du Bureau de Formation de l'USAID, profitera de l'occasion pour vous présenter les conclusions de cette enquête. Par conséquent nous espérons recevoir vos questionnaires dûment remplis avant le 8 octobre, si possible.

Tout en vous remerciant de votre coopération, nous vous prions d'agréer, nos sincères salutations.

Jerome T. French
Directeur

Pièce jointe

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

BUREAU DU DIRECTEUR

MISSION TO HAITI

For U.S. MAIL:
USAID / HAITI
Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520
For INTERNATIONAL MAIL:
USAID / HAITI
P.O. Box 1634
Port-au-Prince, Haiti, W.I.

TRADUCTION DE COURTOISIE

September 20, 1985

La présente est pour vous informer que l'Agence Américaine pour le Développement International en Haiti (USAID/Haiti), entreprendra bientôt une évaluation de son programme de Bourses d'Etudes. Depuis plus de trois décades, l'USAID a mis l'accent tant sur la formation de scientifiques, de techniciens, d'administrateurs et de gestionnaires des pays en voie de développement que sur l'amélioration de leurs capacités internes de formation spécialisée. La formation est un volet essentiel des stratégies de l'USAID dans tous les secteurs; elle complète les autres formes d'assistance et continue d'avoir un impact à long terme sur les investissements en capitaux, en produits ou en assistance technique qui sont utilisés. Comme vous le savez, le programme de Bourses d'Etudes de l'USAID, intitulé "Participant Training", se réfère à la formation classique et technique aux Etats Unis ou dans d'autres pays. Son objectif est de préparer un personnel compétent pour les projets financés par l'USAID et de renforcer les institutions clés de développement.

Depuis le début de ses activités de formation en Haiti, dans le cadre desquelles des bourses de perfectionnement classique à long terme et d'assistance technique à court terme ont été accordées à plus de 350 haitiens, l'USAID n'a jamais eu l'opportunité d'évaluer l'impact de ces programmes de formation. Nous pensons, qu'il est approprié de le faire actuellement vu que la Mission prévoit d'optimiser les contributions de ce programme à ses efforts de développement en Haiti.

Une enquête par questionnaire, complétée par des entrevues auprès des bénéficiaires, nous permettra d'estimer la gestion du programme par l'USAID et son efficacité quant aux objectifs prévus. Nous étudierons également les activités de formation à l'étranger des autres donateurs afin de recommander des moyens d'arriver à une meilleure coordination des efforts de toutes les agences concernées. A cet effet, nous avons choisi Madame Laurel Elmer et Monsieur Charles Tardieu qui se préparent à exécuter cette tâche durant les prochaines semaines.

APPENDIX G: OTHER CORRESPONDENCE

Port-au-Prince October 11, 1985

Mr. Jerôme T. FRENCH
Director USAID/HAITI
Office of the Director

Dear Mr. French:

Thank you for your courteous letter and your interest in our particular training experience.

Also I take the opportunity of returning the questionnaire for former Scholars to thank All Aid members. I want all these members to know that I appreciate greatly the constructive aid, time and effort they gave in favor of my academic Education at U.S.A. during two years: January 1983 through January 1985. I also agree with the new idea of creation of an AID-sponsored participants Association.

Mr. French, you may be assured that if I can be of any assistance I will make every effort to work with your organization.

Sincerely yours

Jean P. Moise PIERRE-LOUIS
83, Ave. Martin L. King , 83
Block Ruelle Nazon-Lalue
Port-au-Prince - HAITI

DATE RECEIVED
OCT 16 1985

UNIVERSITE D'HAITI

UNIVERSITE D'ETAT

FACULTE DES SCIENCES

OFFICE | ACT
D/DIR
A
CONT
DRE
ENG
EXO
GSO
OEA
OPED
PHO
PVD
RCS
RDO
RF
Date:
By:

FDS 17:85

Port-au-Prince, le 16 OCTOBRE 1985

M. Jérome T. FRENCH, Directeur
USAID/Haiti
P.O. Box 1634
Port-au-Prince, Haiti.-

Rec: 10/29/85

Monsieur le Directeur,

J'ai bien reçu votre lettre du 20 Septembre 1985 par laquelle vous m'informez de votre décision d'évaluer l'impact du programme de formation de l'USAID qui a déjà permis à plus de 350 Haitiens de bénéficier de bourses de perfectionnement. Je tiens à vous faire savoir que je suis à votre disposition pour vous communiquer les informations que l'USAID désire obtenir sur les membres du personnel de la Faculté des Sciences qui ont suivi ou qui suivent encore des cours de formation dans le cadre du programme ci-dessus.

Je profite de cette occasion pour vous faire savoir que la Faculté des Sciences souhaite pouvoir explorer avec l'USAID, les possibilités de coopération entre les deux institutions dans un projet de renforcement et de développement de l'enseignement des sciences de l'Ingénieur à la Faculté. Une rencontre pourrait avoir lieu aux bureaux du Doyen entre le 21 et le 31 octobre 1985 ou après le 12 novembre 1985: la date pourrait être fixée par téléphone avec le Secrétariat Général de la Faculté.

Dans l'attente d'une prochaine bonne réponse à ce qui fait l'objet de la présente, je vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Directeur, l'assurance de ma considération très distinguée,

Dr. Pierre Montès
Doyen

UNIVERSITE D'ETAT FACULTE DES SCIENCES

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REPUBLIQUE D'HAITI

MINISTERE DES AFFAIRES SOCIALES

MINISTRE
No. 09

LE 02 OCT. 1985

Monsieur Jérome T. French
Directeur de USAID-HAITI
Casier postal 1634
En ville.-

Monsieur le Directeur,

J'ai l'avantage d'accuser réception de votre lettre datée du 20 septembre écoulé informant le Ministère des Affaires Sociales de votre projet d'effectuer une évaluation du programme de bourses d'études de l'USAID.

