

PD-AAA-910-F1

5200198 - 5

RS/PS
REPORT 0-446

AID 1020-73 110-700

A.I.D.

Reference Center
Room 1656 NS

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO. 520-15-690-198/1	2. PAR FOR PERIOD FY-1969 to FY-1971	3. COUNTRY GUATEMALA	4. PAR SERIAL NO. 72-2
------------------------------------	---	-------------------------	---------------------------

5. PROJECT TITLE
EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (PRIMARY)

6. PROJECT DURATION: Begin FY <u>69</u> End FY <u>74</u>	7. DATE LATEST PIP <u>7/17/70</u>	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
--	--------------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative On-Going This Par FY: \$ <u>71-684,503</u>	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$
------------------	--	------------------------------------	--

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Constructor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
USAID Education Division Chief	N/A

12. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
USAID	AIC/W	IND/F		
X			Appoint Program Assistant	September 1, 1971

D. REPLANNING REQUIRES

REVISED OR NEW: PROP PIP PRO AG PIO/Y PIO/C PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW

July 16, 1971

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE

Peter Wright

MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE

Robert E. Culbertson

II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS

A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT CONTRACTOR, PARTICIPATING AGENCY OR VOLUNTARY AGENCY	B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X)					
	UNSATISFACTORY		SATISFACTORY			OUTSTANDING		LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	
4 1. Short term personnel services					X								X
3 2. Grantee contractors					X								X
3.													

Comment on key factors determining rating

#1 Individual performance ratings range from 4 to 6, determined by inputs and interaction with host country team.

#2 Individual ratings range from 4 to 7.

4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
			X									

Comment on key factors determining rating

Low cost observation trips to Mexico for exposure to different methodologies - also as incentive

5. COMMODITIES	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
					X							X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Teaching materials, shop and agricultural equipment and facilities are essential to the experimental design.

6. COOPERATING COUNTRY	a. PERSONNEL	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
				X									X
	b. OTHER		X										X

Comment on key factors determining rating

Personnel: Retention of selected, qualified, trained, administrative personnel, technicians and trained teachers is essential to the project. Replacement trained personnel by political appointments has slowed the program.

Other: The GOG has so far failed to provide classrooms required for a ratio of 40 students per classroom and teacher. Two pilot schools are overcrowded.

7. OTHER DONORS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5
-----------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

AID 1020-22(10-70) PAGE 3 PAR	PROJECT NO. 520-15-690-198.1	PAR FOR PERIOD: FY-1969 - FY-1971	COUNTRY GUATEMALA	PAR SERIAL NO. 72-2
----------------------------------	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------	------------------------

11. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					FY-74 END OF PROJECT
		CUMU- LATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 72		FY 73	FY	
			TO DATE	TO END			
2. Pilot schools with auxiliary buildings, equipped, and staffed for experimental operations (see comments below)	PLANNED	4	4	4	4		4
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	4	4				
	REPLANNED						
3. All teachers use rural-relevant activities to teach basic subjects.	PLANNED	36	36	36	36		36
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	30	30				
	REPLANNED						
4. Teaching plans per year, teaching guides (cum), supplementary texts (cum) (TP-TG-ST)	PLANNED	36-0-0	36-0-0	36-5-0	36-15-20		36-30-40
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	36-0-0	36-0-0				
	REPLANNED						
5. Trained teachers	PLANNED	58	58	108	158		208
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	58	58				
	REPLANNED						
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	COMMENT:						
1. Administrative Organization coordinates pilot and loan funded programs (PEMEP) All Sections functioning.	All sections functioning satisfactorily now. Changes of personnel after the election delayed project about six months.						
2.	COMMENT: Four schools with auxiliary buildings are ready; irrigation, electricity, & sanitary facilities incomplete in two schools; 2 schools need more teachers and rooms to attain satisfactory teacher-pupil ratio. GOG expected to remedy deficiencies in						
3.	COMMENT:						

FY-72

AID 1020-25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD:	COUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 4 PAR	520-15-690-198.1	FY-1969 - 71	GUATEMALA	72-2

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP? YES NO

Development of models for an effective system of primary education responsive to the needs of rural communities for use in loan funded normal, regional, and satellite schools.

