

EVALUATION OF
AID'S PARTICIPANT TRAINING PROGRAM
IN RWANDA

Prepared By:
Laurel Elmer

Report Submitted to the
Office of AID Representative
Kigali, Rwanda

October 1987

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of the AID Representative/Rwanda carried out an evaluation of its Participant Training Program during September 1987 in order to assess the program's overall effectiveness, and to establish baseline data on the Mission's returned participants. Issues addressed in the evaluation include the overall quality and relevance of training, training utilization, and such implementation concerns as English language training and the nomination process. The experience of long-term participants is given special attention. In addition, improved training opportunities for women as well as the private sector are discussed.

The evaluation involved establishing a database on 322 known returned participants since 1979 using the Participant Training Management System (PTMS). This process included reconciling information from Mission files with records maintained by S&T/IT in Washington on participants trained under bilateral, regional, and centrally-funded programs. A survey was undertaken involving written questionnaires and oral interviews with as many participants as practicable. Interviews were also held with officials of the Government of Rwanda (GOR) and USAID personnel. A total of 67 questionnaires were received in time to be included in the analysis and 23 participants were interviewed.

MAJOR FINDINGS

Program Management

The need for better planning of the Mission's overall training activities was suggested by several patterns identified in the evaluation, including evidence that long-term training targets in Mission projects are not being met. This may reflect poor planning, as well as difficulties in securing nominations from the GOR due to a lack of available candidates, and political and personal factors.

The Training Office appears to be doing a good job in processing participants for training with adequate time for preparation, but the need for a better pre-departure orientation was apparent for both academic and technical participants. In particular, more detailed information is needed on living conditions in the United States and American cultural patterns, as well as more details on specific training programs.

Many participants reported problems in understanding and speaking English, especially those who had some language training in the U.S. and/or Rwanda. This suggests that the Mission has been doing a good job in screening candidates for language training, but that more may be required. A majority of participants received an orientation upon arrival in the U.S., and most did not experience major adjustment difficulties.

Most participants were very satisfied with administrative support provided during training. Although the Mission does not regularly monitor or follow-up the performance of participants in training or upon their return, the Training Office plans to use the PTMS to help manage participant training operations.

Training Quality and Utilization

Overall, participants are very satisfied with the quality and relevance of their training programs. There was less satisfaction with the applicability of participants' training to conditions in Rwanda, largely due to technological differences. The need for more practical experience in programs was also expressed. Participants appear to be using their training in their jobs in varying degree, although a number of constraints to more fully applying their training was noted. In addition to the problem of technological differences, other constraints include lack of financial resources, lack of trained staff, administrative resistance, and more administrative responsibilities.

Participant's Job Status and Professional Development

Participants generally return to training-related jobs with their former employer and are given promotions and/or increased job responsibilities. These promotion patterns reflect positively on the contribution of AID training to participants' professional development. Many participants are also in positions involving supervisory responsibilities which suggests an even broader impact of AID training. A sizable number of participants, however, do not know what job they will occupy upon their return, and some have had problems finding a training-related job. There was also some indication of a potential equivalency problem between the U.S. Masters Degree and the Rwanda Licence, which might hinder promotion opportunities for some participants.

Participants seem to share their training with others on an informal basis within the work environment. Interest was high in establishing an alumni association, which was suggested would be useful for sharing ideas, as well as for continuing education and professional development opportunities.

Other Issues

There has been little private sector training sponsored by AID to date, although there appears to be growing interest and opportunity to do more. These efforts should be pursued in cooperation with the GOR, perhaps through the Chamber of Commerce. The experience of Technoserve, a firm under contract with AID to provide support and some training for the private sector, should be useful.

Mission efforts to increase training opportunities for women will continue to be hindered by deep-rooted cultural and historical factors including the traditional roles of women in Rwandan society, as well as the small pool of eligible trainees. With some innovative planning, however, more opportunities may be available through regional training projects (e.g., AMDP/HRDA and AFGRAD).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Planning Training

- The Mission should prepare a multi-year country training plan to include a breakdown of costs and numbers to be trained, as well as details on level and length of training, field of training, and training location.
- Project papers and project agreements should contain more specific details on training projections. GOR responsibilities in identifying and providing candidates should also be clearly delineated.

Nomination Process

- The Mission may need to formally address the problem of late and withdrawn nominations with the appropriate GOR offices and establish procedures for securing nominations in a timely manner. The development of a country training plan would be a useful first step, and the mechanism used in the Ag Survey Project might provide a useful model in future projects and grant agreements.
- The number of times a candidate has already benefitted from AID-sponsored training should be a criterion in selecting candidates for available training opportunities.

Pre-Departure Preparation

- A standard pre-departure orientation should be provided to all participants before their departure, including written materials covering basic AID regulations and policies, American cultural patterns, practical information on U.S. living conditions, and program descriptions. Similar information should be provided to third country participants. A suggested outline for a pre-departure program is attached in Appendix F.
- Enough time should be allowed in planning for participants' departure for their participation in an arrival orientation program, either at the Washington International Center or at their training site.

English Language Training

- Academic participants should be given at least three months of intensive language training in Rwanda before their training programs, and three additional months in an intensive program in the United States if necessary. Consideration might also be given to providing technical participants with a refresher course or an introduction to basic English language skills, with an emphasis on spoken American English.

Monitoring and Follow-Up

- The Training Office should begin using the PTMS for monitoring its participants at each stage of a participant's program, i.e., planning, processing, in-training, and follow-up. The Training Office may want to wait for the visit by S&T/IT's Field Support Officer for installation and training on the latest version of the PTMS.
- The Training Office should also begin to regularly follow-up its returning participants to evaluate training effectiveness and participants' performance. Two follow-up questionnaires are proposed. The first should be administered in a de-briefing interview with participants upon their return to Rwanda, and another one year after a participant's return to track their job status, location, and utilization of training. Guidelines for these questionnaires are attached in Appendix G.
- The Mission may need to monitor the reintegration of participants into training-related positions upon their return, especially academic participants.
- The GOR policy regarding the equivalence of U.S. degrees should be further investigated, especially given the Mission's recent increase in degree training.

Training Quality

- The Mission might consider providing participants with a re-entry program to address the issue of technological differences between the U.S. and Rwanda. Such a program (one to two weeks) might help participants adapt their knowledge and skills from training to conditions back home. A sample proposal for such a program developed under a separate contract is attached in Appendix H.

Training Quality (cont'd)

- More practical training should be provided in participants' programs where appropriate. While technical participants may need more additional time to schedule a practical training component, academic participants may need specially tailored programs to complement their formal programs.
- Management training should be included in participants' programs where appropriate, especially for participants returning to more administrative jobs. This might be included in the re-entry program addressing technological differences.
- More detailed information should be provided in the PIO/P on participants' backgrounds and specific training needs to ensure more appropriate placements.

Other Issues

- Support for establishing an independent alumni association of returned participant should be provided if enough interest is demonstrated. A summary of the findings from this survey might be distributed to returned participants with a request for proposals to determine such interest.
- Private sector training needs should be identified in cooperation with Technoserve and the Chamber of Commerce. The Mission might consider contracting with a firm similar to Technoserve to serve as a channel for the Mission's private sector training.
- The Mission needs to make a concerted effort to increase the share of women trainees. The Mission might consider more third country or in-country training in areas determined to meet special training needs of women.
- Ways to increase the pool of eligible female trainees in development-related fields at the secondary school level should be explored.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
List of Tables	
I. BACKGROUND	1
A. Purpose of Evaluation	1
B. Methodology	1
C. Demographic Profile of Returned Participants	3
II. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT	8
A. Planning	8
B. Participant Nomination Procedures	10
C. Pre-Departure Preparation	12
D. Monitoring and Follow-up	13
E. USAID and GOR Conditions of Training	14
III. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS: MAJOR FINDINGS	16
A. Implementation	16
● Pre-Departure Preparation	
● English Language Problems	
● Orientation and Social-Cultural Adjustment	
● Administrative Support	
B. Training Quality	19
● Content and Relevance	
● Appropriateness	
● Other Benefits and Suggested Improvements	
C. Post-Training Experience	21
● Job Status and Promotion Patterns	
● Training Utilization	
● Training Transmission	
● Professional Development	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

	<u>Page</u>
IV. OTHER ISSUES	24
A. Private Sector Training	24
B. Training Opportunities for Women	25
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	26

APPENDICES

- A. Returned Participant Survey Questionnaire
- B. List of Participants Interviewed
- C. Other Persons Interviewed
- D. Survey Findings: Statistical Tables
- E. List of Total Returned Participant Population
- F. Suggested Pre-Departure Orientation
- G. Proposed Monitoring and Follow-Up Plan
- H. Sample Re-Entry Workshop (proposed to USAID/Burma)
- I. Glossary of GOR Ministries, Offices, and Other Agencies

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1 - Current Location of Returned Participants	2
2 - Distribution of Returned Participants by Gender	4
3 - Distribution By Type of Training Program	4
4 - Distribution By Training Objective	5
5 - Average Length of Training	5
6 - Distribution By Country of Training	5
7 - Distribution By Type of Training Project	6
8 - Distribution by Field of Study	6
9 - Distribution by Sponsoring Agency	7
10 - Training Targets vs. Participants Trained for Selected Mission Projects	8

APPENDIX D -----

11.1 - Participant Involvement in Program Planning.....	D-1
11.2 - Participant Involvement by Satisfaction and Utilization...	D-1
12 - Selection for Training	D-1
13 - Pre-Departure Orientation.....	D-2
14 - Average Days Notice.....	D-2
15 - Preparation for Program.....	D-2
16.1 - English Language Problems.....	D-3
16.2 - Problems Understanding English by Program Type	D-3
16.3 - Problems Speaking English by Program Type.....	D-3
16.4 - Technical Participants in French-Speaking Programs.....	D-4
17.1 - Language Training Location by Program Type.....	D-4
17.2 - Language Training by Location and Average Length.....	D-4
18 - Language Problems by Location of Training.....	D-5
19 - Arrival Orientations.....	D-5
20 - Usefulness of Orientations.....	D-5
21 - Social-Cultural Adjustment.....	D-6
22 - Adjustment to US Social and Cultural Life.....	D-6

