

# Participant Training Project for Europe

## First Annual Report

### Table of Contents

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <b>Executive Summary</b>  |      |
| The Project .....   | i    |
| The Participants .....  | ii   |
| Project Outcomes .....  | ii   |
| Project Impact .....  | iv   |
| What Has Been Learned About The Project .....                     | v    |
| Evaluation Objectives .....                                       | v    |
| Project Management .....  | v    |
| Recommendations .....   | vi   |
| <br>  |      |
| <b>Chapter One – Project Description</b>                          |      |
| Introduction .....  | 1    |
| Purpose .....   | 1    |
| Scope .....   | 1    |
| Responsibilities .....  | 2    |
| USAID .....   | 2    |
| Cooperative Agreements .....                                      | 3    |
| Inter-Agency Agreements .....                                     | 4    |
| <br>  |      |
| <b>Chapter Two – Project Status</b>                               |      |
| Overall Project Status .....                                      | 7    |
| Participation by Country .....                                    | 7    |
| Training Status .....   | 8    |
| Gender .....  | 8    |
| Type of Training .....  | 8    |
| Major Fields of Study .....                                       | 8    |
| Training Institutions .....                                       | 9    |
| Training Status by Country .....                                  | 9    |
| Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia ..... | 10   |
| Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania .....      | 11   |
| Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Yugoslavia .....                       | 12   |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Chapter 3 – Outcome and Impact</b>                             |           |
| Evaluation Methodology for Outcome and Impact Measures .....      | 13        |
| Highlights of Issues From Exit and Returnee Questionnaires .....  | 14        |
| Program Quality Measures .....                                    | 14        |
| Program Impact Measures .....                                     | 17        |
| Issues Identified in the Poland Site Visit .....                  | 20        |
| Personal Impact of PTPE Training .....                            | 20        |
| Impact of Short-term Programs .....                               | 21        |
| Country Training Strategy .....                                   | 21        |
| <br>  |           |
| <b>Chapter 4 – Observations and Recommendations</b>               |           |
| Observations on the Project .....                                 | 23        |
| Project Design and Strategy .....                                 | 23        |
| Summary of Activities .....                                       | 23        |
| Project Management .....  | 26        |
| Recommendations .....   | 28        |
| <br>  |           |
| <b>Chapter 5 – Monitoring and Evaluation</b>                      |           |
| Introduction .....  | 31        |
| Purpose .....   | 31        |
| Implementing Organizations .....                                  | 31        |
| Project Staff .....   | 32        |
| Accomplishments .....   | 32        |
| Coordination with Organizations .....                             | 32        |
| Database Development .....  | 35        |
| Development of Evaluation Instruments .....                       | 35        |
| Procedures for Obtaining Data .....                               | 35        |
| Deliverables .....  | 37        |
| Financial Status of Monitoring and Evaluation Project .....       | 38        |
| <br>  |           |
| <b>Appendix A – Organizational Profiles .....</b>                 | <b>39</b> |
| <b>Appendix B – PTPE Trainees by Country and Contractor .....</b> | <b>75</b> |
| <b>Appendix C – Country Profiles .....</b>                        | <b>77</b> |

7

### THE PROJECT

The Participant Training Project for Europe (PTPE) was initiated by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in 1991 to provide flexible support for academic education, training, and internships in the United States or in U.S. institutions abroad for participants from the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries. Through PTPE, leaders and potential leaders who may have an impact on the economic and social development of the CEE Region can obtain valuable training. Most of the project's activities are of a short-term technical nature although many participants do enroll in academic programs. All training is done in accordance with Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act legislation which addresses the following themes:

- Economic Restructuring: 50 percent (Economics, Business, Banking, etc.)
- Democratic Institutions: 25 percent (Political Science, Education, etc.)
- Quality of Life: 25 percent (Health, Housing, Labor, Medicine, etc.)

The purpose of the PTPE is to equip a broad base of leaders and professionals in the CEE countries with specialized skills and practical knowledge, in order to develop and support economic restructuring, free enterprise, democratic processes and an improved quality of life in the Region. Some 1,200 to 1,300 trainees are expected each year from 14 countries (Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and the three Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania).

USAID's Bureau of Europe and Newly Independent States (ENI) manages the project with the assistance of a series of private contractors, grantees and U.S. Government agencies including:

- Partners of International Education and Training (PIET)—a private sector training placement contractor.
- Georgetown University which has a legislative earmark for its East Central Europe Scholarship (ECESP).
- Institute for International Education (IIE) through its North American Consortium for Free Market Study.
- United States Information Agency (USIA) which has contracted the Association of International Educators (NAFSA) to implement the academic portion of the program.
- U.S. Department of State's Foreign Service Institute (DOS/FSI).
- The Salzburg Seminars.
- Cooperative Agreements with 12 U.S. organizations (see Chapter 1, page 3).

---

## THE PARTICIPANTS

### ■ *How many are there and where are they from?*

*As of March 31, 1994, PTPE had recruited, selected, and sent 908 participants to a wide variety of training programs. Of this number, 480 participants have completed training and returned home while 428 of them are still in training programs. Table 2.1 on page 7 shows the distribution of trainees by their countries of origin. The greatest numbers of the trainees come from Poland (32.3%), Bulgaria (14.5%), Hungary (13.5%), Czech Republic (10.4%), Romania (7.0%) and the Slovak Republic (5.6%).*

### ■ *What did they study?*

*Nearly two-thirds (457) of the 773 PTPE participants entered in the USAID Participant Training Information System (PTIS) attended long-term academic or technical training (programs of nine months or longer). Approximately 43 percent of them (313) enrolled in academic (degree-seeking) programs. While they studied in 77 different fields (See Table 2.2, page 9), nearly a third of them were in areas related to marketing, business, management, finance/investment, banking, and economics. In addition, a relatively large group (20%) studied agriculture related business and management courses. Another group representing about 10 percent of all trainees enrolled in courses related to public administration and political science.*

### ■ *Where did they study?*

*PTPE training takes place throughout the United States at 125 different public and private sector institutions and organizations as well as the Salzburg Seminars in Austria. U.S. institutions include the University of Wisconsin, Harvard University, Modesto Junior College in California, the State University of New York (SUNY), Georgetown University, the University of Pittsburgh, Southern Illinois University, Bard College, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the U.S. Department of State's Foreign Service Institute (all of which had ten or more trainees).*

## PROJECT OUTCOMES

*Results from the questionnaires filled out by trainees at the completion of their programs indicate that PTPE has no significant implementation problems from the participants' point of view. At the time of this report, 141 Exit Questionnaires had been received from those participants who completed their training after August 1993. Their training ranged from one week to two years in duration. The responses were from participants from all of the CEE countries, although some countries were not sufficiently represented to make intercountry comparisons possible. The responses were from PIET (58), USIA (32), Georgetown University (27), IIE/Cooperative Housing Foundation/Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (6 each), Harvard University (4) and Johns Hopkins University (2).*

---

■ *Were they satisfied with their programs?*

*Most participants are satisfied with the quality of PTPE programs, although vast differences exist among the contractors in their approach to training and the activities they provide.* Overall, 87 percent of the participants were either satisfied or very satisfied with their programs. The only contractor whose participants were not unanimously satisfied was PIET with only 5 percent neutral or dissatisfied.

■ *Did PTPE participants meet their training objectives?*

*Most participants believe that their training objectives were achieved at the completion of their U.S. training.* Overall, 46 percent of the participants completely achieved their objectives; 34 percent achieved many of their objectives; and 19 percent partially achieved their objectives. The programs with the highest percentage of participants who completely achieved their objectives are the Cooperative Housing Foundation (CHF), Harvard University, IIE (see the level of dissatisfaction referred to above), and Johns Hopkins University. Programs with high percentages of trainees who only partially accomplished their objectives include Georgetown University's ECESP, the PIET program, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, and USIA.

■ *Was the training useful and relevant to their needs?*

*A majority (78%) of the participants believe that PTPE training is relevant to their needs.* The strongest endorsements of the relevance of the training programs were from those attending Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, Harvard University, and Johns Hopkins University. Trainees found the least relevant program to be that offered by the Cooperative Housing Foundation where only one-third of the group believed the training to be relevant to their needs. It is interesting to note that the Cooperative Housing Foundation was among the highest with respect to meeting trainees' program objectives. Over 83 percent of the participants believe that the training will be either completely or very useful when they return to their home country. Johns Hopkins University, Georgetown University, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, and USIA participants are the most likely to find the training completely useful, whereas the Cooperative Housing Foundation and PIET participants are the most likely to find the training only partially useful.

■ *Will the training be useful to their country's transition to democracy?*

*Most participants (83%) from all programs believe that PTPE training will be useful to them in helping their country make the transition from its socialist economy to a private enterprise system.* When the question relates to the political transition to a democratic state, however, only 63 percent believe their training will be useful to their countries in this area.

---

## PROJECT IMPACT

At the time of this report, Aguirre International had received a total of 100 questionnaires from participants who had returned to their countries. The responses were from Georgetown University's ECESP (53), PIET (39), IIE (7) and the Department of State—DOS/FSI (1). This response is only from the first of three questionnaires planned for the returnees. The training in these programs ranged from one week to two years in length. The responses came from all of the CEE countries although the limited number will not permit a comparison of program impact by country. Information about PTPE impact was also obtained from a site-visit to Poland completed in April 1994. Polish returnees from the ECESP and PIET programs were interviewed about activities in their work places and communities after returning home.

### ■ *What was the impact of PTPE on the employment of trainees?*

*About 92 percent of the returned participants are employed.* The highest percentage of unemployed returned participants was in Poland, with almost 13 percent unemployed—primarily from the Georgetown ECESP Rural Manager Program. No more than six percent of the participants in other countries were unemployed. The largest number are working in the public sector (45%), followed by private for-profit companies (25%) and mixed private/public sector entities (19%). Overall, more than half of the returnees have returned to the same company or government office where they worked before their training. PTPE training is perceived by the participants as being relevant to their job needs. Overall, 31 percent of the returnees believe that the training is highly relevant and an additional 37 percent have found the training to be relevant. For 31 percent, the training has been helpful in a general way.

### ■ *Have trainees used their training to train or influence others?*

*The majority of the returned participants (82%) have been active in training other people.* Training is provided to co-workers, students, community members and others. The total number of people receiving training from PTPE returnees is reported by them to be 8,407 or an average of 84 people per trainee. Only one-third of the programs reported any Follow-on activities (e.g., workshops) for providing further training for the returnees.

### ■ *Has PTPE affected the lives of the returnees?*

*Living and studying abroad has an impact beyond the specific learning objectives of the program.* The most consistent impact reported by returnees across all programs has been an increased understanding of free-market economics, with about 74 percent reporting a "very much" increased level of understanding. The long-term programs of IIE and Georgetown University have a higher level of impact in this area than do the short-term programs. Visits with Polish returnees from long-term programs often indicated a transformational experience which affected both their attitudes and knowledge. Returned participants from all countries also report a better understanding

---

of democratic institutions, although the level of impact in this complex area is much less than understanding the economic system.

■ *Have returnees participated in post-training Follow-on programs?*

*The overwhelming majority of the returned participants (94%) have not participated in any formal Follow-on activities.* To date, none of the major programs have implemented Follow-on programs. However, most participants from all programs maintain personal contact with other participants and slightly over half maintain contact with their U.S. training institutions.

## WHAT HAS BEEN LEARNED ABOUT THE PROJECT

It is still too early in project implementation to identify any real lessons learned. PTPE returnees are just getting back to their countries and beginning to apply what they have learned from their training experiences. However, some issues have been raised and some observations about the project can be drawn from the monitoring and evaluation data.

### Evaluation Objectives

Programs with clearly defined objectives are the easiest to evaluate since evaluation goals and benchmarks exist to measure project performance and impact. PTPE acts more as a *mechanism* for establishing operational and contractual arrangements for implementing training programs rather than defining the outcomes of these programs. PTPE relies on the SEED Act objectives which are very broad in nature—economic restructuring, strengthening democracy, and improving the quality of life. As a result, PTPE is composed of a range of unconnected activities with broad objectives which cannot help but diminish the potential impact of the project. While individual activities may result in great satisfaction to those who participate and may induce improvements in some areas in the CEE countries, it is difficult without well defined evaluation criteria to measure any overall Regional impact as a result of the project.

### Project Management

Similarly, the project is managed in a manner which does not lend itself to concerted impact in measurable areas. In a number of cases, PTPE activities were designed by the contractors which implement these same projects making it difficult for the activities to respond to objectives established by the ENI Bureau. This is true for the Georgetown, USIA, and Department of State programs as well as the Salzburg Seminars. Of special concern is the USIA program which provides for "topping up" grants for a wide range of students in many academic fields. There is almost no way to identify what finally happens to the students who receive this assistance—do they complete their studies, do they return to their countries? Little can be done to relate program recipients to development consequences which is necessary for measuring the impact of USAID

---

activities. In other cases, activities are very small and unrelated, meaning that concerted impact is difficult to attain. Awards are based more on the cost-effectiveness and quality of the individual program rather than on the collective impact these programs will have on development.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- ***The EUR Bureau should reassess the relationship of the structure of the PTPE training project to the country strategies.*** The project design, and each component activity, should be clearly structured to be responsive to identified training needs in country strategies. In turn, the country representatives should be assisted in developing clear training strategies that are integrated into the broader range of assistance and that directly contribute to identified impact measures. The impact of the PTPE training project can then be assessed in terms of its success in helping to achieve country objectives. This may well result in expanding some components of the project and reducing or eliminating others. This reassessment should be conducted in close collaboration with the country representatives.
- ***If the PTPE project is primarily to support the country strategies, then ENI should provide technical assistance to each country to develop a country training strategy that is integrated in, and integral to, the achievement of country objectives and clear achievement indicators.*** The types and nature of training necessary to achieve the objectives should determine the design of the PTPE project.
- ***The EUR Bureau should explore ways to simplify the management of the project.*** Some streamlining should result from the reassessment of the project design and strategy discussed above. Indeed, this is an essential first step as no decision about how to reduce the number of implementing organizations and types of training can be made in isolation from strategy and objectives. The two issues should be reviewed in concert: (1) what are the core objectives and strategies, and (2) what implementation alternatives are least management intensive and most cost-effective.
- ***The special nature and status of the USIA program should be recognized.*** There is no discernable benefit to USAID, USIA, or the participants in attempting to force-fit two such different organizations and systems. The nature of the "topping-off" program is so different from standard USAID training that attempts to manage or evaluate USIA on the same standards are inevitably artificial and unproductive.
- ***The grant competition program management should also be reviewed.*** If a strategic reassessment determines that this is a priority and should be continued, then the range of training should be more narrowly defined, and a small number of implementing organizations should be identified to conduct training on a multi-

---

year basis. This will provide greater depth for each type of training and will develop greater expertise in the grant recipients.

# CHAPTER 1

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

---

### INTRODUCTION

The Participant Training Project for Europe (PTPE) was initiated by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) in 1991 to provide a flexible means to support academic education, training, and internships in the United States or in U.S. institutions abroad for participants from the Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries. The project will train leaders and potential leaders who can impact the development problems within the Central and Eastern European region. All training is done in accordance with Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act legislation. SEED Act development themes to be addressed through training are:

- Economic Restructuring: 50 percent (Economics, Business, Banking, etc.)
- Democratic Institutions: 25 percent (Political Science, Education, etc.)
- Quality of Life: 25 percent (Health, Housing, Labor, Medicine, etc.)

Training is provided primarily in the United States, emphasizing a rich experience of culture and society as well as exposure to a free-market system. Most of the training focuses on short-term technical training with little emphasis on degree programs. Kinds of training include classroom, short-courses, internships, and on-the-job experiences.

A major difference between participant training in the Central and Eastern Europe region and other USAID participant training programs is that the Regional Mission for Europe (RME) does not have a training office, nor do the USAID Country Representatives (USAID Reps) have training specialists on their staffs. Instead, many of the functions normally performed by a Mission Training Office are in large part handled by a prime contractor under the direction of the EUR/RME and the ENI Bureau's Project Manager for Participant Training, with guidance provided by the Center for Human Capacity Development (HCD).

### PURPOSE

The purpose is to equip a broad base of leaders and professionals in Central and Eastern Europe with specialized skills and practical knowledge, in order to develop and support economic restructuring, free enterprise, democratic processes, and an improved quality of life in the region.

### SCOPE

PTPE anticipates a total of 1,200 to 1,300 trainees each year, from Projects 180-0002 and 180-0045, grant competition recipients (Cooperative Agreements), Inter-Agency Agreements (IAAs), Georgetown University's legislative earmark—the East Central

---

Europe Scholarship Program (ECESP), and Bureau-wide Technical Assistance contract funded trainees.

At present, PTPE serves fourteen countries, which include Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and the three Baltic countries of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

## **RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **USAID**

USAID implements the PTPE program through its buy-in with the HCD contractor, Partners for International Education and Training (PIET), through Cooperative Agreements, and through Inter-Agency Agreements.

USAID responsibilities for training and services provided under the PIET contract are for short-term technical programs, usually non-degree and under one year. The Training and Exchange Office of the ENI Bureau's HR Division has arranged for PIET to perform participant training field support functions for Central and Eastern Europe participants. PIET established two primary field offices headed by Regional Coordinators in Warsaw and Budapest, and located satellite offices in the capitals of the other CEE countries in the region. These offices provide training and support services depending on the needs of the USAID Reps to include: recruitment, PIO/P preparation (Project 180-0045 only), medical examination scheduling, obtaining medical clearance, documentation, language testing, predeparture orientation, travel logistics, liaison services as needed, a participant tracking system, Follow-up, and overall guidance.

USAID Representatives with the assistance of the PTPE staff identify potential trainees. These individuals are submitted to ENI/HR/TE for funding under the project primarily through a nominating process from the USAID Reps, addressing the critical needs in each country.

PIET, funded under Project 180-0045, programs and monitors trainees in the U.S. For these direct placement and monitoring services PTPE also recruits potential trainees when necessary. PIET and PTPE staff consider individual interests, as well as seeking the highest quality programs available at the lowest cost. Attention is also given to placement at Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and placement at facilities with linkages to institutions in Central and Eastern Europe.

In order to provide appropriate and state-of-the-art training designs and activities for PTPE, the ENI Bureau solicits proposals from a broad spectrum of organizations. Under its contract with the ENI Bureau, PIET set up a mechanism for conducting a solicited competition for Training design and activities. This competition, held annually in November and December, is announced through the Commerce Business Daily,

---

Chronicle for Higher Education, the MOLIS System, and the Federal Registry. Applicants must show a working knowledge of SEED Act legislation and goals, and/or have a relationship with counterpart institutions in countries covered under SEED Act legislation. Proposals are screened and evaluated for responsiveness. Criteria for selection include SEED Act priority training areas, quality of program offered, and contribution of cost-sharing from the proposing organization.

