

UNCLASSIFIED
CLASSIFICATION

PD-AAS-184
RN 42298

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE TRAINING FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROMOTERS			2. PROJECT NUMBER 520-0299	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE USAID/Guatemala
6. 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) 84-05	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>82</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>84</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>85</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION	
6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING			7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. Total \$ <u>922,000</u>			From (month/yr.) <u>09/01/82</u>	
B. U.S. \$ <u>420,000</u>			To (month/yr.) <u>06/30/84</u>	
			Date of Evaluation Review <u>09/10/84</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
1. Mission's OHR will advise PVO on mechanisms needed to improve skills application follow-up and materials support services for promoters.	G. Méndez, OHR	10/30/84
2. Mission will encourage MOH to advise PVO on development of appropriate community-based health care and environmental sanitation schemes.	C. Costello, DIR and P. Cohn, OPHP	12/31/84
3. Mission officials will discuss with NRC and other pertinent government agencies the need for more attention to the target area.	C. Costello USAID office directors	12/31/84
4. Mission will discuss and provide PVO a full Spanish report with recommendations for focussing on a more balanced health-education-agriculture approach.	G. Méndez	09/30/84
5. OHR will recommend to PVO mechanisms to improve community council organization.	G. Méndez, OHR	10/30/84

<p>9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Paper <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan a.g., CPI Network <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P _____</p>	<p>10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT</p> <p>A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change</p> <p>B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan</p> <p>C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project</p>
--	--

<p>11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)</p> <p><i>(Signature)</i> Gilberto Méndez, Education Advisor, OHR <i>(Signature)</i> Julio Díaz, Program Assistant, OHR</p>	<p>12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval</p> <p>Signature <i>(Signature)</i></p> <p>Typed Name Charles E. Costello, Director</p> <p>Date August 30, 1984</p>
---	---

13. SUMMARY:

This \$420,000, follow-up OPG to the Movimiento Guatemalteco de Reconstrucción Rural (MGRR), an IPVO, is supporting an integrated community development program aimed at improving living conditions in 36 villages (approximately 23,000 people) in Jalapa. The project consists of training 864 community promoters who are to help their communities utilize more effectively agricultural resource inputs (credit, fertilizer, seeds, equipment, etc.) and technical assistance as well as health and education services.

The project is on schedule regarding achievement of its outputs. Three hundred and fifty (350) promoters have been trained; an agriculture development committee exists in each village and three villages have legalized cooperatives; community development councils are being organized in each village, as expected. In terms of the project purpose, progress is encouraging but slow. The three cooperatives organized thus far are processing more and marketing their products on more favorable terms; 40 percent of the target individuals are using agricultural credit and records show that the repayment rate is 95 percent. New, higher value crops (wheat, coffee) have been introduced; commercial vegetables are being produced by area farmers; an outreach health system (two clinics, 26 community medicine deposits and an itinerant medical team) has been established; literacy and skills training group have been organized in several villages. However, findings from a community survey indicate that change diffusion is quite slow.

Priority has been given to the agriculture sector (with credit and technical assistance being the main mechanisms used) and health, education and community organization have been relegated to a secondary plane. Indicators of modernization (rates of modern agricultural practice adoption) suggest that progress has been modest. Regarding the health area, many people still rely on traditional healers ("curanderos") for help; the incidence of traditional (largely preventable) diseases is still very serious; 95 percent of the target population lacks potable water and simple environmental sanitation measures are not being taken. In terms of education, adult illiteracy is high (50%) and those who are literate have a low level of formal education achievement. There are no official extension or non-formal literacy programs in the area. The level of educational activity by community promoters has not been sufficient to mitigate this problem.

Regarding community organization/participation, it was found that a few committee officials and traditional formal leaders (auxiliary mayors) monopolize decision making, community project control while few community members vote to select formal or informal leaders. Trained community promoters have failed to act as development agents/catalysts thus far.

14. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY:

This is a progress evaluation conducted to assess project accomplishments at both the output (promoters trained) and purpose/goal (community impact)

levels. Two USAID/Guatemala employees, Gilberto Mendez and Julio Diaz, designed the survey instruments, trained the interviewers, supervised the data collection, tabulated the data, and analyzed progress against a logical framework.

The output level assessment consisted of: (1) A review of project courses in agriculture, health, literacy/skills training and community organization, focussing on aspects such as validity and organization of objectives, consistency, and organization of content, adequacy (specificity, variety) of instructional strategies and materials, evaluation standards, timing. (2) Interviews with a representative random sample of trained promoters, which focussed on the level of satisfaction, type of follow-up/supportive services received, generation and application of feedback information, etc.

The purpose level assessment consisted of a community survey in the target area. The survey profile is the following:

- N: 362 cases
- Level of confidence: 93%
- Sampling procedure: random, multi-stage
- Sampling frames: Lists and maps of communities
- Sampling units: Households
- Interviewers: 22; generally hired exclusively for the survey and trained by the evaluators.
- Case load/interviewer: 18
- Observation/Instrument: Structured, fixed-alternative format administered by interviewers.

