

PD-ARM-026
96863

**Georgetown University's
East Central Europe
Scholarship Program (ECESP)**

A Program Review

June 1994

Prepared by:

John A. Gillies
Development Specialists

for

Aguirre International
PTPE Monitoring and Evaluation Contractor
United States Agency for International Development
Contract Number: EUR-0045-C-00-3027-00

Georgetown University ECESP Program— A Program Review

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Introduction	1
Background	1
Program Description	1
Evaluation Methodology	3
The Training Program	6
Strategy and Relationship to USAID Program	6
Selection	6
Placement	7
Orientation	8
English Language Training	9
Homestays	12
Management and Logistics Support	13
Academic Programs	13
Internships	14
Follow-on	15
Participant Satisfaction with the Training Program	16
Recommendations to Improve the Training Program	17
Outcomes and Impact of the Training Program	18
Completion Status	18
Measuring Impact of Training	18
Personal Impact of Training	19
Employment Status	19
Career Impact of Training	20
Relevance and Utilization of Training in Current Job	20
Accomplishments of Returned Participants	21
Multiplier Effect	22
Overall Assessment of Impact by Program Type	22
Program Costs	24
Findings and Recommendations	28

List of Tables

Table 1.	ECESP Participants by Country and Program Type.....	1
Table 2.	ECESP Training Cycles by Type of Program.....	2
Table 3.	Highest Level of Education by Program Type.....	3
Table 4.	Average Number of Years of Previous Employment.....	3
Table 5.	ECESP Cycles by Survey Respondents.....	4
Table 6.	Participant Satisfaction with Program Orientation.....	9
Table 7.	Identified Problems in English.....	10
Table 8.	Participants' Follow-on Activities.....	16
Table 9.	Participant Satisfaction with the Program.....	16
Table 10.	Degree to Which Training Objectives Were Accomplished.....	17
Table 11.	Perceived Relevance of the Training Program to the Home Situation.....	17
Table 12.	Completion Status of Participants.....	18
Table 13.	Understanding U.S. Institutions.....	19
Table 14a.	Employment Status of Returnees.....	19
Table 14b.	Employment Status of Returnees by Sector.....	20
Table 15.	Quality of Employment.....	20
Table 16.	Relevance of Training to Current Job.....	20
Table 17.	Usefulness of the Training in the Current Job.....	21
Table 18.	Accomplishments of Returned Participants.....	21
Table 19.	Level of Impact Achieved.....	22
Table 20.	Cost of Training.....	24
Table 21.	Total Cost Per Participant Training Month—Expenditures to Date.....	26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PURPOSE

This report is one of a series of monitoring and evaluation reports on the component activities of the Participant Training Program for Europe (PTPE). The objective of the monitoring and evaluation project is to improve PTPE project decision-making by providing USAID with accurate, timely information on program management, the training process and training programs, program impact, and cost-effectiveness. The monitoring and evaluation studies are conducted by Aguirre International and Development Specialists International under contract to the Europe and Newly Independent States (ENI) Bureau of USAID.

This report reviews the overall program of the East and Central Europe Scholarship Program (ECESP), a SEED Act Program, implemented and managed since 1990 by Georgetown University under a legislative earmark. The goal of the ECESP is to promote and facilitate the processes of privatization and democratization at the grass roots level in Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and the Slovak Republic. The program operates under Georgetown University's Center for Intercultural Education and Development (CIED) directed by Father Julio Giulietti, S.J., with Maria Pryshlak, Ph.D., as the ECESP Program Director.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

ECESP has three areas of training: Rural Managers, Teachers, and Senior Managers/Public Administrators. To date, a total of 255 participants have entered the ECESP Program, of which 204 have been Rural Managers, 36 have been Teachers, and 15 have been Senior Managers.

- The Rural Managers is the largest group, comprising 80 percent of the total number of participants. The program currently consists of six months of English language training in Europe followed by 12- to 24-month non-degree programs in business and economics in the U.S. This program has evolved since 1990 to target participants with higher levels of education and more experience.
- The Teacher Program, started in 1992, aims to retrain secondary and college level Teachers from the participating countries and enable them to teach market-oriented economics and business courses. The program consists of English language training in Europe, followed by a one-year, non-degree program in the U.S. The participants spend one semester at a small college or university and one semester at Georgetown.
- The Senior Manager/Public Administrator Program, also started in 1992, is designed to help top-level administrators and managers from public and private sectors involved in the processes of democratization and privatization upgrade their professional skills. The programs consist of six- to twelve-month non-degree training programs, mostly at Georgetown University.

METHODOLOGY

This evaluation is based on multiple sources of information: the participant biographical database; interviews with ECESP staff, USAID officials, training providers, employers and sponsors, and participants; mid-term, exit, and returnee questionnaires; and Training Cost Analysis (TCA) data submitted by ECESP. Mid-term questionnaires are administered only to long-term participants when the program is about 40 percent completed. Exit questionnaires are administered at the end of the training program, before the participants leave the U.S. The first of the returnee questionnaires are administered after the

participants have been back in their home country for at least six months, and at six-month intervals thereafter. This program review incorporates the results of interim reports on program management and internship activities, and a site visit to Poland. Despite the multiple sources of information, a caveat is necessary. Because the program had been operating for three years prior to the initiation of the monitoring/evaluation activity, the mid-term and exit questionnaires are only available for the more recent graduates. The number of completed returnee questionnaires is also limited; 50 of 148 returned participants have submitted the first returnee questionnaire at the time of this report. Only the first of three anticipated questionnaires has been distributed, so the longer term impacts of the program are not yet measured. Participant interviews have been conducted in only one country to date—Poland, which has the largest participant training program.

At the time of this evaluation, the process data (mid-term, exit questionnaires) are weighted toward more recent groups of participants and the impact data (returnee questionnaires, field visit) are weighted toward the earliest groups (1990–1991), who were younger and with lower levels of education than the groups who started training in 1992 and later. Finally, the Rural Managers group is so much larger than the other two groups that the sheer numbers may influence the variability of outcomes and impact.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This program assessment covers three interrelated topics:

Program Performance and Impact. The key questions are: Has the program achieved what was expected? How can the program implementation be improved?

Program Strategy and Design. The key questions are: Is the current program supportive of USAID strategic objectives in Eastern Europe? How does the current project design affect program performance and impact?

Cost-effectiveness. The key questions are: Are the ECESP Program costs reasonable given the nature of the training? Is the program cost-effective?

Program Performance and Impact

■ *Has the program achieved what was expected?*

At the time of this report, a total of 255 people have started or have completed the ECESP Program, out of the anticipated total of 315. The additional 60 participants (7 scheduled for Cycle D and 53 scheduled for Cycle E) were not programmed on time and will be placed this year. Of the 255 people currently in the program, 107 participants are still active and 148 participants have completed the program. Of the latter group, 80 percent successfully completed the program; 9 percent finished without successfully completing the requirements (and were given a certificate of attendance); 7 percent did not return to their home country; and 4 percent were terminated or resigned. Several participants have returned to the U.S., but the exact number is unknown. All of the less successful participants have been from the Rural Manager group.

While the unsuccessful outcomes of 20 percent of the program—all from a single group—are not insignificant, the overall performance of the ECESP Program has been good. Most of the returned participants have successfully completed the program with grades in the 2.5 to 3.5 GPA range. Most participants have returned to apply their training at home. For some participants, the ECESP experience has literally transformed their lives and should vastly increase their contribution to society. The best of the returned participants embody the most optimistic goals of this type of program—creative and energetic people who have returned with the skills, knowledge, and motivation to stimulate change in their organizations and in the people around them. For others, the project created dreams that could not be realized.

The problems in the program are directly related to the strategic decision to focus on rural managers, who constitute the majority of the ECESP participants. The outcomes of the training, and findings of this report, are sharply differentiated among the three different programs. The Senior Managers and Teachers are consistently more successful programs by all measures, whereas the Rural Manager program is more problematical in most areas. The Rural Managers are most likely to fail to complete the program, to fail to return to the home country, are the most difficult to arrange internships for, and are a primary contributing factor in the language training problems. They are most likely to be unable to find suitable employment and least likely to find the training relevant to their job needs. It should be noted that the difficulties with the Rural Manager group are not limited to the earliest groups, but rather are also found, albeit to varying degrees, in all Rural Manager groups.

■ *How can the program implementation be improved?*

Overall, the ECESP Program is currently well managed by dedicated staff in the U.S. and Europe and has the strong support of participants, training providers, and sponsors/employers in Europe. Program management in the first several years was marred by misunderstandings, late submission of proposals and budgets, and deviations from some USAID participant training regulations. This was exacerbated by poor relations with the USAID program managers and unclear lines of authority created by the earmark process. Some of these problems have been resolved, others are still concerns of the USAID project manager.

The procedural disputes notwithstanding, by normal standards of implementation performance, the program is doing well. The procedures for selection, placement, and monitoring are reasonably well established and implemented, and the majority of the participants successfully complete the program. Many of the implementation issues are directly related to the project design of training Rural Managers, and the management challenges of meeting the training needs of this group. The design issue is discussed below. The issues relating to the overall implementation of the project are relatively small and easily addressable.

- Internships need to be initiated early, with substantial participation from the participants, and with considerable guidance from the ECESP staff.
- Orientation is generally of good quality. The only recurring issue is that participants need more advance notice of travel dates.
- Homestays are a useful and desirable activity, but must be very carefully managed. ECESP needs to provide better guidelines for selection and management of the host families.
- English Language Training has been controversial because a large majority of the candidates fail to meet the *Handbook 10* test standards. This issue needs to be revisited by USAID in light of decisions on project objectives and target groups, particularly of the Rural Managers group. The *Handbook 10* ALI/GU EPT standards do not appear to be a good predictor of participant success and should be reconsidered, again in the context of project design and strategy decisions.
- The project currently is based on non-degree programs. While this type of program seems appropriate and useful for the Teachers and the Senior Managers, the relevance and utility of this design for the Rural Managers is less clear. Again, clarity as to the objectives of the program will help drive decisions on training design.
- ECESP management attention to the timely submission of complete, accurate project documents should be increased.
- Procedures and responsibilities for country clearances and the appropriate role for the USAID representatives in each country should be clearly established and understood by all

parties—the USAID project manager, ECESP program managers, and the country representatives.

Program Strategy and Design

■ *Is the current program supportive of USAID strategic objectives in Central and Eastern Europe?*

The ECESP project strategy and design were developed prior to the USAID strategic planning process in Europe. The program itself predates USAID involvement in Europe. Therefore, the ECESP activities are not an outgrowth of the strategic objectives, but rather a parallel development. USAID project managers are concerned that the ECESP Program does not adequately support mission objectives.

The answer to this question and to the previous question of whether the program has achieved what was expected, is difficult because the program objectives and expectations are very broadly defined. The lack of clarity of training program objectives and specificity of expected outcomes results in a situation in which most types of training are generally supportive of the strategic objectives. The basis for establishing clear priorities among alternative training modes and target groups is not well developed, and training is not tightly integrated into the strategic framework. Development of clear training objectives, training strategies, and training project design is necessary to adequately guide these activities. It should be noted that the ECESP Program is not unique in this aspect—it applies to most components of the PTP project.

The unique status of ECESP as a legislative earmark clearly complicates the challenge of fashioning clear objectives and priorities. In this case, the determination of appropriate strategy and project design has not followed a standard USAID process. USAID/ENI should initiate a substantive review of objectives and priorities with the ECESP program managers.

In a broad sense, the program is consistent with the strategic objectives—all of the activities and accomplishments fall under the umbrella categories of the strategic objectives. In a more specific sense, the question might be rephrased to ask whether this program, in its current design, is a priority under these strategic objectives. This is not a question that can be answered by an evaluation. What this study can do is to identify the implementation, impact, and cost implications of the current strategy and leave the question of priority to the decision-makers.

■ *How does the current project design affect program performance and output?*

The ECESP project design directly affects the overall program performance. The most critical element of the ECESP project is the Rural Manager component. The Rural Manager group is inherently higher risk, and lower return, than are the other groups. The costs of implementing the program, detailed below, reflect the nature of the group as much as, or more than, any particular failing in the ECESP management of the program. These results can reasonably be expected in any group like the Rural Managers.

The Rural Managers are:

- higher risk of non-completion
- higher risk of non-return
- higher cost of ELT to reach the language goals
- less likely to be employed
- less likely to find the training relevant
- less likely to find the training useful in current job
- harder to place in appropriate internships
- less likely to be satisfied with the program
- less likely to feel that the training objectives were achieved

The issue is not whether these results are an indicator of bad management. Rather, the core issue in the ECESP Program can be stated as follows: “Is the Rural Manager program of sufficient importance to achieving the foreign policy objectives of the U.S., as defined by the mission strategic objectives, as to justify the costs of implementing such a program?” If the answer to this question is “Yes,” the follow-up question is: “What are the specific objectives of the Rural Manager program and how can the project design be adapted to achieve those objectives?”

