

4-23-81

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Methods and Instruments for Evaluating Community Education Projects			2. PROJECT NUMBER 931-0597	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE AID/W-LAC/DR/HR
			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) <u>2</u>	
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES		6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>76</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>76</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>80</u>	A. Total \$ <u>\$445,664</u>	From (month/yr.) <u>7/78</u>
			B. U.S. \$ <u>\$445,664</u>	To (month/yr.) <u>5/80</u>
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>6/19-20/80</u>	

B. 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
The Research Advisory Committee (RAC), March 3, 1980, "Endorsed as Proposed" the requested termination grant of \$144,662.00 for 9 months. However, as funds were not available for immediate implementation, the Project Evaluation Team recommends the postponement of Phase II until after the election and post-election adjustment in Jamaica.	J.D. Singletary	7/30/82
A. Administrative Planning	J.D. Singletary	4/81
B. AID/Tuskegee Contracting	J.D. Singletary	5/81
C. Phase II Implementation (V, VI and VII)	J.D. Singletary	10/81
No major issues or problems were identified that will interfere with the achievement of project purposes within the projected funding and time frame as endorsed by the RAC on March 3, 1980.		

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"/> Financial Plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) <u>Contract</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan 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
LAC/DR/HR, James D. Singletary	Signature <u>Marshall D. Brown</u>
	Typed Name <u>Marshall D. Brown</u>
	Date <u>4/20/81</u>

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - Part II

13. SUMMARY

This project is designed to develop and test evaluation tools that can be used in the appraisal of broad-based community education programs in LDCs. The project is defining socioeconomic variables, measurement instruments (questionnaires), and analytical methodologies that can determine important indicators of success in achieving impact from community education programs.

The project with Tuskegee Institute was initiated as a part of a much larger program to develop non-formal education programs at the local level and to measure the effect of these programs. Several projects were aimed at determining what research programs in non-formal education were possible at the local level and their cost effectiveness. This project is an attempt to develop methods of evaluating these and other non-formal education programs.

The work accomplished to date has been in accord with the tasks and sequence established in the original project plan. The review of the literature has been completed, distributed and discussed. Field sites in Jamaica identified and arrangements negotiated with the National Planning Agency (NPA) and the Local (Jamaican) Advisory Council (LAC). The external panel of scholars and practitioners (Project Advisory Council - PAC) has been formed and has examined the progress of the project on a continuing basis. The initial development of questionnaires has been accomplished, partially field tested, and refined. The project's extension will permit the final field testing and analysis of collected data.

At its meeting March 3, 1980, A.I.D.'s Research Advisory Committee (RAC), "Endorsed as Proposed" the requested termination grant of \$144,622 for nine months. The RAC noted that: (1) Some aspects of the project had been completed with a very high quality effort; (2) Considerable delays, not of the contractor's making, had been encountered; and (3) Extension of the project so that it could be carried out to completion was considered to be reasonable.

As funds are not available for immediate implementation, the Project Evaluation Team recommends a postponement of the initiation of the RAC approved Phase II until after the election and post-election adjustments in Jamaica. It is estimated that the AID/Tuskegee Institute administrative planning for terminating the project, assuming availability of A.I.D. funds, should be completed by the end of April 1981. AID/Tuskegee Institute contract negotiations should be completed by the end of May 1981 and Phase II Implementation (Phases V, VI and VII) should begin during the month of October 1981. (Attachment D: Proposed Budget Break-Out by Month: October 1981 - June 1982; Attachment E: Work Plan Projection with A.I.D. Funding Support in Jamaica and Attachment F: Detailed Sequence of Events Chart Showing Time Required to Accomplish Tasks VI and VII (10/26/81 - 7/30/82).

