

931-131

INSTITUTIONAL GRANT PROJECT STATEMENT

EXTENSION/REVISION

Florida State University
AID/csd - 2945

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Relevance of Problem Area and Need for Expertise-----	1
II.	Grantee Performance and Results to Date-----	3
III.	Grantee Commitment to Long-Term Involvement-----	8
IV.	Rationale for Extension-----	9
V.	Revised Grant Project Design-----	11
VI.	Complementary Action and Management Condiderations-----	16

I. Relevance of Problem Area and Need for Expertise

In most cases, the educational systems in developing countries are not well suited to their developmental needs. The formal school systems typically serve the affluent minority, without taking due consideration of the marginal population in both rural and urban sectors. How can these educational systems be reshaped to help the poorest segments of society? How can systems primarily designed to function in formal, urban settings be redesigned using existing resources to meet these new targets? How should decisions be made to add components, drop others, reorient personnel from the Ministry of Education down to individual school teachers, to reallocate budgets as well as facilities and to redesign instruction itself, including needs assessment, curriculum materials, instructional delivery, teaching/learning strategies, evaluation and research procedures?

It was within this context that AID's key program area of educational technology was established in the early 1970's and its relevance toward basic AID goals remains as immediate today as it was then. The potential of educational technology methodologies to establish learning systems that are more useful, more efficient and more equitable in their societal access is supported by recent experiences of developing countries employing these strategies. AID's interest in this area has broadened considerably expanding from school programs to out-of-school applications in agriculture, health, nutrition as well as education. The need for trained LDC personnel capable of planning and implementing the systematic use of communications and instructional media has continued to grow, as well.

An increasing number of countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, have begun to take a realistic and objective look at their total educational system in terms of both internal and external efficiency. Many Ministries of Education have announced plans to reform their systems to benefit the rural poor. These plans include rural skills training, promotion of rural and community development, and providing minimum education for all individuals. In most instances these ministries are lacking technical and managerial know-how to deal with these problems. They need professional training and assistance in redesigning their traditional formal systems. Korea, Peru, Panama, Colombia, Guatemala, Ethiopia, and Upper Volta are examples of countries presently engaged in educational reform. Their needs are urgent and their budgets are relatively small for the changes expected and demanded. Time to retrain personnel and redesign instructional materials and learning strategies for the marginal population is pressing. Alternatives have to be compared, implemented, and evaluated to determine their effectiveness in meeting the pre-determined goals.

Although AID resources in the area of educational technology have increased since the inception of this 211(d) grant to Florida State University in 1971, the requests for assistance have increased even more rapidly. Consequently, the need for a center of expertise capable of training personnel and delivering technical assistance to the field on relatively short notice is more important now to AID's program effort in educational technology than it was several years ago. Florida State University's Center for Educational Technology (CET), in response to AID funding and direction, has developed a solid professional reputation

among many developing countries for reliable and valuable technical assistance and training.

II. Grantee Performance and Results to Date

In 1971, when FSU was awarded the 211(d) grant, there was no center for educational technology focusing on developing country problems and needs; there was no place to obtain graduate training in the systems approach to the use of educational technology; and there was little organized research and development in the area. During the past four years Florida State has developed into a unique resource for the application of the systems approach in education to developing countries. FSU identified the major components of the systems approach: assessment of needs, analysis of resources, design of alternative solutions, initial tryout and modification, implementation and evaluation and has successfully coordinated their application in the field of education. The grant objective to establish a recognized center of expertise in educational technology has been accomplished.

During the life of this grant FSU perceived that much more was known about the systematic use of educational technology than was being applied in the field. This fact plus their initial lack of LDC familiarity led them to delay research and development work in the area of educational technology until gaps could be more clearly identified and to expend more effort on applying directly to the field what was already known.

FSU, throughout the existence of the grant agreement, has been actively engaged in the establishment of meaningful and mutually supportive relationships with both domestic and overseas institutions involved in the examination, evaluation, and advancement of educational

technology. These interinstitutional ties have evolved at CET's initiative as well as at the initiative of the other institutions.