Le Ministère des Affaires Sociales a pris bonne note de ce projet et des dispositions qui ont été prises à cet effet. Il prend plaisir à vous assurer de sa meilleure collaboration en l'occurrence.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur le Directeur, l'assurance de ma considération distinguée.

Hervé DENIS
Ministre.-

REPUBLIQUE D'HAITI

MINISTÈRE
DE L'ECONOMIE, DES FINANCES
ET DE L'INDUSTRIE

Le Ministre d'Etat

SEC/USAID/10-85/C-50a

USAID ROUTER		
OFFICE	ACT	INFO
DIR		
D/DIR		
A		
CONT		
DPE		
ENG		
EXO		
GDO		
HRS		
OFA		
OPED		
PHO		
PVD		
RCS		
RDO		
RF		
CF		
ACTION TAKEN		
Date:		
By:		

DATE RECEIVED
OCT 16 1985

PORT-AU-PRINCE, LE 15 OCT. 1985

Rec: 10/29/85

Monsieur Jérôme T. FRENCH
Directeur de l'USAID/HAITI
Ancien Hotel Beau Rivage
Cité de l'Exposition.-

Monsieur le Directeur,

J'ai le plaisir d'accuser réception de votre correspondance du 27 Septembre écoulé couvrant un questionnaire relatif à la participation aux programmes de formation de l'USAID organisés à l'étranger pour une meilleure expérience des futurs participants.

J'ai pris note de cette communication et je tiens à vous informer que je n'ai pas jusqu'ici bénéficié de ce programme sauf qu'en Novembre 1983, j'ai été invité aux Etats-Unis d'Amérique par l'USIS, à titre de visiteur international. Mon voyage certes, a été financé par l'USAID mais n'a pas consisté en un programme de formation.

Je vous retourne avec mes remerciements le formulaire dûment rempli et saisis l'occasion pour vous prier d'agréer, Monsieur le Directeur, l'expression de mes salutations les meilleures.

CC/16/5

MINISTÈRE DE L'ECONOMIE, DES FINANCES ET DE L'INDUSTRIE
HAITI

Pierre-Marie BOISSON, Ing.
Conseiller au Cabinet Particulier
du Ministre d'Etat de l'Economie
des Finances et de l'Industrie.-

ACTION USAID

DATE RECEIVED
SEP 30 1985

RÉPUBLIQUE D'HAITI

LE PRESIDENT
DE LA
CHAMBRE LEGISLATIVE

No. P.C.L. 238

PORT-AU-PRINCE, le 26 Septembre 1985

OFFICIAL FILE

DATE REC'D		
USAID ROUTER		
OFFICE	ACT	INF
DIR		
D/DIR		
A		
CONT		
DRE		
ENG		
EXO		
GSO		
ISS		
OEA		
OPED		
PHO		
PVD		
RCS		
RDO		
RF		
CF		
ACTION TAKEN N/A		
Date: 10/3/85		
By: NJ		

Monsieur le Directeur,

J'ai l'avantage de vous accuser réception de votre lettre datée du 30 Septembre 1985 par laquelle vous portez à ma connaissance que l'Agence Américaine pour le Développement international en Haiti (USAID|Haiti) entreprendra bientôt une évaluation de son programme de bourses d'études. Cette évaluation se fera par questionnaire et entrevues auprès des bénéficiaires.

En réponse, je vous informe que la Chambre Législative accueillera avec le plus grand plaisir Madame Laurel ELMER et Monsieur Charles TARDIEU, ces deux délégués de l'USAID auxquels elle fournira toute l'assistance nécessaire à l'accomplissement de leur mission.

Due 10-9-85.

10-8-85

SEP

Je profite de la circonstance pour vous renouveler, Monsieur le Directeur, l'assurance de mes considérations distinguées.

Jaurès LEVEQUE
Président de la Chambre
Législative

Monsieur Jérôme T. FRENCH
Directeur de l'USAID
EN Haiti
En ses Bureaux.-

DATE REC'D		
USAID ROUTER		
OFFICE	ACT	INFO
D.R		
D/DIR		
A		
CONT		
DRE		
ENG		
EXO		
GSO		
ISS		
OEA		
OPED		
PHO		
PVD		
RCS		
RDO		
[illegible]		
[illegible]		
ACTION TAKEN		
Date:		
By:		

DATE RECEIVED
OCT 8 1985

Lundi, 7 Octobre 1985

KAYANOU

20, RUELLE RIVIERE - PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI
TELEPHONES : 5-1777 . 5-1778

Mme: 10/21/85

Cher Monsieur Heyman,

Veuillez trouver, sous pli séparé, le questionnaire (rempli), relatif aux programmes de formation financés par l'AID.

Je crois qu'à un certain nombre des questions il aurait été utile, voire nécessaire, que je fasse des réponses plus détaillées ou nuancées que ce que permet la formulation même du questionnaire. J'ai en ce sens un rapport d'ensemble sur le programme OEA auquel j'ai participé, en avril-mai dernier. Mais la "bousculade" de mes occupations professionnelles fait que je ne peux le joindre

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

KAYANOU
20, RUELLE RIVIERE - PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI
TELEPHONES : 5-1777 . 5-1778

au présent questionnaire. J'en adresserai une copie à Madame Jean-Mary.

Dans l'intervalle, peut-être serait-il utile que je rencontre Monsieur Tardieu et/ou Madame Elmer. Prière de leur faire savoir, en tout cas, que je suis disponible pour tout échange utile à compléter le questionnaire.

Avec mes remerciements, je vous prie, chez Monsieur Réyman, de recevoir mes meilleures salutations.

Jean Alexandre.

OCT - 8

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

OCT. 3 1985

REPUBLIQUE D'HAÏTI

MINISTERE DE L'AGRICULTURE, DES RESSOURCES NATURELLES ET DU DEVELOPPEMENT RURAL

.....A-2:..4079

Port-au-Prince, le .27.Septembre,...1985....

