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Executive Summary

To foster training capacity in developing countries, the World Bank Institute (WBI) has in recent years tried innovative approaches to capacity building, such as using new technologies to share knowledge. In November 1997 WBI’s Economic Policy and Poverty Reduction division (WBIEP) launched the institutional partnership program. The idea is to create a network of partner institutions in developing countries to help WBI share the knowledge Bank work generates.

In Phase One of the program, trainers from potential partner institutions upgrade their knowledge by attending a core course delivered by WBIEP. The first trainer training took place in fiscal 1998.

In Phase Two, trainers from partner institutions adapt the course to local conditions and organize and deliver the course in their region, in collaboration with WBIEP task managers. Partner institutions delivered the first customized core courses in fiscal 1999.

In fiscal year 1999, when the program was about to be extended to other divisions, the WBI Evaluation Unit was asked to evaluate the program — to assess activities and results from the initial trainer training and from delivery of the first core courses by partner institutions.

What the program was expected to achieve

- To understand what the partnership program was expected to achieve and how it was expected to achieve it, the evaluation team first constructed a logic model, a diagram showing the flow of program activities and how they were to produce expected outcomes. Focusing on underlying assumptions, the team asked three questions:
  - *On what theoretical assumptions is the program based?* In other words, why is it assumed that program activities will help develop a worldwide network of partners to deliver core WBIEP courses? Why is it believed that this network will bring the benefits WBI and its partners expect?
  - *In Phase One, how did the training of trainers in fiscal 1998 comply with, or differ from, theoretical assumptions?*
  - *In Phase Two, how did the transfer of core courses to partner institutions in fiscal 1999 comply with, or differ from, theoretical assumptions?*
Were underlying assumptions validated?
Next, the team compared program implementation with the logic model. Data for evaluation were collected in two ways. First, to measure how participants had used the information they got during training, questionnaires were sent to the 138 participants registered in the program database in fiscal 1998. More than half (55.8 percent) responded. In addition to this tracer study, detailed case studies were prepared about four partnerships developed in fiscal 1999.

Of the 13 main theoretical assumptions underlying the partnership, five were validated by the evaluation, three were invalidated, and evidence about five more was mixed.

Some assumptions were validated
There was evidence to support five of the 13 assumptions:

- **Providing trainer training will help us reach out to good training institutions worldwide and develop a pool of potential partners.** During the first phase of training, the program established a basis for selecting partner institutions, entering the names of more than 100 institutions in the program database. In fiscal 1998, 14 universities and research institutes were identified as being the most promising institutions of knowledge. All stakeholders seemed to agree on the criteria for a perfect partner, but no record was made of how the initial partners were selected. Therefore it is unclear whether WBI’s emphasis on nine countries in fiscal 1998 was the result of chance or of an implicit strategy.

- **WBI will concentrate on a limited number of partner institutions.** Establishing partnerships requires intense, time-consuming work, as the four case studies show. Limiting the number of pilot experiences seems to make sense.

- **WBI will partner with good training institutions.** The partner institutions, in the program database, that delivered a course in fiscal 1999 got higher ratings for facilities and faculty strength than the other local institutions that delivered a course with WBI. But task managers in the case studies valued their trust in the director responsible for delivering the course more than they valued the partner institution’s having enough qualified teachers on staff to mount the course. A partner institution can compensate for having a small faculty by drawing on professors from neighboring institutions.

- **WBI and the partner institution will jointly deliver the training course, collaborating on organization and content.** In the four cases studied, WBI was responsible for the quality of the course, but the partner institution played a prominent role in course preparation and delivery. The partner
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Institutions had a comparative advantage in selecting local participants and speakers, adapting the course to regional conditions, and providing logistics at competitive prices. In the two case studies that were formally evaluated, the participants interviewed gave positive feedback about the course they attended and task managers praised the partner institution’s capacity.

- **Delivering the course jointly will make it easier for institutions to exchange knowledge.** In three of the four cases studied, the partner institution enriched WBI’s core course material with information relevant to the local audience. And all four partner institutions have used WBI materials to enrich their own training curriculum.

**Some assumptions were not validated**

Three assumptions proved wrong:

- **Trainers are a good point of entry for informing training institutions of partnering possibilities.** In three of the four cases studied, the key agent for developing a partnership was the training institution’s director or someone else who could leverage human, financial, and organizational, resources.

- **Trainers from partner institutions will be trained beforehand to ensure quality.** In two cases, local trainers delivered a core course satisfactorily in fiscal 1999 without prior training, so clearly it was not always necessary to train the trainers before transferring the course to a partner institution.

- **The partnership program is essential as a clearinghouse for proposals from partner institutions.** In two of the cases studied, the partner institution dealt directly with WBIEP task managers and did not submit their proposals through the partnership program. Task managers and the manager of the partnership program must work out an effective way to exchange information.

**Evidence about some assumptions was mixed**

There was evidence both for and against five of the 13 assumptions:

- **Participants in Phase One workshops will be trainers.** The fiscal 1998 training program was not clearly targeted to trainers. Fewer than half of the participants in the fiscal 1998 partnership program described themselves as trainers or professors. Another 30 percent were interested in improving their training skills, but 20 percent of the participants did not attend WBIEP core courses to improve their training skills.

- **The course will improve trainers’ capabilities.** After the 1998 courses, no level II evaluation was conducted to measure the participants’ increase in knowledge, so we have no measure of the sessions’ impact on learning. Generally participants reported that the training had been a worthwhile professional experience, but 19 percent of the trainers doubted the training
would be useful for their organizations. Participants saw the training as useful mostly for networking with colleagues, finding out about the latest developments in the field, and getting a mix of empirical and theoretical background material. To improve the seminars, they suggested better case studies and less emphasis on the academic. Some also mentioned the need to adapt training to the diversity of the audience.

- **Selecting an audience of trainers will strengthen the course’s impact as trainers will disseminate the information they receive.** Roughly 75 percent of the participants who attended the courses to improve their training activities reported later using the material or information provided. But 70 percent of the participants used the training material for research and only 60 percent used it for training. Many of the participants attended the course to improve their research materials, as well as teaching skills.

- **The partnership program will help promote distance education.** Two of the four case-study institutions were equipped with distance learning facilities that allowed international connections. For the other two, external providers of videoconference facilities were identified but the arrangement worked in only one case.

- **The partnership program will encourage cost sharing or cost recovery on jointly delivered courses.** Training partners were unable or unwilling to bear an equal share of the costs and risks of a training partnership. In two of four cases the partner institution bore no risk or cost. In a third, the partner institution was willing to share some costs with WBI. In the fourth case, the only course designed to generate income, the local partner institution said it had incurred a loss (WBIEP does not concur in this analysis). All four cases raise concerns about effective budgeting of costs and revenues and equitable distribution of partnership risks. The process should definitely be monitored and WBIEP and its partner institutions should come to a clear understanding of what the financial agreements mean.

**Recommendations**

Based on evaluation findings, we recommend that the Partnership Program:

- Make procedures for selecting partner institutions more transparent. The network of partner institutions should serve the World Bank Institute’s strategic objectives, which to some extent reflect the needs of the Bank’s lending departments. Consider using criteria other than institutional strength, such as how high on the political agenda a training topic is in a particular country.

- Tailor the database about partner institutions to meet task managers’ needs. Record the strengths and weaknesses of potential partner institutions as well as the results of their previous experiences with the program. Distinguish between 1) partner institutions that have delivered a course jointly with WBI, 2) weaker regional institutions that have delivered courses with WBI but do
not meet enough criteria to be considered partner institutions, and 3) institutions that have expressed an interest in organizing a course but have not followed through.

- Pay more attention to the selection and mix of people who participate in training. In the partnership database, record only the names of professors, trainers, and directors who might be interested in adapting the course to local needs. It probably makes sense to target directors of partner institutions in addition to trainers, because directors can mobilize the staff and resources needed to adapt the course to local circumstances.
- Exchange information on its database with other Bank departments and programs. Because it takes time to establish a partnership, it is worth it that the partner participate in different WBI programs.
- Establish “best practice” guidelines about the management and organization of partnerships, including cost-sharing agreements. The financial agreement for delivering courses should allow for donors’ possible withdrawal and should reflect consideration for both partners’ relative ability to share risks and absorb losses.
- Improve techniques for training trainers, putting more emphasis on the use of visual aids, computer-based simulations, and power-point presentations in addition to providing technical information. What instructors taking the course appreciated most was the use of the new technologies in teaching along with access to unpublished articles and new bibliographies. To reinforce learning outcomes, consider sending participants updated materials after the course.
I

The evaluation rationale

In recent years the World Bank Institute (WBI) has looked for innovative programs to foster training capacity in developing countries. In light of the perceived limitations of many of its capacity-building efforts, WBI has introduced new features in its capacity building models, like partnering with institutions, or networks of professionals, and using new technologies to scale up the provision of information. The institutional partnership program (the “partnership program”) is one of these initiatives. It was launched in November 1997 by the Economic Policy and Poverty Reduction division of the World Bank Institute (WBIEP, formerly the Macroeconomic Management and Policy Division of the Economic Development Institute). The present evaluation was requested one year later, when the program was about to be extended to other divisions.

The goal of the partnership program is to “create a network of partners in developing countries teaching, in conjunction with WBI, knowledge that is generated in the work the Bank does”. The program is articulated in two phases:
1) In the first phase, trainers from potential partner institutions attend a core course delivered by WBIEP to upgrade their knowledge.
2) During the second phase, trainers from partner institutions, in collaboration with WBIEP task managers, adapt the course to their local context and organize a joint delivery of the course on-site.

It was decided to assess the program activities and results over the first implementation of the program’s cycle: that is, the training of trainers in FY98, and the first delivery of core courses by partner institutions in FY99.

1. The key elements of the WBIEP partnership program

Central to the project is the definition of partnership stated in the program brief: “a clearly articulated arrangement between entities to work toward mutually agreed goals with mutually agreed division of costs, risks, rewards, and mechanisms to assess progress and make adjustments” (see chart 1).

The FY98 program document states that the operating mode of the program unfolds as franchising to partner institutions the core courses that WBIEP offers. The approach is a top-down one: The goals of the partnership and the procedures
of the program are set by WBIEP, a large importance is attached to the selection and the training of the partner, in order to maintain the quality of the product (the course), and expand the dissemination of the course materials while minimizing WBI costs.

Chart 1
The Key Elements of WBIEP Partnership Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBI and Partner Agreement</th>
<th>Procedures (set by WBIEP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost sharing between WBI and partner, for phases One and Two</strong></td>
<td>Two succeeding phases:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsibility sharing for the core course</strong></td>
<td><strong>Phase One</strong>: audience: trainers of potential partners institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal (set by WBIEP):</strong></td>
<td>Delivery of core course made by WBI, with a view to upgrade trainers’ skills and disseminate knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery by regional institutions in the Developing world of WBIEP core courses</td>
<td><strong>Phase Two</strong>: audience: targeted participants selected by WBI and partner institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery of core course made by partner institutions with WBI support, with a view to adapt and disseminate knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of partnership

Clearly articulated arrangement between entities to work towards mutually agreed goals with mutually agreed division of costs, risks, rewards, and mechanisms to assess progress and make adjustments.

Benefits for WBI

- larger dissemination of WBIEP teaching
  - to all regions in the world
  - to a larger number of people trained
  - to a new audience
- reduced cost of delivering course
- wider adaptation of course to regional context
- partner contributes to WBI knowledge bank

Benefits for the partner

- increased training and institutional capacity
- higher visibility in the region
- generation of income through participants fees during Phase Two
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The building of the partnership is articulated in two stages: In Phase One, trainers from potential partner institutions attend the courses delivered by the task managers of the WBIEP in order to upgrade their knowledge. At this stage, WBI carries out a selection of teachers from potential partner institutions who are invited to attend the course during the first phase for two reasons: i) to ensure the broadest dissemination of knowledge, and ii) eventually, when the joint course is actually delivered, to maintain high quality for the on-site training event.

The second phase (Phase Two) unfolds with the adaptation and delivery of the course by the partner institution in collaboration with WBIEP. It is assumed that the trainers trained during the first phase of the program will help adapt the WBI course to local conditions and deliver the course on-site.

The expected benefits of the program are presented in the FY98 program document and summarized above in Chart 1. The WBI expects to benefit from a larger dissemination of its courses at a reduced cost, an enrichment of its knowledge base, and a better tailoring of courses to regional contexts. Partner institutions expect to benefit from increased training and organizational capacity (deriving from the training of its trainers, access to WBI course materials, and the organization of a high quality international training event), higher visibility and a better reputation in the region, and generation of income through participants’ fees.

2. The expected implementation mode of the program

Chart 2 on the next page represents the expected implementation process of the program in FY98 and FY99, as derived from an analysis of the project documents.

*Phase One, the training of selected trainers from potential partner institutions,* was to start in FY98 with publicity of the program, to achieve a large number of applicant institutions from which to choose. Resource people from the Bank (regional coordinators, country resident representatives, and task managers) would nominate strong institutions (universities, think tanks, associations, etc.) who would in turn nominate candidates. Cost sharing—in fact having participants pay for their airplane tickets—was to be an important test of the motivation of the institutions, as well as a means to reduce WBI’s costs, allowing the Institute invite more trainees.
## Chart 2: Program’s Expected Implementation

### Phase One: Training of trainers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBI</th>
<th>Partner Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBI advertises the program of core courses to a large number of potential partner institutions, inviting them to nominate trainees;</td>
<td>Potential partner institutions nominate trainees;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBI selects trainers according to their curriculum and their belonging to promising partner institutes . WBI offers to pay part of training of trainers, the institution must pay a share of the cost;</td>
<td>Motivated partner institutions send trainers to be trained;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBI delivers core courses to trainers of partner institutions. WBIEP presents to all trainers Phase Two of the program;</td>
<td>Trainers have acquired knowledge and skills. Trainers use knowledge and skills in courses to regional audience, for a cascading effect. Trainers will inform their institution of Phase Two;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WBI has reached a larger audience than before thanks to a larger advertisement of program and a focus on trainers.