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In a very real sense, the findings of the Project Advisory Council (PAC) and the Research Advisory Committee (RAC) made important contributions to the

Final Evaluation of Phase I of this project. For example, the September 14 - 15, 1978 and July 26 - 27, 1979 meetings of the Project Advisory Council strengthened the research design, emphasized the importance of developing methodology "on the spot" which required closer collaboration and negotiations between Tuskegee Institute and the Jamaican National Planning Agency and documented the fact that the Project was on track and should continue to its successful conclusion. Also, the findings of the Second Project Advisory Council were included in the proposal and supplementary materials that were reviewed by the LAC Project Review Committee and presented to the Research Advisory Committee (RAC) for consideration at its meeting, March 3, 1980.

The RAC's discussion noted that (1) some aspects of the project had been completed with a very high quality effort, (2) considerable delays, not of the contractor's making, had been encountered and (3) the request to extend the project for nine months with an estimated additional cost of \$144,662 so that it could be carried out to completion was reasonable.

Prior to the Evaluation, a copy of the Final Report: Phase I - Development and Testing of Methodologies and Instruments for Evaluating Community Education Programs" and "Notes: Research Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting March 3, 1980 were considered by the LAC Project Review Committee (David M. Sprague, DS/ED, James Hoxeng, DS/ED, Bernard Wilder, NE/TECH/HR, Bernice A. Goldstein, LAC/DP, Jack Francis, LAC/DP, Irwin A. Levy, LAC/DR, Barry Burnett, LAC/DR, James D. Singletary, LAC/DR/HR, Richard R. Martin, LAC/DR/HR, and Miloslav Rechcigl, DS/RAC).

The Final Project Evaluation: Phase I, held at Tuskegee Institute, Thursday and Friday, June 19 - 20, 1980 evaluated (a) the contracted scope of work, (b) project products and (c) the Final Report: Phase I. Participants were Dr. A. I. Henry, Acting Director Human Resources Development Center (HRDC), Dr. R. S. Hawk, Project Director, Ms. O. E. Hume, Research Team Member, Dr. J. Befecadu, Project Advisory Council Member and Dr. James D. Singletary, USAID.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS

The problems encountered in beginning the work in Jamaica were the direct result of external political, social and economic factors. Mention should be made of the initial problem of getting into Jamaica because of the 1976 elections as well as the shift in the project's counterpart agency from the Jamaican Ministry of Education to the National Planning Agency (NPA).

The fact that effective cooperation was developed with the National Planning Agency supports the need to program adequate lead, orientation and adjustment time for a project that has the potential of multi-sectoral interest and impact.

16. INPUTS

A.I.D. planned inputs included a Research Project Staff with counterparts in the Jamaican National Planning Agency, a Guidance Group composed of 7 - 10

scholars and practitioners as well as funding of local costs such as travel, per diem, materials and supplies, etc.

Host government counterpart contributions including salaries of project personnel in Jamaica and supporting services were not available to the extent anticipated after the shift from the Jamaican Ministry of Education to the National Planning Agency (NPA). Some of the additional costs which were not provided for in the original proposal include travel and honoraria required by the Project Advisory Council (PAC), and (2) the Local (Jamaican) Advisory Council (LAC).

A review of the expenditures for the project indicate that the Contractor stayed within the constraints of the project budget and in spite of the need for funds, the Contractor did not exceed the grand total set forth in the budget. (Attachment C: LAC/DR/HR: Voucher Approval Sheet)

17. OUTPUTS

In addition to a review of pertinent literature entitled "Evaluation in Rural Community Education: The State-of-the-Art," the project outputs to date include: (1) Community Survey Instrument, (CSI) - an interview schedule with the following five sub-sections: a) Socio-Demographic Data, b) Agriculture, c) Maternal and Child Health, d) Communicable Disease, e) Adult Literacy—JAMAL - Non-Participant, JAMAL-Participant; (2) Program Interview Schedule/Rating Scale; (3) Community Characteristics Check List; (4) Youth Training Questionnaire; (5) Manual for Interviewers and (6) Manual for Coding Community Survey Instrument.

