

CENTER FOR HUMAN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

FY 1999

**R4
Parts I and II
RESULTS REVIEW**

HCDR4.PUB

**Center for Human Capacity Development
Results Review and Resource Request
FY 1999
April 1997**

Objectives

Under the current management contract, the HCD Center has two SOs and three Strategic Support Objectives (SSOs). The two SOs are:

SO1 Improved and expanded basic education and learning systems.

SO2 Improved continuing and higher education and training systems in support of Agency strategic objectives.

The three SSOs mirror the SOs, and are not reported on separately below. The SSOs were framed to express the objectives the HCD Center shares with our field missions in the areas of basic education, higher education and workforce development, and participant training. They did not receive core funding, but rather were to be conducted through the use of field support funds, OYB transfers and buy-ins. Progress made during FY 1996 in collaboration with field missions is reported under each of our SO areas.

During FY 1996, the HCD Center was given an added technical area: telecommunications policy. In light of this and other program developments during FY 1996, the HCD Center proposes modification of the management contract resulting in the following SOs:

Basic Education

SO1 Improved and expanded basic education and learning systems.

Higher Education Partnerships

SO2 Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education, and thereby (1) reduce child and maternal mortality; (2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; (3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; and (4) advance human rights and an active civil society.

Workforce Development

SO3 Countries increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

Participant Training

SO4 Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations.

Telecommunications

SO5 Expanded and more affordable telecommunications services.

S))

Basic Education and Learning Systems (BELS)

PART I. OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Over the last year, the Center has surpassed its targets on the strategic objective in basic education and all but one of its intermediate results. However, there have been significant improvements in the sector's performance over the last decade which argue for a progressive shift from quantitative to more qualitative areas of emphases, and therefore, for modification of the Center's basic education strategic framework.

Upon examining available data for the 24 countries where the Agency maintained activities in basic education through 1996, we find that there has been significant improvement in access to primary education for both girls and boys. Recent data on these countries from UNESCO indicates that the gross enrollment ratio rose in ten years from 76 to 84.5. Female enrollment (as ratio of girls/100 boys) rose in that same period from 78.6 to 84.3. In other words, in those countries where USAID has education programs, the DAC goals for universal enrollment by 2015 and gender parity in primary and secondary schools by 2005 appear within reach.

In recognition of this impressive progress, the HCD Center has increasingly focussed on issues of system quality, equity (ethnic and rural/urban in addition to gender), and efficiency. G/HCD, with assistance from CDIE and UNESCO, has established a Global Education Database, which we expect to be available on the intranet by summer of 1997. We expect to use this data base as well as other sources, to track future progress on these selected indicators.

PART II. PROGRESS TOWARD OBJECTIVES

1. Performance Analysis

Strategic Objective 1 (SO1). Improved and expanded basic education and learning systems.

Summary. There was substantial progress toward SO1 over the past year. G/HCD had identified (under all indicators taken together) a target of 12 countries to be reached with HCD assistance. The actual number was 17 countries and 2 bureaus. Particularly noteworthy were customer feedback and final evaluation conclusions that clearly demonstrate that the major impact of the assistance was institutional. In other words, the assistance has contributed to increased awareness, dialogue, and communication on education issues, among major stakeholders in the countries involved.

Last year we identified 4 specific indicators and targets to measure progress toward SO1.

Indicator 1.1: Improved analytic models, assessment and monitoring instruments for formal and non-formal schooling exist/applications in # countries.
Target: 3 countries. **Actual:** 6 countries

o A computer-based simulation for educational planning refined under our ABEL2 (Advancing Basic Education and Literacy) activity has been introduced and applied within state ministries of education in **India**.

o Interactive learning techniques using radio developed under the aegis of the ABEL2 activity, have been adapted, and are now being used in **Bolivia, Haiti** and **South Africa**. In **Bolivia**, interactive radio instruction has been expanded to include programming on early childhood development, and has led to additional follow-up technical assistance to train education ministry officials in using radio instruction more effectively in areas of health education, mathematics education, and education reform. In **Haiti**, radio instruction has been expanded to cover civic education and teacher training. Based on earlier ABEL successes, radio instruction in **South Africa** has been expanded to cover conflict resolution, early childhood development, literacy skills, and school-based management.

o Computer modelling for educational planning developed by ABEL staff, was introduced under ABEL2 to **Ethiopia**'s central ministry of education, with adaptations and training also provided to two regional bureaus of education. This work contributed directly to the Ethiopia mission's bilateral education program support in policy analysis and planning, both in the central ministry as well as in the two regions.

o Under the Center's IEQ (Improving Educational Quality) and ABEL2 activities, a software package for processing national education statistics was developed and installed in the **Benin** Ministry of Education and Culture. It has provided a standard framework for importing, storing, and editing data on the country's education system.

Indicator 1.2: "Best Practices" on girls' and women's education identified and disseminated/# of studies completed or tools and frameworks developed per year.

Target: 3 countries. **Actual:** 4 countries

o In **Egypt**, technical assistance provided under the ABEL2 activity helped the Egypt mission establish a new strategic objective in support of female education and literacy. The team conducted a literature review of materials on female education and literacy. Following discussions with USAID mission staff and Government of Egypt officials, the team conducted a workshop to further define the strategic objective on female education and to lay the groundwork for integrating the objective into the Agency's strategic framework.

o In **Morocco**, an assessment of girls' education identified constraints which led to low participation rates of rural girls and recommended several interventions to correct the problem. As a result, USAID/Morocco, which was not previously active in basic education, began to collaborate with other donors and the Morocco government, established a strategic objective, and initiated a major activity, on behalf of girls' education.

o Four publications: Beyond Enrollment; Making Interactive Radio Instruction Better for Girls; Gender, Culture, and Learning; and Exploring Incentives were completed and disseminated under ABEL 2. In response to mission requests, 3 workshops are being organized around these publications.

o A videotape produced and analyzed under the IEQ activity to determine classroom experiences of girls in **Ghana** and **Mali**, has been used as basis for identifying and providing gender-sensitive guidelines for classroom teachers.

Indicator 1.3. This indicator was eliminated before last year's R4 process.

Indicator 1.4. Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated.
Target: 3 countries. **Actual:** 2 countries and 1 regional bureau

- o The Global Information Network in Education is a Center-funded data resource on basic education for and in nations in crisis. Housed at the University of Pittsburgh, the information is computerized and accessible through Internet. A node has been established in Sarajevo to provide information applicable to rebuilding **Bosnia's** war-torn education system.
- o USAID, UNICEF, and the World Bank are collaborating to introduce models for teacher training, early childhood development, education development centers, and child-centered learning under an activity called Crisis Education, **Bosnia-Herzegovina**. This effort is a joint donor response to help repair an education system devastated by civil war.
- o At the request of the Croatia mission, ABEL 2 staff provided training to Bosnian refugee teachers teaching in refugee schools in **Croatia**. The training involved both pedagogical and social/psychological skills development.
- o A computerized data base on community schools and community participation in education at local levels was developed under IEQ and ABEL 2, on behalf of the Africa Bureau.

Indicator 1.5: Global communications and learning systems models and tools developed and disseminated
Target: 3 countries. **Actual:** 5 countries and 1 central bureau

- o A new contract was awarded and signed September 30, 1996 under the Center's (GC&L) Global Communications and Learning activity. Communication needs assessment tools are being developed to be applied in 3 countries (**Egypt, Ecuador** and **Jamaica**). Pilots to introduce communication/learning systems within mission bilateral activities are being designed for **Egypt, Mali** and **Colombia**. A similar effort has been negotiated under an approved task order with the Training division within M/HR. These activities are in preparation and will be initiated during FY 97 pending finalization of task orders.

The ability of the HCD Center to meet or exceed planned targets can be explained in part by the fact that ABEL2 has become a "flagship" endeavor for the Center. ABEL2 is a highly credible education sector activity among regional bureaus and missions, and is widely used. While we have anecdotal evidence that ABEL2 has had substantial impact (for example, in distance education and interactive radio instruction), no systematic evaluation has been conducted to assess this claim. A comprehensive evaluation is now scheduled to take place before the end of the calendar year.

IEQ is a more recent (1991-1996) and a more targeted activity that focussed on applied research at the classroom level with the objective of improving the quality of education and student achievement.

A final evaluation carried out during the summer of 1996 concluded that IEQ had a major impact on strengthening the host country's research capacity in primary education. Participating researchers in **Ghana, Guatemala, Mali, Uganda, and South Africa** greatly improved their ability to design and conduct observations of classroom interactions, monitor teacher performance, and record and analyze research results. In all 5 countries, there is now a substantial process of change going on within the broader

educational community about how reform should be instituted. Thus, the evaluation concludes that the applied research conducted under IEQ was important principally for the increased dialogue and communication that have taken place among stakeholders in the education sector where IEQ was active.

The IEQ activity has come to an end, with the exception of a few delivery orders that have been extended through March 1997. In FY 1996 based upon a favorable final evaluation, the HCD Center initiated a procurement process for a follow-on activity IEQ2. The Office of Procurement is in the final stages of making a contract award.

While GC&L is still a relatively new activity and most task orders are still in process, planned activities are very much "on track," and will be carried out during FY 1997. The designated emphasis on communications and learning technologies makes GC&L an activity of great present and future utility to USAID missions and bureaus.

In the following section, we discuss the progress achieved under each intermediate result under SO1. We also indicate any changes to the intermediate results that were made as a result of changed circumstances since the last R4 exercise.

