

5270148001502

ISN ?
495527-0148
PD-ANS-5134CLASSIFICATION
PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS			2. PROJECT NUMBER 527-0148	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Peru
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			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) 10	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY: <u>77</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>79</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>82</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. Total \$ <u>3,200,000</u>			From (month/yr.) <u>8/77</u>	
B. U.S. \$ <u>1,590,000</u>			To (month/yr.) <u>12/80</u>	
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>12/80 - 1/81</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

See Item 23

B. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper | <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement | <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P | _____ |

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

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

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

Paul White, USAID/Peru, Chief, Comm. Serv. Div.; Evaluator
Orlando Rojas, Community Services Division
Vicente Huate, OSPE
Claude Boyd, Consultant
Julian Poirar, MinEducation, 8th. Region

12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval

Signature: *Howard Lusk*

Typed Name: Howard Lusk, Actg. Director

Date: _____

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY

EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS

Project No. 527-0148

13. Summary

The project purpose is to test, on an experimental basis, the capability of centralized centers (ESC)* to increase the quality, availability and use of educational services. Four school districts, Trujillo, Huamachuco, Pacasmayo, and Cachicadan, representing differing geographic and socio-economic realities, were selected as the minimum mix of project sites necessary for testing the ESC concept.

The Project was designed to be implemented over four years. All centers were to be constructed, equipped and ready for receiving students by the end of 1979. The final two years of the Project were to be used to evaluate operational aspects and educational impacts of the ESCs. Due to delays in project implementation, explained later in this evaluation, two centers will open in mid-1981; two in early 1982. Therefore, the Project is over two years behind schedule.

The MOE is now giving the Project priority and firm support. During the last four months of 1980, substantial implementation advances were made and the ESC model was placed in the National Development Plan as the MOE's model for secondary education. The evaluator believes that prospects are good for successful achievement of the project goal and purpose if the MOE maintains its current level of interest and support.

14. Evaluation Methodology

This formative evaluation was conducted in order to measure the progress of the Project against the targets set out in the PP and to

-
- * The ESC concept consists of utilization of a central, readily accessible school with a large physical plant, as a center for providing practical technical education to supplement the theoretical education normally received in smaller schools. The ESC is equipped with facilities, equipment for laboratories and workshops, libraries, and guidance services. Surrounding schools utilize these centralized services on a regularly scheduled basis. The concept is more cost effective than the alternative of providing separate equipment and facilities on an individual school basis.

develop recommendations for improving project implementation. This is the first evaluation of the Project since its initiation in August of 1977.

The evaluation was conducted by the Project Manager in coordination with officials of the MOE's Office of Sectoral Planning. It was reviewed by the Project Committee and by the Mission Evaluation Officer prior to being finalized. The evaluator used the following documents and information sources in preparing the evaluation: official project documents; USAID monthly and quarterly reports; consultant reports; Engineering Office and engineering supervision reports; on-site inspection; and interviews with officials from USAID, the MOE and with officials from other institutions that have been associated with the Project. The evaluation was drafted during December 1980 and January 1981, and covers the period from August of 1977 through December of 1980.

15. External Factors

Three major external factors have had significant impacts on the Project: the inclusion of rural centers (the project design envisioned only urban centers), the change in government and inflation. The GOP's original ESC concept was an urban facility located in school districts characterized by high student density. During project design, the MOE requested adding a rural component. USAID readily agreed because this coincided with the Congress' Mandate to target AID programs on the rural poor. Economies of scale inherent in larger urban facilities were lost because, as the number of students decreased, the cost of the facility did not decrease proportionately, resulting in a higher average cost per student in rural centers. (The evaluator estimates that per student costs in the rural centers will triple those in the urban centers.)

