

DD-ABI-609  
FSN-88829

MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

OFFICE OF EDUCATION IN THE  
BUREAU FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

APRIL 1988

Irwin A. Levy  
Richard N. Blue  
Robert Prater  
James A. Graham

1

THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION IN THE  
BUREAU FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

A MANAGEMENT ASSESSMENT

I. Introduction.

In the Omnibus Continuing Resolution for fiscal year 1988, Congress instructed A.I.D to prepare reports assessing the management and performance of several offices including that of the Office of Education in the Directorate for Human Resources, Bureau for Science and Technology. These reports were to assess: the validity of the goals and objectives of the offices; how well these goals are being achieved; the performance of the offices in providing services, as appropriate, to other bureau offices and/or to the Agency's overseas Missions; and, given competing demands being placed on overall Agency resources, whether appropriate personnel and funding resources are being made available for the offices. As further explained by the Senate Appropriations Committee, these reports were to address how well the offices' programs are integrated into the field missions' project portfolio, and to consider whether these offices "are achieving their stated objectives, whether these objectives can be achieved more efficiently through an alternative organizational structure, and whether, in fact, these objectives remain valid in light of funding and personnel limitations."

II. General.

(1) Staffing

The Office of Education ("S&T/ED") has seven professional (two of which are part time) and two secretarial positions. At present, two of the professional positions are unencumbered; they will be filled within the next few months by persons already designated. A temporary employee has been assisting the office, filling a position that will be discontinued upon his departure. While the Office Director and one other professional are designated foreign service positions, all incumbents (including the two who will be joining the office) are GS or AD appointments. The Office Director supervises directly all of the other professionals. He reports to the Agency Director for Human Resources who, in turn, is under the direct supervision of the Senior Assistant Administrator for Science and Technology, the chief bureau officer.

(2) Budget

The office's annual program budget was \$7.4 million in FY 1985, the highest for any year in the eighties. It has declined each year since, to \$5.6 million in FY 1986, \$5.5 million in FY 1987, and \$4.5 million in FY 1988. For the past two years, the office's budget has approximated 3.5% of all funds appropriated for Education and Human Resources (Section 105 of the Foreign Assistance Act).

(3) A.I.D.'s Role in the Education Sector

At various times during the past 10 years, A.I.D.'s role in the education sector has been questioned. It has been argued that A.I.D. has no "comparative advantage" in the sector; that A.I.D. lacks the resources required to play a significant role in this sector; that, in the face of declining budgets, A.I.D. should concentrate its efforts in sectors such as agriculture and health and let other international donors occupy the education field. In the late 1970s, the newly-created International Development Cooperation Agency ("IDCA") proposed that A.I.D. abandon the education sector entirely. While this proposal was not adopted, it was only the most extreme position in a controversy that has continued among A.I.D. policy-makers to this date.

During the past 8 years, one or more of A.I.D.'s regional bureaus has determined, in the face of resource limitations or as a result of policy conviction, to give very low priority to education programs. In Latin America, on the other hand, partly as a result of the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the recommendations of the Kissinger Commission, activities in the education sector have been encouraged.

During these same 8 years there has been a sizeable expansion of general training programs in many A.I.D.-assisted countries, funded to a considerable extent with monies appropriated pursuant to Section 105. This left fewer dollars available for education programs. In FY 1988, Congress earmarked a total of \$42 million of Section 105 funds for programs in basic education.

It is within this context of changing policies and the ebb and flow of resource availabilities that the Office of Education has been developing and implementing its programs.

### III. Objectives and Activities

The Office of Education carries out three principal functions:

- It lends support to the activities and programs of A.I.D.'s field missions and geographic bureaus in the field of education.
- It supports research activities in the education sector which have strong potential application in field programs.
- It serves a coordinating role among the various Bureaus of A.I.D. with respect to matters affecting education activities, and represents A.I.D. in dealings with other Federal agencies, private and international donors, and institutions involved in the field of education.

