



**ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING  
WORKSHOP  
September 17 - 21, 1995**

**Sponsored by:      The Center for Economic Growth,  
Global Bureau, USAID**

---

# **EVALUATION RESPONSES**

**Final Report**

**Prepared for:              Bureau for Global Programs, Center for Economic Growth**

**Prepared by:              Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P.**

**Sponsored by:            Private Enterprise Development Support Project III  
Contract No. PCE-0026-C-00-3030-00  
Task Order No. 21  
Prime Contractor: Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P.**

**October 1995**

**Coopers  
& Lybrand**



**ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING  
WORKSHOP**

**September 17 - 21, 1995**

**Sponsored by:      The Center for Economic Growth,  
Global Bureau, USAID**

---

**EVALUATION RESPONSES**

**Final Report**

**Prepared for:                      Bureau for Global Programs, Center for Economic Growth**

**Prepared by:                      Lynne Manrique, Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P.**

**Sponsored by:                      Private Enterprise Development Support Project III  
Contract No. PCE-0026-C-00-3030-00  
Task Order No. 21  
Prime Contractor: Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P.**

**October 1995**



**ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING  
WORKSHOP  
September 17 - 21, 1995**

**Sponsored by:      The Center for Economic Growth,  
Global Bureau, USAID**

---

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
<b>Section 1: Evaluation Abstract and Synthesis</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
<b>Section 2: Responses to Summary Evaluation</b> . . . . .	<b>6</b>
<b>Section 3: Evaluation Responses by Day</b>	
<b>Legal, Regulatory and Judicial Reform</b> . . . . .	<b>10</b>
<b>Financial Sector Development</b> . . . . .	<b>13</b>
<b>Privatization</b> . . . . .	<b>16</b>
<b>Trade Development</b> . . . . .	<b>20</b>



# **ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING WORKSHOP**

## **September 17 - 21, 1995**

**Sponsored by:      The Center for Economic Growth,  
Global Bureau, USAID**

---

## **Introduction**

This report contains the compilation of responses to the five evaluations distributed during the Economic Growth Training Workshop. These five evaluations centered on each of the four days of the workshop and on the workshop as a whole. This report regarding evaluation responses is organized as follows. Section 1 provides the broadest, most general "lessons learned" from workshop implementation. Specifically, Section 1 includes an "evaluation abstract," which is a qualitative, aggregate level analysis of participants' responses, an "evaluation synthesis," which is more quantitative and includes average scores for each day and for groups of similar questions. These scores address overall responses to individual sessions, substantive learning, achievement of objectives, and overall workshop organization.

Section 2 contains a detailed description of responses to the Summary Evaluation (administered on the last day of the workshop). Section 3 provides responses to the daily evaluations. The raw data (i.e., individual responses) behind these aggregate responses have been archived but can be made available through the Center for Economic Growth.

## **Section 1: Evaluation Abstract and Synthesis**

### **PART 1:      ABSTRACT**

Overall evaluations of the Economic Growth Training Workshop were very positive. For instance, on a scale of 1 to five (with five being highest), participants gave a rating of 4.2 to describe the improvement in their understanding of economic growth issues. In addition to this high aggregate rating of acquired knowledge, ratings for the substantive coverage of the four individual topics (legal, regulatory and judicial reform; financial sector development; privatization; and trade development) ranged from 3.8 to 4.1. These scores also indicate that participants acquired significant substantive knowledge in these areas.

While still quite positive, scores related to the application of this substantive knowledge to project design and development were somewhat lower. Specifically, 3.9 enumerates the improvement of participants' abilities to design and evaluate economic growth activities.

Based on the evaluations, the Economic Growth Training Workshop's greatest accomplishment is perhaps related to its goal of improving linkages between the Global Bureau and missions. This aspect of the workshop earned a rating of 4.5.

