

P.N. ABY 702

90763

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION COURSE

EVALUATION REPORT

ABIDJAN, IVORY COAST

SEPTEMBER 11-23, 1983

Prepared under Contract AID/OTR-C-1868

for

Office of Personnel Management

Training and Development Division

by

Development Associates

2924 Columbia Pike

Arlington, VA 22204

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

I. OVERVIEW

A. Schedule

The Project Implementation Course was held in Abidjan, Ivory Coast from September 11-23, 1983. It followed the standard 8:30 to 5:00 training schedule. (See Attachment A.)

B. Participants

Thirty participants from eleven missions, REDSO/EA, REDSO/WCA and RHUDO/WCA attended the course. Missions represented included:

Mission	Number of Participants
Zaire	2
Upper Volta	1
Rwanda	1
Liberia	3
Mali	3
Cameroon	2
Guinea	1
Togo	1
Senegal	2
Kenya	1
Malawi	1
Niger	1
REDSO/ESA	1
RHUDO/WCA	1
REDSO/WCA	9

Of the thirty participants, four are FSNs, one was a third country national, one was a contractor, and the remaining 24 were U.S. direct hires. Attachment B provides a list of the participants of the Abidjan course.

The mean experience level of course participants was high (7.73 years), with several having over 15 years of experience with AID. Exhibit 1 shows the breakdown of participant experience with AID.

EXHIBIT 1

PARTICIPANT EXPERIENCE WITH AID

Status	Number of Participants	Years				Mean
		0-3	0-4	0-7	10+	
USDH/PSC	25	11	4	1	9	7.58
FSN/TCN	5	2	3	0	0	3.76
TOTAL	30	13	7	1	9	6.94

Historical statistics on all past participants is provided in Attachment E. This group was among the most highly experienced participant groups receiving the course. Additionally, greater percentage of USDH USDH attended this course than most of the previous field courses.

C. Characteristics of the Abidjan Course

For the Abidjan course a new approach to the commodities presentation was tested on a small scale. In response to past critiques of the presentation, the decision was made to team train some of the major components of the unit. For this course a team approach was developed for the initial commodities session on host country methods of contracting for commodities.

Additionally, a survey was taken of participant interest in proposed future computer training to be included in the Project Implementation Course. Levels and nature of interest in possible microcomputer training were ascertained for the Abidjan participants.

II. IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation of the Abidjan course went extremely smoothly. Even though the participants were extremely experienced they were motivated and highly involved in the course. The isolation of the site also contributed to the likelihood that assignments were read and completed. The training facility itself was a good one contributing to the ease of management of the course.

III. EVALUATION

As in previous courses, two types of evaluation instruments were employed. A multiple choice pre/post test was used to measure the change in participants' knowledge from before to after the course. The second instrument was an Overall Evaluation which obtained feedback from participants on the process and content of the course.

1. Impact Evaluation (Pre/Post)

The pretest group mean of 0.97 correct answers increased to a posttest group mean of 14.37 an average increase of 3.4. This difference is significant at well beyond the .001 level. These statistics demonstrate that the course was effective in increasing the participants' knowledge of project implementation issues. Exhibit 2 on the following page presents the pre/post test results of the participants.

EXHIBIT 2

Form no - 488

PRE/POST TEST EVALUATION RESULTS FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS

ID NUMBER	PRETEST	POSTTEST	DIFFERENCE
KT/TD	15	19	+4
790	16	17	1
129	12	14	2
511	11	12	1
JR3	13	16	3
123	10	17	7
826	14	15	1
EL2BF	12	17	5
N01	7	14	7
681	11	15	4
707	10	14	4
813	11	13	2
503	12	14	2
807	15	15	0
496	9	16	7
2369	10	16	6
BBH	8	10	2
R32	13	16	3
John	8	15	7
243	9	14	5
675	10	13	3
PAX7	14	14	0
538	12	14	2
999	10	16	6
1932	6	11	5
478	10	15	5
945	13	15	2
JKD	10	13	3
224	11	13	2
225	7	8	1
MEAN	10.97	14.37	3.4

t = -8.5617
 p(t) = .000000001
 df = 29

2. Process (Overall) Evaluation

Participants provided positive ratings of the course in general.

a. Questions 1-8

The first eight questions elicit ratings on eight components of the course on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). Exhibit 3 below presents the results of these questions.