#### (1) Mission-Support and Research

To a certain extent, support for Mission activities is furnished through direct assistance of office personnel, from Washington or while on temporary duty in the field. This support, which can include such activities as assistance with project design, or evaluation of on-going activities, has been well appreciated, and favorably commented upon by recipient missions. During FY 1987, members of S&T/ED spent approximately 5.5 person-months in the field, at Mission expense, providing such assistance. Office personnel also spend a considerable amount of time working on matters relating to the activities of A.I.D.'s geographic bureaus in Washington. They have helped develop regional education strategies, consulted on proposed geographic bureau projects, and participated in A.I.D./W reviews of Country Development Strategy Statements and Annual Budget Submissions. Otherwise, the office's support and research functions are carried out through its projects. (The current portfolio is listed in Table 1.) These are few in number, and concentrated in three major areas:

- assisting countries to make more efficient allocation and use of their resources, especially at the primary school level.
- developing cost-effective technology that will increase the access to and improve the quality of education in developing countries.

3a

TITLE	NUMBER	START	END	LIFE OF PROJECT \$'000		MANAGER	CONTRACTOR	ANNUAL BUDGET \$'000		
				AUTH	OBLIG THRU FY87			87	88	89
Improving Effic. of Ed Systems (IEES)	936-5823	83	93	17.0	7.84	Rilling (acting)	(GS) Florida State	2,235	1,350	1,500
Basic Res: (BRIDGES)	936-5824	85	93	10.0	2.91	Theisen	(GS) Harvard	1,419	1,100	1,200
Clearinghouse I	931-1231	79	88	2.76	2.22	Hoxeng	(GS) AED	269	57	-
Clearinghouse II	936-5831	88	92					-	143	200
Radio Science	936-5818	84	90	9.22	3.79	Hoxeng Block	(GS) Ed. Dev. Center (GS)	1,224	1,257	1,050
Ed Tech/Studies	931-1109	77	89	10.41	5.72	Block Hoxeng	(GS) Inst. for Int'l Res. (GS)	155	250	275
Cons for Tech Transfer in AGR.	936-5826	85	93	7.3	2.09	Block	(GS) AED	390	275	225
AIDSCOM	936-5972	87	95	13.0	1.0	Block	(GS) AED	-	-	- *(Health Funds)
Applied Tech & Mgmt (ATMED)	936-5832	89	99	5.0 est.		Theisen	(GS) TBD	-	-	382

- providing more effective health and agriculture extension services by using communications combined with social marketing techniques.

(a) Educational Efficiency

During the past 5-to-6 years, the Office's major emphasis has been on projects designed to achieve efficiency in basic education. The Improving the Efficiency of Education Systems project ("IEES"), a ten-year project approved in 1983, with life-of-project funding of \$17 million, marked the start of this new thrust. In 1985, the Basic Research in Developing Education Systems project ("BRIDGES"), another 10-year project, was authorized in the amount of \$10 million. A third project, Applied Technology and Management for Educational Development ("ATMED") is presently under consideration. These activities have absorbed an increasing percentage of the declining S&T/ED budget.

The IEES project, while having a research component, primarily offers long term technical assistance to countries in planning and managing their educational systems so as to maximize the effectiveness of their expenditures in the education sector. This project now operates in seven countries. Three of the project sites are in Africa, three in Asia-Near East, and one in the Caribbean. The IEES project had been designed with African countries in mind, reflecting the concerns and needs of certain Missions in that region. Its subsequent adoption by only three Missions in Africa apparently results from one of those periodic de-emphases on education programs in that regional bureau which, in this case, began in the mid-eighties.

The BRIDGES project concentrates on research that will lead to the development of policy analysis models which can be used by developing country officials when considering options concerning the organization and management of an investment in the education sector. The project is currently carrying out research in seven countries, and is performing other activities in six.

Both projects contemplate "buy-ins" by Missions, that is, funds provided from the Missions own program budget to pay for additional services, complementary to that funded by S&T/ED, but of more direct concern to the particular Mission. All of the seven IEES Missions have bought in, in varying amounts; the newer BRIDGES project has had buy-ins, to date, from three Missions. In FY 1987, Mission buy-ins were almost twice the

amount of S&T/ED obligations for the IEES project, and were approximately 50% of S&T/ED obligations for BRIDGES. While not an infallible indicator, since buy-ins can reflect a myriad of Mission interests and concerns, the level of buy-in activity can serve as a rough surrogate for the degree of Mission support for a project. Presumably, the combination of a rapidly expanding population of school-aged children and a constraint on available resources has persuaded a number of Missions and developing countries that a focus on education efficiency is important and that the S&T/ED projects are useful vehicles for such a focus.

