025-1 (7-71) (PAGE SHEET)
CAPITAL PROJECT (REVISION)

PD-AAC-022-A1

6630167 (1)

PAGE 1 OF 24 PAGES

I. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

1. PROJECT TITLE
Rural Agriculture Development (Non-Formal Education Support)

APPENDIX ATTACHED: [X] YES [ ] NO

2. PROJECT NO. (M.O. 1095.1)
663-55-130-167

3. RECIPIENT (specify)
COUNTRY Ethiopia
REGIONAL [ ] INTERREGIONAL

4. LIFE OF PROJECT
BEGINS FY 72
ENDS FY 78

5. SUBMISSION
[ ] ORIGINAL DATE
[X] REV. NO. 2, 6/1/74 DATE
CONTR./PASA NO.

II. FUNDING ($000) AND MAN MONTHS (MM) REQUIREMENTS

A. FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR	B. TOTAL $	C. PERSONNEL (1) $	C. PERSONNEL (2) MM	D. PARTICIPANTS (1) $	D. PARTICIPANTS (2) MM	E. COMMODITIES $	F. OTHER COSTS $	G. PASA/CONTR. (1) $	G. PASA/CONTR. (2) MM	H. LOCAL EXCHANGE CURRENCY RATE: 5 US (U.S. OWNED) (1) U.S. GRANT LOAN	(2) COOP COUNTRY (A) JOINT	(2) COOP COUNTRY (B) BUDGET
1. PRIOR THRU ACTUAL FY	247	236	84	—	—	—	11	204	72			
2. SERN 74*	262	91	19	108	125	12	51	60	4			
3. BUDGET 75*	210	91	23	90	105	—	29	28	11			
4. BUDGET +1 FY 76	197	147	48	40	55	—	10	102	36			
5. BUDGET +2 FY 77	160	150	48	—	—	—	10	102	36			
6. BUDGET +3 FY 78	76	76	21	—	—	—	—	26	9			
7. ALL SUBQ. FY												
8. GRAND TOTAL	1152	791		238		12	111	522				

(See original)

9. OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

(A) NAME OF DONOR	(B) KIND OF GOODS/SERVICES	(C) AMOUNT
See Budget, page 23 for increases attributable to this revision		

III. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

1. DRAFTER	T.D. Morse	TITLE Multi-Sector Officer	DATE June 1, 1974
2. CLEARANCE OFFICER	J.L. Withers	TITLE Director	DATE June 1, 1974

IV. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

2. CLEARANCES

BUR/OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE	BUR/OFF	SIGNATURE	DATE

3. APPROVAL AAs OR OFFICE DIRECTOR
SIGNATURE DATE

4. APPROVAL A/AID (See M.O. 1095.1 [illegible])
SIGNATURE DATE

ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	3
NFE as part of RAD project	
SUMMARY	3
RATIONALE	4
A. Desire for new strategy for mass education	
B. Integrated Rural Development Strategy	
BACKGROUND AND CONSTRAINTS	5
A. IEG Commitment	
B. Concept Development Process	
C. Constraints	
COURSE OF ACTION	7
A. General Comments	
B. Preparatory Steps - National	
C. Preparatory Steps - Local	
D. AID Actions	
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK	13
A. Project Goal	
B. Project Purpose	
C. Project Outputs	
D. Project Inputs	
BUDGET	23
APPENDICES	
I. Draft Summary Report on the Non-Formal Education Workshop (Phase I), February 18-21, 1974, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.	
II. Consolidated Report on Field Visits, Work-Oriented Adult Education Programme, May 8, 1974; Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.	
III. Final Report, Programme Sub-Committees, Programmes and Strategies for Integrated Rural Development; Planning Commission Office; June 19, 1973, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.	
IV. Proposal for the Creation of Six Experimental Work-Oriented Adult Education Development Programmes, June, 1974, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.	

NFE AMENDMENT TO RAD PROP

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this revision is to add an experiment in rural non-formal education to the Rural Agricultural Development (RAD) project. While the experiment will be conducted within the context of the RAD project goal, it will be treated as a sub-project for more precise definition and evaluation of project purpose.

SUMMARY

A. Following up recommendations contained in the Ethiopian Education Sector Review (EESR)[1/] and the findings of workshops and field visits completed in 1974, the IEG is now moving ahead to develop a non-formal education delivery and evaluation system. AID has been requested to assist in an experimental pilot program in six awrajas (districts) in Ethiopia for the first year of the program. The six pilot activities will represent the initial implementation phase for what is to eventually become a national NFE system.