In addition to positive overall ratings, a number of broad generalizations, applicable beyond this particular workshop, also emerged from the evaluation responses. These generalizations are:

1. Adults do not all learn in the same manner and, thus, it is difficult (despite positive ratings) to please everyone simultaneously with the same training method. This generalization -- that people have different views regarding "best" methods of training -- is illustrated well by reactions to the Financial Sector Development day. Most notably, in nearly equal numbers, participants mentioned one presentation and the break-out sessions as both the "best" and "worst" aspect of the day. That is, some participants learned significantly from one presenter while others found the presentation uninteresting or irrelevant; likewise, some participants appreciated being able to choose and organize break-out sessions, while others found these break-out sessions too unstructured.
2. Participants encouraged the use of case studies and specific examples rather than broader, more theoretical presentations and information. However, there appears to be a "fine line" between case studies and examples that participants believe are relevant and those that are not. For instance, most participants responded positively to the (fairly specific) Bangladesh Fertilizer Privatization case study. By contrast, participants believed that too much time was devoted to describing the Russian privatization experience.
3. Participants expressed strongly that they would like more time for discussion and fewer/shorter lectures. Participants generally appreciated break-out sessions, unless they became dominated by "discussion" leaders.

## **PART 2: SYNTHESIS OF EVALUATION RESPONSES**

### **Evaluation of Individual Sessions and Readings**

<u>Session</u>	<u>Average Score<sup>1</sup></u>
Legal, Regulatory and Judicial Reform	3.8
Financial Sector Development	4.0
Privatization	4.0
Trade Development	4.1

As mentioned above, respondents gave high marks for the substantive knowledge imparted on all four days of the workshop. While the margins among the average scores for each day were slim, respondents provided the highest average scores on the Trade Development Evaluation. This outcome coincided with responses on the Summary Evaluation, in which respondents remarked that one of the two most useful aspects of the workshop as a whole was the Trade Development day.

While the average score for the Legal, Regal, and Judicial Reform sessions was slightly lower than for some of the other sessions, it should be noted that on the Summary Evaluations respondents repeatedly mentioned the information provided regarding LRJ issues as an example of how the Economic Growth Training Workshop would contribute to their work.

### **Achievement of Objectives by Day**

<u>Session</u>	<u>Average Score<sup>2</sup></u>
Legal, Regulatory and Judicial Reform	3.3
Financial Sector Development	3.7

---

<sup>1</sup> The scale from which average scores were developed ranged from 5 (agree strongly [with a given statement]) to 1 (disagree strongly). Scores above 3 indicate that respondents tended to agree with the statements, which relayed positive perceptions of each speaker or activity. Scores above 4 indicate that respondents on average agreed fairly strongly with the statements.

<sup>2</sup> The scale from which average scores were developed ranged from 5 (fully achieved) to 3 (partially achieved) to 1 (not achieved). Scores above 3 indicate that respondents believed that the day's objectives had been more than partially achieved (i.e., mostly achieved). Scores above 4 indicate that respondents on average believed that the objectives had been almost fully achieved.

Privatization	3.6
Trade Development	4.1

As demonstrated above, the pattern of responses for achievement of objectives by day is similar to the pattern for the substantive knowledge imparted (Part 1), although there is a greater range of average scores for achievement of objectives.

**Achievement of Overall Workshop Goals**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Score</u> <sup>1</sup>
Improved substantive understanding of economic growth issues <sup>3</sup>	4.2
Improved ability to design and evaluate economic growth activities. <sup>4</sup>	3.9
Improved linkages between the Global Bureau and missions. <sup>5</sup>	4.5

The above scores reflect the quality and applicability of information imparted during the workshop (which relate to the first goal of the workshop) and progress toward achieving the better communications among Agency actors (the second goal of the workshop). As indicated by the first two scores, respondents left the workshop with a better analytical framework for relating various economic growth issues as well as with an improved ability to put these ideas into action, though the scores for the latter were somewhat lower. The workshop gained high ratings for improvements in communication between the Economic Growth Center of the Global Bureau and missions, as exemplified by the score of 4.5.

**Organizational and Logistical Evaluation**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Score</u> <sup>1</sup>
Workshop format (i.e., balance of presentations, question-and-answer, etc.) <sup>6</sup>	4.3

---

<sup>3</sup> Questions 1, 3, 5, 7, and 13 of the Summary Evaluation.