EXHIBIT 3

PARTICIPANTS' RATINGS ON ITEMS 1-8 OVERALL EVALUATION

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Mean
1. Management of Course	20	8	3	0	0	4.71
2. This course's physical setting	11	11	7	0	0	4.31
3. Relevance of the course topics and content	17	10	1	0	0	4.57
4. Selection of course topics and content	13	14	1	0	0	4.42
5. Methodology of presentation	15	12	1	0	0	4.50
6. Quality of course materials	14	12	11	0	0	4.42
7. Quality of the course staff	19	8	1	0	0	4.64
8. OVERALL QUALITY OF COURSE	16	12	1	0	0	4.51

These are among the most favorable responses ever received for this course. All means are well in the center of the range between very good and excellent.

Question 9 to 13 of the Overall Evaluation look at measures of the course methodology and obtains participants' assessments of its relevance and effectiveness. Exhibit 4 summarizes the responses to these items.

EXHIBIT 4

PARTICIPANT RESPONSES TO ITEMS 9-13, OVERALL EVALUATION

9. Duration of the course

- (2) Too long
- (1) Too short
- (27) Appropriate

10. All in all, this course was for me

- (1) Too elementary
- (1) Too advanced
- (28) Just right

11. The mix of lectures, exercises, discussions, etc. resulted in

- (1) Too many lectures
- (1) Too many exercises, discussions, etc.
- (28) A good mix of the two

12. My professional needs were taken into consideration by the course staff

- (20) Very much
- (9) Some
- (0) Not at all

13. As a result of this course, my work in project management implementation in the Mission will be

- (13) Much better
- (15) Better
- (1) The same

Responses to these items demonstrate participants support of the present, duration, level of sophistication and format of the course. Participants felt their professional needs were taken into consideration and that their work would be improved as a result of the course.

c. Question 14. What were the major strengths of the course?

Participants listed the major strengths of the course as the quality of course staff, the relevance of training experiences, the organization of

the materials, and the small group sessions where participants gained insight from the knowledge of more experienced staff. Participants commented that instructors had obviously done a considerable amount of advance work and were current on the relevant issues. They appreciated the varied format of presentations, the systematic outline of subject matter especially the contract summaries, the good teaching techniques and the positive learning environment. A more complete summary of responses to this question are presented in Attachment C.

d. Question 15

Each of the major units of the course were rated separately. These ratings are presented in Exhibit 5 below.

EXHIBIT 5

15. Please rate the major units of this course on a 1 (poor) or 5 (excellent) scale for the following elements:

	Relevance of Content	Quality of Presentation	Quality of Materials
1. Contracting Direct	4.64	4.60	4.39
2. Host Country	4.71	4.57	4.46
3. Commodity Procurement	4.53	3.46	3.89
4. Financial Management	4.48	4.33	4.17
5. Monitoring	4.29	4.03	4.13
6. Participant Training	4.07	4.03	4.18

In general, the participants rated the course units as either very good or good. The mean ratings were extremely positive for all sessions. Specific comments from participants on each of the units are summarized below:

1. AID Direct Contracting

Excellent in all phases.

Presentation a bit too quick.

Good job

Could use more examples to show variety of uses.

2. Host Country Contracting

Need more on actual Host Country System.

Material could be better organized.

Good session.

3. Commodity Procurement

Presentation a bit rambling.

Application of training techniques would help.

This must be tightened up a great deal.

This was one of only two areas on which some improvement is needed.

Presentation too long winded - not sharp and direct enough.

Too detailed -- not presented from a project officer's point of view.

Materials could be better organized in the manual.

4. Financial Management

The visuals are confusing. Materials could be better organized.

5. Monitoring

More time should be spent on this.

Could use more examples of good procedures and format.

More could have been covered in this area.

A bit more exercises.

6. Participant Training

A good session but more exercises would be helpful.

e. Question 16

The last question on the Overall Evaluation asked for comments, suggestions, criticisms or ideas to improve the course. Specific responses are provided in Attachment D.

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

As a result of having a motivated and interested participant group the Abidjan Project Implementation Course was extremely successful. The participant ratings reviewed above demonstrate that course participants had very positive reactions to the course indicating that it was useful experience and should have a positive impact on their ability to perform their jobs.