The review of the literature and the instruments have been disseminated to the Jamaican Counterparts, the Project Advisory Council in the U.S., the Local Advisory Council in Jamaica, and various program managers in Jamaica. Jamaican participants were involved in training, field work and analysis of the data collected and in further development of the instruments and methodologies. The three Jamaicans who were hired as part of the project research team participated in (1) the development of the instruments, (2) making contacts with program people in Jamaica, (3) hiring twenty-four field investigators who were trained in interviewing techniques by using the Manual for Interviewers, (4) hiring eight data coders who were trained in computer input coding by using the Manual for Coding Community Survey Instrument, and (5) hiring a Jamaican Computer Manager to build the data tape and oversee the keypunching and verification of data cards. The Local Jamaican Advisory Council consisted of fourteen (14) professional Jamaicans who either had expertise in the research area and/or represented one of the programs.

To date, over 45 participants have been involved in the training, field work, and data analysis as well as development of the instruments and methodologies.

The Project Evaluation Team concurred with the findings of the Project Advisory Council (PAC) regarding the quality of the project's outputs as follows:

1. Tasks I, II, III, and IV have been successfully accomplished.
2. The Tuskegee Institute/Jamaican Research Team is to be commended for the high caliber, dedication, and accomplishments of its members. The division of labor, cooperation, respect, and a professional relationship indicate an outstanding working and personal relationship.
3. The project has provided excellent contact between HRDC and NPA, U.S. and Jamaican educators and researchers, and has provided a substantial bridge between those people in both countries who have worked together.
4. The evaluative information already collected should be very valuable to the program planners whose programs have been a part of the research, thus providing them means to improve or adjust their programs to have impact in Jamaica.
5. The work is extremely timely, complex, and valuable. The successful completion of the project should be of great value to LDC's which use its products. Along these lines, greater LDC participation in the form of seminars will be very beneficial.
6. Task VI is critical to a successful completion of the project.
7. The project is on track and should continue to its successful completion.

18. PURPOSE

The purpose of this project is to develop and test evaluation tools, both instruments and methodologies, that can furnish more and better information for the rural community education program planner and implementor. The information to be furnished through the use of these evaluation tools will include data to meet these objectives:

- 1) Determine program impact on individuals, the community and the achievement of wider development goals,

- 2) Identify and assess effectiveness of various programmatic elements and their interaction with various community characteristics to assist planners to:
 - a) Identify communities, on the basis of their characteristics, in which a given type of education program would be most apt to meet with success and,
 - b) Identify the optimum set of education program elements to ensure success, given a specific set of community characteristics.
- 3) Assess costs.

The achievement of the project purposes is based on the following assumptions:

- 1) There are certain identifiable characteristics of community education programs that can be controlled, using the community in which the program is to be conducted as a guide, so as to ensure increased levels of program impact.
- 2) Methodologies and instruments can be developed:
 - a. To identify program characteristics necessary for success of community education programs in specific and general contexts.
 - b. To analyze the community to facilitate a better fit between possible community education program characteristics and community variables.
 - c. To evaluate community education programs on an on-going basis to serve decision-making and the final evaluation of activities in terms of impact on:
 - (1) individuals, (2) communities and (3) national goals.

The acid test of these assumptions lies in the completion of the project. Then the project will have data to support or rebutt the assumption that the instruments can identify the appropriate characteristics. Incomplete analysis gives strong indication that the assumptions are correct. At this point, the Evaluation Team is confident that the variables and indicators from the literature and those suggested by the program administrators are important to their programs and support the first assumption. The instruments have been developed, data collected and experience gained. This experience as well as the reviews of the Project Advisory Council suggest that the second assumption will be supported by the end of Phase II (Tasks V, VI, and VII).