<sup>4</sup> Questions 2, 4, 6, 8 of the Summary Evaluation.

<sup>5</sup> Questions 10, 11 and 12 of the Summary Evaluation.

<sup>6</sup> Question 19 of the Summary Evaluation.

Organization and operation of workshop. <sup>7</sup>	4.7
Xerox site, facilities and service. <sup>8</sup>	4.6
Transportation arrangements. <sup>9</sup>	4.5

As indicated above, respondents gave quite high scores for the workshop's format, although the score of 4.3 conflicts somewhat with the "Other Comments" provided by respondents in the Summary Evaluation in that respondents repeatedly mentioned that the workshop should have provided more time for discussion and question-and-answer and less time for lectures and presentations. The scores for workshop organization and operation were very high and reflected in positive written comments by respondents. Likewise, respondents were very satisfied with the Xerox site and with transportation arrangements.

---

<sup>7</sup> Question 20 of the Summary Evaluation.

<sup>8</sup> Questions 21, 22, 23, and 24 of the Summary Evaluation.

<sup>9</sup> Question 25 of the Summary Evaluation.



**ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING  
WORKSHOP  
September 17 - 21, 1995**

Sponsored by: **The Center for Economic Growth,  
Global Bureau, USAID**

**Section 2: Responses to Summary Evaluation**

Note: 27 responses were received, unless otherwise indicated by the number in parentheses following the end of a question.

**PART 1: SUBSTANTIVE EVALUATION**

		<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
1.	I now have an improved understanding of the relationship between economic growth and legal, regulatory and judicial reform.	5	<b>4.1</b>			1
2.	The workshop provided useful ideas to help me design and evaluate potential USAID activities in legal, regulatory and judicial reform.	5	<b>4.0</b>			1
3.	I now have an improved understanding of the relationship between economic growth and financial sector development. <i>(26 responses)</i>	5	<b>4.0</b>			1
4.	The workshop provided useful ideas to help me design and evaluate potential USAID activities in financial sector development. <i>(26 responses)</i>	5	<b>3.8</b>			1
5.	I now have an improved understanding of the relationship between economic growth and privatization.	5	<b>4.1</b>			1

		<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
6.	The workshop provided useful ideas to help me design and evaluate potential USAID activities in the area of privatization.	5	<b>4.0</b>			1
7.	I now have an improved understanding of the relationship between economic growth and trade development.	5	<b>4.3</b>			1
8.	The workshop provided useful ideas to help me design and evaluate potential USAID activities in trade development.	5	<b>4.0</b>			1
9.	I now can identify best practices in the four areas covered by the workshop.	5	<b>3.7</b>			1
10.	The workshop provided a valuable opportunity to network with other USAID officers working on economic growth programs.	5	<b>4.7</b>			1
11.	The workshop provided me with information on economic growth projects that can help me plan and implement the activities I am responsible for.	5	<b>4.3</b>			1
12.	I can now identify contacts within the Economic Growth Center who can assist me in fulfilling my USAID responsibilities.	5	<b>4.6</b>			1
13.	Overall, I am very satisfied with the technical and substantive content of the workshop.	5	<b>4.4</b>			1

**PART 2: WRITTEN RESPONSES** (Note: Responses and quotations provided below reflect the general pattern of responses.)

14. The most useful aspect of the workshop was:

*Networking, information sharing, and discussion with colleagues.*

*The Trade Development day.*

15. The least useful aspect of the workshop was:

*Un- or mis-guided break-out sessions in which best practices didn't come out.*

16. Please give an example of how this workshop will contribute to your work:

*Provided a better analytical foundation and re-invigorating ideas.*

*Improved recognition and awareness of how LRJ issues intersect with other areas or sectors.*

17. Please comment on whether you believe the inclusion and collaboration of private sector officers, agricultural officers, and economists in the same workshop was useful or not useful:

*Very useful because these officers: work together in the field; need to work together more closely as budget and human resources decline; and need to explore areas of common ground.*