List of Tables, cont'd

Page

23 - Administrative Problems.....	D-7
24.1 - Overall Program Satisfaction.....	D-7
24.2 - Program Satisfaction by Field of Training.....	D-7
25 - Satisfaction With Program Components.....	D-8
26 - Applicability of Training to Conditions in Rwanda.....	D-8
27 - Applicability of Training by Field of Training.....	D-9
28 - Satisfaction With Balance of Theory and Practice.....	D-9
29 - Technical Level of Program.....	D-10
30 - Amount of New Knowledge and Skills.....	D-10
31 - Program Length.....	D-10
32 - Employers' Retention of Returned Participants.....	D-11
33 - Knew Job Upon Return.....	D-11
34 - Current Job Related to Training.....	D-11
35 - Finding a Training-Related Job.....	D-12
36 - Level of Job Responsibility Upon Return.....	D-12
37.1 - Participants in Supervisory Roles.....	D-12
37.2 - Change in Supervisory Responsibilities.....	D-13
38 - Participants' Promotion Patterns.....	D-13
39.1 - Training Utilization by Type of Training.....	D-14
39.2 - Training Utilization by Field of Training.....	D-14
40 - Involvement in Professional Activities.....	D-15
41 - Colleagues' Receptivity to New Ideas and Skills.....	D-15
42 - Share New Knowledge and Skills.....	D-15
43 - Methods for Sharing Knowledge and Skills.....	D-16
44 - Correspondence With Training Program Contacts.....	D-16
45 - Membership in US Professional Associations.....	D-16
46 - Receive Professional Journals.....	D-17
47 - Visited USAID Upon Return	D-17
48 - Interest in Alumni Association.....	D-18

I. BACKGROUND

A. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The Office of the AID Representative/Rwanda carried out an evaluation of its Participant Training Program during September 1987 in order to assess the program's overall effectiveness, and to establish baseline data on returned participants using the Participant Training Management System (PTMS). Since 1979, approximately 322 Rwandans have been sponsored by AID for technical and academic training, primarily in the United States, but in third countries as well. (One degree candidate and several centrally-funded participants are included from earlier years.) Given the Mission's expanding training portfolio for academic training, the experience of long-term participants is given special attention.

Major issues to be addressed in the evaluation include the overall quality of participants' training programs, the relevance and appropriateness of training, participants' job status and promotion patterns, current levels of training utilization, English language training, and other implementation concerns including the participant nomination and selection process. In addition, improved training opportunities for women as well as the private sector are examined. The following presents the findings from this review and includes an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the Mission's participant training activities with recommendations for improvements.

B. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation involved a review of the Mission's Training Office files, a survey of all known returned participants including written questionnaires and oral interviews with as many participants as practicable, and interviews with officials of the Government of Rwanda (GOR) and USAID personnel.

Immediately prior to the evaluation, the Agency's Participant Training Management System (PTMS) had been installed in the Mission's microcomputer system, and efforts were undertaken to establish a database on returned participants. Selected baseline data on most participants in Mission files had been entered by the time of the evaluation. This included information on returned participants' sponsoring employer and address at the time of training, location of training, selected biodata (sex, marital status, date of birth), major field of study, dates and length of training, and training objective (i.e., technical, certificate, or degree). This list was supplemented with names from S&T/IT's records from the PTIS which resulted in a total of 322 known participants sponsored under bilateral, regional, and centrally-funded programs.

An attempt was made to locate as many participants as possible to include in the survey as well as to update the Mission's records. A questionnaire was prepared and addressed to approximately 267 participants in Kigali and other towns. (See questionnaire in Appendix A.) Unfortunately, the full list of 322 returned participants was not completed in time for the distribution of the questionnaires. As shown in Table 1 below, 78% of the sample population was identified as currently working in Kigali, with 14% in other towns; seven participants were reported to be out of Rwanda on other job assignments or in training; two participants are deceased; and two are unemployed. The present location of only ten participants was not determined. These figures indicate a generally positive return rate of participants to jobs in Rwanda. In addition, job movement and changes in participants' employers were noted and are discussed below (see section on Post-Training Experience).

TABLE 1 - CURRENT LOCATION OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

CURRENT LOCATION	RETURNED PARTICIPANTS	
	#	%
KIGALI	208	77.9
OTHER TOWNS	38	14.2
OUT-OF-RWANDA	7	2.6
UNEMPLOYED	2	.8
DECEASED	2	.8
UNKNOWN	10	3.7
TOTAL	267	100%
Participants not yet identified at the time of this exercise	85	
===== Total Returned Participants =====	352	

Given the short time-frame of the evaluation, participants were asked to return the questionnaires within one week. A total of 67 questionnaires were received in time to be included in the analysis. In addition, 23 of these participants, most of whom were in long-term programs, were interviewed for a more in-depth understanding of their respective training experiences. (See Appendix B for List of Participants Interviewed.)

C. DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

Because a number of participants (19 of 322) attended more than one AID program, the total number of participant records included in the database is 352. This larger number is used here in describing the basic characteristics of the returned participant population and should not be confused with the number of individuals trained.

Tables 2 - 9 on the following pages present a statistical description of the returned participant population based on participants' sex, location of training (U.S. or third country), type of training (technical or academic), type of training project (general/scholarship training, project-related, or centrally-funded), distribution among sponsoring employers (government ministries and other agencies), and field of training. A statistical comparison with the survey sample included in the tables suggests that the latter is fairly representative of the total population, although male and academic participants are slightly over-represented.

As shown in Tables 2 and 3, AID-sponsored training in the past has largely been technical (94%) with a majority of male participants (79%). The male/female ratio of four to one is consistent with the current Agency-wide standard. However, the proportion of academic training in the past (6.5%) does not reflect current Mission trends which include more degree training. Table 3 shows that 33 participants are currently in degree programs which is more than the cumulative total since 1979. Most of the academic training has been at the graduate level with an average length of 22 months. The average length of most technical programs is about two months, although a number of technical participants have attended certificate programs averaging 13 months (see Tables 4 and 5).

Table 6 reflects a notable proportion of third country training (24%) sponsored by the Mission, which has mostly taken place in other African countries, especially Senegal, Tunisia, Kenya, Mauritius, Benin, Ivory Coast, Cameroon and Zaire. Other training countries have included Italy, India, Costa Rica, and Belgium.

About half of the Mission's training portfolio (48%) has been project-related, with one third sponsored under regional training projects (e.g., AFGRAD and African Manpower Development Project). A sizable percentage of returned participants (18%) has participated in centrally-funded programs (see Table 7).

Agriculture and health comprise the major areas of training for about 50% of the returned population as shown in Table 8, followed by training in the social sciences (15%), public administration/management (9%), and economics (7%). Other training has been in education, computer science, engineering and other physical sciences. The Ministry of Agriculture (MINAGRI), the Ministry of Public Health and Social Affairs (MINISAPASO), and the Office of Family Planning (ONAPO) have sponsored more than half of all participants (see Table 9). Very little private sector training has taken place (3% of the total population).

TABLE 2 - DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS BY GENDER

GENDER	TOTAL POPULATION		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
MALE	279	79.3	59	88.1
FEMALE	73	20.7	8	11.9
TOTAL	352	100%	67	100%

TABLE 3 - DISTRIBUTION BY TYPE OF TRAINING PROGRAM

PROGRAM	TOTAL RETURNED		SURVEY SAMPLE		IN-TRAINING	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
TECHNICAL	329	93.5	51	76.1	6	15.4
DEGREE	23	6.5	16	23.9	33	84.6
TOTAL	352	100%	67	100%	39	100%

**TABLE 4 - DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
BY TRAINING OBJECTIVE**

TRAINING OBJECTIVE	TOTAL POPULATION		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
TECHNICAL (<10 mos.)	317	90.1	44	65.7
TECHNICAL (≥10 mos.)	12	3.4	7	10.4
UNDERGRADUATE	1	.3	1	1.5
GRADUATE	16	4.5	11	16.4
DOCTORATE	6	1.7	4	6.0
TOTAL	352	100%	67	100%

TABLE 5 - AVERAGE LENGTH OF TRAINING

TRAINING OBJECTIVE	NUMBER OF MONTHS
TECHNICAL (<10 mos.)	2
TECHNICAL (≥10 mos.)	13
UNDERGRADUATE	20
GRADUATE	22
DOCTORATE	45

**TABLE 6 - DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
BY COUNTRY OF TRAINING**

TRAINING LOCATION	TOTAL POPULATION		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
USA	268	76.1	63	94.0
THIRD COUNTRY	84	23.9	4	6.0
TOTAL	352	100%	67	100%

**TABLE 7 - DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
BY TYPE OF TRAINING PROJECT**

TRAINING PROJECT	TOTAL POPULATION		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
GENERAL/SCHOLARSHIP	119	33.8	35	52.2
PROJECT-RELATED	170	48.3	27	40.3
CENTRALLY-FUNDED	63	17.9	5	7.5
TOTAL	352	100%	67	100%

**TABLE 8 - DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
BY FIELD OF STUDY**

MAJOR FIELD	TOTAL POPULATION		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
AGRICULTURE	79	22.4	20	29.8
HEALTH	96	27.3	15	22.4
SOCIAL SCIENCE	52	14.8	9	13.4
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION	31	8.8	6	8.9
ECONOMICS	25	7.1	2	3.0
EDUCATION	16	4.5	5	7.5
ENGINEERING	7	2.0	4	6.0
COMPUTER SCIENCE	8	2.3	4	6.0
PHYSICAL/EARTH SCIENCE	14	4.0	1	1.5
OTHER	24	6.8	1	1.5
TOTAL	352	100%	67	100%

**TABLE 9 - DISTRIBUTION OF RETURNED POPULATION
BY SPONSORING AGENCY**

SPONSORING AGENCY	TOTAL POPULATION		SURVEY SAMPLE	
	#	%	#	%
MINAGRI	64	18.2	10	14.9
MINISAPASO	83	23.6	3	4.5
MINIFOP	12	3.4	2	3.0
MINEPRISEC	11	3.1	7	10.4
MINIPIAN	8	2.3	5	7.5
MIJEUCOOP	7	2.0	2	3.0
UNR	29	8.2	4	6.0
* OTHER GOR Ministries & Offices	25	7.1	4	6.0
ONAPO	53	15.1	13	19.4
OPROVIA	19	5.4	8	11.9
** REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS	19	5.4	5	7.5
OTHER PARASTATALS	12	3.4	2	3.0
PRIVATE	10	2.8	2	3.0
TOTAL	352	100%	67	101%

* MINITRAPE, MINITRANSCO, MININTER, Presidency

MINIFINECO, MINIMART, MINAFFET

** KBO, CEPGL

II. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

A. PLANNING

Although there is no overall Mission training plan or strategy, annual workplans are now prepared for each project which include training projections. As mentioned above, half of the Mission's training portfolio consists of project-related training in agriculture and health, one third is regional development and scholarship training in priority development areas (AFGRAD, AMDP), and the remaining portion includes ad hoc centrally-funded training.

