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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PREM Week 99

PREM Week 99 was the second annual gathering of the PREM Network and was held June 13-14, 1999 at The Inn and Conference Center, the University of Maryland, College Park. It was attended by over 770 participants. The main objective of the conference was to bring staff up to date with the latest thinking and developments on critical issues as well as stimulate thinking “outside the box.” In addition, the meetings were to “provide an opportunity for people to learn from each other and to share experiences, so that the participants can more effectively fight poverty in the next century.”

The specific objectives of PREM Week 99 were to:

- Enable the participants to be more effective in carrying out the Bank’s mission of poverty reduction;
- Bring participants up to date with the latest developments and thinking in their work area;
- Challenge the participants to think in innovative ways and to consider new approaches to apply in their work; and
- Provide adequate opportunities for participants to network with their colleagues.

Purpose of Study

The central purpose of the evaluation was to: assess overall participant satisfaction with the conference; gather suggestions for improvement of future PREM Week conferences; and judge whether the conference met its stated objectives. Additionally, the evaluation design focused on the key evaluation questions which were centered around the objectives of the conference, its relevance to the participants, logistical qualities, and ways which the conference could be improved. A variety of background data questions were also included which would give the PREM organizers the data which they requested on the participants.

Findings

Questionnaires were sent via Lotus Notes to the participants. The use of an entirely electronic-based questionnaire for sending, collecting and analyzing data via Lotus Notes was a pioneering event for the Evaluation Unit as well as for the PREM Network. Of those e-mailed, 198 forms were completed and returned via e-mail. The analysis of the closed-ended and open-ended responses to the questionnaire suggests several key findings. Based on a scale designed to assess training and learning activities against a standard benchmark (see “Analysis of Closed-Ended Responses from Questionnaires” in the main report), the overall mean rating of the conference by the respondents was 3.82,
with 69% rating this as a 4 or 5. Respondents rated the relevance of the conference to their current work or functions with a mean of 3.87 (72% rating it as a 4 or 5)—the highest mean score for a key conference indicator. The relevance of the conference, then, can be considered its strongest asset. The “overall” rating was positively and strongly related to all the key variables mentioned. Additionally, the usefulness of the information acquired had a mean of 3.76 (68% rating it as a 4 or 5). These three key responses suggest that the conference was not rated highly.

According to the mean scores and percentages, the four primary objectives were not met. The highest mean score of all the conference objectives (3.79) was for bringing the participants up-to-date with the latest developments and thinking, but all other scores on the conference’s objectives were lower, again attesting that the objectives were not fully met.

Similarly, networking activities and session content were not rated highly by the respondents (means of 3.36 and 3.81, respectively). These two were considered to be important features in determining the strength of PREM Week’s planning and organization. Indeed, when the respondents were asked how the conference could be changed they indicated that additional time for networking and interaction was needed. Additionally, respondents indicated that more external speakers who were not academic would help to improve the conference.

**Conclusions and Recommendations**

PREM would benefit from opening an on-line dialogue with its members for suggestions and recommendations in advance of next year’s conference. The on-line dialogue also can provide information on session content and information on networking (which received low ratings), once the schedule is finalized.

Although the organizers for this year’s PREM Week took into consideration the recommendations received from last year’s conference evaluation, there were still some negative aspects which were similarly elicited in last year’s conference as well. These are aspects which the organizers should consider changing.

The content of the conference sessions and the opportunities for networking were two key features of the conference which received the lowest ratings. PREM organizers should consider allowing more time and opportunities for the participants to network with each other for upcoming conferences. Additionally, they should continue to solicit additional ideas on the contents of the sessions from its past and future participants. While it is evident that it is impossible to please the entire PREM Network audience, the conference organizers should note that the content of the conference and its lack of networking opportunities are clear trends which were similarly elicited from last year’s conference as well.

A consistent number of respondents indicated that there were too many sessions at the conference and that many of them were unfocused. It is recommended that the

---

1 All mean ratings of closed-ended questions were calculated on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = minimum; 2 = below average; 3 = average; 4 = above average; and 5 = maximum.
conference organizers keep the number of sessions to a minimum and add greater focus to them. By concentrating on fewer key issues of poverty reduction, a more focused approach to the conference may lead to improved ratings by the participants.

The total PREM membership, both primary and secondary, is greater than the number who participated in this year’s conference. There may have been sound causes behind this. Some respondents indicated that the high registration fees were prohibitive. The organizers might consider this factor when planning for next year’s event.
PREM WEEK 99 EVALUATION

“‘Fighting poverty in the 21st Century’ is the theme for PREM Week 99. This year’s event will offer cutting-edge presentations and discussions that will bring you up-to-date with the latest thinking and developments on the critical issues; we also hope it will stimulate thinking “outside the box.” We will share good practices and learn lessons of experience from the vast range of projects, products, and services provided by Network-affiliated staff and our partners. In addition, PREM Week 99 offers staff the opportunity to get to know each other better, as we work together to help our clients reduce poverty more effectively.” [Masood Ahmed, Vice President, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network]

PART ONE:
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW OF PREM NETWORK

The Poverty Reduction and Economic Management (PREM) Network is responsible for economic policy and cross-cutting issues focused around four themes: economic policy, gender and development, poverty, and the public sector.

Economic policy embraces such concerns as broad-based growth, macroeconomic and macro finance issues, fiscal sustainability, international trade and finance and aid effectiveness.

Gender and development includes an examination of the relationships between gender and poverty, growth, intra-household allocations of resources and violence. It aims to mainstream gender issues in all aspects of the Bank’s work.

The poverty group focuses on how to achieve patterns of growth and human capital development, which will benefit the poor. Current emphases include developing strategic approaches to information on poverty, improving the poverty focus of Country Assistance Strategies (CASs), integrating economic and social approaches to poverty, and preparing for the next WDR on poverty (in 2000).