19. GOAL/SUBGOAL

This project was initiated as a part of a much larger program to develop non-formal education programs at the local level and to measure the effect of these programs. Several projects were aimed at determining what research programs in non-formal education were possible at the local level and their cost effectiveness. These included "Participative Education Programming" by North Carolina State University, "Cost Effectiveness in Non-Formal Education" by Educational Testing Service, and "Non-Formal Education for Pre-Literate Adults" by World Education Inc. The present project by Tuskegee Institute is an attempt to develop methods of evaluating the non-formal education programs in Jamaica that with modification can be applied to these and other projects. Documentation that the evaluation methods would also have broader uses is anticipated by the end of Phase II.

20. BENEFICIARIES

As a result of this project, a systematic knowledge base or data bank has begun at Tuskegee Institute on community education. New knowledge generated from this research should be of great benefit to A.I.D. participants in planning, implementing, and evaluating programs in developing countries.

Tuskegee Institute has benefited by the exposure, training and experience of many staff members in evaluation and international development. The opportunity to travel in another country and to experience another culture is in itself a personal benefit for the staff members involved. In addition, the academic and international development communities at large can benefit from the pool of educated and experienced personnel who developed additional skills as a result of the project. In all, seventeen people took part in some aspects of the project. Many of these people will remain on the Tuskegee Institute campus. Their experience and expertise is available as a resource for LDCs, USAID and rural development in general.

Also, a pool of evaluation research expertise has been developed and left in Jamaica. Here, too, many persons have broadened their expertise while some have learned new skills. The list of Jamaicans who have benefited directly and personally from the project is longer than the Tuskegee list: (1) The three Jamaican counterparts were involved in training, field work, and data analysis as well as the development of the instruments and methodologies; (2) Three of the 14 members of the Local Jamaican Advisory Council participated in seminars on evaluation, read the proposal and review of the literature and discussed evaluation in general and the project as a specific application thereof; (3) Twenty-four field investigators were hired and trained in interviewing techniques and some aspects of evaluation, and were given experience in interviewing in a research project; and (4) Eight persons received training in data coding, and reviewing the instruments to code the participants responses. In addition, ancillary personnel, i.e. secretaries, bookkeepers, key punchers and data processors were involved and were paid for their work and the supervisors who were indirectly involved also received some benefit. The principal benefit to Jamaica would be the

pool of over 15 people who received some training, education and experience in evaluation research.

The cooperating programs in Jamaica are also beneficiaries of the project. The data available from the CSI has been returned to Jamaica in two forms: (1) a complete copy of the data on a computer tape and on holorith cards and (2) selected data tables provided to NPA. Additional tables from this report are available and will be sent to the Jamaican program managers.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS

An important unplanned effect resulted from the emphasis of the First Project Advisory Council (PAC), September 14 - 15, 1978 upon the development of methodology "on the spot" rather than arrive at a methodology from a review of the literature. The emphasis required a closer collaboration and negotiations between Tuskegee Institute and the Jamaican National Planning Agency during Task IV and the rest of the project. This took time and resulted in the rescheduling of Task IV. However, at its second meeting, July 26 - 27, 1979, the Project Advisory Council noted that the contact between the Tuskegee Institute's Human Resources Development Center and the Jamaican National Planning Agency could provide a substantial bridge between the people who have been working together as well as LDCs who will use the products of this project.

22. LESSONS LEARNED

The experience of this project documents that one of the major lessons learned was that a successful project requires involvement and inputs from the program implementors in the host country.

The findings to date are: 1) A research proposal of this type can be organized successfully with the direct involvement of LDC personnel and 2) The "iterative" design is a feasible one for developing instruments and methodologies for evaluating rural community education projects in less-developed-countries.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS OR REMARKS

a. RAC Recommendation - At its March 3, 1980 meeting, the Research Advisory Committee (RAC), "Endorsed as Proposed" the requested termination grant of \$144,662 for nine months. However, as funds were not available for immediate implementation, the Project Evaluation Team recommends the postponement of Phase II until after the election and post-election adjustments in Jamaica. It is estimated that the AID/Tuskegee Institute Administrative Planning regarding the feasibility of and the availability of funds for Phase II should be completed by the end of April 1981. Following this, the AID/Tuskegee Institute contract negotiations should be completed by the end of May 1981 and Phase II Implementation (Phases V, VI and VII should begin during the month of October 1981. (Attachments: D: Proposed Budget Break-Out by Month: October 1981 - June 1982: E: Work Plan Projection with A.I.D. funding support in Jamaica, and F: Detailed Sequence of Events Chart Showing Time Required to Accomplish Tasks VI and VII (10/26/81 - 7/30/82).