Monsieur Jérome T. FRENCH
Directeur de l'USAID/HAITI
Port au Prince, Haïti

Monsieur le Directeur,

J'ai l'avantage d'accuser réception de votre lettre du 20 septembre 1985 concernant la décision de l'USAID/HAITI d'entreprendre bientôt une évaluation de son programme de bourses d'études.

Soyez assuré que le MARNDR fournira à l'USAID toute l'aide dont elle pourrait avoir besoin dans la réalisation de cette étude d'évaluation.

Je saisis l'occasion pour vous présenter mes compliments et vous prie d'agréer, Monsieur le Directeur, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

DATE REC'D		
USAID ROUTER		
OFFICE	ACT	INFO
DIR		
D/DIR		
A		
CONT		
DRE		
ENG		
EXO		
OPO		
ISS		
OEA		
OPED		
PHO		
PVD		
RCS		
RDO		
RS		
CF		
ACTION TAKEN		
Date:		
By:		

Frantz FLAMBERT
Ministre

Ministère de l'Agriculture des Ressources Naturelles et du Développement Rural

Dist 10-14-85

4VRD RADIO NATIONALE

cu-P HAITI

khz AM
mhz FM stereo
1 mhz FM mono
770 khz
onite 970 khz
es 270 khz

es décamétriques:
khz bande 31M
khz bande 49M

u magasin de l'état
postale 1143
-P. Haiti (W.I.)

sse télégraphique:
—PAP

-2420, 2-2421, 2-2442

DATE REC'D
USAID ROUTER

OFFICE	ACT	INFO
A		
CONT		
DRE		
ENG		
EXO		
GSO		
ISS		
OEA		
OPED		
PHO		
PVD		
RCS		
RDO		
RF		
CF		

ACTION TAKEN
Date:
By:

DATE RECEIVED
OCT 3 1985

Le 30 septembre 1985

Monsieur Jérôme FRENCH
Directeur de USAID
En ses Bureaux.-

Monsieur le Directeur,

Due 10-14-85

Nous accusons réception de votre lettre du 20 septembre 1985, dans laquelle vous avez sollicité des informations sur ceux de nos employés ayant bénéficié d'une bourse d'Etudes à l'Etranger.

Nous nous empressons de vous informer que Monsieur Alexandre C. ABELLARD, actuellement Directeur Général de la 4VRD, et Melle. Evelyne DANTICA, rédactrice à la Salle des Nouvelles, sont disposés à fournir à vos délégués tous les renseignements désirés. Quant à Mme. Yvette SALOMON, elle a regagné les Etats-Unis depuis plus d'un an.

Dans l'espoir de vous avoir donné satisfaction et dans l'attente de toute démarche ultérieure que vous jugerez utile d'entreprendre à ce sujet, nous vous prions d'agréer, Monsieur le Directeur, nos salutations distinguées.

OCT - 3. 1985

DG|4330

Alexandre C. ABELLARD
Directeur Général

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ACTION COPY

DATE RECEIVED
SEP 30 1985

DATE REC'D
USAID ROUTER

OFFICE	ACT	INFO
DIR		
D/DIR		
A		
CONT		
DRE		
ENG		
EXO		
GSO		
ISS		
OFA		
OPS		
PHO		
PVD		
RCS		
RDO		
RF		
CF		

ACTION TAKEN
Date: 10/3/85

INSTITUT DE TECHNOLOGIE ELECTRONIQUE D'HAITI
INTERNATIONAL I. T. E. H.

Cooperating with Florida International University

D/G- ITEH- 0076.-

10-8-85

September 25, 1985

Mr. Jerome T. FRENCH
Director of USAID
Mission to Haiti
Port-au-Prince.-

OFFICIAL FILE

Dear Mr. FRENCH,

Due 10-4-85.

Thank you for your letter September 20, 1985. We at the Institute appreciate very much your efforts concerning the evaluation of the USAID scholarship training program. We are very pleased to report to you that our two graduates who participated in the Carribean Basin Iniciative Scholarship program financed by your dynamic Institution the USAID, raced the best for all Central America and the Carribean, have been returned to Haiti since last year, just right after their training and both are working at the entire satisfaction of their employers.

Jn-Claude SAINTILUS is working for Teleco and has been also appointed by our Institution as chief of Practical training lab. Department and we are very pleased with his performance thank our Lord Jesus and the USAID.

Marc-Arthur ALCERO is working for the Electricity of Haiti and because of some little mental deficiencies will join us in the very near future.

We have appreciated very much that the USAID has giving us the opportunity to demonstrate througtout the CBI scholarship training program of the President of the United States the final results of the quality technical education offered by our Institution to the benefit of the haitian community.

From the date of our foundation to now and forever, our philosophy and goals will remain the same:

Create a vast pool of human ressources technically well prepared in order to attract establishment of high technology Manufacturing industries in Haiti for job's creation purpose and young haitians mind's stabilization.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

SEP 30 1985

.../2...

159, Rue de l'Enterrement, Port-au-Prince, Haiti • Phone: 2-2032 • Telex: 203-0001

We have been working alone since our foundation, with our own funds, without any grant except one from the ACDI in 1981 of an amount of five thousands U.S. dollars ($ 5.000.000) in order to help us purchasing some lab equipments.

Now, we request your assistance to help us enlarge our delicate mission.

May God bless America.

Sincerely.

Dr. Hugo NOEL

President & Founder.-

Florida International University

Award of Merit

to

Dr. Hugo Noel, President and Founder

of

L'Institut de Technologie Electronique d'Haiti

for the excellence of the graduates
who participated in

The Caribbean Basin Initiative Scholarship Program of the Agency for International Development

Miami, Florida
January 1984–January 1985

Gregory B. Wolfe, President

Excerpt from Le Nouvelliste of 8/21/85

INTERNATIONAL AWARD OF MERIT TO

INSTITUT DE TECHNOLOGIE ELECTRONIQUE D'HAITI (Intl.)

