

PD-ABH-200
85279



**EVALUATION REPORT OF
THE PEACE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
A.I.D. Project: Development Training
Peace Fellowship Component**

No. 263-0125.1

Submitted to:

USAID Mission to Egypt

By:

Gordon B. Ramsey and Dr. Rodney J. Fink

Development Associates, Inc.

1730 North Lynn Street
Arlington, VA 22209-2023
(703) 276-0577

November, 1993

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Abbreviations and Acronyms	
Executive Summary	i
Major Conclusions & Recommendations	iv
Findings	1
Introduction	1
Overall Program Management	3
Policy Issues	5
Program and Administrative Management	10
1989 Evaluation and 1991 Audit Reports	16
Benefits and Impacts of the PFP on Egyptian Development	16
Private Sector, Female, and HBCU Participation	20
Lessons Learned	21
Follow-on Activities	23
Annexes	
I. Egyptian Cultural and Educational Bureau	I-1
Att. A: List of current PF in the US as of 9/15/93	I-16
Att. B: ECEB Peace Fellowship Staffing & Functions	I-21
Att. C: Comparison of ECEB salary level with D.C.	I-23
II. Summary of Peace Fellows Interviews	II-1
Att. A: Survey of Egypt Peace Fellows & Advisors	II-14
Att. B: Survey instrument used for Fellows in U.S	II-17
Att. C: Request to USAID/Cairo for Interviews with returned Peace Fellows	II-19
Att. D-1: Summary of responses to questionnaire	II-21
D-2: Guided interview questionnaire Post-Doctoral Fellows	II-26
D-3: Guided interview questionnaire data collection	II-28
D-4: Guided interview questionnaire Fellows in training program	II-30
D-5: Guided interview questionnaire for Private Sector Fellows	II-32
Att. E: USAID/Cairo follow-up of Peace Fellows	II-34

III.	Missions Department, MOHE	III-1
	Att. A: Job Description for PFP employees & Officials	III-11
	Att. B: FFP Computer Data Base	III-14
IV.	Status of 1989 Evaluation & 1991 Audit Recommendations	IV-1
	Att. A: PIL # 10, Amendment 9	IV-11
V.	Bibliography	V-1
VI.	List of Recommendations	VI-1
VII.	Persons Interviewed	VII-1
VIII.	Suggested Types of Training Programs	VIII-1

**ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS PECULIAR TO
THE PEACE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM**

AUC:	American University, Cairo
ACC:	American Cultural Center (Cairo and Alexandria)
DNDR:	Data Collection Non-Degree Research
ECEB:	Egyptian Cultural and Educational Bureau, Washington, D.C.
GOE:	Government of Egypt
HB:	A.I.D. Handbook. A.I.D. Handbooks contain the policies, regulations and procedures of the agency
MA/MS:	Masters Degree Candidate
Missions Department:	An organizational entity of the Ministry of Higher Education that administers the Peace Fellowship Program and the Egyptian Governments' own program for sending Egyptians abroad for PhD Programs.
MOHE:	Egyptian Ministry of Higher Education
OFE:	Orientation, Follow-up and Evaluation
PhD:	Doctorate Degree Candidate
PFP:	Peace Fellowship Program
PF(s):	Peace Fellow(s)
T:	Training Non-Degree Candidate
Post-Doc, PDR:	Post Doctorate Research

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In conducting this evaluation, the evaluation team has given major emphasis to the search for indications that the Peace Fellowship Program has had and will continue to have an impact on Egypt's development needs and priorities. To focus on this emphasis, the team spent the greatest portion of interview time with Peace Fellows that have completed their training and returned to Egypt. We have found during the evaluation process that there are good indications that this program is having, and will continue to have, an impact on Egypt's progress in development.

The Ministry of Higher Education and USAID/Cairo should be pleased with the outcome of this program. The Peace Fellows have completed degrees, thesis research, and published many academic papers in collaboration with U.S. counterparts and they have gained a wide exposure to the U.S. educational system and culture, one of the original motivations for the program following the Camp David Accords.

Regarding the management of a diverse and large program, one should expect such problems as coordination, length of study programs, and such personal problems as visa extensions, home residence requirements, and others. Some uncertainties were noted between ECEB, MOHE and the USAID concerning implementation policy issues (e.g., course limitations and individual program extensions), and we have made specific suggestions and recommendations regarding these issues in the body of this report. The evaluators were impressed more by the positive aspects of the program than the problems which are not insurmountable and are less important to the overall outcome. Indeed we were not alone in concluding that the accomplishments outweighed the problems. The Fellows interviewed who expressed personal problems with the program ranked the overall achievements of the PFP very high -- 90% gave it a grade of A, 10% a grade of B.

The Project Grant Agreement (263-0125) stipulates that the purpose of this component of that project (263-0125.1) is "To design and implement a better organized and more efficient Egyptian training program and to train Egyptians, primarily in the U.S. and Egypt." The latest Amendment to the basic agreement established the anticipated output at completion of the project at "1250 Egyptians trained."

As of September 20, 1993 -- the date chosen to measure statistics on outputs of the program, since it is continuous and there is a moving target at all times -- 929 Fellows had completed training under this project component; 172 were in training in the U.S., for a grand total of 1101 Peace Fellows selected and placed in training. This is only 149 under the anticipated total of 1250 projected for the end of the project. This 149 target of Peace Fellows trained will certainly be met and could be exceeded by the PACD of September 25, 1995.

Throughout the implementation of the program since September, 1988, various targets have been established and amended for specific groupings of Peace Fellows:

the number of Peace Fellows selected from the private sector; the number of those selected from the public sector; and overall, regardless of the source, the number of women selected and trained. Until February, 1992, the targets for these groups of Peace Fellows were 12% for the private sector; 30% for women; and there was no target set for the public sector. In February, 1992 (PIL #10, Amendment 9) a set of Standing Operating Procedures (SOP) were agreed to between the Ministry of Higher Education and USAID/Cairo which established new targets for these special groupings of Fellows: private sector -- 20%; public sector -- 20%; and overall participation of women 20%. Between September, 1988 and the 1992 SOP, participation of the private sector was at 13%, the public sector at 12%, and women at 17%. Since the 1992 SOP established new targets, the Ministry of Higher Education has made a strong effort to meet the agreed upon targets, and has reached 24% for the private sector, 23% for the public sector, and 18% overall for women. We have concluded that, in this aspect of the project, the management performance has been good.

In the FINDINGS section of this report, we have concluded that the overall management of this project by the host government is one of the best illustrations of how an assistance project should work. Although A.I.D. policy throughout its history has stipulated that the implementation of assistance projects should be the responsibility of and managed by the host country, this is not always the case in many A.I.D. program countries. The Egyptian government, in the task of providing graduate studies for Egyptians, has had long experience through its own funded MOHE Missions Department programs. The management of the Peace Fellowship Program came quite naturally to the MOHE, and it has managed it with confidence and experience.

We believe that, certainly through the completion of the Peace Fellowship Program, the current Government of Egypt counterpart agency should remain the Ministry of Higher Education. Further, we also recommend that if USAID/Cairo contemplates continued support for Egyptian participants in graduate level studies in the U.S. (being recommended here), the Ministry of Higher Education would be the most appropriate counterpart agency to manage a new project of that type, and, we believe, would manage it well.

We also found that the USAID role in the implementation of the PFP has been done professionally. The USAID functions of monitoring implementation, approving PF selections, expediting visa applications and other processing, funding analysis and obligations of funds, issuing the appropriate A.I.D. required documentation, and maintaining the PTIS computer system are all done with competence. And, the USAID project officer has established effective working relations with the MOHE at all levels.

The one serious weakness in the administration of the Peace Fellowship Program has been a lack of structured participant follow-up activities after the Peace Fellows complete their training and return to Egypt. With respect to the participant follow-up activities, we were briefed on HRDC/ET's plans to propose a comprehensive

Orientation, Follow-up and Evaluation (OFE) program, and we urge the USAID to adopt such a program in the near future. Our major criticism of the administration of this aspect of the PFP is that it has taken too long to come to grips with the follow-up facets of the program.

Our major conclusions and recommendations are spelled out in the subsequent section of this report. The major recommendations deal with actions to be taken regarding two periods of time: (1) from now up to the PACD and (2) for the longer term follow-on after the current program is completed.

For the near term, we are recommending the development of effective follow-up programs; some adjustments in procedures of the MOHE, USAID and the ECEB; and the collaborative development of a Phase-Out Plan for the Peace Fellowship Program.

For the longer term, we are recommending that the USAID, in collaboration with the MOHE, design, approve and commence implementation of a new program that would maintain the momentum of the PFP and provide academic degree training focussed on disciplines in the fields of business (general management, operations management, accounting, finance, management information systems, marketing, international business and trade), economics, environmental studies, tourism, education, nursing, and city planning.

MAJOR CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major conclusions and recommendations presented below are listed in order of priority in terms of the relative urgency of implementing them. The first recommendation, the Phase-Out Plan, will set the agenda for implementation actions leading to the PACD. During this final period of the project, recommendations 2 through 7 should be given implementation priority along with the development of the Phase-Out Plan.

1. Peace Fellowship Program Phase-Out Plan (See III, A. of the FINDINGS SECTION)

Conclusions: In order to provide for a reasonable and orderly phase-out of the Peace Fellowship Program (PACD: 25 September 1995), USAID/Cairo and the Ministry of Higher Education must begin immediately to develop a plan that will ensure that all Peace Fellows will have completed training and returned to Egypt by a specified date prior to the PACD.

Recommendation: That USAID/Cairo in collaboration with the MOHE develop a PFP Phase-Out Plan as soon as possible to guide program implementation actions during the last 1 year and 9 months of the LOP. This Phase-Out Plan should include, as a minimum, the provisions specified in III, A. of the FINDINGS section of this report.

Action Responsibility: USAID/Cairo/HRDC/ET and the Ministry of Higher Education.

2. Clarifications/Modifications of Standing Operating Procedures (See III, B. of the FINDINGS SECTION)

Conclusions: The current Standing Operating Procedures (ANNEX IV, Attachment A) need to be clarified and, in some aspects, modified for guidance during the remaining 2 years of the PFP. There have been different interpretations and applications, particularly by the ECEB, of some SOP provisions in implementing those aspects of the program.

Recommendation: That the current SOP be carefully reviewed by USAID/Cairo and the MOHE and a new revised version be issued. The new version must modify the first paragraph under GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS to make it less restrictive with regard to extensions of training programs, and specify the following criteria for extension consideration:

- a. Extensions of up to 6 months (total of 1 year) for current post-doctoral programs can be granted when necessary to allow the completion of a research project; and

-
- b. Extensions of DNDR and Training programs of up to two additional semesters may be granted to complete a Master's Degree; and
 - c. Specify in the original PIO/P the conditions under which extensions may be considered.

The revised SOP should also include provisions that would:

- d. Allow Peace Fellows to take remedial English during their first semester of enrollment in a U.S. university; and
- e. Eliminate the three-course limit on DNDR and Training Fellows programs.

Action Responsibility: USAID/Cairo/HRDC/ET and MOHE/Missions Department.

3. Participant Follow-Up (See III,C. of THE FINDINGS SECTION)

Conclusions: The provisions of Handbook 10, Chapter 35 with regard to the appointment of a Mission Follow-Up Officer, achievement awards ceremonies, and other activities involving returned PFs are not being implemented by USAID/Cairo. A structured and managed follow-up program is badly needed and should be set up as soon as possible.

Recommendation: That USAID/Cairo/HRDC/ET place priority on developing and presenting its recommendations for a comprehensive Orientation, Follow-Up and Evaluation (OFE) program and that mission management act quickly on the OFE proposal.

Action Responsibility: USAID/Cairo/HRDC/ET

4. Salaries of ECEB Staff (See IV,4. of the FINDINGS SECTION)

Conclusions: ECEB staff salaries are, for the most part, at the lower end or below the normal range of comparable positions in the D.C. area (see ANNEX I, Attachment C). Besides the justification that ECEB staff salaries should be more closely equivalent to comparative market rates, ECEB staff morale is at a very low point, and the staff feels very vulnerable during the final phases of the PFP.

Recommendation: That ECEB make significant increases in current staff salaries to bring them within the D.C. market levels for similar jobs, and set up a system that on a continuing basis will keep ECEB staff salaries at average D.C. market levels.

Action Responsibility: ECEB

5. ECEB 6-Month Report

(See IV,B.2. (Weaknesses) of the FINDINGS SECTION)

Conclusions: The recipients of this report (USAID/Cairo and MOHE) have informational needs that are not being met by the ECEB report as it is now designed.

Recommendation: That the ECEB revise the 6-month report to: (1) add statistics on women placements and placements in HBCUs to the tabular and graphic presentations by study goal, sponsor, and field of study; (2) present cumulative statistics on arrivals and departures of PFs in each 6-month report; and (3) add to the narrative portion of the report a description of progress of the program related to the project purpose, problems encountered during the reporting period, and how the ECEB plans to address these problems during the next reporting period.

Action Responsibility: ECEB

6. Quarterly Project Progress Review

Conclusions: It is inevitable in any management system that issues related to interpretation of policy and implementation rules will arise. To deal with different interpretations as they occur, a procedure for regular review should be established.

Recommendation: That the MOHE and the USAID/Cairo institute a quarterly meeting to review progress and deal with policy and management issues that may have come up since the last review meeting. It is important that a formal agenda be agreed to before each quarterly project status review, and that the agenda be adhered to at each meeting.

Action Responsibility: USAID/Cairo/HRDC/ET and MOHE/Missions Department

7. Future Academic Training Programs (Following the PACD)

(See IX,B. of the FINDINGS SECTION)

Conclusions: The Peace Fellowship Program has successfully trained Egyptian Fellows for greater contributions to their employers and to the development process in Egypt. There are important disciplines that were not fully covered under the PFP, and it is important that many more academically trained Egyptians be added to the pool trained under the PFP. The follow-on project we are recommending should be mostly degree training and focus closely on the fields of business (general management, operations management, accounting, finance, management information systems, marketing, international trade, international business), economics, environmental studies, tourism, education, nursing and city planning.

Recommendation: That USAID/Cairo in collaboration with the MOHE design a new project as a follow-on to the Peace Fellowship Program which would maintain the

momentum of the PFP and provide academic degree training focussed on disciplines identified above under conclusions.

ANNEX VIII includes some suggestions with regard to types of training that the USAID might consider for follow-on activities to the Peace Fellowship Program.

Action Responsibility: USAID/Cairo and MOHE.

Besides the major recommendations listed above, ANNEX VI contains a complete listing of all recommendations and suggestions discussed throughout this report.

FINDINGS

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Objectives of This Mid-term Evaluation

The objectives of this evaluation, as stated in the IQC work order, are:

1. Identify strengths and weaknesses in the Peace Fellowship Program.
 2. Identify problems related to design and implementation of the program.
 3. Assess the effectiveness and efficiency of Program management. Review management procedures used by USAID/Cairo, the Missions Department and ECEB and provide recommendations for improving processes.
 4. Present findings to USAID/Cairo to enable the Mission to determine the adherence of GOE entities to USAID requirements and regulations.
 5. Present findings to USAID/Cairo to enable the Mission to follow-up on implementation of actions resulting from audit recommendations.
 6. Determine the benefits, relevance and impact to date of the Peace Fellowship Program on Egypt's development needs and priorities.
 7. Review private sector and female participation and make recommendations on their participation.
-

-
8. Provide information on lessons learned to serve as a guide in improving the current Peace Fellowship Program and in designing a possible follow-on activity.

The Statement of Work specified that the evaluators should provide answers to 30 specific questions covering selection procedures, placement of PFs, services provided by MOHE/Missions Department and ECEB, monitoring, staffing of MOHE/Missions Department and the ECEB, reporting. These questions are answered and recorded in the ANNEXES to this report, which form the basis for the Evaluation Team's statement of findings, conclusions and recommendations in this main body of the report.

B. Team Composition and Evaluation Methods

USAID/Cairo contracted with Development Associates, Inc., to provide two consultants, Mr. Gordon B. Ramsey and Dr. Rodney J. Fink, to complete the evaluation process and present a final evaluation report between September 1, 1993, and December 31, 1993.

The work order stipulated that the team would spend 3 weeks in Washington and 4 weeks in Cairo to accomplish the task. The team began the evaluation by studying the key project documents (ANNEX V), developing questionnaires for each of the main management units (MOHE/Missions Department, ECEB), questionnaires for Peace Fellows, and guides for structured interviews. The team met with the USAID Project Officer, Mona Kaldas, in Washington and together they spent 2 weeks interviewing and gathering data at the ECEB. During this period the team also met with officials of A.I.D./Washington/OIT to explore any problems OIT might have with ECEB, or the Peace Fellowship Program as a whole, and interviewed eight Peace Fellows currently in training at U.S. universities and three academic advisors.

The team arrived in Cairo on 18 September, 1993, proceeded to meet with the USAID (project officer, head of the training division and the USAID evaluation officer), MOHE/Missions Department, group interviews with 60 returned Peace Fellows, the Undersecretary of State in the Ministry of Higher Education, and the Counsellor to the Minister of Higher Education. Most of the team's time was spent in the interviews with the returned Fellows to gather data and information pertinent to addressing questions of benefits and impact of the Peace Fellowship Program, the greatest emphasis in this evaluation report.

II. OVERALL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Overall management of this project by the host country government is one of the best illustrations of how an assistance project should work. A.I.D. policy throughout its history has stipulated that assistance projects are the responsibility of the host government to manage. This is not always the case in many A.I.D. countries wherein the host government takes the reins and manages the projects in all its aspects. The Egyptian government, in the area of graduate studies for Egyptians, has had long experience in this type of endeavor through its own Missions Department programs. The management of the Peace Fellowship Program came quite naturally to the MOHE, and it has managed it with confidence and experience.

Responsibility for the administration and management of the PF Program is shown in the Exhibit.

EXHIBIT

Administration and Management of the Peace Fellowship Program

<u>Function</u>	<u>Responsible Organization</u>
Overall Policy	Undersecretary Of State, MOHE PF Program Project Management Committee USAID/Cairo
Selection Process	MOHE, Missions Department/PFP Unit Selection Committees Appointed by the Minister, MOHE USAID/Cairo Approval of Candidates
Pre-Departure Orientation and processing	Missions Department/PFP Unit USAID/Cairo (Medical, Visas)
Placement	ECEB
PF Travel to U.S.	MOHE/Missions Department
Stateside Orientation	ECEB
PF Progress Monitoring	ECEB
Financial Management	ECEB/MOHE-Missions/USAID-Cairo
PF Return Travel/Trans.	ECEB
PF Return to Egypt	MOHE/Missions and USAID/Cairo
PF Follow-up Activities	MOHE/Missions and USAID/Cairo

The Project Management Committee, the policy making body, is composed of the First Undersecretary, MOHE; the Counsellor to the Minister, MOHE; the Secretary General of the Supreme Council of Universities; and Director, Peace Fellowship Unit, Missions Department (secretariat for the committee). In addition, there are two ad hoc members of the Committee who participate when issues being dealt with require the expertise of the Director General for Technical Affairs, Missions Department, and the Director General for Financial Affairs, Missions Department.

It is the evaluation team's conclusion that certainly through the completion of the Peace Fellowship Program component, the current GOE counterpart agency should remain the Ministry of Higher Education. The team also recommends that if USAID/Cairo contemplates a follow-on project that includes support for Egyptian participants in graduate level studies in the U.S., the MOHE would be the most appropriate counterpart agency to manage such a project, and would manage it well.

III. POLICY ISSUES

The project goal, as reflected in the original Project Grant Agreement and all subsequent amendments is:

"...To increase the operational effectiveness and efficiency of Egyptian institutions contributing to selected key development goals." (Note: The selected develop goals were not listed.)

The project purpose, stipulated in the original Project Grant Agreement and all subsequent amendments is:

"...To design and implement a better organized and more efficient Egyptian training program and to train Egyptians, primarily in the U.S. and Egypt."

The PFP component outputs for trained participants was agreed to in the Fifth Amendment (30 September 1990) to the original Project Grant Agreement and establishes the number of Egyptians to be trained in the project component as 1250, and this number trained, when accomplished, determines the achievement of the project purpose.

The Peace Fellowship Program has been eminently successful to date and will meet its target of 1250 Peace Fellows trained by the PACD -- 25 September 1995.

A. Phase-out Plan

The PACD for the Peace Fellowship Program (263-0125.1) has been established as 25 September 1995, 10 years after the commencement of the Development Training Project of which the Peace Fellowship Program is a component. In order to provide for a reasonable and orderly phase-out of this component of the project, USAID/Cairo and the Ministry of Higher Education need to begin immediately to develop an appropriate Phase-out Plan that will ensure that all Peace Fellows will have completed their training and returned to Egypt by a specific date prior to the PACD. Such a plan will also allow the MOHE to plan for organizational and personnel adjustments that may be required with the staffs of the Missions Department and the ECEB.

The Phase-out Plan should include, as a minimum, the following:

1. Determine and agree on the precise date prior to the PACD that all Fellows currently in training and to be placed in training will have to complete their training and return to Egypt. This date will also affect decisions regarding organizational and personnel actions that must be taken. (Responsibility: MOHE and USAID/Cairo)
-

-
2. Project the best estimate of the amount of funds from both USAID/Cairo and the Government of Egypt that will be made available for commitment in FYs 1994 and 1995. (Responsibility: USAID/Cairo and MOHE)
 3. Based on the estimated amount of funds to be made available, decide and agree on the number of new Peace Fellows that should be selected and trained over the next 2 years in order to meet, or exceed, the numerical target of 1250 trained. (MOHE and USAID/Cairo)
 4. Review current PF applications still pending as a result of the January 1992 newspaper ad solicitation (beyond the 200 selected to date and forwarded to ECEB for placement), and determine if any of these should now be selected toward meeting the final numerical target of 1250. (MOHE/Missions Department/PFP)
 5. After the review of current applications (4, above), determine the necessity of placing a final newspaper ad. If a final newspaper ad is required, specify in the ad that preference will be given to the priority development areas listed in the SOP, i.e., Democratic Pluralism (focused political science studies), Management and Planning, Economics, Environmental Studies, Business/Public Administration, Tourism, Hotel Management and Administration, City Planning and Design of Urban/Suburban Areas, Education (Curriculum Development), Industrial Safety, and Nursing. (MOHE/Missions Department with USAID/Cairo concurrence)
 6. Besides indicating special study area preferences in any new newspaper ad, the MOHE should give special instructions to the selection committees to give preference to the priority areas listed in paragraph 5, above.
-

B. SOP Clarifications/Modifications

The current Standing Operating Procedures (ANNEX IV, ATTACHMENT A) need to be clarified, and in some aspects modified for guidance during the remaining 2 years of the PFP. There have been different interpretations and applications, particularly by the ECEB, in the implementation of the SOP. The following operating procedures need clarification/modification:

1. First paragraph under GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS, beginning with "Flexibility in training durations..." is too restrictive with regard to extensions of training, particularly those that would allow full completion of current research and degrees. The evaluation team suggests that the SOP include the following statement of criteria for consideration of extensions:
 - Allow for extensions of up to 6 months of a current post-doctoral program to allow completion of a research project;
 - Allow for extensions of up to two semesters to complete a Master's Degree for DNDR and Training Fellows who have completed a substantial portion of the Masters degree course work and have unconditional acceptance into a Masters Degree program at the institution where they are doing their studies;
 - Include a provision that, in spite of the fact that the nominees must achieve a certain TOEFL rating before departing, those who are recommended by their academic advisors should be allowed to take remedial English during their first term of enrollment in a U.S. university.
-

-
2. Add a clarification statement that DNDR Fellows and those in the so called "Training" programs can have a mix of non-classroom and classroom training to accomplish their study programs. The ECEB practice of allowing a maximum of only three courses per study program should be eliminated.
 3. To implement the above suggestions with regard to extensions of training duration, we also suggest that the original PIO/P state the conditions under which an extension would be considered (1, and 2, above).

C. Participant Follow-up (Handbook 10)

With regard to participant follow-up activities, Handbook 10, Chapter 35 provisions are not being implemented; i.e., appointment of a mission follow-up officer, certificate of achievement ceremonies, and any program that could involve returned PFs in U.S. mission cultural presentations, e.g., concerts, lectures and seminars, plays, etc. In meetings with USAID/HRDC/ET, we found that that office is developing recommendations to mission management to structure participant follow-up activities. This structure would entail appointment of a mission follow-up officer, then possibly contract for services that would develop specific follow-up activities, such as Achievement Certificate ceremonies, announcements of cultural activities sponsored by the U.S. mission, notifying former PFs of conferences, workshops, etc., that may be of interest to them, and possibly developing a newsletter for circulation to PF returnees.

The HRDC/ET planning includes more than just participant follow-up activities. It is a more comprehensive activity that includes coordination of orientation, follow-up and evaluation (OFE) of all training programs of USAID/Cairo.

The evaluation team believes many opportunities for publicity of A.I.D. funding of the PFP have been missed in the past by not focussing on and implementing participant follow-up activities. Setting up a more structured and managed (follow-up officer) effort is definitely needed and USAID/Cairo should implement such a plan in the near future.

IV. PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT

The evaluation team reviewed program and administrative management procedures used by the three principal management entities -- MOHE, ECEB, USAID/Cairo -- and recorded in considerable detail the results of our review in ANNEXES I through IV. The information and data in these ANNEXES were gathered primarily in answer to specific questions, and provide the background to a more summary presentation of our findings in this section of the evaluation report.