While this present PROP Amendment covers assistance only for this first year, it is envisioned that subsequent AID assistance will be provided to the emerging national NFE program of a nature and extent to be detailed in a later PROP revision to be submitted to AID/W during the course of FY 1975.

B. AID Assistance

1. Technical Services

a. A Field Coordinator to work with the Ministry of Education in oversesing and evaluating the six pilot programs.

b. Continuation of consultants' services from three U.S. Universities already involved in the NFE planning phases.

c. A contract with the Institute of Development Research, HSIU, for research and evaluation.

2. Training

a. Short-term participation at the MSU NFE Conference for two Ethiopian officials.

b. Two observational study trips to Africa and Asia.

1/ Ethiopian Education Sector Review: Challenge to the Nation, August, 1972, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

3. Commodities

Local supplies and instructional materials for NFE classes in the six pilot areas.

4. Other Costs

Workshops, field visits, conferences.

C. IEG Contribution

1. Technical Services

The Ministry of Education will provide a project manager, technical officers, full- and part-time trainers and two field coordinators to work with the U.S.-provided field coordinator.

Other ministries will make available awraja-level field staff, as needed, to assist in the implementation of the six pilot programs.

2. Training

The IEG will provide local in-service training for field staff.

3. Commodities in Kind

Available classroom space, teaching equipment, demonstration materials and vehicles will be utilized.

4. Other Costs

The IEG will help cover the costs of field visits and the review session of the evaluation report.

(Note: For detailed implementation schedule, see Appendix IV.)

RATIONALE

A. New Strategy for Mass Rural Education

The IEG desires to test a new strategy for education and this project will provide external resources for the test. The Ethiopian Education Sector Review concluded that the existing education system will be able to meet the nation's need for academically trained high- and middle-level manpower for the foreseeable future, yet less than 15% of the nation is literate or has access to any form of education. The pressing need now is to develop a new strategy which could begin to bring education to the masses. Inasmuch as 85 - 90% of the existing and immediate future population will live out their lives in the rural areas, the new strategy should provide the rural masses with "development training" relevant to this environment, the EESR recommended.

B. Reconstructed Education as a Component of Integrated Rural Development Strategy

A reconstructed educational strategy is viewed by the IEG as an integral part of their "integrated rural development strategy for transforming the lives and well-being of the great mass of all Ethiopians who will/are leading rural agricultural lives."[2/] The other parts of the strategy include the Minimum Package Agricultural Program, a labor intensive rural public works program, and an expanded program of basic health services. All four development activities are to be coordinated through the mechanism of the Awraja self-administration program as a means of increasing local participation in the development process. Thus the broad IEG strategy is to increase rural income and living standards through developing a single infrastructure for increasing rural productivity, broadening educational opportunities, increasing rural employment and attaining better health.

BACKGROUND AND CONSTRAINTS

A. IEG Commitment

While the IEG has decided to postpone implementation of the EESR recommendations in order to take time to better inform the public about the proposed new education policies (with particular reference to changes in the formal system), it has decided to proceed with the NFE experiment as an expansion of the presently limited work-oriented adult education. In mid-November, 1973, the IEG officially requested USAID assistance for a Five-Phase Experiment.[3/] The IEG commitment to gaining experience in this area was demonstrated by their holding an exploratory workshop[4/] amid urban unrest in February and conducting six field visits in March and April, as soon as teachers and students returned to classes from their strike. While there was some teacher-student opposition to the EESR, it was frequently the result of inadequate information. The NFE component of the EESR recommendations were never an object of protest.

The new Minister of Education has reviewed this program and urged its implementation on a pilot basis. The Ministry believes the program is very responsive to the policy statements in the new government's "white paper":

> "Educational goals shall be more effectively oriented to national objectives and will be employed to accelerate the pace of development. In order to distribute the benefits of development equitably, the government will pursue a policy of re-orienting development programs in the field of education, health, agriculture, etc. from urban to rural areas where the vast majority of the population resides and where the benefits of development have not yet reached."

2/ Strategy for Integrated Rural Development; informal, undated paper by PCO, 1974.

3/ PCO request for assistance; Aclog to Miller letter dated 15 November, 1973.