The comments of Missions (the minority which chose to comment) and geographic bureaus on IEES and BRIDGES have been overwhelmingly favorable, although a couple of Missions have expressed dissatisfaction with some aspect of IEES implementation in their country. The regional technical officers appear to recognize these activities as appropriate for S&T/ED, and even where one believes that his bureau would be equally capable of carrying out IEES-type activities, he recognizes the economies in having one contract for this purpose, managed by S&T/ED.

From the available evidence, it appears that these projects are satisfactorily designed and managed, and the contractors performing in an acceptable manner. Given the long-term perspective of both projects, however, there is as yet no data to indicate whether the projects will succeed in achieving their ultimate objectives of education efficiency. Planning projects in other sectors have frequently developed excellent plans and trained quality planners but have had little impact on decision makers or on the ultimate problems they were designed to address. In view of the large investment contemplated in these two projects, S&T/ED, with the participation of the regional bureaus, should conduct frequent hard-nosed evaluations of project impact, and be prepared to take corrective action if the results are not favorable.

There is more concern expressed regarding the ATMED project, which has been included in A.I.D.'s Congressional Presentation, and is presently in its early stages of consideration by S&T/ED. Technical officers of two geographic bureaus have opined that the project, as they understand its preliminary concept, would duplicate field support activities presently being carried out, more efficiently, by their geographic bureaus.

(b) Cost-Effective Technology

Technology projects, which reflect the same concern with education efficiency as do the projects discussed in Section (a) immediately above, for some time now have focussed primarily on the use of radio for instruction, especially at the primary school level. The Radio Science project, which was authorized in 1984, has two parts. The first, being carried out in Papua New Guinea, is developing and testing a program to teach science by radio. This is the third element in a series of radio learning projects which started in the 1970s. The first, in Nicaragua, developed a curriculum for teaching mathematics. Teaching English was later undertaken in Kenya. The science project was to round out the effort. The geographic bureaus, in commenting on S&T projects in 1986, gave a very low priority to this \$5.3 million sub-project and would have denied it further funding. They pointed out that, until Papua New Guinea expressed interest, it looked as though the activity would be dropped because not one Mission in the world agreed to being used as a pilot site. Given the limited budget for education projects, and the experience with the two radio pilot projects that had already been carried out, they doubted that the project would go beyond its pilot phase, and believed that an additional pilot project was not warranted. Nevertheless, S&T determined to go ahead with the project, because, inter alia, it would provide the final part of the package of instructional materials to offer developing countries for transmission by radio.

The second sub-project, Radio Learning, is an attempt to move radio instruction from its research stage to its adoption as an integral part of the primary education system in developing countries. It is, in short, a promotional effort, embarked upon largely because the earlier pilot projects had not generated much in the way of new radio instruction activities in the missions' education programs. This sub-project has been most active to date in Latin America, where two Missions have bought-in, and two others have expressed interest. Through fiscal year 1987, Mission buy-ins totaled approximately \$1 million, slightly less than the \$1.3 million obligated to that point by S&T/ED.

The other two existing technology projects were started in the 1970s - Rural Satellite in 1979, and Education and Technology: Studies and Application in 1977. The former was designed to test and demonstrate the use of two-way satellite telecommunications systems and low cost telephone and audio-conferencing networks to facilitate development in remote and rural areas. Activities were undertaken in three

countries, and the project is essentially completed. This activity appears to have received considerable support from the host institutions, but it is too early to judge the longer term impact of the project on developing country communication policies.

The Studies and Applications project has two components. The first, Learning Technologies, is designed to assist developing countries to explore learning technologies in basic education, including new technologies such as computers. The obligations for this activity have fallen well below that anticipated, and the level of buy-ins has been minimal. At present, modest activities are under way in Belize and Grenada. The other component, Communications Support, which was to respond to Mission needs to design communication components for new or existing projects, appears moribund. The level of obligations to date is lagging. While buy-ins of approximately \$640,000 slightly exceed S&T/ED obligations, there have been no buy-ins for the last year and a half.

