PD-KAG-903

UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) — PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE	2. PROJECT NUMBER	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE
Literacy Training	650-0028	USAID/Sudan

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) 650-8[illegible]-02

☒ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING	7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 79	B. Final Obligation Expected FY 81	C. Final Input Delivery FY 81	A. Total $ 4,351,700 B. U.S. $ 1,400,000	From (month/yr.) July, 1979 To (month/yr.) November, 1980 Date of Evaluation Review February 24, 1981

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. a) Position paper on schedule for introduction of materials; and b) decision by RMOE.	IRL: JMalou	a) 3/31/81 b) 4/30/81
2. Proposal for teacher training	IRL: JMalou	3/31/81
3. a) Draft Agreement between IRL and CDC on shared responsibility; and b) approval by RMOE.	IRL: JMalou	a) 3/31/81 b) 5/31/81
4. Plan for SIL/IRL division of responsibility and long-range IRL development plan.	SIL: RBergman	3/31/81
5. Proposal for revitalizing the publication unit to be incorporated in proposed extension.	SIL: RBergman	
6. Identification of IRL role in adult literacy	Yithak Lual, RMOE Dir. Gen.	5/31/81
7. Determination of paper needs and identification of means of meeting needs.	SIL: RBergman	3/31/81
8. Ministry plan for printed materials distribution	Yithak Lual RMOE Dir. Gen.	5/31/81
9. Approval of additional funds for staff house.	Dir: USAID	
10. a) Request for proposed project extension; b) Response by USAID.	SIL: RBergman USAID Project Manager.	a) 3/31/81 b) 4/30/81

Best Available Copy

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- [X] Project Paper
- [X] Financial Plan
- [X] Logical Framework
- [X] Project Agreement
- [X] Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
- [ ] PIO/T
- [ ] PIO/C
- [ ] PIO/P
- [ ] Other (Specify) _____
- [ ] Other (Specify) _____

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

- A. [ ] Continue Project Without Change
- B. [X] Change Project Design and/or
  - [X] Change Implementation Plan
- C. [ ] Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)

James Beebe, USAID Project Officer
Richard Bergman, SIL/Sudan Director
Julia van Dyken, SIL Director/Literacy
Job Dharuia Malou, IRL Principal
Edward B. Mandeson, IRL V/Principal
Arlene O'Reilly, USAID/Evaluation Officer

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature

Typed Name
Arthur W. Mudge, USAID Director

Date
6/a/a[illegible]

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART II

Evaluation No. 650-81-02
Project No. 650-0028

13. Summary

Considerable progess has been made toward the establishment of an indigenous capability to produce materials in vernacular languages and toward the introduction into rural schools of vernacular literacy materials. These activities continue to have the potential of significantly increasing the rate of literacy and generally improving the quality of primary education in the region. The grantee, with the cooperation and support of the Regional Ministry of Education (RMOE), has made good use of its resources and the AID grant. The explicit goal and purpose of the project have been modified to make them internally consistent with the other elements of the project. Some modification in the magnitude of outputs was necessitated by a recognition that three years are required before materials are ready for wide scale testing. This is due in part to problems such as limited communications, transportation and human resources, and the timely delivery of government inputs. The evaluati carefully considered a number of issues, including some whose resolution could have a significant impact on education. Finally, the evaluation team concluded that in order for the objective to be achieved, an extension of both time and funding would be needed.

14. Methodology

This was a routine evaluation to determine the adequacy of the original project design, to measure progress to date, and to consider whether, and if so, how much additional time and financial resources would be needed to achieve the project purpose.

The evaluation was conducted in the Southern Region. The USAID/Khartoum team arrived in Juba on November 17, proceeded on November 18, with representati of the RMOE and the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL), to Maridi, the site of the Institute for Regional Languages (IRL). The team returned to Juba on November 20, with representatives of the RMOE, SIL and IRL. On November 25, the USAID/Khartoum team returned to Khartoum.

Semi-structured group discussion, led by the USAID/Khartoum team of Project Officer, James Beebe, and Evaluation Officer, Arlene O'Reilly, was the most important technique used in the evaluation. Approximately 13 hours of discussions were held, mainly in Juba, with the following representatives of the grantee: Richard Bergman, Director SIL/Sudan, Juba; Julia Van Dyken, Literacy Advisor to IRL; and Morris Carney, Project Administrative Manager. More than 18 hours of discussions were held in Maridi with Job Dharuai Malou, Principal of IRL; Edward B. Mondeson, Vice Principal of IRL; Tarcesio Ahmad, Director of the Curriculum Development Center; Andrea Modi, Representative of the RMOE; and Richard Bergman and Julia Van Dyken of SIL. The UNESCO consultants working on the Integrated Rural Education Centers (IREC) program, B.N. Singh and Paul Balyejusa, participated in the discussion concerning the relationship of their project to the Literacy Training Project.

Informal discussions were conducted in Maridi with two Nuer language officers concerning their view of the project and the attitude of different groups in the Southern Sudan towards vernacular education. This topic was also explored informally with other SIL and IRL personnel in Maridi. Both Beebe and O'Reilly spent some time in a village near Maridi, where SIL was conducting linguistic research.

