

PD - AAT - 458

~~25188~~

F I N A L R E P O R T

25188

ON

DEVELOPMENT OF A PROJECT PAPER

FOR

RURAL PRIMARY EDUCATION

IN

EL SALVADOR

PROJECT No. 519-15-169-168 - 6802

Submitted to: USAID/ES

BY

Lic. Salvador Fonseca
PSC
Contract No. 519-187

San Salvador
January 1979

Dr. Peter E. Tobia
PSC
Contract No. 519-134

INTRODUCTION

The following are the highlights of our work as personal services contractors to assist in the development of a project paper for Rural Primary Education in El Salvador. Our work principally was in the Ministry of Education as members of the Ministry of Education's team to develop a proposal for the Ministry and at the same time to provide the necessary information, data, plans, etc. to USAID/ES to prepare a loan-grant proposal for representation to AID/Washington to partially finance the Ministry's program.

Our work was in direct response to one of the recommendations in the Educational Sector Analysis to provide more access to rural primary school youngsters in the fourth, fifth and sixth grade. Taking action on this recommendation the Ministry of Education designed Strategic Program Number 25, to Modernize and Expand Educational Services in the Rural Areas.

All of our efforts have been as a team from the very start of our contracts. We feel that we have accomplished our assignment as the Ministry's proposal will be presented to the Director of Basic Education, the Director of Educational Planning (ODEPOR) for review and then to the Minister of Education, during the week of the 29th of January 1979, and USAID/ES is developing their proposal in final draft form and it should be completed early in February 1979.

Throughout our work we have received the utmost cooperation from staff members of the Ministry of Education and USAID/ES. For this cooperation we express our appreciation.

Since the studies, tables, related materials, and plans are voluminous we have not attached copies to this report, rather, we have provided both the Ministry of Education (ODEPOR) and USAID/ES (Project Officer, Education Division) a copy of all of the materials generated.

The details of this final report are contained in the following pages.

Activities, Findings and Problems.

1. During the entire contract period, we participated in many meetings with various officials and staff members of USAID/ES, the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Interior (DIDECO), and the Ministry of Planning, for example during the month of October we had 23 such meetings. These meetings were principally of three types: orientational, informational and/or work sessions. The results of these meetings were discussed with the Project Officer, and with other staff members of the USAID/ES team who were involved in the project, such as the Loan Officer, Engineer, Controller, etc., for the purpose of providing information and obtaining feedback related to our work.

In addition to these meetings, we had informal discussions with the Project Officer, when necessary on a daily basis, and on an average over the contract period of three times a week. The purpose of these discussions were to: report progress, to discuss the results of our research, to discuss problems and possible solutions, to make recommendations for inclusion in the project paper and to exchange information. These same type of informal sessions were conducted with other members of the USAID/ES team as well as appropriate persons in the Ministry of Education, especially with the Director of the Education Planning Office, ODEPOR and the Director of the Basic Education Department.

2. Shortly after our contract began the Ministry of Education formed a working committee to develop a proposal for a Rural Education project, to be partially financed by the Government of El Salvador and USAID/ES. This committee included representatives of the Ministry's Planning Office, Basic Education Department, Educational Architecture Department, Educational TV, and the Technical Pedagogy Services Department. We became an integral part of this team. Further the Ministry appointed two members of the committee to work with us on a full time basis.

We had committee meetings, normally once a week to discuss progress, problems and to present solutions which were usually the results of a sub-committee studying a specific problem. In addition to these committee meetings, we worked with various members of the committee augmented as required by other members of the Ministry of Education to carry out research, develop a procedure, or to analyse the results of our research, etc.

For example while we were reviewing and analyzing the Educational Map of the Ministry of Education to develop a list of communities which required new or expanded educational facilities, we formed as many as four teams for this activity.

During the last three weeks of our contract our work was intensified and most of the committee members participated in the final preparation of the proposal for the Ministry of Education.