It is apparent that, with the expanding program in Educational Efficiency, and a declining overall S&T/ED budget, the Technology portfolio has been squeezed. It is not clear whether the comparatively small participation by Missions in recent years is the result of budgetary constraint, indifference, or both. It is time for a careful assessment of the Technology projects, particularly the two components of Studies and Applications, to determine whether some merit greater support, and whether others should be modified or terminated. It would be helpful and appropriate for regional bureau representatives to participate in this assessment.

(c) Communications in Health and Agriculture

Except for a modest grant to the U.S. Telecommunications Training Institute, which is funded by another central A.I.D. bureau but managed by an officer in S&T/ED, and the Clearinghouse on Development Communications project which supplies information in the field of development communications to Missions and developing country officials by, among other things, funding a quarterly publication entitled "Development Communication Report," activities in this category consist of Communication for Technology Transfer in Agriculture ("CTTA"), Communication for Child Survival ("HEALTHCOM"), and the Communication Component of the AIDS Technical Support project ("AIDSCOM"). These projects are designed to utilize the media to promote appropriate agricultural or health practices. All three of these inter-disciplinary projects appear to have a significant degree of Mission support. Those in the health

sector are particularly popular and well regarded by the regional bureaus and missions. CTTA was approved in 1985, and through the end of FY 1987 had Mission buy-ins totalling \$1.2 million. Missions buy-ins to HEALTHCOM, in FY 1987 alone, totalled \$2.1 million dollars. While AIDSCOM is just starting up, and has had no Mission buy-ins as yet, the Africa bureau bought-in for \$424,000 in FY 1987.

(d) Summary

The general opinion among geographic bureau technical personnel is that relations with S&T/ED are excellent and that the Office's activities in the past several years have become increasingly useful. In the words of one officer, "I am pleased with the Office and more pleased every day."

S&T/ED's portfolio of activities seems well concentrated and in most cases appears to be responding to the needs of Missions and the geographic bureaus. This is particularly true of the Educational Efficiency projects, IEES and BRIDGES, and the communications projects in the health sector. The Radio Science project in Papua New Guinea is an obvious exception and two other Technology activities, Learning Technologies and Communications Support, under the pressure of restricted budgets or possible lack of Mission interest of both, seem to have slipped to a level of possible irrelevancy.

Perhaps most surprising is the relative absence of battles over "turf" between S&T/ED and the regional bureaus. There is always a potential for such conflict and competition, since S&T/ED's projects involve activities in countries which have bilateral programs, and since a dollar budgeted to S&T/ED is a dollar not available to the regional bureaus or their Missions. With the possible exception of the proposed ATMED project, however, the other bureaus do not believe that S&T/ED's activities overstep their appropriate bounds. It is possible that the small size of S&T/ED's budget, which constitutes only about 3.5% of the overall Section 105 account, and the modest number of projects in S&T/ED's portfolio has contributed to this era of good feelings. It is no doubt also attributable to the collegial nature of the relationship which the Office Director has been able to establish between S&T/ED and the regional bureaus in the last 2-3 years.

The major problem with S&T/ED's portfolio from the perspective of several Missions and regional bureau representatives, is quite the opposite. In their view, S&T/ED should be doing more, particularly in the fields of vocational training, management training, and in-service training. At

present, the Missions have nowhere to turn for support in these activities, which, for a number of them are of high priority. S&T/ED acknowledges its lack of activity in these fields, and points to its declining budget by way of at least partial explanation. At least one regional bureau officer, however, has stated that he would support a larger budget for S&T/ED if it were used to initiate activities supporting Mission programs in these areas.

Whatever the reason for S&T/ED's lack of action to date, given the apparently significant level of Mission interest in these training programs and the possibility of regional support for additional S&T/ED funding, we would suggest that this subject warrants serious consideration by Agency policy makers, particularly in light of the recent Basic Education earmark. The first step should be to put this topic on the agenda of one of the next Education Sector Council meetings.

## (2) Coordination and Representation

Members of S&T/ED have frequent and productive contact with their counterparts in the World Bank and other donor entities. Their comments are solicited on proposed Bank projects and policy papers, and their initiatives in promoting an emphasis on "efficiency" in education systems has had broader impact throughout the donor community. Several members of the office are held in particularly high regard by their peers in the education community at large. They participate actively in technical conferences and contribute articles to technical journals, reporting on the results of A.I.D.'s activities in the field of education. Other U..S. government departments have utilized their services at meetings and conferences.

