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Executive Summary

The Human Development (HD) Network established in FY96 an individualized learning program for staff, the Professional Development Grant (PDG), to offer training tailored to the needs of specialized staff.

The PDG committee, in charge of the management of the program, requested the evaluation unit of the World Bank Institute (WBIES) to evaluate the first three years of the PDG program, focusing the evaluation around the following points:
- To what extent did applicants design their PDG to serve the needs of the World Bank, in particular their division unit and the HD Network?
- Did applicants experience difficulties in designing or implementing their PDG?
- What were the grantees’ perceptions of the impact of the PDG training on themselves, their division, and the HD Network?

The results for this evaluation are mainly derived from a structured phone interview of 34 PDG participants (68 percent of the 50 persons who were awarded a PDG). This interview was complemented by a discussion with four managers (out of the 29 managers who sent a participant on PDG grant).

I. Main findings

• The grants were in their majority designed by the PDG grantees to serve the interest of their division and the HD Network. For most cases (82 percent) the HD Network, the manager, or both, played a role in the design of the applicants’ proposals. The majority of proposals (71 percent) were designed to serve immediate or foreseeable job needs. Yet twenty nine percent of the people interviewed were moved by a personal interest in the topic, rather than immediate or foreseeable job needs. This finding could cause concerns, but has to be toned down by the findings about the high level of use of the PDG knowledge (96 percent).

• No major difficulty was experienced by candidates at the design phase of the grant:
  → Participants did not report any difficulty in accessing information about the PDG program. In most recent years, word of mouth and the combination of media that advertised the program seem to have made staff from the HD Network familiar with the PDG program. Yet E-mail was the only information source cited by interviewees from resident missions.
  → Most participants (68 percent) did not report any difficulty in accessing the information necessary for the design of their grant. However, site selection and the scheduling of activities is time consuming and can prompt a minority of grantees to select a well-known university out of convenience rather than explore other choices.
  → Most candidates (85 percent) did not perceive that the PDG committee was taking an excessive amount of time to decide on their grant. Still, in a few instances, delays at the decision making phase impacted negatively on the management of their grant.

• Time management issues were the prevalent problem at the implementation stage.
  → A large majority of grantees did not experience any difficulty with the allocation of funds which were usually made available in a timely fashion. Participants are
satisfied with the service of the Institute of International Education (IIE) as grant administrator.

→ Time management issues were the largest problem. Most respondents (85 percent) were not replaced by their manager while they were on a PDG. Even when a manager agreed to hire a consultant, participants sometimes had to split their work with colleagues, or do a share by themselves. Three out of the five participants who were backed up by a consultant found it difficult to reconcile the PDG with their work, in spite of the arrangement.

→ The four managers interviewed agreed that the cost of staff replacement was the main limitation for their use of the PDG program. One of them explained that his training budget per capita does not even pay two weeks of staff time.

→ Most respondents (72 percent) did not find it easy to reconcile the PDG with their work. Those participants who found their PDG easy to implement had been fully relieved from their job, with colleagues taking over at least part of their work, had taken short PDGs, or had split their PDG into very short periods, spread over a long period of time. There is a statistically significant trend of participants requesting shorter grants in recent years.

→ Participants’ coping strategies for time management problems include primarily back-up by colleagues, along with work on the PDG during their own free time, or requests for prolonging of the grant. According to the records of the PDG database, 50 percent of the participants in the program have asked for an extension of their grant.

→ If they were to design their grant again, a third of the respondents would readjust the duration of their PDGs, by reducing the number of activities planned or plan more time to do the work.

- **Overall the grantees have a very positive appreciation of the impact of their grant on themselves:**
  
  → All respondents gave a rating of four or five to the usefulness of the PDG for them professionally. This is an indicator of a very high level of satisfaction (WBI benchmark for this indicator is 85 percent). The PDG has fully met their expectations, broadened the perspective they had in their area of expertise, made them more confident in their work, especially in policy dialogue, and provided new work opportunities.

  → All grantees reported that they use the PDG information as the needs arise in their division, mainly to recommend or hire people they met while working with the grant (65 percent), to design a program component (61 percent), to create policy dialogue and technical assistance for client countries (48 percent), and to produce strategy papers (17 percent). Most grantees (78 percent) do not feel that they have used the PDG to make major modifications in the work they were doing.

- **Most grantees have shared the PDG knowledge inside and beyond their division.** Seventy Eight percent of participants have shared the PDG knowledge inside their division, 70 percent have disseminated the PDG knowledge within the HD Network. The most frequent medium of dissemination was the production of a strategy paper. Face to face informal dissemination was also common.

- **The four managers interviewed gave very positive feedback for the PDG program,** in terms of the technical knowledge acquired, the morale of staff, the improvement of project quality, and the production of a new expertise in underdeveloped areas. All managers considered that even if the grants had not always benefited their own
division directly, the PDGs had, without the shadow of a doubt, greatly benefited the Bank.

II. Propositions for improvement

• **Salary continuation over a long grant does not seem to be a feasible option** for the managers even if the committee agrees to pay a share. It is best therefore that the committee either advise grantees to take short and intensive grants, or encourage candidates to build flexibility into the design of the proposal (by planning more time, or taking their grant in short segments).

• **The committee needs to consider whether to take into consideration in its funding policy the potential impact of the different types of PDG for the Bank:**
  → A course-only PDG increases the technical capacity of the recipient, which impacts on the quality of his work. But usually the contribution of such grants to the WB knowledge bank is limited, especially if applicants tend to follow their courses at the same universities, out of convenience. Considering an extreme case, should most PDG applicants choose to attend a course at the same university, there would be little sense in funding several expensive PDGs rather than organizing a training course at the Bank headquarters.
  → Conversely a PDG that includes a research project or an internship has more potential to contribute to the WB knowledge bank.

• **The committee should make a reasonable contribution to the grantee’s salary.** The rules and the level of such contribution should be made clear in advance to potential applicants and to managers. The committee could choose among the following options:
  → A fixed contribution, irrespective of the grantee’s salary. This would advantage junior applicants over senior applicants
  → A fixed percentage of the applicant’s salary. This option would finance the same amount of free time to all participants.
  → A contribution depending on the quality of the proposal. The rules would have to be explicit;
  → A contribution depending on the type of PDG, favoring for example PDGs with hands-on experience (see above).

In addition to the three main recommendations above, some small improvements can be made to the grant procedures:

• **The committee should assist candidates to improve the design of their grants:**
  → Issue guidelines or best practices. This can be done in a formal way, or by facilitating networking between former PDG grantees and new applicants: for example by creating a spot on the web where applicants can exchange with former grantees, or inviting former grantees to informational meetings about the PDG. Asking participants to present their experience on a one page flyer to be widely distributed would facilitate contacts with new applicants. A participant suggested that the PDG committee should interview the applicant, rather than just read his proposal, to exchange views on the feasibility of the grant design.
  → Providing information about where to get content related information. This would help applicants not to choose the most obvious provider of training.
  → Be clearer about the terms of the grantee’s work program and his intended use of the PDG information.
The committee should clarify in advance the grant procedures and improve the approval process by:
- leaving the rules unaltered after a grant has been awarded
- explaining what services IIE is expected to provide to the grantee
- making a quicker decision, in order not to disrupt the planning of the grant, preferably before the end of March so that the staff can incorporate the PDG in their training programs

The following points have been raised by participants and should be answered by the committee:
- whether a PDG could fund an internship with an NGO or a think tank in a client country
- whether field staff moving to the US should be allowed more funds for essentials (transportation, basic subsistence, child care)
- whether a person should be allowed to take a second grant
The evaluation rationale

The Human Development (HD) Network established in FY96 an individualized learning program for staff, the Professional Development Grant (PDG), to offer training tailored to the needs of specialized staff. After the first three years of implementation, the HD Network considered that a formal evaluation process would help the Network learn more about how well the program was functioning, identify problem areas or ways to improve it, and give some sense of its impact. A formal evaluation was also timely as other networks in the Bank were taking steps to replicate the HD Network experience with the PDG.

A Description of the PDG program

The Professional Development Grant was established by the HD Network to update and advance the technical skills of sector specialists in light of the priorities and new directions of the lending program and policy work in the HD Network sectors.

The PDG is expected to offer an alternate solution to the courses, study tours or programs which can be funded out of the general training budgets. The training activities that can be funded through a PDG include:
- attendance in intensive non-degree training programs at external institutions;
- secondments with ministries, partner organizations including non-governmental organizations, and private institutions; and
- involvement in well-defined field visits and short research projects.

The logic of the program is to award a PDG only to the most promising staff, and only for training programs which will benefit the Bank. The indicators used to identify promising staff members are presented in the project document. Special emphasis is said to be placed on those applicants who have been employed by the Bank for a minimum of three years, have a record of satisfactory performance and a promising career potential at the Bank, have the academic background in their technical area at the Masters or PhD level, and have a potential for contributing to the improvement of the sector policies or portfolio.

The PDG is expected to be useful to the Bank, both at the division and the network levels. For that purpose, the proposals are evaluated by a committee, consisting of twelve members, including representatives from the Health, Nutrition and Population (HNP), Education, and Social Protection sectors, and other members who provide a balanced representation of the regions and the disciplines in the HD sectors. Applicants must also involve their immediate supervisors at all stages of proposed planning. The division is responsible for the costs associated with temporarily replacing the grant recipient during periods of absence from his/her post. These include the costs/benefits of the recipient's salary and hiring a replacement. The contribution of the Network, represented by the PDG, covers the direct costs of the activity (e.g. tuition fees, material, transportation and subsistence expenses).
The assumptions of the PDG program (see Chart 1)

**Chart 1**

**Some logistical assumptions about the PDG program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The PDG is designed to serve the needs of the applicant, his division and the HD Network</th>
<th>All stakeholders are committed to the PDG, which facilitates implementation</th>
<th>The PDG benefits all three stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>The grantee will complete the training within the allotted time. He may commit some of his personal time or accept some personal inconvenience</td>
<td>The grantee's personal skills and knowledge have increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• He has designed his training activities and tailored them to his needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>The manager continues to pay grantee's salary while freeing him from his workload at the Bank, so he can learn under good conditions.</td>
<td>• The grantee uses his new knowledge/skills on the job. • He remains in the division “long enough” (implicit). • He disseminates his knowledge within his division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• She sees the interest in advancing the applicant's technical skills.</td>
<td>• She has discussed with him the training and its planning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• She will not approve proposals that do not meet her division's needs.</td>
<td>• She will not approve proposals that do not meet her division's needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD Network</td>
<td>The Network makes available the funds related to the direct costs of the training (exceptionally co-sponsor's salary cost).</td>
<td>• The grantee has acquired knowledge useful for the Network. • He remains in the Bank “long enough” (implicit). • He disseminates his knowledge beyond his unit, inside the Bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The PDG committee will not approve the proposals which are not consistent Network priorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the documents presenting the PDG program to potential applicants shows that the committee has put into place the usual procedures for the assessment of the quality of a grant request: applicants are expected to present their training needs in a project document, identify training opportunities, describe the activities they want the PDG to fund, and prepare a detailed timetable and a budget estimate of the training costs.

But it appears also that the procedures put into place by the HD committee for the examination of a proposal is also expected to ensure that a PDG is approved only if it...
serves the needs of the three stakeholders concerned by the grant: i.e. the grantee, his\(^1\) division, and the HD Network. First the applicant makes his own needs assessment. Second the applicant must clear his proposal through his manager, and it is assumed that the manager will not approve a proposal that is not contributing to the immediate needs of her division. Third the proposal is screened by the PDG committee which weighs the training project according to its interest to the HD Network, and the applicant according to his expected future at the Bank. A PDG is funded only if it is believed that all three stakeholders will benefit from it.

The three stakeholders are expected to show their commitment to and their interest in the PDG: the grantee will complete the training within the allocated timeframe, maybe commit some of his personal time or accept some inconvenience for his family life. The manager is expected to commit herself by continuing to pay the grantee’s salary while freeing him from his workload at the bank. The PDG committee commits the HD Network by funding the costs related to the training (and sometimes part of the applicant’s salary). The commitment of the three parties is expected to result in a good implementation of the grant.

Once completed, the PDG is expected to have a short term impact on all three stakeholders: the grantee (he has reached a higher level of competence), the grantee’s division (the grantee has acquired knowledge needed by the division; it is assumed that he will remain in his division long enough to use his newly acquired knowledge in his job and disseminate the knowledge in his division) and the Network (the grantee will have acquired knowledge needed by the Network; he is expected to stay in the Bank long enough to use his knowledge for the Network’s benefit and participate in relevant dissemination activities).

The evaluation questions

The committee requested WBIES to evaluate the first three years of the PDG program within the framework of the following broad question: “How well did the assumptions of the program described in the above chapter match the reality?” It was agreed that the evaluation would focus on the following points:

- To what extent did the grantees design their PDGs to serve the needs of the Bank, in particular their division and the HD Network?
- Were the PDGs easy or difficult to carry out? Did grantees experience difficulties at the design or implementation phases? To what extent did the three stakeholders (grantee, manager, HD Network) honor their respective commitments?
- How did grantees rate the usefulness of the skills and knowledge they had learned with the PDG? What was their perception of the impact of the PDG training on themselves, their division, and the HD Network?