4/ See Appendix I and Morse to AFR/ESA memo of 2/27/74 which forwarded copies of Workshop (I) papers to AID/W.

The IEG would like to obtain factual data from this experiment to enable informed judgements on the composition of the education and rural development sectors of their national plans. The Ministry of Education is prepared to recommend national replication of non-formal education if the experiment proves it would be an effective way of restructuring education for the masses.

B. Concept Development Process

The exploratory Workshop (I) held in February reached general consensus[5/] on the purposes/objectives, relationships/linkages, target learners, educational programs/content, methods, research/evaluation, relevant experiences and organization/administration and financing topics. These preliminary conclusions and assumptions were then discussed with local awraja authorities during the six field visits (in March) as part of the process to select the general locations for approximately six to eight pilot programs.[6/] The field visits were the first step in joint planning with the awraja-level authorities who found the idea of non-formal education readily acceptable. In mid-May, a planning Workshop (II) was convened to "outline the major components required for the design of a national program in non-formal education."[7/] The output from these three exercises, plus lessons learned at the MSU/AID-W International Conference on NFE, are embodied in this proposal.

C. Constraints.

The above is not to imply full public endorsement of the NFE strategy. The educational values which exist at almost all levels in Ethiopia are those of the academic elite introduced after World War II. That these values will change to embrace non-academic work-oriented adult education remains to be tested. That the model Awraja structure for decentralized administration will function to facilitate expressions of villager and community training needs, as well as coordinate development inputs in response to these expressions, also remains to be tested.

In addition to testing the concepts of non-formal education (non-academic, rural development oriented training), the experiment will test how the system used by the Ministry of Education to deliver formal, academic education may need to be restructured for NFE. Inertia and traditionalism within that system form an additional constraint on the experiment.

5/ See Appendix I and Concepts, Ideas and Questions expressed in Workshop (I) and field visits: Guidance of discussions in Workshop (II); Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; May, 1974, Ministry of Education.

6/ See Appendix II: Work-Oriented Adult Education Program; Consolidated Report on Field Visits; Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, May, 1974; Ministry of Education/USAID Steering Committee.

7/ Agenda for Workshop (II): Planning a National Framework for Non-Formal Education in Ethiopia.

While the IEG can be expected to continue strong support for expansion of rural learning opportunities, there is not unanimity on the content of this expansion; like most new ideas, the time to convey the broader concept of NFE forms a constraint on implementation of even the experiment. Some see NFE as basic formation education for the non-school age population--i.e., development concepts, literacy, numeracy, etc.; others see it as vocational training, rural skills training, cottage industry employment generation; most people working on the project now see NFE in the Ethiopian context as all of the above, built around the program and objectives of other development activities--i.e., agricultural production, health and sanitation, small rural public works, etc. An agreed tenant is to try and offer NFE training relevant to the rural context in which most Ethiopians will live out their lives. This, more than any centrally formulated philosophy, will govern the content of the actual training programs.

NFE is both new and old. The IEG recognizes that many non-governmental organizations are already conducting activities similar to those which it hopes eventually to promote on a wide scale. Also, several similar programs have been attempted by the IEG itself over the last three decades and most have failed. Open discussions at the first workshop identified several reasons for failure (central control; academic orientation; inadequate policy support). A local research contract is included in the program to probe these experiences in more depth.

COURSE OF ACTION

A. General Comments

The course of action which follows supplies to the initial first-year implementation steps envisioned for an experimental pilot program of approximately three years. At the point where evaluated experience indicates continuation of AID support for the experiment into year 2 and 3 is warranted, the PROP will be revised.

Furthermore, just as the IEG has indicated its willingness to consider national replication, so USAID has indicated its willingness, in concert with other donors, to consider AID support for an eventual national expansion of the accepted ideas from the experiment.

During the three-year experimental phase, two concurrent actions will be pursued. In addition to testing the very concept and contribution of NFE in the Ethiopian setting, attempts will be made to design the delivery systems for the experiment in such a way as to develop the basis for designing a national replication of the program. This is extremely ambitious and not without reservations on the part of those who would like to pursue these two actions separately instead of concurrently. However, concurrent action has been chosen primarily to provide a realistic administrative environment for the experiment as well as to provide identification of the administrative implications of national adoption.