Summary. G/HCD surpassed its targets for 3 out of 4 intermediate results over the last year. G/HCD had identified a target of 8 countries (across all intermediate results). In fact, 19 countries, 3 bureaus and 3 international institutions received assistance from the Center.

SO1 Intermediate Result 1.1. Education reform support (tools, models, and materials) for improved formal schooling and out-of-school learning systems developed and disseminated.

Indicator: Number of countries receiving services and materials per year.

Target: 4 countries. **Actual:** 13 countries; 2 regional bureaus, 3 international institutions

- o ABEL2 published a monograph on the design and evaluation of adult literacy programs. This work led to the development and presentation of a keynote paper, "Adult Literacy Practices" to **UNESCO/Thailand.**
- o ABEL2 designed and carried out a workshop on educational decentralization for staff of the **World Bank.**
- o The **Association for the Development of Education in Africa** (an organization consisting of all the African Ministries of Education) has received technical assistance in the design and application of software developed under ABEL2 for data collection and analysis.
- o At the request of **UNESCO/India**, ABEL2 carried out a workshop for India's state education officials and UNESCO staff on decentralization and the role of cluster schools.
- o In **El Salvador**, ABEL2 is providing support to the staff of a local NGO in teacher training

methodologies.

- o In **Haiti**, ABEL2 is continuing support to the country's distance education program, with a focus on math, civics, and reading, to complement the Government of Haiti's efforts in educational planning.
- o On behalf of the **Africa Bureau**, ABEL2 continued research, policy dialogue, and dissemination activities in support of the region's education activities.
- o In **Ecuador**, ABEL2 has been working with a regional NGO to strengthen leadership roles in educational planning.
- o In **Malawi**, ABEL2 staff provided educational planning and analytical assistance, in support of the Government's efforts to increase access to quality education for all students.
- o In **Guinea**, ABEL2 is providing training and support to the Ministry of Education in management information systems, budgeting, and curriculum development.
- o In **Ethiopia** ABEL2 provided support to a major activity design, curriculum development, education finance, teacher training and management information systems.
- o In **South Africa**, ABEL2 provides support to help strengthen the capacity to NGOs in conflict resolution, teacher training, and adult basic education. The assistance directly supports the mission's efforts to strengthen local education NGO capabilities in leadership training for teachers; curriculum reform, school finance/administration, planning, and research; and the provision of bridging programs for black students.
- o On behalf of the **LAC Bureau**, ABEL2 is providing technical assistance to begin activities under the Partnership in Educational Revitalization in the Americas, including a 5-country study in educational reform.
- o On behalf of the Subcommittee IV on Education and Human Resources Development for **Egypt**, ABEL2 staff provided the organization, planning, and materials development for the first major visit by Egyptian officials to the U.S. under the Subcommittee's education initiative. The assistance provided by ABEL2 staff marked the start of a series of activities that constitute the work of the Subcommittee and the U.S.-Egyptian Partnership established by President Mubarak of Egypt and Vice President Gore..
- o In **Ghana**, IEQ designed and adapted assessment instruments for evaluating English proficiency of primary school students, while ABEL2 designed and carried out a follow-on workshop on administering the instruments for Ministry of Education staff..
- o In **Guatemala**, IEQ designed and adapted protocols, interview guides, and achievement tests for math and communication skills to assess the impact of innovative approaches to teaching.
- o In **Mali**, IEQ designed and adapted instruments to assess the impact of school and non-school factors on the learning of French among school children.
- o In **South Africa**, IEQ designed and adapted assessment instruments for assessing the impact of

NGO-managed training activities in education.

- o In **Uganda**, IEQ designed a conceptual framework and survey instruments to guide research and analysis efforts of the country's basic education system.

SO1 Intermediate Result 1.2: Tools, models, and frameworks developed and disseminated to support and facilitate sustainable efforts to increase and improve educational opportunities for girls and women.

Indicator: Number of countries per year in which HCD materials are presented to USAID missions, government and/or private sector and adapted to the local context.

Target: 3 countries. **Actual:** 5 countries

Shortly after a contract was signed to initiate the Girls and Women's Education Initiative under which this intermediate result was to be pursued, this activity was transferred to the WID Office. However, we can report progress toward the target as a result of activities pursued through other Center activities.

- o In **Morocco and Egypt**, ABEL2 supported development of a major activity design and associated strategic objectives focussed on girls' education.

- o In **Nepal**, ABEL2 assisted the mission with a cost-effectiveness study comparing two distinct women's literacy programs' impact on empowerment and the persistence of imparted skills.

- o In **Indonesia**, ABEL2 provided an analysis of data derived from a Ministry of Education policy analysis of girls' access to and performance in secondary school. Follow-up workshops were held in Indonesia to discuss the policy implications of the analytical work.

- o In **Ghana**, ABEL2 continued a study of multi-generational decisions and practices of an extended family with regard to girls' education. The data analysis phase of the study has begun.

SO1 Intermediate Result 1.3. Early Childhood Models and Policy Tools. Models and policy tools of early childhood development programs developed and disseminated.

This intermediate result was eliminated during last year's R4 exercise, and was so reported in May 1996 in the Center's R2b resource request document.

SO1 Intermediate Result 1.4: Community Education Models. Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated.

Indicator: Number of strategies and program models developed and disseminated.

Target: 1 country **Actual:** 1 country and 1 regional bureau

- o As discussed under Strategic Objective Indicator 1.4.

SO1 Intermediate Result 1.5: Global Communications and Learning Systems developed and assessed for application

Indicator: Number of countries using HCD models and tools.
Target: 1 country.

- o USAID/Cairo has been working with Center staff to award a task order to implement an innovative learning system for 1- and 2-room schools in rural **Egypt**. This task order was planned for obligation in October 1996. Due to mission-wide difficulties related to FY 1997 obligations, the task order will be awarded in March 1997 and initiated in June 1997. Therefore, this target will now be reached in FY 1998.

2. Expected Progress Through FY 1999 and Management Actions

In the following section, we discuss further changes in the results framework which have been proposed by the SO1 team for FY 1997 and beyond.

In November 1996, the HCD/BELS SO1 team made the decision to modify the SO1 results framework to reflect changed circumstances. It was decided to keep the same strategic objective. However, IR 1.2 (on girls' and women's education) was eliminated and its activities were subsumed under other intermediate results. With the earlier elimination of IR 1.3, the framework in effect was reduced to IRs 1.1, 1.4, and 1.5. As a result of the SO1 team's revisions, the original 5 intermediate results were reduced to 3: IR(1); IR(2); and IR(3). A "higher level" intermediate result was inserted between the remaining 3 IRs and the SO1.

Strategic Objective 1: Improved and expanded basic education and learning systems.

The SO1 team has proposed indicators at the strategic objective level that more closely measure impact. Thus the indicators which we will follow over the coming year (presuming we keep the present objective) are: access (gross primary enrollment ratio); achievement (primary school completion rate); quality (attrition rate); and gender equity (girls enrollment ratio). Where data are available, we will follow other equity dimensions, such as enrollment in rural and urban areas and enrollment by ethnic categories; and efficiency, which could be measured by (for example) repetition rates.

Indicator: Primary school access improved.

Target: Gross enrollment ratio increase of 1% per year

Indicator: Primary school achievement improved.

Target: 5th grade completion rate increase of 1% per year.

Indicator: Quality of primary school education improved.

Target: Not yet decided, possibly in terms of repetition or drop-out rates

Indicator: Gender equity improved.

Target: Improvement in girls gross primary enrollment ratio of 1.5% per year

Other indicators could be included, such as urban/rural breakdowns or ethnic equity, achievement, and efficiency.

Higher Level IR: Education reform support, especially for girls and women, adapted and applied within learning systems.

Indicator: Technical tools and strategies adapted for and applied within, developing countries.

Target: 4 per year with a total of 12 by 2000.

Indicator: Techniques for institutionalizing tools and strategies applied within and across developing countries.

Target: 5 per year with a total of 15 by 2000.

IR(1). Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.

Indicator: Number of strategies, models, and tools developed and disseminated.

Target: 5 per year with a total of 15 by 2000.

Indicator: Number of strategies and techniques applied to encourage adaptation and dissemination.

Target: 10 per year with a total of 30 by 2000.

IR(2). Education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.

Indicator: Number of strategies, models, and tools developed, and disseminated.

Target: 2 per year with a total of 6 by 2000.

Indicator: Number of strategies and techniques applied to encourage adaptation and dissemination.

Target: 5 per year with a total of 15 by 2000.

IR(3). Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated.

Indicator: Number of models described and disseminated.

Target: 1 model per year.

G/HCD is also considering alternative frameworks. It has been proposed, for example, that the present strategic objective is not within the Center's manageable interest and should be replaced. One option would be to replace the present objective with the "higher level" intermediate result, which more closely exemplifies the areas of Center emphasis. Another option would be to replace the present objective with a modified DAC goal: Universal quality basic education achieved by 2010. We would confine measurement of impact on this goal to those USAID-assisted countries that have major education programs. This option has the distinct advantage of being unambiguous to and recognized by, stakeholders and development partners. Another proposed change to the framework is an altered higher order intermediate result: Basic education reform achieved using policy dialogue, tools, and donor coordination to maximize national education investments. This has the advantage of focussing on policy dialogue, technical assistance, and donor coordination. It also recognizes our comparative advantage in helping nations manage their investments to

achieve universal quality basic education.

