

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES<sup>INC</sup>

9309001 17  
1/11/86  
AID/PPC



95-96067

**AID POLICIES  
AND PROGRAMMING  
IN EDUCATION**

**VOLUME III:  
AN ANALYSIS OF  
CONJUNCTIONS AND DISJUNCTIONS**

SUBMITTED TO AID/PPC

MAY RIHANI  
VICTOR BARNES  
KAREN VANDER LINDE  
JULIE HANSON

APRIL 30, 1986

HEADQUARTERS  
3201 NEW MEXICO AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 270, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20016  
(202) 966-5804 TELEEX: 440523 CREA

**AID POLICIES AND PROGRAMMING IN EDUCATION**

**VOLUME III: AN ANALYSIS OF CONJUNCTIONS AND DISJUNCTIONS**

**Creative Associates, Inc.**

**April 30, 1986**

**CREATIVE ASSOCIATES**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
Acknowledgements .....	v
I. Introduction .....	1
II. Brief Historical Perspective of AID's Policies and Programs in Education .....	2
A. AID Education Technical Assistance in the 1960s and 1970s ....	2
B. Review of Selected AID Projects in Education .....	3
1. Selection of Projects to Review .....	3
2. Paraguay: The Rural Education Development Project .....	3
3. Nepal: U.S. AID to Education .....	4
4. Thailand: Rural Nonformal Education, the Mobile Trade Training School .....	5
5. Kenya: Radio Correspondence Education .....	6
6. Nigeria: Teacher Education Project .....	6
C. Analysis of AID's Record in Education Throughout the 1960s and 1970s .....	7
III. Present AID Policies Concerning Education .....	8
A. AID's legislative Mandate in the Education Sector .....	8
B. AID's Policy for the Education Sector .....	9
1. General Policy for All Sectors .....	9
2. Basic Education and Technical Training .....	10
3. Participant Training .....	12
4. Education Sector Strategy .....	13
5. Regional Strategy Papers .....	15
6. Policy Reflected in AID Presentations to Congress .....	17
C. Analysis of AID's Policy in Education .....	18

**TABLE OF CONTENTS  
(Continued)**

	<b>PAGE</b>
IV. Education Funding Trends in AID .....	21
A. Overview of DAC Funding to Education in the 1980s .....	21
B. Overview of Funding for AID Education Programs in the 1970s ..	22
1. Education Funding for 1971-76 .....	22
2. Education Funding for 1977-79 .....	23
C. Funding for the Education Sector in AID for 1980s .....	23
1. Funding Process within ID .....	23
2. Methodology of the Study .....	24
3. Funding levels in the Education Sector for the 1980s .....	26
D. Analysis of AID Funding in the Education Sector for the 1980s.	38
1. Complexities of Analyzing Funding Data for Educational Activities .....	38
2. Comparison of Central and Regional Bureau Funding Levels in the Education Sector .....	39
3. Responsiveness of Funding in the Education Sector to Educational Policy .....	39
V. Views of Policymakers and Technicians Concerning Education .....	43
A. Overview of Interviews Conducted .....	43
B. Responses of Policymakers and Technicians .....	44
1. Role of Education in Development .....	44
2. AID's Role in Supporting Education in LDCs .....	44
3. Factors that Determine AID's Role in Providing Assistance in Education .....	45
4. AID's Strengths in Education .....	49

TABLE OF CONTENTS  
(Continued)



	PAGE
5. Relationship of AID's Policies and Programming in Education .....	50
6. Current Trends in AID's Programming .....	52
C. Analysis of Views Expressed by Policymakers and Technicians .....	52
VI. Conclusion .....	54
A. Educational Policy as It Relates to Trends in the Literature .....	54
B. Relationship of Policy and Programming .....	55
C. Factors Inhibiting the Translation of Education Policy Into Programming .....	56
1. Role of Educational Policy .....	56
2. Incomplete Educational Policy and Lack of Clear Priorities in Policy .....	56
3. Organizational Factors Affecting Implementation of Educational Policy .....	57
D. Achieving Consistency between Educational Policy and Programming .....	59
Bibliography .....	61
Appendices .....	68
Appendix A: Interview Guide .....	69
Appendix B: 105 Account Allocations: Funding Trends in the 1980s .....	73
Appendix C: 105 Account Allocations: The Regional Bureaus .....	75
Appendix D: 105 Account Allocations: The Central Bureaus .....	89

TABLE OF FIGURES

	PAGE
III-1. Leading DAC Contributors to the Education Sector 1983 and 1984 .....	21
III-2. Funding Percentages for Education Subsectors (Section 105 Account) for the 1980s .....	26
III-3. Funding Percentages for Education Subsectors (Section 105 Account) for the 1980s: The Africa Bureau .....	27
III-4. Distribution of Education Appropriations by Country in Africa, 1980-87 .....	30
III-5. Funding Percentages for Education Subsectors (Section 105 Account) for the 1980s: The Asia/Near East Bureau ...	31
III-6. Distribution of Education Appropriations by Country in Asia/Near East, 1980-87 .....	33
III-7. Funding Percentages for Education Subsectors (Section 105 Account) for the 1980s: The Latin American/Caribbean Bureau .....	34
III-8. Distribution of Education Appropriations by Country in Latin America and the Caribbean, 1980-87 .....	36
III-9. Funding Percentages for Education Subsectors (Section 105 Account) for the 1980s: Bureau for Science and Technology .....	37

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors of this study gratefully acknowledge the generous support of our advisory committee members from the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination/Center for Development Information and Evaluation. The advisory committee was formed of the following members:

W. Haven North:	Associate Assistant Administrator
Paula Goddard:	Deputy Associate Assistant Administrator
Irving Rosenthal:	Program Officer
Raymond Cohen:	Program Officer
Frank Method:	Education Policy Advisor
Annette Binnendijk:	Division Chief
Joseph Lieberman:	Economist
Gary Hansen:	Sector Coordinator

The members of the advisory committee provided us with guidance and assistance; they also reviewed the various drafts of the report and provided valuable insights and comments.

This study would not have been possible without the invaluable information provided by the AID policymakers and education specialists whom we interviewed during the course of our research.

We would also like to acknowledge Brenda Bryant, Vice President, and Danuta Lockett, Director of International Programs, from Creative Associates, who participated in reviewing the various drafts and supplied us with perceptive feedback on the effect of the organizational structure on policy.

Finally we are grateful to Patricia Scully for her excellent editing of the report and to Fannyta Klopfer and her staff, particularly Perla Frilles, who worked long and hard hours to produce it.

## I. INTRODUCTION

This is the third volume of a report on Agency for International Development (AID) policy and programming in education. Under the direction of AID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) in the Bureau of Program and Policy Coordination (PPC), Creative Associates, Inc., conducted this study to examine the relationship between policy and programming in the education and human resources development sector.\*

The purpose of this study is to analyze AID policy and programming in education in order to determine areas of disjunction and conjunction between them. The study responds to a growing concern within AID about the appropriate role the Agency should play to assist education systems in lesser developed countries (LDCs). It is hoped that the report will stimulate thought and dialogue among policymakers and technicians overseas and in Washington concerning the role of education in the development process. It is also hoped that this will lead to a critical and thoughtful appraisal of development assistance in the education sector.

The report consists of three volumes. Volume I condenses the analyses with the report and presents the major conclusions. Volumes II and III present more detailed discussion. Volume II reviews recent developments and findings of the literature on education and international development. Volume III focuses on AID's experience in education, its current education policy, its education funding since 1980, and opinions of AID policymakers and technicians concerning AID's assistance to education as a development strategy. This last volume also contains the conclusions of the report, including suggestions for the next steps AID can take to clearly define its role in the education sector. The bibliography lists the source material used by the research team.

The research team worked closely with an advisory committee consisting of eight AID staff members from the Bureau of Program and Policy Coordination (see the Acknowledgements). The research team and advisory committee determined the focus of the study and the research methodology. The study was based on analyses of over 100 documents produced by the World Bank; the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); academic institutions; the U.S. Congress; and AID. In addition, the research team conducted and analyzed interviews with 33 AID personnel. Before the report reached final form, the advisory committee and other AID personnel reviewed and critiqued its contents and their input was incorporated.

---

\*This will be referred to in the report simply as the education sector.

## II. BRIEF HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF AID'S POLICIES AND PROGRAMS IN EDUCATION

What follows is a brief review of AID's programs in education in the 1960s and 1970s and a description of five AID projects in education. The purpose of this section is to review trends in education programs and AID's capability in the field. AID education policies and programs in the 1980s will be covered in more depth later in this volume.

### A. AID EDUCATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IN THE 1960S AND 1970S

AID Assistance to Education: A Retrospective Study drew attention to the following facts. In the 1960s, there was relatively little emphasis on elementary and secondary education and a strong emphasis in all regions on higher education and the preparation of high-level manpower. In addition, there was no or little assistance in areas such as adult education and vocational or agricultural education.

Overall the total resources committed to education activities in all sectors appeared to be declining and most of the educational assistance concentrated on a few large countries, rather than the smaller and less developed countries. Despite limitations in the funding for and extent of education assistance in the 1960s, the Retrospective Study concludes that the education programs of the 1960s were sound and made positive contributions to the attainment of educational objectives in most of the assisted countries.

The early 1970s were a period of reorientation throughout the Agency but particularly in education. AID's priority areas in education and human resources in the 1970s were:

- educational technology;
- nonformal education;
- research and experimentation with alternative modes of educational finance and with the use of economic measurement tools in educational planning, decision making, and management;
- education and employment;
- the reorientation of teacher-training institutions;
- new directions in higher education; and
- new roles for women in development.

But in spite of these efforts to introduce new priorities in educational assistance, the overall focus in education and its related sectors remained on professional/high-level manpower development.

## B. REVIEW OF SELECTED AID PROJECTS IN EDUCATION

### 1. Selection of Projects to Review

The research team selected projects for which impact evaluations had been conducted, that were representative of a range of programs funded through the education account, and that covered different regions of the world. Its purpose was to examine lessons learned from these various projects and to examine AID's capability in the field of education. The projects reviewed are the following:

- Paraguay: The Rural Education Development Project;
- Nepal: U.S. AID to Education;
- Thailand: Rural Nonformal Education, The Mobile Trade Training School;
- Kenya: Radio Correspondence Education; and
- Nigeria: Teacher Education Project.

The Paraguay project review focuses on decentralization, community support, and curriculum reform for primary and secondary education; the Nepal project summary deals primarily with expansion of a formal basic education system; the evaluation of the Thailand project concentrates on nonformal vocational/technical training; the review of efforts in Kenya illustrates the use of radio education for teacher training; and the evaluation of the Nigeria project demonstrates the results of participant training in the education sector.

### 2. Paraguay: The Rural Education Development Project

In 1970, AID provided \$4.2 million in loan funds and \$300,000 in grant funds to Paraguay to support the country's efforts to improve the quality and equity of the primary and secondary school systems of Paraguay. The six-year project experienced both success and difficulties. One of the most successful components of the project was the decentralization of the education system.

One of the problems facing Paraguay when the project began was that the Ministry of Education "was too heavily centralized to be responsive to local needs" (Project Impact Evaluation Bo. 46--U.S. Aid to Education in Paraguay: The Rural Education Development Project, 1983). However, Paraguay had established Regional Education Centers (RECs). The project sought to create two new RECs, upgrade one school so that it could function as an REC, and to provide the entire system of seven RECs with more administrative responsibility. The centers were to provide leadership for the public school system through their administrative functions, their pre-service and in-service training for teachers, and their role as demonstration centers for the implementation of the new curricula. As the evaluation points out, the RECs were highly successful. They reached more rural students, successfully implemented the new curricula, and became effective administrative centers.

Another positive component of the program was the involvement of local citizenry in the construction of new schools. Though the project financed the construction, the communities provided land and labor and they continue to maintain and upgrade the facilities.

The project experienced some difficulty in the implementation of curriculum reform because of low teacher salaries. To employ the new curricula required extra work on the part of the teachers whose salaries were very low; consequently, they had little motivation for making the changes. This was a serious impediment for educational reform; studies indicated that when the new curricula were implemented, there was improvement in achievement scores, retention and promotion rates, and student motivation.

Overall, the project had a positive impact on the quality and equity of education. One lesson learned is that "in institution-building and policy redirection, consistency of purpose and effort is essential and in many cases a major determinant of success." The project also demonstrated the value of a decentralized education system and means of obtaining community support in the construction and maintenance of schools.

### 3. Nepal: U.S. AID to Education

The 1981 impact evaluation on education assistance in Nepal covers U.S. aid over a twenty-year period, starting in 1954. The funds allotted to primary education alone amounted to \$9,112,500. In general, the evaluation reported that the "impact of AID support has been highly positive, though results are mixed" (Project Impact Evaluation No. 19--U.S. Aid to Education in Nepal: A 20-Year Beginning, 1981).

With AID funding, Nepal was able to dramatically increase the number of schools throughout the country. In 1951 Nepal had only 321 primary schools, with less than 1 percent of the eligible children attending; there were 11 secondary schools educating only .15 percent of the eligible population. In 1975, Nepal was enrolling 59 percent of the children in 8,708 primary schools and 12 percent of its eligible adolescents in 2,809 secondary schools. In addition, the funding helped establish the Institute of Education that had by 1975 trained over 7,000 primary and 3,000 secondary school teachers on 13 campuses. The expansion of the education system has had some impact on other sectors. Studies indicate that increased literacy in Nepal (from 2 percent in 1951 to 17 percent in 1975) has had positive impact on increased agricultural productivity, reduced fertility rates, and some improvements in sanitation practices.

Though the expansion of the system was successful, the system is plagued by inefficiency. Fifty percent of the students drop out of primary school before they have attained basic literacy and there are not enough qualified teachers to staff the schools. Overall quality of education is very low, particularly in math and writing. Furthermore, the evaluation terms vocational training a failure.

The evaluation draws several conclusions. First, AID can have significant impact on a country's educational system if it consistently offers adequate

support over a sufficient period of time. Second, AID needs to seek nontraditional means of meeting educational problems. Third, vocational education must begin early, offer many hands-on experiences, and link up with labor demands. Finally, the evaluation states that "given the importance of basic education in the 'seamless web' of development priorities, AID should not let its capabilities atrophy or resource availabilities wither in this sector to the point when it can no longer play a meaningful role . . . to impart U.S. values and techniques and make a significant contribution to developing a country's basic education system."

#### 4. Thailand: Rural Nonformal Education, the Mobile Trade Training School

From 1966 to 1972, AID assisted Thailand in the development of a rural, nonformal education program designed to provide vocational skills--the Mobile Trade Training Schools. The project received about \$3.3 million in funds and nearly \$4 million worth of excess property donations (i.e., machinery). The assistance included the provision of an advisor to help design, manage, and evaluate the project; the training of 31 Thai educators in U.S. vocational education programs; and the provision of commodities. Youth who were out of school and adults made up the target population of this project. The original goal, which was to provide pre-employment skills, soon was expanded to include upgrading skills of the employed and providing other educational services, such as functional literacy courses and adult education courses leading to primary and secondary school certificates.

The schools were considered mobile because they used portable machinery. Trainers and their machines could establish the units almost anywhere. The courses offered by the mobile schools were in great demand. In fact, the units often became permanent because of constant community interest. Some vans went to the more remote rural areas on occasion. During the project period, 80,000 persons enrolled in the program and 56,000 graduated. The success rate is even higher according to the Ministry of Education because the major factor for the drop-out rate was acquisition of employment.

One reason for the schools' success was that they offered a wide range of training not previously available for these rural populations. The apprenticeship system was limited and the only other trade training schools available were in Bangkok. In addition, no other schools in the area provided out-of-school youth and adults with skills not directly related to a trade, such as literacy and numeracy.

The project pointed out that "nonformal education projects can contribute positively to rural development efforts of the LDCs by providing short-term occupational skills to marginally educated poor people" [original italics] (Project Impact Evaluation No. 25--Thailand: Rural Nonformal Education, The Mobile Trade Training School, 1981). The evaluation also states that the schools contributed to national unity by showing people in more remote areas that the central government was interested in their well-being. Furthermore, the schools, because of their success, spawned Thailand's establishment of a more comprehensive nonformal education system through the Lifelong Education Centers.

---

## 5. Kenya: Radio Correspondence Education

From 1967 to 1971, AID supported the Kenya Radio Correspondence Project with a grant of \$667,000 and technical assistance. The Government of Kenya supplied over twice that amount--\$1,456,000--and the Government of Denmark contributed \$243,314 for construction of facilities. The purpose of the project was to improve the quality of teachers for Kenya's expanding primary and secondary schools. Because the existing teacher training institutions were not prepared to handle the high number of unqualified teachers in Kenya at the time, both Kenyan and U.S. experts recommended the establishment of a system that would use correspondence courses along with radio instruction and occasional face-to-face instruction to provide the training needed. The target audience of the four-year project consisted of in-service primary and some secondary school teachers.

The University of Wisconsin worked with Kenyan specialists to write the courses, radio scripts, and materials and to set up administrative systems. The project also prepared Kenyans to assume the duties carried out by the U.S. specialists. Within four years, 5,000 teachers passed their national qualifying exams, and 7,000 more were trained thereafter. As the evaluation indicates, "if there was a flaw in the Kenya Radio Correspondence Project, it was that it succeeded" (Project Impact Evaluation No. 37--Correspondence Education in Kenya). Higher qualifications warranted promotions and higher salaries under the Kenyan system. Because the Kenyan budget could not handle the increased salaries, it eliminated the policy of automatic promotion upon completion of qualifications--thereby diminishing motivation for enrolling in the course.

Nonetheless, the project was still alive in 1982 when the evaluation was written and it was serving as a model for other national educational tasks. Among the lessons learned from this project are that nonformal education is a sound alternative to the formal school system, that radio correspondence can provide "quality education on par with traditional school systems at significant cost savings" for a wide range of educational needs, and to a broad population. However, success of radio correspondence courses depends on the rewards, both social and material, the clients will receive. Finally, the evaluation also suggests that nonformal education projects should be judged in a "long-term social benefits context rather than from a standpoint of short-term commercial viability."

## 6. Nigeria: Teacher Education Project

The Northern Nigeria Teacher Project received AID funding for the last three years of its implementation period--from 1967 through 1969. This funding amounted to \$2,723,000 plus about \$52,000 in local currency. The Ford Foundation provided over \$2.6 million for the first two years of the project. The purpose of the project was to develop new curricula and methodologies, promote the use of these approaches in the teaching colleges, train personnel to carry out the work at the project's end, and strengthen the Institute of Education. There was a special need for such efforts in Northern Nigeria because this area had less than 10 percent of eligible children enrolled

compared to 75 percent in the other areas of Nigeria and because the few teacher training colleges available did not provide quality education.