### **Cooperative Agreements**

For 1993-1994, USAID signed Cooperative Agreements with 12 organizations (see Appendix A, *Profiles of Organizations* for a more detailed discussion of each Cooperative Agreement).

- Center for International Technological Cooperation, at SUNY—Farmingdale to train 10 Lithuanian participants in Banking and Finance;
- Cooperative Housing Foundation to train 24 participants from the Baltics, Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland in housing delivery;
- Council of International Programs/The Soros Foundation to train 65 participants from the region in Public Administration, Banking, Human Resources Management, Health Care Administration, Environmental Protection, Social Services Management, and Housing and Community Development;
- Goodwill Industries to train 8 participants from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Latvia, and the Slovak Republic in Vocational Rehabilitation, Job Training, and Small Business Development;
- Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration to train 25 participants from the region in Marketing and Competitive Analysis, Production-Technology-Operations Management; Strategic Management and Organizational Behavior, Capital Markets and Corporate Finance, and Managerial Accounting and Performance Evaluation;
- Home Builders Institute to train 30 participants from Poland and the Slovak Republic in the Administration of Building Standards and Testing;
- Institute of International Education (IIE) and Joseph E. Seagram & Sons to train 9 participants from the region in Business and Economics;
- Johns Hopkins University to train 26 participants from the region in Local Government Administration and Non-governmental Organization;
- The Soros Foundation's Management Training Program to train 30 participants from Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Romania, and the Slovak

---

Republic in Business Management, Communications, Environmental Management, Public Administration, Banking and Financial Services;

- Thomas Jefferson University Hospital to train 24 participants from the region in Diagnostic Ultrasound Training;
- U.S. Telecommunications Training Institute to train 40 participants from the region in a variety of Communication fields; and
- William Davidson Institute at the University of Michigan School of Business Administration to train 18 participants from the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the Slovak Republic in Market Economics, Privatization, Sector Reform, and Public Administration.

The Georgetown University legislative earmark, the East Central Europe Scholarship Program (ECESP), began its program in 1990 and has trained nearly 255 participants which includes Rural Managers, Teachers, Senior Managers, and Public Administrators from the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary, and the Slovak Republic.

In 1993, The Salzburg Seminar trained 31 participants from the region in Economics, Federalism, American Law and Legal Institutions.

In 1993 and 1994, the Institute for International Education, through its North American Consortium for Free Market Study, trained 16 participants from the region in Microeconomics, Macroeconomics, Accounting, International Economics, Marketing, Finance, Management Strategy, and Business Environment.

### **Inter-Agency Agreements**

Participants from East and Central Europe were also trained through Inter-Agency Agreements.

- The Department of State's Foreign Service Institute trained 20 participants from Albania and Bulgaria in Diplomatic Training. The program is completed and the participants have returned to their home countries.
- The United States Information Agency (USIA) is responsible for the administration and oversight of the long-term academic portion of the program. The USIA has selected the Association of International Educators (NAFSA) to implement the academic program. The academic grants are for up to two years of study with project funding not to exceed \$10,000 per student per year. Nearly 258 students from the region have participated through this program.

It should be noted that the USIA Top-Up Program is distinctly different from any other USAID participant training program. The academic training provided through USAID's Inter-Agency Agreement with USIA is

---

basically a scholarship program unlike any other East European participant training program. It does not follow the traditional USAID model for training programs beginning with selection and continuing through to Follow-on. Examples of these differences are illustrated as follows:

- a. U.S. institutions identify and nominate participants. These nominees are individuals who qualify for admission to U.S. institutions and possess the requisite English language skills (as determined by those institutions) to succeed in the programs. They are individuals who are eligible for the final two years of an undergraduate degree or eligible for graduate level degrees. The nominees are sent to a NAFSA-appointed committee for selection.
- b. General guidelines for selection include: a field of study that loosely falls within one of the SEED Act Strategic Objectives; no quotas to ensure country representation, although every SEED Act country is represented; sixty percent goal for women; sixty percent goal for undergraduate students; and no particular goal for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) representation, although one HBCU has placed participants. In order to select the very best candidates, however, these general guidelines need not be strictly adhered to.
- c. Campus Coordinators are assigned to monitor and counsel participants at each institution.
- d. At the end of their program, participants and Campus Coordinators complete written narratives about their training experience, which are sent to NAFSA. When the students have completed their programs of one or two years, some return home directly. Many others, however, apply for graduate or post-graduate degrees or other programs in the U.S.

## CHAPTER 2 PROJECT STATUS

### OVERALL PROJECT STATUS

According to Quarterly Report data submitted to Aguirre International by the contracting organizations, supplemented with Europe Information System (EURIS) data, as of March 31, 1994, the PTPE Project has recruited, selected, and sent to training 908 participants. Of this number, 480 participants have completed training, and 428 participants are currently in training. Quarterly Report data do not reflect gender, training institution, nor field of training.

### Participation by Country

The following table shows the number and percentage of PTPE participants by CEE country.

In order to report gender, field of training, type of training, and length of training, it is necessary to draw from data obtained from the Center for Human Capacity Development's Participant Training Information System (PTIS). Each implementing organization is required to submit basic data on the Participant Data Form (PDF) to HCD prior to the start of training, either through electronic transfer or hard copy.

It should be noted that the PTIS data lags behind the Quarterly Report data submitted by the contracting organizations. Regular contact is maintained between Aguirre International and HCD to monitor, share, and insure the quality of the data. On-going reconciliation efforts with the Center for Human Capacity Development will continue to narrow the gap between the Quarterly and PTIS data. For this section of the report, data on gender, type of training, major fields of study, and training institutions, data is obtained from the PTIS.

**Table 2.1** *Percentage of Participants by Country*

| Country         | Completed Training | In-Training | Total      | Percentage   |
|-----------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| Albania         | 18                 | 9           | 27         | 3.0          |
| Bosnia          | 8                  | 1           | 9          | 1.0          |
| Bulgaria        | 62                 | 70          | 132        | 14.5         |
| Croatia         | 8                  | 10          | 18         | 2.0          |
| Czech Republic  | 43                 | 51          | 94         | 10.4         |
| Estonia         | 12                 | 11          | 23         | 2.5          |
| Hungary         | 69                 | 54          | 123        | 13.5         |
| Latvia          | 9                  | 10          | 19         | 2.1          |
| Lithuania       | 12                 | 23          | 35         | 3.9          |
| Macedonia       | 7                  | 6           | 13         | 1.4          |
| Poland          | 168                | 125         | 293        | 32.3         |
| Romania         | 34                 | 30          | 64         | 7.0          |
| Slovak Republic | 28                 | 23          | 51         | 5.6          |
| Slovenia        | 1                  | 5           | 6          | 0.7          |
| Yugoslavia      | 1                  | 0           | 1          | 0.1          |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>480</b>         | <b>428</b>  | <b>908</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

Source: PTPE Quarterly Reports and EURIS database through 3/31/94.

---

## **Training Status**

As of March 31, 1994, the PTIS contained a total of 733 PTPE trainees, including USIA participants. Of this number, 408 had completed training and 325 were still in training.

## **Gender**

Data generated from the PTIS show that 38.5 percent (282) of these 733 participants are women, and 61.5 percent (451) are men.

## **Type of Training**

Slightly over 62 percent of the PTPE participants (457) are enrolled in long-term training, a training program of nine months or longer.

Nearly 43 percent of the PTPE participants (313) are entered into academic (degree-seeking) programs. Of this number, 254 are USIA participants. The largest degree field is the Bachelor's Degree with 129 participants (123-USIA, 6-IIE), followed by the Master's Degree (105-USIA), the Associate Degree [55 (48-GU, 5-IIE, 2-USIA)], and the Doctorate Degree (24-USIA).

Slightly more than 56 percent of the PTPE participants are enrolled in non-degree (technical) programs.

## **Major Fields of Study**

The 733 PTPE Trainees are distributed among 77 fields of study. The largest two fields of study were Agricultural Business and Agribusiness Management, with 83 and 62 participants, respectively. The next three largest fields of study are Marketing, Business, and Political Science.

The following Table shows the 20 largest fields of study, which contain 78 percent (573) of the participants. The remaining 160 participants are divided among 57 other fields of study, with fewer than 10 participants in each field.

The fields of Agricultural Business, Agribusiness Management, Marketing, Economics, Investments and Securities, and Architecture have a large ratio of men to women, while women exceed men in the fields of the Humanities, Finance, Urban Development and Planning, Earth Science, and Education.

In the category of *Other*, 57 fields are represented, each containing fewer than ten participants. These are, for the most part, individual trainees in specific courses. However, eight students each are being trained in Law, General Business, Public Finances and Tax Authority, and General Mathematics; seven each in Communications, Conservation, and Diagnostic Radiology; six each in General Agriculture and International Trade; and five each in General Medicine, Money and Banking, and Telecommunications.

## Training Institutions

PTPE training was conducted through 125 U.S. organizations and institutions as well as the Salzburg Seminar in Austria. Among institutions with the largest numbers of participants are: University of Wisconsin (83), Modesto (CA) Junior College (34), SUNY-Cobleskill (32), Salzburg Seminar (31), Harvard University (23), SUNY-Agricultural Technical Institute (23), Georgetown University (16), Securities and Exchange Commission (12), University of Pittsburgh (11), Southern Illinois University (10), Bard College (10), and SUNY-Farmingdale (10). The remaining institutions trained fewer than 10 participants each. Seventy-three (73) PIET participants had observational/study tours and were not assigned a designated training institution.

## TRAINING STATUS BY COUNTRY

The following is a breakdown by country showing the amount of PTPE training by contracting organization, Cooperative Agreement, or Interagency Agreement according to Quarterly Report data submitted to Aguirre International (see Appendix B, *PTPE Trainees by Country and Contractor*). As discussed earlier, the number of participants reported in the Quarterly Report will, in most instances, exceed the number of participants found in the PTIS, which lags behind the actual counts. For a more detailed discussion to include summaries of the individual country strategies, please refer to Appendix C, *Country Profiles*.

**Table 2.2** *PTPE Fields of Study by Gender*

| Field of Study                  | Women      | Men        | Total      | Percentage   |
|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Agri. Business                  | 19         | 64         | 83         | 11.3         |
| Agribusiness Mgmt.              | 16         | 46         | 62         | 8.5          |
| Marketing (General)             | 12         | 43         | 55         | 7.5          |
| Business (General)              | 20         | 31         | 51         | 7.0          |
| Political Sci. (General)        | 18         | 28         | 46         | 6.3          |
| Business Mgmt. & Admin.         | 16         | 21         | 37         | 5.0          |
| Humanities                      | 32         | 3          | 35         | 4.8          |
| Finance (General)               | 15         | 7          | 22         | 3.0          |
| Public Admin. (General)         | 10         | 12         | 22         | 3.0          |
| Urban Dev. & Planning           | 12         | 9          | 21         | 2.9          |
| Economics (General)             | 6          | 14         | 20         | 2.7          |
| Banking                         | 8          | 12         | 20         | 2.7          |
| Computer Sci/Tech (Gen.)        | 7          | 12         | 19         | 2.6          |
| Investments & Securities        | 3          | 11         | 14         | 1.9          |
| Theory of Public Admin.         | 5          | 8          | 13         | 1.8          |
| Social Sciences (General)       | 5          | 7          | 12         | 1.6          |
| Architecture (General)          | 2          | 9          | 11         | 1.5          |
| Earth Sciences (General)        | 7          | 3          | 10         | 1.4          |
| Education (General)             | 6          | 4          | 10         | 1.4          |
| Management Training             | 4          | 6          | 10         | 1.4          |
| <b>Subtotal</b>                 | <b>223</b> | <b>350</b> | <b>573</b> | <b>78.3</b>  |
| Other (57 fields < 10 trainees) | 59         | 101        | 160        | 21.7         |
| <b>Total</b>                    | <b>282</b> | <b>451</b> | <b>733</b> | <b>100.0</b> |

Source: PTIS database through 3/31/94.

---

## **Albania**

The eighth largest number of PTPE participants (27) come from Albania, where three U.S. organizations have recruited and selected participants for their respective programs. The Department of State trained 10 participants; PIET trained 9, and USIA trained 8. Of this number, 18 participants have completed training, and 9 are still in training status.

## **Bosnia**

The 9 Bosnian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by PIET-7, the Salzburg Seminar-1, and the USIA-1. Of this number, 8 participants have completed training, and one is still in training status.

## **Bulgaria**

The second largest group of PTPE participants (132) come from Bulgaria, where seven U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their respective programs. USIA trained 63 Bulgarian participants, followed by PIET with 49. Other organizations and agencies training Bulgarian participants include: the Department of State-10, the Salzburg Seminar-4, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital-2, IIE-2 (under two different project numbers), and Johns Hopkins-2. Of this number, 62 participants have completed training, and 70 are still in training status.

## **Croatia**

The 18 Croatian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by the USIA-10, PIET-7, and the Salzburg Seminar-1. Of this number, 8 participants have completed training, and 10 are still in training status.

## **Czech Republic**

The fourth largest number of PTPE participants (94) is from the Czech Republic where six U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. USIA trained 37 participants, and Georgetown University's ECESP trained 35. Other organizations and agencies training Czech participants include: PIET-9, IIE-8 (under two different project numbers), the Salzburg Seminar-4, and Johns Hopkins University-1. Of this number, 43 participants have completed training, and 51 are still in training status.

## **Estonia**

The 23 Estonian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by the USIA-13, the Salzburg Seminar-5, PIET-4, and Thomas Jefferson University Hospital-1. Of this number, 12 participants have completed training, and 11 are still in training status.

---

## **Hungary**

The third largest number of PTPE participants (123) is from Hungary, where seven U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. Georgetown University trained 46 Hungarians, and USIA trained 41. Other organizations and agencies training Hungarian participants include: PIET-25, the Salzburg Seminar-5, IIE-4 (under two different project numbers), and Harvard University and Johns Hopkins University-1 each. Of this number, 69 participants have completed training, and 54 are still in training status.

## **Latvia**

The 19 Latvian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by PIET-11 and the USIA-8. Of this number, 9 participants have completed training, and 10 are still in training status.

## **Lithuania**

The seventh largest number of PTPE participants (35) is from Lithuania, where three U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their respective programs. PIET trained 14 participants, and USIA trained 10. Other organizations and agencies training Lithuanian participants include SUNY-Farmingdale-10, and the Salzburg Seminar-1. Of this number, 12 participants have completed training, and 23 are still in training status.

## **Macedonia**

The 13 Macedonian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by the USIA-6, PIET-6, and the Salzburg Seminar-1. Of this number, 7 participants have completed training, and 6 are still in training status.

## **Poland**

The largest number of PTPE participants (293) is from Poland, where seven U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. Georgetown University's ECESP Program trained 153 Polish participants, followed by PIET with 110. Other organizations training Polish participants include: USIA-22, the Cooperative Housing Foundation-6, IIE-5 (under two different project numbers), the Salzburg Seminar-3, Harvard University-2, and Johns Hopkins-1. Of this number, 168 participants have completed training, and 125 are still in training status.

## **Romania**

The fifth largest number of PTPE participants (64) is from Romania, where six U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. USIA trained 28 participants, and PIET trained 26. Other

---

organizations and agencies training Romanian participants include: Harvard University and the Salzburg Seminar-3 each, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital-2, and IIE and Johns Hopkins University-1 each. Of this number, 34 participants have completed training, and 30 are still in training status.

### **Slovak Republic**

The sixth largest group of PTPE participants (51) come from the Slovak Republic, where six U.S. organizations and the Salzburg Seminar have recruited and selected participants for their various programs. Georgetown University trained 21, and PIET trained 16. Other organizations and agencies training Slovak participants include: USIA-5, IIE-5 (under two different project numbers), and the Salzburg Seminar and Thomas Jefferson University Hospital-2 each. Of this number, 28 participants have completed training, and 23 are still in training status.

### **Slovenia**

The 6 Slovenian PTPE participants were recruited and selected by the USIA-5 and the Salzburg Seminar-1. Of this number, one participant has completed training, and five are still in training status.

### **Yugoslavia**

The country of origin of one PTPE participant recruited and selected by the USIA is entered in the PTIS as Yugoslavia. This participant has completed her training through the USIA "topping-off" scholarship program.

## CHAPTER 3 OUTCOME AND IMPACT

---

### EVALUATION METHODOLOGY FOR OUTCOME AND IMPACT MEASURES

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. The Exit Questionnaires are administered in the U.S. when the participants complete the program. A total of 141 Exit Questionnaires have been completed and tabulated from eight different implementers of training (contractors, cooperative agreements, or inter-agency agreements). The eight implementers are Georgetown University ECESP, Institute for International Education (IIE), Partners of International Education and Training (PIET), the United States Information Agency (USIA), and four of the 1993 grantee awards (Cooperative Housing Foundation-CHF, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital-TJUH, Harvard University, and Johns Hopkins University). Exit Questionnaires are not available for any participants who completed the training program prior to September, 1993, because the monitoring and evaluation contract was not in operation prior to that date.

Outcome and impact data are collected through a series of three Returnee Questionnaires beginning six months after participants return to their home countries and through in-country site visits and interviews. To date, only the first Returnee Questionnaires have been returned. A total of 100 Returnee Questionnaires have been completed and tabulated at the time of this report. These Returnee Questionnaires represent four contractors—Georgetown University, IIE, PIET, and the Department of State. Due to the completion dates of the programs, Returnee Questionnaires are not yet available for any of the grantee programs.

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 non-completions, 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.

The limited amount of exit and returnee data to date places some constraints on the comparative project analysis. With the exception of Georgetown's ECESP and PIET, no program has a sufficient number of both Exit and Returnee Questionnaires to adequately track the impact of training. Of the other contractors, only IIE has both exit and returnee data, although for a limited number of participants to date. This limits the amount of comparative analysis of contractor performance that can be completed at this time. While this report does indicate differences by contractor in some areas, these differences should be considered in the context of the small sample size.

The number of responses of either Exit or Returnee Questionnaires is also quite limited for most of the CEE countries. With the exception of the countries with the largest programs (Poland and Hungary), no country has an adequate number of responses to accurately measure differences in impact or performance by country. This will be possible over time as more participants complete the programs and return home.