The MOHE, especially the Peace Fellowship Program Unit, has the responsibility of meeting the provisions of the Project Grant Agreement with USAID/Cairo, and the MOHE has been successful in carrying out this responsibility. Initial target for participation of women was not met. At the start of this project component (263-0125.1), a second phase of an earlier PFP (project 263-0110), initial targets were established as follows: private sector participation - 12%; participation of women, regardless of sector - 30%. The original target for the private sector of 12% appeared to be low given the emphasis of A.I.D. policies on private sector participation and Egyptian Government development plans to increase privatization of industrial and business organizations. The target for women's participation (30%) was too high by comparison to the level of women in the Egyptian work force in general.

By February of 1992, consultations between USAID/Cairo and the MOHE had resulted in agreement to revise these targets. In PIL #10, Amendment 9, the parties agreed to promulgate a set of Standard Operating Procedures that set the target for the private sector at 20%, and for women participation also at 20%. Following the

setting of these new targets, the MOHE has achieved or nearly achieved targets from those areas among those currently in training, 18% are women, and 24% are from the private sector. The MOHE in so doing has shown the ability to adjust procedures to try to meet these project targets.

Management processes, including newspaper advertising, receipt and processing of applications, screening, appointing and using selection committees, communications and coordination with PF candidates and USAID/Cairo for processing of nominees, all are effectively performed. The evaluation team's assessment is that these management procedures are sufficient to meet project outputs.

Project policy regarding placement of Fellows in HBCUs is stated in very general terms in the SOP. This section later discusses and presents recommendations regarding placing a percentage target for utilization of HBCUs.

The ECEB in Washington, D.C., manages the placement, monitoring and provides support services to PFs while in training in the U.S. ECEB placement of PFs in academic institutions has been done well. Placements are appropriate for the academic training needed. ECEB has little experience and little capability of placing PFs in other than academic institutions.

USAID/Cairo's role in the implementation of the PFP includes continuous dialogue with MOHE/Missions Department/ECEB on overall and implementation policies, analysis of funding requirements, incremental obligations of funds to finance approved budgets, processing PF candidates' visa applications, ensuring that PFs have health certification, approving the selection of PF nominees, approval and issuance of PIO/Ps, overall project monitoring including maintenance of computer and other necessary records. These functions are carried out efficiently and the USAID project officer has established effective working relations with the MOHE at all levels.

A. Selection/Predeparture Orientation and Processing

The evaluation noted many strengths in the overall selection process:

1. The use of newspaper ads to solicit applications for the PFP is an effective way to notify a wide and diverse number of applicants that the program exists and this method should be continued.
2. The MOHE staff is experienced and dedicated and thoroughly processes PF applications and moves them through screening and review.
3. Application review uses qualified selection committee members who review "blind" applications which insures fairness. Responses from PFs interviewed indicated that all believed the system was fair.

Weaknesses in the implementation of the processes noted by the team include:

1. The length of time between application and departure of those selected for the U.S. often is 2 or more years. The major problem with such a long time frame is that applicants have constantly to adjust their study agenda in Egypt and this tends to make it necessary to modify their proposed study program. Thus, they must remain flexible because when they are called up, they are given a short period for final preparations and departure. Reduction in this time frame might be achieved if the files of selected PFs were sent to ECEB on a continuous basis rather than being held until a large batch of files had accumulated.
2. PFs interviewed reported unclear understanding of program provisions following pre-orientation. Included were program extensions, three-course limitations during the Fellowship period, rules regarding

dependents travel, home residence requirements, and visa extensions once in the U.S.

3. Other general orientation areas not sufficiently understood by PFs included what to expect at U.S. universities (including housing), transportation in the U.S., and general expectations about U.S. living conditions. Even though the evaluation team concluded that some of these uncertainties are not totally the fault of the preorientation programs but rather a product of selective listening, these PF reactions should be considered and orientation sessions sharpened by emphasizing these dimensions of the PFP.
4. The returned PFs in the private sector suggested that the selection committees use representatives from the private sector on the selection committee. The evaluation team found that the MOHE is using representatives from the private sector on appropriate selection committees; e.g., a representative of the Egyptian Court of Appeals, a representative from the Agriculture Development Bank, a representative for the engineering selection panel was the Chairman of the Union of Labor Industries.

B. Placements and Stateside Orientation

The evaluation found that the ECEB has a mixture of strengths and weaknesses which are pointed out below. Nevertheless, it should be emphasized overall that ECEB's performance has been good.

The strengths observed were:

1. A wide diversity of placements in public and private academic institutions;
-

-
2. ECEB experience in placing participants in universities and effectiveness in making university placements;
 3. The dedication and competence of the ECEB staff; and
 4. The maintenance of comprehensive records on individual Peace Fellows.

The weaknesses observed include:

1. Lack of ECEB experience placing participants in private sector entities. (The ECEB staff is currently staffed and experienced in academic placements only.)
 2. Most data in the ECEB 6-month report is peculiar to ECEB needs, and the recipients of this report (MOHE and USAID/Cairo) have needs beyond those reported. A few additions the evaluation team felt would improve the usefulness of the report to USAID/Cairo and the MOHE would be the addition of statistics in tabular form listing the numbers of women placed by study goal, sponsor, and field of study. Placement of PFs in HBCUs should also be added in the tables covering study goal, sponsor and field of study. A very important piece of information now reported only in the 6-month report period ending December of each year, is the cumulative statistics on arrivals and departures of PFs back to the beginning of activities under the project component (2013-0125.1), covering study goal, field of study, and sponsor. These cumulative tables and graphics should also cover the number of women in these categories, and the cumulative tables should be reported every 6 months, not just once a year. There are other informational needs variously mentioned to the evaluation team,
-

such as a narrative description of progress of the program related to the project purpose; problems encountered during the reporting period; how the ECEB plans to address these problems during the next reporting period; etc. If the MOHE and USAID/Cairo wish these suggested additions, and perhaps others, included in future reports of the ECEB, they should stipulate their specific requirements in a communication to ECEB requesting that the report be revised accordingly.

3. There is little or no delegation of authority to ECEB professional staff. When the Acting Director is absent, program or administrative decisions must await his return. Operational efficiency could be improved if some delegations were made in the areas of placement approvals, ECEB responses to emergency health problems of PFs, and approvals of a PF attending conferences or making a field trip. The evaluation team urges ECEB to study the areas that would improve efficiency and make some operational delegations.

4. ECEB staff salaries, for the most part, are at the lower end or below the normal range of comparable positions in the D.C. area. (See ANNEX I, Attachment C). The evaluation team recommends that the ECEB make significant raises in staff salaries. This is particularly important at this time. Besides the justification to adjust salaries more closely to the market rates, it would be a significant boost to ECEB staff morale at a time when they feel somewhat vulnerable during the final phases of the PFP.

This ECEB low salary issue has been a recurring theme in past evaluations and should be addressed on a continuing basis.

Therefore, it is also recommended that ECEB adopt a system to increase and keep salaries at average D.C. market levels.

5. Another operational problem in ECEB's management of its part of the PFP is that there is insufficient contact with individual Fellows and Education Specialists built into the ECEB management system. The evaluation team feels that Peace Fellows upon arrival in Washington, D.C., should have an "in-depth" discussion with their Placement and Monitoring specialists concerning what has been arranged at the university for them, what to expect when they arrive at the campus, expectations of the Education Specialist from the individual Fellows regarding what reports are expected of the Fellows, what to do if problems occur, and other related matters. The team recommends that these changes to the modus operandi of ECEB be effected.

V. 1989 EVALUATION AND 1991 AUDIT REPORTS

A discussion of the status of the recommendations in the 1989 Evaluation report and the 1991 Audit report is included as ANNEX IV to this evaluation report. By way of a summary of the status of those report recommendations, all of the 1989 Evaluation report recommendations have been dealt with by USAID/Cairo, and this evaluation team has no criticism of the actions taken to carry out or otherwise handle the recommendations. All 1991 Audit report recommendations have been acted upon by USAID/Cairo and the MOHE, and cleared by the IG, except for participant award ceremonies discussed earlier in this report (Section III,C., above).

VI. BENEFITS AND IMPACTS OF THE PFP ON EGYPTIAN DEVELOPMENT

The direct beneficiaries of the PFP are, of course, the Peace Fellows who were trained in the U.S. The secondary beneficiaries are the Egyptians whom the Fellows

are now influencing and will continue to influence. Thus, the total impact of the PFP will not be evident until several years from now. Nevertheless, the evaluation team believes that current evidence gives the USAID a basis for optimism about the positive impact of this program on the continuing development of Egypt, economically and socially.

The program has provided Egypt with an important pool of U.S. trained professionals. Large numbers of medical personnel have received training in the latest techniques of their field. Fellows from the private sector are applying new techniques and skills to the private sector workplace. In addition, many Fellows have developed linkages with U.S. counterparts which will provide continued benefits to both countries. Each category of Fellows brought back unique skills from their training. A full discussion of the results of PFP training is detailed in ANNEX II, and we recommend that ANNEX be studied to gather the flavor of our findings. The essential findings reflected in that ANNEX are summarized below:

A. Post-Doctoral Fellows

Of the Fellows interviewed, over 35 professional papers, co-authored with U.S. counterparts, were either published or are in the process of being published by members of this group. Many skills learned are being used in Egypt, and collaboration with U.S. counterparts is taking place with about one-third of the group. Many long-term development benefits will come from this group as Fellows are now using new methodologies for identifying pharmaceutical compounds; germplasm is being exchanged between an Egyptian and a U.S. professor to improve cereal varieties; new diagnostic procedures are being used by Fellows (and being taught to others) for determination of infectious diseases; Fellows are using improved techniques to develop new and improved, non-pesticide methods of plant and animal pest control. New computer techniques are being used for managing research. New courses have been added to their teaching curricula, and many other long-term benefits appear to us quite possible. Perhaps the most significant, long-term benefits for these Fellows

will be the improvement of their research because of new research techniques learned in their study in the U.S.

B. Thesis Research for PhDs in Egypt

Fellows in this grouping excelled during their study by completing their research, learning new techniques for research and by developing collaboration with U.S. counterparts. Since these Fellows had longer study periods than other PF programs, their potential for long-term collaboration is superior to other groups. Twelve Fellows were interviewed in this group and of them, 14 scientific papers were published (or are in progress). One Fellow received the Best Scientific Paper Award at the 85th Assembly of the Southern Medical Association, and all completed their research goals for the PhD thesis. Examples of development oriented work include the initiation of a surgery section for those with hearing problems; dental use of new laser surgery techniques learned in the U.S.; dental studies on the relationship between genetic factors and dental disorders (a project in collaboration with a U.S. professor); a revised course in demography (using techniques learned in the U.S.); the use of ultrasound for fetus diagnosis; new techniques used to manage different levels of ESL students and many useful techniques of improved research methodology.

C. Training Fellows

These Fellows were from both private and public sectors. Although their program was for non-degree training, some were able to complete the Masters degree as a result of their PF study. Many new techniques were acquired by this group and they are applying this knowledge in their work. Skills related to computer applications, such as CAD/CAM (computer assisted drafting and computer assisted machining), computer networking, and design capabilities have been introduced into these Fellows' work. One Fellow was trained at a technical school and based on this training he was able to obtain the highest level of certification (only the third to be so certified in Egypt) of the American Association of Non-Destructible Materials Testing.

As a result of this training, he is using this capability for the benefit of his company. New techniques for construction, plans for urban renewal, and studies in comparative law are other examples of knowledge being utilized by returned Fellows to benefit the development of Egypt.

Many disciplines have been covered by the Fellows study programs. To date (mid-September, 1993), 1101 Fellows have departed for study and returned or are now in training in the U.S. Below is a percentage breakdown by discipline of those Fellows' programs:

<u>Disciplines</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agriculture	15%
Engineering	31%
Medical Sciences*	30%
Sciences	7%
Veterinary Medicine	6%
Other**	<u>11%</u>
	100%

* Includes Dentistry, Pharmacology, Nursing, and Associated Health Sciences

** Includes such fields as Economics, Business, Education, Humanities, and Social Sciences

All Fellows seemed to recognize the benefit they get from the exposure to a different culture and the effects of their training can be expected to impact on Egypt's development for many years in the future. They are a formidable group of contemporary Egyptians who will certainly cause changes in the places they work and play.

VII. PRIVATE SECTOR AND FEMALE PARTICIPATION AND PLACEMENT IN HBCUS

A. Female Participation

Women interviewed were primarily post-doctoral PFs or doing thesis research. They were enthusiastic about their opportunity to study abroad and reported encouraging results from their studies. The project is short of the projected target of 20%, but the number of women that have been placed is overall 17% which the evaluation team feels is a good performance in Egyptian society. Based on the responses from returned women PFs, the team concluded that in the future applications from women for similar programs should be more easily obtained. Women on post-doctoral programs would like to return and carry out more research in collaboration with U.S. professors. Cultural adjustment in the U.S. was no greater problem for women than for men.

B. Private Sector Placement

The private sector trainees target is currently 20% and the overall placement is 13%. The placement rate is currently 24%. Until 1992, the target for private sector placements was 12%. PIL #10, Amendment 9 revised the private sector target upward from 12% to 20%. The target of 12% was being met in 1992 and currently 24.4% of those in study are from the private sector. Although the overall private sector target of 20% will not be met by the PACD, the selection process has kept pace with the target levels established.

Fellows interviewed from the private sector had positive training experiences. Several new construction techniques were acquired, and two Fellows studying in this area completed Masters degrees. Careful placement of private sector trainees can assist Egyptian development efforts, especially by training Fellows in appropriate technical areas such as computer program design, management and business. Private

sector trainees would like to earn advanced degrees, especially the MBA and related management degrees. Technical training with a theoretical understanding followed by "hands on" experience is especially desired. Future programs for private sector technical training should be separated from academic programs because of differences in selection and placement from pure academic programs.

C. Placement in HBCUS

ECEB has contact with six HBCUs and according to records kept by A.I.D./W/OIT, six Fellows were placed in HBCUs as of September 8, 1993. Of Fellows interviewed, one was placed at an HBCU (Tuskegee University in Alabama) and had an excellent experience working on a hydroponics project for vegetables. ECEB should capitalize on opportunities for placing Fellows in HBCUs, especially in Agriculture. Many HBCUs have linkages with other universities offering programs in agriculture as well as good contacts with USDA sponsored programs. The evaluation team believes, for example, that an HBCU like the University of Maryland, Eastern Shore could easily coordinate a program giving a post-doctoral Fellow experience on their campus, the University of Maryland campus and possibly the USDA Research Facilities in Beltsville, Maryland. Similar arrangements could be made with Lincoln University at Jefferson City, Missouri, and the University of Missouri at Columbia, Missouri (30 miles away). Many HBCUs have specialized research programs and linkage arrangements that could give Fellows broad exposure to a number of systems. HBCU faculty have a good understanding, generally, of development and some HBCUs offer unique opportunities in community development programs. The evaluation team believes many additional Fellows could benefit from and appropriately be placed in HBCUs.

VIII. LESSONS LEARNED

The lessons the evaluation team learned while performing this evaluation were essentially two.

First, when designing a training activity it is very important for any continuing developmental effect to work with and train those individuals in the society who can be most influential. In the Egyptian culture, an individual who acquires a graduate degree is highly respected, listened to, and has a greatly enhanced status in Egyptian society. Because of this cultural more, those individuals who have earned and received graduate degrees are particularly influential in all walks of Egyptian life.

To provide graduate training and, wherever possible, an advanced degree to Egyptians working in the disciplines most needed to foster development is not the only mode of assistance that promotes development, but in the Egyptian context it can be an effective way to assist in Egypt's long term development.

The Peace Fellowship Program, from its beginning under project 263-0110, will have provided U.S. graduate training for about 3,350 Egyptians. All of Egypt's needs for highly trained individuals, of course, can not be met within a single A.I.D. activity. The Peace Fellowship Program has been assisting in this area, and we believe that the momentum it has generated should be continued by designing and implementing a follow-on program focussed more closely than the PFP on specific disciplines most needed to foster economic and social development. We have recommended the design of a new project that will continue the momentum of the PFP, and concentrate in specific areas of expertise and produce more advanced degrees for the Egyptians in these areas.

The second lesson learned in this evaluation is that when the counterpart host government agency shares the same purposes as A.I.D., a project will be managed well by the counterpart agency because there is strong motivation to do so. In the case of the Peace Fellows Program, the real mutuality of purpose between the Ministry of Higher Education and A.I.D. and the dedication of the Egyptian counterparts to the success of the project, we believe, will result in success. For these reasons, the team recommends that for the follow-on project the Ministry of Higher Education should be the Egyptian government agency of choice to manage it.

IX. FOLLOW-ON ACTIVITIES

A. Recommendations for the Balance of the Current PFP Program

Based on findings from Fellows and this evaluation, the team recommends that the following be considered for the remainder of the current project:

- Eliminate the "three-course per program" limit on Fellows now studying and newly selected Fellows.
 - Solidify and articulate the policy on extensions of time for Fellowships, especially for Training Fellowships, between USAID/C, MOHE, and ECEB.
 - Allow Training Fellows (and in some cases non-degree research Fellows) to extend their program for up to 1 year (subject to PACD limitations) if they have (1) completed at least 18 semester hours of graduate credit towards the Masters degree and; (2) have been formally accepted into a graduate program leading to the Master's Degree. (The conditions for approval of an extension for completion of the Master's Degree should be stated in the PIO/P.)
 - Consider post-doctoral Fellows for periods of time up to 1-year (subject to PACD). Extension beyond the initial 6 months should be granted following a request from the Fellow and an accompanying request from the academic advisor (with appropriate agreement of the university).
 - In placing new Fellows from Agriculture and other priority disciplines, first investigate placements with HBCUs or possible joint-placements with HBCUs and the other Land Grant Experiment Stations in the same State.
-

-
- Support the principle and allow one remedial English course for Fellows in their first semester of work.
 - Develop the practice of scheduling student's arrival on campus at least 2 weeks prior to the beginning of school (for English familiarization and housing) and encourage the University Office of International Programs to arrange a "host family stay" for Fellows willing to participate.
 - Since it is inevitable in any management system that issues of policy interpretation and special implementation rules will come up, we recommend that the MOHE and the USAID institute a quarterly meeting between them to review progress and deal with policy and management issues that may have come up since the last review meeting. It is important and we recommend that a formal agenda be agreed to before each quarterly project status review, and that the agenda be adhered to during these meetings.

All recommendations are subject to availability of funds and the PACD.

B. Future Academic Training Programs (Following the PACD)

The Peace Fellowship Program has successfully trained Egyptian Fellows for greater contributions to their employers and to the development process in Egypt. This program was designed to train and expose an anticipated 1250 Egyptian university, public sector and private sector participants to U.S. education and culture. The Fellows, and those they influence through teaching and other exposure, will benefit from the success of this program. Since this program was general in design to cover a very wide variety of study areas, it is now time to address more specific target audiences to assist and help guide the Egyptian development process. Returned Fellows indicated that privatization will be the trend of the future in Egypt, and training should support the technical and management needs of this process. The

major benefits from the program may well be the introduction of new ways of thinking by returned participants, improvement in medical practices and techniques from the large number of Fellows in medicine, and improved teaching and research procedures as a result of many university professors being exposed to experts in the U.S.

Since the priority areas of study specified in the 1992 SOP were only minimally covered, future programs should consider the continuing relevance of these disciplines. Those still considered to be relevant should be targeted for future programs.

The evaluation team recommends that USAID/Cairo in collaboration with the MOHE design a new project as a follow-on to the Peace Fellowship Program which would maintain the momentum of the PFP and provide training in priority development areas minimally covered in the PFP.

ANNEX I

DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROJECT PEACE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (PF) COMPONENT (263.0125.1)

Egyptian Cultural and Educational Bureau (ECEB)

RESPONSIBILITIES: The ECEB is responsible for:

1. Placement of Peace Fellowship Program nominees in U.S.A. higher education institutions;
2. Providing orientation to new arrivals;
3. Monitoring progress of Peace Fellows (PFs); and
4. Providing administrative services to PFs, such as extensions of training, medical insurance coverage, attendance at professional conferences and travel arrangements in the U.S. and return to Egypt.

QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWERS

A. Placement of Peace Fellows

1. Does ECEB have listings of current and past Fellows that:
 - a. Have been placed by ECEB since September, 1988 (0125.1)?
 - b. Privately sought placements since September, 1988 (0125.1)?

ECEB statistics do not separate privately sought placements from ECEB final placements. If a PF candidate indicates on his/her application (or in other documents in PF's file) that he/she has made contact with and requests placement in a specific school, ECEB tries to place the PF at the school indicated.

ECEB Education Specialists indicated that about 60% of the applications request specific schools. They try to place the PFs as requested, and the Education Specialists estimate that over 50% of placements are in the candidates' school of choice. Current PFs interviewed indicated approval of their placements, even when the institution was not selected. Forty five of 55 responding returned Peace Fellows reported being placed at one of their selected choices (indicating involvement in the process).

Post-doctoral PFs usually have made professional contacts with specific schools and professors they wish to work with in their research. In the majority of cases, placement is made as the post-doctoral research candidate wishes.

Based on conversations with the ECEB Education Specialists, current placements are in educational institutions (universities) and not with private sources. Contacts are being made with sources in the private sector. Attempts are being made by ECEB to place private sector PFs in private sector organizations - either in private non-academic institutions or directly in U.S. companies, etc. Many private companies reject placement for proprietary liability reasons. Most trainees from the private sector, placed to date, have been placed in educational institutions with a limitation of three courses per training period and with the expectation the educational institution will arrange the on-the-job part of the PFs training with private entities. Candidates interviewed reveal limited success with this process. The three course limitation has narrowed training opportunities for some trainees. PFs would like to be placed in the private sector, but if this is not possible, they would prefer a full course load. ECEB does a good placement job with academic programs. They lack experience and supervisory authority to be effective in placing participants in private sector companies.

2. What is the average time spent by ECEB to arrange individual placements?

According to the ECEB, the average time taken to arrange individual placement is from 6 to 8 weeks. However, placements attempted during summer vacation periods are much slower because school faculty and administrative officials are not so readily available. ECEB functions most efficiently with a steady flow of placements.

Placements in other than colleges and universities are much more difficult and time-consuming. As indicated above, ECEB is just now attempting to make "training" placements in U.S. private sector organizations.

ECEB staff feel that the best procedure (when possible) to make "private sector" placements would be to arrange training programs through universities using the university-private entity relationships when such is already in place.

3. What are the universities/colleges in which ECEB arranges placements?

ECEB has placed PFs with 54 public and private universities/ colleges in 36 States and District of Columbia (Illinois for example, now has students in four different universities). (See Attachment A to this ANNEX) for listing of current institutions in which PFs are placed)

ECEB continues to contact additional universities and place PFs with the widest variety of institutions. They look for different types of universities so Fellows can have choices in placement.

4. What criteria are being used to make PF placements? Is cost a factor?

ECEB uses the following criteria:

a. Adequacy of study program proposed by the school to meet the study goals of the PFs;

b. Cost of living compared to authorized allowances is a factor (experience has shown that the most expensive centers are most difficult for PFs to handle financially);

c. Cost of research and non-academic programs proposed by schools are also factors in placement;

d. The positive or negative attitudes of the proposed academic/program advisors toward foreign students (particularly Egyptians) perceived by ECEB placement specialists when discussing PF study programs and negotiating costs for the PF's study programs.

5. Are several possible placements sought per training program?

For all placements except post-doctoral researchers (who most often have contacted schools beforehand and designed their own programs on the basis of discussions with those schools), ECEB practice is to review PF study programs with at least three schools.

6. Are PF nominees given the option to choose among training institutions?

ECEB will try to place candidates at the institution the PF has shown preference for in his/her application if all factors are essentially equal.

When two schools are close to being equal (program and cost) in their responses to ECEB requests, the PF candidate will be given the opportunity to choose which of the two schools is preferable. Although cost is a factor, the lowest price for the training is not the total driving force of placement.

7. Does the ECEB try to place several Fellows as a group in the same institution?

Yes, when a university will set up special programs only if more than one PF is involved. This is the case particularly when several PFs may have related study

program content, or simply that the administrative costs of handling special programs are too high if only one PF is involved.

Students being placed in a program largely of course work are generally placed individually in departments. In some cases, such as in training courses with limited time for course work, students are placed in small groups to facilitate the financing of specialized training.

8. Are individual PF placements appropriate (departments where study is arranged) for their field of training?

ECEB staff feel they are careful about arranging appropriate places of study. There is a practice of changing placements if the initial placement is not appropriate either because the PF finds that the program is not right, or if the PF and his/her academic advisor are not compatible personalities.

Fellows are placed in departments prepared to train students appropriately. Our contacts with current Fellows confirmed appropriate placement with one exception (where an architect was placed in a Civil Engineering Department and might have been more appropriately placed in a Department of Architecture). Until recently, all Education Specialists placed students and placed them well. Currently Fellows are placed by two specialists and the followup responsibilities divided among the Education Specialists. This latter practice of separating placement from monitoring duties is not unusual among other placement organizations.

9. Are individual PF placements in university departments appropriate for the required training?

ECEB has long experience with U.S. University research costs, and has come up with a rule-of-thumb cost of from \$2,000 - \$7,000 for a 6-month research program -- the spread depending on the degree of sophistication and costs of materials needed for the research. ECEB has the benefit of A.I.D. data on such costs at U.S. Universities paid for through other A.I.D.-financed programs.