b. Recommendations Regarding Unfinished Work

Completion of Task V - Analysis of the data available from Task IV will be completed. The frequency counts and percentages from the Agricultural Extension program and JAMAL will be transferred from computer printouts to letter-size sheets, and the appropriate cross tabulations and tables will be drawn from the data for all programs. The largest and most complex computer process, that of identification of individual characteristics that lead to successful community education programs, will be attempted.

Modifications of the CSI will be done where necessary as preparation for Task VI. The materials for the stakeholder analysis will be developed.

Task VI. The sixth task is to conduct the full field test of the revised procedures. The context of the test will be other communities in Jamaica, where broad-based community education programs in health education, agricultural extension, and literacy are being conducted. In this phase, the study will begin with a test of the Program Interview Schedule and the Community Characteristics Check List, followed by the Community Survey Instrument. The findings from the Program Interview Schedule and the Community Characteristics Check List will be matched against the results of the survey to insure the validity of the evaluation results.

Stakeholder Analysis. The findings will be presented to the staff of NPA, as well as to the program administrators and others involved in the study to assess the value of the results and to seek further input for modification of the instruments and methodologies. The statistics will then be taken back to the program managers, educators, community leaders, and some participants in a series of individual and group presentations and seminars in Jamaica. The Jamaicans will, through discussion, impart their interpretation to the data and results. It is anticipated that these interpretations will augment the researchers' own analysis. The additional insights gained by having local people interpret the data in field analysis will be included in the final report. Since the local people have a personal involvement, or stake, in the data and its meaning, this analysis procedure is called a Stakeholder analysis. Details of the Stakeholder Analysis procedures are presented as follows: (1) the kinds of questions to be explored, (2) persons involved in the procedure, and (3) the sequence of activities.

Task VII. Task VII is to conduct a final review by the Advisory Council on the results of the evaluation conducted in Task VI. The contractor will also present for review recommendations and specifications for further testing, modification, and/or implementation of the project outputs.

The contractor, taking into account the Advisory Council's recommendations, will organize and present the project outputs in the form of a set of manuals or handbooks. It is anticipated that the instruments will require modification and further validation before full scale use in other situations. One aspect of the final report will be a proposal for a full scale validation in another setting.

Finally, the Evaluation Team identified no major issues or problems that will interfere with the achievement of project purposes within the projected funding and time frame as endorsed by the RAC on March 3, 1980.

Attachments: On File LAC/DR/HR

Clearances: DS/ED, James Hoxeng _____ (Draft)
DS/RAC, Miloslav Rechcigle _____ (Draft)
LAC/DP, Bernice A. Goldstein _____ (Draft)
LAC/DP, Jack Francis _____ (Draft)
LAC/DR, Anthony Cauterucci _____ (Draft)
LAC/DR, Barry Burnett _____ (Draft)
LAC/DR/HR, Kenneth L. Martin _____
LAC/DR/HR, James D. Singletary _____ *JS*

Appendices

PROGRESS TO DATE: Project activities between the signing of the Contract (AID/ta-C-1315) and the Final Project Evaluation: Phase I includes the following:

