9310996 (9)
PD-AAD-234-C1

AID 1020-23 (10-70)

REPORT U-444

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

1. PROJECT NO.	2. PAR FOR PERIOD:	3. COUNTRY	4. PAR SERIAL NO.
933-11-690-996	10/25/73 TO 4/21/75	Worldwide	

5. PROJECT TITLE

Non-Formal Education: Field Support

931-996

6. PROJECT DURATION: Begun FY 1973 Ends FY 1976	7. DATE LATEST PROP 2/16/73	8. DATE LATEST PIP n/a	9. DATE PRIOR PAR Review 10/25/73

10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: $397,265	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: $ 300,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: $ 800,000 est.

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

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
Michigan State University	AID/CM/ta-C-73-22

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

A. ACTION (X) USAID	AID/W	HOST	B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
	x		A conference is planned in which contractor and AID/W personnel will participate in the development of a list of research priorities for non-formal education.	July 1975

161

D. PLANNING REQUIRES

REVISED OR NEW: [XX] PROP [ ] PIP [ ] PRO AG [ ] PIO/T [ ] PIO/C [ ] PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME	SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE	MISSION DIRECTOR TYPED NAME	SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
Myron H. Vent	Myron H. Vent 5/15/75	Robert W. Schmeding	Robert W. Schmeding 5/15

NFA Non-Formal Education

Project [illegible]
No. [illegible] Title Field Support

Contract No. AID/csd/ta-C-73-22
No. (above) Name Michigan State University

Project Officer Byron H. Vent Extension 29752

Worldwide Technical Assistance and Research

FY 1975/76 Technical Assistance Bureau Program Submission
Project and Budget Analysis Matrix

Major Country/Countries
WORLDWIDE

Asia 10, Africa 4,
Latin America 13

Obligation: Initial FY 19[illegible] Final FY 19[illegible]

Service :- Start FY 19[illegible] End FY 19[illegible]

PAC/PRCP Status: Project approved to FY 19[illegible]
Section 23;(d): Project [illegible]
Evaluation Scheduled [illegible] 19[illegible] formal
[illegible] Year [illegible]

On-Going Only

Narrative

A1 PURPOSE:

1. To provide field support in the non-formal education key problem area.
2. To facilitate international exchange of knowledge and experience in the subject area.
3. To stimulate self-generating interest and attention to non-formal education within and among LDCs.
4. To develop and internation network for reinforcing and supporting interests and expertise in NFE.
5. To strengthen the knowledge base on which development of NFE rests.

A2 OUTPUTS:

1. Development of a variety of US response capabilities to service LDC requests.
2. Development of LDC-based knowledge and exchange centers on non-formal education.
3. Project feasibility, design and evaluation work for direct field application and knowledge bank use.
4. Functioning of international network in subject area.
5. Work products from interregional, regional and country seminars and conferences.

A3 INPUTS:

1. Contractor, consultant and other efforts.
2. Interregional, regional and country seminars, conferences and workshops.
3. Support of an international network on the subject.
4. Selected US institutions, organizations and individuals providing field support.
5. US and joint US+LDC feasibility, design, study and evaluation teams.

Objectively Verifiable Indicators

B2 End of Project Status:

1. A representative group of resources within the US and selected LDCs involved. 2. Evidence in selected LDCs of self-generating interest in subject area. 3. Existence of a substantial body of project feasibility, design, evaluation and case materials resulting from field support and other activities. 4. Effective functioning of an international network in non-formal education. 5. Sufficient interregional, regional, and country seminars to stimulate LDC understanding and interest.

B3 Progress to Date:

1. A gradually growing number of requests for assistance with sector reviews, project development and evaluation.
2. Holding of an interregional (international) conference and workshop.
3. Development of an interdisciplinary response capability at MSU.
4. Steady development of a network of US and LDC centers concerned with NFE.

C2 Output Indicators:

1. Identifiable US quality response capabilities in various facets of non-formal education.
2. Existence of knowledge and exchange centers in LDCs in the three regions.
3. Dissemination of work products - reports, case studies, handbook, sourcebook.
4. Evidence of activity by international network on non-formal education with growing requests for informational materials.