### Phase Two: Partnership for the delivery of the core course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WBI</th>
<th>Partner Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WBI accredits strongest partner institutions;</td>
<td>Motivated partner institutions identified in Phase One volunteer to deliver one or several courses, on a cost sharing basis, and write letters of intent to WBI;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBI proposes arrangement concerning cost sharing and responsibility sharing. WBI selects some of the trainers, and selects international participants to the regional course;</td>
<td>Partner accepts cost sharing arrangement and makes proposal of course content, speakers and case studies. Partner selects national participants to the regional course. Some of the participants from the development arena do not belong to WBI usual audience. Partner adapts the course to a regional audience by developing regional case studies. Partner access funds for the delivery of the course;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WBI assist partner in delivering core course, as agreed in the arrangement. WBI costs for the delivery of core courses has decreased. The course has been adapted to a regional context. The course has reached a new audience. Regional case studies are contributing to WBI knowledge bank.

Partner delivers the course. The quality of the course has been maintained as well as client satisfaction. Participants have learned from the course;
The program’s selection criteria for trainers were simple enough: trainers were to hold at least a master’s degree, preferably a PhD, but most importantly had to belong to promising institutions. The key factor, therefore, was to evaluate the potential of the nominating institutions. WBI had commissioned in FY97 the creation of a set of guidelines for selecting country partners\(^1\). The partnership program borrowed from this a very comprehensive system for measuring the capacity of potential partner institutions, which was presented in the project document and which the program was expected to implement.

The expected results of the first phase of the program were twofold:

- First a “snowball effect” in the dissemination of knowledge. Trainers would use knowledge recently gained in their own delivery of courses or seminars, allowing WBI to reach a larger audience.
- Second, the selection of the best candidates from the pool of trainees for the delivery of the course. Trainers would be selected on the basis that they present strong individual qualities and belong to strong organizations. By exposing trainers to the course, WBI could spot the most motivated individuals; face to face discussions would create links between task managers and trainers which would be useful in the creation of the partnership. Training was also considered to be a quality assurance mechanism, WBI making sure that the trainer had sufficient knowledge to deliver the course. The repetition of Phase One over the years was also expected to ensure a continuing selection pressure on the institutions.

Participants trained during Phase One were to be informed of the partnership program, and they would in turn inform their institution.

Phase Two, the delivery of WBI core courses was expected to start when applicant partner institutions sent a letter of intent to the partnership program (see Chart 2). The applicant would then make a proposal describing course content and speakers. The task manager for the course would consider the content of the letter and the proposal, negotiate the financial conditions of the delivery of the course, and select some participants and speakers. The task manager would also be responsible for assisting the partner in the delivery of the course.

The partner was expected to adapt the core course designed in Washington to local conditions. It was also expected that the partner institution would help identify participants, and reach an audience that had not previously benefited from WBI core courses. Finally, partner institutions were expected to contribute to WBI’s knowledge base through the development of regional case studies. For

\(^1\) MOELLER “Training: Guidelines for Selecting In-Country Partners”, WBI internal document, FY97
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WBI, a successful partnership would come with the delivery of a regional core course which possessed the same level of quality, presumably at a lower cost than prior to the establishment of the partnership.

3. The operating context

The idea of testing a partnership approach is not new at WBI; several similar programs are underway. For example a health sector program aims at building the capacity of partner institutions, and an environment sector program deals with building the capacity of a network of experts. Other experiences concern partnering with regional institutions.

Concerning WBIEP, informal interviews with the task managers show that before the launching of the program, a number of task managers were already delivering regional events, using the facilities of institutions in the developing countries, and at times local speakers. Typically, a newly arrived task manager would obtain from WBI regional coordinators the names of institutions with which to partner. More seasoned task managers would nurture their own network of partners throughout the world.

The drawbacks for WBIEP of such a system were significant: when a task manager left the division, there was no guaranteed way to safeguard the efforts that had been invested into developing his/her personal network of partners. There was no centralized information system capturing the strengths and weaknesses of partners in client countries, and no incentive for task managers in Washington to use regional speakers (in fact many WBIEP events were taking place in the United States). Also, the treatment of partners would vary across task managers.

The recent policy guidance documents of the World Bank Institute (WBI) and the World Bank at large have put a new emphasis on the development of partnerships. The partnership program was launched in WBIEP at the same time that new courses were developed and new managers hired. It is therefore difficult to construct a clear “before program” situation. An idea of what would have been the situation in the absence of the partnership program can be observed in the regional deliveries of WBIEP core courses early in FY98, before the completion of the two phase cycle of the partnership program.

In FY98, WBIEP had a portfolio of five core courses, which were delivered eight times during the fiscal year. Two sessions were held in a client country. Five events were held in Washington, and one in another developed country (Vienna). This indicates that at least a few WBIEP managers had by early 1998 established links with local institutions which were used for the delivery of these five core
courses. The role of these institutions, as surmised from the interviews with the task managers in charge of the courses, is presented in box one.

**Box 1**

**The role of local institutions in the delivery of WBIEP core courses in FY98**

| MEFMI (a consortium of banks) was identified for the delivery of the course on Economic Growth in Harare (March 23- April 3, 1998). MEFMI was recommended to the task manager by the regional coordinator in WBI. According to the task manager in charge of the course, the input of the partner institution was significant. MEFMI participated in the design of the course, assumed part of the cost, selected participants, identified some presenters (hired by WBIEP), and conducted their own evaluation. In FY98 the course on Economic Growth focused solely on macroeconomic aspects. In FY99 the course was revised to include a poverty reduction orientation. This latter aspect did not interest MEFMI, which was therefore not a candidate for offering the course again in FY99. MEFMI and the African Economic Research Consortium (AERC) were the two partners of WBIEP for the course on Macroeconomic Management that was held in Nairobi in April, 1998. WBI was solely responsible for the design of the course. MEFMI and AERC participated in the selection of participants and MEFMI funded some participants. Out of the fourteen speakers, twelve were World Bank staff, professors from American universities, or individuals from other developed countries. One speaker was a member of AERC, and one speaker was a professor from Bogazici university. |

4. **The scope of the evaluation**

In FY99, WBIEP had a portfolio of five core courses which were all included within the partnership program:
- New Issues in Economic Growth. A “poverty reduction” dimension was introduced into that core course in FY99;
- Macroeconomic Management: New Methods and Current Policy;
- Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations and Local Finance Management;
- Capital Flow Volatility in a Volatile Financial Environment; and
- Global Integration and the New Trade Agenda.

In FY98, the partnerships program had established links with two WBIGF courses (Budgeting Processes and Public Expenditure Management, and Building Knowledge and Expertise in Infrastructure Finance) and one WBIHD course (Social Security and Pension Reform). These three courses are not addressed in this evaluation, which was made at the request of the WBIEP manager.
It was decided that the evaluation questions would focus on **program implementation** in relation to the program’s underlying **logic model**, i.e. the assumptions upon which the program was based. This evaluation methodology is essential for obtaining information about the future opportunities of the program. The purpose of this analysis is to uncover causal processes to understand why the partnership did or did not work. The more sound the assumptions on which the program is based, the greater the chance that the program will be effective.

It was decided that the evaluation would not have a strong focus on **cost-benefit** aspects of the program for WBI. The reasons are twofold:

- The program is too young. To date, there is no certainty as to the number of partnerships the program will nurture. Comparing the savings for WBI of the current delivery of regional courses by present partner institutions to the cost of the training of trainers would be unfair; the design of a course by a partner institution usually takes time and some partnerships initiated in FY98 may only become a reality in FY2000. Furthermore, considering the partner institutions on the waiting list, and assuming that they will all deliver a course, is too optimistic. The comparison of the partnerships established during FY99 (seven) with the expected number indicated in the program brief (eighteen) shows that it is not possible to predict how many courses will actually be delivered in a near future.

- It is not easy to define with precision the financial contours of the partnership program. The partnership program builds on core courses and other related activities whose costs would have to be taken into consideration by the evaluation team. This was not feasible with the financial accounting system in place in WBI during FY98 and FY99.

The evaluation did, however, address the issue of **cost sharing** between WBI and partner institutions for the delivery of the core courses.

### 5. The evaluation questions

The evaluation has addressed three major questions:

1. On what assumptions is the program based? Put differently, why is it assumed that the program activities will help to develop a worldwide network of partners for the delivery of WBIEP core courses, and why is it believed that this network will bring the benefits expected by WBI and its partners?

2. In FY98, how was the first phase of the program, the training of trainers, implemented? How did the implementation differ from the theoretical model?
3. How was the second phase of the program, the transfer of core courses to partner institutions, implemented in FY99, and how did that implementation differ from the theoretical model?

The evaluation matrix details the more specific sub-questions addressed by this study. It is presented in Appendix I.

6. Methodology

The evaluation first reconstructed the logic model of the partnership program. The logic model is a presentation of the logical assumptions and relations among four components of the program as they are described in official documents: the program activities, the type and level of services delivered and the client served, the direct changes in clients as a result of their participation in the program, and the desired results. The first step for the evaluation team was to construct a diagram presenting the flow of the different activities of the partnership program to illustrate how these were expected to induce desired outcomes, considering the assumed (social and behavioral) premises or mechanisms that lie behind them. Data collection centered on how the program activities were implemented, how they were perceived by partners and what intermediate results they generated. The analysis then compared the implementation of the program with the logic model, identified regularities and discrepancies, and suggested recommendations for implementation improvement as well as program redesign.

Evaluation data were gathered through four methods:

- Semi-structured interviews of key informants, such as the program manager, task managers responsible for the delivery of the courses, members of partner institutions, speakers, course participants and other beneficiaries of the program activities.
- A review of the projects documents, back to office reports, and end of seminar evaluations.
- A questionnaire sent to all participants registered in the program database as trainers trained during FY98. The main object of the questionnaire was to measure how participants had used the information they had gathered and the skills they had developed at the training event. One hundred thirty-eight questionnaires were sent and seventy-seven were returned; the response rate for the survey is therefore 55.8%. The questionnaire was organized in two parts. The first part of the questionnaire focused on gathering background information and having participants assess the quality of the training. The second part collected information about the use trainers had made of the seminars which they attended.
• A case study of four of the seven partnerships for the delivery of courses that were created during FY99. For comparison purposes, information was also gathered about all the regional events that were held during FY99, but had not graduated to full partnerships.

The evaluation methodology has not distinguished among the countries in which the programs were offered, nor among the five core courses.
II
The program’s underlying logic

The objective of this analysis will be to reconstruct the assumptions (premises) that are embedded in the partnership program. These premises will then be confronted in the following chapters with evidence gathered during the first cycle of the project implementation, to test the validity of the assumptions and identify weak causal links between activities and results.

The reconstruction will be presented in two parts. The first set of assumptions addresses the rationale that the sequence of activities proposed by the program (training trainers, consequently selecting among the high quality partner institutions, and jointly delivering WBI core courses in the regions) is an effective way to build sustainable partnerships for the delivery of core courses. This analysis highlights the assumptions of the causal mechanisms underlying the functioning of the partnership itself. It provides an understanding of the potential of the program and also provides a diagnosis of the potential problems for future program improvement. The purpose of this analysis is to uncover the causal processes to understand why the partnership did or did not work.

The second set of assumptions focuses more generally on the WBI partnership rationale for the delivery of core courses and the hypothesis that the delivery of a core course in partnership allows for the benefits WBI expects: the maximization of cross-fertilization of experiences and program successes, the combination of strengths of different institutions, the more efficient use of resources, and the exposure of WBI core courses to a wider audience.

This reconstruction builds upon the analysis of WBI official documentation and individual interviews with current WBI task managers.
1. From training trainers to partnering. The assumptions behind the sequence of program activities

The participation of selected participants for WBI core courses is the starting point of the establishment of a partnership for a regional delivery of the course. The partnership is then built through the joint delivery of the first core course. The assumptions (premises) underlying the idea that the successive delivery of these two phases is an effective tool for building a partnership are the following:

**The training of trainers’ strategy**

Two hypotheses relate to the selection of participants:

Premise A1: *Phase One course participants should be trainers.* The role of WBI should be to wholesale training activities. Therefore, trainers should be the main targets in Phase One course delivery, as they are most likely to disseminate the content of the WBI course.

Premise A2. *Reaching out to high quality training institutions worldwide.* WBI aims at establishing as many new contacts, with strong institutions, throughout the world as possible, to create a database of potential partners.

Two assumptions concern the impact of training trainers:

Premise A3. *Capacity building of trainers.* It is assumed that the core courses will increase the capacity of training institutions by upgrading the skills of trainers by providing them with cutting-edge information. The program makes the assumption that technical skills are what selected trainers need.

Premise A4. *Multiplying impact through dissemination.* Trainers will use new state-of-the-art materials to build courses and curricula. Training trainers will therefore enable WBI to reach larger audiences and to have a greater impact on the ground.

**WBIEP partnership building strategy**

Premise B1.*Quality assurance.* It is assumed by the program that prior training of trainers is a necessary step for the delivery of a core course by a partner institution. More specifically, a limiting factor to quality is the trainers’ technical knowledge.

Premise B2: *Training instrumental to partnership.* Training trainers will ensure that presenters from potential partner institutions will have sufficient knowledge
to deliver the course. It will also enable task managers to screen the most
interesting individuals from the lot of trainees, and provide a face to face
relationship that will foster the development of the partnership.

Premise B3. Informing training institutions of partnering possibilities. Trainers
participating in a core course are informed about the opportunity to deliver an
adapted version of the WBI core course in-house. It is assumed that trainers are a
good point of entry in the institution for the delivery of a core course.

Premise B4. The partnership program serves as an essential clearinghouse of the
proposals sent by partner institutions. It is assumed that some training
institutions, informed of the program by their trainers, formulate a proposal for
the joint-delivery of a WBI core course, and submit it to the partnership program.

Premise B5. Number of partner institutions. “The project should focus on a small
number of institutions worldwide (i.e. 2 in MENA, 2 in ECA, 2 in Africa, 2 in
SEA, 3 in LAC, and 1 in SA) to maximize the overall impact. Increasing the
number of partner institutions should be gradual and based on experience, best
practice, demand requests to enter new markets or new products reaching larger
audiences. This gradual process ensures that the project is manageable, cost
effective while maintaining quality control and allowing for competition.”