G/HCD will continue to discuss within the SO team and with its partners, alternative frameworks, indicators, and targets. We have set a deadline of June 1997 to decide on whether and how we will propose to modify the current framework.

Conclusion. Within the Agency's strategic framework, SO1 is Objective 1.3, under Goal 1: Broad-based economic growth achieved. Data on gross enrollment and gender ratio both show that for those countries in which USAID has education programs, there has been substantial progress toward SO1 and Objective 1.3. By surpassing almost all its own targets, G/HCD in concert with its development partners, has indeed done its part toward achieving the Objective and the Goal.

3. Performance Data Tables

The first two performance data tables that follow on pages 17 through 20 present the planned and actual targets reached on each of the 4 indicators under SO1 during FY 1995-96.

On pages 21 through 23 are performance data tables that present planned targets on each of 3 indicators which we have selected to track under SO1 over the period FY 97-2000.

On pages 24 through 26 are performance data tables that present planned targets on indicators for the higher level IR and IRs (1), (2), and (3).

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/1995 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR: Improved models, assessment and monitoring instruments for formal and non-formal schooling exist			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Applications in number (#) of countries SOURCE: Improving Education Quality Advancing Basic Education and Literacy INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS: The above indicators were discontinued in November 1996 and were replaced by indicators that measure access, achievement and gender equity	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996	3	6

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/95 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR: "Best Practices" on girls' and women's education identified and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of countries for which studies, tools and frameworks developed SOURCE: Improving Education Quality Advancing Basic Education and Literacy INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS: The above indicators were discontinued in November 1996 and were replaced by indicators that measure access, achievement and gender equity	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996	3	4

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/1995 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR: Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Applications in number (#) of countries SOURCE: Improving Education Quality Advancing Basic Education and Literacy UNICEF Global Information Network in Education INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS: The above indicators were discontinued in November 1996 and were replaced by indicators that measure access, achievement and gender equity.	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996	3	2 Countries + 1 Region

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/95 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR: Global communications and learning systems models and tools developed and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of countries involved SOURCE: Improving Education Quality Advancing Basic Education and Literacy Global Communication and Learning Systems Activity INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS: The above indicators were discontinued in November 1996 and were replaced by indicators that measure access, achievement and gender equity.	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996	3	5 Countries + 1 Central Bureau

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/1995 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR: Primary school access			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Gross enrollment ratio increase of 1% per year SOURCE: Global Education Database INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS: This indicator was introduced in November 1996 and will be used from 1997 onward.	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996 (b)		84.5%
	1997	85.5%	
	1998	86.5%	
	1999	87.5%	
	2000	88.5%	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/95 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR: Gender Equity			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Improvement in girls gross primary ratio of 1.5% per year SOURCE: Global Education Database INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS: This indicator was introduced in November 1996 and will be used from 1997 onward.	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996 (b)		84.3%
	1997	85.8%	
	1998	87.3%	
	1999	88.8%	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/1995 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR: Primary school achievement			
UNIT OF MEASURE: 5th Grade completion rate increase of 1% per year SOURCE: Global Education Database INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS: This indicator was introduced in November 1996 and will be used from 1997 onward.	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1996 (b)		64.2%
	1997	65.2%	
	1998	66.2%	
	1999	67.2%	
2000	68.2%		

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/1995 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME: IR (Higher Level) Education reform support, especially for girls and women, adapted and applied within learning systems.			
INDICATOR: Technical tools and strategies adapted for and applied within developing countries.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of approaches developed SOURCE: Global Communication and Learning Systems Activity Improving Education Quality Advancing Basic Education and Literacy INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS:	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1997	4 (t)	
	1998	4 (t)	
	1999	4 (t)	
	2000	4 (t)	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/95		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS	
RESULT NAME: IR (Higher Level) Education reform support, especially for girls and women, adapted and applied within learning systems.			
INDICATOR: Techniques for institutionalizing tools and strategies within and across developing countries.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of approaches applied	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Global Communication and Learning Systems Activity Improving Education Quality Advancing Basic Education and Literacy INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1997	5 (t)	
	1998	5 (t)	
	1999	5 (t)	
	2000	5 (t)	
COMMENTS:			

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS	
RESULT NAME: IR (1) Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.			
INDICATOR: Strategies, models and tools developed and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of approaches developed	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Education Quality Advancing Basic Education and Literacy Global Communication and Learning Systems Activity INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:	1997	5 (t)	
	1998	5 (t)	
	1999	5 (t)	
	2000	5 (t)	
COMMENTS:			

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/95		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS	
RESULT NAME: IR (1) Education reform support for formal and out-of-school learning developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.			
INDICATOR: Strategies and techniques applied to encourage adaptation and dissemination.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of approaches applied	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Improving Education Quality Advancing Basic Education and Literacy Global Communication and Learning Systems Activity	1997	10 (t)	
	1998	10 (t)	
	1999	10 (t)	
	2000	10 (t)	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:			
COMMENTS:			

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems			
APPROVED: 31/05/1995		COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS	
RESULT NAME: IR (2) Education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.			
INDICATOR: Strategies, models and tools developed and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of approaches developed	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
SOURCE: Global Communication and Learning Systems Activity	1997	2 (t)	
	1998	2 (t)	
	1999	2 (t)	
	2000	2 (t)	
INDICATOR DESCRIPTION:			
COMMENTS:			

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/95 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME: IR (2) Education reform support for effective use of education and communication technologies in learning systems developed and disseminated, especially for girls and women.			
INDICATOR: Strategies and techniques applied to encourage adaptation and dissemination.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of approaches applied SOURCE: Global Communication and Learning Systems Activity INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS:	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1997	5 (t)	
	1998	5 (t)	
	1999	5 (t)	
	2000	5 (t)	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 1: Improved and Expanded Basic Education and Learning Systems APPROVED: 31/05/1995 COUNTRY/ORGANIZATION: G/HCD/BELS			
RESULT NAME: IR (3) Models for community education and crisis response described and disseminated.			
INDICATOR: Models described and disseminated			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number (#) of approaches developed SOURCE: Global Information Network in Education INDICATOR DESCRIPTION: COMMENTS:	YEAR	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	1997	1 (t)	
	1998	1 (t)	
	1999	1 (t)	
	2000	1 (t)	

Higher Education and Training Systems (HETS)

PART I Overview and Factors Affecting Program Performance

Introduction. During the past year HETS met and exceeded all major performance targets. At the same time, several new factors substantially affected program performance. These new factors include:

- Transfer into HETS of all operational functions previously performed by another unit (POSS) that was eliminated in the 1996 RIF;
- Transfer into HETS of two additional functions (information technology, AAAS) previously performed by another office (STC) that was also eliminated in the 1996 RIF;
- Transfer into HETS of an additional function (telecommunications training) previously managed by the ENV Center;
- Non-renewal of two longstanding office support contracts; and
- Loss of five staff positions in the 1996 RIF.

These circumstances presented substantial challenges in choosing Office objectives, setting priorities, and maintaining continuity in essential functions. The net effect was to radically increase the workload and results expected of everyone in the Office. To manage this burden, Office staff re-organized themselves into Results Teams. These teams have eliminated marginal and redundant activities, employed each team member's strengths to the fullest, clarified our relations with stakeholders, improved our customer focus, and brought clear definition to the results we are achieving and for which we wish to be held accountable.

Completing this phase of the reengineering process also entailed substantial rethinking of our program framework. The three Intermediate Results (in higher education, workforce development, and training) that constitute the single Strategic Objective approved last year are re-articulated this year as three Strategic Objectives. This does not imply a broader program, but rather accommodates a clearer statement of objectives and the results we intend to achieve. In Part II below, we report on "old results" as agreed, but we also report on "new results" within the new program framework. This provides a fuller picture of the broad impact achieved by HETS programs.

To accommodate our new information technology and telecommunications responsibilities, we propose this year a new Strategic Objective: SO5, "Expanded and More Affordable Telecommunications Services". The program approach, management actions planned to implement this new SO, and results expected are presented in Section II.D below.

Strategy. Because some time has passed since a strategy for this Office was last articulated, and because the Office configuration and responsibilities have changed very substantially, it is appropriate to briefly articulate the Office's current program strategy. This strategy, which builds on core Office strengths, is to:

Foster highly leveraged partnerships with a broad and diverse array of American institutions of higher education, private sector firms, and other government agencies, to provide innovative, low-cost and high impact development solutions that are sustainable and of lasting long term significance.

Foster highly leveraged partnerships...

Our University Development Linkages activity brings forth at least two dollars from the independent sector for every dollar USAID provides, and achieves cost-sharing ratios as high as 4:1. Our university-based networks have achieved cost-sharing ratios as high as 13:1 in Eastern Europe. Here in the U.S., our telecommunications training program draws in four dollars from the U.S. private telecommunications industry for every dollar USAID provides. The ATLAS leadership activity obtains cost-sharing in the form of varying amounts of tuition forgiveness for every trainee. We have other programs less accomplished in this respect, but our goal is to aggressively place all our activities on a cost-sharing basis because this is the true measure of a developmental partnership – the value of the resources our other partners bring to the table.

...with a broad and diverse array of American institutions of higher education, private sector firms, and other government agencies...