3. At the outset of our work, the series of documents which contained the Educational Sector Analysis were obtained, organized and reviewed. Copies of the missing documents were obtained to make the set complete. The set is on file in USAID/ES, Education Division.

Visits were also made to various offices in the Ministry of Education to search for other materials, studies, and documents, which would be valuable as resource materials for our work. One of the most valuable studies which was encountered was the Educational Map, with its related documents. This Map was compiled during the period of May-August 1978. The basic instrument used in gathering data contained 8 pages. The Map, the basic documents and all of the tabulation tables were made available to us for our work.

4. During the latter part of October 1978, we collaborated with members of ODEPOR, in preparing a letter from the Ministry of Education to the Director of USAID/ES. The purpose of this letter was to request USAID to participate in preparing a proposal

for improving education in the rural areas of El Salvador in response to the Ministry's program 25. This letter in its final form was sent to USAID early in November 1978.

5. One of the first actions of the Committee of the Ministry of Education was to determine in which departments of the country the project should be oriented for the construction of new or expanded educational facilities. Using data contained in the Sector Analysis Doc. Estad. de Trab. No. 7, we developed a table arranged in priority order by departments in which there was the most need to the least need in the rural areas, for educational facilities. The department which had the greatest need was Morazán and the least San Salvador. From this table we developed five alternatives. This information was presented to the Committee and the Committee decided that priority should be given to the departments which have the greatest need, and which were completely or partially within the "critical areas" as defined by the Salvadorean Government, and that these departments should be divided into two priorities. Therefore priority one includes (in order of need) the departments of Morazán, San Miguel and La Unión and priority two, the departments of Chalatenango and Cabañas. Based on this decision, we began our research to make a micro analysis of the needs for schools and classrooms in the rural areas of the departments included in priority area one, and then continued with the departments in priority area two.

6. As a first step in carrying out our research and analysis on the needs for new or expanded educational facilities in priority one and two departments, we received a detailed orientation on the process which had been used to develop the Educational Map, including the instrument which was used as the basic document to gather data, and other information on the tables which were used to tabulate data. This orientation was provided by the Chief Supervisor of the Basic Education Department, who was in charge of the project,

and his assistants. The Chief Supervisor also provided us with working space to carry out our study.

We then spent several days studying and reviewing the questionnaires, the tabulation sheets, asking questions, and having discussions with the supervisors, to obtain a thorough knowledge of the entire Educational Map project.

As a result of our work we designed five tables to record the information we felt we needed, and developed techniques and procedures to determine which communities needed educational facilities, and how many classrooms would be required. We also determined that the communities which required educational facilities would be classified under five categories as follows:

- Expansion of existing schools,
- Expansion and substitution of existing schools which were in poor condition.
- Construction of schools in communities where a school did not exist but where there was a population (7-15 years) not attending school,
- Substitution of one room schools in poor condition which would provide access to more youngsters, and,
- Expansion of schools which already had six grades but where there was a substantial population in the community not attending school due to the lack of sufficient facilities.

We then tested our procedures, techniques and tables by doing the review and analysis of the Department of Morazán by ourselves. With this experience, we then made the necessary changes, so we could continue with the other departments. We then formed two teams using two members of the committee who had been assigned to work on the project on a full time basis. Each one of us took a new member to make a team of two. When they were sufficiently experienced, we then split again and formed four teams, training the new member to make a team of two. When they were sufficiently experienced, we then split again and formed four teams, training the new members in the operations of the work.

When we finished the review and analysis of the Educational Map and had the information recorded, we then began the analysis to list the communities under the appropriate category, and to estimate the number of classrooms required in each case. The hand written work sheets, (we made one copy of these) we used for this process are on file in the Ministry of Education, ODEPOR. We reviewed over 1000 questionnaires and/or data sources, during the course of this analysis.