\(^1\) For simplicity, throughout this report he will refer to the grantee, and she will refer to the other players in the PDG program. This in no way reflects the actual gender of individuals involved in the PDG program.
Methodology

The results for this evaluation are derived from:

- an analysis of the PDG brochure and participant database;
- informal discussions with the PDG committee members;
- an interview of four managers (out of the 29 managers who sent a participant on a PDG grant) centering on time management issues and the impact of the PDG.
- a structured interview of PDG participants, via telephone. This was the prime data source. The interview protocol was based on well defined questions (see questionnaire in Appendix I). Responses were recorded as accurately as possible. This was made possible by drafting a series of qualitative questions that were inviting short answers from participants. The protocol allowed for deviations from the questions to gather related information that would help in the interpretation of the findings.

Through FY99, there were 50 participants in the PDG program. The phone interviews were conducted with 34 respondents, 12 male staff (67 percent of the male grantee population) and 22 female staff (69 percent of the female grantee population). Twenty one respondents were nationals of developed countries, and 13 were nationals of developing countries. Twenty eight respondents were headquarters-based staff; six were field staff. The interview concerned six out of the nine grantees for FY96 (60 percent), eight out of the 11 grantees for FY97 (72 percent), 10 out of the 16 grantees for FY98 (62 percent), and 10 out of the 14 grantees for FY99 (71 percent).
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Are the grants designed to serve the needs of the Bank?

A major assumption of the PDG program is that the grantee’s proposal is expected to reflect the needs of himself, his division and the HD Network. To test this assumption, the evaluation gathered data about the contribution of each stakeholder to the design of the grant, the grantee’s motives for taking the grant, and the way he expected his grant to be related to his job. Due to the abundance of participant comments, only a summary is presented in this section. The reader will find a detailed transcript of the participants’ answers in Appendix II.

Main findings:

- The design of the PDG grants for the sample examined in this study was influenced by a variety of resource persons, inside or outside the Bank, none of which had a prevalent influence. However, for most cases (82 percent), the HD Network, the manager, or both played a role in the design of the applicants’ proposals.
- The proposals were designed by most applicants with the needs of their present division in mind. The motivation of most grantees (82 percent) was to deepen sector specific knowledge on the job they had. About 60 percent of respondents expected to use the information for immediate job needs, 12 percent for foreseeable job needs.
- Yet, in some instances the PDG was not designed to serve the immediate needs of the applicant’s division. Nine percent of the people interviewed took the PDG to be prepared for a change of job, six percent wanted to do something different than the routine of the job, 29 percent were moved by a personal interest in the topic, rather than immediate or foreseeable job needs.
- These data suggest that in most cases, the basic assumption that the PDG will be designed to serve the combined needs of the applicant, his division and the HD Network, holds. However, this is not a rigid principle, as some grants which do not serve primarily immediate or foreseeable job needs are approved by the managers and the PDG committee. In some instances managers see an interest in advancing an applicant’s skills, even if the topic does not directly serve their division, but serves the personal development of a very capable staff, or the needs of other units in the Bank. A few applicants declared that their managers did not have any interest in the PDG, although they had approved it.

The respective contribution of grantees, their division chiefs and the HD Network to the design of the PDGs

The results are summarized on the following table, a detailed transcript of participants answers is presented in Appendix II.
In 53 percent of the cases, the manager assisted the respondent in the design of the grant, by informing him about the PDG possibility, or giving some general direction. Two applicants said that their managers had been supportive even if they had not contributed to the proposal.

Fifty six percent of the respondents reported that the PDG committee had provided them some assistance. Three persons said the PDG committee comments helped them refine their proposals; one person said the committee helped by identifying resource people. Forty four percent of respondents did not receive any assistance from the PDG committee. One interviewee reported he did not expect any assistance, as he thought the role of the committee was just to review the proposal.

The PDG administrator provided assistance in most of the cases (76 percent), offering advice, providing examples, explaining the procedures. A third of the applicants (32 percent) considered that the PDG administrator provided them a lot of assistance.

Members of the HD Network assisted 62 percent of respondents. Two applicants approached their mentors inside the Network. One was disappointed by the little help he received. Other applicants received assistance from former PDG members, and from other HD Network members who reviewed the applicants proposals.

Other people inside of the Bank helped in the design of the proposal of 50 percent of respondents. The assistance took the form of colleagues reviewing the draft proposal, writing letters of recommendations, and searching information. The resident mission was approached by one participant to identify client demand.

Fifty percent of respondents received assistance from people outside of the Bank for the design of their proposals. These were usually the host institutions for the grantee’s internship or research project, and in two instances the US private sector.

We can see that with the possible exception of the PDG administrator, no resource person was identified by the respondents as a champion for the design of their grant. In particular, respondents’ appreciation for the input of their manager or the HD Network in

Table 1
Grantees’ perception of the input of potential resource people in the design of their PDG proposal (34 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource person</th>
<th>No assistance</th>
<th>Some assistance</th>
<th>A lot of assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your division manager</td>
<td>16 (47%)</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PDG committee</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDG administrator</td>
<td>8 (24%)</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of your network</td>
<td>13 (38%)</td>
<td>15 (44%)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other resource people inside the Bank</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource people outside the Bank</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>10 (29%)</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the design of their grant does not appear to differ from other resource persons’ contribution (colleagues in the Bank, persons outside the Bank).

In 82 percent of the cases (28 out of N=34), participants reported that their manager, the HD Network, or both, had contributed somewhat to the design of the PDG. Six out of the thirty four respondents (18 percent) reported that they had designed their proposal without the assistance of their managers or the HD Network.

To what extent was the PDG linked to the applicants’ immediate job needs?

Participants were asked what their most important motive was for requesting a PDG, and how they intended to use their grant on the job. Results are presented on tables 2 and 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What was your most important objective for requesting a PDG? (N=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deepening sector-specific (technical) knowledge on the job you had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for a job change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing something different than the routine of the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (get formal training in a condensed way)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what ways did you expect the use of your PDG to be related to your job? (N=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to use the information for immediate job needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was moved by a personal or professional interest in the topic rather than by immediate or foreseeable job needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wanted to be prepared for foreseeable job needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposals were designed by most applicants with the needs of their present division in mind. Referring to Table 2, 82 percent of respondents requested the PDG to deepen technical knowledge related to their current job. Table 3 shows that 71 percent of respondents wanted to use their PDG for immediate or foreseeable job needs.

Yet about a third (29 percent) of the respondents declared that they were moved by a personal or professional interest in the topic rather than by some job needs, and nine percent of respondents were preparing for a change of job (inside or outside the Bank).
It appears that a manager can support a PDG in which the content does not serve her division needs, by indifference (two applicants declared their managers were indifferent), or for other motives. Two of the four managers interviewed said they had supported a very capable staff member, who deserved a personal development, even if their grant was not going to benefit directly the unit, but the Bank at large. One manager dealing with African countries declared that the HD management maintained a low wall strategy between units, shifting staff where and when they were needed, which was a necessity because of the political instability of the countries in the Bank portfolio. He had himself approved a PDG in which fieldwork had been done for the benefit of another unit.
Is a PDG easy or difficult for a participant to carry out?

We will examine the difficulties participants experienced in carrying out a PDG at the design and the implementation stages. Potential difficulties at the design phase can arise regarding access to the information needed to prepare a proposal, or the procedures that the committee has put into place for the review of the proposal. At the implementation stage, the basic assumption of the program is that all stakeholders, having an interest in the grant, will commit the resources they have pledged, which will result in a smooth implementation of the grant. The reader will find a detailed transcript of participants’ answers concerning difficulties in designing or implementing the grant in Appendix III. Time management issues are presented in Appendix IV.

Main findings:

- **No major difficulty was experienced by candidates at the design phase of the grant.**
  - Participants did not report any difficulty in accessing information about the PDG program. In most recent years, word of mouth and the combination of media advertising the program seem to have made staff from the HD Network familiar with the PDG program. Yet E-mail was the only information source cited by interviewees from resident missions.
  - Most participants (68 percent) did not report any difficulty in accessing the information necessary for the design of their grant. However, site selection and the timing of activities is time consuming and can prompt a minority of grantees to select a well-known university out of convenience rather than explore other choices.
  - Most respondents (61 percent) declared that they were not faced with a decision or choice that was difficult to make. Among those who experienced such difficulties timing issues were the most prevalent.
  - Most candidates (85 percent) did not perceive that the PDG committee took an excessive amount of time to decide on their grant. Still, in a few instances, delays at the decision making phase impacted negatively on the organization of their grant.
  - Yet, the fact that candidates try to link the content of their grant proposal to their division needs may lead them to abandon the grant in case of job mobility.

- **Time management issues were the prevalent problem at the implementation stage.**
  - A large majority of grantees did not experience any difficulty with the allocation of funds which were usually made available in a timely fashion. Participants were satisfied with IIE service as grant administrator.
  - Time management issues were the largest problem. Most respondents (85 percent) were not replaced by their manager while they were on a PDG. Even when their manager agreed to hire a consultant, participants sometimes had to split their work with colleagues, or do a share by themselves. Three out of the five participants who were backed up by a consultant found it difficult to reconcile the PDG with their work, in spite of the arrangement.
Most respondents (72 percent) did not find it easy to reconcile the PDG with their work. Those participants who found their PDG easy to implement had been fully relieved from their jobs, with colleagues taking over at least part of their work, had taken short PDGs, or had split their PDGs into very short periods over a long period of time.

Participants’ coping strategies for time management problems included being backed-up by colleagues, along with working on the PDG during their own free time, or requesting a prolongation of the grant. According to the records of the PDG database, 50 percent of the participants in the program have asked for an extension of their grant.

There is a statistically significant trend in recent years for participants to request shorter grants.

If they were to design their grant again, a third of the respondents would readjust the duration of their PDGs, by reducing the number of activities planned or plan more time to do the work.

Designing a PDG

The first questions that arise for the applicant concern learning about the existence of the PDG program, and accessing the data needed to craft the proposal. Other concerns at the design phase are whether candidates have difficulties in choosing among different options, and whether the PDG committee reviews a proposal within a reasonable timeframe. In this chapter the findings from interviews of 34 grantees was complemented with an interview of three persons who had applied for a grant but failed to submit a proposal.

Accessing information about the PDG program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>How did you learn about the PDG? (N=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>via e-mail (announcement for a deadline, Newsnotes etc.)</td>
<td>14 (41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through a combination of media</td>
<td>7 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth (colleagues)</td>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD web site</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From your manager</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (in a newspaper, worked on the PDG program)</td>
<td>2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forty-one percent of the respondents learned about the PDG program by e-mail announcement. E-mail was the only source cited by grantees from resident missions.

Eighteen percent of respondents learned about the PDG from colleagues. This is particularly true in recent years. Word of mouth as a source of information was not cited by FY96 recipients, and only once by FY97 grantees. It was cited by three participants in
FY98 and two in FY99. Former PDG recipients have played a role in counseling four potential grantees.

Twenty percent of respondents learned about the PDG through a combination of media. Again this is a trend that developed in recent years; all six participants who reported learning about the PDG through a combination of media were grantees of FY98 or FY99. A participant comments: “I learned about the PDG program through e-mail, my manager, word of mouth, and brown bag lunches. I feel everybody in HD is pretty familiar with it. I first learned about the project three years ago but the timing was not good as I was taking a project to the board, this is why I waited until FY98”.

**Difficulties Encountered In Crafting The Grant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the design of your grant project/proposal, was there any information that was difficult to get? (N= 34 respondents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (32%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty eight percent of respondents did not report any difficulty in accessing the information necessary for the design of their PDG.

Out of the eleven candidates who experienced difficulties, six (54 percent, N=11) had problems in accessing information concerning the site at which to carry out their PDG and the timing of activities. This problem was mentioned for the three types of PDG (university course, research project, study tour). Three participants commented on how time consuming it was to identify a university at which to take their course, and to get information about course schedules. In one instance, a grantee reports that he chose one university out of convenience, because of the lack of information on alternative sites.

Other problems mentioned, to a lesser extent, were difficulties in the design of the budget (27 percent, N=11), and lack of general guidelines or best practices about how to choose, sequence and organize the PDG activities (nine percent, N=11).
Table 6
During the design of your grant proposal, was there any decision or choice that was difficult to make? (N=33 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty one percent of respondents declared that they were not faced with a decision or choice that was difficult to make.

Out of the 13 grantees who experienced difficulties, the majority (N=8, 62 percent) mentioned timing issues: deciding how long to plan for the PDG, narrowing down the topic to something manageable over the length of the grant, whether to choose a shorter and easier program or a longer and more difficult one.

Two persons (16 percent) had concerns about their workload. Another respondent mentioned learning modalities. One candidate found it difficult to choose a country to carry out his PDG, and another had just been reassigned and had to reconcile his PDG with the needs of his new division chief.

The approval procedures

Table 7
What is your perception of the time the PDG committee took to decide on your grant proposal? (N=34 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too long</th>
<th>appropriate</th>
<th>Very quick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td>12 (35%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large majority of respondents (85 percent) did not experience any difficulties with the amount of time the PDG took to decide on their proposals. Some participants were amazed: “It was very quick, I was impressed. They had already closed the program but they had some money left and were able to reopen it to fit me in”.