Our higher education programs – networks, partnerships, and leadership training – allow us to draw on the strengths of over 100 American colleges and universities. Through our stewardship of USAID's participant training program, we maintain relationships with over 300 institutions of higher education. This includes not only the major universities, but a broad and diverse range of smaller colleges that bring a special quality of flexibility, creativity and expertise to their international relationships. We made an extraordinary and successful effort this year to revitalize our HBCU outreach, and the workforce program, as it goes operational, will enhance our ability to draw on American community colleges, with their strong record of community service and private sector sponsorship. In the private sector, the training programs we manage and monitor benefit from partnership with well over 300 leading firms representing every sector of activity. Our networking activities and telecommunications activities receive substantial and direct private sector support, as will the workforce program as it gathers momentum. We have worked hard to establish new partnerships and strengthen existing relationships with other government agencies, including the Department of Agriculture, the U.S. Information Agency, the Federal Communications Commission, the Commerce Department's National Telecommunications and Information Administration, and State's Office of Communications and Information Policy. In the year to come we will make a special effort to expand outreach to other donor agencies, including the World Bank and the new Korean foreign assistance agency; to U.S. state and local governments, many of which share our goals in the human capacity dimensions of international development; and to several of the largest professional membership associations, thus attaining improved outreach to America's 3,600 institutions of higher education.

...to provide innovative, low-cost, and high impact development solutions...

Our longstanding partnership with USDA brings us a highly diverse group of training and education experts who each year provide in-country technical leadership to 50 percent or more of our field missions. This year we have new experts in workforce development and strategic planning. Our collaboration with USIA, most prominently in the area of training data reporting, has allowed us to harmonize our requirements with theirs to simplify contractor reporting and USG reporting to Congress. Our partnerships with the USG's leading telecommunications agencies will bring coordinated, assembled expertise to bear on problems of information policy overseas, mirrored by a training partnership with the telecommunications industry that provides cutting edge technical training at very low cost to USAID. America's colleges and universities, particularly the smaller institutions oriented to local community development, provide a source of new ideas and flexible, low-cost approaches to human capacity development that we will work hard to incorporate into all our programs. In our own operations this year we have identified an estimated \$3 million in cost savings in health insurance alone, and have replaced an outmoded and costly headquarters-only mainframe training data system with a flexible PC-based system, TraiNet, that now puts instantaneous Agency-wide training data in the hands of every employee through USAID's intranet.

...that are sustainable and of lasting long term significance.

Our focus on cost-sharing, on the private sector, and on sturdy partnerships with committed counterpart institutions, sets the stage for sustainable impact stretching beyond USAID's limited resources. Similarly, our outreach to stakeholder institutions with a long term commitment to growth through international relationships provides for impact greater than what can be encompassed within USAID's comparatively inconstant and short term objective set. By maintaining our focus on constraints to human capacity development, and by seeking sustainable and long term solutions, we position ourselves to make a lasting contribution to the most significant human development objectives.

Evaluation and Impact Assessment. To gauge our success in implementing this strategy, HETS has taken three steps to upgrade evaluation and impact assessment functions. First, we have instituted TraiNet, a new MIS that provides far better data on key systemic performance and results indicators. Second, we are revitalizing our longstanding HERNS activity to support the program evaluation needs of all our Results Teams. Third, we are redefining our longstanding trainee tax analysis function to encompass a broader set of cost containment objectives. Together, these steps will provide us the tools and the independent analytic input required to identify program strengths and weaknesses and make continuous management improvements.

Part II Progress Toward Objectives

- A. SO2:** Target countries use partnerships to revitalize higher education, and thereby (1) reduce child and maternal mortality; (2) conserve biological diversity and manage natural resources better; (3) strengthen markets and expand opportunities for the poor; and (4) advance human rights and an active civil society.

1. Performance Analysis

A high level of program activity in higher education training, in establishing higher education partnerships, and in fostering higher education networks helped to revitalize higher education in many countries and achieved development impact in all of USAID's priority areas.

“**Old Results**”. Here are our 1996 targets and achievements for higher education:

<u>Target</u>		<u>Number</u>	<u>Result</u>
Begin study of partnership model		1	Done
Develop partnership guidebook	1		Done
Initiate partnership database		1	Done
Strengthen LDC educational institutions	1	4	

But the higher education SO team actually accomplished much more than that, as indicated in the remainder of this section.

Leadership Training. Approximately 125 new students started leadership training programs tied to mission strategic objectives (34 percent were female). Three workshops were held in Benin, Ivory Coast and Malawi to strengthen alumni associations (building civil society), and an additional three workshops were held in California, Alabama and New York to strengthen complementarities among stakeholder institutions.

Partnerships. There are 42 centrally-funded and mission-funded partnerships within the University Development Linkages Program (UDLP) that strengthen higher education at home and abroad, and have on-the-ground impact that crosscuts the Agency's goals. These partnerships operate in 29 countries with 58 U.S. colleges and universities and 54 developing country institutions.

Networks. Three new regional higher education networks in Eastern Europe and Latin America build sustainability through substantial business sponsorships (Delta Airlines and Coca-Cola) and increased the development impact of participating higher education institutions. The networks involve 37 host country and 27 American institutions of higher education working in twelve countries. Groundwork was laid for an additional network in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Science Fellows. In partnership with the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), our AAAS Fellows program strengthened USAID's relationship with a broad range of American universities and colleges, as well as research institutions in the private and independent sectors. The Fellows program now has a substantial overseas component, and both domestic and overseas components serve as vehicles for expanding the international impact of America's colleges, universities, and research institutions.

These approaches all grow from partnership relations and we anticipate some degree of operational convergence in the program planning period. Hence the discussion of intermediate results, below, is based on the partnership concept.

IR 2.1: Partnerships transfer technology and skills to build local child and maternal health capacity.

Progress in health and population has been achieved through institution building. This includes advanced training of host country faculty, equipping and upgrading facilities (libraries, laboratories, telecommunications), developing research programs, establishing new academic departments and degree programs, setting up health statistics databases with epidemiological, demographic and clinical data, and pilot extension projects. Taken together, these activities result in better trained and better informed health care managers and practitioners utilizing best practices in the field, leading to a healthier population overall. Best practices may be the adoption of childhood immunization regimes, cooperative production of infant weaning foods and protein supplementation through animal husbandry, and family planning services by community leaders. For example, the University of Nairobi in Kenya and Penn State University have involved nearly 100 women's groups in small nutribusiness pilot projects. The women have developed and will produce and market an infant weaning food to improve child nutrition and enhance their economic status.

IR 2.2: Partnerships create adoption plans for managing natural resources and biologically diverse ecosystems.

Progress in the area of environment and natural resources has been achieved through all the institution building steps outlined in IR1.1, as well as establishment of environmental quality analytical systems and environmental databases, and extension services such as adult short courses for service providers and community and other pilot extension programs. These activities result in better trained and informed environmental managers, farmers and other citizens utilizing best practices in the field leading to more sustainable natural resource management, and biodiversity conservation. Best practices may be the monitoring and analysis of environmental contaminants, sustainable agricultural production practices (e.g. minimizing chemical inputs or using computer programs that maximize water management for irrigation), and promotion of ecotourism for the conservation of biological diversity. For example, the University College of Belize (UCB) and the University of Montana have developed and delivered nine in-country training courses in basic techniques of terrestrial, coastal/marine and recreation resource management for government and NGO personnel and have developed a new Associate Degree Program in Natural Resource Management at UCB.

IR 2.3: Partnerships expand access to technology, skills and outreach services for the poor, thus strengthening the private sector.

Progress in economic growth has been achieved through institution building, as well as pilot extension programs, adult short courses for service providers and the community at large, the establishment of economic and demographic databases, and the introduction of improved technologies. These activities result in better trained and informed business managers and entrepreneurs providing access to best practices for the poor. Some best practices include the commercialization of technology, cooperative marketing, food processing, use of diagnostic tests for the detection of disease in livestock, and using simulation models for maximizing livestock production. For example, the partnership between Morgan State University and Jahangirnagar

University in Bangladesh has provided collateral-free loans for income generating activities to over 1600 women leaders who help provide health and family planning services and encourage female school enrollment. The loan program has a 100 percent recovery rate.

IR 2.4: Partnerships strengthen rules regarding human rights and increase democratic governance within civil society organizations.

Progress in democracy and governance has been achieved through training, institution building, and the creation of civil society organizations. Public servants have been trained in the rule of law, in being responsive to all citizens, and in the practices of public accountability. Five university partnerships either train lawyers or train civil servants in elements of law. Three have established centers containing constitutional materials. The partnership in Senegal assists local governments in assuming the powers extended them under the government's decentralization program. The partnership in Uganda is strengthening the Human Rights and Peace Center, and the partnerships in Chile and Argentina have established student-run law journals. These activities, overall, have helped citizens to advance their rights and opportunities while strengthening an environment in which government recognizes them.

2. Expected Progress Through FY 1999 and Management Actions

Program Approach. We will continue to help bring higher education institutions more strongly, directly, and fully into development over the next five years, thereby strengthening higher education and achieving development impact simultaneously. Our operational programs will work together in this regard:

- Leadership training will enhance the core capacities of institutions.
- Partnerships will revitalize higher education and directly support specific development activities involving teaching, research, and outreach (public service).
- National and regional networks will facilitate continuous policy dialogue and mutual reinforcement among higher education institutions, while increasingly seeking private sector sponsorship.
- Science Fellows will enhance the role of American scientific institutions in international development.

Both the partnerships and networks have sustainability and matching fund requirements designed to continue them beyond the USAID funding periods. We will aggressively explore other donor relationships in the interest of sustainability and cost sharing.