To estimate the number of classrooms required, we made a study of the distribution of students in the rural areas in grades 1-6 to arrive at a percentage of students which normally are in each grade. Using these percentages, we then developed a table to determine how many classrooms would be required for a school population starting with 100 youngsters, and progressing to 500 youngsters, with increments of 50 youngsters in each group. (100, 150, 200, etc., to 500). We based the number of classrooms required on the total possible 7-15 year old population of a community, both those reported in school in 1978 and the estimated amount reported not in school in 1978. Also we used the premise that the classroom would be available for two separate sessions each day. The results of this study and the table we used for our guide is included in the files of studies in the Ministry of Education and USAID/ES.

From the analysis we then proceed to make lists of communities for each of the categories previously mentioned. These lists contained a reference to our worksheets the complete name of the community and the municipality in which it was located the number of classrooms estimated as being required, and the availability of land for construction of the school. As a result of this work, the lists contain a total of 378 communities, located in 75 municipalities, with estimated needs for 671 classrooms in the three departments in priority one area. In the two departments in priority two areas, the lists contain a total of 224 communities, in 33 municipalities, with estimated needs for 511 classrooms. These lists

and corresponding summary tables are also included in the project file in the Ministry of Education and USAID/ES.

Due to many factors, the amount of classrooms to be constructed under the project has not been fixed, however, it now appears that the number will be approximately 700. The lists contain many more than has been anticipated for construction, based on actual needs, allowing for possible situations which might eliminate a community from these lists, for example:

- Before the final lists are prepared a visit will be made to the community by a team from the Ministry of Education, of a Social Promoter and the Educational Supervisor of the circuit in which the community is located. During this visit the community may opt to not be included, perhaps land will not be available for construction, perhaps the population figures reported in the questionnaire may not have been accurate, etc. Therefore the community may be eliminated.
- While we were in the process of completing the lists, the representative of CARE visited us to discuss the possibility of constructing some schools in one of the departments of priority two area. We showed him what we had done and indicated that a list could be provided to him for his consideration and if he decided to accept the list provided then these communities would be eliminated from the lists we prepared.
- The Salvadorean Community Development Agency, DIDECO had a requirement for a list of communities where schools were needed for possible financing by an agency they are working with. They were interested in communities in one of the departments of priority two area. We provided them with a list of 24 communities in that department needing schools. If this project is formalized then these communities will be eliminated from the lists we prepared.

= The new World Bank loan (IBRD IV) is in preparation and when it is approved it is possible that a few of the communities in our lists may be included for construction as part of the World Bank loan for nuclear schools. Therefore, these communities will be eliminated from our lists. Since we began the study we found that the Ministry of Education, using their own funds, as well as funds loaned by the World Bank (IBRD II) was constructing schools in the departments which constitute priority one and two, as well as in other areas of the country. Where these communities were found on our lists, they were eliminated.

- We anticipate savings in the cost of construction based on the innovated design that has been developed by the committee and accepted by the Ministry of Education. Whatever savings there are can be translated into more classroom construction beyond the estimated 700 we now are considering as one of the goals of the project.

Upon completion of the study to establish which communities had needs for new or expanded educational facilities, a visit was made to nine communities which were included in the lists. The purposes of the visit were to see the actual school which may have been listed as in poor condition; the school which may have been listed to be expanded; land available in a community which had been listed as not having a school, etc. Also this visit provided an opportunity to see a Ministry of Education Social Promotor in action.

A three day visit was made by two members of the Committee and a Special Promoter. We saw 7 schools, 2 plots of land for new schools talked with a teacher (school was not in session when we made our visit as we completed the study late in November and the school year ended earlier in the month.), leaders and members of 3 communities,

youngsters who had attended school in 1978, and the Mayor of one of the municipalities included in the study. We found that community interest was high in regard to participating in a school construction program and that in two communities where there was no school, that land was available to build a school. We visited each of the plots of land.