The following list of institutions and agencies represent those with which FSU has been able to establish and maintain working relationships. They have either expressed an interest in CET's special competency, or have provided CET with an opportunity to extend its own understandings of the role of educational technology in the modern world. Those linkages that have developed into so-called partnership undertakings or projects have been asterisked:

AUSTRALIA

Monash University
Sydney, Australia

ARRICA

Egypt: Ministry of Education Center for Educational Research
Ain-Shams University

*Ethiopia: Ministry of Education, Haile Selassie First University
Academy of Pedagogy

Liberia: Ministry of Education, Kakata Rural Teacher Training
Institute

Tunisia: Institute of Educational Sciences

Uganda: Ministry of Education

*Zaire: National University of Zaire, Center for Interdisciplinary
Research in Educational Development

EUROPE

England: Center for Educational Development Overseas

*France: Ministry of Education

Greece: University of Patras - Athens, Greece

Spain: Ministry of Education
National Research Center for the Development of Education

Russia: Ministry of Education

LATIN AMERICA

*The Organization of American States

Argentina: National Radiophonic Education Program (INCUFO)

*Brazil: Ministry of Education

* University of Brazilia

* Instituto de Pesquisas Espaciais

Chile: Ministry of Education
Catholic University of Chile

* Center for Research & Teacher Training

Colombia: Ministry of Education
University of Antioquia

* Accion Cultural Popular (ACPO)

*El Salvador: Ministry of Educacion

Guatemala: Ministry of Education

*Panama: Ministry of Education

*Peru: Ministry of Education

* Peruvian Institute for the Promotion of Education
(IPFE)

* National Institute for Research and the Upgrading of
Teachers (INIDE)

Catholic University, Center for Educational Media for
Development

*Association for Radiophonic Education (ALER)

*Association of Caribbean Universities and Research Institutes

ASIA

*Korea: Ministry of Education

* Korean Educational Development Laboratory
Seoul National University, College of Education
Korean Institute for Research in the Behavioral
Sciences

Singapore: The Southeast Asian Regional Center for Educational
Innovation and Technology

*Thailand: Ministry of Education

MIDDLE EAST

Iran: Free University of Iran

Lebanon: Ministry of Education
* Center for Educational Research and Development
American University of Beirut

U.S. UNIVERSITIES

*Florida: State University System (9 Universities)
*California: University of California at Berkeley, College of
Education
University of California at Los Angeles

*Stanford University, Communications Department

*Hawaii: East-West Center, University Hawaii

*Michigan: Michigan State University

*Texas: Baylor University

Utah: Brigham Young University

Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University

SPECIAL U.S. AGENCIES

*Washington: American Council on Education (OLC)
Inter-American Bank

* AACTE
World Bank

*Georgia: U.S. Army TRADOC
Georgia Public Television System

California: Far West Regional Laboratory
* Naval Instructional Development Center

Massachusetts: Arthur D. Little Inc.

In fulfilling the grant training objective, FSU has provided a
great variety of training opportunities for both U.S. and foreign

personnel in educational technology. Five distinct types of training programs have been developed: (1) supplementing formal graduate degree training with specialized project work-experience related to specific problems in the field of educational technology; (2) developing new formal University courses in specific areas of educational technology, and designing new graduate degree programs for training U.S. and foreign specialists, (3) providing specialized training programs either at FSU or in an LDC for developing particular skills in educational technology that will be used for solving specific educational problems, (4) providing individualized training for high level education personnel who wish to familiarize themselves with new ideas and possible applications of educational technology to their own problems, and (5) special "Seminars" for both faculty and students relating to significant educational development, and the utilization of educational technology in the developing world.

The total number of students trained by FSU at the completion of the third year of the grant totaled 285 and represented 30 countries.

The following chart gives the breakdown by country:

<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>COUNTRY</u>	<u>NUMBER</u>
United States	120	Argentina	3
England	1	Bolivia	2
Australia	2	Brazil	23
Egypt	2	Colombia	15
Ghana	1	Costa Rica	1
Nigeria	1	Chile	7
Lebanon	3	Ecuador	4
Nepal	1	El Salvador	3
India	3	Guatemala	1
Korea	32	Honduras	11
Thailand	13	Mexico	5
Philippines	1	Nicaragua	1
Hong Kong	1	Panama	12
Paraguay	1	Peru	11
Uruguay	2	Venezuela	2

All of the students listed here have been trained in the systems approach to educational technology. Although the grant authorized payment of student expenses, not all of these students have received total support from the grant.

In general, the grant support has definitely contributed to the establishment and development of a Center which has not only become a viable part of the University's program, but which has attracted the interest of, and helped to establish working relationships with responsible educational officials and agencies from many countries around the world.

III. Grantee Commitment to Long-Term Involvement

The 211(d) grant awarded FSU in 1971 has contributed materially to the University's increased sensitivity to international affairs in general and to the problems of developing countries in particular. Efforts by FSU to contribute to the solution of educational problems in LDCs will continue into the foreseeable future. Presently FSU is providing support to countries in personnel development, technical assistance and developmental research. In most cases this support is being paid for directly by the countries themselves. Some of these countries are Chile, Peru, Colombia, Brazil, Guatemala, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Yugoslavia, Korea, Indonesia, and others.