Premise B6. Selection of training partner institutions. Once WBIEP has received
the institutions’ proposals for joint delivery of core courses, WBIEP singles out
the training institutions which best suit its educational, organizational, and
financial requirements. The selection builds upon the following criteria:
• faculty;
• facilities (especially, distance education facilities);
• managerial internal capacity;
• financial stability;
• curriculum; and
• regional exposure.

---

2 See WBI, “Selection of Training Institutions in Developing Countries to Form Partnerships”
Premise B7. Collaboration on the educational and organizational aspects of the training. Once a common understanding has been reached, the partners begin to collaborate for the actual organization and implementation of the joint program. Consultation develops specifically on the following issues:

i. budget;
ii. type of course;
iii. content of course;
iv. training materials;
v. presenters;
vi. participants;
vii. quality assurance mechanisms;
viii. evaluation; and
ix. logistics.

Premise B8. Joint delivery of the course. The actual delivery of the course takes place on-site within the partner institution’s facilities, with the contribution of local presenters and regional case studies.

Premise B9. Methods of Teaching: Traditional vs. Distance Education. “A mix of both traditional education, where the trainer is present in the classroom, and distance education is ideal. However, the criteria for selection of institutions should not exclude those without infrastructure for distance education but value the ones that provide these kinds of facilities.”

2. Why deliver courses with partner institutions?

The following set of assumptions focuses on the rationale that the delivery of core courses in partnership allows for all the benefits WBIEP expects for itself and for the partner institution: the maximization of cross-fertilization of experiences and program successes, the combination of strengths of different institutions, the more efficient use of resources, and the exposure of WBIEP core courses to a wider audience. The premises underlying this idea are the following:

Premise C1. Co-organization for Comparative Advantage. It is assumed that each partner contributes to the delivery of the course, in the area for which it has a comparative advantage. The process is bi-directional and iterative. WBIEP remains responsible for the overall quality of the course; the comparative advantages of the partner institutions are believed to be with the selection of local

---

3 See WBI, “Selection of Training Institutions in Developing Countries to Form Partnerships” internal document, FY98, page 4.
participants and speakers, the adaptation of the course to regional conditions, the provision of infrastructure, the logistics, and the obtainment of presenters at competitive prices.

Premise C2. Mutual Intellectual Contributions for the delivery of the course. It is assumed that WBI should provide all the *state-of-the-art* course materials, whereas the partner institutions should integrate and adapt them with local and regional case studies, articles, and the presentations of the local trainers and speakers.

Premise C3. Mutual Exchange of Knowledge between institutions. Working in partnership for the delivery of core courses is expected to bring new knowledge into the Bank and provide opportunities for clients to learn from each other’s best practices.

Premise C4. Cost-sharing/Cost-recovery. “WBI, where appropriate should emphasize cost recovery as a practical market for programs to increase participant ownership of the program and for revenue enhancement. WBI’s partner should be committed to the partnership by pledging its own resources (funds, time, expertise, existing knowledge products and services) and through mutual commitments of resources and mutually agreed programs of activity. Pricing and charging fees to joint programs has the beneficiary effect of identifying what is being demanded by the final consumer. These revenues could help WBIEP subsidize more needed institution in poorer regions such as Africa and Central Asia.”

Premise C5. Potential for follow-up. Other activities may be organized and shared together with the partners in the coming years. “The potential success and sustainability of the partnership program arrangement will be greater if the demand side for training is actively engaged and linked with supply side: the needs of clients should be the starting point for getting training providers involved. Finally, the programs being demand driven will ensure continuity in the coming years.”

---

4 See WBI, “Selection of Training Institutions in Developing Countries to Form Partnerships” internal document, FY98, page 3.

5 ibidem, page 3.
III
Empirical evidence from Phase One: training of trainers

FY98 marked the first round of the training of trainers, with a view to building partnerships for the joint delivery of a core course. We will first consider how the program was implemented and the adjustments that had to be made to the operational mode presented in the first chapter of this report. We will then consider how the implemented program matched against the assumptions (premises) identified above.

1. The selection of institutions and participants

As a reminder, the two assumptions related to the selection of participants for Phase One were that the partnership program was to select trainers, and use the selection process to reach out to high quality training institutions worldwide.

The selection criteria

The selection process that had been originally presented in the project document was modified and simplified. In practice, task managers and the program manager said they applied the following selection criteria.

Trainers selected had to present the following characteristics:
- more than a master’s level, preferably a doctorate level; and
- affiliation with promising institutions (good trainers belonging to unsuitable institutions were not selected)

Training institution partners had to present the following characteristics:
- financial soundness;
- good faculty;
- regional exposure; and
- very good infrastructure, preferably distance learning.

According to the program manager, the selection process was conducted through peer review (task managers, project manager, division manager). However there is no written record of the selection process nor the grounds on which decisions were taken. Therefore, there exists no documentation concerning decision making
by which we can judge what respective weight was assigned to the above criteria for the selection of participants.

The nominating process

The evaluation team was not able to fully reconstruct the nominating procedure and check how many institutions had been contacted by WBIEP. The database of the partnership program shows that 100 institutions nominated 313 trainers to attend one of the five core courses WBIEP selected for the partnership program.

Chart 3 presents the geographical distribution of nominating institutions across the six regions defined by the World Bank. We can see that institutions belonging to the Mediterranean and North Africa (MENA) region represent 34% of the total, the Africa (AFR) region and the Latin America and Caribbean (LAC) region each account for 21% of the nominating institutions, Europe and Central Asia (ECA) account for 15%, and the South Asia region (SAS) and the Eastern Asia and Pacific region (EAP) are the least represented (around 5% each).
The selection pressure

141 participants belonging to 60 institutions were finally invited. Chart 4 represents the division of participants across the six regions of Bank Operations. We can see that the LAC and the Africa regions are the most represented (they account for 32% and 23% of the participants respectively), MENA and ECA come next (18% and 15% of participants), and the SAS and the EAP regions are the least represented (6% of participants).

Chart 4
Regional Distribution of Participants

The selection pressure on participants (number of nominated candidates excluded, divided by the total of nominated candidates) varies across the regions, the countries and the institutions, thereby suggesting an active role of WBI in selecting desirable candidates.

To illustrate this point, let us consider the Africa region. For this region, the selection pressure on participants was highest with only 31% of the nominated participants finally retained (average 55%). WBI invited 32 trainers from 13 African countries, but 60% of these participants came from only three countries: Zimbabwe (nine participants), Ethiopia (six participants), and Senegal (four participants). Furthermore, three institutions account for more than half of the candidates finally selected: the Economic Commission for Africa (Economic
Commission for Africa, seven participants), the Zimbabwe Institute of Public Administration and Management (ZIPAM, seven participants) and the Banque Centrale des Etats d’Afrique de l’Ouest (BCEAO, four participants).

This emphasis placed on a few countries and a few institutions is observable also for the EAP, SAS, ECA and LAC regions. The exception was the MENA region, where there was a strong collaboration with the Palestinian Authority (half of the 25 participants), with no particular focus on specific institutions by WBI. The reader will find additional details on the selection process across regions in appendix II of this report.

**An emphasis placed on a few countries and institutions**

The analysis of the data demonstrates that WBI focused narrowly on *nine countries* (out of 40), which were able to send six participants or more, while the average number of participants per country was 3.5 (see Chart 5). These nine countries together account for 55% (78) of the participants registered in WBI courses. They are:

- Zimbabwe and Ethiopia (AFR region);
- the Czech Republic (ECA region);
- Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela and Mexico (LAC region); and
- the Palestinian authority and Egypt (MENA region).

**Chart 5**

*Geographical Distribution of Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 other countries</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total participants = 47
Likewise the selection process resulted in an emphasis placed on 14 favorite institutions (out of 60), which were able to send more than four participants to a WBI core course, when the average per institution was 2.3 (see Chart 6). Together, these 14 institutions account for 55% (78) of the people trained in FY98. As we can see in the following list, all 14 institutions favored by WBI were either universities, regional institutions, or research institutes. They are:

- **For the Africa region:** the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), the Zimbabwe Institute of Public Administration and Management (ZIPAM) and the Banque Centrale des Etats d’Afrique de l’Ouest (BCEAO);
- **For the EAP region:** the Philippines Institutes for Development Studies;
- **For the ECA region:** the Czech Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education, and the Taschkent State economic university (Uzbekistan);
- **For the LAC region:** the Universidade autonoma de Guadalajara (Mexico), the Universidad de los Andes (Colombia), the Fedesarollo (Colombia), the University of Sao Paolo (USP, Brazil), the University of the West Indies (Barbados), the Institute of Advanced Studies in Administration (IESA, Venezuela);
- **For the MENA region:** the An-Najah National University (Palestinian Authority); and
- **For the SAS region:** the Lahore University of Management Science (Pakistan).

**Institutional origin of participants**

Universities and research institutes make up the bulk of the institutions which sent participants to the core courses in FY98 (40% and 28% of the trainees, respectively). However management schools (8% of participants), governments (14%), intergovernmental organizations (7%) and the private sector (3%) were also represented.

**Trainers vs. non-trainers**

A questionnaire was sent to all FY98 participants registered in the partnership program database. The response rate was 55.8%. One question addressed the participants’ current role in their organization. Forty six percent of respondents described themselves as trainers or professors, 20% answered that they were researchers, 27% were working as directors or at another management position, and 7% were private sector or development specialists. Less than fifty percent of respondents classified themselves as the category targeted by the program. Of course participants from categories other than trainers or professors may also
occasionally deliver courses, but we have no measure of the extent to which they
do.

Another question addressed the motivation of participants in attending the
courses. Interviewees were asked to answer the last part of the questionnaire
concerning their use of the course only if they had attended it with the view to
enhance their training skills. Out of the 77 respondents to the questionnaire, 62
(80%) participants answered the second part and 15 (20%) did not answer it,
which suggests that 80% of participants to the core courses were interested in
enhancing their training skills (note that this does not necessarily translate into an
intention to use these skills in teaching).

In conclusion, although 80% of respondents had attended the workshops to
enhance their training skills, only 46% percent of respondents described
themselves as trainers or professors.

**Conclusions for the phase of selection**

Premise A: *participants to Phase One courses should be trainers.* Less than 50% of
the participants listed for the partnership program in FY98 described
themselves as trainers or professors. An additional 30% of the participants were
interested in enhancing their training skills and a proportion may be occasional
trainers, while 20% of the participants did not attend WBIEP core courses to
enhance their training skills. We may therefore conclude that in FY98 the
targeting of the program on trainers was incomplete.

Premise A2. *Reaching out to good quality training institutions worldwide, so as
to create a database of potential partners.* Evidence for the first year of the
program implementation shows the following results:

- WBI established a large basis for selection. More than 100 institutions were
  contacted during the first year of the program’s activities; their names,
  addresses, phone numbers, fax numbers and names of references/contact
  persons were entered into a database.

- The procedures for the selection of institutions set in the program document
  were modified. Although all stakeholders of WBIEP seem to have agreed on
  the set of criteria that a perfect partner should meet, no record was made on
  the operational selection mode. There is therefore no documented evidence by
  which we can judge what respective weight was assigned to each criterion
  identified as desirable for the selection of participants.
• The selection process resulted in an emphasis on a few institutions. This is consistent with WBI’s determination to select the most promising candidates for the partnership program in terms of institutional capacity, regional exposure and financial stability. Most of the institutions selected by WBI were universities and research institutes, which conforms to WBI’s intention to select knowledge institutions. There was no reference to desirable criteria for country selection in the project document, nor did the task managers or program manager mention any. We cannot be clear whether the emphasis placed by WBI in FY98 on nine countries was due to chance or the result of an implicit strategy.

2. The outcomes of the training

The outcomes of the training of trainers phase of the program relied on three hypotheses: one was that the level of knowledge of participants would be increased, the second was that the participants would disseminate the new knowledge they had acquired in delivering training sessions, and the third was that the identification of qualified trainers by task managers would foster the development of the partnership.

The data for this section of the analysis have been gathered with a tracer questionnaire (see Appendix III) sent to all participants in FY98 courses.

As we have seen above, a significant proportion of the participants to the core courses selected for the delivery of the partnership program did not describe themselves as trainers or professors. We have therefore distinguished, where feasible, between the impact of the training for the populations of trainers and non trainers. The two groups have comparable sizes (thirty three trainers and forty non trainers, there were three non respondents).

Did the core courses in FY98 increase participants’ technical knowledge?

As there was no level II evaluation conducted at the end of the core courses to measure the participants’ increase in knowledge, it was not possible to determine the actual learning impact of the training sessions.

Did participants state that the training in FY98 was useful to them or to their organization?

The questionnaire sent to all participants in the FY98 courses gathered information about whether they believed that they had learned from the training,
An Evaluation of the WBIEP Partnership Program

and to what extent they considered it a useful experience for themselves and for their organizations.

A worthwhile personal and professional experience was reported, but some participants, especially trainers, have doubts about the worth of the training for their work or their organization.

A five point scale, ranging from 1=minimum to 5=maximum was used for answering questions regarding the usefulness of the training. The results are summarized on Charts 7 to 9, and detailed in Appendix IV. We have distinguished between the results for the entire population of 77 respondents, the trainer sub-set, and the non trainer sub-set.

Overall, the participants felt that the seminar was a worthwhile experience for them personally and professionally. The proportion of respondents giving high ratings (% of 4 and 5) was 83% and 81% respectively, slightly below the WBI benchmark of 85%.

Results from two indicators suggest that participant interest in the courses was more theoretical than practical. One indicator was the practical contribution of the seminars to the understanding of policy options (Chart 7), and the other was the relevance of the seminars to the participants’ functions (Chart 8). These two items are a measure of how well the seminars are adapted to participants’ needs. The proportion of respondents giving a rating of 4 or 5, 63% and 67.6% respectively, were markedly below the benchmark for WBI (85%).