Evaluation plans called for an observational visit to a school where the materials were in use, but the announcement of a one week "local" holiday that coincided with the evaluation precluded this. Instead, with the help of a Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL consultant, Gary Cziko, interviews were arranged in Juba with two teachers who were using the materials in their school and with the Bari Language Officer responsible for overseeing the work in this language. Gary Cziko also participated in several of the sessions and elaborated on CAL's position on several points raised in CAL's reports. Previous reports by SIL and IRL were also reviewed. Direct observation was made of produced materials and of the constructed facilities. The Nile Press in Juba was visited and discussions were held with the manager.

Despite his having been invited, travel to Khartoum prevented Yithak Wel Lual, Director General of the RMOE, from participating in the Evaluation. USAID Social Scientist, Jerry Weaver and USAID/Juba Coordinator, Robert McCandliss were not able to participate in the evaluation because of other demands on their time.

15. External Factors

There have been no major changes in the project setting, including socio-economic conditions and host government priorities, which have had a major impact on the project. The two important assumptions that link education in the vernacular to literacy and literacy to development continue to appear valid.

16. Inputs

Both the RMOE and SIL have provided highly qualified and motivated personnel to the project, although there were delays in fielding qualified RMOE counterparts. RMOE support of the project activity, given limited human and financial resources, has been impressive. SIL, in cooperation with various local agencies, has been able to keep costs for commodities and construction considerably lower than other AID-funded projects in the Southern Sudan. Inputs that were supposed to have been furnished by other donors have been somewhat a problem. The Integrated Rural Education Centers (IREC's) have not been established by IBRD, the British curriculum development and teacher training experts for the Curriculum Development Center (CDC) have not yet arrived, and the two UNESCO curriculum development experts working at the project site have made little progress towards developing materials in local languages.

17. Outputs

As indicated in the attached "Project Outputs-Progress to Date" table, considerable progress has been made towards achieving the revised outputs.

18. Purpose

As originally defined, the purpose of the project was "to re-orient education in the Southern Sudan to the development needs of the rural majority and to bring quality up to standard norms for the lower primary grades." While few would question the desirability of re-orienting education and improving overall quality of education in the primary grades, a capability to "re-orient" the education system was from the very beginning beyond the scope of the project. A more realistic purpose of the project, and one that contributes directly towards improving the quality of education in the primary grades, is in the area of literacy education. The evaluation team re-defined the purpose statement to read "to develop a local institutional capability for producing literacy materials in vernacular languages and for introducing these materials into rural schools as part of a vernacular based literacy program."

The original End of Project Status (EOPS) statements were highly optimistic and placed too much emphasis on what it would mean to achieve a long term goal and not enough emphasis on what it would mean to achieve the project purpose. The original EOPS were defined in terms of:

1. Percentages of children in the trial program who could read and demonstrate a positive change in individual self-image and behavior patterns toward development; and

2. Percentages of adults achieving functional literacy at the end of six months in a trial literacy program.

An evaluation of these EOPS indicates that neither one provides an indication that education has been re-oriented. In the absence of reliable data concerning the conditions before the project was started, there is no indication that the quality of the system has improved.

At the time of this evaluation there were no students who had received a year of instruction with the new materials. Preliminary results from a testing program being conducted by CAL indicate that following several months of instruction with the materials some of the children's word identification and comprehension was consistent with the acquisition of literacy. The Southern Sudanese working with the project display a strong positive opinion of vernacular education; but there is, at present, no way of knowing whether this extends to children in the trial program. There is no adult literacy program nor plans to include one as part of this project within the period of AID assistance. However, outside the scope of this project, SIL could honor its commitment to the GOS by providing adult literacy materials in the vernacular.

As a result of the evaluation, the EOPS were revised as follows:

1. IRL is administering a primary program in the vernacular in 8 language areas, i.e., Bari, Dinka, Lotuko, Ndogo, Nuer, Zande, Kresh and Muro with external assistance.

2. About 6,000 primary students will be reading in the vernacular in one of four language areas.

3. A long term plan will have been formulated that will allow IRL to develop local capabilities for implementing a program without external assistance.

Against these revised indicators of the attainment of the purpose, progress is verifiable. Programs are well under way in four of the projected eight languages and are beginning in four additional vernacular languages and in the preparation of bridge materials in English and in Arabic. Only an approximate 1,000 students are now enrolled in programs using the materials, against a revised goal of 6,000 because none of the materials have been reproduced for wide scale use as it is now recognized that it takes at least three years for materials to reach this stage. While there is no long term plan for the operation of the IRL without outside technical assistance, progress, to date, consists of:

1. Sudanese counterparts administering the IRL.

2. Plans developed for establishing a Diploma course in applied linguistics at the University of Juba; and

3. Almost complete plans for the MA degree training for the IRL principal.

To achieve the conditions implied by the original EOPS, the timely introduction of vernacular language materials which will lead to increased literacy for both school age children and adults, will require more time and resources than originally anticipated.