After twelve years of military rule, Peru returned to democratic government in 1980. A civilian government was inaugurated on July 18, 1980. Prior to the change, there was a long transition period where project activity was virtually suspended because politics was dominating all activities. After the change, new officials had to study the Project prior to proceeding. The change added almost one year's delay to a project that was already one year behind schedule. This, combined with the tremendous increases in construction costs, has reduced the scope of the Project (covered in the 'INPUT' section of this evaluation).

16. Inputs

The provision of inputs to the Project has been substantially different from that projected in the PP. In December 1979 it became apparent that cost increases in the construction component would limit the Project to two rather than four centers. A joint USAID-MOE budget reprogramming exercise was initiated to free enough money from the project budget to permit construction of at least three centers. A concurrent search for additional funding was also conducted.

By mid-1980 a solution had been worked out which permitted construction of all four centers. Some 380,000,000 Soles (\$127,000) from the PL-480 Title I fund were added to the project budget and an extensive reprogramming of project funds was carried out. Chart I summarizes the reprogramming results.

The technical assistance (TA) component was reduced from \$380,000 to \$124,000. TA speciality areas were maintained but were reduced in duration from 63 to 39 person-months of services. (See Chart II). Reducing TA weakened the Project but did not, in the opinion of the evaluator, jeopardize accomplishing the project goal and purpose. The quality of TA has been good but the assistance has been short-term, limited in scope and its effect has not been cumulative. Use of long-term TA will help to tie together some of the work of previous consultants and focus the TA effort more closely on the overall direction of the Project.

Training in the United States was cut from \$100,000 (46 participants-months) to \$45,000 (18 participant-months). In-country training was cut from \$65,000 to \$36,000. (See Chart III). Given the scarce amount of resources available for training, the MOE is seriously considering eliminating all U.S. training. It feels that more persons can be trained longer and more thoroughly by training in-country, utilizing U.S. and local instructors. Longer vocational training programs might be carried out under UNESCO auspices. The original purpose of the training component can be met within the limited budget available if the MOE's plan is followed.

Commodity funding was increased from \$345,000 to \$450,000. Equipment lists are being finalized now but need to be reviewed to insure proper fit with the curriculum, shop and laboratory areas that have been or are being constructed. TA will be needed to carry-out this task. The \$450,000 will be sufficient to buy the basic equipment needed to initiate activities at the four centers but additional funding will be needed to fully equip the centers. The MOE is searching for a source of additional funds for equipment.

Construction costs have escalated in an impressive manner since this Project was designed. (See Chart IV). The readjusted budget provides 679,100,000 Soles (\$2,264,000) for the construction of the four centers. This includes 70,000,000 Soles (\$233,000) from the original MOE counterpart contribution, 398,105,700 Soles (\$1,328,000) from the 1980 PL 480 Title I fund and 210,959,800 Soles (\$703,000) from the AID Grant. An additional \$250,000 will be available from the 1981 PL 480 Title I budget. These funds are sufficient to fully fund the construction component through the end of the Project.

Although there were significant delays caused by problems in land titling, changes in plans and specifications and location of construction sites, the GOP met its input commitments scheduled for the construction

phase of the Project - provision of land and construction counterpart funding. It is making plans to meet additional input commitments related to the provision of personnel, operational costs, materials, maintenance costs, and other such items.

17. Outputs

Outputs targets for 1981 have not been met because the Project is two years behind schedule. Most of these targets will be met by the end of 1981 (exception will be evaluation targets which won't be met until late 1981). (See Table I) Following is the status of assumptions linking project inputs to outputs.

a. A sufficient number of qualified candidates available for training. This assumption remains valid. The MOE has identified a considerable number of science teachers who are already qualified to teach. A similar list of vocational teachers is being prepared. These candidates will not need extensive training in their speciality fields but will need orientation training on the ESC concept and may require refresher training in their specialties.

b. Construction material and school equipment prices will remain reasonable. Not valid. Increased costs have forced a restructuring of the budget and a general limiting of the scope of the Project. Some of the changes made due to the cutbacks have not yet been adequately documented in project files. The Peruvian Institute of Educational Promotion (IPFE) administers project funds and is responsible for contracting the construction and supervision of construction at the four sites. IPFE should be requested to adequately document all changes in construction plans and specifications.