ECEB Education Specialists (all of whom placed candidates until recently) indicated using the guide of \$1,000 per month (which includes tuition) as programming costs to support the fellow. They indicated that when discussing research and training costs with universities, since they generally placed only one student at a site, they generally did not negotiate tuition. In comparing research costs with known university costs, ECEB Fellows receive good value.

Fees for university support of research costs are negotiated for each PF program. Of post-doctoral Fellows contacted, one gained new research skills and as a result of his study, will co-author (with U.S. scientists) two publications.

10. Is ECEB making efforts to increase placements in HBCUs?

Yes, ECEB has relations with HBCUs and has made placements with six of them: Howard University, Tuskegee University, Southern University of Baton Rouge, Morgan State University, Prairie View A&M University, and Florida A&M. ECEB staff experience reveals that Fellows prefer other assignments. Although ECEB works to place students in HBCUs, it appears that more Fellows could be appropriately placed in these institutions. To improve HBCU placements, one Education Specialist should investigate the strengths of specific HBCUs and be the source within ECEB for information about them. Some schools with good academic programs and training potential are being overlooked (e.g., University of Maryland, Eastern Shore; Lincoln University, Jefferson City, Missouri; Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio; and others).

ECEB is trying to encourage more use of HBCUs in carrying out A.I.D. policy. ECEB placements at HBCUs take into consideration the environment at the schools (personal safety, adequateness of housing and other facilities), and the availability of appropriate and adequate academic programs. ECEB staff have indicated that very few post-doctoral research Fellowships can be arranged at HBCUs, because of the special needs for the research activity, and more often because post-doctoral PFs usually arrange their own programs at institutions and with professors with whom they are acquainted. And so far none of the post-doctoral Fellows have had previous contact with an HBCU.

11. What is the breakdown of placements between public sector and private sector fellows?

Of 172 PFs currently in training in the U.S. (as of 9/15/93), 42 (24%) are from the private sector; 38 (22%) are from the public sector; and 92 (54%) are from universities and research centers.

12. What is the target for female PF placements?

The target is 20%.

13. What is the percentage of female PFs that have been placed by ECEB since this component of project 263-0125.1 began being implemented in September, 1988?

The overall percentage is 17%; and 18% of those currently in training.

B. Services

1. Does the ECEB provide the following services:

a. Meet PFs as they arrive in the U.S.?

No. PFs are given instructions to check into hotels close by ECEB in Washington, D.C., on Sunday night, then come to the ECEB on Monday morning. This procedure seems to be working quite well.

b. Do all PFs arrive in Washington, D.C. prior to travelling to their placement institutions?

Yes, unless a Fellow does not follow instructions. Very few PFs have gone directly to schools where they have been placed.

c. Does the ECEB provide orientation to PFs upon their arrival in the U.S.?

Yes. Orientation covers 2 days at ECEB. PFs are given an orientation packet that contains instructions on how to arrange for all related costs and finances, what the PFs are authorized to do and get paid for, special handouts dealing with Washington D.C., (where to go, metro services), tipping in the U.S., health insurance benefits and how it is administered, what PF's responsibilities are, various hints on how to live in the U.S.

Special sessions are held with PFs on financing arrangements (what allowances amount to, limitations on costs, how and when PFs will receive subsistence checks, book allowances, per diem for authorized field trips, etc.); special sessions are presented to the male Fellows on U.S. attitudes and legal definitions of "sexual harassment"; and special counselling of any PFs who seem to have attitude problems perceived by the ECEB staff during orientation that may cause such PFs trouble during their stay in the U.S. A special video program is shown to arriving PFs dealing with U.S. cultural habits, mores -- how to react to social situations in public and private, etc.

d. If all PFs do not enter the U.S. through Washington, D.C., how and where are they provided orientation?

When a PF does not pass through Washington, D.C., that PF simply is sent the orientation packet at the institution where placed.

-
- e. Does ECEB make housing arrangements for PFs? In Washington, D.C.? At the universities?

ECEB makes housing arrangements for three nights in Washington, D.C., and usually for the first three nights at the school site. At training institutions, PFs have experienced some housing difficulties. The high cost of housing (last minute arranged by PF and advisor etc.), especially in large urban areas has been a problem for some. Fellows contacted suggested they be sent information on housing at the selected site before arrival and where possible, have housing arranged for them when arrival coincides with the beginning of the school session. Team comment: One solution on residential campuses would be for ECEB to place Fellows in a graduate (or older student residence hall) for the first semester they are on campus. Many universities have married student apartments and will place older students in such housing on a near equal priority as married students. **ECEB should look deeper than now into the housing situation as they place students on various campuses.**

- f. How is medical insurance coverage arranged for PFs?

Medical insurance is made through OIT/Washington under the HAC program for all A.I.D.-financed participants. All Fellows contacted were aware of the health program and most stated they had no problems with medical coverage. Short-term participants (6 months or less) had the most problems with medical coverage.

- g. What financial transfer arrangements for PF allowances are made by ECEB (tuition, school activities, lodging, maintenance checks, etc.)?

(1) Tuition and fees - ECEB pays directly to school admissions offices. Research costs are arranged with departments or colleges with appropriate transmittal through university channels. No payment goes directly to individual university faculty or staff.

(2) Medical Insurance - A.I.D./HAC and the institution's required coverage, if any. Dependents, if any, ECEB covers under a separate policy with Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Dependents coverage varies, Blue-Cross/Blue Shield is one of the sources.

(3) Monthly maintenance for PF -- ECEB sends a monthly check to the PF. This procedure works well. Handbook 10 maintenance allowance rates are carefully followed.

(4) Transportation -- ECEB pays for international and domestic travel of PFs. For dependents, where authorized, ECEB, through the GOE Missions program, pays authorized costs including domestic and international travel and some allowances.

(5) Books and Equipment -- PFs are reimbursed by ECEB for allowable items up to \$65 per month. Post-doctoral fellows contacted said they had received \$65.00 (total) for books and supplies for their stay and expressed need for more funds. Post-doctoral Fellows should have funds for purchasing books and supplies equal to other Fellows(\$65.00 per month) preferably paid at beginning of study. If this is a serious problem, **ECEB should address a request to change these costs to the allowance committee.**

(6) Allowances for post-doctorates -- those sponsored by universities or research centers. This allowance is provided only if total PFP funds do not exceed those funds available to Egyptian Missions students. Authorized dependents of this group are eligible if they remain in the U.S. 9 months or more.

- h. Does ECEB request tuition waivers or reduction of tuition costs from placement institutions?

Reduction in tuition or waivers are discussed with universities when placement negotiations take place between ECEB and universities. There has not been a great amount of success in acquiring reductions in school costs.

- i. Does ECEB make arrangements for Fellows:
(1) to attend professional conferences?
(2) membership in professional societies?
(3) subscriptions to journals and other publications?

ECEB (1) approves requests for attendance and makes reimbursement for approved conferences; (2) acquires memberships for PFs in professional societies; (3) arranges for subscriptions to professional journals and relevant publications related to a PF's field of study.

- j. Is there a toll-free telephone service for meeting Fellows' urgent needs while they are in training?

No 800 toll-free number is in use and education specialists can not accept collect calls, but PFs may use E-mail or regular telephones or FAX messages to ECEB. ECEB feels this works well and is sufficient to meet PF's needs. Fellows (in-training) contacted expressed satisfaction with their ability to make contact with ECEB Educational Specialists and felt they were supported well, some returned fellows mentioned the inconvenience of (1) no 800 toll-free number (2) ECEB's policy on collect calls and (3) the 5-minute limitation on calls from education specialists.

2. Does ECEB feel current services are adequate for meeting PFs' needs?

ECEB believes current services are adequate for PF's needs. If trouble develops between PF and ECEB Education Specialists, ECEB will make appropriate changes, or otherwise try to solve any problems.

3. Does ECEB recommend other services which could (or should) supplement currently provided services?

ECEB believes current services meet PF's primary needs and that any additional services are not necessary, nor appropriate for PFs who are all adult and doing study and projects at the graduate level.

C. Monitoring Training Programs

1. What procedures does ECEB use to monitor the progress of PFs while they are in training?

See following discussion paragraphs 2 through 8.

2. Are Fellows required to submit to ECEB Plans of Study covering the whole training period signed by each Fellow's academic advisor? Do ECEB officials evaluate and approve these study plans?

Study plans covering the whole training period must be submitted by PFs and signed by academic advisors. These plans form the basis of budgetary decisions and base line for monitoring progress of the PF by ECEB. Files studied in ECEB verified a continuous monitoring of funding, Fellows' progress, end of program accounting and general caretaking. Each educational specialist took special interest in each Fellow assigned to them and constructively assisted with the program.

Progress reports on PFs in trainee status must be submitted at least twice: at mid-point and at the end of the training period (usually 12 months); for post-doctoral PFs - only at the end of the PF period since the post-doctoral research is usually no more than 6 months; for PFs in degree programs, each semester. Formats for specific reports are given to PFs in the orientation package.

ECEB estimates that 60 - 80% of progress reports are received on a timely basis. PFs and academic advisors are contacted when reports are not submitted on a timely basis. At the end of the training period, in cases when reports have not been regularly submitted, ECEB informs the academic advisor that PFs can not get airline tickets for return to Egypt unless an itemized accounting of budget expenditures and final progress or evaluation report is submitted. This practice in most cases generates the reply with progress and evaluation reports.

-
3. Does ECEB receive reports on academic Fellows' examination results and cumulative GPAs?

Examination results and GPAs (transcripts) are submitted to ECEB.

4. Are placement universities filling out and reporting AETR forms for academic Fellows at the end of each quarter/semester?

AETRs are regularly submitted on a semester basis to ECEB.

5. Is the non-academic progress report form being used for tracking achievements of non-academic Fellows?

Non-academic reporting is the weakest area. ECEB has provided a non-academic progress report format, but some professors/academic advisors do not like pre-determined formats and often prefer to send narrative reports on non-academic progress. Folders evaluated showed good monitoring by the specialists and reasonable responsiveness from the advisors and trainers whose reports, though not in the prescribed format, cover the same information requested but in narrative form.

6. Is there a minimum established requirement for a Fellow's academic work load?

Rather than a minimum credit load (except for degree training in which the institution sets the minimum load) ECEB policy has established a maximum of three classes during the training period for non-academic training and for DNDR programs. No course work is allowed for post-doctoral research fellows. Some exceptions are granted to DNDR Fellows if the advisor requests that the Fellow take some "tools" courses such as computing or statistics, and some 12 month trainees have been allowed to take more than the three course maximum.

7. Do Fellows' chosen courses relate to the overall objectives of the training program (Egypt's development needs: development activities as contrasted with areas such as fine arts, etc.)?

ECEB accepts MOHE judgment that in the selection process PF nominee programs have been judged as appropriate to meeting the substantive objectives of the PFP -- meeting Egypt's development needs.

8. Do Fellows take courses for credit or do they audit courses?

For non-degree training of PFs, the three allowed courses may be for academic credit or the classes may be audited. Fellows generally prefer to get credit for any classes in which they participate.

9. Are summer periods utilized for training?

Summer periods for non-academic trainees are usually devoted to course work, independent study, and practical study. Some universities place students with private institutions (businesses, industries, corporations, companies) under arrangements made by the universities where PFs are studying. The PFP through ECEB pays any fees required and transportation to and from the training site, as well as per diem.

Fellows talked to and the word from Education Specialists of ECEB was that most Fellows in school during the academic year are also in school in the summer (except for Fellows with a three course limit).

10. Does ECEB staff make field visits to U.S. universities to monitor training progress? How often? Is there an established schedule, or are trips planned on an ad hoc basis?

Only the ECEB Acting Director makes any trips to training sites. When academic advisors happen to visit Washington, D.C., they usually meet with the ECEB Acting Director only. The ECEB Education Specialists who backstop and monitor individual PFs have no planned personal contact with either the individual PF nor with the academic advisors.

11. What is ECEB's method of allocating funds to universities?

Allocations are made against vouchers submitted by the universities. Each program starts with an advance of funds that is liquidated at the time of submission of the next voucher from a given school. The amount provided against the voucher submitted will usually approximate the school's stated requirements for the next 90 days, minus the amount of funds still on hand. The required financial reports from schools must show funds on hand at the beginning of the period just passed, the expenditures made, the balance of funds on hand, the projections of requirements over the next 90-day period, and the net request for new funds.

12. Are U.S. universities regularly reporting on expenditures and reimbursing unused balances?

ECEB reports that the universities are regularly reporting on expenditures and are very good at returning unused balances. These returned balances are placed back in the program account and used to finance future expenditures for PFs. Random spot checks of Fellows folders confirmed the above. Reimbursements from universities since September, 1988, have amounted to \$132,531.59.

D. ECEB Staff

1. Is there sufficient ECEB staff to cover the workload?

There is sufficient staff to cover the workload easily. Indeed, by comparison with private contractors doing similar work, the ECEB would appear to be a little over staffed with regard to the monitoring workload.

2. Does ECEB have a listing of its staff that describes each person's function?

ECEB did not provide the evaluators a functional listing of its personnel. As a result of discussions with ECEB personnel, however, a list of personnel and their approximate functions is included in Attachment B to this Annex.

3. Are the staff salary scales adequate to insure qualified personnel?

Staff salary scales have increased since the last evaluation in January, 1989. A comparison of current ECEB salaries with comparable Washington area salary scales is included in Attachment C to this Annex. ECEB salaries are, by and large, still below area rates for comparable jobs.

4. Do ECEB staff members receive training suitable for improving their functions?

Little training is provided by ECEB except on-the-job help from principals and senior staff as individuals perform their daily functions. Some computer training has been provided as well as limited opportunities for area programs.

5. How are ECEB staff kept up to date on requirements?

Any changes in policies or requirements from MOHE are communicated verbally to the ECEB staff by the Acting Director. There were no internal ECEB instructional series provided to the evaluation team.

ECEB receives regular updates of A.I.D. Handbook 10, and copies of these updates are disseminated to all professional staff as they are received from A.I.D.

6. Do individual ECEB staff members have authorities commensurate with their responsibilities?

ECEB staff members are delegated no authorities:

- Acting Director makes all decisions regarding approvals of PF placements;
-

-
- Acting Director must sign any and all communications that leave ECEB;
 - Acting Director receives all communications coming to ECEB.
 - Acting Director makes all decisions regarding any extensions of training;
 - Rules for the use of the FAX machine, use of kitchen facilities, length of telephone calls, policy regarding acceptance of collect calls, printing of computer reports, use of copying machine, etc. are established and discretionary authority for any of these matters is not delegated to any staff member. All authority rests with the Acting Director.

E. Reporting

1. What is included in ECEB's data bases on the project?

The computer program data base (D-Base III) records data in the following categories:

- Fellow's ID#
- Fellow's name (last, first and middle)
- Sponsor (university, or research center, ministry or other public sector, private sector.
- University where Fellow is placed
- Goal of study (PhD, MA, DNDR, training (non degree)
- Arrival date
- End date.

2. What are ECEB's reporting requirements?

Six month "Peace Fellowship Program; comprehensive report" (see paragraph 3).

3. What reports go to the Missions Department of the MOHE? What is frequency and content of such reports?

Aside from any ad hoc requests from MOHE/Missions Department and USAID for specific information, the only reporting requirement of ECEB is to prepare and forward to MOHE/Missions and USAID/Cairo a report called "PEACE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM; Comprehensive Report". This report is submitted at six-month intervals, i.e., covering the periods of January 1 - June 30, and July 1 - December 31 each year.

This report is composed of a statistical compilation of placement and placement related data for the six-month period covered. The tables, graphics and short narrative explanations are organized under the following sections:

PART I - STUDENT AFFAIRS

- SECTION I - Peace Fellow participant files (the numbers of PF files broken down by those: (a) currently in the U.S.; (b) placed but not arrived; and (c) pending placement.
- SECTION II- Arrivals and departures (shown by sponsor, goal, field of study).
- SECTION III- Placement (shown as placed by sponsor, goal, field of study; and distribution of PF files for placement action by sponsor, goal, field of study).
- SECTION IV- Conferences (conferences described and ECEB staff who attended.)

PART II- ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCE

- SECTION I - Administrative (Shows program expenses during reporting period chargeable to project 263-0125.1)
- SECTION II- Finance (shows program expenses paid by Egyptian government; and administrative budget expenses paid from the A.I.D. and GOE contributions).

4. Does ECEB make any reports to USAID/Cairo or A.I.D./Washington? If so, what is their frequency and content?

No, other than the report described above under questions 2 and 3 or special requests for specific information.

5. Does ECEB suggest any changes in reporting requirements that might produce a more efficient process?

The format and content of the current six-month report was changed beginning with the July 1 - December 31, 1992 report and the ECEB Acting Director believes this report has been improved and is appropriate for the project.

09/16/93

Page: 1

List of all current PF in the USA as of 09/15/1993

ID#	STUDENT'S NAME (last, first middle)	SPONSOR	UNIVERSITY	FIELD	GOAL	ARV-DATE	EXT-DATE
4351	ABBAS, ABDUL SHAFY ABD ALLAH	MIN. EDUCATION	U. MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST	EDUCATION	T	08/27/93	08/26/94
4170	ABBALLA, MOUNIR MAHMOUD EMMADI MOSTAFA	CAIRO U.	U. OF MARYLAND	MICROBIOLOGY	PDR	05/23/93	11/22/93
4286	ABBALLA, SALMA MOHAMED ABDEL RAHMAN	ASSIUT U.	LOUISIANA STATE U./BATON ROUGE	MEDICINE	DMDR	05/22/92	11/21/93
4172	ABDEL CAWAD, EL SAYED MOHAMED MAHMOUD	CAIRO U.	OHIO STATE U.	MEDICINE	PDR	04/04/93	10/03/93
4360	ABDEL GHANY, EMMY MOSTAFA FOUAD	PUBLIC SCORE	CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC INST.	ACCOUNTING	T	09/07/93	09/06/94
4027	ABDEL HALIH SAAD, TAREK AHMED	U. ILLINOIS/CHICAGO	U. ILLINOIS/CHICAGO	RESTORATIVE DEN T	T	06/07/92	04/06/94
4366	ABDEL HANDED, EZZAT SALEM MOHAMED	CENT. AUDIT ORG.	U. NEW HAMPSHIRE	ECONOMICS	T	08/22/93	08/21/94
4334	ABDEL KADER, GABAL MOHAMED ABDEL RAHMAN	AIN HELWAN U.	VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INS.	TOURISM/HOTELS	T	01/03/93	01/02/94
4164	ABDEL KADER, SALLY MOHAMED	ALEXANDRIA U.	HARVARD SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY	MEDICINE	PDR	07/13/93	12/12/93
4399	ABDEL MAGEED, ALAA EORAHY	CAIRO U.	TEXAS A&M U./COLLEGE STATION	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/05/93	07/04/94
4301	ABDEL MAGIED, AHMED ZAKARIA	PRIVATE SECTOR	COLUMBIA U. LAW SCHOOL/ NY	ATTORNEY	T	08/22/93	08/21/94
4302	ABDEL MEGUID, BADR SHAWKY	CAIRO U.	CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO	HOTELS ADMIN.	T	07/11/93	07/10/95
4471	ABDEL MEGUID, ANCAD RAFIE RADY	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. COLORADO	ENGINEERING	T	08/08/93	02/07/94
4138	ABDEL RAHMAN, MAGLAA MOHAMED	MATL RES CTR	M. COLLEGE OF PHARMACY	CHEMISTRY	PDR	06/20/93	11/15/93
4341	ABDEL SALAM, METWALLI KOTB ABDURAO	MIN. INDUSTRY	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	06/04/93	06/03/94
4427	ABDEL SHAFY, RANDA MOHAMED SAFY EL DIM	ZAGAZIG U.	TEXAS A & M	EDUCATION	DMDR	08/15/93	02/14/95
4294	ABDEL WAHAB, MAHMOUD MOHAMED ABDEL WAHAB AMIN	NEW TECH. CO.	OHIO STATE U.	ENGINEERING	T	06/06/93	06/05/94
3292	ABDEL-RAHMAN, ABDEL-RAHMAN A.R.	SABBOUR ASSOC.	COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY	ENGINEERING	T	08/13/89	08/24/94
4032	ABDINE, MOHAMED HASSAN MOHAMED	PRIVATE SECTOR	U OF ARIZONA	PHARMACOLOGY	T	08/01/93	05/31/94
4292	ABDOU, ALAA ELOIN HUSSEIN IBRAHIM	PRIVATE SECTOR	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNO	ENGINEERING	MA	08/17/93	08/16/95
4362	ABDULLAH, GHADA SHAWKI	IDMC	SYRACUSE U./NEW YORK	COMPUTER SYS.	MA	01/03/93	01/02/95
4393	ABOU ELFATOH, ABDEL AZIZ MAHMOUD	MAT RES CTR	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/17/93	07/16/94
4453	ABOU SALEM, MOHAMED EL SAYED SOUSHI	ZAGAZIG U.	U. NORTH TEXAS	BIO. SCIENCES	PDR	05/23/93	11/22/93
4683	ABOU ZEID, AHMED WAIL ALY	PRIVATE SECTOR	TUFTS U./BOSTON	MEDICINE	DMDR	12/13/91	12/13/93
4414	ABOU ZEID, KHALED MAHMOUD ISMAIL	CAIRO U.	PENNSYLVANIA STATE U.	CHEMISTRY	DMDR	05/23/93	11/22/94
4371	ABOUL HOUR, LOUAY A.R	ZAGAZIG U.	CARMICHAEL WELDON U./PITTSBURGH	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/26/93	07/23/94
4314	AHMED, ATEF MAGATY MAHMOUD	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. OKLAHOMA / NORMAN	ENGINEERING	T	05/10/93	05/09/94
4625	AHMED, MOHAMED SALEM	MIN. HEALTH	U. PITTSBURGH	DENTISTRY	T	01/15/93	11/14/93
4278	AHMED, ZAKIA ATTIA MOHAMED	CAIRO U.	VIRGINIA TECH INST.	MEDICINE	PDR	03/23/93	09/22/92
4347	AL ALPI, ALI MOHAMED ALI	MIN. EDUCATION	U. OF PITTSBURGH	EDUCATION	T	06/06/93	06/05/94
4435	ALI, EMAD MOHAMED EL SAGHIR	ZAGAZIG U.	U. ILLINOIS/URBANA	ECONOMICS	DMDR	06/06/93	12/05/94
4047	ALI, IBRAHIM MOHAMED	CAIRO U.	PURDUE U.	ENGINEERING	DMDR	02/07/93	08/06/94
4299	ALI, TAREK SAPWAT	PRIVATE SECTOR	UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA	ENGINEERING	T	02/21/93	02/20/94
4257	ALLAM, AIDA MOHAMED	MEMPHIS U.	U. GEORGIA	HORTICULTURE	PDR	08/01/93	12/31/93
4300	ALLAM, HOSSAM ESWAT	EGYPTIAN PRESS	U. NEW HAVEN/WEST HAVEN	ENGINEERING	T	08/29/93	08/28/94
4192	AMIN, MAHMOUD KAMEL ALY	ZAGAZIG U.	NORTH CAROLINA STATE U	AGRICULTURE	PDR	06/13/93	11/12/93
4428	AMIN, SAMIR MOHAMED	CAIRO U.	OHIO STATE U./COLUMBUS	EDUCATION	DMDR	04/04/93	10/03/94