19. Goal/Subgoal

A significant improvement in the literacy rate, which is estimated at approximately 10 percent for the region, is a necessary but not sufficient condition for reaching the goal. It was originally defined, "to provide the trained manpower necessary for Southern Sudan to raise levels of agricultural production, nutrition, health and participation in civic life for the rural population." The revised goal is "to promote the development of literacy" with the added phrase"... and the development of Southern Languages as a tool for increasing literacy." To date, there is no evidence that the project is contributing to the achievement of the goal, but there is reason to believe that the assumptions that link the purpose to the goal are valid and that the achievement of the purpose will make a major contribution toward the goal.

20. Beneficiaries

The ultimate beneficiaries of this project are the rural children of the Southern Region who will have a significantly increased chance of acquiring literacy. Direct beneficiaries of the project are RMOE and the IRL, as well as those children who receive the experimental materials in their classroom. The project is contributing useful institution building support to the RMOE, including construction of facilities, establishing systems, and providing formal, non-formal, and on-the-job training to individuals responsible for the preparation of materials and their introduction into the school system. For the rural children, the project is bringing learning materials to classrooms

where such materials are either in very short supply or non-existent. By introducing literacy to these children in their first language, the chances are increased that the majority of children, especially the more disadvantaged, will acquire sufficient literacy skills to maintain life-long literacy, despite the likelihood of being forced to drop out of school. Meanwhile, the minority of students who remain in the system should find literacy in second languages easier and the chance of success at higher levels of education improved.

21. Unplanned Effects

None identified.

22. Lessons Learned

As a result of the evaluation process, two lessons which may be common to other development projects and one lesson specific to this project emerged. The first "lesson learned" which may be common to other projects is that the original purpose and goal statements were much more ambitious than the other components of the project could justify. Any evaluation against these statements would have been meaningless. The second lesson is the importance of the process of evaluation in helping the different parties articulate the broader issues in a development project, such as possible conflict between production goals and institutional development, and the need to ensure that there is an opportunity to examine these issues.

The inclusion within the grant for an evaluation of the technical quality of the literacy materials produced by the project by a highly qualified outside organization proved to be extremely useful and the need to consider providing for independent evaluation of technical issues provides the final lesson recognized as a result of this evaluation.

23. Special Comments on Remarks

None.

Attachment:

Project Outputs--Progress To Date, 3 pages.

Progress Review Worksheet
PROJECT OUTPUTS-PROGRESS TO DATE

Evaluation for Period 7/79 to 11/80

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount) 9/30/81					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 81 TO DATE	CURRENT FY 81 TO END	FY 82	FY 83	END OF PROJECT
5. Transitional Materials Arabic and English (2 sets each)	PLANNED	–	–	4	–	–	4
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	0				
	REPLANNED			4	–	–	4
6. Grammar Analysis	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	11
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	4				
	REPLANNED			2	–	–	6
7. Vocabulary lists, Phonology analysis	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	16
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	8				
	REPLANNED			6	–	–	14
8. Facilities	PLANNED	1	–	–	–	–	1
a) Transit facilities in Juba.	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	1	–				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	–
b) Storeroom in Juba	PLANNED	1	–	–	–	–	1
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	1	–				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	–
c) Staff houses (6-3 Bedrooms) (6-2 Bedrooms)	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	12
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	1				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	9
d) Classroom/Library	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	1
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	0				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	–
e) Dormitory	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	1
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	99%				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	100%

Progress Review Worksheet

PROJECT OUTPUTS - PROGRESS TO DATE

Evaluation for Period 7/79 to 11/80

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount) 9/30/81					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 81 TO DATE	CURRENT FY 81 TO END	FY 82	FY 83	END OF PROJECT
1. Trained staff:	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	16
a) Language Officers	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	8				
	REPLANNED			4	–	–	12
b) Literacy Writers	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	–
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	8				
	REPLANNED			4	–	–	12
2. Training:	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	–
a) Teachers trained in 4 languages.	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	20				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	20
b) MA degree training in U.S. (36 Mos).	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	1
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	–				
	REPLANNED			–	1 for	18 Mos	at least
c) Short term 3rd country (1 Mos) B.A. degree (24 Mos)	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	2
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	–				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	1
d) 2 Ling. Participants Graduate/under graduate training in Khartoum	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	–
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	–				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	2
3. Language materials prepared and experimentally tested	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	16
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	4				
	REPLANNED			4	–	–	8
4. Literacy Materials Produced for large scale distribution in 4 Languages	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	8
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	–	0				
	REPLANNED			4	–	–	4

Project No. 650-0028

Progress Review Worksheet

PROJECT OUTPUTS- PROGRESS TO DATE

Evaluation for Period 7/79 to 11/80

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY 81		FY 82	FY 83	END OF PROJECT
			TO DATE	TO END			
f) Workshops	PLANNED	–	–	–	–	–	2
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE	0	0				
	REPLANNED			–	–	–	2
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						
	PLANNED						
	ACTUAL PERFORMANCE						
	REPLANNED						