



DRAFT

BRAC - DONOR CONSORTIUM RDP II

BRAC WIDE MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING REVIEW

REPORT PREPARED BY:
ROGER YOUNG AND IFTEKHAR HOSSAIN

JULY 1992

DRAFT

BRAC - DONOR CONSORTIUM RDP II

BRAC WIDE MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING REVIEW

REPORT PREPARED BY:
ROGER YOUNG AND IFTEKHAR HOSSAIN

JULY 1992

BRAC-WIDE TRAINING AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	i
LIST OF TABLES AND ANNEXES.....	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
1. Training Needs and Capacity.....	1
2. Management Issues.....	3
3. Summary of Recommendations.....	4
1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT.....	5
2. MONITORING TRAINING QUALITY.....	8
3. TRAINING - MATCHING NEEDS AND CAPACITY.....	9
3.1 RDP III Training Needs.....	9
3.2 Training Needs by Programme Components.....	9
4. MANAGEMENT OF GROWTH.....	18
4.1 Current Practices for Selection of Area Managers.....	18
4.2 Quantitative Analysis.....	19
4.3 Qualitative Analysis.....	21
4.4 NFPE Staff Requirements.....	22
REFERENCE.....	29

LIST OF TABLES AND ANNEXES

	Page
Table 3.1: BRAC wide Training Needs, available residential capacity (by Participant Days) and Trainer Requirements, 1993 - 1995.....	12
Table 3.2: Training Requirements of RDP III: 1993 - 1995.....	13
Table 3.3: Training Requirements of NFPE - within and outside RDP III.....	14
Table 3.4: Training Requirements of RCP during 1993 - 1995.....	15
Table 3.5: Training Requirements of WHDP at TARC/CDM	16
Table 3.6: Training Space (residential) availability in TARC/CDM/FHTC/Others.....	17
Table 4.1: Staff Training Courses Pre-requisite to Promotion to Position of Area Managers..	23
Table 4.2: BRAC Staffing Projection for Area Managers RDP III.....	24
Table 4.3: RDP Area Office Forecast Staff Requirements 1993- 1995.....	26
Table 4.4: NFPE Estimated Staffing Requirements 1993 - 1995.....	27
Table 4.5: Combined RDP & NFPE Field Based Management Positions 1993 - 1995.....	28

LIST OF ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference.....	30
Annex 2: List of Persons Met.....	33
Annex 3: Draft Proposed Reporting Formats: Monitoring of Training.....	34
Annex 4: Report on Trainer Workloads.....	35
Annex 5: Training Target and Achievement of Group Members BRAC Staff 1990-92.....	36
Annex 6: Staff Assessment Form.....	38

BRAC-WIDE TRAINING AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Training Needs and Capacity

The consultants have reviewed the BRAC-wide training needs and training capacity for the period 1993-1995 (see Annex 1 for TORs) by means of a thorough review and analysis of BRAC documentation, various recent consultants' reports related to training and management topics and discussions with BRAC's senior management responsible for RDP, NFPE, WHDP, personnel and training (Annex 2).

The discussion and analysis in the report proceeds from an assumption that the RDP III expansion will result in 95 new area offices being opened and that the NFPE expansion, outside RDP, will open 35,000 schools as planned over 1993-1995.

BRAC-wide training needs and capacity for the period 1993-1995 are presented in Table 3.1 enclosed.

Based on these estimates and the analysis we conclude that

- a) TARC and other residential training capacity now in existence or planned for construction should be adequate to meet currently planned BRAC-wide training requirements in 1993-1995;
- b) BRAC has a sufficient number of qualified trainers currently available to meet the training requirements for 1993 and can train adequate numbers of trainers to meet the training demands in RDP III;
- c) We are uncertain of the extent, if any, of a shortfall in training achievements relative to targets in the period 1990-1992; we recommend that BRAC present this information so that it can be incorporated into our final report.

The enclosed table, or a modified version, adapted according to BRAC's experience with it should be utilized and updated by BRAC to report regularly to senior management and the donor consortium on training targets, achievements, and capacity. It can also serve as a planning and programming tool.

We RECOMMEND that BRAC prepare this report twice a year - with June and December as reporting dates - for monitoring, planning and decision making purposes.

Responsibility for training is diffused throughout BRAC - at head office, with RDP, NFPE and the other sector programs such as IGVGD, WHDP; at the TARCs; with the general- and sector-specialist POs and GS in the field.

Accountability for training throughput and quality is also diffused resting with Coordinators and Regional Managers in RDP, NFPE, WDHP, IGVD as well as the headquarters's coordinators for RDP, (with which RCP has recently been integrated for management purposes) NFPE, WDHP, Training and the Centre for Development Management.

This is an effective management practice for a decentralized organization such as BRAC. However, there is no focal point within BRAC for monitoring, planning, programming and reporting upon BRAC-wide training per se. Given the rapid expansion of BRAC, the requirement for managing the training component will also grow. This should be seen to encompass monitoring the quantitative and qualitative aspects of training, and planning training capacity in relation to training needs.

We RECOMMEND that BRAC's office of the Programme Manager for Training be strengthened and made responsible for:

- The coordination, the preparation and the distribution of regular reports on BRAC-wide training targets, achievements and training capacity. Data currently suffers from a number of weaknesses within the capacity of BRAC to remedy; these are: training data are sometimes inconsistent and partial, relating only to a component part of BRAC programming;
- A monitoring and planning unit should be established in the office of the Programme Manager, Training, equipped with its own computers and staff, to collect training data from the responsible program managers and format it in the type of spreadsheet provided;
- Consistency and timeliness are of central importance; for example, training targets continuously change and an explanation is needed for the rationale underlying BRAC's choice of target when reporting achievements;
- This unit should monitor training capacity at the TARC and other centres in relation to current and planned training needs and recommend appropriate expansion;
- The unit should coordinate a study of TARC- trainer workloads and the monitoring of trainer quality;
- The unit should coordinate the necessary follow-up to any studies of training quality undertaken by RED and other units within BRAC.

Recent external reviews have expressed concern about the implications of heavy trainer workload. BRAC continues to assert that this is under control. A survey of trainer workload would be an effective means to help BRAC monitor trainers' workloads. We understand that trainers will be reporting their training days per se separately in the near future. The proposed monitoring and planning unit should collect this data and analyze it for review by the Programme Manager, Training and other relevant program managers. A possible format for such a survey is attached to the report.

2. Management Issues

The quantitative analysis of the potential supply of qualified candidates according to BRAC's current policies for promotion to Area office/Branch manager - or AM - suggests that BRAC will have an adequate supply of such candidates to be able to open 95 new area offices under RDP III.

Qualitative assessments of POs selected for potential promotion are made by supervisors who know their potential best ie Regional Managers, Area Managers and senior TARC trainers. The case for strict adherence to guidelines cannot be justified without reference to this qualitative assessment.

However, only regular staff who are being considered for promotion are assessed in this manner. RECOMMEND that all regular staff be given a written assessment on a regular basis. BRAC should continue to develop indicators for the assessment of managerial capability.

There is also a need for regularised documentation on the managerial capacity of all POs including level of experience, a written assessment, information on the in-service training completed by POs. This would promote a more professional management approach to the selection of Area Managers at the time when BRAC is poised for another rapid expansion of its managerial capacity. It would make the process of assessments more equitable and transparent.

In light of this recommendation, it may be timely to develop assessment indicators, to monitor the assessment process. BRAC could develop a reporting format for the assessment of regular staff to include the following:

- Qualifications;
- Current level and years of experience;
- A written assessment of his/her experience in BRAC with VO institutional development, credit management, sectoral programmes;
- In-service training completed by course.

