EVALUATION OF AFGRAD-III

Submitted by

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Paul Kimmel, Team Leader
Norman Green
Elizabeth McDavid

Contract number: PDC-1109-I-00-7119-00

Work Order Number 8

November, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface 1

Executive Summary 2

The AFGRAD Program 6

The Evaluation 9

Results 14

Conclusions and Recommendations 50

Bibliography 57

Appendix A: 58

Appendix B: 64

Appendix C: 67

Appendix D: 71

Appendix E: 73

EVALUATION OF AFGRAD-III

PREFACE

The Division of Education and Human Resources, Technical Resources Office, of the Africa Bureau (AFR/TR/EHR) has provided funding for a mid-project evaluation of the African Graduate Fellowship Program, Phase III (AFGRAD-III) under the Agency for International Development's Project 698-0455. This *Evaluation of AFGRAD-III* was produced by Creative Associates International, Inc., (CAI), in response to that requirement.

Dr. Paul Kimmel of CAI was the team leader for this evaluation. Mr. Norman Green was the African education specialist, and Mrs. Elizabeth McDavid of A.I.D. was the Training Specialist on the evaluation. All of these professionals have many years of experience working with A.I.D. training programs. Dr. Kimmel has been involved with the evaluation of A.I.D. participants for over 20 years. Mr. Green and Mrs. McDavid have over 10 years of experience working with these participants in the U.S. and Africa. All are very familiar with the AFGRAD program.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to all of the participants, academic officials, Deans, A.I.D. personnel in Washington and Africa, and employees of the African-American Institute (AAI) who gave so generously of their time and information. Their insights and assessments make up the core of this report. The findings and conclusions contained in this report, however, are those of the contractor and not necessarily those of respondents, the Africa Bureau, or A.I.D.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In July, 1988, Creative Associates International, Inc. (CAI), undertook a two-month review of the AFGRAD-III program at the request of AFR/TR/EHR. This evaluation looked at the documentation of the program, questioned the African USAIDs involved, met with the personnel at the African-American Institute (AAI) who administer the program, interviewed four members of the Dean's Committee who assist with the selection and placement of participants, discussed the program with A.I.D. officials in A.I.D./W and others in the Washington area knowledgeable about the program, and visited two college campuses to talk with 20 participants, their academic advisors and university officials.

All of the parties contacted in this mid-project evaluation were supportive of the AFGRAD program and recommended that it be continued. Many specifically commented on the fact that the program is meeting Africa's human resource needs and several suggested that it be expanded to meet more of those needs. Those who were familiar with the general procedures used to implement the program such as the members of the Dean's Committee and the university officials, said that AAI's approach to selecting and monitoring the participants was quite successful, especially compared with other international scholarship programs.

AAI has met the general performance standards established in the Cooperative Agreement. It is too early to ascertain completion and repatriation rates for AFGRAD-III, but current and past performance in these areas suggest that they will be well within the guidelines of the Agreement. AAI should have no trouble programming the number of participants at the degree levels established for each country in the Project Paper. There is a consensus that present policies established for the program such as tuition waivers, percentage goals for female and private sector students, and training at various academic levels in fields determined by the missions and host country should be continued.

While AAI's performance is very satisfactory and meets all of the requirements of the Cooperative Agreement (except the

provision of an annual report), a number of suggestions were made by our respondents, including AAI staff members, as to how the AFGRAD-III program could be made even more effective through modifications to the Cooperative Agreement. Since it has been shown that African students who are knowledgeable about life in the U.S. and on university campuses do better socially and academically (Pruitt, 1978), more adequate provision should be made by A.I.D. for AFGRAD participants to have orientations in their home country; in New York City and/or at the Washington (D.C.) International Center; and on their campuses. This will require that participants have enough time to attend such orientation programs and that such programs be mandatory.

The home country orientations can be organized by the AAI field representatives with assistance from the USAIDs, USISs, and AFGRAD alumni. The New York orientations can be developed by AAI with assistance from the Washington International Center and National Association for Foreign Students Affairs. The International Center should be used for Anglophone participants who arrive at times other than the usual fall registration period. The on-campus orientations can be provided by the international student offices, English Language programs, and the participants' academic departments. On campuses with several AFGRAD participants, special orientation programs using other AFGRAD students could be developed with the assistance of the international student office.

Similarly, re-entry programs for participants can help them better reestablish themselves socially and occupationally. The Manpower Development Training Institute programs have been successful in preparing participants for their return to work. The use of these programs should be continued and should be supplemented by programs in-country coordinated by the AAI field representatives with assistance from the USAIDs, USISs, and AFGRAD alumni in their countries. A.I.D. should require the participants to attend such programs.

Another important tool for improving participant satisfaction and performance is the use of systematic evaluations. Three kinds of evaluation have been shown to be useful (Kimmel &

Elmer, 1987), exit interviews, participant follow-ups, and impact studies. Evaluation programs have been specifically designed for A.I.D. participants in all of these areas (Kimmel, Ockey, & Sander, 1972), (Sanguinetty & Kimmel, 1985). AAI needs technical assistance to develop and improve the instruments and procedures they are now using to gather data on what AFGRAD participants are thinking and doing. A.I.D. should mandate and fund the development of AAI exit interviews and of an independent impact study of the AFGRAD participants. AAI should also be professionally assisted in the development of their 1993 follow-up of AFGRAD fellows.

Another factor critical to program success is the monitoring of participants' situations. Periodic correspondence, phone calls and annual campus visits to participants by AAI program officers are critical and should be kept in place. In addition, campus officials, such as international student advisors, and in-country officials, such as mission training officers should be periodically consulted and kept informed about the participants' social and academic situations. To expand the sense of concern and caring that most individuals connected with the program attribute to AAI, AAI should: (1) keep the program officer's case load to 80 participants or less; (2) retain and publicize the toll-free (800) number; (3) ensure that program officers make calls and campus visits on a regular basis; (4) include a place on undergraduate participants' progress reports for international student advisors to comment; (5) have program officers make reports (as an attachment to the progress reports) on each participant to interested parties in the home country, including AAI field representatives; and (6) perhaps create a participant newsletter.

Finally, there are some A.I.D. rules and regulations affecting the AFGRAD program that should be investigated and clarified or modified. Participant liability for U.S. taxes and A.I.D. regulations on housing for single, undergraduate participants are areas of concern and confusion among participants, program officers and university officials. More concrete information and guidance is needed. CAI recommends that A.I.D./W establish policies to pay any tax liability the participants may have and seriously consider dropping the

requirement that undergraduate participants live in dormitories.

The book shipping allowance should be increased to keep up with increases in shipping costs. A.I.D. should authorize allowances for the use and purchase of personal computers instead of typewriters, and should remove the costs of word processors and personal computers from the book and equipment allowance. A.I.D. should consider providing matching funds when an academic advisor/department sponsors a participant's attendence at a professional meeting. The approved duration of studies for M.A. and Ph.D. candidates should be counted from the time that any English language training required is completed, rather than from the time of arrival in the U.S. The time allowed in training should be 28 months for M.A. students and 54 months for Ph.D. students.

THE AFGRAD PROGRAM

Since its inception in 1963, the AFGRAD program has been a collaborative activity supported by A.I.D., African countries and U.S. universities. Program management has been provided by the African-American Institute (AAI) under A.I.D. grants and cooperative agreements, with certain management responsibilities being retained by A.I.D.. The collaboration of U.S. universities has been obtained to a large degree through the active support of the Council of Graduate Schools and its AFGRAD Executive Committee of Graduate Deans. The various roles and responsibilities of these contributing agencies are summarized in the following paragraphs.

A.I.D.'s current Cooperative Agreement with AAI authorizes expenditures totaling $36.8 million for Phase III of the AFGRAD program, which commenced in 1985. To date, approximately 75% of these funds have been used for students' monthly maintenance allowances, tuition (for undergraduate students), non-waiveable fees, English language training, books, insurance, some travel expenses, and other miscellaneous program costs.

A.I.D.'s Office of International Training (OIT) is responsible for setting policies and procedures for all participant training, including AFGRAD training programs. A.I.D.'s management of the AFGRAD-III project is the responsibility of AFR/TR/EHR. The management responsibilities of this office include establishing quotas of scholarships for the participating countries; preparing and overseeing a Cooperative Agreement with AAI to implement the program; reviewing and authorizing special program activities and expenditures; monitoring the project's financial status; and evaluating the project's progress and accomplishments.

In Africa, USAID personnel participate to varying degrees in management and program activities such as the recruitment of candidates for AFGRAD training and the orientation of participants for departure to the U.S. These activities are carried out in cooperation with host governments, and with field representatives employed by AAI in many countries. USAIDs may increase their participation in AFGRAD beyond the quotas established by AFR/TR/EHR by transferring funds from bilateral budgets to the regional project for the purpose of "buying" additional fellowships. These additional fellowships are referred to as buy-ins.

African countries participate in the selection of candidates, the designation of fields and levels of study, and the identification of positions the candidates will occupy upon completion of their training. There must be a position identified on each candidate's application form in order for them to be eligible for an AFGRAD fellowship. Many countries pay part or all of the international travel costs for AFGRAD participants.

Thus far under AFGRAD-III, 112 U.S. universities have contributed to African development by admitting 308 AFGRAD fellows to their graduate schools on a tuition-free basis. Tuition waivers have been a key feature of the AFGRAD program since its inception. Candidates for tuition waivers are presented to U.S. universities after their academic records have been reviewed and endorsed by the AFGRAD Executive Committee of Graduate Deans (see Appendix E for a list of the current members of the "Deans' Committee"). Representatives of the Deans' Committee also travel to Africa each year with staff from AAI's New York office, to participate in selection interviews and explain requirements for admission to U.S. graduate schools. For the past 25 years, the AFGRAD Deans' Committee has been a valuable connection between Africa's higher level human resources development requirements and the resources of the U.S. academic community.

AAI has the major responsibility for managing the procedures of the AFGRAD-III project, under guidelines provided by A.I.D.'s Handbook 10, OIT's Participant Training Notices, and the A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement. AAI's tasks include announcing the program to participating missions and countries; establishing selection procedures in each country; placing participants and obtaining tuition waivers at U.S. universities; arranging travel and visa sponsorship; providing orientation and English language training for some of the participants; monitoring each participant's progress and maintaining close contacts with academic and foreign student advisors at the universities; providing counseling; delivering monthly maintenance allowances, book allowances and other authorized payments; arranging special training activities and membership in professional societies; conducting exit interviews; and maintaining contact with participants after they return home.

AAI's management tasks are currently carried out by a staff of 14 full-time and 12 part-time educational and financial personnel in

New York City and 21 part-time field representatives in Africa. AAI personnel work in close coordination with U.S. universities, A.I.D./Washington, USAID missions and host countries to provide quality education to Africans. These participants have assumed leadership positions in government service, universities, or the private sector in their countries (see AAI, 1988) and thus have strengthened the capacity of public and private institutions in Africa to achieve their development objectives.

THE EVALUATION

A. Purposes of the Evaluation

The overall objectives of this mid-project evaluation are to: (1) review the first three years of operation of the AFGRAD-III program; (2) comment on any significant problem areas discovered and suggest how current operations could be improved; and (3) make recommendations on the future directions of AFGRAD training.

More specifically, the statement of work asks CAI to review AAI's implementation of the general performance standards established in the Cooperative Agreement; compare the placement of students by country and degree level with the country quotas established in the Project Paper; assess the authorization of undergraduate scholarships for certain countries and the implementation of that authorization; review the comparative costs of AFGRAD programs and A.I.D.'s other academic training programs; and assess AAI's performance with regard to the placement, orientation, management and monitoring of participants. CAI is also asked to look at the duration of participant training, the case loads of AAI staff, and follow-up procedures for repatriated participants.

In considering the AFGRAD program in the future, CAI is asked to comment on whether the program should be continued; its contribution to meeting Africa's human resource needs; whether it should focus on different fields, training institutions or countries; whether tuition waivers are worthwhile; and how the program should be implemented administratively if it is extended.

B. Evaluation Methodology

Given the wide range of activities and the many organizations involved in the AFGRAD-III program, the scope of work for this evaluation required a number of different assessment techniques. CAI completed the following activities in conducting this evaluation.

1. A review of relevant documents including the Project Paper, the current Cooperative Agreement, the 1988 Study of AFGRAD Alumni, AAI's computer listing of participants, selected Academic

Enrollment and Training Reports, AAI's estimated costs and financial reports, recent USG audits of AAI.

2. The preparation and sending cables and telexes to all USAID missions involved in AFGRAD-III, and to six of the 21 AAI field representatives in Africa, requesting comments on AFGRAD-III and recommendations about the continuation of AFGRAD.

3. A three-day site visit to AAI in New York City to interview the staff in the Division of Education, review relevant documents and discuss AFGRAD with the deputy director, the treasurer and senior vice-president.

4. A meeting with three members of the AFGRAD Executive Committee of Graduate Deans, and a phone conversation with the chair of this committee to obtain comments and recommendations on the AFGRAD program and its future.

5. Discussions with the director of AAI's Washington office and the executive director of Partners for International Education and Training (PIET) to obtain their views on selected aspects of the AFGRAD program.

6. Interviews with selected A.I.D. officials in A.I.D./W on the role of AFGRAD in A.I.D.'s development programs and priorities.

7. Campus visits to Cornell University and the University of Arizona to discuss the AFGRAD-III program with 20 participants, two graduate Deans, ten academic advisors, two foreign student advisors, three admissions officers, an English language training director, and the director of the Institute for African Development .

8. A meeting with the executive director of the Management Training and Development Institute in Washington, D.C., to discuss his program and the participation of AFGRAD trainees.

C. Evaluation Activities

Cables were sent to all of the 42 African countries that have AFGRAD-III participants. Replies were received from 20 of them. The cable that was sent, and the countries that responded are included in Appendix A.

Telexes were sent to six of the AAI field representatives in Africa who were recommended by AAI as being knowledgeable, experienced and representative of their 21 field representatives. Five of the six responded. The telex that was sent and the field representatives that replied are also included in Appendix A.

On August 9, 1988, the AFGRAD evaluation team of Paul Kimmel, Norman Green and Elizabeth McDavid travelled to New York City to visit the African-American Institute (AAI). They were met by Ms. Heather Monroe, Acting Director, Division of Education and Training, and Ms. Yolande Zahler, Placement Coordinator. After reviewing the purpose of the visit, Ms. Monroe provided the team with the latest General Field Office Bulletins on the program and several sheets of summary statistics on current AFGRAD participants. The remainder of the first day was spent going over general questions about the program with Ms. Monroe and Ms. Zahler and meeting most of the other staff members at AAI who work on the AFGRAD program.

On August 10, 1988, Dr. Kimmel went over the questionnaires from AAI's 1983 follow-up study of project participants (published in 1988) while Mr. Green and Ms. McDavid were talking with Ms. Monroe. The team met with Mr. Frank Ferrari, Senior Vice President of AAI, to go over the Institute's plans for the future. Green and McDavid then met with Michael Jennings, the treasurer of AAI to review the AFGRAD budget while Kimmel looked at the most recent terminal reports from participants. The afternoon was devoted to interviews with AFGRAD program staff about their work and their recommendations regarding current operations. Dr. Kimmel talked with Taina Bien-Aimé, Barbara McKinney, Anita Johnson, and Yolande Zahler while Ms. McDavid interviewed Carol Castiel, Bella Endeshaw and Michael Hornsby. Mr. Green continued the discussion of the contractual agreement with Ms. Monroe.