Finally, public sector work cuts across various Bank lending and economic sector work on governance (including corruption), public expenditure policy, administrative and civil service reform, decentralization, institutional development and capacity building.

The PREM Network had its first major gathering in 1998. The event took place in June at the Inn and Conference Center, the University of Maryland and drew 750 network members including 100 11-17 staff, 41 field office staff and seven country directors. The objectives of the 1998 meetings were to:

• provide an opportunity for PREM staff to better know each other,
• exchange knowledge and experience,
• expose participants to the latest thinking on important issues for the Bank’s policy and operational work, and
explore together critical operational issues faced in the course of designing policies, programs and projects for the Bank’s clients.2

Following the two day conference, about 200 staff had attended a Town Hall Meeting to discuss operational issues such as how to draw on the network’s resources to improve the quality and effectiveness of the Bank’s work, particularly in professional development and knowledge management resources.

PREM Week 99

PREM Week 99 was the second annual gathering of the PREM Network and was held June 13-14 at same venue, The Inn and Conference Center, the University of Maryland, College Park. Over 770 participants were in attendance. While "Fighting Poverty in the 21st Century," was the theme for this year’s PREM Week, its main objective was to bring staff up to date with the latest thinking and developments on critical issues as well as stimulate thinking “outside the box.” In addition, the meetings were to “provide an opportunity for people to learn from each other and to share experiences, so that the participants can more effectively fight poverty in the next century.”

The specific objectives3 of PREM Week 99 were to:

• Enable the participants to be more effective in carrying out the Bank’s mission of poverty reduction;
• Bring participants up to date with the latest developments and thinking in their work area;
• Challenge the participants to think in innovative ways and to consider new approaches to apply in their work; and
• Provide adequate opportunities for participants to network with their colleagues.

Contents and Structure of PREM Week 99

Based on feedback from Network staff at last year's PREM Week, the organizers had decided to include a fewer number of keynote addresses, and a wider variety of breakout sessions, open fora, and interactive kiosks. Breakout sessions were organized mainly by Thematic Groups, sponsored by each of the four PREM Sector Boards, as well as by Development Economics (DEC), Operations Evaluation Department (OED), and WBI. In addition, the organizers offered sessions sponsored by other Networks, including the new Administration and Client Services (ACS) Network. Speakers at the sessions included Bank staff as well as external experts. Following last year’s recommendations, during "Pre-PREM Week”—the days leading up to the main Conference event—a number of training opportunities and other events were organized mainly for field staff, in partnership with the Regions and the World Bank Institute. The conference itself was limited to two days.

2 Information based on PREM Week 98 evaluation report.

3 Information based on discussions with PREM Week 99 organizers.
The opening plenary by Mr. Joseph Stiglitz on “Development as Transformation” was followed by three parallel panels addressing “Comprehensive Development Framework,” “International Financial Architecture,” and “From Poor Macroeconomic Policy to Macroeconomic Policy for the Poor.” The lunchtime keynote address on the first day was delivered by Mr. Derek Hanekom, member of parliament and former minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs, South Africa, on “Fighting Poverty and Inequality in the 21st Century: Opportunities and Challenges.” This was followed by two breakout and open-forum sessions, each comprising 11 to 16 separate individual sessions on various topics from which participants could choose.

The second day of the conference had one panel session on “Aid Effectiveness,” a lunchtime discussion (a Balloon Debate on Population and Economic Development) and four breakout and open-forum sessions. As on the first day, each of these 90 minute long breakout sessions had 12 to 16 individual sessions presented by three to four speakers. The last breakout session (6th session), had only eight presentations. Altogether there were 79 individual sessions, within these six breakout and open-forum sessions, from which participants could choose to attend. With the four panel sessions, two lunchtime discussions, opening plenary and the keynote address, there were 87 different activities in PREM Week.
PART TWO: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODS

Purpose of the Evaluation

The PREM Week organizers were interested in obtaining an assessment of how effectively the conference achieved its stated objectives. Thus, the WBI Evaluation Unit was requested to undertake the evaluation of PREM Week 99. The Memorandum of Understanding is included in Appendix A.

The central purpose of the evaluation was to: assess overall participant satisfaction with the conference; gather suggestions for improvement of future PREM Week conferences; and judge whether the conference met its stated objectives. In general, the organizers of PREM Week requested an evaluation to assess how well the conference was received and how it could be improved for next year’s event. With this in mind, the evaluation design focused on gathering information from as many participants as possible. The key evaluation questions were centered around the objectives of the conference, its relevance to the participants, logistical qualities, expectations of the participants, and ways in which the conference could be improved. A variety of background data questions was also included which would give the PREM organizers the data which they requested on the participants.

Sources of Information

Two members of the Evaluation Unit (WBIES) of the World Bank Institute (WBI) managed the evaluation. The primary data collection instrument was a questionnaire, a copy of which is provided in Appendix B. In particular, summative methodologies were used for the evaluation. The ex-post evaluation questionnaire was created to gather conference results and participant feedback. The Evaluation Unit used Lotus Notes, the Bank’s electronic-mail (e-mail) software program to both create and mail the questionnaire—the first time this source had been used by WBIES to obtain participant feedback. The participant list was made available by the conference organizers. Since the participants of PREM Week were employees of the Bank, the questionnaire was available to all conference participants and was convenient to access and reply to via Lotus Notes. The questionnaire was sent out approximately one week after the conference ended. Participants were given a two week deadline to complete the questionnaire and return it.

The participants were informed of the confidentiality of the questionnaire data when the instrument was sent via e-mail. Responses were not attributed to any respondent and no personal information could be obtained by the evaluation team or the PREM Network, other than what was asked on the questionnaire.

A post-conference questionnaire was envisioned to work best because the organizers believed that the time and participation level of the respondents would be limited with any other data collection strategy. Therefore, a questionnaire was an
The use of an entirely electronic-based questionnaire for sending, collecting and analyzing data via Lotus Notes was a pioneering event for the Evaluation Unit as well as for the PREM Network.