Management Actions. Progress will be in the form of: (1) expanding the leadership training program world-wide; (2) strengthening and expanding the partnerships for sustainability purposes; (3) initiating and testing new higher education pilot activities, (4) adopting a “managing for results” approach to the AAAS program, and (5) seeking greater direct involvement from other donor agencies. These programs will achieve broader intermediate development results as measured by our development indicators and units of measure.

- Leadership Training. The successful leadership training features of ATLAS will be expanded world-wide. Simultaneously we will enhance the partnership qualities of the program and further reduce “scholarship” functions. Strategically, we plan to begin the expansion with six to eight new countries that have historical, linguistic, and cultural ties with Africa. This leadership expansion will strengthen at least six national and three regional alumni associations.
- Partnerships. The existing partnerships will be monitored to encourage sustainability beyond USAID funding. This monitoring will include measuring of results by partners and progress in securing alternative resources for sustaining useful activities. In each case we will identify and share lessons learned on these partnerships with Global Centers, Missions, business, industry, donors and other donors through newsletters and websites. Three to five new International Development Partnerships will be initiated per year through the involvement of U.S. Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Five to ten additional partnerships will be established per year in a modified expansion of the established UDLP program. This program will continue the high impact partnership model, but with small seed grants rather than the larger institutional development grants provided heretofore.
- Networks. The existing networks will be monitored to ascertain the extent to which they take permanent form and follow developmentally oriented agendas. Successful precepts and lessons learned will be shared as mentioned above in partnerships. We plan to initiate and test four new networks and pilot models for development during the period, including at least one additional network in Latin America and our first network in Africa. Several of these pilots may shed light on franchising possibilities as the Agency reduces its presence in graduate countries.
- Science Fellows. The program will be strengthened by instituting a stronger internal evaluation function (mentors will evaluate Fellows, and Fellows will evaluate sponsoring Offices). Better internal evaluation will strengthen the developmental impact of the program. We will also seek to increase the number of Fellows in Missions, with the ultimate goal of placing Fellows in 25 - 35 percent of our overseas offices.

Results Anticipated. These program actions will bring about development progress in 80 higher education institutions with policies more supportive of sustainable development; with programs more active in teaching, applied research and outreach; and the enhanced human capacity to better formulate and implement these policies and programs.

We will in addition support each of USAID’s four strategic goals. Within these goals, however, our program history and the comparative advantages of higher education institutions drive us toward specific intermediate results in maternal and child health care; natural resource management and biological diversity; broader access to employment and income in the private sector; and increased expertise and access in democracy and governance.

The indicators which best measure our partnership results are: (1) best practices identified and utilized; (2) leadership skills provided and applied; (3) technology transferred; (4) service programs initiated; and (5) support groups formed. Our units of measure will be number of sustained partnerships, number of partner organizations (U.S. and abroad), numbers of people trained, number of practitioners utilizing better practices, and number of end customers. All told, by the end of the period (2001) we expect to benefit 80 institutions abroad, 230 developing country leaders, 2,000 practitioners (U.S. and abroad), and 10,000 beneficiaries, leveraging USAID dollars to obtain other resources on a 2:1 basis (partnerships) and 4:1 basis (networks).

3. Performance Data Tables

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Number of target countries using sustainable partnership-based leadership training			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of target countries	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	10**	16**
	97	18	
	98	22	
	99	26	
	00	30	
	01	35	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Number of target countries using sustainable higher education partnerships			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of target countries	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	20**	29**
	97	30	
	98	32	
	99	34	
	00	36	
	01	40	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 3: Number of target countries using sustainable higher education networks			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of target countries	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	3**	12**
	97	15	
	98	20	
	99	25	
	00	30	
	01	40	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 4: Number of partnerships strengthened by Science Fellows			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of AAAS/USAID	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	28**
	97	34	
	98	40	
	99	45	
	00	50	
	01	55	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.1			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Adoption of best practices by host-country partners. <i>HPN, APAs—3.2.2, 3.3.2</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of best practices	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	12**
	97	15	
	98	20	
	99	25	
	00	30	
	01	40	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.1			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Individuals using advanced leadership skills to build local child and maternal health care capacity. <i>HPN, APAs—3.2.2, 3.3.2</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of leaders trained	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	20**
	97	30	
	98	40	
	99	50	
	00	60	
	01	70	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Adoption of agreed-to plans and practices by partners who manage natural resources and biologically diverse ecosystems. <i>EV, APAs—4.1.1, 4.5.1</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of host country	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	7**
	97	10	
	98	12	
	99	14	
	00	18	
	01	25	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Partnerships transfer technology and skills to build local management capacity. <i>EV, APAs—4.1.1, 4.5.1</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of leaders trained	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	13**
	97	15	
	98	25	
	99	35	
	00	45	
	01	55	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.3			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Partnerships adopt and transfer technology to the private sector. <i>EG, APA—1.1.5</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of target countries	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	15**
	97	16	
	98	20	
	99	25	
	00	30	
	01	35	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.3			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Individuals use advanced leadership skills to provide services to the poor <i>EG, APA—1.1.5, 1.2.3</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of leaders trained	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	20**
	97	30	
	98	40	
	99	50	
	00	60	
	01	70	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.3			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 3: Partnerships adopt and transfer technology, skills, and outreach services to the poor. <i>EG, APA—1.2.3</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of host country	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	16**
	97	18	
	98	21	
	99	25	
	00	30	
	01	35	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.4			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Installation of agreed measures, practices, and activities <i>DG, APA—2.1.4</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of measures,	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	8**
	97	10	
	98	15	
	99	20	
	00	25	
	01	30	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.4			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Individuals use advanced leadership skills to strengthen rule of law, respect for human rights, access to equal opportunity, and governmental accountability. <i>DG, APA—2.1.4, 2.3.2</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of leaders trained	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	13**
	97	16	
	98	20	
	99	25	
	00	30	
	01	35	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2.4			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 3: Increased presence and activity of civil society organizations <i>DG, APA—2.3.2</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Cumulative number of civil society	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	3**
	97	6	
	98	9	
	99	12	
	00	15	
	01	18	

- B. SO3:** Countries increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs.

1. Performance Analysis

During FY 96 HETS nurtured the workforce concept, explored operational feasibility, and is now prepared to initiate pilot activities.

“**Old Results**”. Here are our 1996 targets and achievements for workforce development:

Target	Number	Result
Workforce study completed	1	1
Models disseminated to field	Several	Done
Missions apply workforce models	Several	0
Host country policies modified	Several	0

Few Results Teams would have expected to start a program from scratch and achieve Mission buyins and policy adjustments within a 12 month period. Not surprisingly, only the preparatory work was accomplished. But the breadth and depth of the preparatory work is far greater than suggested above, setting the stage for increased impact in the coming years.

The workforce team initiated and completed a world-wide study of workforce development best practices. We initially convened a working group to consider the definition of workforce and the

criteria to be applied in selecting sites for in depth case studies. This informal, ad hoc reference group was composed of representatives from the private sector, international donor agencies, other federal agencies, and USAID. The group provided guidance on the character of successful workforce initiatives, as well as an initial listing of 65 potential workforce models for inclusion in the study.

We refined the larger list to 20 workforce development cases in 20 countries: Australia, China, Egypt, India, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Germany, Czech Republic, Poland, Ukraine, Ghana, Senegal, South Africa, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Honduras, Peru and the USA. The case study results are presented in the Compass to Workforce Development which is composed of:

- a Best Practice Guidebook, which explores these 20 best-practice cases -- specific places in six continents where people's lives have been improved by investment in their skills and productivity;
- an accompanying analytical Study, which addresses the challenges of implementing workforce development projects, the social and economic issues addressed by current investments in this arena, and the principles of best practice common to successful workforce development programs; and
- a conference video Investing in Tomorrow's World, which highlights the diversity of workforce development around the world with illustrations from the Philippines, Ghana, Germany, Honduras and the United States.

The study products have been distributed to all Missions, international donors, and interested participants; they are also available on the newly established workforce website (www.edc.org/cwd).

Combined, these "compass" headings provide conceptual help in understanding the issues and options as host country officials and international donors manage or seek to foster responsive, market-oriented local workforce development capacities.

2. Expected Progress Through FY 1999 and Management Actions

Program Approach. In the context of Mission SOs, the bottom line is the betterment of the community through increased and enhanced employment. However, to become competitive in the local, national or global economy, communities must build a workforce with (1) basic and technical skills mastery, (2) problem solving skills, and (3) the ability to learn new skills rapidly as technologies advance and markets change, and (4) the capability to work in teams. Existing public education systems often cannot respond quickly to changing skill requirements. National policies guaranteeing public employment or high minimum wages may distort the incentives to invest in skills development. Where training providers exist, policies may restrict their flexibility in providing timely responses. As a consequence workers lack needed basic skills, technical training becomes unresponsive and outmoded, and people already in the labor force have nowhere to turn to update their skills in the face of rapidly changing needs.

Objectives, Intermediate Results, and Indicators. We will assist selected countries to increase and enhance employment and human productive capacity through improved responsiveness to workforce development needs. Our strategic preference will be given to pilot initiatives and technical support in countries where: (1) unemployment, underemployment and the numbers of displaced rural youth and young adults are greatest; (2) those affected represent low income populations; (3) governments are prepared to address the issues involved in enhancing their workforces; and (4) the private sector displays a willingness to participate in such initiatives. Additionally, we will seek (5) to establish workforce approaches within transition activities undertaken in countries rebuilding their human and institutional capacity after large scale civil disruptions or natural disasters.