The project suffered some difficulties, including civil war and administrative problems, but "on the balance, the project was a success" (Project Impact Evaluation No. 23--Northern Nigeria Teacher Education Project, 1981). All 15 participant trainees now serve as leaders in the educational community--many holding very high occupational posts. The curricula coincided with national philosophical trends, and the region reached consensus concerning the curricula and related examinations. Furthermore, the project assisted in the development of the Institute of Education.

Despite this success, the quality of education declined because of organizational problems and an emphasis on expansion rather than quality. Also, the teacher education project failed to "impact positively on efficiency with regard to student learning and manpower utilization."

One of the lessons learned from the project was that participant training is "a least-cost strategy to assure long-term project continuity and institution-building." The evaluation also states the both donor agencies and host governments need to understand that curriculum reform is often a long-term venture.

#### C. ANALYSIS OF AID'S RECORD IN EDUCATION THROUGHOUT THE 1960S AND 1970S

AID has demonstrated that it has broad capability in the field of education: it can design and implement successful projects in various educational subsectors. It can assist in the areas of basic education, both formal and nonformal, vocational/technical training, use of modern educational technology, and institution building through participant training. As the 1984 Education Sector Report indicates, "AID has assisted both in expanding enrollment and in solving some of the problems inadvertently created by that expansion." Of particular note was the preliminary success AID had with innovative techniques such as decentralization, community support for financing education, and radio education.

A repeated theme in the impact evaluations of education projects is the need to assist governments in ways to stretch their limited resources by improving the efficiency of the education systems. The incentives offered the teaching cadre appear to have significant impact on the quality of instruction. The impact evaluations also stress the need for long-term investment in education and the need to measure the success of education projects over the long term rather than in a short-term context.

An interesting fact revealed by this review of AID policies and programs, which has continuing implications, is that despite the expertise AID has demonstrated in the education sector, funding for the sector declined in the 1960s and 1970s. Furthermore, the bulk of funding for the sector focused on higher education and participant training projects.

### III. PRESENT AID POLICIES CONCERNING EDUCATION

This section reviews the documents that provide current guidance for AID in the education sector. These documents include both congressional materials and official Agency policy papers.

#### A. AID'S LEGISLATIVE MANDATE IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR

The legislative mandate for AID concerning programs in the education sector covers a broad range of activities, but places particular emphasis on development efforts that will reach the poor. This emphasis is apparent in "Section 105: Education and Human Resource Development" of the Foreign Assistance Act, which states that

assistance in education shall be used primarily to expand and strengthen nonformal education methods, especially those designed to improve productive skills of rural families and the urban poor and to provide them with useful information; to increase the relevance of formal education systems to the needs of the poor, especially at the primary level, through reform of curricula, teaching materials, and teaching methods, and improved teacher training; and to strengthen the management capabilities of institutions which enable the poor to participate in development. Assistance under this section [105] shall also be provided for advanced education and training of people of developing countries in such disciplines as are required for planning and implementation of public and private development activities (Legislation on Foreign Relations Through 1984, March 1985).

The major components of AID's development efforts in the education sector are again stated in the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations concerning the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985. Here the Committee states that it "continues to endorse the key elements of AID's education and human resources program: increased support for improving basic schooling opportunities for the 6-14 age group; support for skill training for adolescents and adults; and support for the strengthening of training and research institutions" (Report 99-34, April 1985, p. 33). The Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives in their Report on the International Security and Development Cooperation Act highlights the importance of AID's programs in primary education that will provide more equitable access. The following statement was the only one made within the report concerning the direction of programs funded by the education account: "The committee supports AID's stated intention of increasing support for improvement in primary education systems, emphasizing increased education opportunities for girls and for children in rural areas" (Report 99-39, April 1985).

AID's legislative mandate is not restrictive in that it provides support for education programs in formal and nonformal education at all levels.

Special concern, however, lies with efforts that provide education to those who have previously been unable to attain access to the formal education system within a developing country.

## B. AID'S POLICY FOR THE EDUCATION SECTOR

AID's policy for investment in the education sector can be found in several documents. First, this sector is covered in the Blueprint for Development: The Strategic Plan for the Agency for International Development; second, educational policy is defined in the AID Policy Paper: Basic Education and Technical Training and the Policy Determination: Participant Training; third, appropriate approaches for development in the education sector are discussed in the AID Sector Strategy: Education. Each regional bureau also produces a strategy statement that provides guidance for programming in all sectors, including education. In addition, documents AID presents to Congress reflect its policy in education.

### 1. General Policy for All Sectors

The Blueprint for Development, AID's general policy document concerning its development efforts, states that AID's approach to development will "emphasize four basic programmatic components": policy dialogue; institutional development and training; technology that includes research, development, and transfer; and, finally, reliance on the private sector and market forces. AID's development efforts will rely on the above approaches and focus on five problem areas. The Blueprint groups illiteracy and lack of education together as one of these problem areas--along with economic growth, hunger, disease and early death, and unmanageable population pressures.

To guide AID's efforts in combating illiteracy and lack of education, the Blueprint lists the following standards as goals for the year 2000.

Increase primary school enrollment to above 90 percent for both boys and girls, with 70 percent of the age groups completing at least four years of schooling. Provide skills training compatible with development requirements. Raise adult literacy above 50 percent for both men and women.

These targets coincide with the congressional mandate in that they allow for educational programs at all levels in both formal and nonformal settings. However, the Blueprint does not provide guidance concerning the priority of these target levels in relation to one another or in relation to the benchmarks listed for the other problem areas. The broad scope of AID's approach and focus in education permits much flexibility and variability for programming but provides little direction.

In the detailed section on illiteracy and lack of education, the Blueprint is consistent with the research that demonstrates the importance of education in development.

Basic literacy and related skills training are among the fundamental requirements for sustained economic and social development in all sectors. An educated citizenry and a skilled work force are essential to the efficient functioning of the economy and to the many technical and personal choices leading to changes in productivity, health, nutrition and other indicators of development.

The Blueprint goes on to cite the importance of an educated work force, particularly in agriculture where productivity improves as individuals acquire literacy and technical skills. Furthermore, this document states that "widespread development of human capital is a basic underpinning of broad-based economic growth."

In its discussion of illiteracy and lack of education, the Blueprint points out a broad range of needs to be met, such as

- relating skills training to labor market demands;
- providing equitable access to education;
- improving the efficiency of existing education systems in developing countries;
- improving literacy levels;
- engaging in policy dialogue with host countries to generate long-term plans for eliminating deficiencies within educational systems;
- encouraging decentralization of educational systems;
- supporting improvements of the educational systems through technology transfer, such as the use of modern communications;
- expanding participant training programs to provide the skilled manpower needed for development programs;
- involving the private sector in the educational systems; and
- working with other international donors.

Again, the amount of guidance provided by such a discussion is limited in that no priorities are indicated for countries experiencing different stages of development.

## 2. Basic Education and Technical Training

AID's Policy Paper: Basic Education and Technical Training in its introduction states that "increasing the efficiency and improving the

distribution of basic education and skills training . . . are among the priorities of AID's assistance programs." The document then states that AID should focus attention on increasing "(1) the efficiency with which education resources are used, (2) the quantitative and qualitative outputs of education and training investment, and (3) the effectiveness of the education and training systems in supporting economic and social development objectives."

For both basic education and technical training, the Policy Paper identifies certain areas of high priority. In the subsector of basic education, highest priority should be given to improving internal efficiency of schooling for children 6-14 so that the current systems can increase the number of students they serve by lessening the rate of drop out, academic failure, and retention. For programs in vocational education and technical training, AID will concentrate on improving the external efficiency by relating these programs more to labor market demands and circumstances as well as to the personal goals of the participants.

Another high priority area in basic education and technical training is the decentralization of the educational systems. AID will work with host governments to assist them in encouraging local administration of educational institutions and involvement of the parents and community in decision-making processes within the institutions.

AID also provides some guidelines for selecting countries in which to initiate programs in basic education and technical training. For example, AID will concentrate its assistance to basic education in countries that

- encourage both public and private schooling;
- encourage decentralized management of the school system, local participation in schools, and diversified sponsorship of schools;
- support programs that address qualitative and quantitative aspects of efficiency, adequacy, and effectiveness; and
- encourage and support increased access and opportunities for girls and other segments of the population who are deprived of access.

Within the subsector of vocational and technical training, the Policy Paper states that AID will support project activities that

- "increase the productivity of individuals;
- "increase the productivity of enterprises using the trained employee;
- "improve the productive performance of public sector agencies; and

- "strengthen technical and administrative capacities of local development organizations."

In the field of technical training, AID encourages the involvement of prospective employers and trainees in the identification of training needs and support of training programs. In addition, AID gives preference to providing assistance for vocational and technical training programs that arise from initiatives of community organizations, that include women, that concentrate on skills related to employment (including self-employment) in important development sectors, and that are responsive to the needs of the participants.

This Policy Paper states that AID's education policy concentrates on "strategies which address the problems of the education system as a whole," such as constraints caused by policy, organization and management, limited technology, and lack of adequate resources. Yet the Policy Paper also states that AID assistance to developing countries will be limited in terms of funding: "Indeed, most education assistance programs are expected to be relatively small. Only a few developing countries . . . will have education sector assistance programs as large as \$5 million annually."

AID Policy Paper: Basic Education and Technical Training provides some specific guidelines in the field of education; however, it does not cover all subsectors of education and does not indicate priority areas for funding. First, basic education for adults is mentioned only very briefly in the section on vocational education and technical training. Second, though objectives are established for both basic schooling and vocational/technical programs, these subsectors are not placed in a priority order. Both appear to be equally important for AID assistance.

### 3. Participant Training

AID's Policy Determination: Participant Training states that the goal of participant training is to provide the skilled manpower needed for continued development of a country through training programs that take place in the United States or other (third) countries. Consequently, it is crucial that all participant training programs be closely linked to the specific development objectives defined in the CDSS and sector strategy statements.

AID policy encourages participant training in three areas. First, there is project-related participant training. This training is designed to ensure that AID-supported development efforts involve appropriately trained host-country staff and that trained manpower exists to carry on programs once AID withdraws its support. Second, there is participant training that is provided to strengthen key private and public institutions. This training should be based on institutional needs. Third, there is participant training that provides training for trainers and thereby assists in establishing or strengthening local training capacities that are strategic to a country's development.

Equitable access is a concern of this policy determination as it was in the Blueprint and Basic Education and Technical Training: all participant training programs are expected to provide opportunities for women. In

addition, the policy determination states that all participant training programs must be justified by needs assessments and economic analyses and that participant training programs must include efforts to place the trainees in appropriate positions within their home countries. The policy paper also encourages the involvement of the private sector in both assessments and sponsorship of participants.

Other selected policy guidance is stated in the Policy Determination.

- Participant training funded under the 105 account should concentrate on training for educators, educational administrators, private and public sector administrators, social scientists, and those involved in labor development programs.
- Participant training for specific projects should ensure the skilled manpower needed for effective project implementation.
- Participant training programs should provide training that is not available in the host country, that can be attained more cost-effectively in the United States, or that offers strategic exposure to key U.S. institutions or leaders.
- Long-term training in the United States should be limited to three calendar years and concentrate on graduate training.

In summary, AID's Policy Determination: Participant Training encourages the use of participant training to improve national training capacities, ensure the availability of key project staff and professional counterparts, and contribute to the ongoing process of improving the technical, managerial, and policy leadership of private and public sector development institutions.

This policy determination relates to the programming of all sectors because participant training is one form of assistance provided by all sectors. No clear priorities or benchmarks are set, for example agriculture is not indicated as the area in which the highest level of training will be provided under particular development conditions. Furthermore, because this is a cross-sectoral document, it does not weigh the importance of participant training programs compared to the importance of programs in other subsectors of education, such as basic education for children, literacy and numeracy for adults, or vocational training.

#### 4. Education Sector Strategy

The educational policies outlined above have been translated into appropriate strategies or approaches in the document AID Sector Strategy: Education. This document defines the education sector as "formal schooling, basic education within or outside of a school setting, and vocational and technical skills training" and provides strategies that are appropriate for programs funded by the education account.

The document begins by stating that one of AID's strengths in the field of education is expanding and improving basic education--expertise that has been repeatedly demonstrated in such countries as Nepal, Brazil, Korea, and Jordan. In addition, this strategy paper points out that AID can cost-effectively assist in education reform if it focuses its efforts, works closely with the host-country government, and participates, even though indirectly, in other aspects of the reform.

Other conditions that are important for development in education are the implementation of long-term programs that span a minimum of ten years; the existence of a strong host-country institution to serve as a base for the programs; the provision of long- and short-term training for educators and administrators; and the use of innovative techniques, such as radio and paraprofessionals, to cut costs.

The education strategy reflects the policy paper, Basic Education and Technical Training, in that it focuses on measures to increase the efficiency of education systems, their qualitative and quantitative outputs, and their effectiveness in terms of impact on development. But the strategy paper goes beyond the policy paper in that it also provides guidance concerning when investment in basic education is a priority and when investment in vocational and technical training is a priority. Countries that have less than two-thirds of eligible-age children completing four years of primary school require more assistance in primary education. Those with more than two-thirds of the eligible age group completing four years of schooling may need more assistance in the area of vocational and technical training if labor market demands and potential also indicate the need for such efforts.

Furthermore, the strategy paper states that participant training funds from the education account should support the sector by training educators and educational administrators in countries in which AID has education sector programs. In those countries that do not have AID education programs but could benefit from them, participant training funds should be used to train those who initiate activities in the education sector and support change in this area. The strategy paper, however, does not provide any benchmarks for determining what type of participant training is appropriate under specific development conditions.

The strategy paper also states that AID will provide assistance through some new approaches. One such approach is decentralization. In addition, the paper recommends that AID work with host countries to develop innovative means of financing. In the area of vocational and technical training, AID should work with host countries to provide skills that are applicable to the labor market in a timely and cost-effective manner.

Recognizing that all guidelines are not applicable to each country situation, the strategy paper stresses the importance of basing any programs in education on a sector assessment that could in fact become part of the CDSS.

Though the strategy paper does provide some focus for AID efforts in education, the priorities indicated are limited. In general, funds should focus on basic schooling rather than vocational/technical training until the

primary education system is strong. Just how participant training fits into this picture is not clear. Missions are not given such clear guidelines concerning support for higher education programs.

#### 5. Regional Strategy Papers

Several of the regional strategy papers concerning assistance to the education sector or assistance to all sectors provide direction for the Missions concerning educational programming.

The Africa Bureau Basic Education and Technical Training Assistance Strategy Paper "recommends a significant increase in Bureau efforts to improve basic education and technical training opportunities," a statement that indicates the region's intent to implement Agency policy concerning education. Furthermore, the Africa strategy paper reiterates what is stated in the AID Education Sector Strategy in that it "accords priority in the education sector to increasing the efficiencies of basic formal education" and it indicates that "Basic Education is a priority area."

The Africa strategy paper also coincides with the development literature and other policy documents in that it indicates the importance of education and its relationship to development in other sectors.

A literate and numerate society is among the fundamental requirements for institutional development at all levels, facilitating the diffusion and adaptation of new technology and ideas and enabling individuals to make better informed choices and participate more fully. Raising the general levels of education in a society is among the priority strategic tasks for key development objectives including increased agricultural productivity and reduction in birth rate.

The Africa strategy paper is closely linked to both Basic Education and Technical Training and AID Sector Strategy: Education in that it opens with summaries of both documents. The specific problem areas identified in this Africa strategy paper also relate directly to those discussed in the other policy documents. The areas listed are:

- limited access;
- internal and external inefficiencies;
- ineffective instruction;
- inadequate physical capacity;
- administrative and management problems;
- inadequate data and data analysis;
- recurrent budget constraints; and

- inadequate training opportunities for out-of-school youth and adults.

This strategy paper, like the document AID Sector Strategy: Education, recognizes that each country has specific needs; consequently, it presents this strategy as "a general methodological approach" that presents "broad options to be considered." The paper suggests that though basic education is a high priority for the region, high completion rates for primary school could justify programs in other educational levels, but it states that the "combination of high costs and expansion of secondary and higher education often results in the reduction of opportunities for basic education." The strategy paper also advocates other forms of educational assistance, such as nonformal training in vocational/technical skills and literacy/numeracy skills.

The Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC) is currently updating its strategy statement. However, the document LAC Management by Objectives Goal Structure illustrates how the Bureau's objectives meet the priorities and mandates provided by Agency policy documents and congressional documents. Three of the eighteen objectives directly concern assistance to the education sector: Objective 12--to increase literacy rates; Objective 16--to improve education; and Objective 17--to increase participant training. This document does not provide strategies for implementation of the objectives nor does it rank the priorities. Instead, the document is designed to demonstrate how LAC objectives relate to AID policy statements, CDSS's produced by countries in the region, and project portfolios. Using this type of comparison, the Bureau can easily identify the program areas that are receiving high priority, but this system functions more as a review of the current situation rather than as guidance for future programming.

The Asia/Near East Bureau is currently using the two separate strategy statements that were developed before the Asia and Near East Bureaus merged into one. The new bureau soon will be reviewing the differing points in the two strategies to see whether they should be resolved in one strategy statement. For the purposes of this report, each document will be reviewed individually.

The Asia Regional Strategic Plan (1983) is not consistent with AID policies on education in that it indicates that "education will remain an area of fairly limited involvement for the Bureau." Technical assistance for the education sector in Indonesia, however, will increase. Educational activities undertaken in this region will concentrate "on strengthening agricultural education, the internal efficiency of education systems, and basic education and skills training, particularly of girls and women."

Despite the lack of priority education holds in the Asia strategy, the document does recognize U.S. expertise in this area, stating that the United States "has much to offer LDCs in technical assistance to overcome some of the major management problems facing administrators of LDC education programs." Consequently, the Asia Bureau recommends policy dialogue with ministries of education to improve research systems, planning for education and training programs, and internal efficiency of existing systems.

In addition, AID will supplement the work of other donors in countries with low literacy rates to support basic education and skills programs. Such efforts will include development of appropriate technology, for example radio education. Participant training receives continuous support, and new projects in this area will be considered for strengthening institutions in both the private and public sectors.

Though the Asia Regional Strategic Plan presents different strategies for low income countries and more rapidly progressing countries, the difference in educational assistance for these two development levels is not clear. The strategy for low income countries points out the need to train managers and technicians, and the strategy for rapidly progressing countries indicates the same need.

The Near East Bureau Strategy (1983-1988) states that "the countries of the Middle East region exhibit major differences in their degree of educational development and in the types of major educational issues they will face in the coming decades." The Bureau will focus on basic education projects, including the improvement of efficiency and quality as well as increased access for females in countries with low literacy rates, such as Egypt, Morocco, Oman, and Yemen. In countries with higher literacy rates (Jordan, Lebanon, and Tunisia), the Bureau will focus on "the provision of trained manpower for existing and future jobs requiring secondary and post secondary education." Egypt will also receive assistance to improve its higher education systems because of a decline in their quality.