List of all current PP in the USA as of 09/15/1993

IDA	STUDENT'S NAME (last, first middle)	SPONSOR	UNIVERSITY	FIELD	GOAL	ARR DATE	EXT-DATE
4361	ATALLAH, EMAD BAKIN	MIN CIVIL AVIA	EMBRY RIDDLE AERONAUTICAL U.	CIVIL AVIATION	T	01/19/93	01/18/94
4362	ATTA, WADA PAROUK	CAIRO U.	U. CINCINNATI	CHEMISTRY	PHD	01/01/93	12/31/93
4363	ATTIA, EKRAM KADRY	PRIVATE SECTOR	NORTH CAROLINA STATE U.	ENGINEERING	T	08/15/92	08/14/94
4364	AYAD, HANY MOUNIR	MINIS. HOUSING	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	08/16/93	08/15/94
4365	AZZAM, ELY HAMED ALY	AG RES CTR	IOWA STATE U.	MEDICINE	PDR	03/28/93	09/27/93
4366	AZZOUZ, EL SAYED IBRAHIM MOJIB	PRIVATE SECTOR	FLORIDA INST OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	06/25/93	06/24/94
4367	BAHR, AHMED ABDEL MOHSEN	ALEXANDRIA U.	CLEVELAND STATE U.	ENGINEERING	T	03/21/93	03/20/94
4368	BASSIOUNI, ALI HOSAMUO ALI	EGYPTIAN ELECT.	COLORADO STATE U.	ENGINEERING	T	08/22/93	08/21/94
4369	BASTOKOS, SAPWAT HENRY ELIAS	MIN. INDUSTRY	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	06/04/93	06/03/94
4370	BAYOUNI, SALAH EL DIN HOSAMUO ALI	ZAGAZIG U.	U. WASHINGTON	ENGINEERING	DMDR	09/29/91	09/28/93
4371	BEKHIT, AHMED BEKRIT ALI	ALEXANDRIA U.	OHIO STATE U./WOOSTER	VETERINARY	PDR	05/14/93	11/13/93
4372	BELASSI, WALID ABDEL PATTAR AHMED	CAIRO U.	CLEVELAND STATE U.	COMMERCE	MA	08/29/93	08/28/95
4373	BISTAHROUS, MASR SFLIM	PRIVATE SECTOR	NORTH CAROLINA STATE U.	ENGINEERING	T	08/08/93	08/07/94
4374	BLOULOUS, OSSAMA IBRAHIM	MIN. OF AGRICULT	UNIV. OF CINCINNATI/CINCINNATI	ENGINEERING	T	01/09/90	01/07/95
4375	DABEES, MOHAMED ABDEL MONIEM S.M.	PRIVATE SECTOR	DREXEL U./PHILADELPHIA	ENGINEERING	MA	09/05/93	09/04/95
4376	DAUD, MADIA DAQUD YOUSSEF	ALEXANDRIA U.	U. OF PITTSBURGH	EDUCATION	T	06/06/93	06/05/94
4377	DIAB, OLFPAT ABDEL RAHMAN	CAIRO U.	NEW YORK UNIV.	PHYSICAL THERAP	DMDR	08/22/93	02/21/95
4378	DIMANA, FOUAD AHMED MOHAMED	MIN. EDUCATION	U. MASSACHUSETTS/AMHERST	EDUCATION	T	08/24/93	08/23/94
4379	EBRAHIM, YASSER HAMED	SADAT ACADEMY	DE PAUL U./CHICAGO	BUSINESS	MA	03/15/93	03/14/95
4380	EID, ISMAIL MOHAMED ABDEL HAMID	ALEXANDRIA U.	U. PITTSBURGH	DENTISTRY	DMDR	01/05/92	01/04/94
4381	EL ABBASI, IBRAHIM HAFEZ EL SAYED	AG RES CTR	NORTH DAKOTA STATE U./USDA	AGRICULTURE	DMDR	03/07/93	09/06/94
4382	EL ASSARY, KHALED AHMED ISMAIL	MINIST. OF PETR.	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	01/10/93	01/09/94
4383	EL BADRABY, HISHAM MAHMOUD ROUSEDY	PRIVATE SECTOR	FLORIDA INT. U./MIAMI	ENGINEERING	MA	01/03/93	01/02/95
4384	EL BAKARY, IMAN PAROUK MOHAMED	AIN SHAMS U.	GEORGE WASHINGTON U.	ENGLISH	DMDR	01/16/92	10/15/93
4385	EL DIB, MOHAMED EL SAYED AHMED	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. DELAWARE/NEWARK	HOTEL ADMIN.	T	01/05/93	01/04/94
4386	EL DIPRAWY, MOHAMED ABDEL MONIEM F.I.	CAIRO U.	LAMONT-DOHERTY/COLUMBIA U./NY	GEOPHYSICS	PDR	08/08/93	02/07/94
4387	EL EBBADY, JAREK MOHAMED ISMAIL ATTA	PRIVATE SECTOR	FLORIDA INST OF TECHNOLOGY	BUS. ADMIN.	T	06/20/93	06/19/94
4388	EL ERHAN, ABD ALLA AHMED	CAIRO U.	U. OF MARYLAND	ARCHITECTURE	PDR	08/22/93	01/21/94
4389	EL ESHAWI, BASSAM HUSSEIN HASSAN	AL AZHAR U.	CASE WESTERN RESERVE U.	STRUCTURAL	DMDR	01/19/92	01/18/94
4390	EL PADLY, GOMAH ALI BARCAT	TANTA U.	U. MISSOURI/COLUMBIA	AGRICULTURE	PDR	04/04/93	10/03/93
4391	EL PEKEY, SHERSEEN PATHY	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. NEW HAVEN/WEST HAVEN	ECONOMICS	T	12/29/92	12/28/93
4392	EL GAJAR, MOSTAPA AHMED AWAD	NATL RES CTR	U. NEW MEXICO/ALBUQUERQUE	CHEMISTRY	PDR	04/06/93	10/05/93
4393	EL GEBALY, RAMEZ MOHAMED REZKES MAHMOUD	PRIVATE SECTOR	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	08/16/93	08/15/94
4394	EL CHAMMAN, MOHAMED MAH. GHARIB MAH.	CENTRAL AUDIT	U. ILLINOIS/URBANA	ECONOMICS	T	01/10/93	01/09/94
4395	EL HABASHI, ALAA AL DIN ALWI ABDEL RAZEK	ALEXANDRIA U.	U. PENNSYLVANIA/PHILADELPHIA	ENGINEERING	MA	09/01/92	08/31/94
4396	EL KADI, AHMED MABIL	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. MICHIGAN/ANN ARBOR	ENGINEERING	MA	08/31/93	08/30/95
4397	EL KATEB, MAGHA MOHAMED	MIN. HIGHER ED	U. ILLINOIS/CHICAGO	NURSING	PDR	03/28/93	09/27/93

List of all current PP in the USA as of 09/15/1993

ID#	STUDENT'S NAME (last, first middle)	SPONSOR	UNIVERSITY	FIELD	GOAL	ARR DATE	EXT-DATE
4324	EL KHATIB, HASSAN MOHAMED	PRIVATE SECTOR	CALIFORNIA STATE U./SACRAMENTO	ENGINEERING	MA	08/07/93	08/06/95
4325	EL KWAWAS, IHAB HABIL	ALEXANDRIA U.	OHIO STATE U./COLUMBUS	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/10/93	07/09/94
4345	EL KHOLIE, EKRAM EL SAYED EL SAYED	MIN. EDUCATION	U. OF PITTSBURGH	EDUCATION	T	06/06/93	06/05/94
4343	EL KHOSHREBY, HASSAN MAHMOUD EL SAYED	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. OF PITTSBURGH	EDUCATION	T	06/06/93	06/05/94
4051	EL KORNABY, BESHAM MOHAMED HADIN	ZAGAZIG U.	DREXEL U./PHILADELPHIA	ENGINEERING	DMDR	02/09/93	08/08/94
4459	EL LICY, FATMA ABDOU IBRAHIM	CAIRO U.	OAKLAND U./ROCHESTER	ENGINEERING	DMDR	08/29/93	02/28/95
4464	EL MANDY, MAISA SALAH EL DIN MOH.	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. MISSOURI/ROLLA	ENGINEERING	T	08/22/93	08/21/94
4375	EL MAHADILI, YASSER MOHAMED	CAIRO U.	OHIO STATE U./COLUMBUS	ENGINEERING	DMDR	03/02/93	09/01/94
4320	EL MIHI, MAHMOUD ABDUL GABER	PRIVATE SECTOR	PACE U./NEW YORK	ACCOUNTING	T	02/02/93	02/01/94
4384	EL MOKADEN, KHALED MOHAMED MOHIB	MEMPHIS U.	OKLAHOMA STATE U.	ENGINEERING	MA	05/25/93	05/24/95
4412	EL MOKADEN, MAGLAA MOHAMED NUSSEIN ALI	EL MEMPHIS U.	GEORGE MASON U.	NURSING	PDR	08/23/93	02/21/94
4024	EL SABAGH, ATEF SHAWKY	HEALTH MINISTER	U. MARYLAND/BALTIMORE	DENTISTRY	T	02/21/93	02/20/94
4323	EL SABAI, ALAA IBRAHIM M.	PRIVATE SECTOR	GEORGE WASHINGTON U./D.C.	COMMERCE	MA	08/27/93	08/26/95
4111	EL SAFORI, YASER ABDEL MARIN MOH.	AIN SHAMS U.	U. SOUTH CAROLINA	GEOLOGY	DMDR	02/02/92	02/02/94
4327	EL SAHNY, EL SAYED KAMAL MOH.	PRIVATE SECTOR	EASTERN MICHIGAN U./YPSILANTI	ECONOMICS	T	01/01/93	12/31/93
4382	EL SAYED, BESHAM ABDEL KHALEK	ALEXANDRIA U.	U. KENTUCKY	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/10/93	07/09/94
3976	EL SHAKAWY, MAGDY ALI ABDEL FATAH	PRIVATE SECTOR	VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INST.	ENGINEERING	T	08/09/92	02/08/94
4163	EL SHAZLY, DINA AHMED	ALEXANDRIA U.	MEDICAL COLLEGE GEORGIA	DENTISTRY	PDR	05/02/93	11/01/93
4340	EL SHEHAWY, MOHAMED HAGI ALI MOHAMED	MIN. INDUSTRY	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	06/04/93	06/03/94
4368	ELEKISH, MOHAMED AMR	GEN AUTH INVEST	U. SOUTH CALIFORNIA/LOS ANGELES	ECONOMICS	T	01/18/93	01/09/94
44159	EMARA, LAILA HASSANIER	NATL RES CTR	OHIO STATE U./COLUMBUS	PHARMACOLOGY	PDR	06/28/93	11/19/93
4053	EMIRA, MOHAMED MADIN AHMED	ZAGAZIG U.	WAYNE STATE U./MICHIGAN	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/13/92	01/12/94
4303	PANHI, REBA AHMED	PRIVATE SECTOR	FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY	HOTEL ADMIN.	T	08/22/93	08/21/94
4339	PANHY, KHALED MAHMOUD MOHAMED	GEN ORG WATER	ILLINOIS INST. OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	06/04/93	06/03/94
3987	PARGHAL, SHERIF HASSAN MOHAMMAD	ALEXANDRIA U.	U. MICHIGAN/ANN ARBOR	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/01/92	12/31/94
4305	PAYED, WALID ABDEL RAOUF MAGDY	PRIVATE SECTOR	VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INST	PUBLIC ADMIN.	T	08/06/93	08/05/94
4415	GABER, MOHAMED HASANEM	CAIRO U.	U. CALIFORNIA/SAN FRANCISCO	BIOPHYSICS	DMDR	02/23/93	08/22/94
4297	GABER, MOHAMED PATHY	CAIRO U.	GEORGIA INST OF TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	T	03/15/93	03/14/94
4588	GABAL EL DIN, AHABI ABDEL AHAD	PRIVATE(ISHI)	GEORGE WASHINGTON U.	ECONOMICS	MA	08/28/93	08/27/95
4381	GHATHY, MOUSTAFA AHMED ABDEL WASIE	CAIRO U.	COLORADO STATE U./PORTE COLLIN	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/19/93	07/18/94
4335	GHALY, MEDHAT FADIM	AIN SHAMS U.	VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INS.	TOURISM/HOTEL	T	01/03/93	01/02/94
4449	GOHAR, HAWY MOHAMED	CAIRO U.	U. ILLINOIS/URBANA	MEDICINE	PDR	09/12/93	03/11/94
4396	HALPAWY, MAHMOUD MOHAMED RASHAD	CAIRO U.	CARNEGIE MELLON U./PITTSBURGH	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/03/93	07/02/94
3214	HAMED, MOHAMED THARWAT KHALIL	CAIRO U.	HARVARD UNIVERSITY	DENTISTRY	DMDR	09/02/90	09/01/94
4367	HASHISH, AKRAM MOUMIK IBRAHIM	CENTRAL PONCIEP U.	ARIZONA/TUCSON	BANKING	T	08/08/93	08/07/94
4329	HASSAN, BAHAR SAIED	EGYPT AIR	U. OF CALIFORNIA	LAW	T	08/17/93	08/16/94
4373	HASSAN, MOHAMED SAAD EL DIN	CAIRO U.	U. ARIZONA/TUCSON	ENGINEERING	DMDR	01/10/93	07/09/94

List of all current PP in the USA as of 09/15/1993

ID#	STUDENT'S NAME (last, first middle)	SPONSOR	UNIVERSITY	FIELD	GOAL	ARR DATE	EXT-DATE
4600	HASSAN (ROSHY), IMAN SALOM	KEMINCO TRADING	GEORGE HASON U./ARLINGTON	BUSINESS ADMIN.	T	09/10/93	09/09/94
4033	RAVAS, AMR MOHAMED ZAKI	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. MICHIGAN/	ENGINEERING	T	12/31/91	12/30/93
4400	HELAL, MAHAMED HELAL GAMAL	CAIRO U.	FLORIDA ATLANTIC U.	ENGINEERING	PDR	06/20/93	12/19/93
4191	EMRID, ALAA EL DIN ABDEL SALAM	AIN SHAMS U.	THE SOUTHERN U.	AGRICULTURE	PDR	04/13/93	10/12/93
4321	MUSSEIN, MAMAR MOHAMED	CAIRO	COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY	ENGINEERING	DNR	08/13/89	02/24/94
4022	IBRAHIM, AMRO ESSAM MAHMOUD	PUBLIC SECTOR	KANSAS STATE U.	COMMERCE	T	02/14/93	02/13/94
4276	IBRAHIM, CHAZY EL SAID ABDEL KERIM	ALEXANDRIA U.	U. NEBRASKA/LINCOLN	ENGINEERING	DNR	01/03/93	07/02/94
4308	IBRAHIM, HESAM ALI	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. DELAWARE/NEWARK	HOTEL. ADMIN	T	03/28/93	03/27/94
4204	IBRAHIM, KAMAL ABOU EL BASSAM ALY	CAIRO U.	U. NEW ORLEANS	ENGINEERING	PDR	04/18/93	10/17/93
4157	IBRAHIM, YOUSRY EL SAYED MOHAMED	MASSOURA U.	U. MINNESOTA	PHARMACOLOGY	PDR	04/04/93	10/03/93
3955	ISHAIL, AYMAN MOHAMED	GOPP	OHIO STATE U.	ARCHITECTURE	T	01/08/92	01/09/94
4407	ISHAIL, MOHAMED ASHRAP SAAD M. ZAKI		TUSKEGEE U.	ENGINEERING	PDR	07/04/93	01/03/94
4397	KAMEL, AMRO MUSSEIN	CAIRO U.	U. LOUISVILLE/KENTUCKY	COMMUNICATION	DNR	01/19/93	07/10/94
4290	KAMEL, AMRO SHEAIP	AIN SHAMS U.	UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME	ENGINEERING	T	08/22/93	08/21/94
4336	KAMEL, YASSAN SELIM	CAIRO U.	VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INST.	TOURISM/HOTELS	T	01/03/93	01/02/94
4352	KHALID, MOHAMED EL GEDDAWI SAAD	MIN. EDUCATION	CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC	ENGLISH	MA	09/05/93	09/04/94
4378	KHALIL, MUSAM EL DIN MOHAMED BAKR	HELMAN U.	GEORGIA INST. OF TECH./ATLANTA	ENGINEERING	DNR	03/28/93	09/27/94
4403	KHALIL, IMAN IBRAHIM MAHMOUD	ARAB CONTRACTOR	U. CALIFORNIA/DAVIS	ENGINEERING	T	04/17/93	04/16/94
4357	KEDDE, MAGAT MOHAMED MOSTFA	SHORB PROT. AUTH	KANSAS STATE UNIV. INT. TRADE	IN BUS. ADMINISTRATION	T	01/15/93	01/14/94
4325	KORTAN, MUSSEIN MOHAMED FAROUK	PRIVATE SECTOR	NEW HAMPSHIRE COLLEGE	BUSS. ADMIN.	MA	09/05/93	09/05/95
4356	LOUNA, ESSEN LOFFY	CENT. AUDIT ORG.	CHEBRIGHTON U.	ACCOUNTING	T	07/11/93	07/10/94
4119	MAROUK, AIMEAN MOHAMED MERYY	CAIRO U.	AUBURN U./ALABAMA	AGRICULTURE	PDR	04/25/93	10/24/93
4401	MADDOG, SABRY ABDELLA	EL MINIA U.	CALIFORNIA POLYTECHNIC STATE U.	FOOD TECHNOLOGY	PDR	06/27/93	12/28/93
4609	MAHMOUD, SALMA AMRO	NAT'L RES CTR	PENNSYLVANIA STATE U.	PHARMACY	DNR	06/20/93	12/19/94
4333	MAHMOUD, SANI YOUSSEF	CAIRO U.	VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INST.	HOTEL	T	01/03/93	01/02/94
4116	MAKEMAR, SAMER SALAM EL DIN MOSEBY	NAT'L RES CTR	U. CALIFORNIA/LAS ANGELES	ENGINEERING	PDR	05/09/93	11/08/93
4310	MASSOUR, KERRAN ABDEL MAHID AMRO	PRIVATE SECTOR	HOWARD U./WASHINGTON	EDUCATION	T	06/20/93	06/19/94
4405	MOHAMED, AMR ALY GAMAL EL DIN	ZAGAZIG U.	UNIV. OF NEBRASKA	ENGINEERING	T	08/09/93	08/08/94
4391	MOHAMED, SAMIA HASSAN	PRIVATE SECTOR	TULANE U.	ENGINEERING	T	01/05/92	12/31/93
4423	MOUSTAPA, ABDEL RAOUF ABDEL RHMAN	SIIZE CANAL U.	ARIZONA STATE U./TEMPE	ENVIRONMENTAL	PDR	09/07/93	03/06/94
4023	MABIE, GHADA MUSSEIN MAGUIB	PRIVATE SECTOR	BOSTON U./BOSTON	MEDICINE	T	01/03/93	11/02/93
4473	MASRAT, WAZEN IBRAHIM SAPEL EL DIN	PRIVATE SECTOR	DREBEL U.	ENGINEERING	T	06/20/93	06/19/94
4163	MAUR, AMR AMRO MOUMIN HASSAN	MIN. FOREIGN AFF	SYRACUSE U./SYRACUSE	ENGINEERING	T	08/29/93	08/28/94
4344	MASSNA, SOLIMAN ABDEL ALAZEM	MIN. EDUCATION	U. OF PITTSBURGH	EDUCATION	T	06/06/93	06/05/94
4346	MAUR, AMRO ABDEL AZEZZ	MIN. EDUCATION	U. OF PITTSBURGH	EDUCATION	T	06/15/93	06/14/94
4089	MAURA, ABDEL AZIZ MAHROUK ABDEL AZIZ	CAIRO U.	LOUISIANA TECH. U.	ENGINEERING	DNR	12/01/91	11/30/93
4437	MADY, TAMER ABDEL MOHIB	AIN SHAMS U.	NORTHERN ILLINOIS U	ECONOMICS	MA	06/06/93	06/05/95

ID#	STUDENT'S NAME (last, first middle)	SPONSOR	UNIVERSITY	FIELD	GOAL	ARR DATE	EXP DATE
4398	RAFAT, RADIA HUSSEIN	CAIRO U.	NORTH CAROLINA STATE U.	ENGINEERING	DNR	03/07/93	09/06/94
4467	RAPEE, SALWA GALLAL	NATL RES INST.	GEORGE WASHINGTON U.	ENGINEERING	MS	08/22/93	08/21/95
4472	SAAD, IMAN MOHAMED BANGI	CAIRO U.	U. KENTUCKY	ENGINEERING	T	06/20/93	06/19/94
4457	SAIF EL DIN, MOUSTAFA EL BALEY	ASSIUT U.	U. GEORGIA/ ATHENS	POULTRY DIS.	PDR	05/09/93	11/09/93
4486	SABR, TAREK MOHAMED JERABT	GEN ORG.HOUSING	HARVARD U./CAMBRIDGE	ENGINEERING	DNR	09/07/93	03/06/95
4331	SALAMA, EBALLO AHMED	AIN SHAMS U.	ST. LOUIS U.	LAW	T	08/22/93	08/21/94
4462	SALER, AZZA ABDEL ALIZ	ZAGAZIG U.	U. GEORGIA /ATHENS	ENGINEERING	T	06/20/93	06/19/94
4417	SALER, HANNOUD MOHAMMAD SALER	CAIRO U.	U.SOUTH CAROLINA/COLUMBIA	CHEMISTRY	DNR	02/16/93	08/15/94
4403	SALER, MOHAMED ALI KERASHA	HELWAN U.	ROCHESTER INST.TECHNOLOGY	ENGINEERING	MS	04/25/93	04/24/95
4376	SALER, AHMED ZAFARIA IBRAHIM	ZAGAZIG U.	CARNEGIE MELON U.	ENGINEERING	DNR	08/15/93	02/14/95
4465	SALER, HANADI AHMED ABDEL BAKI	PUBLIC SECTOR	TEXAS A&M U.	ENGINEERING	DNR	08/08/93	02/07/95
4372	SALER, TAREK MASCED ABDALLAH	ZAGAZIG U.	U. HOUSTON/HOUSTON	ENGINEERING	DNR	02/23/93	08/22/94
44210	SAMHOUR, OMIHA AHMED AMIN	ZAGAZIG U.	U. NORTH CAROLINA	PHARMACOLOGY	PDR	06/13/93	11/12/93
4358	SEHOUSI, ISMAIL BASSAM	MIN. PUB WORKS	GEORGE WASHINGTON U.\DC	ACCOUNTING	T	01/23/93	01/22/94
4386	SEALABY, ABOUL PETOUE SAAD ABOUL PETOUE	CAIRO U.	U. NEVADA/RENO	ENGINEERING	MA	09/06/93	09/04/95
4436	SEKEATA, ZAFARIA KOLLAIB MOHAMED	MEMPHIS U.	U. ILLINOIS/URBANA CHAMPAIGN	COMMERCE	T	01/26/93	01/25/94
4348	SOROUR, MOSTAPA ABDEL HANED	MIN. EDUCATION	U. NEW HAMPSHIRE/DURHAM	EDUCATION	T	08/24/93	08/23/94
3791	TADROS, OSSAMA SHAPIK SAHI	PRIVATE SECTOR	OHIO STATE U.	ENGINEERING	T	09/23/91	09/30/93
4359	TABA, OSSAMA MOHAMED	MIN LOCAL ADMIN	CITY U. OF NEW YORK/NY	BUS.ADMINISTRAT	T	02/02/93	02/01/94
4293	TALAAZ, ALIA HANDOUH	RED.CONCRETE CO	CALIFORNIA STATE U./SACRAMENTO	ENGINEERING	T	08/07/93	08/06/94
4127	TORANY, ABDEL MOSEB TORANY ABDEL GRAMY	NATL RES CTR	U. MARYLAND /COLLEGE PARK	AGRICULTURE	PDR	05/11/93	11/10/93
4858	ZARRAN, MOHAMED IBRAHIM MOSTAPA	ZAGAZIG U.	OHIO STATE U.	ENGINEERING	DNR	01/12/92	10/11/93
4307	ZAKI, HATEM EZZAT	PRIVATE SECTOR	U. DELAWARE/DELAWARE	HOTEL ADMIN.	T	01/02/93	01/01/94
4316	ZEBEN EL ABDEEN, ASHEAP ALI	CERAMICA CLEOP.	U. NEBRASKA/LINCOLN	ENGINEERING	T	05/25/93	05/24/94

Universities and Research Centers: 92 (54%)
 Public Sector: 38 (22%)
 Private Sector: 42 (24%)

Total: 172

Women: 31 (18%)

ANNEX I, ATTACHMENT B

ECEB PEACE FELLOWSHIP STAFFING AND FUNCTIONS

A. Administration: (Funded by the Egyptian Government)

Acting Director: Overall direction and management of all ECEB functions, including both the Egyptian Government Missions program and the Peace Fellowship Program.

Cultural Attache: Responsible, under the Acting Director, for managing the Peace Fellowship Program in the ECEB.

Financial Affairs Attache: Head of the Financial Administration for the ECEB.

B. Operations Staff: (Funded through Project 263.0125.1)

1. Peace Fellowship Program Coordinator

Responsible for coordinating operational aspects of the PFP -- placement and monitoring PFs in U.S. academic institutions; liaison with A.I.D./Washington, Office of International Training (OIT); carries a case load of about 30-40 individual PF files for monitoring academic progress and backstopping administrative problems and/or needs of the individual PFs in the case load.

2. Education Specialist - Placement/Reports

Responsible for contacting and negotiating with educational institutions to set up study programs for PFs to be placed; and for preparing the six-monthly comprehensive reports to the GOE Ministry of Higher Education and USAID/Cairo. The incumbent also carries a caseload of 20-30 PF cases for monitoring and backstopping.

3. Education Specialist - Computer Management/Placement

Responsible, along with the other placement officer (No. 2), for arranging study programs for PF candidates, and overseeing the programming and maintenance of the ECEB computer network.

4. Education Specialist - Monitoring

5. Education Specialist - Monitoring

The incumbents of these similar positions are responsible for monitoring academic progress and administratively backstopping 40-50 PFs after they have been placed in a U.S. educational institution.

6. Education Specialist - Professional Memberships and Journals

Responsible for carrying a PF monitoring caseload of 30-40; and handling the processing of PF requests for membership in professional societies and subscriptions to professional journals as part of the follow-up activities of the PFP training.

7. Secretary - Health Insurance/Visas/Arrivals and Departures

Prepares the original and amendments to A.I.D. "Participant Data Form" (PDF) that contain the information on each PF with regard to status of U.S. Visas, medical certification, arrivals and departures of PFs. This information is passed to OIT in A.I.D./Washington, which in turn registers the PFs for health insurance coverage (HAC), and processes amendments to IAP-66 forms to acquire extensions, additions of dependents, arrivals and departures of PFs, etc.

8. Accountant

Responsible for maintaining Peace Fellowship Program accounting records and reports and preparing monthly checks for PF maintenance, advances to training institutions; and payment documents of all types, from reimbursements to participating universities, to payment of utility bills for the office.

9. Assistant Accountant - Voucher Review

Responsible for reviewing funding requests from PFs and academic institutions and preparing payment documents for the approved amounts.