Last Thursday, August 15, 1985 at the International Ceremony for the graduation of outgoing classes (81-85 Engineering Department) (82-85 Higher Technique Department) of the ITEH, an International Award of Merit was handed to our great friend, Engineer Hugo Noel, President and Founder of this institution of national pride by the representative of Florida International University (FIU) and the Inter-American University Council for Social and Economic Development (CUIDES), Dr. Lisa LEKIS, especially sent to Haiti for the occasion due to the excellent academic, scientific and human training of Haitian graduates of this Institute who participated with brilliance in the CBI fellowship program funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Our fellow citizens were rated the best for Latin America, Central America and the Caribbean out of a total of 40 participants.

This official commencement ceremony took place in the presence of Presidential Guard Second Lieutenant Joseph Michel, representing the presidential couple Mr. and Mrs. Jean-Claude Duvalier, Captain Raphael François of the General Headquarter, representing the Haitian Armed Forces; Secretary of State for National Education, Mr. Gérard Dorcély; Dr. Raoul Pierre-Louis, Vice-Chancellor of the State University of Haiti; USIS Director Mr. Jeffrey Lite; USAID Chief of the Office of Private and Voluntary Development Mr. Barry Heyman; HAMCHAM Executive Director Mrs. Benjie Duval, as well as representatives of the news media.

Best wishes for the continued success of the ITEH.

Port-au-Prince, le 4 octobre 1985

Monsieur Barry N. HEYMAN
Chef du bureau pour le développement
par les Agences Bénévoles
Agence pour le développement International (AID)
Edifice Beau Rivage
Boîte Postale 1634
Port-au-Prince, HAITI

Monsieur le Chef du Bureau,

Nous avons reçu au cours de cette semaine le questionnaire que vous aviez bien voulu nous faire parvenir. Cependant n'ayant pas bénéficié de bourse de formation nous estimons que ce questionnaire ne nous est pas destiné. En effet dans le cadre d'une enquête que l'IHSI devra mener conjointement avec l'USAID nous avions été invités par cette institution à discuter à Washington avec les responsables de l'USAID en Haiti et les techniciens du Bureau du Recensement des Etats-Unis des objectifs de cette enquête et à préparer ensemble le questionnaire y relatif. Pour cela nous ne disposerons pas d'éléments permettant de remplir ce formulaire. Si d'aventure il en existe un plus adapté à ces genres de mission nous nous ferions un devoir de le remplir et de le retourner d'urgence.

Tout en regrettant de ne pouvoir collaborer effectivement dans cette enquête d'information, nous vous prions d'agréer, Monsieur le Chef de Bureau, l'expression de nos considérations distinguées.

Madame Danilia M. Altidor

Madame Fernande S. Pierre-Louis

Burel Décopain

APPENDIX H: LIST OF SURVEYED PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX I: LIST OF SUPERVISORS INTERVIEWED

LIST OF SURVEYED RETURNED USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES

Mr. Yves Abraham	National Pedagogical Institute
Mr. Paul Rilieau Affricot	Agricultural Credit Bureau
Mr. Sylvio Alber	Division d'Hygiene Familiale et Nutrition
Mr. Marc Arthur Alcero	Electricite d'Haiti
Mr. Guy Alexandre	Kayanou
Mr. Yves Pierre Alexandre	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. Joseph Alexis	Ministry of Commerce
Mr. Reynold Alexis	Integrated Agricultural Development Project
Ms. Antoinette Alezi	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Ms. Adeline B. Aly	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. Jean-Claude Amédée	Agricultural Credit Bureau
Dr. Mar Angrand	Retired Cap-Haitien
Mr. Ducarmel Aristide	Ministry of Plan
Ms. Evelyne Armand	Cité Simone Health Center
Ms. Genevieve Armand	Dynamic Enterprises

APPENDIX J: PROPOSED PARTICIPANT MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP PLAN

LIST OF SUPERVISORS INTERVIEWED

1.	Dr. Leopold Bonhome	MSPP[1]	DESE[2]
2.	M. Sylvio Albert	MSPP	DHFN[3]
3.	M. Guy-Serge Pompilus	MEN[4]	IPN[5]
4.	M. George Gonel	PLAN[6]	DCE[7]
5.	Mrs. Florence Cadet	PLAN	DCE
6.	Agr. Jacques Edouard Alexis	MARNDR[8]	FAMV[9]
7.	Agr. Mathelier	MARNDR	PDAI[10]
8.	Agr. Pierre-Louis	MARNDR	BCA[11]
9.	Ing. Michel Simon	MINES[12]	
10.	Mrs. Sylvain	MINES	

Ministry of Public Health and Population
[2]Training Department
[3]Family Hygiene and Nutrition Bureau
[4]Ministry of National Education
[5]National Pedagogical Institute
[6]Ministry of Planning
[7]External Cooperation Section
[8]Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural
[9]Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine
[10]PDAI
[11]Credit Bureau for Agriculture
[12]Ministry of Mines

USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINING APPLICATION GUIDELINES

Part One - Personnel and Professional Background
(To be completed by applicant.)