On August 11, 1988, the team had planned to observe an orientation to be given by the AAI staff to eight arriving AFGRAD participants. However, only two of the eight arrived as scheduled, so the orientation was postponed. The team went over some questions with Ms. Monroe that had come up in the previous day's discussions. More visits were made with staff members to finish the interviews which had been interrupted by an AAI staff meeting, and Dr. Kimmel talked with Elizabeth Ward and her program assistant. The team then thanked the staff members for their generous assistance and

after making arrangements for further contact with Ms. Monroe, departed for Washington, D.C.

On August 24, 1988, the AFGRAD evaluation team of Paul Kimmel, Norman Green and Elizabeth McDavid visited the Washington, D.C., office of The African-American Institute (AAI). They were welcomed by Mr. Jerry Drew, Director, who described the activities of his organization and introduced three members of the Dean's Committee who had come to Washington to discuss the AFGRAD program. The afternoon was devoted to talking with Deans Russell Hamilton of Vanderbilt University, William McMillan of the University of Alabama, and Ann Spearing of the University of Vermont about their role in the AFGRAD selection, placement, and follow-up activities and their recommendations about the program. They were all enthusiastic about the program and had many valuable suggestions to offer.

On August 25, 1988, Dr. Kimmel called Dean Jules LaPidis, chair of the Deans Committee and president of the Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S., about the AFGRAD program. Dean LaPidis was recovering from an operation and was not able to attend the Wednesday meeting. He also endorsed the program and had several useful insights to share.

On September 6, 1988, Dr. Kimmel travelled to Ithaca, NY, to discuss the AFGRAD-III program with students, faculty, and administration officials at Cornell University. On Wednesday, September 7, he met with Graduate Dean Alison P. Casarett, Director of Graduate Admissions Jane Jones, Director of International Students and Scholars Office Jerry D. Wilcox, Professor Fred Scott in Veterinary Medicine and seven AFGRAD-III participants (six graduates and one undergraduate). A listing of all the AFGRAD Fellows at Cornell from 1984 to 1989 is included in Appendix B.

On September 8, Dr. Kimmel met with Dr. David Lewis, Director of the African Development Institute, Professor Emil Haller in Education, Professor Barclay G. Jones in City and Regional Planning, and Judith Hammes, Director of the Fellowships and Financial Aid Office, and had follow-up visits with Jerry D. Wilcox, and Jane Jones.

On September 17, 1988, Dr. Kimmel travelled to Tucson, AZ, to discuss the AFGRAD-III program with students, faculty and administration officials at the University of Arizona. On Monday,

September 19, he met with Professors Robert E. Briggs, Michael Ottman and Robert L. Voight in Plant Sciences, Professor Ben Sternberg in Mining and Geological Engineering, Program Advisor Sharon S. Jensen and Career Development Advisor Vic Zimmerman in the International Student Office, and five AFGRAD-III participants (four graduates and one undergraduate). A listing of all the AFGRAD students at the University of Arizona in 1988-89 is included in Appendix B.

On September 20, 1988, Dr. Kimmel met with Associate Graduate Dean Adela Allen, Program Coordinator Chris Hiemstra in Foreign Graduate Admissions, and six AFGRAD-III participants (two graduates and four undergraduates). On September 21, 1988, he met with Associate Director of the Center for English as a Second Language Elizabeth Templin, Director of International Programs Bodo Bartocha, Professor Roger Fox in Agricultural Economics, Professor Phil Ogden in Range Management, Professor Bobby L. Reid in Nutritional Sciences, and two AFGRAD-III participants, both graduate students.

RESULTS

Since the purposes of this evaluation call for a comprehensive examination of all the aspects of the AFGRAD-III program rather than an in-depth look at a few aspects, CAI will present most of its results in a descriptive and narrative form (rather than the analytic and numerical form associated with in-depth studies). We will present the findings from each of the field visits and meetings and discuss our reviews of the pertinent documents and the responses to our cables and telexes.

A. AFGRAD-III Country Quotas

A.I.D.'s Cooperative Agreement with AAI for the AFGRAD-III program was authorized in April 1985. From that date through August 1988, AAI has enrolled 436 students in undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate study programs, and, as of August 1988, was in the process of placing 87 additional candidates. The total number of students placed or pending placement was 523, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. AFGRAD-III Fellows--Summary of Number Enrolled

Program	No. Enrolled	No. of Placements Pending	Total	No. Authorized by Cooperative Agreement
AFDEP (undergraduate)	105	2	107	120
AFGRAD (graduate)	308	72	380	530
POSTAF (postgraduate)	23	13	36	50
TOTALS	436	87	523	700

The last column in the above table shows the estimated distribution of the 700 fellowships authorized by the Cooperative Agreement for the five-year period, 1985-90. These authorized life-of-project figures have been slightly altered by two events. First, the number of fellowships authorized for the eight countries of the Sahel was reduced by 65 (from 130 to 65) because core funding from the Sahel Development Program for this project was not forthcoming. However, this reduction was offset by buy-ins of $2.8 million to the project by six missions (Cape Verde, Mali, Mauritius, Swaziland, Togo, and Zaire), for a total of approximately 70 fellowships. The net effect of these events is that the total number of fellowships to be funded by the Cooperative Agreement is approximately 705.

AAI's enrollment of 436 students at this stage of the project is on schedule. However, recent buy-ins by missions will necessitate intensive placement activities for the final (i.e., 1989-90) academic year of the current program. Assuming AAI completes enrollment procedures for 87 students, whose placements for the 1988-89 academic year are pending, there will be a balance of 182 students to be placed for the final year to reach the authorized level of 705 fellowships. AAI should not have difficulty fulfilling this objective.

Table 2 shows the distribution of the 523 AFGRAD-III participants, placed or pending placement as of August 1988 by country and academic level. Forty-two countries are eligible to participate in AFGRAD-III programs. Ghana has delayed sending participants for long-term academic training until the 1989-90 school year because of prior problems with repatriating students from the U.S. Nigeria's participation is restricted to post graduate training activities.

Academic levels for AFGRAD participants are determined by the needs and conditions in their countries of origin. The 107 candidates for AFDEP undergraduate degrees, for example, have come from 13 countries, as shown in Table 2. These countries have no, or limited, post-secondary educational institutions. The project has been especially useful in bringing undergraduate students to the U.S. from such small countries as Comoros, Seychelles, Sao Tome/Principe,

Equatorial Guinea and Guinea-Bissau. This undergraduate training has helped these countries to expand their pool of trained human resources in the way that similar programs did for larger African countries in the 1960s. AFDEP training is a principal A.I.D. activity in these Category III countries which is much appreciated by their governments.

Table 2. AFGRAD-III Fellows, Placed or Pending Placement (April 1985 to August 1988)

Country	Undergraduate (AFDEP)	Master's (AFGRAD)	Ph.D. (AFGRAD)	Postgraduate (POSTAF)	Total
Benin	0	10	2	0	12
Botswana	4	5	0	0	9
Burkina Faso	0	5	1	2	8
Burundi	0	16	3	0	19
Cameroon	0	8	7	2	17
Cape Verde	5	0	0	0	5
Central African Repub.	8	7	0	0	15
Chad	4	1	0	0	5
Comoros	14	0	0	0	14
Congo	0	8	2	0	10
Cote d'Ivoire	0	10	11	0	21
Djibouti	8	6	0	1	15
Equatorial Guinea	15	0	0	0	15
Gambia	2	3	0	0	5
Ghana	0	0	0	2	2
Guinea	0	14	4	0	18
Guinea-Bissau	11	4	0	0	15
Kenya	0	7	3	1	11
Lesotho	0	3	4	1	8
Liberia	0	12	0	2	14
Madagascar	0	8	4	1	13
Malawi	0	4	7	0	11
Mali	0	5	0	2	7
Mauritania	0	2	4	1	7
Mauritius	0	7	2	1	10
Mozambique	6	9	0	0	15
Niger	0	3	3	0	6
Nigeria	0	0	0	9	9
Rwanda	5	7	5	0	17

Country	Undergraduate (AFDEP)	Master's (AFGRAD)	Ph.D. (AFGRAD)	Postgraduate (POSTAF)	Total
Sao Tome/Principe	13	0	0	0	13
Senegal	0	5	0	1	6
Seychelles	12	0	0	0	12
Sierra Leone	0	9	2	0	11
Somalia	0	11	1	0	12
Sudan	0	4	8	4	16
Swaziland	0	15	7	0	22
Tanzania	0	7	0	0	7
Togo	0	21	2	0	23
Uganda	0	10	2	1	13
Zaire	0	14	13	0	27
Zambia	0	9	3	3	15
Zimbabwe	0	7	4	2	13
Totals	**107**	**276**	**104**	**36**	**523**

As anticipated by the Project Paper, the most favored level of training is the master's degree. To date, AAI has obtained, or is in the process of obtaining, tuition-free fellowships for 276 candidates for M.S. or M.A. degrees from 35 of the 42 African countries participating in AFGRAD-III programs. In addition, 104 candidates have been processed for tuition-free fellowships at the doctoral level. Ph.D. candidates come from 24 countries, with the greatest numbers from larger countries with well-established university systems such as Zaire, Cote d'Ivoire, and Sudan.

The AFGRAD-III training programs will provide the following skilled personnel for Africa: 62 economists and agribusiness specialists; 61 business administrators, accountants, and bankers; 60 engineers; 50 scientists and mathematicians; 49 educators; 35 public health technicians; 30 agronomists and soil scientists; 25 computer technicians and statisticians; 19 nutritionists and home economists; 18 technicians in animal husbandry; 17 public administrators; 15 technicians in natural resources, fisheries, and range and wildlife management; 13 rural sociologists, anthropologists, and rural development specialists; 12 linguists and ESL teachers; 10 foresters; six urban planners; and five demographers.

In addition to long-term undergraduate and graduate academic training, the AFGRAD-III Cooperative Agreement authorized 50 short-term study programs at the postgraduate level (POSTAF). Interest in this training activity, which is new to the AFGRAD program, has accelerated. As of August 1988, AAI has placed 23 fellows in POSTAF training and has placements pending for 13 fellows. These advanced students come from 17 African countries, as shown in Table 2. The program costs for six of the nine POSTAF fellows from Nigeria are funded by the National Cash Register Company through grants of local currency to the U.S. Embassy in Lagos. The AFGRAD Cooperative Agreement funds the administrative costs for these fellows.

B. AFGRAD-III Performance Standards

1. Training for Women

The Cooperative Agreement for AFGRAD-III sets a performance level of 30% participation by women. Of the 487 AFGRAD and AFDEP fellows placed or pending placement for long-term training, 119 are women. This is a participation rate of 24.4% in the current program.

This level of participation by women compares to a participation level of 7.4% for AFGRAD-I for the years 1963-76 (96 women out of 1,301 participants) and a level of 18.4% for AFGRAD-II for the years 1977-85 (127 women out of 690 participants). The substantial increase in the percentage of women recruited for the program over the past 25 years is attributable to: the gradual growth in the number of women completing secondary and undergraduate training in African institutions; the interest expressed by the donor countries in increasing the participation of women in development; and a more receptive attitude toward women entering new professional fields in some countries. Although this increase in the rate of women's participation in the AFGRAD program is commendable, all organizations involved in the AFGRAD program believe continued efforts are necessary to raise the level of participation to at least 30%. As CAI learned, many factors still preclude the participation of women in the AFGRAD program, especially married women (see section E).

Not surprisingly, recruitment of African women for long-term academic training in the U.S. is more readily achieved at the undergraduate level than at the graduate level, where there are

fewer candidates. Of 107 B.A./B.S. candidates, 33 are women (30.8%), while of the 380 candidates for graduate degrees, 86 are women (22.6%). Some countries that nominate undergraduate trainees (Cape Verde, Djibouti, Rwanda, Sao Tome, Seychelles) have exceeded the 30% objective. So, too, have a number of countries in Southern and Eastern Africa (e.g., Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Kenya), which have a high proportion of females in their post-secondary schools. Three other missions that have been particularly successful in recruiting women for AFGRAD (graduate) training are Cameroon (33%), Mali (40%), and Sudan (50%).

In their responses to the evaluation cables, USAID missions and AAI field representatives cited several common causes for low levels of female participation in long-term training: social and cultural factors, women's early marriages and family responsibilities, and a limited number of qualified females in the pool of candidates. Some missions noted recent positive changes in attitude towards providing higher-level training opportunities for women in their countries. The missions' cables indicate they are well aware and fully supportive of the policy of increasing training for women in the AFGRAD program, as well as in all of A.I.D.'s training activities in Africa.

A.I.D. and the AFGRAD program are also concerned with training African women in fields other than women's "traditional" professions. As shown in Table 3, 47 (39.5%) of the 119 female AFGRAD and AFDEP fellows are in the traditional fields of education, communications, library science, public health, nursing, nutrition, food science, social work, home economics, and family planning. On the other hand, 12.6% are in sciences and engineering, 8.4% in economics, 14.3% in public or business administration, and 7.6% in agriculture and animal sciences. Although the numbers are small, it is evident that AFGRAD is helping to bring more women into areas of development where men have been the predominant participants in the past.

2. Training for the Private Sector

The Cooperative Agreement requires at least 20% of the AFGRAD-III training programs be for participants who will return to

Table 3. Female AFGRAD Participants by Field of Study

Education, Communications, Library Science	16
Public Health, Pharmacy, Nursing	13
Nutrition, Food Science	12
Sciences	11
Economics, Agricultural Economics	10
Public Administration, Management	9
Business Administration, Marketing	8
Agriculture, Agronomy, Forestry, Irrigation	7
Applied Linguistics, TESL	7
Money, Banking, Accounting, Auditing	6
Computer Sciences	4
Engineering	4
Social Work, Home Economics	4
Demography, Family Planning	2
Sociology	2
Urban Planning	2
Animal Sciences	2
TOTAL	119

private firms, to agencies that support the private sector (through banking, marketing, training, and other services), or to positions in public agencies that formulate policies affecting the private sector.

In this mid-project evaluation, the role of the AFGRAD program in the private sector was reviewed with a number of respondents. The consensus was that most training activities appropriate for Africa's private sector should be technical, at lower levels, of short duration, and near the trainee's work place. A.I.D. provides training of this nature through bilateral projects and under the regional Human Resources Development Assistance project. The largest portion of AFGRAD's long-term, academic programs in the U.S. will probably continue to train personnel for African universities, research institutions and high-level positions in public service (AAI, 1988). However, CAI believes that the AFGRAD program should provide U.S. academic training for the private sector whenever appropriate.

Of the 487 graduate and undergraduate participants thus far enrolled or pending placement under AFGRAD-III, an estimated 123, or 25%, are being trained in fields that are likely to lead to future employment in the private sector. (This figure is approximate because neither AAI nor A.I.D. has established definitions, procedures, or data systems to clearly enumerate which participants in A.I.D. projects are in or being trained for the private sector.) The estimate of 123 is derived as follows: 61 participants are in the fields of business administration, accounting, finance, marketing, and money and banking; 21 participants are in agribusiness and agricultural economics; and 41 participants are in economics, for a total of 123.