This strategy paper recognizes the importance of literacy for agricultural productivity and population reduction as do the agency-wide policy papers that concern education. Nonetheless, the strategy paper presents a caveat concerning literacy campaigns because "based on evidence to date, very few of these campaigns have been successful." Also in this strategy statement, basic education and technical training, listed together, are indicated as one of seven development problems AID will address in the region. In an appendix, this strategy paper also shows Mission ranking of priority development problems region-wide. Education is ranked as the region's fourth priority problem behind population, agricultural productivity, and water scarcity/utilization.

This strategy paper also makes a distinction between strategies for different levels of development. However, in the case of education, the strategies for these two different levels that appear in the beginning of the document are very similar--higher level training is the main concern. Nonetheless, of the regional strategy papers reviewed, the Near East Bureau Strategy has the most specific and directive presentation of Agency interventions in the education sector.

## 6. Policy Reflected in AID Presentations to Congress

The policies concerning development efforts in the education sector are reiterated in the 1984 and 1985 Annual Report of the Chairman of the Development Coordination Committee, which is presented to the U.S. Congress. The 1984 Annual Report, in fact, states a strong case for AID's support for basic education.

In general, those countries which have the least adequate technical training and university systems have also made slower programs in expanding basic education systems. While improvements are required at all levels of national education and training systems, the most basic task is the establishment of schooling systems for children and skills training opportunities for adolescents and adults. Until these basic systems are substantially established, the universities and more advanced or specialized training programs will rest on a weak foundation and the supply of higher level manpower will be quantitatively and qualitatively inadequate as well as very expensive to produce.

The 1984 Annual Report also reflects the increasing priority that basic education and vocational and technical training are receiving in AID and states that these programs will account "for at least 30 percent of the bilateral EHR [Education and Human Resource] effort in FY [Fiscal Year] 1984."

The 1985 Annual Report continues in this vein, stating that "basic education for children and for adults is attaining a higher priority" and that "programs supporting school system improvement and basic adult education account for about 30 percent of the bilateral EHR effort." Furthermore, the 1985 Annual Report illustrates the new emphasis on improving the efficiency of existing systems because of the scarcity of resources.

### C. ANALYSIS OF AID'S POLICY IN EDUCATION

The congressional mandate and AID's policy concerning the education sector highlight some of the major themes found in the literature. For example, the Foreign Assistance Act, Blueprint, Basic Education and Technical Training, AID Sector Strategy: Education, and the strategy papers for Africa and the Near East stress the importance of a strong basic schooling system for overall development of a country. Repeatedly, these documents state that completion of basic education has a positive impact on productivity, health, and reduced population levels. Only the Africa strategy paper, however, points out (as does the development literature) that investments in higher education are costly and may result in less support for basic education.

There are also common threads that run throughout the AID policy papers on education. First, basic education is generally seen as a priority area for education investment. Even the Asia strategy paper, which states that education investment will be limited, indicates that an area of emphasis will be basic education and skills training. Second, though basic education as it is defined in these documents includes both schooling for children 6-14 and functional skills training for adults, the focus of the discussions for this subsector of education is on basic schooling for children. Nonformal literacy and numeracy training for adults is one of the strategies included in the policy papers on education, but this subsector receives very limited coverage, making education policy somewhat incomplete.

Other common themes that run throughout the policy documents are the following.

- A high priority will be development efforts that focus on improving the efficiency of existing educational systems.
- AID's educational assistance should focus on improving the qualitative and quantitative output of education.
- Equitable access to formal and nonformal learning opportunities is a high priority.
- Programming for vocational and technical training must be closely linked to labor demands.
- Participant training funded by the 105 account should focus on training directly benefiting the education sector.
- Decentralizing educational systems should be encouraged.
- Education and training projects sponsored by AID should seek increased involvement of the private sector.
- Appropriate technology, such as radio education, will play an important role in AID's educational assistance.
- Success of educational assistance will depend greatly on the level of collaboration maintained between AID and the host country government, institutions, and communities.
- Policy dialogue will play a key role in improving education and training systems.
- AID will collaborate with other donors in its development and implementation of education and training programs.

Though this list demonstrates general commonality in the policy documents concerning education, it also indicates one of the major problems concerning education policy: an overabundance of priorities. The education sector is by definition a broad one that includes programs for children and adults, both formal and nonformal, at all levels. AID policy, in general, sanctions programs in all of the subsectors of education without indicating what investments in education could have the most significant impact.

Several AID documents do indicate some criteria for setting priorities. The strategy paper for the education sector specifies the development conditions that require basic schooling as the highest priority and what conditions merit more investment in vocational/technical training. This establishment of priorities, however, occurs for only those two subsectors of education so the process is incomplete. The Near East strategy paper provides the most clear presentation of priorities. This document lists the Missions' ranking of priority development problems so that the importance of investment

in education is seen in relation to the other major sectors. The paper also clearly indicates in which countries basic schooling will be a priority and in which countries AID will concentrate on other levels or forms of education and training. Furthermore, the paper provides rationale for setting these priorities.

The rest of the policy documents do not provide such a clear understanding of priorities. How important are programs combating illiteracy and in relation to those combating hunger? How do the different development levels possible across regions affect educational priorities? These and similar issues are not addressed. While education policy must be flexible to adapt to varying conditions within countries, the similar policy documents could provide, as the AID Sector Strategy: Education and Near East Bureau Strategy do to a certain degree, guidelines for determining appropriate development strategies based on economic realities.

Education policy should be more complete by addressing all of the major education subsectors. Nonformal literacy and numeracy training for adults is not discussed fully in the document Basic Education and Technical Training, even though it is included in this document's definition of basic education. Nor is support for higher education institutions or secondary education in developing countries explored thoroughly in AID policy on education. AID needs to establish more complete education policy, discussing the relative importance of all subsectors of education and the conditions that determine how much emphasis should be given to each.

Based on the 105 account funding data, it would appear that funding in the education sector is not consistent, overall, with official Agency educational policy. AID policy documents indicate that basic education is to be a major priority for the education sector; yet funding levels for the 105 account show that support for basic education has been steadily declining in the 1980s.

#### IV. EDUCATION FUNDING TRENDS IN AID

The purpose of this section is to identify funding trends within the education sector, as defined by the Section 105 of the Development Assistance Program. Once those trends have been determined, they will then be measured against Agency educational policy. To provide a context for that analysis, below is an overview of Development Assistance Committee (DAC) funding for the education sector in the 1980s. This is followed by background information on AID funding for education in the 1970s and an in-depth analysis of AID education funding in the 1980s.

##### A. OVERVIEW OF DAC FUNDING TO EDUCATION IN THE 1980S

The 1985 Report by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) states that Development Assistance Committee (DAC) member countries provided the developing world with \$5.96 billion in aid for education for the years 1983 to 1984. This represents 15.7 percent of total bilateral Official Development Assistance (ODA) commitments for that period.

FIGURE III-1  
LEADING DAC CONTRIBUTORS TO THE EDUCATION SECTOR  
1983 AND 1984

Countries	Education (\$ million)	Total ODA commitments allocable by sector (\$ million)
France ..... 1983	1350.2	3970.9
..... 1984	1262.1	3723.5
..... Total	2612.3	7694.4
Germany ..... 1983	391.4	1922.3
..... 1984	491.0	2399.0
..... Total	882.4	4321.3
United States ... 1983	253.9	3581.5
..... 1984	574.1	5967.9
..... Total	828.0	9549.4
Japan ..... 1983	216.0	3086.9
..... 1984	188.4	3203.3
..... Total	404.4	6290.2

Source: OECD (1985)

Although the United States is by far the greatest source of overall aid among the 17 DAC countries, it ranks third behind France and Germany in the amount of funds allocated to the education sector. Even though France provides the developing world with more than \$1 billion per annum in education

assistance, it should be noted that this development assistance is primarily in the form of teachers who work in the formal education system at the secondary or university level.

Basic education and training receive special attention in the 1986 OECD report. The report found that the sole component of training assistance that can be readily measured is that of individual fellowships for study and training. Expenditures by DAC member countries for subsidized scholarships equaled approximately \$600 million in 1980 and \$650 million in 1983.

As for basic education, the report contends that this subsector is a cost-effective means of achieving educational progress, especially in rural areas. However, in spite of its emergence as an important development strategy, basic education still receives only a small share of total DAC education funds. In fact, bilateral programs continue to concentrate on higher, technical, and secondary education. According to the OECD, only the World Bank appears to be allocating significant amounts of resources to primary and nonformal education.

## B. OVERVIEW OF FUNDING FOR AID EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE 1970S\*

### 1. Education Funding for 1971-76

In 1971-76, total assistance for educational activities, including those funded by accounts other than the 105 account, is estimated at \$807 million. Of this, \$503 million was funded through the education (105) account, and an estimated \$304 was funded through other sector programs. The \$304 million estimate includes all projects that have staff training, participant training, and extension education as a major focus, and represents the estimated value of these components.

For the period 1971-76, the Bureaus for Asia, Africa, and Latin America received approximately the same amount of funds for technical assistance--about \$60 million each. Technical assistance funds allotted to the Near East/South Asia Region were \$27.7 million, and most of this amount was designated for the Near East countries.

In addition, during this period there was an increase in the amount of technical assistance provided by regional and AID/Washington accounts. In 1971, assistance to the education sector provided by regional offices and AID/Washington accounted for 10 to 20 percent of total technical assistance in education. By 1976 educational assistance from these offices rose to approximately 30 percent. The Africa Region, for example, was administering almost 50 percent of its technical assistance through regional and subregional programs by the end of this period.

---

\*The source for funding data for the period 1970-1979 is the study, AID Assistance to Education: A Retrospective Study.

From 1971 to 1976, assistance to higher education was the highest priority in all regions, accounting for 40 to 50 percent of the technical assistance obligations related to education. This assistance included scholarship, fellowship, and participant training programs; teacher-training programs; and assistance to universities, including agricultural universities.

## 2. Education Funding for 1977-1979

For the period 1977-79, education sector obligations amounted to \$493.9 million. Of this, \$257 million is identified as education sector projects, \$169.2 million as human resources projects, and \$67.7 million as institution-building endeavors. Funding from sectors other than the education sector that supported educational activities amounted to \$234.8 million, \$123 million of which was designated for manpower development and participant training.

For educational programs other than human resource development activities, the Latin America Region received the largest amount (\$96.3 million) allotted from the education sector account. The Near East Region received \$59 million, the Africa Region \$58.5 million, and the Asia Region \$45.5 million.

Until 1979, basic education (primary education, secondary education, and adult/community education) constituted approximately one-third of the education sector account. A second third was invested in manpower development while the remaining third was apportioned to labor development programs, vocational/technical training, and support for private voluntary organizations (PVOs). However, in 1979, IDCA proposed that AID concentrate its resources in energy, food/agriculture, population, and health. Education was, therefore, indirectly targeted for phase down. Accordingly, missions began scaling down their education sector activities. The following section will demonstrate to what extent funding priorities have shifted.

## C. FUNDING FOR THE EDUCATION SECTOR IN AID FOR THE 1980S

### 1. The Funding Process within AID

Much of the funding process, at least at aggregate levels, initially takes place outside the Agency. Determinations specifically lie with Congress. AID submits line item requests (line items represent functional accounts) to the Office of Management and Budget, which determines levels of funding. Through a passback process AID can review and appeal specific line item ceilings and consensus is reached through a process of negotiation. The budget is then sent to Congress where three other sets of actors become involved:

- the authorizing committees, which are the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee;
- the appropriations committees of the House and Senate; and
- the budget committees of the House and Senate.

An authorizing bill passed by Congress determines by line item (functional accounts) funding levels as actual ceilings. When no authorization bill is passed, a continuing resolution is passed that determines ceilings based on historic levels using a set formula.

At the same time the authorization committees are determining levels, the appropriations committees are also determining appropriations levels that cannot exceed ceilings set by the authorizing committees. These levels are also determined by line item.

The committees least concerned with specific AID budgets are the Budget Committees of the House and Senate, which determine the aggregate ceiling for foreign assistance including AID. Within this overall ceiling, the appropriations committees must work to determine individual agency budgets and functional account funding. Once this has been determined, the budget allocations and appropriations are sent to AID.

Within the Agency, the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination (PPC) approves all allocations and resolves all budget issues in coordination with the State Department. PPC then allocates funds by Bureau and functional account. In turn, Bureaus allocate funds by project through the project review process.

## 2. Methodology of the Study

### a. The Unit of Analysis: The Section 105 Account

Analyzing AID's budgetary allocations to educational activities is an extremely complicated undertaking due to the multiplicity of funding sources for education and training projects. Monies for such activities are not only appropriated from the education and human resources sector functional account (Section 105), but can also be allocated from the Sahel Development Program and the Selected Development Activities Account (Section 106), which are all components of AID's Development Assistance Program. Another possible source is the Economic Support Funds. It should be noted that the analysis that follows is based solely on Section 105 obligations. Such a study is not intended to provide the reader with a comprehensive view of the Agency's total expenditures for educational activities. Rather, the education sector (Section 105) is considered to be representational of the Agency's involvement in education.

### b. Data Sources

Actual and estimated expenditures for the fiscal years 1980 through 1987 have been used as the basis for analysis. These figures were taken from the document FY 1987 Congressional Presentation Summary of Obligations in Functional Subcategories by Bureau. These raw data were provided by the Office of Planning and Budgeting in the Bureau of Program and Policy Coordination. Although the requested figures may still be subject to change, the relative emphases placed in education subsectors are unlikely to experience any dramatic shifts.

### c. The Classification and Reclassification of Appropriations

Programming in the education sector has been classified by AID into twelve categories. Some refer to actual subsectors of education, while others appear to have been devised strictly for budgetary purposes. These are

- Planning/Policy Analysis;
- Research;
- Elementary Education;
- Secondary Education;
- Administrative/Managerial Education;
- Professional/Scientific Education;
- Adult/Community Education;
- Vocational/Technical Education;
- Labor Development;
- Development Administration;
- U.S. Institutions (PVOs); and
- Not Classified.

For the purpose of this paper, these headings have been regrouped into five categories that represent a clearer, more accurate portrayal of educational programming. These categories, which will be referred to as subsectors of the education sector, are:

- **Basic Education:** Elementary (which will be referred to as "primary" in this paper), Secondary, and Adult/Community Education;
- **Manpower Development:** Administrative/Managerial, Professional/Scientific, and Development Administration;
- **Vocational/Technical Education;**
- **Labor Development; and**
- **Other:** Planning/Policy Analysis, Research, U.S. Institutions (PVOs), and Not Classified.

### 3. Funding Levels in the Education Sector for the 1980s

The chart below represents total obligations for the education sector in the 1980s. The education sector includes programs of the Bureau for Africa, the Bureau for Asia/Near East, the Bureau for Latin America and Caribbean, the Bureau for Science and Technology, the Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, and the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination. In the following sections these data have been disaggregated in order to conduct an analysis of education sector programming in the regional bureaus and the Bureau for Science and Technology. Attention will focus on these bureaus as they represent over 95 percent of funding for the education sector. However, for the sake of completeness, data analyses can be found for the remaining bureaus in Appendix D. In addition, the data on which the in-depth discussions of the regional bureaus are based can be found in Appendix C.

**FIGURES III-2  
FUNDING PERCENTAGES FOR EDUCATION SUBSECTORS  
(SECTION 105 ACCOUNT) FOR THE 1980S**

SUBSECTOR	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 EST.	1987 REQUEST
Basic Education	30.0%	26.8%	13.5%	11.3%	19.6%	22.1%	15.4%	15.3%
Manpower Development	26.7%	28.7%	45.5%	47.2%	38.7%	40.6%	44.4%	49.9%
Vocational/Tech- nical Education	7.3%	11.1%	12.6%	16.2%	10.5%	9.8%	4.3%	6.2%
Labor Development	22.4%	20.1%	15.3%	14.0%	13.2%	9.1%	9.6%	8.9%
Other	13.6%	13.3%	13.1%	11.3%	18.1%	18.4%	26.3%	19.8%
TOTAL PERCENT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Appropria- tions (\$000)	97831	102721	103880	114161	120698	186565	162134	179789

#### a. The Africa Bureau

Appropriations from the 105 account for the Africa Bureau have increased somewhat during the 1980s. More importantly, major shifts have occurred in the shares of total funding that have been allocated to the various subsectors.

Comparing the FY 1987 figures to the FY 1980 Africa Bureau 105 account funds, the most dramatic changes have taken place in labor development, which has declined by two-thirds, and basic education, which has almost doubled its percentage share.

The manner in which those appropriations have been classified by AID somewhat skews the overall presentation of funding percentages for the various subsectors in FY 1987. Accordingly, significantly large appropriations that had been placed in the "Other" category have been recategorized based on the educational focus of the activity. Those figures bracketed in Figure III-3 are percentages that have been readjusted to show more accurate funding levels. For FY 1987, it would appear that manpower development and basic education receive approximately equal funding. However, for that year the \$2.85 million that was obligated to the African Manpower Development III was originally classified as "not classified." Once those monies were recategorized, manpower development is seen to have 39.1 percent of total Africa Bureau funding for the education sector.

FIGURE III-3  
FUNDING PERCENTAGES FOR EDUCATION SUBSECTORS  
(SECTION 105 ACCOUNT) FOR THE 1980S: THE AFRICA BUREAU

SUBSECTOR	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 EST.	1987 REQUEST
Basic Education	15.9%	13.7%	3.8%	5.6%	23.3%	26.8%	35.3%	30.4%
Manpower Development	39.2%	38.0%	56.1%	43.3%	46.5%	44.7%	38.2%	31.3% [39.1%]
Vocational/Tech- nical Education	12.1%	8.4%	28.4%	36.8%	16.2%	8.5%	8.1%	9.0%
Labor Development	28.4%	30.2%	8.4%	10.2%	8.4%	11.9%	7.1%	9.2%
Other	4.4%	9.7%	3.3%	4.1%	5.6%	8.1%	11.3%	20.1% [12.4%]
TOTAL PERCENT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Appropria- tions (\$000)	30343	25148	35845	29341	35827	35419	47558	36869

## The Subsectors

### Basic Education

Support for basic education in Africa has fluctuated dramatically from 1980 to 1987. Significant decreases or increases in the percentage of the budget allotted to basic education from year to year can be attributed to funding patterns used in the Africa region. The tendency appears to be toward funding only a few relatively large projects. For example, funding levels for basic education rose from 5.6 percent in FY 1983 to 23.3 percent in FY 1984 largely because of the Support to Primary Education project begun in Cameroon and the Primary Education Improvement Project in Botswana. In addition, \$3.0 million were obligated to the Lesotho Basic and Non-Formal Education Systems Project.

In primary education, programs have been implemented in four countries (Botswana, Cameroon, Guinea-Bissau, and Swaziland) with Cameroon and Swaziland capturing the largest share of funding. From 1980 to 1987, Cameroon received 69.2 percent of all monies obligated to primary education while Swaziland acquired 24.6 percent. Swaziland has enjoyed the most long-term support for primary education, as witnessed by the the Curriculum Development Project (funds obligated FY 1979-FY 1982) and the Teacher Training Project (FY 1983-FY 1987).