15. EXTERNAL FACTORS:

Lack of development infrastructure has limited project impact. The MGRR has been working in the target area for 30 years but this is virtually the only institution which has continuous presence and adequate penetration in the area. The National Agricultural Credit Bank (BANDESA) has only two extension agents in the area and only seven percent of the credit users reported having received BANDESA credit over the last five years. Access roads were built in the area six years ago; however, lack of maintenance has rendered such roads nearly useless. Area residents rely on traditional means to deal with illnesses, with the MGRR health program representing the main assistance effort in this area; only one of the 36 target communities has potable water; the formal education infrastructure is very insufficient (the MGRR has helped build a few schools) and there are no public non-formal programs in the area.

16. INPUTS:

All project inputs have been provided on a timely basis and in the magnitude programmed. In addition to the OPG, the MGRR has managed to obtain \$350,000 from ESF local currency generations provided to the National

Reconstruction Committee (NRC), which oversee and coordinates PVO operations in Guatemala, and tapped the revolving fund provided to Agua del Pueblo, a potable water specialized IPVO. The MGRR has also received additional funding from abroad through the OAS, the Inter-American Foundation, CIDA, PACT and World Vision.

17. OUTPUTS:

The level of outputs thus far realized is adequate; the following table illustrates the programmed/achieved output relationship.

OUTPUT	Life of Project	Scheduled To Date	Achieved To Date
1. Trained promoters	830	350	350
2. Functioning Agricultural Committees	36	36	36
3. Functioning Community Councils	36	45% progress	45% progress
4. Functioning Regional Council	1	25% progress	25% progress

18. PURPOSE:

A network of community promoters (20 to 25 per community) will exist at the end of the project; each community should have functioning councils and agricultural committees and a regional development council will probably exist at the end of the project (EOP). However, these EOP conditions, although necessary may not be sufficient for achievement of the project purpose -- "support socio-economic development improvement in Jalapa." It is doubtful that the promoters will have received sufficient preparation and resources to act as development agents effectively. Consider, for example, the following findings from the promoter interviews.

- a. 60% of the promoters believe that the courses they received (30 hours each) are too short.
- b. 93% of the promoters believe that the courses are good and useful but perceive the benefits from the courses to be personal.
- c. Nearly all the promoters lack equipment and materials needed for demonstrations.
- d. Most promoters indicated that they do not follow any standard reporting procedures/forms; 63% of the promoters do not provide any information at all to the MGRR.

- e. 77% of the promoters indicated that they need instructional materials but have not received any materials from the MGRR.
- f. 70% of the promoters indicated that they neither organize nor attend committee meetings. Not surprisingly, these promoters do not know what other community promoters are doing.

19. GOAL/SUB-GOAL:

The OPG has no enunciated goal per se; nevertheless, it is implicit that the projects' higher order outcomes relate to improving living conditions in the target area. The Grantee's own goal is to "Improve economic productivity, general education, health conditions and civic preparation" in the area (MGRR Annual Report, 1983: Page 3). Accordingly, it is also necessary to assess the degree to which living conditions are improving.

Since adequate baseline data are not available, it is difficult to determine project progress toward improving living conditions. This evaluation does provide sound data which can be used in the future to assess project impact. At this time, progress toward improving living conditions can only be assessed by analyzing rates of diffusion. Survey findings indicate that change diffusion is slow and uneven (on a project component basis) as discussed below.

A. Agriculture:

Practically all (97%) of target individuals consider agriculture their livelihood; 50% work their land alone; 44% require labor from their families and the rest work the land on a partnership basis. All individuals produce corn; in addition, 62% produce beans; 20% produce coffee; 8% produce wheat. Accordingly, the MGRR's program emphasis on agriculture is well based. To date, slow agricultural modernization is evidenced as follows:

1. Wheat, a higher value crop, has been adopted by 8% of farmers. Coffee has long been cultivated in the area; thus it is difficult to ascertain what its diffusion rate is.
2. 11% of farmers are using certified seeds for corn and beans.
3. 40% use agricultural credit either in cash or in kind (e.g., fertilizer).
4. About half the farmers understand the relationship between a problem (insects, fungi, soil erosion, etc.) and a solution (insecticide, fungicide, terracing, etc.) but only 17% of them apply the solution.

5. 60% of the farmers indicated that they have improved their practices over the last five years; however, only 26 per cent of them have learned new techniques from extension agents.
6. Only 14% of the farmers seek advice from trained promoters to solve their problems.
7. The average yield for basic grains is slightly below the region's average and the range is wide -- as low as 10.5 hundred weights per acre and as high as 25.6 hundred weights per acre. Most farmers attribute yield variations to weather conditions.
8. Most farmers find out grain prices through intermediaries.
9. 70% of the farmers use rudimentary storage facilities to store surplus; about half do not use organic or synthetic means to preserve stored grain.

B. Health:

Health problems beset the target individuals; currently only one of 36 communities has potable water. The MGRR appears to be following a curative, outreach health program scheme instead of a promoter/midwife-based preventive scheme. The existence of two MGRR clinics and an ambulatory medical team represents progress for the area but long range coverage and cost implications call for a community-based, preventive health and environmental sanitation program. Consider, for example, the following health conditions.