These calculations may include a few participants destined for strictly public sector positions, but they also omit a number of participants in such fields as engineering and computer sciences, whose future employment is likely to be in, or related to, positions in their countries' private sectors. The 1993 AAI follow-up study should ascertain the actual number of AFGRAD alumni employed in such positions.

It is necessary to have clearer definitions of the private sector from the missions and more data at AAI on private sector training to measure more precisely progress towards achieving private sector development objectives. The evaluation team is reasonably certain that AAI, with strong support from some African countries and USAID missions, is exceeding the minimum requirements for this

category of training, but without better data it is impossible to say exactly by how much.

3. Attrition and Repatriation

The performance standards in the Cooperative Agreement state that the attrition rate for students in training should be no more than 5% and the repatriation rate for all participants should be a least 90%.

AAI's reported performance to date (in AFGRAD I and II) in these areas is within these standards, but the AFGRAD-III project has completed only three academic years (including a delayed start of the first year), and therefore any attrition and repatriation figures for this phase have little significance at this time. The AFGRAD-III fellows' performance in these areas should be reviewed in the follow-up study of program participants scheduled to be carried out in 1993.

4. Duration of Studies

The Cooperative Agreement states that AAI will request approval from A.I.D. for any individual training program that exceeds the following durations, which include English language training:

TIME LIMITS ON TRAINING PROGRAMS

	For Students from Anglophone countries	For Students from non-Anglophone countries
Undergraduate programs	48 months	60 months
Master's degree programs	24 months	30 months
Doctoral programs	48 months	54 months

The Project Officer in AFR/TR/EHR receives an average of two requests per week for extensions of training beyond these approved durations, indicating that the times allowed in the Cooperative Agreement to complete training programs are not realistic. This fact is reinforced by data gathered by the evaluation team from AAI on

the actual duration of master's degree training program under AFGRAD-II. This information is summarized as follows:

- Of 124 candidates for master's degrees from Anglophone countries, 72 completed their program within 24 months and 52 required extensions.

- Of 124 candidates for master's degrees from non-Anglophone countries, 45 completed their program within 30 months, and 79 required extensions.

These data show that AAI currently requests A.I.D. authorization to extend training programs for over half the candidates for master's degrees. Since nearly all of these requests are valid enough to be approved, it appears that the approved duration of studies in the Cooperative Agreement is too low. AAI's data indicate that after English language training has been completed, 75% of all candidates for master's degrees complete their academic programs within 28 months. The CAI team suggests that program management would be more realistic if the Cooperative Agreement were amended to exempt the time spent in English language training from counting toward the approved amount of time, and increase the approved duration to 28 months for M.A. candidates. Any M.A. programs going beyond that duration should be reviewed, in advance, by A.I.D. to determine if they should be terminated or allowed to continue.

For similar reasons, the approved duration of studies for Ph.D. candidates should be fixed at 54 months exclusive of English language training. The evidence indicates that the currently approved duration of studies for undergraduate students are appropriate, and need not be amended.

C. Program Costs

As of June 1988, total expenditures for the AFGRAD-III program reached $10.2 million, or approximately 28% of the $36.8 million authorized by the Cooperative Agreement. These expenditures are in line with the estimated schedule of expenditures in the Project Paper, as adjusted for the reduced participation of the Sahel countries.

Obligations for the project total $20.8 million, leaving a substantial pipeline of $10.6 million. However, AAI expenditures will rise

sharply during the middle years of the project when the majority of the project's 705 students receive their training. Estimated expenditures for FY 88 are $6.8 million; for FY 89, $7.8 million.

Obligations for the project are scheduled to continue through FY 92 and expenditures through FY 94. The project action completion date for the project is September 30, 1994.

Expenditures thus far in the program are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4. AFGRAD-III EXPENDITURES TO JUNE 1988

	($)000	Percent
Student costs (maintenance, required fees, insurance,books, travel, etc.)	$7,233	70.9%
Other program costs (Deans' Committee travel, staff international travel, special equipment, studies)	499	4.9
Administration (AAI/NY and Field Reps: salaries, benefits, staff U.S. travel, printing; communications, supplies)	1,550	15.2%
Overhead	921	9.0%
Totals	$10,203	100.0%

NOTE: Administrative and overhead costs amount to 24.2 percent of the total costs. If "other program costs" are combined with administration and overhead, the total amounts to 29.1 percent of all program expenditures, with the balance of 70.9 percent going for direct student costs. Of course, these calculations are based on only the initial three years of this nine-year project. During this time, student costs are lower, while costs for selection and placement of participants are proportionately higher. The ratio of administrative costs to total costs will be less in the last four years of the project when selection and placement activities are completed and only student program costs continue.

Figures furnished by AAI based on AFGRAD-II analyses show that average costs for graduate students are $1,275 per month or $15,300 per year. Average costs for undergraduates are $1,600 per month or

$19,200 per year. These figures include administrative and overhead costs, all student expenses, and travel costs charged to A.I.D.

According to AAI's figures, costs under AFGRAD-II for a master's degree for an Anglophone student whose average time for degree completion was 24.3 months averaged approximately $31,000. Average costs for a master's degree for Francophone student whose average time for degree completion was 31.8 months were $40,650.

Under AFGRAD-II, AAI administrative, overhead and "other program costs" amounted to 20.5 percent of their total costs. When this percentage is applied to the average monthly costs of $1275 for graduate students, a figure of $261 is obtained for program administration. The monthly cost for administering undergraduate programs is $328 (20.5% of $1,600).

In a 1986 study conducted for A.I.D.'s Office of International Training by Development Associates, Inc., it was found that the average monthly administrative cost per participant among 10 contractors who managed only academic program was $246 (DAI, 1986, p. 26). AAI's somewhat higher average costs are attributable to the administrative requirements for obtaining tuition waivers and for recruiting and placing students from 42 African countries.

The CAI team used AAI's financial vouchers to obtain total program and administrative costs, but did not verify the data provided by AAI on average monthly costs. However, the team believes the AFGRAD program is operating on a financially sound basis and in conformity with A.I.D. regulations. Student expenditures conform to OIT regulations; exceptions to programs authorized in the Cooperative Agreement are approved by AFR/TR/EHR; and AAI's financial reports are regularly audited by the government.

D. Responses from the USAIDs

USAID missions in 20 African countries submitted comments on the AFGRAD program in response to a circular cable sent out by the evaluation team. All of them wish to have the AFGRAD program continue after the 1989-90 academic year. Five missions plan to buy into the AFGRAD project in the future and five other missions said they might consider buying into the project if their bilateral budgets permit.

All missions endorsed the cost-saving tuition waivers provided by U.S. universities for AFGRAD fellows. Three missions said they are not kept informed of the status of students during the placement process, but most missions understood that obtaining tuition waivers can cause delays in placing candidates. One mission said it received "very little, if any information on AFGRAD training activities."

Seven missions were satisfied with their current average of three AFGRAD fellowships per year. Eight missions would like to have this average raised by a least two or three fellowships. Five missions did not comment about their quota of fellowships.

If the AFGRAD program is extended, the USAID office in Lagos requests that long-term training opportunities be made available to students from Nigeria. This request should be reviewed by the Africa Bureau.

Eleven missions plan to nominate candidates for the short-term POSTAF fellowships, seven of which said they would like to have two or more of these fellowships per year. REDSO/WCA commented that the POSTAF program's English language requirement causes problems for many interested Ivorians who are otherwise qualified to apply for these study opportunities.

Many missions rely on the local AAI representative to keep them informed of AFGRAD affairs. The Botswana mission suggested that joint training conferences be held for USAID training officers and AAI representatives to improve communications. Several missions also stressed the importance to the host country and mission of the annual visits by members of AAI's New York staff and the AFGRAD Deans' Committee.

The Zimbabwe, Cameroon and Swaziland missions do not regularly receive the Academic Enrollment and Term Reports, that monitor students' grades each semester. This may indicate a lack of communication between the AAI representatives and the missions in these countries, since all the other missions stated that these reports have been received. Embassy personnel in Equatorial Guinea quoted the Foreign Ministry as saying "these reports are the most relevant, timely and comprehensive provided by any international donor." On the other hand, the Zaire mission suggested that more comprehensive reports would be useful and recommends AAI prepare annual reports on each student's accomplishments, problems, and other

AFGRAD issues. The Cape Verde mission recommended tighter monitoring of any student in probationary status. REDSO/WCA wished to receive cables from AAI advising when AFGRAD fellows return to Cote d'Ivoire. Such notifications to the missions and host countries are a requirement of the Cooperative Agreement.

Four missions suggested that AAI discourage U.S. universities and AFGRAD fellows from requesting program extensions to obtain a second degree, even if the extension is funded by private sources. For some countries, program extensions tend to increase the rate of non-returnees. It should be noted, however, that AAI has followed the terms of the Cooperative Agreement which state that any extensions for back-to-back degrees must be approved in advance by the host country and the mission.

Finally, none of the missions expressed a desire to change the present focus or direction of the AFGRAD program in their countries in any substantive manner. Several missions stated that they will try to direct more AFGRAD fellowships to the private sector. Four missions suggested that the AFGRAD program train some participants at selected African universities in lieu of training them in the U.S.

E. Responses from the AAI Field Representatives

Five of the six AAI field representatives (FR) contacted in Africa responded to our telexes. All of them said that there was a selection committee set up in their country to assist in the screening of applicants. (One of the FRs said that she was responsible for organizing this committee). All of them said that these committees worked very well in providing excellent candidates and that their home country governments were satisfied with the selection process.

The FRs all said that they keep in touch with the candidates from selection to call forward by phone, correspondence, telegram, visits and/or radio, and that they are satisfied with the amount of contact they have. They are also well satisfied with their relations with the USAIDs and USISs in their countries. They all know the training officer at their Mission and three of them work with the USISs to provide pre-departure orientations to the participants. They had no suggestions for improving their relations with the selectees, the USAIDs or the USISs, (although one commented on the difficulties caused by high rates of turn-over at her Mission).

While all five of the FRs provide some information to the participants about the U.S. prior to their departure, only one of them always uses former participants in her orientation. Another uses them when possible. The orientations usually deal with life in the U.S. (especially on campus), geography, clothing and money, and American culture.

All of the FRs said that there were problems recruiting women for the AFGRAD program primarily because of family constraints. Relatives, husbands, and children make it difficult for married women to go abroad. Also, the fields of study and the three-year diplomas of some women who have attended post-secondary schools in their countries do not make them viable candidates for AFGRAD. One FR suggested more undergraduate slots for women in her country and another mentioned that the invitational letter should more strongly encourage women to apply.

All of the FRs said they were able to follow their participants while in the U.S., primarily through the progress reports that they receive at the end of each term through AAI. Four of them said they also receive an occasional letter or telephone call. While there were no strong feelings expressed, they seemed to be satisfied with this amount of contact.

Two of the FRs said that all or almost all of the participants visited with them shortly after their return home. One said that the participants came to her for program assistance or social visits on some occasions. The other two FRs said they counselled some participants on employment and changing values in their country, but did not indicate how many returnees they saw. One of the two FRs who said they did not brief returnees felt that this should be done by AAI in New York City. None of the FRs were aware of any other re-entry briefings in their countries.

Four of the five FRs were involved in the 1983 AAI follow-up study of AFGRAD alumni in their countries. Three of them felt that future follow-ups could be improved through more involvement of the FRs and returnees in the design and data-gathering. They said there was not enough coordination and information available in the first survey.

Two of the FRs said there were alumni organizations in their countries (one for all U.S. trainees and one just for AFGRAD) and

another said there were meetings in some areas of her country. One FR made use of AFGRAD alumni as contacts for employment for returnees.

All five of the FRs had attended the two-week AAI workshop in the U.S. (5/87) and found it very useful. They all felt that these should be held regularly to allow them to share views, better understand the U.S. and its University system, make contacts with relevant officials, and understand their relations with AAI.

Three of the FRs suggested that more fellowships were needed for their countries (one especially for undergraduates). Two of them would like to assume more responsibilities in AFGRAD (such as forming an alumni association or assisting with some USAID or USIS activities), and with other international exchange programs. One said that more information on the number of awards, dates of interviews, and the status of candidates, plus more money for expenses were needed to fulfill her responsibilities to the AFGRAD program.

F. Operations of the AAI

The team interviewed the senior vice-president of AAI, the treasurer, the acting director and the placement coordinator of the Division of Education and Training and nine of the ten program officers and program assistants in a three day visit to New York City. From these interviews and a review of relevant documents made available to the team by AAI officials, CAI has abstracted the following results.

AAI is generally doing an excellent job in implementing the program procedures outlined in the Program Description of the current Cooperative Agreement. The high quality of their personnel, their dedication to the AFGRAD program, and the long experience that AAI has had in administering this program impressed the team throughout their visit. All of the staff that we spoke with were most forthcoming in discussing the program and making recommendations for its improvement. They also coordinate well with the other groups with which they work (USAIDs, Deans' Committee, University officials, A.I.D./W, etc.) as documented by the many favorable comments that we received in our discussions with members of these groups.

AAI strongly recommended that serious in-country selection committees be used in recruiting and screening the AFGRAD candidates before their annual visits to the countries with the Deans. When this is done, as it is in many countries, their time in-country can be used much more productively. When it is not done, they may have far too many candidates and/or too many unqualified candidates to see in the time available. The USAIDs do a good job of getting the information needed on the selectees to AAI for review by the Deans' meeting, with the exception of test scores which are often late or missing.

Placements are going well, with 112 different colleges and universities being used out of 200 which are screened. AAI's placement staff try to take account of the participants' wishes in making assignments (as expressed on their applications) whenever possible. AAI believes it could obtain up to 150 new tuition waivers each year if there were enough participants. They currently obtain about 120.

The program officers and their assistants handle between 80 and 100 participants as their case load. There was some feeling that 80 is a reasonable figure while 100 participants is too many to do as much as they would like for each participant. AAI is moving toward the 80 figure as an upper limit, although somewhat hampered by a recent turn-over in personnel. They may have difficulties in maintaining this lower number if there is a large influx of participants in the last years of their contract as USAIDs strive to fill their quotas and use their buy-ins.

Orientation programs at AAI are somewhat problematic due to the uncertainty in arrivals of the participants in the U.S. The CAI team was hoping to see a group orientation that AAI had scheduled for eight participants on the last day of our visit. This was cancelled due to the failure of most of the group to arrive as scheduled. Although AAI is authorized to send participants to the orientation program at the Washington International Center (WIC) in the District of Columbia, it does not do so. Again timing is often the issue. The WIC program lasts for one week and begins only on Mondays. While this does present some scheduling problems for students arriving in the fall, AAI might make more use of WIC for AFGRAD fellows who arrive at other times. The WIC orientation to life in the U.S. may be more useful for them than for the fall students anyway, because

there are less likely to be orientations on these topics at their schools when they arrive.