Interpretation of the evaluation results is also limited by the wide variety of program design and objectives among the different contractors. In large part, the programs included under the PTPE umbrella are not comparable programs and so any interpretation of comparative statistics must take this into account. Issues that are important to a long-term academic program, for example, may be of very little interest for participants in a two-week seminar.

## HIGHLIGHTS OF ISSUES FROM EXIT AND RETURNEE QUESTIONNAIRES

### Program Quality Measures

#### *Assessment of the Training Experience*

*Results from the Exit Questionnaires indicate that the PTPE program has no significant implementation problems, although substantial differences exist among the contractors in the approach and activities.* At the time of this report, Aguirre had received a total of 141 Exit Questionnaires. The responses were from Georgetown University (27), PIET (58), IIE (6), USIA (32), Cooperative Housing Foundation (6), Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (6), Harvard University (4) and Johns Hopkins University (2). These Exit Questionnaires reflect only the participants who completed their training later than August 1993. Prior to that date, the monitoring and evaluation system had not yet been established. The training in these programs ranged from one week to two years in length. The responses were from all of the PTPE countries, but the limited number of responses from most countries limits comparison by nationality.

---

## Orientation

***The considerable variety in the PTPE program component designs and purposes results in a variety of orientation activities. Overall, 60 percent of the participants have received orientation prior to the program and 89 percent have received some orientation upon arrival in the U.S.*** A total of 80 percent of the participants felt either very prepared or prepared for the program after the orientation. The programs with the lowest rankings in this area were IIE, Georgetown ECESP, and USIA. (These findings should be taken with caution given the small number of responses for each of these contractors. Nonetheless, this does indicate that some improvement is possible.)

Some areas of orientation are not being universally covered by contractors. The issues that were least likely to be included were USAID program objectives, USAID policies and regulations, U.S. culture, U.S. educational system, and U.S. political/economic institutions. The contractor least likely to adequately cover these areas, or to do so adequately, was USIA. This is not surprising given the design of the "topping up" USIA program.

Overall, IIE has a relatively high percentage of the small number of respondents who reported being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with aspects of the orientation. In particular, IIE participants were dissatisfied with advance notice of travel, course content, medical insurance information, and USAID policies and procedures. Again, while the number of respondents limits an overly broad interpretation of this data, the consistent pattern in each area indicates that the orientation needs improvement.

USIA also had a higher than average number of participants who were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with aspects of the orientation. Among the areas of dissatisfaction were orientation to the U.S. educational system, U.S. political and economic institutions, medical insurance, and stipends. The Georgetown ECESP program had 10 percent or more of the participants who were dissatisfied with the following aspects of orientation: stipends, advance notice of travel, USAID policies, and information about travel. Some of the Cooperative Housing Foundation participants were dissatisfied with the orientation as it related to stipends, medical insurance, and information on travel.

## Logistics

***The majority of the participants from all contractors were satisfied with the logistical support and facilities.*** Only the USIA program had a consistent pattern of having 10 percent or more of the participants being dissatisfied with some aspect of the support. Contractors with 10 percent or more of the participants who are very dissatisfied or dissatisfied with some aspect of logistical support were:

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Training facilities   | USIA   |
| Housing               | Georgetown, USIA, Thomas Jefferson U. Hospital |
| Travel/transportation | Georgetown, USIA, Johns Hopkins                |
| Amount of stipend     | USIA, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital     |
| Medical Care          | USIA   |

### *English Language*

***The majority of the PTPE participants have not received any language training as part of the program.*** Only the Georgetown's ECESP program has a substantial English Language Training program in Europe prior to the program. Some participants from IIE, PIET, USIA, TJUH, and Johns Hopkins reported having some English language training in the U.S. or in their own country. The language training in-country may not have been part of the PTPE program, particularly for the USIA participants.

In general, language has not been a problem for the majority of the participants. Half of the participants reported never having language problems in lectures; 64 percent never had problems in reading; 51 percent had no problems in writing; 44 percent had no problems in class discussions; and 38 percent had no problems in oral reports.

Nonetheless, some participants reported frequent or very frequent problems with the language. One participant each from IIE, USIA, and PIET programs reported having frequent problems in lectures and reading assignments. Participants from the Georgetown ECESP, USIA, and to a lesser degree, PIET, reported having frequent difficulties with writing assignments. Class discussions were problematic for about 33 percent of the Georgetown participants, 9 percent of the USIA participants, and one participant each from IIE, PIET, and Cooperative Housing Foundation. Oral reports were also problematic, with 30 percent of Georgetown participants having problems, 5 percent of PIET, 7 percent of USIA, and one participant from the Cooperative Housing Foundation program. Only three percent of the participants reported still having language problems by the end of the program.

Overall, about nine percent of the participants believe that language problems limited their ability to succeed in the program. This included half of the respondents from the Cooperative Housing Foundation program, 21 percent of the Georgetown participants, 9 percent of the USIA participants, and one each from IIE and PIET.

### *Satisfaction with the Training Program*

***The large majority of participants have been satisfied with the quality of the training program.*** Overall, over 87 percent of the participants are either satisfied or very satisfied with their programs. The only contractor whose participants were not unanimously satisfied was PIET, with only 5 percent neutral or dissatisfied. The only specific aspects of the training programs with even small levels of dissatisfaction have been field trips (5%) and computer equipment available (3%). Over half of the participants believe that the training is as least as good as was expected, and 34 percent believe that it is better than they had expected.

***Most participants believe that their training objectives have been achieved.*** Overall, 46 percent of the participants completely achieved their objectives, 34 percent achieved many of the objectives, and 19 percent partially achieved the objectives. The programs

---

with the highest percentage of participants who completely achieved their objectives are Cooperative Housing Foundation, Harvard University, IIE, and Johns Hopkins (which have a very small number of respondents). The programs with the highest percentage of participants who only partially accomplished their objectives were Georgetown's ECESP, PIET, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, and USIA.

*Most participants (87%) believe that the programs were appropriately designed in terms of the level of difficulty.* A majority (61%) also believe that the programs are the right length for the objectives, although 36 percent believe that the programs are too short. This response came from long-term programs (Georgetown's ECESP, IIE, and USIA) as well as short-term programs (PIET, Cooperative Housing Foundation, and Harvard University).

*A majority (74%) of the participants believe that the training is relevant to their needs.* The strongest endorsements of the relevance of the training program were from the programs at TJUH, Harvard University, and Johns Hopkins. The least relevant program was the Cooperative Housing Foundation, where two-thirds of the small group believe that the training was only partially relevant. One PIET participant found the training to be not at all relevant, and two USIA participants only found a little relevance.

*Over 83 percent of the participants believe that the training will be either completely useful or very useful when they return to their home country.* The Johns Hopkins, Georgetown, TJUH, and USIA participants are the most likely to find the training completely useful, whereas the Cooperative Housing and PIET participants are the most likely to find the training only partially useful.

*A large majority of participants (83%) from all programs believe that the training will be useful in helping their country make the transition from a socialist economy, while 16 percent believe that it is not applicable.* Most participants (63%) also believe it will be useful for the political transition to democracy, although a substantial minority (27%) believe that it is not applicable to this objective.

### **Program Impact Measures**

At the time of this report, Aguirre International had received a total of 100 returnee questionnaires. The responses were from Georgetown University's ECESP (53), PIET (39), IIE (7) and the Department of State (1). This response is only for the first of three planned returnee questionnaires. The training in these programs ranged from one week to two years in length. The responses were from all of the PTPE countries. However, the limited number of responses from most countries does not permit comparison, so the countries have been placed into groups for comparison purposes.

---

## *Employment Status*

***About 92 percent of the returned participants are employed.*** The country with the highest percentage of unemployed returned participants is Poland, with almost 13 percent unemployed. No more than six percent of the participants in the other countries was unemployed. The largest number of returnees are working in the public sector (45%), followed by private for-profit companies (25%) and mixed (19%). The PIET returnees are predominantly in the public sector (63%) and the IIE returnees are predominantly in the private for-profit sector (57%). Georgetown returnees are more evenly distributed among the private and public sectors, and also include the only returnees who are self-employed. Participants are much more likely to be working in the public sector in Hungary and the other Southern Tier countries (Bulgaria, Romania, former Yugoslavia) than in the Northern Tier countries. Participants in the Czech and Slovak Republics are much more likely to be working in the private for-profit sector than are participants in other countries.

***Overall, more than half of the returnees have returned to work in the same company.*** The PIET returnees are most likely to return to their previous employer (82%), and Georgetown returnees are least likely to do so (33%). Interestingly, the IIE component, which is a long-term program, also has a relatively high percentage of participants returning to their previous job (57%). The majority (61%) of all participants working in the same company are working at the same level, while about 37 percent returned to a better job. The long-term participants from the Georgetown and IIE programs are much more likely to return to a better job than are the short-term PIET trainees.

***The training received is perceived by the participants as being relevant to their job needs.*** Overall, 31 percent of the returnees believe that the training is highly relevant and an additional 37 percent have found the training to be relevant. For about 31 percent of the participants, the training has been helpful in a general way. The IIE returnees have found the training more relevant than returnees from either Georgetown or PIET. The Department of State returnee found the training to be highly relevant.

*The participants from Hungary were much less likely than participants from other countries to be employed in the same field as their training program, primarily because they were unable to find a job in that field.* The Hungarian participants are also least likely to find the training highly relevant to their career, least likely to be very satisfied with the training, and least likely to find the training very useful in their current job. While the Hungarian ratings of the program are overall comparable to those from other countries when comparing the total of favorable rankings (e.g., very satisfied plus satisfied, highly relevant plus relevant), the proportion of Hungarians who were strongly favorable is notably lower than for participants from other countries.

The evaluation data collected is designed to identify differing levels of the impact achieved by the returned participants. The data collected to date is still very preliminary and incomplete, but it does provide some early insights into the activities of the returned participants. These responses are the participants' opinions. As is expected, most participants believe that the training has a positive impact on their job performance.

While there were no strong patterns of impact across countries, the participants from the Southern Tier group were least likely to notice an impact on their own job performance, but most likely to influence overall company policy. About one participant in seven from all countries has had some influence on government policy.

### Multiplier Effects

*The majority of the returned participants (82%) to date have been active in training other people.* The training has been provided to co-workers, students (in formal school settings), community members, and others. The total number of people reported trained is 8,407, or an average of 84 per returned participant. However, only 33 percent of the

**Table 3.2 Impact on Job Performance (Percentages)**

| Level of Impact                                | Georgetown<br>n = 49  | IIE<br>n = 7   | PIET<br>n = 38  | DOS/FSI<br>n = 1  | Overall<br>N = 95 |
|--|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Improved working of the office unit            | 49                    | 43             | 47              | 0                 | 47                |
| Degree of functioning of employer organization | Georgetown<br>n = 353 | IIE<br>n = 297 | PIET<br>n = 269 | DOS/FSI<br>n = 01 | Total<br>N = 3100 |
| Changed company policies                       | 28                    | 43             | 36              | 100               | 31                |
| Resulted change in government policy           | 36                    | 40             | 33              | 0                 | 33                |
| Resulted change in general policy              | 36                    | 14             | 30              | 0                 | 31                |
| Influenced economic policy                     | 2                     | 0              | 10              | 0                 | 5                 |

Source: Returnee Questionnaire

---

training programs included any specific workshops to prepare the participants for further training.

### *Personal Impacts*

*Living and studying in another country has many impacts beyond the specific learning objectives.* The PTPE participants have been exposed to numerous aspects of U.S. life and institutions. The most consistent impact across all programs has been an increased understanding of free market economics, with about 74 percent of the returnees reporting a "very much" increased level of understanding. The long-term programs (IIE and Georgetown) have a higher level of impact in this area than short-term programs.

Returned participants also better understand democratic institutions, although the level of impact in this complex area is much less than for the economic issues for all of the contractors. The long term programs (Georgetown and IIE) were also more likely to provide a better understanding of ethnic diversity in the U.S. and a better understanding of U.S. families. Participants in the Georgetown program, with its homestays and longer overall training periods, are most likely to have a much increased understanding of U.S. families.

### *Follow-on*

*Since the program is still in its early stages, the overwhelming majority of the returned participants (94%) have not participated in any formal Follow-on activities.* To date, none of the major programs have implemented Follow-on programs. However, most participants from all programs maintain personal contact with other participants and slightly over half maintain contact with U.S. training institutions. Returnees from the Georgetown program (35%) and PIET program (42%) also maintain contact with U.S. business contacts. The long-term participants from Georgetown (85%) and IIE (71%) are much more likely to maintain contact with American friends than are the short-term PIET (45%) or Department of State participants.

## **ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE POLAND SITE VISIT**

The country site visits are intended to complement the data collected through the questionnaires. The Poland site visit was completed in April 1994. The primary observations about the training program concerned the type of training and the country training strategy. Returned participants from the PIET (short-term) and Georgetown University's ECESP (long-term) programs were interviewed.

### **Personal Impact of PTPE Training**

*The most noticeable aspect of the interviews was that the participants who had attended long-term programs had, in general, a transformational experience that affected both their attitudes and knowledge.* This was true for both the younger rural managers who

---

attended two year programs, and for the older, more experienced senior managers who attended programs lasting one year or less. A common statement was, "It changed my life." In some cases, this was literally true—high school graduates returned with a whole new range of career options available. For others, who remained in an existing profession like teaching, the impact was on how they did their work and their enthusiasm about the work.

### **Impact of Short-term Programs**

*The short-term participants, while very appreciative for the training program, were much less likely to be able to identify any particular impact on their lives or their work.* The most common statement was that the training was helpful "in a general way." In part, this was due to the structure of these training programs—most were survey courses of a topic (privatization, security markets, business development) that covered a broad range of topics. While informative, these programs did not focus on specific job-related needs of the participants, so the direct application was often limited.

### **Country Training Strategy**

*The country training strategy was informal, with identified areas of priority which were not based on a training needs assessment or an institutional/organizational focus.* The training was not directly related to specific accomplishments or objectives of either the employing organizations or the USAID missions. While this is the most common structure for participant training in USAID, it nonetheless limits the applicability of the training. The Poland country staff recognized these issues and was interested in developing a more focused country training strategy.

## CHAPTER 4

# OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### OBSERVATIONS ON THE PROJECT

At this early point in the PTPE project monitoring and evaluation process, no definitive lessons learned can be identified. However, some issues have been raised and some observations on the project can be drawn from the data.

#### Project Design and Strategy

A defining characteristic of the PTPE project that influences in-country planning, implementation, and evaluation is the broad scope of the project design and the project strategy. PTPE primarily functions as an important *mechanism* for implementing participant training in the CEE countries. This mechanism establishes the operational and contractual arrangements necessary to implement the labor-intensive work of participant training. The PTPE mechanism is given focus and direction by the SEED Act objectives, which are very broad in nature—economic restructuring, strengthening democracy, and quality of life. The operational definitions of these objectives, and the priorities within each objective, are largely defined by the individual PTPE contractors rather than by either USAID/W or the country representatives.

As a result, the PTPE program structure emphasizes process and operations more than impact. This applies to both programming and evaluation. As currently structured, the PTPE project lacks a defining central strategy and a clear set of expectations against which to implement programs, measure progress, or compare achievements. The PIET activity (which is the largest single component) is the only component that is directly responsive to the country demand—all other activities are supply driven. This activity could also be strengthened through assistance in developing country training strategies. Most current country strategies have an overall focus, but in general do not have a clearly defined strategy for using the training resources to contribute to the overall program impact. Therefore, the PTPE training is designed to fall into the general categories of sector priorities, but without the defining context of a training plan focused on specific achievements. Under these circumstances, the range of unconnected activities and the broad objectives cannot help but diminish the potential impact of the program.

#### Summary of Activities

Each of the component activities of the PTPE project is distinct in terms of target group, type of training, field of training, and expected results of the training. The following brief summary of the activities illustrates the issue:

---

## ■ *PIET*

The PIET program is a traditional short-term technical training activity and is the activity that is most closely linked to the priorities of the country representatives. Mission staff are involved in setting priorities and fields of training and in selecting the participants. As a result, the in-country staff has more control over this program than either the PTPE small grant or TA funded programs. However, the country strategies are, for the most part, somewhat vague about the focus and purpose of the training programs. In Poland, the training ranged from one week to over a month and included a range of activities centered around private sector development and privatization. No particular field, institution, or profession was targeted. Some training was initiated by resident long-term advisors to the government, but did not appear to be part of a structured training plan. The majority of the participants are from the capital cities and generally have advanced education and English-speaking skills.

## ■ *ECESP (Georgetown University)*

ECESP is a Congressional earmark program that was initiated before USAID had any in-country presence. The program objectives emphasize rural development, with the bulk of the training opportunities going to rural managers. While the program has evolved since 1990 to include managers with a higher level of education as well as teachers and public administrators, the overall emphasis is still predominantly rural. The majority of the ECESP participants require English language training. The program is long-term, non-degree training plus internships. The program objectives and focus were developed independently of USAID/W and the program is administered largely independently of the in-country representatives.

## ■ *USIA*

The USIA "topping up" program is conceptually and operationally different from any of the other USAID-financed training programs. Rather than recruiting participants from the countries, candidates are nominated by U.S. colleges and universities where they have already been accepted. The selection of the candidates follows broad outlines of fields provided by USAID, but is not directly related to any specific country objectives. Both undergraduate and graduate students are accepted in the program and the range of academic majors is quite broad. Unlike other programs, the USIA students will not necessarily return to their home country when the USAID grant is completed. Rather, some may stay to finish the degree and others may stay to gain a subsequent degree. Both the operations and strategic focus of the USIA program are very different from USAID programs.

## ■ *IIE*

The IIE program offers long-term non-academic training in business and economics for a total of 25 participants (including both the cooperative agreement and the previous contract) from six countries. The participants are generally more educated and more

---

urban than are the ECESP participants. Participation by USAID in selecting participants is limited.

■ *DOS*

The diplomatic training conducted by the Department of State for Albanian and Bulgarian diplomats had a unique and highly-focused purpose. The target group was diplomats, and was, therefore, considerably different from any other program. The activity was in large part separate from the USAID and country representative programs.

■ *Salzburg Seminars*

The Salzburg Seminars are a short-term program implemented in Europe—which makes them third-country training for the majority of the participants.