C3 Progress to Date:

1. Growing evidence of an understanding on the part of LDC educators to the importance of NFE especially for rural development programs.
2. Over 1,000 copies of ten different studies in process of being disseminated to LDCs and U.S. institutions.
3. Provision of assistance to other US institutions and organizations in developing common base.

D2 Budget Summary (in thousands of dollars)

	(1) Personnel Dollars	(2) MM	(3) Commodities	(4) Other Costs	(5) Total	(6)* Expenditures	(7) June 30 Pipeline	(8) Funding Period Month	Year
1. Thru FY 1973	69	30		30	99	5	94	March	1974
2. Actual FY 1974	216	100		81	297	00	292	June	1975
3. Estimated FY 1975	219	100		81	300	400	192	June	1976
4. Proposed FY 1976	150	65		50	200	300	92	June	1977
5. All other						92	0		
6. Total	654			242	996	896			

*Expenditures are to be computed on an accrual basis.

162

Pre-Terminal Evaluation of: Non-Formal Education: Field Support AID/CM/ta-C-73-22

Section III Standard Key Questions (PAR)

A. Project Inputs

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

   X yes ____ no

2. Were assumptions regarding the supply of inputs valid?

   X yes ____ no

   With the exception that the possibility for holding regional conferences on non-formal education proved impractical. The difficulty of finding an LDC/Mission to host such conferences was overlooked in the initial planning of the project. The result was that national conferences or seminars were held in place of regional meetings.

3. Rate performance of action agent against plan:

   X outstanding ____ satisfactory ____ unsatisfactory

   The contractor has not only met all requirements of the contract on time, he has anticipated requirements especially with regard to the availability of technical teams to assist with feasibility studies, project design and evaluation and the development of a resource base. The contractor has also anticipated the problems of developing linkages with other centers by establishing a Non-Formal Education Information Services Center with a full-time professional in charge. Publications developed under the knowledge-base contract have been distributed on a user-based plan. These studies have placed greater demands on the contractor for technical assistance services, in some cases funded outside the contract budget. One of the requests involved cooperation with the Dag Hammarskjold Foundation in preparing material for the Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly to be held in September 1975. Another activity that justifies the rating is the development by the contractor of courses in the regular curriculum bearing on non-formal education in rural development and as related to human ecology. These are funded and staffed outside the framework of the contract. In less than two years the contractor has gained international repute as a center for NFE.

B. Transformation of Inputs into Outputs

4. Given the answers above, i.e., progress to date in supplying inputs, changes in assumptions, etc., 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 still valid?

____yes X no If no, explain.

The assumption that this project could fulfill all of the targets stipulated in the end of project status within a three-year period was unrealistic. Some of the targets have been achieved, e.g., "a representative group of resources within the U.S. and selected LDCs involved; existence of a substantial body of project feasibility, design, evaluation and case materials." However, there is as yet no "effective functioning of an international network in NFE." The basis for the network has been laid but it will take several additional years to develop. Similarly additional seminars are needed to provide understanding and interest in non-formal education in a manner that it can contribute to the advancement of the rural poor. "Self-generating interest in selected LDCs" is still a relatively early stage and needs additional assistance in comprehending the role that non-formal alternatives can play in the development of national learning systems.

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

  X yes ____no If no, what changes need to be made in either inputs, workplans, and/or output expectations?

As stated under #4, the only approach to the development of the project was an under-estimation of the amount of time needed to arrive at output expectations.

C. Project Outputs

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

Planned	Actual
(a) Identifiable US quality response capabilities in various facets of non-formal education	(a) Contractor has responded to over 20 requests from 11 countries in 4 regions
(b) Existence of knowledge and exchange centers in LDCs in three regions.	(b) Groundwork being laid for exchange centers
(c) Dissemination of work products - reports, case studies, handbook	(c) Undertaken on large scale but handbook to be completed.
(d) Evidence of activity by international network on NFE with growing requests for materials.	(d) Evidence is at hand that the network is developing through examination of requests.

a. **Was actual performance less than planned target?**

__X__ yes no

Without any reflection on the contractor, the establishment of an international network for reinforcing and supporting interests an expertise in NFE has not been as effective as envisaged. The reason for this is that a greater input must be made in assisting in the establishment of such centers, possibly through auxiliary means.