The "last-minute" nature of the arrival process for some of the students that we observed is not optimal for individuals who have not been to the U.S. (or in some cases out of their country) before. Sometimes these participants are not met at the airport, and have little time in New York City to get acquainted with their program officers. More important, in these cases there is very little time to get adjusted to the time/seasonal/cultural differences, learn about the mechanics of the AFGRAD program and AAI's administrative policies, and get oriented to the campus and going to school in another country before registration and classes begin.

Those participants who begin their studies with English language training (ESL) have more opportunities and resources to help them "settle in." AAI reported no major problems with any of the ESL programs they are currently using for these participants. They recommend strongly that English language training be done in the U.S. rather than in the participants' home countries because of the opportunity to experience directly both the language and culture here and because of the quality of the training.

Another regulation that AAI personnel strongly endorse is A.I.D.'s rule on dependents. Given all the other adjustments that participants must make, they feel it is wise to require them to wait at least six months before taking on the added responsibilities that having dependents in the U.S. entails. Several of the AAI staff suggested that there should be an opportunity for all participants to bring dependents over if their program in the U.S. is more than two years in length. Having dependents here usually eases participants' anxieties about their families, which helps them in their academic work and facilitates their re-entry to their country. Those participants who do not have dependents or who cannot meet the A.I.D. regulations for bringing them to the U.S., can benefit from a visit to their country for independent study or a vacation after their second year in the U.S.

None of the program officers reported problems in monitoring their participants after they arrived on campus. There is an 800 number that the participants can use to reach AAI during office hours. The program officers receive progress reports from the participants'

academic advisors at the end of each term and call these advisors if there appear to be any problems. In some cases (usually for undergraduates), they may get in touch with the international student advisor on campus. They also make visits to a number of campuses each spring to see the participants and their advisors. (Given the logistics and the turn-over in program officers, they may not always see all of their "own" participants on an annual basis.) The program officers reported very few serious personal problems (such as emotional difficulties, drug or alcohol addiction, leaving school, long illnesses) with the AFGRAD participants. They said they seldom hear from the majority of participants who are doing well academically unless they have difficulties with administrative regulations.

The A.I.D. policies with which AAI personnel and AFGRAD participants have the most problems include: housing regulations, health and accident (HAC) insurance policies, income tax policies, and regulations regarding computer purchases. No one at AAI favors the regulation which requires single, undergraduate students under 25 years of age to live in campus dormitories. They feel that the problems caused by this regulation (such as what to do when dormitories are closed) and the extra administrative time and paperwork entailed to sort out these problems, more than offsets any monetary savings on stipends. Moreover, since this regulation has exceptions due to waivers and the date of implementation, it causes resentments and misunderstandings among the participants (see section H.1.). AAI believes that the previous regulation, which required only ESL students to live in dormitories, was more cost effective and conducive to the participants' satisfaction.

AAI's initial experience with the new carrier of the HAC (National Capitol Trust Fund) suggests that the services have improved, but there are still persistent problems. New cards are not yet available for all participants, reimbursements take time, and the letter provided by the carrier to the participants does not always communicate effectively to health care providers. AFGRAD participants have commented negatively on their health insurance (see section H.1.).

The staff at AAI is looking forward to the revision of A.I.D. Participant Handbook 10 which they hope will clarify the regulations regarding federal income taxes. The question of participant liability

for U.S. taxes was a source of concern for several of the participants, AAI program officers, and university officials. Although A.I.D. Participant Training Notices have been issued on this subject, all would like more concrete information. Participants have received contradictory information from AAI and local IRS representatives. All concerned parties want to know their legal obligations and how to comply with them. AAI personnel believe that it is not possible for most participants to pay taxes out of their stipends.

AAI program officers (and several academic advisors, see H.3) stated that many of the AFGRAD participants (at the graduate level) make good use of personal computers while on campus and after returning to their countries. They would like to see A.I.D. regulations on typing allowances revised to take account of the shift to word processors.

AAI program officers also mentioned that A.I.D.'s authorized book and shipping allowances were too low, especially for students in technical fields. They recommended that these be reevaluated in light of the recent increases in mailing and textbook costs. There was a general consensus that there needed to be more flexibility in these A.I.D. policies. Also, there was some sentiment that contingency funds that could be quickly accessed for use in participant emergencies (with A.I.D. approval) would be most welcome. Several AAI staff members said that their ability to be humane and caring about the participants often made the critical difference in the feelings of the trainees about their U.S. experiences. Any assistance A.I.D. could provide in the form of resources and permissions to facilitate AAI's capacity here would be most welcome.

The AFGRAD participants do very well in their academic programs. AAI reports that 95 percent of the M.A. candidates, 89 percent of the Ph.D. candidates and 85 percent of the B.S. candidates from earlier waves of the program have completed their degrees. Graduate participants are encouraged to enroll in the Management Development Training Institutes' two week program sometime in the last year of their training. Three of the AAI program officers mentioned this as an important part of all their trainees' education and reentry programs. Many M.A. candidates are provided practical training in their fields in the U.S. after they have finished their degrees. Two program officers felt that more time should be allowed by A.I.D. for this important training. The current limit is 120 days, although this may be extended with mission and host country

approval. This type of training was not as strongly recommended for B.S. and Ph.D. candidates.

Several AAI program officers stated that there should be stricter criteria for approving studies at the Ph.D. level. They suggested that such training should normally be limited to candidates who will return to university teaching and research positions in their national institutions. They felt that Ph.D. candidates should have prior work experience, a minimum of five years of post-secondary education, and have undertaken some serious research. They suggested that most dissertation research should be done in Africa.

AAI begins the process of repatriation about six months before the end of the participants' programs. They send out a terminal report questionnaire and a letter concerning return transportation to each participant (see Appendix C). Unfortunately, many of the participants do not return this questionnaire, and the nature of the questions (open-ended) makes them difficult to tabulate and use in program planning. Staff members said they would welcome more assistance with their evaluation efforts. AAI reports that about 90 percent of the AFGRAD and 85 percent of the undergraduate participants from prior waves have been repatriated.

AAI staff felt that it was very difficult to provide adequate follow-up for returnees in Africa. More field staff and money is needed to build alumni associations and provide the kind of professional help that AFGRAD participants request after returning (see the 1988 AAI Study of AFGRAD Alumni) and that A.I.D./W requires in Handbook 10 and the current Cooperative Agreement. One follow-up activity that is proving successful is the Distinguished AFGRAD Alumni Award initiated by AAI in 1985. Each year one or more recipients is selected by the Deans' Committee in recognition of his or her professional achievements and outstanding contributions to their country's development. A list of the five AFGRAD alumni who have received this award to date is provided in Appendix D.

The CAI team noted that AAI has fulfilled the reporting requirements of the AFGRAD-III Cooperative Agreement (e.g., participant data forms, semi-annual student progress reports, and financial reports) with the important exception of the annual report at the end of each fiscal year. The annual reports are to include a statement of the achievements of the program, significant problems

encountered, and recommendations concerning future activities; summary tables on the project criteria (fields and levels of study, number of female and private sector students, etc.); and a cumulative listing of all students entering the program that year by country of origin. A.I.D. requests that AAI provide 50 copies of this report each year so that distribution can be made to participating USAIDs. AAI has information on all of these topics, but has not published an annual report since 1985. Under prior AFGRAD programs, AAI's annual reports were an important informational and administrative link among A.I.D./W, AAI, and the field missions. AAI should immediately return to their previously successful practices in meeting this reporting requirement of the AFGRAD-III program.

G. Deans' Committee Suggestions

The CAI team discussed the AFGRAD program with four of the 13 members of the Executive Committee of Graduate Deans (the Deans' Committee) at the Washington offices of AAI. Members of the Deans' Committee serve two to three year terms and must be sitting Deans who are willing to become involved with the AFGRAD program and to go to Africa and New York City to assist in the selection of candidates. The Deans we talked with were knowledgeable and enthusiastic about the program and AAI. They had all been to both New York City and Africa. They said that there were many Deans on the waiting list to serve on the Committee (a list of all the Committee members appears in Appendix E).

The Director of the AAI's Washington Office, Jerry L. Drew, discussed his programs with the team prior to the meeting with the Deans' Committee. He assured CAI that his office could coordinate any orientation programs that AAI might plan at the Washington International Center and that they could also be of assistance in planning and implementing participants' post-degree training (with a few more staff members). They currently only back-stop administrative problems of participants in the Washington, D.C., area for AFGRAD. He suggested that AAI needed better contacts with the historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), and that his office could be helpful here. He said that the HBCUs have different interests and constraints than other U.S. colleges and universities and needed to be approached differently.

The Deans endorsed the use of selection committees to screen candidates prior to their visits, but said that this sometimes results in the selection committee believing that they are making the final selections. This is particularly true in the cases where the slot being filled is a buy-in. The Deans' role in these situations is to convince the selection committees that the American universities have the final say, that some of the candidates are not qualified, and that they (the Deans) can get the committee members "off the hook" when favored candidates must be turned down.

The Deans suggested that the schedule of their annual visits to African countries be planned and announced further in advance by AAI. They said that a longer lead time between the announcement of the visits and the arrival of the Deans and AAI staff would be appreciated by the missions and would help to improve the in-country selection procedures.

Three of the Deans agreed that the AFDEP programs for undergraduates are still needed in some African countries, especially the Lusophone countries, although there was a general feeling that the undergraduate program was more problematic than either the AFGRAD or the POSTAF programs. The selection of undergraduate participants is more difficult than the selection of graduate fellows because records, tests, and credentials are not as reliable. They also found more nepotism in the nomination of undergraduate candidates than in the nominations of other candidates. The Deans' key consideration in their screening of undergraduate candidates was the motivation that the candidates displayed in their interviews.

All of the Deans agreed that the AAI field representatives are crucial to an effective selection process. They can help form the selection committees, give the Deans and AAI program officers information about the committees and the candidates proposed, keep in touch with the candidates during the selection process, and assist with the orientation and repatriation of participants. They recommended that AAI continue to bring these FRs to the U.S. for campus visits and meetings with Americans working on those AFGRAD programs with which they are associated. They endorsed policies that would help AAI recruit and retain qualified FRs.

The Deans felt that there was good cooperation in the AFGRAD program from USAIDs and USISs, especially in the smaller African

countries. In the larger countries, there may be differences in the training programs emphasized and the type of participants focused on between these agencies, which impedes such cooperation. A problem for some USAIDs is turnover in personnel which necessitates a learning process for the new officers.

The Deans felt that they and the AAI representatives have been helpful in the selection of women participants for AFGRAD, especially in the Lusophone countries. They gave examples of situations in which selection committees were asking female candidates questions which would have resulted in their being eliminated from the selection process. By changing the questions, the Deans were able to keep the women in contention. They said it is hard for women with families to leave Africa, and that those from Francophone countries often preferred to go to France for study since it was easier to return to their families from there.

Another issue discussed was candidates who have degrees from three year colleges in Africa which the Deans felt were comparable to community colleges in the U.S. They suggested that those selected from these schools be classified as special students who spend their first year taking prerequisites for admission to graduate school at the U.S. institution from which they want to get a higher degree. In some cases, AAI may be able to get tuition waivers for these participants that are available for minority students who need remedial work before entering graduate programs.

The Deans were not optimistic about recruiting candidates for AFGRAD from the private sector in many African countries. They said that the governments in many of the countries they have dealt with turn a "deaf ear" to their fledgling private sectors and nominate candidates with whom they are more familiar. Also, individuals in the private sector do not seem to have as much interest in advanced degrees as individuals in the public sector. They are more reluctant to leave their jobs for two to four years. The Deans said that many of the returning participants from the public sector eventually work in the private sector in their countries

All of the Deans felt that effective orientation programs were essential for AFGRAD participants. They said that those participants who spent several months in ESL programs in the U.S. usually got such orientations, but that those from Anglophone countries

sometimes did not. They suggested providing formal orientations with the FRs at the USIS in the home country before departure (with provision for child care if necessary), longer orientations at AAI or WIC in the U.S. before going to campus, and putting the participants in touch with fellow countrymen or international student networks on their campus whenever possible. Early contacts with international student and academic advisors were also important, especially for students who arrived at mid-year or in the summer.

The Deans agreed that the A.I.D. and AAI rules for participants were made clear to the candidates in their in-country interviews. They felt that rules on bringing dependents to the U.S. were good. They mentioned that in some cases the university can help with travel funds. It can also sometimes help students go to professional meetings when they are presenting papers, especially if AAI/A.I.D. can provide matching funds. They strongly endorsed the participation of AFGRAD fellows in professional meetings in their field.

There was agreement that the allowances for books and equipment were too low for most graduate students. The Deans felt that those participants who were required to use personal computers should be assisted to buy them at discounted university rates.

The Deans generally supported field work (OJT) for the graduate participants, but felt that most of it should take place after the degree was completed. They said that unless practical experience was specifically provided for in their academic programs, it could interrupt the flow of their work.

The Deans agreed that repatriation was not a problem for AFGRAD as there were strong incentives for the participants to return to their families and higher job positions. They said that in some countries (mainly in West Africa) there were sometimes problems with jobs and recognition within the governments. Those participants who keep in touch with their home country governments or other employers throughout their programs are usually better off with respect to occupational placement when they return. All participants face reverse culture shock and need some help in adjusting when they get home.

All of the Deans felt that it was very difficult for AFGRAD returnees to form alumni associations. While there are informal networks

among international students in some countries, there is seldom enough incentive to form a formal organization and plan activities even with the encouragement of USAID personnel and AAI FRs. Other activities and politics usually take precedence.

The Deans enthusiastically supported the continuation of the POSTAF program which helps Ph.D.s keep in touch with their professors, professional organizations and changes in their fields, and mentioned that it may be more appropriate for some fields than for others. The Deans believe it will become a popular program as it is better understood and publicized.

All of the Deans gave a vote of confidence to AAI, stressing the dedication, experience, and flexibility of the staff.

H. University Visits

A three-day visit was made to Cornell University and a four day visit to the University of Arizona (UA) to observe the activities associated with the AFGRAD and AFDEP programs on those campuses and to talk with university officials, professors and program participants. These two schools were chosen because they had large numbers of AFGRAD participants, had been involved with the program for a number of years, and represented two different types of universities (private/public, Eastern/Western).

Seven of the eight AFGRAD participants at Cornell and 13 of the 24 at UA were interviewed. Three academic advisors were seen at Cornell and seven at the UA. The Dean of the Graduate School, the director of Graduate Admissions, the director of the International Student Office, and the director of the African Development Institute were interviewed at Cornell. At UA, the Associate Dean of the Graduate College, the program coordinator for Foreign Graduate Admissions, the program advisor for the International Student Office, the associate director of the Center for English as a Second Language, and the director of the International Programs Office were interviewed.

1. Students

Two of the students at UA were interviewed individually, while the rest were seen in groups of two, four and five. The seven AFGRAD students at Cornell were interviewed together. Since a discussion format was used, not all students talked about all topics. When

possible, the number of students making any of the suggestions mentioned in this report will be indicated.

All of the students think the AFGRAD program is a good one that should be continued. As one participant said, "It is better to invest in people than in technical projects that are not relevant for Africa." The participants were glad to be at Cornell and UA which all thought were very good schools for them. Since they were asked to comment on how AFGRAD could be improved, most of their suggestions presented below will be critical. These should be treated as ideas intended to make a good program better.