Their coordination role within A.I.D. is exercised largely through the vehicle of the Education Sector Council. The Council consists of representatives from the Office of Education, and the education officers elsewhere in the Agency, including those in the regional bureaus and PPC. It meets under the Chairmanship of the Agency Director for Human Resources.

Both the Sector Council and the Directorate for Human Resources to which it relates were established in the early 1980's in an effort to upgrade the quality, prestige, and influence of education officers in the Agency. (Similar Sector Councils and Directorates were established for other technical specialties). As now constituted the Education Sector Council serves as the vehicle by which other Bureaus review proposed

S&T/ED projects (about which, more, below); facilitates exchange of information, both technical and bureaucratic among the education officers and their bureaus; and serves as the forum for consideration of such matters as agency education policy and personnel-related issues, such as the technical qualifications that should be required of applicants for employment as education officers. The Council appears to be performing a useful and necessary function. One officer, however, believes that the Council could be more active, taking more effective initiatives, though he faults the members from the geographic bureaus on this score. Several members expressed frustration at having their recommendations or positions filter through the S&T Bureau super-structure, rather than go directly to the Administrator.

We are informed that, prior to the creation of the Sector Council, education officers from the geographic bureaus regularly met with their S&T/ED counterparts on an informal basis, and considered many of the same matters which now form the agenda of Sector Council meetings. While the Sector Council did not, therefore, fill a gaping need, it has been useful in formalizing and adding to, an existing process, and we would strongly recommend its continuance.

#### IV. Management

##### (1) Office Staffing

##### (a) Mix

While the Office of Education has a number of highly respected members, its mix is not optimal in that no positions are presently filled by foreign service officers. (If the office were to undertake to support the training activities suggested in paragraph III-(1)-(d), above, it might also have to adjust the mix of technical skills among its personnel.) It is understandable and logical that most officers would be GS employees. The continuity thus permitted is one of the strengths of an office which is to develop state-of-the-art expertise, and establish continuing relationships with the community of professional educators. It is important, however, to season this basic dish of technical competence with insights concerning the problems and opportunities of carrying out activities in developing countries. (A project may be technically perfect but not achieve its development objectives because its design or implementation does not reflect the realities in the host country.) This can best be provided by officers with that foreign experience. It is presumably for this reason that two positions in the office are designated for foreign service personnel.

The present office director acknowledges this deficiency but indicates that attempts to attract qualified foreign service officers have frequently failed. Capable foreign service officers apparently do not regard assignment to S&T/ED as being beneficial for their career. While we cannot provide specific recommendations for how to overcome this deficiency, it is clear that the staff mix is a concern, which, until it is adequately addressed, has the potential for adversely affecting the office's performance.

(b) Size

The seven professional positions in the office will soon be filled. At that point, it is our view that the office will be over-staffed for the size of its budget and portfolio. While the office is not large, even with the addition of temporary employees, it is managing a very modest portfolio, reflecting a declining program budget. S&T/ED officers argued, however, that less than half their time (perhaps only a third) is spent on matters related to their project portfolio, the balance being devoted to their other support functions, to their coordinating activities within A.I.D., and, particularly, to their external coordination and representation roles. The team recognizes both the quantity and quality of S&T/ED's external coordination and representation activities. However, it is our view that, given the pressure on its personnel levels, A.I.D. cannot afford to devote a sizeable amount of staff time to these activities. We believe that the staffing level of the office, and its mix of functions, should be carefully reviewed by Bureau management, given the apparent shortage of positions in other Agency units. We would recommend, however, that such a review not take place until there is greater certainty as to the future of the Congressional earmark for Basic Education. If this earmark should rise to 50% of the Sec. 105 account, as Congress has indicated it will, then, following the example of S&T/H's role in the Child Survival initiative, S&T/ED might have new responsibilities thrust upon it in assisting the Agency to meet the earmark. A reduction in staff under those circumstances might not be warranted.