We understand that BRAC's senior management is currently considering means and indicators for staff assessments.

3. Summary of Recommendations

1. A report of BRAC-wide training targets by program and achievements beginning from the period January-June 1992. The source for the targets should be clearly identified and justified. This report should be standardized and prepared twice a year, for the six-month period, January-June and again with annual figures. We have prepared a draft format for such a report to assist BRAC in the development of this management tool (Annex 3).

In light of BRAC's desire to reduce external consultants missions and the donors' desire for accessible reporting on training demands and capacity, this report will become a key planning and programming tool for BRAC's training activities. If a report for the period 1990-1991 can be prepared by July 10 1992 it could be incorporated into the final report. Otherwise, the first report should be prepared for the period January-June 1992 and should be available by the end of September 1992.

2. There is no focal point within BRAC for monitoring, planning, programming and reporting upon BRAC-wide training. With the rapid expansion of BRAC's activities in the near future, the need for managing training will also grow. We recommend that BRAC establish a monitoring and planning unit in the Office of the Programme Coordinator, Training to monitor and assist management with the planning of training requirements and the expansion of training capacity.

3. In light of the concerns expressed about trainer workloads in the Appraisal Report we recommend that a report which identifies actual trainer workloads assessing the time spent training, in follow-up in the field and in course development be developed. This monitoring report should be introduced from January 1993 as per the format in Annex 4. Regular assessment of training quality should be a part of the Training Monitoring Plan now being developed by BRAC.

4. A status report, prepared in mid-year, on the supply of potential Area managers with an ordering based upon qualifications, years of BRAC or other relevant experience, level of position, and BRAC training completed, together with a qualitative assessment should be prepared. The first report should be available by mid-1993. This report should also depict the current status of area office expansion and a forecast of the number of area office posts to be filled in the coming year.

5. BRAC should prepare a revised staff assessment form to be used for all regular staff to include indicators of managerial capacity. We understand this is under consideration by senior management.

BRAC WIDE MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING REVIEW

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

In mid-1992, BRAC is poised to commence upon a major expansion of its activities. BRAC currently reaches about 6% of its target population, the rural poor, defined as the functionally landless. Its longer term strategic goal is to reach 25% of this target population by the year 2000. To achieve its strategic objective and medium term goals of empowerment and poverty alleviation, BRAC has presented two proposals for a significant scaling-up of its work:

- RDP III covering the period 1993 to 1995 seeks to expand BRAC's core programme of organisation of the poor and extension of credit and training facilities;
- A second proposal covering the same time period will expand BRAC's non-formal primary education (NFPE) programme to operate 50,000 schools by the end of 1995 up from approximately 9,000 schools at the end of 1992.

The donor consortium (DC) for BRAC's rural development programme (RDP II covered 1990-1992) commissioned two external reviews in 1992 - a mid-term evaluation (MTE) assessing BRAC's RDP II activities retrospectively and an appraisal mission (AM) assessing BRAC's request for approximately US \$ 50 million over three years for RDP III beginning in January 1993.

Both reviews, but the appraisal mission in particular, raised a number of questions concerning the ability of BRAC's training capacity to keep pace with the rapid expansion of training needs as identified in the proposed expansion under RDP III. The appraisal report stated:

" In view of the difficulty experienced by the Appraisal in assembling clear data on training targets, capacity and achievements, it would be advisable to undertake a separate comprehensive review of these issues prior to the commencement of RDP III. What is needed is a planning and programming analysis of BRAC- wide training targets and capacity, including analysis of the projections both for targets and capacity during RDP III.

The analysis should also not be confined to RDP III and the specific funding package requested from the Donor Consortium. It should extend to cover (a) the training implications of non-RDP, non-Consortium activities such as WHDP and (b) the training projections for programmes such as NFPE which are within the scope of RDP III but to which RDP III will make only a partial contribution."¹

¹. BRAC Appraisal Report, Main Report (Volume I) paragraph 9.14

Another concern raised by the appraisal team refers to the capacity of BRAC to undertake this expansion without a sacrifice in the quality of its work. In particular, the appraisal mission commented on the rapid promotion of some BRAC staff to managerial positions apparently prematurely in light of the criteria established for promotion to the post of manager of an area office or RCP branch.

BRAC has recognized from its inception that training is a key element of its empowerment and poverty alleviation goals. The absence of basic literacy and other skills necessary for economic activity contributes forcefully to the dependency and despondency of the rural poor. High quality, relevant and accessible training can help to overcome these constraints and provide the poor with a means to enhance their economic standard of living and social and political power as well.

Training in BRAC is widespread among several different programmes and for staff development. In summary form, training encompasses the following activities:

- . Human development and management training - the purpose of these training courses given to VO group members and to staff is to create and to develop awareness, capacity and skill to analyze and to initiate action by the rural poor. It aims at developing leadership, management and operational skills for the poor to initiate and to maintain activities for their benefit. Some 26 different courses are offered to VOs and staff under this rubric.

- . Human development and management training takes place primarily at BRAC's Training and Resource Centres (TARCs).

- . Occupational and skills development courses seek to increase the capacity and skills of the landless to undertake economic activities as efficiently and as effectively as possible. These courses are given by qualified trainers to POs who together with the Gram Sheboks and Shebikas (GS) conduct the bulk of this training in the field.

- . Management development training is given to enhance the management capacity of BRAC's senior staff to effectively manage an expanding and increasingly differentiated programme of activities.

This review of BRAC's training and management capacity has attempted to address the following issues as requested in the terms of reference which are appended to this report:

- Establish the training needs as forecast for 1993-1995 for RDP III and other BRAC activities, in particular but not limited to, the expansion of NFPE outside RDP III;

- Establish the training capacity of BRAC including those TARC's now operational and planned to be in operation in the next three years;
- Assess the ability of BRAC to meet these training needs on the basis of current and planned training facilities; assess whether planning procedures are adequate to meet the growth in training needs over the period under review and if not what can be done to improve the situation;
- Assess BRAC's reporting formats for training and offer suggestions for improvement as warranted;
- Analyze BRAC's procedures for monitoring training quality with particular attention to the workload on trainers;
- Analyze the likely supply of qualified POs able to staff and manage area offices/branches under the planned expansion of RDP III to add 95 area offices to its operations in 1993-1995;
- Discuss with BRAC the means used to monitor training quality with respect to VO development and skills acquisition and to staff development.

In order to make this report accessible to decision makers in BRAC and the donor consortium, we have minimised descriptions of BRAC goals and activities and history of achievement. We assume the principal readers will be familiar with these details and as we wish to focus attention on the analysis and recommendations, we have sought to write a succinct document. Readers who require additional background detail should consult the list of documents referenced in preparation for this report.

Section three presents the results of our statistical analysis of BRAC-wide training demands and capacity for the period 1993-1995. We have included historical data for the 1991 (actual) and 1992 (planned) period to show trends, which may be relevant.

For example, over the period 1988-1991, BRAC's Human Development and Management training grew from 65,213 participant days to 188,380 participant days, an increase of 188% or an average rate of growth of 47%. (TARC Annual Report 1991).

Section four presents the analysis of management requirements for 95 additional area/branch office managers in 1993-1995.

2. MONITORING TRAINING QUALITY

While BRAC will monitor trends in training requirements and capacity to ensure that quantitative targets can be met, it will also monitor training quality to ensure that the training standards which have been achieved are not sacrificed as training expansion proceeds.

BRAC has begun to prepare for this additional monitoring of training quality by establishing a committee involving research and evaluation division, RED, and the training specialists in headquarters, the TARC and CDM.

The first draft of a training monitoring plan was prepared in June 1992. The monitoring will attempt to evaluate the quality of BRAC training using TARC/Savar as a pilot centre for the monitoring initially.

