

9310925011001

9310925(11)
 Page No. 93/001
 ID-~~AA~~-95-A1
 REPORT

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO. 931-11-690-925.73	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: 9/1/73 TO 8/31/74	3. COUNTRY Worldwide	4. PAR SERIAL NO. 10p
-------------------------------------	---	-------------------------	--------------------------

3. PROJECT TITLE
 Information Center on Instructional Technology
 (This is one segment of project: Field Services in Educational Technology)

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 74	Ends FY 77	7. DATE LATEST PROP	8. DATE LATEST PIP	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
----------------------------------	------------	---------------------	--------------------	-------------------

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 00	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ 135,000 FY74	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ 355,000
------------------	---	---	--

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

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
Academy for Educational Development	Contract AID/ta-C-1056

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

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
AID	Contn.	Other		
X			1) Program visits to the Center by Mission Officers when they are in AID/W.	continuing
	X		2) Enlarge circulation of materials to USIS and other elements of international community.	continuing
	X		3) Increase information flow to the Center from AID.	continuing
X	X		4) Develop plan for Center input into early planning sessions in Missions.	Sept. 1, 1975
X	X		5) Start tailoring some information packages to a particular country. Center Staff to review AID Country Program materials for focus and selection of materials.	continuing (begin 11/74)
	X		6) Implement a policy of selective translation, encouraging recipients to translate and/or adapt any materials found useful.	continuing
	X		7) Study possible fee schedule for workshop services to non-AID-related agencies & organizations. This to include study of costs for other kinds of service.	Aug. 1, 1975
	X		8) Study a variety of possible cost reductions and reimbursements for the printing and mailing of materials.	Feb. 28, 1975
X	X		9) AID and Center personnel jointly select for implementation appropriate findings of studies in 2) & 3).	Sept. 1, 1975

D. REPLANNING REQUIRED					E. DATE OF REVIEW	
REVISED OR NEW:	<input type="checkbox"/> PROP	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP	<input type="checkbox"/> PRO AG	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP/T	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP/C	<input type="checkbox"/> PIP/D
PROJECT MANAGER: C. Hugerth	TYPED NAME: C. Hugerth	SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE: 5/20/75	MISSION DIRECTOR: James B. Chandler	TYPED NAME: James B. Chandler	SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE: 124	DATE OF REVIEW: Oct. 16, 1974

NARRATIVE: Information Center on Instructional Technology

Project : Field Support for Educational Technology
Project No. : 931-11-690-925.73
Sub-Project : Information Center on Instructional Technology
Contractor : Academy for Educational Development
Contract No.: AID/ta-C-1056

Cross Reference:

Project : Information Preparation & Dissemination (Educational Technology)
Project No. : 931-11-680-022
Contractor : Academy for Educational Development
Contract No.: AID/csd-2506

The information activity began under the cross-referenced project and contract, not as an organized entity but as a dissemination activity for a film and handbook produced under that project. Requests for additional information coming to the KPA manager continued to build up and in time required establishment of a modest information center under the then-existing project for both acquisition and dissemination of materials.

In December 1972 a formal evaluation of the prior project included a review panel which focused on the new information center, at that time operational for only one year. Though critical of many aspects of the center's operation, the panel recommended that it be greatly strengthened in order to meet a clear demand. Therefore, during the remaining months of the existing project, AID developed a new plan for an Information Center on Instructional Technology, still to be a sub-project under Field Support. All major recommendations by the review panel were included in the Scope of Work for the new activity/contract.

The Information Center began to operate under the new three-year contract September 1, 1973, though the contract was not signed until October 23. In the interim period, September 1 through October 23, between expiration of the old contract and the execution of the new, the contractor advanced funds for the Center's operation on the basis of a letter of understanding.

As the first year of operation under the new plan was drawing to a close it was apparent that the Center was gaining strength, breadth and depth in a very satisfactory manner. All of the review panel's recommendations had been carried out, and the Center's outreach and networking had grown visibly. The contractor's Project Director and the AID Project Manager reviewed the progress and tentative plans for the future and decided that the most useful kind of evaluation at that point would be a combination evaluation-and-planning meeting with fairly sizeable attendance to be held at the Information Center. Since the activity was clearly on target and on schedule, the need was to review the progress to date and then move into discussion pro and con of various possible next steps.