Contract Agreement, June 28, 1976	6/28/76 - 6/30/78	Signed
<u>TASK I: Literature Search: State-of-the-Art Theory</u>	12/77 - 3/78	Completed
Report: "Evaluation in Rural Community Education: The State-of-the-Art, March 1978.		
Annual Report - June 1976 - June 1977		
<u>TASK II: Field Review-Reality Test</u>	4/78 - 5/78	Completed
Field Observation (Site visits and planning; orientation of Tuskegee Researchers to Field testing site); Establishment of Local Advisory Council in Jamaica (LAC); monitoring instruments developed.		
<u>TASK III: Review-Formulate Tentative Tools for Evaluation</u>	6/78 - 9/78	Completed
Recruitment of Jamaican Research Counterparts.		
First Project Evaluation, at Tuskegee Institute, May 31 - June 1, 1978, (PES I and II)		
Contract Amendment No. 3 extended the completion date from June 30, 1978 to December 30, 1979.		
Annual Report - June 1977 - June 1978		
First Project Advisory Council Meeting, Chicago, IL,		

TASK IV: Short Field Test: Conduct
Case Studies for Use in Validation

10/78 - 6/79

Completed

Jamaican Research Counterparts
hired, October 1978.

Preliminary Program Interviews in
Jamaica by Jamaican Research
Counterparts, November 1978.

Visit of Jamaican Research Counter-
parts - orientation and planning
for instrument development and
field testing, November -
December 1978.

Meeting of Local Advisory Council
in Jamaica - Report on visit to
Tuskegee, January 1979.

Continuation of program inter-
views-preliminary data gathering
for input into the content of
community survey instruments,
January - March 1979.

Tuskegee Research Counterparts
join the Jamaican Counterparts
in Jamaica-design and construc-
tion of instruments, March 1979.

Local (Jamaican) consultants and
the local Advisory Council review
draft instruments, March 1979.

Pilot Test - 40 interviews, April
1979.

Analysis of pilot test results,
April 1979.

Consultant review, April 1979.

Refinement and preparation of
third draft for field testing,
April 1979.

Selection and training of interviewers and site selection, May 1979.

Promotional work in selected sites, May 1979.

Field Testing - Data collection in selected communities, May - June 1979.

Feedback with interviewers, Local Advisory Council (Jamaican) members, Consultants and Project Staff, June 1979.

Data Preparation - coding, editing, June 1979.

TASK V: Analyze/Review/Modify -
Prepare Evaluation Tools for Full
Field Test

7/79 - Present

Preliminary Data Analysis, July 1979.

Joint Jamaica/Tuskegee Project Review: Second Meeting of the Project Advisory Council (PAC), July 26 - 27, 1979, Tuskegee Institute, Institute, Alabama.

Project Review, July 27 - 28, 1979, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama.

Annual Report - June 1978 - June 1979.

Research Project Extension Statement, October 23, 1979

LAC Project Review Committee reviewed Proposal to Extend the Research Contract and transmitted the request to the Research Advisory Committee (RAC), November 2 - 14, 1979.

Contract Amendment No. 4 extended the completion date from December 30, 1979 to March 31, 1980.

The Research Advisory Committee (RAC) "Endorsed as Proposed", the requested termination grant of \$144,662.00 for 9 months, March 3, 1980.

Contract Amendment No. 5 extended the completion date from March 31, 1980 to May 31, 1980.

Contract Amendment No. 6 substituted Dr. Arthur I. Henry for Dr. T. J. Pinnock as the Principal Investigator.

"Notes: Research Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting - March 3, 1980" transmitted to the Tuskegee Research Team, April 22, 1980.

Final Report: Phase I - Development and Testing of Methodologies and Instruments for Evaluating Community Education Programs, June 3, 1980.

Review of Final Report, Phase I by LAC Project Review Committee, June 11, 1980.

RAC Recommendations on Proposals Reviewed at the March 3 - 4, 1980 Meeting, June 13, 1980.

Project Evaluation Phase I, at Tuskegee Institute, June 19 - 20, 1980, (PES I and II).