Problems were experienced by a minority of applicants on the following aspects:
- the PDG committee sometimes took an excessive amount of time to take their decision (15 percent, N=34). In four instances delays were due to the negotiation of cost items: the applicant’s salary continuation with the manager, or direct costs with the applicant.
- In two instances delays at the decision making phase impacted negatively on the organization of the grant (six percent, N=34). In these two cases (a study tour and a research project), the delays disrupted the applicants’ careful planning for local arrangements and back-up of their work at the Bank.
Two participants experienced what they considered to be a lack of trust from the PDG committee: in one instance the PDG committee changed a rule after the applicant was awarded the grant. The other person, who was preparing a study tour, was vexed by some of the committee requests.

**Interview of applicants who quit the PDG program during the design phase.**

To have another perspective on the difficulties faced by applicants in designing their PDG grant, we interviewed three persons who had applied for a grant but who had failed to submit a proposal. In the three cases, the **explanatory factor was the candidate change of assignment**: one person was about to retire, another had just moved into a new division and his priority was to concentrate on his new job, although he might consider a PDG in the future. The third candidate had been recruited by a new division, and had to modify entirely his proposal, as the content was very much linked to the needs of his former division, and no longer appropriate.

**The implementation of the PDG**

The first section of this chapter deals with the allocation of funds: whether the funds were made available in a timely fashion, and participants’ appreciation of IIE service as grant administrator. The second section relates to time management issues: whether the manager fulfilled the PDG committee’s expectation in hiring a consultant to replace or complement the grantee on his work, what type of time management problems grantees encountered and what coping strategies grantees put into place to deal with them. The third section addresses problems other than time management issues that grantees encountered during the implementation of their grant. The last section presents the lessons learned by the grantees about their grant implementation.

**The allocation of funds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Were the funds made available in a timely fashion? (34 respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 (91%)</td>
<td>3 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 91 percent of the respondents, funds were made available in a timely fashion. In one instance a problem arose with the late transfer of the PDG contribution to the applicant’s salary. Another grantee said the late signing of the letter of award contributed to the postponement of his grant.
Table 9
Were you satisfied with IIE service as grant administrator? (34 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, no problem</th>
<th>Yes, minor problems</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 (85%)</td>
<td>4 (12)</td>
<td>1 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A vast majority of respondents (29 respondents, 85 percent, N=34) has only positive remarks about IIE manager. “She is very helpful and pleasant, she understands problems…. She followed me up reminding me of the administrative steps I had to do…. She was wonderful and very efficient to manage funds in New-York, as the PDG administrator was on the Washington side... She tries to solve our problems, the traveling arrangements, she is very helpful”.
- Four respondents (12 percent, N=34) were satisfied but reported minor problems, i.e. delays in the processing of the status of expenses, and problems related to the electronic wiring of the funds. One grantee from a resident mission lamented the absence of a local grant administrator.
- One respondent was clearly dissatisfied with IIE assistance on logistical aspects, and recommended that the committee should clarify for the grantee what services IIE is supposed to provide.

Time management issues

We will examine here whether managers replaced grantees, as was the agreement for the PDG grant, or if not, what arrangements had been made to carry out the grantee’s workload. We will also consider how difficult it was for participants to reconcile their PDG with their work. The reader will find a detailed transcript of participants’ answers to time management issues in Appendix IV.

Table 10
Did your manager hire someone to replace you or to complement your work while you were working on the PDG? (34 answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (15%)</td>
<td>29 (85%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In 85 percent of cases, managers did not commit resources for staffing to complement or replace the grantee. In five instances (15 percent), managers hired a consultant to ease the grantee’s workload. Two of these five grantees found that the PDG was easy to reconcile with their job. In one case the consultant knew the project beforehand; in the other, the consultant took part of the work, and project work was split among colleagues. The three other staff reported that time management was difficult in spite of the arrangement. In two cases, the grantee was still responsible for part of his job, and no mention is made of colleague assistance. In one instance, the grantee’s projects were assigned to a newly hired regular staff and he had to find himself new work to do on his return.
The four managers interviewed agreed that the **cost of staff replacement was the main limitation for their use of the PDG program**. One of them explained that his training budget per capita does not even pay two weeks of staff time, and that out of that amount 20 percent is transferred back to the HD Network, as a contribution for the HD Week, which he considers to be more of a networking event than a training event. The funding of the PDG he supported was split between his training budget, a contribution from the PDG committee, and a contribution from an operating unit, which funded the fieldwork.

**Table 11**
**From a time management perspective, was it easy or difficult to reconcile your PDG project with your job? (32 answers)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Moderately difficult</th>
<th>difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 (28%)</td>
<td>8 (25%)</td>
<td>15 (47%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nine respondents **found it easy to reconcile their PDG with their grant**:
- Two persons were able to take time off, having their job covered by a hired consultant and colleagues.
- Two persons were entirely relieved of their work at the Bank by colleagues, without a hired consultant. One of them comments, “I took some time off so I was relieved from my work. I was not replaced. The unit was trying to recruit but it did not work. In the end my manager split the work among my colleagues. My colleagues were very supportive during all my grant (eight months, FY96)”.
- Two persons arranged to take their PDG in summer, or at a time when their responsibilities were not overwhelming.
- Three persons either took a very short grant or split their PDG into small segments. One respondent explains, “I was given the flexibility to do my PDG (field visits) in small trenches, over a long period of time (5.5 weeks over more than a year). This made it easy to fit the PDG into my work schedule. It also made it unnecessary to hire someone, which was very important for my PDG to be accepted”.

Fifteen respondents **found it difficult to reconcile their PDG with their job**:
- Eight persons did not have any back-up system and had to do their PDG along with a normal workload. Two of those had many problems with missions competing with their PDG. Says one respondent, “It was difficult. I had to do my job plus the PDG. During my internship abroad, I kept doing my job using e-mail. It was just like working from home, and I could continue to monitor the things I was doing. I just did not start new things during the PDG period, that’s all. I was not replaced, it worked for me like this. Anyway four months of PDG is not enough to leave your work so you have to keep doing it to be effective when you return”.
- Four persons were partially relieved of their workload by a consultant (two cases) or colleagues (two cases).
- Two persons were allowed by their manager to take some time off, but not during the entire PDG.
- One person from operations was fully replaced by a regular staff member, and had difficulty reconstructing a new project portfolio after completing his PDG.
An analysis of sub-group patterns in participants’ self-assessment of their grant difficulty was tested for a number of variables, but made difficult by the small size of our participant sample (see details in Appendix V):

- Grant difficulty vis-a-vis participants’ sectoral employment: It appears that regional specialists from the LAC region found it more difficult than other regional specialists or thematic specialists to reconcile their PDG project with their job.
- Grant difficulty vis-a-vis the length of the grant: It appears that grants shorter than two months were the easiest to implement from a time management perspective.
- Grant difficulty vis-a-vis participants’ grade in the Bank: The participant’s grade in the Bank does not appear to make a difference within the sample of interviewees.
- Grant difficulty vis-a-vis grant year: The year the respondent took the grant does not appear to make a difference within the sample of interviewees.

The interviewees reported that they were implementing strategies, in the design of the PDG, to reduce the competition between the PDG and their workload:

- Arranging for back-up by colleagues for a part of or the entire workload (nine times, 26 percent). The limits to that strategy is the workload of colleagues, and the necessity for them to have a good knowledge of the applicant’s portfolio of projects.
- Working on the PDG during their own free time (nine cases, 26 percent).
- Planning for a reduction of own workload during the PDG period (seven times, 20 percent).
- Organizing the PDG during summertime or a period of low Bank activity (seven times, 20 percent).
- Taking a very short PDG or breaking it into small segments (six times, 18 percent). In this grant sample, there is a statistically significant trend of taking shorter PDGs in the most recent years (see appendix VI for details).
- Delaying PDG implementation, or asking for an extension of the grant. This was mentioned by six (18 percent) of the respondents. According to the records of the PDG database, 50 percent of the participants in the program have asked for an extension of their grant.
- Arranging for back-up by hired consultants (five times, 15 percent). The limit to this approach is that consultants must have prior knowledge of the grantee’s projects. If not, the grantee will have to continue to take a share of his work.
- Dropping a component of the PDG, or not attending all sessions of a course (four cases, 12 percent).

Other obstacles to the implementation of a PDG grant

The transcript of participants’ answers for this section is presented in Appendix III.

| Table 12 |
| Did you encounter any obstacle I have not addressed so far (other than time management issues) in carrying out your grant? (33 respondents) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 (39%)</td>
<td>20 (61%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixty one percent of participants did not experience any problem other than time management issues in carrying their grant.

Thirteen respondents identified the following problems:

- Five (15 percent, N=33) participants mentioned a modification of the grant environment that could not be prevented: illness of a stakeholder, change of a counterpart, or political instability.
- Two (six percent, N=33) participants said that during their internships they had a hard time avoiding being perceived as representing the Bank, especially when dealing with sensitive issues.
- One participant mentioned each of the following problems: lack of interest and support from the division manager; difficulty in coordinating the work schedule with the courses available at the university; lack of time to produce the output report after the grant; housing conditions; changes in the rules for the grant during the implementation phase; and lack of a back-up system by colleagues.

Interview of the grantees who decided to quit the PDG during the implementation phase

For another perspective on the difficulties participants may face in implementing a PDG grant, we interviewed the four persons who had applied and received a grant but who then withdrew their application. In one case the candidate did not continue his PDG because he was reassigned to a new position. Another person left the Bank. In the two remaining cases, the difficulties were due to an excessive amount of time spent bargaining over the conditions of the grant. Candidates explained that some of the activities they had planned for could not be carried out, as so much time had elapsed. Both of these candidates reported being put off and somewhat vexed by the negotiation process.

Lessons learned by the grantees about their grant implementation

Twenty eight (82 percent) of the 34 interviewees reported that if they were to design their grant again, they would make some changes.

The lessons learned can be classified in the following broad categories:

- Eleven respondents (39 percent, N=28) said they would readjust the duration of the PDG: They would reduce the number of activities in order to leave more opportunities for in depth learning, and they would concentrate the activities over a shorter period of time, planning more time to do the work. Candidates felt that they tended to shortchange themselves on the time needed to carry out their PDG, they mentioned in particular the need to provision time after a course for the completion of the homework. They also mentioned the risks involved in relying on local sources of information, which are subject to circumstances beyond the grantees’ control and may negatively effect information flows.
- Four persons (14 percent, N=28) who had taken a combination of internships and a research project reported that they would plan more time in the headquarters of the partner institution, rather than making several small field visits.
- Three persons (11 percent, N=28) would change the type of PDG they request and design a shorter, more academic program. Two persons would replace their study tour or research project with an academic program: although they feel that a research project or study tour offers more learning opportunities, they believe a course is easier to plan for and easier to reconcile with their workload. Also, they feel the PDG
committee makes approval for a study tour more difficult than approval for a course. One person would replace a traditional course with a shorter summer course, which he believes offers concentrated and cost-effective information. The same person would also consider an internet course.

- Three persons (11 percent, N=28) would make sure they receive a higher commitment from their managers, by securing some time off to pursue their PDG, and registering the grant as a formal output during the fiscal year.
- Two persons (seven percent, N=28) would prepare themselves better before the grant, by refreshing their skills in a foreign language, or by visiting the site to arrange logistical matters.
- One person who would like to repeat a PDG (the committee does not award second grants) would design a proposal in two parts that would encompass all his interests.
What was the impact of the grants?

This part of the interview only concerns the twenty four (71 percent, N=34) out of the 34 interviewees who had completed their grant. Seven of the ten respondents who had not completed their grant were on the FY99 program, and three had their grant approved in FY98, and delayed because of the illness of a key stakeholder or an intensive workload. Transcripts of the participants’ answers for this chapter are presented in Appendix VI.

Main findings

- Overall the grantees have a very positive appreciation of the impact of their grant on themselves: the PDG has fully met their expectations, has broadened the perspective they had in their area of expertise, has made them more confident in their work, and has provided new work opportunities.
- All grantees report that they use the PDG information as the need arises in their division, mainly to recommend or hire people they met while working with the grant (65 percent), to design a program component (61 percent), to foster policy dialogue and technical assistance for client countries (48 percent), and to produce strategy papers (17 percent). Most grantees (78 percent) do not feel that they have used the PDG to make major modifications in the work they were doing.
- Most grantees have shared knowledge resulting from their PDG inside and beyond their division. The most frequent medium of dissemination is the production of a strategy paper. Face to face informal dissemination is also common.
- The four managers interviewed gave positive feedback for the PDG in terms of the technical knowledge acquired, the morale of staff, the improvement of project quality, the production of new expertise in underdeveloped areas, and the new approaches discovered for HD problems.

Usefulness for the participant

The results for this section are presented in Tables 13, 14 and 15.

### Table 13

Overall how would you rate the usefulness of your PDG for you professionally?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>4.83</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Arithmetic average rating of all respondents to the question on a scale of 1 to 5, where "1" = "very low," and "5" = "very high."
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.
All respondents gave a rating of four or five to the usefulness of the PDG for them professionally. This indicates a very high level of satisfaction (The WBI benchmark for this indicator is 85 percent).

All participants’ comments are very positive: The PDG provides a customized complement to the participants’ experience (eight percent), a validation of their work by academia (four percent), a unique combination of practical experience and academic approaches (four percent), and an outsider’s view of a problem (four percent). One person said the PDG helped him get a promotion, another expressed satisfaction for getting a PDG which he considered a very important sign of support and recognition from his manager. One person says, “The PDG was the best training in my 20 years at the Bank”.