The evaluation-planning meeting was held at the Center October 16, 1974. Those present included representatives of various AID Offices and Bureaus, the project staff, an LDC professional who had worked in the Salvador TV project, a State Department representative and the president of the contracting organization.

The meeting was tape recorded; Attachment B provides a summary of the tapes.

On the face sheet of this PAR the List of Actions contains the more important and feasible suggestions made during the discussion.

III. Standard/Key Questions

A. Project Inputs

1. Are key inputs being supplied according to plan by (a) AID, (b) action agent, (c) cooperating countries, (d) multilateral organizations, and/or (e) other donors?

YES NO

2. Are assumptions regarding the supply of inputs still valid?

YES NO

3. Rate performance of action agent against plan:

OUTSTANDING SATISFACTORY UNSATISFACTORY

Contractor has maintained full staffing, and each staff member is appropriately qualified for his work. All elements in the contract Scope of Work have either been completed or, if ongoing, have been continuing or progressing very satisfactorily.

B. Transformation of Inputs into Outputs

4. Is the management hypothesis that the totality of the resources applied to the project will be sufficient to produce the predetermined outputs by the specified target dates still valid?

YES NO

5. Is the approach or course of action originally selected, i.e., project design and/or methodology, still the most appropriate?

YES NO

C. Project Outputs

6. List the output indicators, their planned targets, and the actual performance achieved for each during the period under review.

The OUTPUT of this sub-project is a functioning information center. The OUTPUT INDICATORS below are included in the contract Scope of Work:

1. Maintain roster of experts. Being maintained.
2. Identify primary audience and its needs. Done by questionnaire, various personal contacts, and constant correspondence.
3. Continue to serve secondary audience. Being done as in 2. above.
4. Develop information acquisition policy. Done
5. Develop information dissemination policy. Done
6. Organize Center's holdings. Done.
7. Continue and develop referral service and collaboration. This work is progressing. See next item.
8. Establish working relationships with other AID supported (*) entities apparently do not. The result is a one-way flow of information and referrals, from the Center to the others but not vice versa.
9. Hold, or participate in meetings, seminars, workshops. Being done.
10. Disseminate already available materials. Being done.
11. Create informational materials, including:
 - NEWSLETTER - issued bi-monthly
 - INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY BULLETINS - two this year.
 - Guide to the Information Center - brochure created and in constant distribution.
 - Roster of Sources - Work in process.

(*) entities. The Center has a high priority on this, still in very tentative stage. but the other

12. Translation services. Done very selectively, but present inflation causing re-examination and search for feasible alternatives.

13. Maintain record of services. Being done. The record for each quarter of year is included in Quarterly Reports and is providing a detailed history of the sub-project.

14. Reports:

Quarterly. Being done. Outstanding in quality and detail.

Travel. Done as needed.

Fiscal. Being done.

NOTE: For summary of the year's activities See Attachment A.

a. Was actual performance less than planned target?

YES

NO

b. What changes, if any, are necessary in outputs, output indicators, target dates, and assumptions?

No changes needed at present.

c. Do action agent's reports provide adequate progress data for monitoring and analysis?

YES

NO

The Evaluation/Planning meeting of AID personnel hosted by the Information Center on Instructional Technology at its offices with the Academy for Educational Development on Wednesday, October 16, 1974 was not reviewed in the first quarterly report, but is highlighted in this second quarterly report in order to present a comprehensive summary of activities before the replacement of the Center Director, Selma Dublin, whose resignation becomes effective March 31, 1975.

After welcoming remarks by Dr. A. C. Eurich, president of AED, a historical review of the Center by Selma Dublin, and a summary of current activities by Christine S. Hugerth, Project Monitor, Dr. Hugerth requested suggestions for future directions and activities.

The opening discussion comments were made by Dr. Edwin Martin whose comments were particularly significant in that he had served on the original evaluation committee of the Information Center's activities before the award of the present contract. Dr. Martin congratulated the Center for acting positively upon that panel's recommendations to:

- 1) determine our audience (see attached questionnaire response packet),
- 2) establish an acquisition policy,
- 3) develop a dissemination policy, and
- 4) network with other agencies in the field.

The audience, which has been verified by the questionnaire referred to above, is made up mainly of education planners and managers in Asia, Africa and Latin America, AID personnel working with these planners, and other international agencies involved in similar activities.