TASK VI: Test in Context of Various Rural Community Education Projects in Jamaica:
(See PES No. 23 and Attachments D, E and F)

10/15/81 - 1/27/82

TASK VII: Final Review/Modification, Preparation of Handbook - Specifications for Further Testing: (See PES No. 23 and Attachment D, E and F).

2/1/82 - 7/30/82

PROJECT DOCUMENTS

- I. Contract, AID/ta-C-1315, Methods and Instruments for Evaluating Community Education Projects (Project No. 931-0597).
- II. Annual Reports: June 1976 - June 1977
June 1977 - June 1978
June 1978 - June 1979
Final Report - Phase I, June 3, 1980
- III. Minutes of Meetings:
- Annual Project Evaluation Meeting - Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, May 31 - June 1, 1978 and PES I and II.
- Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting, Chicago, Illinois, September 14 - 15, 1978.
- Local Advisory Council (Jamaica) (LAC) Meeting, January 17, 1979.
- Project Advisory Council (PAC) Meeting, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, July 27 - 28 1980.
- Notes: Research Advisory Committee (RAC) Meeting, Washington, D.C., March 3, 1980.
- Project Evaluation Meeting, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, June 19 - 20, 1980 and PES I and II.
- IV. Project Products:
- A. Evaluation in Rural Community Education: The State-of-the-Art, March 1978.
- B. Evaluation Instruments:
1. Community Survey Instrument (CSI)
 2. Program Interview Schedule Land Rating Scale (PIS/RS)
 3. Community Characteristics Check List (CCCL)
 4. Youth Training Questionnaire (YTQ)

LAC/DR/HR: VOUCHER APPROVAL SHEET

PAYEE'S NAME AND ADDRESS: Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Alabama 36088

CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE: AID/ta-C-1315

VOUCHER NO.	PERIOD FROM ----- TO	EXPENDITURES		BUDGET	BALANCE
		THIS PERIOD	TO DATE		
9429573 (17)	7/1 - 31/78	8,218.48	281,748.66	445,664.00	163,915.34
9421143 (18)	8/1 - 31/78	7,137.42	288,886.08		156,777.92
9422679 (19)	9/1 - 30/78	19,225.01	308,141.09		137,522.91
9429873 (20)	10/1 - 31/78	7,036.35	315,227.44		130,436.56
9424143 (21)	11/1 - 30/78	19,746.32	334,973.76		110,690.24
9424650 (22)	12/1 - 31/78	7,431.74	342,405.50		103,258.50
9425263 (23)	1/1 - 31/79	5,315.88	347,721.38		97,942.62
9426271 (24)	2/1 - 28/79	1,097.48	348,818.86		96,845.14
9428772 (25)	3/1 - 31/79	15,537.39	364,356.25		81,307.75
9426486 (26)	4/1 - 30/79	8,438.09	372,794.34		72,869.66
9430209 (27)	5/1 - 31/79	6,595.42	379,389.76		66,274.24
0440213 (28)	6/1 - 30/79	14,312.78	393,702.54		51,961.46
0440214 (29)	7/1 - 31/79	5,971.75	399,674.29		45,989.71
0440215 (30)	8/1 - 31/79	18,539.48	418,213.77		27,450.23

ATTACHMENT C

Attachment D

Proposed Budget Break-Out by Month, October 1981 - June 1982.

TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE/USAID COMMUNITY EDUCATION PROJECT

	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	March	April	May	June	TOTAL
SALARIES ON CAMPUS	5,306	5,306	5,306	5,306	5,306	5,306	5,306	5,306	5,306	47,750
SALARIES OFF CAMPUS	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533	2,533	22,800
FRINGE BENEFITS	467	467	467	467	467	467	467	467	467	4,200
CONSULTANTS	100	200	100	100	100	100	100	3,500	500	4,800
TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION	1,950	1,885	1,325	1,350	776	676	478	2,860	700	12,000
EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES	1,160	430	500	530	625	375	305	1,250	1,075	6,250
PER DIEM	3,400	3,600	3,600	1,400	1,200	1,200	200	2,400		17,000
OVERHEAD	2,489	2,489	2,489	2,489	2,489	2,489	2,489	2,489	2,489	22,399
OTHER DIRECT COSTS	1,117	1,025	1,050	670	1,420	560	575	580	460	7,463
TOTAL	18,522	17,935	17,370	14,845	14,916	13,706	12,453	21,385	13,530	144,662