**Sampling and Response Rates**

Concerted efforts were made to bring the evaluation process to the attention of the participants once the conference had ended. Approximately 774 end-of-conference evaluation questionnaires were e-mailed to participants. The original mailing was followed by two e-mail reminders to encourage the participants to complete the questionnaire.

Of the questionnaires distributed to the approximately 774 participants, 198 forms were completed and returned via e-mail. We also received 98 responses via Notes indicating that the participant was out of the office or that the message was undeliverable, attesting that the participant could not respond to the questionnaire. Taking this into account, we subtracted 98 participants from the original 774, giving a total of 676 possible respondents and a response rate of 29%.

**Strengths and Limitations of the Evaluation**

There were many strengths to this evaluation. The use of an entirely electronic-based questionnaire for sending, collecting and analyzing data via Lotus Notes was a pioneering event for the Evaluation Unit as well as for the PREM Network. In several WBIES evaluations in which a hard (paper) copy of the questionnaire was used, there was continually the threat that copies of the questionnaire would be lost, damaged, or unreadable. These constraints were virtually eliminated by using Notes. The convenience of the electronic medium was also considered to be positive in that it was a convenient method of responding for all Bank staff. Also, it ensured that all those who registered (since the survey was sent out to all registrants) had a chance of being included in the survey. Additionally, we could assure confidentiality more readily because the respondents’ names, e-mail addresses, and phone numbers would not be revealed in their replies.

There were also several limitations in conducting this conference evaluation. Notably, we could not control for those participants who were out of the office or unreachable when the questionnaire was sent, nor could we control for those participants

---

4 Total count of the PREM primary membership is 866 (287 women and 579 men), while secondary PREM membership is 152 (52 women and 100 men).

5 The exact response rate is impossible to compute, given the fact that some registered participants may not have attended the conference.
who did not respond even after two reminders were sent. Both of these factors contributed to a lower than expected response rate.

The limitations of self-reported data and self-selection in answering the survey are constraints to weigh. The evaluators often cannot control the selection of participants in answering questionnaires, as was the case with this conference. Moreover, self-selection may not offer as diverse a respondent pool as desired and this can lead to unsubstantiated inferences.
PART THREE: 
DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Overview

This section of the report summarizes the findings of the evaluation. The data reported are from the 198 questionnaires completed by the respondents. The questionnaires were analyzed according to their content and coded into themes that best matched the participants’ responses. In particular, closed-ended responses were examined and tallied for their validity; open-ended responses were content-analyzed, grouped by themes that best qualified their responses, and peer reviewed for their validity by the two evaluators from WBIES. These responses were then matched to the counterpart questions on the questionnaires.

The results of the analyses are reported here in the same order and format as the questionnaire’s design: response numbers correspond to those of the questions. This will allow readers to observe and analyze the quantitative and qualitative results of the questionnaire in a systematic and clear manner. A complete report of the closed-ended responses was processed by two evaluators in WBIES. General information and backgrounds of the respondents are also presented to provide an overall view of the respondents. Some responses may total more than 100% due to rounding and multiple answers to select questions.

Demographics of Respondents

According to the responses received for general background information questions, the participants represented a diverse selection of the bank’s employees. The primary network affiliation of the 193 respondents indicated that 149 (77%) of the respondents were from the PREM network (as expected, a majority). Fifteen respondents (8%) stated “other” and only 6 (3%) were from ESSD. The secondary network affiliation listed by 63 of the 118 respondents (a majority of 53%) was again from PREM. Twenty-six (22%) respondents indicated they were from “other” networks, while 6 (5%) each said they were from the HD and FPSI networks.

The regional affiliations listed by the respondents were quite diverse. Of the 187 respondents, 59 (32%) said that they were not from a region/network, while 33 (18%) stated that they were worked in the ECA region. Thirty-one respondents (17%) were from the LCR region, and 30 (16%) were from the AFR region. Only 14 respondents (7%) came from EAP, and 10 respondents (5% each) were each from MNA and SAR. These results are shown in Table 1:
TABLE 1: Regional Affiliation of PREM 99 Participants (n=187)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Affiliation</th>
<th># of Respondents From Each Regional Affiliation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No network</td>
<td>59 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>33 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCR</td>
<td>31 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>30 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>14 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNA</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>10 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that a fairly diverse regional affiliation was achieved at the conference, although a majority of respondents were not from any network.

Of the 188 respondents, 141 (75%) stated that they were from headquarters, while 47 (25%) came from various field offices of the bank. Forty six percent of the respondents were women and 54% were men.

The question for job titles was left as optional for the participants, since we wanted to assure confidentiality. The job titles of the respondents proved to be fairly diverse. Of the 106 respondents to the question, a majority of 52 (49%) stated that they were economists (of the 52 economists, 15 respondents (29%), said they were at the senior level). Eight respondents (8%) said they were team assistants and an additional 8 said they were research analysts. Seven respondents (7%) indicated they were specialists, while 6 (6%) were consultants. Three respondents (3%) were language team assistants. The remaining respondents listed their job titles in various positions such as “analysts”, “assistants”, “coordinators”, and “managers”.

Analysis of Closed-Ended Responses from Questionnaires

On the questionnaire, the participants were asked to rate various aspects of the conference on a scale of 1-5 (a score of one is “minimum,” a score of 5 is “maximum” and another option was “no opinion.” A score of 3 is the mid-point of the scale). Specifically, there were nine questions, both closed-ended (6) and open-ended (3). General questions were also asked on network and regional affiliations, gender, job base, job title, and years employed at the Bank.