One more explanation is offered. A primary tenant of this evolving program is local-level participation in the decision making process of those

activities which are designed to affect the participants' lives. A national policy and resource framework is being proposed in which local action can take place. Therefore, it is not desirable to spell out, at this time, from the central level, even the initial six village-level development projects, let alone the specific NFE/training components of those projects. Nor is it desirable in the experiment to try to quantify in great detail the number of trainees who will be involved in the program on any precise timetable. To do so would be fabricating figures and debasing fundamental philosophy. Furthermore, the identification of integrated development projects and the provision of training to support these projects is viewed as a dynamic process which, to be responsive, may defy national-level detailed pre-project planning. Therefore, the following course of action describes the building of a flexible, responsive NFE delivery and evaluation system rather than a specific training project.

B. National Level Preparatory Steps

Drawing on over two years of extensive discussions, working papers and workshop proceedings, a consolidated policy paper on the Work-Oriented Adult Education Program has been drafted by a joint Ministry of Education/U.S. Steering Committee. (See Appendix IV.) The Ministry of Education will use the paper at the central level as a record of the inter-ministerial discussions which have gone into preparation of this experiment. The Ministry will also approach the new Minister for Economic and Social Affairs in the Prime Minister's Office to get an inter-ministerial policy and coordination committee appointed at the Assistant Minister level. Simultaneously, beginning early July, the Ministry will re-deploy field teams to the six Model Awrajas previously visited. They will report on their findings from the previous field visits, discuss the national policy paper and operational framework outlined at Workshop (II), orient the Awraja Administrator and Development Committee (representatives of development ministries) seek their strong support, and reaffirm the recommended Woredas for the six pilots.[8/] Arrangement for local participation in the baseline surveys will also be made during these re-visits.

While the field teams are planning with the Awraja and Woreda authorities, the Ministry of Education staff in Addis will: (1) complete orientation of other Ministry representatives; (2) identify and employ two Ethiopian Field Liaison Officers; (3) assign responsibilities to the educational materials unit (for identification, collection, analysis and reproduction of relevant training materials); (4) assign responsibilities for in-service training (for project staff, other development agents and local committees); (5) arrange for independent research and evaluation services, probably with HSIU/IDR (for design, conduct and analysis, supervision of local baseline

---

[8/] The awrajas for the experimental program were chosen on the basis of (a) participation in the Model Awraja Decentralization project; (b) concurrently a Minimum Package agriculture area; (c) strong leadership and development interest. The pilot awrajas are: (i) Chebo and Gurage, (ii) Keffa, (iii) Tegulet & Bulga, (iv) Bahr Dar, (v) Chilalo, (vi) Jiggiga.

surveys project and activity evaluation and to counterpart with external international evaluation consultants); (6) arrange for in-house and international consultants (on overall systems designs and budget, staff and procedures revamping, as necessary). The above steps are spelled out in more detail in Appendix IV. They will be carried out between July and October, 1974.

C. Local Level Preparatory Steps

For periods to be defined for each awraja between July and October, 1974, a 2 - 3 day orientation (see B above) and in-service training programs for Awraja based Development Committees (technical employees) will be conducted. The training will include basic objectives, organization, methods or work and related subjects of the experiment. This will be followed by development committee visits to selected government and non-government experimental demonstration centers (CADU, WADU, MPP, Agri-Service, etc.).

As each in-service training program is complete, the Awraja Development Committee (accompanied by the centrally deployed field teams) will proceed to the recommended woreda-level project site. This will be during the October - January period. Using existing village committees or indigenous groups, a development project will be jointly prepared to respond to a development problem clearly identified by the villagers. Guidelines will be followed to assure the proposed project contributes to the general objectives of increased agriculture productivity, employment generation, and increased income.

Under the Awraja Administrator's chairmanship, the Development Committee will analyze the proposed integrated rural development project recommended by the villagers. The interdisciplinary components, including training/education, will be identified, and resource inputs committed by the various ministry representatives at the awrajas. At that point, primarily using local and awraja-level resources, implementation could begin. During the first cycle of planning and until the national backstop services are functioning smoothly, it may be necessary to refer individual projects back to the national level. The Field Liaison Officers and Coordinator will facilitate this two-way communication.

Back at the national level, the specific projects from the six awrajas, along with the problems and possibilities encountered, will be consolidated into the experimental NFE program for management, analysis and evaluation purposes by the MOE Project Director.