(2) Project Design and Review

Projects developed by S&T/ED follow a formal procedure established for all S&T projects. The proposing office prepares a "concept paper" for the Senior Assistant Administrator. If he gives the go-ahead, the office then prepares a PID for review by the Sector Council. (In some cases, typically a follow-on project, the Senior Assistant

Administrator may approve dispensing with a PID and moving directly to the PP. Normally, the PID is the initial document in the project review process, which identifies the basic nature of the project. Only if it is approved will the Agency spend the time and money to develop a complete project design.) If, after the PID review, the Director for Human Resources, who chairs the Sector Council meeting, approves proceeding with project development, the office prepares a PP, which is again reviewed in the Sector Council. While members of the sector council may oppose the project, final approval authority rests with the Director for Human Resources.

This procedure raises concern in several respects. (While the team received a few comments questioning certain aspects of S&T/ED projects, it did not have the time, nor was it so charged, to evaluate closely the quality of their design and implementation. Our comments in this section, therefore, stem more from a concern about the process and its potential for creating problems, than from the identification of specific defects in the existing portfolio.) First, almost all of the participants in project review are technical experts. Only a contracting officer, and, at times, a member of the general counsel's office are consulted, and their participation may take place before, after, or during the formal project review in the Council meeting. The S&T program office has the opportunity to review any PID and PP and make its views known; but we are informed that it frequently does not participate in Sector Council reviews, and in any case, the office does not have the experience that would enable it to make a significant impact. What is missing in the project development and review process is that input provided by project development officers in Missions and geographic bureaus -- the sharp analytical questioning of assumptions by someone outside the technical field, forcing the project proponents to address critical issues so as to assure that the project is correctly designed to meet its stated objectives, that it can be appropriately implemented, and that it complies with A.I.D. regulations and procedures.

We think it important to provide for this input and to have a project development officer ("PDO") serve as a member of each project design team. One way to accomplish this result would be to establish a small project development office in the S&T Bureau, to work with S&T/ED and the other technical offices. It would be difficult to find qualified PDOs who would wish to serve in such an office, but Agency management could construct a system to resolve such a problem. There might be other possible alternatives as well. The important point is to get PDO input. We also think it important that

each member of S&T/ED be familiar with A.I.D.'s project design requirements, and, accordingly, that those office members who have not already done so, attend the Agency's project design course.

The participation of the regional bureaus in the review process is also important. There should be not only informal discussion and consultation between S&T/ED and some bureau officers on possible project ideas, but also regular, substantive regional bureau participation in the project design and review process, particularly since, (a) projects increasingly are designed for the ostensible purpose of providing Mission support, and (b) the regional education officers usually offer the only potential foreign service input in the process.

There are existing S&T Bureau directives on this point. For example, a March 13, 1985 memorandum from the Senior Assistant Administrator, entitled "Project Design," requires the establishment of a project design team consisting of, inter alia, a representative of S&T's program office, and, for some teams "one or more of the following: . . . technical representatives of one or more of the Regional Bureaus, and a representative from GC [General Counsel], CM [Contract Management], or both." A May 3, 1982 memo on the "Project Review System" states that, "in general, projects will be jointly conceptualized by the S&T Bureau, the Missions and the Regional Bureaus." After a PID is approved, "working with the Bureaus and Missions identified in the PID . . . the office should continue the joint preparation efforts utilizing all available resources (travel and personnel) in preparing the PP." [Emphasis added.]

It seems that this system is not being followed. The participation of GC has been haphazard, and while regional bureau officers are frequently consulted on proposed projects, it does not appear that any of them, in fact, has served as part of a project design team. We believe that an education officer from one or more of the regional bureaus should be a member of every project design team, and that the other offices should be utilized in the design and review process as contemplated in existing S&T guidance.

The Sector Council, which deals with numerous matters of varying import, does not appear to be the appropriate forum for project review. Council meetings should have a tone of collegial informality, if they are to work best in addressing most issues of concern to education officers. A project review meeting should have a different tone, even if many of the

participants are the same. We would recommend that a separate committee be established by S&T, for the purpose of project review. Though the Chairman and many of the members might be identical to those of the Sector Council, the project review committee would meet in a more formal, structured environment.

### (3) Project Management

There are three agriculture or health related communications projects which were developed with major contributions by the Office of Education -- HEALTHCOM, CTTA, and AIDSCOM. HEALTHCOM was originally funded out of the education account, was jointly funded by education and health monies in FY 1985, and, since FY 1986, has been funded exclusively with health monies; CTTA has been funded jointly with education and food and nutrition monies since its inception; AIDSCOM is funded entirely from the AIDS earmark in the health account.