10. Secretary/Typist - English

11. Secretary/Typist - Arabic

12. Receptionist

ANNEX I, ATTACHMENT C

COMPARISON OF CURRENT ECEB SALARY RATES WITH RATES IN THE WASHINGTON, D.C. AREA FOR SIMILAR POSITIONS

A. Base Salary Comparison (Annual)

<u>POSITION TITLE</u>	<u>ECEB CURRENT SALARY RANGE</u>	<u>WASHINGTON, D.C. CURRENT SALARY RANGE</u>
SENIOR EDUCATION SPEC. (SUPERVISOR)	-	\$32,000 - 38,000
EDUCATION SPECIALIST (PLACEMENT/MONITORING)	\$23,500 - 31,750	\$29,000 - 34,000
SENIOR FINANCIAL ADMIN. (SUPERVISOR)	-	\$34,000 - 38,000
FINANCIAL OFFICER (ACCOUNTING/VOUCHER)	\$22,300 - 28,800	\$24,000 - 26,000
CLERICAL (SECRETARY/TYPIST/REC- EPTIONIST/OTHER SUPPORT)	\$14,400 - 25,300	\$21,000 - 24,000

B. Fringe Benefit Packages

ECEB:

- Employer share of Social Security/Medicare Taxes
- Group Health Insurance
- Sick Leave (7 days per year)
- Annual Leave (15 days per year)
- Paid Holidays: Egyptian (Approx. 13), and U.S.(9)

D.C.:

- Employer share of Social Security/Medicare Taxes
- Group Health Insurance
- Some Type of Retirement Program (e.g., 401(K), Profit Sharing, etc.)
- Workman Compensation Insurance when Travelling Outside the U.S.
- Sick Leave (No. of days varies with employer policies)
- Annual Leave (No. of days varies with employer policies)
- Paid Holidays (U.S. Official Holidays only)

ANNEX II

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM PEACE FELLOWS AND RECORDS OF PEACE FELLOWS

Introduction

Personal contact was made with 8 Fellows and 3 university advisors in the U.S. and with 60 Peace Fellows in Egypt. Fellows from all categories of training were interviewed using systematic sampling methods to obtain names provided by either ECEB, MOHE, or USAID/Cairo. Peace Fellow files were randomly selected in ECEB for examination and study, and the summary of findings from Fellows currently studying is in Attachment A of this Annex. Termination, 6-month, and 1-year questionnaires filled out in USAID/Cairo by returned Fellows, are summarized and the results are in Attachment E. In Egypt, Fellows were selected by the Missions Department of MOHE using a random selection procedure and interviewed using small group focus interview techniques. Fellows were questioned regarding their training experience, outcomes of the training, and their suggestions for additional educational offerings. Attachments B, C, and D provide methodology, instruments of evaluation and summaries of evaluations done by Fellows. (Attachment E).

Findings

Peace Fellows serve in positions important to Egypt's development. Medical sciences, sciences (including agriculture and veterinary medicine) and engineering comprise the major groups awarded Fellowships. The number of Fellows trained in priority areas as called for in Peace Fellowship Project 263-0125.1, PIL #10, Amendment #9 (including disciplines such as Management & Planning, Business/Public Administration, Education and Tourism) was small in comparison to those trained in the sciences. By looking at the Fellows' fields of training, the program has successfully provided enrichment to the fields of Medicine, Science (including agriculture), and Engineering with limited coverage in other areas. Private sector representation has been a targeted component of the program, and represents over 20% of current Fellows in training. By far the largest makeup of Fellows has been for short-term, post-doctoral training, joint thesis work (Egyptian candidates for PHDs in Egypt) and non-degree training. Limited numbers have been sent for the PHD and Masters degree.

Many disciplines have benefitted by the Fellows study programs. As of 20 September, 1993, 1,101 Fellows had departed for study and the following percentage breakdown by discipline is as follows:

<u>Disciplines represented</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Agriculture	15 %
Engineering	31 %
Medical Sciences *	30 %
Sciences	7 %
Veterinary Medicine	6 %
Other **	<u>11 %</u>
	100 %

* Includes Dentistry, Pharmacology, Nursing, and Associated Health Sciences

** Includes such fields as Economics, Business, Education, Humanities, and Social Sciences

Since target areas of Democratic Pluralism, Management and Planning, Economics, Environmental Studies, Business/Public Administration, Tourism, City Planning and Design of Urban/Suburban Areas, Education, Industrial Safety, and Nursing were not major recipients. These areas (if still considered priority areas) should be more specifically targeted in future programs.

Program Satisfaction: Fellows currently studying and those who have completed their studies are generally pleased with the program. Seventy percent of study respondents were totally pleased with their training institution, and similar numbers were satisfied with the medical coverage, support for supplies and books, and overall program support. Orientation in the U.S. was viewed more favorably than pre-departure (from Egypt) orientation where deficiencies were noted in expectations and obligations of individual programs and failure to provide "what to expect" briefings. Many PFs mentioned that shortcomings were program length (post-doctoral and non-degree training Fellows wanting to continue to a degree), a tedious application process involving a 2-year or longer wait before acceptance and departure for the U.S., 2-year home residence requirement before returning to the U.S., low salary, low stipend for books (post-doctoral Fellows especially), restrictions on the number of courses they could take, and initial problems with housing. When participants were asked to grade the overall program (using A, B, or C), over 90% responded with an "A" grade and none with a "C" grade. The cultural exposure and the opportunity to observe new surroundings and make new friends ranked high with all candidates interviewed. Most Fellows had good relationships with their advisors and many keep in continuous professional and/or social contact.

Appropriateness of Training: Fellows studied in a variety of both public and private universities in the U.S. Most participants, being from science or medicine, were exposed to and worked in, high technology areas. Although new analytical techniques, procedures, and processes were learned or observed, many Fellows can not duplicate the work in Egypt because of limitations in facilities, supplies or finances. Many Fellows suggested that since USAID provided the training, they should upgrade laboratories (or medical procedures) or provide necessary supplies for continuation of

the work. This is an unrealistic solution; however, care should be taken to match Fellow placements with their capabilities. Fellows should be realistic in their requests for training and should prepare requests for training which their facility capability will support. Exposure to the latest research and technology is generally beneficial even if the work can't be duplicated in Egypt. Some Fellows came back with excellent capabilities (such as laser surgery for a dentist and glazing technique for a private sector engineer) that were both useful and applicable in Egypt.

Language Skills: Communication skills were limiting for some Fellows. Several Fellows told of examples where they had to rely on other Fellows to interpret for them when seeing their advisors. Many schools placed Fellows in an English course during the first term as one of the courses for the term. This is a good policy and should be continued. Many Fellows disliked the TOEFL as a means of selection (suggesting that an interview with an English speaker would be better) but this is not acceptable for admission to U.S. universities and is not a good test. Since (at least with the over 60 interviewed) most wanted to take classes, the TOEFL score should be acceptable. Suggested steps to improve initial English capability follow:

1. Plan Fellow arrival at the U.S. university at least 20 days before the term starts.
2. In the contract with the U.S. University, (when possible) include the option for the university to provide a week with a U.S. host family where the Fellow will be forced to use English for daily survival. An alternative would be a 10-day intensive English course in Egypt within a month of departure.
3. Encourage and allow the Fellow to enroll in at least one remedial English class during the first semester at the university.
4. For future academic programs (new projects), increase the TOEFL requirement to 475 for those not taking courses and to at least 500 for those taking courses, regardless of whether the training is degree or non-degree.
5. Fellows candidates should be encouraged to take advantage of ETP/ACC, AUC, and other in-country English language programs. (A.I.D. HB 10 regulations allow 2-year validity for TOEFL scores, while MOHE allows only one year. This difference in application of regulations should be cleared up.

One additional complaint associated with English requirements was that the slowness of processing applications often required retaking the TOEFL test before departing to the U.S. for training.

Women in the Fellows Program: Ten women participants in Egypt and one in the U.S. were interviewed. The overwhelming response from these Fellows was one of enthusiasm, exceptional achievement, and satisfaction with the opportunity to study. These Fellows published papers with their advisors, learned new research/practice techniques and were very successful in their studies.

Historical Black Colleges and Universities: One post-doctoral Fellow interviewed was at Tuskegee University (the only HBCU Fellow interviewed). His research experience was appropriate technology using non-soil (hydroponics) growth of vegetables. He was one of the more pleased and enthusiastic Fellows interviewed. ECEB should take advantage of the many Agriculture Fellows and make initial requests for placement at some of these institutions. Since many HBCUs offering agriculture have linkages with the other Land Grant College in their state, the Fellow could have the best of both universities. Some HBCUs have specialized research programs (such as goat research at Langston, Oklahoma; hydroponics and others at Tuskegee in Alabama; University of Maryland, Eastern Shore has affiliations with the University of Maryland). Creative placement could provide joint affiliation with the University of Md., Eastern Shore and the University of Maryland; Lincoln University in Missouri with the University of Missouri; and many others. Many HBCU faculty have a better understanding of third world development needs than non-HBCU counterparts. In addition to agriculture, some HBCUs (Tuskegee University for example) offer unique opportunities in community development.

Value of Training to the Fellow: Fellows interviewed were asked if their experiences had helped them professionally. Some Fellows indicated professional improvement leading to promotions due to increased publications, new skills useful in their job or ability to get a new job, even in a slow economy. Several said employers or peers rejected their new skills/techniques because of peer or employer jealousy, and one Fellow was having difficulty completing the PhD degree in Egypt because the departure for the 18 months in the U.S. had been delayed so many times that it was impacting his ability to get his degree done in the required 5-year time frame. All Fellows concluded that over the "long run", the training would positively enhance their professional careers (at least 75 % said it already had).

Maintenance, Support and Health Care: Low monthly stipend was a major concern of Fellows, especially those taking families. Basic support of research was deemed satisfactory by slightly over half the Fellows. Most Fellows' health care problems were related to the slowness with which payment was made and failure to cover all health needs. Dependents' coverage was frequently mentioned. Most health insurance problems of Fellows were from early illnesses of Fellows in the U.S. for less than 6 months. Other issues mentioned were:

1. Travel to professional meetings was expensive and often Fellows couldn't attend because ECEB does not pay a travel advance.

-
2. Many wanted to apply the \$200 typewriter allowance towards a computer and were frustrated that they could not. Most Fellows felt the purchase of a computer would have been desirable. (Note: Chapter 11, HB 10, allows application of the typewriter allowance toward purchase of a computer).
 3. Post-doctoral Fellows were allowed one \$65.00 book allowance which was not enough for any significant purchases of reference materials. We recommend a monthly allowance of \$65.00 for post-doctoral Fellows which is permitted in Ch.11, HB 10 if training exceeds 5 months.
 4. Many Fellows received journals for 1 year following their return (subscriptions were for 3 years) and began receiving renewal notices for years two and three. Apparently some journals and professional associations are not able to handle advance payment and thus the billing problems. The solution for this problem rests with ECEB and may be difficult to correct in all cases (especially in situations where a non-U.S. journal is involved).
 5. Fellows reported problems getting deposits from utility companies, landlords, and cable companies prior to their departure from the U.S. Often checks in U.S. dollars are forwarded to Egypt and Fellows can not convert these to Egyptian pounds. ECEB is perhaps best qualified to provide a workable solution to this problem.

Housing Arrangements: Fellows frequently experienced difficulty finding affordable housing. A major problem was that the cost of rental units consumed most of their maintenance allowance. The problem was greater near urban universities, especially when the student's arrival was near the beginning (or at the beginning) of the term. Housing information received from ECEB before arrival apparently was minimal. To help alleviate this problem, applications should be processed early enough to allow information about housing to reach the student. For example, if university housing is available at a given cost (and ECEB or the university provides comparative private housing), the student could elect to take the university housing or take his/her own chances with private housing on arrival.

Contact with ECEB: ECEB Educational Specialists generally received favorable comments from Fellows. A frequent complaint was the inability to contact them without the expense of a phone call. Educational Specialists are restricted to 5 minute phone calls so it takes time to resolve problems. This policy should be changed.

Because of cultural adjustment, new residents in the U.S. should have easy and immediate access to a counsellor. Support group contact may be unavailable during the early days at a foreign city so immediate contact without hassle should be available. The easiest way to accomplish this is to have an 800 toll free number or

allow Educational Specialists to accept collect calls from Fellows. This situation needs to be changed and Fellows provided an 800 number for contacts with ECEB.

Program Limitations: Post-doctoral Fellows, almost unanimously, felt that 5 months was insufficient time for completion of research. Fellows working on PhD data collection and processing were generally satisfied with the program except many complained about the ECEB imposed three course limitation which prohibited them from working for the Masters degree.

The most frustrated group was the non-degree Training Fellows, who have been primarily placed in universities. Universities generally were unable to provide enough training to keep them busy and they were generally limited to three courses per training period. Thus they were not fully occupied and they could not work toward a Masters' degree. The three course limit is imposed by ECEB and should be eliminated. Many Training Fellows took full course loads and then tried to extend to complete the Masters degree (some lacking only one term to complete the degree). After a lengthy struggle to obtain an extension (generally denied) they returned to Egypt without a degree. Most had assumed that an extension was possible. The confusion regarding extension of training period reflects (at least early in the program) the Project Implementation Letter (PIL # 10, Amendment #9) which stated under general considerations that flexibility in training durations should be encouraged but, in the next sentence states that "durations as approved on the original PIO/P of the Peace Fellow will be strictly adhered to". According to the Missions Department of MOHE, USAID has since moderated the "strict adherence policy" and currently is flexible on the issue. Many misunderstandings exist on this issue so one solution is to simply state on the PIO/P what conditions would be considered as justification for extensions. For example, if 18 hours of graduate credit towards the Masters' degree are completed and the Fellow is accepted into a Masters' program, an extension may be granted (considered).

Universities are not well equipped to provide training opportunities for Fellows unless they had an appropriate research project. Private sector Fellows generally desired training working in a company related to their work (construction engineer in a construction company) and universities couldn't provide this. Thus, Fellows were left with the option of library work/observation, courses, or free time. Most wanted to work towards a degree and many did. Allowing students to take a full course load appears to be the best solution for the current situation. ECEB has little background in placing participants in private companies and without contact and supervision experience, they should not enter a major effort of this type. For the current program, allow academic training (full-time generally) or contract a group of Fellows with like need (quality control for example) to a good university program and in the same contract, have the university arrange an "on-the-job- internship experience in the private sector. Such a program (for example) might have 8 weeks classroom/laboratory experience and a 4-week internship. Economy of numbers makes such a program practical. Such programs need to be well-defined (needs and

objectives) on the PIO/P. Placement of students in private sector companies is always difficult.

Egyptian Library Facilities: Fellows liked using the library resources available in U.S. universities. Egyptian university libraries, especially in the sciences and medical areas, apparently lack many of the recent journals and library resources which Fellows had learned to appreciate in the U.S. USAID should consider the strengthening of library resources in selected university libraries (including the latest search databases such as Agricola and others) in Egypt. This could appropriately be a part of the participant follow-up program when implemented.

Advertising and Selecting for the Program: Each Fellow interviewed in Egypt was asked how Fellows should be informed of the process. All Fellows were pleased with the newspaper advertisement (said that was the most fair way). Sending the announcement to appropriate departments was suggested as a complementary action. Fellows didn't like the long wait between application and program implementation but felt the Missions Department of MOHE was fair in administering the program.

Follow-up of Returned Fellows: Good records of returned Fellows (even knowledge of their return) are difficult to find. Even though over 1,000 Fellows have gone to the U.S., USAID Cairo has "immediate return from training questionnaires" from only 180 Fellows, 6 months questionnaires from 17 Fellows and one-year follow-up questionnaires from 7 Fellows. These questionnaires provided similar information as our own surveys and are a good source of data for program monitoring. The collection of this information (and study of the results) should be an integral part of follow-up programs.

USAID-Cairo is missing a good public relations opportunity by not having periodic functions to provide public recognition of these Fellows in Egypt. Fellows mentioned (especially training Fellows) that they returned without even a certificate. USAID Cairo is in an excellent position to remedy this situation and should at least consider the possibility.

Outcomes of the Program: Sixty-eight Fellows were interviewed (60 in Egypt, 8 in the U.S.). Questionnaires were filled out by 65 fellows to obtain general information about their perceptions of the program. Fellows in Cairo were interviewed using "small group guided interviews". Interview guides were designed for each group (post-doctoral, training, thesis research, private sector). Outputs of the programs were numerous such as new skills and techniques, degrees, special professional certifications, contacts for research continuation, and others. General outcomes within groups of trainees are listed as follows:

Post-Doctoral Fellows: These Fellows made good contacts in their schools and developed good rapport with their advisors. Specific outcomes from those interviewed were:

-
- Many papers published in professional journals (international, U.S. and Egyptian Journals) as a joint author with an advisor and/or other U.S. faculty. Of the 27 post-doctoral Fellows interviewed, over 35 papers were either published, approved for publication, or are in progress.
 - New methodology for identifying pharmaceutical compounds not used here. A Fellow has taught others to do the identification techniques.
 - Collaborative research underway between Fellow and U.S. professor.
 - One U.S. professor has visited Fellow in Cairo in regards to collaborative research the two are conducting.
 - Course in "Post-Harvest Physiology" added to curriculum as a result of information learned on Fellowship.
 - Several learned new techniques for conducting studies in Integrated Pest Management (isolating natural predators, maintaining cultures) which they are now using in their research to develop biological control (non-pesticide) methods of pest control.
 - Three Fellows have prepared joint research proposals with their U.S. advisor (for funding) to do work with components in both the U.S. and Egypt.
 - A Fellow learned to isolate a blight pathogen which can be used to infect test plants of cereal crops. He is using the technique in his research to develop genetic disease resistance in cereal crops.
 - A Fellow is exchanging germplasm (cereal seeds of different genetic background) with a U.S. collaborator. As a result of the exchange the potential for developing improved varieties has increased in both countries.
 - Two Fellows learned new diagnostic techniques for infectious diseases which they are using as well as teaching to their colleagues and medical school students.
 - A Fellow learned new computer analyses for research data using software packages not previously available. Now teaching same to colleagues and graduate students.
 - A Fellow learned new method of infecting insect tissues with tumors which is helping in the development of new techniques for biological insect control.
-

-
- A Fellow learned technique for developing a diet to keep sugar cane borer alive so life cycle could be studied. Is using the research technique to look for control mechanisms of biological control of the borer.
 - A Fellow from school of nursing has learned a computer program which is used to monitor care of cancer patients. The procedure will be implemented and taught in the school.
 - A Fellow is utilizing new techniques of isolating insecticide metabolites in treated plants and teaching the techniques to students and others working in toxicology.

Private Sector/Training Fellowc:

- A lawyer studied comparative law and is transferring and sharing this information (U.S. vs. Egypt system) with his colleagues working in international export work.
 - An engineer acquired new techniques for building foundations research and is expanding these techniques with thesis students and fellow researchers.
 - A Private Sector Fellow learned a new glazing technique that extends the life of building blocks, and his company is utilizing this technique.
 - One Fellow has developed a "joint venture" with a U.S. entrepreneur dealing with design.
 - A Fellow learned to use a tensile tester in the U.S. and has modified the tester in his own company for use with plastics - benefitting his company.
 - A Fellow opened new design section in his company (supervisor asked him to open section and utilize new techniques) for design using CAD/CAM (computer assisted drafting/computer assisted design).
 - A Fellow received training in technical school allowing him to be certified by the American Association for Non-Destructible Testing (one of only three so certified in Egypt). His company was pleased that he has this certification and increased his salary and responsibilities.
 - One Fellow entered a joint venture with a World Bank Project between Egypt and the U.S. for service in Angola.
 - A Fellow learned networking of computers and has provided networking for his agency.
-

-
- A Private Sector Fellow observed urban renewal taking place in Baltimore and studied the process. His unit is carrying out a similar process in areas of Cairo where properties have deteriorated.

Thesis Research, Non-degree: Most all of the Fellows completed the work required for their thesis. One had finished his thesis while waiting for his Fellowship but went anyway to have the opportunity to study in the U.S. (published several papers as a result of the stay).

- A Fellow received "Best Scientist Paper Award" at 85th Assembly of the Southern Medical Association.
- Of 12 Fellows interviewed, 14 scientific papers (co-authored with U.S. scientists) are either approved, have been published, or are in progress.
- An orthopedic surgeon has initiated a department of surgery for audio problems based on the techniques learned.
- A dentist learned new laser surgery technique which he is using here and teaching others to use.
- A Fellow revised courses in demography based on findings of Fellowship.
- A Fellow learned new techniques of managing different levels of ESL instruction and is using these skills.
- A doctor learned methods of computer generated biostatistics for predicting medical outcomes and is teaching this technique to students and colleagues.
- A dentist learned methods of laser oral surgery and is using the procedure.
- A doctor learned use of ultrasound on developing fetus and is using and teaching the procedure.

Summary of Fellows Categories: Fellows from all categories experienced success in their Fellowships. General observations reveal the following about each group:

1. Post-Doctoral Fellows: Generally satisfied with the experience. Two major problems were shortness of time for Research (would have liked a year) and limited funds (\$65.00) for books and supplies. Many
-

professional papers and presentations evolved from this group and a large number of collaborative papers generated.

2. Thesis Preparation, Non-degree: These Fellows were generally satisfied with their achievements. Those interviewed completed their research objectives, generated professional papers on their research, and many have completed the PhD degree. Major complaint was the inability to take but three courses. Some of these had time on their hands and would have preferred the opportunity to have worked on the Masters degree.
3. Training, Non-Degree: This category had the most concerns but still rated the experience well. They wanted to take full-time course loads and if successful, stay on for the Master's degree. They complained that training was not provided and thus they had no programmed activity much of the time.
4. Private Sector, Training: Wanted training in private companies and if this was not available, they wanted to work on the Master's degree which could be extended to complete the degree (if satisfactory progress was made). Private sector Fellows (and public sector training Fellows) had the most complaints about the ECEB and felt that the private sector program should be separate from the university/government sector program. Private sector people had no problems with the Missions Department of MOHE for administering the program but did suggest consideration of the Egypt/American Chamber of Commerce for the job (if a private sector program evolves).

Conclusions

- Fellows are satisfied with their experience in the United States. They received advanced degrees, developed new research skills, completed significant research projects, published papers jointly with U.S. advisors, and interacted favorably with the U.S. culture.
- The Fellows program has especially enriched backgrounds of university (medical, agriculture, engineering, and science faculty.
- The lengthy application process and short notice for departure created problems for Fellows. Arrival on campus on the date classes started (sometimes after) made initial terms difficult.
- Many Fellows benefitted from additional English training early in their training period. A policy of funding one English class during the first term is not stated. Potential Fellows should utilize more fully the available in-country English language programs.
- Many Fellows in training and non-degree research programs were limited by the inability to take more than three courses during their training period. This was a major source of dissatisfaction among these groups.
- The Policy regarding program extensions was not well articulated between USAID/Cairo, MOHE/ECEB, and departing Fellows. Inconsistency in granting program extensions was a major source of dissatisfaction among trainees.
- Post-doctoral Fellows felt that a 5- or 6-month program was rarely enough time for completion of a research project. The general feeling of this group was that a 10- to 12-month program would provide a better chance of meeting research objectives.
- Many post-doctoral and non-degree research Fellows developed collaboration with a U.S. advisor but lack resources (facility and/or travel) to maintain collaborative research momentum.
- Private Sector Fellows felt that the program for Private Sector training should be separated from training for the public sector. They had no objection to MOHE administering the program but suggested consideration of the Egypt/American Chamber of Commerce.

ATTACHMENTS

The following Attachments provide summary materials for studies conducted, methodology, and instruments used for the studies:

- Attachment A. Survey of Egypt Peace Fellows (in the U.S.) and Advisors.
 - Attachment B. Survey instrument used for contact of Peace Fellows in the U.S.
 - Attachment C. Request for samples of Peace Fellows for interview in Cairo.
 - Attachment D:
 - D-1. Summary of Responses to Questionnaires administered to Peace Fellows in Egypt.
 - D-2. Guided Interview Questionnaire - Post Doctoral
 - D-3. Guided Interview Questionnaire - Non-degree Research
 - D-4. Guided Interview Questionnaire - Training Programs
 - D-5. Guided Interview Questionnaire for Private Sector Fellows.
 - Attachment E . Evaluation team's Summary and Analysis of USAID Cairo's Questionnaires from Returned Fellows (immediate return, 6 months and 1-year followup).
-

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT A

SURVEY OF EGYPT PEACE FELLOWS (IN THE U.S.) AND ADVISORS

Summary of Survey of Peace Fellows/Advisors in the U.S. September 16, 1993

The Survey Sample

Eight students and three advisors were contacted during the first 15 days of September as part of the Egyptian Peace Fellowship evaluation process. Two candidates were located on the east coast and six were in the Midwest. Following are the characteristics of the Fellows and Advisors contacted:

Type of training program:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Post doctoral program | - 2 Fellows |
| 2. Training program (12 mos.) | - 4 Fellows |
| 3. Masters degree | - 2 Fellows |

Participants sex:

- | | |
|-----------|-------------|
| 1. Male | - 7 Fellows |
| 2. Female | - 1 Fellow |

Sponsoring organization:

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. Private Sector sponsors | - 2 Fellows |
| 2. University sponsors | - 5 Fellows |
| 3. Public sector (non-univ.) | - 1 Fellow |

Type of university by placement:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Private university | - 4 universities |
| 2. Public universities | - 3 universities |
| 3. Public training (post-doctoral) | - 1 institution |

Contacts with advisors:

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| 1. Public universities | - 2 advisors |
| 2. Public institutions (non-university) | - 1 advisor |

Summary of Findings:

In general, Fellows were pleased with their placements in the U.S. Two of the Fellows indicated they were not placed appropriately (architect in a civil engineering dept. and a post doctoral Fellow desiring specialized computer techniques) but both indicated their advisor had made arrangements to see that appropriate training was available through workshops and special courses. One Fellow (in training program for

1 year) felt the three course limitation, without additional on-the-job training, had limited his progress. He would have preferred more course work so he could have prepared for a Master's degree. Half of the Fellows were placed in the institution they had requested. One Fellow was not placed in his choice of institution but was extremely pleased with the selection provided by ECEB. All Fellows felt that the selection process in Egypt was satisfactory and fairly administered. The newspaper notification seemed satisfactory but two Fellows suggested MOHE interview candidates so they more clearly understood what training was being requested.