The monitoring will include assessment of the TARC trainers and facilities as well as the participants, and monitor elements such as:

- Availability of teaching materials;
- Participation in discussions;
- The methods used for training;
- Time management by the TARC and trainers.

The monitoring plan will be implemented by a combination of the TARC manager, TARC trainers and spot checks by a monitoring team on a regular basis. The draft monitoring plan appears to be a conscious effort to monitor the expanding training programme.

It is important to compliment the results of this monitoring exercise with the field-based follow-up to training courses. It is the acquisition and utilisation of skills that ultimately determines the effectiveness of training. Some of the indicators which BRAC may wish to consider including in this component of monitoring quality would include:

- For VO members training - the use of training skills in fostering VO development and maturity, acquisition and utilisation by members of specific technical and managerial skills in the sectoral training programs;
- For staff members, monitoring the performance of area/branch offices including credit recovery rates, and VO development.

3. TRAINING - MATCHING NEEDS AND CAPACITIES

3.1 RDP III Training Needs

The training requirements given in the RDP III Project Document (May '92) was revised by BRAC during the course of this Mission (Table 3.2). A comparison of the two set of estimates is shown below:

	May 1992	June 1992
1993	1,046,003	1,071,097
1994	962,703	975,898
1995	1,165,266	1,215,479
	-----	-----
Total:	3,173,972	3,262,474
	=====	=====

Appraisal mission of the Sericulture expansion programme was underway in June 1992. It is understood that none of the training requirements of the Sericulture Programme will involve either TARC/CDM residential training facilities or TARC/CDM trainers.

3.2 Training Needs by Programme Components

The TOR specifies identification of the training requirements of the following programmes other than RDP: NFPE, WHDP, RCP, IGVD, REP and Head Office.

Programme-wise training requirements are discussed in the paragraphs below:

NFPE

Training requirements of NFPE, within RDP III and outside RDP III is shown in Table 3.3. The non-RDP figures are revised versions from those given in the BRAC document titled "Basic Education for Human Development; A Programme for Expansion of Non Formal primary education 1993 - 1995; Version June 7, 1992". In addition to the training to be given under RDP III, the following additional training facilities and trainers will be organised for the expanded NFPE programme:

	Training centres (25 participants)	Trainers
1993	14	18
1994	26	34
1995	41	50

RCP

Training requirements for the period 1993-1995 is given in Table 3.4.

WHDP

The current Women's Health and Development Programme is being carried out over a three year period (July 1991 - June 1994). Training requirements for the years 1993 and 1994 is given in Table 3.5. The status of the Programme after June 1994 is not yet known and no training requirement has been estimated for 1995.

Field based training to be conducted by WHDP personnel and technical training to be conducted outside BRAC has not been shown.

IGVGD

The RDP III training requirements are inclusive of the IGVGD and so it has not been shown separately.

REP AND HEAD OFFICE

The training requirement of REP and Head Office is estimated to be very small and has been kept in a "Block Allocation" of 10% of TARC residential capacity.

RDP III project document RDP III 1993-1995 file name RDP3PD.WP51 was used as the source for the estimates of training requirements; revisions were made after discussion with RDP, WHDP, NFPE and Training managers. These are BRAC data as of June 1992.

TARC and other residential capacity now in existence or planned for construction should be adequate to meet currently planned training needs in 1993-1995. BRAC can rent training space if necessary to supplement existing residential capacity.

BRAC will have an adequate supply of trainers to meet training needs. Table 3.1 estimates the number of trainers needed to fulfil BRAC's training needs. There are 100 trained trainers in mid-1992 and the current requirement is for less than 90. It is prudent for BRAC to maintain a reserve of additional trainer capacity to meet future requirements.

NFPE managerial staff will be trained in TARCs but NFPE POs and teacher training will be outside TARC using NFPE programme trainers - a change from original plan. This will relieve pressure on the TARCs. NFPE refresher courses will be conducted by program trainers.

Table 3.1 is not a complete picture of BRAC's training requirements. It has not been possible to fully estimate field-based training to be conducted by programme trainers. We recommend that BRAC monitor training demand and supply in a format similar to Table 3.1 and revise it regularly. This should be an important planning and programming tool for BRAC.

We recommend BRAC report training achievements relative to target, or revised target as appropriate, twice a year. revised targets should be dated and the rationale for the revisions clearly noted. At the request of this mission, BRAC prepared the Training targets for RDP II and achievements in 1990 and 1991 (Annex 5). This statement contains the latest revised figures from BRAC as of June 1992. In case of any inconsistencies with other BRAC reports, this data are correct one. BRAC is already working on a reporting system and expect no inconsistencies with future reports.

Responsibility for training is diffused throughout BRAC - with program managers, area offices, and at TARCs. This is an effective management strategy; however, BRAC lacks a focal point to plan and programme BRAC-wide training requirements and capacities. We recommend a Monitoring and Planning unit, with staff and computers, to be used in the office of Programme Manager, Training. Its function would be to coordinate, and reconcile training data, prepare BRAC-wide training reports and help monitor and plan the expansion of training capacity.

Table 3.1 BRAC-wide Training needs, available residential capacity (by Participant Days) and Trainer requirements, 1993 - 1995

Programme	1991 (Actual)			1992 (Budget)			1993			1994			1995			1993 - 1995		
	TARC/ CDM/FHTC Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Program trainers)	TARC/ CDM/FHTC Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Program trainers)	TARC/ CDM/FHTC Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Program trainers)	TARC/ CDM/FHTC Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Program trainers)	TARC/ CDM/FHTC Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Program trainers)	TARC/ CDM/FHTC Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Program trainers)
A. Training requirement																		
1 ROP (excluding NFPE)	64,888	55,401		116,253	52,000	466,112	120,843	135,000	759,240	130,843	147,500	634,851	150,365	157,500	807,100	402,051	440,000	2,201,191
2 NFPE (ROP)	34,131	1,388			24,000		56,014			62,704			100,514			219,232	0	
3 WHDP	4,678			6,045			10,420			3,800						14,220	0	
4 IGUGDP	2,730	152																
5 RCP	11,105	3,886					2,840			3,976			5,112			11,928		
6 NFPE (non-ROP)									107,860			209,748			328,100			645,708
7 TARC	384	40																
8 Audit/Accounts	256																	
9 Other Deptts.	925						21,907			25,471			29,035			76,413		
10 GOVERNMENT	1,098	2,783																
11 NGO	568	3,975																
	120,763	67,625					212,024	135,000		226,794	147,500		285,026	157,500		723,844	440,000	
B. Residential capacity	112,413			154,051			219,067			254,707			290,347			764,121		
C. Excess capacity (B - A)	(8,350)						7,043			27,913			5,321			40,277		
D. Trainer requirement (Note)	53			100			88			95			112					

Note: Trainer requirement is for both TARC and field-based requirements of TARC trainers.