Although all of the interested offices participate in project management to some degree, the designated project manager (known in S&T as the Cognizant Technical Officer, or "CTO") for HEALTHCOM is now in S&T/Health (though, until last year, the CTO was in S&T/ED); the CTO for CTTA is in S&T/ED; the CTO for AIDSCOM is in S&T/ED. Although a certain amount of ambiguity is inevitable with any inter-disciplinary activity, the logic of this distribution of management responsibility is not apparent. On the one hand, if the emphasis is on the communications tool rather than the technical message, there is a certain rationale for having all three projects managed by S&T/ED, particularly since they are implemented by the same contractor. If the message is of more significance, however, then the two health projects should be managed by S&T/H, and CTTA by S&T's Office of Agriculture. Our concern is that the present assignment of CTO responsibilities may reflect considerations of comparative office workload rather than appropriate office responsibility. If necessary, staffing levels should be adjusted among the offices.

### (4) Portfolio Management

The S&T/ED office has comparatively few projects, most of which extend for many years, and several of which are of considerable magnitude. Of the eight projects managed principally by the office (excluding USTTI), three were approved prior to 1980, one as far back as 1977. Under such circumstances, regular and structured reviews of the project portfolio are essential to determine whether the projects are achieving their anticipated objectives; whether there are

problems which need to be addressed; whether changed circumstances or initial design errors indicate that the project should be modified or terminated; whether new Agency or office priorities indicate that some of the funds originally destined for certain projects can better be used for other activities. It is our understanding that a portfolio review was instituted in 1987, under the chairmanship of a Deputy Assistant Administrator of S&T, with the participation of relevant S&T offices. We think it important that such reviews continue on a regular basis and that they address the difficult issues of project performance. Since Regional bureaus are utilizing the services of the projects being reviewed, their officers should participate as well. Whoever chairs the reviews should have authority to determine that any given project be further studied, modified or terminated, as the circumstances require.

#### V. Summary and Conclusions

(1) The Office of Education, at the present time, is a small office with a small budget, operating in a sector with uncertain priority within A.I.D.

(2) Given its limited budget, the Office's areas of project concentration appear to be appropriate, as does its mix of Mission-support and research (a conclusion supported by the fact that the level of buy-ins for some projects is well in excess of S&T/ED budget obligations for those projects). An occasional activity in the past has been of doubtful priority, however, and one or two current projects appear to be stagnating. Within the possibilities permitted by the recent Basic Education earmark, the Office should attempt to be responsive to the needs of several Missions and regional bureaus in the fields of vocational, management, and in-service training, and a slightly higher budget for this purpose would appear to be appropriate.

(3) Both S&T/ED and the regional bureau education officers are performing useful, and usually complementary functions. No reorganization of responsibilities would be appropriate at this time.

(4) There is a need for greater rigor and structure in the development and review of new project proposals, and in periodic portfolio reviews. These should involve the participation of a project development officer, and education officers from regional bureaus.

(5) Particularly careful reviews should be made of the existing Technology projects, to see if they are achieving the purposes contemplated, and if not, to take corrective action.

(6) There should be frequent periodic impact evaluations of the IEES and BRIDGES projects, to assure that they are achieving their ultimate objectives.

(7) There is a healthy absence of serious "turf" battles between S&T/ED and the regional bureaus, and the Office and Agency Director should attempt to conserve this state of affairs by (a) continuing the collegial nature of Sector Council meetings; (b) involving the regional officers systematically in project design and review (see para. 4, above); and paying particular attention to the design of the ATMED project.

(8) S&T/ED has more positions than would appear warranted to manage its existing budget and portfolio. While it is important for S&T/ED to interact with the external donor and professional education community, given existing pressures on A.I.D. personnel levels, it is not appropriate for S&T/ED to devote a large percentage of staff time to such activities. There should be a management review of the office's staffing level after it is determined what role S&T/ED will be called on to play in the event of an expanded Basic Education earmark.

(9) There should be a modest foreign service contingent among S&T/ED's professional staff, and, particularly if the office assumes responsibilities in new technical areas, a different mix of technical skills may be required.

(10) The management of the three agriculture and health related communications projects should be rationalized.