If the Rural Managers are in fact a priority in the context of the strategic objectives, then costs of the program in terms of language, non-completion, etc., are simply part of the risk inherent in meeting the training needs of this challenging group. The next step is to clearly define the objectives of the Rural Manager program and to adjust the project design accordingly.

■ *What are some of the design issues of the Rural Manager groups?*

Clarity in objectives and expected outcomes is most notably lacking in the Rural Manager program—far more so than in the other two ECESP Programs. If the objective is to facilitate rural transformation—to promote rural development by creating a cadre of Rural Managers—then success is unlikely. The economic policy reforms in Eastern Europe over the past several years, particularly in Poland, have seriously undermined the viability of the rural areas, particularly in agricultural related activities. Few of the returned participants have found meaningful employment in their rural villages—most end up going to the city to find work with American firms or the government, or staying in their villages and teaching, or starting (very) small businesses. Rural development is going against the flow of reform and is likely to be particularly unstable in the near future as the state-owned factories that have formed the economic backbone of rural communities are privatized or go bankrupt.

If the purpose of the program is to create a cadre of small entrepreneurs, then the program should be structured to meet these needs. This would probably entail a different selection and programming process, and possibly an expanded follow-on effort. In overall strategic terms, the issue would be whether a U.S. training program is the appropriate vehicle to achieve this goal. The total number of small businesses that could conceivably be initiated through this program is insignificant in the context of the CEE economies. A more effective strategy for achieving this goal would be to develop local capacity for delivering this training.

If the purpose of the program is to meet the needs of the Rural Managers and help them improve their skills and find appropriate employment to fully use the skills, then the program should probably be degree oriented. The addition of a U.S. degree will greatly increase the employability of the program graduates and increase the likelihood that they will work in the field of training. However, again the issue of strategic importance would be raised—is this an employment program? Another rationale for the program would be the equity concern—all of the other training activities focus on a stratum of society who already speak English and have access to opportunity and advancement. The ECESP Rural Manager program is the only activity that offers such opportunities to a broader cross-section of society.

The answer to the question of priorities in strategic objectives is not a matter of analysis as much as a matter of policy. However, once this determination is made, the objectives should be clear and the project design should be consistent with the objectives.

Cost-Effectiveness

■ *Is the program cost-effective?*

Cost-effectiveness is a measure of the relative cost of alternatives to achieve a specified objective. In the case of ECESP and other components of the PTPE project, the objectives and anticipated outcomes of the

training are not clearly specified. Without a clear “finish line,” it is not possible to know when the project has arrived. Given this situation, the approach taken in the evaluation of the PTPE project is to establish a set of standards for outcome and impact that will apply to all aspects of the program (a progressive set of “finish lines”), measure the achievements of the PTPE component activities against these standards, and then compare the relative costs against the relative achievements. To date, the data collected on the full range of PTPE activities is not sufficient for such a comparison. Therefore, the best option at this point is to assess program performance and then determine whether the costs are reasonable in the context of the project design and performance.

■ *Are the ECESP Program costs reasonable, given the nature of the training?*

Participant training expenses are calculated in terms of cost per participant training month (one participant for one training month) for training and administrative expenses. In the case of ECESP, two calculations are necessary to distinguish between the cost of the ELT program in Europe and the cost of the training in the U.S. No other activity in the PTPE project incurs in-country language training costs.

- The cost for the training in the U.S. is \$1,317 per participant training month for the period through December 31, 1993. The total participant costs were \$4,313,530 and the total number of participant months in the U.S. was 3,275.
- The cost for in-country ELT program was approximately \$893 per participant month. The total program cost in-country was \$1,045,055 and the total number of ELT training months was 1,170. The ELT program represents almost 20 percent of the total program costs.
- The total administrative costs are approximately \$369 per participant training month in the U.S. (This figure is slightly high, as it does not account for administrative time spent in support of the ELT program. The available data was not adequate to make this distinction.)
- The total cost share contributions as of December 31, 1993, were \$1,182,658, of a total projected cost share budget of \$1,425,236. This represents a projected 11.5 percent of the total ECESP program cost. Most of the cost-sharing is applied to the participant costs, representing 13 percent of the total ECESP program costs. Cost sharing for the administrative costs has exceeded the budgeted amount by 162 percent.
- If the cost calculations are adjusted for the failed programs (non-return, non-completion, termination, etc.) to cover only the successful training months, the cost per successful U.S. training month increases to \$1,665 and the cost of successful ELT training months increases to \$990.
- The training costs are reasonable for the type of training provided in small, rural campuses. The average cost of tuition and fees through December 31, 1993, was \$524 per participant training month. This is less than the full-time nonresident student tuition rates at most of the training institutions.

SUMMARY

Overall, the ECESP Program has been adequately implemented and has achieved a reasonable level of outputs and impact at reasonable program cost, given the nature of the training groups. The program can be improved in several areas, including internship management and timely submission of documents and budgets. The continuing disputes with USAID project managers over regulations and procedures need to be resolved jointly by establishing clear, reasonable standards and expectations for performance. Expectations for the ELT program, in particular, need to be realistic in the context of the target groups.

The related issues of program strategy and training design are much more significant than the implementation issues and will affect every other aspect of the program. The nature of the groups to be trained, the specific selection criteria (including language capability), the objectives of the training, and, consequently, the design of the training programs are critical issues of strategy and priority. These issues are at the heart of much of the on-going disputes about this program.

ECESP is a legislative earmark program. The evaluators recognize that this considerably complicates the process of developing strategies and applying priorities. However, in the absence of mutually acceptable objectives, the ECESP component cannot be effectively managed, designed, or evaluated. It should be noted, however, that any strategy developed for the ECESP should be in the context of a broad strategic framework for training in CEE countries that establishes clear priorities and standards that apply equally to all components of the PTPE Program. An overall training strategy would provide a valuable focus to the USAID training activities in the CEE countries.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

This evaluation of the East and Central Europe Scholarship Program (ECESP) at Georgetown University is part of an overall series of evaluation studies of the implementing organizations for the PTPE Project. The evaluation is an on-going activity designed to provide both process and impact evaluation information. This report is based on the information collected to date through the biographical database; Mid-term, Exit, and Returnee Questionnaires; interviews with USAID and ECESP Program managers; interim reports on the 1993 internships and program management; Training Cost Analysis (TCA) data provided by ECESP; and in-country interviews in Poland with participants, program managers, mission staff, and employer/sponsors. The impact data is limited to the results of the first of three returnee questionnaires.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Georgetown University East Central European Scholarship Program (ECESP) was started in 1990 with the goal "to promote and facilitate the processes of democratization and privatization at the grass roots level." The program was funded through a \$2 million legislative earmark in the Congressional Appropriations Act of 1990, and later developed and modified as a

subcategory of Section 402 of the SEED Act of 1989. The Cooperative Agreement has been amended twice to extend the project termination date, include additional funding, and expand the program from Poland and Hungary to include the Slovak Republic and the Czech Republic. Currently, the project has been extended to June 10, 1997 and has a total budget of \$10,962,000.

The ECESP Program operates in four countries—Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and the Slovak Republic. To date, a total of 255 participants have entered the program and initiated training. (A further 60 participants have been authorized and will be selected and placed.) Of the total participants, 148 have completed or terminated the program, and 107 are still active. The Poland program is the largest, with 153 participants, or 60 percent of the total. Hungary has the next largest program, followed by the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. The program has evolved over the past four years to target three major types of participants: Rural Managers, Teachers, and Senior Managers/Public Administrators. The Rural Managers form the bulk of the program, with 80 percent of the total number of participants. The Teachers are the next largest, followed by the relatively small Senior Manager group.

The ECESP Program plans and budgets are based on an estimated total of 314 participants in Cycles A through E to be trained from 1990–1996. The program was unable to program and place all of the anticipated number on schedule. An additional 7 participants programmed for Cycle D and 53 participants programmed for Cycle E will be placed at least one year behind schedule.

Rural Managers: The purpose of the Rural Managers program is "to educate a core of managers and experts in marketing, trade, finance, and banking who are dedicated to democratic values and the economic restructuring of their nature regions, and to facilitate the processes of democratization and privatization in East Central Europe and stimulate the growth of healthy rural communities." This is a 12–24 month

Table 1
ECESP Participants by Country and Program Type

Country	Rural	Senior	Teachers	Total
	Managers	Managers		
Czech Republic	24	2	9	35
Hungary	37	1	8	46
Poland	131	8	14	153
Slovak Republic	12	4	5	21
Total	204	15	36	255

Source: Participant Biographical Database

certificate program of study and training in business which began in 1990. Six months of intensive English as a Second Language in the home country is provided to participants with limited English language skills, followed by 12–18 months of education and internships in the U.S. The courses are concentrated in management, marketing, banking, finance, or commerce. In the first group, the training was focused on agriculture, but the program has concentrated on business, management, marketing, banking, finance, or commerce in the later groups. The first groups were placed in community colleges for 18–24 month non-degree programs, supplemented with internships. Later, the two-year colleges were phased out and participants were placed in small, rural campuses of state university systems that offer both two- and four-year degree programs.

Teachers: The purpose of the Faculty Program is “to retrain secondary and college level Teachers from the participating countries and enable them to teach market-oriented economics and business courses.” The program began in 1991 to support privatization efforts in the CEE countries. Teachers spend one semester at a U.S. college observing courses in management, marketing, economics, finance, or banking, which they will then introduce into the curriculum in their own schools. They also visit agribusinesses, cooperatives, and financial institutions to gain first-hand knowledge and observe practical applications of the management principles. They study the problems of privatization and a free market economy at Georgetown University for the final semester. During this final semester, they prepare a textbook for a new course to introduce in their home country.

Table 2
ECESP Training Cycles by Type of Program

Training Cycle	Dates	Total	Women	Men
A09 Rural Mgrs	9/90–8/92	51	15	36
B02 Rural Mgrs	2/92–3/93	10	2	8
C01 Teachers	1/92–12/92	10	3	7
C01 Rural Mgrs	1/92–7/93	48	12	36
C08 Senior Mgrs	8/92–8/93	6	2	4
C08 Teachers	8/92–8/93	9	6	3
C13 Teachers	1/93–1/94	5	3	2
C13 Senior Mgrs	1/93–1/94	1	1	0
D01 Rural Mgrs	1/93–8/94	57	14	43
D08 Senior Mgrs	8/93–2/94	1	0	1
D13 Teachers	1/94–1/95	12	5	7
D13 Senior Mgrs	1/94–8/95	7	1	6
E01 Rural Mgrs	1/94–1/95	11	2	9
	1/94–7/95	27	6	21
Total To Date		255	72	183
D Senior Mgrs	TBD	7	TBD	TBD
E Rural Mgrs	TBD	13	TBD	TBD
E Teachers	TBD	25	TBD	TBD
E Senior Mgrs	TBD	15	TBD	TBD
TOTAL Projected		315		

Note: TBD = to be determined. The remaining participants for Cycles D and E will be selected in 1994. Participants and funding for Cycle F is still in negotiation.
Source: Participant Biographical Database

Public Administrators and Senior Managers: The purpose of the Senior Manager program is “to help top-level administrators and managers involved in the processes of democratization and privatization upgrade their professional skills.” The Senior Manager program was initiated in 1992, with a focus on more experienced, high level administrators. The program is shorter than the other two, with participants spending four to five months at Georgetown University attending special seminars and workshops on management, public policy, and administration, followed by six to ten weeks of internships.

Participant Characteristics

Overall, about 28 percent of the ECESP participants have been women. The percentage of women varies with the program—almost half of the Teachers have been women compared to only about a quarter of both the Rural Managers and Senior Manager groups.

The great majority of the ECESP participants have been Rural Managers, the first groups of whom were predominately young, with relatively limited education, and from very rural areas with agricultural backgrounds. About 63 percent of the Rural Managers have had only a high school or vocational school education.

The Rural Managers have had an average of only 4.9 years of work experience prior to entering the program. As the program has evolved, more participants with MS/MA degrees have been recruited and the participants have had more work experience.

The Teachers are more experienced and more educated than the majority of the Rural Managers—all but one of the Teachers have either a Masters or Doctorate degree and have an average of 7.2 years of work experience prior to entering the program. The Senior Managers have

generally higher levels of experience, responsibility, and education than do the other groups, with an average of nine years work experience prior to entering the program.