1. Diarrhea and respiratory infections were reported as the main illnesses (90 and 95% of illness cases, respectively.)
2. Nearly half of all individuals see a "curandero" for medical help and about one third go to a rudimentary drug store for treatment. Only 19% go to a health clinic for medical help and 24% seek the advice of promoters.
3. 10% of mothers use oral rehydration salts to fight children's diarrhea; more than half of all children under seven do not get essential vaccinations and those who get them usually do not get booster shots. It came as no surprise that measles ranked fourth on the illness list.
4. 78% of the households have no latrines or other adequate excreta disposal system.
5. Animals are not confined and have access to living quarters in 90% of households.

6. Most individuals never boil drinking water and have no direct access to potable water.
7. The diet pattern for children and nursing mothers is quite inadequate (protein sources are not emphasized; vegetables and fruit are underutilized) and clearly shows lack of nutrition information.

C. Education:

Low levels of education represent a constraint to overall project progress. Half the adult population is illiterate, the average literate adult has completed only 2.5 grades of formal schooling. Most literate adults very seldom read newspapers, books, magazines or similar printed materials. Radio is the predominant information channel in the area. Most adults in the area have a very positive attitude toward education (as measured by attitude scales used in the survey) and are willing to participate in adult literacy/skills training courses. Furthermore, most parents in the area have realistic expectations for their children -- completion of an elementary education, which indicates improved generational options for education.

Survey findings indicate that only 17% of adults belong to literacy groups formed by promoters or MGRR extension agents. Only one of every four literacy groups integrates literacy to skills tracks in agriculture, health, small enterprises, appropriate technology, etc. The skills being taught emphasize production of items for local and outside consumption (e.g., candle-making, dollies-making, etc.)

D. Community Organization/Participation:

Training of local promoters and development of local committees/councils are essential to help communities help themselves. The MGRR's efforts to generate community self-help efforts need more attention, as the level of community participation is modest, as evidenced by the following survey findings:

1. 98% of adults believe that it is important to belong to development committees/councils; however, only seven percent of them belong to such groups.
2. 75% of adults are willing to participate in community projects, have time to do so and have participated in projects in the past. As participation has consisted mainly of providing hand labor, the MGRR ought to facilitate more meaningful types of participation.
3. The order of priority for community self-help projects is: water, schools, road improvement, community centers, health clinics. However, few communities seem to have the

wherewithal and drive to undertake water projects. Likewise, participation in road improvement has not been strong. The MGRR should focus their community organization efforts on solving priority problems.

4. Survey scales used to determine the nature and extent of community participation produced data which overwhelmingly indicate that participation is generally indirect (mediated by municipal authorities and a few committee officials) and sporadic.
5. Less than one third of adults have voted to select "their" community promoters or committee officials. There is little evidence that would indicate that adults assemble to select representatives; accordingly, if decisions are arrived at through consensus, few individuals are participating.
6. There is little community participation in decision-making by community members. A few committee officials and municipal authorities decide what problems are more serious, what projects are more urgent, what courses should be offered, and what is to be done by whom and when.

20. BENEFICIARIES:

A. Direct Beneficiaries:

The MGRR is to provide training to 864 promoters from 36 communities, in the areas of agriculture, health, adult education and community organization/participation. These promoters will benefit from the new knowledge/skills acquired through the courses.

73% of the promoters are young and thus training has long pay-off potential. 98% of promoters are literate; most have completed up to three grades of elementary education. 70% have an average yearly family income of Q600; 30% have an average family income of Q900; both levels are below the national average (Q1,059). Their main income source is the sale of their agricultural products.

B. Indirect Beneficiaries:

The target population which will ultimately benefit from the project consists of subsistence farmers. 78% are married and have an average of six children. 91% own small plots of land (2.4 acres average) and sub-standard houses. There is no irrigation in the area and most of the terrain is rough.

Even though the population is stable and most have lived in their communities for at least 20 years, about one third migrate for short-term seasonal wage-labor agriculture. Nearly 40% reported that short-term jobs

outside agriculture are undertaken in the area. The average daily wage in the area is Q1.58. The socio-economic status (SES) index developed for the survey clearly places the majority of indirect beneficiaries below the direct beneficiaries.

21. UNPLANNED EFFECTS:

Not pertinent at this time.

22. LESSONS LEARNED:

It is obvious that the MGRR cannot do the development support job required in the target area by itself. Strong government and PVO support is needed in the area. The MGRR is a strong and well funded IPVO; however, their work should complement, not substitute, Government development services. Mission officials will discuss with MGRR, NRC and other pertinent government agencies the need/possibility of more attention to the target area.

23. SPECIAL COMMENTS:

IPVO's in Guatemala do not seem to have the capacity to undertake meaningful program evaluations. Over the past few months, the Mission has conducted evaluations for IPVO's with the dual purpose of assessing project progress and helping IPVOs deploy adequate evaluation systems. As a result, a tested model for evaluating IPVO programs has been developed; this model will be transmitted to the appropriate AID/W offices, as other Missions may experience similar IPVO evaluation problems and may find the model useful.