As for secondary education, commitment to this subsector ended in 1980 during which \$225,000 was allotted to the Africa Regional program for science education.

Adult/community education constitutes approximately one-third of total basic education appropriations. Programs have existed in Djibouti, Ghana, Lesotho, and Sudan. Funds have also been allocated to the Africa Regional program. By 1981, the only adult education program was to be found in Lesotho. In fact, 83.4 percent of obligations to this subsector have been used for Lesotho's Instructional Materials Resource Center and the Basic and Nonformal Education Systems Project.

### Manpower Development

Appropriations for projects with manpower development as their focus have fluctuated slightly from 1980 to 1987, but have always enjoyed the greatest percentage share of the overall Africa bureau 105 account budget. The latest figures would indicate a downward trend in terms of funding. Obligations are almost evenly divided between administrative/managerial education (54 percent) and scientific/professional education (45 percent). Projects classified under the administrative/managerial education rubric include the African Manpower Development II project and the African Graduate Fellowship III project. The majority of projects geared toward professional/scientific education are found in Lesotho, Swaziland, and Zimbabwe.

## Vocational/Technical Education

Vocational/technical education has had uneven support in the Africa region. Although it is difficult to draw any major conclusions, it would appear that the regional bureau's commitment to vocational/technical education is declining.

A third of all obligations have been administered by the Southern Africa Regional program. In FY 1982 and FY 1983, \$3 million and \$3.05 million respectively were appropriated for training disadvantaged Southern Africans. The second largest program in this subsector is found in Malawi. 18.4 percent of all vocational/technical education appropriations have gone to the support of the Malawi Polytechnic Institute. The greatest funding increments to the project were allotted in FY 1982 (\$2.70 million) and FY 1983 (\$2.73 million). The two projects in Southern Africa and Malawi can, therefore, explain the rise in funding for vocational/technical education from 8.3 percent of the total Africa Bureau budget in FY 1981 to 36.8 percent in FY 1983.

## Labor Development

Support for labor development has steadily been declining in the Africa Bureau. In 1980, labor development received 28.4 percent of the total budget, while projections for FY 1987 indicate a 9.2 percent share. Labor development funds are solely managed by the Africa Regional program.

## Distribution of 105 Account Funds by Country

As seen in Figure III-4, the recipients of the greatest amount of assistance in the education sector have been Cameroon and Lesotho. Liberia and Swaziland have also received a high proportion of available aid. It should be noted that the Africa Regional program controls more than a third of education funds allocated to the Africa Bureau. This is in keeping with a general trend begun in the early 1970s.

### **b. The Asia/Near East Bureau**

The Asia/Near East Bureau exemplifies the difficulties involved in determining the extent of AID involvement in education. Of the nine countries in the Near East region, only Yemen and Morocco presently receive 105 account monies. Tunisia was also once a recipient of DA funds; that assistance ended in FY 1984, however. Therefore, funding for education projects that may have been implemented in Israel, Lebanon, Egypt, Oman, Tunisia, Jordan, or Turkey is not reflected in this report. The majority of educational funding outside the 105 account is for building construction or participant training. So, the nature of AID support to education in the Near East can not be gleaned from an examination of 105 account expenditures.

The Asia/Near East bureau is characterized by its lack of support for fundamental levels of basic and vocational/technical education. The most striking readjustment in appropriations has occurred between basic education and manpower development. In 1980 those subsectors each represented approximately 29 percent of the total budget for the education sector in the

FIGURE III-4  
DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS  
BY COUNTRY IN AFRICA, 1980-87

Country	Amount (\$000)	Percentage (%)
Botswana	\$ 4,467	1.6
Burundi	\$ 1,250	0.5
Cameroon	\$ 26,624	9.6
Congo	\$ 312	0.1
Djibouti	\$ 2,800	1.0
Ghana	\$ 2,641	1.0
Guinea-Bissau	\$ 2,050	0.7
Kenya	\$ 1,065	0.4
Liberia	\$ 23,706	8.6
Lesotho	\$ 30,612	11.1
Malawi	\$ 8,314	3.0
Sierra Leone	\$ 1,249	0.5
Somalia	\$ 7,737	2.8
Sudan	\$ 697	0.3
Swaziland	\$ 27,350	9.9
Tanzania	\$ 9,377	3.4
Zaire	\$ 3,458	1.3
Zimbabwe	\$ 3,000	1.9
Africa Regional	\$100,751	36.5
Southern Africa Regional	\$ 18,890	6.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$276,350</b>	<b>101.0*</b>

\*Total exceeds 100% due to rounding errors.

Asia/Near East region. However, projections for FY 1987 indicate that manpower development will claim 78.0 percent of the total Asia/Near East 105 account, whereas basic education will have been nearly phased out. Figure III-5 illustrates this phenomenon.

### The Subsectors

#### Basic Education

Funding for basic education in the Asia/Near East Bureau has witnessed a steady decline since 1980. In the early 1980s there were basic education projects in six countries and two regional programs. As of FY 1986, support for this subsector will be limited to Nepal.

The Asia/Near East Bureau has implemented primary education projects in Yemen, Nepal, Indonesia, and Thailand, while 7.9 percent of allocations for this subsector have been appropriated by the Near East Regional program. However, the majority of 105 monies have gone to Yemen; 63.1 percent of the total appropriations for primary education in Asia/Near East were directed towards the Basic Educational Development Project for which funding ended in

FIGURE III-5  
 FUNDING PERCENTAGES FOR EDUCATION SUBSECTORS  
 (SECTION 105 ACCOUNT) FOR THE 1980S: THE ASIA/NEAR EAST BUREAU

SUBSECTOR	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 EST.	1987 REQUEST
Basic Education	28.8%	24.5%	8.1%	11.2%	13.4%	8.2%	3.5%	2.4%
Manpower Development	29.6%	36.0%	60.8%	68.5%	42.3%	36.2%	55.3%	78.0%
Vocational/Tech- nical Education	2.1%	7.4%	2.8%	0.9%	1.5%	1.8%	2.2%	0.5%
Labor Development	16.3%	13.8%	15.9%	10.7%	10.7%	15.5%	18.6%	12.5%
Other	23.2%	18.3%	12.4%	8.7%	32.1%	20.6%	20.4%	6.6%
TOTAL PERCENT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Appropria- tions (\$000)	23915	29774	25872	38455	38253	26517	20925	31120

FY 1985. That project also represents the most long-term endeavor for the region as funds were allocated steadily from FY 1980 to FY 1985.

There have not been any projects in secondary education during the period under review.

Funding for adult/community education has been somewhat evenly distributed between Indonesia (55.9 percent) and Morocco (43.4 percent). The final appropriation for the Indonesian Education Communication Development project was made in FY 1981. Funding for Morocco's Social Services Training Project ended in FY 1983. The remaining share (\$67,000) was allocated to the South Pacific Regional program in FY 1984, which was the last year of obligations to this subsector.

#### Manpower Development

Funding for manpower development has been concentrated in Indonesia (30.6 percent) and Yemen (35.0 percent). In addition, nearly 10 percent of the Asia/Near East budget for manpower development has been obligated to the American University of Beirut.

## Vocational/Technical Education

Although vocational/technical education has never been considered a priority in the Asia/Near East bureau, projections indicate that it is to be all but terminated by FY 1987. This subsector will be allocated 0.5 percent of Asia/Near East's section 105 account for FY 1987.

The largest recipient of funds for vocational/technical education has been the Philippines. The Agricultural Education Outreach project, for which monies were obligated in FY 1981 and FY 1982, received 34.8 percent of the region's vocational/technical education budget during the period under review. The Near East Regional Program has garnered 14.4 percent of the budget for the Science and Technical Information Transfer Project. Morocco was allocated 15.3 percent of the regional budget for the 1980s for the Industry and Community Job Training for Women Project (FY 1981-FY 1982).

## Labor Development

Funding for this subsector fell slightly during the mid-1980s, but has regained the percentage of the budget that it enjoyed at the beginning of the decade. Adjusted for inflation, this would not represent a real gain over 1980 funding levels. The Asia Regional Program is charged with the management of labor development projects.

## Other

As this category has consistently accounted for more than one-quarter of the region's total appropriations of the education sector, it merits a closer look. In the "Other" category, 15.6 percent of total monies have been allocated to the Indonesian Education Policy and Planning project. The other sizable project from the planning/policy analysis subcategory has been in the Philippines. In FY 1983 and FY 1984 \$4.5 million were appropriated for the Training and Development Issues project.

The subcategory U.S. Institutions (PVOs) accounts for nearly half of the funds spent in this category. This classification does not indicate around which level of education the activity is centered, but rather focuses on the mode of disbursement of funds. This is a prime example of the limitations of the classification system used by AID. Attempts to review how and where these funds have been spent would have required a time-consuming, project-by-project review which was beyond the scope of this study.

## Distribution of 105 Account Funds by Country

Figure III-6 reveals that Indonesia and Yemen have each received more than one-fifth of the total education sector budget for the Asia/Near East Bureau. As witnessed in the Africa Bureau, the regional programs manage nearly 30 percent of the region's total funds for the education sector. Of the three regional bureaus, funding appears to be most unevenly distributed within the Asia/Near East region.

FIGURE III-6  
DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS  
BY COUNTRY IN ASIA/NEAR EAST, 1980-87

Country	Amount (\$000)	Percentage (%)
Bangladesh	\$ 3,250	1.3
Burma	\$ 1,100	0.5
India	\$ 5,100	2.2
Indonesia	\$ 57,220	24.4
Morocco	\$ 18,163	7.7
Nepal	\$ 5,270	2.2
Pakistan	\$ 3,000	1.3
Philippines	\$ 8,967	3.8
Sri Lanka	\$ 643	0.3
Thailand	\$ 2,998	1.2
Tunisia	\$ 10	0.0
Yemen	\$ 58,401	24.9
Asia Regional	\$ 30,467	13.0
Asia/Near East Regional	\$ 10,948	4.7
Near East Regional	\$ 15,630	6.7
South Pacific Regional	\$ 13,664	5.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$234,831</b>	<b>100.0</b>

c. The Latin America/Caribbean Bureau

The dramatic increase in investment for education that began in FY 1985 can be attributed to implementation of the recommendations of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America. The most readily apparent shifts in funding priorities have occurred within the basic education, manpower development, and labor development subsectors. Obligations for basic education and labor development have decreased since 1980, whereas those for manpower development have witnessed a sizable increase throughout the 1980s.

**The Subsectors**

Basic Education

Support to basic education has declined in the Latin America/Caribbean (LAC) Bureau. In 1980, it was at the highest point of the decade with a 37.2 percent share of LAC 105 account monies. However, projected budgetary figures for FY 1987 indicate that expenditures for basic education will account for 14.4 percent of the education sector budget. Honduras attracts the greatest share of funding with 33.6 percent of LAC Bureau monies in the education sector.

Projects in primary education have been implemented in eight countries (Bolivia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Paraguay, and Peru). In addition, the LAC Regional and Caribbean Regional

Programs have funded projects in this subsector. More than half the funds appropriated to primary education have been invested in Honduras where several projects for rural primary education have been undertaken. Support for these endeavors has been consistent throughout the 1980s. The second greatest recipient of primary education monies has been Guatemala, which received 26.5 percent of the LAC primary education budget.

**FIGURE III-7**  
**FUNDING PERCENTAGES FOR EDUCATION SUBSECTORS**  
**(SECTION 105 ACCOUNT) FOR THE 1980S: THE LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN BUREAU**

SUBSECTOR	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 EST.	1987 REQUEST
Basic Education	37.2%	33.2%	22.1%	9.8%	20.8%	21.4%	7.6%	14.4%
Manpower Development	14.7%	15.7%	32.0%	37.3%	34.8%	45.5%	48.6%	51.5%
Vocational/Tech- nical Education	6.1%	18.6%	5.0%	20.0%	12.8%	7.3%	3.1%	7.6%
Labor Development	27.9%	21.6%	24.0%	21.6%	22.1%	7.4%	9.2%	7.8%
Other	14.1%	10.9%	16.9%	11.3%	9.5%	18.2%	31.5%	18.7%
TOTAL PERCENT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Appropria- tions (\$000)	30128	36085	33435	37026	36221	107822	83451	101400

Support for secondary education ended in FY 1983. During the period when programs did exist (FY 1980-FY 1982), the Caribbean Regional Program constituted 77.8 percent of the 105 account for secondary education. The remaining funds were evenly divided between Nicaragua and Panama.

In addition to the LAC regional program, adult/community education programs have been funded in the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, and Peru. Of the LAC monies allocated to this subsector, 67 percent were used in Guatemala for two projects, the Community Education Project and the Integrated Non-formal Education Project.

### Manpower Development

Support for manpower development has increased significantly since FY 1981. The majority of manpower development projects are managed through the regional programs. The largest is the Central American Peace Scholarship program, which is administered through the Central America Regional Program (ROCAP).

### Vocational/Technical Education

The level of programming in vocational/technical education has been uneven during the period under review. Given the fluctuations in funding, it is not possible to identify trends at this time. Although this subsector does not receive a great amount of funding, its coverage throughout the region is quite extensive. Vocational/technical education programs have been implemented in eleven countries (Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Haiti, Jamaica, Panama, and Peru). The regional programs also administer projects in this subsector. Among the countries cited above, the largest program is in Jamaica, which accounts for 37 percent of the LAC vocational/technical education budget. In fact, the great rise in funding to this subsector in FY 1983 can be attributed to the inception of Jamaica's Basic Skills Training project.

### Labor Development

Funding levels for labor development have declined steadily from 1980 to 1987. In 1980 this subsector constituted 27.9 percent of the LAC 105 account. According to 1987 projections, the share is to be reduced to 7.8 percent. The LAC Regional Program is almost entirely responsible for the management of labor development projects.

### Other

This final category bears some explanation. In the seven-year period examined in this study, \$58 million have been classified under the planning/policy analysis subcategory. This sum has been distributed among fifteen countries (Belize, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, and Peru). Funds have also been channelled through ROCAP, LAC Regional, and the Caribbean Regional Program. The majority of projects supported by these monies are termed Program Development and Support. Determining each project's content area would again require a project-by-project reevaluation. It is interesting to note, however, that although there is great regional representation within this subaccount, 62.4 percent of the obligated funds have been allocated to El Salvador.

### Distribution of 105 Account Monies by Country

Although in the LAC Bureau there is a heavy concentration of resources in two countries--El Salvador (8.9 percent) and Honduras (8.5 percent)--there appears to be a greater range in the distribution of funding levels than in the Africa and Asia/Near East Bureaus. As with the other regions, the regional

programs manage a significant portion of the education sector budget. In the LAC Bureau, this share is the largest, being well over 40 percent.

FIGURE III-8  
DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS BY COUNTRY  
IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN, 1980-87

Country	Amount (\$000)	Percentage (%)
Belize	\$ 4,000	0.9
Bolivia	\$ 7,014	1.5
Colombia	\$ 240	0.1
Costa Rica	\$ 6,712	1.4
Dominican Republic	\$ 28,418	6.1
Ecuador	\$ 16,020	3.4
El Salvador	\$ 41,427	8.9
Guatemala	\$ 31,880	6.8
Guyana	\$ 6	0.0
Haiti	\$ 9,980	2.1
Honduras	\$ 39,393	8.5
Jamaica	\$ 31,999	6.9
Nicaragua	\$ 1,185	0.2
Panama	\$ 12,546	2.7
Paraguay	\$ 528	0.1
Peru	\$ 9,698	2.1
Caribbean Regional	\$ 44,361	9.5
Central American Reg.	\$ 72,115	15.5
ROCAP	\$ 9,994	2.2
LAC Regional	\$ 98,051	21.1
TOTAL	\$465,568	100.0

d. The Bureau for Science and Technology

The AID system of classification does not provide the casual observer with an accurate assessment of programming priorities in the Bureau for Science and Technology (S&T). Accordingly, the "Other" category has had to be disaggregated for the purpose of analysis. The figures in brackets represent those disaggregated numbers. The subcategories that have greater significance for the S&T Bureau than the regional bureaus are planning/policy analysis and research. As the S&T Bureau is considered the research and development (R&D) arm of the Agency, it would seem only appropriate that these categories should be budgetary priorities.

Before a more in-depth discussion of the subsectors, it should be noted that 105 account funds are divided among three offices in the S&T Bureau. They are the Office of Education, the Office of International Training, and the Office of Rural and Institutional Development. The majority of the funding has gone to the Office of Education (67.3 percent); 22.8 percent has

FIGURE III-9  
FUNDING PERCENTAGES FOR EDUCATION SUBSECTORS  
(SECTION 105 ACCOUNT) FOR THE 1980S: THE BUREAU FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

SUBSECTOR	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 EST.	1987 REQUEST
Basic Education	55.41%	50.7%	48.2%	45.7%	30.5%	16.0%	11.5%	7.4%
Manpower Development	26.9%	36.9%	10.6%	13.3%	16.6%	15.8%	21.2%	20.4%
Vocational/Tech- nical Education	0%	0%	1.0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Labor Development	0	0	12.5%	10.9%	10.7%	8.0%	8.9%	8.6%
Other	17.7%	12.4%	27.7%	30.1%	42.2%	60.1%	58.4%	63.6%
[Planning/Policy Analysis]	[17.7]	[12.4]	[27.7]	[30.1]	[42.2]	[49.4]	[52.6]	[52.5]
[Research]	[ 0 ]	[ 0 ]	[ 0 ]	[ 0 ]	[ 0 ]	[10.7]	[5.8]	[11.1]
TOTAL PERCENT	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total Appropria- tions (\$000)	10109	8854	6648	7242	7408	8082	7800	8100

been obligated to the Office of International Training, while the remaining portion has been allocated to the Office of Rural and Institutional Development.

### The Subsectors

#### Basic Education

Funding in primary education has been concentrated in the Radio Community Basic Education project. The other project in this subsector was the Radio Language Arts Project for which the last funds were obligated in FY 1984.

There have not been any secondary education projects during the years under review.

Adult/community education has comprised more than half (58.6 percent) of S&T funds designated for basic education. The majority of monies classified within the adult/community education subaccount have been used by the Office of Education. Less than 5.1 percent were used by the Office of International Training for the English Language Training Project.

#### Manpower Development

The Office of Rural and Institutional Development has appropriated 36.8 percent of the available funds in this subsector for 11 projects focusing on different aspects of management in the development context. Just over one-quarter has been used for the U.N. Fellows program, which was administered by the Office of International Training. It should also be noted that approximately one-third of the budget went to the Office of Education for the implementation of the Radio Science project.

#### Vocational/Technical Education

This subsector has traditionally not received funding through this bureau, the one exception being in FY 1982. In that year, \$65,000 was obligated to the Literacy-Oriented Functional Education Project.

#### Labor Development

The majority of funds for this subsector are administered by the Office of International Training. The other 12.2 percent has been used for projects implemented by the Office of Rural and Institutional Development.