It has been consciously decided to implement as much of the experiment as possible using existing staff. The only additional staff being added by the IEG at this time will be the two Field Liaison Officers. The additional responsibilities for NFE will be added to the MOE Adult Education Department staff. This will start with the Assistant Minister for Primary and Adult Education (Project Director) through the Director of Adult Education (Project Manager) to the Adult Education (Awraja) Supervisors and the NFE facilitators.

The latter could be primary school directors (there are more of these than any other type of rural based change agents), priests, non-governmental, private institution leaders, etc. The experiment will test the combination of incentives necessary for the facilitators to execute this additional responsibility.

D. AID Actions

1. USAID. The Mission Multi-Sector Officer will assume project management responsibilities; he will call on the Education and Agriculture Officers for technical support, and Program and Controller Offices staff for policy and administrative backstopping. In the forthcoming USAID reorganization, special attention will be given to a structured coordination of Mission interests in NFE, MPP and Awraja programs.

   The Ministry has requested that an American Field Coordinator be counterparted with two Ethiopian field coordinators on a two-year contract basis. An attempt will be made to contract ($16,000) with an ex-Peace Corps Volunteer who is (a) knowledgeable about Ethiopian education and rural development problems, (b) is free to travel extensively, and (c) is both operations and operations-analysis oriented. If project approval is obtained as scheduled, it is planned to contract for an in-country Field Coordinator beginning July.

2. AID/W. Dr. Bernard Wilder, TAB/EHR, has had a close association with the evolution of this project going back to its inception some two years ago. His work is well known and respected by all concerned. It is hoped his consulting services will continue to be available on an "on-call" basis 3 - 4 times per year. As the Mission plans to call on the services of several TAB "knowledge base centers," it is hoped a "country-project" focus will be taken by TAB to concentrate and coordinate the resources (below) on non-formal education in Ethiopia. It may be necessary to form a consortium of U.S. universities to structure the application of their talent and resources on this experiment; however, we will rely on AID/W to organize the most effective backstopping possible.

3. Michigan State University. Professor Richard Niehoff has participated in the formulation of this project over the last two and half years and has had a positive influence on its design. The Mission would like to have MSU/Niehoff's commitment to serve as the Senior Consultant on the project. He would consult with USAID and the IEG on overall policies, design, implementation and evaluation of the project. In addition, he would coordinate the inputs of the education technology and outputs measurement contractors and facilitate, (making specific requirements) inputs to them on the Ethiopian experiment.

   While the MSU effort to date in Ethiopia is seen more as an individual effort, it is hoped that wider experience and MSU resources developed under the 211(d) Grant can be applied effectively for a reinforcing

support to the Ethiopian experiment. Also, MSU has other interests in Ethiopia's development (Ada evaluation, HSIU institution building, individual participant training). It is believed a more imaginative coordination of these interests on campus in the U.S. could pay extra dividends to both Ethiopia and MSU. Inasmuch as these senior consulting services (three trips/yr., 3 weeks each) are very important to the bilateral project, we have budgeted bilateral support ($10,500). However, MSU's continuing association with the Ethiopian experiment would seem to be in TAB's interest of developing U.S. "knowledge base centers," and it is hoped their services' overhead can be absorbed by MSU's 211(d) Grant from AID/W.

4. Florida State University. The Ministry of Education Mass Media and Curriculum Design Center will be responsible for developing the "material package" envisioned by the project. In addition, they will be responsible for designing innovative, low-cost, highly efficient instructional methodologies. While we do not believe this will become a major preoccupation during the experiment, we believe something very innovative could result. We would like Florida State University services available for approximately six weeks over the next year, to share worldwide experience in the field of educational technology with the Mass Media/Curriculum Center staff. The Ministry is seriously considering the use of radio to reinforce the training at one of the model awrajas (Debre Berhan); they are also considering "packaged Programs" for use with illiterate by non-professional teachers. FSU consultation could be very useful in avoiding mistakes made elsewhere in the educational methodologies field and informing FSU about Ethiopian experiments. It is requested that AID/W add a field support component to the FSU Grant for six weeks of consulting services.

5. Georgetown University. Inasmuch as the Ministry of Education is approaching this as a serious experiment with a high possibility for national replication, independent, thorough evaluation is mandatory. Evaluation is built into the project at all levels--participant, community and awraja committee perceptions, NFE program and integrated rural development contributions. Baseline surveys, progress reporting, and scheduled evaluations are planned.