Ten of the students said that the AFGRAD program should be better publicized in their countries. In some cases, they said that the program was well-known only within certain government circles, in others only in the capital or the large cities. One participant said that it was hard to distinguish among different U.S. scholarship programs available in her country. Another suggested that AFGRAD use Peace Corps volunteers, the Voice of America, and the newspapers to publicize the program.

All of the students who had in-country screening interviews with the Deans and AAI staff felt that these were helpful and informative, but at least three of them did not have such interviews. All of the students at Cornell said they would like to have been better informed about the A.I.D. regulations on dependents and graduate assistantships before they went to the capital for their interviews. A few said that they might not have made the commitment to go through the selection process, had they known these regulations. Students at the UA, however, said that these rules were made clear to them. Two of the students said that the USAIDs were helpful during the selection process and one mentioned the valuable assistance of the AAI FR. None of the participants mentioned any meetings with AFGRAD alumni prior to their departure for the U.S.

The Cornell participants found the A.I.D. regulations booklet provided at AAI useful, but wished that they had received this before leaving their countries, preferably prior to coming to the screening interviews. A general feeling among the participants was that there should be more flexibility in the application of some of these regulations. Thirteen of the participants said that the stipends provided by A.I.D. were too low for their training sites. The students

in Ithaca said that the rates for that city were probably outdated, as their average expenses for room and board required over 75 percent of their stipend. Participants at both schools compared their stipends unfavorably to those of nonacademic A.I.D. participants and fellows sponsored by other programs such as FAO, UNDP, and UNU.

Five of the participants said that AFGRAD fellows should be allowed to take available teaching or research assistantships when they are approved by their academic advisory as being relevant to their degree programs and not apt to prolong that program. They did not feel that participants' stipends should be cut when on such assistantships, as other programs did not cut fellows' stipends in this situation. Four of the participants said that stipends should not be cut when they return to Africa for visits, if they pay their own transportation. Most of the participants believed that AFGRAD students with programs that require more than two years in the U.S. should be allowed to return home after two years. They said that a few months in country was necessary to keep in touch with their employers and families, or as one student put it, "You can forget your country if you are gone too long. You need a visit every two years to become fresh." Two participants mentioned the necessity for doing their thesis research in-country with their academic advisor's approval, since the data they needed could only be obtained at home.

Two of the participants mentioned that their departures for the U.S. were very rushed, giving them less than three weeks to make necessary arrangements. Three of the participants said that their orientations were fine, while eight said they needed more and better orientations to life in the U.S. and at their university. Their feeling was that the information they received was too conceptual and provided at a time when they were too busy and/or tired to absorb it. Printed material and lectures were not especially useful for those who had not been abroad and had no frame of reference for incorporating such information. The students suggested more audio-visual materials and conversations with AFGRAD alumni who had been to the school they were going to attend. More time should be allowed for such orientations, preferably in the home country. Six of the participants said that they would be willing to help provide such orientations after they finished their programs and returned to Africa.

All of the participants said that they had met their program officers at AAI in New York City and, in most cases, they liked them personally. However, there was some feeling that the work load of these counselors and the inflexibility of A.I.D. regulations impeded their assistance with student problems. Three participants indicated that their phone calls were not always answered and one said that the 800 number did not always work. The students at UA said they were all visited by an AAI officer last spring and that he had been very helpful in solving problems with HAC, stipends, and academic advisors. The students at Cornell said they had not had a campus visit from AAI since January, 1987. The students specifically mentioned problems with health and accident insurance claims, reimbursements for books (over allowance), notification of visa extensions, and stipends.

Thirteen of the participants mentioned problems with HAC. Most felt that the coverage was not sufficient. They said that routine examinations that are necessary to good health care should be covered, since Americans endorse preventative medicine. Two participants said they had to have teeth extracted that could have been saved with better dental coverage. Three participants mentioned the lack of coverage for automobile accidents. Many of the participants said they had to pay for some of their health care up-front out of their stipends and then wait for several months to be reimbursed by HAC. This imposed financial hardships for them. When they were not able to make full payments, two of the students at Cornell were harrassed by marshalls and three at the UA were not allowed to register for their classes by the Bursar. This resulted in the payment of late fees and for one student the inability to take a required course at the proper time. Calls to AAI and HAC were of little help.

One participant said he had been waiting four months for notification of his visa extension. Another, who said she had met all the A.I.D. requirements, cannot get J-1 visas for her two children and intends to bring them to the U.S. on tourist visas. One participant said that her stipend and that of another woman from her country were lower than those of other students at UA. She had moved out of the dormitory after the first year as it was too noisy and public for her to study. Her stipend was adjusted,. but was still $165 per month less than that of other participants in Tucson. She has been in touch with AAI, but has been told nothing can be done since officials in her

country will not agree to a higher stipend. She has had her academic advisor write the vice-president of AAI on her behalf as she cannot make ends meet or repay a loan. If she does not get an increase soon, she intends to ask to be sent home.

All of the students agreed that life in American dormitories is difficult at best, and all but the student mentioned above had made other living arrangements. Most of these older Africans prefer to live alone, with their dependents, or with one other student (usually from Africa), so that they can cook their own foods and have privacy. The rules on single students under 25 living in dormitories is not well understood nor accepted by these participants. The only occasion on which these participants valued living in a dormitory situation was when they were learning English as a second language and were housed with other ESL students. (Two of the participants said the ESL program at UA was very good. One mentioned that a program he attended in California was better. One other said that the program at Georgetown University was not as good.)

The AFGRAD (graduate) students all endorsed their academic advisors. They said they were very helpful with courses and thesis direction; providing space and facilities, including personal computers and loaning books; and finding money for incidental expenses and professional meetings. They all said that the progress reports that they and their advisors completed each term were useful and necessary for accounting purposes. The students at Cornell were puzzled at the need for providing two-year academic program plans. They said there was no way to realistically provide such information, although they did comply with the requirement.

Three of the undergraduate (AFDEP) students were not pleased with their advisors. They said that they were difficult to get to see and too busy (with as many as 400 students) to give them much attention. One participant suggested having the international student advisor make comments on their progress reports so that participants would become better acquainted with the services of the international student office (ISO). This might be especially useful for undergraduates.

Most of the AFGRAD students had had very little contact with the ISO. A few mentioned that they had attended an orientation to the campus there on their arrival and one said he had taken part in a

few organized activities. One student was especially thankful for the host family program provided by the UA ISO which was very helpful to him when he was "overwhelmed" during his first semester. The students said that they spent most of their time studying and did not have time for many social activities such as those provided by the ISOs. They tended to turn to other students (often Africans from their country), their academic advisors, and their AAI counselors with their problems.

Some of the participants felt that they were sometimes treated "like kids" and not given the respect they deserved during the AFGRAD program. Four participants said that American officials had told them they should be "grateful" and not complain about problems they experienced. Several said they were used to paying their own expenses at home and were embarrassed when they were not able to do so because of inadequate funds in the U.S. Being cut off from their families posed problems for many participants which made them feel like they had to "start all over again with their adult lives."

Five participants were frustrated when A.I.D./AAI turned down their requests (often approved by their academic advisor) for special conferences and short courses which they believed were more relevant to their training than other activities occurring at the same time. Since other A.I.D. trainees were attending these conferences and courses, the AFGRAD participants felt slighted. Six participants cited the need for personal computers in their academic work and the value of having these computers in their jobs at home. They were frustrated when their requests, usually with approval of their advisors, to purchase computers were denied by A.I.D./AAI. Most of the other problems mentioned such as lost checks, cancelled classes, misplaced luggage, cold weather, and not being met at airports were treated as minor annoyances, but the issues listed above caused hard feelings in some of the participants.

The short courses and workshops that the participants had attended in addition to their academic programs were much appreciated. Participation in professional meetings, management courses and in one case, a special program for all of the international students from one African country in the U.S. were enthusiastically discussed by the participants. Those who had attended mid-winter seminars were also satisfied with these programs.

2. Administration Officials

Most of the officials interviewed at the two universities held similar positions on their campuses (e.g. Deans and international student advisors) and had similar views on the AFGRAD program. Their comments will be combined in this section unless there were distinct differences.

The Deans felt that the AFGRAD program was good for their schools and that their schools were good for the AFGRAD program. They stressed the need for flexibility in the academic programs of AFGRAD participants and the ability of their faculties to provide such flexibility due to their professional qualifications and international experience. At UA there are biannual training sessions for academic advisors to help them in advising international students. The Dean at Cornell felt that their programs were best for graduate AFGRAD fellows, while AFDEP undergraduates would be "somewhat lost in such a large school."

The Deans said that the AFGRAD selection process worked well and that their participants were mature, intelligent, and self-directed. They also said that they had good relations with AAI which they found flexible and knowledgeable about the participants. As another administrator put it, "AAI is more interested in their participants than most other sponsoring agencies."

The admissions officers also said they had good contacts with AAI, although the Cornell officer would like to meet with AAI representatives when they visit Cornell to get more information on degree equivalence and language requirements. Both schools have computerized their students' files. UA still has some snags in their computer program which the program coordinator for Foreign Graduate Admissions said may have resulted in recent registration problems for one or two of the AFGRAD students. The UA Dean said that AFGRAD students could come to her with any registration problems, but her offer was not known to the students interviewed at UA or to the International Student Office.

A fiscal officer at Cornell said that the AFGRAD stipends were similar to those of other graduate students, but that these did not always meet all expenses, and that student loans were "a fact of life." The UA Dean said that a 3/4-time assistantship or a 1/2-time

assistantship and a stipend were necessary to live "comfortably" as a graduate student there.

The ESL official at UA felt that the AFGRAD participants were well selected and highly motivated. She could recall no learning or social/personal problems with any of the participants in her program. She mentioned that they often helped each other in the ESL program which she said is both an orientation to life in the U.S. and on the UA campus and a language learning program.

The international student advisors were acquainted with the AFGRAD program, but said that they did not see many of the participants in the course of their work. Much of their counselling has to do with the personal and immigration problems of international students which do not seem to be major issues for AFGRAD participants on their campuses. They would like to see more AFGRAD fellows in their orientation sessions and programs for international students, but since these are not mandatory (for a while there was a fee for the UA orientation), they must rely on the international student networks and registration officials to publicize these programs.

They suggested that more information from AAI on who is coming when and what has happened to the AFGRAD alumni from their schools would be useful (the AAI Directory of Alumni was much appreciated). The Cornell advisor recommended requiring the AFGRAD participants to obtain comments from the international student office on their progress reports so that there would be more contact with them.

Both international student advisors said they could help the AFGRAD participants with information and contacts which would be useful, especially when they first arrive on campus. UA has a host family program which some AFGRAD participants have enjoyed. Cornell provides short-term, interest-free loans; free housing for three days after arrival; and did have a re-entry program for graduates. Help with housing and orientation to the campus are important parts of the orientations at both schools.

Both international student advisors said that the AFGRAD and other international program stipends were low given costs at their schools. With dorm space at a premium and often not suitable for graduate students, private housing is a necessity. This is quite expensive for individual students unless they are willing to live quite a distance

from campus which usually means getting a car. The advisors leave academic orientations and counselling to the participants' academic advisors unless the student has a conflict with this person.

They both favored practical training for international students including research assistantships, mid-winter and professional seminars and meetings, management training (the Cornell advisor recommended the Management Development Training Institute) and field work in relevant settings including in-country. They recommended that A.I.D., AAI, and their schools do as much as possible to facilitate and finance such training.

3. Academic Advisors

All of the professors interviewed at Cornell and UA were (and in some cases had previously been) advisors to graduate (AFGRAD) participants. (One was also advising an undergraduate and one recalled another undergraduate who had failed to complete a degree.) All of the comments which we will include below concern their relationships with graduate students.

The professors agreed that the AFGRAD participants had done well, were mature and were not a problem. Several participants were seen as leaders in their fields in their countries who would return to key positions. Three of the professors mentioned the very practical orientation of their participants. The departments that the participants were enrolled in at the two schools had between 20 percent and 60 percent international students. All but one of the advisors were happy to have such good students who came with funding and seldom needed assistantships. Only one AFGRAD student was reported having any academic difficulties.

The academic advisors agreed that there was much to be learned from international students and expressed great satisfaction at having AFGRAD participants as their students. They said they saw no resentment by other students of the AFGRAD participants in their programs, and that they often encouraged American and international students to work in teams to learn from each other. One advisor mentioned that some American students had become interested in international development after working with international students. Most of the professors kept in touch with some of their international students after they returned to their

countries and two mentioned AFGRAD participants who were now at the highest levels of government in their countries.

For three professors the current participant was their first AFGRAD, for two the second, and for one the fourth. The other advisors said they had had several African students, but could not recall how many were AFGRAD. Two of the professors mentioned that the students were well screened and one said that AAI keeps good track of their participants. One recalled a campus visit by an AAI representative when there was a problem student.

Four of the academic advisors mentioned that international students generally were more work for them, especially if English was not their primary language. Although the ESL programs helped, their pronunciation and writing skills required more help and time than other students (although one professor said some U.S. students were just as difficult). One professor mentioned inviting international students to his home. A senior professor said it was problematic for younger professors to advise international students because they took more time, but did not contribute directly to the professor's professional advancement.

The advisors made a number of suggestions regarding their current AFGRAD participants. Three mentioned that funds should be provided to allow them to purchase discounted PCs to take back to Africa. One had written AAI on this issue, but had not been successful in getting funds, as the rules seemed very confusing. Three advisors said that A.I.D. should address the family situations of the participants better, and help those with dependents to return home occasionally or bring their dependents to the U.S. with proper justification. One mentioned that international students (not necessarily AFGRAD) who bring their families with them at the beginning of their training often have more problems than those on their own.

Two professors suggested that the participants should attend one professional meeting or workshop each year and that their departments could (and had) provide(d) matching funds for such trips. One was disappointed that his participant's request for a workshop that he (the advisor) had recommended had been turned down by A.I.D./W. Two advisors said that A.I.D. stipends should be more flexible to fit the participants and their situations, especially

since their access to assistantships is limited and those assistantships which are available sometimes require too much of the participants' time.

One advisor said that making up the plan of study required by AAI at the beginning of the participants' programs was impossible. Another said that Ph.D. candidates would need teaching skills and should have some practical experience in teaching during their programs. Field experience for the participants was favored by several of the professors as being necessary and, in some cases, more useful than high technology classes and laboratories. One professor said that the research of the AFGRAD participants should be supervised by their advisor whether in the U.S. or in Africa, and that joint projects involving U.S. and African professionals made the best research programs. He had worked successfully with an AFGRAD fellow on a dissertation project in Africa.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The last group of new students authorized under the current AFGRAD project will be recruited at the end of 1988 for enrollment in the 1989-90 academic year. Any further recruitment of students in 1989 and beyond will depend on determinations by the Africa Bureau of A.I.D.'s future support for the AFGRAD program. The CAI evaluation team believes the questions listed below are the key issues the Africa Bureau should address concerning the future of this project.