■ *Cooperative Agreements*

The cooperative agreements are an innovation in both process and product. The contractors are selected through a competitive proposal process, based on a wide range of factors. One of the basic criteria for the program is substantial cost-sharing by the grantee—with a minimum of 50 percent cost-share. The types of training and the target groups vary widely among the grantees, including training in housing sector, ultrasound medicine, business management, banking and finance, etc. (see Appendix B for further discussion of each implementing organization). There are twelve different grantees for 1993-1994, each with from 8 to 75 participants from several of the CEE countries. The quality of the grantee programs is as yet unclear—enough data is not yet available. It is reasonable to expect that the quality of such specialized programs would be high because each institution is concentrating on its perceived strengths. However, since many of these institutions have limited experience in group training of foreign students, they lack knowledge about some of the special requirements of this target group. The Missions have some input into the selection of the grantees, but the activities are driven more by the nature of the proposals than from a strategic focus in any given country. Once the selection has taken place, communications with the country training staff is minimal.

Each of these activities is, in itself, a worthy activity. The issue for USAID/W and the country representatives to address is whether they add up to a program that furthers the country strategies and USAID objectives in the CEE countries. In this particular case, neither the central Bureau nor the country representatives have any clear control to define the program objectives. As a result, there are no specifically defined project objectives. The alternative would be to define one clear actor to define the priorities—either the Bureau or the country representatives. If the country representatives are empowered to define the types of training needed, and if they are assisted in developing a training plan that is designed to achieve impact, then the PTPE program truly does become a mechanism for implementing a strategic vision of human resource development based on country needs. If the ENI Bureau defines the priorities for all countries, then it needs to supplement this with a clear set of indicators for what types of impact is expected and to refine the project structure to support only those objectives.

---

Implementing changes in the PTPE project design is probably easier said than done. For the most part, the structure of the PTPE project is not the result of a traditional project design process implemented in the context of established country strategies. Rather, PTPE was created prior to the development of detailed country strategies and was intended to be a mechanism for providing timely training support to the new country programs. As a result, the project became the vehicle for funding a wide variety of training options that were proposed in the early stages of program development—a project design driven by supply and proposals rather than demand-derived from country strategies. The wide variety of types of training and the number of separate implementing organizations reflects this history. Nonetheless, the conditions in the CEE programs are not static, and this is an appropriate time to review the project design and to propose revisions based on the current strategic focus of the bureau and countries.

### **Project Management**

The nature of the PTPE project, which is distinctly different than traditional USAID programs, has a direct impact on project management as well as project impact. In other bureau training programs, the Mission is responsible for implementing training and often has a direct contractor for its programs. In Central Bureau training programs, the project management may be retained at the central level but the key decisions about who and how to train are made by the in-country Missions. In the CLASP program, in the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) Bureau, the strategy and objectives are defined at the central level, but the decisions on how to operationalize the strategy in the context of each country, and the implementation management responsibilities, remain with the country Missions.

In the ENI Bureau, the key design and management decisions are made by the Central Bureau rather than the country representatives. The direct management of all contractors is also at the Bureau level. Participant training in the other Bureaus has had the benefit of years of experience, established training offices in each country, contractors who are fully familiar with USAID regulations, and a predominant pattern of mission-driven programs. The ENI Bureau, by contrast, has a split management structure, with the Bureau management located in Washington and the country representatives in the field. The PTPE project is a Bureau-created mechanism that defines the types of training as well as providing a mechanism for training. However, the type of training is not wholly directed by the Bureau either. Several of the component programs were initiated through non-standard design procedures and non-competitive contractor selection—including Georgetown, USIA, DOS, and the Salzburg Seminars. In these cases, the type of training was determined independently of USAID objectives and strategy.

The PTPE project involves 18 different contractor/implementers, each of which is implementing a different type of training with different target groups. Neither the field nor the ENI Bureau has a staff of training specialists, and most of the implementing organizations have little or no experience with implementing USAID projects. Some, like USIA, have established organizational patterns of "doing training" that are quite different in philosophy and procedures than are USAID projects.

---

The combination of these factors complicates even the most basic management activities. Each of the implementing organizations must be trained in the USAID participant training requirements and documentation requirements. Of the PTPE contractors, only PIET, Georgetown University, and IIE have existing experience and knowledge of USAID training requirements. For the other contractors, the challenge is much greater. Of the PTPE component activities, two deserve some special mention—the grantee program and the USIA program.

The strength of the innovative grantee program is that it experiments with new approaches to identifying training needs and developing appropriate programs. By the competitive grant process, it reaches beyond the traditional sources of USAID training and encourages focused programs based on clear areas of expertise. The quality of the training appears, from the limited data available, to be strong.

However, this design has both management and strategic weaknesses. From a management point of view, the process is highly labor intensive. The Bureau manages a program with 18 different contractors for 13 different countries. Virtually none of these grantees have USAID training experience, so they require individual training sessions. Even this level of training is minimal for the complexity of the USAID programs—a minimum of several training sessions is necessary to really understand the requirements. By the time these new contractors know the system, the program is over. From the perspective of monitoring and evaluation, this is a challenge because the data is difficult to collect in time to either visit or apply the Exit Questionnaires. In addition to adherence to implementation and reporting requirements, limited overseas training experience also affects the quality of the details of implementing training. Over many years, the USAID contractors who work in this field have reviewed and refined the procedures such as selection, orientation, planning, and Follow-on based on experience. Without this experience, the grantees are less able to identify the important elements of the process.

Management from the perspective of the country representatives is also difficult. The number and variety of the training programs is difficult to keep track of. Communication on the status, nature, timing, and design of the grantee programs is difficult to maintain with adequate timeliness and accuracy, so the country representatives have difficulty keeping track of the activities in their own countries.

From a strategy perspective, the grantee program lacks a consistent and coherent set of objectives. The grantee program is driven primarily by the innovation in *process* rather than an overriding strategic vision of the proposed *impact* in the recipient country. The structure of the program results in having a range of different contractors training a small number of people in each country in many different areas. All of this training falls under the general categories of the SEED act, but this is broadly defined and is not driven by the more specific priorities of each country strategy. The result in any one country will be a small number of people trained in a wide variety of areas rather than a focus on either key institutions or skill deficits that would characterize a country training strategy.

---

The USIA program is substantively different in nature and structure than any of the USAID training programs. The structure—to identify students who are already studying in the U.S.—for financial "topping off" has the advantage of appearing to be a low cost alternative to full training. However, it is not clear that this program actually adds to the total number of CEE students in U.S. schools as these students are already accepted in or are attending a U.S. university. Most importantly from a strategy viewpoint, however, is the fact that selection is not driven by country priorities, but rather by the current availability of CEE students in the U.S. Finally, the USIA program interests do not extend to the eventual utilization of the training in the home country. Participants are not tracked or even required to return home within a given period after the grant.

The unique nature of the USIA program presents a significant challenge to evaluating and assessing the program. Comparisons on either cost or programmatic impact to other USAID programs is of limited value. The program expectations for the participants are undefined and the implementation procedures are significantly different from any other program. The USIA program managers recognize that their program is different and are understandably hesitant to be evaluated on USAID terms.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- *The EUR Bureau should reassess the relationship of the structure of the PTPE training project to the country strategies.* The project design, and each component activity, should be clearly structured to be responsive to identified training needs in country strategies. In turn, the country representatives should be assisted in developing clear training strategies that are integrated into the broader range of assistance and that directly contribute to identified impact measures. The impact of the PTPE training project can then be assessed in terms of its success in helping to achieve country objectives. This may well result in expanding some components of the project and reducing or eliminating others. This reassessment should be conducted in close collaboration with the country representatives.
- *If the PTPE project is primarily to support the country strategies, then ENI should provide technical assistance to each country to develop a country training strategy that is integrated in, and integral to, the achievement of country objectives and clear achievement indicators.* The types and nature of training necessary to achieve the objectives should determine the design of the PTPE project.
- *The EUR Bureau should explore ways to simplify the management of the project.* Some streamlining should result from the reassessment of the project design and strategy discussed above. Indeed, this is an essential first step as no decision about how to reduce the number of implementing organizations and types of training can be made in isolation from strategy and objectives. The two issues should be reviewed in concert: (1) what are the core objectives and strategies, and (2) what implementation alternatives are least management intensive and most cost-effective.

- 
- ***The special nature and status of the USIA program should be recognized.*** There is no discernable benefit to USAID, USIA, or the participants in attempting to force-fit two such different organizations and systems. The nature of the "topping-off" program is so different from standard USAID training that attempts to manage or evaluate USIA on the same standards are inevitably artificial and unproductive.
  - ***The grant competition program management should also be reviewed.*** If a strategic reassessment determines that this is a priority and should be continued, then the range of training should be more narrowly defined, and a small number of implementing organizations should be identified to conduct training on a multi-year basis. This will provide greater depth for each type of training and will develop greater expertise in the grant recipients.

## CHAPTER 5

# MONITORING AND EVALUATION

---

### INTRODUCTION

On May 26, 1994, the ENI Bureau's Participant Training Project contracted with Aguirre International to monitor and evaluate the Bureau's participant training; the Project Activity Completion Date (PACD) is February 21, 1997.

The objective of the contract is to develop a computer-based evaluation system for which all current and future Bureau for Europe Participant Training projects will be evaluated on a longitudinal basis. This includes the creation of the methodology, tools, computer database, and implementation of an evaluation system to assist the Project Officer in monitoring the Bureau Participant Training portfolio.

### Purpose

The purpose of the monitoring and evaluation system is to answer the key questions that will enable the Project Manager to 1) improve the existing process, and 2) assess the value of the activity in relation to the objectives. The contractor is required to design and implement an evaluation system that cross cuts all project designs related to participant training, addresses specific areas of quantifiable evidence that a specific training program does or does not meet Agency needs in terms of cost efficiency and quality as compared to other training programs within the Bureau.

The monitoring and evaluation contractor also provides ongoing monitoring services to assist the Project Manager. These services include periodic reviews of programs to insure that individual programs are living up to Agency requirements such as cost-sharing contributions, program quality and appropriateness, and compliance issues in terms of USAID, IRS, INS, and other government requirements.

### Implementing Organizations

The contractor is responsible for the evaluation and monitoring of the following Europe Participant Training Projects:

- the technical training component of the PTPE #180-0045 administered by the Partners for International Education and Training (PIET)
- the Georgetown University East Central European Scholarship Program (ECESP)
- the academic training component of the PTPE #180-0045 administered through an Inter-Agency Agreement (IAA) with the United States Information Agency (USIA)

- any and all training programs resulting from grant awards based on competed solicitations
- Diplomatic Training through an IAA with the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute (FSI)
- the Salzburg Seminars

## Project Staff

The project staff, positions, and levels of effort include:

| Name                          | Title                          | Level of Effort     |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Allan Broehl                  | Project Director               | 00.50 person months |
| John Gillies (Sub-Contractor) | Evaluation Specialist          | 10.00 person months |
| Tom Judy                      | Project Coordinator            | 02.00 person months |
| Wanda Foster                  | Monitoring/Database Supervisor | 04.00 person months |
| Maria Bolt                    | Research Assistant             | 20.45 person months |
| Hector Martinez               | Database Management Specialist | 04.00 person months |

## ACCOMPLISHMENTS

### Coordination with Organizations

Aguirre International has coordinated and collaborated with all of the contractors, agencies, and cooperative agreements that participate in the PTPE Project. In addition to maintaining regular contact with each organization, Aguirre International has received Quarterly Reports from each organization which are compiled into a comprehensive Quarterly Report for the ENI Bureau. Exit and Returnee Questionnaires are distributed to participants from each of the organizations.

#### ■ PIET

Aguirre International has worked closely with PIET in the following areas: revision of their Participant Nomination Form, mailing questionnaires to returned participants in their home countries, distributing Exit Questionnaires to participants upon program completion, and insuring quality of PTIS data. In December, 1993, Aguirre conducted a general evaluation of exiting PIET participants. In January, 1994, an evaluation report was prepared on a Torture/Trauma Training Group programmed by PIET. To date, 68 Exit Questionnaires and 41 Returnee Questionnaires have been received from PIET participants.

---

■ ***Georgetown University's ECESP***

Aguirre International has worked with Georgetown University to produce reports on Exiting Participants (December, 1993), Returned Participants (John Gillies' Trip Report, April 1994), Internships Programs (November, 1993), Project Management (January, 1994), and an overall Program Review (June, 1994). Exit and Returnee Questionnaires have been distributed to all ECESP participants. To date 27 Exit Questionnaires and 54 Returnee Questionnaires have been received from ECESP participants.

■ ***USIA***

Aguirre International has met with USIA on several occasions to develop procedures for data-gathering through Participants Data Forms (PDFs) and EURIS Supplemental Forms. Aguirre has also distributed Mid-term, and Exit Questionnaires to USIA participants and, within the next six months, will distribute Returnee Questionnaires. To date, 46 Exit Questionnaires have been received from USIA participants.

■ ***Salzburg Seminar***

Aguirre International will be doing a summary evaluation of the 31 Salzburg Seminar participants. To date, one Returnee Questionnaire has been received from the Salzburg Seminar participants.

■ ***Department of State***

Aguirre International will be doing a summary evaluation of the Diplomatic Training Program conducted at the Foreign Service Institute. To date, two of the 20 participants have returned their Returnee Questionnaires.

■ ***Cooperative Agreements***

Aguirre International has maintained close coordination with each cooperative agreement to insure that participant data is entered into the PTIS, that EURIS Supplemental Forms are prepared, and that Quarterly Program and TCA reports are submitted. The organizations with cooperative agreements for 1993-1994 training are:

***Center for International Technological Cooperation (SUNY-Farmingdale).***

This cooperative agreement to train 10 Lithuanian bankers (five men and five women) will conclude its two-semester training program (6.7 months) in August, 1994.

***Cooperative Housing Foundation (CHF).*** The CHF has trained half of its proposed 24 participants; the remainder will be programmed the last half of 1994. A Site Visit Report was produced in April, 1994 following the completion of training of the first cohort. To date, 12 Exit Questionnaires have been received from CHF participants.

---

***The Council of International Programs (CIP).*** The CIP sent its first cohort of 7 participants in May, 1994, the remainder of its 58 participants will enter training in September, 1994.

***Goodwill Industries.*** The first Goodwill participant entered training in June, 1994; two participants will enter training the third quarter of FY 1994, and four will begin in the final quarter.

***Harvard University.*** Six participants have completed training; five will enter training in the third quarter of FY 1994. Fourteen individuals will be programmed for the final quarter. To date, five Exit Questionnaires have been received from Harvard University participants.

***Home Builders Institute (HBI).*** HBI will train its 30 participants beginning in September, 1994.

***Institute for International Education—IIE (Projects 180-0002 and 180-0045).*** Under the 180-0002 project, fourteen participants have completed training, and two will complete their training in August, 1994. To date, five Exit Questionnaires and seven Returnee Questionnaires have been received from the IIE participants.

Under the 180-0045 project, nine participants will complete their training and return to their home country in August, 1994. To date, one Exit Questionnaire has been received from the participants in this group.

***Johns Hopkins University.*** Three participants have completed training in May, 1994, and the remaining 20 participants will be recruited during the third quarter of FY 1994. To date, three Exit Questionnaires have been received from Johns Hopkins' participants.

***The Soros Foundation's Management Training Program.*** The first of the 30 participants in the Soros' Program will arrive for training in late August, 1994.

***Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (TJUH).*** One group of seven participants has completed training, and a second group will enter training in July, 1994. The third, and final group will enter training in September, 1994. To date, six Exit Questionnaires were received from TJUH participants. A Site Visit was conducted, and a report was issued in May, 1994.

***U.S. Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI).*** The 40 prospective USTTI participants will enter training in the Fall of 1994.

---

*William Davidson Institute, University of Michigan.* The 18 participants in the William Davidson Institute program will enter training late in the summer of 1994.

### **Database Development**

Aguirre International has developed four databases for the PTPE Monitoring and Evaluation Contract.

The Participant Database contains the basic data obtained from the Participant Data Form (PDF) which each contracting agency prepares for every participant. The PDF data is forwarded to the Center for Human Capacity Development (HCD) for entry into the Participant Training Information System (PTIS). Currently, only PIET is submitting the data electronically. Georgetown University is developing the capability for electronic transmission. The other contractors, cooperative agreements and agencies send the information in hard copy format. Aguirre International receives the PTIS data from HCD every two weeks. It is reconciled with the Questionnaire Tracking System and with Monthly and Quarterly Reports of training.

The EURIS Supplemental Database contains additional biographical and demographic information on each participant beyond that captured in the PTIS. The contractors send the supplemental forms to Aguirre where they are processed and data entered. PIET revised its Nomination Form to include the EURIS supplemental data, and Aguirre is collecting those forms to enter the data into the EURIS Supplemental Database. To date, no supplemental information has been obtained for PIET participants prior to 1994, USIA participants, Department of State and Salzburg Seminar participants. Georgetown University has furnished Aguirre International with a copy of its database which contains most of the supplemental information.

An Exit Questionnaire Database was developed to capture all of the data supplied by participants on the Exit Questionnaires completed at the end of their U.S. training program.

A Returnee Database was developed to capture all of the data supplied by participants who complete the Returnee Questionnaire in-country.

### **Development of Evaluation Instruments**

Aguirre International and its sub-contractor developed a series of Questionnaires to capture information about the training programs at three stages: the Mid-term Questionnaire for long-term programs, Exit Questionnaires at program completion, and two, out of a series of three, Returnee Questionnaires, to be completed at six-month intervals following return to home country. Questionnaires have also been developed for training providers and employers.

---

## **Procedures for Obtaining Data**

### **■ *Biodata***

Biodata is obtained in the following manner: Bi-weekly downloads from the PTIS are received from HCD. The data on USIA participants is maintained in a separate file at HCD, and this data is also downloaded. Because of frequent time lags between the start of training and the receipt of the PTIS downloads, efforts are made to receive some data directly from the implementing organizations. The Cooperative Agreements, including Georgetown, send Aguirre participant biodata simultaneously with its transmission to HCD. The Georgetown data is sent electronically, while the smaller cooperative agreements send hard copies of the PDF along with the EURIS Supplemental Form. PIET sends copies of monthly status reports to Aguirre which are compared with PTIS data and usually the most recent participants have not yet made it into the PTIS. In the cases of very short-term programs, this enables Aguirre to locate the individual and get an Exit Questionnaire to him or her before departure from the U.S.

### **■ *Mid-term Questionnaire***

The Mid-term Questionnaire is mailed directly to the individual participant at the training institution, near the mid-point of long-term training. The participant completes the questionnaire and mails it back to Aguirre International in a stamped, pre-addressed envelope. These questionnaires are not coded, nor data-entered, but each questionnaire is read and problems noted. If it appears that the problems are serious enough to warrant intervention, the Project Manager is advised and, at his direction, the implementing organization is contacted and advised of the problems. As of June 30, 1994, 232 Mid-term Questionnaires had been mailed, and 151 had been received.