Florida State University is now in the last year of its 211(d) institutional development grant. The funds have been used to enhance FSU's capability in educational technology and instructional systems design and have been particularly directed to strengthening the Center for Educational Technology (CET). CET has grown and expanded its range of activities, especially those related to the problems of developing

countries. FSU has, in addition to CET, several other organizations on campus contributing to programs through the application of educational research and technology. These include the Office of Evaluation Services, the Instructional Media Center, the Center for Educational Development, the Library Learning Resources Center and the Instructional Television Program. In July of this year all of these activities and CET were organizationally consolidated to form the new Instructional Systems Development Institute (ISDI). The new Institute will be directed by the former director of CET, Dr. Robert M. Morgan, and is administratively responsible to the Vice President for Educational Services. This move raises the organizational level of educational technology at FSU, substantially increases the level of state funding and generally reflects the high regard with which it is held by the FSU faculty and administration. Moreover, the breadth and depth of support by FSU for developing countries has been significantly increased and can be more flexibly utilized.

FSU has always been responsive to AID requests to assistance whether from AID/W or the field. FSU's consulting work under the grant has been almost exclusively with the more advanced of the developing countries. This fact is mainly the result of AID direction and the greater ability of those countries to draw upon available resources. FSU has agreed to concentrate its efforts during the extension period on the least advanced of the developing countries.

IV. Rationale for Extension

As described earlier in this paper educational leaders in developing countries are increasingly realizing the inadequacy of their educational systems. Too few schools, too few students entering and remaining in school long enough to become functional in a modern society, too few

qualified teachers for the present number of students not to mention the prospect of significantly increasing that number, too few teaching materials with which to improve the learning process, and too often a curriculum out of touch with the needs of the majority of the people. In addition, in many countries 80% to 90% of the national education budget is committed to teachers' salaries.

It is within this context that the skills and competencies contained within the systems approach to educational technology are becoming more in demand by the developing countries. Recent AID mission responses to a TA/EHR airgram offering technical services in the area of educational technology indicate that a significant number of developing country educational planners are considering the alternatives provided by educational technology. Several on-going LDC projects, e.g., El Salvador and Korea and several proposed projects, e.g., Pakistan and Paraguay, indicate the potential usefulness of technology to substantially improve learning situations in developing countries. At the present time FSU is the major U.S. center for training developing country personnel in the systems approach to the use of educational technology. Stanford University's Institute for Communication Research, another TA/EHR 211(d) grantee, has developed a two year M.A. program for developing country personnel in the use of communications for social development but that program is necessarily limited to a relatively small number of students and has a substantially different focus. Although other universities have courses which are of varying relevance to LDC problems and needs in the field of education, Florida State has fashioned a variety of training programs both at FSU and in the LDCs which are tailored to the specific needs of the participants.

TA/EHR agrees with the conclusions of the review committee that FSU displayed more ability in the area of training than any other during the period of the grant. We intend to capitalize on this strength for the benefit of the least developed countries. Without the extension of the grant this valuable center of expertise would most probably be lost for the poorer developing countries. Florida State would be forced to concentrate more on domestic applications of educational technology with international work limited to those countries most capable of paying for technical assistance. Although the grant money constitutes a relatively small percentage of the total Instructional Systems Development Center budget, it does provide the major share for its international work. Without the grant money the training and consulting capacity for the poorer developing countries will not be maintained by the University and a valuable resource for AID's work will be lost.

It is not anticipated that all technical assistance by FSU in the RLDCs should be centrally funded. Rather grant funds will enable FSU to make known their specific capabilities to the RLDCs and maintain its training capacity during this exploratory period. Every effort will be made during the proposed extension to obtain local financing from the host governments, AID missions, multi-lateral donors and other sources for the specific services that are requested.

Revised Grant Project Design

Formerly the grant project purpose was broadly defined as "increasing the institutional capabilities of Florida State University in the systems approach to the use of educational technology in developing countries". The activities under the grant were spread over four

areas: (1) research and development, (2) training, (3) linkages and liaisons, (4) consultation and technical services.

The purpose of the grant extension is to facilitate greater utilization of FSU's training capacity in the concepts and methodologies of the systems approach to educational technology in several select RLDCs. There will be a focus specifically on training in the developing country with follow-up consultation services on specific problems and adaptations. This revision will reflect the recommendations made by the Review Team. These include:

1. Florida State University has developed a significantly worthwhile training capability which AID should assist in promoting for RLDC use.
2. The capability at FSU to analyze and design different approaches or new components of existing educational or learning systems should be continued and focused upon RLDC problems.
3. AID/W should assist Florida State University in informing AID missions in RLDCs and the RLDC governments of their specific capabilities with the understanding that funding for specific training and technical assistance requests be sought initially from non-grant sources.