18. Other comments regarding the substance of the workshop:

*"Overall I feel great about the workshop. The exchange of experiences among Missions was particularly important. It could be useful if the Center for Economic Growth helps field missions in their capacity to write up case studies and success stories that better capture what we do."*

*"The workshop and its substance were right on the mark -- job well done!"*

*Should use more specific examples, case studies, and USAID experiences.*

*Provide more opportunities for discussion and fewer lectures.*

*"The people who put together the workshop deserve a lot of credit and thanks. They did an excellent job overall."*

**PART 3: ORGANIZATIONAL AND LOGISTICAL EVALUATION**

	<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
19. I believe that, overall, the workshop provided a good balance of presentations, question-and-answer periods, break-out sessions, and group discussions. (22 responses)	5	<b>4.3</b>			1
20. Overall, the workshop operated smoothly and in a manner that facilitated learning. (22 responses)	5	<b>4.7</b>			1
21. The site (rooms and meeting space) were highly satisfactory. (22 responses)	5	<b>4.5</b>			1
22. The recreational facilities and amenities (e.g., gymnasium, pub, etc.) were highly satisfactory. (17 responses)	5	<b>4.7</b>			1
23. The meals and meal schedule were highly satisfactory. (22 responses)	5	<b>4.5</b>			1
24. The personnel and level of support service at the Xerox center were very good. (21 responses)	5	<b>4.7</b>			1
25. The transportation arrangements (i.e., Xerox shuttles to Dulles Airport, daily bus transportation from SA-2) were sufficient, efficient, and helpful. (17 responses)	5	<b>4.5</b>			1
25. Other comments on organizational/logistical arrangements:					
<i>"Superb!"</i>					
<i>"Good job! May you do it again!"</i>					
<i>"Monica -- You and your team did an outstanding job, and it is very much appreciated. Thank you for your fine efforts on our behalf."</i>					



**ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING  
WORKSHOP**  
September 17 - 21, 1995

Sponsored by: The Center for Economic Growth,  
Global Bureau, USAID

**Section 3: Evaluation Responses by Day**

**Legal, Regulatory and Judicial Environment**

Note: 63 responses were received, unless otherwise indicated.

**PART 1: EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS AND READINGS**

	<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
1. The first presentation (M. Olson) provided a solid, broad array of information regarding the linkages between economic growth and the legal, regulatory and judicial environment.	5	<b>4.1</b>			1
2. The second presentation (A. Braginski, F. Duncan) helped me understand the relationship between LRJ theory and USAID policy and priorities. (24 responses)	5		<b>3.1</b>		1
3. The panel discussion (A. Swamy, C. Cadwell, and P. Murrell) elicited practical ways to identify and sequence potential LRJ activities. (62 responses)	5		<b>3.7</b>		1

		<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
4.	Through the break-out sessions and the plenary session summarizing each group's findings, I learned a great deal about how I, as a USAID officer, might plan LRJ activities. (61 responses)	5		<b>3.4</b>		1
5.	The structure of today's session (i.e., two presentations, panel discussion, and break-out sessions) was conducive to learning about the relationship between economic growth and legal, regulatory and judicial reform.	5		<b>3.9</b>		1
6.	<b>Answer 6 ONLY if you have read today's assigned reading.</b> I believe this reading was useful and relevant to my USAID responsibilities. (35 responses)	5		<b>3.8</b>		1
7.	<b>Answer 7 ONLY if you have read some or all of the additional reading materials provided in the course binders.</b> These readings provide a good framework for understanding this topic and thinking about potential activities. (17 responses)	5		<b>4.4</b>		1

**PART 2: ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES**

<u>Objectives:</u>	<i>Fully Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Unachieved</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>
8. To explain the importance of legal, regulatory and judicial reform and its linkages to economic growth, private sector development, and agribusiness development.	5		<b>3.8</b>		1
9. To discuss the implications of LRJ reforms for Agency priorities.	5		<b>3.2</b>		1