The number is estimated on the basis of 1 trainer for 20 participants and working 18 days per month for 11 months

Source: Tables 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6

Table 3.2 Training requirements of RDP III : 1993 - 1995

	----- 1993 -----			----- 1994 -----			----- 1995 -----			----- Total -----		
	TARC/ CDM/FHTC/ Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Progr. trainers)	TARC/ CDM/FHTC/ Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Progr. trainers)	TARC/ CDM/FHTC/ Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Progr. trainers)	TARC/ CDM/FHTC/ Others	Field (TARC trainers)	Field (Progr. trainers)
Staff	26,973			26,378			32,412			85,763		
Gram Shabok	27,240			24,535			30,403			82,178		
Group Members	66,630	135,000	759,240	76,930	147,500	634,851	87,550	157,500	807,100	231,110	440,000	2,201,191
	120,843	135,000	759,240	130,843	147,500	634,851	150,365	157,500	807,100	402,051	440,000	2,201,191
NPPE teachers	45,216			51,648			66,928			163,792		
NPPE PO/PI/AM	10,798			11,056			13,586			35,440		
	56,014			62,704			100,514			119,232		
Total	176,857	135,000	759,240	193,547	147,500	634,851	250,879	157,500	807,100	621,283	440,000	2,201,191

Note: NPPE Field Officer and Area Manager training includes both RDP and non-RDP personnel
includes JGVCDP training

Source : RDP III Project Document (Revised June'92) - Tables IIA,IIB,IIC,IID

Table 3.3 Training requirements of NFPE - within and outside RDP III

	----- 1992 -----			----- 1993 -----			----- 1994 -----			----- 1995 -----			-- Total (1993-1995) --		
	RDP	Non-RDP	Total	RDP	Non-RDP	Total	RDP	Non-RDP	Total	RDP	Non-RDP	Total	RDP	Non-RDP	Total
Schools															
New	1,500	4,497	5,997	2,300	5,500	8,000	3,000	9,000	12,000	3,500	14,500	18,000	9,000	29,000	38,000
Brought forward	4,683	1,320	6,003	6,183	5,817	12,000	8,683	11,317	20,000	11,683	20,317	32,000	6,183	5,817	12,000
Total schools	6,183	5,817	12,000	8,683	11,317	20,000	11,683	20,317	32,000	15,183	34,817	50,000	15,183	34,817	50,000
Re-opening	1,009			1,629	1,000	2,629	1,141	1,000	2,141	3,413	2,497	5,910	6,183	4,497	10,680
Teachers															
NFPE (new + 20%)	1,702	4,497	6,199	2,826	5,700	8,526	3,228	9,200	12,428	4,183	15,000	19,183	10,237	29,900	40,137
PEOC	1,104		1,104					2,203	2,203	1,250	2,750	4,000	1,250	4,953	6,203
Total	2,806	4,497	7,303	2,826	5,700	8,526	3,228	11,403	14,631	5,433	17,750	23,183	11,487	34,853	46,340
Field staff															
P.O.				216	476	692	260	780	1,040	303	1,260	1,563	779	2,516	3,295
Field Officers						98			60			91			249
Area Managers						22			12			19			53
Training requirement (Person days)															
Teacher (16 days)				45,216	91,200	136,416	51,648	182,448	234,096	86,928	284,000	370,928	183,792	557,648	741,440
P.O. (35 days)				7,560	16,660	24,220	9,100	27,300	36,400	10,605	44,100	54,705	27,265	88,060	115,325
Field Officers (29 days)						2,842			1,740			2,639			7,221
Area Managers (18 days)						396			216			342			954
Total						163,874			272,452			428,614			864,940
Training at TARC/COM						56,014			62,704			100,514			219,232

Source : RRAC NFPE Department

- Notes:
1. RDP III training and all PO & AM training will be conducted in TARC's, other training will be arranged by NFPE Dept. elsewhere
 2. Orientation and refresher trainings will be conducted by NFPE staff and has not been included in the above statement
 3. No formal training is contemplated for other NFPE field staff i.e. Regional Manager, Accountant, Office Assistant & Store Keeper.
 4. P.O. Training : In-service & Basic training 12 days + Staff Development (school management) 8 days + Training of Trainers 12 days + Pre-service 3 days = Total 35 days
 5. P.O. Training : Management Development 18 days + Organisation Development 6 days + Workshop 5 days = Total 29 days

Table 3.4 Training requirements of RCP during 1993-1995

	Number of Participants				Training days	Participant Days			
	1993	1994	1995	Total		1993	1994	1995	Total
Pre- & In-service Foundation	55	77	99	231	7	385	539	693	1,617
Functional Education	55	77	99	231	7	385	539	693	1,617
Social issue	55	77	99	231	7	385	539	693	1,617
Credit management	55	77	99	231	7	385	539	693	1,617
Approach to Rural Development	50	70	90	210	13	650	910	1,170	2,730
Organisation Development	50	70	90	210	13	650	910	1,170	2,730
Total	320	445	576	1,344		2,840	3,976	5,112	11,928

Source : BRAC, RDP June 1992.

Table 3.5 Training requirements of WHDP at TARC/CDM

	Number of participants			Training days	Participant days			
	1992	1993	1994		1992	1993	1994	Total
Village Committees	1,000	2,000	150	4	4,000	8,000	600	12,600
P.O. - Facilitation training	50	10	10	13	650	130	130	910
P.O. - Organisational development	25	10	10	7	175	70	70	315
T.O.T. (estimate)	10	10		7	70	70	0	140
Govt. employees (at CDM)	10	10		15	150	150	0	300
Provisional (Govt. employees)	100	200	300	10	1,000	2,000	3,000	6,000
Total	1,195	2,240	470	36	6,045	10,420	3,800	20,265

Note: Field-based training to be conducted by WHDP personnel and trainings to be conducted outside BRAC are not shown.

Source : BRAC, WHDP, June 1991

Table 3.6 Training space (residential) availability in TARC/CDM/FHTC/Others

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
T A R C						
Savar	100	100	100	100	100	100
Rangpur	100	100	100	100	100	100
Jessore	66	100	100	100	100	100
Pabna	50	54	100	100	100	100
Modhupur	58	58	58	58	58	58
Faridpur (Note 1)	25	25	100	100	100	100
Comilla (Note 1)		25	100	100	100	100
Mymensingh				50	50	50
Bogra/Hobiganj				50	50	50
Kushtia/Rajshahi				50	50	50
New					50	50
New					50	50
New					50	50
	399	462	658	808	958	958
CDM			76	76	76	76
FHTC			38	38	38	38
OTHERS						
AAF (4)		100	100	100	100	100
Markuli, Sulla		25	25	25	25	25
Kutubdia			25	25	25	25
R.M. Office		125				
Aarong, Ctg.		25				
Total number of seats		737	922	1,072	1,222	1,222
		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
Participant days (PD)						
TARC		124,351	156,341	191,981	227,621	227,621
Others		29,700	62,726	62,726	62,726	62,726
		=====	=====	=====	=====	=====
	112,413	154,051	219,067	254,707	290,347	290,347
	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====	=====

Note: 1. Faridpur is expected to have 100 seats from July'92 and
and Comilla from Oct'92

2. PD 1991 = Number of seats x 24 days x 11 months

3. PD 1992-1995 = Number of seats x 24 days x 11 months x 90 %

Source: 1. 1991 Actuals = TARC Annual Report
2. 1992 = RDP III Appraisal Report (May'92) Annex 2.3 and BRAC
3. 1993 to 1995 = Project Document May'92

4. MANAGEMENT OF GROWTH

The RDP III appraisal report contains some reservations regarding the implications of rapid growth under RDP III for the quality of programme management. In particular, the appraisal report points to a concern with the promotion of POs to positions of area managers prematurely:

"One of the consequences of rapid expansion of operational activities has been the need for rapid promotion of field staff - without in some cases strict adherence to the policy and criteria for promotion originally laid down. As noted, ... this has had beneficial effects, no doubt contributing to high morale. Yet....this report has already raised the question of adequate experience at the field level as a key issue for caution in further expansion."

The terms of reference (Annex 1) for this report request a systematic review of the implications of the growth of RDP III for training and management capacity at BRAC. As the TORs state, the position of area manager in particular is one of the most significant field positions within BRAC as the area manager (AM) is responsible for all aspects of VO institutional development, for credit discipline and for supervising the effective transfer of skills training to both BRAC staff and for VO members.