The acquisition policy has been established to collect materials which deal with educational technology as an integrated systematic approach to teaching/learning applicable to the needs of our audience in both in-school and out of school education. Out of this collection we disseminate the information in a number of forms, tested by person-to-person contacts in visits by staff to Asia, Africa and Latin America:

- a. Bi-monthly newsletter present innovations in formal and nonformal education in succinct, readable fashion;
- b. Bulletins of a more scholarly nature, featuring in-depth studies.
- c) Response to correspondence with individualized packets of material,
- d) Seminars at the Center plus in-house response to individual or groups of out-of-country visitors,
- e) Utilization of in-house capacity for translation.

(The fact that our network activities, so far, seem to be more giving than sharing has been discussed at length with the project monitor.)

Our collection, including printed materials, visuals (other than film) and audiotapes, has been organized into a retrieval system useable by staff and researchers. The materials are organized around three major areas: geography (region and country), media (e.g. television, radio, film, programmed learning, satellites, etc), and process (nonformal, adult, village, distance, self instruction, etc.).

The discussion of Center future directions, activities, and relations with AID can be summarized from the tapes of the meeting as follows:

1. AID must move more information to the Center before the Center can move information back to AID.
2. Contacts have to be developed with the Missions and Bureaus, keeping TAB informed. Only in proceeding with the mandate to have good information can the Center's services to TAB be successful.
3. Contact should also be developed with other AID-related organizations whose interests include an education component (as voluntary agencies, private sector contractors, educational institutions, and other development agencies).
4. If Missions request material the AID/W Bureau does not have, the Bureau should contact the Information Center and the Center should respond directly to the Mission request.
5. Mission Education Officers brought into Washington should be programmed to visit the Center. The Bureau Technical Office would probably be the office responsible for such programming. This suggestion was broadened to include agricultural and other advisors whose programs require target groups to change behavior.
6. The question was raised on how to have Center input into early planning sessions in the missions. Suggestions included:
 - a. Use regional meetings to reach mission people. It would be effective for the Center to be included in regional meetings of Mission personnel. Here again the regional bureaus in D.C. could be helpful in informing the Center of such meetings and in letting Missions know the Center is available to help.

- b. Formal plans for the Center should include such participation at the region and Mission levels.
 - c. A related comment dealt with the importance of directing the Center's materials to the proper person (as in a Mission). In some places, AID/W bureau offices could help; in others, actual contact with Mission directors would provide the information.
 - d. Another suggestion for stimulating Missions to interact with the Center would be an introductory letter with a sample publication and a self-addressed return card asking for the remainder of the package of Center materials, for a personal visit, or for forwarding materials to a host country official.
7. A corollary subject, discussed was how to assure the best and widest dissemination among host country people.
8. A state department representative suggested that the Center enlarge its circulation of materials to U.S.I.S and other elements of the international community.
9. Discussion returned to the significant role to be played by Washington bureau personnel in identifying the most active and interest Mission staff members in areas which can use information on educational technology.
10. There was extended discussion on workshops and seminars. The substance of such an activity is crucial. Three types of seminars were presented:
- a. One-half day seminar focusing on services, reports, special information (similar to this meeting).
 - b. Full day seminar with afternoon session complementing above session with a more substantive focus, such as, on recent developments in nonformal education.
 - c. Two to three days of serious, substantive discussions to include 211 D grantees, contractors, AID/TAB and Bureau people.

As a result of the discussion on potential participants and subject areas for Center directed seminars and workshops, the route recommended as most practical seemed to be:

- a. to continue to develop ever closer relationships with all potential users;
- b. to offer any seminar or workshops kind of participation at the program planning stage when time is best spared by both LDC and AID personnel for extended consideration of alternatives:

- c: several participants urged the Center to emphasize the broad range of technology possibilities and thus not fall into the trap of promoting only the glamour modes.
 - d. one speaker suggested that the better the Center can play to the characteristics of the country involved the more useful Center materials and services will be. (A start in gaining such knowledge on the part of Center staff can come from reading AID Country Program Reports, and Mr. James Chandler, Director, TAB/EHR, made available to the Center for review the country development assistance program submissions.)
11. There followed a long discussion of the pros and cons of document translations. The final consensus was that the Center should be selective in the materials it translates, and should encourage recipients to translate and/or adapt the materials as found useful.

The Center staff was most appreciative of the full participation of all who attended the meeting and of the guidelines indicated for future development of our program.