- Bilateral Project-Training. Training projections for the Mission's bilateral projects are identified in individual project agreements, either in terms of overall numbers or training months/years. A comparison of the number of technical and academic participants that were originally proposed for training in Mission project agreements with those actually trained reveals that long-term training targets in several Mission projects have not been met. As shown in Table 10 below, three projects (MCH/FP, Ag Survey I, Cropping Systems Improvement-Design Phase) represent cases where the number of degree candidates has fallen far short of original plans. This was explained in part by the the difficulties the Mission faces in receiving nominations from the GOR which is discussed further in the following section.

**TABLE 10 - TRAINING TARGETS vs. PARTICIPANTS TRAINED
FOR SELECTED MISSION PROJECTS**

USAID PROJECT			NUMBER PROPOSED		NUMBER TRAINED	
NAME	#	LOP	TECHNICAL	DEGREE	TECHNICAL	DEGREE
AGRICULTURE EDUCATION	0109	79-87	14		6	
FISH CULTURE	0112	81-87	12		11	
MCH/FP	0113	81-88	70	16	56	2(4)*
AGRICULTURE SURVEY I	0115	81-87	3	9	8	1(1)*
CROPPING SYSTEMS	0123	83-88	10 mos.	7 yrs.	11	-
PRIME	0127	85-88	6	4	1	-
KBO	0413.10	80-85	8	6	5	3

*Participants In-Training

The second phase of the Ag Survey Project was designed to include a U.S.-based training coordinator who will develop training plans with the GOR in order to prevent such training short-falls. The Health Officer also indicated that the follow-on MCH/FP project due to begin next year will include a much more elaborate training strategy in the project paper.

- Regional Development & Scholarship Training. The AFGRAD program has been operating in Rwanda since 1979 and has averaged five scholarships a year. Up until 1985, AFGRAD scholarships have been designed for Masters and PhD degree-training in specified development priority areas agreed upon by the GOR and USAID. A more recent program (AFDEP) was created to respond to undergraduate needs, especially for women. Currently, fifteen scholarships are awarded over a three-year period with specific quotas for female candidates (i.e., one in five). In the last two years, the Mission has become more active in using this resource to support program objectives by providing the implementing contractor, the African-American Institute (AAI), with lists of priority training areas. These reflect a shift in emphasis from the social sciences to the hard sciences.

Although the AMDP regional training project requires an annual training plan as a basis for the allocation of funds, training under AMDP has been purposely reactive and used to fulfill other training needs not covered in existing bilateral projects. The identification of training programs funded by AMDP largely results from selecting among the constant stream of program announcements received on a daily basis by the Training Office which are screened for their appropriateness to the Mission's overall development priorities. The allocation has always been less than proposed in the training plan, resulting in a necessary reordering of training targets. However, the project's quotas for female candidates (30%) and for candidates from the private sector (20%) are given active consideration.

- Centrally-funded programs. There is no standard planning mechanism for centrally-funded training opportunities which are made available to the Mission on an ad hoc basis. Sometimes invitations are made directly to GOR offices without consulting the Mission which may result in training that is not particularly appropriate or relevant to the Mission's training goals. Another problem arises when training sponsors (especially other U.S. Government agencies) publicize their training offerings to the various GOR ministries which are often misinterpreted as Mission-funded training opportunities.

B. PARTICIPANT NOMINATION PROCEDURES

The GOR identifies candidates for training opportunities made available by USAID in bilateral projects and regional and central training programs. The Mission may not itself nominate specific individuals for training. For bilateral projects, requests for nominations are made directly to the GOR implementing ministry as named in the project agreement, while other training opportunities (e.g., AMDP, AFGRAD) are channeled through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to the appropriate Ministries depending on the type of training involved. Nominations for academic training are processed by the Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieure (MINISUPRES) for the graduate level, or the Ministère de l'Enseignement Primaire et Secondaire (MINIPRISEC) for undergraduate training; and technical training opportunities are handled through the Ministère de la Fonction Public (MINIFOP).

Candidates for academic training are solicited by the GOR on an annual basis through general announcements over the radio. MINISUPRES receives about 500 applications a year for graduate training which are reviewed and screened for annual scholarship opportunities. These include AFGRAD awards as well as various ad hoc offers under the African Manpower Development Program (only three degree candidates have been sponsored so far by AMDP). For the AFGRAD program, a list of candidates and their dossiers are provided to the AFGRAD/AAI selection committee, and an AFGRAD review team visits Rwanda once a year to interview prospective candidates. Given that the AFGRAD program operates on a tuition-waiver basis with cooperating U.S. universities, these awards are highly competitive.

MINIFOP solicits nominations for technical training from the appropriate GOR ministries and agencies on a case-by-case basis under the African Manpower Development Project (AMDP) and for centrally-funded programs. Candidates for both technical and academic training are then presented to the Mission for final approval, which bases its assessment on the candidate's basic qualifications and English language ability. Official travel authorization must be secured through the Office of the Presidency for every candidate.

Despite these standard nomination and selection procedures, the Mission has experienced some problems in securing timely nominations. As discussed earlier, training targets in several Mission projects have not been met. There have also been instances where nominations were changed or withdrawn at the last moment, resulting in a loss of training opportunities. Discussion with Mission personnel indicated that a basic lack of available candidates, especially for project-related training, and political and personal considerations may be factors impeding the nomination process.

Given that only 21% of the population attend secondary school in Rwanda, and less than 1% go for university training, there is a small pool of available candidates for degree training to begin with. Short-falls in project-related training were also attributed to a lack of GOR project-related staff to spare for training during the active project phase. An attempt was made to prevent this from occurring in the second phase of the Ag Surveys Project by negotiating for a larger project staff. In an effort to secure nominations, this project also includes a provision in which the release of certain project operating expenses (staff, transport, supplies) is contingent upon the provision of candidates' names for the life of project. It is too early to determine how effective these provisions will be in securing candidates.

Related to the small pool of available candidates is the incidence in which the same individuals continue to be nominated for training. This was noted to be a problem in health and family planning projects. Although only 6% of the returned population was identified as attending more than one AID program, this potential trend should be checked as it suggests that training design may not be meeting priority needs.

Numerous examples were given of cases where nominations had been withdrawn or official travel authorization refused on the eve of participants' departure. The Mission Health Officer provided an example where two candidates, who had been accepted by the School of Public Health in Zaire, were replaced by two other candidates at the last moment. However, it was too late to propose the new candidates and the training opportunities were lost. One candidate from the private sector was withdrawn by his employer the day before departure in light of other commitments. The candidate, whose official travel documents had been processed through MINIFOP, explained that his supervisor was merely trying to prevent him from going due to a personal conflict. The candidate proceeded to the airport with his personal passport which was confiscated by immigration officials. He resigned from his company as a result.

Another case involved an AFGRAD candidate who was refused official travel permission after his nomination and university application had been processed because of the political actions of his brother. The USIS Public Affairs Officer provided the example of a Professor at the National University who had been nominated to attend a symposium sponsored by USIA in Dakar. Despite his unique qualifications to participate in the conference, his nomination was withdrawn at the last moment with no explanation. Another example was provided of a PhD candidate accepted under the Fulbright program who departed for Belgium on another grant four days before he was due to leave. The USIS representative explained that fellowship opportunities with the Fulbright and Humphrey Programs have shrunk in recent years--not because of budget cuts, but due to the difficulties in securing nominations.

A more serious case where travel documents were refused to departing participants involved a group of twelve participants who were being sponsored under an AID contract for long-term training in accounting in Nairobi. Although the nomination of all twelve had been approved prior to their attending a three-month intensive English language program, three were not permitted to depart.

The USAID Training Office has a list of cases where candidates were withdrawn at the last moment with no explanation. It was suggested that this pattern of sabotaged nominations may be due to sensitive regional and ethnic distribution considerations as well as personal reasons. The unpredictable nomination process is clearly an important matter to be resolved, given the time and expense invested in preparing for a participant's program once a nomination is approved. This is especially true for participants who are funded for in-country language training.

C. PRE-DEPARTURE PREPARATION

- English Language Training. With the exception of AFGRAD students, most long-term and degree candidates are sponsored by the Mission for intensive English language training at the English Teaching Center (ETC) of the U.S. Information Service. USAID partly subsidizes the Center's regular activities through these intensive programs which are tailored to the needs of different projects (e.g., FSIP project and Technoserve). The Mission requires a minimum TOEFL English language score of 550 before allowing participants to leave for training. Participants who do not reach a TOEFL score of 550, but have more than 500 are allowed to leave only with a positive recommendation from the ETC staff. In addition to these intensive programs, USAID funds an ongoing program for senior GOR officials. USIS also operates a regular evening program three times a year, to which nearly 300 Rwandans subscribe each term.

- Travel Arrangements. Upon approval of a candidate's nomination and travel authorization by the Office of the Presidency, the USAID Training Office makes the necessary placement, visa and travel arrangements. Given that these steps are the most time-consuming in processing participants for training, the incidence of cancelled nominations is a serious drain on the Training Office operations. In addition, the Training Office has experienced problems with some centrally-funded programs when individuals are contacted directly by the training sponsor (e.g., JHPIEGO, INTRAH, USTTI) without the Mission's knowledge. Although the Mission is generally informed at some point of a participant's nomination for a centrally-funded program, the Training Office is often asked to make travel arrangements and process an advance at the last moment.