A. Should the AFGRAD program be continued?

The evaluation team strongly recommends extension of the AFGRAD program and provision of A.I.D. funds to support it. Among the many priorities for A.I.D. funding in Africa, there continues to be a need to develop higher-level human resources, something the AFGRAD scholarship program is helping to do. Representatives of all of the agencies involved in the program contacted during this evaluation believe that AFGRAD is successfully fulfilling its purpose of providing relevant, high-quality education for future African leaders. USAID missions responding to the evaluation are unanimous in wishing the program to continue. At least five missions have indicated they intend to buy into the project if it is extended.

Few A.I.D. projects, except AFGRAD, serve 42 countries in Africa. For some of the smaller African countries, the AFGRAD program is the principal A.I.D. activity and the only means of obtaining U.S. academic training available to the participants. For all of the countries, AFGRAD's selection procedures identify highly qualified candidates for training at levels and in fields suited to each country's developmental requirements. The AFGRAD program has trained over 2000 professional personnel for Africa's development since 1963. It is in A.I.D.'s interest to continue this successful program.

B. Should the program continue to seek tuition waivers from U.S. universities?

The evaluation team recommends that future AFGRAD programs continue to obtain tuition-free scholarships from U.S. universities for students in graduate-level training. This feature of the AFGRAD

program reduces training expenditures, even though the process of obtaining tuition waivers entails some added administrative costs and may cause delays in placing some students. Aside from cost reductions, tuition waivers help ensure that candidates for graduate studies are carefully screened by the Deans' Committee and that those selected have academic and personal qualifications that merit scholarships at U.S. universities. The universities, in turn, make substantial contributions to African development not only by waiving tuitions for AFGRAD fellows, but also by committing themselves to provide meaningful academic and field experiences for each student they accept.

C How should future AFGRAD scholarships be distributed among African countries?

The evaluation team recommends that the current system of quotas of scholarships for each country be continued under "core" funding, with provision for missions to buy into the project if they wish to increase their quotas. In the AFGRAD-III project, the basic quota for each country is three scholarships per year, or fifteen scholarships over a five-year period. This quota appears suitable for small countries with a limited pool of qualified applicants. That number of scholarships may be less meaningful for larger countries, but the option of "buying" additional training opportunities is generally available to missions in these countries. We recommend that the buy-in opportunity be continued and that provision be made for increasing the budget of the administering organization to accommodate a new program officer position for every 80 fellows who are added to the program through buy-ins.

The AFGRAD fellowships are presently widely spread over Africa. The Africa Bureau may wish to review the list of countries currently participating in AFGRAD (see Table 2, pages 16 and 17) to determine if assistance to all these countries should continue under an extension of the program. If some countries are eliminated, the quotas for other countries might be increased. Countries should be encouraged to include the AFGRAD program in their Country Training Plans. The Bureau should respond to the request by the A.I.D. representative in Lagos that long-term scholarships be provided to Nigeria in the future.

D. Should any new policy directives be established for the AFGRAD program?

The evaluation team did not find any strong interest in, or need for changing the direction of the AFGRAD program, and therefore recommends that current project policies be maintained. Fields of study for AFGRAD training should be selected by missions and host countries based on the developmental and human resource needs of public and private institutions within each country. Through discussions of the allocation of their quotas, local and USAID officials will develop a greater investment in the program.

The objective of attaining at least 30 percent participation by women is strongly supported. As more women go beyond secondary education in Africa, A.I.D. should raise this percentage, and move away from undergraduate training as a means of including more women in the program. Using AFGRAD training to support private sector development is also encouraged, although training for this purpose is often short-term and at lower levels, and therefore better suited to training under bilateral projects or the HRDA project.

E. Should changes be made in the authorized levels of study?

The evaluation team recommends that an extended AFGRAD program continue to provide training opportunities at the undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels, with the majority of students receiving training for the master's degree. Undergraduate training should be restricted to those countries with no, or very few, post-secondary training institutions. Ph.D. training should be primarily for persons returning to positions in universities or research programs. Short-term postgraduate training programs are proving useful to high level personnel seeking refresher training in their professional fields and should be continued.

F. Should changes be made in the administration of the AFGRAD program?

The evaluation team found that AAI's administration of the AFGRAD program has been generally excellent. The selection, placement and monitoring of participants is done in an effective manner. No major administrative changes are required, but the recommendations below suggest improvements in management procedures that can be

achieved by AAI and A.I.D. in the current program and/or in an extension to the program.

1. AAI, their Field Representatives, and USAIDs should improve the announcement of AFGRAD scholarships by getting out more publicity on the AFGRAD programs and its participants through the Peace Corps, the Voice of America, and the mass media in the participating countries. More emphasis should be placed on publicizing and implementing the POSTAF program and training opportunities for women and the private sector and less on the AFDEP program.

2. AAI should encourage USAIDs which have not done so to form selection committees to recruit and screen candidates prior to the Deans and AAI staff selection meetings. AAI should provide written guidelines on the AFGRAD recruitment and selection processes to these committees and ensure that the missions are involved in the selection of fields included in the AFGRAD training programs. AAI should announce the visits of Deans and staff members to the selection committees earlier if possible.

3. A.I.D. should establish a clear definition of the term "private sector" to assist AAI in recruiting participants. This definition should include individuals working in government organizations associated with private enterprise. AAI should enumerate these participants in their data-tracking system.

4. AAI and USAIDs should assist the AAI field representatives to contact the USIS offices and libraries in their countries for information about the U.S. USIS can provide materials and assistance in conducting orientations for departing participants. All participants should be required to attend such orientations before their departure and allowed enough time to do so.

5. A.I.D. should authorize AAI to send participants who enter their training at mid-year or during the summer and those who are going to schools that do not provide an orientation to American culture to the Washington International Center for one week of orientation. These will be primarily Anglophone participants, as the ESL programs for other participants usually include material on American culture (see Kimmel, 1970; Kimmel & Perlman, 1970). All participants should have an orientation to life in the U.S. and on campus before they begin classes.

6. AAI should make more use of their field representatives to contact and brief the participants before departure and when they return to their home countries. A space should be provided on the application form for applicants to indicate how they can most quickly be notified by the field representative if they are selected. The field representatives could coordinate AFGRAD alumni organizations for those fellows who indicate an interest in staying in touch with the program (over 50 percent) (see AAI, 1988). These alumni could be used in the orientations for departing and returning participants.

7. AAI, with A.I.D. funding, should continue biannual AAI workshops for field representatives. The workshops should include visits to a variety of University campuses where they could meet admissions officers, international student and academic advisors, and participants. These workshops could profitably be coordinated with conferences of the National Association for Foreign Students Affairs, and, perhaps, with workshops for A.I.D. training officers (see Mestenhausen, Marty, & Steglitz, 1988).

8. AAI should keep the participant load of the AAI program officers and assistants to 80 or less. They should retain the (800) number and make sure all participants are aware of its availability. AAI program officers should visit every campus with three or more participants at least once a year and meet with some of the academic advisors and the foreign student advisor, as well as the participants, when there. At schools with more than four participants, admissions officials, and groups of participants should also be interviewed.

9. AAI should classify exceptional graduates from three-year African undergraduate programs as "special" students and provide them the remedial courses needed to enter advanced degree programs at their U.S. universities. They should try to obtain tuition waivers for minority students for these participants.

10. A.I.D. should authorize allowances for students to use personal computers instead of typewriters and increase the typing allowance so that students may purchase these computers. Computers should not be included in the book and equipment allowances which should <u>not</u> be reduced. A.I.D. should increase the book shipping allowance (now $120) to keep up with increases in the costs of mailing.

11. A.I.D. should make the regulations on housing and stipends much clearer to the participants and should strongly consider dropping the requirement that undergraduate participants live in dormitories unless they choose to do so or are in ESL programs.

12. A.I.D. should provide matching funds for students to attend professional meetings when they are giving papers. AAI should ensure that every graduate student has the opportunity to attend at least one professional meeting in their field in the U.S., whether they are giving papers or not.

13. A.I.D. should allow participants to attend short courses for credit off campus (such as those provided by the USDA) whenever they are certified as relevant and feasible by the student's academic advisor. AAI should encourage academic advisors to include field work in their AFGRAD students' programs and enroll them in the Management Development Training Institute one year or less prior to their program completion if similar training has not been part of their study program.

14. A.I.D. should clarify the tax regulations for the participants (and AAI). If taxes must be paid, the monies should come from A.I.D./W, <u>not</u> from the participants' stipends.

15. A.I.D. should revise the Cooperative Agreement to begin calculating the duration of studies from the completion of all English language training. Approved durations of training should be 28 months for M.A. candidates, and 54 months for Ph.D. candidates. Any extensions beyond the mandated maximum periods should be approved by A.I.D., based on justifications provided by AAI and the participating university.

16. AAI should return to its previously successful procedures to meet the A.I.D. requirement for an annual report by submitting to A.I.D. a report on AFGRAD-III for the program's first three academic years. In future, AAI should adhere to the Cooperative Agreement requirement which calls for annual reports to be submitted to A.I.D. within 90 days after the end of each fiscal year.

17. AAI should replace the open-ended terminal report form with a closed-ended questionnaire which would be easier for the departing

participants to answer and for AAI to analyze for use in future programming (see Kimmel, Ockey, & Sander, 1972).

18. AAI should develop a more focused version of the 1983 questionnaire for the 1993 follow up of AFGRAD participants. They should enter the relevant data from the 1983 questionnaire into a participant data bank as soon as possible (see Kimmel & Elmer, 1987) and analyze these data for use in the development of the 1993 instrument and for analytic comparisons with the data gathered at that time.

19. In addition to the mandated AAI follow-up surveys in-country, A.I.D. should contract with an evaluation research organization with international experience to conduct an impact study. AFGRAD participants from all five waves and at least one comparison group of African students sponsored by some other agency or country plus a control group which studied only in-country should be included in this study. In-country research organizations, AAI field representatives, and returned participants with relevant research skills should be used in this study (see Sanguinetty and Kimmel, 1985).

20. AAI should continue and better publicize the annual Distinguished AFGRAD alumni awards. They should consider increasing the number of these awards each year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The African American Institute (1988) The Study of AFGRAD Alumni: Training High Level Human Resources for African Development, 1960-1980. New York, New York.

Development Associates, Inc. (1986) Final Report. Participant Training Contractor Cost Study. Agency for International Development, PDC-1406-I-15-4053-00. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.

Kimmel, P.R. (1970) Orientation of A.I.D. Trainees at the Washington International Center. Agency for International Development. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.

Kimmel, P.R. & Elmer, L. (1987) Selection Monitoring Study for A.I.D.-sponsored Participants [Academic]. Agency for International Development. PDC-1406-1-0-4055-00. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.

Kimmel, P.R., Ockey, W.C., & Sander, H.J. (1972) Final Report, International Training Assessment Program. Agency for International Development, No. 374.013, A512d. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.

Kimmel, P.R. & Perlman, D. (1970) "Psychological Modernity and the Initial Accommodation of Foreigners Visiting the U.S." Journal of Social Psychology, 81, 121-123.

Mestenhuser, J., Marty, G., & Steglitz, I. (1988) Culture, Learning and the Discipline: Theory and Practice in Cross-cultural Orientation. National Association for Foreign Students Affairs.

Pruitt, F. (1978) "Adaptation of African Students to American Society." International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2, [1], 91-118.

Sanguinetty, J. & Kimmel, P.R. (1985) A Comparative Method to Evaluate the Developmental Impacts of A.I.D.-assisted Training. Agency for International Development, PPC/CDIE. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State.

APPENDIX A:

(1) CABLE TO USAIDS AND USAIDS RESPONDING

(2) CABLE TO AAI FIELD REPRESENTATIVES AND FIELD REPRESENTATIVES RESPONDING

Department of State

ORIGIN AID-00

ORIGIN OFFICE AFTR-05
INFO AFEA-03 AFSA-03 AFFW-04 AFCW-03 AFPD-04 AAAF-03 IT-06
ES-01 /032 A4 0826

INFO LOG-00 AF-00 /000 R

DRAFTED BY: AFR/TR/EHR MGREENM
APPROVED BY: AFR/TRLINE
AFR/TR/EHR:JSHAMPAIN (DRAFT) OITMCDAVID (DRAFT)
OICARTER (INFO) AFR/SWAPDICHTER (INFO)
AFR/CCWA JCCOLES (INFO) AFR/SAFISCHER (INFO)
AFR/EASMINTZ (INFO) AFR/PD/SAP RCESER (INFO)

----------172327 231859Z /34

R 231056Z JUL 88 ZEX
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USAID MISSIONS IN AFRICA

UNCLAS STATE 238291

AIDAC ABIDJAN FOR REDSO; NAIROBI FOR REDSO AND USAID

E.O. 12356: N/A

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF AFRICAN GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, PHASE III (AFGRAD-III), 698-0459

1. AN EVALUATION OF THE AFGRAD-III PROJECT WILL BE CARRIED OUT IN AID/W DURING AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER 1988 UNDER THE DIRECTION OF AFR/TR/EHR. THIS CABLE SOLICITS MISSIONS COMMENTS ON THE VALUE, MANAGEMENT AND SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE AFGRAD TRAINING PROGRAMS. MISSION COMMENTS ARE AN ESSENTIAL ASPECT OF THIS EVALUATION. MISSIONS ARE STRONGLY URGED TO CABLE THEIR COMMENTS TO AFR/TR/EHR NOT LATER THAN AUGUST 26, 1988.

2. THE LAST AFGRAD CANDIDATES AUTHORIZED UNDER THE CURRENT PROJECT WILL BE SELECTED THIS FALL FOR ENTRY IN U.S. UNIVERSITIES IN THE 1989-90 ACADEMIC YEAR. BASED ON MISSION COMMENTS AND OTHER INPUTS, THE EVALUATION WILL MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE AFRICA BUREAU CONCERNING CONTINUATION OF THE AFGRAD SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM AFTER THE 1989-90 ACADEMIC YEAR. THE EVALUATION WILL ALSO REVIEW THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAINING ACTIVITIES BY THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE (AAI) DURING THE FIRST THREEE YEARS OF THE CURRENT PROJECT AND THE EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF MANAGEMENT

PROCEDURES.

3. FYI, THE FOLLOWING TABLE SUMMARIZES THE NUMBER OF AFGRAD SCHOLARSHIPS AND UNDERGRADUATE PARTICIPANT PROGRAMS PROVIDED EACH COUNTRY UNDER THE AFGRAD-III PROJECT, AS OF MAY 1988. THESE FIGURES GENERALLY COVER STUDENTS WHO HAVE ENTERED STUDIES DURING THE FIRST THREE YEARS OF THE CURRENT PROJECT.