### **■ *Exit Questionnaire***

Exit Questionnaires are mailed directly to participants at their training institutions two to three weeks before the completion of their programs. The participant completes the questionnaire and returns it to Aguirre International in a stamped, pre-addressed envelope. These questionnaires are coded and data-entered into the Exit Questionnaire Database and periodic reports are produced. As of June 30, 1994, 350 Exit Questionnaires had been mailed, and 173 had been received.

### **■ *Training Provider Questionnaire***

Training Provider Questionnaires are mailed to the training institutions two to three weeks before the completion of a training program. The Training Providers complete the questionnaire and return it to Aguirre International in a stamped, pre-addressed envelope. These questionnaires along with the Exit Questionnaires provide a more balanced view of the training program.

### **■ *Returnee Questionnaire***

---

Returnee Questionnaires are mailed to participants in their home countries six months after their return from U.S. training. PIET assists Aguirre International in the posting of these questionnaires in country and providing return postage. The participant mails the completed questionnaire directly back to Aguirre International. These questionnaires are coded and data-entered into the Returnee Database and their tabulation provides data for evaluation reports. As of June 30, 1994, 281 Returnee Questionnaires had been mailed, and 105 had been received.

During the final quarter of FY 1994, a second, abbreviated Returnee Questionnaire will be developed as a six-month follow-up to the first Returnee Questionnaire. It will be disseminated and tabulated in the same manner as the first Returnee Questionnaire.

### **Deliverables**

|                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <b>Annual Workplan:</b>         | Workplan Submitted (December 1994)  |
| <b>Annual Report:</b>           | First Annual Report (July 1994)   |
| <b>Quarterly Reports:</b>       | Fourth Quarter FY 1993 (November 1993)<br>First Quarter FY 1994 (January 1994)<br>Second Quarter FY 1994 (May 1994)   |
| <b>Final Report:</b>            | Due February 21, 1995   |
| <b>Trip Reports:</b>            | Bolt-Gillies Site Visit to Thomas Jefferson University<br>Hospital (March 1994)<br>John Gillies' Evaluation Visit to Poland (April 1994)  |
| <b>Ad Hoc Reports:</b>          | Collaboration on PIET Nomination Form<br>Review of Georgetown's ECESP Internship Program<br>(October 1993)<br>Preliminary Report on Georgetown's ECESP Exit<br>Questionnaires (December 1993)<br>Preliminary Report on PIET Exiting Short-term<br>Participants (December 1993)<br>Exit Report on Training for Torture/Trauma Victims<br>(February 1994) |
| <b>Evaluation Reports:</b>      | Management Review of Georgetown University's ECESP<br>Program (December 1993)<br>Georgetown University ECESP Program Review (June<br>1994)  |
| <b>Publication in Journals:</b> | At conclusion of project  |

---

## FINANCIAL STATUS OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION PROJECT

### Financial Report through March 31, 1994

|                    |           |
|--------------------|-----------|
| Amount Authorized: | \$378,451 |
| Amount Obligated:  | \$300,000 |

|                           |           |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Accrued Expenditures:     |           |
| Period - Projected:       | \$56,768  |
| Period - Actual (Billed): | \$50,305  |
| Cumulative (Billed):      | \$157,190 |
| Period - Next 6 mo.:      | \$66,768  |

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| % of LOP Elapsed:           | 50.00% |
| % of Total Auth. Obligated: | 79.27% |
| % of Total Obligated Exp.:  | 52.40% |
| % of Total Auth. Exp.:      | 41.53% |

**Center for International Technological Cooperation (CITC) SUNY-  
Farmingdale** NY

Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-3048-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Director:                        | Dr. Eleanor Fapohunda   |
| Professor:                       | Gary Rupp   |
| Assistant to the Provost:        | Margaret Baglivio   |
| CEE Country:                     | Lithuania   |
| Number of Awards:                | 10  |
| SEED Act Priority:               | <i>Economic Restructuring with special emphasis on<br/>the banking sector</i> |
| Sector or Field of Training:     | Banking and Finance   |
| Length of Training:              | 12 months (2 semesters and a 3-month internship)                              |
| Total Cost of Project: \$364,038 | USAID Amount: \$176,404 (48.46%)  |

---

**Purpose:** To aid in the development of the Lithuanian banking system by providing training for current and prospective bank administrators.

**Goals:** The program has five basic goals: 1) to introduce individuals to modern banking concepts and practices so upon their return to Lithuania they can be a catalyst for the development of a free market banking system; 2) to provide practical, short-term internships at financial institutions; 3) to sensitize the participants to the special credit needs of women entrepreneurs; 4) to establish a supportive network that includes SUNY—CTF faculty, business, and banking leaders that will nurture the program participants while in the U.S. and also upon their return to Lithuania through the use of the established e-mail linkage; and 5) to introduce the participants to American culture and society.

**Summary:** The program, running for two academic semesters, consists of classroom instruction at the SUNY College of Technology at Farmingdale, a seminar series, internships at financial institutions and discussions with college mentors. The program exposes participants to American society by introducing them to cultural activities on the campus and in the New York metropolitan area. Participants will be Lithuanian members of the Kaunas (Lithuania) University of Technology community of faculty and students. At least 50 percent of the applicants will be women and at least 50 percent of the training in the U.S. will be by women. The participants will be encouraged to create an active alumni association under the patronage of the Rector of Kaunas University of Technology.

**Participants in Training:** 10 (5 women and 5 men)

---

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** SUNY reports pertinent monitoring, program, and participant biographical data by submitting a copy of the PDF Form, the EURIS Supplemental Form, and the Quarterly TCA Report. SUNY submits the data in a timely manner and is responsive to requests for additional information.

**Status of Project:** The Lithuanian Banking Internship Program is scheduled to end on August 20, 1994.

## The Cooperative Housing Foundation (CHF)

Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4008-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Executive Vice President,        |   |
| International Programs:          | Dr. Judith A. Hermanson   |
| Program Director:                | Barbara Czachorska-Jones  |
| Program Development Specialist:  | Rebecca Bailey  |
| CEE Countries:                   | Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland   |
| Number of Awards:                | 24  |
| SEED Act Priorities:             | <i>Economic Restructuring, Quality of Life</i>  |
| Sector or Field of Training:     | The Role of Public Administrators in Housing<br>Delivery: A Training and Internship Program for<br>Participants from Central and Eastern Europe |
| Length of Training:              | 6.5 weeks (4 groups of 6 participants)  |
| Total Cost of Project: \$576,912 | USAID Amount: \$232,600 (44.28%)  |

---

**Purpose:** To expose public administrators from CEE countries to U.S. approaches to housing delivery and helping these countries to address issues related to housing during a period of economic restructuring.

**Goals:** The training internship program will provide participants with: 1) skills training in strategic approach to housing issues; 2) exposure to a variety of approaches implemented in the U.S.; and 3) an established linkage to a number of organizations in the U.S. through a variety of strategies involving both public and private sectors. The immediate output of each country-based session will be specific Action Plans for each participant which will set out a course of action with respect to an issue identified by the participant as his/her number one priority from among the broad areas referred to as important to public administrators' approaches to housing delivery.

**Summary:** Through a series of internships, CHF links the participants with a variety of U.S. co-sponsoring organizations, exposing them to U.S. approaches to housing delivery at the state, city, and local levels. This exposure helps participants gain first-hand knowledge and understanding of different strategies used to mobilize resources for housing development, means of successfully involving private sector organizations, and lessons learned in the privatization of communal housing projects. Participants work in workshops for two weeks at the Cooperative Housing Foundation and continue for the next two week period as interns with two of three cooperating American housing authorities (The Rhode Island Housing and Mortgage Finance Company, the Kentucky Housing Corporation, and the Albuquerque Housing Services).

**Participants in Training:** 6 (May 14—June 28, 1994)

---

---

**Participants Trained:** 6 (3 women and 3 men) from Poland. An Exit Report was submitted to the Europe Bureau on this training group in April 1994.

**Participants to be Trained:** 12 (Estonia-2, Latvia-2, Lithuania-2, and Hungary-6)

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** CHF reports pertinent monitoring, program, and participant biographical data by submitting a copy of the PDF Form and the EURIS Supplemental Form. CHF submits the data in a timely manner and is responsive to requests for additional information.

*Quarterly TCA Report.* None currently due.

**Status of Project:** The project is one-fourth complete, one-fourth are in training, and half will be programmed during the remainder of FY 1994.

**The Council of International Programs (CIP)**  
**co-funded by The Soros Foundation**

Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-3047-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Project Manager:                 | Dr. Glenn Shive   |
| Program Officer:                 | Soeurette Grammont  |
| Program Officer (Soros):         | Amanda Leness   |
| CEE Countries:                   | Albania, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia,<br>Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovak<br>Republic  |
| Number of Awards:                | 65 (down from 75)   |
| SEED Act Priorities:             | <i>Economic Restructuring, Quality of Life</i>  |
| Sectors or Fields of Training:   | Economic Restructuring (Public Administration,<br>Taxation and Public Finance, Banking and<br>Securities, Personnel and Human Resources<br>Management), and Quality of Life (Health Care<br>Administration, Environmental Protection, Social<br>Services Management, and Housing and<br>Community Development); 30 percent will be in<br>Public Administration, and 10 percent in each of<br>the other 7 fields |
| Length of Training:              | 4 months (in 2 groups)  |
| Total Cost of Project: \$887,802 | USAID Amount: \$249,102 (28.06%)  |

---

**Purpose:** To assist key institutions in CEE to rebuild themselves in the context of open societies with free market economies, and to promote long-term linkages between these institutions in CEE and their counterparts in the U.S.

**Goals:** To provide powerful professional learning opportunities in the U.S. to young leadership talent in the public and business sectors of CEE in order to assist key institutions in CEE to rebuild themselves in the context of open societies with free market economies.

**Summary:** CIP and The Soros Foundation jointly proposed a program of 75 four-month training internships in the U.S. for mid-career professionals from ten CEE nations in two SEED Act priority areas: Economic Restructuring and Quality of Life. They will learn practical managerial skills while also discovering how public organizations work in a market economy with democratic institutions. CIP has an office in the District of Columbia and twelve affiliate offices in other U.S. cities, each associated with a local university. Upon arrival at the affiliate city, the participant begins a one to two week orientation on the city, the region, and issues in the American workplace. CIP affiliates are responsible for negotiating the internships, finding

---

homestays, securing appropriate academic coursework, and tracking the progress of the participant's individual project. They also organize an orientation program at the beginning of the training and a debriefing and professional integration seminar prior to departure. Each affiliate also holds weekly or bi-weekly seminars with the participants. CIP training involves three other components: family homestays, academic coursework, and the individual project.

**Participants in Training:** None

**Participants to be Trained:** Cohort 1 (7 participants) will train May—August, 1994; Cohort 2 will train September—December, 1994.

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** None.

**Status of Project:** The training of this project is in its start-up phase.

**Department of State (Inter-Agency Agreement)**  
**The Foreign Service Institute**  
**Participant Training-Diplomatic Training**

Project Number: 180-0045-G-00-2483-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| Project Coordinator:         | Vladimir P. Sambaiew  |
| CEE Countries:               | Albania, Bulgaria   |
| Number of Awards:            | 20 (10 Albanians, 10 Bulgarians)                                |
| SEED Act Priorities:         | <i>Economic Restructuring, Democratization, Quality of Life</i> |
| Sector or Field of Training: | Diplomatic Training   |
| Length of Training:          | 5-6 weeks in U.S.; 2 weeks in Albania                           |
| Budgeted Cost of Project:    | \$443,017   |
| Actual Cost of Project:      | \$213,000   |

---

**Purpose:** To offer focused training in key diplomatic skills, especially in areas such as professional communication, negotiations, and conflict resolution for ten Albanian and ten Bulgarian diplomats; and exposure to U.S. and public/private institutions.

**Goals:** Three goals for the diplomatic training program include: 1) to explain requesting nations' professional foreign affairs capabilities; 2) to provide current Western perspectives on diplomatic practice, international relations, and political and economic topics; and 3) to offer a contemporary overview of the U.S. Ideally, the trainees should be in a position to become "trainers" in their home countries and to speed the introduction of Western diplomatic methods and concepts.

**Summary:** The State Department administered the program through its Management Bureau, which includes the Foreign Service Institute (FSI). The training program content and schedule was developed through extensive talks with the Albanian and Bulgarian government and Follow-on communications. Five to six weeks of training was offered in the U.S., following two weeks of training in basic diplomatic terminology, conventions, protocol, and representation in Albania.

**Participants Trained:** 20 between January 25 and February 28, 1993

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** Participant data is not maintained in the PTIS, however, DOS submitted the participants' name, address, and training dates as well as financial reports for the Fiscal Year 11993. DOS has been responsive to requests for additional information.

---

**Status of Project:** Training has been completed and participants have returned to home countries. An evaluation of the training program will be conducted in the fourth quarter of FY 1994.

# Georgetown University—East Central European Scholarship Program (ECESP)

Cooperative Agreement No. ANE-0002-A-00-0036-00

PACD: 06/10/97

---

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Director:                    | Dr. Maria Pryshlak   |
| Academic Advisor:            | Dr. Andrzej Kaminski   |
| CEE Countries:               | Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia  |
| Number of Awards:            | 255  |
| SEED Act Priorities:         | <i>Economic Restructuring, Democratization, Quality of Life</i>  |
| Sector or Field of Training: | Rural Managers (Economics of Private Farming, Organization and Management of Small Rural Cooperatives, and Development of Small Agribusinesses); Teachers, Senior Managers and Public Administrators |
| Length of Training:          | Rural Managers 12–24 months; Teachers, 1 year; Senior Managers, 6–12 months  |

**Project Costs:** The Congressional Appropriations Act of 1990 earmarked \$2.0 million for a three year "Poland/Hungary Scholarship Program" to be implemented by Georgetown University. This project was developed and modified as a subcategory of Section 402 of the SEED Act of 1989's International Student Exchange Program, already underway through Georgetown. A Cooperative Agreement (ANE-0002-A-00-0036-00) was signed on August 8, 1990, wherein the program components, specific goals, objectives and evaluation criteria were agreed upon. The FY 1991 Authorization Amendment #1 authorized additional funding for a total of \$4,962,000. The FY 1991 Appropriations Act allocated an additional \$3.0 million from the Development Assistance/Education and Human Resources Account to include the Czech Republic and Slovakia. The 1992 Authorization Amendment #2 extended the project to June 10, 1997, and allocated another \$3.0 million, for a total five-year project budget of \$10,962,000.

---

## **Purpose:**

*Rural Managers Program:* 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 native regions; and to facilitate the processes of democratization and privatization in East Central Europe and stimulate the growth of healthy rural communities.

*Teachers (Faculty) Program:* to retrain secondary and college level teachers from the participating countries and enable them to teach market-oriented economics and business courses.

*Public Administrators and Senior Managers Program:* to help top-level administrators and managers involved in the processes of democratization and privatization upgrade their professional skills.

**Goal:** To promote and facilitate the processes of democratization and privatization at the grass roots level.

**Summary:**

*Rural Managers:* This is a 12—24 month certificate program of study and training in business which began in 1990. Participants with poor or no English language skills receive six months of intensive English as a Foreign Language training in their home country. They are then placed in U.S. colleges where they complete 12—18 months of education and internship training in either management, marketing, banking, finance, or commerce. They learn U.S. methods for business, trade, and finance organization, and acquaint themselves with the fundamentals of American political, social, and cultural life.

| ECESP Training Cycles       |            |            |               |                |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------|---------------|----------------|
| Training Cycles             | Dates      | Total      | Women         | Men            |
| A09 Rural Managers          | 9/90—8/92  | 51         | 15            | 36             |
| B02 Rural Managers          | 2/92—3/93  | 10         | 2             | 8              |
| C01 Teachers                | 1/92—12/92 | 10         | 3             | 7              |
| C01 Rural Managers          | 1/92—7/93  | 48         | 12            | 36             |
| C08 Senior Managers         | 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 Managers         | 1/93—1/94  | 1          | 1             | 0              |
| D01 Rural Managers          | 1/93—8/94  | 57         | 14            | 43             |
| D08 Senior Managers         | 8/93—2/94  | 1          | 0             | 1              |
| D13 Teachers                | 1/94—1/95  | 12         | 5             | 7              |
| D13 Senior Managers         | 1/94—8/94  | 7          | 1             | 6              |
| E01 Rural Managers (12 mo.) | 1/94—1/95  | 11         | 2             | 9              |
| E01 Rural Managers (18 mo.) | 1/94—7/95  | 27         | 6             | 21             |
| <b>Total</b>                |            | <b>255</b> | <b>72—28%</b> | <b>183—72%</b> |

*Teachers:* In 1991, ECESP incorporated a Faculty Program to multiply its effects on privatization in East Central Europe. Teachers spend their first semester at an American college observing and assisting in either management, marketing, finance, or banking courses which they will introduce into their schools' curricula. They spend

55

---

two months visiting agribusinesses, cooperatives, and financial institutions in order to gain first-hand knowledge of their operations and to observe practical application of management, marketing, and financial principles. The final semester is spent at Georgetown University as Research Associates where they study the problems of privatization and a free market economy in developing countries while participating in various courses and extension programs offered by the Business and Graduate Schools. They also participate in seminar discussions on the role of education in economic restructuring, the functioning of a free market economy, and the formation of a strong civil society. During this semester, faculty participants concentrate on preparing a textbook for a new course they intend to teach at home.

*Public Administrators and Senior Managers:* Participants spend four to five months at Georgetown University attending special seminars, colloquia, and workshops on management, public policy, and administration. They then spend six to ten weeks interning at public or private institutions.

Of the 204 Rural Managers, 153 (75%) are men, and 51 (25%) are women. Of the 36 Teachers, 19 (53%) are men and 17 (47%) are women. Among the Senior Managers, 11 (73%) are men, and 4 (27%) are women.

**Participants Trained as of March 31, 1994:** 142 (six participants were terminated)

**Participants in Training as of March 31, 1994:** 107

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** Georgetown University reports pertinent monitoring, program, and participant biographical data through the ECESP database and is responsive to requests for additional information. The Georgetown University Management Review Report (December 1993) shows that the ECESP participant files are approximately 93 percent complete.

*Quarterly TCA Report:* Fourteen TCA reports have been submitted since the start of the program in 1990. Ten of the reports were submitted within two months of the end of the fiscal quarter. Since the first quarter of Fiscal Year 1991, all TCA reports have been submitted in a timely manner with the exception of the reports for the third and fourth quarters of Fiscal Year 1993. Currently all TCA reports have been submitted.