- Pre-Departure Orientation. There is no standard pre-departure orientation given to participants by the USAID office. However, the Training Officer does provide most participants with a briefing covering administrative details regarding travel, contacts in the country of training, allowance, medical insurance, and other logistical information. Several S&T/IT brochures ("AID's Participant Training Program" and "Handbook for Travelers to the USA") are given to departing participants. In addition, the Training Officer spends more time with long-term participants and tries to schedule the showing of a video at the USIS library (e.g., "Welcome to the USA, developed by the Washington International Center, and "Agriculture in the USA"). The intensive English language program organized for most long-term AID participants provides a wealth of cultural material in its instruction, with practical information on the U.S. educational system, social-cultural life, and living conditions.

The Training Officer would like to have better materials to distribute to participants and welcomed suggestions for improving the USAID pre-departure briefing. Interest was also expressed by the Training Officer and ETC staff in developing a standard program for long-term participants and one specifically for short-term participants. Materials in ETC's library could be utilized and adapted for such orientation packages. A suggested outline for a pre-departure orientation is attached in Appendix F.

D. MONITORING AND FOLLOW-UP

The Training Office does not have any standard procedures for monitoring the status of participants in training or after they have returned. However, the Mission receives regular progress reports on most long-term participants and is also in frequent contact with returned participants on an informal basis. This was supported by the survey findings in which the majority of participants surveyed contacted the USAID office upon their return from training (see Table 47 in Appendix D). Of potential concern, however, is the lack of any policy or procedures regarding centrally-funded participants. The Training Office is often not involved in the selection or processing of centrally-funded participants and does not maintain records for them. As a result, the Mission has little control over a candidate's suitability in terms of technical background, relevance to the Mission's development strategy, or the number of times a candidate has already benefitted from other AID-sponsored training.

- Participant Training Management System (PTMS). The Mission has recently installed the PTMS which is meant to serve as a management tool for monitoring participant training activities at the planning, processing, in-training and follow-up stages in a participant's program. Several Mission staff demonstrated interest and ability in using the microcomputer system. Although only the PTMS follow-up file was used during the evaluation, the Training Office expressed interest in using the PTMS to facilitate

the processing and monitoring of participants. An improved version is currently being finalized by S&T/IT, and plans are underway to install it in early 1988. This evaluation represents a comprehensive follow-up of the Mission's returned participants and should provide solid baseline data for periodic assessments of program effectiveness in the future. A suggested follow-up plan, to be adapted to the PTMS, is presented in Appendix G.

- Alumni Association. The Mission has been exploring interest in the establishment of a returned participant alumni association and recently organized an informal reception for long-term participants. Participants' interest in having such an association was also explored in the survey which revealed overwhelming interest. Nearly all the participants surveyed would also be willing to pay an annual fee (see Table 48 in Appendix D). Activities suggested included sponsoring conferences and seminars focused on technical areas of interest; developing an information resource center with subscriptions to professional journals; English language practice; orienting other participants; and other professional development activities.

However, one participant cautioned, that "If there were indeed such strong interest by returned participants in establishing an alumni association, one would have been operating long before." On the other hand, someone has to take the initiative. There may also be some sensitivity within the GOR regarding this kind of an association. It was learned that recent attempts to establish a similar association of Rwandans trained by another donor (i.e., Soviet Union) were discouraged.

E. MISSION AND HOST GOVERNMENT CONDITIONS OF TRAINING

- Mission Conditions. The fundamental intention of AID'S Participant Training Program is the return of participants to appropriate jobs which utilize the knowledge and skills learned in training. There is no formal protocol between USAID and the Government of Rwanda regarding a participant's reintegration into an appropriate job upon return. However, this intention is generally articulated in the standard provisions governing project grant agreements between USAID and the GOR, with more specific language contained in individual project agreements. In some cases, participants are asked to sign an agreement to return to work in a training-related capacity (e.g., FSIP).

The Ag Survey Project, for example, requires the grantee (GOR) to "establish arrangements to ensure that all personnel completing long-term training under the Project will return to Rwanda to serve as employees of the respective Participating Agencies and that such personnel are promptly assigned to positions commensurate with the training and experience they have received under the Project." The Grant Agreement for the African Manpower Development Project also stipulates that the GOR will

"take measures to ensure their (participants) continued employment in relevant positions after successful completion of training."

However, there is evidence that participants returning from training are not always assigned training-related jobs despite these covenants. Under the AMDP project for example, three participants were recently sponsored for graduate training in agronomic research. In addition to the stipulation in the Grant Agreement, conditions were specified in a letter to MINISUPRES that returnees be employed in positions involving agronomic research either at the University or the Institute of Agronomic Research within the Ministry of Agriculture for a period of time twice the length of training. The first of these participants to return has been waiting for four months for a job assignment.

● GOR Conditions. Different conditions of training for public service employees apply to technical and academic training. Employees who leave for academic training ("bourse d'etudes") are separated from public service and lose their jobs. They are asked to sign an agreement obliging them to return to government service for five years, if needed. The GOR, however, is not obliged to retain them. Although they are given priority consideration for employment upon their return, there is no guarantee of a job or training-related position. When participants return with a higher degree and are reabsorbed into government service, they are normally given a promotion in grade in recognition of their training. Employees who leave for technical training ("bourse de perfectionnement") do not lose their government position, despite the length of their training as long as no degree is earned. Furthermore, technical participants continue to receive their salaries for up to nine months and also receive a 2% increase in their salaries upon their return from training.

The fact that academic participants are not guaranteed a training-related position upon their return presents a potential conflict with the intent of the Participant Training Program. Also, situations where degree participants are not employed upon return in training-related positions reflect poor planning and suggest that the training was not necessary to begin with.

There is also some evidence that the GOR policy regarding the equivalence of U.S. degrees with European degrees may hinder some participants' professional development. For example, one participant who had earned a Licence in Soil Chemistry from the National University returned from U.S. training with an MS in Soil Science. Because the GOR equates the licence to the U.S. masters, he did not qualify for a grade promotion. It was mentioned that the licence may be restructured in the future from five to four years which might help to resolve possible equivalency issues. However, given the Mission's recent increase in degree training, the reintegration of degree participants and their professional recognition should be monitored on a case-by-case basis.

III. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS: MAJOR FINDINGS

The following discussion presents a summary of the survey findings, based on the written questionnaires and oral interviews, that reflect on the overall effectiveness of the Mission's training activities to date. The variables used for examining training effectiveness include implementation factors (e.g., preparation for training, language problems, orientation and social-cultural adjustment, administrative support); training quality indicators (e.g., relevance and appropriateness); and the post-training experience (e.g., job status and promotion patterns, current levels of training utilization, transmission of training, professional development activities).

Although the survey sample of 67 participants is too small to demonstrate statistical significance in some cases, inferences are made where possible trends or patterns were also suggested in the oral interviews. Selected findings were analysed for differences between technical and academic participants, and also for field of training. The statistical tables corresponding to the following discussion are presented together in Appendix D.

A. IMPLEMENTATION

Pre-Departure Preparation

More than half the survey sample (55%) was involved to some extent in program planning, either in the choice of institution or the setting of training objectives; and almost one third of surveyed participants (28%) were active in presenting themselves as candidates for training (see Tables 11 and 12). This was particularly the case for academic participants. It has been suggested in training evaluation literature that personal involvement in program planning and candidate selection has a positive relationship with program satisfaction, as well as with training utilization. Indeed, the data suggest that participants with high levels of involvement in planning their programs are also more satisfied with their training and are higher utilizers than those with less involvement (Table 11.2).

Although a majority of the survey group (64%) received a pre-departure briefing by the USAID office, less than half (42%) felt well-prepared for their training experience (see Tables 13-15). Overall, participants were given an average of six weeks notice regarding their departure dates. Academic participants received slightly more advance notice than technical participants (i.e., eight weeks compared to five weeks), and also reported being better prepared. A number of participants, however, complained of late nominations or delayed departures causing late program starts. One participant commented that "...someone informed me that I had five days to prepare to leave. I had to get a passport and visa, a vaccination certificate, take a medical exam, etc. I received my airline ticket at 5:00 pm and I

was at the airport at 6:00 pm! I thought my participation would have to be cancelled or postponed."

Of those who received a briefing at USAID, 60% thought it very useful...no one thought it not useful. In varying degree, the USAID briefing included information on overall policies and regulations governing the AID program, socio-cultural information on living conditions in the United States, and program details. However, many participants expressed the need for more practical information, especially in the areas of travel (e.g., connecting flights, airport facilities); budgeting (cost-of-living, regional differences); housing arrangements (furnished vs. unfurnished, rental agreements, other options); transportation and communications (i.e., using public phones, taxis, buses); and clothing requirements (costs, sizing, climate). Many participants also would have liked more information on their specific programs, especially in terms of the expected workload. Several participants suggested that a booklet containing general practical information, as well as program brochures would be helpful.

English Language Problems

Almost half (42%) of the sample reported having some to much difficulty speaking English during their training in the United States, and more than one third (36%) had similar levels of difficulty understanding spoken English. The American accent and rapid speech were cited as problems by many participants. Reading and writing posed less of a problem, with about 11% of the sample reporting any difficulty in these areas (see Table 16). It appears that academic participants had more problems in understanding and speaking than technical participants. This may be due to greater demands placed on language ability in academic programs, as well as the fact that 35% of all technical participants attended French-speaking programs.

As shown in Table 17, about half of the survey sample (33 participants) received some form of English Language Training. While most academic participants received some English language training, only 30% of technical participants did. Half of these studied in Rwanda and half in the United States (six participants studied English both in Rwanda and the United States). While the majority of those who studied in Rwanda did so for an average of ten months on a part-time basis, most participants who received language training in the United States attended intensive programs of about three months.