With this in mind, we have investigated the policy, criteria and processes for promoting POs to the position of area managers under RDP and have analyzed these processes in light of the staffing needs to establish 95 new area offices within RDP III.

4.1 Current Practices for Selection of Area Managers

POs who are to be promoted to the position of area manager, AM, ideally should have a Masters degree and three years of field based experience with BRAC prior to being placed in the AM position. This experience should also be accompanied by a BRAC training exposure which covers the basic elements of BRAC's activities, ie. institutional development, credit management and sectoral programmes for income generation as well as social and political issues related to the condition of the rural poor. This training involves 118 training days or almost 20 working weeks. See Table 4.1 for a list of courses which are a pre-requisite for POS to be promoted to the position of AM.

² Appraisal Report, Volume I, Paragraph 10.17

In 1991, BRAC changed its hiring practices. MA graduates enter BRAC at the PO V level rather than at level VI as previously. Area Managers should have attained promotion to PO level VI and have completed at least two years of experience.

These are staffing guidelines and are not seen as hard and fast regulations by BRAC.

In addition to these qualification and experience guidelines, BRAC management relies upon a qualitative assessment (see Annex 6) of PO promotional prospects from Regional Managers and TARC trainers who are able to observe the performance, maturity and potential of POs.

However, written assessments are required only for promotion to a higher level and not necessarily for a PO to be put in charge of an area office on a probational basis. BRAC should consider the merits of a written assessment for all POs prior to confirming a PO in the position of AM.

BRAC also maintains a record of training experience for each PO so that the qualitative assessment of POs by those most directly knowledgeable of their performance can be analyzed alongside the training needs of potential AMs. This training experience has been computerised, however, it is our understanding that it has not yet been implemented as a management or monitoring tool.

Regional managers are tasked to do an initial selection of potential POs who are suitable for promotion to the post of AM and a TARC is then assigned to give the candidate a 4-5 day training course and to prepare an assessment of his/her potential. The regional managers and the RDP Director of Field Operations make the final selection of AMs.

4.2 Quantitative Analysis

BRAC employs 263 regular staff members at Levels V and VI, and 33 staff members at Level VII, the staff levels from which BRAC can draw upon for Area Manager positions. (as of April 1992 according to documents of BRAC personnel department). This constitutes an ample supply of potential Area Managers for 1992 and 1993.

However, the appraisal mission noted that 55% of Level VI and VII and 30 % of POs serving as Area Managers on probation as in charge AM, have less than three years of service with BRAC. Appraisal Report 1992 Main volume Table 10.1. The Appraisal commented that less-experienced staff may be being promoted prematurely.

A review of the table suggests a somewhat different interpretation. All Level VII POs or AMs have more than three years of service and 74 out of 294 or 25% of Level VI regular staff will have less than 3 years of service at the beginning of RDP III in January 1993.

Table 4.1 reports on the number of current AMs and POs with the potential to serve as AM in the next three years for RDP III. The table contains the current "stock" of AMs and POs in charge (POs who are serving as AM under a probation of 6-12 months) of area offices as at February 1992. The computations proceed from a number of assumptions to estimate the supply of AMs for the three year period appropriate to RDP III ie 1993-1995.

The assumptions are taken from working documents of BRAC RDP management and reflect their expectations based on past experience with AM and PO promotion and redeployment within BRAC.

These assumptions can be varied to test alternative scenarios regarding personnel promotions and redeployments or dropout rates. The number of AMs required in any given year is assumed to be 10 % larger than the number of AOs in operation. For example, at the end of 1992 when 140 AOs will be in operation, 154 area managers will be needed throughout the year to staff these offices because of promotion, dropout or redeployment within BRAC.

The assumptions for the model are:

- The more senior area managers can be expected to be promoted or redeployed to head office or to a TARC as a senior trainer for example.
- 25% of the current Regional Managers and/or senior AMs and 70% of those AMs with three years of experience in the position of Area Manager are assumed to be promoted or redeployed elsewhere in BRAC in a year.
- 80% of the POs in charge are assumed to be suitable for promotion to the post of AM after their probationary period.
- The recruitment of new Masters level graduates as new POs is also shown and the future supply of POs is related functionally to the number of new recruits. BRAC can influence the future supply of POs by the number of graduates it hires in a given year.

The table shows that there should be an adequate supply of experienced POs in strictly quantitative terms to meet the needs of RDP III under the premise that 95 new area offices will be opened in 1993-1995.

However, if the numbers referring to the current stock are accurate then the proportion of "seasoned" and more senior POs - those with 2 years or more in the post of Area Manager, categories a-c in the table - will fall from the current ratio of 52% to 28% in 1994 before rising again to 42% in 1995.

While this is only a partial analysis of BRAC's capacity to implement and manage growth, we recommend that BRAC utilize this format as a tool to monitor AM and PO experience and availability and to plan training for POs as part of its AM selection procedures.

BRAC should report in this format, or one amended as appropriate, as a means of monitoring the evolution of PO availability. The report could include not only quantitative information but more qualitative data as well; for example, branch performance in terms of credit disbursement and recovery, and the degree of VO development might be suitable indicators for use by BRAC. Regional Managers could be tasked with the responsibility for the preparation of such an assessment.

4.3 Qualitative Analysis

Regular staff assessment is an important aspect of the selection of AMs. BRAC should continue to develop appropriate assessment approaches to ensure equity and transparency in promotions. This might include written assessments by RMs and by TARC at time of POs relevant training; assessments should include the capacity of potential area managers to manage staff, evaluation of performance with respect to VO development, credit operations and sectoral activities.

BRAC has computerised data on the training experience of POs to be able to monitor training exposure including if all relevant training has been given to the PO in his/her first two years of service.

The training of POs is monitored and there is follow up by the TARC trainers but it is limited to the short term following the provision of training; we recommend some selective additional assessment of management training one year after course has been given; this should be tied to indicators of area/branch office performance already mentioned.

BRAC disputes the assertion of the Appraisal Mission that it should adhere strictly to its own guidelines regarding the number of years of experience required before appointing POs to the position of Area Manager; BRAC prefers to rely rather more heavily upon the assessment of Regional Managers and the TARC trainers who have direct knowledge of the POs performance and potential.

Written assessments are currently required of AMs annually; this assessment should be developed further, especially for the newly appointed AMs to include performance criteria such as branch credit performance as a means of monitoring AM effectiveness in their positions and as feedback to RMs and the Director Field Operations of RDP of the emerging strengths and weaknesses of newly appointed AMs.

An analysis of training courses required for POs prior to promotion to AM indicates 13 courses requiring 118 training days. BRAC recognises the importance of training for staff effectiveness; there should be no compromise on training prerequisites for AMs; BRAC should confirm that each POs has had the minimal requisite training before appointment as a PO in-charge.

4.4 NFPE Staff Requirements

BRAC is also seeking financial support for a major expansion of its non-formal primary education programme - NFPE. The proposed expansion will increase the total number of BRAC NFPE schools from approximately 6,000 in mid-1992 to 50,000 by the end of 1995.

There will be additional staff required for the management of NFPE field operations. These estimates are presented in Table 4.3. Given the rapid growth in NFPE, there will be a need to draw on the staff of RDP for staffing of NFPE area offices in 1992-1993. Thereafter, NFPE should be capable of training and promoting its own staff to assume managerial positions.

Given the overall needs of RDP and NFPE for experienced area office management staff, we have analyzed their combined needs for the period 1993-1995. These are presented in Table 4.4 which in quantitative terms confirms that BRAC has an adequate supply of level V and higher POs available in 1993-1994 to fill these posts. The current non-confirmed staff would have two years or more BRAC experience by the end of 1994. In mid-1992, there are 238 non-confirmed staff with NFPE and 382 with RDP.