### Table 14
Upon reflection, did your PDG serve the objectives you had set for yourself? (N=24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22 (92%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety two percent of the 24 respondents felt that the PDG had served the objectives they had for themselves. One of the two respondents in the “somewhat” category said that a limitation came from the fact that he was able to carry out only a part of his grant. Another found limitations in the content of the course he had taken at the university.

### Table 15
Did your grant have some unexpected outcome? Was there something that was totally unanticipated? (N=24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than half of the respondents (54 percent, N=24), commented that the PDG had had some unexpected outcomes:

- One person made a statement of concern about being away from the Bank and losing precious information.
- All other comments were positive; six interviewees reported that the grant had broadened the perspective they had on their area of expertise by providing an outsider’s view of Bank projects. Other unexpected benefits were reported, each by one participant: the PDG had made them more confident in their work, had been a rich humanistic experience, had provided opportunities for networking, had offered them time to reflect upon their work, and had provided work opportunities.
Impact on the grantee’s division

The first section of this chapter tests the assumption that participants would remain in their division and keep the same manager after the grant. A second section deals with the use participants made of the information, contacts or material they had gathered as part of their PDG experience. The last section of this chapter addresses dissemination issues.

Mobility of managers and grantees

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you been employed in a different division since you requested the PDG? (N=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did your manager change since you requested the PDG?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All respondents (N=34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding FY99 grantees (N=24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The proportion of respondents who have changed managers since they requested the PDG is 58 percent if we exclude the FY99 grantees. The Bank reforms of FY97-FY98 certainly effected mobility among managers, which can explain this result. Another factor is participants’ mobility within their divisions.
- Participants’ mobility away from their divisions explains manager changes to a limited extent; only six (18 percent, N=34) respondents declared that they had moved from their division since the PDG.

The mobility of participants and managers does not seem to affect managers’ incentives for funding PDGs. The four managers interviewed declared that they were not solely reasoning in terms of the benefits of a grant for their division, but from an institutional perspective. One of them declared that as everyone in the headquarters was changing jobs every three years, he could not help if a person was leaving his division and thus considered the PDG an opportunity for the personal growth of his staff within the Bank. Another manager reported that one of her staff left the Bank shortly after completing a PDG. Still, she considered the experience beneficial for the Bank, as the person trained now held a senior position in his government.
How did participants use the PDG in their work?

The findings for this question are presented in tables 18 and 19.

Table 18
“I am going to read some statements concerning the use you might have made of the information, contacts or material you gathered as part of your PDG experience. Please answer with true/ false” (23 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True</th>
<th>False</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intensity of use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I refer to the information/contacts or materials when the need arises during my work.</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the information/contacts material in my work on a routine basis.</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use for innovation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used the material/contacts information to refine my analysis of the work I am doing.</td>
<td>22 (96%)</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used the material/contacts information to make major modifications or innovations in the work I was doing.</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19
“Can you think of some specific examples of ways that you have used your PDG in your work such as” (N= 23 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use made of the PDG</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hiring or recommending people you met</td>
<td>15 (65%)</td>
<td>8 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in designing a project/ program component</td>
<td>14 (61%)</td>
<td>9 (39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or any other task that you can think of:</td>
<td>18 (78%)</td>
<td>5 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy dialogue and technical assistance</td>
<td>11 (48%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production of strategy paper</td>
<td>4 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation of seminar</td>
<td>2 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>networking</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>training colleagues</td>
<td>1 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation of the Professional Development Program

- **Intensity of use:** All respondents use the information, contacts or material gathered as part of their PDG experience as the need arises during their work. Sixty one percent of the interviewees use the information on a routine basis, 39 percent do not, sometimes because the PDG concerned a very specialized field which is not needed everyday.

- **Innovative use:** All respondents but one have used their PDG to refine their analysis of the work they were doing. Seventy eight percent of respondents do not consider that they have used their PDG to make major modifications in the work they were doing.

- **Uses made of the PDG:** respondents have used their PDG to recommend or hire people they had met (65 percent of the 23 respondents), to design a project or program component (61 percent), and for policy dialogue and technical assistance to client countries (48 percent). Participants commented on the last aspect, explaining the PDG made it possible for them to react in an efficient way when a client country makes demands on short notice, stating that their grant gave them a feeling of security in policy dialogue, improved their analytical rigor, helped them to sell their projects inside the Bank and assisted them during project preparation. Other uses made of the PDG include the production of a strategy paper (17 percent), the preparation of seminars (nine percent), networking (four percent), and training colleagues (four percent).

- **The four managers interviewed gave very positive feedback on the usefulness of the PDG, in terms on the technical knowledge acquired.** A resident mission chief explained that the person from his unit who went on a PDG had been recruited shortly afterwards in the headquarters. This lifted the morale of the remaining staff in his mission, who often feel they lack possibilities for mobility. Another manager explained that staff in operations needed the opportunity to deepen their technical knowledge, because it resulted in an improvement of project quality. Two managers mentioned that a PDG grant had allowed their division to gain new expertise on underdeveloped fields, and news ideas about how to do things.

**Sharing PDG knowledge inside the division**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighteen participants (78 percent, N=23) said that they have shared the knowledge they received while inside their division.

**Means of dissemination** are the following:

- The production of a paper is the most frequent medium (11 cases, 48 percent, N=23). However two participants did not feel responsible for an active circulation of the document beyond their boss, their mentor and the PDG committee.
• Informal dissemination (four participants, 17 percent, N=23), in meetings and in the mentoring of younger staff.
• E-mail (four participants, 17 percent, N=23).
• Brown bag lunch (three grantees, 13 percent, N=23).

**Impact of the PDG on the HD Network**

The first section addresses the assumption that grantees would remain in the Bank after they had completed their PDG. The second section deals with the dissemination of the PDG information beyond the grantee’s unit. The last section presents the grantees’ perceptions of whether their colleagues have also benefited from their PDG.

**Grantee’s mobility away from the Bank**

Out of the 50 persons who were awarded a grant, two (four percent) have since left the Bank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 21</th>
<th>How long do you expect to remain at the World Bank as an active staff member? (N=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than five years</td>
<td>Between five and 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (20%)</td>
<td>20 (59%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty percent of respondents expect to remain at the Bank more than five years. Twenty percent of the respondents expect to leave the Bank within the next five years; two persons who answered so are FY99 grantees. It is difficult to know whether the respondents’ aspirations for leaving the Bank will materialize over the next years. In a sense the answers to this question are more an indicator of respondents’ dissatisfaction with their present situation. The fact that only four percent of the PDG grantees have moved from the Bank seems to be a good result if we take into account the breadth of recent institutional reforms.

**Sharing the PDG knowledge beyond the grantee’s unit?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 22</th>
<th>Did you produce a completion report for your grant?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twelve persons did not answer this question as they had, from their own assessment, either not completed their grant or just completed it. Out of the people who had completed their grant (N=22), 64 percent have handed in a completion report for their grant; 36 percent have not done so. One person declared that he did not see the point of producing a report as he had been attending a course. Two persons declared they had been outstretched with travel and had not yet found the time.

Two participants (nine percent, N=23) who had not produced a report declared that they were unsure whether their completion report was to serve the dissemination of PDG technical information or the information for potential PDG applicants on the program.

Table 23
Have you disseminated the knowledge you received while on the PDG beyond your own unit? (N=23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 (70%)</td>
<td>7 (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The diffusion of the information in the HD Network does not seem to differ from the pattern of circulation in the grantees' divisions. The most common media reported by interviewees (nine cases, 39 percent, N=23) was a paper, circulated through e-mail to the grantee's division manager and the PDG committee. Six participants (26 percent, N=23) also held brown bag sessions. Five participants (22 percent, N=23) reported they only disseminated the information in an informal way through face to face discussions, training of interns or mentoring of younger staff.
- Two participants (nine percent, N=23) regretted that the HD Network was not proactive enough in the dissemination of PDG knowledge.

**Side benefits on colleagues of the PDG grant**

Only 12 (52 percent) out of the 23 persons who had completed their grant answered the following question “Could you explain me whether and how colleagues or peers have benefited directly or indirectly from your grant?”.
- Formal dissemination of PDG knowledge (strategy papers) was mentioned by two respondents (16 percent, N=12).
- Six respondents (50 percent, N=12) considered that their colleagues had benefited because the PDG experience had made respondents more knowledgeable about their field.
- Four respondents (33 percent, N=12) referred to the improvement of the quality of their output, or their increased network of contacts.
- One person identified several areas in which his colleagues had benefited: “I can bring a more substantive contribution to the work I was doing. Then I became a team leader and I hope my colleagues have benefited from it. I have also helped other people who wanted to apply for a PDG by providing advice”.
5
Conclusions

The strengths and the challenges of the PDG program

The main findings of the evaluation are summarized in Chart 2. For more details refer to the main findings section at the beginning of each chapter of the report.

The PDG program presents a series of strong assets:
- The procedures the committee has established are usually effective at the design and implementation stages. Very few participants reported problems, while the committee is perceived by many as flexible and non-bureaucratic.
- The grants are in their majority designed to serve the needs of the Bank, in particular the applicant’s division and the HD Network. The number of grants (29 percent) which in our study were not primarily designed to serve immediate or foreseeable job needs could cause concerns, but this issue has to be toned down by the findings about the high level of use of the PDG knowledge (96 percent).
- One Hundred percent of the participants interviewed expressed a very high level of satisfaction (ratings of 4 or 5) about the usefulness of the training for their professional life. This is a very good result, as the WBI benchmark for this indicator is 85 percent. The training has broadened participants’ perspectives on their areas of expertise, has made them more confident in their work, has helped them in policy dialogue and has provided new work opportunities.
- Seventy-eight percent of participants have shared PDG knowledge inside their division; 70 percent have disseminated PDG knowledge in the HD Network.
- The four managers interviewed gave very positive feedback of the PDG, in terms of technical knowledge acquired, the morale of staff, the improvement of project quality, and the production of a new expertise in underdeveloped areas. All managers determined that, even if the grants had not always benefited their own division directly, the PDGs had without a shadow of a doubt greatly benefited the Bank.

The main limitations of the program rest with salary continuation and time management issues. The cost of salary continuation during a PDG exceeds by far the per capita allocation allotted to the division for staff training, which means that few managers can afford to free their staff from their workload during the entire PDG. As a result, the incentive is for the grantee to take shorter PDGs, and not to be replaced.

A danger of this situation is that in the future participants may increasingly favor course-only PDGs over PDGs with hands-on experience (research projects, study tours, internships, secondments). The latter present several handicaps, which make them more difficult to reconcile with an applicant’s workload: they call for more planning, are less flexible to implement, often pose logistical issues, and are more prone to difficulties arising from a modification of the grant environment (unavailability of a counterpart etc.).
Propositions for improvement

• *Salary continuation over a long grant does not seem to be a feasible option* for the managers nor for the committee. It is best therefore that the committee either advise grantees to take short and intensive grants, or encourage candidates to build flexibility in the design of the proposal (by planning more time, or taking their grant in short segments).

• *The committee needs to consider whether to take into consideration in its funding policy the potential impact of the different types of PDG for the Bank:*
  → A course-only PDG increases the technical capacity of the recipient, which impacts on the quality of his work. But usually the contribution of such grants to the WB knowledge bank is limited, especially if applicants tend to follow their courses at the same universities, for reasons of practicality. Considering an extreme case, should most PDG applicants choose to attend a course at the same university, there would be little sense in funding several expensive PDGs rather than organizing a training course at the Bank headquarters.
  → Conversely, a PDG that includes a research project or an internship has more potential to contribute to the WB knowledge bank.

• *The committee should make a reasonable contribution to the grantee’s salary.* The rules and the level of such contribution should be made clear in advance to potential applicants and managers. The committee could choose among the following options:
  → A fixed contribution, irrespective of the grantee’s salary. This would advantage junior applicants over senior applicants.
  → A fixed percentage of the applicant’s salary. This option would finance the same amount of free time to all participants.
  → A contribution depending on the quality of the proposal. The rules would have to be explicit.
  → A contribution depending on the type of PDG, favoring for example PDGs with hands-on experience (see above).

In addition to the three main recommendations above, some smaller improvements can be made to the grant procedures:

• *The committee should assist candidates in improving the design of their grants:*
  → Issue guidelines or best practices. This can be done in a formal way, or by facilitating networking between former PDG grantees and new applicants (for example, by creating a spot on the web where applicants can exchange with former grantees, or inviting former grantees to informational meetings about the PDG). Asking participants to present their experience on a one page flyer to be widely distributed would facilitate contacts with new applicants. A participant suggested that the PDG committee should interview the applicant, rather than just reading his proposal, to exchange views on the feasibility of the grant design.
  → Provide information about where to get content related information to help applicants choose sites beyond the most obvious universities.
  → Provide more clarity in terms of the grantee’s work program and the intended use of the PDG information.

• *The committee should clarify in advance the grant procedures and improve the approval process by:*
  → not altering the rules after a grant has been awarded;
  → explaining what services IIE is expected to provide to the grantee;
making a decision quickly, in order not to disrupt the planning of the grant, preferably before the end of March so that the staff can incorporate the PDG in their training program.