Table 3
Highest Level of Education by Program Type

Level of Education	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
High School	42	0	0	42
Vocational School	86	0	1	87
Engineering	2	1	0	3
MA/MS	74	12	31	117
Ph.D.	0	2	4	6
Total	204	15	36	255

Source: Participant Biographical Database

Table 4
Average Number of Years of Previous Employment

Number of Years	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
None	8	0	0	8
1 to 5 Years	124	7	20	151
6 to 10 Years	47	2	6	55
Over 10 years	25	6	10	41
Average Years	4.9	9	7.2	5.5

Source: Participant Biographical Database

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The PTPE monitoring and evaluation contract reviews both the process and impact of the various training activities funded by the project. At the process level, the monitoring function maintains a comprehensive database on all participants during and after training and collects information on the program through mid-term and exit questionnaires. Outcome and impact data are collected through a series of three returnee questionnaires beginning six months after return and in-country site visits and interviews.

Assessment of the outcomes and impact of the program is measured on a progressive scale of increasingly important impacts. The progression of evaluation measures are:

- Program outcome—number of participants successfully completing the program, and percentage of unsuccessful, non-returnees, and dropouts.
- Participant satisfaction with training, perceived achievement of training objectives.
- Personal impact on participants—new skills, confidence, perspective.
- Employment and career impact—new or improved job, salary, or changed career path.

- Impact on employing organization at different levels—improved job performance, impact on co-workers (multiplier effect), improved performance in the organizational unit and changes in organizational structure, policy, or performance.
- Policy change at sector or national level.

This report on the ECESP Program is a review of the experience in the program to date based on multiple sources of information: biographical data and mid-term and exit questionnaires completed in the U.S.; returnee questionnaires from participants who have been home six months or more; a site visit to Poland to interview returned participants, program managers, and employer/sponsors; discussions with the ECESP Program managers at Georgetown University; interviews with USAID program managers and mission staff in Poland; and the findings of interim reports on program management and the 1993 internship activities. Participant data is from Georgetown University's database because the PTIS database was incomplete at the time of this report.

The information available to date is limited in some ways. The biodata reported were for the universe of the participants who have already started or completed training (255 people). However, the Exit questionnaires are only available for 27 participants, as most of the participants had left the U.S. before the evaluation system was established. Returnee Questionnaires were sent to all participants who had been back in their home countries for six months or longer (148 people), of which only 50 (33%) of the returned participants had been completed and returned at the time of this report. Only the first of three anticipated returnee questionnaires have been administered, so the longer term impacts of the program are not yet measured. Finally, participant interviews have been conducted in only one country to date—Poland, which has the largest participant training program. These interviews were conducted with a sample of the returned participants based on type of training and geographical considerations. About 45 percent of this sample was from the Rural Managers from Cycles A and B, with the majority being from Rural Managers, Senior Managers, and Teachers from Cycle C. It should be noted that that the in-country interviews are intended to provide supplemental information to better interpret the results of the returnee questionnaire.

Table 5
ECESP Cycles by Survey Respondents

Training Cycles	Dates	Total	Site Interview	Returnee Questionnaire	Exit Questionnaire
A09 Rural Mgrs	9/90–8/92	51	12	19	0
B02 Rural Mgrs	2/92–3/93	10	1	2	0
C01 Teachers	1/92–12/92	10	1	5	3
C01 Rural Mgrs	1/92–7/93	48	7	11	6
C08 Senior Mgrs	8/92–8/93	6	4	4	5
C08 Teachers	8/92–8/93	9	1	9	9
C13 Teachers	1/93–1/94	5	0	0	1
C13 Senior Mgrs	1/93–1/94	1	1	0	0
D01 Rural Mgrs	1/93–8/94	57	0	0	3
D08 Senior Mgrs	8/93–2/94	1	0	0	0
D13 Teachers	1/94–1/95	12	0	0	0
D13 Senior Mgrs	1/94–8/95	7	0	0	0
E01 Rural Mgrs	1/94–1/95	11	0	0	0
E01 Rural Mgrs	1/94–7/95	27	0	0	0
TOTAL		255	27	50	27

The result is that the process data (mid-term and exit questionnaires, internship review) is weighted toward more recent groups of participants and the impact data (returnee questionnaire, in-country interviews) are weighted toward the earliest groups (1990–91).

The makeup of the data sources is important because of the changes in the program since 1990. Participants from Cycle A and B Rural Managers were primarily young, from very rural areas, with agricultural backgrounds, and relatively low levels of education. As the program has evolved the training emphasis has been away from agricultural production toward agribusiness and business, and selection has focused increasingly on participants with higher levels of education. In 1991 and 1992, ECESP continued to select rural participants, but shifted from a strictly agricultural program to one with emphasis on agribusiness. Cycle C participants had the opportunity to expand their skills in the area of food processing and agricultural machine production and repair. Stress was placed on the management of agribusinesses, cooperatives and individual farms and the marketing of products. Participants in Cycle C received additional courses in export and import, as well as extensive training and computer applications in agribusiness.

The outcomes and impact from the early Cycle A and B groups are likely to differ from the later groups of Rural Managers who are older, with more experience, and with higher levels of education. Indeed, some of these differences are noted in this report. In some respects, the cycles do not differ significantly. Overall, having taken these limitations into consideration, the available data is adequate to provide a reasonable assessment of the program performance and impact for the groups involved. As more of the later groups return home and begin working, an assessment of their impact and accomplishments can be completed.

THE TRAINING PROGRAM

STRATEGY AND RELATIONSHIP TO USAID PROGRAM

The ECESP Program is unique among the many PTPE activities for two reasons: ECESP is a Congressional mandate ("carmark") and it predates significant on-ground USAID presence. As a result of these two characteristics, the strategy of the ECESP Program has not been closely coordinated with the mission strategic planning nor has the design been subject to the normal USAID procedures. The programmatic emphasis on rural and Senior Managers and Teachers is supportive of mission strategies in a general sense, but is not the result of specific decisions on priority areas of emphasis as are the other USAID activities in Europe. Communications and relations with the country offices have been minimal. Unlike the short-term training program, in which the country representative staff are directly involved in decisions on program emphasis and selection of participants, the ECESP Program operates in large part independently of the in-country missions. This lack of contact and involvement has been a source of friction with the field missions.

The overall priority areas for the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act legislation are Economic Restructuring, Democratic Institution Building, and Quality of Life. The specific program objectives in each participating country differ slightly, but all fit under the broad rubric of the SEED Act objectives. The USAID/Poland overall objective is "to support achievement by Poland of sustainable broad based economic growth with an open market and democratic system." The four specific areas of emphasis are (1) support private sector development; (2) assist development of the financial sector; (3) help transform the public sector to better support democratic development and a market economy; and (4) strengthen institutions essential for sustainable democracy.

In Poland, with the largest ECESP Program, the mission has concerns about the focus of the ECESP Program and the overall utility of long-term training. These concerns are primarily focused on the Rural Manager program. While some of the concerns are specific to the first groups, the broader issue is whether this type of training is, or should be, a mission priority. The Rural Manager program, in particular, is designed to provide skills at the mass level, where the needs far exceed the numbers that can or should be trained by USAID scholarship programs. They also question whether the mission should be doing any long-term training, particularly two-year, non-degree programs. They have expressed a strong preference for short-term training.

These questions will be reviewed in the evaluation in terms of both operational and impact issues. On the general issue of short and long term training, it is worth noting that these are very different activities with different expected impacts. Long-term training can achieve a degree of personal and professional transformation that is simply not possible with shorter programs. Short-term training can be carefully targeted to specific skill needs for particular jobs or organizational objectives. Both types of training can be useful in achieving the broad strategic objectives common to USAID missions, but both must be carefully defined and structured to accomplish the objectives.

SELECTION

Participants, administrators, and USAID/Poland training staff generally agree that the ECESP selection process has been effective and well-structured. The process is highly participatory, involving notables at both the local and national level. The recruitment and selection procedures include all of the elements of an effective process. These are (1) widespread publicity and open application process, (2) initial review and recommendations from local committees who will know of community leadership roles, (3) composition of selection committees changes with the type of participants being selected, (4) selection criteria are

transparent, communicated to all committee members, and uniformly applied, (5) personal interviews are conducted, and (6) finalists are selected from a pool of qualified candidates. The selection process appears to be well documented. Some participants from the early programs felt that the selection process placed excessive weight on the aptitude tests and not enough weight on what the candidates had actually accomplished in their lives. They recommended that the program should select only people who had tangible achievements rather than those with the potential for achievement—an argument that weighs toward older participants with more work experience. The ECESP Program has been moving in exactly this direction over the past several years.

The Poland mission does not have direct involvement in selection, but has few concerns about the operational procedures or quality of the process. Rather, the larger issue is the focus of the program and overall strategy. As discussed above, the ECESP emphasis on 12-24 month programs for Rural Managers does not reflect the mission priorities. In particular, the early Rural Manager program, focused on relatively young people with limited education, was questioned in terms of relevance, impact, and effectiveness. Experience throughout the world has shown this type of participant to be a high risk for non-return and non-completion because they have limited ties to the home country, no job to return to, and a limited understanding of what opportunities may exist. The ECESP experience supports this—the non-return rate has been relatively high for this target group and some have been unable to utilize the training.

On the other hand, for those participants who returned and found employment, the program literally transforms their lives and has a lifelong impact on their productivity and contribution to their society. From the perspective of the individuals involved, the impact is enormous.

PLACEMENT

The ECESP participants have been placed in groups in many different schools, including Modesto Junior College, North-Central Community College, SUNY-Cobleskill, SUNY-Morrisville, University of Wisconsin-River Falls, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse, Frederick Community College, LeMoyne College, San Francisco State, and Georgetown University. A very few participants have been placed at University of California at Davis, the Economics Institute in Colorado, and George Washington University for short programs. The Senior Managers and Teachers spend most or all of their training periods at Georgetown University.

For the Rural Managers, the schools have been small campuses in rural locations. The junior college system was used exclusively for the first group of students, who were rural leaders with relatively low levels of education. As the nature of the participants changed in the succeeding years and began to include Senior Managers with considerably higher levels of education and life accomplishment, the program moved to small campuses of state university systems. The educational program in each of these sites is the same—a non-degree training program in an academic environment combined with internships and cultural/experiential activities. All of these schools were selected from a shortlist of programs that responded to an advertisement in the Chronicle of Higher Education and were able to provide some tailored programs for the ECESP students. The transfer of students from Modesto Junior College to LeMoyne, San Francisco, and Wisconsin-LaCrosse used the same site selection criteria, but failed to obtain advance approval from USAID as required in the Cooperative Agreement.

The study program in each campus followed a pattern of including a range of introductory survey courses (e.g., principles of marketing, management, principles of business, accounting, international business, organizational behavior, business communications) and some computer courses. In the first group of Rural Managers in 1990, the heavy emphasis on agriculture was adjusted as the participants found that the courses were neither particularly relevant to their situations nor was the level of instruction appropriate. Since that first group, the emphasis has regularly been on business and management subjects.

The program of study of the Senior Managers and Public Administrators at Georgetown University includes a number of more advanced courses (Microeconomics II, Econometrics II, Advanced Financial Management, Business Policy and Strategic Planning, Investment Analysis, etc.).

Some USAID officials have questioned whether the schools that are less academically rigorous are appropriate locations for Eastern European students, who, in the current cycles, hold graduate level degrees from their own countries. The rationale provided by Georgetown is that these schools were selected because (1) the students were Rural Managers with interest and background in agriculture, so rural schools were appropriate; (2) the program is not degree oriented, so the program requires expertise in a narrow range of subjects (business, economics, political science) at an introductory level rather than high level excellence across a broad spectrum; (3) these schools could provide tailored programs, structured for groups of Eastern European students; and (4) the English language skills of the students were not always strong enough to be successful at more competitive schools.

The academic reports show that the majority of the participants achieve acceptable grades in these institutions—mostly in the 2.5 to 3.5 GPA range. In the Cycle D Rural Managers group in the winter semester of 1993, over 31 percent of the participants were on the Deans List. In the fall semester (August through December 1993), the academic performance was also good. The best students were placed in Georgetown and all received grades in the A and B range. Achievements at the other schools were mixed, with more C's, but most in the passing range. In general, the grade levels do not indicate that the level of academic instruction is too low for most of the students. (It is worth noting that ECESP semester reports do not follow any consistent format, so comparison of grade achievements over time and between groups is difficult. A standard format would be helpful). Of course, the grades reflect not only academic level but also English language skills, which have been low for some students.

The participants themselves have been satisfied with the level of instruction. Responses in the exit questionnaire indicate that over 80 percent of the participants have been satisfied or very satisfied with the level of instruction, over 94 percent with the course content, and over 89 percent with the preparedness of the institution. The degree of satisfaction at the better known schools (George Washington, Georgetown, Economics Institute, University of California at Davis, etc.) are much higher than for the other schools. One hundred percent of these respondents to the questionnaire, most of whom are Senior Managers or Teachers, were "very satisfied."