TABLE 4.1

STAFF TRAINING COURSES PRE-REQUISITE TO
PROMOTION TO POSITION OF AREA MANAGER

1. In-service Foundation	11 days
2. Functional Education	7
3. Social Issues	7
4. Credit Management	7
5. Organisational Development	13
6. Approach to Rural Development	13
7. Sectoral Planning	13
8. Gender Issues	4
9. Area Office Management Training	30
10. Financial management	13
Total Training Days	118

Source: RDP III Project Document and RDP Coordinator Field
Operations

TABLE 4.2

BRAC STAFFING PROJECTION FOR AREA OFFICE MANAGERS RDP III

STAFF/LEVEL	YEAR END	1992	1993	1994	1995
A. Potential Supply of Area Managers by Category		<u>132</u>	<u>263</u>	<u>392</u>	<u>484</u>
a) RM/Senior AM i/c		17	40	45	50
b) AM 3y+ in post		39	22	23	46
c) AM 2y		13	20	42	111
d) Base AM		10	42	111	137
e) PO in charge		53	139	171	140
B. PO level V 2y+		214	285	178	204
C. PO level V 1y+		199	84	132	182
D. New Recruits PO level V		120	189	260	216
<hr/>					
E. Existing Area Offices		140		165	195
New Area Offices			25	30	40
F. Total Area Offices		140	165	195	235
G. No. AMs Required*		154	182	215	259
I. No. of Trainers Required		-	-	-	-
H. Surplus Available		(22)	<u>81</u>	<u>177</u>	<u>225</u>

Source: RDP Coordinator Field Operations June 1992
and Consultants computations.

Notes, Definitions and Assumptions to the Table 4.2

- PO in charge is on a 6-12 month probation prior to confirmation in the post of Area Manager (AM)
- Actual staffing for 1992 AMs is at April 1992 and additional appointments have been made to fill all AOs.
- G * 10% of Area Managers are promoted or redeployed each year and their posts must be filled.

Projected numbers assume that:

- a) 25% of Regional Manager/Senior AM are promoted/redeployed within one year
- b) 70% of AMs with 3 years or more in the post are promoted or redeployed each year
- c) 20% of AM with 2 years in the post are promoted/redeployed each year
- d) All Base AMs ie with one year in post become 2+ years in post
- e) 80% of POs in charge are promoted to AM within one year, another 10% in the second year and 10% are redeployed.
- B) 60% of POs with 2 years service are promoted to PO in charge
- C) All POs with 1 year of service become PO with 2 years service
- D) 70% PO level V with 2 years experience are promoted to PO in charge
- E) 30% of PO level V recruits dropout
- F) % of AMs in "senior" categories C. a-c:

1992 - 52.3
 1993 - 31.2
 1994 - 28.1
 1995 - 42.8

TABLE 4.3

RDP AREA OFFICE FORECAST STAFF REQUIREMENTS
1993-1995

<u>STAFF</u>	END 1992	END 1993	END 1994	END 1995
Regional Manager	14	17	20	24
Area Manager	140	165	195	235
Sub-total	154	182	215	259
POs	470	555	655	790
TOTAL	624	737	870	1049
Projected availabilities				
RM/AM	132	263	392	484
POs	533	558	570	602
TOTAL	665	821	962	1086

Source: BRAC RDP Field Operations 1992 notes, June 1992.
Consultants calculations.

TABLE 4.4
 NFPE ESTIMATED STAFFING REQUIREMENTS
 1993-1995

	1993	1994	1995	TOTAL
Regional Manager	4	3	4	11
Area Manager	22	12	19	53
Field Office	98	60	91	249
Trainers	18	34	50	112

Sources:

NFPE Program Staff Position mimeo June 1992.
 NFPE Program Staff Requirements mimeo June 1992.

TABLE 4.5

COMBINED RDP & NFPE FIELD-BASED MANAGEMENT POSITIONS
1993-1995

	1993	1994	1995
RDP III	182	215	259
NFPE	124	75	114
TOTAL NEEDS	306	290	373
AVAILABLE RDP	263	392	484
NFPE	242	n/a	n/a
TOTAL	505		

Source: Tables 4.2 and 4.4

REFERENCE

- BRAC 1992a RDP III Project Document File: D2RDP3PD.W51
- BRAC 1992b Basic Education for Human Development: A Programme for the Expansion of NFPE 1993-1995
- BRAC 1992c Statistical Report December 1991
- BRAC 1990 A Report on Training Needs, Capacity and Utilization 1990-1992, December RDP
- BRAC TARC Annual Reports various years
- Dani Anis 1992 Management and Training Annex to RDP III Appraisal Report
- DLO 1992 RDP III Appraisal Report Volume I, Main Volume and Volume II Annexes
RDP II Mid-Term Evaluation Annex: Management and Training, Draft report: Mario Ganuza
- Marsden D. and Paul Webster 1990 A Report on the AKRSP Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Section July 1990
- Shordt K. 1991 The Growth of BRAC's Training Capacity: Human Development and Management Training 1990-1992 May 1991

ANNEX 1

BRAC-WIDE REVIEW
OF
MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING REQUIREMENTS AND CAPACITY

Terms of Reference

Background

1. One of the components of the RDP III Appraisal carried out in March, 1992, was an assessment of the management and training requirements for RDP III and BRAC's capacity to meet those requirements. The findings of this assessment are summarised in Section 9 of the Main Report (Volume I) and presented in more detail in Annex 4, 'Management and Training', in Volume II.

As stated in Volume I (para 9.14):

"The analysis should also not be confined to RDP III and the specific funding package requested from the Donor Consortium. It should extend to cover (a) the training implications of non-RDP, non-Consortium activities such as WHDP, and (b) the training projections for programmes such as NFPE which are within the scope of RDP III but to which RDP III will only make a partial contribution."

2. The need for such a review is also highlighted in section 10 of the Main Report on 'Planning, Management and Organisational Development'. In particular, the sub-section on 'Management Issues in the Context of Rapid Growth' (para 10.17-10.19) draws attention to the importance of ensuring that BRAC staff at field level have adequate management experience.

3. This is particularly relevant to the crucial position of Area/Branch Manager. S/he has a key role to play in ensuring that sufficient attention is given by the POs to all aspects of VO development, in particular areas of weakness that the Appraisal identified such as institution building and ensuring that there is full integration of sector specialists in loan monitoring.

4. As the report points out, however, at the end of the second year of RDP II there were a significant number of RDP and RCP Offices with acting Managers who did not yet have the requisite length and breadth of experience. If this is the case in RDP II, what then will be the position in RDP III with its even greater (+50%) rate of expansion than RDP II?

5. In view therefore of the ambitious plans for the expansion of RDP and of NFPE in the years 1993-95, and the level of external funds required, it is considered essential that a review of management and training requirements and capacity is carried out at the earliest opportunity.

Objective and Scope

6. The basic objective of the review is therefore to carry out a BRAC-wide assessment of management and training requirements and capacity. The primary purpose is to provide reassurance that BRAC can develop the human resources to realise the planned expansion of the various programmes in 1993-95, notably 95 new RDP Area Offices and 50,000 NFPE schools, whilst at the same time maintaining the quality of output of those programmes. As the Appraisal report makes clear, the output indicators of achievement are not only quantitative, eg numbers of members, loan disbursements, loan performance, numbers of pupils, etc but also those of a more qualitative nature, eg institutional (VO) development and the social maturity of VO members.