The HSIU Institute of Development Research has agreed to be the in-country focal point for research and evaluation. They have indicated a desire to continue their collaboration with Georgetown University in measuring the inputs and outputs of this project. Recognizing that accurate projections of implications for national replication might be a key factor in the acceptability of the new strategy for mass education in Ethiopia, as well as international donor support for national expansion, we concur in this collaboration. Therefore, we are programming eight weeks of Georgetown University consulting services over the next

year. If these services cannot be obtained under a field support addition to the existing Georgetown Grant, USAID has programmed bilateral funds for the direct costs of these services, with the request that any administrative overhead be absorbed by the 211(d) Grant.

6. Timing. In-country implementation will continue from July through October, using funds outlined in this PROP, which will be obligated before 30 June. While all three of the above Universities have indicated a willingness to provide on-campus, informal support through that period, contractual arrangements should be complete by 1 October to allow in-country consultation in October 1974, February 1975 and June 1975.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Project Goal

1. **Statement of the Goal:**

To develop the basis for the non-formal education component of the proposed IEG rural development program in order to bring more relevant educational experiences to Ethiopia's rural poor.

2. **Measures of Goal Achievement:**

Determination by the IEG that non-formal education can be a viable and contributory link in the IEG's rural development program. More specifically, the determination would be measured by:

a. Research conclusions which support the view that the pilot non-formal education experiment forms an important contributory link to the IEG's integrated rural development strategy.

b. Noting an increase in the allocation of funds in 1975/76 in the national budget for launching new community training programs as part of their overall rural development strategy.

c. Noting, if in its forward planning for the rural sector, the IEG includes valid conclusions drawn from the experiments in non-formal education.

3. **Means of Verification:**

a. Review evaluation findings

b. Review the 1975 national budget

c. Review Ministry of Education's and other development ministries' forward plans.

4. **Important Assumptions**

a. Non-formal education will continue to be an important component of the IEG's education and integrated rural development strategies.

b. Non-formal education can facilitate desirable changes in the lives of the agrarian masses.

c. Adequate IEG budgetary support in 1975/76 for the related Minimum Package Program, Awraja Self Administration Program, and non-formal education will become available.

d. The IEG will continue to view education for the masses as a priority in the education sector during the Fourth Five-Year Plan period.

B. **Project Purpose**

1. **Statement of Purpose:**

To conduct an experiment in non-formal education in order to identify the critical components of a tested/workable locally administered program which could be flexibly replicated on a national level in rural Ethiopia to provide increased, relevant training/learning opportunities for the masses.

2. **Conditions Expected at the End of the Project (EOPS):**

Phase I:

a. A specific set of operational guidelines pertaining to the conduct of pilot training schemes in non-formal education will have been established and tested.

b. A "package" of training materials usable by change agents in rural development will have been developed.

c. A work plan for each pilot scheme will be available.

d. Six - eight training experiments will have been conducted so as to identify the strengths and weaknesses in the basic concept and design of the NFE experiment.

e. An evaluation report on program and process achievements and shortcomings, an analysis of program costs and benefits, and the administrative articulations will be available to IEG administrators for policy determinations concerning the nature of the role which non-formal education can play in an integrated rural development strategy.

3. **Means of Verification:**

a. Review Ministry of Education filed on NFE project.

b. Review materials put together and tested by Mass Media and Curriculum Center.

c. Contact Assistant Minister of Primary and Adult Education and Inter-Ministerial Steering Committee members.

d. Evaluation reports by the Institute of Development Research, HSIU and U.S. Contractor.

e. Field visits to training sites.

4. Basic Assumptions About Achievement of Purpose:

a. The Ministry of Education will continue to provide the human and fiscal resources necessary to conduct the experiment.

b. Vigorous and positive support for the experimental programs will be forthcoming from the other functional ministries and Awraja Administrators.

c. Relevant activities can be developed which are useful to the rural populace and consequently they will willingly participate in the activities developed.

d. The Ministry of Education and AID leadership will follow an experimental approach as they evolve the concepts, design and implementation of the experiment.

e. The project will meet no significant political resistence.