ORIENTATION

The orientation program for the ECESP scholars consists of both in-country and in-U.S. activities. The in-country orientation incorporates a range of cultural orientation activities included in the language programs as well as specific orientation sessions to familiarize the students with the actual program content. The Orientation and Intercultural Training course in the language program consists of three components: survival skills (functional skills for telephones, banking, customs, air travel, shopping, etc.); intercultural training (identification of different cultural values and behaviors); and orientation to the U.S. (workshops on higher education, films, articles, college catalogues, U.S. magazines and journals, etc.). Those participants who do not attend the language program do not receive the same level of orientation. Each participant also receives a Participant Guidebook that covers most relevant information.

About 63 percent of the respondents to the exit questionnaire indicated that they had received orientation prior to coming to the U.S., and 85 percent indicated that they had received an orientation upon arrival. The orientation appears to be effective in preparing the majority of the participants for most aspects of the program. The orientation is effective in providing the participants with a broad understanding of the program, the training objectives, the U.S. educational system, U.S. political and economic institutions, medical insurance, and USAID program objectives.

The area in which the participants were least satisfied was advance notice of travel, with only 56 percent being satisfied or very satisfied, and about 28 percent being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. This high level of dissatisfaction indicates that Georgetown needs to address this with all future groups. It is understandable that the participants need and want adequate advance notice to make their preparations for spending a year or more abroad.

The other aspects of the orientation in which the level of participant satisfaction was low included USAID policies and regulations; the specifics of course content; and stipends/allowances. The issue of stipends is always an area of intense interest for participants

because it directly affects their daily lives. Therefore, it is useful to put adequate effort into the orientation to assure that participants understand the conditions under which they will be living.

It is worth noting that these ratings for orientation are from the exit questionnaire, which was completed by the more recent graduates of the program. In interviews with participants from the first programs, it appeared that the orientation and program planning was not as effective as it was in later groups. (However, no comparable exit questionnaire data is available for these earlier groups.) This indicates that the ECESP Program has learned from experience and improved over time.

Georgetown University provides each affiliate training organization with background biodata—data on each participant and documents to orient the university to the PTPE program needs. In each training contract, the institutions receive written instructions about the purpose of the program and the governing regulations. In addition, the ECESP Academic Director provides a personal orientation to the instructors who will be involved with the students. In the early years of the program, he spoke only to the administrators, but now increasingly he tries to speak to all of the professors who will be dealing with the students. The administrators feel adequately prepared for the program.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE TRAINING

English Language Training (ELT) has been a highly contentious issue in the ECESP Program—an issue that is unique to ECESP because no other PTPE component offers such language training. The issue is important because the cost of language training is significant—in-country ELT costs represent almost 20 percent of the total training expenditures for the project and over 35 percent of the tuition/training fees line item. The tuition cost of the ELT per participant month is more expensive than the average for U.S. training and the total cost is almost \$900 per participant month. The core issue is that the ECESP participants have been unable to pass the ALI/GU English Proficiency Test (EPT) test after six months of intensive ELT training.

The Basic English Language Test (BELT) is used at the beginning and middle of the summer session to determine the beginning level proficiency of the students and to assess their ability to acquire the basic forms of English. This was primarily used for diagnostic purposes. In the fall session, the ALI/GU EPT

Orientation Component	Satisfied/ Very Satisfied
Overall preparation for the U.S. training	85
Understanding the training objectives	92
Understanding USAID program objectives	84
Understanding the U.S. educational system	84
Understanding U.S. political/economic institutions	83
U.S. culture	81
Information on travel and scheduling	77
Stipends/allowances	76
Course content	68
USAID policies and regulations	64
Advance notice of travel	56

Source: Exit Questionnaires (N=27)

was used in 1991 and the Comprehensive English Language Test (CELT) was used to 1992 to establish comparable measures of English proficiency. Beginning with the 1993 ESIT program, all students take the ALI/GU EPT test prior to initiating the U.S. training program. The results of these tests, plus Teachers observations and student class performance, form the basis for classifying the continuing ELT needs of the students and for determining appropriate course load.

From program inception until mandated by USAID in the winter of 1993, ECESP did not use the *Handbook 10* standards for minimum language proficiency, but rather placed the students in different categories of preparedness. In the group starting U.S. training in January 1993, 27 percent of the participants were judged to have a sufficient level of English proficiency to complete the program with few or no difficulties. About 58 percent were expected to have difficulties but could overcome them with a language support course (advanced ESL class in the U.S., or freshman composition class). About 15 percent of the participants were judged as needing additional full-time ESL instruction before participating fully in the U.S. training program. The group starting training in 1992 had similar scores—36 percent, 54 percent, and 10 percent respectively. These groups initiated the U.S. portion of the training program on schedule.

In December 1993, the issue of English language scores became problematical when the ALI/GU EPT scores for the group to start training in January were received. According to PIET records, only six of the 69 people who took the test met the *Handbook 10* “call forward” standards for acceptance into a participant training program. This represents a failure rate of 91 percent. A waiver was requested from the Director of OIT, who accepted the recommendations of the ESL Teachers as to the language skills of the participants. As with the previous groups, the participants were divided into three groups. The first group consisting of 23 people who had, for the most part, passed one or more sections of the EPT and had scores of 70 and above, was allowed to enter the program with no additional ELT but with recommended tutorial support. A second group of 23 people, with EPT scores ranging from the 40s to the 70s, was required to receive additional semi-intensive ELT consisting of support courses in English reading, writing, and public speaking. The last group of eight people was reprogrammed to SUNY/Cobleskill, because of its bilingual teachers. A future site visit would be useful to determine if the bilingual training have proven effective.

Interviews with participants, training providers, and internship supervisors indicate that a number of the current and past ECESP students have relatively limited English language skills. Several participants indicated that they were not comfortable in English when they arrived, although most seem to have learned

Table 7
Identified Problems in English (Percentages)

Activity	Never	Occasionally	Frequently	Very Frequently	Not Applicable
Lectures	30	67	0	0	0
Reading	48	48	0	0	0
Writing	44	37	15	0	0
Class Discussions	15	52	22	11	0
Oral Reports	18	44	26	4	4

Note: This data is from available exit questionnaires and therefore only reflects the experience of participants leaving the program in the Summer of 1993 or later. It does not reflect the experience of Cycle A or B participants. Percentages do not add to 100% due to non-responses to the item.

Source: Exit Questionnaires (N=27)

by the time they leave. Internship supervisors also indicated that language was a significant problem for some participants. About 71 percent of the current participants who responded to the mid-term questionnaire say that they have difficulties communicating in English. Responses to the same issue in the exit questionnaire indicate that the majority of the participants have at least occasional problems using English in classroom situations. The most challenging situations are oral reports and class discussions,

although two-thirds of the students have occasional problems in understanding lectures. Written assignments are challenging for over half of the participants and even reading, the least interactive communication process, presents occasional problems for almost half of the participants.

Despite the problems identified above, only 15 percent of the respondents in the exit questionnaire believe that language problems substantially limited their ability to learn or contribute in class. Moreover, only seven percent are still having language difficulties by the last half of the program.

The ECESP managers feel strongly that the ALI/GU test is the wrong standard, and inadequately measures the participant abilities to undertake the specific non-degree training programs that are offered. Moreover, they argue that the strict use of this standard effectively limits the program to the urban elites who have had more access to language training in the past. As ECESP is aimed at Rural Managers, a strict language requirement would essentially disqualify the target group. In this view, it is not possible to take people from zero language skills to passing the TOEFL or ALI/GU tests in six months.

These are essentially valid points. While the language skills of the previous participants have been lower than the *Handbook 10* standard for academic programs, most participants have managed to overcome this obstacle and complete the program. The grades of the majority of the participants are acceptable—some are exceptional—and fewer than nine percent of all of the participants since 1990 have been unable to complete the academic requirements of the program. (An additional three percent have been terminated, some due to poor performance.) The majority of the participants themselves have not considered language a significant obstacle to learning, although most acknowledge the difficulties.

The question of equity of access is relevant because all other PTPE activities are limited to participants who already speak English or have had previous travel in the West, which may not be representative of the overall society. This issue must be considered from the perspective of overall program strategy as well as unintended impact on the strengthening broad-based democracy and economic opportunity.

The USAID project manager sees the issue very differently. He considers the *Handbook 10* standards to be established agency policy and as such, not being open for discussion. He also feels strongly that the ECESP program should simply recruit English speakers like the other PTPE components. He doubts that the pool of candidates is so small in the four countries as to be unable to fulfill the training numbers.

As with many other issues raised in this evaluation, the problems of language achievement are attributable to the limited starting English skills of the Rural Manager group. The core problem of meeting the ALI/GU standards is that the program targets individuals with little or no English language skills. It is difficult to achieve university level language skills in six months from such a base. It is worth noting that this is consistent with the experience in other programs that target participants with little or no English, such as the Caribbean and Latin American Scholarship Program (CLASP). In this program, missions have addressed the problem in various ways, from extending the language training period to a year or more, offering long-term training in Spanish, or trying to eliminate long-term training for these participants. For ECESP, there are few real options for improving the English training program other than simply having longer training—and this will add significantly to the cost of the program.

Given the expense and challenge of providing such training to this group, the issue can best be articulated as follows: *Can the objectives of this program be met by limiting participation to candidates with higher levels of English? Does the programmatic and strategic importance of providing this type of training to the Rural Manager group justify the expense and effort of the language training? If so, is the Handbook 10 standard for call-forward scores appropriate for this type of training and this group?*

Therefore, a series of decisions are needed to fully address the issues surrounding the English Language Training program. First, is the Rural Managers group, as currently structured, enough of a priority in

terms of strategic objectives to maintain? If so, is the *Handbook 10* ELT standard an appropriate and useful measure of potential accomplishment in the program? Finally, whatever the standard agreed upon by USAID and ECESP, the ELT program should be structured to meet this standard for all participants—and all participants should have to meet the standard to proceed.

HOMESTAYS

All of the initial groups of Rural Managers began their U.S. experiences with a homestay lasting a minimum of two months. The host families were arranged by the training institution. As the first groups knew very little English when they arrived in the U.S., the homestay was seen as an opportunity for extensive English practice and cultural adaptation. It was also seen as an opportunity to form lasting friendships with American families. The following detailed information about these homestays, particularly in the first years of the program, was obtained from the interviews with participants in Poland. Most of these participants had not completed exit questionnaires (as the evaluation contract was not initiated at the time of their departure). Responses to the exit questionnaire, for participants completing their programs in the summer of 1993 or later, indicated that about 30 percent had experienced a homestay. Over 96 percent had visited U.S. families for short periods of time.

The participants' experience with homestays was decidedly mixed. In the best cases, the participant stayed with the host family for the full two years and truly became part of the family. For these people, who achieved exceptional fluency in English, the experience provided an intimate understanding of America, and Americans, and created close friendships. For one young woman, who had entered the program when she was only nineteen years old, this became a particularly close relationship. Having been raised by relatives, she felt that this American family was her first real family. About one in five of the participants interviewed—mostly women—had this experience.

At the other extreme, some participants had unpleasant experiences with the host families. In some cases, multiple participants, including Latin Americans from the Georgetown Cooperative Association of States for Scholarships program (CASS) as well as from ECESP, were staying with the same host family. In one case, four students were being boarded by one host family. Host family problems stemmed from two primary issues: location of the home, and host family motivation for accepting the students. Some of the host families were located on relatively isolated farms as far as 50 miles from the campus. As the participants were not allowed to own cars or to drive, this created an excessive degree of dependence on the host family and limited the participants' social life. Some participants, particularly older ones, found this situation very restrictive.

A more serious issue was that some host families apparently accepted the participants for the compensation rather than any real interest in the students. (In the first group, the program could pay the families to cover expenses. This practice has since been discontinued.) Several of the host families were low income and racially/ethnically diverse. While exposure to the diversity of the U.S. may be a laudable goal, it made the adjustment process more difficult for some of these participants. Moreover, several participants reported being hungry on a regular basis—the host family neither prepared meals for them nor had food available in the house. In one instance, the family would take all of the food to church gatherings every weekend, leaving the participants alone in an empty house. The age of the participants was also a factor. The host family arrangement, with the expectation that the participant is a member of a family headed by a “host mother” and “host father,” was difficult for men in their thirties or older who have families of their own.