**Status of Project:** Sixty-one (61) participants await processing for the Fall Cycle.

## Goodwill Industries of America

Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4002-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Director of International Affairs: | Elizabeth Scott   |
| Assistant:                         | Suzanne M. Yuskiw   |
| Financial Advisor:                 | Joanne Mozynski   |
| CEE Countries:                     | Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Slovak Republic              |
| Number of Awards:                  | 8   |
| SEED Act Priorities:               | <i>Economic Restructuring, Quality of Life</i>                        |
| Sectors or Fields of Training:     | Vocational Rehabilitation, Job Training, Small Enterprise Development |
| Length of Training:                | 2 months  |
| Total Cost of Project:             | \$173,182   |
| USAID Amount:                      | \$86,127 (49.73%)   |

---

**Purpose:** To develop a corps of NGO executives and professional managers in the field of vocational rehabilitation in Poland, Hungary, Latvia, and the Czech and Slovak Republics.

**Goals:** Through the job training and employment facilities, the programs will create jobs, provide wages, and support independence for people with disabilities and others in the community. The establishment of a PVO network will also provide models for other small business enterprises.

**Summary:** Through a step-by-step curriculum at local Goodwill sites in North America, the trainees will be introduced to the techniques of operating and staffing the traditional Goodwill vocational/rehabilitation/contracting and retail sales organizations. The eight rehabilitation professionals will be prepared to set up and operate a minimum of three full-scale job training and production centers. The project primarily focuses on improving the quality of life of hundreds and potentially thousands of people with disabilities and other disadvantages in these countries.

**Participants to be Trained:** Two participants will enter training in the third quarter of FY 1994, and four will begin in the following quarter.

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** None.

**Status of Project:** The training portion of this project is in its start-up phase.

**Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration  
Central and Eastern European Teachers Program (CEETP)**

Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4006-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Assistant Dean, Business School: | Kathryn F. Venne   |
| Assistant Director:              | Constance Galanis  |
| Administrative Director:         | Joanne F. Segal  |
| CEE Countries:                   | Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Poland,<br>Romania, Slovak Republic   |
| Number of Awards:                | 25 USAID-sponsored (5 others)  |
| SEED Act Priorities:             | <i>Economic Restructuring, Quality of Life</i>   |
| Sectors or Fields of Training:   | Marketing and Competitive Analysis, Production-<br>Technology-Operations Management, Strategic<br>Management and Organizational Behavior,<br>Capital Markets and Corporate Finance,<br>Managerial Accounting and Performance<br>Evaluation |
| Length of Training:              | 9-12 weeks   |
| Total Cost of Project: \$439,466 | USAID Amount: \$216,271 (49.21%)   |

---

**Purposes:** To give teachers an exposure to how businesses and economies function in free markets by providing: 1) a broad understanding of the main functional areas of business and of the challenged encountered in integrating these functions into an effective strategic and operating plan of action; 2) an increased awareness of the workings of a market economy in competitive, political, and managerial terms; 3) a managerial perspective, oriented strongly toward action; 4) an understanding of an educational process that focuses on the development of judgment and of the skills of problem identification, decision-making, and action planning; 5) a command of business terminology; and 6) a strengthened facility with English, which is one of the important languages of business.

**Goal:** To assist in the development of management education institutions and their teachers, whose programs and skills are critical to the transformation of Central and Eastern European countries to market economies.

**Summary:** Selected teachers will attend existing executive education programs at Harvard Business School. These existing programs include the program for Management Development, the Advanced Management Program, the International Senior Managers Program, and possibly other advanced functional courses in areas of particular interest or need of the participants. A few participants may also attend similar exiting executive education programs at one of the other U.S. consortium schools, particularly Wharton or MIT. The programs ranged from 9 to 12 weeks in

---

length; are non-degree granting programs; and are also attended by executives and managers from businesses and other related organizations in the U.S. and abroad.

**Participants Trained:** 6 participants (3 women and 3 men) from Hungary-1, Poland-2, and Romania-3.

**Participants to be Trained:** Five participants will enter training during the third quarter of FY 1994, from the Czech Republic-1, Poland-2, and Romania-2.

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** Harvard University reports pertinent monitoring, program, and biographical data by submitting a copy of the PDF Form and the EURIS Supplemental Form. Harvard University is responsive to requests for additional information. However, a Quarterly Program Report is due for the first quarter of FY 1994.

*Quarterly TCA Report.* None currently due.

**Status of Project:** The first group completed training in the second quarter of FY 1994. Five new participants entered training during the third quarter of FY 1994. Fourteen individuals will be programmed later in the year.

## Home Builders Institute (HBI)

Cooperative Agreement No. EUR-0045-A-00-4003-00

PACD: 10/31/94

---

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| President and CEO:           | Phillip Polivchak  |
| Project Director:            | Dr. Michael McIntyre   |
| Project Manager:             | Robert Erwin   |
| Training Manager:            | Judith Becker  |
| CEE Countries:               | Poland and the Slovak Republic   |
| Number of Awards:            | 30 (Poland-22, Slovak Republic-8)  |
| SEED Act Priorities:         | <i>Democratic Institution Building (primarily),<br/>Economic Restructuring and Quality of Life</i> |
| Sector or Field of Training: | Administration of Building Standards and Testing   |
| Length of Training:          | 4 weeks (originally 6 weeks in-U.S.)   |

Total Cost of Project: \$613,661

USAID Amount: \$249,865 (40.71%)

---

**Purposes:** To promote the adoption of fair, democratic, and efficient procedures for building code administration in East Europe and develop the skills of thirty (30) carefully selected participants from Poland and the Slovak Republic for protecting the public health and safety while accommodating much needed improvements in building technology and business practice. Toward this end, the curriculum will seek to develop and improve: 1) professional and managerial skills; 2) field inspection procedures; and 3) materials approval methodology.

**Goal:** The primary goal is to train East European building officials in the public administration skills necessary to both regulate and support the development of a private sector housing industry. Ultimate goals are to: 1) encourage the adoption of democratic administrative procedures for revising and enforcing Eastern European building codes and standards; 2) support the development of a private-sector housing industry in Eastern Europe, through the smooth introduction of new technology and business practices; 3) facilitate economic restructuring through increased production of affordable housing, which in turn facilitates labor mobility; and 4) improve quality of life, by providing East Europeans with more and better housing through the introduction of new technology and business practices

**Summary:** The program includes an intensive six-week training program in the United States, followed by a monitored three-month practicum in the home country, which culminates in a group reunion for review and assessment of results. The U.S. portion includes two weeks of initial classroom orientation and instruction, two weeks of visits to leading U.S. building standards, codes, and testing institutions, two weeks of individual U.S. field placements with local "host" building code officials and their families, and a classroom wrap-up session.

**Participants Trained:** None

---

---

**Participants to be Trained:** 30

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** None.

**Status of Project:** This project will train 30 students in September—October, 1994.

**Institute for International Education (IIE)**  
**North American Consortium for Free Market Study**

Contract No. EUR-0002-G-00-2049-00

PACD: 12/31/93

---

Manager, Scholarship and Training Programs Division: Helene Mantell

CEE Countries: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and the  
Slovak Republic

Number of Awards: 16 (Bulgaria-1, Czech Republic-6, Hungary-3,  
Poland-3, Slovak Republic-3)

SEED Act Priorities: *Economic Restructuring*

Sectors or Fields of Training: Microeconomics, Macroeconomics, Accounting  
International Economics, Marketing, Finance,  
Management/Strategy, Business Environment

Length of Training: one year (9 month academic program, 3 months  
internship)

Total Cost of Project: \$1,252,738

USAID Amount: \$400,000 (31.93%)

---

**Purpose:** To develop the necessary educational background and skills in participants from Central and Eastern Europe so that they can contribute toward their countries' movements toward market driven economies and enhance the capacities of these countries to develop solutions to their economic problems. Additionally, the future work of these participants is expected to encourage democratic values and strengthen U.S. competitiveness within their countries.

**Goal:** To enable East Central Europeans to gain the insights, skills, and knowledge, their countries urgently need to become economically competitive, and in turn, to improve the well-being of their people.

**Summary:** This program recruits mid-career professionals with a minimum of two years of work experience who need substantive knowledge in Western business practices in order to take up leadership positions upon their return home. Participants are placed in a nine-month graduate business program, where they are expected to take at least four courses per semester. They also attend career seminars and meet with counselors to enable them to research the job market to determine their competitive advantage, prepare resumes, and write detailed cover letters to companies with which they are seeking summer internships.

**Participants Trained:** 14 participants (6 women and 10 men) from Bulgaria-1, Czech Republic-6, Hungary-3, Poland-2, and the Slovak Republic-2

**Participants in Training:** 2 participants (Poland-1 and Slovak Republic-1)

---

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** IIE (0002) reports pertinent monitoring, program, and participant biographical data by submitting copies of the PDF Form and the EURIS Supplemental Form. Quarterly program reports have been submitted for the period from April 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993. Quarterly program reports are due from the third and fourth quarters of FY 1992 and the first and second quarters of FY 1993. IIE is responsive to requests for additional information.

Due to a problem with in-country medical clearances, the IAP66a Forms for the final two participants under this grant have not been signed. The participants have not been able to send the forms to INS, therefore, the participants are under IIE visa sponsorship and not under USAID visa sponsorship.

*Quarterly TCA Report.* IIE has submitted TCA Reports for the third and fourth quarters of FY 1993 and the first quarter of FY 1994. TCA Reports are due for the third and fourth quarters of FY 1992 and the first and second quarters of FY 1993.

**Status of Project:** Fourteen participants have completed the program and returned home. The final two participants will complete the academic portion of their program and will begin their field consulting/internship assignments during the third quarter of FY 1994, and the participants will return home in August, 1994.

**Institute for International Education (IIE) and  
Joseph E. Seagram & Sons  
North American Consortium for Free Market Study**

Cooperative Agreement Contract No. EUR-0045-A-00-3045-00

PACD: 12/31/94

---

|                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Executive Vice President:         | Richard Dye  |
| Assistant Director:               | Susan Karp   |
| Manager, Scholarships & Training: | Helene Mantell   |
| CEE Countries:                    | Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland,<br>Romania, Slovak Republic                             |
| Number of Awards:                 | 9 (Bulgaria-1, Czech Republic-2, Hungary-1,<br>Poland-2, Romania-1, Slovak Republic-2)             |
| SEED Act Priorities:              | <i>Democratic Institution Building (primarily),<br/>Economic Restructuring and Quality of Life</i> |
| Sector or Field of Training:      | Business and Economics (graduate level)  |
| Length of Training:               | one year (9 months academic, 3 months internship)  |
| Total Cost of Project: \$837,900  | USAID Amount: \$250,000 (29.84%)   |

---

**Purpose:** To develop the necessary educational background and skills in participants from Central and Eastern Europe so that they can contribute toward their countries' movements toward market driven economies and enhance the capacities of these countries to develop solutions to their economic problems. Additionally, the future work of these participants is expected to encourage democratic values and strengthen U.S. competitiveness within their countries.

**Goal:** To enable East Central Europeans to gain the insights, skills, and knowledge, their countries urgently need to become economically competitive, and in turn, to improve the well-being of their people.

**Summary:** This program recruits mid-career professionals with a minimum of two years of work experience who need substantive knowledge in Western business practices in order to take up leadership positions upon their return home. Participants are placed in a nine-month graduate business program, where they are expected to take at least four courses per semester. They also attend career seminars and meet with counselors to enable them to research the job market to determine their competitive advantage, prepare resumes, and write detailed cover letters to companies with which they are seeking summer internships.

**Participants Trained:** 9 presently in training (4 women and 5 men)

**Participants to be Trained:** None

---

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** IIE (0045) reports pertinent monitoring, program, and participant biographical data by submitting copies of the PDF Form and the EURIS Supplemental Form. Quarterly program reports have been submitted for the period from July 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993. IIE submits the data in a timely manner and is responsive to requests for additional information.

Due to a problem with in-country medical clearances, the IAP66a Forms for the nine participants under this grant have not been signed. The participants have not been able to send the forms to the INS, therefore, the participants are under IIE visa sponsorship and not under USAID visa sponsorship.

*Quarterly TCA Report.* None currently due.

**Status of Project:** All participants will complete their academic programs during the third quarter of FY 1994 and will proceed to their internship assignments. Participants will return to home countries in August, 1994.

# Johns Hopkins University

Cooperative Agreement Contract No. EUR-0045-00-3044-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Special Assistant to the Director: | Robert A. Seidel  |
| CEE Countries:                     | Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland,<br>Romania, Slovak Republic                  |
| Number of Awards:                  | 26 (Bulgaria-2, Czech Republic-7, Hungary-3,<br>Poland-8, Romania-3, Slovak Republic-3) |
| SEED Act Priorities:               | <i>Economic Restructuring and Democratic Institution<br/>Strengthening</i>              |
| Sector or Field of Training:       | Public Administration   |
| Length of Training:                | 9 months junior fellow, 4 months senior fellow<br>academic, 6-month internship program  |
| Total Cost of Project: \$493,476   | USAID Amount: \$246,695 (49.99%)  |

---

**Purpose:** To build the human infrastructure necessary for both effective autonomous local government and a vibrant private, non-profit sector in Central and Eastern Europe.

**Goals:** To help equip a cadre of personnel in Central and Eastern Europe with knowledge and skills they need to: 1) implement effective local self-government; 2) to organize and manage non-profit organizations; 3) to understand the role these organizations can play in local and national life; and 4) to pass on to others these skills and perspectives.

## Summary:

*International Fellowships in Urban Studies.* Six positions are offered to CEE participants engaged in the process of reform of institutions of local public administration. Four Senior Fellows will spend four months, and two Junior Fellows spend nine months at Johns Hopkins. They attend a semester-long seminar on local self-government. The Fellows prepare technical assistance manuals on key facets of government operation, such as finance, budgeting, intergovernmental relations, environmental policy, economic development policy, and land valuation and planning. They also take field visits to one or two cities and meet with local government officials.

*Internships in the U.S. in Local and Regional Public Administration.* Ten local and regional government officials from CEE will participate in six-week internship programs in local public administration in local and state government agencies in the Baltimore—Washington area. Two days are spent in expert briefings at Johns Hopkins University. They receive weekly debriefing sessions at Johns Hopkins, take at least one field trip to Washington for briefings on the relevance of the federal

---

government to local administration, and three days at Johns Hopkins at the conclusion of the six week period for group discussion and individual writing of memos for colleagues in CEE on the major conclusions of the internship experience.

*The Third-Sector Project: Training of Trainers.* This is a six-week training program for ten CEE leaders of the nongovernmental sector to become effective trainers in the area of non-profit management. The program is composed of two activities: in-country training workshops for emerging non-profit sector leaders in Central and Eastern Europe; and supervised internship opportunities of six weeks duration in American non-profit organizations for CEE non-profit leaders.

**Participants Trained:** 3 in training (2 women and 1 man), from the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Romania

**Participants to be Trained:** 23

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** Johns Hopkins University has not submitted copies of the PDF Form and the EURIS Form containing monitoring, program, and participant biographical data for the first three participants. (One participant began training in September 1993, the other two started in January and February 1994.) A quarterly program report is past due for the first quarter of FY 1994.

*Quarterly TCA Report.* Johns Hopkins University has not submitted a Quarterly TCA Report for the first quarter of FY 1994.

**Status of Project:** Three participants, one Hungarian Junior Fellow, a Czech Senior Fellow, and a Romanian Senior Fellow completed their training in May 1994. During the third quarter of FY 1994, planning and recruitment is taking place for the training of trainers program.

## Partners for International Education and Training (PIET)

Buy-in to existing Contract No. DHR-0000-Z-00-00-9079-00, "Placement, Programming, Management and Field Support Services for USAID Participant Training," managed by the USAID Center for Human Capacity Development

EUR-0045-3-262-2481

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Project Director:              | Colin J. A. Davies  |
| Program Director:              | Lisa Posner   |
| Overseas Coordinator:          | Anne Woods  |
| Regional Coordinator:          | Mada McGill, Northern Region (in Europe)  |
| Regional Coordinator:          | Gerald Martin, Southern Region (in Europe)  |
| CEE Countries:                 | Northern Tier: Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovak Republic; and Southern Tier: Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Macedonia, Romania  |
| Number of Awards:              | 284 (Albania-9, Bulgaria-49, Croatia-14, Czech Republic-9, Estonia-4, Hungary-25, Latvia-11, Lithuania-14, Macedonia-6, Poland-101, Romania-26, Slovak Republic-16)   |
| SEED Act Priorities:           | <i>Economic Restructuring-50%, Democratic Institution Strengthening-25%, Quality of Life-25%</i>  |
| Sectors or Fields of Training: | Economic Restructuring: Economics, Business, Commercial Law, Banking, Energy, Small Business Development, Marketing, Trade and Investment;<br>Democratic Institutions: Political Science, History Education, Journalism, Natural Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences; and Quality of Life: Health, Medicine, Housing, Labor |
| Length of Training:            | Individual programs may mix academic training and on-the-job training. Private sector training and internships are a priority for all sectors.  |
| Cost of Project:               | \$6,583,571   |

---

**Purpose:** The purpose of this contract is to provide training and training-related assistance to Central and Eastern Europe under the SEED legislation. The project places great emphasis on identifying and training leaders and potential leaders who can address the development problems within this region. The contractor is charged with the development of a Participant Training Plan to include: an Institutional

---

Competition for Training, as well as Training to Service USAID/Rep/Embassy Needs.

**Goals:** The goals of this project are to address through training the substantive areas of SEED priorities: a) Economic Restructuring—by assisting in transforming centrally planned economies into market-based economies led by the private sector and integrated into the world economy; b) Democratic Institutions—by developing and building democratic, pluralistic societies based on values of human rights and individual freedoms; and c) Quality of Life—by education and training in the areas of health, medicine, housing, and labor in order to improve the basic quality of life.

**Summary:** USAID managed short courses and technical training are being done through a buy-in to the existing contract between the Center for Human Capacity Development and PIET. PIET arranges training to service the needs of USAID Representatives and Project Managers. USAID Reps, Project Managers, or others managing project activities identify key private and public sector counterparts to attend short-term or medium-term training, in order to further project specific activities. PIET arranges a suitable training program for each individual or group and prepares, processes, and forwards all necessary paperwork.

USAID/Europe anticipates 1,200 to 1,300 participants for whom PIET supplies support services. An estimate of the number of trainees from each country is as follows: Poland 300—350, Hungary 300—350, with the remaining numbers fairly evening divided between the other eight countries, approximately 60 to 75 each.