In general, respondents felt that the seminar they attended was less worthwhile from their organizational perspective than it was from a personal point of view (see Chart 9). For this item, the proportion of dissatisfied participants (participants giving a rating of 1 or 2) is 14%. This can be problematic, as a financial contribution was requested from the organizations.
Chart 7
To what extent did the seminar strengthen participants’ understanding of policy issues? (1=minimum; 5=maximum)

Chart 8
Relevance of the seminar to participants’ work (1=minimum; 5=maximum)
Participants who do not describe themselves as trainers or professors were more satisfied by the core courses. Non-trainers gave high grades to the training for personal and professional satisfaction (more than 85% of them gave a mark of 4 or 5 to these two questions). The non-trainer subgroup gave the highest scores to the questions related to the relevance of the training to their work (73% marked 4 or 5), the usefulness of the training for their organization (76% marked 4 or 5) and the strengthening of their understanding of policy issues (75% marked 4 or 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% ratings 1 or 2</th>
<th>% ratings 4 or 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All participants</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainers</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-trainers</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for the subset of trainers are more problematic. Trainers reported that the training was a positive personal and professional experience. But 15% of them gave a low rate of 1 or 2 to the question relating to their understanding of policy issues. Trainers gave lower ratings than non-trainers for the relevance of the training to their work (60% rating 4 or 5). And almost 19% of the trainers had serious doubts (ratings of 1 or 2) about the usefulness of the training for their organization (see chart 9 above).
Participants, especially non-trainers, felt that the seminars could be improved by increasing the quality of the case studies and putting less emphasis on academic aspects. The management of participant diversity was another issue.

When asked in an open-ended question to identify what aspect of the seminar proved most useful to them, about half (44%) of the respondents identified one or several course topics. Three other items were mentioned by about 13% of the participants: Networking with colleagues, following the latest developments in the field, and the mix of empirical and theoretical background.

Conversely, when asked to identify what aspect of the seminar had proven least useful, about half (43%) of the respondents identified one or several specific presentations. Twenty three percent of the respondents said they could not identify any problems. The poor quality of case studies was the third ranking answer (identified by 12% of the respondents).

Thoughtful data were obtained when participants were asked in an open-ended question to give advice as how to improve future seminars (see Table 1, and details in Appendix V). Almost all (90%) respondents to the questionnaire answered this question. A third (32%) of the respondents requested an improvement in case studies. Another third of the participants (30%) wanted the courses to be less academic, and six percent wanted higher level presentations. Twenty one percent of the respondents referred to the selection of participants: the advice was either to make more homogeneous groups, or to make a better use of the existing diversity of participants during discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Participants’ advice for future improvements*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have more country specific case studies.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course should be less academic, more policy oriented or practical.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either have a more homogenous audience or draw upon diversity of participants.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve agenda design, extend the duration of the course or have a less crowded agenda (time constraints to assimilate the course content). Have more time out for visits or purchase books.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have better presenters.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have more high level specialized presentations.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide reading material in advance.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*66 respondents to this question, some offered multiple answers.
There were differences between trainers and non-trainers concerning the recommendations. Non-trainers requested more case studies than trainers; this was especially true for participants from a management position (40% of them requested an improvement in this aspect) and participants from the private sector (80% of them). Non-trainers were also more likely to request less academic courses (100% of members from the private sector made this request), although this item also concerns 27% of the trainers. These results illustrate the difficulty of trying to satisfy an heterogeneous audience when delivering a core course.

**Knowledge Dissemination**

Participants were asked a series of questions about the use they had made of the learning, or materials they gathered in FY98 as part as their training experience. The tracer questionnaire was sent to participants in April 1999 and the study was completed in June 1999, more than a year after the last training event in FY98. We will assume hereafter that if participants did not use the information or material within a year, they were unlikely to do so later.

Respondents were asked to answer the part of the questionnaire concerning their use of the workshop only if they had attended the conference with the desire to enhance their training skills.

Out of the 77 respondents to the questionnaire, 62 (80%) participants answered the second part, and 15 (20%) did not.

Chart 10 depicts the results of the use of training by the 62 participants which chose to answer the second part of the questionnaire—they will be referred to as the “instructors” in this analysis. More details are presented in Appendix VI.

Globally, 46 (75%, N=62) of the instructors who attended one of the courses reported that they used the core courses to prepare training activities. The contribution of the core courses most appreciated by participants was the access to unpublished articles, up to date material, and new bibliographies (cited five times).
Twenty nine (49%, N=62) of the instructors thought that the training enhanced their capacity to prepare case studies, and 35 (60%, N=62) felt that the training enhanced their capacity to deliver more effective presentations. Concerning the latter, participants reported that they were inspired by the structure of the core courses (four cases) and the use of visual aids and technology in training (seven cases).

Forty three (70%, N=62) instructors used the material for research, which is comparable to the number who used it in teaching (40 persons, 65% of the 62 respondents).

Nineteen (31%, N=62) instructors used the material gained during the seminar for consulting.

Seven (11%, N=62) instructors reported that they had not used the knowledge material since the seminar, because it was too theoretical, or not adapted to their situation.
Conclusions concerning the outcomes of the training

Premise A3. capacity building of trainers. As there was no level II evaluation made at the end of the core courses to measure the participants’ increase in knowledge, it was not possible to measure the actual learning impact of the training sessions.

Overall, participants reported that the training had been a worthwhile professional experience. Still 19% of trainers had doubts about the usefulness of their training for their organizations.

Networking with colleagues, following the latest developments in the field, and the mix of empirical and theoretical background were the top three areas of perceived usefulness. Participants considered that the seminars could be improved by increasing the quality of the case studies and placing less emphasis on academic aspects.

The management of participant diversity was another issue mentioned by respondents. The non-trainer audience would have preferred a more practical version of the core courses, with more country specific case studies and more interaction between participants. On these two aspects, local institutions tend to have a natural comparative advantage over WBI. This is an argument in support of WBI policy to choose a local institution when it comes to delivering the message of the core course to a non academic audience.

Premise A4. Multiplying impact: 75% of the participants who had attended the core courses with the desire to enhance their training activities reported that they have used the material or information provided. The proportion of participants who used the training material for research (70%) was comparable or greater than the number who used it for training activities (60%). This can be explained by the fact that an important proportion of people attended the course to improve their research skills, as well as their teaching skills. It can also be explained by the fact that the courses were of a high level and theoretical (see participants’ remarks above).
IV

Empirical evidence from Phase Two: The building of the partnership

The first section of this chapter will address the selection of partner institutions. A comparison will be made between joint deliveries of WBI core courses and other regional events. The second part of this chapter will present the case study results of four partnerships initiated in FY99.

1. The selection of partner institutions

The application process

Task managers report that during the training sessions in FY98, participants were presented with the partnership program, and were invited to encourage their institutions to build a partnership with WBI for the delivery of the core course. The first step of this partnership was to be the design by a partner institution of a proposal for the delivery of the course. This proposal was then to be reviewed by WBI for its quality. If the proposal was accepted, a formal agreement was to be established between WBI and the partners institution for the delivery of the course.

Between July 1998 and April 1999, 50 proposals for the delivery of a core courses were received by the partnership program, originating from 28 institutions. With the exception of the course on “Capital Flows” (which received only five proposals), the number of proposals was distributed equally across WBIEP core courses: macroeconomic management (13 proposals), economic growth (13 proposals), fiscal relations (9 proposals), and trade (10 proposals).

During FY99, 26 of the 50 proposals for the delivery of a course originated from institutions from the LAC region. Eleven out of the 15 LAC institutions invited by WBI during Phase One of the program sent proposals. This is a measure of the region’s interest in the WBI partnership program. By contrast, only four out of the 12 institutions invited from the Africa region sent proposals.

Six countries presented four proposals or more (see Appendix IX): Mexico, Barbados, Venezuela, Brazil, China and Palestine. Together these six countries
make up 62% of the total number of proposals received by the partnership program.

It is worth noting that in FY99, two institutions, the Municipal Development Program in Zimbabwe, and the University of Bogazici in Turkey delivered a course jointly with WBIEP without writing a formal proposal through the partnership program.

**The selection criteria: How partner institutions differ from other institutions delivering courses**

Once the proposals were received from applicant partner institutions, WBI started to sort out the candidates which best suited WBI educational, organizational, and financial requirements. A first and important factor was the quality of the proposal itself. The selection also considered the quality of the applicant partner.

The criteria for quality were:
- *strength of faculty*: to what extent the institution adapted the course to local conditions, and percentage of presentations made by local speakers;
- *facilities*: presence/absence of a conference room, a dormitory, and a videoconference room in working conditions;
- *financial stability*: whether the institution contributed financially to the delivery of the course; and
- *regional exposure*: whether the institution identified some of the participants.

In FY99, 13 regional courses were offered, seven of which were considered joint deliveries for the purposes of the partnership program. Six of the core course offerings were held in Washington. By comparison, in FY98 five core courses were held in Washington and only two in a client country. Thus, it is worth noting that there was a considerable increase in regional offerings during FY99 due to the decentralization of the courses operated by task managers and the partnership option, that is, joint-courses in partnership with local training institutions.

We have tried to compare the partner institutions and the other regional non-partner training institutions, hereafter the “regional institutions,” according to the four above mentioned criteria. This was done by interviewing the six task managers responsible for the delivery of WBIEP core courses. They were asked to rate the institutions with which they had worked for the thirteen regional events against the indicators previously identified. The results are summarized as follows (for a more detailed analysis, Appendix VII):
**Strength of faculty:** Task managers were asked to rate the adaptation of the course to local conditions on a scale from 1=minimum to 5 =maximum. This scale was modified by task managers who replaced ratings 2 and 3 with 2.5 and 3.5 respectively. A qualitative analysis of the results show us that five out of the seven partner institutions, and two out of the five regional institutions are rated 4 or higher. The two lowest ratings (2.5) are obtained by two regional institutions. Partner institutions also have a stronger contribution of presentations made by local speakers. All partner institutions provided local speakers to deliver presentations. In four instances local speakers presented more than 50% of the modules, while only one regional institution had similar input in the course.

**Facilities:** The conference room is the most common facility provided by both regional institutions and partner institutions. Partner institutions were better equipped in dormitories and video-conference rooms.

**Cost sharing agreements:** Four partner institutions out of seven, and one regional institution out of six funded local participants. Four partner institutions and one regional institution recovered fees from participants. Two partner institutions, and no regional institutions, were paid by WBI for the organization of the course.

**Regional exposure:** There is not much difference between partner institutions and regional institutions on this respect. Five of the seven partner institutions and four of the six regional institutions identified more than 50% of the participants.

Overall, task managers seem to have a positive appreciation for the quality of the partner institutions they selected, especially concerning facilities and faculty. However, the selection process was complex as none of the four above mentioned criteria seems to have played a determinant role. For instance, USP was selected as a partner, but was rated just above average in the adaptation of the course; MDP in Harare was selected as a partner, but did not offer any facility; Bogazici did not identify any participants. Likewise, the financial commitment of the partner institution was not always required; WBI paid IESA and Bogazici for the delivery of the course.

**2. The joint-delivery of WBI courses**

By the end of FY99, seven core courses were jointly delivered by WBI and partner institutions\(^6\), four of which were held in the LAC region. The results for

---

\(^6\) Three courses on intergovernmental fiscal relations and local financial management (in collaboration with the Municipal Development Program in Zimbabwe, the Institute of Advanced Studies in Administration in Venezuela, and the School of Public Finance in Brazil); one course in macroeconomic management (in collaboration with the University of Sao Paolo in Brazil); two
the following part of the report are based on the case study analysis of four partnerships:

- the University of Bogazici (Turkey) for the delivery of a course on economic growth and poverty reduction;
- the University of Sao Paolo (USP, Brazil) for the delivery of a course on macroeconomic management;
- the School of Public Finance (ESAF) in Brasilia (Brazil) for the delivery of a course in intergovernmental fiscal relations; and
- the Municipal Development Program (MDP) in Harare (Zimbabwe) for the delivery of a course on intergovernmental fiscal relations.

A table summarizing the main findings concerning these partnerships is presented in Appendix VIII.

The rationale for the partnerships

In the four cases analyzed here, the rationale for a partnership, for the delivery of a course, between partner institutions and WBI varied widely.

The topics selected for the courses in both ESAF and USP—fiscal federalism and macroeconomic management, respectively—were strongly influenced by WBI task managers and local organizers, and were driven by Brazilian political, economic, and development concerns.

In the case of Turkey, WBI was driven by organizational concerns in partnering with Bogazici University. Turkey enjoys a strategic geographical position—it lies in Europe, but close to the Middle East and Central Asia, and is therefore a logical center of WBI training events for participants from Central Asia. Central Asian participants and the course topic (economic growth) were chosen by WBI alone.

Because MDP is a program on decentralization with a broad grasp of the African context, it is a very specialized partner which can offer courses only on a very limited range of topics. The core course organized in FY98 was a means to systematize the diverse and sometimes scattered empirical practices MDP had gathered in the South Africa region. The joint course would also allow WBI to
draw on the program’s network of contacts in the development community in order to reach a wider audience.

Brazilian professors and members of Bogazici university argued that partnerships beyond those for training could be organized. They envisaged regular collaboration on specific scientific exchanges and joint research projects.

**Was the training of trainers instrumental to building partnerships?**

*In two instances (Bogazici and MDP), the partner institution did not require prior training of its trainers in order to deliver the core course.* Contact between the task managers and the partner institution was established through other means: In the case of Bogazici, the director of the department which organized the course was a former Bank employee. In the case of the MDP, which had been supported by the Bank since 1991, the partnership was initiated through the long established relationship between the Director of MDP and the task manager in charge of the course on fiscal decentralization. In these two cases, the partnership was feasible because WBI task managers trusted the capacity of a counterpart in the partner institution to conduct a serious selection of speakers for the delivery of the core course.

In these two cases, the partner institution was willing to comply with WBI qualification procedures, even if training was not needed. For example MDP nominated and funded a professor from the university of Zimbabwe to participate in the intergovernmental fiscal relations course in FY98, although MDP did not see the need for such training. In the case of Bogazici, no presenter was trained in FY98. However some of the presenters of the core course on economic growth applied in FY99 for training in environmental economics issues. Their primary reported objective was networking with researchers from other countries and identifying common fields of study; gaining knowledge was not emphasized.