In one community, under the DIDECO Community Development Program, approximately 3/4 of a kilometer of access road was built by the community from the highway to the edge of the land for building the school to provide access to the site for delivery of construction materials. We were impressed with the way the Ministry of Education Social Promoter related with the community, community leaders and the municipal Mayor.

As a result of this visit it was recommended to the Ministry Committee, that a team of two persons, a Ministry Social Promoter and the Educational circuit Supervisor visit each community on the lists to confirm data, to see if land is available, to determine if skilled and/or unskilled labor is available in the community to work on the construction of the school, etc. Prior to these visits a questionnaire will have to be developed to record the information and data which will be used to make the final determination as to whether the community will appear on the final lists and if so how many classrooms are needed. This study should be done while school is in session and could be accomplished as a pre-condition of the loan. The Ministry of Education has personnel and transportation available to conduct this survey and it could be programmed for the second quarter of 1979. They may require some technical assistance to develop the questionnaire to field test it and carry out the study. Also it may be advisable to have some technical assistance to analyze the results of the survey before the final selection lists are made. It is estimated that the entire activity, from de-

sign of the instrument to the field work, to the final analysis and preparation of the lists should not exceed 90 days.

The results of our work with Ministry personnel were used in the writing of a draft for inclusion in the project proposal both at the Ministry and at USAID/ES as Component Two, Rural School Expansion.

7. When it was identified to us that an education material production center was to be included in the component for teacher training, we recommended that USAID contract with Mr. Lloyd McEwen of Guatemala, to provide the input for this activity. He has done similar work in the other Latin American countries. On the 30th of October 1972 a proposal was presented to the Project Officer for his consideration to contract with Mr. McEwen. USAID/ES approved of our recommendation and on the 14th of December Mr. McEwen began his work. During his seven working days, Mr. McEwen made his study, prepared a layout of the materials production center, identified the location and use of equipment, prepared a list of equipment, materials and supplies, including estimated costs, developed a list of employees and their duties to operate the center, and made recommendations.

In preparation for Mr. McEwen's work, we discussed with personnel of Ciudad Normal the requirements for the center, the type of materials to be produced, located an existing building which could house the center with very little changes, methods of distribution of the materials, personnel available to work in the center, etc, to enable him to accomplish his work in a relatively short period of time.

After Mr. McEwen's arrival, meetings were arranged with personnel of Ciudad Normal, including the Director and those who would be involved in production and use of the materials. The purposes of these meetings were to discuss the policies and aims of Ciudad Normal in preparation of educational materials, to whom they would be distributed and why they were required. Also while at Ciudad Normal Mr. McEwen had an opportunity to see the building which had been

selected to house the center.

Mr. McEvens' recommendations have been accepted by the Ministry of Education Committee and the USAID/ES team and form a part of Component three of the Project Paper.

8. We worked intensively with selected personnel of Ciudad Normal usually on a weekly basis and at times we had several meetings and work sessions per week. Also we worked with the Director of Ciudad Normal when necessary.

Some of the data and requirements for the teacher training component provided by Ciudad Normal were sketchy and incomplete, therefore, through these meetings and work sessions the data were further developed and requirements were amplified and clarified, resulting in dividing this component into three sub-components:

- Plan 3, consists of the period of resident study by the student teacher at Ciudad Normal.
- Practice teaching, is that period when the student-teacher is actually teaching students in rural schools supervised by personnel of Ciudad Normal; and,
- Production of Educational Materials, to provide the student teacher with graphic and written materials while he is studying at Ciudad Normal and is teaching in the rural schools.

In developing this component, personnel requirements were calculated, both for new professional employees and contract type employees. Transportation requirements were also developed for the supervisors who would supervise the practice teaching in the rural schools. The costs for all of these inputs were calculated and included in the final writing of the component.