c. Foreign expertise available to adapt the ESC concept to the Peruvian reality. Valid. TA, in general has been available and excellent. Two limiting factors have inhibited full achievement of this assumption. First, the TA budget cuts have reduced the amount of assistance. Second, tight control of project planning by the MOE's Planning Office has limited the adaption of the ESC concept to the reality of each center. TA, more than any other effort, has forced the inclusion of local reality into project planning activities. But, because of budget cuts, the TA has been sporadic and, to some extent, uncoordinated. The provision of a long-term consultant stationed in Trujillo would correct these deficiencies.

18. Purpose

The purpose of the Project is to test on a pilot and experimental basis the ability of ESCs to increase the quality, availability and use of education services for students and adults in selected school districts containing predominantly disadvantaged populations. The PP, written in May-June 1977, anticipated that by the end of 1981 the ESC

TABLE I

PLANNED AND ACHIEVED OUTPUTS

<u>OUTPUT</u>	<u>PLANNED BY 1981</u>	<u>ACHIEVED TO DATE</u>
1. ESCs		
Service Centers	4	2 (constructed)
Equipped	4	0
2. Services/Facilities		
Libraries	4	0
Skill Shops	29	14
Science labs	8	4
Agriculture plots	2	1
Primary classrooms	12	4
Health room	4	0
Audio Visual	4	2
Material production	4	2
Teacher training	4	0
Physical educ.	4	0
Community dev.	4	0
3. Trained Personnel		
Instructional	90	90
Administrative	26	26
4. Regional Personnel	6	12
5. Evaluation Reports		
Effectiveness	5	0
Costs	5	0
Coverage	5	0
Community Support	5	0
Revenue generation	5	0
Replicability	1	0

concept would have been tested for two years and the purpose of the Project would have been achieved. This will not be accomplished within this timeframe but is achievable by the end of 1983.

The PP called for substantial remodeling of existing buildings (7,460 square meters in Trujillo and 420 square meters in Cachicadan) based upon several studies by private consulting firms. Soil and structural studies carried out during Project implementation led to the conclusion that remodeling was not prudent. Project implementation was delayed to do a complete redesign of these two centers. Architectural advisors from CONESCAL told project architects to up-grade preliminary designs to a more sophisticated level and to add more square meters of construction than was originally contemplated. These changes were rejected by the MOE, requiring more redesign and delays. Additional delays were encountered when the community of Cachicadan acquired a better construction site after the final design for the old site was completed. This required another new design. As a result of these and other delays, the architectural design phase required almost a year rather than the planned three months.

The bid procedure for construction of the four centers was initiated in the Spring of 1979. Over thirty firms responded. Seven were prequalified and bids were opened on June 25, 1979. The lowest responsive bid was 20% under all other bids but was still almost \$80,000 above available funding due to changes in design, increases in square meters of construction, elimination of remodeling in favor of new construction, and inflation. Project funds were only sufficient to construct two of the four centers. A contract for the first two centers was signed in September of 1979. Additional funding was found and construction contracts for the second set of two centers were signed in December of 1980.

The above paragraphs indicate that the original project design was faulty and that major problems and deficiencies were encountered during the initial year of implementation that severely delayed the progress of the Project and reduced its scope. Despite the changes in plans and specifications and the modification of some EOPS target figures, the EOPS conditions are still considered to be good descriptions of what should exist when the project purpose is achieved. Progress towards and/or modification in each EOPS condition follows.