COUNTRY	BS/BA	MS/MA	PHD	TOTAL	NO. OF WOMEN
BENIN	-	4	1	5	1
BOTSWANA	4	5	-	9	3
BURUNDI	-	12	2	14	2
CAMEROON	-	5	2	7	0
CAR	6	5	-	11	1
COMOROS	14	-	-	14	2
CONGO	-	3	1	4	0
DJIBOUTI	4	1	-	5	0
EQ. GUINEA	15	-	-	15	4
GHANA	-	-	-	0	-
GUINEA	-	10	4	14	3
GUINEA-BISSAU	3	3		2	4
IV. COAST	-	10	5	15	1
KENYA	-	7	2	9	4
LESOTHO	-	2	1	3	0
LIBERIA	-	8		8	5
MADAGASCAR	-	4	3	7	1
MALAWI	-	2	5	7	2
MAURITIUS	-	4	1	5	1
MOZAMBIQUE	5	6	-	11	4
RWANDA	5	5	5	15	6
SAO TOME	10	-	-	10	5
SEYCHELLES	12	-	-	12	4
S. LEONE	-	6	2	8	2
SOMALIA	-	10	1	11	3
SUDAN	-	4	5	9	4
SWAZILAND	-	14	1	15	7
TANZANIA	-	-	-	0	-
TOGO	-	13	2	15	3
UGANDA	-	7	-	7	1
ZAIRE		1	3	4	0
ZAMBIA	-	6	2	8	0
ZIMBABWE		4	2	6	0
SAHEL COUNTRIES					
BURKINA	-	5	1	6	0
CAPE VERDE	5	-	-	5	3
CHAD	4	1	-	5	1
GAMBIA	2	3	-	5	0
MALI	-	5	-	5	2
MAURITANIA	-	2	3	5	0
NIGER	-	-	1	1	0
SENEGAL	-	5	-	5	0
TOTAL (41 COUNTRIES)	85	182	55	332	76

(23 PERCENT)

4. DISTRIBUTION OF TRAINING PROGRAMS HAS BEEN BASED ON QUOTAS OF 15 SLOTS PER COUNTRY OVER FIVE YEARS, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF THE SAHEL COUNTRIES WHICH CURRENTLY HAVE 5- OR 6 SLOTS EACH AND IVORY COAST WHICH HAS 25. IN ADDITION, SOME COUNTRIES (ZAIRE, MALI, TOGO, SWAZILAND, CAPE VERDE, MAURITANIA) HAVE INCREASED THEIR QUOTAS BY BUYING INTO THE PROJECT.

5. IN ADDITIONTO THE LONG-TERM ACADEMIC TRAINING PROGRAMS, THE AFGRAD-III PROJECT AUTHORIZES 50 SHORT-TERM (APPROXIMATELY SIX MONTHS) POST-GRADUATE U.S. OR THIRD-COUNTRY TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR HIGH-LEVEL POLICY MAKERS, TEACHERS, RESEARCHERS AND SCIENTISTS. THIS AFRICA-WIDE PROGRAM ALLOWS PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL TO UNDERTAKE SABBATICAL-TYPE REFRESHER STUDIES AND DO RESEARCH AND WRITING ON DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS. ALTHOUGH DEMAND FOR SUCH PROGRAMS WAS THOUGHT TO BE HIGH, AS OF MAY 1988 ONLY 18 POST-GRADUATE AWARDS HAVE BEEN MADE AS FOLLOWS: SUDAN (3), ZAMBIA (2), GHANA, NIGERIA, KENYA, MAURITIUS, DJIBOUTI (1 EACH). THE EVALUATION TEAM WILL DETERMINE REASONS FOR THE SEEMINGLY UNDERUTILIZATION OF THESE TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES.

6. MISSIONS ARE ASKED TO COMMENT, AT WHATEVER LENGTH FELT APPROPRIATE, ON THREE GENERAL TOPICS: (A) AAI'S MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES; (B) AFGRAD'S SPECIAL FEATURES; AND (C) AFGRAD'S DEVELOPMENTAL VALUE. THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS, WHICH ILLUSTRATE THE EVALUATION TEAM'S CONCERNS, MAY BE HELPFUL TO MISSIONS IN PREPARING THEIR COMMENTS. HOWEVER, MISSIONS NEED NOT RESPOND TO EVERY QUESTION OR LIMIT COMMENTS TO THE SUGGESTED TOPICS.

UNCLASSIFIED

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

(A) AAI'S MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES

(1) HOW WELL HAS MISSION BEEN KEPT INFORMED OF AFGRAD TRAINING ACTIVITIES?

(2) TO WHAT EXTENT HAS MISSION EXPERIENCED PROBLEMS WITH ANY OF AAI'S MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES E.G., SELECTION OF CANDIDATES, TIMELY PLACEMENT OF PARTICIPANTS, ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING, MONITORING STUDENT PROGRESS, REPATRIATION, FOLLOW-UPN?

(3) IF AFGRAD PROGRAM IS EXTENDED, WHAT CHANGES IN ANY OF PRESENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURES ELECTION, PLACEMENT, ETC.) DOES THE MISSION RECOMMEND?

(B) AFGRAD'S SPECIAL FEATURES:

(1) TUITION WAIVERS PROVIDED BY U.S. UNIVERSITIES FOR AFGRAD STUDENTS (AT GRADUATE LEVEL ONLY) ARE A COST-SAVING FEATURE OF THIS PROGRAM. HOWEVER, AAI OCCASIONALLY HAS PROBLEMS OBTAINING WAIVERS FOR SOME STUDENTS, CAUSING DELAY OR DISAPPOINTMENT IN SOME CASES. WHAT COMMENTS DOES MISSION HAVE ON THIS FEATURE OF THE AFGRAD PROGRAM AND THE RELATIONSHIP OF TUITION WAIVERS TO PLACEMENT OF STUDENTS?

(2) OF 332 PARTICIPANTS IN FIRST THREE YEARS OF AFGRAD-III, 76 (23 PERCENT) WERE WOMEN. GOAL OF PROJECT IS 30 PERCENT PARTICIPATION BY WOMEN. PER PARA. 3, ABOVE, SOME COUNTRIES HAVE EXCEEDED THIS GOAL BUT OTHERS HAVE NO FEMALE AFGRAD PARTICIPANTS. WHAT HAVE BEEN SOME OF THE PROBLEMS AND WHAT ARE THE FUTURE PROSPECTS FOR RECRUITING GREATER PERCENTAGE OF WOMEN?

(3) DOES MISSION INTEND TO NOMINATE CANDIDATES FOR AFGRAD SHORT-TERM POST-GRADUATE TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE FUTURE? APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY?

(C) AFGRAD'S DEVELOPMENT VALUE:

(1) DOES MISSION WISH TO HAVE THE AFGRAD PROGRAM EXTENDED?

(2) IS THE QUOTA OF TRAINING POSITIONS AND THE LEVEL OF TRAINING (GRADUATE/UNDERGRADUATE) CURRENTLY ASSIGNED TO YOUR MISSION SATISFACTORY? IF NOT, HOW WOULD MISSION WISH TO REVISE ITS QUOTA IF THIS PROGRAM IS EXTENDED?

(3) DOES MISSION INTEND TO BUY INTO AFGRAD PROGRAM IN FUTURE YEARS?

(4) IF AFGRAD PROGRAM IS EXTENDED, WHAT SUGGESTIONS, IF ANY, DOES MISSION HAVE FOR REDIRECTING AFGRAD IN THE FUTURE (I.E., BY RELATING TRAINING MORE TO PRIVATE SECTOR OR FOCUSSING TRAINING ON SELECTED INSTITUTIONS SUCH AS AFRICAN UNIVERSITIES)?

7. MISSION'S ASSISTANCE IN COMMENTING ON AFGRAD PROGRAM AND PROVIDING COMMENTS BY AUGUST 26 IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

8. REDSO/WCA. PLEASE COMMENT FOR SAO TOME.

9. REDSO/ESA. PLEASE COMMENT FOR COMOROS, MAURITIUS AND SEYCHELLES.

10. USAID/CAMEROON. PLEASE COMMENT FOR EQUATORIAL GUINEA AND CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC. WHITEHEAD

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The evaluation team received responses to its questionnaire (State 238291) from missions for the following countries:

Benin
Botswana
Cameroon
Cape Verde
Cote d'Ivoire
Equatorial Guinea
Gambia
Guinea
Liberia
Niger
Nigeria
Senegal
Somalia
Sudan
Swaziland
Togo
Uganda
Zaire
Zambia
Zimbabwe

TELEX AND CABLE MESSAGES TO AAI FIELD REPRESENTATIVES

MAMA TAPO: TELEX 402 MALI. CHECK WITH WORLD BANK

CLARA OSINULU: CABLE TO AMERICAN EMBASSY, NIGERIA C/O ANYASO FOR OSINULU

MARGUERITE VIEYRA: CABLE BP2650, DAKAR, SENEGAL

MARY JO GABIAM: CABLE TO AMERICAN EMBASSY, TOGO FOR AAI GABIAM

LOUISE AFRICA: TELEX 42270 FOR LOUISE AFRICA

MESSAGE TO ALL

FROM CREATIVE ASSOCIATES, INTERNATIONAL, INC.

The Africa Bureau of AID has contracted with our organization to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the African Graduate Fellowship Program known as AFGRAD III. The evaluation team has interviewed AAI AFGRAD staff in New York City and has sent cable inquiry to participating African USAIDs. The team will be interviewing several AFGRAD Deans, visiting two Universities and contacting AID Washington staff and project officers.

This telex (cable) is to request your input to this evaluation. It solicits selected field reps' comments on the features of the AFGRAD program listed below. We would highly value your answers to these questions:

1. Is there an AFGRAD selection in your country(ies)? If so, how well does it work in selecting top candidates? If not, how is the selection process handled?

2. How do you feel about the way the final selection of candidates is made? How do host country officials involved feel? What could be done to recruit more female AFGRAD fellows?

3. How do you keep in touch with fellows who have been selected before their placement and call forward? Are you satisfied with your contact at this time?

4. What kind of relationship do you have with the USAID in your country(ies)? With the USIS? How could these be improved?

5. What is your role in providing pre-departure orientations to the fellows? What resources do you use?

6. Do you follow the course of the fellows' academic programs after they have gone to the U.S.? Is your contact adequate? If not, how could it be improved?

7. Do fellows visit you on their return from the U.S.? Do you ever provide a re-entry orientation for them? If so, what resources do you use? If not, what other debriefings do the fellows in your country receive on return?

8. Have you been involved in any follow-up studies of fellows? How could these be improved?

9. Does an alumni association of fellows exist in your country(ies)? Are alumni ever used in pre-departure or re-entry orientations?

10. Did you attend the AAI workshop in New York in 1987? Was this useful to you in your work? What, if anything, would you add or change in future workshops?

11. How would you recommend that the AAI field reps be used more effectively? What other suggestions do you have for the more effective implementation of the AFGRAD program?

Thank you for your help with our evaluation. Please send your answers via telex to Creative Associates, Attn: Paul Kimmel; telex number 440523. As our time is limited, a response by August 29, 1988, would be appreciated.

APPENDIX B: CORNELL AND ARIZONA STUDENTS

1984-89 AFGRAD FELLOWS

1988-89 AFGRAD FELLOWS

NAME	FIELD	TUITION	SOURCE OF SUPPORT
Abdi, Omar Ahmed	CRP	$13,100	Graduate School
Bamba, Awa	C&EE	13,100	Institute for African Development
Ben, Peter	Education	6,040	Graduate School
Faulkner, Dorothea	Nutrition	6,040	Graduate School
Kone, Solomaine	CRP	13,100	Institute for African Development
May, Babatunde	Communication	6,040	Institute for African Development
Ngichabe, Christopher	Vet Medicine	8,000	Graduate School
Niameogo, Cyrille	Nutrition	400	Graduate School
Sayed, Zeinab	Nutrition	6,040	Graduate School
	TOTAL:	$71,860	

1987-88 AFGRAD FELLOWS

Abdi, Omar Ahmed	CRP	$12,300	Graduate School
Faulkner, Dorothea	Nutrition	3,638 (5,670)	Graduate School
Niameogo, Cyrille	Nutrition	3,638 (5,670)	Graduate School
Ngichabe, Christopher	Vet Medicine	8,000	Graduate School
	TOTAL:	$27,576	

1986-87 AFGRAD FELLOWS

Abdi, Omar Ahmed	CRP	$5,750 (LOA Sp 87)	Graduate School
Baidu-Forson, Joseph	Ag Economics	1,924 (INABS Fl 86; 2,900)	Graduate School
Faulkner, Dorothea	Nutrition	3,448 (5,400)	Graduate School
Niameogo, Cyrille	Nutrition	3,448 (5,400)	Graduate School
	TOTAL:	$14,570	

1985-86 AFGRAD FELLOWS

Abdi, Omar Ahmed	CRP	$5,250 (Sp Only)	Graduate School
Baidu-Forson, Joseph	Ag Economics	3,272 (5,020)	Graduate School
Faulkner, Dorothea	Nutrition	1,636 (Sp Only - 2,510)	Graduate School
Lakoh, Alpha	Education	1,000 (Fl Only)	Graduate School
Niameogo, Cyrille	Nutrition	3,272 (5,020)	Graduate School
Sock, Donald	Education	1,636 (2,510)	Graduate School
	TOTAL:	$16,066	

1984-85 AFGRAD FELLOWS

Abdulla, Mustafa	Economics	$4,800 (Sp 85 TA)	Graduate School (Fall)
Baidu-Forson, Joseph	Ag Economics	3,042 (4,782)	Graduate School
Lakoh, Alpha	Education	1,721 (INABS Fl 84; 2,591)	Graduate School
Sock, Donald	Education	3,042 (4,782)	Graduate School
Yumkella, Kandeh	Ag Economics	3,042 (4,782)	Graduate School
	TOTAL:	$15,647	

AAI/AFGRAD STUDENTS
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

Mamadou BARO	Anthropology	Mauritania
Abou Elimane BOUSSO	Agr. Engineering	Senegal
Dah SALIHI	Range Management	Mauritania
Sinsi LUMBUENAMO	Soil & Water Science	Zaire
Sita LUMBUENAMO	Nutritional Science	Zaire
Meta Lidoga MOBULA	Economics	Zaire
Mohamed Hachi IMAN	Agronomy	Djibouti
Abdi Mahamoud ABDI	Mgmt. Info. Systems	Djibouti
Juma MASSINGA	Business	Mozambique
Fouad Mahamoud ABDI	Mgmt. Info. Systems	Djibouti
Safia Hachi IMAN		Djibouti
Abdoulaye Foula DIALLO	Physics	Guinea
Didace DIDI	Geological Engineering	Burundi
Mahaman GAYA	Ctr. for Engl. Sec. Lang.	Niger
Fatoumata KANTE-RICHARD	" " " " "	Guinea
Toupta BOGUENA	Agronomy	Chad
Moussa SOUMAINE	Pre-med Technology	Chad
Antonio BARBOSA	Agr. Economics	Guinea Bissau
Humberto Jose DA SILVA	Agr. Economics	Guinea Bissau
Luis Hernani SOARES	Elect. Engineering	Cape Verde
Ahmed Omer JAMA	Agronomy & Plant Genetics	Somalia
Joseph BISSO-EYA	" " "	Cameroon
Bernard NYAWAKIRA	Agr. Economics	Burundi
Ambroise ZANGA	Forestry	Central Afr. Republ

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

APPENDIX C: AAI'S TERMINAL REPORT FORM

THE AFRICAN GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

TERMINAL REPORT BY FELLOW
(Confidential)

NAME_____ COUNTRY_____

U.S. UNIVERSITY_____

FIELD OF STUDY_____

DEGREE AND COMPLETION DATE_____

CURRENT MAILING ADDRESS_____

_____

(Continue answers on reverse side if necessary)

1. Please evaluate your program of study in the United States: has the specific program of your department achieved what you had hoped it would achieve when you came to the U.S.? Was the content of your course in line with your expectations? Please explain your answer.