- The following points have been raised by participants and should be answered by the committee:
  - whether a PDG could fund an internship with an NGO or a think tank;
  - whether field staff moving to the US should be allowed more funds for essentials (transportation, basic subsistence, child care); and
  - whether a person should be allowed to take a second grant.
Appendix I

Phone interview questionnaire

SECTION 1

Background information

1) a. male  b. female

2) At the time of the grant, were you working
   a. at the Bank headquarters  b. as a field staff

3) Year of the grant: FY96  FY97  FY98  FY99

4) how long have you been working for the World Bank group?

5) In which department were you employed when you requested a PDG?

6) Are you employed in a different division now?

7) Has your manager changed since you requested your PDG?

8) what was your grade in the Bank when you were approved for a PDG?

9) what is your grade now?

10) what kind of position did you hold when you received a PDG?
    a. short term consultant  b. long term consultant
c. fixed term  d. regular staff

11) what kind of position do you hold now?
    a. short term consultant  b. long term consultant
c. fixed term  d. regular staff

12) How long do you expect to remain at the World Bank as an active staff member?
    a. less than five years  b. between five and 10 years
c. more than 10 years

13) your nationality:

14) your highest level of education
    a. masters  b. PHD
c. other _________
SECTION 2  
Your experience with the PDG Grant

15) How did you learn about the PDG program?  
   a. via e-mail (announcement for a deadline, Newsnotes etc.)  
   b. HD web site  
   c. from your manager  
   d. word of mouth  
   e. other: __________  

16) What was your most important objective for requesting a PDG?  
   a. prepare for a change of job  
   b. deepen sector specific (technical) knowledge on the job you had  
   c. gaining non sector specific (non technical) knowledge for the job you had  
   d. doing something different than the routine of the job  
   e. others: __________  

Section 2.1  
Design of the grant

17) In what ways did you expect the use of your PDG to be related to your job?  
   a. I wanted to use the information for immediate job needs  
   b. I wanted to be prepared for foreseeable job needs  
   c. I was moved by a personal or professional interest in the topic rather than by  
      immediate or foreseeable job needs  

18) How would you rate the input or assistance of these resource persons in the design  
    of your grant proposal? (3 means a lot of assistance, 2 means some assistance and 1  
    means no assistance at all)  

    | No assistance | some | a lot |
    |---------------|------|------|
    | your division manager | 1    | 2    | 3    |
    | the PDG committee      | 1    | 2    | 3    |
    | PDG administrator (Miyuki, Toby) | 1    | 2    | 3    |
    | members of your network | N/A  | 2    | 3    |
    | resource people inside the Bank (specify ________________) | 1    | 2    | 3    |
    | resource people outside the Bank (specify ________________) | 1    | 2    | 3    |

19) During the design of your grant project/proposal was there any information that was  
    difficult to get?  
   Yes (Specify)   No  

20) During the design of your grant proposal, was there any decision or choice that was  
    difficult to make?  
   Yes (specify)   No
21) For what activity (or activities) did you request the grant?
   a. study tour
   b. field visit
   c. attendance in a course
   d. on line or distance education
   e. internship in other organizations, ministries, NGO’s…..
   f. research project
   g. other __________

22) When you applied for a PDG, what was your level of education in the field related to your grant?
   a. Masters
   b. PHD
   c. other (specify)………
   d. no formal education in my field of study
   e. Not applicable

23) When you applied for a PDG, how long had you had experience in the field related to your grant?

Section 2.2
Implementation of the grant

24) What is your perception of the time the PDG committee took to decide on your grant proposal?

25) Were the funds made available in a timely fashion?
   Yes      No
   Comments offered:

26) Were you satisfied with IIE (Sandra Cervera) service as grant administrator?
   Yes      No
   Comments offered:

27) From a time management perspective, was it easy or difficult to reconcile your PDG project with your job?
   easy    difficult    moderately difficult
   Comments offered:

28) Did your manager hire someone to replace you or to complement your work while you were working on the PDG?
   Yes      No
29) What was the arrangement? How did it work?

    5. very well
    4. Quite well
    3. Satisfactorily
    2. Not very well
    1. Did not work at all.

30) Did you encounter any obstacle I have not addressed so far in carrying out your grant?

    Yes  No

Comments:

31) If you were to design your proposal again, what changes (activity, timing... etc) would you make?

32) In your view, what improvement could the grant committee make?

SECTION 3
What impact did your PDG grant have?

This last section is to be completed only for participants who have completed their grant.

33) Have you completed your grant?

    Yes  No  

SKIP QUESTIONS 32-40 END, ask why?

34) You said your personal objective for requesting a PDG grant was..... (see question sixteen) Upon reflection, did your PDG serve the objectives you had set for yourself?

    Yes  
    No  somewhat

    comments offered:

35) Did your grant have some unexpected outcome? Was there something that was totally unanticipated?

    Yes  No

Comments offered:

36) overall how would you rate the usefulness of your PDG for you professionally ? (rate on a scale from 1 to 5)?

    5. very useful
    4 useful
    3 partly useful, partly not useful
    2. Not very useful
    1. not useful at all
37) I am going to read some statements concerning the use you might have made of the information, contacts or material you gathered as part of your PDG experience. Please answer with true/ false.

a. I refer to the information/contacts or materials when the need arises during my work
   True    False

b. I use the information/contacts material in my work on a routine basis
   True    False

c. I have used the material/ contacts information to refine my analysis of the work I am doing
   True    False

d. I have used the material/contacts information to make major modifications or innovations in the work I was doing
   True    False

38) Can you think of some specific examples of ways that you have used your PDG in your work such as:

a. hiring or recommending people you met yes no
b. in designing project/ program component yes no
c. or any other task that you can think of yes no

specify: __________

39) Have you disseminated the knowledge you received while on the PDG inside your division?
   a. yes        b. no

   If yes through what media?

40) Have you disseminated the knowledge you received while on the PDG beyond your own unit?
   a. yes        b. no

   If yes through what media?

41) Could you explain me whether and how colleagues or peers have benefited directly or indirectly from your grant?

42) Did you produce a completion report for your grant?
   a. yes        b. no
   c. grant not completed or just completed

43) Do you have any additional comment or information which you think is important for me to know for this evaluation?
Appendix II
To what extent was the PDG designed to serve the needs of the applicant, his manager and the HD Network?
Participants comments

1) Grantee’s perception of the input of potential resource people in the design of their PDG

**Their Manager**
“My manager was very supportive, as he sits a the PDG committee”.
“My direct manager did not contribute to the design of my grant proposal, though he was very supportive”.
“My direct boss did not help me nor oppose me in doing a PDG. Here everybody works on their own and are thematic experts, so acting managers do not have to design global strategies, they don’t see how a PDG will help them”.
“My division chief was not interested though she approved it, no arrangement was made to facilitate my project or recognize its value. The manager did not feel it was important for the department”.

**The PDG administrator**
“The PDG administrator offered good advice on the application procedures…”
“The PDG administrator was very proactive in reminding me the steps to follow and helping me to put everything together”.
“(he) gave me information about how much money I could request”.
“I was late when I applied; the PDG administrator helped a lot in structuring my proposal”.

**The PDG committee**
“I did not receive any assistance from the PDG committee, but then I did not think they would assist me. I thought their role was just to review a proposal”.
“The PDG committee through their comments helped me to make my proposals objectives sharper. Their reactive comments were very good, in a reduced time”.
“The PDG committee helped me a lot, by asking questions which made me refine my study, and also by identifying resource people”.
“The PDG committee helped me to format the proposal and to work out the budget”.

**Members of the HD Network**
“My mentor helped me to prepare the format of my proposal by asking me the type of questions the committee would inquire”.
“I was supposed to have a mentor to guide me, but I was disappointed because she was not able to help me as much as I expected”.

**People inside of the Bank**
“I have received assistance from lots of people (from the Bank): my manager encouraged me a bit and gave me a general direction, the PDG committee gave the format and provided examples, the PDG administrator helped by answering very quickly, people from my unit wrote letters of recommendation to my university”.
“The resident mission helped me to identify client demand, this has helped me refine my proposal so that my study would better serve the client needs”.
“Colleagues from the Bank reviewed my draft”.

People outside of the Bank
“My host institutions (the Johns Hopkins university and IREDU in Dijon, France) helped me to design my grant”.
“The Harvard group (the university where I was going) helped me a lot to refine my proposal”.
“Resource people outside the Bank (US aid and a private consultant) helped me a lot to focus my research project”.
“Contacts in the UK (where I was going to be intern) and in the US researching the topic I was going to study helped me focus my PDG”.
“Partners from Australia (where I was going to do field study work) helped me a lot to make my proposal more realistic”.
“The Maryland State government and the US private sector helped me design my internship”.
“A professor in Boston introduced me to other people who helped me to shape my proposal”.

2) To what extent was the PDG linked to the applicants’ immediate job needs?
“I have been working in the social sector for a long time, but wanted to sharpen technical knowledge on education and most specifically on the social-cultural dimension of education, which is not taken enough into consideration at the Bank”.
“I wanted to deepen my technical knowledge. The PDG gave me the flexibility to do activities that did not fit in a normal training program”.
“I designed the course in three steps 1) a course in Boston, 2) an internship in Bangladesh 3) I was supposed to prepare a study when back at work using the contacts in Bangladesh. The third part was supposed to be heavily linked to my project. The PDG was for the first two parts”.
Appendix III
Is a PDG difficult to design?
Participant comments

Remarks concerning how participants learned about the program
“My manager suggested it”.
“I just work in the HD Network”.
“In an article in a newspaper”.
“combination: It was announced in a flyer, I kept it and the first year I didn’t apply. My colleagues told me about their grant experience and at that time I had plans for a change in my professional career, therefore I applied. I didn’t want to have a training I would not use immediately”.
“from colleagues”.
“I learned through an e-mail, word of mouth, and also a brochure”.
“I worked with the group that established the PDG”.
“I read an other applicant BTO. This made me aware of the PDG, as the HD Network is my secondary network, I do not get all the e-mails. I also had to review another applicant’s proposal”.
“I knew via e-mails, information from my manager and word of mouth (FY98)”.
“Via e-mail, but I also know people who did it, and my manager told us about the grant”.
“I learned about the PDG program through e-mail, my managers, word of mouth, brown bag lunches. I feel everybody in HD is pretty familiar with it. I learned about the project three years ago but the timing was not good as I was taking a project to the board, this is why I waited until FY98”.

Information that was difficult to get at the design phase
“I wanted to know on which sites I could do my research project. I was expecting my mentor to help me with sites selection, but she was not able to give me this information, maybe for lack of data from the client country”.
“Yes (it was difficult to identify) the courses available in my topic. It was very time consuming to look for a university, I had to talk to lots of people to identify Boston”.
“It was difficult to get accurate information on courses schedules or study tours. I had to guess from the previous year offerings”.
“I could not get information from Stanford University and another university in England. They were not very responsive. So in the end I took that university in the US, because they were good and it was easier, but I wish I had had the opportunity to explore the two others. I feel the PDG committee could have helped me in that”.
“Yes. Putting the budget together (cost estimates). Also getting the information about short-term housing in the country (London)”.
“Yes. Getting information on specific programs in Italy and Spain, where I wanted to make a study tour”.
“Yes. Well not during the design phase by itself, because I wanted to do a course and this is easy to decide. But I made errors in the designing phase that led me to difficult choices afterwards”.
“No I got the information from John Hopkins university and this was it”.
“I could not get information from Stanford University and another university in England. They were not very responsive. So in the end I took … (this American University) because they were good and it was easier but I wish I had had the opportunity to explore the two others. I feel the PDG committee could have helped me in that”.
“The cost of the program. John Hopkins had not updated their web site. But I gave an approximate cost for the program in the first proposal and was then able to make corrections”.
“Cost data: allowances, what would be covered etc”.
“No. I had decided that it would be a course in Boston university, so they sent me the information I requested. I had been on their mailing list for a while and they had sent me brochures over the years”.

**Choices that were difficult to make at the design phase**
“The timing. It was not possible to do three months in spring, with my work program. That’s why I picked one month only and chose to do it during summertime”.
“The timing (was difficult). I did not know how much time it was reasonable to plan for my research project to get the learning that I needed. Also I did know how to reconcile the PDG with my workload”.
“(It was difficult) to narrow down the topic to something manageable over a four month period”.
“whether to go to the Harvard program or apply for shorter programs provided locally but that captured only part of my package”.
“(I didn’t know) whether to take the grant at all. I knew that I would be running into difficulties as I would have to do the PDG on top of my work”.
“How to learn best about my topic of interest, by pre-cooked training or by working with other people. And then it was not easy to set the modalities of learning, because the area was not widely explored”.
“How much of my time I could take out from work, and also if my division had the resources to pay for staff work, as the PDG only compensates for direct costs”.
“For the study tours, choose the countries to look at, the programs to look at”.
“I was just coming into a new division and had to focus on THEIR needs. By chance, my needs and the division needs were the same”.
“How long I could afford to go. I wanted to make a longer internship but I am a consultant and am paid from a trust fund, so I had to reduce my proposal to five days, which was very short”.
“How long you can take off your job, how long to spend on a course or on field work”.
“Yes, because I had to keep up with much of my regular operational work at the same time”.
“Yes. My first proposal was too ambitious. It was very difficult for me to cut down on my proposal”.