EOPS

a. Three types of ESCs should be in operation in four school districts serving a combined student and adult population of 30,000. Four centers will be functioning in four school districts. A more realistic estimate of direct beneficiaries over the short-term is 15,000. Over time, the number served will approach the PP estimate of 30,000.

b. The second EOPS lists service areas to be provided; including job skills training areas, science laboratories, libraries, primary classrooms,

art workshops, audiovisual support rooms, health rooms and physical education facilities. Key job skill training workshops and natural and physical science laboratories were retained but many of the other areas were eliminated due to lack of funds. Many of these cutbacks were justified by focusing project activities on grades 7, 8 and 9 instead of grades 1 through 9 as was contemplated in the PP. The tighter project focus brings the project design more closely in line with the original GOP concept of an ESC and it enhances the chance for lasting Project impact by concentrating efforts on the age-level where the most impact can be made utilizing this particular project concept.

c. Trained Peruvians from the Eighth Educational Regional offices will be able to carry out additional training with minimal outside assistance. The evaluator was impressed by the quality of the Eighth Region staff associated with this Project. Many have been involved since the earliest planning stages and fully understand the ESC concept. They are capable educators and should have no trouble fulfilling this EOPS condition.

d. The PP projected an ESC staff of 90 teachers (18 new hires) and 26 administrative/support personnel (all new hires). Initially, no more than 50 education and administrative personnel will be needed to staff the four centers due to cutbacks in the scope of the Project. Many of these people can be found 'within the system,' enabling the MOE to pick 'known quantities' for key positions.

e. The evaluation of the ESCs and their impact on education services will be completed at the end of the Project. The original plan was to have two full years of active project life (1980 and 1981) to evaluate the centers in operation. But, by the PACD (March 1982), only two of the centers will have been in operation (6 months) and the other two will just be ready to receive students. This will not form an adequate base for evaluating the impact of the Project. Evaluation will either have to take place after the AID funding life of the Project or the PACD will have to be extended for one year. The evaluator recommends following the first alternative and funding evaluation activities using PD and S funds.

f. Finally, a series of EOPS measurements were outlined for determining the impact of the ESCs on learning and achievement, occupational aspirations, job possibilities and on costs of education. The evaluator is not aware of any systematic collection of baseline data that is being carried out at this time. Without baseline data no impact measurement can take place. TA should be provided to assist the MOE set up an evaluation scheme and initiate baseline data collection activities.

All assumptions linking project outputs to purpose remain valid. With the reduced scope of the project the GOP can realistically meet these assumptions.

19. Goal

The goal of the Project is to make the education system more responsive to the needs of the poor majority of Peruvians. It is impossible to measure the Project's impact on the level of school enrollment, student repeater rates, levels of urban unemployment, etc., at this time. However, two elements important for goal achievement seem to be somewhat off-track, both related to project beneficiaries. First, the PP's social analysis indicates that the majority of beneficiaries will be from low income families and that educational facilities available to them are sub-standard. Some schools with adequate but under-utilized space and equipment are being considered for inclusion in the Trujillo system. Second, the effort to make the system more responsive by eliciting community participation during the construction phase, and by involving the community, local and regional MOE officials in the programming and planning phase has been weak. At this point the Project is being over-controlled by the Central Ministry. OSPE has not allowed Eighth Region officials to participate in project decisions and because of this, the Project is not being as responsive as it could be to the unique socio-cultural characteristics and educational needs of each center site. USAID should encourage a more active participation role for communities. This can best be accomplished through provision of long-term TA, based in Trujillo rather than Lima.

The assumptions linking project purpose to goal are still valid. The GOP is committed to the concept of developing relevant education programs for disadvantaged Peruvians and resources have been forthcoming to implement programs in disadvantaged areas. Only after a year of actual ESC operation can it be determined that the Center's operational costs are manageable for the GOP. The MOE remains committed to decentralization and is planning to decentralize educational planning even more by putting more responsibility on schools rather than on nuclear centers.

The real test of the likelihood of achieving the Project goal is still far into the future. The goal will not be reached unless the pilot activity is replicated on a wide scale. The GOP has taken the first steps towards this by elevating the priority of the Project to a level far above that of the previous government, by accelerating the implementation schedule so that the ESCs can open for operation earlier and be evaluated sooner, and by including the ESC concept in its sector strategy statement in the National Development Plan for 1981-1985.