The ECESP Program manager was responsive to the identified problems and in some cases had to make several trips to the campus to resolve the issues. Some participants had to change host families two or three times, and most finally moved into apartments after about six months. Despite the problems, all of the participants thought that a good host family situation was important and that all participants should have this experience. To the evaluator, the value of an extended homestay was immediately obvious. Those who

had developed and maintained good host family relationships were noticeably better at English than other participants.

Overall, the host family approach appears to have value, and to add significantly to the training experience. The majority of the returnees interviewed in Poland and about 40 percent of the respondents to the exit questionnaire indicated that they would like to have a homestay. However, the ECESP Program must provide very clear directions and criteria for selection, assure that the families are carefully screened, help the participants and families work out mutually agreeable understandings about roles, and deal with the problem of location and transportation. The host families need to be as well oriented to the experience as are the participants.

MANAGEMENT AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT

Participants were asked in the exit questionnaire about the quality of program management and logistics support provided by the contractor. The questions dealt with training facilities, housing, local transportation, the amount and timeliness of the stipend, medical care and insurance, and resolution of academic or personal problems. The only areas in which there was a notable amount of dissatisfaction were local transportation, where 37 percent of the respondents were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, and in the quality of housing, with about 15 percent of the participants being dissatisfied. In addition, about 7 percent of the participants indicated dissatisfaction with the amount of the stipend.

The question of local transportation has been an issue since the program began. The USAID rules on driving and owning cars as applied by the ECESP program managers and related health insurance issues (which have changed in this period) have been a point of serious contention. The majority of the participants have been placed in small colleges in rural areas or small towns where public transportation is often very limited. This creates dependence and frustration for the participants. In fact, many participants have either purchased (individually or jointly) or driven cars during their time in the U.S., usually without notifying ECESP or requesting permission. As current USAID policy delegates decisions about vehicles and transportation to the contractors, ECESP management needs to develop a clear and supportive set of guidelines to allow participants to meet their legitimate transportation needs.

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Quality of Academic Program

Results from the exit questionnaire, the mid-term questionnaire, and interviews with the returned participants indicate that the majority of the participants are satisfied with the quality and content of the academic programs. Participants were asked about a range of aspects of the instructional program, including quality of instruction, preparedness of institution, course content, field trips, computers and equipment, and consultations with instructors. On the exit questionnaire, the level of satisfaction was higher than 80 percent in all areas except for field trips, which was the least favorably rated activity in all locations. The results of the mid-term questionnaire are even more unequivocally positive, with 97 to 100 percent of the participants satisfied with the quality of instruction, preparedness of the institution, and course content. Again, the field trips were the least successful, with only 65 percent of the participants satisfied with this aspect of the program.

Overall, participant opinions indicate that the program placements are appropriate for the needs of the participants. About 88 percent of the responses to the exit questionnaire said that the program was about the right level of difficulty. In terms of the length of the training program, about 56 percent believed that the program was about right, while 41 percent believed that the program should be longer. All of those who want a longer program are in the Rural Manager program, and would like to have a degree oriented program. The results of the field interviews were consistent with the questionnaire answers on these points.

At the same time, several participants candidly agreed that participants would be more likely to try to stay in the U.S. in a longer program than in a shorter one.

Training Objective: Non-degree Programs

A fundamental concept of this training program has been that a non-degree program is appropriate and preferable because the purpose is to give the participants a focused set of directly applicable knowledge and skills. A degree program would require more time, more cost, and a broader range of coursework to meet degree requirements. The expectation is that returned participants will directly apply the knowledge and skills in their jobs, or will start new businesses to capitalize on this training.

The reality is somewhat more complex. Several participants have done exactly what was anticipated—started a business or parleyed their English skills and training into jobs. For others, however, the option of starting a new business is unrealistic. The very high interest rates in Eastern Europe—approximating 50 percent in Poland—greatly increase the (already high) potential for failing in a small business. The volatile economies of the region also increase the risk. Several of the returned participants in Poland have started, and failed, businesses. Moreover, not everyone is well suited to starting a business. For these people, the remaining viable option is to use the training program to secure a responsible job. The general employment environment in Poland is quite positive for educated young people, particularly those with English skills and training in marketing and accounting. However, the ECESP Program credentials are not particularly helpful in opening doors for good employment. Many complained that “when I returned, no one was interested in me.” The returned participants do not have university degrees, and the program completion certificates are not, in general, recognized by Polish employers, the university, or the Ministry of Education. Had the program resulted in BS/BA degrees, the participants would have greatly expanded employment opportunities. The ECESP Program managers have recognized the problem of certificate recognition for several years and have been continually working with the governments to find a means of assuring creditation.

It should be noted that the technical training and English skills have been an important factor for all of the participants who did find employment. However, the nature of the certificate of completion did not open doors, particularly to Polish organizations.

The 18- to 24-month non-degree program is inherently problematical. It is too long for the type of directed studies that are found in the Senior Manager and Teachers programs, and yet too short to gain any more useful credential. It could be argued that the bulk of the impact on participant attitudes and understanding happens in the first year. Again, the questions are primarily directed at the Rural Manager training groups.

INTERNSHIPS

Overall, the Georgetown internships have been adequate. The majority of the students were placed in reasonably appropriate settings, consistent with their fields of training, and the majority conducted themselves well. Most supervisors in internship sites have been pleased with the experience and most participants have found the internships useful. However, a significant minority of the students have been dissatisfied with at least one internship experience.

Responses to the exit questionnaires indicate that about 15 percent of the participants who responded to the question were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their internships and a further 15 percent were neutral. In the mid-term questionnaire results, four respondents (13%) were dissatisfied with the internships and one was neutral. The personal interviews with returnees from Poland indicated a roughly equivalent degree of satisfaction, with some internships being of lasting value and others being very poor. While these numbers still result in a 70 to 80 percent rate of satisfaction, the high negatives are indicative of problems that should be addressed.

In the sample reviewed in 1993, 87 percent of the internships were ranked as either good or excellent by the supervisors. Most of the supervisors are eager to have more interns in the future. The internship programs at Wisconsin-River Falls and SUNY-Morrisville consistently were rated much higher than were the programs at MJC and SUNY-Cobleskill. In several cases, the internships were simply too short to be useful, but only about 10 percent were ranked as poor or problematical.

The challenges of implementing a successful internship program were most clearly visible at Modesto Junior College (MJC). The program had the lowest rate of supervisors' Excellent rankings (overall rate of 29%) and the highest rate of poor or problematic internships. There were vehement complaints—from the students about the administrators and from the administrators about the students—that did not occur in the other programs. Despite all of these drawbacks, however, the majority of the internships (79%) appear to be useful. Some were very highly regarded by both participants and their supervisors. Much of the problem at MJC was related to the coordinator's attempts to make placements in companies in which the participants had no interest.

Internships are always programming challenges. The problems in the ECESP internships must be understood in this context, and with the recognition that the challenge is much greater for a program that attempts to place every participant in an internship. Setting up successful intern experiences requires considerable staff and participant time, regular and clear communication about interests and objectives, and careful matching of interests, skills, and personalities. Some students and some businesses are better suited for this type of experience than others. It is particularly challenging given the rural location of many participants.

It appears that the most successful internships have been those where the participant made the arrangements directly, or at least have had a major role in identifying possibilities and planning the activity. In order to have active participation, the process of identifying possible sites and planning activities should start as early as possible. The ECESP managers need to provide clear written guidance to college administrators, participants, and potential internship sites on both USAID regulations and expectations about what a successful internship experience entails.

Participants must clearly understand the nature of their responsibilities and opportunities, and their expectations should be kept in line with reality. Internship supervisors must clearly understand the advantages and disadvantages of this arrangement, including the substantial management time and effort required for a successful and mutually beneficial internship. They can and should be provided with more assistance in planning successful internship activities and molding the activities around the participants' skills and interests. It should be recognized that few internship supervisors in private firms have any experience in planning this type of activity. Much of this planning can and should be completed before the internship starts and should be highly interactive between the supervisor and the participant. The Georgetown project management could draw on the knowledge of the program director at each college and of the students to develop a checklist of issues to clarify during planning. This might include student and supervisor understandings of work schedules, time flexibility, reliability and punctuality, responsibilities, learning objectives, starting and ending dates, transportation requirements, payments, etc.

FOLLOW-ON

Although a small number of re-entry activities have been conducted or encouraged, there has been no formal follow-on program for the ECESP participants. Over 82 percent of the participants have gathered resources to use at home; 48 percent have maintained contact with an employer; 56 percent have written resumes; and about 18 percent have initiated job applications. The ECESP Program administrators notify the people involved in selection or program support in each country when the participants are returning,

who they are, and what they studied. At least one group had meetings with USAID, Embassy, and local government officials and discussion as to job opportunities.

Although the program does not have an official follow-on component, the participants themselves have been active in follow-up types of activities. Several participants who are currently in training are organizing an alumni association and have initiated the process for formal organizational status. Many of the returned participants have

Table 8
Participants' Follow-on Activities (Percentages)

Activity	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
Contact w/other participants	79	75	77	78
Read U.S. prof. Magazines	58	75	62	60
Attend formal Follow-on activity	9	25	8	10
Contact w/U.S. training institutions	46	25	69	50
Contact w/U.S. businesses	49	25	8	36
Contact w/U.S. citizens	79	75	100	84
Business relationship w/U.S. firms	30	0	23	26

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

also maintained personal and professional contact with U.S. organizations and individuals and with each other. The Teachers in particular have established an effective network to share materials and activities.

The degree to which the returned participants have maintained contact and friendships with their American professors, friends, internship supervisors, and host families is notable. The majority of the returned participants interviewed in Poland talked about visits from their American friends—either planned or completed.

PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION WITH THE PROGRAM

The majority of the participants were satisfied with the training program, found it relevant to their needs, and consider it to be at least as good as they expected it to be. On the returnee questionnaire, 42 percent of the respondents were very satisfied with the training

Table 9
Participant Satisfaction With the Program (Percentages)

Level of Satisfaction	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
Very Satisfied	33	75	54	42
Satisfied	40	25	46	40
Neutral	21	0	0	14
Unsatisfied	6	0	0	4

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

program and another 40 percent were satisfied. Only two respondents (4% of the total) were unsatisfied with the program and about 14 percent were neutral. The Senior Managers and Teachers are much more satisfied with the program than are the Rural Managers. These findings are consistent with those from the mid-term questionnaire, in which 44 percent of respondents are very satisfied and 50 percent are satisfied, with one person being undecided.

By comparison, the responses to the same question on the exit questionnaire showed 65 percent to be very satisfied and 35 percent were satisfied, with no participants reporting either dissatisfaction or neutrality about the program. The reason for the difference is difficult to identify because the two groups (exit and returnee) are different. The higher levels of satisfaction in the exit may reflect improvements in the program since the earliest groups, or it may reflect decreasing satisfaction over time, or it may just reflect a natural enthusiasm for a program as it is ending. It will be possible to interpret this data as more responses are collected over the next year.

The training program was consistent with the expectations of the participants. About 27 percent of the participants thought the training was better than they had expected and 58 percent found it about the same as expected. Only eight percent thought the program was worse than expected.

A majority of the respondents to the exit questionnaire feel that they achieved their training objectives. About 46 percent of the participants believe that the training objectives were completely achieved, and a further 23 percent believe that a lot of the objectives were achieved. About 30 percent felt that the objectives were only partially achieved. The Rural Managers were least likely to completely accomplish their training objectives.

Table 10
Degree to Which Training Objectives Were Accomplished (Percentages)

Objectives Accomplished	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
Not at all	0	0	0	0
Partially	33	20	33	31
A lot	56	0	9	23
Completely	11	80	58	46

Source: Exit Questionnaires (N=27)

No clear pattern existed in the reasons given as to why the training objectives were not achieved, and no one answer or issue was predominant. The only reasons that were given by more than one participant were that objectives were unclear or there were too many objectives (three responses) and the duration of training was too short (two participants, both Teachers). Other constraints identified included English language skills, training either too theoretical or not relevant, institution not well prepared, no internship, and trainers were unprepared.

Overall, 58 percent of the participants felt that the length of the training program was about right, and 42 percent felt that it was too short. This varied considerably by the type of group, with 67 percent of the Rural Managers stating that the program was too short, compared to 42 percent of the Teachers and none of the Senior Managers.

The participants responding to the exit questionnaire expect that the training will be relevant to the situation in their home countries. Overall, 48 percent of the participants felt that the training was completely relevant to their home situation and a further 22 percent believed that the training was largely relevant. As with the other questions, however, the different types of training groups answered this differently, with the Rural Managers least likely to feel that the training was relevant. The most useful and relevant skills gained were identified as computer skills, financial management skills, and marketing.