The intermediate results listed below will contribute to this strategic objective, the attainment of which will be measured by employment changes in the target groups within each community. At this initial point, each IR represents a stage in the development of this program. As the program becomes established, each IR will be addressed simultaneously rather than sequentially.

IR 3.1: Initial partnerships established.

The first result will be to establish, publicize and manage a process of identifying and selecting initial partners for workforce development pilot initiatives. Emphasis will be on developing a self-selection process, a process whereby interested participants come forward on their own and undertake the commitment to develop and manage a workforce development initiative. The stakeholders must be involved from the outset; the process must be such that local participants fully buy into the undertaking. Partners may include private sector entities that originate demand for skills; host country and U.S. institutions of higher education, NGOs, and PVOs that provide the skills transfer; and the local communities that need the employment. We would expect to initiate two pilots in the first two years of operation, with six to eight pilots being initiated over a period of three to five years.

IR 3.2: Policy and institutional constraints are identified.

Specific steps will be necessary at the time partnerships are being developed to analyze the human capacity needs, policies and prospects of local businesses, the strengths and weaknesses of education and training institutions, expected local and sectoral labor and skill requirements, and the economic and regulatory policy environment.

IR 3.3: Policy and institutional issues are resolved.

In instances where there are legal, policy or regulatory constraints, or in which they emerge once activity is initiated, these issues will need to be addressed by the partnership. This underscores the importance of the initial market survey and determining the degree to which the local environment is supportive, or has the potential for becoming so. Inevitably, there will be the need for some policy and/or regulatory modifications or adjustments. We would expect that in each community, there would be the need for 2-4 such adjustments or modifications.

IR 3.4: Responsive workforce development programs adopted.

The test will be the ability of any given pilot to respond to local demand, and remain both substantively flexible and financially viable to continue that responsiveness over time. In the process one would expect curriculum changes, the development of certification processes, the

evolution of a mechanism for collaboration among the various stakeholders, and resolution of the question of financing.

Management Actions. HETS planned actions include:

- Information Dissemination. We will identify and disseminate a series of best workforce practices for local workforce policy development and program implementation. The application of best practices from these materials will assist people of working age, whether employed or unemployed, to obtain those specific skills needed for employment, to enhance existing employment, or to start their own enterprises;
- Seek Operational Partners. We will establish a capability to provide individual communities with workforce development analytical, program design and evaluation support, and a complementary capability to serve Mission/Bureau SOs by fostering pilot public-private partnership-based, community level demand-driven workforce initiatives. At every point, we will move energetically to communicate our objectives and approaches to other donors, and seek their active involvement.
- Foster Interventions. We seek partnerships capable of providing, on a sustainable and replicable basis, responsive training capable of enhancing the employability and productivity of young people and adults; identifying and advocating needed policy interventions; and fostering economic growth. Models may take many forms including linkages between secondary education and non-university post-secondary programs as well as opportunities to enhance employee participation in on the job learning and decision-making. The immediate pay off: increased capacities, employment, income, productivity, and, for the poor, an escape from poverty.

Results Anticipated. One consequence of the wide distribution of the workforce study materials in FY 97 will be an increased awareness and understanding of workforce concepts and practices. Three regional workforce workshops will further sharpen understanding and identify next steps at the country level, thus enhancing the attainment of Mission Strategic Objectives -- most probably in economic growth, though not necessarily. A planned five country study of the factors and processes fostering an enabling environment will result in policy and procedural guidance. The Workforce Development website will foster the collection and dissemination of information and the exchange of views among practitioners.

Additionally, during FY 97, HETS is able to respond to field requests for workforce technical assistance using several IQC arrangements as well as RSSA and direct hire staff.

Results over the next three to five years: six to eight community pilot experiences to refine our understanding of operational approaches most supportive in attaining Agency strategic objectives. Undoubtedly, host country practitioners and stakeholders will provide the leadership in problem identification and the crafting of solutions throughout this effort.

3. Performance Tables

The performance tables identify the IRs and related indicators which will ultimately depend on the context of each pilot community initiative or technical assistance assignment. Targets and benchmarks will be established in each case depending on the specifics of the situation. Focus will

be on the number of models in use, increases in employment and the economic growth of the communities. In each instance the relevant Agency Program Approach (APA) is noted to indicate the relationship of our indicators to core Agency strategic objectives.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Number of target countries using partnership-based workforce development approaches.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	0**
	97	1	
	98	3	
	99	9	
	00	12	
	01	15	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 3			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Employment grows in target communities.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: People employed in communities	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	0**
	97	500	
	98	1500	
	99	4500	
	00	6000	
	01	7500	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.1			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Number of partner institutions identified and selected.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Partners participating in workforce	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	0**
	97	1	
	98	2	
	99	3	
	00	6	
	01	6	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Completed labor market, demographic, economic and community surveys.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of surveys completed	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	0**
	97	1	
	98	3	
	99	4	
	00	6	
	01	6	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.3			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Number of laws or policy changes implemented which increase incentives for private and public/private responses to workforce development. <i>EG, APAs—1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.3.1</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of laws and policies	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	0**
	97	0	
	98	3	
	99	6	
	00	9	
	01	12	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.4			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Number of workers and entrepreneurs graduating from workforce programs employed within six weeks of program completion. <i>EG, APA—1.2.3</i>			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of graduates employed.	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	0**
	97	0	
	98	0	
	99	500	
	00	5000	
	01	50000	

SO4: Training improves performance of individuals and effectiveness of host country organizations.

1. Performance Analysis

The SO4 team directly strengthens the strategic impact of mission and bureau training activities, on which USAID spends approximately \$200 - \$300 million per year to train 10,000 - 20,000 people annually in the U.S. We teach missions how to identify and fill performance gaps within targeted host country institutions or groups to promote democracy, improve economic growth, improve health, decrease fertility, and protect the environment.

Increased impact is achieved by (1) improved USAID training policies and best practices which more effectively address identified skills gaps; and (2) improved performance of the Agency's training system, which operates through 2,500 training institutions and 350 contractors.

Consistent application of refocused policies and system-wide procedures lead to training that is more job-relevant to trainees and their supervisors, strengthens individual performance of returnees, and increases the effectiveness of organizations where returnees work.

HETS' success in pursuing this SO is measured by two primary indicators:

- new training skills are applied by returned participants in their work to fill identified performance gaps; and
- decrease in the non-returnee rate.

“Old Results”. Here are our 1996 targets and achievements for training:

Target	Number	Result
Missions assisted by SO4 technical leadership	20%	50%
Missions use reengineered SO4 mechanisms	20%	25%
Missions benefit from simpler training system	20%	50%
Percent of SO teams identifying human capacity constraints	25%	35%
Percent of SO teams using HCD analysis techniques	25%	35%
Percent of SO teams using HCD management techniques	25%	35%
Number of SO teams with SO4 virtual members	3	3

The SO4 team exceeded its targets, and also had other very substantial achievements, as indicated in the remainder of this section.

IR 4.1: USAID training policy and practice improved.

In February 1996 HETS issued a new policy directive, ADS 253, replacing the lengthier, more detailed Handbook 10. The broad directions laid out in ADS 253, coupled with less onerous and more flexible administrative requirements, moved missions toward the re-engineering goal of increased working-level empowerment and accountability. In-country training, heretofore unaddressed by any policy guidance, is now covered in ADS 253, requiring higher standards of tracking and impact measures. Specific FY 96 policy improvements include:

- Dropping the so-called “single contractor rule” in favor of increased Mission flexibility;
- Delegation to Missions of authority on English language test administration procedures;
- Dropping the requirement for a single Mission “Human Capacity Development Manager” as inconsistent with SO team organization;
- Abolishing the specialized PIO/P form, too often used for ad hoc rather than strategically designed training programs; and
- Shifting from a compliance approach to one of technical leadership in Mission relations.

The SO4 team has assembled – through research, evaluations, and professional experience – a landmark series of “best practices” in training that earns the respect of training professionals everywhere. Disseminated to the field through direct technical leadership visits, this field guidance works at ground level within each host country to increase the relevance, the impact, and the staying power of the Agency’s multi-million dollar training investments. The best practices assure that when trainees return to work, they are able to apply new skills and improved performance levels in making mission-targeted organizations more productive.

Our RSSA technical leadership teams and contractor sector-specific technical specialists made field visits to 35 countries (16 AFR, 7 LAC, 7 ANE, 5 ENI) to assist missions in applying best practices, to strengthen mission SO team understanding of cutting edge human capacity development management, analysis, and planning techniques, and to integrate FSN training specialists effectively into new SO team working structures.

IR 4.2: Systemic improvements increase the impact and cost-effectiveness of USAID training.

In September 1996 HETS and OP successfully initiated the Global Training for Development program to meet mission training support needs. GTD provides top-quality, low cost technical services from the finest US training contractors, using the one-stop convenience of an IQC. To date, there have been 11 buy-ins from missions in all four regions and from the ENI Bureau, totaling over \$100 million dollars over three years.

In close coordination with IRM, the SO4 team took the lead to establish a single, Agency-wide training Management Information System, called TraiNet, which is integrated with other Agency systems. TraiNet will replace two existing, incompatible trainee data systems, simplify data entry and tracking, allow Missions to specify and track training results within their Results Frameworks, and enable the SO4 team to do a far better job of tracking training impact and controlling training costs.