Table 18 indicates that those participants who studied only in Rwanda had more problems speaking English than those who studied in the United States (see Table 18). One participant commented on the difficulties of trying to study English on a part-time basis in preparation for the training program. His work responsibilities and the reluctance of his supervisor to

release him during office hours prevented him from taking full advantage of his language program which was supposed to meet twice a week for two hours a day at the English Teaching Center.

There is also evidence that the group of participants who received some English language training (33 participants) had higher levels of language difficulty than those who had no training (34). This suggests that the Mission has been doing a good job in screening candidates for English language training, but that more training may be required, especially for academic participants. It was generally suggested in the oral interviews that an intensive language session in Rwanda followed by an intensive program in the United States would be the optimal combination for long-term participants.

Many technical participants also commented in the survey on the need for a better understanding of English. Although those technical participants who attended French-speaking programs in the United States generally did not report any major language problems, many felt that their lack of English prevented them from more fully benefitting from their training experience. Several mentioned the poor French-speaking ability of some U.S. instructors and the basic inadequacy of simultaneous translation.

Orientation and Social-Cultural Adjustment

A majority of participants (72%) received an orientation upon their arrival in the United States (see Table 19). More than half attended the program at the Washington International Center (WIC), and about one third attended programs at their training institution. The rest reported other orientation briefings by such groups as the African-American Institute and the Language Institute at Georgetown University (ALIGU). A majority of participants felt these orientations were very useful, although the WIC program was rated slightly less favorably than other orientations (see Table 20). Some participants explained in the oral interviews that this was due to their late arrival in Washington preventing them from benefitting from the entire program.

The most commonly-cited adjustment difficulty was the U.S. lifestyle with 40% of the sample reporting some problems (see Tables 21 and 22). Academic participants reported notably more problems in adjusting to the U.S. social-cultural life than technical participants (i.e., 68% vs. 29%). Many participants mentioned the lack of social contact with Americans, either due to language barriers or the individualistic nature of Americans. Some felt isolated and cut off from the "real world" at their training centers, while others mentioned the loneliness of big cities. Several participants mentioned having difficult interactions with Black Americans, as well as encountering some racial discrimination.

Homesickness and loneliness were commented on by about a third of the participants surveyed (27%). Difficulty with the climate and American food and eating habits was mentioned by a number of participants (22%). Kansas was too hot and Buffalo too cold. While different methods of preparing and eating food was a typical problem for many participants, the limited choice of eating arrangements in various technical programs (i.e., cafeteria-style) seemed unreasonable to some. The U.S. educational system, especially instructional methods, presented problems for many participants (21%). Some academic participants complained of poor interactions with their instructors.

Administrative Support

No one had any major problems with immigration procedures, using medical insurance, or with travel arrangements (see Table 23). However, many participants commented that the allowance was insufficient to cover the high costs of living in some cities. Some gave examples where the price of a hotel exceeded their per diem. Several participants were not reimbursed for some medical costs and were not properly briefed on what kinds of medical illness would be covered by the insurance policy.

Participants appeared to have more problems with accommodations than other areas. Generally, U.S. hotels seemed very expensive and apartments were hard to find. Also, academic participants generally were not happy with dorm life because of various restrictions and limited eating arrangements. One Phd candidate commented that "at a certain age, lodging in a dormitory is not conceivable...it is also against Rwandan culture." Several participants mentioned having their hotel rooms broken into and personal articles stolen. Despite these few problems, the majority of participants (70%) were very satisfied with assistance from the AID program monitor in the United States (see Table 25).

B. TRAINING QUALITY

Training Content and Relevance

A majority of participants (79%) reported high levels of satisfaction with their overall training experience (see Table 24). However, participants in agriculture programs expressed more moderate levels of overall satisfaction than other fields. There was no difference between technical and academic participants in this regard. As indicated in Table 25, participants were generally very satisfied with the content of their programs (96%), with the competence of their instructors (87%), and with technical and academic guidance (73%). Although a majority of participants were also very satisfied with the relevance of their training (79%), less satisfaction was reported with regard to the applicability of participants' training to

conditions in Rwanda (61% very satisfied), and with the amount of practical applications in their programs (64%). Tables 26 and 27 indicate that academic participants are slightly less satisfied with the applicability of their training than technical participants; and that participants in agriculture and the physical sciences are less satisfied than participants in other fields of training. All management participants were very satisfied with the applicability of their training.

The problem of technological differences between the U.S. and developing countries, rather than the poor quality of individual programs, best explains participants lower satisfaction levels with training applicability. Most often, the technologies being transferred to students in the American classroom are "state of the art," "high tech" and computerized, which may be ill-fitting to the needs of developing countries. Participants' comments in the survey reflected this problem that some ideas and techniques learned in their programs are not directly transferable to the Rwandan context (e.g., data collection and analysis techniques using telephone polls and computers; fertilizer production methods based on large-scale factories). However, despite the differences in methods and equipment, participants generally acknowledged in the oral interviews that exposure to different and more advanced technologies is a valuable experience for comparative purposes.

Training Appropriateness

Most participants thought the technical level of their programs was appropriate (85%); and a majority (70%) claimed to gain a large amount of new knowledge and skills from their programs (see Tables 29-30). Several participants, however, criticized the inflexibility of certain technical programs, in which major components were not appropriate to their particular needs. For example, a participant in the Francophone Seminar on Development Management felt that although the overall program was very useful, participants should have the opportunity to specialize in one of the modules that would be of most value, rather than giving each module the same emphasis (e.g., financial management, personnel management, information management). Another participant in a grain storage and marketing seminar found the storage component repetitive and unnecessary given his other training and experience. One participant felt that the technical level of his seminar was diluted because of the different technical backgrounds of other participants.

More than half of the survey sample felt their training programs were too short, of which the majority were in technical programs (see Table 31). Many participants commented that the fast-paced schedules and heavy workloads prevented them from absorbing all of the material or practicing the skills presented in their programs.

Other Benefits and Suggested Improvements

The cross-cultural experience was the most-frequently mentioned benefit of participants' training experience beyond the technical aspects. This included exposure to the United States and American culture, as well as to people from other countries. In particular, many participants appreciated sharing experiences with professional peers from other African countries. Many also commented on their broadened horizons and more global outlook as a result of their experience.

The most frequently-mentioned recommendation, however, involved the provision of more practical training in participants' programs (e.g., field trips, factory visits, lab work, on-the-job training, etc.). Many also commented that their programs should be longer to allow for more practical training. Other suggestions included more English language training, better orientations, more flexibility in programs and better tailored to needs of developing countries, refresher courses in Rwanda to keep current with developments in participants' area of expertise, and continuing education opportunities.

C. POST-TRAINING EXPERIENCE

Job Status and Promotion Patterns

Attempts to locate the bulk of the returned participant population revealed that the majority returned to and are still employed by their respective sponsoring employers. Table 32 shows that only 5.3% changed GOR ministries, 3.4% left for jobs in the private sector, and 2.6% are out of the country. The location of another 4.5% is unknown. This represents an overall positive retention rate of AID-trained employees by the GOR.

A more disturbing finding, however, is that almost half of the survey sample did not know what specific job they would be returning to (45%). Although this is especially true for degree participants, Table 33 shows that over one third of technical participants also did not know what job was awaiting them upon return. This suggests that training is not systematically planned within the larger organizational context. However, most participants (82%) claim to be in a training-related job (see Table 34). Some of those who are not in a training-related job (15%) explained that they have been promoted to more administrative positions which do not require the technical skills learned in their program. Also, a number of participants (9%) reported having difficulty in finding a training-related job (see Table 35).

Tables 36 - 38 suggest that AID-training has contributed to participants' overall professional development, with promotions in many cases. A majority of participants (63%) report having more job responsibility since their training. Also, most participants (78%) are currently in positions involving supervisory responsibilities. Of these, 28% had no prior responsibilities, and 44% report an increase in the numbers of individuals they currently supervise.

A majority of the survey group (66%) has received a promotion since their return from training, and most attribute it to their AID training. Some felt they would have received a promotion anyway. Although many of these promotions involved a 2% standard increase in salary for technical participants upon their return, 19 participants (or 28%) also received grade promotions. Half of these participants attributed their move to their training program.

Training Utilization

Only 60% of the sample report high levels of utilizing their training in their current jobs. Low levels of training utilization were reported by 15% of the sample. This may be related to the 15% who are not in training-related jobs as discussed above. Table 39 shows that lower utilization levels are reported by academic participants, as well as those in agriculture and science programs. As discussed above, these groups of participants also were less satisfied with the applicability of their training to conditions in Rwanda. This was cited by many participants as a basic constraint to more fully utilizing the ideas and techniques they learned in their training programs.

Other constraints mentioned are the lack of financial resources, lack of basic equipment, lack of trained staff, and resistance by superiors. As shown in Table 40, many participants (42%) reported some resistance by their colleagues and/or supervisors to the new ideas or techniques they brought back from training. This was explained by some as a basic resistance to change, a lack of training, a lack of interest due to other priorities, or political sensitivities. One example of such resistance involved a participant who proposed to undertake a research project on AIDS transmission and prevention in conjunction with another project with private funding. Because of the sensitive nature of the project and the reluctance of his superiors to endorse it, he was unable to get approval in time to participate in the project.

Despite moderate utilization levels, a majority of the survey group (61%) reported making some improvements in their programs or services, participating more in planning activities (57%), and more involvement in developing new programs (46%), planning training activities (45%), and participating in research activities (36%).

Many participants provided examples of new ideas and/or changes they have been able to introduce in their jobs as a result of their training program. Several reported computerizing their respective departments' accounting, inventory, and payroll systems. One participant was responsible for developing the computer program for the national census. Several other participants have made changes in their departments to improve efficiency and productivity through staff reorganization, revision of job descriptions, and regular staff meetings.

Others mentioned improving their management and planning activities through the use of flow charts, financial analysis, and management-by-objective techniques. One participant developed a program to make mud schools more durable based on her observation tour in Senegal. Another participant set up a lab to analyze mycotoxins in relation to grain storage. Several participants who studied statistics and demography have participated in the design and conduct of various surveys. The most valuable skills and ideas that participants reported gaining from their training include management and organizational techniques, planning skills, and research and evaluation methods. These categories were mentioned more frequently than specific technical skills.