Every participant said they received their maintenance check when it was due and with the exception of post-doctoral Fellows, the support for books and supplies was adequate. Post-doctoral fellows indicated receiving a total of \$65.00 for books and supplies and felt this was not sufficient. University advising support was termed as satisfactory, and candidates felt the length of the program was satisfactory. Several in "training" programs would like to extend their training to the masters degree. All students were aware of their medical insurance coverage and felt overall program support from ECEB was satisfactory. Many Fellows had attended professional meetings and had received reimbursement from ECEB. All candidates were aware of their eligibility for membership in a professional organization for three years following return to Egypt and planned to take advantage of the opportunity. Fellows felt they had easy access to ECEB education specialists and contacted them when necessary. Funds for the support of research of post-doctoral Fellows appeared adequate. The report on orientation (both in Egypt and by ECEB) revealed a mixed opinion but identified room for improvement both in Egypt and in ECEB.

Fellows provided many avenues for utilization of their training on return to Egypt. Responses ranged from improved background for their research to preparation for study for a PhD degree. One Fellow had acquired new research techniques which would benefit Egyptian research, student research, and teaching. Techniques of information retrieval for nurses will be utilized in a University nursing program. One Fellow will complete two research papers (co-authored with his advisors) and anticipates continued collaboration on return to Egypt. One Fellow in a 12-month training program plans to computerize the financial procurement and accounting records in his home university (he is a supervisor in purchasing).

Several Fellows indicated a problem in finding housing on their campus. These Fellows arrived simultaneously with the beginning of school and on-campus housing was not available. Several suggested that in some instances, it would be well for ECEB to make arrangements for housing (with the university) in advance of Fellows arrival. Those in training programs felt that training opportunities (other than courses) were inadequate and the option for taking more courses would help their program. In one example, however, three Fellows placed in a university program were receiving a good combination of training combined with seminars, workshops, industry tours, and course work. One Fellow said this was the most important opportunity of his career and urged the continuation of the program for other Egyptians. Fellows generally reported excellent help from their university advisors.

Fellows felt they would be able to do a better job in their current position and many felt they would be advanced to jobs of greater responsibility and authority because of the training. The overall response from the Fellows was positive.

Advisors contacted had experienced good working relationships with ECEB, and two of the three said their Fellows were exceptionally good students. The relationship with ECEB had outlined the parameters for training and the programs were going well. One Fellow (with a TOEFL score of 503) arrived after courses had started and had difficulty catching up with the class because of the late start and poor English language skills. He requested that ECEB allow him to take a course in English which was denied. He finally took a refresher on his own and took incomplete grades in the two courses he was enrolled in. He felt that had he been allowed to take the remedial English course simultaneously with his two academic courses, he could have completed the two courses on schedule.

Summary: Conclusions and recommendations from such a small sample are limited; however, the following are suggested:

1. Training Fellows placed in universities should be monitored to see that training (other than the three courses they are allowed to take) is being provided.
2. Action to eliminate the "three course policy" should be taken by ECEB.
3. When candidates are placed (and arrive on campus late), ECEB should, when possible, facilitate housing with the host university.
4. Efforts to provide a more comprehensive pre-departure (from Egypt) orientation by MOHE and/or USAID should be considered. More in-depth orientation should be provided by ECEB on arrival in Washington D.C.
5. Fellows should arrive at least 2 weeks before classes begin so they can concentrate on English.
6. Clarification of the policy on English remedial training is needed. It appears that opportunity to take one remedial English course along with a reduced course load during the initial term would be appropriate and should be considered.
7. Minimum TOEFL level should be reevaluated as students with TOEFL scores below 500 (preferred 550 minimum) will often have difficulty in academic training. An ALIGU evaluation of ELT programs in Egypt comes to a similar conclusion.

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT USED FOR FELLOWS IN THE U.S.

Development Training Project (263-0125.1)
Peace Fellowship Program (PFP) Component
(Sept., 1993)

Interviewee: (Your Name): _____

Institution (Name/location): _____

Type of Interview: In person/by phone/mail survey (circle one)

Egyptian Employment: Private Sector/Public Sector/University/ Research
Center/other _____ (circle one)

Gender of Interviewee: Male/Female (circle one)

Duration of Fellowship (months): _____

Questionnaire For Fellows Currently in Training

1. When did your study program in the U.S. begin? _____
2. Was placement at this institution made based on: (circle one)
 - A. Your request (one of your requested selections)
 - B. Without your recommendation
3. Are you satisfied with your training institution?(Circle one)
 - A. Totally satisfied
 - B. Somewhat satisfied
 - C. Not satisfied with the selection
4. Do you have any suggestions for the training selection process?
5. Please answer the following questions regarding the support services for your training:

	<u>yes</u>	<u>no</u>
A. Support check received in timely manner	_____	_____
B. Support for books, supplies satisfactory	_____	_____
C. University advising support satisfactory	_____	_____
D. Program length satisfactory	_____	_____
E. Training is provided for summer session	_____	_____
F. Tutor services are available if needed	_____	_____
G. Medical coverage is satisfactory	_____	_____
H. Funds to support research expenses are satisfactory	_____	_____
I. Overall program support is satisfactory	_____	_____
J. Attendance at professional conferences	_____	_____
K. Membership in professional societies	_____	_____
L. Toll-free telephone service to ECEB	_____	_____

-
- M. Arrival(in U.S.) orientation satisfactory _____
- N. Orientation in Egypt (pre-departure) appropriate _____
and satisfactory _____
6. What is the objective of your program of study?
- A. Advanced degree? Masters degree, PHD, other (circle one).
- B. Research (state type):
- C. Training (state area of training):
- D. Other (please state): _____.
7. Do you have any specific comments concerning:
- A. The Peace Fellowship Program selection process?
- B. Your placement in an academic or training institution?
- C. Support services from ECEB?
8. How will you be able to utilize your training (received through your Fellowship) when you return to Egypt?
9. From your point of view, what significant strengths do you recognize in the Peace Fellowship Program.
10. From your point of view, what significant weaknesses (if any) have you experienced with the Peace Fellowship Program?
11. Please give us your overall evaluation and/or additional comments about the Peace Fellowship Program. Use additional sheets if necessary.
12. After returning to Egypt, as an outcome of your fellowship, do you expect to:
- A. Return to the same position
- B. Obtain a better position
- C. Be more productive in your position
- D. Expect no change in your work productivity.

Thanks for your help

16

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT C

REQUEST TO USAID CAIRO FOR INTERVIEWS WITH RETURNED PEACE FELLOWS

Egypt Peace Fellows Program Small Group Interviews for Returned Participants September 10, 1993

Of approximately 800 arrivals to the U.S. during 1989 through 1992, the breakdown consisted of over 50% post doctoral Fellows, 25% data collection for non-degree research, and 25% for non-degree training.

To gain input regarding impact of the program, the following samples of returnees are suggested for small group interviews.

1. Post-Doctoral Fellows - interview approximately 40 returnees in groups of 10 each (4 groups).
2. Data collection, non-degree research - interview approximately 20 returnees in groups of 10 each (2 groups).
3. Training, non-degree candidates - interview 20 returnees in groups of 10 each (2 groups).
4. Women - Interview 10 returnees in a group interview.
5. Private sector candidates - interview 10 returnees in a group interview.

Selection of Fellows for interview: Candidates should be selected using a random system covering year groups of returnees since 1990. For example with post-doctoral Fellows, select 10 Fellows each from returnees of 1990, 1991, 1992, & 1993 for a total of 40 candidates. If an anticipated show rate of 50% is anticipated, 80 fellows should be contacted. Selection should be made using a random method for example if 10 Fellows from a population of one hundred are to be selected, select each 10th Fellow from an alphabetical listing.

Time for Interviews: Group interviews should be structured to last for one to one & one-half hour with time for follow up discussions with individuals. Availability of a comfortable room, preferably with a table surrounded by chairs is the preferred setting. The following dates and groups are suggested:

Post Doctoral Fellows:

- Group 1: 22 Sept. at 8:30 A.M.
 - Group 2: 22 Sept. at 11:00 A.M.
 - Group 3: 27 Sept. at 8:30 A.M.
 - Group 4: 27 Sept. at 11:00 A.M.
-

Data collection, non-degree research Fellows:

Group 1: 23 Sept. at 8:30 A.M.

Group 2: 23 Sept. at 11:00 A.M.

Training, non-degree Fellows:

Group 1: 25 Sept. at 8:30 A.M.

Group 2: 25 Sept. at 11:00 A.M.

Women Fellows:

Group 1: 26 Sept. at 8:30 A.M.

Private Sector Fellows:

Group 1: 26 Sept. at 11:00 A.M.

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT D-1

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO PEACE FELLOWS IN EGYPT

Questionnaire and Answers

Development Training Project (263-0125.1)
Peace Fellowship Program (PFP) Component

Interviewee: (Your Name): _____

Institution (Name/location): _____

Type of Interview: In person/by phone/mail survey (circle one)

Egyptian Employment: Private Sector: 9 persons
Public Sector: 2 persons
University: 40 persons
Research Center: 6 persons

Gender of Interviewee: 47 Males & 10 Females

Questionnaire For Fellows Who Have Completed Training (Interviews to be completed in Egypt)

1. Study dates in the U.S.:
 - 2 persons stayed 4 months
 - 11 persons stayed 5 months
 - 19 persons stayed 6 months
 - 4 persons stayed 10 months
 - 1 person stayed 10 + 2 month
 - 4 persons stayed 11 months
 - 1 person stayed 14 months
 - 3 persons stayed 17 months
 - 6 persons stayed 18 months
 - 1 person stayed 21 months
 - 1 person stayed 22 months
 - 4 persons stayed 24 months.

 2. Was your placement at a University made based on:
 - A. Your request (one of your requested selections)
45 persons

 - B. Without your recommendation
10 persons
-

3. Were you satisfied with your training institution?
- A. Totally satisfied: 38 where totally satisfied
 - B. Somewhat satisfied: 19 where somewhat satisfied
 - C. Not satisfied with the selection: NONE

4. Please answer the following questions regarding the support services for your training:

	yes	no	blank
A. Support check received in timely manner	56	1	
B. Support for books, supplies satisfactory	32	25	
C. University advising support satisfactory	50	6	1
D. Program length satisfactory	9	48	
E. Training was provided for summer session	26	26	5
F. Medical coverage was satisfactory	40	17	
G. Funds to support research expenses were satisfactory	29	22	6
H. Overall program support was satisfactory	42	15	
I. Attended a professional conference/s	40	16	1
J. Membership in professional societies	43	13	1
K. Regular contact with services of ECEB	36	12	9
L. Arrival(in U.S.) orientation satisfactory	45	9	3
M. Orientation in Egypt (pre-departure) appropriate and satisfactory	30	16	11

5. What was the objective of your program of study?
- A. Advanced degree? Masters degree, PHD, other. 7 persons
 - B. Research (state type): 38 persons
 - C. Training (type): 11 persons
 - D. Other (please state): 1 person

6. Do you have any specific comments concerning:

- A. The Peace Fellowship Program selection process?
 - * 6 persons said that the selection in Egypt took too long (one said 3 years);
 - * 4 persons said that it was based on good and fair criteria and very efficient;
 - * 2 persons said interview with a professor in the same field is much better than TOEFL (TOEFL is not the way);
 - * 2 persons said they should consider more job related training;
 - * PFP should allow people to continue their study running for degree;
 - * Any person who got one fellowship shouldn't be granted another one; and
 - * More time is needed for arrangement between the candidate and the University in USA, to assure a high percentage of success.

B. Your placement in an academic or training institution?

- * 3 persons said the best place, as I wanted and very good;
- * 2 persons said it was my choice;
- * 2 persons said my placement was in a different field than my field of study;
- * Hospital was too small not prepared for training; and
- * Not satisfactory but adjusted later.

C. Support services from ECEB?

- * 5 persons said it needed to be increased;
- * 4 persons said very good;
- * 2 persons somewhat helpful;
- * 2 persons said very helpful;
- * Not good especially the health insurance;
- * When I needed help they did not help me;
- * Good but, needs more cooperation with the fellowship members;
- * The \$35 family support is very low;
- * Lack of support and insufficient information about the regulation;
- * The salary in the state of Florida is very low; and
- * No regular contact from ECEB.

7. How have you been able to utilize your training (received through your Fellowship) since returning to Egypt?

- * 10 persons said YES;
 - * 4 persons said By giving lectures in Institutions;
 - * 4 persons said I improved my ability to design, conduct and publish my research work;
 - * 7 persons said that lack and weakness of facilities in Egypt did not allow to utilize the training;
 - * By sharing what I learned with my colleagues;
 - * Improving my way of thinking and the way of approaching problems;
 - * Teaching only but not applying;
 - * I have program to improve the wheat genotype and also barley;
 - * I was faced with "red-tape" problems, no budgets for further studies or possible applications of the theory studied in the U.S.A.;
 - * I added new information to my scientific publications;
 - * In obtaining my Ph.D. degree;
 - * I joined a world bank project to prepare a study;
 - * I have been nominated to a higher position to utilize my master degree;
 - * I am trying now to apply my experience to do some research in the same field of my study;
 - * Materials are not available in Egypt, I contacted an American professor to send it to me;
 - * Somewhat utilizing;
 - * In supervising two M.Sc. thesis; and
-

-
- * I made some experiments to see how much is useful under Egyptian conditions.
8. From your point of view, what significant strengths do you recognize in the Peace Fellowship Program.
- * 16 persons said getting to know the latest technology and the cultural exposure;
 - * 9 persons said training and study;
 - * 7 persons said learning and knowing about U.S.A. and meeting American professor;
 - * 4 persons said fast, good research;
 - * 3 persons said the chance to attend conferences;
 - * 2 persons said the very good organization aspects;
 - * Future contact;
 - * University advising support is very good;
 - * The very good orientation and helpful publication; and
 - * The facilities provided by the American Universities and the scientific and social meetings.
9. From your point of view, what significant weaknesses (if any) do you recognize in the Peace Fellowship Program?
- * 30 persons said the program is too short;
 - * 12 persons said the funds are very low;
 - * 3 persons said health insurance;
 - * 2 persons said orientation;
 - * The aim was collecting data for the degree rather than obtaining degree;
 - * Rigid regulation and lack of support especially at the beginning;
 - * Only one conference chance;
 - * No extension for fellows running for degree;
 - * Communications; and
 - * The program does not allow members family to accompany him/her.
10. Has the training you received helped you in your work since returning to Egypt?
- * 45 persons said YES of course;
 - * 7 persons said YES, somehow, but no facilities;
 - * No, because I need a special equipment, but I applied it in another field; and
 - * NO (one person)
11. Compared to the position you had before you went abroad for your Peace Fellowship, please rate your current work position (circle one).
-

-
- | | |
|--|-------------------|
| A. Less responsible job (worse job). | <u>0 persons</u> |
| B. Current position the same (no worse, no better) than previous position. | <u>13 persons</u> |
| C. More responsible job (better job). | <u>20 Persons</u> |
| D. Same position but more responsibility. | <u>20 Persons</u> |

12. Please add additional comments you may have about the Peace Fellowship Program? (use additional sheets if necessary).

- * 4 persons said candidates who finished their degree should have the chance for post doctor study (extension);
- * 2 persons said It would be very helpful if P.F. could stay at the university hostel as housing is a problem when they first arrive;
- * 2 persons said a P.F. should obtain a degree or a certificate;
- * A P.F. should be allowed to own and drive a car in U.S.A.;
- * Separate the training program from the academic program;
- * Bad support from ECEB; and
- * For physician, should be approved to practice medicine before travelling to U.S.A.

Thanks for your help

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT D-2

GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE, POST DOCTORAL FELLOWS

Interview Guide for Small Group PFP

Post-Doctoral Fellows

Interview location/date: _____

Moderator/s: _____ / _____

Moderator should facilitate group interaction and guide interviewees to provide input on the topics listed below. Each general topic should receive 10 to 15 minutes with time at the conclusion for additional input. The following general information should be obtained:

1. Type of training received (# of trainees per category).
 - A. Post doctoral - _____.
 - B. Research towards PHD degree - _____.
 - C. Masters degree - _____.
 - D. Training - _____.
2. Egyptian employment (# of trainees per category).
 - A. Private Sector - _____.
 - B. University Employment - _____.
 - C. Government (Other than Univ.) - _____.
 - D. Other employment - _____.

Interview Questions

1. What New research or teaching skills/techniques did you learn doing your Fellowship?
2. What collaborative or individual outputs resulted from your study?
 - A. Improved teaching techniques for my students.
 - B. Research publications or reports.
 - C. Presentation/s at seminars, professional meetings, or workshops.
 - D. Other collaborative work.
3. Is continued collaboration with U.S. counterparts (advisors, etc.) taking place? If so, in what ways? Research, writing, proposals, etc.
4. Give some specific examples of how your Fellowship has helped you with your work in Egypt.

-
5. Have you been promoted in your work (or obtained a better job) as a result of your Fellowship training?
 6. To facilitate development progress in Egypt, what academic training in the U.S. should be provided to future Egyptian scholars?
Emphasize the group to benefit (for ex. private sector) and the educational level (graduate work vs. 4 year program).
 7. What non-academic training could help development in Egypt?
 8. Other information relevant to the current/and/or future programs.
-
- 92

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT D-3

GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE, DATA COLLECTION, NON-DEGREE RESEARCH.

Interview Guide for Small Group PFP

Data Collection Non-Degree Research

Interview location/date: _____

Moderator/s: _____ / _____

Moderator should facilitate group interaction and guide interviewees to provide input on the topics listed below. Each general topic should receive 15 minutes with time at the conclusion for additional input. The following general information should be obtained:

1. Type of training received (# of trainees per category).
 - A. Post doctoral - _____.
 - B. Research towards PHD degree - _____.
 - C. Masters degree - _____.
 - D. Training - _____.
2. Egyptian employment (# of trainees per category).
 - A. Private Sector - _____.
 - B. University Employment - _____.
 - C. Government (Other than Univ.) - _____.
 - D. Other employment - _____.

Interview Questions

1. What New research skills/techniques did you learn doing your Fellowship?
2. What collaborative or individual outputs resulted from your study?
 - A. Completed collection of data for Egyptian PHD
 - B. Research publications or reports.
 - C. Presentation/s at seminars, professional meetings, or workshops.
 - D. Other collaborative work.
3. Is continued collaboration with U.S. counterparts (advisors, etc.) taking place? If so, in what ways? Research, writing, proposals, etc.
4. Give some specific examples of how your Fellowship has helped you with your work in Egypt(in addition to completion of your degree).

96

-
5. Have you been promoted in your work (or obtained a better job) as a result of your Fellowship training? Have you completed the PHD since returning to Egypt?
 6. To facilitate development progress in Egypt, what academic training in the U.S. should be provided to future Egyptian scholars?
Emphasize the group to benefit (for ex. private sector) and the educational level (graduate work vs. 4 year program).
 7. What non-academic training could help development in Egypt?
-

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT D-4

GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE, FELLOWS IN TRAINING PROGRAM.

Interview Guide for Small Group PF

Fellows in Training Program

Interview location/date: _____

Moderator/s: _____ / _____

Moderator should facilitate group interaction and guide interviewees to provide input on the topics listed below. Each general topic should receive 15 minutes with time at the conclusion for additional input. The following general information should be obtained:

1. Type of training received (# of trainees per category).
 - A. Post doctoral - _____.
 - B. Research towards PHD degree - _____.
 - C. Masters degree - _____.
 - D. Training - _____.
2. Egyptian employment (# of trainees per category).
 - A. Private Sector - _____.
 - B. University Employment - _____.
 - C. Government (Other than Univ.) - _____.
 - D. Other employment - _____.

Interview Questions

1. What New skills/techniques/knowledge did you learn during your Fellowship?
 2. What were the limiting factors (if any) in your training program?
Is continued collaboration with U.S. counterparts (advisors, etc.) taking place?
If so, in what ways? Research, writing, proposals, etc.
 3. Give some specific examples of how your Fellowship has helped you with your work in Egypt.
 4. Have you been promoted in your work (or obtained a better job) as a result of your Fellowship training?
 5. What academic training in the U.S. should be provided to future Egyptian trainees?
Emphasize the group to benefit (for ex. private sector, environment, etc) and the educational level (graduate work vs. 4 year program).
-

6. What are examples of non-academic training which could help future development in Egypt?

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT D-5

GUIDED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRIVATE SECTOR FELLOWS.

Interview Guide for Small Group PF

Fellows From Private Sector

Interview location/date: _____

Moderator/s: _____ / _____

Moderator should facilitate group interaction and guide interviewees to provide input on the topics listed below. Each general topic should receive 10 - 15 minutes with time at the conclusion for additional input. The following general information should be obtained:

1. Type of training received (# of trainees per category).
 - A. Post doctoral - _____.
 - B. Research towards PHD degree - _____.
 - C. Masters degree - _____.
 - D. Training - _____.
2. Egyptian employment (# of trainees per category).
 - A. Private Sector - _____.
 - B. University Employment - _____.
 - C. Government (Other than Univ.) - _____.
 - D. Other employment - _____.

Interview Questions

1. What New skills/techniques/knowledge did you learn during your Fellowship?
 2. What were the limiting factors (if any) in your training program?
 3. Is continued collaboration with U.S. counterparts (advisors, work counterparts, etc.) taking place? If so, in what ways? Joint ventures, cultural contacts, sharing of information, others.
 4. Give some specific examples of how your Fellowship has helped you with your work in Egypt.
 5. Have you been promoted in your work (or obtained a better job) as a result of your Fellowship training?
-

-
6. What academic training in the U.S. should be provided to future Egyptian trainees?
Emphasize the group to benefit (for ex. private sector, environment, etc.) and the educational level (graduate work vs. 4 year programs, short courses).
 6. What types of non-academic training which could help future development in Egypt?
 7. What U.S. technological know-how (if any) can help the Egyptian Private sector?
 8. Additional comments related to current or future training.
-

ANNEX II, ATTACHMENT E

USAID CAIRO FOLLOW-UP OF PEACE FELLOWS

USAID Cairo Follow-up of Peace Fellows (Data from USAID Cairo files)

When Peace Fellows return to Egypt they are instructed to stop in at HRDC/ET and fill out a questionnaire as required in AID Handbook 10. HRDC/ET has kept the completed questionnaires on file but apparently made little attempt to analyze the responses. One hundred and eighty "immediate return from training questionnaire" forms, seventeen 6-month and 7 "annual follow-up return questionnaire forms" were available from HRDC/ET. Systematic review from selected forms revealed the following:

Immediate Return From Training Questionnaire:

From 180 "Immediate Return From Training Questionnaire" forms obtained from HRDC/ET, 38 were systematically selected for evaluation. Of the 38 selected, 7 reported that the training did not fulfill the designated objectives. Four (of the 7) reported not achieving objectives because the training period was too short. One Fellow was placed in a university when he had requested training in a U.S. construction company, and one Fellow experienced problems with the administration of the program as well as program understanding and content.

All participants were returning to their same positions, and most experienced few major problems abroad. The overall evaluations were positive, although careful study of the questionnaires could identify areas where improvements in the program could be made. The questionnaires should be evaluated on a regular basis to maximize their value.

Six-Month Follow-up Return Questionnaire:

Seventeen questionnaires were provided from this group. Sixteen of the 17 Fellows were in positions they were trained for. Only one reported less responsibility than before the training, and about an equal number reported either the same or more job responsibility. Eleven were very satisfied with their training and 6 were moderately satisfied. Two Fellows reported ability to share a large amount of their training program with colleagues and supervisors and the other 15 reported moderate to very little sharing of information. Seven of the 17 reported ability to fully use their training in their present job.

Annual Follow-up Return Questionnaire:

Seven questionnaires were available in this category. Four of the 7 reported more responsibility in their current job (as compared to their last), and 5 of the 7 reported

they supervised others in their work. Five of the 7 reported at least one job promotion since completing the Fellows program. Six of the seven indicated their training was very relevant to their present job and they were able to utilize lessons learned from the program in their current work. Four of the 7 reported constraints to more fully utilizing their training with most common reason being lack of equipment, supplies, or resources. Most commonly listed benefits from the training were enhanced professional capabilities and exposure to other cultures and social systems. Six of the 7 were very satisfied with their overall training experience and one moderately satisfied. Three Fellows had been able to share a large number of ideas and techniques learned to colleagues and supervisors, and the other 4 had shared a moderate amount. Only 1 of the 7 had received any other external training since completing the AID sponsored program,

The questionnaires provide a good deal of information that is useful to those monitoring the project. More complete and regular follow-up would provide a better evaluation of the status of the program from the Fellows' perspective.

ANNEX III

DEVELOPMENT TRAINING PROJECT (#263-0125.1) PEACE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM (PFP) COMPONENT

INTERVIEWEE: Missions Department of the Ministry of Higher Education (MOHE) in Cairo

RESPONSIBILITIES: The Missions Department is responsible for administering:

1. Setting PFP Policy, Guidelines and Operating Procedures in Coordination With USAID/CAIRO;
2. The screening and selection of Peace Fellow nominees;
3. The processing of selected nominees;
4. The travel arrangements of nominees within Egypt and to the U.S.

QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Policy, Guidelines and Operating Procedures

1. Does MOHE use as its program management principles the Standing Operating Procedures (SOPs) spelled out in the attachment to PIL #10, Amendment 9?

Yes, PIL #10, Amendment 9 is understood and used as policy guidance within the Missions Department of the MOHE. There is an effective working relationship between the Missions Department, Peace Fellowship unit and the USAID/Cairo project officer for this project component.

2. Are there any aspects to those SOPs MOHE would like to clarify or change in coordination with USAID/Cairo (e.g., targets for the number of Women; targets for private sector participation in PFP; priority fields of training)?

No, the chief of the PFP unit agrees with the SOP, understands it and uses it as guidance in administering the program. However, the majority of fellows selected have not represented SOP priority fields of development priorities.

3. What aspects of these agreed SOPs are causing the biggest problems? Should these problems be addressed by revising the SOPs?

The most difficult problem for MOHE/PFP is in meeting the targets set for the women PFs. The Missions PFP Unit does not suggest a change in the targets or other provisions of the current PIL #10, A9 SOP. The selection performance in meeting these targets has been improving since these targets were agreed to in February, 1992. Fellows meeting disciplines stated in the SOP as development priorities are still low.

B. Criteria and Procedures for Peace Fellow Selection

1. What are the selection criteria established for screening Fellow candidates?
2. What procedures are followed to apply the selection criteria? Please provide written materials describing the procedures, if available.

a. Initial screening of candidates is done by MOHE/Missions/PFP Unit upon receipt of applications resulting from newspaper advertisements. This screening checks applications for completeness of requirements stated in the newspaper ad, essentially: (1) Is the application in both English and Arabic? (2) Does it show approval of the sponsor? (3) Does it stipulate that the applicant commits him/herself to spending 2 years in the old job or organization after returning from training in the U.S.? (4) Does the private sector sponsor guarantee employment of the PF after his/her return? (5) Is the candidate's TOEFL certification and score presented and still valid (PFP unit states that the cost of TOEFL testing is the responsibility of the applicant); (6) For those applying for DNDR, does the application show that the candidate has a Master's Degree and is registered in a PhD program? (About one-third of the applications are screened out in this initial screening.

b. Missions/PFP then separates remaining applications and batches them according to field of study.

c. The number of selection committees is determined by the number of applicants in each field of study, e.g., one selection committee of three members for "X" number of applications by field of study. There may be more than one committee per field of study, but the composition of the selection committees is different for each field of study and will include different members depending whether the candidates are public or private sector, or from universities or research centers.

d. The Supreme Council of Universities is asked to recommend to the MOHE Minister the names of individuals to be placed on selection committees. The Minister, MOHE must approve nomination of individuals who will compose the selection committees.

e. When selection committees are appointed, Missions/PFP then provides the candidate files to the separate committees according to the field of study and sponsoring entity (e.g., public or private sector, universities, etc.).

f. The individual files are given to the selection committees without the names of the candidates on the files (blind files), so the selection committees do not know who they are reviewing. All they have is a number for each file.

g. The selection committees are given written criteria to be used in reviewing the file of each candidate which stipulates that:

- The study plan must be in the area of the applicant's expertise.
- The quality of the application (language, logic of presentation, etc.) must be assessed.
- The reasonableness of the proposed length of study must be determined.
- The study must be compatible with Egypt's development objectives.
- The appropriateness of the material requirements (equipment) to complete the training must be assessed.

These criteria apply to every committee regardless of the sponsoring entity (private or public sector, university or research centers).

h. Selection committees grade each applicant file as "A" (very good), "B" (good), and "C" (average), and return the reviewed files to Missions/PFP.

i. The total number of applicants to be selected for nomination is set by the PFP Project Committee of the MOHE. This committee is composed of the Ministry's Under Secretary of State, the Secretary General for the Supreme Council of Universities, the Chief of the Missions' PFP Unit, the Missions Department Directors General for Technical and Finance (five members).

j. This project committee breaks down the total number to be finally selected for PFP training into so many for each area of study and within those areas, those that should be in the public and private sectors, universities/research centers, and of these, the number of women who should be selected.

-
3. Are there differences in criteria and procedures applied to selection in different sectors?
- a. Private sector
 - b. Public sector
 - c. Universities and Research Centers
 - d. Female Peace Fellows from any/all sectors

No. All selection committees use the same screening and review criteria described above in the answer to questions 1 and 2.

4. Are there established targets (percentage of Fellows) for the three sectors (public, private, universities and research centers)? What are the established targets?
5. Are there established targets for the number of female Peace Fellowships?

Yes. the targets are:

- Private Sector - 20%
- Public Sector - 20%
- Women from any/all sectors - 20%
- Universities and Research Centers - All others

6. How does the selection process assess the appropriate programs and duration of training for selected candidates (particularly those from the private sector and women)?

See description of selection process under questions 1 and 2, above.

7. Is the competitive selection process producing suitable candidates for potential contribution to Egypt's development needs?

The MOHE/Missions/PFP certainly believes the selection process is doing just that. The selection committees apply this criteria as a purpose criteria in the review of applications.

8. Does the selection process lead to selection of the best candidates for training in their respective fields of expertise?

The MOHE/Missions/PFP believes its selection process does lead to the selection of the best candidates. In most cases in meeting percentage quotas for the target as established, MOHE is able to select candidates from those applications rated in the "A" category.

9. Is the newspaper announcement method suitable for producing a selection of the best candidates? Does this method of advertising help insure fairness?

Although somewhat skeptical about this method of finding candidates for the PFP, after reviewing the process and its results, the evaluation team has come to the conclusion that it is probably the best method. It is fully understood in the Egyptian cultural context, and is a very fair selection process. It attracts a much wider range of candidates than another system that might advertise PFP scholarships through notification of institutions that such a program exists, or some other, less public procedure. It also puts the responsibility on the individual Egyptian to make the decision and work his/her application through the whole process, which is not an easy nor short term endeavor. Peace Fellows interviewed endorsed the method as being best and most fair. Some suggested contact through universities in addition to the advertisement.

10. What other methods could be used?

The only other reasonable advertising method that could possibly result in sufficient numbers of candidates seems to be one in which notices of PFP scholarship availability would be disseminated to universities, ministries and other public sector organizations, and selected organizations in the private sector (e.g., Chamber of Commerce, Lions/Rotary/etc. clubs, etc. We believe such a selection method would not provide as broad a cross-section of the population, since not all members of the community who might benefit from the program are members or associated with the institutions that would be given notices. Although the newspaper ad alone is not perfect, it does provide a fair and good cross-section access to potential participants.

11. Does the Missions Department have suggestions for improved selection procedures?

The Missions Department believes that the present system developed over the period of the PFP project component has been correctly responsive to the needs for the project. Through experience of applying it, they have refined and developed a most appropriate system.

C. **Placement of Peace Fellows**

Is the Missions Department at all involved in the placement of Fellows in U.S. universities?

No. The placement process is solely in the hands of the ECEB in Washington, D.C. (with exception as possible intermediary between ECEB and the participant).

D. Services of the Missions Department

1. What is frequency of pre-departure orientations for nominated Fellows?
2. What is covered in pre-departure orientations?

The frequency of pre-departure orientations is set by the Missions Department when sufficient nominees for foreign study (both PFs and Missions program nominees) are selected and can be oriented all together. According to the PFP unit, it covers the following subjects: explanation of the PFP; U.S. laws and restrictions the Fellows must be familiar with; social mores in the U.S.; hints on personal relations with Americans. These topics are dealt with over 2 days at the MOHE/PFP.

The Missions/PFP arranges for all nominees (PFPs and Missions sponsored trainees) to spend a day at the AMIDEAST facility where videos and lectures are given on Life in the United States, the Educational System in the U.S., and such topics as How to Correspond with U.S. Universities and Faculty.

3. Does the Missions Department have any suggestions for improving pre-departure orientations?

The Missions Department believes the current pre-departure orientation activities are sufficient for preparation of PFs for study programs in the U.S. What orientation is done in Cairo must be related to the additional orientation given by ECEB when the Fellows arrive in the U.S. Both parts, taken together, are thought to provide effective orientation. The Missions/PFP Unit would, however, like to provide departing PFs with a copy of the publication "Participant Handbook" written by the Washington International Center, Meridian House in Washington, D.C., and published by A.I.D./Washington.

4. What is involved in the processing of selected Fellows besides pre-departure orientation?
 - a. Language testing?
 - b. Medical clearances?
 - c. Educ. background documentation -- transcripts, etc.
 - d. Travel arrangements?

The results of language testing (TOEFL) is required as part of the application documentation. When candidates have been chosen through the selection process described above, under an arrangement with USAID/C the PF nominees are sent to the Cairo Kidney Center to have a physical examination required for a medical certification. The nominee then goes to USAID/C to fill out a VISA application, and

USAID/C then requests a visa from the U.S. Embassy Consular office. The Missions/PFP section makes travel arrangements with Egypt Air or TWA (if Egypt Air does not have space on the departure date).

E. Monitoring

1. Does the Missions Department process and/or evaluate progress reports from ECEB?

The Missions Department (PFP) makes no independent analysis of progress reports sent to it by ECEB. When the Missions (PFP) receives such reports, they are passed to the PF's sponsor. It is up to the sponsor to take any action after reviewing PF progress reports -- whether to contact the PFs if the reports are not satisfactory and find out reasons, or to praise good work and record it for later consideration for promotion, salary increase, etc.

2. Does the Missions Department have any regular reporting requirements to USAID/Cairo?

None, but will prepare specific information when requested by USAID/C.

3. What is the content and frequency of such reports?

N/A

4. Does the Missions Department have follow-up programs to assess utilization by Peace Fellows of the training provided through this project?

The Missions Department does not have a structured follow-up program for Peace Fellows who have completed their training, but does maintain and update data on actual return and current addresses and phone numbers of returned PFs.

5. Does the Missions Department keep a list of Peace Fellows who have completed their training? Does the list provide current locations and work assignments of these Fellows?

Yes. Such a list is maintained by Missions/PFP and this list is updated on a regular basis.

F. Missions Department Staff

1. Is the number of staff members assigned responsibilities for the Peace Fellowship Program adequate to cover the workload?

The Missions Department is adequately staffed to cover the workload using the current procedures.

-
2. Are individual staff members given authorities commensurate with their individual responsibilities?

The Missions/PFP staff is small, and each employee has a clear understanding of his/her responsibilities. Under current responsibilities and procedures, the Missions/PFP section is functioning efficiently and the evaluators find no reason to suggest any additional delegations of authority.

3. Does the Missions Department have any suggestions with regard to staffing for the Peace Fellowship Program?

The Missions Department feels it is staffed appropriately for the job to be done and does not have any staffing suggestions.

4. Does the Missions Department produce any written organization and staffing descriptions? If so, please provide copies.

Attachment A to this Annex contains a listing of the staffing and a short description of the functions of each position. Job descriptions or organizational charts are not a system used by the Missions Department.

G. Reporting

1. What is the content of the Missions Department database for the Peace Fellowship project?

See Attachment B to this Annex.

2. Does the Missions Department have any suggestions regarding frequency, format, recipients of reports that might produce a more effective process?

The Missions Department relies on the ECEB to report on implementation of the PFP, and does not believe any additional reporting would produce a more efficient process.

H. Statistics on Accomplishments and Overall Budgets

1. How many Peace Fellows are in training and have completed training from September, 1988 through September, 1993 (under project component 263-0125.1)?

The statistics are as follows:

PFs currently in training in the U.S. - 172*

PFs completed training since project 0125.1 began - 929**

Total - 1101**

(* Source: ECEB records)

(** Source: Missions Department/PFP)

2. Of these trainees, how many were:

a.	From the private sector?	143 (12.98%)
b.	From the public sector?	134 (12.17%)
c.	From Universities?	703 (63.85%)
d.	From Research Centers?	121 (10.99%)
e.	Women, from all sources?	188 (17.08%)

These overall statistics show that the established targets for the different categories of Fellows (Private Sector - 20%; Public Sector - 20%; Women from all categories - 20% were not met. However, these precise targets were agreed to in PIL #10, A9, dated February 19, 1992. The trend since these targets were set is moving closer to the agreed targets as evidenced by the categories of those Fellows currently in training (172). Of the Fellows currently in training (Sept. 1993), the statistics are:

a.	From the private sector	42 (24%)
b.	From the public sector	38 (22%)
c.	From Universities and Research Centers	92 (54%)
d.	Women, from all sources	31 (18%)

3. What are the amounts of overall obligations and expenditures?

ECEB reports overall obligations and expenditures for the PFP (Project component 263-0125.1) as follows (as of 9/16/93):

	<u>Obligations</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>	<u>Balance</u>
Program	\$22,252,718	\$17,953,392	\$4,299,326
Administrative	<u>\$ 2,170,361</u>	<u>\$ 2,050,117</u>	<u>\$ 120,244</u>
TOTALS:	\$24,423,079	\$20,003,509	\$4,419,570

The LOP budget estimate, unless or until changed, is \$41,000,000.

I. **Compliance with Project Rules**

The Missions/PFP Unit keeps a constant check on returned PFs to see if they fulfill their commitments:

- to complete their PF scholarship and return to Egypt; .
- to spend 2 years with their sponsors after the PF scholarship;

Since the beginning of the second phase of the Peace Fellowship Program (263-0125.1), 15 PFs either did not complete their study program, did not meet their 2-year commitment back with their sponsors, or completed their PFP studies but did not return to Egypt.

Each of these former Peace Fellows are sent a bill for collection in the amount spent on them by the PFP project. Repayments are deposited in the PFP account and used to meet budgetary requirements for the continuing program.

ANNEX III, ATTACHMENT A

JOB DESCRIPTION FOR PFP EMPLOYEES AND OFFICIALS

1. First Undersecretary

He is the decision maker as he represents the Minister of Higher Education. He has the authority to approve study leaves, to cancel a fellowship, if there are reasonable reasons, and to set rules and regulation ...etc. He supervises all the cultural bureaus all over the world.

2. Undersecretary (Counsellor to the Minister)

He is the main source of information as he is directly involved in the program since the very beginning. He helps the First Undersecretary in defining the exact rules and regulations to be followed. He has the authority to approve the number of PF participants, permit them to travel, to have their tickets and before leave money, to cancel a fellowship, ... etc.

3. Director General (Technical Affairs)

He signs memos for the participant and allows them to have the yellow card so as to be able to leave Egypt to the U.S.A. He signs as well the papers concerning the PF participants that we send to the ECEB, and he is a member of the PF program committee.

4. Peace Fellowship Director

He is responsible for all the statistics concerning the Peace Fellowship Program. Since the very beginning, he figures out the form of the advertisement to be issued in newspapers. He should get the approval on it from the undersecretary and the USAID and the committee of the PF program. He divides the PF employees in groups to handle the files of the participants and to prepare for the process of selection. He should sign all the papers concerning the participants, their visas, ... etc. When a number of participants are selected, their files sent to ECEB, files are to be distributed among employees by sector:

- a. Public sector and Ministries (1 employee)
- b. Private sector (1 employee)
- c. Universities (2 employees)
- d. Research Centers (1 employee)

5. PF employees (Administrative Assistants)

Four employees, each one handling all the procedures to be taken... corresponding and making contacts with the participants and the ECEB till placement is settled and the participants go to the U.S. Being a source of information on the PF participants. Preparing memos for them so as to get their study leaves approved. Guiding them as to how to get their medical certificate, what papers needed to have their wives with them, how to fill the visa forms ...etc.

6. Typists

They write down all memos and letters on typewriters, type faxes. Prepare files and arrange them with the administrative assistants, type the visa forms for PF participants ...etc.

7. Administrative Assistants of Financial Affairs

They handle the financial affairs of the participants, issue them tickets, pay them \$300 each etc. They set the PFP budget, and they set and approve the budget of the ECEB.

8. Director General for Financial Affairs

He approves the budget and shares in all the financial affairs of the project.

9. Computer Section

They write down the full details of the participants before they leave to the U.S.A.

10. Legal Affairs Department

A group of employees to sue those who do not come back to fulfil their pledges and work for the sponsor. They ask them for reimbursement.

11. PFP Committee Formed by:

First undersecretary

Undersecretary

Director General for Technical Affairs

Director General for Financial Affairs

Head of the PF unit

Secretary General for the Supreme Council of Universities.

12. Follow up Department

They follow-up the participants till they come back to Egypt and work for their sponsors. If a participant does not go back to his sponsor, they take the legal actions against him. They handle the extension issues with the USAID and ECEB, get in touch with the sponsor to check if the sponsor approves such extension or not, prepare memos to be exposed to the Missions executive committee, to approve such extension of study leaves ...etc. They handle all the problems that might face the participants and try hard to solve them on all levels.

ANNEX III ATTACHMENT B

THE MOHE MISSIONS DEPARTMENT PFP UNIT COMPUTER DATA BASE

The computer program at the Missions Department is an archival system which stores data on the PFP under the following headings:

- Peace Fellow ID# (Established by the PFP Unit and is used in the ECEB and USAID/C data bases)
- Name of the Peace Fellow
- Name of sponsoring organization (Cairo U., Private Sector, Min. Education, etc.)
- Location of U.S. educational institution where PF is placed (California, Florida, etc.)
- Purpose/Goal of study (PhD, Masters Degree, non-degree training, data collection)
- Financing Source (USAID)
- Field of study (Agriculture, Engineering, Education, etc.)
- Date travel to the U.S. commenced
- Date of return to Egypt (actual date, not programmed date)

ANNEX IV

I-STATUS OF 1989 EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Principal (Numbered) Recommendations

Recommendation No. 1. That USAID work as closely as necessary with MOHE to ensure that the project expectations of both sides are clearly stated, fully understood, and sufficiently agreed to so that implementation can take place at a reasonable pace.

Status: Following this recommendation, discussions among appropriate officials in the MOHE Missions Department and USAID/Cairo officials were constant and continuing in an effort to clarify understandings with regard to fields of study, types of programs and distribution of candidates by sponsoring organizations.

Understandings between MOHE/Missions Department and USAID/Cairo were folded into implementation of the PFP as consultation discussions continued. The understandings were incorporated into an Annex to PIL #10, Amendment 9, dated February 19, 1992 as Standing Operating Procedures (SOP) (See Attachment A to this Annex). These SOPs contain several sections, i.e., Training Restrictions; Guidelines for Training Activities, and General Considerations. The SOPs establish agreed upon targets for participation of PFs from the private sector, from the GOE Ministries and other public sector employees, for the number of female PFs from all sources. The General Considerations section of the SOP spells out needed understandings regarding such aspects of the PFP as extensions of training, non-academic types of programs for specific categories of PFs, required TOEFL scores for non-academic and academic training. It is a thorough iteration of detailed understandings between the parties on implementation of the program.

Recommendation No. 2. That all fields of clinical medicine be eliminated from eligibility under the Peace Fellowship Program and that applications of the large number of candidates in these fields currently in process be canceled.

Status: The Ministry and USAID agreed to eliminate this category of PFs, but to implement it incrementally during FY 1990 -- not to cancel PF applications of candidates that were in process in early 1989. This understanding for future selections was reflected in the SOP in PIL #10, A9.

Recommendation No. 3. That a portion of the project budget be set aside for the private sector and that a new selection procedure for this group be adopted.

Status: USAID/C and the Ministry agreed to give priority to candidates from the private sector particularly to meet the agreed upon target of 20% of total number of

PFs. They did not agree to set aside specific sums in the project budget for this purpose. To actually earmark specific amounts of funds for private sector PFs only would run the risk of running short on the overall numbers trained established as an output objective of the program, especially if sufficient private sector candidates did not apply for the program to equal the amount of funds set aside (earmarked).

Recommendation No. 4. That special project assistance be given to help the ECEB solve its personnel and working conditions problems with the Peace Fellow Unit.

Status: Working conditions (crowded) were relieved in 1990 by the GOE purchase of a building on New Hampshire Avenue in Washington, D.C. with reasonably adequate space for ECEB staff - both PFP and Missions program.

USAID has accepted increases in the administrative budget to cover some increases in ECEB/PFP staff salaries over the past three and one half years since the 1989 evaluation was prepared. Salaries of the PFP staff are still, however, low by comparison to the current rates for comparable jobs in Washington, D.C. (See ANNEX I, Attachment C).

The administrative budget for ECEB/PFP was also increased to allow for the purchase of new computer hardware and software (approximately \$65,000) to set up a computer network for the PFP.

As discussed elsewhere in this evaluation, the computer network is still a purely archival system and does not allow the use of word processing for the professional staff. Education Specialists maintain and rely almost entirely on a parallel manual system of recording data on preprinted data cards and following the progress of placement and monitoring of PFs in the system.

All in all there has been some improvements in both office space and remuneration for the ECEB/PFP staff. The PFP staff are still suffering from a rather low morale. And there is considerable concern among the PFP staff due to the fact that USAID funding of the PF Program is scheduled to terminate in September, 1995 which the staff feel will be the demise of the Peace Fellowship Program and hence the ECEB/PFP staff who implement it.

B. Miscellaneous Recommendations (Unnumbered)

- That the master's degree in certain developmentally-oriented disciplines be approved as a goal under the PF program.

Within the PFP under project 263-0125.1, there have been 20 Fellows whose study goal was/is to acquire a Master's Degree. 18 of the PFs with an MA/MS as a study goal are still in training in the U.S., all having been selected since this recommendation was filed in the 1989 evaluation report. Of the 18 PFs still in training with a Master's degree as a goal, 10 are studying engineering, 1 in computer systems, 2 in commerce, 2 in business administration, 2 in economics, and 1 in English.

- That a candidate sent under the PF program for a PhD degree be continued under PF funding to the end of that degree and not switched to Missions funding.

There have been very few PF candidates selected for PF sponsorship with a Ph.D degree as a study goal. Currently, since this recommendation was made, there is only one PF with a Ph.D as a study goal. There is likely to be no others before phase out of this project component since the criteria for selection of a study program leading to a Ph.D degree calls for allowing a period of five years to complete the degree.

- That the Missions Department practice of setting training periods based on allowance rates be abandoned, and the period for the post-doctoral program be extended for a period of up to two years.

The Missions Department, with USAID/C concurrence extended the allowable period for post-doctoral research from five to six months. Though there is always a possibility on a case-by-case basis of extending the post-doctoral PFs period of training, the Missions Department and ECEB has generally held the line to six months training, though many post-doctoral trainees have requested extensions of training. This recommendation was partially accepted by extending the period to 6 months regardless of the lowering of the allowance for the last month, but the general practice of allowing post-doctoral research up to 2 years was not.

- That a minimum percentage of all person-months of training be reserved for the private sector.

See numbered recommendation 3, above.

- That ECEB working conditions for the Peace Fellows Unit be improved and that higher salaries be paid.

See numbered recommendation 4, above.

-
- That an education specialist receive training and assist in Placement, and that the next replacement for any education specialist be an individual with previous Placement and Monitoring experience who could work part time in both positions, according to the volume of work.

ECEB has instituted no formal training for education specialists. Current education specialists up to approximately one and a quarter years ago were all performing both placement and monitoring functions. This functional arrangement was changed by the current Acting Director. The two functions -- placement and monitoring -- have now been separated with two specialists handling all placements, and two specialists functioning as study program monitors only. The placement specialists do, however, carry some monitoring duties. And the PFP coordinator in ECEB also shares some of the monitoring duties.

- That the computer hardware be upgraded and its software be improved and the basis of expert advice.

See numbered recommendation 4, above.

- That wherever clearly outstanding candidates might qualify for acceptance in the most competitive US institutions, efforts be made to place them there, even if the cost is higher than at other universities.

Cost is a strong factor in ECEB placements, however, when applicants have outstanding records and request placement in the most competitive and expensive institutions, ECEB has arranged such placements. Among the current PFs in training, 14 are placed in the most competitive and expensive U.S. institutions.

- That only those Peace Fellows who have been placed be authorized by the Missions Department to travel

Selected PF candidates are not provided airline tickets to travel until the ECEB informs the MOHE/Missions Department that placement has been made.

- That the circumstances behind recent, large-scale pickups of new Peace Fellows from among individuals in the US be examined with an eye to stopping or at least curtailing the practice.

This practice has been totally stopped.

- That ECEB restrictions on field trips and conference attendance be relaxed.

Since this recommendation was made, ECEB has instituted a standard policy of allowing one conference or field trip per training period for each PF. This constitutes a relaxation of restrictions that were extended during the previous period.

-
- That Peace Fellows be informed of and be allowed to attend AID-sponsored Midwinter Community Seminars.

This recommendation was not accepted. The reason given is that most PFs are too pressed to complete their studies to break at mid-winter for these seminars.

- That the USAID/Cairo Training Office receive copies of all Peace Fellows AETR's.

USAID/Cairo does not accept this recommendation. The USAID believes the current system of forwarding the AETRs through the Missions Department to the PF's sponsor is the appropriate process. It is up to the sponsor to follow the PF's academic progress and take any actions that seem appropriate based on a PF's record (good or bad) as reflected in the AETRs.

- That ECEB allow basic decisions on placement, monitoring and payment of allowances to be made by Peace Fellow staff, within well-understood policy guidelines.

All placement and allowances payment decisions are made by the Acting Director of ECEB in accordance with his understanding of PFP policies.

- That the data elements in the still to be activated Missions Department computer in Cairo be made as compatible as possible with the ECEB system and the USAID PTIS.