Participants responding to a survey of their computer training needs indicated that they were very interested and motivated in participating in microcomputer training. Their major interest in software were in spreadsheets, data base management and time management as well as wordprocessing. The results of this survey are presented in full under separate cover.

ATTACHEMENT B
PARTICIPANT LIST

<u>Name</u>	<u>Soc. Security</u>	<u>Mission</u>	<u>Position Title</u>
Awantang, Felix N.		Zaire	Public Health Advisor
Bambara, H. Bruno		Upper Volta	Program Specialist
Bennett, Mary Beth	189-44-2644	Rwanda	Asst. Ag. Officer
Braden, Robert C.	487-36-4282	Liberia	Engineering Office
Conley, Ralph L.	442-46-1979	Mali	Asst. Ag. Dev. Officer
Cowles, David L.	215-66-8378	REDSO/ESA	Asst. Supply Mgt. Office
Deikun, George	150-44-5673	RHUDO/WCA	Reg. Housing Office
Deolazo, Ben G.	577-66-1013	Cameroon	B&A Officer
Dia, Ouma		Mali	Program Specialist
Dodson, Buddy K.	496-34-001	REDSO/WCA	Reg. Food for Peace Officer
Edin, Neal C.	076-36-7724	REDSO/WCA	Reg. Contracting Officer
Garner, Normal L.	482-30-1370	Guinea	Ag. Proj. Officer
Guild, Paul D.	540-42-5251	Togo/Benin	Proj. Manager
Hahn, Zachary M.	456-66-2336	REDSO/WCA	Asst. Director
Heise, Ken G.		Zaire	Population Advisor
Jenkins, Dan	264-74-1295	REDSO/WCA	Engineering Advisor
Judy, William H.	259-42-3228	Malawi	Ag. Dev. Officer
MacAlister, Robert	002-16-4954	Senegal	Project officer
MacArthur, Archibald Gordon	093-24-0297	REDSO/WCA	Deputy Director
Martin, Raymond S.	165-32-2325	Cameroon	Health Dev. Officer
McClellan, Dorothy M.N.	261-48-6188	REDSO/WCA	Engineering Advisor
Miller, Duncan R.	323-32-8936	REDSO/WCA	Asst. Director, Prog. Analysis & Dev.
Mullef, Maria N.		Kenya	Ag. Specialist
Newton, Alexander D.	176-34-0515	REDSO/WCA	Reg. Legal Advisor
Rea, Samuel S.	176-34-0515	Senegal	Program Officer
Scherrer-Palma, Carole	224-66-1930	Liberia	Reg. Dev. Economist
Stervinou, Theodora W.	411-80-5417	REDSO/WCA	Reg. Prog. Economist
Tata, Sangare		Mali	Prog. Spec., Health/Pop.
Vigil, F. Rudolph	525-78-8136	Niger	Proj. Manager
Weisel, Peter F.	535-34-3233	Liberia	Economic Advisor

STAFF

Gordan Ramsey	Development Associates
Sheila Maher	Development Associates
Robert Wiley	Development Associates
Tom Stuman	Development Associates
James Brady	PM/TD
Glenn Slocum	AFR/DR

ATTACHEMENT C

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 14

14. What were the major strengths of the course?

It didn't have one particular strength because it is well planned, very appropriate.

Organization of the course materials

Highly experienced staff

First week contracting sessions were the most relevant

Example from actual projects.

Supply management - Host country, Commodities, AID-Direct procurement

Manual

Awareness of the links among various implementation procedures.

Concern with concrete tasks of project officers so that content and examples were relevant.

Small group sessions and discussions

Wide range of experience of other students

Wide range of topics covered dealing with Project Implementation

The staff members have done a considerable amount of advance work and are current on most issues.

Suggestion - get a new video tape from the AA-a bad job on an important topic.

Good working environment

Varied format of course presentation.

Sytematic outline of subject matter

Good training techniques

Good choice of contents

Methodology of training

Composition of the Participants

Question 14 (Cont.)

The course gives an overview of the various responsibilities of a project officer and ties together the timing and necessity for necessary actions, while stressing the importance of flexibility and the need to be prepared for changes in circumstances.

Mix of lectures/exercises/group meetings

Well laid out text especially contract type summaries

Organization toward role play actual situations, participation

Exposure to somewhat more detail to subjects one was familiar with through practice but never had the time to research properly.

Awareness of the links among various implementation procedures.