This section will offer data from the closed-ended responses, while the next section will provide an analysis of the open-ended responses. The questionnaire which was used at the conference is included in Appendix B. These results are interpreted using the benchmarks established by WBIES for rating Bank-wide learning events. The following shows the cutoff points in the benchmarks:

WBIES conducted a study of 1015 Bank wide respondents which included the following ratings for levels of performance:

*Excellent* 90-100% of the respondents provide ratings of 4 or 5
Very Good  85-89% of the respondents provide ratings of 4 or 5 (85% is the benchmark for quality)
Good  80-84% of the respondents provide ratings of 4 or 5
Average  75-79% of the respondents provide ratings of 4 or 5 (the Bank-wide average is generally between 75% and 79%)
Below Average  70-74% of the respondents provide ratings of 4 or 5
Poor  69% and below of the respondents provide ratings of 4 or 5

Finally, a data report of the bivariate relationships of the variables is offered in Appendix C.

Question 1: How would you rate the relevance of PREM Week to your current work or functions?
There were 196 respondents who answered this question. The mean score was 3.87. Seventy-two percent of the respondents awarded a score of 4 or 5 to this question, while 10% rated it a 1 or 2. Two respondents indicated they had no opinion. Based on WBIES benchmarks for all World Bank courses (as shown above), the 72% of respondents which gave this item a score of 4 or 5 translates into a “below average” level of performance for the conference.

Question 2: How would you rate the usefulness of the information that you have acquired?
The 195 responses to this question summed a mean score of 3.76. Of those respondents, 68% gave a score of 4 or 5 (a "poor" level of performance based on the WBIES scale), while 12% gave a score of 1 or 2. Two respondents had no opinion.

Question 3: How would you rate the logistical organization of PREM Week in the following areas: Registration process; information on the content of sessions; information on other networking activities; transportation; conference facilities.
These questions were posed to assess how well organized PREM Week was in different areas of importance. The two highest mean scores were given to the organization of the registration process (4.30, with 79% awarding a score of 4 or 5, indicating an “average” level of performance) and to the conference facilities (4.10, with 79% giving a score of 4 or 5, indicating another “average” rating). There were 195 respondents to both of these categories. Lower mean scores were awarded to the content of the sessions (3.81, with 195 respondents; 65% giving a score of 4 or 5 (a “poor” rating) and 12% a score of 1 or 2), to networking activities (mean of 3.36, 193 respondents; 41% awarded a score of 4 or 5 (“poor”), while 15% gave a score of 1 or 2), and to transportation (mean of 3.88, 195 respondents; 50% giving a score of 4 or 5 and 9% with as score of 1or 2).

These data suggest that the more important features of the conference such as networking activities and content of the sessions were not well received. The mean scores for these two important categories were two of the lowest from the evaluation data. However, the registration process was rated very highly.

Table 2 shows a comparison with last year’s ratings for the same variables. The scale used by last year’s evaluation was different from this year’s, hence the means were converted to match with 5 point scale ratings. However, the differences are quite minimal.
TABLE 2: Comparison with PREM Week 98 Results on Logistical Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Ratings: PREM Week 98* (n=91)</th>
<th>Ratings: PREM Week 99 (n=198)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registration process</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on the content of sessions</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on other networking activities</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facilities</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Note: While PREM Week 98 (n=91) used 6 point Likert scale, PREM Week 99 (n=198) had a 5 point scale. The mean values obtained for the above variables in the two conferences are matched using conversion rate of 0.78.

Question 4: Rating PREM Week 99’s contribution in the following areas: a) Enabling you to be more effective in carrying out the Bank’s mission of poverty reduction; b) Bringing you up-to-date with the latest developments and thinking in your work area; c) Challenging you to think in innovative ways and to consider new approaches to apply in your work; d) Providing adequate opportunities for you to network with your colleagues.

This question was asked to have the participants rate the key objectives of PREM Week. The mean score responses to these questions were rated lower as the following data attest:

**Question 4a: Effectiveness of conference in carrying out Bank’s mission**
The lowest rated objective (mean of 3.49, 51% with a score of 4 or 5) suggests that the respondents believed that the conference was “poor” in enabling them to be more effective in carrying out the bank’s mission.

**Question 4b: Bringing participants up-to-date**
The highest mean score for all four objectives (3.79, 195 respondents) was given to bringing the participants up-to-date with the latest developments and thinking. With 71% rating this aspect a 4 or 5, this is considered to be a “below average” level of performance.

**Question 4c: Innovative thinking and considering new approaches in their work**
This question also received “poor” ratings (mean score of 3.59 from 190 respondents, with 55% rating it a 4 or 5).

**Question 4d: Networking opportunities**
Networking opportunities were again rated “poor” with a mean of 3.68 (195 respondents, 64% rating it a 4 or 5).

---

As these responses show, three of the four key objectives were rated as “poor” and one was rated “below average.” With these “poor” to “below average” scores, it is evident that the primary objectives of PREM Week 99 were not fully met.

**Question 5: Overall rating for PREM Week 99**

This is one of the key questions for overall assessment of the conference. The mean score of the 194 respondents was 3.82, with 69% providing a rating of 4 or 5 (a “poor” level of performance), while 10% gave it a score of 1 or 2.

Table 3 summarizes the quantitative results from the closed-ended questions.

**Bivariate Relationships of Variables Used in the Analysis**

While these are only relationships between variables, these do not infer causality. The relationships show that when one exists, you can reasonably predict the other.

As expected, those who rated various aspects of the conference highly (namely, relevance, usefulness, satisfaction with logistical arrangements, and conference objectives), awarded high rates for overall satisfaction as well. All these variables showed a positive, and a strong association, which are statistically significant at .01 level, with the “overall satisfaction” variable (Appendix C).

There were four questions measuring the achievement of conference objectives. The participants were asked to rate the following questions that directly contributed to the conference objectives: (a) enabling the participants to be more effective in carrying out the Bank’s mission of poverty reduction; (b) bringing the participants up-to-date with the latest developments and thinking in their work area; (c) challenging them to think in innovative ways and to consider new approaches to apply in their work; and (d) providing adequate opportunities for the participants to network with their colleagues. While all these four aspects were positively correlated with the overall rating of the conference, the aspect of networking with colleagues had a less strong association (.4997) compared to the other three (.678, .709, and .717 respectively).