This recommendation was reviewed by USAID and the Missions Department with the result that such an effort would not be practical. The three systems have sufficient data bases that are common (e.g., PF identification numbers, PFs grouped by fields of study, study goal, and by sponsoring institutions, type of fellowship such as post-doctoral, DNDR, degree training, and non-degree academic and practical training, number of women selected and trained, numbers of selections by public sector and private sector, universities, and research institutes, beginning and ending dates for each PF training period). Each management entity -- USAID/C, Missions Department and ECEB -- have their own data requirements peculiar to their role in managing the program, and it was decided that there was sufficient common characteristics.

- That ECEB act immediately to replace the non-Peace Fellow officer who now handles most ECEB compliance with AID Handbook 10 and who is scheduled to leave in May 1989.

This was done.

- That a procedure be developed between ECEB and the Missions Department to allow positive confirmation that a Peace Fellow has returned to Egypt.

The Missions Department now sends monthly to ECEB a list of PFs who have returned to Egypt and checked in with the Missions Department as they are instructed to do. The Missions department also, on a continuing basis traces down those PFs that ECEB reports have received airline tickets and presumed to have departed for Egypt from the U.S. but have not checked in at MOHE/Missions Department. When their return is verified, the Missions Department informs ECEB.

- That Missions raise the age limit in training programs to 45 or 50 years of age and, if permissible under law, provide a preference for women with children over a certain age to apply to the program

Age limits were raised to 45 for post-doctorate PFs; 35 for data collection, non-degree research; and 35 for private sector PFs. Egyptian law and practice does not allow special treatment for women different from treatment for men.

- That preferential acceptance from among the middle ranked candidates be given to the spouse of a man or a woman who has been given a Peace Fellowship on the basis of his or her top ranking.

Tandem placement considerations were not specified in the newspaper ads that solicited applications for the program. The system all the same has been able to make 2 tandem placements of PFs and their spouses. In these cases, both candidates were given high ratings in the screening and review processes.

- That shorter time periods be adopted for training programs, so as to meet needs of a broader constituency, including women.

This recommendation was not accepted. The constituency is thought to be sufficiently broad under current length of training policies.

- That the Peace Fellowship program cover costs of tuition for a dependent spouse who wished to pursue course work in the United States.

This recommendation was judged to be inappropriate by both USAID/C and the Missions Department. It was not accepted.

- That USAID and MOHE identify fields in which women are strongly represented or recently successful in the work force and seek the support of leaders in these fields to publicize the Peace Fellowship opportunities for younger women or female colleagues.

The Missions Department made a search for areas in which women are strongly represented and recently successful. The results of the search was that the

areas were secondary education and nursing. Nursing and education were advertised as areas of study that would be considered for scholarships. No special formal notification of leaders in these fields was made.

II-STATUS OF 1991 AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation No. 1. We recommend that USAID/Egypt, in consultation with the Ministry of Higher Education, and prior to approving its use of A.I.D. funds in fiscal year 1992:

- 1.1 develop a training plan for the remainder of the Program which establishes realistic targets for the distribution of fellowships to the Egyptian private sector and women;**
- 1.2 ensure that certain Peace Fellowship funds be reserved for Egyptian private sector and female participation; and**
- 1.3 report the unfulfilled status of Special Covenant 5.4 in Mission Quarterly Implementation and Covenant Reports until it is met for the Peace Fellowship Program.**

Status:

- 1.1 As a result of consultations with the MOHE, PIL #10, Amendment 9 was issued and satisfies the training plan requirement.**
- 1.2 USAID/Cairo and the MOHE disagreed with this audit recommendation in the sense that funds should be reserved for private sector and women. Rather the emphasis was placed on meeting the established targets within the total funds available for the fellowships. In placements made since the audit, as reflected in PFs currently in training, the private sector placements represent 24% of all placements, and women placements reached 18% of all placements, which indeed the evaluators believe is good performance.**
- 1.3 USAID/Cairo commenced reporting unfulfilled status of Special Covenant 5.4 in its quarterly reports. The SOP agreed to in PIL #10, Amendment 9, resulted from a review of targets for private sector and female participation. Private sector participation was established at 20% and female participation at a more realistic 20% (reduced from the earlier 30%). Placements after PIL #10, Amendment 9, as indicated above have been very close or exceeded the new targets set.**

Recommendation No. 2. We recommend that USAID/Egypt prepare a plan to ensure that financial records relating to the Program are audited on a regular basis.

Status: Funds were set aside in the project to fund audits of program funds records. Currently (September, 1993) two financial audits are being completed -- one in Washington to review records at ECEB, and one in Cairo to review the records at MOHE/Missions Department.

Recommendation No. 3. We recommend that USAID/Egypt develop a system to ensure that research funds paid to U.S. institutions on behalf of Peace Fellows are adequately accounted for and that unused research funds are refunded to Program accounts on a timely basis.

Status: A system for reimbursement of unused advances to institutions where PFs are placed is in use by ECEB. The system requires such institutions to submit a final accounting of funds allocated to them and return unused portions. The result of this system is that reimbursements from U.S. Institutions since September, 1988 have amounted to \$132,531.59.

Recommendation No. 4. We recommend that USAID/Egypt determine the amount of A.I.D. funds expended for training the three Peace Fellows who did not comply with the terms of their training agreements upon return to Egypt (estimated at about \$67,440), and recover the determined amount from the Government of Egypt:

Status: The MOHE and USAID/Cairo have agreed on a resolution to this problem: two of the three returned PFs were from the public sector and were seconded to countries in the Gulf. This is a standard practice in Egyptian public service, and does not change the individuals status as working at his or her GOE job. Consequently, the MOHE does not consider these two PFs as having not complied with the terms of their training.

The third PF reviewed was from the private sector and was not required to remain with his same employer after returning from his training. He did not leave Egypt, which is the applicable rule, and therefore is in compliance with the rules.

The MOHE/Missions Department now keeps a continuing check upon returned PFs to see if they fulfill their commitments. Since the beginning of Project 263.125.1, the Missions Department reports that 15 PFs either did not complete their study program, did not meet their 2-year commitment back with their sponsors, or completed their studies but did not return to Egypt. These former Peace Fellows have been sent bills for reimbursement of the full amount spent on them by the PFP project.

Recommendation No. 5. We recommend that USAID/Egypt:

5.1 plan and develop a follow-up program, in collaboration with the Ministry of Higher Education, specifically designed to implement follow-up activities for returned Peace Fellowship participants, including at a minimum:

(a) periodic ceremonies to issue Certificates of Achievement to all returned Peace Fellowship participants; and

(b) financial assistance to selected local professional organizations as described in Special Covenant 5.5 of the Development Training Project Grant Agreement;

-
- 5.2 report the unfulfilled status of Special Covenant 5.5 in Mission Quarterly Implementation and Covenant Reports until the Covenant has actually been met; and
 - 5.3 improve the accuracy of the Mission's Participant Training Information System by verifying the accuracy of work and home addresses and telephone numbers, employer, position, and field for each returned Peace Fellowship participant on an annual basis.

Status:

- 5.1. (a) and (b) - USAID/Cairo recognizes there is a need for an effective follow-up program for participants sent for training from all projects. Plans are being formulated within USAID to set up a general program (using a contractor) for effective participant follow up. Such a program will include periodic ceremonies for issuance of Certificates of Achievement to all returning Peace Fellowship participants.

Special Covenant 5.5 dealing with the Grantee making efforts to assist the development of professional organizations that returning Peace Fellows would join as part of planned follow-up activities. The USAID and the MOHE considered this Covenant 5.5 to be unrealistic in the Egyptian context, and both parties agreed to delete it from the grant agreement. Section 5.5 was deleted from the grant agreement in the Seventh Amendment to the agreement dated 24 August 1992.

- 5.2 Prior to the deletion of the special covenant, USAID/Cairo reported in its quarterly reports that the covenant was unfulfilled until it was deleted from the grant agreement.
- 5.3 USAID/Cairo instituted a system of improving the accuracy of personal information about the returned PFs by special mailings to each PF to solicit current information.

STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES

TRAINING RESTRICTIONS

o Training in the following fields will not be eligible for A.I.D. financing:

- Military or paramilitary fields;
- Fields related to police or other law enforcement functions, prisons, internal intelligence, or surveillance;
- Fields related (in whole or in part) to abortion or involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning;
- Operation of casinos and other gambling facilities; and
- Weather modification.

o Training of the following categories of individuals will not be eligible for A.I.D. financing:

- Employees of the Ministry of Interior who are engaged in, or otherwise work in direct or indirect support of, police or other law enforcement functions, prisons, internal intelligence, or surveillance;
- Employees of the Ministry of Defense;
- U.S. citizens and legal residents; and
- Employees of firms which are not at least 51% owned and managed by individuals who are citizens of the A.R.E.

o Training in the following fields may or may not be eligible depending on the circumstances. Proposals for training in these fields should be discussed with USAID/Cairo at the earliest possible date:

- Fields related to the growth or production for export of any agricultural commodity which would compete with a similar commodity grown or produced in the United States (especially citrus, palm oil, or sugar crops); and
- Fields related to the manufacture or production for export of any goods which would compete with similar goods manufactured or produced in the United States (especially textiles, apparel, footwear, handbags, luggage, flat goods, work gloves, and leather wearing apparel); and
- Nuclear technology and related fields.

Guidelines for Training Activities

o Training in the following fields related to USAID/Cairo's and Egypt's development priorities will be encouraged:

- Democratic Pluralism
- Management and Planning
- Economics
- Environmental Studies
- Business/Public Administration
- Tourism; Hotel Management and Administration
- City Planning and Design of Urban/Suburban Areas
- Education; Curriculum Development
- Industrial Safety
- Nursing

o The following fields have been over-represented in the past and should be excluded from future plans:

- Medicine as represented by: physicians, pharmacists, and dentists.
- Literature, arts, applied arts and crafts, music, history and humanities.

o The following individuals must be encouraged and given priority

- Egyptian private sector employees. A target of 20% of the total number of Peace Fellows has been established for private sector employees. These firms should certify that:

* The firm is at least 51% Egyptian owned and managed by individuals who are citizens of the A.R.E.

* The training requested is required and beneficial for the firm and fits its plan for upgrading personnel.

* The candidate has been employed by that firm for at least two years prior to his/her application for a fellowship and will continue as an employee of the firm during the period of his/her training in the U.S.

* Employment with the firm will be guaranteed to the Peace Fellow for at least two years after return.

- Ministry and Public Sector Employees: A target of 20% participation is encouraged.

- Women: A target of 20% female participation has been established. We can achieve an increase in the numbers of women through the

encouragement of tandem couples traveling for the same durations of training at the same location.

o GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS:

- Flexibility in training durations may be encouraged as training will not be limited to durations of 5-months, 10-months, 18-months, etc. This will take into consideration that durations as approved on the original PIO/P of the Peace Fellow will be strictly adhered to. Extensions may be considered in very rare and exceptional cases when strongly justified as was previously agreed to by both the Ministry of Higher Education and USAID/Cairo.
- Non-academic training settings and locations for short term training durations to meet with candidates' employment requirements and needs will be encouraged.
- Degree training for longer training durations that usually take place in academic settings will be encouraged.
- Selection for non-academic training will be done by the Private Sector Selection Committee which was previously established by the Project Management Committee for that purpose. Also, it will be necessary to establish a similar committee for the selection of Public Sector candidates who will not be going for academic training.
- An institutional TOEFL score of 450 would be required of all non-academic training candidates and an international TOEFL score of 500 would be required of all academic degree candidates. TOEFL scores must be valid and less than two years old at the time the documentation is being processed. The Peace Fellowship Project may take advantage of the English Language Training programs funded by USAID in Cairo and Alexandria.
- Placement of Fellows at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) will be encouraged. The Agency for International Development has a requirement to meet a target of 10% of person-months of training worldwide at HBCUs. The Peace Fellowship Project will have to contribute to that percentage in order that the Agency may meet its requirement.
- Issuance of Letters of Acceptance to candidates approving them for training under the Peace Fellowship program will take place after USAID's approval of individual programs.
- Dependents who meet AID dependent certification requirements will be allowed to join the Peace Fellow only after 6 months.
- Peace Fellows are bound by the two-year home residence requirement under AID's J-1 visa and action will be taken against those who do not return. Employers may not approve leaves of

absence for purposes of overseas employment during those two years.

- Training Announcements must be cleared and approved by USAID/Cairo in writing before publication.

- All PF candidates must complete USAID/Cairo's pre-departure medical examination and clearance process. Medical examinations must be completed within four to six weeks prior to departure for the U.S.

- A list of all candidates to be sent to ECEB for placement will be forwarded to USAID/Cairo for review and approval prior to being sent to ECEB. The list will include, among other things: name, sponsoring institution, field of study, training/degree objective, and training durations.

Key Documents Consulted by the Evaluation Team

- USAID/Cairo Project Paper 263-0125, Development Training Project, July, 1985;
- Project Grant Agreement, Amendment One through seven; Development Training Original Grant Agreement 26 September 1986, First amendment 19 August 1986 - seventh Amendment 22 August 1992;
- USAID/Cairo PIL # 10,, Amendments 1 through 11, 9 August 1988 through December 1992;
- A.I.D. Handbook 10, (Latest version);
- Evaluation of Peace Fellowship Program, Checchi and company, Inc., January, 1989;
- Audit Report No. 6-263-91-07, dated 28 August 1991; RIG/A/C Audit of USAID/Egypt's Peace Fellowship Program; and
- USAID/Cairo Country Program Strategy, Egypt, May 1992.
- PEACE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM; COMPREHENSIVE REPORT; July 1 - December, 1992. Egyptian Cultural and Educational Bureau, Embassy of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Washington, D.C.

LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Recommendations for the Balance of the Current PFP Program

Based on findings from Fellows and our evaluation of the project, we have the following recommendations to be considered for the remainder of the current project. All recommendations are subject to availability of funds and the PACD

- Eliminate the "3 course per program" limit on Fellows now studying and newly selected Fellows.
 - Solidify and articulate the policy on extensions of time for Fellowships, especially for Training Fellowships, between USAID/C, MOHE, and ECEB.
 - Allow Training Fellows (and in some cases non-degree research Fellows) to extend their programs for up to one year (subject to PACD limitations) if they have (1) completed at least 18 semester hours of graduate credit towards the Masters degree, and (2) have been formally accepted into a graduate program leading to the Masters degree. In the PIO/P, state these criteria for approval of an extension for completion of the Masters degree.
 - Consider Post-doctoral Fellows for extensions up to one year (subject to PACD). An extension beyond the initial 6 months should be granted following a request with justification from the Fellow and an accompanying request from the Academic Advisor (with appropriate agreement of the university).
 - Allow Post-doctoral Fellows \$65 per month, if the research program exceeds five months, for purchase of books and supplies - preferably advanced to the PF at the beginning of study.
 - In placing new Fellows from Agriculture and other priority disciplines, first investigate placements with HBCUs or possible joint-placements with HBCUs and the other Land Grant Experiment Stations in the same State.
 - To improve HBCU placements, ECEB should assign one of its Education Specialists to investigate the strengths of specific HBCUs and become the source within ECEB of information on HBCUs.
 - Support the principle and allow one remedial English course for Fellows in their first semester of work.
-

-
- Develop the practice of scheduling student's arrival on campus at least 2 weeks prior to the beginning of school (for English familiarization and housing) and encourage the University Office of International Programs to arrange a "host family stay" for Fellows willing to participate.
 - MOHE should send files of selected PFs to ECEB on a continuous basis rather than holding selectees' files until a large batch of files has accumulated.
 - ECEB should revise the six-months report to: (1) add statistics on women placements and placements in HBCUs to the tabular and graphic presentations by study goal, sponsor, and field of study; (2) present cumulative statistics on arrivals and departures of PFs in each 6-month report; and (3) add to the narrative portion of the report a description of progress of the program related to the project purpose, problems encountered during the reporting period, and how the ECEB plans to address these problems during the next reporting period.
 - ECEB should study areas where operational efficiency could be improved by the delegation of some authority to Education Specialists: e.g., placement approvals, immediate responses to emergency health problems of PFs, approval of PF attendance at conferences or making field trips.
 - USAID/Cairo should approve an increase in the administrative budget and ECEB should make significant raises in staff salaries to bring them within the D.C. market levels for similar jobs.
 - ECEB should institute a process whereby when PF selectees arrive in Washington at the ECEB, they should each have an in-depth discussion with their placement and monitoring specialists concerning what has been arranged for their study program and what are the specific responsibilities of the individual PFs during their Fellowship period.
 - Since it is inevitable in any management system that issues of policy interpretation and special implementation rules will come up, we recommend that the MOHE and the USAID institute a quarterly meeting between them to review progress and deal with policy and management issues that may have come up since the last review meeting. It is important that a formal agenda be agreed to before each quarterly project status review, and that the agenda be adhered to during these meetings.
 - That USAID/Cairo in collaboration with MOHE develop a PFP Phase-Out Plan as soon as possible (by 1 January, 1994) to guide program implementation actions during the last 1 and 3/4 years of the LOP. This Phase-Out Plan should include, as a minimum, the provisions specified in III, A. of the FINDINGS section of this report.
-

-
- That USAID/Cairo and the MOHE carefully review the current SOP and issue a revised version. The revised version should modify the first paragraph under GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS and make it less restrictive with regard to extensions of training programs; specify new criteria for extension consideration (see III, B. of FINDINGS section); and modify or add provisions allowing remedial English classes during the first semester of training, and eliminate the 3-course limit on DNDR and Training Fellows programs.
 - Review pre-orientation offerings of both the Missions Department and the ECEB and be sure they include personal and programming issues listed in IV, B. of the FINDINGS section of this report.
 - That USAID/Cairo place priority on developing and approving a comprehensive Orientation, Follow-up and Evaluation (OFE) program.

B. Future Academic Training Programs (Following the PACD)

Since the priority areas of study specified in the 1992 SOP will have been only minimally covered, future programs should consider the continuing relevance of these disciplines. Those still considered to be relevant should be targeted for future programs.

- We recommend that USAID/Cairo in collaboration with the MOHE design a new project as a follow-on to the Peace Fellowship Program which would maintain the momentum of the PFP and provide training in priority development areas minimally covered in the PFP.

ANNEX VII

PERSONS INTERVIEWED BY THE EVALUATION TEAM

AID/Washington

- Michael J. Korin, NE/ENA/E, Egypt desk officer
- Hubert W. Porter, NE/ME/LI, former Egypt desk officer
- Peter Kresge, HRDM/TSD/PMT, former HRDC officer, USAID/CAIRO
- CDIE Library, AID/Washington
- Judy McKeever, OIT/W, AD, Resources and Support Division
- Carolyn Colman, OIT/PP
- Thomas R. Donnelly, OIT/PETA
- Alan K. Kreger, OIT/SIMS

Egyptian Cultural and Educational Bureau (ECEB)

- Prof. Kamel A. Ahmed, Ph.D., Acting Director, ECEB
- Dr. Ragaa Selim, Cultural Attache
- Mr. Mohamed Nashaat Fahmy, Financial Affairs Attache
- Ms. Frances Jarvis, PFP Coordinator
- Ms. Lois Noroozi, Education Specialist
- Ms. Winfred Sanquoi, Education Specialist
- Ms. Sandra El Haj, Education Specialist
- Ms. Fatima Abdelsamad, Education Specialist
- Mr. Abdel Latif Nabawi, Education Specialist, Computer Prog.
- Ms. Aster Kiross, Accountant
- Ms. Ghada Shehata, Accountant Assistant
- Ms. Hazel Adams-Shango, Secretary

USAID/Cairo

- Thomas McKee, Chief, HRDC,ET
 - Diane Leach, HRDC/ET, Training Officer
 - Mona Kaldas, HRDC/ET, Project Officer
 - Randall Parks, USAID/C, Evaluation Officer
 - Timothy Hammonn, USAID/C/TI/FI
 - Adel Gohar, HRDC/ET
-

GOE Ministry Of Higher Education, Missions Department

- Farouk H. Abdel Fattah, Undersecretary of State, MOHE
- Fathy Ghoneim, Counsellor to the Minister
- Abdel Salem, Director General
- Mohamed Mahmoud, Chief, Missions Department, PFP Unit
- Madiha Ghalib, Administrative Assistant, PFP Unit

Peace Fellows and Academic Advisors

- Eight (8) Peace Fellows in Training in the U.S.
- Three (3) Academic Advisors at U.S. Universities
- Sixty (60) Returned Peace Fellows in Cairo

ANNEX VIII

SUGGESTED TYPES OF TRAINING FOR FOLLOW-ON CONSIDERATION

The following are descriptive characteristics of four types of training programs USAID/Cairo might consider in the design and development of a new project or projects following the completion of the current Development Training Project, 263-0125.

1. Joint PHD Thesis Supervision

Candidates for this type of training would be from Egyptian Universities who are enrolled in PHD programs. They would complete a portion of their work in a U.S. university. Advisors from both the Egyptian and U.S. universities would work with the candidates to guide them with their PHD research. A significant part of the study in the U.S. would be course work to support the PHD candidate's study. The length of the training should be 18 months with latitude for up to a 12 month extension, if the candidate is able to complete a U.S. masters degree within that time.

The elements of this training category would be:

- a. TOEFL score requirement: 500
 - b. Target areas of study: 80% of the participants should be chosen from the fields of Business (including all areas such as management, operations management, accounting, finance, management information systems, marketing, planning, international business, and general business), Economics, Environmental Studies, Tourism, Education, Nursing and City Planning.
 - c. Project Management: MOHE/ECEB
 - d. Project Duration: 7 Years
 - e. Target for Females: 20%
 - f. Target for HBCU Placement: 10%
 - g. Maximum Age: 35 Years at time of application
-

2. Masters Degree Training for University/Public & Private Sector Participants

Candidates for this type of training program should be selected for training in the following areas and within the target percentages shown below:

- Business/management 50%
- Engineering/technology 30%
- Other development areas 20%
- a. TOEFL score requirement: 525
- b. Project Duration: 7 Years
- c. Project Management: MOHE/ECEB
- d. Target for Females: 20%
- e. Target for Private Sector 50%
- f. Target for HBCU Placement 10%
- g. GMAT & GRE Requirement As required by participating university
- h. Maximum Age: 40 at time of application

3. Follow-on Professional Participation Program for Former PFs and their U.S. Counterparts

Many Peace Fellows who studied on Post-doctoral and non-degree research Fellowships developed collaborative projects which should be perpetuated. To facilitate and perpetuate this collaboration, this element of a new project would cover the financing of travel grants for the strongest collaborative programs. This element should be a limited program to support a continuation of work between former Peace Fellows (Post-doctoral and thesis non-degree research only) and U.S. professional collaborators. We suggest a maximum of 50 such travel

grants. The description and request (application) for continuation of research collaboration should be jointly proposed by the Egyptian and U.S. counterparts. The grant would support travel of the Egyptian collaborator to the U.S. and for the U.S. collaborator to travel to Egypt. The grant would stipulate that travel by the U.S. co-researcher to Egypt would be for "travel only", whereas for the Egyptian researcher the grant should cover travel costs and maintenance costs while in the U.S. If travel could be planned to coincide with professional meetings/conferences, such travel would be preferable.

Project factors for this element are:

a.	Maximum duration (each grant)	3 months
b.	Maximum individual grant:	\$12000
c.	Maximum number of grants:	50
d.	Length of program:	7 Years
e.	Program management:	MOHE
f.	Frequency of repeat participation:	3 Years
g.	Maximum age:	50 Years at time of application

4. "Training Programs"

The following is a discussion of "Training" programs that we believe the USAID should consider implementing within its general participant training programs. We do not believe that the type training described below should be included as a direct follow-on activity to the PFP. Our recommendation for follow-on to the PFP, after the PFP is completed in September, 1995, calls for a restriction of focus to academic degree studies in specified priority fields of study.

"Training" in the current PFP is not clearly defined. Training consists of a mixture of academic and non-academic programming, and fails to meet the objective of "training" in the participants' minds. Training should be clearly separated from "academic programs" (even though some training could be conducted in educational institutions) and designed to meet definite objectives such as CAD/CAM (computer assisted drafting, computer assisted machining), quality control, operations management, information systems, irrigation management, small business

development, community health programming, and numerous other such practical study areas. Training should not be oriented to train basic users but should be directed towards "training of trainers" so the training could be shared and multiplied by returning trainees. With such training programs, linkages should be made with user groups (both public and private sector) to identify needs and decide if the training could best be provided in Egypt, the U.S. or in a third country. For training to be provided in the U.S., the following are some U.S. entities which could assist in providing such training:

1. U.S. Universities: Areas requiring combination academic and practical training can often be handled by universities. Programs such as CAD/CAM or quality control can consist of theoretical training followed by "on-the-job" placement for "hands on" experience. U.S. university faculty are often more available in summer periods and thus summer is a good time to consider such programs.
2. U.S. Community and Technical Colleges: Many programs are available in training through these types of schools. ranging from certificate (6 or so months) to two-year Associate degree programs. Community colleges can arrange specialized programs in a variety of areas such as health related programs (nursing to dental hygiene), manufacturing technology, various areas of design, computing, electronics, printing technology, and others. Community colleges and technical schools often have linkages with industries and routinely place students in these firms for "on-the-job" training. Thus special programs can be arranged to meet "hands on" training needs.
3. Private Sector Companies/Industries: Fellows interviewed desired "hands on" work with U.S. firms. Two Fellows in the construction industry desired work experience in U.S. firms. Such training, however, requires special placement and often the training is of minimal value after a few weeks of orientation. Cost of such training may be expensive and might not meet the desired goals of the trainee. In addition, such training might have minimal application in the Egyptian workplace.