7. In terms of the types of training, the review will cover the following areas:

For BRAC management and staff

- training to develop the technical and managerial skills of BRAC's regular and project staff
- both basic and refresher training for BRAC's field staff including POs and NFPE schoolteachers

For VO members

- human development training
- occupational and technical skills training

8. In terms of programmes, the review will need to include the management and training requirements of:

Head Office
RDP, RCP and REP
NFPE
IGVGD
WHDP

9. Of particular importance are the staff requirements and training capacity of both the TARC's and the MDP. In relation to training capacity, the review will need to consider both the availability and quality of trainers and also the availability of, or access to, the necessary physical facilities, eg at the TARC's.

10. Having carried out their analysis of management and training requirements and capacity, the review consultants have a final, important, task. This is to: (a) consider the planned rate of expansion of Area Offices under RDP III; (b) assess whether BRAC has the management and training capacity to achieve that rate, bearing in mind the need to maintain the output quality of programmes and the parallel plans under NFPE III to open 50,000 schools in the period 1993-95; and (c) make recommendations accordingly. Such recommendations may include options as to how the rate of expansion desired by BRAC can be achieved without compromising the programme quality, or other possible courses of action.

11. The consultants should also review with BRAC the monitoring of management & training capacity in relation to the requirements of opening new AOs and make recommendations in terms of the criteria, indicators and methodology for the ongoing monitoring of this capacity.

Consultants

12. In view of the importance of the review and the need for it to be carried out over a short period - preferably not more than two weeks - it is considered essential that (a) two consultants should be appointed to carry out the review, and (b) both consultants, certainly the team leader, should have had substantive and ideally recent exposure to BRAC, preferably in the area of management and training.

Timing

13. The review should be undertaken as soon as possible, but not at the expense of compromising on the quality of the consultants. At the latest, the consultants' report should be in the hands of BRAC and DC members by mid August, 1992. This is in order to allow sufficient time for consideration of the consultants' findings and recommendations before the planned meeting of the DC with BRAC in early September.

2 June 1992

ANNEX 2

LIST OF PERSONS MET

June 16 1992	Briefing at DLO with Ms. Lyne Paquette BRAC Donor Liaison Officer
June 17 1992	Ms. Samshad Rahman Khan Senior Personnel Officer
	Ms. Kaniz Fatima Programme Coordinator NFPE
	Dr. Sudhir Chandra Sarkar Education Specialist NFPE
June 18 1992	Mr. Shabbir Ahmed Choudhury Programme Manager Training
	Mr. Sukhen Sarkar Director, Sector Programs RDP
June 20 1992	Mr. Aminul Alam Director, Field Operations RDP
June 23 1992	Mr. Aminul Alam Mr. Shabbir Choudhury
June 24 1992	Ms. Sadia Chowdhury Coordinator WHDP
June 25 1992	Mr. Aminul Alam
	Mr. Salehuddin Ahmed Director, Programs
June 27 1992	Mr. Aminul Alam Mr. Shabir Chowdhury
June 28 1992	Mr. F.H. Abed Executive Director

ANNEX 3

DRAFT PROPOSED REPORTING FORMATS:
MONITORING OF TRAINING

1. BRAC -WIDE TRAINING MONITORING REPORT

Programme	TARGET		ACTUAL		ACHIEVEMENTS %	
	For the Period	Cumulative	For the Period	Cumulative	For the Period	Cumulative
1. RDP						
2. NFPE						
3. WHDP						
4. IGVGD						
5. RCP						
6. RED						
7. TARC						
8. OTHER BRAC						
9. GOVERNMENT						
10. NGO						
TOTAL						

ANNEX 4

REPORT ON TRAINER WORKLOADS

Month _____

Name of Trainer	Training days		Follow-up	Course Development	Total
	TARC	Field			

Training Target and Achievement of Group Members and BRAC Staff
1990-1992

Sl No	Particulars of Training	Duration of Training (Days)	Target as per proposal			Total		Revised Target			Total		Achievement		Total		Date of Revised Target	VENUE	
			1990	1991	1992	P/W	P/D	1990	1991	1992	P/W	P/D	1990	1991	P/W	P/D			
A. Group Members																			
a) Human Development																			
1	Social Awareness worker trng.	7	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000	21,000	600	600	600	1,800	12,600	974	1,107	2,081	14,567	N/A	TARC	
2	Consciousness raising	6	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000	36,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	12,000	72,000	3,535	5,754	9,289	55,734	N/A	A/O	
3	Planning & Mang't (Leadership)	7	2,200	2,200	2,200	6,600	46,200	4,000	4,000	4,000	12,000	84,000	3,257	6,688	9,945	69,615	N/A	A/O	
4	Planning & Mang't (Management)	7	2,200	2,200	2,200	6,600	46,200	4,000	4,000	0	8,000	56,000	2,872	6,393	9,265	64,855	01/01/92	TARC	
5	Basic Accounts	13	4,400	4,400	4,400	13,200	171,600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	01/07/91	TARC
6	VO & Credit Management	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8,500	8,500	59,500	0	0	0	0	0	01/09/91	TARC
7	Planning & Mangt.(Sec. Program)	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,828	11,828	70,968	0	0	0	0	0	01/09/90	A/O
8	Paralegal Teachers Training	28	0	0	0	0	0	100	75	315	490	13,720	85	65	150	4,200	01/04/90	TARC	
9	Functional Edu. & CR Teachers	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	700	700	9,100	0	0	0	0	0	01/12/91	TARC
10	Consciousness Raising Teachers	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,000	1,000	7,000	0	0	0	0	0	01/12/91	TARC
Sub-Total		101	11,800	11,800	11,800	35,400	321,000	12,700	12,675	30,943	56,318	384,888	10,723	20,007	30,730	208,971			
b) Occupational Training																			
1	Poultry worker	5	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000	15,000	1,000	1,000	1,844	3,844	19,220	685	1,159	1,844	9,220	N/A	A/O	
2	Key Bearer	3	20,000	20,000	20,000	60,000	180,000	20,000	30,000	50,000	100,000	300,000	18,720	30,280	49,000	147,000	01/04/91	UNION	
3	Paravet	30	200	200	200	600	18,000	200	300	304	804	24,120	240	240	480	14,400	N/A	TARC	
4	Cow Bearer	3	6,500	6,500	6,500	19,500	58,500	11,000	35,000	4,000	50,000	150,000	11,015	34,946	45,961	137,883	01/09/90	UNION	
5	Goat Bearer	3	0	0	0	0	0	3,500	1,500	0	5,000	15,000	3,557	1,424	4,981	14,943	01/07/90	UNION	
6	Chick Bearer	3	0	0	0	0	0	150	700	950	1,800	5,400	170	710	880	2,640	01/09/90	A/O	
7	Feed Seller	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	30	85	140	420	24	28	52	156	01/09/90	A/O	
8	Artificial Insemination	30	0	0	0	0	0	58	0	0	58	1,740	58	0	58	1,740	01/09/90	GOVT.	
9	Bearer (Silk worm)	5	700	1,000	1,000	2,700	13,500	700	1,000	1,800	3,500	17,500	650	1,350	2,000	10,000	01/07/91	A/O	
10	Chawki Bearer	7	0	0	0	0	0	40	60	100	200	1,400	37	63	100	700	01/09/90	SEKICULTURE	
11	Horticulture Nursery	5	200	200	200	600	3,000	200	200	800	1,200	6,000	255	105	360	1,800	01/09/90	A/O	
12	Vegetable Grower	5	2,000	2,000	2,000	6,000	30,000	2,000	4,000	5,636	11,636	58,180	4,636	2,500	7,136	35,680	01/07/90	UNION	
13	Apiculture	3	200	200	200	600	1,800	400	400	458	1,258	3,774	300	900	1,200	3,600	01/01/91	A/O	
14	Fish Nursery Worker	7	200	200	200	600	4,200	200	200	200	600	4,200	74	244	318	2,226	N/A	TARC	
15	Fish Culture	3	500	500	500	1,500	4,500	500	1,000	3,630	5,130	15,390	607	807	1,414	4,242	01/04/90	A/O	
16	Thal Sarputi	1	0	0	0	0	0	200	2,000	15,000	17,200	17,200	170	760	930	930	01/07/91	UNION	
17	Mechanic	3	25	75	75	175	525	24	50	81	155	465	28	46	74	222	01/07/91	TARC	
18	Scheme Management	3	200	1,000	1,000	2,200	6,600	1,000	1,200	600	2,800	8,400	1,565	2,250	3,815	11,445	01/09/90	A/O	
19	Driver	7	0	0	0	0	0	235	500	165	900	6,300	441	735	1,176	8,232	01/09/90	A/O	
20	Farmer	4	0	0	0	0	0	10,000	20,000	10,000	40,000	160,000	5,023	12,000	17,023	68,092	01/09/90	UNION/FIELD	
21	Other Training	13	1,200	1,200	1,200	3,600	46,800	2,000	1,600	400	4,000	52,000	1,000	2,000	3,000	39,000	01/09/90	DIFF. PLACES	
22	Progressive Farmer (SN)	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400	400	12,000	0	0	0	0	0	01/12/91	SEKICULTURE
23	Water distribution (Lineman)	2	200	200	200	600	1,200	400	400	200	1,000	2,000	576	1,050	1,626	3,252	01/02/91	A/O	
24	Vegetable Worker	13	0	0	0	0	0	400	0	400	800	10,400	458	0	458	5,954	01/07/90	A/O	
Sub-Total		191	33,125	34,275	34,275	101,675	383,625	54,232	101,140	97,053	252,425	891,109	50,289	93,597	143,886	523,357			