*In the two joint courses held in Brazil at ESAF in Brasilia and at USP/FIPE, respectively, the sequence of the two-phase program was followed.* The first phase provided trainers with state of the art materials and a conceptual framework which were largely utilized during the joint delivery of the course:

In particular, in the case of ESAF, the director of the school participated in the Joint Vienna Institute (JVI) seminar on fiscal interrelations in November 1997. Informed of the possibility of developing a partnership, and in collaboration with another Brazilian professor from USP (also invited to the same seminar), she submitted the partnership proposal to WBI.
In the case of USP/FIPE the department of economics is committed to a long-term policy of continuously upgrading its faculty and curricula. By the end of FY99, nine professors had participated in WBI core courses. The professor who participated in the seminar on macroeconomic management in February 1998 was assigned by the director of FIPE and the head of the department of economics to negotiate the joint delivery of the course with WBI. Several proposals for alternative courses were submitted, until August 1998, when WBI approved the joint delivery of the course on macroeconomic management.

In both Brazilian cases, the participation of the director of ESAF and the two professors of USP was instrumental to the organization of the joint-deliveries. First and foremost, the core courses held in Washington DC and at the JVI in Vienna provided a conceptual framework and state of the art materials which were largely utilized in the regional deliveries. This is considered the greatest value-added by WBI to the partnerships. Second, trainers who were interviewed considered their exposure to international audiences and presenters a very challenging experience. WBIEP task managers felt that the courses provided models of teaching that could be replicated on-site in order to maintain WBI’s level of quality.

The preparation of the joint courses

In the four case studies, the outline of the regional course was developed over a period that exceeded eight months. For example, the course delivered by MDP and WBI was being developed from April 1998 until its delivery in early December 1998. Likewise, trainers from USP attended the WBI core course in February 1998, and their proposal for the delivery of the course was approved in August. Budgeting the respective costs and revenues, choosing the speakers and the presentations, and setting up the logistics took a semester of work. The first delivery of the course was offered in January 1999. It will be interesting to monitor whether the time invested by WBI is reduced with the subsequent offerings of the course by the same partners.

In the cases of the Bogazici and MDP offerings, the person who negotiated with WBI for the outline of the course, the cost recovery issues and the selection of speakers was the director of the department (Bogazici), or the director of the program (MDP). Yet, the program documents do not identify department directors as targets of Phase One, nor as preferred points of entry for partner institution in the program.
Adaptation to local context and audience

The adaptation of the course to local or regional conditions was one of the key contributions WBI task managers expected from the partner institution. In three cases out of four the partner institution substantially contributed to adapt the WBI course to a local audience.

For example, MDP did not usually deliver academic training as would a university. The institution’s strength was in its knowledge of local needs for development, and its capacity to generate case studies covering local issues. The director reported that the preparation of the core course was a unique opportunity for MDP to reflect on its work, put together composite pieces of information scattered in various project documents, and tap into the expertise of WBI.

In Brazil, the outline of the two courses mainly built upon the WBI theoretical and organizational framework. However, in both cases, the partner institutions substantially adapted the content to Brazilian needs. For example, in the case of ESAF, the conceptual structure of the course was rethought according to suggestions that the ESAF director had proposed at the end of the JVI seminar. According to the ESAF director, improvements in and local adaptations of the course content were needed to appropriately address a Brazilian audience. The topic of the course was, in fact, highly relevant as fiscal federalism and decentralization were the top priorities on the Brazilian political agenda. Iterative discussions between ESAF organizers and the WBI task manager brought about the final version of the course program. In the case of USP as well, the topic of the course was of paramount importance in the wake of the economic and financial crises which affected Brazil in the fall of 1998. The content of the course rested on the WBI theoretical structure with the input of local empirical examples.

In the case of Bogazici, the task manager was disappointed with the lack of Central Asian case studies, as the participants came from Central Asia, and not from Turkey. This was clearly a handicap for Bogazici University, which was more exposed to European or national case studies. However all professors reported that the development of the core course for a first delivery had been time consuming and that they had to work within short deadlines. Now that this initial investment had been done, the course could easily be consolidated over the next years to introduce Central Asian case studies.

International vs. local speakers

Generally, the WBI task manager suggested and/or provided the international speakers, while the partner institution selected the local or regional speakers. This division was followed in the two joint courses held in Brazil. However, the
director of MDP reported that the selection of international speakers partially
drew on his personal network of resource persons he had met during his Ph.D. in
the Netherlands. His network, he said, was a value added to the seminar, because
it broadened WBI’s network of contacts, which centered on North American
academics.

_The percentage of presentations made by local or regional speakers was
significant:_ Local speakers from Bogazici university delivered 56% of the 40.5
hours of teaching. African presenters delivered 68% (N=13) of the 19 sessions in
the course with MDP.

The University of Bogazici used professors from its own faculty exclusively, and
did not require faculty from other local or regional institutions. Conversely the
MDP program lacked the academic resources for the delivery of the course and
relied heavily on the contribution of other professors from regional universities.
_The lesson is therefore that it is possible to compensate for a weaker faculty if the
person coordinating the delivery of the course is able to identify capable regional
speakers._

_Distance learning_ was identified by WBI as a means to have international
speakers present a training session in a cost-effective way. Three out of the
four partner institutions were equipped with distance learning facilities (the
exception was the MDP program). ESAF, however, could not be connected
outside of Brazil. In two cases (Bogazici and USP/FIPE) some sessions were
effectively delivered using videoconference facilities. MDP used the
videoconference facilities of the resident mission. In the case of ESAF, the
arrangement to use the videoconference facilities of an other institution did
not work out.

_Selection of participants_

_In three of the four case studies, the partner institution assisted WBI with the
selection of local and regional participants._ Bogazici was an exception, the
participants were identified and funded exclusively by WBI, and the university
had no role in the selection.

For the delivery of the course in Harare, MDP requested the ministries of finance
and the chambers of commerce in the Eastern and Southern Africa region to
nominate participants. The criteria for an acceptable candidate were set by MDP
and WBI managers. In some instances, the nominating institutions did not answer,
therefore the MDP manager directly selected candidates. Participants were funded
by WBI through MDP.
Being a governmental institution with decentralized offices throughout Brazil, ESAF chose participants primarily from among civil servants working at the federal and state levels. Invitations, therefore, were sent to all administration agencies which in turn selected the personnel to attend the two-week seminar. On WBI’s request, participants from Lusophone Africa and Uruguay were added as well. The whole process of participant selection was managed by ESAF 49 participants took the course.

USP widely advertised the course among financial institutions, central banks, and investment banks mostly in Brazil, but also in other Latin American countries (such as Ecuador, and Nicaragua). The agreement with WBI was that at least 40 participants had to take part in the course. WBI committed to securing half of them, in particular, twenty participants from the Inter American Development Bank. The rest had to be secured by USP directly. However, the twenty participants from Inter American Development Bank withdrew two weeks before the beginning of the course. At that point, USP and FIPE sought a remedy by aggressively marketing the course. Still, only seventeen participants attended the course.

**Cost sharing and cost recovery issues**

As mentioned in the introduction, this evaluation does not address the issue of the cost effectiveness of delivering a core course through a partner institution. WBI’s assumption remains that the cost of delivering a core course will fall as partner institutions bear increasing portions of the risk and cost of the common undertakings.

*Cost-sharing agreements varied:* In two instances (Bogazici and MDP) all expenses of the training were borne by WBI. In the case of Bogazici, WBI paid the speakers and funded all participants; while in the case of MDP, the program was reimbursed for its expenses by WBI. One partner institution (ESAF) agreed to share the cost of the delivery with WBI and to bear all organizational costs; WBI only provided the course materials and funded the honorarium of two international speakers. In the last case (USP/FIPE) the course was expected to generate profits for the partner institution. In three cases out of four (the exception being ESAF) a formal funding agreement was signed by the two partners for the delivery of the core course.

*The attitude of the partner institution towards cost-sharing or cost recovery was also variable:* In two instances (USP/FIPE and Bogazici), WBI’s partner was a semi private unit. The department of economics of USP created FIPE, organized as a foundation, to escape the bureaucracy of the very large public university. FIPE needs to market its training courses to collect resources for research and
education projects. The Center for Economics and Econometrics, in Bogazici university, follows the same rationale.

The Municipal Development Program did not need to generate revenues from the training activity as it is a development project which receives a three year budget funded by international donors (the World Bank, and the governments of Italy, Canada and the Netherlands).

ESAF is a government agency which receives federal allocations within the federal budget. ESAF has spending authority up to the ceiling fixed by the Brazilian government. Beyond that ceiling, expenses for school activities have to be out-sourced. Because of this financial structure, ESAF can share the cost of delivery with WBI only to a limited extent.

Cost recovery: In the cases of Bogazici and MDP, the course was free for participants. In the two Brazilian cases, tuition fees were collected. Tuition fees accounted for 20% of ESAF costs, the remaining 80% being the actual ESAF contribution to the joint course. In the second case, FIPE stated that tuition from participants covered 64% of its expenses and that the 36% was a net disbursement. It is worth noting that WBIEP contests FIPE figures. Auditing the cost items of the course is beyond this evaluation. It is suffice to note that WBI and the partner institution disagree about this matter.

The sharing of risks: The diversification of the sources of funds for the delivery of WBI core courses poses some risks to the partner institution that need to be addressed in the funding agreement. In two of our cases studied, events occurred that upset the presumed financial arrangements.

In the case of Bogazici, one of the course co-sponsors defaulted at the last minute. As WBI was the sole remaining contributor to the course, WBI bore the additional expenses alone, and the partner institution was not affected.

The case of USP/FIPE was more problematic. The sharing of the joint-course’s costs was precisely established in a formal agreement which both WBI and USP/FIPE signed. According to this document, USP/FIPE was to bear 60 percent of the total expenses, whereas WBI was to bear 40 percent. In particular, USP/FIPE was to bear organizational and logistical costs as well as speakers’ honorariums; WBI was to bear the cost for instructional materials for each participant. The revenues collected through tuition, once all expenses were covered, had to be shared according to the above mentioned percentages. The withdrawal of more than half of the anticipated participants (see paragraph on participants selection) resulted in a loss for both partners. Since the shares of contribution were to be 60 percent for USP and 40 percent for WBI, losses accrued differently for each partner. The agreement on the distribution of
financial burden was not easy to reach as USP refused several times to comply with WBI interpretation of the formal contract. USP claimed unfairness in the financial clauses; however, after an intense confrontation, USP accepted the conditions as formally agreed upon. This incident did not disrupt the partnership as FIPE agreed to prepare a course in FY2000.

Whether this instance signals a critical weakness in the budgeting process is of crucial relevance, as it has implications for sustainability. There is clearly a need for some guidelines concerning the sharing of losses between WBI and partner institutions.

**Evaluation of the joint-courses**

Two of the four core courses were evaluated at the end of the seminar. Participants’ satisfaction was at levels comparable to the core courses delivered in Washington. Ninety-six percent of the respondents to the end of course seminar in Bogazici gave a rating of 4 or 5 on a 5 point scale to the overall usefulness of the training. The same item (overall usefulness of the course) was rated 4 or 5 by 91% of the respondents to the course organized by USP. Both scores exceed WBI’s benchmark for the item (which is 85% of 4 or 5 ratings)

3. Conclusions concerning the partnerships

Premise B1: *Training of trainers as quality assurance*
Premise B2: *Training instrumental to partnership*

Two sets of local trainers, belonging to the University of Bogazici in Turkey and the Municipal development Program in Harare, were able to deliver a core course in FY99 without prior training. Although we cannot infer that these trainers would not have benefited from being exposed to WBI core courses, clearly the assumption that the training of trainers was necessary before the transfer of the course to a partner institution was not validated in these two cases.

In the two joint courses held in Brazil, at ESAF in Brasilia and USP/FIPE, respectively, the sequence of the two-phase program was followed. The first phase provided trainers with state of the art materials and a conceptual framework which were largely utilized during the joint delivery of the courses.

The evaluation team was not able to document whether the joint delivery had maintained, improved or diminished the quality of the WBI courses. It was not possible to formally compare the quality of the courses delivered with partner institutions to the quality of courses delivered by WBI alone, because of the lack of level II evaluations. Yet, in the four case studies participants interviewed gave
positive feedback of the course they had attended, and task managers reported positively on the partner institution’s capacity.

Premise B3: *Trainers are a good point of entry to inform training institutions of partnering possibilities.* In three of the four cases studied, the key agent for the development of the partnership was the director of the training institution or another actor with the power of leveraging organizational, financial and human resources. However, the program documents do not identify department directors as targets of Phase One, nor as a preferred points of entry for partner institutions in the program.

Premise B4. *The partnership program serves as an essential clearinghouse of the proposals sent by partner institutions.* In three cases out of four, there was a financial agreement for the delivery of the core course. However, Bogazici and MDP dealt directly with WBIEP task managers and did not approach the partnership program before the delivery of the core course.

In the Brazilian cases, the interest for partnering by both local institutions arose during the training of trainers phase, during which the trainers began to sketch possible options for events to host in their institutions. The proposal sent to WBI, therefore, was the formal outline of the potential joint course which resulted from the process of elaboration and exchange with WBI.

We can therefore conclude that in some instances partner institutions dealt directly with WBI task managers, and did not always submit their proposals through the partnership program. This creates challenges for the exchange of information between WBIEP task managers and the partnership program.

Premise B5. *Number of Partner Institutions.* The analysis of the four cases shows that the partnerships required intense and time-consuming work. The preparation and organization of the courses were mostly managed by the task managers and local organizers. Because of the complexity of the undertaking, we deem that WBI strategy to limit the number of pilot experiences is a thoughtful one. It is reasonable to expect that after a pilot phase the WBI learning curve will grow faster, as well as the number of partnerships in the field.

Premise B6. *Selection of training partner institutions.* The seven partner institutions as a group received higher rates than regional institutions for the aspects related to facilities and strength of faculty. However, we have also seen that the procedures in place with the partnership program could not explain why some individual events delivered in FY99 were labeled partnerships and others were not.
We have seen that a partner institution can compensate for a small faculty by drawing on professors from neighboring institutions. Task managers have placed a larger emphasis on trusting the director responsible for the delivery of the course than on the fact that the partner institution had all the faculty to mount the course.