Table 11
Perceived Relevance of the Training Program to the Home Situation (Percentages)

Degree of Relevance	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
None	0	0	0	0
Partially	67	0	15	30
A lot	22	0	31	22
Completely	11	100	54	48

Source: Exit Questionnaires (N=27)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO IMPROVE THE PROGRAM

Participants were asked both in the exit and returnee questionnaires how they would change the program to improve it. The largest number of respondents recommended having a longer program and having more practical training activities. Other significant responses included establishing more business contacts, improve the internships, and earn a degree. It is worth noting that only the Rural Managers recommended having a longer program and earning a degree.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT OF THE TRAINING PROGRAM

COMPLETION STATUS

At the time of this report, 148 ECESP participants had completed the program or had been terminated, and 107 were still active. Of the total former participants, 119 (80%) successfully completed the program and 13 (9%) finished without successfully completing the program requirements. The ECESP Program terminated the programs of five participants for non-performance, and one participant resigned. Ten participants are reported as non-returnees. Two of the successful participants are currently living in other CEE countries.

Several other participants have since returned to the U.S., but the exact number is not known. In sum, a total of 20 percent of the ECESP training programs were not successfully completed as of December 31, 1993. The non-returnee rate of over 8 percent is high for most training programs. The relatively large number of participants who completed the program, but were unable to complete the academic requirements, is more ambiguous. Many of these people have returned to their countries to take up responsible positions.

As is evident from the data in Table 12, the Rural Managers have been the most problematic of the training groups in terms of program outcome. All of the ECESP participants who resigned or quit, were terminated, did not complete the program successfully, did not return to the home country, or later returned to the U.S., were from the Rural Managers.

<u>Current Status</u>	<u>Rural Managers</u>	<u>Senior Managers</u>	<u>Teachers</u>	<u>Total</u>
Currently Active	88	7	12	107
Completed (successful)	87	8	24	119
Completed (unsuccessful)	13	0	0	13
Resigned/Quit	1	0	0	1
Terminated	5	0	0	5
Non-returnee	10	0	0	10
Total	204	15	36	255

Source: Participant Biographical Database

One out of four (25%) of the Rural Managers did not complete the program successfully, whereas none of the other (albeit much smaller) groups had such problems. While the less successful performance of the Rural Manager group is concentrated in the early Cycle A group, the Cycle C group also has its share of non-returnees, terminated, and unsuccessful participants.

Most of the returned participants (72%) live in the same city or community as they did before the program. Of those who have moved, 77 percent have moved from rural areas to a city.

MEASURING IMPACT OF TRAINING

The PTPE evaluation is designed to measure outcomes and impact of training at several different levels, each of which has a different value to development. The evaluation seeks to identify training impact at six different levels: personal; career; job performance; organizational performance; sector policy; or national policy.

For each participant, the experience of living in a different country and culture and attending a training program for a year or more has an impact. The personal impact may be quite intangible—broader understanding of the world or intercultural social skills—or it may be as tangible as language skills. Some of

these personal impacts may end up being beneficial to a participant's career, others may only make him or her a more interesting person.

On the career level, training may lead to finding a new job, increased job responsibilities, a promotion, higher salary, greater opportunities for advancement, or similar short and long term impact. In terms of job performance, the direct utilization of new skills and knowledge may make the participant a more productive employee (which may result in a promotion or other career advancement). When the improved job performance results in the office working more effectively—either through a multiplier effect, new ideas, or improved management, the overall impact of the training is even greater. The highest level impacts may be on either sector or national policy, which usually require a combination of position, personal skills, circumstances, and a dose of luck.

PERSONAL IMPACT OF TRAINING

Returned participants were asked to identify the most valuable benefit they received from the program. Many identified the most valuable benefit as being confidence—in themselves, their capability, and their future. This is an intangible benefit of an educational program, and yet one with far-reaching impact on their lives and their

potential for contributing to society. As one enthusiastic participant explained, she was able to talk to important people in her own country, and in other countries, in a way that she would not have dared previously. Several other returned participants discussed the general value of being familiar and comfortable with the challenges of cross-cultural communication, particularly with Americans. In personal interviews in Poland, about twenty percent of the respondents answered in this way.

The returned participants also gained an understanding of the U.S. and its institutions. In particular, the participants believe that they have gained a good understanding about how the free market system functions. This is a topic of considerable interest to these participants, coming from a lifetime of central planned economies. They also improved their understanding of U.S. families.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

For the most part, the returned participants have found employment in the same field as the training. Overall, 88 percent of the returnees are employed. All

of the returnees who are still not employed are in the Rural Manager group. About 83 percent of the returnees are working in their field of training. Again, the Rural Managers group was the one least likely to

Table 13
Understanding U.S. Institutions (Percentages)

Increased Understanding of:	Very Much	Some	Not At All
U.S. Families	66	32	2
Role of U.S. Women	34	60	6
Ethnic Diversity	42	52	2
Democratic Institutions	40	54	4
Free Market System	84	16	0
Volunteerism in U.S.	36	50	12

Note: Percentages do not add to 100% due to non-responses to the item.

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

Table 14a
Employment Status of Returnees (Percentages)

Employment	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
Yes	82	100	100	88
No	18	0	0	12
Same Employer:				
Yes	13	75	54	30
No	57	25	46	51
Not previously employed	30	0	0	19

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

find employment in the field of training—only 77 percent of this group are working in their field of training compared to over 92 percent for the other groups.

Only 30 percent of the returnees continue to work with the same employer as before the training. The Senior Managers are most likely to remain with the same employer, followed by the Teachers. Only 13 percent of the Rural Managers stay with their previous employer—and 30 percent were not previously employed.

The large majority of the returned participants are working in the private sector, either in for-profit companies, self-employed, or in mixed public-private organizations. About 32 percent of the returnees are working in the public sector. The Senior Managers/Public Admin-

istrators and Teachers are, not surprisingly, more likely to be working in the government than are the Rural Managers.

Table 14b
Employment Status of Returnees by Sector (Percentages)

Sector of Employment	Rural	Senior	Teachers	Total
	Managers	Managers		
Public	14	75	61	32
Private for-profit	45	25	8	33
Mixed	20	0	31	22
Self-employed	14	0	0	9
Not Applicable	7	0	0	4

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

CAREER IMPACT OF TRAINING

Most returned participants have received personal benefits from the training in their work situation. Most have either been promoted, received increased responsibilities, or have received a salary increase. This indicates that the employers

value the training. The impact has been more pronounced for the Rural Managers, who are more likely to increase their salary level and/or receive increased responsibilities than are the other groups. In part, this reflects their low level of employment prior to the program.

Table 15
Quality of Employment (Percentages)

Outcome	Rural	Senior	Teachers	Total
	Managers	Managers		
Promoted	71	75	12	58
Increased Responsibility	81	67	73	78
Salary Increase	65	33	40	56

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

RELEVANCE AND UTILIZATION OF TRAINING IN CURRENT JOB

Once the participants have returned to their home countries and are working, they are again asked whether the training is relevant and useful in their current job. The question was asked in different ways and in both cases the majority of the responses indicated that the training

was useful. Again, the Rural Manager group was less likely than the other groups to find the training relevant or useful. Only 52 percent of the Rural Managers consider the training to be relevant or highly

Table 16
Relevance of Training to Current Job (Percentages)

Relevance to Current Job	Rural	Senior	Teachers	Total
	Managers	Managers		
Highly Relevant	16	50	46	27
Relevant	36	25	46	38
Helpful (generally)	45	25	8	33
Not Relevant	3	0	0	2

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

relevant to their jobs, whereas the responses for the Senior Managers and Teachers were 75 and 92 percent, respectively. Interestingly, compared to the expectations identified in the exit questionnaire, the Rural Managers found that the training was more relevant than had been anticipated and the other two groups found that the training was somewhat less relevant and useful than had been anticipated.

The most frequently cited aspects of the training that have been most useful are English, marketing, management, computer skills, general business studies, finance, and professional contacts. Many participants have taken accounting

courses, but this was only useful for general principles, as the accounting systems used in Eastern Europe differ considerably from those in the U.S. In a few instances, participants have managed to build on the professional and personal contacts made in the U.S. to develop business opportunities. Agriculture was most frequently cited as the least useful aspect of training.

Returned participants were also asked to identify the constraints to using the new skills and knowledge effectively. Fewer than half of the respondents answered this question or identified any significant constraint. For those who did answer, the most common constraint was lack of adequate equipment and lack of support for change by the supervisor.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF RETURNED PARTICIPANTS

The accomplishments of the returnees were assessed in two ways: the specific activities that they have done and their assessment of the level of impact that these activities have had. The utility of the training can be assessed by the type of impact the training has made on the participants' job performance and the accomplishments that they

can attribute to the training. As Table 19 indicates, the types of accomplishments identified by the returned participants usually reflect their circumstances. Teachers are most likely to be training, conducting seminars, developing new curriculum, or writing papers for their peers. Senior managers are more likely to be working at the policy level.

The level of impact also is closely related to the circumstances of employment. For the Teachers, for example, the training has a high impact on their direct job performance but they may not be in the type of job to improve the working of an office or overall company. Interestingly, however, several Teachers have considered themselves to be in a position to influence sectoral policy, particularly in developing new curriculum for teaching economics and business. Teachers are also in the position to make relatively rapid impact on their environment, whereas managers usually need to influence others to make change.

Table 17
Usefulness of the Training in the Current Job (Percentages)

How useful is the training?	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
Very Useful	32	75	62	44
Useful	49	25	38	44
Average	19	0	0	12

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

Table 18
Accomplishments of Returned Participants (Percentages)

Participant Accomplishment	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
Conduct Seminars	24	33	73	39
Develop New Projects	48	33	46	46
Develop Curriculum	0	67	91	31
Publish Scholarly Papers	12	33	55	26
Train Co-workers	44	33	46	44
Write Policy Papers	8	33	18	13
Volunteer Activities	32	67	9	28

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

MULTIPLIER EFFECT

The degree to which returned participants have been active in training others—co-workers, community members, students, etc.—is notable. Whereas this would be expected of the Teachers, of whom 92 percent were teaching others, the high degree of participation by the other groups was less predictable. Members of all three groups have been involved in

regular and repeated training activities, reaching hundreds of other people. The largest number of people trained have, not surprisingly, been students. One Teacher reports having trained over 600, and both a Rural Manager and a Senior Manager estimate that they have trained 400. These were the exceptions, of course, as most returnees had reached between 10 and 50 other people with some form of training. This is particularly notable because the majority of the returned participants (57%) had not received any instruction as part of the program in how to train others.

Table 19
Level of Impact Achieved (Percentages)

Job Impact	Rural Managers	Senior Managers	Teachers	Total
Able to do own job better	90	75	92	89
Improve working of the office	57	75	23	49
Trained other people	79	100	92	84
Improve overall company performance	33	50	31	34
Influenced company or organizational policy	27	25	15	24
Influenced change in government sector policy	10	0	31	14

Source: Returnee Questionnaires (N=50)

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT, BY PROGRAM TYPE

Rural Managers

The Rural Managers are the most problematical of the Georgetown training groups from the point of view of cost, performance, and impact. The question resulting from this assessment of both process and outcomes is whether the Rural Manager program is sufficiently important to the strategic objectives to justify the cost and mixed success. The Rural Manager program contributes the least in terms of impact and outcomes, and requires the most in terms of cost of English training and support services. The cost of non-completion and non-return is also significant. In terms of objectives and development impact, this group will have the least valuable impact. These observations are unquestionably valid for the first groups of Rural Managers, but also reflect the experience of the later cycles as well.

The nature of the training program itself—an 18- to 24-month non-degree program—is a hybrid that is too short to gain a valuable credential and yet is too long for a training program focused on job needs. In programmatic terms, the Rural Managers do not occupy a strategic position with leverage to affect change. This is not to diminish the accomplishments of the successful returnees. However, the focus of the Rural Managers program is primarily at the micro level—individual entrepreneurs, entry level technicians, and mid-level managers. Most participants must find employment when they return. This combination of lack of an organizational/occupational base and economic status contribute to the limited expectations of impact. While they do form part of the mass of capable people in society who will be necessary for economic transformation, the numbers that can potentially be trained in a USAID program are insignificant in the context of the economic society.

In many ways, the project concept for this training group was weak from the start. The focus on agriculture was misplaced—the participants already knew a lot about agriculture—and could find little in the way of immediately applicable knowledge in the farming structure of the U.S. Equally, the emphasis on rural development was based on a misreading of the dynamics of change in Eastern Europe. The participants

were marching down a road that was being abandoned in many CEE countries. For example, the changes in Poland between 1990 and 1993 seriously diminished the viability of agriculture and rural careers.