An innovated system of supervision of the practice teaching was designed by utilizing personnel of Ciudad Normal and the Basic Education Department Circuit Supervisors. By using this system the

Ministry will utilize personnel now in the field to provide some of the supervision thus reducing the requirement for a huge amount of new professional employees to carry out this most important phase of the Plan 3 teacher training program.

The work of Mr. McEwen (ref. Part 7) was incorporated in the development of this component. The results of our work with Ministry personnel were used in writing a draft for inclusion in the project proposal both at the Ministry and at USAID, as Component Three, Teacher Training.

9. In addition to drafting Components Two and Three for the project proposal, we also worked with specialized persons in the Ministry of Education to develop the following:

- The organizational concept for the coordination, management and implementation of the project.
- Financial considerations, such as the establishment of a revolving fund reimbursement procedures bid procedures, payment of personnel.
- Personnel requirements, including identifying personnel on board and those which would be required to be contracted, for all of components.

In carrying out this activity we worked with personnel of ONEPOR and the financial section of DAE. An organizational chart was designed, which included the relationships between elements, an advisory and policy committee to support and direct the general coordinator of the project, and the number of persons assigned to each section. Supporting this organizational chart were lists of personnel for each position indicating the title, section, number of work months required, salary, fringe benefits, and whether the person was on board or had to be contracted.

The charts, personnel lists, duties, etc. were all provided USAID/PS for incorporation in the project proposal. This information was also incorporated in the Ministry's proposal.

10. We assisted members of the Committee in developing the following portions of the Ministry's project proposal

- Description of the project
- Component One, the coordination, management, and implementation system to carry out the project.
- The evaluation system
- Technical Assistance requirements, and
- Short and long term training requirements.

All of these inputs will appear in the final draft of the Ministry's proposal. As we were developing these parts of the proposal, we consulted with members of the USAID/ES and used the outline provided by the USAID/ES project team as a guide.

11. As drafts of the Interim Report for the Project Paper were developed by the loan and project officers of the USAID/ES team, we collaborated in this effort by providing information and data, and, reviewed and made comments on the interim report. We also provided inputs to these officers in the draft preliminary budget structure for the project proposal and in the outline for the project paper.

12. We actively participated in the planning, organization and execution of a seminar of high level officials of the Ministries of Education, Finance and Planning. The purpose of this seminar was to inform those attending the seminar about the general program of the Ministry of education, the need for coordination among all levels in the Ministry of Education and with other Ministries, and the possible financing of the Ministry's programs, both from internal and external sources especially from USAID/ES. This seminar was held at the Pacific Paradise Hotel in El Salvador, during the early part of December and lasted for 3 days. The Minister of Education made the opening address.

During the fourth part of the Seminar the Director of Basic Education, and the Director of Ciudad Normal presented an outline

of the proposal that the committee was developing, emphasizing the construction of facilities and teacher training. We were responsible for the coordination and moderation of the presentation and some members of the committee were available for consultation and to answer questions. The questions and comments were very useful in providing us with some insights regarding the development of the proposal. USAID/ES which sponsored the seminar felt it was quite successful as it provided the high officials with an opportunity to discuss common problems in a different setting and to become aware of one another's feelings and thoughts on problems facing the Ministry of Education.

13. In our report of the 3rd of November 1978, we identified as a major problem that of arriving at a reasonably innovated construction technique for classroom construction in the rural areas, using as much local labor and materials as possible and with mutual assistance to reduce costs and have community involvement.

Attempting to arrive at a solution to this problem we discussed experiences in other countries, i.e. Guatemala, Nicaragua and Ecuador with the Committee. In these countries use has been made of pre-fabricated construction elements, combined with traditional methods which have proved successful.

We visited representatives of two Central American companies located in San Salvador which manufacture pre-fabricated construction elements to obtain price estimates. We also discussed this problem with the Director of the Ministry's Educational Architecture Department, DAE, to relate the experiences mentioned above and to obtain his opinions. He was very much interested in our concepts and the basic construction method we had discussed with the Committee.