We have also seen that some countries have already been identified by WBI as natural bridgeheads for the delivery of the core courses to a specific audience (e.g. Turkey for training participants from Central Asia). The selection of these countries depend on geographical factors, quality of infrastructure, and other strategic considerations. However, no “country dimension” has been made explicit by the partnership program for the selection of partner institutions.

Premise B7. Collaboration on the educational and organizational aspect of the training
Premise B8. Joint delivery of the course
Premise C1. Co-organization
Premise C2. Mutual Intellectual Contributions for the delivery of the course
In all cases, the courses were jointly conducted in the field. The partner institution played a prominent role in preparation and delivery. Local presenters integrated the course program with presentations and articles containing evidence from the field. In the four cases studied, the division of responsibilities identified in the project document was followed. WBI remained responsible for the overall quality of the course. The comparative advantages of the partner institutions were the selection of local participants and/or speakers, the adaptation of the course to regional conditions, and the provision of infrastructure and logistics at competitive prices.

Premise B9. Methods of teaching: traditional vs. distance education. From the above analysis, it emerges that three of the four partner institutions were equipped with distance learning facilities, but the fourth could only allow national connections. In two cases, the videoconference facilities of the partner institution were used for the delivery of some training sessions. In the other two cases, an external provider for the videoconference facilities was identified, but the arrangement worked in one instance only.

It is therefore possible for partner institutions to out-source distance learning facilities, although this option presents risks.

Premise C3. Mutual Exchange of Knowledge between institutions. In the case of Bogazici, the benefits of the partnership for the WBI knowledge bank were limited by the fact that the university was not able to introduce Central Asian case studies in the FY99 edition of the core course, although a few case studies about
Turkey were presented by the partner institution. In the three other cases, the partner institution enriched the WBI core course with local data relevant to the regional audience.

All four partner institutions reported having used WBI material to enrich their own training curriculum.

In all four cases, the delivery of a joint course constituted a critical event for WBIEP and the partner institution alike: WBIEP course materials were integrated, translated, modified, disseminated; the organizational process led WBI and the partner institution to work together, sharing different practices, ideas, and cultures. The delivery of the course was the result of this common undertaking, and will be the precedent to which both WBI and the partner institutions will refer in their historical memory. This course was a first step towards building a common knowledge which will need to be constantly up-dated and expanded to ensure its sustainability.

Premise C4. Cost-sharing/cost-recovery. From the analysis it emerges that during FY99 two of the four partner institutions in our study charged fees to participants. Although cost recovery was a firm WBI objective, no course was able to generate enough revenues to outweigh the costs. No profits, therefore, have arisen. In two cases (Bogazici and MDP), the partner institution did not bear any cost. In one case, the partner institution, ESAF, accepted sharing some costs with WBI. In the last case, which was designed with a perspective of income generation, USP/FIPE declared that they incurred a loss (although WBIEP does not share this analysis).

Despite the fact that the immediate objective of partnership was cost sharing, the capacity and the willingness to bear the costs and risks of a training partnership were not equally shared between WBI and the other partner institutions. The semi-private institutions (USP/FIPE, Bogazici/CEE), in fact, followed an income-generating logic that public institutions such as ESAF, or development programs such as MDP, and WBI itself did not have. This does not hinder the possibility of pursuing partnerships with private institutions. However, a better budgeting process which estimates costs, revenues, potential risks and profits needs to be carefully undertaken. It is also necessary that WBIEP and partner institutions have the same interpretation of the financial agreement.

The four cases raise a number of concerns in terms of effective budgeting of costs and revenues, and equitable distribution of risks of the partnership. Monitoring this process is highly desirable. Furthermore, implications for accountability reciprocal to both partners, sustainability and institutional capacity building need to be taken into serious consideration.
Premise C5: *Potential for follow-up.* Professors from three partner institutions argued that other types of partnerships, besides training partnerships, could be organized. They envisaged other ways to collaborate on a regular basis, such as specific scientific exchanges and research projects developed in common. There is therefore a need to connect the partnership program with other departments or networks in the Bank.
V

Recommendations

Based on evaluation findings, we recommend that the Partnership Program:

• **Make procedures for selecting partner institutions more transparent.** The network of partner institutions should serve the WBI’s strategic objectives, which to some extent reflect the needs of the Bank’s lending departments. Consider using criteria other than institutional strength, such as how high on the political agenda a training topic is in a particular country.

• **Tailor the database about partner institutions to meet task managers’ needs.** Record the strengths and weaknesses of potential partner institutions as well as the results of their previous experiences with the program. Distinguish between 1) partner institutions that have delivered a course jointly with WBI, 2) weaker regional institutions that have delivered courses with WBI but do not meet enough criteria to be considered partner institutions, and 3) institutions that have expressed an interest in organizing a course but have not followed through.

• **Pay more attention to the selection and mix of people who participate in training.** In the partnership database, record only the names of professors, trainers, and directors who might be interested in adapting the course to local needs. It probably makes sense to target directors of partner institutions in addition to trainers, because directors can mobilize the staff and resources needed to adapt the course to local circumstances.

• **Exchange information on its database with other Bank departments and programs.** Because it takes time to establish a partnership, it is worth it that the partner participate in different WBI programs.

• **Establish “best practice” guidelines about the management and organization of partnerships, including cost-sharing agreements.** The financial agreement for delivering courses should allow for donors’ possible withdrawal and should reflect consideration for both partners’ relative ability to share risks and absorb losses.

• **Improve techniques for training trainers, putting more emphasis on the use of visual aids, computer-based simulations, and power-point presentations in**
addition to providing technical information. What instructors taking the course appreciated most was the use of the new technologies in teaching along with access to unpublished articles and new bibliographies. To reinforce learning outcomes, consider sending participants updated materials after the course.
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## Appendix I
### The Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Information sources</th>
<th>Design strategy</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data analysis methods</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>What the analysis allows us to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- On what assumptions is the program based?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) What is the program’s definition of partnership?</td>
<td>(i) Goals, procedures, arrangements, expected benefits of the partnership for WBI and partner institutions.</td>
<td>(i) Program document</td>
<td>Interview of program manager, task managers and WBIEP division manager.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders may have different definitions.</td>
<td>What does the program try to achieve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) By which logical steps is the partnership to be obtained?</td>
<td>(i) Interim markers of progress.</td>
<td>(i) Program documents; (ii) interview of stakeholders.</td>
<td>(ii) Interview of program and task managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders may have different definitions.</td>
<td>(i) Detailed procedures of the program; (ii) what constitutes success; (iii) what expectations are embedded in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- In FY 98, How did the implementation of the training of trainers compare with the theoretical model?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Were WBIEP core courses widely advertised to potential partner institutions?</td>
<td>(i) Number of institutions contacted by WBIEP; (ii) geographical distribution of contacted institutions.</td>
<td>Partnership program database.</td>
<td>Task managers and program manager.</td>
<td>Desk review of documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible missing data.</td>
<td>Whether the selection of partner institutions was made out of as large base.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Information required</td>
<td>Information sources</td>
<td>Design strategy</td>
<td>Data collection methods</td>
<td>Data analysis methods</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>What the analysis allows us to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) What implicit and explicit criteria were applied by WBIEP for the selection of teachers nominated by the institution?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Task managers; (ii) project manager.</td>
<td>Interview.</td>
<td>All.</td>
<td>Descriptive analysis; Comparison w/ situation prior to project.</td>
<td>May vary across core courses.</td>
<td>On which criteria trainers were selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) What was the geographical distribution of selected trainers?</td>
<td>Participants’ country of residence.</td>
<td>(i) Participants’ application and registry lists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review.</td>
<td>Whether all regions were represented during Phase One.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) What was the selection pressure on partner institutions?</td>
<td>(i) Ratio number of nominating institutes/selected institutes; (ii) geographical distribution of contacted/nominated institutions.</td>
<td>FY98 registration lists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review.</td>
<td>Selection pressure on institutions; whether WBIEP has facilitated selection of preferred institutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) What was the selection pressure on participants?</td>
<td>(i) Ratio number of nominating institutes/selected participants; (ii) geographical distribution of contacted/nominated participants.</td>
<td>Participant registration lists.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk review.</td>
<td>Selection pressure on trainers; whether WBIEP has facilitated selection of certain types of trainers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Did participants trained in FY98 use the training they received: - to deliver a new course or, - to modify a course they already gave?</td>
<td>(i) Number of participants who used the course (distinguishing between the two options); (ii) number who did not use the course.</td>
<td>(i) Participants trained in FY98; (ii) partner institutions.</td>
<td>(i)All participants trained in FY98; (ii) 4 case studies.</td>
<td>(i) Tracer study questionnair e; (ii) interviews with trainers trained in FY98.</td>
<td>(i) Possible response bias; (ii) no benchmark for comparison.</td>
<td>Whether the phase of training of trainers had a multiplying impact.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Information sources</th>
<th>Design strategy</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data analysis methods</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>What the analysis allows us to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(vii) If some participants did not use their training, why is it so?</td>
<td>(i) Participants trained in FY98.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tracer study questionnair</td>
<td>Possible response bias.</td>
<td>Trainers’ perception of why they did not use WBIEP courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- In FY99 how did the second phase of the program relating to the transfer of the course to partner institutions compare with the theoretical model?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) What institutions approached in FY98 applied to become WBIEP partners?</td>
<td>(i) Number of institutions; (ii) list of institutions; (iii) geographical distribution.</td>
<td>(i) Letters of intent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The final list of partner institutions may not yet be consolidated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) What criteria did WBI set for the selection of partner institution for Phase Two?</td>
<td>(i) Scores of partner institutions on criteria; (i) scores of regional non-partner institutions on criteria.</td>
<td>(i) Interview of project and task managers; (ii) project manager back to office reports.</td>
<td>Information from all WBI stakeholders concerned by selection process.</td>
<td>Comparison of partner institutions and regional institutions which delivered courses in FY99.</td>
<td>For comparison with model and departure from official policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) What were the cost, profit, and risk sharing agreements between WBI and the partner institution?</td>
<td>(i) What items of costs were to be paid by WBI and partner institution; (ii) how were benefits/losses expected to be shared.</td>
<td>(i) Contract between WBI and partner institution; (ii) interview of stakeholders.</td>
<td>Case studies of 4 regional courses.</td>
<td>Collect sharing of cost items only, not figures.</td>
<td>For comparison with model and departure from official policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Appendix I*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Information required</th>
<th>Information sources</th>
<th>Design strategy</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
<th>Data analysis methods</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
<th>What the analysis allows us to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Did regional decentralization of the course attract a new audience (for WBI and the partner institution)?</td>
<td>(i) Geographical distribution of audience academic level and occupation of persons trained.</td>
<td>(i) Participant lists; (ii) interview of partner institutions.</td>
<td>Case studies of 4 regional courses.</td>
<td>Desk review and interviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whether there was a diversification for WBI courses; whether partner institutions have also perceived a diversification of their audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) How was the responsibility for the organization of the course shared between WBI and the partner institution?</td>
<td>The details of who did what for each of the 10 Kirkpatrick steps.</td>
<td>(i) Partner institutions; (ii) task and project manager.</td>
<td>Case studies of 4 regional courses.</td>
<td>(i) Back to office reports; (ii) interview of partner and task managers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>How WBI and partners institutions have shared the responsibility for the course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Did the partner institution experience any difficulty in delivering WBI core course?</td>
<td>Qualitative assessment of difficulties experienced by partner institution.</td>
<td>(i) Partner institutions; (ii) task and project manager.</td>
<td>Case studies of 4 regional courses plus any failed attempt.</td>
<td>Interview.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Partners and WBI assessment of difficulties; (ii) if such case occur why some partners failed to deliver the course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Was there any capacity building of the institution by WBI prior to the delivery of the regional course?</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Task and project manager.</td>
<td>Case study of 3 regional courses.</td>
<td>(ii) Interview of task managers and institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii) Was there a customization of the courses content/level to regional audience?</td>
<td>Detailed course agenda for FY98 and FY99.</td>
<td>Task managers; partner institutions.</td>
<td>Case studies of 2 regional courses.</td>
<td>Back to office reports; Interview.</td>
<td>Comparison of FY98 and FY99 courses.</td>
<td>Whether the course content has evolved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Questions</td>
<td>Information required</td>
<td>Information sources</td>
<td>Design strategy</td>
<td>Data collection methods</td>
<td>Data analysis methods</td>
<td>Limitations</td>
<td>What the analysis allows us to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ix) Did regional speakers attend WBI courses in FY98</td>
<td>List of speakers for regional courses; FY98 list of participants.</td>
<td>Activity completion reports; partner institutions</td>
<td>Case studies of 2 regional courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Desk study.</td>
<td>Whether WBI made use of the teachers trained in FY98.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(x) Were clients satisfied with the regional courses?</td>
<td>Check all 10 Kirkpatrick steps.</td>
<td>Participants to regional meetings.</td>
<td>Level one evaluation of 4 case studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Client satisfaction for first regional courses led by partner institutions is a marker of course quality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(xi) What were WBI and the partner institutions’ satisfaction with regional courses?</td>
<td>Suggestions for improvement.</td>
<td>Task manager and regional institution.</td>
<td>4 case studies, interview.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A qualitative assessment of WBI and partners satisfaction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II
The Selection of Participants During Phase One (FY98)

**Africa region** (AFR, 23% of participants): For this region, the selection pressure on participants was highest as only 32 participants out of the 102 nominated were finally retained (pressure selection 69% while the average was 55%). But this region is also the one where institutions nominated more candidates: Le Programme de 3eme Cycle Inter-Universitaire en Economie presented 17 nominees, the Zimbabwe Institute of Public Administration and Management (ZIPAM) nominated 14 trainers, and The University of Zimbabwe presented 15 candidates. Three institutions account for more than half of the candidates finally selected: the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA, 7 participants), ZIPAM (7 participants) and the Banque Centrale des Etats d’Afrique de l’Ouest (BCEAO, 4 participants). WBIEP invited trainees from 13 African countries, but 47% of participants come from two countries only: Zimbabwe (9 participants) and Ethiopia (6 participants).