Training Transmission & Professional Development

Participants reported more moderate levels of sharing training with their colleagues with only 43% reporting high levels. Of those who are sharing their training, the majority (66%) do so most often on an informal basis. Written reports and on-the-job training are other means often used for transmitting training to others (see Table 43).

A majority of participants (77%) reported having some correspondence with their training institution or contact made during their program. Only one-third, however, has joined an American professional association after training, despite the fact that this is often provided out of training funds. However, most who have joined (86%) are still current members. More than half (57%) of the survey sample report receiving professional journals or newsletters. Some participants mentioned that they would take advantage of professional memberships if they had a better understanding of English.

IV. OTHER ISSUES

A. PRIVATE SECTOR TRAINING

As noted earlier, only three percent of the total participant population has been trained from the private sector. The Mission is interested in supporting more private sector training, especially in light of specific quotas in several regional training projects. The Human Resources Development Assistance (HRDA) project, for example, will require an increase in the number of training awards to the private sector from 20% to 50%.

The prospect of providing more training opportunities for the private sector was discussed with several GOR officials from MINIFOP and MINESUPRES, as well as with the Chamber of Commerce which represents the interests of all private enterprises in Rwanda. The Training Coordinator of an AID contract with Technoserve, which provides support and some training for the private sector was also consulted for her views and experience.

Given that participant training activities are carried out through agreements between the GOR and USAID, the identification of training needs and selection of candidates should be done in cooperation with the GOR. There apparently has been some friction in the past where an individual from the private sector had been processed for training without consulting the GOR. Based on the experience of Technoserve, participants nominated from the private sector are reviewed by a selection committee composed of GOR and private sector representatives. Despite the fact that several candidates were refused travel documents at the last moment by the GOR, this arrangement appears to be a workable option. GOR officials suggested that a similar firm like Technoserve be identified to support further private sector training in cooperation with the GOR. A training needs assessment of private sector firms is currently being planned for early 1988 by MINIFOP in conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce.

The Chamber of Commerce coordinates some training for its members, including programs in basic accounting, procurement, and fiscal law which are directed mostly to the smaller enterprises. The Chamber's Training Coordinator indicated that the larger businesses need training in the areas of international trade, contract negotiation, and finance. He further proposed that technical programs and observation tours would be more appropriate since private sector firms might not be able to spare their personnel for long periods of time. Although some feel that the Chamber is a government-controlled institution and Chamber staff might be favored for AID training opportunities, it would appear to be a logical channel for private sector training.

B. Training Opportunities for Women

Female participants constitute 21% of the total number of AID-sponsored participants since about 1979. This percentage is consistent with the Agency's overall participant training activities, but is lower than the desired target of 35-40% set by the Africa Bureau. The HRDA project will require a 35% quota for women, and the AFGRAD program has a quota of 30%.

It is generally acknowledged that deep-rooted cultural and historical factors tend to favor men over women for the available educational opportunities in Rwanda, especially for overseas training. These include the persisting traditional roles of women in Rwandan society, and the small pool of eligible female trainees. The latter can be traced to the small number of girls who attend secondary school, as well as the prejudice against women from entering development-related fields.

A recent study on the status of women in Rwanda reported that although girls constitute about half of the primary school population, "this changes drastically at the secondary school level where there are currently 25 secondary schools for women and 47 for men. Only one-third of the students enrolled in secondary school are girls....At the university-level, the percent of women students has risen slightly, from about 10% through the 1970s to 15% in 1985." In addition, less than 25% of applications received by the GOR for academic training are from females.

Several Rwandan officials also explained that the pool of available candidates is further reduced by the fact that women with family responsibilities and those of marriageable age may be reluctant to leave Rwanda for a long period of time on an academic program. A female returned participant, however, suggested that women are not selected for training because of these presumptions.

The AFGRAD's newly introduced undergraduate program favoring women will contribute to improving training opportunities for women in Rwanda, but clearly a more concerted effort to recruit female candidates will be necessary.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

1. Planning Training

Although there is no overall Mission country training strategy, annual workplans for training activities are prepared for the Mission's bilateral projects, which constitute half of its overall training portfolio. The other half consists of general development and scholarship training (e.g., AMDP and AFGRAD), as well as training under centrally-funded programs. While priority training areas for AFGRAD are identified jointly by USAID and the GOR, AMDP is purposely unplanned and used to fulfill other training needs not covered by existing projects. There is no standard mechanism for planning training under centrally-funded programs which are available to the Mission on an ad hoc basis.

Several patterns were identified in the evaluation with implications for the Mission's planning activities. These include evidence that academic training targets in several bilateral projects have not been met, due to difficulties in securing nominations from the GOR; the pattern of nominating the same individuals for training; possible duplication of training efforts by ad hoc centrally-funded programs; and evidence that some long-term participants are not being immediately employed in training-related positions. Although the Mission has recently placed more emphasis on the development of training plans, these findings underscore the need for better planning of training activities, both within individual projects and in the overall Mission.

- Recommendation: that the Mission prepare an overall country training plan to include a breakdown of costs and numbers to be trained through bilateral projects, as well as regional and centrally-funded opportunities. Details on level of training (academic and technical), field of training, and location of training (U.S., third country, or in-country) should be included.
- Recommendation: that project papers and project agreements contain more specific details on training projections. GOR responsibilities in providing candidates should also be clearly delineated.

2. Participant Nomination Process

There has been considerable difficulty in securing nominations for training in a timely manner by the GOR. The Mission has experienced problems with late nominations, as well as with nominations being changed or withdrawn on the eve of participants' departure, resulting in a loss of training opportunities. The findings suggest that this problem is related to the small pool of available candidates, which might also explain the incidence in which the same individuals are nominated for training. Political and personal considerations were also identified as factors impeding the nomination process.

The Mission has made some effort to address the problem of securing nominations in the project design of its newest project (i.e., Ag Survey), which ties certain local project expenses to the provision of candidates. It also provides for a training coordinator who will be responsible for developing annual training plans with the GOR.

- Recommendation: that the Mission formally address the problem of late and withdrawn nominations with the appropriate GOR offices and establish procedures for securing nominations in a timely manner. The development of a country training plan would be a useful first step, and the mechanism used in the Ag Survey Project might provide a useful model in future projects and grant agreements.
- Recommendation: that the number of times a candidate has already benefitted from AID-sponsored training be considered in determining the selection of candidates for available training opportunities.

3. Pre-Departure Preparation

One-third of the survey sample did not receive a briefing by USAID before leaving for training, and less than half felt well prepared for their programs. The need for a better pre-departure orientation was expressed by both technical and academic participants in the survey. In particular, more detailed information is needed on living conditions in the United States, especially regarding travel logistics, housing, budgeting, use of medical insurance and coverage policies, security measures in hotels and large cities, and racial issues. Participants also expressed the need for more information on their specific training programs, as well as on American cultural patterns.

- Recommendation: that a standard pre-departure orientation be provided to all participants before their departure. A booklet should be developed and distributed to participants, covering basic AID regulations and policies, social and cultural life in the United States, and practical information

on U.S. living conditions. Program descriptions and university catalogues should also be made available if possible. Similar information should be provided to third country participants as well. Materials from USIS and the English Teaching Center could be utilized and adapted to the AID program. A suggested outline for a pre-departure program is attached in Appendix F.

4. English Language Training

Half of the survey sample received some English language training in Rwanda and/or the United States. However, the group of participants with some language training also reported having more language problems than those with no training, especially in speaking and understanding American English. This suggests that the Mission has been doing a good job in screening candidates for language training, but that more may be required, especially for academic participants. There was some indication that intensive in-country training at the English Teaching Center coupled with an intensive program in the United States would be the most effective approach. Technical participants also expressed the need for a better understanding of English, including those who participated in French programs in the United States.

- Recommendation: that academic participants be given at least three months of intensive language training in Rwanda before their training programs, and three additional months in an intensive program in the United States if necessary. Consideration might also be given to providing technical participants with a refresher course or an introduction to basic English language skills, with an emphasis on American English.

5. Orientation and Social-Cultural Adjustment

A majority of participants received an orientation upon arrival in the United States, either at the Washington International Center or participants' training site. All felt these were useful. However, a number of participants arrived too late to benefit from an orientation program. Most participants did not experience major adjustment difficulties, although many typically had some problems adapting to the U.S. lifestyle, including social interactions and eating habits. Many long-term participants also reported feeling homesick and lonely.

- Recommendation: that enough time is allowed in planning for participants' departure for their participation in an arrival orientation program, either at the Washington International Center or at their training site.

6. Monitoring and Follow-Up

The Mission does not have a standard procedure for monitoring and tracking the status of its participants. However, the Training Office has recently installed the PTMS and has demonstrated interest and ability in using the system to help manage the Mission's participant training program. A new version is being finalized by S&T/IT in Washington, and plans are underway to introduce this latest version to the Mission in early 1988. If properly used, the PTMS can facilitate the processing of participants and alert the Training Office to delays and other problems. A database on all returned participants was established during this evaluation using the PTMS Follow-Up File, which can be easily transferred to the revised version. This database is essentially a record-keeping tool which offers a wealth of information on the basic characteristics of the Mission's training program. It also provides baseline data for for future assessment of training effectiveness and participants' performance upon return.

- Recommendation: that the Training Office begin using the PTMS for monitoring its participants at each stage of a participant's program, i.e., planning, processing, in-training, and follow-up. The Training Office may want to wait for the visit by S&T/IT's Field Support Officer for installation and training on the new PTMS version.

- Recommendation: that the Training Office begin to regularly follow-up its returning participants to evaluate training effectiveness and participants' performance. Two follow-up questionnaires are proposed. The first should be administered in a de-briefing interview with participants upon their return to Rwanda, and another one year after a participant's return to track participants' job status, location, and the utilization of training. Guidelines for these questionnaires are attached in Appendix G.

B. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

1. Training Quality

The survey findings indicate that participants are very satisfied with the overall quality of their training and with the administrative support provided by the AID program monitor during their training program. In particular, training content and relevance, technical and academic guidance, and the competence of instructors were highly rated. Besides the technical aspects of participants programs, the cross-cultural experience was considered very valuable, especially exposure to the United States and American culture, as well as opportunities for sharing ideas and experiences with people from other countries.