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

Actual changes have not been made since the project has not been in existence long enough for the Agency to determine exactly where or how these changes should be made. A greater degree of collaboration is necessary so that the project remains on target.

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

__X__ yes ____ no

Although the answer is essentially "yes," the review of the project on April 21 indicated the need for more frequent discussions with the contractor in which the bureaus, TAB, and other appropriate offices concerned take part.

D. Program Goal

7. Give statement of programming goal - if different from attached matrix - and/or key problem are addressed.

Is it same as in PROP?

__X__ yes ____ no

8. Does achievement of project purpose - in relation to other sector or KPA activity - still have the same priority and significance in contributing to the programming goal?

__X__ yes ____ no

9. Are assumptions for achieving goal and measure of goal achievement still valid?

__X__ yes ____ no The answer is positive with the reservation indicated in B.4 preceding.

Are they reflected in the attached matrix?

____yes X no

10. If appropriate, comment on project interactions with: (a) other interregional, regional or Mission GTS projects; (b) 211(d) institutional grants; (c) interregional or mission research projects: and (d) other U.S. Government agencies.

Michigan State University has had numerous informal contacts with Florida State University, 211(d) grant in Educational Technology; AED Information Center; UCLA 211(d) grant in Alternatives to Traditional Education in Latin America; and 211(d) grant to University of Massachusetts in NFE. It has used personnel from these various centers on occasion to fill out technical teams requested by the Missions. It has had both formal and informal contacts with SEAMEO regional programs, and more recently with projects sponsored by the World Bank and the United Nations. A more detailed and comprehensive listing can be found in the report of the contractor attached to this PAR dated April 21, 1975.

Section IV Issues Narrative

A. Introduction

This contract to provide field support services to USAIDs was signed on August 10, 1973, and is scheduled to terminate on March 31, 1976. The total cost of the project is estimated at $700,000.

The primary objectives of the project are to:

1. Provide field support in NFE
2. Facilitate international exchange of knowledge and experience in NFE
3. Stimulate self-generating interest in and attention to NFE within and among LDCs
4. Develop an international network for reinforcing and supporting interests and expertise in NFE
5. Strengthen the knowledge base on which development of NFE rests

On April 21, 1975, TA/EHR held a contract evaluation meeting to discuss accomplishments to date and insure that the contractor was meeting the Agency's needs in this key problem area. The review was invaluable in providing AID personnel with the status of the contractor's accomplishments and in indicating areas which required strengthening.

B. Attendees

Stanley Applegate, LA/DR
Robert Mills, TA/PPU
Stanley Handleman, NESA/TECH
Willie Whitte, AFR/ESA
Frank Moore, AFR/DP
David Sprague, TA/EHR
Bernard Wilder, TA/EHR
Hal Hall, EA/ID/ED
Harold Freeman, NESA/TECH
William Charleson, TA/EHR
Myron Vent, TA/EHR
Cole Brembeck, MSU
Richard Niehoff, MSU
Harold Case, MSU

C. Summary of Conclusions from evaluation meeting

1. Contractor had performed exceedingly well.

2. It is important to provide the contractor with the greatest degree of flexibility in order to meet the requests of the Bureaus and the Missions, especially in providing technical assistance for "targets of opportunity."

3. Country seminars are preferable to regional or international seminars since they enable ministry officials to focus on individual country problems.

4. There is a great need for additional research beyond that involved in the development of the knowledge base. It was proposed that MSU revisit Washington at the earliest opportunity to discuss with Regions and TA/EHR the development of a list of priorities in research. Such areas as the development of rural leadership, the importance of human motivation, utilization of societal relationships, human resource development needs, and the tie-in of non-formal education with other sectors were mentioned as important in setting priorities.

D. TA/EHR Reactions to Recommendations

The TA/EHR project monitor agrees with the recommendations and will insure that they are incorporated in the implementation of the project.

E. Supporting Attachments

Report to AID/TAB on Field Application Phase of Program of Studies in Non-Formal Education, dated April 21, 1975.