The manual will be excellent as a future guide.

The purpose of the course was well met, i.e., to upgrade or skills re AID implemenation procedures. Again, what is lacking in this sort of exercise is development context - this is reflected in Missions, we all spend our time doing the paper/procedure stuff and think too little about development.



ATTACHMENT D

COMMENTS, SUGGESTIONS, CRITICISMS, IDEAS

16. Please provide any comments, suggestions, criticisms or ideas that may make future courses more effective:

Include section/materials on training yourself how to listen (particularly to Host Country) officials and counterparts.

Too much reading. If condensed, it would be more fully read.

Clarity and responsiveness to questions of presentation on commodity procurement were a bit too weak.

Project implementation must be difficult to make interesting and I thought it was nearly as interesting as it could be made.

Commodity Procurement was not presented in as logical and organized manner as other units. Although a lot of material was presented, some i.e. excess property section is not of relevance to most Project Officers.

Sheila, Gordon and Tom were excellent in getting information across to participants. Commodity Procurement is critical in implementation but presentation fell far short of what was needed.

A specific managerial skill needs to be developed for Project Officers.

The Financial Management aspects, need to be more clarified.

Procurement discussion should be made more general, for purposes of being more relevant to P.O.s rather than supply management types; it also should be limited to one day.

The course is too short for such long topics of discussions.

Graphic summary sheets for each chapter very helpful.

Use of more training materials and audio visual equipment.

The commodity unit was not as well presented as other units and it's probably one that project officers understand the least.

To provide an earlier PI training to new project officers prior to their assignments overseas as part of the orientation program. Upon arrival as part of the assignment they can get their feet wet with the real experience and tailor to the needs of the job.

A group exercise on mid-project modifications and change of strategy could be useful—even a mini role play.

Question 16 (Cont.)

Exercise on IV-23 (in-box) needs to be carried thru on overhead projector or done in class so we can follow process.

What are actual obligating documents, define exactly?

Commodity guidances, samples and instructor were not strong point of course.

Evaluation should be a very essential part of project development etc. thus, I feel a little more work would be fruitful in this area -- visual aids, etc.

Got very confused with semantics and terminology than anything else. I mean, like in contracting, there are many terms to describe the same types. Our groups were always looking for one word or phrase to describe a type of contracting. You just don't have large capacity to absorb terminology as opposed to principles.

The course covers a lot of materials which is all important in project implementation the length of the course has to be two weeks to cover the material, but towards the end of the second week it becomes harder to focus on the course materials. This is a problem but I don't have any suggestions on how to resolve it.

Design and print a one page outline on where one can find in the manual a one page review sheets of subject materials.

Do not use slides which wastes time for one and does not allow one to take notes on the printed diagram in the manual.

Must get a better trainer for commodities.

Need more quizzes during course-they're an excellent way to learn and also to get an idea of how strong/weak one is in a given area.

ATTACHMENT E

**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION COURSE
PARTICIPANT EXPERIENCE PROFILE**

LENGTH OF SERVICE WITH AID

Course	Number of Participants	Date	0-3	4-6	7-9	10+	Mean	
Panama	32	1/12-28/81						
AID/W	34	2/25-3/6/81	STATISTICS NOT AVAILABLE					
Tunisia	21	3/23-4/3/81						
Nepal	30	5/25-6/6/81	14	6	0	10	9.19*	
Kenya	33	9/14-25/81	20	7	3	3	4.12*	
Cyprus	34	11/2-13/81	19	8	0	6	5.88	
Philippines	34	1/24-2/5/82	16	7	4	7	6.00	
Peru	34	3/15-26/82	15	4	1	12	7.15	
Senegal	28	5/9-21/82	20	6	0	2	3.41	
Ivory Coast	25	5/24-6/4/82	16	5	0	4	5.21	
Swaziland	28	9/12-24/82	16	5	1	6	5.87	
Egypt	32	10/23-11/4/82	15	11	2	4	5.47	
Jamaica	32	12/6-17/82	9	8	0	8	7.53	
Indonesia	32	1/9-21/83	18	7	1	5	5.82	
Arusha	29	2/27-3/11/83	12	7	3	5	5.63	
Haiti	31	5/1-13/83	19	7	2	2	4.03	
HF I	24	7/10-22/83	8	6	2	7	7.3	
HF II	24	8/7-19/83	7	7	3	7	7.79	
Abidjan II	30	9/11-23/83	12	7	1	9	6.94	
TOTAL	567		237	108	23	97	5.43	