In partnership with the United Nations and Partners for International Education and Training (PIET), we developed the International Training Opportunities database and distributed it to over 300 development partners and USAID missions on CD-ROM and diskette. This database identifies over 4,000 training providers and over 11,000 training programs worldwide, a vast collection of development training information in a single, easy to use and inexpensive format.

We launched a cost containment initiative, which resulted in an immediate decrease in the cost of health care insurance from \$200 to \$150 per person/month, and will attain a further reduction to \$78 per person/month beginning June 1, 1997, which will allow the Agency to reprogram approximately \$3 million annually to higher-priority uses.

In support of high-impact training activities Agency-wide, the SO4 team has drawn on earlier Agency experience with participant training in developing its "best practices" addressing specific stages or components of the training process. These guidance pieces reflect and advance reengineering principles by focusing on results, on shared responsibility for impact, and by strengthening client orientation as applied to the field of training. To enhance this body of knowledge, the SO4 team undertook six training impact evaluations in FY 96.

By incorporating best practices as well as reengineering principles into the new TraiNet management information system, the SO4 team has laid the groundwork for an order of magnitude improvement in managing USAID's overall training system. The SO4 team will now use TraiNet to track individual performance improvements, as well as improvements at the organizational level. Best Practices ask that each trainee and their supervisors understand and accept the programmatic reasons for training, and that they be committed to applying skill and knowledge gains in meeting Mission and host country goals for performance and productivity improvement. This reengineered approach has also been introduced to all our contractor and grantee partners.

2. Expected Progress through FY 1999 and Management Actions

Program Approach. Training is the ultimate cross-cutting Agency activity, contributing to the success and sustainability of virtually every USAID activity in the field. But because USAID training is disaggregated down to the activity level, its true consequence is disguised. Estimated annual aggregate costs of U.S. training alone: over \$200 million, with perhaps an equal amount combined

in third- and in-country training. Over 10,000 trainees come annually to the U.S., served by over 350 U.S. contractors who place them with over 2,500 U.S. training providers.

Our partners in this major enterprise include: training contractors and training providers, host country institutions where training impact occurs, Global Centers, regional bureaus, U.S. institutions such as CRSP and UDLP members, and individual trainees' supervisors (the ultimate judges of training impact). G/HCD/HETS procedures are also of real interest to USIA, USDA, IRS, INS, State, and other donor countries, with whom G/HCD/HETS collaborates on many shared issues of training.

Management Actions. In response to field mission reengineering, the SO4 team and training officers in the regional bureaus and field missions will continue to educate new cadres of environmental, economic, health and democracy specialists in how to achieve results-oriented training. We will continue to provide leadership in redefining indicators of training success, away from input/output "bean counting" (e.g. numbers trained, returned and placed in jobs), to more meaningful terms:

- Did training change returnees' performance back at work?
- Is this change welcomed and accepted within a returnee's work unit?
- Has the work unit's productivity improved?

Indicators to measure these performance improvements in organizational settings are hard to quantify, because results are felt at the working level rather than the SO level. Attribution is difficult, nevertheless, SO4 team leadership in implementing the TraiNet management information system and striving for other systemic efficiencies will allow us to contribute to and measure on-the-ground results.

We will continue to refine and promulgate best practices in training to help field staff achieve cost-effective, results oriented training investments. HETS staff restructuring to support high-impact training will include: (1) combining three RSSA staff agreements into one forward focused instrument serving all HETS operational objectives; (2) fully globalizing the scope of certain programs of AFR Bureau origin, thereby radically expanding their impact; (3) clarifying for the benefit of our clients the different services provided by GTD, HERNS, HRDA, ATLAS and TraiNet; and (4) maintaining and broadening interchanges between SO4 and our client missions, partners, contractors and other donor organizations.

Results Anticipated. By exercising technical leadership in its work with missions, partners and contractors, the SO4 team has established a framework for systemic improvements in impact and cost-effectiveness, through which it expects to realize higher-impact mission and bureau training activities that respond to host country performance-improvement needs over FY 97 - 01. Here are some concrete examples:

- Promoting training events that directly address trainee and supervisor perceptions of needed performance changes;
- guiding missions toward meaningful measures of training impact and trainee data collection in the host country;

- enabling missions and bureaus to stretch diminishing training dollars by reducing unit costs of training and by promoting cost-effective training procedures.

3. Performance Data Tables

Indicators are at three levels: impact in host countries; impact on partners, missions and contractors; and changes in USAID policy responsiveness based on client feedback and interagency coordination. Most indicator information is contained in normal reporting through the TraiNet, the new training management information system, and so requires little extra work.

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: New training skills applied to fill identified work unit performance gaps.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Percent of returnees applying skills to fill	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	NA**	NA**
	97	25%	
	98	35%	
	99	50%	
	00	65%	
	01	80%	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 4			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Decrease in non-returnee rate.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Non-returnees as percent of total	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	NA**	5.0%**
	97	5.0%	
	98	4.5%	
	99	4.0%	
	00	3.5%	
	01	TBD***	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.1			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Policies lead to performance changes.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of trainee-stakeholder	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	NA**	NA**
	97	10	
	98	40	
	99	150	
	00	300	
	01	400	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.1			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Training programs designed and implemented using Best Practices.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of SO teams using Best	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	60**	80**
	97	150	
	98	200	
	99	250	
	00	All	
	01	All	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: GTD programming mechanism meets Mission needs.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of GTD buy-ins.	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	5**	11**
	97	15	
	98	30	
	99	45	
	00	60	
	01	TBD	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Increased cost-sharing by stakeholders and partners in USAID-sponsored training.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Aggregate cost-sharing as percent of	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	NA**	NA**
	97	5%	
	98	10%	
	99	15%	
	00	20%	
	01	25%	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 4.2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 3: Number of Missions using TraiNet			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of Missions.	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	0**	2**
	97	30	
	98	50	
	99	60	
	00	All	
	01	All	

D. SO5: Expanded and More Affordable Telecommunications Services.**1. Performance Analysis**

In 1996, the United States Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI) continued to provide high-quality training to participants at low cost to USAID. Support from the U.S. telecommunications industry to provide courses, in partnership with USAID provision of travel and subsistence costs, allowed 62 host-country participants to attend training provided by the U.S. telecommunications sector as well as the Federal Communications Commission. This partnership with USTTI supports an institution that annually trains more than 400 telecommunications and broadcast professionals from approximately 120 countries using the facilities of about 70 telecommunications companies, universities, federal government agencies, and other institutions.

Until the current year (1997), the USTTI training activities were managed by another Office but not included in an Agency results framework. As a result, indicators had not been established in 1996. In 1996, USAID funding directly supported the training of 62 host-country participants. From 1997 onward we will be measuring the increased capacity of institutions that benefit from this training (IR 5.2 indicator).

The policy and operational components of this SO (IR 5.1, IR 5.3) will be commencing in 1997. We will measure performance based on the adoption of regulatory or policy reforms, and based on the expansion and increased affordability of telecommunications services.

2. Expected progress through FY 1999 and management actions

Program Approach. This is a new strategic objective reflecting the growing importance of the Global Information Infrastructure (GII) to development. Telecommunications will be the single most important constraint to economic and social development in the early 21st century, and this is an area where the United States should be taking an active role in assisting the developing world. The 1996 Telecommunications Act and U. S. regulatory expertise are widely viewed as models for reform, and America's telecommunications industry is the world's most competitive. An emerging international regime in telecommunications, developed through the World Trade Organization and International Telecommunications Union, seeks to liberalize telecommunications policy and to open up trade in equipment and services. Developing countries moving along this path will benefit greatly from assistance in implementing these principles. Others have yet to commit to this approach and will benefit from assistance targeted toward adoption of these basic principles as well as their implementation.

The primary goal of this SO is to create the enabling conditions for the expansion of telecommunications services and their greater affordability. In addition, achieving this SO will open doors to increased U. S. industry sales and investment in telecommunications infrastructure in developing countries. Bilateral assistance to host country governments for telecommunications development also supports the United States in international negotiations in such areas as trade and satellite slot/spectrum allocation. This sector is particularly vulnerable to problems stemming from lack of donor coordination, hence, active donor collaboration will be an important part of our overall approach.

Establishing Global Bureau leadership in this area provides a valuable means to initiate work with Missions and host country governments that have identified telecommunications as a priority. The

program builds on the successful experiences of more narrowly defined USAID telecommunications activities in Eastern and Central Europe and Africa, and makes this type of assistance available globally. A Global Bureau program provides Missions with an ongoing mechanism that can support sustained telecommunications activities and provide technical expertise, and offers USAID the capability to respond more rapidly to host country needs.

Telecommunications enables new modes of education and training, and advances applications across all USAID strategic objectives, from facilitating economic growth to enhancing delivery of health care. The value of this content will be a strong motivator for host country governments to implement telecommunications reforms. The resulting improvements in telecommunications infrastructure will allow significant extension of services vital to development. The mechanisms described below draw on the best U. S. expertise and the best technical practices in telecommunications applications.

Objectives, Intermediate Results, Indicators. This SO will seek to create the enabling conditions for telecommunications development in three ways: (1) Policy and regulatory reforms are required for increased investment and establishment of competitive markets in telecommunications services; (2) Regulatory and technical capacity to implement policies and build and operate infrastructure must be strengthened through training; and (3) Implementation of innovative practices and technologies on a commercial basis will expand and improve sustainable telecommunications services.

The intermediate results below address these enabling conditions.