ANNEX 5. (Cont'd)

Sl No	Particulars of Training	Duration of Training (Days)	Target as per proposal			Total		Revised Target					Total		Achievement		Total		Date of Revised Target	VENUE
			1990	1991	1992	P/W	P/D	1990	1991	1992	P/W	P/D	1990	1991	P/W	P/D				
c) IGVGD																				
1	Poultry Worker	5	3,200	3,600	3,600	10,400	52,000	6,000	0	3,000	9,000	45,000	6,000	0	6,000	30,000	01/07/90	UNION		
2	Key Bearer	3	24,000	27,000	27,000	78,000	234,000	30,000	25,000	20,000	75,000	225,000	33,305	21,379	54,684	164,052	01/07/90	UNION		
3	Chick Bearer	3	220	360	360	940	2,820	450	150	350	950	2,850	452	157	609	1,827	01/07/90	UNION		
4	Feed Seller	3	0	0	0	0	0	60	160	0	220	660	57	171	228	684	01/07/90	UNION		
Sub-Total		14	27,420	30,960	30,960	89,340	288,820	36,510	25,310	23,350	85,170	273,510	39,814	21,707	61,521	196,563				
B. NYPE Teachers Training																				
1	Teachers Training	16	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000	48,000	2,004	1,000	1,500	4,504	72,064	1,912	1,044	2,956	47,296	N/A	A/O		
Sub-Total		16	1,000	1,000	1,000	3,000	48,000	2,004	1,000	1,500	4,504	72,064	1,912	1,044	2,956	47,296				
C. GRAM SHEBOI TRAINING																				
1	GS (Poultry)	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	12	162	4,860	0	142	142	4,260	01/04/91	TARC		
2	GS (Seri)	30	40	30	10	80	2,400	40	40	70	150	4,500	0	65	65	1,950	01/09/90	SERICULTURE		
3	GS (Fishculture)	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	140	200	1,400	28	32	60	420	01/09/90	TARC		
4	GS (Irrigation)	6	0	0	0	0	0	25	75	20	120	720	86	84	170	1,020	01/07/90	TARC		
5	GS (Vegetable)	6	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	50	300	65	0	65	390	01/07/90	TARC		
Sub-Total		79	40	30	10	80	2,400	115	325	242	682	11,780	179	323	502	8,040				
D. Staff																				
1	Approach to Rural Development	13	50	175	200	425	5,525	120	0	240	360	4,680	80	174	254	3,382	N/A	TARC		
2	Organisation Development	13	50	75	200	325	4,225	120	0	240	360	4,680	132	150	282	3,666	N/A	A/O		
3	Functional Education	7	50	75	200	325	2,275	150	150	350	650	4,550	140	150	290	2,030	N/A	A/O		
4	Social Issues	7	0	75	200	275	1,925	150	140	350	640	4,480	119	161	280	1,960	01/07/90	TARC		
5	Credit Management	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	350	350	2,450	0	0	0	0	01/07/91	TARC		
6	NDP (A/W)	17	25	25	25	75	1,275	100	60	60	220	3,740	56	57	113	1,921	N/A	CDM		
7	Br. Operation Management	30	25	25	25	75	2,250	0	0	60	60	1,800	0	0	0	0	01/07/91	CDM		
8	NYPE PO TOT	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	266	331	3,972	N/A	TARC		
9	Staff Development NYPE PO	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	144	204	4,692	01/12/91	TARC		
10	Sericulture	30	8	8	0	16	480	10	10	20	40	1,200	0	15	15	450	01/07/91	GOVT & OTHERS		
11	Scheme Mgt PO (Irrigation)	5	0	0	0	0	0	100	50	50	200	1,000	117	57	174	870	01/7/90	TARC		
12	Improve Aquaculture PO (Fish)	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	0	15	105	0	24	24	168	N/A	A/O		
13	TOT (Skill PO)	13	0	0	0	0	0	60	100	100	260	3,380	71	136	207	2,691	N/A	A/O		
14	Preservance Foundation	13	0	0	0	0	0	300	300	300	900	11,700	575	466	1,041	13,533	01/07/90	TARC		
15	NDP (IGVGD) PO	21	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	20	60	1,260	40	0	40	840	01/07/91	TARC		
16	NDP (Skill PO)	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	20	420	0	20	20	420	N/A	CDM		
17	Monitoring PO	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	20	120	0	20	20	120	01/07/91	CDM		
18	Technical Training Skill PO	6	200	0	0	200	20	20	20	0	40	240	48	40	88	528	N/A	TARC		
19	Credit Management (PO IGVGD)	3	0	0	0	0	0	150	0	0	150	450	0	144	144	432	01/12/91	TARC/WFP		
Sub-Total		254	408	458	850	1,716	17,975	1,330	875	2,140	4,345	46,255	1,503	2,024	3,527	41,595				
Grand Total (A+B+....+C+D)		655	73,793	78,323	78,895	231,211	1,061,820	106,891	141,325	155,228	403,444	1,679,606	104,420	138,702	243,122	1,025,822				

ANNEX 6

Staff Assessment Form

BRAC

Staff Confidential Information

AREA:

- A) Name of Staff:
- B) Date of Joining BRAC:
- C) Present level of work: Starting time:
- D) Is he/she capable of fulfilling the present responsibilities of the position? Can he/she be dependable?
(Answer should be detailed)
- E) Can he/she be given additional responsibilities and what type?
- F) Is he/she...
1. Honest?
 2. Friendly?
 3. Dependable? (especially handling money)
 4. Careful? and does work as expected from a good worker?
- G) Does he/she takes interest in the welfare of her subordinates or he/she only busy with himself/herself?
- H) Does he/she gives any clear practical idea (suggestion) with respect to the work?
- I) His/her bad side:
- J) Overall opinion:

Date : _____

Signature
Area Incharge/P/OIncharge

Opinion of Area Incharge