A working paper was developed and presented to the committee and reviewed with the USAID/ES General Engineer, the Director of ODEPOP and the Basic Education Department. As a result of these discussions, it was decided to develop the concept further and to obtain cost figures.

We then asked the staff of DAF to make a preliminary drawing of what we had in mind and to estimate the costs. This was done, however, everyone we discussed their estimate with felt that it was too high, based on similar construction here and in other countries.

Another factor entered into the problem that of whether the schools would be built by a Force Account management system or under a bid-contract system. The decision as to which route to take was beyond the scope of activities of the committee, however, a sub-committee was formed to study the problem and to make recommendations which could be presented to the Minister of Education for a decision. (The USAID/FS General Engineer took part in this study.

The sub-committee obtained cost figures for the following:

- The actual contract costs for schools built under the World Bank program (IBRD II) in 1978. From these figures we selected those which were built in the Departments located in priority one and two areas. These schools were being constructed under a bid-contract procedure.
- A revised cost estimate based on the plans which DAF prepared using 1978 costs, to be constructed under Force Account.
- The actual costs of a school built in 1978 by the Ministry of Education using Force Account.
- The actual costs of a school built in 1978 by DIDECO in cooperation with the Ministry of Education using community participation under Force Account.

The results of the sub-committee study indicated that a three rooms school in the rural areas of El Salvador could be constructed under Force Account for less than one half the cost of a similar school that was being built under the IBRD II bid-contract procedure. This would hold true only if the Force Account system was efficient, well organized and well managed.

The results of the study were discussed with the Committee, the Director of DAE and of ODEPOR, and with members of the USAID/ES project team. Resulting in taking the matter to the Minister of Education for a decision as to which route to follow in our proposal, that is, Force Account or Bid contract. The decision was to consider that the construction would be done under Force Account based on potential for cost savings and increased coverage.

We therefore designed a unit to administer the field operation, located in San Miguel which is centrally located for the priority one departments with back up support from San Salvador. Direct and indirect costs were then estimated and the information plans etc. were included in the draft for Component two.

It is estimated that with the loan funds available and the Government of El Salvador contribution that 700 classrooms could be constructed over the life of the project using the plans and system we designed. Since the first year will be a start up year with a new system it is estimated that 15% of the schools could be built during that year and that 35% during the second and third years leaving the remaining 15% to be built in the last year which is programmed at this time to be only six months.

If the construction of the schools under Force Account is as successful as we contemplate it will not only achieve the objectives of an innovative technique at lower costs with community participation, but it will also serve as a model to be strongly considered with other nationally and/or internationally financed school construction projects.

14. Another problem which arose in the course of our work was a requirement to project the amount of new students who would be enrolled in the educational facilities programmed for construction under the project. We discussed the problem with the Chief of the Educational Statistics Section of ODEPOR to see if he had data

to make the projections. We found that he did not, therefore after studying the problem, we developed a methodology to make the projections. The methodology and the results follow:

The projections were based on the five categories of communities/schools which were being considered in the universe of the project, as follows:

- Communities without schools
- Expansion of existing schools
- Expansion and substitution of existing schools which are in poor condition.
- Substitution of one room schools which are in poor condition to provide more access to youngsters in the community.
- Expansion of schools which already have six grades but where there is a substantial population in the community not attending school due to lack of sufficient facilities.

Two projections were made, the first, to obtain the possible maximum enrollment and the second the possible minimum enrollment. Both projections were made using a 10% random sample of enrollment in the five departments for each of the five categories above for both priority one and two departments.

The first projection was made based on the retention rate of the cohorts of students in the rural areas starting in grade 1 in 1973 and completing grade 6 in 1978.