**Comments about the approval procedures**
“The informal decision was quick, but it took time to inform me officially”.
“It took more than one year between my application and the final decision. The cost of the program was trivial, I could have paid it myself, but the cost of my salary continuation was very important. The PDG had a very hard time negotiating with my manager and the PDG program ended by picking up half of the cost of my salary”.
“(It was) a bit long, because of the cost, but I had no time pressure, so it did not impact on my proposal”.
“A bit long (study tours), but I had no time pressure, so it did not impact on my proposal”.
“Very quick I was impressed. They had already closed the program but they had some money left and were able to reopen it to fit me in”.
“Okay, the PDG bargained a little bit and asked me to trim off the air fare to Boston”.
“A long time (more than two months) was spent bargaining over cost items. This was a difficulty because I had to plan when I wanted to go, make arrangements for my work at the Bank, and know when I was expected to hire local researchers to assist me”.
“Okay. Very reasonable by the standards of grant deliveries, but longer than I expected”. “A miracle. I was late but the committee came back so quickly on my proposal”. “I applied in August and was only approved the following February. It was too long and disrupted my program. It took a long time because I changed one of the countries I was going to visit and also because the PDG wanted me to reduce the cost of the program (per diems)”. “Appropriate. Could have been shorter”. “Quick and efficient”. “There was only one review per year at that time. There were lots of discussion about my proposal, some explanations were required, but my manager was very supportive and helped me to answer the committee”. “The committee changed the rules in August 98, six months after I had applied. They had sent me an e-mail, saying it was OK, so I started my field trip, on a free ticket I had. Then, when I came back, they told me I had to sign for 12 months in the Bank for every month of PDG program. I could not sign so I stopped after four days of official time, the field trip was spent on my personal time and expenses”. “I was to visit programs overseas. The committee asked to see the list of people I had taken appointments with. I have been working at the Bank for 15 years and I feel this was a hurting lack of trust”.

Comments about the allocation of funds

Delays in payments
“I had three sources of funding. My manager had part of it and was very supportive. The money to hire a local researcher team was managed from the Bank and it went well. But the share of my salary (25 percent) that was the PDG contribution took months to be transferred. My grant was finished in November and the funds were transferred in April the following year”. “The decision was very quick, but the signing of the letter of awarding took some time, and coordination with my university overseas also took some time. I postponed my program by six months”.

Comments about IIE
“(IIE manager) is very nice but also seems very busy and somewhat disorganized. It took her a long time to process my status of expenses at the beginning and the end of the grant”. “(IIE) There were problems related to the electronic wiring to the French institute where I was working. The confirmation of receipt by the French side was not made before two months”. “The distance between the grant administrator (IIE) and my location (resident mission) is a little problem. It would be better if someone from the student’s location was designated as grant administrator”. “She (IIE manager) was very helpful however reimbursement for expenses did sometimes take too long and in one instance there was a mess up about paying for a conference fee”. “They (IIE manager) just sent the check for the course. They did not help me with the logistics, the housing, they did not contact the university when I was there the university did not know how to register me. They spent less than an hour dealing with my case.... I think IIE should come into the picture earlier and help the grantee with the logistical problems. Also the committee should clarify, for the grantee, what services IIE is supposed to do for them”. “She (IIE manager) is very helpful and pleasant, she understands problems”.

Evaluation of the Professional Development Program
“I was very much satisfied, she followed me up reminding me of the administrative steps I had to do”.
“She (IIE manager) was wonderful and very efficient to manage funds in New-York, as the PDG administrator was on the Washington side. The problem for funding was with the Bank”.
“She (IIE manager) has been very helpful and dedicated”.
“She (IIE manager) was just incredible. She assisted me to find housing”.

Obstacles other than time management to the implementation of a PDG grant
“My division chief was not interested though she approved it, no arrangement was made to facilitate my project or recognize its value. The manager did not feel it was important for the department”.
“The lack of back-up system, there is no incentive for a co-worker to assist you”.
“The most important was the time issue. But also I found it difficult to coordinate my schedule with the courses available at the university”.
“I could not find the time to finish my output report yet”.
“After five weeks I was badly injured in a car crash. I had a long commute but manage to continue to go to class though I would not have been able to go to work”.
“The housing conditions were not very good”.
“My adviser at HQ became suddenly ill and was unable to help me by commenting on my papers”.
“I had designed my proposal in three stages: a refresher course in Atlanta, a survey in Sierra Leone, and then the validation of my survey in Atlanta. Because of the political situation in Sierra Leone, I could not do the field work in Sierra Leone and only did the course. Funds were supposed to be spent before the end of the fiscal year and this was not possible. The money could not be used for the purpose originally designed. I fear some of the budget has been lost. But the design of my grant was good and I would not change anything. I don’t think anything could have prevented the problem I encountered”.
“(I had problems) with my secondment. My original assignment was changed. I had to switch from Brazil to south Africa because my counterpart in Brazil was ill”.
“Working with a partner organization, I had to clarify that I was not to be considered as working for the world bank, but a person on training. Once this was clarifies, everything went smoothly”.
“While I was working on my research paper, back at work, my counterpart in the country I was working on changed and I have not been able to get the information to complete my paper yet”.
“I was dealing with a very sensitive issue (pharmaceutical pricing) and some companies where I was intern were more open than others”.
“My original proposal was 25,000$, the committee took too much time deciding over a two week seminar. One week before the event it was not approved yet, so this activity was dropped. Other activities in the proposal the committee refused to fund too. This again took a lot of bargaining and time. In the end I was left with a proposal reduced to 5,000$, and the committee sounded as if they were doing me a favor but the content of the proposal was far less appealing now. Also I had an increased burden of work on my projects so I reassigned my priorities and dropped the PDG”.

Lessons learned by the grantees about their grant implementation

Readjust the duration of the PDG
“I would not shortchange myself on my research time. I should have planned more days to do my work”.
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“I would make it longer. Four months was just to short to rush around two institutions (internships). The rest was fine”.

“I would program one or two weeks after the course, for the completion of homework”.

“My grant was in two parts, were I to do it again, I would make it in one part. To cut it makes it more expensive and more difficult (lodging). Also I had planned too many field visits (five in each country). I would focus on fewer programs and deepen the internship side”.

“I would start my classes in fall and not in winter, because of the commute. I would also make it eight months instead of four. The course was eight months long and I missed half of it”.

“I had designed my proposal in three steps i) a course in Boston at Harvard university, ii) an internship in Bangladesh and iii) a study when back at work using the contacts I had made in Bangladesh. This third part was supposed to be heavily linked to my project. The first two parts (the course and the internship) went fine, my manager replaced me. But I would not do the third part when back at work, because it depends so much on the information flows from the country and other people contribution, which is dangerous. I would do it in Bangladesh. That means do everything while on the PDG and extend the grant to six months”.

“I would make my grant easier to implement. I would try to be able to take off a few weeks to be dedicated fully to the PDG. But it would have to be less than four months, the duration of the PDG I did, because this would not be technically feasible”.

“I would discuss with my manager to make it in one set (3 months off) up front, instead of taking evening classes. I can see in retrospect why the committee suggested me not to do evening classes”.

Plan more time in the headquarters of a partner institution

“Don’t split your grant in different small visits, it is better to visit one country/institution in depth than making short stays, learning is better. When the time is too short, you spend too much time explaining people what you do and understanding how the institutional system works, what people do etc”.

“My internship with pharmaceutical companies was too short (1 week). I would spent more time with the companies in the headquarters, where pricing decisions and policies are made”.

Change the type of PDG

“I would not do the John Hopkins course, it was too fragmented (one course per week). Also a lecture type course is less useful for people of my level (PHD in the field of study). It is better to do things than being given a presentation. It would have been fruitful if I could have been inside a research project with a professor. That was my initial plan. But then I decided against it because it is not possible to do a research work while you are in Washington, because of your workload. You just have to be away, but this is not always easy to design, because a research work has to be planned one year in advance”.

“I would try to design an academic program instead of a study tour, because the PDG takes it more easily, but I did not want theory, I wanted practice. I have talked with other recipients who feel the same. It is more difficult to be approved on a study tour. Maybe the PDG committee has more difficulties in assessing those kinds of proposals”.

“I would focus on summer institute courses instead of regular courses. During these summer courses they concentrate all the information over four or five days, it is easier for us and very cost-effective. Or I would do an internet course. You can advance at your own rhythm. I wonder why it is not more developed inside the PDG”.
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**Higher commitment from manager**

“Get an agreement with your department that your grant will be registered as a formal output during the fiscal year. The grant has to be a commitment on both sides”.

**Other comments**

“For Argentina, I would refresh my Spanish before going with two intensive weeks of language, just before going, in order to be operational right away. I can speak Spanish, but it takes a few days before being fluent, and the language was really a barrier in such a short time”.

“I would go to the place (the university) before I finalize things with them to see what the place looks like and arrange logistical matters. Concerning the selection of the University, I would like to explore more options than the easiest choice. But I would need somebody’s help on that. I would also try to link my work with more immediate goals (like doing case studies on aspects of my work)”.

“I want to repeat the experience, but I am on a waiting list because people who did not get a PDG have the priority. My grant was not very expensive (14,000) and I know some people made proposals that were more costly so maybe I could prepare a proposal in two parts, not to have to reapply, but then would the committee accept a proposal that would last more than one year?”
Appendix IV

Transcript of participants’ answers concerning time management issues

27) From a time management perspective, was it easy or difficult to reconcile your PDG project with your job? (32 answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Moderately difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EASY**

It was easy. I was replaced. My manager was very supportive. A short term consultant was hired to complement my work, also I shared some of my work with colleagues. The arrangement, splitting work among my colleagues worked quite well.

It was easy, I planned my five weeks and half of travel in August which is not too busy at the Bank. I’m not sure it would be easy now because my responsibilities have increased (was not replaced).

It was easy. I was replaced at my work. I had an assistant that was hired before, working as a team has helped me to handle my four week training. It worked quite well.

It was easy during the short course. But I had a lot of reading to do before finalizing the design, which was not easy to reconcile with my work load. (was not replaced)

It was easy. I wish I had had more than two months, but it was okay, it was a very intensive course. I did my course during the summer, it was a slow season at the Bank. My supervisor was here in July and was very supportive. I had joined the division in March, but he agreed I could do a PDG in July.

It was easy. I was given the flexibility to do my PDG (field visits) in small trenches, over a long period of time (5.5 weeks over more than a year). This made it easy to fit the PDG into my work schedule. It also made it unnecessary to hire someone, which was very important for my PDG to be accepted. I was not replaced. it was not necessary.

It was easy. I took some time off so I was relieved from my work. I was not replaced. The unit was trying to recruit but it did not work. In the end my manager split the work among my colleagues. My colleagues were very supportive (easy) (8 months, FY96).

It was very easy. The topic I had selected for the PDG was a 100 percent related to what I was doing at work, plus it was a very short grant (5day internship). I was not replaced. It was not possible because of my consultant status. Anyway, the PDG was so short it was not worth it.
It was easy, thanks to a careful planning. I had a backup ready who was familiar with my work. I was not taking any project to the board. I planned all my supervision missions in April and October, so I could take the classes in summer. I had a lot of homework to do after the course, but the university agreed that I could extent the time to make my homework and get the credits. I had everything done by October. I was not replaced, my work was split between three colleagues (one staff in headquarters, one consultant and one operation officer at the resident mission). It worked very well.

MODERATELY DIFFICULT

Moderately difficult. I did not ask my manager to be complemented because I received no indication that it would be feasible.

It was moderately difficult. It was difficult for the course I attended at the University. I had one class a week, I was not altogether away, and I missed some of the classes because I had too much work. The research part in internship was easier because I was away from Washington. I was not replaced. That was part of the problem, I had to do my job on top of the PDG.

It was moderately difficult. I was not replaced but I worked it out with my manager before I submitted the application. He helped me a lot. I planned to deliver all urgent work before I went on the PDG. I worked more during the grant, doing office work during my weekends, but I consider it my personal contribution to the PDG. The tension was about the time planning. I did not know when I was going to start the PDG and had other commitments, this put an unexpected stress on me.

Moderately difficult, I changed division. I was not replaced. When I applied I had a different boss and I moved during the PDG. My former boss was very supportive. My new manager had a neutral attitude towards my grant. I mean he wasn’t that supportive. The arrangement would be that I would take the course one weekend every month (Friday to Sunday, sometimes Thursday to Sunday). I managed with AWS and some time off during my holidays. This arrangement worked quite well. I did my field work with my old division unit.

It was moderately difficult. I am a thematic specialist, my clients are the staff dealing with health nutrition and population issues. So I feel it was easier to organize myself than if I were a regional staff where I would have to keep up with lending projects. I was not replaced. I used the e-mail to follow my work from abroad, and I traded with a colleague who helped me while I was away on a PDG, in return I will help him now that he is on training. The arrangement (trading work with a colleague) worked very well because 90 percent of my work could be done either by mail or by attending meetings. Monitoring projects would have been more problematic. But I have only one project, and I work together with a colleague on it. This is seldom the case at the bank where everything is so individualistic. So I made a deal with the colleague who is working on the project with me.