Personal Information

LAST NAME 01 ___
FIRST NAME
GENDER 02 ___
AGE 03 ___
HOME ADDRESS
HOME TEL:
LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY 04 ___
French
English
Other

Professional Information

PROFESSION 05 ___
LAST DEGREE OBTAINED 06 ___
NAME AND LOCATION OF INSTITUTION 07 ___
GRADUATION DATE
LIST OF ALL OTHER DEGREES
LIST OF ALL OTHER OVERSEAS TRAINING (DATES & SPONSOR)

Present Job Status

EMPLOYMENT AGENCY 08 ___
DEPARTMENT
LOCATION 09 ___
TEL:
POSITION 10 ___
MAIN DUTIES
DATE OF EMPLOYMENT
NAME OF SUPERVISOR
EMPLOYMENT SECTOR: Public (Parastatal, Project) 11 ___
Private (PVO, NGO, Self-employed)

Previous Job

EMPLOYMENT AGENCY 12 ___
POSITION 13 ___
DATES OF EMPLOYMENT
EMPLOYMENT 14 ___

I understand the objectives of the USAID Participant Training Program and have been presented with the "Conditions of Trainging" to which I agree. I also understand that before leaving for training, a contractual agreement will be signed by me, my supervisor, and USAID/Haiti.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE: _____

STANDARDIZED MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP PLAN

The attached forms are proposed in an effort to standardize information on all Mission participants for the purposes of monitoring their progress in training and their post-training job status. The attached application forms and follow-up questionnaires are proposed as a means for gathering information on participants which, if regularly entered into a computerized database, will greatly ease future analysis. Codes have been suggested for fields on which statistical operations might be desirable.

Participant Application Form.

1. Part one is to be completed by applicants. It provides basic personal, professional, and employment information. At this time, candidates should be made aware of the conditions governing the Participant Training Program and be given the "Conditions of Training" form.

2. Part two of the application form should be completed by the Training Office, drawing information on the type of training from the PIO/Ps oar other documents.

3. Part three is a confidential reference letter from the applicant's supervisor or employer and is intended to encourage more involvement by supervisors in the training plan and commitment to reintegrating participants in an appropriate position upon return.

Participant Follow-Up Questionnaires

Two follow-up questionnaires are proposed to track the status of returned participants. One is a debriefing questionnaire upon a participant's return; and a second questionnaire is to be administered a year after training. Taken together, these instruments should provide a useful rating of the program and its utilization, as well as guide the Mission in making necessary improvements.

PARTICIPANT TRAINING APPLICATION GUIEDLINES

PART THREE - Supervisor Reference Letter (to be completed by the applicant's employer or supervisor)

Name of Applicant

Position

Training Requested

Reasons for Training

How long have you known the applicant, and in what capacity?

What are the applicant's qualifications for this training?

Position to be filled by applicant after training:

How is the training requested related to that position?

NAME OF EMPLOYMENT AGENCY
DEPARTMENT
ADDRESS
TEL:

NAME OF SUPERVISOR
POSITION

I understand the objectives of USAID'S Participant Training program and recommend the applicant for training. If accepted, the applicant will be given all required assistance from this agency before and after training. I also understand that before leaving for training, a contractual agreement will be signed by me, the candidate, and USAID/Haiti.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE: _____

Part Two - Type of Training
(To be completed by applicant.)

PIO/P # _____ PIO/P Amount $ _____

MODE OF FUNDING: (Bilateral or central) 15 ___

MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITY: (Contract or AID-managed) 16 ___

DATES & LENGTH OF TRAINING: # of weeks _____ 17 ___

LOCATION OF TRAINING: (U.S. or third country) 18 ___

TRAINING FIELD: _____ 19 ___

TRAINING INSTITUTION: _____ 20 ___
Address:

DEGREE OBJECTIVE: (BA/S, MA/S, PHD, diploma/cetificate, non-degree) 21 ___

THESIS TITLE (where applicable)

OTHER TRAINING-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Language of Training 22 ___

Language Training (In-country or in United States) 23 ___

Orientation (WIC or other) 24 ___

Other Complimentary Training (special courses) 25 ___

EXIT INTERVIEW: GUIDELINES FOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Participant 01 ___
Return Date: _____

Employment Status

1. Are you returning to your former employer? 26 ___
   If not, why?

2. Are you returning to the same position you occupied before training? If not, does your new position have more, less, or the same responsibility? 27 ___

Preparation for Training

3. To what extent were you involved in planning your program (content, objectives, schedule) 28 ___

4. How satisfied were you with the information provided by the AID mission in the following areas prior to departure?

   a) administrative aspects (visa, travel arrangements, allowance, insurance) 29 ___

   b) technical aspects (program content, objectives, schedule) 30 ___

   c) practical aspects (social and cultural life in country of training) 31 ___

5. How satisfied were you with assistance from the USAID office in preparing you for your program? 32 ___

6. Did you attend an orientation in the country of training? If so, where: _____ 33 ___

7. How useful was your orientation (not at all, somewhat, very)? What other information would have been useful? 34 ___

Quality of Training Experience

8. During training, did you have problems with administrative support in the following areas:

   a) receipt of allowance 35 ___
   b) amount of allowance 36 ___
   c) living arrangements 37 ___
   d) program changes 38 ___
   e) program guidance 39 ___
   f) personal counseling 40 ___

9. To what extent did you have language problems during training? 41 ___

10. Overall, how satisfied are you with your training experience? 42 ___

11. To what extent were you satisfied with the following aspects of your program:

    a) content 43 ___
    b) technical level 44 ___
    c) relevance to Haitian conditions 45 ___
    d) competence of instructors 46 ___
    e) training resources (equipment, library) 47 ___
    f) practical experience 48 ___

12. Do you think the knowledge and skills learned in your training program will be useful in your job? 49 ___

13. Which skills do you think will be most useful? 50 ___

14. What other benefits were there from your program? 51 ___

15. Have you joined a professional association in connection with your training? 52 ___

16. Would you recommend this program to others of similar background? 53 ___

GUIDELINES FOR FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE (to be administered to participants one year after return)

Name of Participant
Date of Return
Program Attended

1. Have you changed job positions since your training. If so, does your current position have more, less or the same responsibility? 54 ___

2. Have you received a training-related promotion or salary increase? 55 ___

3. Is your present position in the same field for which you were trained under the AID program? 56 ___

4. Overall, how satisfied are you now with your training experience? 57 ___

5. To what extent are you now satisfied with the following aspects of your program?

   a) content 58 ___
   b) technical level 59 ___
   c) relevance to Haitian conditions 60 ___
   d) competence of instructions 61 ___
   e) training resources (equipment, library) 62 ___
   f) practical experience 63 ___