		<i>Fully Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Unachieved</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>
10.	To describe how LRJ program applications can be identified through the analysis of benefits produced by LRJ reforms. (59 responses)	5		3.0		1
11.	To list best practices for identifying, implementing, and measuring successful LRJ reforms that promote private sector and agribusiness development. (59 responses)	5		3.0		1

**PART 3: WRITTEN RESPONSES** (Note: Responses and quotations provided below reflect the general pattern of responses.)

12. The most useful aspect of today's session was:

*Mancur Olson's presentation*

13. The least useful aspect of today's session was:

*Break out sessions*

14. We intend to use this evaluation to design a follow-on training course. Accordingly, we would appreciate your ideas on how today's topics might best be presented (potentially long distance) to:

*For both host country counterparts and USAID colleagues, respondents suggested that more case studies and specific examples (including sectoral examples) should be used and developed.*

15. Other comments:

*"Why doesn't PPC care enough to come?"*

*Very good start. Excellent organization."*

*Use/develop country specific examples, case studies.*

*No discussion of required reading.*



**ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING  
WORKSHOP  
September 17 - 21, 1995**

Sponsored by: **The Center for Economic Growth,  
Global Bureau, USAID**

**Section 3: Evaluation Responses by Day**

**Financial Sector Development**

Note: 60 responses were received, unless otherwise indicated.

**PART 1: EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS AND READINGS**

	<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
1. The first presentation (C. Gonzalez-Vega provided relevant and useful information regarding how to extend credit markets to harder-to-reach clients. <i>(58 responses)</i> )	5	<b>3.9</b>			1
2. From the second presentation (J. von Pischke), I gained critical knowledge regarding innovative financial products that can be used in developing and transitional countries.	5	<b>4.1</b>			1
3. The third presentation (R. Wagner) provided a good background on the role of commercial banking in financial sector development. <i>(58 responses)</i>	5	<b>4.5</b>			1
4. The fourth presentation (P. Knapp) provided useful insights regarding the role of capital markets in development. <i>(58 responses)</i>	5	<b>3.7</b>			1

	<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
5. The break-out sessions and plenary session summarizing each group's findings resulted in a clear definition of the types of activities I, as a USAID officer, might pursue to best contribute to financial sector development. (53 responses)	5		<b>3.6</b>		1
6. The structure of today's session (i.e., four presentations followed by break-out sessions) was conducive to learning about the relationship between economic growth and financial sector development. (57 responses)	5		<b>3.9</b>		1
7. <b>Answer 7 ONLY if you have read some or all of the additional reading materials provided in the course binders.</b> These readings provide a good framework for understanding this topic and thinking about potential activities. (26 responses)	5		<b>4.1</b>		1

## **PART 2: ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES**

<u>Objectives:</u>	<i>Fully Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Unachieved</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>
8. To describe the linkage between financial sector and economic development. (58 responses)	5	<b>4.0</b>			1
9. To describe the policy framework required to encourage and implement financial sector development. (58 responses)	5		<b>3.8</b>		1
10. To identify best practices and lessons from experience. (59 responses)	5		<b>3.4</b>		1
11. To identify what USAID should and could be doing in the financial sector arena. (55 responses)	5		<b>3.4</b>		1

**PART 3: WRITTEN RESPONSES** (Note: Responses and quotations provided below reflect the general pattern of responses.)

12. The most useful aspect of today's session was:

*Tie between: Claudio Gonzalez-Vega's presentation and the Break-out Sessions*

*Also mentioned frequently: J.D. von Pischke's presentation and Robert Wagner's presentation*

13. The least useful aspect of today's session was:

*Tie between: Claudio Gonzalez-Vega's presentation and the Break-out Sessions*

*Also mentioned: Paul Knapp's "advertisement"/"promotion" of the "non-profit" Catalyst Institute*

14. We intend to use this evaluation to design a follow-on training course. Accordingly, we would appreciate your ideas on how today's topics might best be presented (potentially long distance) to:

a. Your host country counterparts

b. USAID colleagues

15. Other comments:

*"The workshop is very timely and should be done for others. Confusion remains throughout the Agency on what is the microenterprise program, how does it relate to other things AID does or does not do. I congratulate you for this excellent effort."*

*"Get speakers' notes into our hands before presentations. Be more strict on timing to permit Q&A."*

*"I would love to see this conference offered to each Bureau where issues and subjects are specific to the region being studied and its needs."*



# ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING WORKSHOP

September 17 - 21, 1995

Sponsored by: The Center for Economic Growth, Global Bureau, USAID

## Section 3: Evaluation Responses by Day

### Privatization

Note: 51 responses were received, unless otherwise indicated.