---

7 The correlation coefficients are reported here. Please see Appendix C for detail results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>% 1 or 2</th>
<th>% 4 or 5</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How do you rate the relevance of PREM Week to your current work or functions?</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>0.991</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How would you rate the usefulness of the information that you have acquired?</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How would you rate the logistical organization of PREM Week in the following areas?:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a) Registration Process</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b) Information on the content of sessions</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>1.070</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c) Information on other networking activities</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>41.0 *</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d) Transportation</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>49.5 **</td>
<td>1.132</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e) Conference facilities</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>1.045</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you rate PREM Week’s contribution in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a) Enabling you to be more effective in carrying out the Bank’s mission of poverty reduction?</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b) Bringing you up-to-date with the latest developments and thinking in your work area?</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>1.083</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c) Challenging you to think in innovative ways and to consider new approaches to apply in your work?</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d) Providing adequate opportunities for you to network with your colleagues?</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Overall, how would you rate PREM Week 99?</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>0.947</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Arithmetic average rating of all respondents to the question on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 = minimum; 2 = below average; 3 = average; 4 = above average; 5 = maximum.
2. Most frequent score (1 to 5 scale).
3. Proportion of participants who answered with a “1” or “2” out of all respondents to the question.
4. Proportion of participants who answered with a “4” or “5” out of all respondents to the question.
5. Standard deviation: the larger the standard deviation, the more heterogeneous the opinion of the group on the question.
6. Number of responses.

* “No opinion” category had 11%.
** “No opinion” category had 31.5% (63 out of 196 respondents).
The number of years in service and the location of office were significantly correlated. Those who had longer years of service were more likely to be from the Headquarters. Interestingly, all the variables mentioned above (various aspects of the conference and objectives) showed a negative correlation with the variable “location of office” – those respondents from WB headquarters were less likely to rate high than those from field offices. The responses from headquarters staff show a negative correlation with rates awarded to information on networking, opportunity to network and on overall rating. All these are significant at .05 level. The other associations, although inverse, were weak and did not have any statistically significant effect on any of the variables.

In general, there was no difference in the way men and women rated the variables tested. Except in the case of “opportunity to network,” all other variables had a positive correlation with women respondents but, none of these correlations were statistically significant.

Overall, the pattern of the correlations show a consistency in the way respondents rated the conference, and all the variables related to the conference objectives had a positive relationship with the overall ratings of the conference. As mentioned earlier, these are only the bivariate associations.

### Analysis of Open-Ended Responses from Questionnaires

The open-ended responses from the 198 completed questionnaires were analyzed according to their content and grouped into themes or similar categories which best represented the responses.

The limitations of self-reported data and self-selection should be considered when reading the following impressions from the respondents. Evaluators often cannot control the selection of participants in answering questionnaires, as was the case with this conference. Additionally, self-selection may not offer as diverse a respondent pool as desired and this can lead to unsubstantiated inferences.

Overall, a number of categories emerged from the content analysis of each open-ended question, which are as follows:

**Question 6: The three best sessions**

PREM Week 99, according to the final updated program, had 79 individual sessions and four panel sessions (see page 3 for details). Three of these panel sessions ran in parallel. In addition to the individual sessions and the panels, there were lunch time sessions on both days. A larger number (18) mentioned the “Balloon debate” as one of the best sessions, for its thought provoking and innovative presentation. “Policy Making in Dolarized Economies” was mentioned by nine. This session is commented as a useful one for it had an “excellent presentation and a lively discussion” and had “provided good discussions on pros. and cons. of dollarization” delivered by “experienced panelists.” One person wrote, “I learned a lot from the session and I am about to write a note… for the country team.” The most popular sessions are summarized in Table 4.

---

8 “Location of Office” is a binary variable with “HQ” being 1 and “Field Office” equal to 0.
Table 4: Most Popular Sessions Mentioned by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session Name</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balloon Debate</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Making in Dollarized Economies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development in Transformation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Poor Macro-policies to Macro-policies for the Poor</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict and Poverty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for Anti-corruption &amp; Institutional Reform</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisiting Development Lessons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table displays the balloon debate as being the most popular session, while others such as “Policy Making in Dollarized Economies” and “Development in Transformation” were also received well.

Question 7: In what ways should PREM Week be changed for next year with respect to: a) Selection of topics; b) Selection of speakers; c) Venue and logistics; and d) Duration

These questions were asked to receive both specific and general feedback from the participants in order to improve PREM Week for the year 2000.

Question 7a: Suggested changes for selection of topics

A question was asked, “In what ways should PREM Week be changed for the next year with respect to selection of topics.” The PREM Week participants came from different backgrounds although the majority were economists. The suggestions and comments made by this group were diverse:

Eighty-four (42% of the 198 total respondents) commented on this question with different viewpoints. Few offered more than one response. Sixteen (19%) respondents requested additional information on various subject areas. The respondents wanted certain areas to be included in the program, such as:

“More EP topics; more on macro-structural issues,” “more on micro-economics,” “more financial sector sessions,” “more on development lessons and implications for our work,” “more emphasis on public sector performances,” “more statistics,” “more ACS topics,” “more operationally relevant,” and “more best practice type practical topics.”

Fifteen ACS staff responded to the survey and five responses suggested more tailored topics for ACS staff.

“More topics for the ACS,” “more substantive topics geared to ACS—but neither too technical nor patronizing that seem to underestimate the intelligence of the group,” and “more ACS non managerial breakout sessions,” were some common suggestions.

Respondents also indicated various features of the planning process which could be improved. Additional comments such as “more active solicitation of papers six months
in advance,” “more participatory selection process is needed to select the main themes,” were directed toward improving the conference planning process.