C. Project Outputs

1. Statement of Project Outputs

Phase I: (February - June, 1973)

a. Reports summarizing Workshops I and II.

b. Report analyzing Field Visits.

c. Generally agreed program design introducing NFE component into rural development program.

d. Plan of action for implementing the program including provision for evaluation.

Phase II:

a. A complement of rural participants trained and ready to take a more active role in the rural economy.

b. A mechanism for recruiting, screening, training and providing re-entry openings to rural participants.

c. A mechanism for identifying Awraja and Village level development priorities and the training components of these.

d. A coordinated administrative system for project decision making, resource allocation and technical support at the Awraja level.

e. A mechanism for drawing on locally available talent as trainers.

f. Alternative methodologies and materials for imparting relevant skills and learning to rural adults.

g. A financial system to support each training activity with local, Awraja or central resources.

h. An evaluation system for each level of the NFE program.

i. A national coordination mechanism.

2. Magnitude of Outputs

Phase I:

a. One report/each workshop (Appendices I and II)

b. One report (Appendix II)

c. Program description and policy statement paper (Appendices III & IV)

d. Plan of action for implementing the program (Appendix IV, PROP/PIP)

e. Overall research design.

Phase II:

a. Between 80 - 100 individuals per center during first year.

b. At least one mechanism of system devised and tested.

c. Same

d. Same

e. Same

f. At least two tested methodologies. At least one "package" of materials used, analyzed and evaluated.

g. At least one system described and tested.

h. System for participant, community, awraja, national levels and overall program evaluation.

i. One operational coordination mechanism.

3. Means of Verification:

Phase I:

a. Copies from Assistant Minister of Primary and Adult Education.

b. same.

c. same.

d. same; also contact USAID/HDG.

e. same; also contact the Institute of Development Research, HSIU.

Phase II:

a. Assessment of (a) - (i) will be indicated in the June, 1975 first evaluation report.

b. Review MOE files on NFE and field progress reports.

4. Output Assumptions:

Phase I:

a. Adequate data can be gathered from the two workshops and the field visits to develop flexible and relevant program and procedural designs in rural NFE and an implementation plan.

b. There will be preliminary unanimity of purpose amongst all parties to draft a policy statement and implementation plan.

Phase II:

a. The systems analysis approach for developing the critical components of an NFE program is understood or can be taught.

b. The IEG is willing to devote the time and attention necessary to identify and design the systems which need to be changed or built to accommodate the new strategy.

c. The approaches being considered are not so radical as to create insurmountable resistence on the part of more traditional practitioners.

d. The integrated approach will continue to be accepted by all agents needed to reinforce the experiment.

D. Project Inputs:

1. Outline of Project Inputs:

Phase I:

1.1 U.S.

a. Technical Services:

i. Project Manager--and supporting USAID team

ii. Short-term consultants

b. Training:

i. Observational training in U.S.

c. Other Costs:

i. Workshop I and II

ii. Field Visits

1.2 IEG/MinEd:

a. Technical Services:

i. Project Manager

ii. Technical Officers

iii. Administrative support

b. Other Costs:

i. Workshops I and II

ii. Field Visits

iii. Observational training in U.S.

1.3 IEG/Other Ministries:

a. Technical Services:

i. Technical Officers

ii. Administrators

1.4 Other Donors (UNICEF):

a. Technical Services:

i. Short-term consultant

b. Commodities

i. Research literature

Phase II:

1.1 U.S.

a. Technical Services:

i. Project Manager

ii. Field Coordinator (1)

iii. Short-term consultants (3) (design/operations: MSU; educational methodologies/techniques: FSU; and evaluation/research services: GU.)

b. Training:

i. Short-term U.S./third country observational training to programs which have successful demonstrations in aspects of integrated rural development and NFE activities.

ii. Local in-service training for development agents

iii. Local observational training

c. Contract Services:

i. Research services (local)

ii. Evaluation services (local)

d. Other Costs:

i. Field Visits

ii. Coordination conference

iii. Review session of evaluation reports

iv. Materials preparation

e. Commodities:

i. Demonstration supplies

ii. Instructional/training materials

1.2 IEG/MinEd:

a. Technical Services

i. Project Director and a Project Manager (1 each)

ii. Full/part-time trainers

iii. Technical officers

iv. Government administrators

v. Field Coordinators (2)

b. Training:

i. Local in-service training for MOE staff.

c. Commodities in Kind:

i. Available training space

ii. Available teaching equipment

iii. Vehicles

iv. Office equipment

d. Other Costs:

i. Field visits

ii. Review session of evaluation report

1.3. IEG/Other Ministries:

a. Technical Services:

i. Technical officers

ii. Government administrators

b. Training:

i. Local in-service training

c. Commodities in Kind:

i. Agricultural tools

ii. Seeds, fertilizers, medicines

iii. Vehicles

iv. Office equipment

1.4 Other Donors (UNICEF):

a. Technical Services:

i. Short-term consultant for training and materials preparation.