#### Other

As previously stated, the "Other" category is comprised of the planning/policy analysis and research subcategories. One-third of these monies has gone to the Increasing the Efficiency of Educational Systems (IEES) project. The Training and Evaluation Support Project, which is implemented by the Office of International Training, accounts for 19.4 percent of these funds.

### **D. ANALYSIS OF AID FUNDING IN THE EDUCATION SECTOR FOR THE 1980s**

#### **1. Complexities of Analyzing Funding Data for Educational Activities**

The researchers used the education appropriations from Section 105 of the Development Assistance Program, and the disaggregation by subsectors, as representative of the Agency's funding for programming in education.

The education sector is officially defined as a functional account (Section 105) of the Development Assistance Program. The researchers used the education appropriations from this account as a measure of the Agency's involvement in education. In addition, funds are disaggregated by subsector

in the 105 account; this breakdown was viewed as representative of the Agency's funding for programming in the various education subsectors.

The classification system used within the 105 account itself does not allow for an accurate appraisal of funding levels or priorities in the education sector. The data-analysis phase of this paper revealed that significantly large appropriations are sometimes grouped into the "Not Classified" subcategory. Even for those which have been classified under more descriptive subcategories, a number of projects, representing a significant amount of funding have been given such vague titles as "New Activities," "PVO Cofinancing," or "Program Development and Support." Based on that information, it is not possible to determine whether or not the project classification accurately represents the technical focus of the activity.

## 2. Comparison of Central and Regional Bureau Funding Levels in the Education Sector

For FY 1980-87, the Latin America/Caribbean Bureau has accounted for 43.6 percent of total 105 account funds. The Africa and Asia/Near East Bureaus have approximately an equal share of funding with 25.9 percent and 22.0 percent, respectively. The Bureau for Science and Technology constitutes 6.0 percent of the total education sector budget.

As the LAC Bureau enjoys the greatest overall funding, it accordingly has the largest appropriations in basic education, vocational/technical education, labor development, and planning/policy analysis. Exceptions to this general rule can be found in the professional/science education, adult/community education, and research subcategories. Of funds allocated for scientific/-professional education, 39.9 percent have been directed to the Asia/Near East Bureau. Because of the heavily-funded project in Lesotho, Africa accounts for 39.7 percent of adult/community education monies.

The second largest overall expenditures in adult/community education have been made by the S&T Bureau. Although S&T comprises only a small percentage of the total education sector, it accounts for 26.8 percent of spending for adult/community education activities. This is indicative of priorities set for that particular bureau. In addition, more than half (58.1 percent) of the monies allocated to research have been channelled through this bureau. As S&T is the R&D branch of the Agency, this appears to be an appropriate distribution.

## 3. Responsiveness of Funding in the Education Sector to Educational Policy

### General Conclusions

Based on the 105 account funding data, it would appear that funding in the education sector is not consistent, overall, with official Agency educational policy. AID policy documents indicate that basic education is to be a major priority for the education sector; yet funding levels for the 105 account show that support for basic education has been steadily declining in the 1980s.

This reversal in funding priorities from basic education to manpower development has implications for the attainment of certain goals the Agency set in The Blueprint for Development. Goals for the year 2000 are to:

- increase primary school enrollment to above 90 percent for both boys and girls;
- increase the rate of completion of at least four years of schooling to 70 percent;
- provide skills training compatible with development requirements; and
- raise adult literacy rates for both men and women to above 50 percent.

Several factors seem to be working against realization of those goals. Less and less money is being requested for basic education projects, both for children and for adult literacy and numeracy training. Instead, higher education and advanced training, as evidenced by the rise in participant training, are becoming the basis of AID's approach to educational assistance. Moreover, other donors, with the exception of the World Bank, do not allocate significant amounts of resources to either primary or nonformal education.

#### The Central and Regional Bureaus

Before discussing each Bureau individually, it should be noted that programming in the education sector is in line with policy in terms of the fiscal magnitude of education projects. As previously cited, AID's Policy Paper: Basic Education and Technical Training states that only a few developing countries will have education sector assistance programs exceeding \$5 million annually. This is borne out by the funding analysis, which shows that 105 sector funds are often concentrated in one or two countries from each region (i.e., Cameroon, Swaziland, Yemen, Indonesia, Honduras, and El Salvador). Below is a discussion of the fit of each Bureau with both Agency-wide policy and its own strategy statement.

#### The Africa Bureau

The Africa Bureau Basic Education and Technical Training Assistance Strategy Paper "recommends a significant increase in Bureau efforts to improve basic education and technical opportunities." Basic education indeed has more priority than it did in 1980. However, funding for vocational/technical education has received uneven support and appears to be following a downward trend. Given the fact that basic education was receiving a low percentage of funds at the beginning of the period under review, one can conclude that programming for the Africa Bureau is more in line with educational policy than it was at the beginning of the decade.

### The Asia/Near East Bureau

As this Bureau was only recently formed through the consolidation of the former Asia Bureau and Near East Bureau, a single strategy statement reflecting this union has not yet been formulated. Accordingly, the programming and policy of each former Bureau will be examined separately.

The Asia Regional Strategic Plan states that "education will remain an area of fairly limited involvement for the Bureau." Although this is in contrast to overall Agency policy, this statement is reflected by actual programming trends for Asia's education sector. Within the education sector itself, manpower development is clearly the priority, with basic education and vocational/technical education as the least-funded subsectors. This is in keeping with the Bureau's stated intention of considering new projects in which participant training for strengthening institutions in both the private and public sectors would be the focus. It would appear that programming within the Asia Bureau is consistent with its own strategic plan, but diverges from official Agency policy.

In evaluating programming in the Near East, it should be kept in mind that the only countries receiving DA funds (rather than ESF monies) are Morocco and Yemen. Tunisia used to be included in the DA Program, but now receives predominantly ESF fundings. Hence, any discussion will be limited to those three countries. The Near East Bureau Strategy is somewhat unique in that it has devised strategies according to levels of development. However, at one point in its strategy statement, the Bureau states that it will support basic education projects in specific countries where these systems are weak. This is reflected in programming through the large Basic Educational Development Project found in Yemen. However, the largest portion of funding of the 105 accounts goes to manpower development in both Yemen and Morocco. So, although some attention has been given to basic education in the Near East, the programmatic priorities lie with manpower development.

### The Latin America/Caribbean Bureau

As previously stated, the LAC Bureau is in the process of updating its strategic plan. However, according to the LAC Management by Objectives Goal Structure, the major objectives of the LAC education sector program are to improve education, increase literacy rates, and increase participant training. The funding priorities established by the National Bipartisan Committee on Central America have enabled the last priority to be achieved easily. As far as the first two are concerned, it can only be noted that FY 1987 budgetary requests for basic education are less than one-third (in terms of percentage of the 105 account) of the FY 1980 funding. In addition, the proposed budget for FY 1987 reveals no funding for adult/community education. In sum, the funding priority for the LAC Bureau is manpower development, which would appear inconsistent with Agency policy.

### The Bureau for Science and Technology

The S&T Bureau does not have a strategic plan per se, but it should be noted that the AID Sector Strategy: Education was prepared by the Office of

Education in S&T. There has been a shift in focus for the Bureau during the period under review; however, this does not represent a divergence from Agency educational policy. In the early 1980s, the majority of S&T funds were for basic education, specifically radio education, which was being experimented with as a cost-effective means of increasing access of rural people to education. In FY 1984, the area of greatest emphasis had changed to planning/policy analysis and research. In this subsector, the main activity is the Improving the Efficiency of Education Systems (IEES) project. As S&T/Education focuses on increasing access to education, improving the efficiency of existing education systems, and supporting improvements of educational systems through technology transfer (specifically modern communications), this Bureau's programming appears consistent with Agency policy for the education sector.

---

## V. VIEWS OF POLICYMAKERS AND TECHNICIANS CONCERNING EDUCATION

This section of the report relates information the research team received through interviews with both policymakers and education technicians within AID. The interviews focused on AID's policies and programming in education, and the pages that follow present the thoughts and impressions of AID staff concerning these subjects.

### A. OVERVIEW OF INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

As part of the analysis of whether AID policy is reflected in programming in the education sector, the research team interviewed ten AID officials from policy offices and twenty-three from technical offices. Most of the technicians interviewed are specialists in education. The number of representatives interviewed from each bureau within AID is listed below.

Bureau of Science and Technology .....	7
Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination .....	7
Bureau for Africa .....	5
Bureau for Asia and Near East .....	7
Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean .....	6
Bureau for Private Enterprise .....	1

Through the interviews, the research team was able to obtain the opinions of AID officials concerning the following:

- the role of education in development;
- AID's role in supporting education in LDCs;
- identification of factors that determine AID's role in this field;
- AID's strengths in education programs;
- the relationship between AID policies and programming in the education sector; and
- current trends in this area.

---

## B. RESPONSES OF POLICYMAKERS AND TECHNICIANS

### 1. Role of Education in Development

There was strong consensus among both AID policymakers and technical officers that education at all levels is crucial to the overall development of a country for numerous reasons. Several officials stated that literacy and numeracy were not only valuable in their own right but also have a positive impact on progress in other sectors. They agreed with the literature demonstrating how education increases productivity, lowers fertility rates, and improves health and nutrition. Some also pointed out that basic education can provide more equity within a system for women and other disadvantaged populations and helps develop a sense of nationalism. In relation to AID policy, one policymaker pointed out that education is one means of attaining AID goals, such as institutional development and private sector development.

### 2. AID's Role in Supporting Education in LDCs

The policymakers and technical officers agreed that AID's role in supporting education would vary from country to country, for the needs are often very different. Several interviewees cited the CDSS as a means of guiding education activities. They also stated that close collaboration with host-country officials and community members is especially necessary to the education sector in order to ensure the development and implementation of culturally sensitive programs.

There was a difference in perspective, however, between the policymakers and technical officers concerning how extensive AID's role should be and what type of assistance it should provide. The policymakers often stated that with limited funding and personnel, AID needs to concentrate on sectors in which it has expertise, congressional interest, and the capability to produce measurable results within a short time span. In terms of assistance for the education sector, they put more emphasis on the need to support technical training, higher education, and institutional development because, they said, these are areas in which AID can have more impact in a shorter period of time. Although policymakers agreed that basic education is important, they stated that support for basic education is less appropriate for AID than support for higher education programs because investment in basic education requires long-term commitment and expertise that AID has not demonstrated. In particular, they stated that AID should focus on the following areas, listed according to the frequency with which they were mentioned:

- participant training;
- strengthening LDC universities in areas that will improve productivity, such as agriculture;
- educational assessments that indicate the need for technical assistance;
- decentralization of educational systems; and
- improving efficiency of educational institutions.

The technical officers stressed the importance of a strong educational system for a country's development in all areas. They stated that literacy and socialization provided by basic education are key factors for the success of development efforts in other sectors, such as agriculture, health, and population. The technical officials focused on the need to improve the efficiency and quality of basic education systems in LDCs because, they said, it is essential to build a complete educational system. They indicated that AID's current funding emphasis on participant training is an imbalanced approach to assistance in education. AID should be assisting the educational systems of developing countries at all levels. The technicians, therefore, had a different order of priority for assistance in education as evidenced below (these areas are also listed beginning with the most frequently mentioned):

- teacher training and training programs for educators;
- improved efficiency of basic education programs, through, for example, decentralization;
- increased access to education for females and disadvantaged populations; and
- strengthening LDC university systems in all fields.

As the two lists of priorities illustrate, policymakers tended to favor higher education and technical programs. Education specialists put more emphasis on assistance for basic education.

### 3. Factors that Determine AID's Role in Providing Assistance in Education

The policymakers and the technical officials shared the same views concerning factors that determine AID's role in supporting education. The factors they mentioned are discussed below.

#### a. External and Internal Pressure

External pressure and internal pressure were frequently mentioned as factors affecting AID's involvement in education. Several policymakers and technicians stated that certain subsectors of education, unlike the sectors of agriculture, health, and population, do not have a strong constituency to influence congressional leaders or AID staff. The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) lobbies for more agricultural projects; the National Council for International Health is a strong force; and the field of population has major groups, such as Planned Parenthood and right-to-life organizations, espousing their views.

To stress the importance of a strong constituency, one policymaker pointed out that AID received more funds in the field of health than it requested because of Congress's current concern with child survival. Several other interviewees indicated that the dramatic increase in education funds for the Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean was a result of congressional concern over the findings of the National Bipartisan Commission on Central America.

Some of the interviewees indicated that internal pressure, such as the AID Administrator's strong support for participant training, influences programming in education. Others stated that basic education, in particular, may receive low priority because not enough staff members are actively and forcefully advocating programming in this area.

Though policymakers and technicians presented the same descriptions of external and internal pressure, they held different attitudes about the situation. The technicians took a negative view of the power of external and internal pressure; they expressed concern for the validity of development activities based on political pressure rather than on host-country needs, sound research, and experience. The policymakers did not view external or internal pressure either negatively or positively; instead, they expressed a desire to carefully consider and respond to political pressure.

#### b. Lack of Staff and Appropriate Expertise

Another factor often mentioned was the lack of staff in education and the lack of education officers in AID. Some interviewees referred to an AID memorandum stating that ten years ago there were over 200 education and training professionals in AID and that currently there are only 53 located in 24 missions and AID/Washington. The interviewees, did, however, recognize that the lack of staff could be both the result and cause of the decline in emphasis on the education sector within AID. The concern of the technicians was that without education officers in the field to provide input on the CDSS's, education projects, especially those dealing with basic education, are destined to receive low priority, and the policymakers agreed that lack of staff would affect the level of programming in the field of education. One policymaker, however, pointed out that there are other factors to consider in addition to the lack of education officers; political and social factors related to education may be stronger impediments to AID educational programs than the lack of staff.

Some of the technicians also stated that the expertise of the staff in education was not adequately representative of the quality of U.S. expertise that exists in the field. Others argued that because of the freeze on hiring in the field of education, there is a lack of "new blood," which in turn affects the quality of the programming and the emphasis placed on education. Over half of the current staff will be of retirement age in the next three to five years, and in three years with no further hiring there will be no education specialists in AID under 40 years of age. As some technicians pointed out, there has been a freeze on hiring education specialists for the last seven years, though currently there are plans to hire one to three education specialists through the International Development Professional Program. However, even when a vacancy does occur, Missions report that it is difficult to attract high quality professionals.

Some technicians indicated there is a general lack of appreciation among AID personnel for U.S. expertise in education programs, particularly at the primary and secondary levels. A couple of technicians also stated that AID education specialists are not receiving any training to keep them well-versed

in state-of-the-art development approaches in the field. As a result, many of the technical skills of the education and training staff differ from those required by present programming.

Policymakers and technicians varied in their response to the lack of staff in education. Several policymakers stated that the cutbacks in education specialists were appropriate because, with current and future budget restrictions, AID needs to focus its efforts more in fields where it has expertise, such as agriculture. Technicians, however, were very concerned that the diminishing staff would drastically affect AID's ability to effectively assist LDCs in education.

#### c. Cultural Considerations

Numerous interviewees stated that education programs, especially those in basic education, are culturally very sensitive. Thus, it is difficult for U.S. experts to provide assistance in curriculum development because the U.S. system is so different from that of the host country. Experts cannot transplant ideas as readily because much more adaptation is required. With regularity, the interviewees presenting this argument used former French colonies as examples to support their point. Numerous interviewees stated that because of the cultural complexities, it is best for AID to focus on higher education and training where the cultural factors are less prohibitive.

The difference in the perspective of policymakers and technicians on this topic was that policymakers viewed the cultural complexity of education programs, especially at the level of basic education, as a reason to limit intervention in this area. Technicians, although recognizing the cultural complexities of education programs, stated that programs in other sectors, such as health, population, and agriculture, are also culturally complex; AID continues to invest in these sectors without hesitation. Technicians pointed out that cultural differences in education systems should not be reasons for limiting investment in education because close collaboration with the host country and responsiveness to host country requests in education are means of overcoming these barriers.

#### d. Need for Long-Term Investment

Both policymakers and technicians agreed with the literature stating that many education projects require long-term efforts and provide fewer quantifiable results over the short term. However, the policymakers viewed this fact as a drawback to investment in education. As one policymaker stated, "our democratic system forces quick results"; in other words, Congress is interested in seeing concrete progress in a short period of time. Consequently, AID often tends to favor short-term projects that provide visible outcomes.

Another factor that works against the implementation of long-term projects is the rapid turnover of field staff who want to see some results from their efforts before they leave their posts. Several interviewees suggested that this tendency toward short-term projects with quantifiable results could be one reason for the priority placed on participant training and the decline in emphasis on basic education.

The emphasis on short-term projects was viewed as a problem by the technicians while some policymakers viewed such an emphasis as appropriate in light of their need to defend the funding of AID before Congress.

#### e. Complexities of the Field

Because education covers a broad spectrum of programming, it is difficult to decide what to focus on, according to a couple of policymakers. As a result, often vocational or technical training receives priority in the field because these activities tie in neatly with programs in other sectors. Both policymakers and technicians stated that the extensive nature of the field requires that AID identify what it does best in education--information that would prove useful for both AID staff and the LDCs the Agency assists.

Some interviewees also mentioned that management of some educational programs was a barrier to investment in this field because such projects are often labor intensive and involve a wide range of beneficiaries. Under the current directive to reduce program management, AID staff are reluctant to develop or implement projects that are labor intensive.

Policymakers used the complexity of the field of education as a reason for limiting funding. They argued that with limited funds, AID needs to be more expedient and that education programs do not lend themselves to expediency. Technicians, on the other hand, believed that the broad scope of the field is not a limitation. In their view, the United States has expertise in many subsectors of education and can thus offer a wide range of assistance to LDCs depending on the level of development within a particular country.

#### f. Budget Limits and Means of Funding

A number of the AID staff interviewed stated that budgetary constraints limited programming in education. In order to provide adequate funds for high priority sectors, some other areas must be cut or more strictly limited. The educational specialists interviewed were concerned about the use of education account funds (the 105 account) for participant training programs that support other sectors. A number of the technicians stated that participant training in agriculture or health, for example, should be funded by agriculture or health accounts. They stressed that proposed programs key to the development of education systems within LDCs are not possible because they must compete with participant training. Programs in basic education therefore suffer as a result of the emphasis placed on participant training.

One policymaker also suggested that education programs are often not high among LDC requests for assistance because they are funded through local currency. Other programs such as those in engineering receive higher priority because they are based on foreign exchange.

Some policymakers supported some of the cutbacks in education while there was unanimous agreement among the technicians that the declining percentage of funds for education in general and basic education in particular is inappropriate.

#### 4. AID's Strengths in Education

Although the strengths mentioned by policymakers and technicians were very similar, the focus and emphasis of the officials were different. Policymakers tended to begin with strengths related to higher education and technical training while technicians highlighted AID's capability in assisting basic education programs. The strengths identified are listed below.