#### PART 1: EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS AND READINGS

	<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
1. The case study and discussion added significantly to my understanding of broad privatization issues (such as rationale and strategy) as well as specific privatization options and steps.	5	<b>4.2</b>			1
2. The first lecture (J. Waddell) provided a solid foundation for understanding the reasons that governments pursue privatization, the elements of a typical privatization program, and global experiences with privatization.	5	<b>4.2</b>			1
3. From the second lecture (D. Seader), I gained a clear perspective on the transaction cycle itself and on potential roles for USAID in different stages of the privatization process.	5	<b>4.1</b>			1

*Agree Strongly    Somewhat Agree    Neither Agree nor Disagree    Somewhat Disagree    Disagree Strongly*

4.	Through the break-out sessions and plenary session summarizing each group's findings, I developed a good understanding of issues that may arise during the privatization cycle, tools that may be used to overcome such obstacles, and USAID's potential role in the process.	5	<b>3.7</b>	1
5.	The structure of today's session (i.e., case study and discussion, two presentations, and break-out sessions) was conducive to learning about the relationship between economic growth and privatization.	5	<b>4.0</b>	1
6.	<b>Answer 6 <u>ONLY</u> if you have read today's assigned reading.</b> I believe this reading was useful and relevant to my USAID responsibilities. <i>(40 responses)</i>	5	<b>4.0</b>	1
7.	<b>Answer 7 <u>ONLY</u> if you have read some or all of the additional reading materials provided in the course binders.</b> These readings provide a good framework for understanding this topic and thinking about potential activities. <i>(21 responses)</i>	5	<b>4.0</b>	1

**PART 2:      ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES**

<u>Objectives:</u>		<i>Fully Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Unachieved</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>
8.	To describe the linkage between privatization and economic development.	5	<b>3.5</b>		1	

		<i>Fully Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Unachieved</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>
9.	To list the factors accounting for the growth of opportunities for privatization in an increasing number of sectors and regions of the world.	5	<b>3.7</b>			1
10.	To describe the policy framework required to encourage and implement privatization. (50 responses)	5	<b>3.5</b>			1
11.	To examine the more common forms of privatization including a framework for evaluating their applicability in a wide range of sectors and country environments. (50 responses)	5	<b>3.7</b>			1

**PART 3: WRITTEN RESPONSES** (Note: Responses and quotations provided below reflect the general pattern of responses.)

Please provide a brief response to each of the following questions.

12. The most useful aspect of today's session was:

*"A Future of Hope: The Quiet Revolution in Bangladesh (the Bangladesh Fertilizer Distribution Privatization Experience" -- case study and discussion.*

13. The least useful aspect of today's session was:

*Too many long presentations and lectures, and not enough opportunity for discussion.*

*Break-out groups did not provide the chance for discussion because moderators turned into lecturers.*

*Too much focus on ENI by the contractor.*

14. We intend to use this evaluation to design a follow-on training course. Accordingly, we would appreciate your ideas on how today's topics might best be presented (potentially long distance) to:

- a. Your host country counterparts
- b. USAID colleagues

15. Other comments:

*"Case study was a great idea. I think a better way of utilizing it would have been to break up into groups of 10 with a discussion facilitator and then present the groups' ideas back to the whole [group]. It would also have facilitated more intimate discussion among more people. Make sure break-out sessions are discussion-oriented. NO PRESENTATIONS."*

*"World Bank participation in these sessions would have been insightful. Less domination from the consulting firm would have been appreciated."*

*Why did no senior USAID people attend, as planned?*



**ECONOMIC GROWTH TRAINING  
WORKSHOP**  
September 17 - 21, 1995

Sponsored by: The Center for Economic Growth,  
Global Bureau, USAID

**Section 3: Evaluation Responses by Day**

**Trade Development**

Note: 38 responses were received, unless otherwise indicated.