TOTAL PROJECT BUDGET

	<u>Original Budget</u>	<u>Requested Addition</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
Salaries and Wages	\$221,832.00	\$ 70,550.00	\$292,382.00
Fringe	33,275.00	4,200.00	37,475.00
Consultants	9,450.00	4,800.00	14,250.00
Per Diem	9,872.00	17,000.00	26,872.00
Travel and Transportation	32,167.00	12,000.00	44,167.00
Equipment, Materials, and Supplies	14,920.00	6,250.00	21,170.00
Other Direct Cost	28,760.00	7,463.00	36,223.00
Overhead	<u>95,388.00</u>	<u>22,399.00</u>	<u>117,787.00</u>
Totals	\$445,664.00	\$144,662.00	\$590,326.00

Attachment E

WORK PLAN PROJECTION WITH AID FUNDING SUPPORT IN JAMAICA

<u>Activities</u>	<u>Estimated Starting Dates</u>
1. Election	12/80
2. Administrative Planning	4/81
3. AID/Tuskegee Contracting	5/81
4. Start-up time	
(a) Staff identification	7/81
(b) Host-country Program Contacts	9/81
5. Phase II Implementation (V, VI, VII)	10/81
6. Final Evaluation - Termination	7/82

Attachment F

DETAILED SEQUENCE OF EVENTS CHART SHOWING TIME REQUIRED TO ACCOMPLISH TASKS VI & VII

	START	ESTIMATED NO. OF DAYS REQUIRED	COMPLETION DATE
1. Field Testing Task VI Data in Jamaica	10/15/81	8	10/26/81
a. Contact made with Jamaica program			
b. Data shared with program managers		14	11/13/81
c. Inputs from Data Sharing written up and prepared for manual consideration		5	11/20/81
2. Second Field Test	11/14/81		
a. *Program Case Studies/ PIS/RS/field test		13	12/11/81
b. *Site Selection/ Community Check List field test.		3	12/16/81
c. Interviewer Selection		5	12/23/81
d. Interviewer Training		3	1/8/82
e. CSI field test		12	1/26/82
f. Supervision/Checking	With 2.e. on site	13	1/27/82
3. Preparation for Data Analysis			
a. Coding	After 20% of 2.e. completed	18	2/8/82
b. Key Punching	One day after 3.a. begins	15	2/9/82

c. Prepare Tape	2	2/11/82
4. Data Analysis		
a. Debug Program/Tape	10	2/25/82
b. Run Tables	18	3/23/82
c. Examine Data***	32	4/29/82
5. Final Report to AID	/	
a. *Outline/Sections of Manual and Final Report	3	5/4/82
	end of 2.f.	
b. Assign sections	1	5/7/82
c. First Draft/Manual	16	5/17/82
d. Examination of First Drafts by Research Team and Con- sultants	4	5/21/82
e. Second Draft/Manual	10	6/4/82
f. Team Examination of Second Drafts	4	6/18/82
g. PAC Review/Recommendations	3	6/24/82
h. AID Project Review	1	6/29/82
i. Third Draft/Manual	7	6/30/82
**		
j. Examination of Third Drafts by Team and Consultants	3	7/9/82
k. Typing	8	7/14/82
l. Reproduction	5	7/23/82
m. Distribution	3	7/30/82

*These items can be accomplished as concurrent actions.

**Additional drafts/refinements as time allows.

***In keeping with PAC advice: longer examination of data takes place as conditions permit