*Approximate statistics

ATTACHMENT F

Numbers of Project Implementation Course Participants by Region and Mission and Employment Status as of September 30, 1983

<u>Mission</u>	<u>USDH</u>	<u>FSN</u>	<u>PASA</u>	<u>PVO</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Near East Region</u>							
Egypt	9	7	-	-	-	-	16
Italy	-	-	-	-	1	-	1
Jordan	4	8	1	-	-	-	13
Lebanon	-	2	-	2	-	-	4
Morocco	4	1	-	-	-	-	5
Portugal	-	3	-	-	-	-	3
Syria	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
Tunisia	10	5	1	-	-	-	16
Yemen	<u>5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>6</u>
TOTALS	32	28	2	2	1	0	65
<u>Asia Region</u>							
Bangladesh	6	2	-	-	-	-	8
Burma	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
India	5	3	-	-	-	-	8
Indonesia	10	6	-	-	-	-	16
Nepal	10	12	-	-	-	-	22
Pakistan	5	5	-	-	-	-	10
Philippines	15	7	-	-	-	-	22
Sri Lanka	-	4	-	-	-	-	4
Thailand	<u>3</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>11</u>
TOTALS	56	46	0	0	1	0	103
<u>AID Washington</u>							
Roslyn/HF	56	-	-	-	-	-	56

ATTACHMENT F (Continued)

<u>Mission</u>	<u>USDH</u>	<u>FSN</u>	<u>PASA</u>	<u>PVO</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Inspector General</u>							
RIG/EA	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
RIG/WA	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTALS	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
<u>Africa Region</u>							
Bissau	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Botswana	3	-	-	-	-	-	3
Burundi	3	1	-	-	-	-	4
Cameroon	14	6	-	-	-	-	20
Cape Verde	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Gambia	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
Ghana	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Guinea	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Kenya	8	5	-	-	-	-	13
Lesotho	2	3	-	-	1	-	6
Liberia	6	5	-	-	-	-	11
Malawi	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Mali	6	6	-	-	-	-	12
Mauritania	5	-	-	-	-	-	5
Niger	6	-	-	-	-	-	6
Rwanda	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
Senegal	7	10	-	-	4	-	21
Sierre Leone	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
Somalia	3	--	-	-	-	-	3
Sudan	11	-	-	-	2	-	13
Swaziland	4	-	-	-	-	-	4
Tanzania	11	3	-	-	-	-	14
Togo	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
Upper Volta	7	1	1	-	1	-	10
Zaire	5	1	-	-	1	1	8

ATTACHMENT F (Continued)

<u>Mission</u>	<u>USDH</u>	<u>FSN</u>	<u>PASA</u>	<u>PVO</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Africa Region (Continued)</u>							
Zambia	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
REDSO/EA	11	1	-	-	3	-	15
REDSO/WCA	17	1	-	-	2	-	20
RHUDO/WCA	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>1</u>
TOTALS	141	47	1	0	14	1	204

Latin America/Caribbean

Barbados	3	2	-	-	-	-	5
Bolivia	1	2	-	-	1	-	4
Costa Rica	1	1	-	-	-	-	2
Ecuador	5	3	-	-	-	-	8
El Salvador	8	7	-	-	-	-	15
Guatemala	4	2	-	-	-	-	6
Guyana	2	2	-	-	-	-	4
Haiti	6	5	-	-	3	-	14
Honduras	3	-	-	1	1	-	5
Jamaica	17	13	-	-	-	8(GOP)	38
Nicaragua	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Panama	7	5	1	-	-	1(GOP)	14
Paraguay	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Peru	4	11	-	-	1	-	16
ROCAP	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
RDO/C	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2</u>
TOTALS	63	57	1	1	6	9	137

ATTACHMENT F (Continued)

Total by Year and Regions or Function
as of September 30, 1983

<u>Region</u>	<u>FY 1981</u>	<u>FY 1982</u>	<u>FY 1983</u>	<u>Total</u>
AID/W	34	0	22	56
Africa	33	89	82	204
Asfa	29	34	40	103
LAC	32	34	62	128
NE	21	26	18	65
IG	1	0	1	2
HOST GOV.	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>
TOTALS	150	183	234	567