##### a. Technical Training in Higher Education

Technical training at the postsecondary level was most frequently mentioned as one of AID's strengths, being identified by both policymakers and technicians. This subsector includes not only participant training but also institutional development in LDCs. The interviewees stated that AID was well-equipped in this area because the Agency could draw on the strong university systems in the United States that offer a wide range of expertise. One interviewee noted that the returns on participant training are greater at the graduate level than at the undergraduate level.

On a number of occasions, interviewees identified the institutional development of agricultural university systems as one of AID's strengths because the land-grant university model, which incorporates research, training, and extension, is appropriate for many LDCs.

##### b. Assessment and Analysis

Another strength the interviewees identified is AID's capacity to do assessment and analysis to determine the need for technical assistance in the field of education. Cost-effectiveness analysis was one area highlighted. Projects relating to improving the efficiency of educational systems were also mentioned.

##### c. In-Country Technical Training

Technical training delivered in-country was considered a strength for several reasons, including AID's technical expertise and ability to provide hands-on training.

##### d. Basic Education

Many technicians and some policymakers pointed to basic education as one of AID's strengths, stating (in agreement with the literature) that it offers high returns. One interviewee pointed out that AID can do well in basic education where the Agency is willing to invest the money necessary, has the support of the community, and employs a culturally sensitive approach. Another opinion common among the educational technicians was that the United States can provide a sound model of a decentralized basic education system. One technician quoted a third-world colleague who stated that, since the United States has one of the best basic education systems in the world, it would be selfish not to share it.

#### e. Other Identified Strengths

The strengths mentioned below were each identified in the interviews by one interviewee only:

- provision of educational materials and equipment;
- development of instructional materials;
- curriculum development;
- construction and renovation; and
- provision of a model for universal basic education.

#### 5. Relationship of AID's Policies and Programming in Education

##### a. Educational Policy and Programming in the Regional Bureaus

Both policymakers and technicians agreed that it is difficult to establish policy that would apply in all regions and countries receiving AID assistance. The policies are viewed as guidelines, or as one policymaker expressed it, a "wish list" or a "backdrop" for development programs. The policies, for example, provided by the two documents, Basic Education and Technical Training and Participant Training Policy Determination, are viewed by some policymakers as guidelines for Missions that choose to be involved in educational programs, but not as mandates for involvement in education. In addition, a number of interviewees indicated that the policies provide little direction because it is difficult to sort out all the priorities indicated by AID/Washington.

As a result, the AID missions develop their programs more according to the Country Development Strategy Statement. The CDSSs, however, are based more on country need, Mission interest, and regional priorities than they are on general policy. In the Bureau for Asia and the Near East, Missions are not encouraged to support basic education programs even though the need to support these programs is indicated in the Blueprint for Development and in the educational policy papers. A number of the interviewees, both policymakers and technicians, stated that a mission may justify its CDSS by turning to the policy papers rather than developing the CDSS on the basis of the policy papers.

The interviewees indicated that policy and programming do coincide in some areas. Participant training, for example, is receiving the priority indicated in the Blueprint for Development. Basic education and literacy programs, however, are not receiving the same emphasis, though they too are indicated as priorities in the Blueprint for Development. In addition, several technicians indicated that AID's goals concerning transfer of technology and institutional development are no longer high priorities because of the decline in education projects. They see more emphasis being placed on policy dialogue and private sector development.

Where there is a discrepancy, however, between policy and programming emphasis, there was little concern among the AID policymakers; they interpret the written policy more as a guiding rather than a directing force and value the independence of the missions, which they view as better equipped to assess a country's needs. Technicians, on the other hand, were more concerned about the lack of coordination between educational policy and programming because, in their opinion, AID missions are not providing assistance that could be crucial to the development of many countries.

b. Educational Policy and Programming in the Bureaus for Science and Technology and Program and Policy Coordination

The interviewees indicated that the research and development efforts conducted by the Bureau for Science and Technology/Education (S&T/ED) do follow policy and in fact have an impact on policy. For example, S&T/ED is currently conducting several projects designed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of educational systems, including primary education systems. Furthermore, S&T/ED has projects that focus on increasing access to education through cost-effective means, such as radio. These areas of research are also consistent with priority areas indicated in the literature concerning development efforts in the field of education.

Some technicians were concerned that the development projects conducted by S&T/ED were difficult to replicate. However, one policymaker countered this argument by stating that innovations require time before they are fully embraced by the field.

The work of S&T/ED has also influenced the present emphasis in policy statements on basic education, and one interviewee stated that S&T/ED research results were used for the policy paper, Basic Education and Technical Training.

The research conducted by the Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination (PPC) is primarily concerned with policy issues and is not technical research. It should be pointed out that areas of PPC research are reflective of and consistent with agency policy. One area of focus is on efficiency and cost-effectiveness, especially in higher education and manpower development. The Bureau also has projects that look at intersectoral linkages, increased access, and privatization. It was stated by one interviewee that the research produced provides background working papers for use in intra-agency debate and that it is difficult to judge the impact of any one piece of research.

The interviewees indicated that though the evaluations of education projects do feed into the policy-making process within PPC, there is no consistent system for ensuring this linkage occurs at all times. Furthermore, the evaluations are not always appropriate for policy-making purposes. Most of the evaluations conducted do not focus on lessons learned from the project. Although the Center for Development Information and Evaluation does have an impact evaluation series in education, the results of the evaluations are at times difficult to aggregate because they concentrate on different countries; in addition, impact evaluations are more costly. Synthesizing the information presented in the end-of-project evaluations is cumbersome because the evaluations are often conducted for different purposes. One interviewee

suggested that AID be more selective with their evaluations--conducting fewer evaluations but in a manner that will provide clear guidance for future projects.

#### 6. Current Trends in AID's Programming

Increased participant training is clearly one of the current trends in AID educational programs. The interviewees indicated that AID gives high priority to higher education programs that train foreign nationals in the United States, in country, or in a third country. Such training is linked to institutional development in numerous sectors, which is another priority. Other priorities mentioned were decentralization and improving efficiency. Several interviewees also indicated that basic education and adult literacy are now lower priorities.

There was general agreement among the interviewees that funding for education will continue to decline as a portion of the entire AID budget. Moreover, with limited funds and the historical and current support for participant training, basic education programs will be severely limited, they believe. The majority of the interviewees stated that further cutbacks in educational programming can be anticipated. Some expressed hope, however, that this trend would be reversed in the long run.

#### C. ANALYSIS OF VIEWS EXPRESSED BY POLICYMAKERS AND TECHNICIANS

The research team found distinct differences in opinion among the policymakers and technicians. Though both groups recognized the importance on assistance in the field of education, the majority of the policymakers--unlike the technicians--did not believe that education should be a high priority for AID. In general, the policymakers expressed the view that, in light of limited funding, AID should concentrate on projects in other sectors such as agriculture, health, and population. Their arguments are that AID has excellent expertise in these areas, that these fields produce concrete results more rapidly, or that these areas are receiving more support from Congress or within AID itself. Furthermore, the AID policymakers argued that AID's best contributions to education are in participant training, the provision of support to higher education institutions, and technical training.

On the other hand, technicians argued that since education is crucial to development in other sectors and since the United States has expertise in this field, education should have a higher priority within AID. They related much concern over the decrease in funding for basic education, the lack of internal support for education programs within AID, the lack of staff to carry out education projects, and the emphasis on participant training. Though they acknowledged AID's expertise in higher education and the importance of assistance in this field, they perceived an imbalance of programming in education because of the lack of funding for basic education. In their opinion, AID's approach to the education sector is building expertise at the top without assisting in the development of a literate labor force.

Policymakers and technicians agreed that internal factors may currently inhibit AID programming in education. Because Missions realize they cannot meet all of the priorities stated in AID education policy nor all of those set in other sectors, a decision to provide little or no support to the education sector, even though there is a need within the country, is not viewed as a serious digression from policy. When policy is viewed as flexible because it is not designed to apply to different national development levels, many differences between policy and programming can be expected.

In addition, because education projects generally require extensive mission staff time to design and manage, a lack of field staff in education can make Missions hesitant to plan and implement such projects. Without the staff to lobby for and carry out education programs, fewer education programs will be implemented. In addition, this lack affects program integration in education. With few education specialists in the field, it is more difficult for the research and evaluation offices to conduct field work and to promote the results of their work in the field. A widespread system such as AID's requires strong lines of communication and internal networks. Education technicians expressed frustration concerning their ability to influence programming because their network is limited.

Lack of education staff may result from education's low priority status within the Agency, according to the interviewees. Despite policy statements to the contrary, the interviewees agreed that education is not a high priority, especially basic education, both formal and nonformal, and they cited lack of staff and funding for these programs as evidence. In this way, the interviews substantiate what the policy and funding studies demonstrate: There is a strong discrepancy between education policy and programming in AID.

The area of debate concerns not the value of education to development but AID's capability in this sector. Policymakers see cultural differences, lack of U.S. expertise, and the need for quick and concrete results as reasons for placing education on a lower rung in the priority list. On the other hand, education technicians argue that AID has much capability in education, and they point to U.S. expertise in education, past AID successes in the field, and present innovations in approach that AID is pursuing in this sector. Both groups of interviewees did, nonetheless, agree that participant training is a strength AID has demonstrated.

## VI. CONCLUSION

### A. EDUCATIONAL POLICY AS IT RELATES TO TRENDS IN THE LITERATURE

AID policy reflects recent trends found in the literature concerning investment in education. First, the policy recognizes the importance of education for the overall development of a country as well as education's positive impact on productivity, health, and limited population growth. Second, AID policy states the need to address many of the critical issues facing educational development. AID educational policy, like the literature, specifically states that AID programs should focus on

- improving basic education;
- improving the external and internal efficiency of educational systems;
- improving the quality of education;
- improving the curricula; and
- increasing access to education.

In its efforts to meet these goals, AID is investigating possibilities of assisting countries in the decentralization of their educational systems and the encouragement of private educational systems as well as private sector involvement in training programs.

One issue raised in the literature that AID is not addressing fully is the inequitable allocation of resources between basic education and higher education. The literature points out that developing countries spend large amounts of their resources on higher education. An examination of AID funding in education reveals the same pattern: AID is spending a far greater proportion of money on participant training programs and higher education than it is on basic education.

Though papers such as the Africa Bureau Basic Education and Technical Training Assistance Strategy Paper indicate that assistance for higher levels of education is costly and limits the funds available for basic education, this issue is not clearly addressed in the other policy papers. The interviews with AID personnel indicated that this issue is a concern within the Agency. Numerous interviewees stated that the current funding trend in AID educational assistance is not the most effective means of meeting the educational needs of many developing countries.

AID's approach to development in the various subsectors of education coincides to a great extent with the findings of the literature, though there are some areas where the literature findings are not reflected in AID policy. For example, AID's congressional mandate and policy recognizes the importance

of primary education; however, the policy does not clearly place this subsector as a priority area in relation to the other subsectors of education, while the literature definitely illustrates that investment in primary education is the most sound of educational interventions.

In the area of vocational and technical training, AID policy is consistent with the literature in that it is stressing the importance of linking all vocational and technical training with labor demands and of providing such training to disadvantaged populations, such as the rural poor and women.

AID is considered a leader in the field of nonformal education in that it is one of the few donor agencies that has conducted research in this field. But its policy does not reflect its leadership role in that there are no clear guidelines for missions concerning investment in this subsector. Though nonformal education relates directly to both basic education and technical training, it is mentioned only briefly in the policy paper on these two subsectors.

AID policy encourages project-related, in-country training--an investment that is considered to be highly cost-effective according to World Bank literature. Much project-related training takes place in the United States, which makes it more costly than in-country training. AID policy stresses, nevertheless, that participant training should occur only when there are no other cost-effective alternatives that can provide quality training or when such training offers strategic exposure to the United States. Presently, AID recognizes the need to investigate more thoroughly its heavy investments in participant training, but such research has not as yet been completed.

## **B. RELATIONSHIP OF POLICY AND PROGRAMMING**

There are both conjunctions and disjunctions between policy and programming. Programming does reflect AID's interest in increasing the efficiency of education systems, though these projects have not yet been replicated throughout most AID missions. Programming also reflects AID's interest in providing technical training that is related to the development needs of a country, its intention to increase participant training programs, and its concern with increasing equitable access to education systems.

Programming does not, however, reflect the interest AID expresses throughout its policy papers and congressional presentations concerning the importance of providing assistance to basic education. In FY 1980 basic education was 30.1 percent of the total education sector budget, but this subsector will account for only 13.1 percent of the total education budget (105 account) for 1987 as the appropriations requests now stand. On the other hand, manpower development projects in the 105 account have received increased funding in the 1980s. In 1980, 26.7 percent of the 105 account went to higher level training and education. The 105 account request for 1987 places higher education and training at 49.9 percent of the education sector budget.

Both the literature review and the interviews indicated the value of higher level training, though it is often a more costly level of investment in education. However, the policy does not indicate, as the funding does, that participant training programs should take precedent over basic education programs. In fact, if the balance of funding continues to support higher level training programs, it is unlikely that AID will increase primary school enrollment, improve retention and completion, and increase adult literacy by the year 2000 at the rates indicated in the Blueprint. Furthermore, because the funding studies indicate that little support is being provided to basic education by other donors, with the exception of the World Bank, it appears that third-world governments are receiving insufficient support in the development of quality basic education systems--a task that swallows large portions of LDC budgets yet has far-reaching impact on a country's development.

### C. FACTORS INHIBITING THE TRANSLATION OF EDUCATION POLICY INTO PROGRAMMING

This disjunction between policy, which indicates that both basic education and participant training are priorities, and programming, which clearly gives higher priority to participant training, could be the result of one or more of several factors. These factors are discussed below.

#### 1. Role of Educational Policy

What is the role of policy in the Agency's decision-making process with respect to programming? AID personnel interviewed in PPC and the other Bureaus agreed that the policy directives established by the Agency are meant to be guidelines rather than mandates for programming. This definition of policy leaves much room for a variety of interpretations concerning the role AID should play in various regions and countries. Though flexibility is essential in an organization such as AID that has such a wide range of clients, the extent of this flexibility regarding policy leads to possibilities for inconsistencies and discrepancies between policy and programming.

One of the reasons that AID's policy in education must be viewed as a collection of guidelines is that it does not provide priorities that are tailored to different development levels. Most of the policy statements, with the exception of the Education Sector Strategy paper and the Near East Strategy paper, do not set different priorities for varying development conditions. When policy attempts to apply to such a broad range of country differences it provides very general direction and much more room for each AID Bureau and Mission to interpret the policy differently.

#### 2. Incomplete Educational Policy and Lack of Clear Priorities in Policy

The educational policy papers and strategy papers often cover only certain subsectors of educational assistance. The Strategy Paper for the Education Sector is one of the more complete documents, but it does not cover nonformal education thoroughly--even though its definition of basic education includes functional skills training of adults, which is generally achieved through

nonformal education. Nor does this document cover assistance to higher education, other than participant training.

Furthermore, the Agency-wide policy documents on education do not establish priorities for investments in education clearly and they do not thoroughly relate investment in education to levels of development within host countries. AID Strategy: Education Sector provides guidelines for when to invest in basic education and when to invest in vocational and technical training according to quantitative measures of development within a basic education system, but criteria such as these are not applied to the other subsectors of education. Moreover, a framework for priorities based on development levels does not appear in documents that provide more general sector policies.

In addition, there are no overall criteria provided for the whole Agency concerning levels of development and investment in the major sectors. The development conditions that would make agriculture a higher priority than education, for example, are not covered in general AID policy. Thus the regional bureaus can differ greatly in the priorities they set internally. Some bureaus provide clear guidelines concerning regional priorities, others have developed strategies that let the Missions play a more major role in the determination of priorities. The result is a lack of consistency within the Agency, as funding for education within the different regions suggests. Though blanket policy statements would not be appropriate because of the wide range of development levels among the countries AID assists, the Agency could develop policy that provides more benchmarks for determining appropriate development strategies within various countries.

The lack of consistency within AID concerning policy priorities became apparent in the interviews. Although all the AID personnel interviewed agreed with the literature that demonstrates how crucial education is to development, policymakers in particular saw other sectors such as agriculture, health, and population as higher priority areas and as areas in which AID has more demonstrated expertise. Technicians, on the other hand, saw education as a priority that is as important as the agriculture, health, or population sectors. Some policymakers believed that education was a high priority within AID because of the level of internal and external support for participant training. Many technicians stated that education was not a high priority because of the lack of internal and external support for basic education. Such variance in opinion is possible when policy does not delineate priorities clearly. When there are too many priorities for the missions to meet and no clear criteria for determining what is most important, the process for distributing resources becomes less objective.

### 3. Organizational Factors Affecting Implementation of Educational Policy

Another factor affecting AID educational policy is organizational design. Any organization, by virtue of its structure, procedures, norms, and decision processes, shapes the policy that it receives for implementation. Organizations convert policy into program, and bureaucratic organizations such as AID have an impact on and alter policy in certain ways. The AID

organization appears to have a number of effects on policy in the education sector, as discussed below.

First, the limited size of the education staff impedes the implementation of AID policy in education. The smaller number of staff members is both a result of and a cause for the Agency's declining programming education. Without education officers in the field to contribute to the preparation of the CDSS and to manage education projects, Missions may tend to overlook education needs because they do not have the resources to assess or meet these needs adequately. Though the Agency can and does rely on contractors to carry out projects in the field of education, contractors do not play major roles in determining what projects a mission will undertake. Decisions such as these are appropriately made by AID personnel. As numerous interviewees pointed out, when the education staff is small the influence it carries in the determination of programming is minimal.

A systemic characteristic that was cited as a reason for the lack of consistency between policy in education and programming is the level of independence the missions are allotted. The AID staff interviewed indicated that the CDSS's were crucial in determining programming; yet, often the CDSS design process does not reflect the influence of policy. Numerous interviewees indicated that often Missions use policy to justify the programming needs they have identified rather than using policy as a guide to determine which programs they should fund. Though all AID staff agreed that mission independence is essential, the extent of their autonomy can allow for inconsistency between policy and programming. This autonomy becomes a factor particularly with sectors such as education in which the priorities are not clear and for which there is little internal support.

Another problem noted is the lack of linkage among the different bureaus and the different sectors concerning education assistance. The strategies developed by the regional bureaus are varied not only in form but content. This lack of uniformity or consistency throughout the Agency encourages different interpretations of policy.

In addition, there is little integration of activities among sectors because of the Agency's sectoral focus. This organizational design is especially constraining for education because educational methodology is critical to all kinds of projects where the performance and behavior of people is an essential outcome. The complex funding classification system for education programs is evidence of the lack of linkage between various sectors and funding sources. This lack of linkage makes it difficult for AID to assess both its capability and its programming in education.

The structure for the evaluation system of education programs sponsored by AID is also an example of the need for more extensive linkage. As it now operates, evaluations are not uniformly designed so that they can easily feed back into the policy-making system. Because of this lack of coordination, AID is not able to take full advantage of a system that could provide valuable guidance for future efforts in education.