During the course of the comprehensive review which extended over a six month period, FSU reflected upon the AID request to focus their capabilities on the RLDCs and fully committed themselves to do so. This shift in direction although on the same continuum as their former work will require a period of adaptation and preparation on the part of CET. To some degree this work has already begun with the acceptance of a larger number of African students into their current training programs than has previously been the case.

The main objective of the grant will be to conduct two- or three-month workshops in several select RLDCs to train a cadre of policy makers and technicians in the systems approach to educational technology. The exact nature of the workshops and follow-up consultation services will depend upon the RLDC requests and the specific problems identified. The work of the grant extension period will be divided into the following phases and subactivities:

Phase I: Literature and Institutional Search - January 1976 - August 1976 - to:

1. locate, study and analyze relevant literature on the political, economic, social and educational situations in the RLDCs;
2. contact international agencies and relevant academic institutions, with the aim of gathering information and becoming aware of projects in the RLDCs related to educational technology;
3. develop a statement of FSU capabilities in language understandable to the non-professional in the RLDCs;
4. design and develop an AV presentation for the purpose of explaining the present capabilities of FSU in relation to RLDC problems and conditions;
5. meet with AID/W regional bureau representatives and AID mission personnel in from the field;
6. identify 7-8 RLDCs as potential clients in consultation with AID/W
7. prepare country profiles on these countries

It should be noted that the first six months of phase one will take place during the concluding time period of the present grant. FSU hopes this will substantially increase the effective working time available with the countries finally selected.

Phase II: Contact, Selection and Linkage - September 1976 - December 1976

1. contact designated countries and arrange travel;
2. visit each country for 5-8 days for comprehensive briefing regarding FSU capabilities;
3. reduce the number of client countries to 3-4, with AID/W advice, based upon visits;
4. final selection with AID/W of 2-3 linkage countries.

Phase III: Project Development and Implementation - January 1976-
June 1978

This final phase will contain four main activities designed to bring FSU expertise to bear in the RLDCs:

1. preparation of a specific workshop based upon the requested assistance of the particular RLDC;
2. implementation of two workshops, possibly one in Africa and one in Asia, each running from six to 12 weeks;
3. follow-up consultation and assistance over a three month period in each country;
4. a seminar at FSU for the presentation and dissemination of conclusions from the workshops and consultations in the field.

The approximate budget for the two year period is:

July 1976 to June 1978

<u>INPUTS</u>		<u>OUTPUTS</u>	
Salaries & Benefits	\$228,000	Information Capacity	\$20,000
Travel	50,000	Linkage & Liasion	35,000
AV Presentations		Training	225,000
Workshop Materials	60,000	Consultation	
Publications	10,000	Follow-up	55,000
		Dissemination	13,000
	<u>\$348,000</u>		<u>\$348,000</u>

Costs by Phases

The costs over the 24 month period have also been broken down by phase and have been estimated as follows:

Phase 1: \$20,250: principally for travel within the United States, the costs of research and the literature review and the design and development of the A.V. presentation.

Phase 2: \$35,500 principally for travel to the potential client countries.

Phase 3: \$287,500: to be broken down as follows: \$50,000 for the preparation of workshop #1, since this initial preparation will involve extensive development of materials and training of workshop leaders; \$50,000 for the workshop itself; \$10,000 for the preparation of workshop #2, which preparation will involve modification of the materials developed in the first preparation period; \$50,000 for workshop #2; \$15,000 for follow-up and consultation related to workshop #1; \$15,000 for follow up and consultation related to workshop #2; and \$10,000 for

seminar that will integrate and consolidate the work of the extension period.

Expenses in the form of publications, salaries for faculty, a secretary, and graduate students for 2 years, come to \$123,000 and are included in the above figures. The total comes to \$348,000.

As mentioned previously the grant money will not be used for phase three of this extension until all other means have been explored. Unless local commitment is obtained to the success of the training programs, then little lasting effect is likely to be obtained. Consequently, TA/EHR is proposing to obligate the entire amount of the grant (\$348,000) at the on-set but will determine in concert with regional bureau personnel at the end of phase two whether sufficient demand has been generated and, if it has, whether non-grant funds could not be used instead of grant funding.

VI. Complementary Action and Management Considerations:

This grant is supportive of a larger effort by AID to assist the RLDCs to reform and adapt their educational systems for reaching their rural populations. For example the applications of the systematic use of radio as a means of assisting the instructional process both within and outside the school system are rapidly increasing throughout the world. The expertise that Florida State University has demonstrated in a number of developing countries has seldom reached the countries now most in need of technical assistance. This grant will provide a unique opportunity for that to happen.

One specific activity which complements this grant is now under serious consideration by the Latin American Bureau. It appears likely that Florida State will be the contractor for the evaluation of the ACPO radio program in Colombia. The findings of this evaluation will have applicability around the world to other comparable country situations.