

PD-AAC-541-D1 *at 4/79*

9310089001501
9310089 (3)

CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Analysis Methodologies for Education and Human Resources			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-11-960-089 18	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/ED
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <i>2p.</i>	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>76</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>79</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>79</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. Total \$ <u>1,194,696</u>			From (month/yr.) <u>12/77</u>	
B. U.S. \$ <u>1,194,696</u>			To (month/yr.) <u>10/78</u>	
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>2/78; 9/78</u>	

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Review of draft methodological papers	Regional Bureau, DS and PPC ed. reps.	Oct. 30, 1978
2. Communication with Harvard about A.I.D.'s reactions to the proposed instructional modules.	D. Sprague	Nov. 3, 1978
3. Planning with Harvard about proposed schedule for field workshops	D. Sprague	Nov. 30, 1978
<p>This project was reviewed in September 1978 and there are no problems or issues which will delay the accomplishment of the purpose for which this project was approved.</p>		

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	A. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T	_____	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	_____	C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval
<i>David Sprague</i> (S/ED)	Signature _____
	Typed Name DAVID SPRAGUE
	Date _____

Various aspects of the project were the subject of three review meetings during the past year (December 13-14, February 8, September 7) by an inter-bureau task force. This Project Evaluation Summary (PES) will contain the results of all three meetings and indicate the anticipated next actions.

As described in the scope of work for this contract, this project has two major activities to undertake: (1) field support and (2) methodological development and testing. From September, 1977 (when work under this contract actually began) until February, 1978, the main concentration was upon the field support activities. Significant support was given by the contractor to El Salvador, Paraguay, Botswana, Pakistan and countries in the Sahel region. Additional funds were added to the contract by A.I.D. missions for these services.

Beginning with the review meeting in February, 1978, in which representatives from all the regional bureaus and PPC attended, Harvard was directed to shift time and attention to the development of planning and analysis methodological materials. Because of the field service emphasis up till that time, the schedule for developing and delivering reports had not been met. Harvard had submitted a comprehensive state of the art report in draft as well as a short account of activities completed in FY 77 and underway in FY 78. It was agreed that Harvard would not go back and write interim reports that would have no practical value but instead should concentrate on writing the methodological papers.

In September, 1978, the contractor turned over 50 papers in draft to A.I.D. An accompanying paper listed a series of proposed modules that illustrate instructional groupings of the papers. Presently, regional bureau and PPC education representatives are reviewing these papers and will, by the end of October, indicate which papers, and in what sequence, appear appropriate for A.I.D. and LDC audiences. The intent is to hold several workshops to try out these materials so that the final manual will be able to stand on its own as much as possible.