6. Do you think the knowledge and skills learned in your training program are useful in your job? 64 ___

7. Which skills are the most useful? 65 ___

8. Overall, how much do you think your training increased your professional competence? 66 ___

9. Have you experienced any change in attitudes as a result of your training experience? If so, please describe: 67 ___

10. Have you experienced problems in applying the knowledge and skills acquired in training in your present job? Please describe: 68 ___

11. How successful have you been in introducing new ideas and/or changes in your job? If not, why? 69 ___

12. As a result of your training, are you involved in the following activities more, or less, or about the same (where applicable):

develop/revise policy	70 ___
develop/revise operating procedures	71 ___
participant in planning	72 ___
develop new programs or services	73 ___
develop educational or training materials	74 ___
plan or coordinate workshops	75 ___
research	76 ___
publishing	77 ___

13. Have you corresponded with your training institution or a professional contact made during training? If so, how frequently? 78 ___

14. Are you in contact with other AID participants 79 ___

15. How much have you used each of the following methods to share knowledge from training with others?

informal discussion	80 ___
on-the-job training	81 ___
formal presentations	82 ___
exchange of training material	83 ___
written reports	84 ___

16. Have you had any of the following problems since returning from your training?

finding a training-related position	85 ___
adequate resources to carry out job duties	86 ___
acceptance by colleagues and/or superiors	87 ___
readjusting to bureaucratic procedures	88 ___
readjusting to lifestyle	89 ___

17. Are you a member of a professional association? 90 ___

18. Do you receive professional publications? 91 ___

19. Would you recommend this program to others of similar background? 92 ___

COMMENTS

OTHER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (continued)

Dr. Serge Armand	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. Fritz Assad	Ministry of Public Works and Transportation
Ms. Francoise Aubry	Aubry's Farm
Ms. Bernadette Augustin	Ministry of National Education
Mr. Jonas Avrilus	Ministry of Finance, Economy and Industry
Mr. Jacques Backer	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Ressources and Rural Development
Mr. Jean-Marie Backer	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Ressources and Rural Development
Mr. Wilkens Basile	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Ressources and Rural Development
Mr. Yvon Basquiat	Ministry of Public Works and Transportation
Mr. Arsene Bastien	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Ressources and Rural Development
Ms. Gabrielle Beaudin	College of Agriculture
Mr. Claude Berrouet	National Pedagogical Institute
Mr. Edward Berrouet	
Mr. Michel Berthoumieux	International Tank Terminal
Dr. Marie Christine Bertrand	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Dr. Felix Binette	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Ms. Claire Blanchet	
Ms. Marguerite Blemur	Integrated Agricultural Development Project
Mr. Pierre-Marie Boisson	Ministry of Finance, Economy and Industry
Dr. Jean-Rony Boulin	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Dr. Esteve Brutus	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Ms. Florence Cadet	Ministry of Plan

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (continued)

Mr. Yves Cadet	Ministry of Commerce
Ms. Josette Calixte	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Ms. Marlene Cantave	Complexe Acra
Mr. Alix Marc Cauvin	
Mr. Franck Richard Cave	Ministry of Public Works and Transportation
Dr. Michel Cayenittes	Grace Children's Hospital
Mr. Guy-Fred Celestin	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Dr. Claude Champagne	Ministry of Public Health and Population, Finche
Mr. Paul Laraque Charles	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Ms. Yvette Charles	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Ms. Clothilde Charlot	OEF/Factory Women
Mr. Jacques Charlot	OPRODEX
Ms. Gina Cheron	Ministry of Commerce
Mr. Louis Delima Chery	Ministry of National Education
Mr. Calixte Clerisme	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Ressources and Rural Development
Mr. Louis Clervil	Ministry of Public works and Transportation
Ms. Georgette Colas	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. St.Fort Colin	Ministry of National Education
Ms. Rose Odile Creed	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. St.Fort Dadaille	Ministry of Commerce
Mr. Jean-Claude Daloe	Agricultural Credit Bureau
Dr. Guy Dambreville	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Ms. Danick Damour	Ministry of Plan
Mr. Gerard Pierre Daniel	Ministry of Commerce
Ms. Evelyne Dantica	Radio Nationale

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (CONTINUED)

Mr. Francisque Dubois	Exports Promotion Office
Mr. Wilfrid Dubuisson	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Carmelle L. Ducasse	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Jean-Paul Duperval	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Ernst Dupont	Ministry of Agriculture, Agricultural Development Support II Project
Mr. Marcel Duret	AGRICORP
Mr. Paul Duret	AGRICORP
Ms. Nirva Duval	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Serge Edme	Ministry of Agriculture
Dr. Michelle Edouard	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Pierre-Emile Edouard	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Jeantyrard Elmera	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Jean-Robert Emmanuel	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Julien Etienne	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Raymond Etienne	Haitian Association of Voluntary Agencies
Mr. Richard Etienne	Haitian Association of Voluntary Agencies
Mr. Levael Eugene	Ministry of Agriculture
Dr. Laurent Eustache	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Bossuet Exantus	Service d'Entretien Permanent du Réseau Routier National
Mr. Luc Faustin	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Jean-Fenel Felix	College of Agriculture
Mr. Joseph Felix	College of Agriculture
Mr. Saurel Felix	College of Agriculture
Dr. Wilfrid Figareau	Ministry of Public Health

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (continued)

Ms. Jocelyn David	Ministry of Mines and Energy
Mr. Jacques Debrosse	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. Claude Defay	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. Samuel Demosthenes	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Ressources and Rural Development
Mr. Emmanuel Jean-Luc Desinor	Ministry of Plan
Mr. Jean Desinor	Agricultural Credit Bureau
Mr. Franck Desir	Caritas
Mr. Guesler Desir	Integrated Agricultural Development Project
Mr. Bernateau Desmangles	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. Julio Desormeaux	Ministry of Public Health and Population
Mr. Wilner Dessources	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Ressources and Rural Development
Mr. Marc Dieudonne	Agricultural Credit Bureau
Mr. Musset F. Dorcine	Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Ressources and Rural Development
Mr. Ludovic Dorfeuille	OPRODEX
Mr. Alix Dorilas	L&P Express
Mr. Pierre Dorismond	
Mr. Michel Guilbert Dorival	Banque Nationale de Developpement Agricole et Industriel