Twelve (14%) felt that the number of sessions were just about right or there was no need to change. For some, while the selection of topics was good, they also had additional comments such as:

- “Generally on the right track, they certainly should reflect the TGs,”
- “Good. But too many interesting sessions in parallel,” and
- “It’s just about right; but how about another Int’l Organization’s perspective (UNESCO, ILO etc.).”

Eleven out of eighty four (13%) opted for fewer sessions and some common responses were:

- “Number of topics should be reduced.”
- “Fewer, more consolidated around major themes”
- “Possibly fewer choices, it was hard to decide between all of the topics,”

Another eight (9%) thought that there were too many sessions and most not well focused. Their comments were:

- “Many were too broad so the session was too unfocused,”
- “The sessions should fit into an overarching framework. This one was too ‘free-wheeling’,” and
- “Sessions should be more specific in focus, rather than trying to capture a wide audience.”

Six respondents (7%) mentioned the need to link poverty with other areas, such as environment, corruption and country assistance strategies while retaining the conference’ focus on poverty. Following are a few comments supporting the poverty focus and linkages with other areas:

- “More sessions should be devoted to discussing individual micro/community interventions/experiences which helped graduate beneficiaries from poverty in a sustainable way. Like the former South African lands minister put it, we need to demonstrate our pro-poor strategies by championing the cause of the poor and the less privileged in order to live the spirit of our mission statement.”
- “All sessions should directly or indirectly address the main reason of our existence, namely poverty reduction. For example, if the session is on debt management, there should be at least one speaker who can provide some rationality on whether prudent debt management can affect growth and thus poverty.”
- “Keep up the poverty/growth/gender linkages.”

Five (6%) expressed the need to include some sessions on “basic” topics that are needed by field staff and junior staff. Comments on this were:

- “A basic economics workshop for the first day, with a focus on economics in a global perspective, the WB’s mission and procedures...some introductory courses on economics would be helpful. Maybe rate the topics (A: Advance, M: medium, and B: beginners).”
- “There should be a lot more emphasis on basic issues-not everyone wants to know what the frontiers of knowledge are. In countries, we are always struggling with getting the simple messages across.”
In sum, the majority of the respondents felt that fewer and more focused sessions would be their desired change for next year. The problem of having too many sessions, according to their perception, was that it was harder to choose when it was not clear about the contents of the session and conflicts in scheduling. Some of these comments illustrated the issue:

- “Smaller selection so that there are fewer sessions dealing with the same topic running in parallel.”
- “Sessions with common topics/areas of interest or target audience should not be scheduled at the same time.”

On the contrary, out of those who said PREM Week should have more of certain specific sessions, one commented on parallel session where the respondent felt that fewer choices was a problem:

- “The parallel panels were a disappointment. For those wishing to attend a session with a “social slant,” the CDF was the obvious choice, but it was stunningly boring and uninformative. When choices are so few, it’s important to make certain that all panels are winners.”

**Question 7b: Selection of speakers**

Sixty-four respondents answered the question on selection of speakers. Some offered more than one suggestion. The following categories emerged from the content analysis of their responses:

Twenty-nine respondents (45%) stated that more external/outside speakers were needed. These were the most revealing responses:

- “Consider adding speakers who are more critical to the Bank.”
- “Invite someone who belongs to the ‘poor’ and give us actual situations of what ‘poor’ means.”
- “We can listen to each other during brown bag seminars in the Bank. This should be an opportunity to bring together outside thinkers to address the issues that we think about daily.”
- “More diversity, more higher level outside speakers.”

Fourteen respondents (22%) said that the speakers were too academic and not well prepared. Their comments included:

- “Sometimes the speakers were very academic and narrowly focused (Harvard and LSE come to mind).”
- “Would put more emphasis on using staff experts working in areas other than outside academic speakers. Emphasis should be on relevance for country programs.”
- “Speakers should be better prepared and some were very academic. More hands-on experience in the design and implementation of poverty reduction interventions (both successful and unsuccessful).”
- “Big name speakers from the Bank were not always well prepared.”
- “Many speakers had not prepared their talks thoroughly.”

Ten respondents (16%) indicated that the selection of speakers was fine/good and needed no change. One response was:

- “This year’s approach is fine (Bank plus outside speakers), but more experiences from the field and clients is needed.”
There were five respondents (8%) stated that fewer speakers were needed. Three responses were especially revealing:

- “Could we have less ritual exhortation from top Bank leaders that delay us from getting down to the real work/fun of these meetings?”
- “Please do not fly in speakers who are being invited to lecture on poverty and then turn around and charge $3,000 as honorarium.”
- “Fewer speakers would further improve the sessions as there would be more time for discussion with the audience.”

An additional five respondents said that more Bank speakers were needed. These were some of their comments:

- “Need more emphasis on using staff/experts working in areas rather than outside academics.”
- “People who have a clue about what the Bank does (draw on more Bank staff, who tend to prepare on average better than the outsiders.”

Four respondents (6%) said they had no opinion.

**Question 7c: Suggestions for the venue and logistics**

Sixty six (33%) out of 198 responded to this question and 36 (55%) of the respondents felt that the current venue and logistics were fine and no changes necessary. Several said, “fine,” “excellent,” “OK,” “same,” or “no need to change.”

Fifteen (23%) felt the current venue was too far and suggested to bring the venue closer to the HQ. Reasons were given as:

- “Bank headquarters for better turnout; attendance tends to be counterproductive given the transportation schedule and distance of the venue,” “please find a more accessible location and better facilities.”
- “Please, next time do not hold an event like this so far away, … people who cannot attend all sessions will not make the effort to drive or come by metro if it is just for one session.”

**Question 7d: Suggested changes for duration**

Out of the 198 respondents only 60 (30%) commented on this question. Of those who commented, thirty nine (65%) said two days were right. “two days is about right,” “two days is fine,” “same,” were common expressions supporting the same format as the current duration.