2. Implementation Targets:

(See IV Course of Action and Budget--attached)

2.1 Phase I: Organize the following:

a. February 74 - Exploratory Workshop (I)

b. April, 74 - Field visits to six Awrajas; Attendance at MSU Conference.

c. May, 74 - Planning Workshop (II), Program Design and Implementation Plan papers.

d. June, 74 - AID planning documentation.

Phase II: (See July 1974 - June 1975 Course of Action)

a. Six Awraja Development Team Orientation sessions: July - October, 1974.

b. In-service training conferences for trainers, development agents: July - October, 1974.

c. Six Baseline Surveys: July - October, 1974.

d. Six Woreda project selection meetings:- October - February, 1975

e. "Materials Package" reproduced: October, 1974 - February, 1975

f. Systems designs meethings (monthly).

3. Means of Verification:

3.1 Phase I:

a. Workshop papers

b. Field visit reports

c. Workshop papers; Design and Implementation plans.

d. PROP Amendment; Logical Framework; PIP; ProAg

3.2 Phase II:

a. Field trip reports

b. Monthly progress reports

c. Copies of baseline designs and surveys

d. Copies of materials reproduced

e. Minutes of system designs meetings

4. Input Assumptions:

4.1 Phase I:

a. The IEG is willing to devote time to organizing the experiment despite the present political/financial/administrative constraints.

4.2 Phase II:

a. MOE staff will take on the additional responsibilities at virtually no cost.

b. No new major facilities will be built for the experiment; simple village structures will be built with self-help efforts where needed.

c. Existing program have the flexibility to apply their resources to this experiment when called upon.

DOLLAR BUDGET

Non-Formal Education Support Sub-Project

Rural Agricultural Development Project

FY 1974 Funds (for FY 75 Expenditures)

I. Technical Services

a) Project Manager - (covered from Tech. Support)
b) Field Coordinator - (local hire) $16,000
c) U.S. Consultants:

(i)	Mich. State Univ. (63 days)	10,500*
(ii)	Florida State Univ. (42 days)*	(7,000)**
(iii)	Georgetown Univ. (56 days)	8,500*

II. Training

a) Short-term/observational

(i)	MSU April 1974 Conference (2 people)	$ 3,000
(ii)	2 (Africa & Asia) Study Trips	6,000

b) Local In-service Training

(i)	6 Development Team Orient. Sessions	5,000
(ii)	Adult Edu. & Teaching Staff	10,000
		$24,000

III. Contract Services

Local Research and Evaluation services $25,000

IV. Commodities

Local Supplies & Materials for 6 pilots 12,000

* Assumes any overhead charges will be covered by existing 211(d) Grants from AID/W.
**To be supplied if available under FSU 211(d) Grant from AID/W.

V. **Other Costs**

a)	Workshops (Two, already held)	$2,000
b)	Field visits (One of two, already made)	1,500
c)	Mid-point coordination conference (Oct.)	1,000
d)	End-of-year evaluation conference (June)	1,000
e)	Training materials preparation, analysis and reproduction	5,000
		$10,500

Total = $106,500 — $106,500

I.E.G. Costs

I. **Technical Services**

A.	Direct M.O.E. 32 part-time staff	E$45,200
	2 full-time staff	12,000
		57,200
B.	Indirect (M.O.E.) support staff	80,000
C.	Other IEG Ministry support staff	120,000

II. **Training**

A.	In-service Local	10,000

III. **Commodities** (in-kind)

A.	M.O.E. (vehicle, equipment, facilities & supplies)	175,000
B.	Other Ministries	38,000

IV. **Other Costs**

A.	Operational Research	10,000
B.	Materials collection, evaluation	10,000
C.	Field Liaison - Supervision	8,000
D.	Evaluation Conference	2,500
		E$ 510,700

E$510,700