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (CONTINUED)

Ms. Marie Denise Fleurant	Assemblee Nationale
Mr. Pierre Florival	Presidence
Ms. Marie Delourdes Fontaine	Ministry of Education
Mr. Michelet Fontaine	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. William Fougere	
Ms. Claudette B. François	Agricultural Credit Bureau
Mr. Fritz R. François	Action Familiale d'Haiti
Mr. Gérard Bernard François	Ministry of Agriculture (Cayes)
Mr. Marcel François	Ministry of Plan
Mr. Roger François	Ministry of Plan
Ms. Maude Frédérique	Ministry of Public Health (Miragoane)
Mr. Raymond Gardiner	Haitian Statistical Institute
Ms. Elise B. Gelin	Ministry of Mines and Energ
Ms. Alliette Georges	Ministry of Social Affairs
Mr. Roger Gerard	Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Germaire Germain	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Suze Gesse	Ministry of Public works and Transportation
Mr. Alexandre Gouthier	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Yves Gouthier	Ministry of Commerce
Mr. Pierre Andre Guillaume	Ministry of Commerce
Ms. Jeanine Henriquez	Ministry of Commerce
Mr. Normil Henry	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Adrien Hilaire	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Sebastien Hilaire	Ministry of Agriculture, Agricultural Development Support II Project
DR. Philippe Hirsch	Ministry of Public Health, Cap-Haitien
Mr. Karl G. Honore	Agricultural Credit Bureau

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (CONTINUED)

Dr. Yvon Isaac	Diquini Hospital
Mr. Farnel Jacques Louis	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Jean-Claude Janvier	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Jacques Antoine Jasmin	Ministry of Public Health
Dr. Henri-Claude Jean	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Viviane Jean	
Mr. Ady Jean Gardy	Tele Haiti
Ms. Fernande Jean-Baptiste	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Jose Jean-Baptiste	Ministry of Agriculture (Jeremie)
Ms. Josette Jean-Baptiste	Ministry of Public Health (Gonaives)
Mr. Obed Jean-Baptiste	Ministry of Agriculture St. Michel de l'Attalaye
Mr. Wesner Jean-Baptiste	Ministry of Public Works and Transportation
Mr. Louis-Ferere Jean-Charles	Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Jocelyne Jean-Jacques	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Michely Jean-Joseph	
Ms. Joelle Jean-Julien	CAF
Mr. Raoul Jean-Louis	IICA
Mr. Fred Joseph	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Gerard Joseph	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Marie Jose D. Joseph	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Yves Joseph	Haitian Association of Voluntary Agencies
Mr. Pierre Josue	ENAO
Mr. Paulin Justafort	Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Rachel Kajos	Ministry of Public Health

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (CONTINUED)

Mr. Alphonse Labissiere	Ministry of Agriculture ,Agricultural Cr. Bureau
Dr. Ludovic Lafontant	
Dr. Roger Laforest	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. David Lafrance	Ministry of Commerce
Ms. Yanick Lahens	National Pedagogical Institute
Ms. Angelina Laire	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Nicole Lalanne	
Dr. Comoche Lamothe	Ministry of Public Health
Dr. Frantz Lamothe	Red Cross
Mr. Elie Laroche	
Mr. Jean Hugues Laroche	Ministry of Public Works and Transportation
Mr. Harold F. Latortue	Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Elsie Lauredent	Ministry of Public Health
Dr. Wagner Lecoin	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Arlan Lecorps	Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Anne-Marie Legagneur	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Edith Valcin Legagneur	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Jean-Robert Legros	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Emeline Leonidas	National Nursing School

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (Continued)

Dr. Gérald Lerebours	Ministry of Plan
Ms. Elfriède Lespinasse	Ministry of Commerce, CPRODEX
Ms. Raymonde Lespinasse	
Dr. Ernest Léveillé	Ministry of Public Health, Cap-Haitien
Mr. Michel Lima	Electricité d'Haiti, EDH
Mr. Gérard Lohier	Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Rénette Lorméus	Ministry of Education, IPN
Ms. Edline C. Lorthé	Maternité Isaie Jeanty
Ms. Carole M. Louis	Banque Nationale de Développement Agricole et Industriel
Mr. Jean-Claude Louis	Administration Portuaire Nationale (APN)
Mr. Joseph Louis	College of Agronomy
Mr. Pierre-Antoine Louis	Integrated Agricultural Development Project (PDAI) Gonaives
Mr. Saturnin Louis	Agricultural Credit Bureau (BCA)
Dr. Joseph Serge Louissaint	Ministry of Public Health, Cayes
Mr. Ernst Louverture	Ministry of Agriculture
Dr. Gérard Lubin	Ministry of Public Health, Cap-Haitien
Mr. Martin Lionel Lubin	Agricultural Credit Bureau (BCA)
Mr. Pierre-Yves Lubin	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)
Ms. Denise Luc	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Danielle Lustin	Ministry of Mines and Energy
Mr. Roc Magloire	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Jessie Marcel	Mairie de Port-au-Prince

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (CONTINUED)

Mr. Serge Mondesir	Ministry of Commerce
Ms. Marie Gardenia Monrose	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Ulrich Montas	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Marie Josee Moreau	
Mr. Jean-Errol Morose	Renovation
Mr. Joseph Nanphy	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Robert Neree	Ministry of Interior and National Defense
Ms Dominique Nezivar	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. David Nicolas	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Elie Nicolas	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Mireille Nicolas	Organisme de Developpement du Bassin Fleuve Artibonite (ODBFA)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (continued)