Participants were less satisfied, however, with the applicability of their training to conditions in Rwanda. This was especially the case for academic participants, as well as those trained in agriculture and the physical sciences. The problem of technological differences between the United States and Rwanda may explain these lower satisfaction levels with training applicability. Participants also expressed the need for more practical training in their programs, and suggested incorporating more on-the-job training, field trips, and lab work in their programs. Many technical participants felt their programs were too short, with limited time to practice the skills learned. Some cases of inappropriate placements were noted where participants' backgrounds and training needs were not adequately matched to their programs.

- Recommendation: that the Mission consider providing participants with a re-entry program to address the issue of technological differences between the U.S. and Rwanda. Such a program (one to two weeks) might help participants to adapt their knowledge and skills from training to conditions back home. A sample proposal for such a program developed under a separate contract is attached in Appendix H.
- Recommendation: that more practical training be provided in participants' programs where appropriate. While technical participants may need more additional time to schedule a practical training component, academic participants may need specially tailored programs to complement their formal programs.
- Recommendation: that more detailed information be provided in the PIO/P on participants' backgrounds and specific training needs.

2. Job Status and Promotion Patterns

The survey findings indicate an overall positive return rate of participants to Rwanda to their respective sponsoring employers. Most participants surveyed are in training-related jobs and report an increase in their job responsibilities. Many have also received a training-related promotion. These promotion patterns reflect positively on the contribution of AID training to participants' overall professional development. Also, most participants surveyed are in positions involving supervisory responsibilities which suggests an even broader impact of AID training in terms of the number of individuals who may be indirectly benefitting from AID training.

Although most participants are in training-related jobs, almost half of the survey sample did not know what job they would be returning to, including a sizable proportion of short-term participants. A number of participants in the survey also indicated they had difficulty in finding a training-related job

upon return. This is especially problematic for academic participants who are separated from government service and lose their jobs when they leave for training. Although they are given priority consideration for appropriate employment upon return, there is no guarantee of a training-related position. The responsibility of the GOR to reintegrate participant's into a training-related job upon return is generally understood in project agreements. There was also some indication of a potential equivalency problem between the U.S. Masters Degree and the Rwanda Licence, which may hinder promotion opportunities for some participants.

- Recommendation: that the Mission closely monitor the reintegration of participants into training-related positions upon their return, especially academic participants.
- Recommendation: that the GOR policy regarding the equivalence of U.S. degrees be further investigated, especially given the Mission's recent increase in degree training.

3. Training Utilization

Although a majority of participants indicate high levels of using their knowledge and skills from training in their current jobs, over one-third reports only moderate to low utilization levels. It appears that academic participants, as well as those in agriculture and the physical sciences are among those reporting lower utilization levels. As noted above, these groups were also less satisfied with the applicability of their training. The problem of technological differences was cited by many as a major constraint to more fully utilizing training. Other constraints include lack of financial and other resources, lack of trained staff, and administrative resistance to change. Another typical problem cited by many is the promotion of participants into more administrative jobs which limits the use of their technical skills.

- Recommendation: that management training be included in participants' programs where appropriate, especially for participants returning to more administrative jobs. This might be included in the re-entry program addressing technological differences.

4. Training Transmission & Professional Development

Participants in the survey group reported moderate levels of sharing their training with others, mostly on an informal basis within the work environment. Most have corresponded with a contact made through training, although only one-third has joined a professional association upon return. Interest was high in establishing an alumni association and most participants would be

willing to pay an annual fee. Participants suggested that such an association would be useful for sharing their training experiences and ideas, as well as for continuing education and professional development opportunities.

- Recommendation: that the Mission assist returned participants in establishing an independent alumni association, if enough interest is demonstrated. A summary of the findings from this survey could be distributed to returned participants with a request for proposals. Some initial funds might be offered to support the organization's proposed activities, e.g., newsletter, journal subscriptions, etc.

C. OTHER ISSUES

1. Private Sector Training

Although only a small proportion of AID training has been in the private sector (3%), the Mission intends to support more of this in the future, especially under the HRDA project. A private sector training needs assessment is being planned by MINIFOP in collaboration with the Chamber of Commerce in early 1988. Most of the Mission's private sector training is being carried out under a contract with Technoserve in small enterprise development, which may provide the Mission with a model for future private sector training.

- Recommendation: that the Mission identify private sector training needs in cooperation with Technoserve and the Chamber of Commerce and contract a firm similar to Technoserve as a channel for the Mission's private sector training.

2. Training Opportunities for Women

The proportion of Rwandan women sponsored for AID training in the past is consistent with the overall Agency standard of about 20%, but is lower than the desired targets of the African Bureau of 35-40%. Mission efforts to increase training opportunities for women will continue to be hindered by deep-rooted cultural and historical factors which tend to favor men over women for available educational opportunities. These include the practical inability of women to leave their households for extended periods due to family responsibilities, as well as the small pool of eligible trainees, especially in development-related fields. The AFGRAD programs's recent change in allowing a number of undergraduate scholarships through AFDEP will help recruit more female candidates.

- Recommendation: that the Mission make a concerted effort to increase the share of women trainees by specifically requesting nominations for training opportunities to include female candidates.
- Recommendation: that the Mission consider more third country or in-country training in areas determined to meet special training needs of women.
- Recommendation: that the Mission consider ways to increase the pool of eligible female trainees in development-related fields at the secondary school level.

APPENDIX D

SURVEY FINDINGS-STATISTICAL TABLES

APPENDIX D - STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE 11.1 - PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAM PLANNING

PARTICIPANTS	INVOLVEMENT		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	27.5	25.5	45.1
ACADEMIC (16)	31.3	31.3	37.5
TOTAL (67)	28.4	26.9	43.3

TABLE 11.2 - PARTICIPANT INVOLVEMENT IN PROGRAM PLANNING
BY PROGRAM SATISFACTION & TRAINING UTILIZATION

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF INVOLVEMENT		
	HIGH (19)	MODERATE (18)	LOW (29)
HIGH SATISFACTION	89.5	77.8	69.0
HIGH UTILIZATION	63.2	55.6	58.6

TABLE 12 - SELECTION FOR TRAINING

PARTICIPANTS	HOW SELECTED	
	SELF	EMPLOYER
TECHNICAL (51)	21.6	74.5
ACADEMIC (16)	43.8	56.3
TOTAL (67)	26.9	70.1

TABLE 13 - PRE-DEPARTURE ORIENTATION

PARTICIPANTS	USAID BRIEFING	
	YES	NO
TECHNICAL (51)	56.9	43.1
ACADEMIC (16)	87.5	12.5
TOTAL (67)	64.2	35.8

TABLE 14 - AVERAGE DAYS NOTICE

PARTICIPANTS	NUMBER OF DAYS
TECHNICAL (51)	37
ACADEMIC (16)	58
TOTAL (67)	43

TABLE 15 - PREPARATION FOR PROGRAM

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF PREPARATION		
	VERY	MODERATE	NOT
TECHNICAL (51)	39.2	19.6	25.5
ACADEMIC (16)	50.0	12.5	37.5
TOTAL (67)	41.8	17.9	28.4

TABLE 16.1-ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROBLEMS
(N=67)

ABILITY	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY		
	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
UNDERSTAND	44.8	22.4	13.4
SPEAK	38.8	29.9	11.9
READ	68.7	9.0	1.5
WRITE	67.2	10.4	1.5

TABLE 16.2 - PROBLEMS UNDERSTANDING ENGLISH
BY TYPE OF TRAINING PROGRAM

PROGRAM TYPE	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY		
	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
TECHNICAL (51)	41.2	25.5	7.8
DEGREE (16)	56.3	12.5	31.3
TOTAL (67)	44.8	22.4	13.4

TABLE 16.3 - PROBLEMS SPEAKING ENGLISH
BY TYPE OF TRAINING PROGRAM

PROGRAM TYPE	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY		
	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
TECHNICAL (51)	35.3	27.5	11.8
DEGREE (16)	50.0	37.5	12.5
TOTAL (67)	38.8	29.9	11.9

TABLE 16.4 - TECHNICAL PARTICIPANTS

IN FRENCH-SPEAKING PROGRAMS

(N=51)

ENGLISH PROGRAMS		FRENCH PROGRAMS	
#	%	#	%
33	64.7	18	35.3

TABLE 17.1 - LANGUAGE TRAINING LOCATION
BY TYPE OF TRAINING PROGRAM

PROGRAM TYPE	RWANDA	USA	BOTH
TECHNICAL (20)	11	6	3
DEGREE (13)	3	7	3
TOTAL (33)	14	13	6

TABLE 17.2- ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING:
LOCATION AND AVERAGE LENGTH

LOCATION	FULL-TIME		PART-TIME		TOTAL	
	#	AVERAGE LENGTH	#	AVERAGE LENGTH	#	AVERAGE LENGTH
RWANDA	9	3 mos.	11	10 mos.	20	6 mos.
USA	15	2.6 mos.	4	4.6 mos.	19	3 mos.