When the participants returned, they were encouraged to start their own businesses—a risky venture at any time and doubly so in an economy with interest rates at 40 and 50 percent. Some did so, only to close down for lack of capital after a few months. For those who sought to turn their training into well paid jobs, some found that the training certificate (not a degree) did not open any doors. A common lament was “I came home, and found that no one was interested in me.” The job possibilities that existed were in high-cost cities, but the salaries offered were often not adequate to cover the expenses of such a move. Many of these Rural Managers have found themselves back home, doing what they did before the program, or teaching English in a local school and hoping for a change. Some blame the program, others the circumstances.

All of the non-returnees and those who returned to the U.S., come from this group. While the problems are somewhat more intense for the Cycle A returnees, the Cycle C group also has non-returnees, unsuccessful programs, and those for whom nothing has changed. More than half of the terminated participants were from Cycle C or D, as were more than half of those who did not complete the training program successfully. A third of the non-returnees were from Cycle C.

Nonetheless, it must be recognized that a majority of the Rural Managers did complete the program, return to their home countries, and find responsible work. There are success stories from both cycles of returned Rural Managers. Several have started their own businesses—some in Warsaw, others in small towns, one in joint venture with Italians. A few have found employment with U.S. or British companies. A few have moved to Warsaw and acquired government jobs. One participant, a self-proclaimed “black sheep” of his group, stayed with his internship company in the U.S. after his program ended, entered the regular company training program, and four months later took up duties in Poland. All of these people have credited the program with giving them the job opportunities. It should be emphasized that the successes are significant against a backdrop of relatively limited opportunities.

Senior Managers and Teachers

The Senior Managers and Teachers, both more recent groups, have been almost uniformly impressive. These are shorter programs and are targeted at individuals with more experience and potential for applying new ideas. The training programs are much more focused, with the Teachers program having a specific objective of developing and applying new curriculum to use in their schools. The potential impact of these programs is considerable—changing the way that business and economics are taught in the schools, development of new materials, introduction of advanced management techniques, and sector/national policy impact. The potential is for impact at the organizational productivity level, and possibly (with time) at the sector policy level for education. At this point, the impact is improvement at the level of job performance and organizational unit. There has also been a substantial amount of training others—the multiplier effect.

The potential impact of the Senior Managers and public administrators has probably been dampened, at least in the short run, by the results of the 1993 elections. The first group of Senior Managers returned in August of 1993, just before the elections changed the government. Some of the Senior Managers held high level positions in the government, including the Ministry of Privatization, and returned to find a new minister in place. This type of turnover is expected in any government. A true measure of the potential of these participants will be found over time in the future returnee assessments. Even so, they have been impressively active, and activist, in their short time back.

PROGRAM COSTS

PARTICIPANT COSTS IN THE UNITED STATES

The ECESP Program has a total USAID obligation of \$10,962,000 covering all Cycles (A through E) since 1990. A total of 315 participants are programmed for training under this amount, of whom 255 are either currently in training or have completed the program. Another 60 participants from cycles D and E, who had been scheduled to start training in 1993 or 1994, were delayed and will be programmed later. The cost implications of these delays, in terms of both program and administrative costs, are not clear. A total of 69 percent of the total estimated training months have been completed, 59 percent of the total estimated training budget, and 63 percent of the total administrative costs have been used to date.

Table 20
Cost of Training as of December 31, 1993

Expenses	USAID Expenditures				Cost-Share Amount	
	Budget	U.S. Expenses	In-country Expenses	Total Expenses	Budget	Contributions
Participant:						
Training	3,942,709	1,716,539	887,457	2,603,996	591,406	611,171
Travel	543,892	322,822*		322,822	81,584	19,561
Allowances	3,824,997	2,098,296*		2,098,296	573,750	323,710
HAC Insurance	482,865	210,555*		210,555	72,430	0
Supplemental	252,003	123,383*		123,383	37,801	57,235
Total Participant Costs	9,042,466	4,313,530	1,045,525	5,359,054	1,356,971	1,011,677
Administrative Costs	1,915,534	1,209,360	*	1,209,360	68,265	170,981
TOTAL COSTS	10,962,000	6,568,414	*	6,568,414	1,425,236	1,182,658

* Total administrative costs per participant month are calculated using the training months for the U.S. portion only, as the majority of the administrative costs are attributable to that aspect of the program. This makes the calculation more comparable to the other PTPE programs that do not include ELT. If administrative costs are spread over both in-country and U.S. portions, the cost per training month would be \$272. Alternatively, one could assign a proportion of the administrative costs to the ELT program, say 10 percent, which would result in administrative costs per U.S. training month at \$332.

Source: Quarterly TCA Report

The total number of participant training months¹ in the U.S. completed as of December 31, 1993, is 3,275. The total participant costs attributed to this portion of the program was \$4,313,530, for a total program cost per training month of \$1,317. This figure includes all tuition, allowances, travel, insurance, and supplemental activities. The portion of the total expenditures for tuition and training fees is \$1,716,539, or \$524 per participant month. This is a reasonable cost of training for the schools involved, and is less than the full-time non resident tuition costs at these schools.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

The administrative costs of the ECESP Program include all of the expenses of Georgetown University to recruit, select, place, and monitor the participants. They do not include the costs incurred by the training institutions to manage the technical training aspects of the program. The total ECESP budget for

¹ Aguirre International uses a standard formula to calculate participant training months by determining the total number of training days in the training program and dividing the number of training days by 30 (the total number of days in a training month). The result of this calculation represents the total training months of each training program and is used for each participant in training. In using this standard calculation, the administrative and training costs per training month can be compared with other contractors/grantees in the ENI Bureau.

administrative costs is \$1,915,534, of which \$1,209,360 had been expended as of December 31, 1993. Costs sharing contributions to administrative expenses have totaled \$170,981.

The calculation of administrative costs per participant training month is complicated by the substantial number of training months spent in ELT programs in Europe. For the purposes of this study, the assumption was made that the majority of the administrative costs are related to the U.S. portion of the training. Using this base, the administrative costs was \$369 per participant training month. If the administrative costs are spread over the full number of training months (ELT in Europe and technical training in the U.S.), the cost would be \$272 per training month. These costs are not unreasonable for this level of training.

IN-COUNTRY ELT PROGRAM COSTS

The ECESP Program differs from the other PTPE activities in that it includes a substantial element of English Language Training in Eastern Europe. This ELT program has a significant impact on cost. The total program cost incurred in Europe to date is \$1,045,055, of which most is attributable to the ELT program. This represents almost 20 percent of the total training expenditures of the project. A total of 1,170 person months of training was spent in the ELT programs in Europe, for a total ELT training cost per participant month of \$893. Of this total, \$759/participant month was spent directly for tuition and fees for the ELT program and the remainder for other direct costs (travel, living allowances, etc.).

The ELT program costs more in tuition and fees than does the U.S. portion of the training. The high cost of this program is partly due to the approach of establishing a project specific training program conducted by the ALI/GU staff. Unlike other country programs, where on-going ELT programs are often available in binational centers or local universities, the ECESP Program had to create an independent capacity.

COST-SHARE CONTRIBUTIONS

Cost sharing is an important element of the ECESP component. The budgeted amount of cost share contributions for all sources is \$1,425,236 (according to the budget in the latest Cooperative Agreement). The cost share contribution to date (as December 31, 1993) is \$1,182,658, which is approximately 83 percent of the total budgeted contribution.

It is worth noting that the cost-share budgets in the Cooperative Agreement are not particularly clear. The language in the budget line items call for a 15 percent contribution in both administrative costs and in participant costs. However, this is somewhat misleading. The actual cost share budgets show that cost sharing for the administrative costs is actually 15 percent of the USAID budget for Cycle E only. The cost share budget for participant costs is 15 percent of the USAID budget for all cycles. A more standard approach to calculating cost sharing, or counterpart contributions, is to apply the cost share percentage to the total program costs (USAID and other combined). Using this standard, the \$1,425,236 cost share contribution is equivalent to 11.5 percent of the total program costs of \$12,387,236.

COST OF NON-SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS

An alternative approach to calculating the cost of the ECESP Program is to focus on the cost per *successful* participant training month. In the ECESP Program, almost 20 percent of the participants did not successfully complete the training, either because of failure to return to the home country, early termination, resigning, or not successfully completing the training requirements. At least 10 participants did not return to their home country after going through the English and training programs at project expense. Five participants were terminated after completing the ELT program and some portion of the U.S. training program. Thirteen participants did not successfully meet the requirements of the program, and thus received only an attendance certificate.

The cost of these failed participants is significant. The non-returnees represent approximately 32 person months of ELT training and 211 person months of U.S. training (\$28,576 in Eastern Europe; \$277,887 in the U.S.). The terminated participants represent 24 person months in ELT and 96 person months of training in the U.S. Those who were unsuccessful in the academic training portion represent 58 participant months in ELT and 378 participant months in the U.S. (It should be noted that some of the participants who did not complete the program successfully nevertheless have returned to their home countries and have found good jobs.)

Table 21
Total Cost Per Participant Training Month—Expenditures to Date

	Total Expenditures	Total Training Months	Cost Per Training Month
Training Costs (U.S.)	4,313,530	3,275	1,317
Training Costs (In-country)	1,045,055	1,170	893
Total Training Costs	5,359,054		
Administrative Costs	1,209,360		369*
Total Costs	6,568,414	4,445	1,477 2,006**

* Total administrative costs per participant month are calculated using the training months for the U.S. portion only, as the majority of the administrative costs are attributable to that aspect of the program. This makes the calculation more comparable to the other PTPE programs that do not include ELT. If administrative costs are spread over both in-country and U.S. portions, the cost per training month would be \$272. Alternatively, one could assign a proportion of the administrative costs to the ELT program, say 10 percent, which would result in administrative costs per U.S. training month at \$332.

** The first number is total costs per total training months (including in-country ELT) and the second number is total costs divided only by the U.S. training months.

Source: Quarterly TCA Report

The total cost of these failed programs can be calculated in two different ways. First, they can be seen as direct costs to the U.S. taxpayer—the total is estimated at \$1,169,000. The total cost of the non-returnees is approximately \$306,000, the total cost of the terminated participants is approximately \$148,000, and the cost of the trainees who failed to achieve the training objectives is about \$498,000. The administrative cost associated with these participants is about \$217,000. To place this in a proper context for comparison purposes, the same standard should be applied to other programs.

An alternative approach, and probably more useful, is to recalculate the cost of training to include only the successfully completed training months. Using this approach, the total number of ELT months is 1,056, reduced by 114 participant months, and the total number of successful U.S. training months is reduced by 685 participant months to 2,590. Using these measure of successful outcomes, the program costs would be calculated as \$1,665 per successful U.S. training month and \$990 per successful ELT training month. The overall administrative cost per participant month would increase from \$272 to \$332 (covering both U.S. and ELT costs). The total cost of training in the U.S. increases by 26 percent on this measure of cost-efficiency.

While this is a valid measure of overall program cost-effectiveness, some caveats are necessary. For comparison purposes, these numbers should be compared to other programs with similar training designs. A comparison to short-term technical training would be misleading because the nature of the program reduces the likelihood of non-return. Moreover, many short term programs lack the strict measures of accomplishment that are possible in a long term program.

REASONABLENESS OF TRAINING COSTS

The ECESP participants are placed in small, rural colleges and community colleges. The average cost of the U.S. portion of tuition and fees in the ECESP Program was \$524/participant month. These costs are reasonable and appropriate in light of the fee structure of the schools involved. The normal fees for a full-time, non-resident student at each of the colleges is shown on the next page:

College	Fee	Cost	Cost/month
LeMoyne College	Comprehensive fee	14,145	1,572
	Tuition	9,620	1,068
	Fees	265	29
	Room and Board	4,260	473
Wisconsin - River Falls	Tuition	6,209	690
	Room and Board	2,442	271
Wisconsin - LaCrosse	Tuition	5,800	644
	Room and Board	2,210	245
SUNY - Cobleskill & Morrisville	Tuition	6,550	728
	Room and Board	4,470	497
Modesto Junior College	Tuition	3,150	350
Kings River College	Tuition	3,390	377
Georgetown University	Tuition	16,440	1,827

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROGRAM STRATEGY AND DESIGN

- The ECESP program is not closely coordinated with the ENI mission and country strategic plans. The history of the program—a legislative earmark that predated substantive USAID strategies in the region—contributes to this problem and is the root of much of the problematical relationship with USAID. USAID staff in Washington and the CEE countries have concerns about the focus of the program and the utility of long-term training.
- The project design, with a heavy emphasis on non-degree programs for rural managers, lacks a clear strategic framework and specific expected outcomes that would enable clear impact level objectives. Ideally, this would be provided by the overall strategic framework of the PTPE program, but PTPE also lacks clear, specific objectives and established priorities.
- The Rural Manager group is the largest training group and the most problematic in terms of both operations and outcomes. The nature of the intended impact and the relationship to training design are the weakest for this group. A review of program strategy and priorities should focus on the role and justification for providing this type of training.
- Problems caused by strategy differences are exacerbated by the ECESP operational independence from the in-country representatives. Communications and coordination with the in-country staff are minimal. This issue is partly a function of ECESP operational procedures and partly a function of the split management responsibilities in USAID between the ENI Bureau and the field representatives.