Ms. Claimène Marcelin	CARITAS
Mr. Fritz Marcelin	Integrated Agricultural Development Project (PDAI), Belladères
Mr. Bogart Marseille	Ministry of Plan, Title III Bureau
Mr. Antoine Mathelier	Integrated Agricultural Development Project (PDAI)
Mr. Georges Mathelier	Archevêché de Port-au-Prince
Mr. Marcel Mathieu	Radio Diffusion Cayenne, Cayes
Mr. Laurent Mathurin	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Charles Maxi	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Elrick Métayer	Cité Simone Health Center
Dr. Gardner Michaud	Ministry of Public Health, DHFN
Mr. Antoine Michelot	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Roger Midy	Ministry of Public Works and Transportation
Mr. Renaud Millien	Ministry of Agriculture (Port de Paix)
Mr. Decatrel Mirville	Ministry of Public Health
Mr. Jules Albert Moleon	Ministry of Public Health
Ms. Carmen Montpoint	Social Medical Center (Boston)
Dr. Dietz Montpoint	Ministry of Public Health

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (Continued)

Ms. Immacula Rateau	Division of External Cooperation, Min. of Plan
Ms. Ghislaine P. Raymond	Div, of Health Educ. & Training, Min. of Health
Dr. Martial Raymond	Ministry of Health
Ms. Marie Jacqueline Rémy	Ministry of Health, Division of Family Health and Nutrition (DHFN)
Mr. Jean-Guy Rigaud	Ministry of Mines and Energy
Ms. Anne-Marie Robert	General Hospital, Nursing School
Ms. Josette Roc	Nursing Bureau
Mr. Willhem Roméus	Ministry of Education
Mr. Alfred Rousseau	Ministry of Public Works
Ms. Marie-Alice S. Lafontant	Télévision Nationale d'Haiti (TNH)
Mr. Jean-Claude Saintilus	Institut de Technologie Electronique d'Haiti
Ms. Adrienne Salomon	Ministry of Health, Cayes
Mr. Rostant Salvant	CARE, Gonaives
Mr. Fritz Semé	Ministry of Agriculture, Teledetection
Ms. Florence Sergile	Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Florence Severin (ALSO USIS GRANTEE)	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Julien Simon	Red Cross
Mr. Marc Solis	Ministry of Health, SNEM
Ms. Monique Souvenir	Ministry of Health
Mr. Joseph St. Phard	Ministry of Agriculture, Jérémie
Mr. Wilfrid St. Jean	Ministry of Mines and Energy
Mr. Pierre St. Albin	Ministry of Plan
Mr. Samuel St. Dic	Agricultural Credit Bureau (BCA)
Mr. Emmanuel St. Fleur	Export Promotion Office (OPRODEX)
Mr. Joseph St. Fleur	Agricultural Credit Bureau, Cayes (BCA)

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (Continued)

Mr. Joseph Carlo Noel	Ministry of Agriculture, Integrated Agricultural Development Project (PDAI)
Mr. Jude Noel	Agricultural Credit Bureau (BCA)
Mr. Pierre Paquiot	School of Sciences
Mr. Claude Péan	Ministry of Social Affairs
Mr. Antoine Pélissier	Haitian Statistical Institute (IHS)
Dr. Jacques Petit-Ton	Carrefour Hospital
Mr. Jean-François Philippe	Ministry of Agriculture, Swine Repopulation Project
Mr. Reynold Pierlus	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Betonus Pierre	Ministry of Mines and Energy
Mr. John Elie Pierre	Ministry of Health, POCHEP
Mr. Gabriel Pierre-Bernard	
Mr. Wilner Pierre-François	Division of Family Health and Nutrition
Mr. Jean-Claude Pierre-Gilles	Service d'Entretien Permanent du Réseau Routier National (SEPRRN)
Ms. Chantale Pierre-Louis	
Mr. Jean-Pierre Pierre-Louis	
Mr. Wilner Pierre-Louis	Agricultural Credit Bureau (BCA)
Mr. Guy-Serge Pompilus	National Pedagogical Institute (IPN)
Dr. Jean-Alix Préval	Ministry of Health, St. Marc
Mr. Edgar Prévilon	College of Agronomy
Mr. Wilson Prévilor	
Ms. Mona Prismy	Cité Simone Health Center
Mr. Eberle Prophète	Service National des Endémies Majeures (SNEM)
Mr. Emmanuel Prophète	Ministry of Agriculture, Organisme de Développement du Nord (ODN)
Mrs. Yolande Prophète	Administration Portuaire Nationale (APN)

FORMER USAID PARTICIPANT TRAINEES (Continued)

Ms. Guerda St. Gilles	Ministry of Health, Gonaives
Mr. Jean-Robert Sterlin	Banque Nationale de Développement Agricole et Industriel (BNDAI)
Ms. Ghislaine D. Sylvain	Ministry of Mines and Energy
Ms. Eliane Telson	
Mr. Ernst Theano	Integrated Agricultural Development Project (PDAI), Belladères
Mr. Rolès Théard	Ministry of Agriculture , Cap-Haitien
Mr. Jérémie Théodore	Service National d'Eau Potable (SNEP)
Mr. Yvens Touzin	Division of Family Health and Nutrition
Dr. Gérald Ulysse	Ministry of Health, Cap-Haitien
Mr. Wiemer Verdier	Ministry of Agriculture
Ms. Adeline Verly	
Mr. Jean Verret	Agricultural Credit Bureau (BCA)
Mr. Carl Frederic Villard	Circle Manufacturing Co.
Ms. Sybille Vital	Ets. J.B. Vital
Mr. Ronald Vulcain	Ministry of Agriculture
Mr. Michel Welters	Action Familiale d'Haiti
Mr. Georges Werleigh	Ministry of Agriculture, Agricutural Development Support II (ADSII)
Dr. Benjamin York	Maternité Isaie Jeanty