**PART 1: EVALUATION OF INDIVIDUAL SESSIONS AND READINGS**

		<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
1.	The first presentation (V. Ramachandran) provided a useful overview of trade theory, relationships, and strategies.	5	<b>4.2</b>			1
2.	Through the second presentation (K. Axaroglou), I developed a clear understanding of how growth in trade translates into financial and socio-economic gains. <i>(37 responses)</i>	5	<b>4.0</b>			1
3.	The third presentation (P. Abbott) offered critical information regarding agricultural trade and potential USAID initiatives in this area. <i>(37 responses)</i>	5	<b>4.6</b>			1
4.	The fourth presentation (R. Koskella) improved my understanding of the institutional framework for trade development, including best practices. <i>(31 responses)</i>	5	<b>3.8</b>			1

		<i>Agree Strongly</i>	<i>Somewhat Agree</i>	<i>Neither Agree nor Disagree</i>	<i>Somewhat Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>
5.	Through the fifth presentation (J. Mathieson), I gained a better understanding of the importance of trade and commercial policies, means to measure and compare policy frameworks across countries, and ideas for potential USAID policy reform initiatives. (31 responses)	5	<b>4.2</b>			1
6.	The structure of today's session was conducive to learning about the relationship between economic growth and trade policy and development. (34 responses)	5	<b>4.2</b>			1
7.	<b>Answer 7 ONLY if you have read today's assigned reading.</b> I believe this reading was useful and relevant to my USAID responsibilities. (22 responses)	5		<b>3.5</b>		1
8.	<b>Answer 8 ONLY if you have read some or all of the additional reading materials provided in the course binders.</b> These readings provide a good framework for understanding this topic and thinking about potential activities. (12 responses)	5	<b>4.0</b>			1

**PART 2: ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES**

<u>Objectives:</u>	<i>Fully Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Unachieved</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>
9. To discuss the framework for international trade development. (37 responses)	5	<b>4.2</b>			1
10. To analyze implications of GATT for agricultural trade. (36 responses)	5	<b>4.4</b>			1

		<i>Fully Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Achieved</i>	<i>Partially Achieved</i>	<i>Mostly Unachieved</i>	<i>Not Achieved</i>
11.	To identify lessons learned and examples of best practices in the area of trade and market development. (36 responses)	5		<b>3.7</b>		1
12.	To discuss the importance of appropriate trade and commercial policies. (33 responses)	5		<b>4.2</b>		1
13.	To examine a framework for measuring and comparing policies across countries and regions and to discuss and develop effective strategies for initiating USAID policy reforms. (34 responses)	5		<b>3.8</b>		1

**PART 3: WRITTEN RESPONSES** (Note: Responses and quotations provided below reflect the general pattern of responses.)

12. The most useful aspect of today's session was:

*Philip Church Abbott's presentation.*

*John Mathieson's presentation.*

*All presentations.*

*"The quality of the presentations -- the speakers were interested and excited about their subjects, they were animated, they used visual aids, and they used humor!!"*

13. The least useful aspect of today's session was:

*Dated reading materials and data.*

14. We intend to use this evaluation to design a follow-on training course. Accordingly, we would appreciate your ideas on how today's topics might best be presented (potentially long distance) to:

a. Your host country counterparts

b. USAID colleagues

15. Other comments:

*Best/most useful day.*

*"Hats off to the G Bureau and project managers for good projects and presentations of findings to date."*

*"Tremendous job Monica et al.!!"*

*"Today's speakers exuded a sense of confidence and authority (without pretension) that previous days' speakers did not have."*

*"This seems to be four one-day workshops instead of one well-integrated four-day workshop. There was little effort to tie LRJ with financial sector reform to privatization to trade. A final wrap-up and daily integration session would have been useful to tie everything together."*