The actual enrollment figures for 1978 were listed for each school in the sample and in the case of the community without a school, a projected enrollment for first grade was made based on the average % of students in the respective department that enrolled compared to those which are not enrolled. Using this technique it is estimated that there would be an increase in enrollment of new students from grades 1 to 6 of approximately 34570

in priority one departments, and 23,250 new students for priority two departments.

The second projection was made based on the percentage of students in school compared with those not in school in 1978, in the 5 departments included in the universe of this project. For each department the enrollment and those youngsters not attending school, in the 7-15 year age group was studied, and then a random sample of data for four educational circuits in each department was taken to determine the percentage of those students in school. This percentage was then applied to the 10% random sample in each of the five departments. The results of this second projection were: 22,530 new students in priority one departments and 13,140 new students in priority two departments.

When the worksheets of the projections were completed, the methodology and the results were explained to the USAID/ES Project Office loan officer and to the Deputy Program Officer who was to provide the economic analysis input for the project paper. They all felt that the study we had done would meet the needs. A set of the tables are included in the files of USAID/ES and the Ministry of Education.

15. During the course of our work we generated a good deal of material which served as a basis for the drafting of the project paper. Since the amount of material is voluminous and plans, tables and other materials are of different size, we have not included these materials as annexes to this report. Rather we have provided a complete set of all we gathered or generated to the Project Officer for the USAID/ES Education Division files. These materials have been arranged in five files as follows:

- Information relative to costs
- Studies
- Tables
- List of Communities
- Miscellaneous

Copies of materials mentioned above were provided the Project Officer and discussed with him as they were produced. All of these materials have also been filled by the full time ODEPOR Committee member in ODEPOR in the Ministry of Education.

16. During the course of our contract we have worked with a number of officials in the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Interior DIDECO, and USAID/ES. The following is a list of these personnel:

Ministry of Education

Prof. Julio César Posa Manzano	Director of ODEPOR
Lic. Hortensia Dueñas de García	Chief of the Planning Section ODEPOR
Ing. Héctor Jerónimo Varela	Chief of the Program Section ODEPOR
Br. José Luis Martínez Figueroa (Full time ODEPOR Committee Member)	Collaborator in the Planning Section ODEPOR
Ing. Carlos Morán	Collaborator Systems Develop- ment Section ODEPOR
Ing. Edeardo Martínez	Director of DAF
Br. Gilberto Palma	Chief of the Social Promotion Section DAE
Br. Fernando Linares	Collaborator of the Special Development Section DAE
Arq. Juan Ricardo Choto	Chief of the Special Develop- ment Section DAE
Br. Mario Martínez	Technical Collaborator Finance Section DAE
Br. Mauricio Gutiérrez	Costs Estimator, Design Department DAE
Prof. Carlos Arturo Flores	Director of Basic Education
Prof. Rigoberto Aguilar Guido	Chief Supervisor Basic Education
Prof. Braulio Jerez Mangandi	Assistant Chief of Supervision
Prof. Mardoqueo Argueta	Collaborator Basic Education Division

Prof. Oscar Antonio Sandoval	Director Ciudad Normal Alberto Masferrer
Lic. Natilde de Gutierrez	Asst. Director Ciudad Normal Alberto Masferrer
Lic. Víctor Arturo González	Asst. Director In-service teacher training section Ciudad Normal Alberto Masferrer
Lic. Marina de Jesús López Calan	Chief of the Practice Teaching Section of Ciudad Normal Alberto Masferrer
Prof. José Benjamin Aldana	Chief of the Department of Production Educational TV
Prof. Hilda Lovo	Chief of the Science Section Educational TV

Ministry of Interior

Ing. Cosme Ialdemar Durán G.	Asst. Director DIDECO
------------------------------	-----------------------

USAID/ES

Hunter Fitzgerald	Project Officer Chief EHRD
Bruce Blackman	Capital Development Officer
George Beloz	EHRD
Roberto Gavidia	Engineer Officer
Frank Latham	Asst. Controller
Marvin Schwartz	Acting Program Officer