2. Was your academic program more or less difficult than you expected or about the same? Please comment.

3. Do you believe that you were adequately prepared academically for your AFGRAD program of study or would you have been better off with more or better background in certain areas? Specify any discrepancies.

4. In what way if at all, did your own goals change with regard to degree objective, program content, or career aims during your program of study here? Why?

5. In what way or ways was your U.S. program of studies especially relevant or irrelevant as a means of preparing for employment in your home country?

6. Give names and titles of any members of the faculty of your institution who showed particular understanding and interest in Africa or developing areas generally:

7. From your standpoint as an African student, how would you describe the social environment at your university and in the local community?

8. Would you recommend that other African participants be placed in the same department? In the same university? For what reasons, principally?

9. Did you participate in any practical training programs or summer intern-type programs? If so, please describe briefly. If not, do you think you should have? What was (or would have been) the value of such activities to you?

10. Please evaluate the PARTNERS program services with regard to orientation, counelling, finances, etc. Your frank comment and suggestions for improvement will be appreciated.

11. What type of position do you expect to hold when you return to your home country? (If you have already returned, what position do you now hold?) Is this position appropriate or inappropriate to the level you have reached in your studies? Do you believe you will be (or are) in any way over-qualified or under-qualified for the position? Would you have been better off with a degree from an African or European university?

12. Additional Comments:

SIGNATURE_____ DATE_____

APPENDIX D: DISTINGUISHED AFGRAD ALUMNI AWARDEES

DISTINGUISHED AFGRAD ALUMNI AWARDS

AWARD YEAR	NAME	COUNTRY	AFGRAD UNIVERSITY	FIELD OF STUDY DEGREE/YEAR	EMPLOYMENT AT TIME OF AWARD
1985	Ibrahim, Abdelaiz ElTayeb	SUDAN	Univ. of Minnesota	Veterinary Ph.D. 7/76	Dean and Professor Preventive Medicine and Veterinary Public Health Public Health College University of Khartoum
1986	Atsain, Achi	COTE D'IVOIRE	SUNY, Albany	Economics Ph.D. 1976	Directur CIRES Universite Nationale de Cote d'Ivoire
1987	Andriamananjars, Rajaona	MADAGASCAR	Univ. of Michigan	Economics M.A. 12/68 Ph.D. 5/71	Director-General Institute of Madagascar for Techniques of Planning (IMATEP) Antananarivo
1987	Matambo, Ontefetse K.	BOTSWANA	Williams College	Development Economics M.A. 1975	Director of Economic Affairs at the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning
1988	Adalemo, Isaac A.	NIGERIA	Univ. of Michigan	Geography Ph.D. 1974	Deputy Vice-Chancellor University of Lagos

APPENDIX E: LIST OF DEAN'S COMMITTEE

AFRICAN GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
administered by
THE AFRICAN-AMERICAN INSTITUTE

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF GRADUATE DEANS

Dr. Jules B. LaPidus	President, The Council of Graduate Schools in the U.S.	Medicinal Chemistry
Dr. Clara I. Adams	Dean, School of Graduate Studies, Morgan State University	Physical Chemistry
Dr. John Dowling	Dean of the Graduate School, University of Georgia, Athens	Romance Languages
Dr. Robert E. Gordon	Vice President for Advanced Studies, University of Notre Dame	Biology
Dr. Russell G. Hamilton, Jr.	Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, Vanderbilt University	Romance Languages
Dr. Barbara C. Hansen	Vice Chancellor for Graduate Studies and Research, University of Maryland, Baltimore, Graduate School	Physiology and Psychology
Dr. Lee B. Jones	Executive Vice President and Provost, University of Nebraska, Lincoln	Chemistry
Dr. George G. Karas	Associate Dean of the Graduate College, Iowa State University	Psychology
Dr. Madelyn M. Lockhart	Associate Dean, Graduate Studies, University of Florida	Economics
Dr. William H. Macmillan	Dean, Graduate School University of Alabama	Biomedical Sciences
Dr. Allan G. Marr	Dean of Graduate Studies and Research, University of California, Davis	Microbiology
Dr. John P. Noonan	Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Kansas State University	English
Dr. Ann M. Spearing	Associate Dean, Graduate School, University of Vermont	Plant Physiology, Biophysics
Dr. Gustave O. Arlt	Chairman Emeritus (deceased) Executive Committee of Graduate Deans	Germanic Languages

MINUTES OF THE REVIEW OF THE AFGRAD-III MID-TERM EVALUATION

Dates: December 9 and 12, 1988

Places: Room 3676 NS and 2637 NS

Participants:
Brian Kline, AFR/TR
Cameron Bonner, AFR/TR/EHR
Judith Shampain, AFR/TR/EHR
Norm Green, AFR/TR/EHR
Elizabeth McDavid, OIT/PETA
Elizabeth Carter, OIT/PETA
Annette Adams, GC/AFR
Jay Knott, GC/AFR
Rudy Thomas, AFR/CCWA
Paul Kimmel, Consultant
Randy Roeser, AFR/PD/SA (chair)

I. Overview

The African Graduate Fellowship Program (AFGRAD) was intiated in 1963, and is one of A.I.D.'s oldest ongoing participant training programs. The third phase, AFGRAD-III (Project 698-0455), was authorized on March 8, 1985, at the level of $42,000,000 (core funding plus buy-ins). The project purpose is to provide qualified men and women to staff key African institutions in priority development fields. This is being accomplished through U.S. training at the undergraduate, graduate, and post-graduate levels. AFGRAD-III was designed to finance student intakes for the academic years of 1985-86 through 1989-90. To date, $23,300,000 million have been obligated. Funding is channeled through a cooperative agreement with the African-American Institute (AAI) which manages the recruitment, placement, monitoring, and support of AFGRAD-III participants. The PACD is September 30, 1994.

A mid-term evaluation of the project was conducted during the fourth quarter of FY-88 under an IQC Delivery Order with Creative Associates. The evaluation report was submitted in November 1988. The AID/W review of the evaluation took place on December 9 and 12.

The review of the AFGRAD-III mid-term evaluation was divided into two parts. The bulk of the time was devoted to discussing a series of recommendations relating to the operations of AFGRAD-III and developing a committee consensus on actions to be taken under the current project or to be considered in the design of a new AFGRAD project. Dr. Kimmel of Creative Associates, who was the team leader for the evaluation,

75

participated in this part of the review. The operational recommendations from the evaluation report and the corresponding decisions reached by the review committee are set forth in Section II, below. Based on these decisions, AFR/TR/EHR will prepare an Evaluation Summary.

The second part of the review took into consideration the evaluation's broader recommendations concerning the continuation of the AFGRAD program beyond AFGRAD-III. Dr. Kimmel did not participate in this part of the review. Section III summarizes the results of the committee's discussion of these strategic recommendations.

II. Operational Recommendations

1. Improve program publicity - especially for women, private sector, and post-graduate students.

Decision: AFR should work this into new project design. May require additional level of effort/budget for project field staff.

2. Form selection committees in all countries.

Decision: AFR should look at this in new project design. Formal committees may not be necessary in all countries, especially smaller ones. If problem is insufficient screening of candidates, there may be other, more practical solutions.

3. Establish clear definition of "private sector" for student recruitment purposes.

Decision: The PP for a subsequent project should include an operational definition (albeit a broad one) which, in addition to aiding recruitment, will allow meaningful measurement of attainment of the project's private sector target.

4. Improve pre-departure orientations and require attendance. Get alumni involved.

5. Ensure adequate U.S. orientation - especially for off-cycle arrivals.

Decision: AFR/TR/EHR will request AAI to try to strengthen orientation, starting with the 1989 intake, especially making use of the Washington International Center. Also, AAI will be requested to perform a small study of orientation methods and prepare recommendations for improvements which could be implemented under a future project.

76'

6. Keep work load of AAI program officers to 80 participants or less. Visit every campus with 3 or more participants at least once a year.

Decision: AFR/TR/EHR will request AAI to provide to A.I.D. a plan for attaining and maintaining a reasonable workload and level of student support over the remainder of the current project, as well as an estimate of any additional costs that this plan may entail. Furthermore, in evaluating any future proposals for administrative support services for AFGRAD, A.I.D. should carefully review the efficiency of the proposed management arrangements.

7. Accept exceptional students from 3-year Africa undergraduate programs and provide remedial courses as needed.

Decision: AFR/TR/EHR will instruct AAI to pay close attention to the educational backgrounds of three-year students and to negotiate appropriate remedial programs with universities.

8. Authorize allowances for personal computers. Increase book shipping allowance.

Decision: The committee decided against seeking general exceptions to A.I.D. allowance policies for AFGRAD, so that all A.I.D. funded participants will continue to be treated on an equal footing. AFR/TR/EHR will ensure that AAI is aware of A.I.D./OIT policy regarding allowances for personal computers (allowable when university requires them) and will instruct AAI to disseminate this information to students and universities. If AAI believes the book shipping allowance is inadequate, it should present specific evidence for OIT to take into consideration when reviewing the level of the allowance.

9. Drop requirement that undergrads live in dormitories.

Decision: Again, the committee did not agree with the establishment of special rules for AFGRAD. However, AFR/TR, in collaboration with OIT and GC, will explore the possibility of delegating to AFR/TR/EHR the authority to approve exceptions to this requirement.

10. Provide matching funds for students to attend professional meetings when presenting papers.

11. Allow participants to attend short courses for credit off campus.

Decision: As part of a new project design, AFR should consider giving the contractor/recipient authority and budget to approve funding for meetings and short courses.

71

12. Clarify tax regulations. If participants are liable to pay taxes, AID should pay on behalf of participants.

Decision: The Agency is looking at ways to deal with this problem which affects all U.S. participant training programs and it is expected that Agency-wide guidance will be issued. Meanwhile, GC/AFR will look into precedents within A.I.D. for increasing stipends to compensate for tax liabilities and will report to AFR/TR/EHR.

13. Revise standard durations of study programs: 28 mos. for MA, 54 mos. for PhD, after completion of English training.

Decision: The committee felt that, in the interest of cost containment, A.I.D. should encourage participants to complete their degree programs within the current standard durations, while recognizing that some master's degree students require extra time for thesis writing. The committee did agree that the amount of time allowed for English training prior to initiation of the degree programs (now fixed at 12 months for undergraduates and 6 months for graduate students from non-Anglophone countries) should be made more flexible. Consequently, AFR/TR/EHR, in consultation with SER/OP and AFR/PD/SA, will initiate the appropriate actions to revise the cooperative agreement to establish the standard training periods under AFGRAD-III as follows: 24 mos. for nonthesis MA (28 with thesis) after English training; 48 mos. for PhD after English training.

14. Submit report on first three academic years and annual reports thereafter.

Decision: AFR/TR/EHR will request AAI to provide, by a specified date, a report covering the period from the last report to the present, and to provide annual reports regularly thereafter, as called for by the cooperative agreement. If deadline is missed, AFR/TR/EHR will discuss actions to be taken with SER/OP.

15. Revise questionnaire for returning students.

16. Set up data base for 1983 survey of AFGRAD alumni, analyze data, and develop more focused questionnaire for 1993 survey.

Decision: AFR/TR/EHR will instruct AAI to implement these two recommendations.

17. Conduct impact evaluation of AFGRAD.

Decision: AFR should address this in the design of a new AFGRAD project.

18. Publicize and increase number of distinguished alumni awards.

Decision: AFR/TR/EHR will instruct AAI to implement this recommendation.

III. Strategic Recommendations

The evaluation report concluded that:

(a) The AFGRAD program should be continued.

(b) The current system of country training quotas funded out of "core" project funds with a provision for Mission buy-ins for additional training should also be continued.

(c) Training should continue to be provided at all levels (undergraduate through post-graduate). Emphasis should be at the masters level. Undergraduate training should be limited to countries with few or no post-secondary institutions, and PhD training should generally be restricted to persons who will return to university or research positions.

The committee agreed that the Bureau should pursue the design of a fourth phase of AFGRAD, based on its effective operation to date, the cost savings from tuition waivers, and the continuing training needs in African countries. (A major extension of AFGRAD-III is not considered an option because the project already has an LOP of 9-1/2 years and because, as indicated below, there are issues which need to be examined which could result in important changes in the design of the program, e.g., greater use of buy-ins.) It was noted that the justification for continuation was weakened somewhat by the fact that there has never been a comprehensive and rigorous evaluation of the development impact of the AFGRAD program, which began in 1963. AFR/TR responded that there is general research which demonstrates the value of this type of training and which could be cited in establishing a rationale for further A.I.D. investment in this area. At the same time, there was general agreement on the need to include an impact evaluation in the early stages of a new project.

The issue was raised of whether AFGRAD is consistent with the Bureau's evolving training strategy as embodied in HRDA. This strategy emphasizes in-country and third-country training and the strengthening of African training institutions. AFR/TR stated that AFGRAD is complementary to HRDA. Over the medium term, the capacity of African training institutions to absorb participants will remain limited. Moreover, there are fields of study and specialties, particularly at the graduate level, for which there are no African degree programs. AFGRAD can

help fill these gaps. Finally, it was noted that AFGRAD supports an important participant training objective of exposing Africans to the cultural, social, and political environment of the U.S.

On the question of core funding versus buy-ins, AFR/TR acknowledged that the present AFGRAD system is out of sync with the current Bureau emphasis on funding regional projects through buy-ins. It was also noted that the AFGRAD core funds have been spread across virtually all AFR countries in contrast to recent Bureau strategies to concentrate resources in certain categories of countries. Some committee members pointed out that, in certain countries with very small OYB's, AFGRAD was the main A.I.D. presence and development activity. It was agreed that these features of AFGRAD will have to be re-examined in the context of a new project design.

The timing of a new project was also discussed. AFGRAD-III currently covers student intakes through the 1989-90 academic year. In order to accommodate the recruitment and placement of the 1990-91 class, the new project would have to be designed, reviewed, and authorized and the contractor/cooperative agreement recipient would have to be selected and funds obligated, all by April 1989. Clearly, this is not feasible.

The committee recommended the dual design strategy of (a) a short extension of AFGRAD-III and the cooperative agreement with AAI to cover the class of 1990-91 intake, and (b) design of a new project to begin with the 1991-92 intake. The "bridging" extension of AFGRAD-III can probably be accomplished within the current authorized funding level of $42 million, since the estimated cost of funding the program through the 1989-90 class is $36,800,000 (including both core funds and buy-ins). The extension should be accomplished by March 1989. Design work on AFGRAD-IV should begin in the second quarter of FY-89 with the objective of obtaining PP approval and authorization by the first quarter of FY-90 and obligation of funds by the end of the second quarter or early third quarter of FY-90.

clearances:
BKline, AFR/TR (draft)
CBonner, AFR/TR/EHR (draft)
JShampain, AFR/TR/EHR (draft)
ECarter, OIT/PETA (draft)
JKnott, GC/AFR (draft)
RThomas, AFR/CCWA (draft)
CRozell, AFR/PD/SA (draft)

drafted: RRbeser:1/5/89:eld:4603L