Ten (16%) felt that three days would be good and five (8%) thought more days, i.e., four or more days, would have been better. A comment from one of the field staff was “It should be longer, making more worthwhile for field staff—or events should be conducted immediately around PREM Week, such as training, workshops, etc., much more than this time around.” Six other respondents either had no suggestions or said “not to exceed one day.”

**Question 8: Additional ways to improve PREM Week**

Fifty-three respondents answered this question, some offering more than one suggestion. The following categories emerged from the content analysis of their responses:
Twenty-five respondents (47%) stated that better planning and organization were needed in various areas of PREM Week. Their responses fell into five different categories: more interactions and opportunities for networking, too many parallel sessions, change month of event, fewer sessions, and more outside participation. These were among the most revealing comments:

Twelve of the twenty-five respondents in this category said that more time for networking and for interactions (and fewer lectures) was needed:

- “Instead of pretending that PREM Week is an intellectually stimulating event, which it is not, let’s make it a networking event which is what happens there.”
- “More brainstorming sessions and fewer lectures. PREM Week is still a very passive activity.”
- “A little more time for informal networking during the two days. There was not enough time between sessions or at lunch.”
- “I think it is good to have some kind of activities where all of us can participate as a group to get to know each other better.”

Eight of the twenty-five respondents indicated that there were too many parallel sessions or too many sessions, in general.

- “Shorter sessions could give an opportunity to attend more events.”
- “Avoid running several sessions in parallel, especially when the sessions have some degree of overlap. I saw one breakout session with three non-panel participants.”
- “Activities around PREM Week clashed (e.g., the PREM picnic). Some of our field staff missed presentations because of being in other courses.”
- “Reduce the number of open forum sessions to a maximum of six per series.”

Three of the twenty-five respondents indicated that a different time or month other than July was preferred for the conference:

- “I’m not sure that mid-July, in the holiday season, is the best time to hold PREM Week.”
- “I’d suggest holding it biannually, with greater focus.”
- “Better timing. Hold it in March or April.”

Three of the twenty-five respondents said that more participation from outside agencies was needed:

- “Participation of bilateral agencies or even NGOs in the exhibit and forums would help.”
- “More cross sectoral attendance in specific sessions.”

Seven respondents (13%), of the 53 total respondents, stated that the organizers should ask bank staff in advance for ideas on topics and sessions for PREM Week:

- “Ask Thematic Group organizers of specific sessions to survey staff in advance, especially field staff, so that they focus the sessions on a specific tool/lesson rather than trying to make them general to attract a wide audience.”
- “Ask World Bank staff for their preferences in selection of topics.”
- “Create a survey for have people express which topics they would like to have.”

Seven respondents had general recommendations which did not fall into a similar category. Some of their suggestions included:

- “Less sound and fury. More substance.”
• “I would have a Web page for PREM Week papers in advance.”

Five respondents (9%) stated that more training events and workshops were needed. These were their ideas:
• “Practicing economists can get rusty on basics, so there should be courses which help to renew these skills, such as basic econometrics, trade, monetary theory, etc. These can be 3-5 day courses before PREM Week and there would probably be a large demand for them.”
• “Perhaps a few more training opportunities during the week.”

Four respondents (8%) indicated that the conference was good and therefore needed no changes:
• “Great improvement over last year. Very worthwhile.”
• “Continue to think creatively. I was impressed by the creativity and boldness of the balloon debate format and by your ability to find such good sports as participants.”
• “I though PREM Week was a success.”

Three respondents (6%) said that conference was too far away and needed to be held in Washington:
• “Find a place closer to DC. University of Maryland is a bit far away.”
• “Can’t this be held downtown?”

Three respondents stated that their budget constraints or the costs of attendance were a problem for them or for their colleagues to attend PREM Week:
• “Charge less so that more staff can attend.”
• “Let staff who want to attend do so without any constraints of budget.” I know many staff who did not attend because of budget constraints…somebody else was watching the purse’s strings.”

An additional three respondents had no opinion.

**Question 9: Preferred date for next PREM Week**

There was a near majority voting for PREM Week to be held again in the month of July for next year, as 88 of 178 respondents (48%) indicated that July, 2000 was a good month to hold next year’s conference. Twenty respondents (11%) said that May was appropriate and 18 respondents (10%) chose the month of June. The organizers of next year’s PREM Week would do well then, according the respondents, to keep the conference in the month of July.

**Summary of Findings**

This evaluation of the PREM Week 99 Conference was intended to provide general information relevant to future planning and to offer specific ideas for making the conference as effective as possible. The analysis of the closed-ended and open-ended responses to the questionnaire suggests several key findings. There was a diverse group of respondents at the conference—a good balance of women and men as well as regional affiliations was achieved. As anticipated, the majority of respondents (77%) listed the PREM Network as their primary network affiliation.
The overall mean rating of the conference by the respondents (3.82) was “poor” (only 69% gave this item a score of 4 or 5). The mean score of the respondents indicated that conference was not relevant to their current work or functions (3.87), as 72% gave this aspect a score of 4 or 5, suggesting it was “below average.” Additionally, the usefulness of the information acquired was also rated as “poor” (68% gave it a score of 4 or 5). These three key responses suggest that the conference was rated “poorly” to “below average.”

Three of the four primary objectives were also rated as “poor” while one was rated as “below average.” The highest mean score (3.76) was for bringing the participants up-to-date with the latest developments and thinking, but all other scores on the conference’s objectives were lower, again attesting that the objectives were not fully met.

Networking activities and session content were similarly rated as “poor” by the respondents. These two were considered to be important features in determining the strength of PREM Week’s planning and organization. Indeed, when the respondents were asked how the conference could be changed, the highest scores indicated that added time for networking and for interactions were needed. Additionally, respondents indicated that more external speakers who were not academic would help to improve the conference.