Moderately difficult. I had moved in the division as a health specialist one year before so I was not fully pressed with work and did not have many projects. Even so I had applied for a two month project but was not able to complete it in one year. I did only three weeks in FY97, I applied for a prolongation of the grant and made two weeks in FY98 and 10 days in FY99. I was not replaced. It was not needed because I broke the PDG in small pieces.
Moderately difficult. I asked that the grant period be extended as I could not do it all within the original time period, this was granted. I also asked to replace one activity by another and this was granted. I like this flexibility very much. (Eased by committee flexibility and time extension). I was not replaced. I asked that the grant period be extended as I could not do it all within the original time period.

Moderately difficult, there are always competing missions. I would prefer to have more time budgeted for the program. I was not replaced.

DIFFICULT

It was difficult. Initially I wanted to take four months off, but it was not possible so I hard to do it part time. Furthermore, as there was little money in my division to charge my time week, I had to do it outside of my work, in out time. I was not replaced (grant delayed).

It was difficult, so personal reasons I could not take three months off, so I broke my study tours in small pieces, but in practice there was a lot of competition between my PDG and my mission. I was not replaced. There is no back-up system for the person taking a PDG. Now everybody in my unit is overworked. There is no incentive for a co-worker to assist you and complement your work. The manager needs to put into place a back-up system.

It was difficult. I was so overload I could not do it on time. Nobody replaced me and I had to come back from Atlanta where I was following a course, every week-end at my expenses, to do my job.

It was difficult. I had a major problem in the middle of the grant because of a promotion I changed direct manager, so I had to cut my grant into two trips and come to an agreement with a new manager. I was not replaced. I did all the important missions before starting the grant, so I would have no problem with having my colleagues monitoring my files.

It was difficult. I had to continue about 30 percent of my regular workload. My colleagues helped me with the rest (was not replaced).

It was difficult. I had to do my job plus the PDG. During my internship abroad, I kept doing my job using e-mail. It was just like working from home, and I could continue to monitor the things I was doing. I just did not start new things during the PDG period, that’s all. I was not replaced it worked for me like this . Anyway four months of PDG is not enough to leave your work so you have to keep doing it to be effective when you return.

Difficult. I am an operation officer. I had planned my PDG (study tours) to be implemented at a time when I had few missions. Because of the delays in taking the decision on my grant, my planning was disrupted and my missions came in. I was not replaced.

It was difficult. I started my PDG by taking evening classes. Although the PDG committee had advised me to take some time off, I thought I could do evening classes because I had been able to do a master’s degree while I was working. But it was not possible. Traveling was a big constraint, and in nine months, I was only able to do two courses out of the seven courses that were initially planned in the proposal. Also I was taking technical classes in labs, when you miss on session, you cannot make up like you do in a more academic course. So I have asked for an extension of the grant. I asked my
manager if I could take 12 weeks off to complete the course as quickly as possible, but he did not agree and gave me only three weeks. That was nice of him but not enough, so I guess I will do the rest out of my free time. I really want to complete this course because I can see the effects on my efficiency at work. I was not replaced.

It was difficult. I had applied for a field visit and a course. First I did not have time to refine my proposal on the field visit so I had to cancel it. Then I was working on a country and there was this crisis, people asked me if I could postpone my PDG. As they did not press me too hard I said no. When I came back I realized that the crisis had in fact been a proper time for the grant because there were fewer projects under way. I was replaced. My manager was very supportive. I did three things. A consultant working for one of my project provided backup while I was away (four months). I delayed other things. And I took some work by e-mail. It worked quite well; the consultant knew the project and counterparts very well as we were working as a team.

It was difficult. I took three weeks of course work. My division chief gave me these three weeks off so it was fine. I took five courses, that was 14 credits, but then I had three research papers and two take home exams to complete in less than a month. This was not possible especially with the back load of work I had when I returned to the Bank. My professors gave me an extension on my three courses so I can write the research papers until fall. Also the university sent me thousand of pages of readings to complete before the course. This I could not do. I would recommend to program at least one week or two for the completion of the homework after the course. I was not replaced. I took the course during summertime.

It is difficult. Given time related constraints, I had already to postpone the grant activities for six months and I am just starting with the implementation of my PDG. I foresee that it is likely that I may have some difficulties delegating tasks on other staff in order to have the time necessary for the PDG. (resident mission staff)

Difficult. I had to do it on week-ends or very late after finishing a long day work. Someone was hired to replace me during the six month period (field staff) It worked satisfactorily, but I still had to do some work.

difficult, I had to keep up with much of my regular operational work at the same time (short secondments, was not replaced).

Difficult because of the way I designed my grant (courses + internship) I was not replaced. I had to do the PDG on top on my work. I would go to the courses in the morning and do my work at the Bank in the afternoon. Or I would go on evening classes. I had to ask for an extension of the grant to complete my studies. And I just did not do the internship that was initially planned.

Being away during four months was difficult, because I was losing information. I was replaced during four months, one month internship + summer courses. I had two projects that were completed. I did not take a new project while on the PDG. And a regular staff was hired to complement me on my other activities. It worked quite well, but when I returned from the PDG, I had to find some new work to do, all the projects were assigned and I also lost information while I was away.
28) Did your manager hire someone to replace you or to complement your work while you were working on the PDG?

(34 answers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yes  My manager was very supportive. A short term consultant was hired to complement my work, also I shared some of my work with colleagues. The arrangement, splitting work among my colleagues worked quite well.

Yes. I had an assistant that was hired before, working as a team has helped me to handle my four week training. It worked quite well.

Yes, I was replaced. My manager was very supportive. I did three things. A consultant working for one of my project provided backup while I was away (four months). I delayed other things. And I took some work by e-mail. It worked quite well; he consultant knew the project and counterparts very well as we were working as a team.

Yes. Someone was hired to replace me during the six month period (field staff) It worked satisfactorily, but I still had to do some work.

Yes. I was replaced during four months, one month internship + summer courses. I had two projects that were completed. I did not take a new project while on the PDG. And a regular staff was hired to complement me on my other activities. It worked quite well, but when I returned from the PDG, I had to find some new work to do, all the projects were assigned and I also lost information while I was away.

I was not replaced. The work was broken up and absorbed by colleagues and consultants. The arrangement (breaking work between colleagues) worked fine and my work did not suffer, but I was working on a desperate country and the level of my job input at that time was not making any kind of difference anyway.
Appendix V
Participants’ assessment of grant difficulty
testing for subgroup patterns

This section is testing for explanatory factors, while seeking for subgroup patterns in the participants’ answer to the following question: “From a time management perspective, was it easy or difficult to reconcile your PDG project with your job?” (32 answers)

Self-assessment of grant difficulty according to participant's sectoral employment
(32 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector of activities</th>
<th>Grant was Easy</th>
<th>Moderately difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional specialists</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>1 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (83%)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic specialists</strong></td>
<td>1 (33%)</td>
<td>2 (67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clustering of data suggest that regional specialists from the LAC region found it more difficult to reconcile their PDG with their work. Because of the small size of the sample we cannot be conclusive about the repartition for other regions.

Participants’ self-assessment of grant difficulty according to PDG length
(32 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDG length</th>
<th>Difficult of grant</th>
<th>Less than two months (N=9)</th>
<th>Two months to less than five months (N=14)</th>
<th>More than five months (N=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>4 (44%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderately difficult</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (21%)</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>3 (33%)</td>
<td>8 (57%)</td>
<td>3 (44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents found that grants shorter than two months were the easiest to reconcile with their job (44 percent of the sample awarded such a grant found it easy to reconcile with their job). There is no significant difference between grants longer than two months but shorter than five months, and grants longer than five months.

Self-assessment of grant difficulty according to participant’s grade in the Bank (32 respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant grade</th>
<th>Grant was Easy</th>
<th>Moderately difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UC (consultant)</strong></td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>2 (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td>2 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>4 (31%)</td>
<td>7 (54%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>1 (14%)</td>
<td>5 (71%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the small size of the sample we cannot reach a conclusion about the distribution per grade level.

Participants’ self-assessment of grant difficulty according to PDG year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDG year Grant was:</th>
<th>FY96 (N=5)</th>
<th>FY97 (N=8)</th>
<th>FY98 (N=10)</th>
<th>FY99 (N=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>1 (12%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately difficult</td>
<td>1 (20%)</td>
<td>3 (38%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>4 (50%)</td>
<td>4 (40%)</td>
<td>5 (56%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no clear pattern about participants assessment of grant difficulty according to grant year.
Appendix VI
Pattern of grant length per year (N=32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY96 (N=5)</th>
<th>FY97 (N=8)</th>
<th>FY98 (N=10)</th>
<th>FY99 (N=9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than two months</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 (30%)</td>
<td>6 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two months to less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than five months</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>5 (62%)</td>
<td>5 (50%)</td>
<td>1 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than five months</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>3 (38%)</td>
<td>2 (20%)</td>
<td>2 (22%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the sample concerned by this study, the most recent PDGs tend to be shorter than the oldest ones. This trend is significant when we run a CHI-square test (chi-square=12.49, with six degrees of freedom, significant at the $\alpha=0.05$ level).

For this sample, grants shorter than less months represented 67 percent of the FY99 PDGs, while there were none in the FY96 and FY97 sub sample. Grants representing a duration of more than five months represented about 40 percent of the FY96 and FY97 PDGs, and only about 20 percent of the FY98 and FY99 PDGs.
Appendix VII
How did the grantee rate the usefulness of the PDG?
Transcripts of participants answers

Usefulness for the participant

General appreciation of the PDG
“The PDG has been extremely helpful. Extremely positive in terms of job satisfaction, unbelievably non bureaucratic. I only wish I could apply again”.
“The contact with my professors allowed me to validate the work I was doing in the operations. It is very encouraging to get this endorsement by a famous university of the technical decisions we take during our work at the Bank”.
“The flexibility of the PDG is ideal. This is a fabulous program. I have the idea of requesting a second grant”.
“The PDG is an important program. We step away from what we do on a regular basis. Working in a hospital and being seconded at a national health service gave me a practical experience, which complemented the academic approach I had at the university”.
“The combination between the work and the attendance to a course was very useful. The fact that you have to work on personal time and not only bank time shows your commitment to learning. I enjoyed the PDG a lot. In fact I have applied for another”.
“The PDG was the best training in my 20 years at the Bank”.
“Internships are truly good experiences. It gives you an outsider view which is good as the Bank tend to be too self centered”.
“I think the PDG helped me to get my promotion, I could tell the Bank that they had to keep me now that they had invested in me”.
“About PDG: In house training is fine to get knowledge, but in order to deepen analytic skills you need a good solid amount of time and customized/personalized training, which is what the PDG provides. The person has to analyze in advance what she wants to get from the training. The preparation stage is quite long, but it is necessary to make the best of the grant. Also for research you need to have a solid amount of time. six months was fine. It was also important to have a supportive manager. She paid my salary over such a long time. It was the first time in my whole career I received such a support from my management”.
“It was a major milestone for me, a very good program”.

Unexpected outcomes
“I was away from the Bank, therefore I was missing the information that was circulating in the Bank (FY97)”.
“I met gypsies who invited me in their homes in places I was not planning to visit. This offered great development after the PDG”.
“Because of my experience in organizational change in the health sector, I became involved in the organizational change process at the Bank that took place just after my return (FY97)”.
“I got to know people outside the Bank working on my field, the expertise of other companies broadened my perspective”.
“The PDG provided a such solid vehicle for collaboration and partnership. I am still exchanging information with people in the UK. I was also surprised that the people in the UK were so skilled and impressive. I did not expect them to be so good”.
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“I got exposed to a wide array of topics. I emerged with a passion with a few things I did, like a strong interest on tobacco control programs”.
“I got more information from the internship that I was expecting to. The companies organized things so nicely”.
“I had a chance to read lots of things I did not have time to. Also the stimulus of an academic environment really widen your perspective. Not being a Bank staff for four months gives you time to think about what you are doing. Time to reflect is an important by-product of the PDG”.
“The variety of people who exposed their views (teachers and participants) gave me a wider perspective on the problem. Also I gained more confidence by giving a theoretical confirmation to things I knew from a practical point of view”.
“Going on field as a research person I was given more open access, more information, people were more frank, more critical of the Bank’s actions. This was not expected and a good surprise to me”.

Impact on the grantee’s division

Managers and grantee mobility
“Maureen approved the grant and was very supportive, but when I was preparing the PDG we were reorganizing so I had three managers, the old one, one acting, and the new one (FY98)”.
“I changed twice since my PDG (FY98)”.
“I changed direct manager and division in the middle of the grant (FY97)”.

How participants used the PDG in their work
“I have recruited as consultants three of my former professors and I have recommended another one. The PDG was great for networking”.
“When a project is designed I will use the knowledge have I gained to the extent that revision is needed”.
“In Poland the deputy prime minister made demands on three occasions with a very short response time given (less than three days). I would not have been able to react in an efficient way if it were not for this training”.
“In daily policy dialogue with governments. It gives me security to know about social exclusions programs in the European Union when I talk with people in Eastern Europe”.
“(I have used the PDG) for improving my analytical rigor, selling my projects inside the Bank, discussing with clients during project preparation”.
“Communicating with people of the Harvard network, exchanging views to keep me updated”.
“Support the change of management inside the Bank by training and team development”.

sharing the information inside the division
“I intend to write a note to my boss, my mentor and the PDG committee. These people will then choose whether to disseminate it or not. It is not a mandated output, but I choose to do it. I have already produced the draft, but it’s not completed yet because I am outstretched with travel”.
“I have sent my final report to my manager and sector leaders. But I don’t know if they have disseminated it”.
“Yes, (I have disseminated the knowledge) but not through mass communication, on a one to one basis, either on the technical advice or for the preparation of a PDG grant”.