Recommendations

- PTPE and ECESP should develop a common training strategy that is responsive to mission and country strategy statements and provides clear objectives. This training strategy should drive the design of ECESP and all other PTPE activities. This will be challenging, given the history of the programs.
- The strategy review should specifically focus on the Rural Manager group, to determine whether this group is important enough to overall USAID objectives to justify the costs of non-completion and non-return.
- ECESP program representatives should schedule regular, substantive meetings and communication with the USAID field offices. The participation of USAID in the process should be based on clear understandings of roles and strategic priorities.

Selection

- The selection process has been well-structured with a high degree of participation from local, regional, and national leaders. USAID has not been involved in the selection process.
- The selection criteria and participant profiles have been revised since the program start to target more senior individuals with higher levels of education and experience. The first group of participants were relatively young people with lower levels of education, with limited ties to

the home country, often no job to return to, and a limited understanding of what opportunities exist.

- The primary issues in selection are related to program strategy, and the targeting of Rural Managers, rather than the process.

Recommendations

- ECESP and PTPE should establish clear, mutually agreed program objectives and target group strategies (see above.)
- The current structure of participatory selection procedures should be continued. USAID and country representatives should be kept better informed about the selection process.

Placement and Programming

- The ECESP participants have been placed in community colleges and, in later groups, in small campuses of state university systems. The Senior Managers and Teachers spend all or part of their training at Georgetown University. The level of academic instruction appears to be appropriate for the majority of the participants.
- The non-degree program is a basic element of project design. This design appears directly useful and appropriate for the 6-12 month programs for Teachers and Senior Managers, but the utility of the 12-24 month programs for Rural Managers is less clear. Returned participants have not found ECESP program credentials particularly helpful in opening doors for good employment, although the training and English skills have been an important factor for the participants who have found employment. For these participants, the program appears too short to gain a useful credential and too long for a technical program focused on job requirements.

Recommendations

- If the program strategy is revised (as discussed above) and results in modifications of the target groups, the project design and placement strategies should be revised accordingly.
- The ECESP Program should continue to monitor and evaluate the programs of its cooperating training institutions to insure that they offer training that corresponds appropriately with the background, experience, and training needs of the participants.

Orientation

- The ECESP in-country orientation, included in the ELT program, does an effective job in preparing participants for the training experience—about 85 percent of the participants felt either prepared or very prepared for the program.
- The area in which participants were least satisfied was advance notice of travel, with only 56 percent being satisfied or very satisfied.

Recommendation

- The ECESP Program should assure that participants who do not attend the full ELT program receive an adequate orientation. The program needs to address the participants' dissatisfaction with advance notice of travel.

English Language Training

- The 24-week English Studies and Intercultural Training (ESIT) course conducted under contract to the American Language Institute at Georgetown University (ALI/GU) has not been adequate to bring participants to the *Handbook 10* standards for minimum language proficiency using the ALI/GU EPT test. About 91 percent of the most recent group of candidates did not meet the call-forward scores. OIT approved a waiver based on the recommendations of the ESL teachers.
- ECESP recruits and selects individuals who often have minimal or no English language skills. Starting from such a low base, it is very difficult to achieve fluency at the university level in six months.
- Although a majority of the participants acknowledge difficulties in English, only 15 percent believe that language problems substantially limited their ability to learn. By the last half of the program, only 7 percent are still having language problems. The majority of the participants complete the academic requirements. This lack of relationship between English language scores and overall participant performance—90 percent failing the ELT test but 80 to 90 percent successfully completing the program—calls into question the predictive value of the test.

Recommendations

- USAID and ECESP should review the whole issue of English language in the context of the decisions on program strategy. The options are a) to require longer periods of ELT; b) to change the target groups and require higher levels of starting English; c) to use a different standard for English proficiency; or some combination of the above.

Homestays

- In the first ECESP groups, all participants had homestays of at least two months. In the more recent groups, only 25 percent report having homestays.
- The experience with homestays has been mixed. Some homestays were the basis for lasting relationships and resulted in exceptionally good language acquisition. Other participants were poorly placed and had unpleasant experiences. The key elements for poor homestays were the isolated location of the homes and placement with low income families whose motivation appeared to be financial. Older participants, particularly men, have more difficulty adjusting to this arrangement than do younger participants.
- Most participants continue to believe that a good homestay opportunity is valuable.

Recommendation

- Information on the homestays and family visits of later participants is still being gathered. The experiences of the earlier groups suggest that a great deal more care and preparation must go into the selection of a host family, as well as orienting them to the needs and customs of the participants. A pleasant homestay experience is invaluable to the enhancement of English language acquisition, cultural adaptation, and better understanding of U.S. institutions.

Management and Logistics Support

- The participants were mainly dissatisfied with only two areas of program management and logistics support provided by the contractor—local transportation (37 percent were either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied); and quality of housing (15 percent were dissatisfied).
- USAID and ECESP had numerous disagreements about procedural issues such as timing and quality of reports, country clearances, and late submission of proposals.

Recommendations

- The ECESP program should make provision for adequate transportation of participants, especially those in small town or rural areas where there is little or no public transportation.
- ECESP should work to be more cognizant of and responsive to the procedural requirements and standards that are regularly and consistently applied to all other contractors.

Academic Courses

- Interviews with the returned participants indicate that the majority of the participants were satisfied with the quality and content of the academic programs.
- Eighty-eight (88) percent felt that the training was at about the right level of difficulty.
- In terms of the length of the programs, about 58 percent felt that their program was about right, while 42 percent (all Rural Managers) believed it should be longer.
- Only the Teachers expected to train others upon return (in order to achieve a multiplier effect), and they felt that the program was designed to help them achieve this.

Recommendations

- The ECESP program should continue monitoring the training to insure the continued quality and appropriate content of the academic programs.
- In addition to the Teachers, other training groups should be apprised of their role in sharing the training and contributing to the dissemination of new skills and ideas throughout their institution, workplace, community, and region.

Internships

- Overall, the ECESP internships appear to be adequate with the students placed in reasonably appropriate settings, consistent with their fields of training. In several cases, the internships were too short to be useful, but only about 10 percent were ranked as poor or problematical.
- A notable exception was the Modesto (CA) Junior College internship program which had vigorous complaints by both students and administrators. Some of these problems appear to have been related to the coordinator's attempts to make placements in companies in which the participants had no interest.
- Participant reviews of the internships are mixed. While most are positive, 15 percent of the respondents are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their internships, and a further 15 percent are neutral.
- It appears that the most successful internships have been those where the participant made the arrangements directly, or at least have had a major role in identifying possibilities and planning the activity.

Recommendation

- Setting up successful intern experiences requires considerable staff time, regular and clear communication about interests and objectives, and careful matching of interests, skills, and personalities. The ECESP program managers should provide clear written guidance to college administrators, participants, and potential internship sites on both USAID regulations and expectations about what a successful internship experience entails. Participants must be clearly told the nature of their responsibilities and opportunities, and their expectations should be kept in line with reality. Much of the planning should be completed before an internship starts and should be highly interactive between the supervisor and participant.

Follow-on

- There has been no formal Follow-on program for the ECESP participants, although a small number of re-entry activities have been conducted directly by participants.

Recommendation

- The ECESP program should be expanded to allow for more Follow-on and re-entry activities. Participant interests should determine whether this takes the form of an alumni association, newsletter, periodic meetings of returned participants, reinforcement seminars, assistance with project development, job search assistance, or some combination of these.

Participant Satisfaction With The Program

- The majority of participants are satisfied with the training program, find it relevant to their needs, and consider it to be at least as good as they expected it to be. Teachers and Senior Managers are much more satisfied with the program than are the Rural Managers.

- A majority of the respondents to the Exit Questionnaire (69%) feel that they largely achieved their training objectives.
- A majority of the participants (70%) expect the training will be relevant to the situation in their home country.
- The participants identify computer skills and financial management skills as being the most useful skills obtained in the program.
- Program improvements recommended by participants from all groups include having more practical training activities, establishing opportunities for more business contacts, and improving internships. In addition, the Rural Managers recommend having a longer program and earning a degree.

Recommendation

- ECESP should review the program to identify opportunities for more practical training activities and improved internships. Issues on program length and degree objectives should be related to strategy decisions.

OUTCOMES AND IMPACT OF THE TRAINING

- At the time of this report, 148 ECESP participants had completed the program or had been terminated, and 107 were still active.
- Ten participants are reported as non-returns; two of the successful participants are currently living in other CEE countries. Several former participants have returned to the U.S., but the exact number is not known.
- Rural Managers have been the most problematical of the training groups in terms of program outcome. All of the ECESP participants who resigned, quit, were terminated, did not complete the program successfully, or did not return to the home country were from these groups.
- Most of the returned participants live in the same city or community as they did before the program.

Personal Impact of Training

- Returned participants identify “confidence” as being the most valuable benefit they received from the program.
- The returned participants also gained an understanding of the U.S. and its institutions. The large majority of returned participants reported having a much better understanding of the functioning of free markets and democratic institutions.

Recommendations

- The program should continue to provide opportunities for participants to develop confidence and leadership qualities.
- Opportunities to experience the U.S. and its institutions should continue to be provided and expanded where possible.

Employment Status

- Eighty-eight (88) percent of the returned participants are employed; most are employed in the same field as their training. Those not employed are from the Rural Managers group.
- Only 30 percent of the returnees continue to work with the same employer as before training. The Senior Managers, followed by the Teachers, are most likely to remain with the same employers.
- Nearly two-thirds the returned participants are working in the private sector; about 32 percent are working in the public sector.
- Most returned participants have received personal benefits from the training in their work situation either through promotions, increased responsibilities, or salary increases. The impact has been more pronounced for the Rural Managers who are more likely to increase their salary level and/or receive increased responsibilities than are the other groups, in part due to their lower level of employment prior to the program.

Relevance and Utilization of Training in Current Job

- The majority of returned participants indicate that their U.S. training was useful. Again, the Rural Manager group was less likely than others to find the training useful or relevant.
- According to participants, the aspects of training that are most useful include: English, marketing, management, computer skills, general business studies, finance, and professional contacts.
- Returned participants identify lack of adequate equipment and lack of support for change by the supervisors as the most common constraints to using new skills and knowledge effectively.

Recommendation

- If employers and/or sponsoring institutions are brought into the training planning process, a commitment for support for the returned participant might be sought. Employers will be much more likely to support a returned participant's ideas for change if they are aware of and a party to the process. To the extent possible, ECESP program staff should try to incorporate the employer into the planning process.

Accomplishments of Returned Participants

- The degree to which returned participants have been active in training others—co-workers, community members, students, etc.—is notable.
- The training has had a high impact on teachers in their direct job performance. This group is most likely to make relatively rapid impact on their environment by developing new economics and business curriculums.
- The training has also had a direct impact in the lives of most of the participants. A few participants have started new businesses, some have been able to find a job - or a better job, and most have been able to improve their job performance. A few have written scholarly papers, policy advocacy papers, and developed new community or business projects.

Multiplier Effect

- Members of all three groups (Rural Managers, Teachers, and Senior Managers) have been involved in regular and repeated training activities reaching hundreds of other people.
- Not surprisingly, the largest number of people trained have been the classroom students of the Teachers. One teacher reports having trained over 600 individuals, and both a Rural Manager and a Senior Manager estimate that they have each trained 400.
- Most returnees had reached between 10 and 50 other people with some form of training.

Program Costs

- Through December 31, 1993, the total participant cost attributed to U.S. training was \$4,313,530, for a total program cost per training month of \$1,317. The portion of total expenditures for tuition and training fees is \$1,716,539, or \$524 per participant month.
- Total program cost incurred in Europe to date is \$1,045,055, of which most is attributable to the ELT program. A total of 1,170 person months was spent in ELT, for an average cost per participant month of \$839. Of this amount, \$759 per participant month was spent directly for tuition and fees for the ELT program.
- The total administrative costs expended as of December 31, 1993 was \$1,209,360. This is equivalent to \$369 per participant month in the U.S. If administrative costs are applied over the base of both U.S. and Europe (ELT) training periods, the per participant month cost drops to \$272.

Recommendation

- ECESP should review opportunities and alternatives to reduce the high cost of the ELT program. All other costs appear reasonable for this type of training.