Finally, the emphasis in AID on attaining short-term results, an emphasis that was highlighted in the interviews, may also be a characteristic that limits programming in education. As the literature and the impact evaluations illustrate, education requires long-term investment, especially when the assistance is directed toward basic education. The rapid turnover of personnel in the Missions and the limitation of most projects to a short time frame discourage programs in education that may need at least ten years of investment.

#### D. ACHIEVING CONSISTENCY BETWEEN EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND PROGRAMMING

Currently AID policy and programming regarding the education sector do not fully coincide. Such a discrepancy weakens the impact of education as a sector in the Agency and may have a negative impact on AID's effectiveness in the field. To eliminate this discrepancy, AID can either match its programs to its policies or vice versa. Careful study is needed in the near future to develop a plan of action for education. Several topics for study are evident as a result of this study. Ordered by level of importance, priority areas for further research into Agency policy and programs are listed below.

##### Study of Policy and Priorities

- A determination of priorities, based on levels of national development, for the sectors (e.g., agriculture, health, education) and for programs within sectors (e.g., basic education, higher education, and participant training)
- A comparative review of AID education policy with policy in other sectors and with education policy of other donor agencies to determine the characteristics of effective policy and the conditions necessary for implementation
- A study of AID processes for setting policies (including the effectiveness of the CDSS's) to determine where linkages between policy and programming can be strengthened
- An examination of AID's project evaluation process and how it can be designed more uniformly and effectively to feed into the policy-making process

##### Studies of General Strategies

In establishing priorities for educational programming, the Agency should consider the relative effectiveness of various strategies.

- A study of decentralization to determine whether, how, and when it would be an appropriate intervention in education
- Investigation into the inappropriate flows of resources in education systems that limit efficiency, effectiveness, and quality

- A determination of AID's most prominent capabilities in the field of education

#### Areas of Technical Research

Studies are also needed to supply a technical basis for policy decisions and to assess the degree to which programming meets policy objectives.

- Investigation of the impact of participant training to determine the value of the Agency's extensive investments in this type of programming
- Examination of the relevance of vocational and technical education programs to labor demands and the benefits experienced by the graduates of these programs
- Assessment of the effectiveness of nonformal education programs to determine more accurately their rates of return
- A study of whether there is a universal approach to a subject area, such as mathematics or science, to which AID could effectively increase assistance

BIBLIOGRAPHY: STUDY OF AID EDUCATION POLICY AND PROGRAMMING

- AID, Africa Bureau Basic Education and Technical Training Assistance Strategy Paper, Washington, D.C., 1984.
- AID, AID and Education: A Sector Report on Lessons Learned, Washington, D.C., 1984.
- AID, AID's Participant Training Program Can Be Made More Effective, Washington, D.C., 1984.
- AID, AID Policy Paper: Basic Education and Technical Training, Washington, D.C., 1982.
- AID, AID Sector Strategy: Education, Washington, D.C., 1983.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Washington, D.C., FY 1980.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Washington, D.C., FY 1981.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Office of Policy Development and Program Review, Washington, D.C., FY 1983.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Office of Evaluation, Washington, D.C., FY 1984.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Science and Technology, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., FY 1984.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Office of Policy Development and Program Review, Washington, D.C., FY 1985.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Office of Policy Development and Program Review, Washington, D.C., FY 1986.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Science and Technology, Washington, D.C., FY 1986.
- AID, Annual Budget Submission, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, Office of Policy Development and Program Review, Washington, D.C., FY 1987.
- AID, Blueprint for Development: The Strategic Plan for the Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- AID, Central Program Strategy Statement, Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination, April 1979.

- AID, Comparison of AID's Policy and Program in Education and Human Resources Development, FY 1978, FY 1979, FY 1980, and FY 1981, Richard Shortlidge, Jr., Washington, D.C.
- AID, Congressional Presentation, Washington, D.C., FY 1980.
- AID, Congressional Presentation, Washington, D.C., FY 1981.
- AID, Congressional Presentation, Washington, D.C., FY 1982.
- AID, Congressional Presentation, Washington, D.C., FY 1983.
- AID, Congressional Presentation, Washington, D.C., FY 1984.
- AID, Congressional Presentation, Washington, D.C., FY 1985.
- AID, Congressional Presentation, Washington, D.C., FY 1986.
- AID, Congressional Presentation, Washington, D.C., FY 1987.
- AID, FY 1987 OMB Submission: Obligations in Functional Subcategories, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- AID, Investments in Education in Developing Countries: The Role for AID, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- AID, "The LAC Management by Objectives Goals Structure," Washington, D.C.
- AID, Lessons Learned From AID Program Experience in FY 1984, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- AID, "Participant Training FY 85," Washington, D.C., 1985.
- AID, Project Impact Evaluation No. 8--Morocco: Food Aid and Nutrition Education, Washington, D.C., 1980.
- AID, Project Impact Evaluation No. 19--U.S. Aid to Education in Nepal: A 20-Year Beginning, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- AID, Project Impact Evaluation No. 23--Northern Nigeria Teacher Education Project, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- AID, Project Impact Evaluation No. 25--Thailand: Rural Nonformal Education, The Mobile Trade Training School, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- AID, Project Impact Evaluation No. 37--Radio Correspondence Education in Kenya, Washington, D.C., 1982.
- AID, Project Impact Evaluation No. 46--U.S. Aid to Education in Paraguay: The Rural Education Development Project, Washington, D.C., 1982.

AID, Report to House Foreign Affairs Committee on AID Policy and Priority for Education Programs, Washington, D.C., 1982.

AID, Sector Statement on Education, Washington, D.C., 1973.

Development Issues: U.S. Actions Affecting Developing Countries, The 1984 Annual Report of the Chairman of the Development Coordination Committee, U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency, Washington, D.C., 1984.

Development Issues: U.S. Actions Affecting Developing Countries, The 1985 Annual Report of the Chairman of the Development Coordination Committee, U.S. International Development Cooperation Agency, Washington, D.C., 1985.

Eng, Gweneth, "Expenditures on Basic Education as a Proportion of Total AID Education Expenditures," January 1984.

Hullinder, Edwin L., "Education Policy & Regional Strategy," January 1984.

Hullinder, Edwin L., "Increasing and Improving the Focus of the Agency's Assistance for Education," October 1983.

International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985: Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives on H.R. 1555 (Report 99-39), U.S. Government Printing Office, April 11, 1985.

International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985: Report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, on S. 960 (Report 99-34), U.S. Government Printing Office, April 19, 1985.

International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985: Conference Report, House of Representatives, (Report 99-237), U.S. Government Printing Office, July 29, 1985.

Legislation on Foreign Relations Through 1984, Volume I, Committee on Foreign Relations and Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1985.

Method, Frank, AID Assistance to Education: A Retrospective Study, Creative Associates, Inc., Washington, D.C., 1981.

Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, Twenty-five Years of Development Co-operation: A Review, Paris, November 1985.

Public Law 99-83 - August 8, 1985: International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 99th Congress, U.S. Government Printing Office.

Report 99-167: Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 1986, Senate, 99th Congress, 1st Session, U.S. Government Printing Office, October 1, 1985.

Report 99-252: Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 1986, House of Representatives, 99th Congress, 1st Session, U.S. Government Printing Office, August 1, 1985.

Shortlidge, Richard, IDCA's Proposal to Reduce the Number of AID Missions and the Number of Sectors in which AID Operates, May 1980.

USAID, Niger Education and Human Resources Sector Assessment, (draft) Niger, 1983.

USAID, Somalia Education & Human Resources Sector Assessment, Somalia, 1984.

USAID, Yemen Education & Human Resources Sector Assessment, Yemen, 1985.

Zagorin, Ruth, "Discussion of Education Issues Raised at 7/11/83," November 1983.

Zagorin, Ruth, "Education and Training Technical Staff: Backstop 60," December, 1985.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY: LITERATURE REVIEW

AID, "A.I.D. and Higher Education in Latin America for the Eighties," Matt Seymour, Washington, D.C., 1985.

AID, "Investments in Education in Developing Countries: The Role for A.I.D.," Washington, D.C., 1980.

AID, "Literature Review: Relationship of Education to Productivity, Employment, Health, Fertility, and Technical Change," Gary Theisen, Washington, D.C.

AID, Past Experiences and Promising Directions Concerning AID Support of Vocational Education (second draft), Joan Claffey, Washington, D.C., 1982.

AID, "The Role of Private Education in Relieving Education Cost Burdens in Developing Countries," Washington, D.C.

Alexander, Leigh, and John Simmons, The Determinants of School Achievement in Developing Countries: The Educational Production Function, World Bank Staff Working Paper no. 201, Washington, D.C., 1975.

Botswana, A Social and Economic Survey of Three Peri-Urban Areas in Botswana, General Statistics Office, Gaborone, 1974.

Bulatao, R. A., "Mortality Thresholds for Fertility Transition in Developing Countries", World Bank, Washington, D.C., 1983.

- Cochrane, Susan Hill, Fertility and Education: What Do We Really Know? World Bank Staff Occasional Papers, 26, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1979.
- Colclough, Christopher, Primary Schooling and Economic Development: A Review of the Evidence, World Bank Staff Working Paper no. 399, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., 1980.
- Coombs, Philip H., The World Crisis in Education: The View from the Eighties, New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Coombs, Philip H. and Manzoor Ahmed, Attacking Rural Poverty: How Nonformal Education Can Help, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- Eachem, R.G., David J. Bradley, Hemda Garelick, and D. Duncan Mara, Sanitation and Disease: Health Aspects of Wastewater Management, London: John Wiley, 1983.
- Gerhart, John, The Diffusion of Hybrid Maize in Western Kenya (abridged), Mexico City: Centro Internacional de Mejoramiento de Maiz y Trigo (CIMMYT), 1975.
- Hadad, Wadi, Educational and Economic Effects of Promotion and Repetition Practices, World Bank Staffing Paper no. 319, Washington, D.C., 1979.
- Heyneman, Stephen P., "Differences Between Developed and Developing Countries: Comments on Simmon's and Alexander's Determinants of School Achievement," Economic Development and Cultural Change 28, no. 2 (January): 403-06, 1980.
- Heyneman, Stephen P., "Improving the Quality of Education in Developing Countries," Finance and Development 20, no. 1 (March), 18-21, 1983.
- Heyneman, Stephen, Joseph Farrell, and Manuel Sepulveda-Stuardo, "Textbooks and Achievement in Developing Countries: What We Know," Journal of Curriculum Studies 13(3), 227-46, 1981.
- Heyneman, Stephen, Dean T. Jamison, and Xenia Montenegro, "Textbooks in the Philippines: Evaluation of the Pedagogical Impact of a Nationwide Investment," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 6(2), 139-50.
- Heyneman, S. and W. Loxley, "The Effect of Primary School Quality on Academic Achievement Across Twenty-Nine High and Low Income Countries," American Journal of Sociology 88 no. 6 (May), pp. 1162-94, 1983.
- Heyneman, S., "Research on Education in the Developing Countries," (speech delivered at Harvard University), World Bank, Washington, D.C., 1984.
- Hicks, Norman L., "Sector Priorities in Meeting Basic Needs: Some Statistical Evidence," World Development, Vol. 10, no. 6., pp. 489-499, 1982.

- Husen, Torsten, Lawrence Saha, and Richard Noonan, Teacher Training and Student Achievement in Less Developed Countries, World Bank Staff Working Paper no. 310, Washington, D.C., 1978.
- Jamison, Dean T., and Lawrence Lau, Farmer Education and Farm Efficiency, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982.
- Jamison, D.T. and P. R. Mook, "Farmer Education and Farm Efficiency in Nepal: The Role of Schooling, Extension Services, and Cognitive Skills," World Development 12, no. 1 (January), 67-86, 1984.
- Krueger, Chris and Jeanne Moulton, Nonformal Education: A Retrospective Study, AID, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- Lockheed, Marlaine E., Dean T. Jamison, and Lawrence J. Lau, "Farmer Education and Farm Efficiency: A Survey" In Education and Income, ed. Timothy King, World Bank Staff Working Paper no. 402, Washington, D.C., 1980.
- Method, Frank, "The Development of Technical Skills in LDC's," AID, Washington, D.C., 1979.
- Mingat, Alain, "Measuring the Economic Efficiency of Project-Related Training: Some Evidence from Agricultural Projects," Washington, D.C.: World Bank, Education Department, 1984.
- Mook, Peter R., "The Efficiency of Women as Farm Managers: Kenya," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, Vol. 58, no. 5, December 1976.
- Mook, Peter R., "Education and Technical Efficiency in Small-Farm Production," Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. 29, no. 4, July 1981.
- Noor, Abdun, Education and Basic Human Needs, World Bank Staff Working Paper no. 450, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- Psacharopoulos, George, "Returns to Education: An Updated International Comparison," Comparative Education 17(3): 321-41, 1981.
- Psacharopoulos, George and Maureen Woodhall, Education for Development, New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Psacharopoulos, George, et al, Manpower Issues in Educational Investment: A Consideration of Planning Processes and Techniques, World Bank Staff Working Paper no. 624, World Bank, Washington, D.C., 1983.
- Rosenzweig, Mark R., "Schooling, Allocative Ability and the Green Revolution," Paper presented at the Meetings of the Eastern Economic Association, Washington, D.C., April 1978, processed.
- Schiefelbein, E., J.P. Farrell, and M. Sepulveda-Stuardo, The Influence of School Resources in Chile: Their Effect on Educational Achievement and Occupational Attainment, World Bank Staff Working Paper no. 530, Washington, D.C., 1983.

- Schiefelbein, E. and J. Simmons, The Determinants of School Achievement: A Review of the Research for Developing Countries, IDRC Document MR-9, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, 1978.
- Shuluka, S., "Achievements of Indian Children in Mother Tongue (Hindi) and Science," Comparative Education Review 18, no. 2 (June), 237-47, 1974.
- Tan, J. P., "Private Education: Some Macro Trends on Enrollment and Expenditure," World Bank, Washington, D.C., 1983.
- UNESCO, Educational Reform: Approaches, Paris, 1981.
- UNESCO, Educational Reforms: Experience and Prospects, Paris, 1977.
- UNESCO, Educational Reforms and Innovations in Africa, Paris, 1978.
- UNESCO, The Politics of Educational Planning in Developing Countries, Paris, 1971.
- Woo, Louis K. and Gweneth Eng, Economic Analysis of Nonformal Education: Four Case Studies, AID, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- World Bank, Accelerated Development in Sub-Saharan Africa: An Agenda for Action, Washington, D.C., 1981.
- World Bank, Education: Sector Policy Paper, Washington, D.C., 1980.
- World Bank, Impact of World Bank Lending for Educational Development in Korea: A Review, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- World Bank, The World Bank Annual Report, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- Yoloye, E. A. and S.T. Bajah, A Report of Twenty Years of Science Education in Africa, SEPA, 1981.

**A P P E N D I C E S**

**APPENDIX A**  
**INTERVIEW GUIDES**

INTERVIEW GUIDE: AID PERSONNEL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND PROGRAMMING

1. What role does education play in development?
2. Define or describe AID's educational programs. What do they include?
3. How important is AID's role in supporting education compared to its role in supporting agriculture, health, and other sectors?
4. What is the role of AID policy in determining educational funding and programming for specific regions and countries?
5. What is the role of each of the following in the determination of AID policy?
  - Blueprint for the Development
  - the education policy papers, such as Basic Education and Technical Training
  - the Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSSs)
  - the Annual Budget Submission (ABS)

Which document is most influential in determining actual programming?

6. What criteria is used to determine policy for programming?

7. Does policy in education coincide with programming in education at this time? In what ways are they similar or different?
8. What factors determine the effectiveness of AID support to educational programs?
9. In what type of educational program is AID most effective?
10. Does AID's effectiveness in these areas vary by region or country?
11. Are there criteria AID Missions can follow to determine what programs in education are most appropriate for their countries? If so, what are they?
12. Is AID currently appropriately staffed to carry out educational programs effectively? Why or why not?
13. Has the evaluation process for educational programs been effective in determining policies and programming? Why or why not?
14. Are education specialists involved in programs that are not funded by the 105 account? Should they be involved in these programs? Why or why not?
15. What are the current programming trends in education? Are these current trends appropriate?

---

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR S&T

1. What is the stated mission of the S&T/Education office?
2. Has its roles changed since the bureau began functioning?
3. What are the different S&T programs?
4. What is the role of field technical support?
5. What is the role of the bureau vis-a-vis the needs of the Missions?
6. What official linkages exist between S&T/Education and the regional bureaus and the Missions?
7. How does S&T/Education determine where its pilot projects will take place?
8. Have the pilot projects been successfully replicated by the Missions? Why or why not?
9. How does the evaluation system with AID feed into S&T/Education activities?
10. What linkages existst between S&T/Education and PPC?
11. Have research findings had an important impact on policy or programming? Could you provide examples?