**Participants Trained:** 229

**Participants in Training:** 55

**Participants to be Trained:** Approximately 169 for the third quarter of FY 1994

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** PIET reports pertinent monitoring, program, and participant biographical data electronically to OIT's Participant Training Information System (PTIS.) However, due to incomplete information in the PTIS, Aguirre International has had difficulties obtaining participant information in a timely manner. Aguirre International and PIET are coordinating efforts to remedy this problem.

PIET regularly submits monthly program reports.

*Quarterly TCA Report.* None currently due.

**Status of Project:** On-going.



---

privatization, the government, and foreign direct investment as a carrier of higher technological standards, as well as marketing and financial skills, was developed.

*Perspectives on Federalism—one participant.* This session examined different federal systems, including those of the United States and the European Community, comparing and contrasting their structures and identifying the partners they face in the future. It focuses primarily on the legal aspects of federalism and the various models of federated states. Issues included the political and legal dimension, the historical role of federal systems, and economic aspects.

*Ethnicity, Cultures and the Making of Nations—14 participants.* These sessions examined the roles of geography, religion, language, culture, and the law in establishing national identity. By considering four regions of the world—North America, Central and Eastern Europe, SubSaharan Africa, and China—these sessions examined those influences that lead to the creation or unraveling of a nation state.

*American Law and Legal Institutions—2 participants.* This session provided a general introduction to American law and legal institutions. While specific issues related to the American legal system were addressed, the session looked at the American and European legal systems. Within the context of this approach, the session considered similarities and differences between litigation and the appellate process in these two sessions.

**Participants Trained:** 31 (15 women and 16 men)

**Participants to be Trained:** None

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** Salzburg Seminar has submitted program and participant biographical data in a timely manner. Quarterly program reports have been submitted for the third and fourth quarters of FY 1993.

*Quarterly TCA Report.* No Quarterly TCA Reports have been submitted by Salzburg Seminar.

**Status of the Program:** The programs are completed and the participants have returned to their home countries.

**The Soros Foundation's Management Training Program  
Training Internship Program through the  
Business Higher Education Forum—American Council on Education**

Contact No. EUR-0045-A-00-4007-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Project Officer:                 | Amanda Leness  |
| Director:                        | Susanna Khavul   |
| Chairperson:                     | Mrs. Herta Seidman   |
| CEE Countries:                   | Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic  |
| Number of Awards:                | 30   |
| SEED Act Priority:               | <i>Economic Restructuring</i>  |
| Sectors or Fields of Training:   | Business Management, Communications,<br>Environmental Management, Public<br>Administration, Banking and Financial Services |
| Length of Training:              | 3 months   |
| Total Cost of Project: \$510,781 | USAID Amount: \$249,964 (48.93%)   |

---

**Purpose:** The purpose of this Cooperative Agreement is to develop and implement a thorough, targeted, high quality Training Internship Program (TIP) to serve the educational and training needs of Central and Eastern Europe. The TIP will combine professional, hands-on internships with structured academic training for thirty professionals and industry leaders from Bulgaria, Estonia, Poland, Romania, and the Slovak Republic in the areas of communications, business management, environmental management, public administration, and banking and financial services.

**Goal:** The goal is to develop a critical mass of business managers, trained in the West, to develop functional markets in Central and Eastern Europe. Through the Training and Internship Program, participants will gain hands-on experience within their particular professional specialties in a free market, competitive business environment. Training internships such as those proposed are an important initial response to the widely-held perception that without rapid development of a critical mass of practical managers, the economic reforms now under way in Central and Eastern Europe are not likely to succeed.

**Summary:** The TIP will last approximately three months. It will be preceded by a three-day orientation session, and concluded with a one-day briefing session, both to be held in Washington, D.C. Participants will be grouped into training clusters according to the targeted priority areas and across country lines. The clustering approach will allow participants to share cross-country experiences, reinforce a common training experience, and form a core professional group which may foster future cooperation. The academic—corporate partnerships for the TIP clusters may

---

include institutions and organizations such as: Northwestern University and Ameritech (communications management); Ford Motor Company and the University of Michigan; Digital Equipment and Harvard Business School (business management), Indiana University and Cummins Engine (environmental management); American University and the National Academy of Public Administration (public administration); and Mellon Bank and the University of Pittsburgh (banking and financial services).

**Participants Trained:** None

**Participants to be Trained:** 30

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** None.

**Status of Project:** The first participants will be arriving the week of August 23, 1994.

# Thomas Jefferson University Hospital (TJUH)

Contract No. EUR-0045-A-00-4004-00

PACD: 12/31/94

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Project Director:                                | Barry B. Goldberg, M.D., Professor Radiology,<br>Director Division of Ultrasound  |
| Coordinator:                                     | Janice Bogen Field  |
| Soros Foundation (co-funder)<br>Program Officer: | Sara Klaus  |
| CEE Countries:                                   | Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia,<br>Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic                               |
| Number of Awards:                                | 24 (Albania-2, Bulgaria-3, Estonia-2, Hungary-3,<br>Latvia-2, Lithuania-2, Poland-4, Romania-2, and<br>Slovak Republic-3) |
| SEED Act Priority:                               | <i>Quality of Life</i>  |
| Sector or Field of Training:                     | Diagnostic Ultrasound Training  |
| Length of Training:                              | 3 months  |
| Total Cost of Project: \$496,852                 | USAID Amount: \$157,965 (31.79%)  |

---

**Purpose:** The purpose of this program is to provide training in the use of diagnostic ultrasound, providing both theoretical and practical training with the objective of preparing the participant to return to his or her native country to introduce the use of diagnostic ultrasound in general medical care.

**Goal:** The goal is to improve the quality of medical care for the people of Central and Eastern Europe, and therefore, improve the quality of life. A second goal is to encourage investment of scarce resources in the relatively low cost, effective, and sustainable technology of ultrasound. By introducing a core group of trained physicians to the Eastern and Central European nations, these individuals will provide training to others and the benefits of ultrasound diagnosis may be quickly introduced to the general population.

**Summary:** The program consists of a one-week introduction to the program, a four-week didactic program with hands-on training, a five-week clinical tutorial, and two weeks of special procedures in ultrasound evaluation, and resource assessment.

**Participants Trained:** 7 (2 women and 5 men), from Bosnia-1, Bulgaria-2, Romania-2, and the Slovak Republic-2

**Participants to be Trained:** The second group is scheduled to enter training on July 1, 1994.

---

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** TJUH reports pertinent monitoring, program, and participant biographical data by submitting a copy of the PDF Form and the EURIS Supplemental Form. TJUH did not submit the PDF and EURIS Supplemental Forms for the first seven participants until the last day of their training program. Aguirre was notified of the completion of the program by USAID. A quarterly program report is past due for the first quarter of FY 1994.

*Quarterly TCA Report.* A Quarterly TCA Report is due for the first quarter of FY 1994.

**Status of the Project:** The project is one-third complete. A detailed, special report was written on the first training group.

75

# United States Information Agency (USIA)

## Participant Training "Top-Up" Project

Inter-Agency Agreement, Project Number: 180-0045

PACD: 02/21/95

---

Coordinator: Rosalind Swenson  
Program Officer: Allison Crocker Portnoy  
Special Projects Officer/Budget: Kim Havenner  
Program Assistant: Carole Reb  
NAFSA Program Officer: Martin Pittman

CEE Countries: Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Poland, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Yugoslavia

Number of Awards: 258 (Albania-8, Bosnia-Herzegovina-1, Bulgaria-63, Croatia-10, Czech Republic-37, Estonia-13, Hungary-41, Latvia-8, Lithuania-10, Macedonia-6, Poland-22, Romania-28, Slovak Republic-5, Slovenia-5, Yugoslavia-1)

SEED Act Priorities: *Economic Restructuring, Democratization, Quality of Life*

Sectors or Fields of Training: Humanities-35, Social Sciences-12, Economics-20, Political Science-43, Earth Science-10, Mathematics-8, Computer Science-16, Business-43, Small Business Development-1, Banking-1, Marketing-3, Architecture-11, Communications-7, Journalism-1, Law-4, Medicine-5, Public Administration-11, Theory of Public Administration-13, Education-7, Agriculture-5, Conservation-7, Urban Planning and Development-7

Length of Training: one year with option for a second

Total Cost of Project: \$1,387,745  
(Top-Up Scholarships 4/92-6/93)

USAID Amount: \$400,000  
(Top-Up-former Yugoslavia)

---

**Purpose:** The purpose of the project is to provide funds to support academic training in the U.S. for both undergraduate and graduate students in a broad range of fields, including democratic processes, free market economics, and quality of life.

**Goal:** The goal is to equip a broad base of leaders and professionals in Central and Eastern Europe with specialized skills and practical knowledge in order to develop and support democratic processes, a free market economy, and an improved quality of life in the region.

---

**Summary:** USIA provides grants to undergraduate (entering their third or fourth year of schooling) and graduate students to undertake a one to two-year term of study at U.S. universities. Only students who are accepted at U.S. universities and who receive substantial fellowships or tuition waivers are eligible for assistance. Using a grantee organization, NAFSA, to manage the administrative details, U.S. universities were invited to nominate accepted student with tuition waivers for consideration. Applications were reviewed on a competitive basis for assistance grants not to exceed \$10,000 per student. Sixty percent of the total selected students are to be present or future public officials. The program provides students the opportunity to live and learn in a free, open, market-oriented society, and encourages the students to engage in rigorous academic discourse.

**Participants Trained:** 39

**Participants in Training:** 219 (101 Women, and 118 Men)

**Participants to be Trained:** To be decided

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** USIA reports monitoring, program, and participant biographical data to OIT's PTIS. USIA has submitted quarterly cost data from the first quarter of FY 1993 through the first quarter of FY 1994. Program reports have been submitted through the first quarter of FY 1994. USIA has submitted the data in a timely manner and has been responsive to requests for additional information.

**Status of the Project:** In September 1992, USIA selected and placed 98 students at U.S. universities to begin their studies. Approximately 50 percent were undergraduate, and 50 percent were graduate students. A geographical mix among the countries of Central and Eastern Europe was achieved, as well as the focus of students in the fields of public administration and policy. The average range of "Top-Up" funds per student exceeded the \$7,500 range, but were within the \$10,000 maximum.

For FY 1993, approximately 225 students (renewals and first-year grant recipients) from 13 countries participated in USIA's Participant Training "Top-Up" Scholarship Program. Graduate students and degree-seeking students in their last two years of undergraduate study were eligible for grants.

# United States Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI)

Contract No. EUR-0045-A-00-4001-00

PACD: 02/21/95

---

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Special Projects Coordinator:  | Wade Warren  |
| Curriculum Coordinator:        | Michael Deegan   |
| Curriculum Coordinator:        | Pat Kennard  |
| CEE Countries:                 | Albania, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia,<br>Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania,<br>Slovak Republic   |
| Number of Awards:              | 40   |
| SEED Act Priorities:           | <i>Economic Restructuring, Democratic Institution-<br/>building, Quality of Life</i>   |
| Sectors or Fields of Training: | Communications training, including privatization<br>concepts for telephone and broadcasting,<br>spectrum management, telephone network<br>management, broadcast studio design, satellite<br>communications, and regulatory structure |
| Length of Training:            | 4 week courses   |
| Total Cost of Project:         | \$660,500  |
| USAID Amount:                  | \$250,000 (37.85%)   |

---

**Purpose:** The purpose is to provide participants from the emerging democracies of Central and Eastern Europe with the skills necessary to operate, maintain, update, and expand their telephone and broadcast facilities, and to meet their domestic communications requirements. Communications officials will be trained in both telecommunications and broadcast technology and administration.

**Goal:** The goal of the program is to share the U.S. communications advances on a global basis by providing a comprehensive array of managerial and technical courses in telecommunications and broadcasting.

**Summary:** All USTTI courses take place at the training facilities of the corporate or federal sponsor offering the course. USTTI training is not product-specific, but rather is intentionally oriented toward adaptive strategies that help the telecommunications or broadcast leaders make informed assessments about where their own organizations stand in relation to new technologies. USTTI training courses cover multiple subject areas, offering 74 courses in the field of communications. All USTTI training programs begin with a three-day orientation in Washington, D.C. At the end of each course, a USTTI staff member conducts a written and oral evaluation at the training site.

**Participants Trained:** None

---

**Participants to be Trained: 40**

**Monitoring/Management Issues: None.**

**Status of Project: Participants to begin training in Fall 1994.**

79

**William Davidson Institute, University of Michigan,  
School of Business Administration**

Contract No. EUR-0045-A-00-3040-00

PACD: 11/30/94

---

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Director of Operations:        | Hans Bechbuhl   |
| Coordinators:                  | Ted Snider, Suzanna Heike, Martha Lee,<br>Julie Martin, Maureen Deegan      |
| CEE Countries:                 | Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovak Republic                            |
| Number of Awards:              | 18  |
| SEED Act Priorities:           | <i>Economic Restructuring</i>   |
| Sectors or Fields of Training: | Market Economics, Privatization, Sector Reform and<br>Public Administration |
| Length of Training:            | 23 days   |

Total Cost of Project: \$308,514

USAID Amount: \$78,519 (25.45%)

---

**Purpose:** The purpose of this program is to provide the necessary educational background and skills to countries in Central and Eastern Europe making the transition from command to market-oriented economies by assisting companies that wish to operate effectively in these economies.

**Goal:** This program has three main goals. The first is to provide participants with a "cognitive road map" of principles to guide their decision-making in business functions such as marketing and finance. The second goal is to develop the manager-students' leadership skills and increase their capacity to manage change. The third goal is to encourage the manager-students to identify specific means of addressing the business problems they face.

**Summary:** The Instructional Program will have three components: 1) Basic Instruction in Managerial Functions; 2) Executive Skills Development; and 3) Analysis of Major Business Problems. The Instructional Program will be preceded by an internally-funded Internship Program which will send teams of Master's-level student to work in-country with the participants prior to their U.S. training (writing a thorough assessment of aspects of the enterprise's business operations to be used in the course of the Instructional Program).

**Participants Trained:** None

**Participants to be Trained:** 15—20

**Monitoring/Management Issues:** None.

**Status of Project:** Due to start at the end of Summer 1994.

PTPE TRAINEES BY COUNTRY AND CONTRACTOR  
(Trainees who have completed or are in training as of March 31, 1994.)

Contractors, Cooperative Agreements, Inter-Agency Agreements

| Country     | SUNY | CHF | DOS | ECESP | Harvard | IIE-02 | IIE-45 | Johns<br>Hopkins | PIET | Salz-<br>burg | TJUH | USIA | TOTAL |
|-------------|------|-----|-----|-------|---------|--------|--------|------------------|------|---------------|------|------|-------|
| Albania     |      |     | 10  |       |         |        |        |                  | 9    |               |      | 8    | 27    |
| Bosnia      |      |     |     |       |         |        |        |                  | 7    | 1             |      | 1    | 9     |
| Bulgaria    |      |     | 10  |       |         | 1      | 1      | 2                | 49   | 4             | 2    | 63   | 132   |
| Croatia     |      |     |     |       |         |        |        |                  | 7    | 1             |      | 10   | 18    |
| Czech Rep.  |      |     |     | 35    |         | 6      | 2      | 1                | 9    | 4             |      | 37   | 94    |
| Estonia     |      |     |     |       |         |        |        |                  | 4    | 5             | 1    | 13   | 23    |
| Hungary     |      |     |     | 46    | 1       | 3      | 1      | 1                | 25   | 5             |      | 41   | 123   |
| Latvia      |      |     |     |       |         |        |        |                  | 11   |               |      | 8    | 19    |
| Lithuania   | 10   |     |     |       |         |        |        |                  | 14   | 1             |      | 10   | 35    |
| Macedonia   |      |     |     |       |         |        |        |                  | 6    | 1             |      | 6    | 13    |
| Poland      |      | 6   |     | 153   | 2       | 3      | 2      | 1                | 101  | 3             |      | 22   | 293   |
| Romania     |      |     |     |       | 3       |        | 1      | 1                | 26   | 3             | 2    | 28   | 64    |
| Slovak Rep. |      |     |     | 21    |         | 3      | 2      |                  | 16   | 2             | 2    | 5    | 51    |
| Slovenia    |      |     |     |       |         |        |        |                  |      | 1             |      | 5    | 6     |
| Yugoslavia  |      |     |     |       |         |        |        |                  |      |               |      | 1    | 1     |

TOTALS 10 6 20 255 6 16 9 6 284 31 7 258 908

Sources: Quarterly Reports and EURIS Database as of March 31, 1994.

USAID Representative: Dianne M. Blane

PIET Regional Coordinator: Mada McGill

PIET Training Coordinator: Stan Nowakowski

## U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The goal of U.S. assistance policy in Albania is to support the historic political and economic transformation now underway. This transformation seeks to restructure the economy based on the principles of a free market and a democratic system of governance. The U.S. assistance strategy to help Albania move towards achieving this goal gives highest priority to the following objectives:

- promoting agricultural development;
- developing a market economy;
- fostering democratic institutions; and
- at least within the three-year timeframe of this strategy (1993-95), improving the quality of life through the provision of humanitarian assistance.

## Training Activities

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 27 Albanian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Humanities, Economics, Politics; and the specific fields of Public Accounting, Agriculture, and Urban Development.

The following table provides a breakdown of Albanian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

| Contractor/<br>Grantee/IAA | Completed | In-<br>Training | Total     |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Dept. of State             | 10        | 0               | 10        |
| PIET                       | 8         | 1               | 9         |
| USIA                       | 0         | 8               | 8         |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>18</b> | <b>9</b>        | <b>27</b> |

Twelve (12) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

13

## BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

USAID Representative: Michael S. Zak  
USAID Training Officer: Slavica Radosevic  
PIET Regional Coordinator: Gerald Martin

### U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

Policy paper forthcoming.

### Training Activities

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 9 Bosnian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Social Sciences, Business Management, Medicine.