Overall, the conference received between “below average” to “poor” ratings. The mean rating given to the overall conference by the respondents was 3.82—this was one of the higher mean ratings for the conference. Additionally, the relevance of the conference to the respondents’ current work or functions was rated as “below average” (3.87, with 72% of the respondent giving it a score of 4 or 5). This was the highest mean score from the responses that were deemed to be most important for assessing the primary value of the conference. The relevance of the conference, then, can be considered its strongest asset. The “overall” rating was positively related to all the key variables mentioned.

A near majority agreed that the venue and the duration should remain the same for next year. The registration process and conference facilities were rated as “average” (79% awarding 4 or 5 rating), but information on content of sessions and networking received lower (“poor”) ratings.
PART FOUR:
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions and Recommendations

The respondents in this evaluation offered a number of ideas on how to improve future conferences for PREM Week. This year’s response rate of 29% was significantly higher (a 142% increase) than 1998’s response rate of 12%. This suggests that a more diversified view of PREM 99 is offered in this report due to an increased number of respondents.

Since the opportunities for networking and the content of the conference sessions were two key features of the conference which received the lowest ratings in both the closed-ended and open-ended questions, the PREM organizers should consider allowing more time and opportunities for the participants to network with each other during future conferences. Additionally, they should continue to solicit additional ideas on the content of the sessions from its past and future participants. While it is evident that it is impossible to please each participant, the conference organizers should note that the low ratings for content of the sessions and limited opportunities for networking are clear trends which were similarly elicited from last year’s conference.

A thorough content analysis of the open-ended responses revealed a pattern of dissatisfaction with both the number and focus of the sessions. A consistent pattern of responses indicated that the respondents viewed the conference as having far too many sessions and many others which were unfocused. It is recommended, therefore, that the organizers attempt to lower the number of sessions and add greater focus to the topics of poverty reduction (the overall conference theme). By paying better attention to fewer sessions and by organizing them in a more focused manner, the future participants of PREM Week might be more satisfied with the conference and may rate it as a greater success. Moreover, the participants would have the opportunity to attend sessions which are of most interest to them and worry less about missing other parallel sessions in which they showed interest.

The respondents in this evaluation commented that additional external speakers were needed at the conference. Many found this year’s speakers to be too academic and not well prepared.

The total PREM membership, both primary and secondary, is greater than the number who participated in this year’s conference. It would be useful to find out why

---

10 Increasing the number of breakout sessions was based on recommendations made by those who responded to last year’s evaluation.
It would be beneficial to open an on-line dialogue with PREM members for suggestions and recommendations for next year’s conference. The findings of this year’s evaluation could be sent out to the members to provide concrete suggestions and to come into a consensus when finalizing the conference agenda and the format. The on-line dialogue can also provide information on session content and information on networking (these two aspects received low ratings), once the schedule is finalized. Moreover, increased networking opportunities and improved session content may also make the conference more valuable to the respondents.

some members did not participate. This year’s evaluation did not address that question. However, it would be a worthwhile effort to explore that aspect\(^\text{11}\).

\(^{11}\) The high registration fees and long distance to the venue were viewed as prohibitive for some respondents. Additionally, those respondents who stated they could only attend a few sessions believed that they should be charged lower conference fees. For those who participated throughout the two days, this did not appear to be an issue.
Appendix A: Memorandum of Understanding

THE WORLD BANK/IFC/M.I.G.A.

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 24, 1999

TO: Ray Rist, Manager, WBIES

FROM: Ann Duncan, PREM Professional Development Adviser, PRMVP

EXTENSION: 35890

SUBJECT: Evaluation of PREM Week '99

1. This note lays out arrangements agreed between PRMVP and WBIES for undertaking the evaluation of PREM Week '99. The aims of the evaluation are:

   (i) to develop a simple but effective and valid evaluation that provides essential information to assess the level of satisfaction with PREM Week, and to obtain suggestions on how to improve future PREM Week events; and

   (ii) to build on last year's evaluation of PREM Week and other sector weeks by:
        − capturing a wider variety of demographic information to undertake differential analysis separated by group (Network, Family, Region, Gender, etc.);
        − to implement the evaluation in a systematic way to provide all staff attending PREM Week the right incentive and opportunity to participate in the evaluation; and
        − to improve the statistical robustness of the evaluation

2. Inter alia, the evaluation will address a range of questions related to what participants felt about PREM Week, including:

   • an overall rating of PREM Week
   • the extent to which participants felt objectives of PREM Week were met?
   • what participants like and what not?
   • what would participants like for next year?
   • what else should be offered?

3. The basic elements of evaluation approach are as follows:

   • a single, electronic post-event evaluation administered anonymously by WBIES;
   • no paper-based evaluation forms will be handed out at PREM Week itself: the monitoring of individual sessions will be limited to one question on the evaluation form, together with a head-count of the numbers of participants attending each session, which will provide a reasonable indicator of demand; and
there will be no individual assessments of panels, breakout sessions, open fora—the evaluation will instead undertake a broader, more encompassing and general assessment, covering issues such as the balance between different activities; and advice on organization and delivery.

4. Implementation arrangements and resources for the evaluation are as follows:

- the evaluation will be managed and implemented by WBI Evaluation and Scholarships Unit (Manager: Ray Rist; Implementing officers: Padma Karunaratne and Mark Bardini, Evaluation Specialists)
- WBIES will draft the evaluation questionnaire based on inputs from PRMVP (first draft due: July 1; final draft: July 8)
- PRMVP will provide a list to WBIES of all Bank participants who attend PREM Week (due date: July 16)
- WBIES to send out a Lotus Notes-based evaluation form to all Bank participants at PREM Week immediately after PREM Week finishes (due date: July 20, with participant responses due by July 27)
- WBIES will take the necessary steps to ensure that the anonymity of respondents is maintained
- WBIES collects and analyzes data and prepares evaluation report (report due: August 10)

cc: Messrs./Mmes. Abundo, Jones, Parker (PRMVP); Iqbal (WBIEP); Karunaratne, Bardini (WBIES); Garcia-Thoumi (WBIRM)
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