**East Asia Pacific region** (EAP, 6% of participants): Seven out of eight participants belong to two institutions: the Philippines Institute for Development Studies (PIDS, 4 participants), and Pekin University (China, 3 participants). It is worth noting that 8 out of the 15 nominees had been proposed by PIDS.

**Europe Central Asia region** (ECA, 15% of participants): Two institutions, the Czech Center for Economic Research and Graduate Education (CERGE, 7 participants) and the Taschkent State economic university (Uzbekistan, 4 participants) accounted for more than half of the 21 trainees. These two institutions also accounted for half (49%) of the 49 nominees.

**Latin America and The Caribbean** (LAC, 32% of participants): WBI’s favorite institutions were: the University of West Indies, the university of Sao Paolo, the University of Los Andes, the Universidad autonoma from Guadalajara, the Institute of Advanced Studies in Administration (IESA), and the Fedesarollo. Each of these institutions sent between 4 and 8 trainees. The same 6 institutions were the ones that had nominated most (56) of the 83 nominees. Two countries, Brazil (13 trainees) and Colombia (12 trainees), sent most participants.

**The Middle east and North Africa region** (MENA, 18% of participants): There has been a strong emphasis on collaboration with the Palestinian authority (12 out of the 25 participants), and to a lesser extent Egypt (6 participants). Unlike the ECA region were most nominees were proposed by a small number of institutions, nominees from the MENA region have been proposed by more than 20 institutions. Selected institutions sent a small number of trainees: Only the An-Najah national University (4 trainees) and the League of Arab states (3 participants) sent more than 2 participants.
The South Asia region (SAS, 6% of the participants): 5 out of the 8 participants come from the Lahore university of management sciences (Pakistan), which had nominated 8 out of the 12 nominees. This region is the one on which the selection pressure on participants was the least (33%).
Appendix III: Tracer study questionnaire
## Appendix IV
### Overall Usefulness of the Training: Quantitative Results From the Tracer Study

Table: 1 All participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate each aspect below on a scale of 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum).</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>% 1 or 2</th>
<th>% 4 or 5</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On reflection, to what extent did the seminar strengthen your understanding of policy options and policy responses?</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relevance of the seminar to your work or functions in the months since you attended the seminar?</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On reflection was your participation in the seminar really worthwhile?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. For you personally</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. For you professionally</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. For your organization</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Arithmetic average rating of all respondents to the question on a scale of 1 to 5, where "1" = "minimum;" and "5" = "maximum."
2 Percentage of participants who answered with a "1" or a "2" out of all respondents to the question.
3 Percentage of participants who answered with a "4" or a "5" out of all respondents to the question.
4 Lowest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
5 Highest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
6 Standard deviation: the larger the standard deviation, the more heterogeneous the opinion of the group on the question.
7 Number of responses
Table: 2 Trainers or professors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate each aspect below on a scale of 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum).</th>
<th>Mean¹</th>
<th>% 1 or 2²</th>
<th>% 4 or 5³</th>
<th>Lowest¹</th>
<th>Highest⁴</th>
<th>Std. Dev.⁵</th>
<th>N⁷</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On reflection, to what extent did the seminar strengthen your understanding of policy options and policy responses?</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relevance of the seminar to your work or functions in the months since you attended the seminar?</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On reflection was your participation in the seminar really worthwhile?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. For you personally</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. For you professionally</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. For your organization</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Arithmetic average rating of all respondents to the question on a scale of 1 to 5, where "1" = "minimum;" and "5" = "maximum."
2 Percentage of participants who answered with a "1" or a "2" out of all respondents to the question.
3 Percentage of participants who answered with a "4" or a "5" out of all respondents to the question.
4 Lowest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
5 Highest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
6 Standard deviation: the larger the standard deviation, the more heterogeneous the opinion of the group on the question.
7 Number of responses

Table: 3 Non trainers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate each aspect below on a scale of 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum).</th>
<th>Mean¹</th>
<th>% 1 or 2²</th>
<th>% 4 or 5³</th>
<th>Lowest¹</th>
<th>Highest⁴</th>
<th>Std. Dev.⁵</th>
<th>N⁷</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On reflection, to what extent did the seminar strengthen your understanding of policy options and policy responses?</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Relevance of the seminar to your work or functions in the months since you attended the seminar?</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. On reflection was your participation in the seminar really worthwhile?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. For you personally</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. For you professionally</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. For your organization</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Arithmetic average rating of all respondents to the question on a scale of 1 to 5, where "1" = "minimum;" and "5" = "maximum."
2 Percentage of participants who answered with a "1" or a "2" out of all respondents to the question.
3 Percentage of participants who answered with a "4" or a "5" out of all respondents to the question.
4 Lowest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
5 Highest rating awarded by at least one participant to the question.
6 Standard deviation: the larger the standard deviation, the more heterogeneous the opinion of the group on the question.
7 Number of responses
Appendix V
Participants’ Suggestions for Improving The Training

**Question 1: What aspect of the seminar has proven the most useful to you?**
Open-ended question, 72 respondents, some offered multiple answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of the course topics</td>
<td>32 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with international colleagues</td>
<td>10 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following the latest development in the fields</td>
<td>10 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mix of empirical evidence and theoretical background</td>
<td>9 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>6 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussions</td>
<td>5 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity of topics</td>
<td>4 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading material</td>
<td>3 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good quality of teachers</td>
<td>2 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>1 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 2: What aspect of the seminar has proven to be least useful?**
Open-ended question, 60 respondents, some offered multiple answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of the course topics</td>
<td>26 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies (poor quality, too simplistic)</td>
<td>7 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too dense for good learning--time constraints</td>
<td>4 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneous audience, too crowded</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor pedagogical skills of presenters, made no progress in teaching techniques</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses too theoretical, high level, complex</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion not always fruitful, lack of advanced preparation</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 3. What advice can you give us to improve seminars of this kind in the future?**

Open-ended question, 66 respondents, some offered multiple answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More country specific case studies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less academic, more policy oriented or practical</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve agenda design, extend the duration of the course/less crowded</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agenda (time constraints to assimilate the course content), more time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out for visits, purchase books</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve selection of participants (more homogenous)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More informal discussion among participants, draw upon diversity of</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better presenters</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More high level specialized presentations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide reading material in advance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI
What Use Did Instructors’ Make of The Course They Attended during FY98? (Transcripts of Answers, 62 respondents)

**Question 10: Do you think the seminar enhanced your capacity as a trainer?**

10 a. To prepare activities? Comments provided by the respondents who answered yes (N=46, 75% of the 61 answers)
   “Access to unpublished articles and surveys, inspiring way to present materials”.
   “I didn't carry out training myself. But I made the materials available to others, including trainers, to use”.
   “The seminar brought together experts that are at the frontier of the issues and was successful in guiding me to analyze problems”.
   “It helped me in designing a module in macroeconomics for a course targeted at senior/middle level executives.”
   “Because the seminar provides the opportunity to get the interrelations of each module (topic) with the others.”
   “It updated my knowledge”.
   “It gave classroom examples on the impact of trade policies”.
   “The econometric time series analysis was useful”.
   “It included non conventional approaches to my lectures”.
   “Use of up-to-date material in macroeconomic policy management”.
   “It allowed me to know new bibliography and to contact its authors”.
   “Helped me better explain the concept of “convergence and growth”.
   “By providing a sound foundation for some arguments and questions for others”.
   “The planning and preparation was thorough, as evidenced by the quantity of materials distributed”.
   “It demonstrated the use of technology in lectures”.
   “*Fiscal decentralization: theory and empirical evidence* was a seminar offered by me to senior economics students”.
   “Provided me with more comparative materials”.

10b. To prepare and utilize case studies? Comments provided by respondents who answered yes (N=29, 49% of the 59 answers)
   “I used the material from lecture: "the assignment of expenditure responsibility" to prepare a case study”.
   “The material was useful for my department as a diagnostic tool for financial/public sector reforms”.

* Instructors are participants who declared they attended the course with a view to improve their teaching skills. They represented 62 (80%) of the 77 participants who returned the questionnaire.
“I gave some material to a Colombian researcher”.
“Preparation of an expertise on export credits for the government of Poland”.
“Change in recent trade policies in Brazil”.
“I view the current collapse of the Zimbabwe currency more broadly”.
“Use of computer based presentations”.
“One of the weaknesses of the workshop was the absence of case studies from developing countries, especially from my region”.
“That was my first contact with case studies on the subject”.
“Using some examples of case studies in class”.
“Your presenters had well researched their material”.
“Indeed cases were provided, but more appropriate cases could have been used”.
“I made a comparison of economies in the southern Africa vs Asia and OECD countries”.
“I prepare to undertake a research on fiscal decentralization in Palestine as well as on the intergovernmental relations”.

10c. To prepare and deliver more effective presentations? Comments provided by respondents who answered yes to this question (N=35, 60% of the 58 answers)
“I used some slides and statistical data”.
“The structure of presentations was useful”.
“I try to emulate their style”.
“I saw the difficulties of the use of laptops for training”.
“Structure of presentation; how to change presentations with respect to different audiences”.
“Inspired by the various presentations at the seminar, I tried a power point presentation at a training program”.
for public servants”.
“It improved my dialogue skills”.
“Presentation techniques, hands-on exercise”.
“I use more frequently slides and presentations”.
“We are using the materials we got”.
“Comments from participants show they find my presentation more relevant”.
“Use of computer based presentations”.
“The contact with different speakers and materials helped me to shape my style”.
“Doing a better presentation of the topics in class (better selection of the main points)”.
“Use of technology as an aid in training”.
“Use of statistics to give graphic and pictorial presentations”.
“Can reference some viewpoints and case studies from the workshop.”
Question 11. Have you been able to use any of the materials provided in the following areas?

11a. In teaching? Comments provided by respondents who answered yes (N=40, 65% of the 62 answers)

“In principal, I use material from all lecturers, but most of all from the following: Expenditure assignment, tax assignment, intergovernmental grants, property tax”. “Part of the materials has been included in the syllabus of my course in macroeconomics”. “I used the reading material related to Trade & Exchange rate in the BSC program at my university and in an executive Program”. “I have used the teaching materials to improve the existing reading list for my lectures”. “I enclosed the reading list of my course on economic growth”. “Presented a conference paper based on some abstracts from the course. Have developed a module on economic growth factors in Africa”. “I am committed for teaching the same course in West Africa”.

11b. In research? Comments provided by respondents who answered yes (N=43, 70% of the 61 answers)

“Advancing research on financial/public sector reforms in African countries”. “I used the Tybout’s framework in a study for Colombia”. “I prepared a paper which I presented in the conference on fiscal decentralization in Palestine, May 1998”. “Providing a scope for me in writing a paper on China’s rural industrialization”. “Up-dated my theoretical background and my literature on global trade and development issues”. “My ongoing study on "sustainable growth in Africa" has benefited at lot from the seminar's papers”. “I have used some content and materials into my research about Venezuelan Public Finance”. “Materials have supported some activities in the Research Department at Central Bank”. “As reference material”.
11c. In consulting? Comments provided by respondents who answered yes  
(N=19, 31% of 62 answers)

“In analyses of anti dumping measures for the governmental agency in charge of those actions”.
“I am not directly involved in training. However, the seminar helped me with a capacity building project (for trade policy formulation) I am presently involved in”.
“People from other units come to consult us on issues of macroeconomic management and policy implementation”.
“The Work Bank database information was useful”.
“For working on local administration draft bill”.
“Held consultations with the World Bank country offices in drawing up a Country Economic Memorandum”.
“I have responded to a consultation using the information from those modules”.
“I advise the government to study possibility of building up an early warning system”.
“I have requested the materials for their own consultation”.
“I’ve got a lot of information for my everyday work”.

12. If you have not used the knowledge material since the seminar can you explain to us briefly why?  
Comments provided by respondents (N=7, 11% of 62 instructors)

“Because of my position at this institution (participant is a director) and the lack of a background in economics. However, I will review the materials in order to improve a course on Economic Development that is part of the International Relations undergraduate program”.
“Even if this is not an answer to this question I have to mention that it was very useful to me…The visit, and purchases, I made in the bookstores of IMF and World Bank”.
“Since the course coverage was too theoretical and not applied, it is very difficult to adapt such material to my work which is Applied Science”.
“The materials provided were of little use”.
“It would be very useful to send the reading list in advance to have the time to review some of the papers studied”.
“Because the program content had very little on what I deal with and case studies are too foreign to my regional environment”.
### Appendix VII

**A Comparison Between Partner Institutions and Regional Institutions**

For the Delivery of Core Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>Bilkent University</td>
<td>ADB+CIRES+ AERC</td>
<td>National Planning Department</td>
<td>ESAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(dormitory, conference room, video conference)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (Video conference did not work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation/local input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations by Local speakers</td>
<td>Yes (17%)</td>
<td>Yes (17%)</td>
<td>Yes (30%)</td>
<td>Yes (70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified participants</td>
<td>Some, less than 50%</td>
<td>Yes (50%)</td>
<td>Yes (more than 50%)</td>
<td>Yes (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local adaptation of core course</td>
<td>3.5 out of 5</td>
<td>2.5 out of 5</td>
<td>4 out of 5</td>
<td>5 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institution funded participants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (most)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institution funded logistics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institution charged fees to participants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Delivered with a partner institution**

---

An Evaluation of the WBIEP Partnership Program
(continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>MDP</td>
<td>ICRIER</td>
<td>University of Sao Paolo (FIPE)</td>
<td>Bogazici university</td>
<td>NIFPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities (dormitory, conference room, video conference)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Conference room</td>
<td>Yes, all</td>
<td>Yes, all</td>
<td>Conference room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation/ local input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations by local speakers</td>
<td>Yes (30%)</td>
<td>Yes (25%)</td>
<td>Yes (60%)</td>
<td>Yes (56%)</td>
<td>Yes (86%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified participants</td>
<td>Yes (50%)</td>
<td>Yes (all)</td>
<td>Yes (more than 50%)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes (some, less than 50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local adaptation of core course</td>
<td>4 out of 5</td>
<td>4 out of 5</td>
<td>3.5 out of 5</td>
<td>4 out of 5</td>
<td>2.5 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institution funded participants</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institution funded logistics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local institution charged fees to participants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No (WBI paid the institution for the delivery of the course)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Global Integration and the New trade agenda
**Bogota May 27-28, 1999**

- Logistics: Yes
- Facilities: Yes (transport, coffee breaks)
- Adaptation/local input: Yes (%)
- Cost reduction: N/A
- Cost recovery: ?