TABLE 18 - LANGUAGE PROBLEMS BY LOCATION OF TRAINING
(SOME & MUCH DIFFICULTY)

ABILITY	RWANDA (14)		USA (13)		BOTH (6)		NO ELT (34)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
UNDERSTAND	8	57.1	7	53.8	3	50.0	6	17.6
SPEAK	11	78.6	7	53.8	4	66.7	6	17.6
READ	3	21.4	4	30.8	0	0	0	0
WRITE	2	14.3	5	38.5	0	0	0	0

TABLE 19 - ARRIVAL ORIENTATION

LOCATION OF ORIENTATION	PARTICIPANTS	
	#	%
WASHINGTON INT'L CENTER (WIC)	26	38.8
TRAINING CENTER (TC)	15	22.4
BOTH WIC and TC	2	3.0
OTHER	12	17.9
ANY	48	71.6
NONE INDICATED	19	28.4

TABLE 20 - USEFULNESS OF ORIENTATIONS

ORIENTATION LOCATION	HOW USEFUL		
	VERY	MODERATE	NOT
RWANDA (43)	58.1	39.5	0
WIC (28)	60.7	35.7	3.6
OTHER (29)	75.9	10.3	0

TABLE 21 - SOCIAL - CULTURAL ADJUSTMENT
(N=67)

AREAS OF ADJUSTMENT	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY		
	NONE	SOME	ALOT
CLIMATE	76.1	17.9	4.5
FOOD	74.6	20.9	1.5
US LIFESTYLE	58.2	25.4	13.4
HOMESICK	67.2	22.4	4.5
LONELY	67.2	25.4	3.0
US EDUCATION SYSTEM	70.1	20.9	0
RELATIONS WITH INSTRUCTORS	86.6	7.5	1.5
RELATIONS WITH OTHER STUDENTS	80.6	11.9	3.0

TABLE 22 - ADJUSTMENT TO US SOCIAL & CULTURAL LIFE

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY		
	NONE	SOME	ALOT
TECHNICAL (51)	66.7	21.6	7.8
ACADEMIC (16)	31.3	37.5	31.3
TOTAL (67)	58.2	25.4	13.4

TABLE 23 - ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS
(N=67)

ADMINISTRATIVE ASPECTS	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY		
	LOW	MODERATE	HIGH
VISA-IMMIGRATION	95.5	3.0	0
MEDICAL INSURANCE	89.5	6.0	0
ALLOWANCE	89.5	7.5	0
TRAVEL	91.0	6.0	0
HOUSING	88.1	7.5	1.5

TABLE 24.1 - OVERALL PROGRAM SATISFACTION

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	78.4	17.6	3.9
ACADEMIC (16)	81.3	12.5	6.3
TOTAL (67)	79.1	16.4	4.5

TABLE 24.2 - PROGRAM SATISFACTION BY FIELD OF TRAINING

FIELD OF TRAINING	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRICULTURE (20)	65.0	25.0	10.0
HEALTH (15)	86.7	13.3	0
SOCIAL SCIENCE (11)	81.8	9.1	9.1
PHYSICAL SCIENCE (7)	85.7	14.3	0
MANAGEMENT (6)	83.3	16.7	0
OTHER (8)	87.5	12.5	0

TABLE 25 - SATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM COMPONENTS

PROGRAM COMPONENTS	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
PROGRAM CONTENT	95.5	0	1.5
PROGRAM RELEVANCE	79.1	14.9	3.0
APPLICABILITY TO RWANDA	61.2	28.4	7.5
PRACTICAL EXPERIENCE	64.2	20.9	6.0
COMPETENCE OF INSTRUCTORS	86.6	7.5	1.5
TECHNICAL/ACADEMIC GUIDANCE	73.1	11.9	1.5
PROGRAM MONITOR SUPPORT	70.1	14.9	1.5

TABLE 26 - APPLICABILITY OF TRAINING TO CONDITIONS IN RWANDA BY TYPE OF TRAINING

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	64.7	21.6	9.8
ACADEMIC (16)	50.0	50.0	0
TOTAL (67)	61.2	28.4	7.5

**TABLE 27 - APPLICABILITY OF TRAINING TO CONDITIONS
IN RWANDA BY FIELD OF TRAINING**

FIELD OF TRAINING	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRICULTURE (20)	50.0	30.0	10.0
HEALTH (15)	60.0	26.7	13.3
SOCIAL SCIENCE (11)	63.6	36.4	0
PHYSICAL SCIENCE (7)	28.6	71.4	0
MANAGEMENT (6)	100.0	0	0
OTHER (8)	87.5	0	12.5

**TABLE 28 - BALANCE OF THEORY & PRACTICE BY
TYPE OF TRAINING**

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF SATISFACTION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	64.7	17.6	5.9
ACADEMIC (16)	62.5	31.3	6.3
TOTAL (67)	64.2	20.9	6.0

TABLE 29 - TECHNICAL LEVEL OF PROGRAM

PARTICIPANTS	TOO HIGH	OK	TOO LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	5.9	86.3	5.9
ACADEMIC (16)	18.8	81.3	0
TOTAL (67)	9.0	85.1	4.5

TABLE 31 - PROGRAM LENGTH

PARTICIPANT	TOO LONG	OK	TOO SHORT
TECHNICAL (51)	0	39.2	58.8
ACADEMIC (16)	0	81.3	18.8
TOTAL (67)	0	49.3	49.3

TABLE 30 - AMOUNT OF NEW KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS

PARTICIPANT	LARGE	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	62.7	31.4	3.9
ACADEMIC (16)	93.4	6.3	0
TOTAL (67)	70.1	25.4	3.0

TABLE 32 - EMPLOYERS' RETENTION OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS
(N=265)

CHANGED MINISTRY		LEFT GOR TO PRIVATE SECTOR		LEFT GOR (unknown)		OUT-OF-RWANDA	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
14	5.3	9	3.4	12	4.5	7	2.6

TABLE 33 - KNEW JOB UPON RETURN

PARTICIPANTS	YES	NO
TECHNICAL (51)	64.7	35.3
ACADEMIC (16)	18.8	75.0
TOTAL (67)	53.7	44.8

TABLE 34 - CURRENT JOB RELATED TO TRAINING

PARTICIPANTS	YES	NO
TECHNICAL (51)	86.3	13.7
ACADEMIC (16)	68.8	18.8
TOTAL (67)	82.1	14.9

TABLE 35 - FINDING A TRAINING-RELATED JOB

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF DIFFICULTY		
	NONE	SOME	MUCH
TECHNICAL (51)	98.0	0	2.0
ACADEMIC (16)	56.3	18.8	12.5
TOTAL (67)	88.1	4.5	4.5

TABLE 36 - LEVEL OF JOB RESPONSIBILITY UPON RETURN

PARTICIPANTS	MORE	SAME	LESS
TECHNICAL (51)	60.8	33.3	5.9
ACADEMIC (16)	68.8	12.5	6.3
TOTAL (67)	62.7	28.4	6.0

TABLE 37.1- PARTICIPANTS IN SUPERVISORY ROLES BEFORE AND AFTER TRAINING

PARTICIPANTS	SUPERVISE NOW		SUPERVISE BEFORE	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
TECHNICAL (51)	84.3	13.7	70.6	29.4
ACADEMIC (16)	56.3	43.8	50.0	50.0
TOTAL (67)	77.6	22.4	65.7	34.3

**TABLE 37.2 - CHANGE IN SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITIES
(N=52)**

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
NO PRIOR SUPERVISORY RESPONSIBILITY	14
INCREASE IN NUMBER'S SUPERVISED	23
SAME OR FEWER NUMBER'S SUPERVISED	15

**TABLE 38 - PROMOTION PATTERNS
(N=67)**

PROMOTED SINCE TRAINING		ADVANCE IN GRADE	
#	%	#	%
44	65.6	19	28.4

PARTICIPANTS	RELATED TO TRAINING	
RECEIVED PROMOTION (44)	35	79.5%
ADVANCE IN GRADE (19)	10	52.6%

TABLE 39.1 - TRAINING UTILIZATION OVERALL AND BY TYPE OF TRAINING

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF UTILIZATION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	64.7	21.6	9.0
ACADEMIC (16)	43.8	18.8	25.0
TOTAL (67)	59.7	20.9	14.9

TABLE 39.2 - TRAINING UTILIZATION BY FIELD OF TRAINING

FIELD OF TRAINING	LEVEL OF UTILIZATION		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
AGRICULTURE (20)	45.0	25.0	20.0
HEALTH (15)	66.7	26.7	6.7
SOCIAL SCIENCE (11)	72.7	9.1	9.1
PHYSICAL SCIENCE (7)	28.6	28.6	42.9
MANAGEMENT (6)	100.0	0	0
OTHER (8)	62.5	25.0	12.5

TABLE 41 - INVOLVEMENT IN PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	*	MORE INVOLVEMENT
DEVELOP PROGRAMS	*	46.3
IMPROVE PROGRAMS	*	61.2
PLANNING	*	56.7
TRAINING	*	44.8
RESEARCH	*	35.8

TABLE 40 - COLLEAGUES' RECEPTIVITY TO NEW IDEAS AND SKILLS

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF RECEPTIVITY		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	41.7	39.2	5.9
ACADEMIC (16)	43.8	12.5	18.8
TOTAL (67)	46.3	32.8	9.0

TABLE 42 - SHARE NEW KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS

PARTICIPANTS	LEVEL OF SHARING		
	HIGH	MODERATE	LOW
TECHNICAL (51)	49.0	37.3	7.8
ACADEMIC (16)	31.3	31.3	25.0
TOTAL (67)	44.8	35.8	11.9

TABLE 43 - METHODS FOR SHARING KNOWLEDGE & SKILLS

METHODS	FREQUENCY OF USE		
	OFTEN *	SOMETIME *	RARELY *
INFORMAL DISCUSSION	65.7 *	22.4 *	6.0 *
WORKSHOPS	19.4 *	28.4 *	34.3 *
ON-THE-JOB TRAINING	29.9 *	17.9 *	26.9 *
REPORTS	43.3 *	25.4 *	16.4 *
TRAINING MATERIALS	28.4 *	28.4 *	29.9 *

TABLE 44 - CORRESPONDENCE WITH TRAINING PROGRAM CONTACTS

OFTEN *	SOMETIMES *	RARELY *
*****	*****	*****
32.8 *	44.8 *	20.9 *

TABLE 45 - MEMBERSHIP IN U.S. PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

JOINED ASSOCIATION			*	CURRENT MEMBER		
#	*	%	*	#	*	%
22	*	32.8	*	19	*	86.4

TABLE 46 - RECEIVE PROFESSIONAL PUBLICATIONS

YES	NO
56.7	43.3

TABLE 47 - VISITED USAID UPON RETURN

YES	NO
62.7	37.3

TABLE 48 - RETURNED PARTICIPANT ALUMNI ASSOCIATION

PARTICIPANTS (67)	YES	NO
INTEREST IN PARTICIPATING	88.1	3.0
WILLING TO PAY ANNUAL FEE	85.1	4.5