56
Impact of the PDG on the HD Network

**Sharing information beyond the grantee’s unit.**

“I made a brown bag lunch. I followed up by an e mail to the network asking how I could help them but I received no answer. They were not very active after investing in us”. 
“I sent this BTO to the PDG but I wonder who gets it afterwards. I suppose they post it on the web. But by whom is it used? Is it read mainly by people who want to take a PDG?” 
“In the discussion groups of a workshop in Africa”. 
“through Bank’s mentoring program missions”. 
“I wrote a paper on my work that was circulated on the HD electronic journal”. 
“Informally yes, formally no”. 
“I have spoken to different people in the bank while preparing a project”. 
“I trained some interns”. 
“Bank wide, through seminar publications and by answering e mails from developing countries”. 
“No, I haven’t done a brown bag yet (FY98). My course was a very broad thing so I am not sure it would be of interest to anyone else, but my experience on the PDG and the Boston University could be useful to others. Also there is all this bibliography, but it is not on a diskette, so it would be a large task to make it available to others. Still I think it would be useful”.

**Side benefits of the grant on colleagues**

“I’m not sure. I have organized seminars bringing speakers in order to make the information available. How many of my peers have benefited?” 
“Informal conversations”. 
“I have prepare a methodology paper that helps in policy dialogue”. 
“People operating projects with a HIV component, because I work faster”. 
“Indirectly through my increased knowledge”. 
“By being a better peer in reviewing projects, also by helping peers to complete a program component”. 
“Through the information, contacts, data I can now provide”. 
“Through my contribution to public health thematic groups and the knowledge Management base, I am working on a series of indicators that will be posted”. 
“I can bring a more substantive contribution to the work I was doing. Then I became a team leader and I hope my colleagues have benefited from it. I have also helped other people who wanted to apply for a PDG by providing advice”. 
“My economist colleagues listen to me more now that I can link health issues with financing”. 
“I know a lot more on health insurance and have transmitted this knowledge to colleagues. Also I know more people I can recommend when colleagues phone me for advice”.

Appendix VIII
Participants recommendations

This section presents the answers participants made to the two following questions “In your view, what improvement could the grant committee make?” and “Do you have any additional comment or information which you think is important for me to know for this evaluation?”. Recommendations of participants cover the following points:

• **Assisting candidates to improve the design of their grants.**
  → Issue guidelines (requested by 12 percent of respondents, N=34). This can be done in a formal way, or by facilitating networking between former PDG grantees and new applicants: for example by creating a spot on the web where applicants can exchange with former grantees, or inviting former grantees to information meetings about the PDG. Asking participants to present their experience on a one page flyer to be widely distributed would facilitate contacts with new applicants. A participant suggested that the PDG committee should interview the applicant, rather than just read his proposal, to have an exchange of view on the feasibility of the grant design.
  → Provide information about where to get content related information, what courses are available, or a list of resource people (requested by six percent of respondents, N=34), might help the applicants not to choose the most obvious university.
  → Have more clarity in terms of the grantee’s work program, managers should commit to use the information (3 percent respondents).

• **Clarify in advance the grant procedures and improve the approval process:**
  → Do not alter the rules after a grant has been awarded (3 percent respondents, N=34).
  → Explain what services IIE is expected to provide to the grantee (3 percent respondents).
  → Take a quicker decision, in order not to disrupt the planning of the grant (6 percent respondents), preferably before the end of March so that the staff can incorporate the PDG in their training program.

• **Make the rules relative to the funding of time off more transparent**
  → Secure the salary continuation problem by having part of the grant to cover salary costs (12 percent of participants).
  → Set rules about the committee’s contribution to salary to avoid unjust decisions (6 percent participants).

• **Improve follow-up after the grant**
  → Participants should feel more pressure to communicate some results to the HD Network after the grant (3 percent participants).
  → Have more clarity in terms of the grantee’s work program and the use of the information (3 percent respondents).
• *Make the PDG more open to*
  → new types of grants (9 percent respondents): internship with NGOs, shorter PDGs, a sabbatical year;
  → field staff (3 percent respondents): field staff moving to US should be allowed more funds for essentials (transportation, basic subsistence, child care);
  → people who want to take a second grant (3 percent respondents).
Appendix IX
Transcript of participants’ recommendations

This transcript presents the answers participants made to the two following questions “In your view, what improvement could the grant committee make?” and “Do you have any additional comment or information which you think is important for me to know for this evaluation?”

The committee could assist candidates to improve the design of their grants.
→ “Advise candidates to simplify their learning goals”.
→ “Issue guidelines (with examples or successful PDG grants)”.
→ “Create a spot on the web where applicants can contact former PDG recipients to ask questions they want to discuss about”.
→ “The procedures are very clear. But the committee should not be satisfied with just establishing clear procedures. It should assist candidates with a pool of information about where to get content related, research specific information, or a list of resource people”.
→ “At the end of the year, when the PDG results are presented (so many people did the grant, they did that kind of activity...), it would be good to invite the people who participated to discuss about how they and the Bank have benefited from that learning, the lessons learned, in order to advertise the PDG. I would help also if the participants would present their experience on a one page flyer, to be distributed widely. It would facilitate networking with new applicants to help them design their proposals”.
→ “not only a written proposal, the PDG should interview the applicant in order to really have an exchange of views and facilitate feedback on the following points: the general usefulness of the grant for the unit, the integration of the PDG within the overall training plan of the Network, the feasibility of the PDG design”.
→ “The committee should provide information in terms of what courses are available, how long are their duration, when they are given. They could have brochures, a little library, post information on the web site. Researching is very time consuming. I did my course in Harvard because I had no time to look elsewhere, while it might not have been the best university”.
→ “I under estimated how much time the PDG would take. My program was too ambitious for the time frame I designed. But the committee was well administered, flexible and understood my problem”.

The committee should clarify in advance the grant procedures and improve the approval process:
→ “I was a victim of the tightening of PDG rules. I was told that five people with senior experience had used the PDG to prepare for a change of work so the committee wanted to tighten the rules to prevent it. But they should not alter rules after the person has applied and has been approved for the grant. They should set the rules up front when people apply and not alter them in between”.
→ “Explain why the grant is administered through IIE (although I have nothing to complain about)”.
→ “Speedier approval of the PDG (although in my case, as I was not under pressure, it was not a serious problem)”.
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“The budget. The administrators in New-York (IIE) and Washington were very supportive and efficient, but the problem was with the committee. They should give their approval very quickly as the decision has an impact on how the staff plan their time. The salary contribution once approved by the PDG, should be transferred up front and administered by the unit manager”.

“I consider it a small problem, but if possible, have the timing to be such so that everybody can have a PDG decision about their proposal by the end of March, in order to be able to present it in their training program for the following year. Avoid decisions at the end of the fiscal year”.

The committee could make the rules relative to the funding of time off more transparent

“The grant committee should try to cover part of the staff time, not at the end of the year, if money is available which is sometimes what is done, but by making provisions from the beginning, which would make it easier for us to plan our PDG”.

“Ensure that the person can be complemented or replaced”.

“Secure the salary continuation problem. The cost of course tuition is trivial compared to the salary continuation, yet the PDG acts as if they were doing a great favor to the managers by paying this amount. The department directors feel that they are not going to reap full benefit of the training because the people are going to move anyway. So this PDG is more an institutional interest than a division interest, and therefore divisions should not have to bear the salary costs which are the highest contribution”.

“The committee should increase its collaboration with the managers. Set rules about how long you can take off and how much you are covered. Now this is made on an individual basis. It depends on how much there is left on the budget. Some people are lucky and get six weeks off, others not. This is not to say that the system is unjust but surely there must be some way to improve it and set rules. The committee should also have part of the grant to cover salary costs. The salary ends up being a larger cost than the grant itself”.

Remarks relative to the follow-up after the grant

“The PDG is an investment. The PDG committee might want to look what they want to get from their investment, they need to follow-up. I Insisted and in the end I was able to communicate them some results, but I didn’t feel the pressure form them to do so. The committee should be more committed in getting their money value back. The grant should not be the end”.

“Have a larger commitment from the manager. Is this an area where the Bank is going to be involved, where the person is going to be assigned to? The PDG should not be only a personal experience. It should not end when the BTO is given in, but be going afterwards. The value of the PDG for the Bank is not only whether people have gained knowledge. It is whether people will apply the knowledge they gained. The PDG should try to have more clarity in terms of the grantee’s work program”.

“Managers should commit themselves to follow-up and use the knowledge that PDG members have acquired”.

The committee should open the PDG

“The committee should also expand their focus not to consider only conventional grants. I wanted to work in a consortium of NGO’s in Ivory Coast and help them in capacity building. It would have been good for the image of the Bank and have
promoted the capacity of partner that does not have the money to afford it. But this was not possible”.

→ “The committee should accept annual PDG proposals for a shorter period, as this is more compatible with our work plan. I had to break my initial PDG into small pieces (3 weeks in FY97, two weeks in FY98, 10 days in FY99)”. 

→ “The PDG should be even more open to field staff with five years or more experience. The budget is calculated in a too narrow way. Field staff moving to the US to pursue their PDG should be allowed a bit more funds to cover for essentials such as transportation (especially when going in small cities where public transportation is not good) and basic subsistence, and day-care fees for accompanying children under school-age (as day-care fees are absolutely immense)”.

→ “To make PDG available to long term consultant would be a very good point, long term consultant need training to be more effective, they also need to be valued by the Bank. Young people (after three years or so experience at the Bank and if they ask for a reasonable budget) should also be considered. They are an interesting segment to be trained. Training should not be only for senior staff. My application was discussed a long time because I was not a regular staff, but I feel grateful it was accepted because I learned a great deal”.

→ “Allow the people to take a second grant. I understand that from an equity point of view the PDG committee wants to get new applicants. But the prospect of a second grant could be an incentive for those who did well in the first. Or at least the committee should clarify the eligibility criteria. They do a lot of marketing for this grant, and then they refuse your proposal”.

→ “This was a fantastic program. But a sabbatical year would event be better. Is the PDG a cheap way to avoid a sabbatical? Three months is very short for a research project. Also we don’t know how many times we can repeat the PDG”.

**General remarks concerning the universities or institutions where the interviewees took their grant**

→ “It worked effectively because the Harvard environment is very conducive, this was unexpected. The training would have been less effective if the group had come to Washington. The diversity of views and perspectives was very constructive though I thought I was more advanced than many in the group”.

→ “I was happy with the Institut de recherche sur l’économie de l’éducation in Dijon, France. It is a good institution and good counterparts are a key elements for a research project”.

→ “The CDC (Center for disease control) in Atlanta may not be the best place for studying my field (tropical diseases). It is a big shop, with 6000 employees, many labs and info, but the training is formal, with specialized modules. There is no possibility to customize, no professor to tutor your work. The agenda is set long in advance and the setting is rigid, everything is precooked, no adjustment is possible. Also the modules are organized by disease, there is no cross-cutting approach...”

→ “About the John Hopkins School of Public Health. Hopkins doesn’t have the same rigor in health economics than Berkeley or Harvard universities, but it is within commuting distance from Washington which is practical. Hopkins has a tropical medicine bias which was not useful for me (Europe missions) Hopkins is weak on cost-effectiveness and analytical rigor. In a way that was useful because it kept me active in sorting what was true from false and it was prompting me to check other sources of information”.

→ “The fieldwork was great. The courses were great too, however I wanted to concentrate on health insurance. Harvard offered health management courses, with
emphasis on jurist skills which were not my design. I use the information provided but I wonder whether another university offers better courses on health insurance”.

→ “The Boston university school of public health was a very good choice for me. It is broad based and this is very good for non specialists in the field of health care in developing countries”.

→ “About Wharton School (Philadelphia): this is one of the best courses for financing and business, so combining this with health was a very good choice. The faculty was very good and helpful. The university of Philadelphia also has an excellent web site which was how I managed to find housing, parking, and all the logistical support I needed”.

→ “Concerning the John Hopkins University in Baltimore. It was great, although I could name some individual professors that were not that good . I selected that university because it was a good university, conveniently located. The University of Michigan might have been another great choice but I was not ready to travel”.

→ “About John Hopkins University DC (environmental health and science). You get a lot of technical knowledge, but it is not too specialized, and having a little of knowledge over a variety of issues improves your skills in assessing the environmental impact of many social funds. That is why I believe John Hopkins is very good”.

→ “The University of Louvain was one of the good universities for smoking prevention problems. Maybe it was not the top. The top would probably have been Hopkins, but I had personal contacts in Louvain and therefore it was easier for me to organize a PDG there”.

→ “The internship experience in ADIE (association pour le droit à l’initiative économe) in France was very valuable. They gave me actual work to do, I was not just visiting. This was a very good balance between research and internship. My experience with the secretariat of social development in Argentina was more about research and visits than a true internship”.

→ “Harvard university, from a professional and academic point of view is top…”