### Economic Growth, poverty reduction and social protection
**Addis Ababa June 1-11th, 1999**

- Logistics: Yes
- Facilities: Conference room, no accommodation, no videoconference room
- Adaptation/local input: Yes (36%)
- Cost reduction: No (WBI paid IESA for the delivery of the course, below market price)
- Cost recovery: Yes (cost sharing agreement)

### Fiscal Relation, Caracas, June 1-12, 1999

- Logistics: Yes
- Facilities: All except dormitory
- Adaptation/local input: Yes (~30%)
- Cost reduction: No
- Cost recovery: No

### Capital flows, Buenos Aires June 24-25

- Logistics: Yes
- Facilities: Conference room, no video-conference, no dormitory
- Adaptation/local input: Yes
- Cost reduction: No
- Cost recovery: No

---

### Internal Capacity of the Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University El Rosario</th>
<th>UNECA</th>
<th>IESA</th>
<th>Universidad di Tella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Conference rooms, did not use dormitory, no video-conference</td>
<td>Conference room, no accommodation, no videoconference room</td>
<td>All except dormitory</td>
<td>Conference room, no video-conference, no dormitory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation/local input</td>
<td>Yes (50%)</td>
<td>Yes (36%)</td>
<td>Yes (28%)</td>
<td>Yes (~30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified participants</td>
<td>Yes (all) and other regional speakers</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local adaptation of core course</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost reduction</td>
<td>Local institution funded participants</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, some</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local institution funded logistics</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (cost sharing agreement)</td>
<td>No (WBI paid IESA for the delivery of the course, but below market price)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost recovery</td>
<td>Local institution charged fees to participants</td>
<td>?, WBI only paid for North American speakers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
### Appendix VIII

#### A Summary of The Four Case Studies (Bogazici and MDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (MDP) - HARARE</strong></td>
<td>MDP director nominated a professor from the University of Zimbabwe and funded its participation to the “intergovernmental fiscal relations” course in Vienna. No one from MDP attended the course. The professor trained in FY98 moved to the University of Namibia in FY99. WBI is contributing to the MDP program since 1991. This partnership has been initiated on a long established relationship; The seminar in Vienna provided the course conceptual framework and materials to be ADAPTED.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase One</strong></td>
<td>MUTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS: WBI provided: 1. The conceptual framework and course materials; 2. the funding of international speakers; 3. technical assistance throughout the process; 4. the funding of participants and speakers; 5. the selection of half the participants; and 6. the funding of facilities (conference room). WB provided the videoconference room. MDP provided: 1. the organization of the course; 2. the selection of half the participants; 3. logistics; and 4. the selection of regional speakers. ADAPTATIONS of the content to the African context and INVITATION of regional speakers were coordinated by MDP. The course built on the workshops organized by MDP in the last three years. Regional speakers represented 70% of the speakers. The professor trained in FY98 delivered one of the thirteen courses delivered by regional speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase Two</strong></td>
<td>BEARING THE RISK OF THE JOINT VENTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participan ts’ Learning and Behavioral Change Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>PARTICIPANTS’ LEARNING AND BEHAVIORAL CHANGE OUTCOMES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. UNIVERSITY OF BOGAZICI – CENTER FOR ECONOMICS AND ECONOMETRICS (CEE)</strong></td>
<td>MUTUAL CONTRIBUTIONS: WBI provided: 1. the conceptual framework, bibliography and course materials; 2. the selection of participants and international speakers; and 3 all the funding for the course, including a retribution of the CEE speakers. CEE provided: 1. the organization of the course; and 2. the logistics. ADAPTATION of the content to the context of Central Asia was made mainly by WBI (presentation of case studies); CEE presented some case studies of the Turkish economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*All interviewees (29 out of 30 participants) expressed a positive evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the speakers in communicating their message, and the relevance of the course content for their job needs.*

*→A test of knowledge administered at the end of conference indicated that the participants, in general, had acquired the main messages the training intended to convey.*

*→The weakest points identified by participants of the Istanbul offering concerned non-educational logistics (dormitory) and the inability of some trainers to answer questions effectively.*
### INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING: within the region, MDP plays a leading role in the advancement of policies aimed at democratic local governance. The World Bank bears the main financial responsibility of the program, which is funded in 3 year budget phases. MDP is becoming institutionalized, but is not self sufficient. The delivery of core courses by MDP is an example of coordination between several WBI programs. The durability of the partnership depends on MDP’s ability to find long term financial commitments after the present budget phase (ending Yr2000).

**TRAINING CAPACITY:** The MDP program was established in 1991. MDP delivers technical assistance, policy services and capacity building through training to national universities and local municipalities. The partnership with WBI meant a consolidation of MDP staff organizational and intellectual skills; and a strengthening of MDP’s regional and international network. The trainer trained in FY98 delivered one of the thirteen courses presented by regional speakers.

**INTERNATIONAL EXPOSURE:** MDP was already delivering one regional training per year, with international speakers. The “Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations” course was the reinforcement of MDP strategy and should permit the delivery of two of such events.

### TAILORING THE COURSE CONTENT: the course addressed the issue of fiscal decentralization in Eastern and Southern Africa, and included regional case studies.

**BETTER PARTICIPANT TARGETING:** Larger outreach obtained with the participation of representatives of local municipalities and governments.

**KNOWLEDGE SHARING:** Enrichment of course materials with Eastern and Southern Africa case studies, and empirical evidence.

**KNOWLEDGE NETWORK:** MDP has a strong regional network of professionals in the sector. Comparative advantage over an University, which would have a more academic approach.

**COST SAVING:** The interesting feature is the high level of local or regional speakers in the delivery of this course (70%). The facilities for the delivery of the course had to be rented.

**COST RECOVERY:** none. MDP would be willing to assist participants in identifying a source of funding.

### TAILORING THE COURSE CONTENT: There was little adaptation by the partner of the course content. This was due (1) to time constraints in the preparation of the course and (2) to the fact that the University did not have much expertise on the economy of Central Asia.

**KNOWLEDGE NETWORK:** Bogazici is well connected to research networks in western Europe and the MENA region, but does not have much experience in the Central Asia region.

**COST SAVING:** The features that are interesting for WBI are the high proportion of local speakers in the delivery of the course (56%) and the presence of adequate training facilities on the University site. There is no benchmark to which compares the cost of this course.

**COST RECOVERY:** None.

### LESSONS LEARNED ABOUT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

- The Phase One (training of trainers) did not play an important role in the development of this partnership.
- The main strengths of MDP are 1. its regional and local networks and 2. its capacity to adapt the course to local development realities. This institution does not have strong facilities. It does not yet have long term financial sustainability.

- Bogazici was able to deliver a high quality course to participants from Central Asia.
- This institution did not need extensive technical training. CEE would be interested in WBI assistance to strengthen its research network.
- This institution will only be interested in courses that generate a revenue.

* Based on the end of course evaluation, February 1999.
A summary of The Four Case Studies (ESAF and FIPE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. ESAF – SCHOOL OF PUBLIC FINANCE - BRASILIA</th>
<th>4. UNIVERSITY OF SAN PAOLO/FIPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAINING OF TRAINERS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PHASE ONE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only the Director of the School participated in the “Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations” core course in Vienna, 1998.</td>
<td>Two professors of the department of economics participated in the “Macroeconomic Management” core course, in 1998.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The director – having the decision power on behalf of ESAF – started the negotiations for the transfer of the course.</td>
<td>To date, nine professors have participated in WBI seminars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The seminar in Vienna provided the course conceptual framework and materials to be ADAPTED.</td>
<td>Informal agreement on the joint program was reached at the seminar between the WBI task manager and the trainers from USP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **PARTNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT** | **PHASE TWO** |
| Mutual contributions: WBI provided: 1. the conceptual framework and course materials; 2. the funding of two international speakers; and 3. technical assistance throughout the process. ESAF provided: 1. the organization of the course; 2. the selection of participants; 3. logistics; and 4. the selection and funding of Brazilian speakers. Adaptations of the content to the Brazilian context and INVITATION of Brazilian speakers: ESAF coordinated this phase by selecting the speakers and matching their intervention with WBI materials. | Mutual contributions: WBI provided: 1. the conceptual framework and course materials; and 2. the technical assistance and coordination in process. USP/FIPE provided: 1. the organization of the course; 2. marketing the course; 3. logistics; and 4. the selection and funding of Brazilian speakers. Adaptations of the content to the Brazilian context. INVITATION of Brazilian speakers coordinated by both WBI and USP/FIPE. |

| **BEARING THE RISK OF THE JOINT VENTURE** | |
| The course was fee-based. | The course was fee-based. |
| No formal agreement was signed as far as the distribution of costs and revenues. | A formal agreement was signed by the two partners. |
| WBI provided only services in kind: (i) course materials, and (ii) two international speakers honorarium. NO COST RECOVERY. | WBI was to bear 40% of all costs and revenues; USP/FIPE was to share 60% of all costs and revenues. |
| ESAF bore organizational costs: (i) current cash expenses, and (ii) fixed non-cash costs. COST RECOVERY: tuition from participants did not cover all ESAF expenses. Revenues accounted only for 20% of ESAF costs, the remaining 80% being the actual ESAF disbursements. | WBI provided only course materials; NO COST RECOVERY. |
| Outsourcing: IMF (International Monetary Fund), University of San Paolo/FIPE/FEA, and CIAT (Centro Interamericano de Administracao Tributarios) funded the Brazilian speakers’ honorarium. | UPS/FIPE bore (i) all organizational costs on site, (ii) the all speakers honorarium, and (iii) logistics. COST RECOVERY: tuition from participants did not cover all USP/FIPE expenses. Revenues accounted for 64% of USP/FIPE costs; the remaining 36% was the actual USP/FIPE disbursements. |

| **PARTICIPANTS’ LEARNING AND BEHAVIORAL CHANGE OUTCOMES** | |
| All interviewees (seven out of 39 participants) report that the course responded very positively to the need of a comprehensive overview of fiscal expenditure control and tax administration.* | All interviewees (8 out of 17 participants) expressed positive evaluation on the quality of the course, the speakers, and the relevancy of the content for their job needs.* |
| Four interviewees out of 7 reported that they had a clearer view on the repercussions on the federal budget of their specific functions – expenditure or revenues.* | Five interviewees out of eight have already applied the macroeconomic assessment model to forecast macroeconomic fundamentals.* |
| All interviewees report that the training event provided the opportunity to spur an extensive debate among public sector employees who do not communicate with each other; three interviewees out of 7 state that it is now easier for them to exchange work experiences.* | Two interviewees complained about time allocation for each presentation.* |
| | All interviewees remarked on the delay in providing the course materials.* |
| **PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES FOR PARTNERS** | INSTITUTIONAL STRENGTHENING: Within the Ministry of Finance, ESAF played a leading role in the public sector modernization process. The partnership with WBI contributed to strengthening its position within the federal government and its function with the support of the World Bank.**<br>TRAINING CAPACITY: ESAF is already a long lasting government training institution with a very entrepreneurial style of management and a consolidated experience in the selection and development of civil servants. The partnership with WBI contributed to the upgrading of staff organizational and intellectual skills; internationally known speakers; and cutting-edge research materials.INTERNATIONAL EXPOSURE: the “Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations” course was the first training event with an international audience, coming from mostly from Latin America and Lusophone Africa. | PARTICIPANTS’ RESEARCH AND TEACHING SKILLS<br>UPGRADING: Through the training of trainers, the faculty of the department of economics has been exposed, to date, to international presenters, cutting-edge materials, and have networks of other international participants.<br>TRAINING CAPACITY BUILDING: The joint course contributed to promote USP/FIPE capacity of offering professional training to private sector participants in advanced macroeconomic topics.<br>INSTITUTIONAL HIGH-PROFILE PROMOTION: Organizing a training event with the WBI is considered a prestigious endeavor with high visibility domestically and internationally. |
| **PARTNERSHIP OUTCOMES FOR WBI** | TAILORING THE COURSE CONTENT: The course addressed the issue of fiscal decentralization among the Brazilian tiers of government.<br>BETTER PARTICIPANT TARGETING: Larger outreach in the field at different government levels.<br>KNOWLEDGE SHARING: Enrichment of course materials with Brazilian case studies, and empirical evidence.<br>KNOWLEDGE NETWORK: ESAF is a partner with whom to organize future training events.<br>COST SAVING: There is no benchmark against which to measure costs of the same type of WBI regional event.<br>COST RECOVERY: None. | TAILORING THE COURSE CONTENT: The course addressed the issue of macroeconomic management in the midst of the Brazilian financial crisis.<br>BETTER PARTICIPANT TARGETING: Larger outreach in the field especially within the private sector.<br>KNOWLEDGE SHARING: Enrichment of course materials with Brazilian case studies, and empirical evidence.<br>KNOWLEDGE NETWORK: USP/FIPE is a partner with whom to organize future training events.<br>COST SAVING: There is no benchmark against which to measure costs of the same type of WBI regional event.<br>COST RECOVERY: None. |
| **LESSONS LEARNED ABOUT PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM** | ➔Need for a careful selection of trainers who have the institutional leverage, in order to develop the partnership.<br>➔Need for a better coordination between WBI and ESAF within the planning and preparation phase for quality assurance concerns and time.<br>➔Need for better budgeting costs and revenues between the two partners.<br>➔Need for taking into account the distribution of costs and risks between ESAF and WBI. | ➔Need for a careful selection of trainers who have the leverage of maneuvering.<br>➔Need for a better coordination between WBI and USP/FIPE within the planning and preparation phase for quality assurance concerns and time.<br>➔Need for better budgeting costs and revenues for the two partners.<br>➔Need for taking into account the distribution of costs and risks between ESAF and WBI.<br>➔Need for better course marketing. |

* Based on interviews, March 1999.<br>** Based on interview with the Advisor of the Brazilian Deputy Minister of Finance, March 1999.