IR 5.1: Policy, law, and regulatory reforms adopted to allow improved, expanded, and more affordable telecommunications services.

Policy and regulatory reform is increasingly widely recognized as necessary to extend the benefits of telecommunications services to a wider population. This reform will permit and encourage investment, allow effective and appropriate regulation, and decrease barriers to entrepreneurial provision of vital services. Recent adoption of the World Trade Organization (WTO) "Basic Telecommunications Services Agreement" highlights the importance of these reforms as well as the challenges ahead. In those countries that have adopted the agreement, significant policy and regulatory reform will be required to implement the principles of the agreement. Further, while 70 nations made offers under this agreement, few USAID-assisted countries have fully adopted the WTO agreement, and less than half have adopted any of the agreement's provisions (in sub-Saharan Africa, less than one-quarter).

An interagency agreement bringing in U.S. government telecommunications expertise from the Department of State, Federal Communications Commission, and National Telecommunications and Information Administration (Commerce Department) will provide government-to-government advocacy, training, and technical assistance to telecommunications authorities in target countries. Core funding from the Global Bureau will support selection of target countries, and initial work with countries; continued exploratory work or operational programs will require Mission funding.

Results under this IR are country specific, but will include: (1) Target countries adopt WTO basic telecommunications agreement provisions; (2) Target countries adopt policies, laws, and regulations that privatize telecommunications services, allow competition in telecommunications services, and encourage private investment in telecommunications services; (3) Target countries create or

strengthen telecommunications regulatory authorities; (4) Target countries adopt new regulations that support telecommunications sector reform; and (5) Target countries adopt regulations that permit establishment of new telecommunications services.

IR 5.2: Improved capacity of key institutions to expand or improve telecommunications services.

Rapidly evolving technologies and an ever-wider range of services drive constant improvements and lower costs for telephony, mobile telephony, and computer networking. To appropriately regulate and make use of these evolving technologies, telecommunications providers, regulators, and policy makers must be knowledgeable about both the technologies and effective policies and regulatory approaches. Institutions to be assisted through training include telecommunications ministries, regulatory authorities, Post, Telegraph, and Telephone (PTT) entities, and other telecommunications service providers. The precise mix of regulatory and technical capacity building will depend on the target countries, and the match between institutions and partner training providers.

IR 5.3: Innovative practices and technologies implemented to expand and improve telecommunications services.

This IR addresses the implementation of innovative practices and technologies that offer expanded and improved telecommunications services. For example, tele-centers offer access to disadvantaged communities; wireless and wireless local loop systems allow more rapid and affordable expansion especially in rural areas; and Internet Service Providers offer low-cost, innovative means of communications and enhanced opportunities for entrepreneurs as well as established service and commercial organizations.

Results Anticipated. In 1997, we will establish an Interagency Agreement to work with FCC, NTIA, and State to implement the policy/regulatory assistance component of this SO. We will work with Missions, US Government telecommunications agencies, and the U.S. private sector to identify target countries, and work with Missions to design appropriate policy dialogue and other assistance programs. In partnership with the telecommunications agencies and USTTI we expect to work with 3-5 countries to reform their telecommunications policy and regulatory frameworks. We expect in the year or two following initial assistance to realize measurable progress in implementing policy, legal, or regulatory reforms.

In 1998-1999, we will work in partnership with Missions to implement telecommunications policy/regulatory reform programs, as well as initiate new programs in 3-5 countries per year.

In 1997-99 we will work with Missions and the U.S. private sector to select key participants for training through USTTI. The USTTI training will provide regulatory and policy leaders and key technical personnel the technical leadership and expertise of the U.S. telecommunications industry. It is a highly-leveraged partnership – U.S. companies cover the full cost of the training and training facilities with USAID only covering travel and subsistence costs.

This partnership will provide high-quality, low-cost training, with approximately 50 host country institutions each year improving their capacity to provide expanded and more affordable telecommunications services -- a performance indicator that provides us a direct measure of the impact of the training. The increased capacity developed through this training will lead to improved regulatory practices as well as directly to improved services through the adoption of new

technologies.

Overall progress toward the strategic objective will require measurement several years following the initiation of each country program. Each country strategy will establish targets reflecting expansion of service, reduction of pricing, and access for poor or rural communities. The performance indicator will be the number of countries meeting targets established in each of these three areas.

3. Performance Data Tables

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 5			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Number of target countries achieving goals for # of lines and traffic volume.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	NA**	NA**
	97	0	
	98	0	
	99	0	
	00	3	
	01	6	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 5			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 2: Number of target countries achieving goals for service pricing.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries.	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	NA**	NA**
	97	0	
	98	0	
	99	0	
	00	3	
	01	6	

STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 5			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 3: Number of target countries achieving goals for rural or poor communities served.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries.	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	NA**	NA**
	97	0	
	98	0	
	99	0	
	00	3	
	01	6	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 5.1			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Number of target countries adopting reforms.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of target countries.	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	NA**	NA**
	97	0	
	98	3	
	99	6	
	00	9	
	01	12	

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 5.2			
RESULT NAME:			
INDICATOR 1: Trained professionals provide institutions with improved capacity.			
UNIT OF MEASURE: Number of professionals trained in host	YEA	PLANNED	ACTUAL
	96	40**	62**
	97	50	
	98	100	
	99	150	
	00	200	
	01	250	

CENTER FOR HUMAN CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

FY 1999

R4

**Parts III and IV
RESOURCE REQUEST**

Part III. Status of the Management Contract

The following changes to the HCD management contract are proposed:

1. Eliminate the three Strategic Support Objectives contained in HCD's current strategic plan. These three support objectives reflected those activities funded by missions towards the attainment of shared objectives. They did not relate to the core funding of the Center which is the focus of the management contract.
2. Replace previous single aggregated SO2 with three separate SOs. The previously approved Strategic Objective 2 ("Improved Continuing and Higher Education and Learning Systems in Support of Agency Strategic Objectives") incorporated three Intermediate Results (for higher education, for workforce development, and for training). Replacing this highly aggregated SO with the three separate SOs laid out in Section II implies no programmatic expansion, but will strengthen results-based management by providing for a clearer definition of objectives and improved tracking of results.
3. Incorporate new SO5 for telecommunications. This is needed to accommodate telecommunications programming accepted by the Office after the 1996 RIF.
4. Revisit FY 1998 budget. The FY 1997 OYB for SO2 is \$8.2 million. This compares with a planned FY 1998 and FY 1999 budget of \$1.9 million. These low levels are based on a review of the aggregate single SO last year, a results framework that provided insufficient scope for laying out the legitimate objectives and the actual achievements of the Results Teams. Here, in the FY 1999 R4, we have sought to present our objectives and our results with greater clarity. We believe these objectives are essential to achieving Agency goals, and we further believe that the results we have documented here present a compelling case for continued modest funding. Accordingly, we request that the Global Bureau accept the objectives as laid out here, and provide the resources required to pursue these objectives, by adjusting the FY 1998 budget to the extremely modest levels contained in the FY 1997 OYB.
5. Revise FY 1998 and 1999 staffing levels, as indicated in the table on the following page to achieve the objectives proposed.

HCD Staff Allocation by Strategic Objective FY97/98/99

	SO1	SO2	SO3	SO4	SO5	Total
FY97						
USDH	6.00	2.00	1.00	2.50	0.50	12.00
RSSA	2.00	2.50	1.50	4.00		10.00
Fellows		1.00	0.50		0.50	2.00
Total	8.00	5.50	3.00	6.50	1.00	24.00
FY98						
USDH	8.00	3.50	1.00	1.50	1.00	15.00*
RSSA	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00		10.00
IPA		1.00				1.00**
Fellows		1.00	1.00		1.00	3.00***
Total	10.00	9.50	4.00	3.50	2.00	29.00
FY99						
USDH	8.00	4.50	1.00	1.50	1.00	16.00
RSSA	2.00	4.00	2.00	2.00		10.00
Fellows		1.00	1.00		1.00	3.00
Total	10.00	9.50	4.00	3.50	2.00	29.00

* Addition of 3 USDH, 2 for Basic Education and 1 for telcoms.

** Addition of 1 IPA for expanded university relations function.

*** Addition of 1 Fellow

Program Achievement at Assigned FY98/99 Level for SOs 2 thru 5:**Program Management at Assigned FY98/99 Level**

At this level (\$1.9 million) total for SO2, SO3, SO4 and SO5, HCD would place \$1 million in SO2 to meet our HBCU directive, we would place \$500,000 in SO5 to meet our telcoms earmark, and we would place the remaining \$400,000 in SO4. Results would be:

SO2: Higher Education			
Indicator 1 (leadership training)	–	Nothing	
Indicator 2 (higher ed partnerships)	–	98: 4, down from 32	
		99: 5, down from 34	
Indicator 3 (higher ed networks)	–	Nothing	
Indicator 4 (Science Fellows)	–	Nothing	
SO3: Workforce Development			
Indicator 1 (target countries)	–	Nothing	
Indicator 2 (employment growth)	–	Nothing	
SO4: Training			
Indicator 1 (trainees apply training)	–	98: 10%, down from 35%	
		99: 10%, down from 50%	
Indicator 2 (decrease in non-returnee rate)	–	98: no decrease	
		99: no decrease	
SO5: Telcoms			
Indicator 1 (countries achieve service goals)	–	Nothing	
Indicator 2 (countries achieve pricing goals)	–	Nothing	
Indicator 3 (rural communities served)	–	Nothing	