The following table provides a breakdown of Bosnian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

No new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| Contractor/<br>Grantee/IAA | Completed | In-<br>Training | Total    |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|----------|
| PIET                       | 7         | 0               | 7        |
| Salzburg Seminar           | 1         | 0               | 1        |
| USIA                       | 0         | 1               | 1        |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>8</b>  | <b>1</b>        | <b>9</b> |

|                            |                                   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | Gerald Zarr                       |
| USAID Training Officers:   | Brad Fujimoto,<br>Jenny Georgieva |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Gerald Martin                     |
| PIET Training Coordinator: | Donna Niclaus                     |
| PIET Program Manager:      | Penka Nikolova                    |

## U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

During FYs 1993 through 1995, the U.S. assistance strategy for Bulgaria will continue to consist of regional programs, predominantly of technical assistance and training. Progressively, though, a unique Bulgaria country program will be planned within the regional parameters established by Washington. In the country strategy, stress has been placed upon managerial burdens and pay-offs. A core program consisting of seven activities has been developed:

- complete key legal reforms;
- privatize, restructure, and deepen financial services;
- privatize and restructure industry;
- restructure agriculture to support private farmers;
- strengthen municipal governance;
- support the private sector; and
- help institutionalize two U.S.-sponsored educational institutions.

The program seeks to assist development of democratic, free market reforms and to spread the impact of reforms to the general populace. Geographically, emphasis will be placed upon activities centered outside the larger cities of Sofia, Varna, and Plovdiv. Ethnic minority areas will receive particular attention. A general training program will continue to buttress activities in the core areas, although genuine, "targets of opportunity" may be funded in individual training cases.

## Training Activities

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 132 Bulgarian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Agriculture, Architecture, Communication, Conservation, Education, Humanities, Law, Medicine, Public Accounting, Social Sciences, Economics, Earth Science, Computer, Business, Marketing; and the specific fields of Public Finance, State and Local Government, Business Management, Small Business Development, Investments and Security, Banking, Diagnostic Radiology, Ophthalmology, Teaching English, Urban

Development, Hotel and Resort Administration.

The following table provides a breakdown of Bulgarian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

Ten (10) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| <b>Contractor/<br/>Grantee/IAA</b> | <b>Completed</b> | <b>In-<br/>Training</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| DOS                                | 10               | 0                       | 10           |
| Johns Hopkins                      | 0                | 2                       | 2            |
| IIE (EUR-0002)                     | 1                | 0                       | 1            |
| IIE (EUR-0045)                     | 0                | 1                       | 1            |
| PIET                               | 40               | 9                       | 49           |
| Salzburg Seminar                   | 4                | 0                       | 4            |
| Thomas Jefferson<br>Hospital       | 2                | 0                       | 2            |
| USIA                               | 5                | 58                      | 63           |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>62</b>        | <b>70</b>               | <b>132</b>   |

USAID Representative: Michael S. Zak  
 USAID Training Officer: Slavica Radosevic  
 PIET Regional Coordinator: Gerald Martin

### U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

Policy paper forthcoming.

### Training Activities

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 18 Croatian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Agriculture, Humanities, Social Sciences, Economics, Education, Politics, Earth Sciences, Mathematics, Medicine, Computers; and the specific field of Business Management.

The following table provides a breakdown of Croatian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

No new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| Contractor/<br>Grantee/IAA | Completed | In-<br>Training | Total     |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| PIET                       | 7         | 0               | 7         |
| Salzburg Seminar           | 1         | 0               | 1         |
| USIA                       | 0         | 10              | 10        |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>8</b>  | <b>10</b>       | <b>18</b> |

|                            |                             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | Lee D. Roussel              |
| USAID Training Officers:   | Bob Posner,<br>Jan Duskocil |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Mada McGill                 |
| PIET Training Coordinator: | Mari Novak                  |

### **U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy**

The overall U.S. policy goal is to support the continuation of the economic and institutional reforms to the point that they are irreversible and Czech citizens are once again incorporated into the economic and political mainstream of the West. The Country Team believes U.S. support can gradually be phased from its present aid format to one more characteristic of that for an Advanced Developing Country. Such an arrangement would permit Embassy/USAID response to specific, short-term requests from the Czech government and private sector for help in completing the transformation process, while continuing to strengthen U.S. business and commercial ties. In the interim, the U.S. program will increasingly be focused on support four Czech initiatives:

- complete the major portions of the privatization program and establish the basic infrastructure needed for the financial sector and capital markets;
- broaden participation at the regional and local level in addressing key issues, strengthen municipalities' administrative and financial capabilities, and support small and medium-sized business development;
- foster the development of efficient energy production and use, which concurrently improves the environment; and
- further bolster media, legal, and educational institutions essential to broadening public participation in economic and political reform.

### **Training Activities**

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 94 Czech participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Architecture, Communications, Conservation, Education, Humanities, Social Sciences, Economics, Politics, Earth Sciences, Finance, Marketing, Mathematics, Computers, Business, Business Management; and the specific fields of Banking, Banking and Finance, Theory of Public Administration, Teaching-secondary level, Education of the physically handicapped, Secondary School Administration, Agricultural Business,

Agribusiness Management,  
Agricultural Development.

The following table provides a breakdown of Czech PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

Fourteen (14) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| <b>Contractor/<br/>Grantee/IAA</b> | <b>Completed</b> | <b>In-<br/>Training</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| PIET                               | 4                | 5                       | 9            |
| Georgetown ECESP                   | 17               | 18                      | 35           |
| Johns Hopkins<br>University        | 0                | 1                       | 1            |
| IIE (EUR-0002)                     | 6                | 0                       | 6            |
| IIE (EUR-0045)                     | 0                | 2                       | 2            |
| Salzburg Seminar                   | 4                | 0                       | 4            |
| USIA                               | 12               | 25                      | 37           |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>43</b>        | <b>51</b>               | <b>94</b>    |

89

|                            |                         |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | Adrian L. deGraffenreid |
| USAID Training Officer:    | Marika Tomberg          |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Mada McGill             |

**U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy**

The U.S. development program can assist Estonia in meeting its priorities, particularly in completing its open market economic reforms, and assisting selectively in democratic reforms. U.S. assistance will ensure that U.S. business has an equal opportunity to participate in local and regional markets and can stimulate U.S. private investment in the region by linking U.S. firms with Estonian development opportunities. U.S. assistance should focus on only on those program areas which will: have the greatest impact; provide long-term solutions; strengthen government institutions and local systems, and promote the self-sustaining development process. This strategy assigns priority to three major program goals:

- strengthen pluralistic democracy;
- support economic reforms and growth; and
- support environmental protection.

**Training Activities**

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 23 Estonian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Business, Business Management, Communications, Computers, Conservation, Economics, Humanities, Law, Politics, Social Sciences; and the specific fields of Public Finance and Tax Policy, Diagnostic Radiology, Agricultural Business.

| Contractor/<br>Grantee/IAA   | Completed | In-<br>Training | Total     |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| PIET                         | 3         | 1               | 4         |
| Salzburg Seminar             | 5         | 0               | 5         |
| Thomas Jefferson<br>Hospital | 1         | 0               | 1         |
| USIA                         | 3         | 10              | 13        |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>12</b> | <b>11</b>       | <b>23</b> |

The following table provides a breakdown of Estonian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

Five (5) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| USAID Representative:      | David L. Cowles                        |
| USAID Training Officers:   | Nedra Huggins Williams<br>David Molnar |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Gerald Martin                          |
| PIET Program Manager:      | Annamaria Kekesi                       |

## **U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy**

Hungary's progress toward becoming a stable and prosperous democratic nation can be measured by its success in meeting a series of related strategic objectives in the next five to seven years. These successes will be predicated on progress in meeting strategic objectives in the four mutually reinforcing areas of:

- macroeconomic stabilization and structural reform;
- democratic institutions and processes;
- economic transformation; and
- quality of life.

## **Training Activities**

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 123 Hungarian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Architecture, Communications, Humanities, Social Sciences, Business, Computers, Earth Science, Economics, Finance, Law, Marketing, Mathematics, Politics, Public Administration, Theory of Public Administration; and the specific fields of Government Organization and Management, Public Finance and Tax Policy, Business Management, Management Training, Business Statistics, Banking, Investments and Securities, International Trade, International Law, Observation-U.S. Legal System, Teaching-secondary level, Teaching-agriculture, Agricultural Development, Agricultural Business, Agribusiness Management, and Urban Development.

The following table provides a breakdown of Hungarian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

Thirty-two (32) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| <b>Contractor/<br/>Grantee/IAA</b> | <b>Completed</b> | <b>In-<br/>Training</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| PIET                               | 23               | 2                       | 25           |
| Georgetown ECESP                   | 31               | 15                      | 46           |
| Harvard University                 | 0                | 1                       | 1            |
| Johns Hopkins<br>University        | 0                | 1                       | 1            |
| IIE (EUR-0002)                     | 3                | 0                       | 3            |
| IIE (EUR-0045)                     | 0                | 1                       | 1            |
| Salzburg Seminar                   | 5                | 0                       | 5            |
| USIA                               | 7                | 34                      | 41           |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>69</b>        | <b>54</b>               | <b>123</b>   |

|                            |                        |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | Baudouin F. de Marcken |
| USAID Training Officer:    | Elita Sproge           |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Mada McGill            |
| PIET Training Coordinator: | Astrida Levensteins    |

**U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy**

U.S. assistance to Latvia focuses only on those program areas which will have the greatest impact, provide long-term solutions, strengthen key government institutions and local systems, and promote a self-sustaining development process. The assistance program to Latvia places a priority on:

- a multi-faceted program to further develop and consolidate open-market reforms;
- technical assistance and training to enhance private sector business development and managerial skills; and
- support for democratic pluralism.

**Training Activities**

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 19 Latvian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Humanities, Economics, Marketing, Mathematics; and the specific fields of International Economics, Industrial Relations, Management Training, and Business.

The following table provides a breakdown of Latvian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

| Contractor/<br>Grantee/IAA | Completed | In-<br>Training | Total     |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| PIET                       | 9         | 2               | 11        |
| USIA                       | 0         | 8               | 8         |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>9</b>  | <b>10</b>       | <b>19</b> |

Fifteen (15) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

93

|                            |                    |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | John J. Cloutier   |
| USAID Training Officer:    | Reda Bagusinskiene |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Mada McGill        |
| PIET Training Coordinator: | Cristina Bucher    |

## U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

The U.S. Government assistance program has concentrated on flexible delivery mechanisms that respond rapidly to new and unanticipated demands, in a few, well-chosen areas. The effectiveness and impact of the program depends on continuing with this approach and improving coordination among other donors as well as among U.S.G. agencies receiving SEED Act funds. The U.S.G. has worked closely with the Government of Lithuania to identify priority areas where we have the clearest comparative advantage over other donors:

- private sector development;
- energy sector reform; and
- democratic initiatives.

## Training Activities

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 35 Lithuanian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Economics, Politics, Energy, Business, Communications, Computers, Education; and the specific fields of Business Management, Banking, and Public Relations.

The following table provides a breakdown of Lithuanian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

Fourteen (14) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| Contractor/<br>Grantee/IAA | Completed | In-<br>Training | Total     |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| PIET                       | 11        | 3               | 14        |
| Salzburg Seminar           | 1         | 0               | 1         |
| SUNY-<br>Farmingdale       | 0         | 10              | 10        |
| USIA                       | 0         | 10              | 10        |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>12</b> | <b>23</b>       | <b>35</b> |

USAID Representative: Linda R. Gregory  
 USAID Training Officer: Rajna Cemerska  
 PIET Regional Coordinator: Gerald Martin

## U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy

Policy paper forthcoming.

## Training Activities

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 13 Macedonian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Business, Computers, Humanities, Politics; and the specific fields of Business Management and Urban Development.

The following table provides a breakdown of Macedonian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

No new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| Contractor/<br>Grantee/IAA | Completed | In-<br>Training | Total     |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| PIET                       | 6         | 0               | 6         |
| Salzburg Seminar           | 1         | 0               | 1         |
| USIA                       | 0         | 6               | 6         |
| <b>Total</b>               | <b>7</b>  | <b>6</b>        | <b>13</b> |

|                            |                                    |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | Donald L. Pressley                 |
| USAID Training Officers:   | Charles Aaenson<br>Anna Jozefowicz |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Mada McGill                        |
| PIET Program Manager:      | Agnieszka Nowakowska               |

### **U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy**

The over-riding U.S. assistance policy goal is to support achievement by Poland of sustainable broad-based economic growth with an open market and democratic system. Over the next three years (1993-95), the U.S. assistance strategy to help Poland achieve this goal gives highest priority to the following interrelated and mutually reinforcing objectives:

- supporting private sector development;
- assisting development of the financial sector;
- helping transform the public sector to better support democratic development and a market economy; and
- strengthening institutions essential for sustainable democracy.

### **Training Activities**

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 293 Polish participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Humanities, Social Sciences, Politics, Energy, Business, Computers, Finance, Marketing, Architecture, Law, Public Administration, Teacher Training, and Conservation; and the specific fields of Economic Planning, Economic Development, Public Finance and Tax Policy, Banking and Finance, Business and Commercial Training, Transportation Economics, Municipal Government, State and Local Government, Observation-U.S. Government, Telecommunications, Business Management, Cost and Financial Management, Business Policy, Management Training, Accounting, Investments and Securities, Banking, International Trade, Sanitation, Theory of Public Administration, Secondary School Administration, Vocational/Technical School Administration, Agricultural Business, Agribusiness Management, Extension Services, Urban Development, and Hotel and Resort Administration.

The following table gives a breakdown of Polish PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

Forty-five (45) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| <b>Contractor/<br/>Grantee/IAA</b> | <b>Completed</b> | <b>In-<br/>Training</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Cooperative Housing<br>Foundation  | 0                | 6                       | 6            |
| Georgetown ECESP                   | 87               | 66                      | 153          |
| Harvard University                 | 0                | 2                       | 2            |
| Johns Hopkins                      | 0                | 1                       | 1            |
| IIE (EUR-0002)                     | 2                | 1                       | 3            |
| IIE (EUR-0045)                     | 0                | 2                       | 2            |
| PIET                               | 73               | 28                      | 101          |
| Salzburg Seminar                   | 3                | 0                       | 3            |
| USIA                               | 3                | 19                      | 22           |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>168</b>       | <b>125</b>              | <b>293</b>   |

|                            |                                  |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | Richard J. Hough                 |
| USAID Training Officers:   | Mary Ann Micka<br>Rodica Furnica |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Gerald Martin                    |
| PIET Training Coordinator: | Margaret Knight                  |
| PIET Program Manager:      | Cristian Andriciu                |

## **U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy**

The U.S. anticipates providing assistance programs to Romania for the next seven to ten years. U.S. assistance has moved from emergency and humanitarian assistance at the beginning to technical assistance in most sectors currently. In the future, the bilateral relationship is expected to be based more on trade, investment, and commercial ties rather than traditional assistance activities.

The overall goals of the U.S. assistance program in Romania are to support:

- the development of democratic attitudes and institutions;
- the creation of free market policies and processes; and
- the improvements in the quality of life of the Romanian people.

## **Training Activities**

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 64 Romanian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Business, Computers, Energy, Humanities, Economics, Law, Marketing, Politics, Earth Sciences; and the specific fields of Money and Banking, Statistics, Bioengr/biomedical Engineering, Business Management, Management Training, Journalism, Public Health, Diagnostic Radiology, Theory of Public Administration, Agricultural Business, Natural Resources, and Urban Development.

The following table gives a breakdown of Romanian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

Twenty (20) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| <b>Contractor/<br/>Grantee/IAA</b> | <b>Completed</b> | <b>In-<br/>Training</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Harvard University                 | 0                | 3                       | 3            |
| Johns Hopkins                      | 0                | 1                       | 1            |
| IIE (EUR-0045)                     | 0                | 1                       | 1            |
| PIET                               | 24               | 2                       | 26           |
| Salzburg Seminar                   | 3                | 0                       | 3            |
| Thomas Jefferson<br>Hospital       | 2                | 0                       | 2            |
| USIA                               | 5                | 23                      | 28           |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>34</b>        | <b>30</b>               | <b>64</b>    |

|                            |                  |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | Patricia Lerner  |
| USAID Training Officer:    | Hana Mociarikova |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Mada McGill      |
| PIET Training Coordinator: | Mari Novak       |

## **U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy**

The goal of U.S. policy is to help root Slovakia firmly in the Western economic and political community and to accelerate its transformation toward a market economy and healthy democracy. The Core Program has two principal elements:

- transformation to a market economy, including privatization of State-owned assets, restructuring of major industry, and development of the financial sector (strengthening key institutions and development of capital markets); and
- bolster the forces which make for diversity and pluralism in Slovak Society (in part by continued progress in decentralizing decision-making to elected officials).

There also is a role in minimizing the human travail associated with the abrupt shift from a centrally-planned command economy and shrinking of the social safety net. There are two areas in particular where the U.S.G. has a comparative advantage and where targeted U.S. support can make a critical difference: in the health sector and in housing allowances.

## **Training Activities**

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, 51 Slovak participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Architecture, Humanities, Politics, Earth Sciences, Marketing, Public Administration; and the specific fields of Business Management, Cost and Financial Management, Business Policy, Investments and Securities, Teaching-secondary level, Secondary School Administration, Agricultural Policy, and Agricultural Business, and Diagnostic Radiology.

The following table gives a breakdown of Slovak PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

Fourteen (14) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

| Contractor/<br>Grantee/IAA   | Completed | In-<br>Training | Total     |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|
| Georgetown ECESP             | 7         | 14              | 21        |
| IIE (EUR-0002)               | 2         | 1               | 3         |
| IIE (EUR-0045)               | 0         | 2               | 2         |
| PIET                         | 14        | 2               | 16        |
| Salzburg Seminar             | 2         | 0               | 2         |
| Thomas Jefferson<br>Hospital | 2         | 0               | 2         |
| USIA                         | 1         | 4               | 5         |
| <b>Total</b>                 | <b>28</b> | <b>23</b>       | <b>51</b> |

|                            |                   |
|----------------------------|-------------------|
| USAID Representative:      | Michael S. Zak    |
| USAID Training Officer:    | Slavica Radosevic |
| PIET Regional Coordinator: | Gerald Martin     |

**U.S. Seed Act Assistance Strategy**

Policy paper forthcoming.

**Training Activities**

As of March 31, 1994, the second quarter of FY 1994, six Slovenian participants have entered or completed training under the PTPE Project.

The participants have entered a variety of fields of training: the General fields of Economics, Law, Mathematics, Politics, Social Sciences; and the specific fields of Business Management and Urban Development.

The following table gives a breakdown of Slovenian PTPE participants who completed training or were in training as of March 31, 1994.

| <b>Contractor/<br/>Grantee/IAA</b> | <b>Completed</b> | <b>In-<br/>Training</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Salzburg                           | 1                | 0                       | 1            |
| USIA                               | 0                | 5                       | 5            |
| <b>Total</b>                       | <b>1</b>         | <b>5</b>                | <b>6</b>     |

Twelve (12) new starts are projected for the third quarter of Fiscal Year 1994.

102