20. Beneficiaries (See Section 18 and 19)

21. Unplanned Effects

Not pertinent at this time.

22. Lessons Learned

Not pertinent at this time.

23. Special Comments or Remarks

Following are the recommendations and actions resulting from this evaluation:

<u>Action</u>	<u>Responsible Agency</u>	<u>Target Action Completion Date</u>
Seek additional funding for training, equipment and TA components	USAID and MOE	-
Hire TA to design evaluation scheme for determining educational impacts, comparison of educational costs, etc. (3-5 weeks)	USAID	6/81
Hire TA to study construction costs for ESC as compared to ESEP and MOE force account construction; compute per student costs and compare with PP figures (3-5 weeks)	USAID	7/81
Hire long-term TA to work in Trujillo (6-8 months) administration and curriculum, general vocational education background	USAID	5/81
Hire TA for curriculum area (6 weeks)	USAID	5/81
Hire local TA to finalize equipment lists (1 month)	MOE	3/81
Move operational control of project to Trujillo	USAID/MOE	3/81
Require Trujillo to develop operational and administrative plans for all centers	USAID/MOE	6/81
Request justification for each participating satellite school based on a) low income, and b) lack of space and equipment	MOE	4/81
Identify all changes made in plans and specifications during construction phase	IPFE	4/81

Encourage more community participation	MOE	4/81
Do impact evaluation in Oct. 1983 utilizing PD&S funds; don't extend PACD	USAID	10/83

This evaluation consists of 11 pages, including a cover sheet summary (PES Part I), and the following attachments:

- Chart I - AID Contribution to ESCs (Reprogrammed Budget)
- Chart II - Technical Assistance Reprogramming
- Chart III - Training Reprogramming
- Chart IV - Construction Costs for ESCs
- Chart V - Espino Report

CHART I

A.I.D. CONTRIBUTION TO

EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS

PROJECT No. 527-0148

(In thousands of dollars)

Items	Original Programming 1977	Proposed Readjusted Programming	Differences
I. Technical Assistance	320.0	124.0	196.0 (-)
II. Training	165.0	81.0	84.0 (-)
III. Commodities	345.2	450.3	105.1 (+)
IV. Construction	611.8	770.5	158.7 (+)
V. Other Costs	145.0	164.2	19.2 (+)
TOTALS	1,590.0	1,590.0	- . -

EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS

PROJECT No. 527-0148

(In Thousands of Dollars)

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Consultants and/or Specialists	Original Programming \$320	Current Programming \$124
1 Learning Resources Specialist	24 months \$120	12 month \$ 60 (USA)
1 Vocational Education Specialist	16 months \$ 80	6 months \$ 32 (USA)
1 Education Specifications	1 month \$ 5	1 month \$ 7 (USA)
1 Science Education Specialist	8 months \$ 40	6 months \$ 8 (Peru)
1 Education Economist	5 months \$ 24	2 months \$ 2 (Peru)
1 Arch. Engineering Specialist	1 month \$ 5	2 month \$ 3 (Peru)
1 Researcher and Evaluation Specialist	8 months \$ 40	10 months \$ 12 (Peru)
Available	\$320	\$124
	63	37

CHART III

EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS

PROJECT N° 527-0148

(In thousands of dollars)

TRAINING

Training	Original Programming	Proposed Adjusted Programming
In U.S.A.	100.0 (46 p/m)	45.0 (18 p/m)
In-Country Training	65.0 (workshops, seminars)	36.0 (3 workshops)
Total	165.0	81.0

CHART IV

CONSTRUCTION COSTS FOR ESCs (\$000)

<u>Center</u>	<u>PP Projection</u>	<u>Actual/Estimated</u>	<u>Increase</u>
Cachicada	150	733.3	389%
Huamachuco	210	444.4	111%
Pacasmayo	445	677.4	52%
Trujillo	305	408.4	34%