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
1. 25% increase in retention at all grade levels	Results should show by 1973
2. 25% increase in 6th. grade graduates	" " " " 1974
3. Average achievement scores significantly better than in control schools	" " " " 1973
4. Average problem solving scores significantly better than in control schools	" " " " 1973
5. Identification of skills in agriculture, industrial arts, home economics within the capability of rural primary students.	Students are being taught now

Tests being developed now for use in 1972-73

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

The model for rural primary education developed in pilot schools is used in the loan-funded, regional, and satellite schools.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

The model being developed in the pilot schools is essential to goal achievement. Use of the model is a condition precedent to the loan for 2 normal schools and 50 regional schools.

TABLE A

Input Implementation Schedule

<u>USAID</u>	<u>FY-71</u>	<u>FY-72</u>	<u>FY-73</u>
I. Technical Advisory Services			
U.S. Direct Hire:	74,000	84,000	70,000
Contracts, U.S.	18,000	19,000	19,000
National grantee	14,000	19,000	28,000
II. Participants	7,000	2,000	18,000
III. Commodities			
ODECA/ROCAP texts	49,000	-0-	95,000
IV. Support Costs	<u>79,000</u>	<u>44,000</u>	<u>44,000</u>
TOTAL	241,000	168,000	274,000
<u>GOG (such as)</u>			
I. Operational & Administrative Costs		150,000	150,000
II. Teachers salaries		<u>8,440</u>	<u>8,440</u>
TOTAL		158,440	158,440

NOTE: GOG inputs do not include loan and counterpart funds estimated at \$15,000,000 over 4 years including FY-72 and FY-73

PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Title: GUATEMALA RURAL DEVELOPMENT PRIMARY

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS
<p>Program or Sector Goal Model for rural primary education developed in pilot schools is used in the loan funded normal, regional, and satellite schools, and leads to a qualitative improvement in the entire system.</p>	<p>Measures of Goal Achievement Use of system by 1974 in 2 normal schools and 50 regional schools Increase in percentage of satellite and other primary schools using the system.</p>
<p>Project Purpose: Development of Models for an effective system of primary education responsive to the needs of rural communities for use in loan funded normal, regional, and satellite schools.</p>	<p>Conditions Expected at End of Project: IN THE FOUR PILOT SCHOOLS: 1. 25% increase in retention at all grade levels. 2. 25% increase in 6th grade output. 3. Average achievement scores better than in control schools at all grades. 4. Average scores on problem solving better than in control schools. 5. Teaching of skills in agriculture, industrial arts, home econ. Within capability of rural primary students. 6. Teaching methods & curriculum design</p>
<p>Outputs: 1. Administrative organization which coordinates Pilot and loan funded programs (PEMEP). 2. Pilot schools. 3. Teaching methods. 4. Course content and materials. 5. Teachers trained (in-service).</p>	<p>Magnitude of Outputs: transparable to normal schools 1. All sections functioning: Finance, purchasing, engineering, personnel, direction and supervision. 2. Four pilot schools with auxiliary bldgs. equipped and staffed for experimental operations. 3. All pilot school teachers trained to use rural relevant activities to teach basic subjects. 4. 36 teaching plans / year, 30 published teaching guides, and 40 supplementary texts.</p>
<p>Inputs: SEE TABLE A</p>	<p>Inputs: See Table A 5. 200 teachers trained in new methods and curriculum use. SEE TABLE A</p>

PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Title: GUATEMALA RURAL DEVELOPMENT PRIMARY

IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Measured against baseline data (Student control records) 2. Same as #1 3. Specially designed achievement tests for pilot and control schools 4. Specially designed tests for problem solving. 5. Special tests of effectiveness of new learning methods. 6. Tests to determine: trained teacher behavior and attitudes. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loan program will be implemented as planned, with acceptance and installation of system developed in pilot schools.
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Memoria de Labores and direct observation. 2. Direct observation, contractor reports, Memoria de Labores. 3,4. Supervisor, contractor reports. 5. Supervisor and contractor ratings. 	
<p>USAID documentation, memoria de labores, direct observation.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continued GOG financial support of administrative organization and pilot schools (approximately Q100,000 annually.) 2. GOG appointees to key positions will be adequately qualified. 3. Continued support of GOG for Program Goal and no undue opposition within Ministry of Education. 4. Retention of 25% of key trained personnel.