**APPENDIX B**

**105 ACCOUNT ALLOCATIONS: FUNDING TRENDS IN THE 1980s**

AGENCY FOR  
 FY 1987 COMMISSIONAL PR  
 SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL S CATEGORIES  
 BUREAU  
 (IN \$000)

The Education Sector	FUNC SUBCAT	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 ESTIMATE	1987 REQUEST	TOTAL
<b>Education and Human Resources</b>										
Planning/Policy Analysis	EHPP	7,225	5,786	6,044	7,963	17,008	24,641	32,577	23,571	124,815
Research	EHRE	756	130	300	113	71	868	455	900	3,593
Elementary Education	EHED	13,575	17,207	7,352	9,225	18,998	35,648	18,184	22,308	142,497
Secondary Education	EHSD	1,602	1,388	1,035	621	---	---	---	---	4,646
Admin/Managerial Education	EHMA	14,643	15,184	27,862	28,499	22,270	30,901	34,541	36,550	210,450
Prof/Scientific Education	EHSP	11,115	14,136	12,870	21,750	20,593	41,138	35,768	51,345	208,715
Adult/Community Education	EHAC	14,204	8,915	5,675	3,028	4,596	5,492	6,838	5,150	53,898
Vocational/Technical Education	EHVT	7,141	11,355	13,051	18,545	12,681	18,277	6,893	11,169	99,112
Labor Development	EHLA	21,928	20,607	15,935	15,894	15,890	16,968	15,606	16,000	138,828
Development Administration	EHDA	350	180	6,505	3,670	3,809	3,758	1,672	1,750	21,694
US Institutions (PVOS)	EHPV	3,492	5,233	4,451	4,164	4,728	8,153	7,461	4,189	41,871
Not Classified	EHZZ	1,800	2,600	2,800	689	54	721	2,139	6,857	17,660
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>97,115</b>	<b>12,721</b>	<b>13,880</b>	<b>4,161</b>	<b>20,698</b>	<b>5,565</b>	<b>162,134</b>	<b>79,112</b>	<b>1,067,112</b>

-74-

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES

**APPENDIX C**  
**FUNDING DATA**  
**105 ACCOUNT ALLOCATIONS: THE REGIONAL BUREAUS**

FOR  
 FY 1987 CONGRESSIONAL PR  
 SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL S  
 BUREAU CATEGORIES  
 (IN \$000)

The Africa Bureau	FUNC SUBCAT	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 ESTIMATE	1987 REQUEST	TOTAL
<b>Education and Human Resources</b>										
Planning/Policy Analysis	EHPP	1,092	2,448	1,178	1,218	1,929	2,867	4,346	3,350	18,428
Research	EHRE	230	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	230
Elementary Education	EHED	1,623	1,080	980	1,343	5,350	6,497	11,660	7,005	35,538
Secondary Education	EHSD	225	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	225
Admin/Managerial Education	EHMA	4,196	4,902	11,531	7,969	9,784	11,364	10,019	4,900	64,665
Prof/Scientific Education	EHSP	7,684	4,665	8,580	4,727	6,862	4,005	7,668	6,650	50,841
Adult/Community Education	EHAC	2,981	2,359	391	300	3,000	3,000	5,138	4,200	21,369
Vocational/Technical Education	EHVT	3,684	2,099	10,185	10,784	5,817	3,000	3,840	3,312	42,721
Labor Development	EHLD	8,628	7,595	3,000	3,000	3,000	4,221	3,350	3,400	36,194
Development Administration	EHDA	---	---	---	---	---	465	472	---	937
US Institutions (PVOS)	EHPV	---	---	---	---	85	---	1,065	1,202	2,352
Not Classified	EHZZ	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	2,850	2,850
<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATION</b>		<b>30,343</b>	<b>25,148</b>	<b>35,845</b>	<b>29,341</b>	<b>35,827</b>	<b>35,419</b>	<b>47,558</b>	<b>36,869</b>	<b>276,350</b>

-76-

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES

OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORIES  
BY COUNTRY  
(IN \$000)

AFRICA	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>Botswana</b>									
EHED					1650				1650
EHVT					2817				2817
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0	0	4467	0	0	0	4467
<b>Burundi</b>									
EHSP								1250	1250
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1250	1250
<b>Cameroon</b>									
EHRE	230								230
EHED					3245	5500	10460	5405	24610
EHPV						2	15		17
EHPV							815	952	1767
<b>Total</b>	230	0	0	0	3245	5502	11290	6357	26624
<b>Congo</b>									
EHVT								312	312
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	312	312
<b>Djibouti</b>									
EHAC	1100	1700							2800
<b>Total</b>	1100	1700	0	0	0	0	0	0	2800
<b>Ghana</b>									
EHMA	445	533							978
EHAC		59							59
EHVT		236	1368						1604
<b>Total</b>	445	828	1368	0	0	0	0	0	2641
<b>Guinea-Bissau</b>									
EHED	550								550
EHSP					1000	500			1500
<b>Total</b>	550	0	0	0	1000	500	0	0	2050
<b>Kenya</b>									
EHSP		500							500
EHPV							65		65
EHPV							250	250	500
<b>Total</b>	0	500	0	0	0	0	315	250	1065

AFRICA	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>Lesotho</b>									
EHMA	391	389	320						1100
EHSP	1587	2400	3180	3027	1350	155			11699
EHAC	1184	600	391	300	3000	3000	5138	4200	17813
<b>Total</b>	<b>3162</b>	<b>3389</b>	<b>3891</b>	<b>3327</b>	<b>4350</b>	<b>3155</b>	<b>5138</b>	<b>4200</b>	<b>30612</b>
<b>Liberia</b>									
EHPP	573	2204	597	1000	1000	2223	2450	2350	12397
EHMA			2000	1000	1295	594	1500	1100	7489
EHVT	1428	176	2216						3820
<b>Total</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2380</b>	<b>4813</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2295</b>	<b>2817</b>	<b>3950</b>	<b>3450</b>	<b>23706</b>
<b>Malawi</b>									
EHVT	1500	1380	2700	2734					8314
<b>Total</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>1380</b>	<b>2700</b>	<b>2734</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8314</b>
<b>Sierra Leone</b>									
EHVT	337	109	803						1249
<b>Total</b>	<b>337</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>803</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1249</b>
<b>Somalia</b>									
EHMA						2700	2000	3000	7700
EHPP						37			37
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2737</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>7737</b>
<b>Sudan</b>									
EHAC	697								697
<b>Total</b>	<b>697</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>697</b>
<b>Swaziland</b>									
EHED	1073	1080	980	1343	455	997	1200	1600	8728
EHSP	2175	500	2400	1700	3322	3000	3540	1900	18537
EHPV					85				85
<b>Total</b>	<b>3248</b>	<b>1580</b>	<b>3380</b>	<b>3043</b>	<b>3862</b>	<b>3997</b>	<b>4740</b>	<b>3500</b>	<b>27350</b>
<b>Tanzania</b>									
EHSP	3922	1265	3000		1190				9377
<b>Total</b>	<b>3922</b>	<b>1265</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1190</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9377</b>
<b>Zaire</b>									
EHMA	1000	1225		319				800	3344
EHPP						14	100		114
<b>Total</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>1225</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>800</b>	<b>3458</b>
<b>Zimbabwe</b>									
EHSP							2000	1000	3000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>3000</b>

AFRICA	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>Africa</b>									
Regional									
EHPP	519	244	581	218	929	591	1716	1000	5798
EHSD	225								225
EHMA	2360	2755	9211	6650	8489	8070	6519		44054
EHSP						350	2128	2500	4978
EHVT	419	198	98	5000					5715
EHLA	8628	7595	3000	3000	3000	4221	3350	3400	36194
EHDA						465	472		937
EHZZ								2850	2850
<b>Total</b>	<b>12151</b>	<b>10792</b>	<b>12890</b>	<b>14868</b>	<b>12418</b>	<b>13697</b>	<b>14185</b>	<b>9750</b>	<b>100751</b>
<b>Southern Africa</b>									
Regional									
EHVT			3000	3050	3000	3000	3840	3000	18890
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>3050</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>3840</b>	<b>3000</b>	<b>18890</b>

AGENCY FOR  
 FY 1987 CONGRESSIONAL PR  
 SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL S CATEGORIES  
 BY BUREAU  
 (IN \$000)

The Asia/Near East Bureau	FUNC SUBCAT	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 ESTIMATE	1987 REQUEST	TOTAL
<b>Education and Human Resources</b>										
Planning/Policy Analysis	EHPP	2,727	1,178	449	1,686	8,819	2,176	1,268	740	19,043
Elementary Education	EHED	1,698	4,840	1,500	3,700	5,074	6,854	724	753	25,143
Admin/Managerial Education	EHMA	5,924	4,200	7,700	10,118	2,600	625	1,500	8,000	40,667
Prof/Scientific Education	EHSP	1,156	6,500	3,982	15,158	13,069	8,978	10,080	16,020	74,943
Adult/Community Education	EHAC	5,200	2,480	600	600	67	---	---	---	8,947
Vocational/Technical Education	EHVT	500	2,209	726	353	580	486	453	157	5,464
Labor Development	EHLA	3,900	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	4,100	3,900	3,900	32,200
Development Adminis- tration	EHDA	---	---	4,050	1,050	500	---	---	250	5,850
US Institutions (PVOS)	EHPV	2,810	4,267	2,765	1,680	3,444	3,298	2,900	1,200	22,364
Not Classified	EHZZ	---	---	---	10	---	---	100	100	210
<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATION</b>		<b>23,915</b>	<b>29,774</b>	<b>25,872</b>	<b>38,455</b>	<b>38,253</b>	<b>26,517</b>	<b>20,925</b>	<b>31,120</b>	<b>234,831</b>

-80-

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES

OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORIES  
BY COUNTRY  
(IN \$000)

ASIA AND NEAR EAST	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>Bangladesh</b>									
EHPP	250	400				300	300		1250
EHMA								2000	2000
<b>Total</b>	250	400	0	0	0	300	300	2000	3250
<b>Burma</b>									
EHDA			50	50					100
EHMA							500	500	1000
<b>Total</b>	0	0	50	50	0	0	500	500	1100
<b>India</b>									
EHMA				1100	2600			1400	5100
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0	1100	2600	0	0	1400	5100
<b>Indonesia</b>									
EHPP					4990	1510			6500
EHED	500	1175							1675
EHMA	3000		1750	4750					9500
EHSP	500	1200		10150	4770	2000		4000	22620
EHAC	4000	1000							5000
EHDA			4000	1000					5000
EHPV	400	725	500		1250	1250	2300	500	6925
<b>Total</b>	8400	4100	6250	15900	11010	4760	2300	4500	57220
<b>Morocco</b>									
EHPP	500	500	200	300					1500
EHMA	572	1000	750						2322
EHSP				1320	3105	1800	1900	1500	9625
EHAC	1200	1480	600	600					3880
EHVT		600	236						836
<b>Total</b>	2272	3580	1786	2220	3105	1800	1900	1500	18163
<b>Nepal</b>									
EHED		250		100	950	1243	724	753	4020
EHMA						250	500	500	1250
<b>Total</b>	0	250	0	100	950	1493	1224	1253	5270
<b>Pakistan</b>									
EHMA								3000	3000
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3000	3000

ASIA AND NEAR EAST	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>Philippines</b>									
EHPP				1000	3500				4500
EHMA	100								100
EHVT		1609	290						1899
EHPV	228	290	300	100	300	300	300	400	2218
EHDA								250	250
<b>Total</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>1899</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>1100</b>	<b>3800</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>650</b>	<b>8967</b>
<b>Sri Lanka</b>									
EHVT			100	100	143	200	100		643
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>643</b>
<b>Thailand</b>									
EHED	600	1000							1600
EHVT	500								500
EHPV	295	500			103				898
<b>Total</b>	<b>1395</b>	<b>1500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2998</b>
<b>Tunisia</b>									
EHZZ				10					10
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Yemen</b>									
EHED	598	2415	1500	3600	3000	4761			15874
EHMA	2252	3200	5200	4268					14920
EHSP					4959	5078	7500	10070	27607
<b>Total</b>	<b>2850</b>	<b>5615</b>	<b>6700</b>	<b>7868</b>	<b>7959</b>	<b>9839</b>	<b>7500</b>	<b>10070</b>	<b>58401</b>
<b>Asia Regional</b>									
EHPP	349	271	196	307	221	260			1604
EHSP	155	1200	800	720					2875
EHLA	3900	4100	4100	4100	4100	4100			24400
EHDA					500				500
EHPV	350	488	250						1088
<b>Total</b>	<b>4754</b>	<b>6059</b>	<b>5346</b>	<b>5127</b>	<b>4821</b>	<b>4360</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30467</b>
<b>Near East Regional</b>									
EHPP	1628	7	53	79	108	106			1981
EHED					1124	850			1974
EHSP	501	4000	3082	2968	235	100			10886
EHVT				153	350	286			789
<b>Total</b>	<b>2129</b>	<b>4007</b>	<b>3135</b>	<b>3200</b>	<b>1817</b>	<b>1342</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>15630</b>

ASIA AND NEAR EAST	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
Asia/Near East Regional									
EHPP							968	740	1708
EHLA							3900	3900	7800
EHVT							353	157	510
EHSP							580	350	930
Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	5801	5147	10948
South Pacific Regional									
EHMA						375	500	600	1475
EHSP		100	100				100	100	400
EHAC						67			67
EHVT			100	100	87				287
EHPV	1537	2264	1715	1580	1791	1748	300	300	11235
EHZZ							100	100	200
Total	1537	2364	1915	1680	1945	2123	1000	1100	13664

FY 1987  
SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS BY PROGRAM AND FUNDING CATEGORIES

(IN \$ MIL)

The Latin America and Caribbean Bureau	FUNC SUBCAT	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 ESTIMATE	1987 REQUEST	TOTAL
<b>Education and Human Resources</b>										
Planning/Policy Analysis	EHPP	1,228	614	1,388	2,033	2,368	14,353	21,863	14,131	57,978
Research	EHRE	526	130	300	113	71	---	---	---	1,140
Elementary Education	EHED	9,254	10,337	2,402	2,423	7,384	21,797	5,800	14,550	73,947
Secondary Education	EHSD	1,377	1,388	1,035	621	---	---	---	---	4,421
Admin/Managerial Education	EHMA	3,332	5,080	8,042	9,450	9,279	18,237	22,897	23,175	99,492
Prof/Scientific Education	EHSP	748	400	193	1,770	---	27,550	16,500	27,500	74,661
Adult/Community Education	EHAC	585	269	3,949	579	155	1,367	500	---	7,404
Vocational/Technical Education	EHVT	1,846	6,709	1,691	7,408	4,646	7,996	2,600	7,700	40,596
Labor Development	EHLD	8,400	7,800	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	7,656	8,000	63,856
Development Admini- stration	EHDA	350	180	2,455	2,620	3,309	3,293	1,200	1,500	14,907
US Institutions (PVOS)	EHPV	682	578	1,180	1,832	1,009	4,508	2,396	1,137	13,322
Not Classified	EHZZ	1,800	2,600	2,800	177	---	721	2,039	3,707	13,844
<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATION</b>		<b>30,128</b>	<b>36,085</b>	<b>33,435</b>	<b>37,026</b>	<b>36,221</b>	<b>107,822</b>	<b>83,451</b>	<b>101,400</b>	<b>465,568</b>

-84-

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES

OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORIES  
BY COUNTRY  
(IN \$000)

LATIN AMERICA /CARIBBEAN	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>Belize</b>									
EHPP						300	50	50	400
EHPV						0	100		100
EHVT						2000	500	1000	3500
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	2300	650	1050	4000
<b>Bolivia</b>									
EHPP	62		50	1	25	300	70	60	568
EHED	372		200	400	254				1226
EHMA	710	500	400	600	500	1000	810	700	5220
<b>Total</b>	1144	500	650	1001	779	1300	880	760	7014
<b>Colombia</b>									
EHVT	240								240
<b>Total</b>	240	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240
<b>Costa Rica</b>									
EHPP	27	14	100	600	616	75	80	100	1612
EHMA					350	3650	500	500	5000
EHVT	29								29
EHPV						71			71
<b>Total</b>	56	14	100	600	966	3796	580	600	6712
<b>Dominican Republic</b>									
EHPP	100	21	97	200	68	300	150	100	1036
EHED					5151	2849			8000
EHMA				540	1690	3889	881	1000	8000
EHSP				1550			1500		3050
EHAC	100		110	160	155				525
EHVT	81	5200		50	76	400			5807
EHPV						0	500		500
EHZZ							1500		1500
<b>Total</b>	281	5221	207	2500	7140	7438	4531	1100	28418
<b>Ecuador</b>									
EHPP	40	54	50	50	300	770	480	304	2048
EHMA	400	230	300				2870	1500	5300
EHVT	130	110	300	128	200	188	1000	1000	3056
EHDA				675	325	2200			3200
EHPV				370	264	902	400	400	2336
EHZZ				80					80
<b>Total</b>	570	394	650	1303	1089	4060	4750	3204	16020

LATIN AMERICA /CARIBBEAN	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>El Salvador</b>									
EHPP	400			62	175	9125	16455	1000	36217
EHPV				210					210
EHVT								5000	5000
<b>Total</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>9125</b>	<b>16455</b>	<b>15000</b>	<b>41427</b>
<b>Guatemala</b>									
EHPP	50	89	75	50	50	389	200	200	1103
EHEH	414	232	275	500	150	12000		6050	19621
EHAC	125	120	3609			1117			4971
EHDA	350	180	455	200					1185
EHSP							5000		5000
<b>Total</b>	<b>939</b>	<b>621</b>	<b>4414</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>13506</b>	<b>5200</b>	<b>6250</b>	<b>31880</b>
<b>Guyana</b>									
EHPP				6					6
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Haiti</b>									
EHPP	98	25	95	30	70	165	250	150	883
EHVT	400	350	235	315	300				1600
EHPV	500	550	500	242	120	385			2297
EHEH							1200	2000	3200
EHMA						450	800	750	2000
<b>Total</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>925</b>	<b>830</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>490</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>2250</b>	<b>2900</b>	<b>9980</b>
<b>Honduras</b>									
EHEH	6580	8427	197	650	800	3600	3600	5000	28854
EHVT	100	125							225
EHLA		50							50
EHDA			2000	245	580	475	200		3500
EHPV	96	28	100		225	400	455	537	1841
EHZZ						387	93	1707	2187
EHPP	134	183	458	380	300	800	181	300	2736
<b>Total</b>	<b>6910</b>	<b>8813</b>	<b>2755</b>	<b>1275</b>	<b>1905</b>	<b>5662</b>	<b>4529</b>	<b>7544</b>	<b>39393</b>
<b>Jamaica</b>									
EHPP	15	80	210	145	160	550	150	100	1410
EHMA						350	500	700	1550
EHVT	452	374		5950	4070	1530	600	200	13176
EHDA				1500	2404	618	1000	1500	7022
EHPV			490	1010	400	1000	441		3341
EHEH						3000	1000	1500	5500
<b>Total</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>454</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>8605</b>	<b>7034</b>	<b>7048</b>	<b>3691</b>	<b>4000</b>	<b>31999</b>

LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>Nicaragua</b>									
EHPP	100	43	4						147
EHSD	202	288							490
EHSP	248	150							398
EHAC	150								150
<b>Total</b>	<b>700</b>	<b>481</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1185</b>
<b>Panama</b>									
EHPP	74	32	90	170	210	445	500	500	2021
EHSD		250	240						490
EHMA	125	2700	1470						4295
EHAC		99	150	419					668
EHPV	86		90			1750	500		2426
EHZZ						200	446	2000	2646
<b>Total</b>	<b>285</b>	<b>3081</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>2395</b>	<b>1446</b>	<b>2500</b>	<b>12546</b>
<b>Paraguay</b>									
EHPP	10								10
EHED	313	205							518
<b>Total</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>528</b>
<b>Peru</b>									
EHPP	4	29	40	179	190	635	250	100	1427
EHED	400	250	530		200				1380
EHVT	70	400	550	405		180			1605
EHZZ				97					97
EHMA						1489	1750	1000	4239
EHAC						250	500		750
EHPV						250	500	200	200
<b>Total</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>679</b>	<b>1120</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>390</b>	<b>2554</b>	<b>2500</b>	<b>1300</b>	<b>9698</b>
<b>Caribbean Regional</b>									
EHPP	76	44	59	100	100	405	100	100	984
EHED	1175	1033	975	773	500				4456
EHSD	1175	850	795	621					3441
EHMA	500	500	800	2170	1457	1394	7000	9600	23421
EHVT	344	150	606	560		3200			4860
EHZZ	1800	2600	2800						7200
<b>Total</b>	<b>5070</b>	<b>5177</b>	<b>6035</b>	<b>4223</b>	<b>2057</b>	<b>4999</b>	<b>7100</b>	<b>9700</b>	<b>443621</b>
<b>Central America Regional</b>									
EHPP							2165	1900	4065
EHSP						27550	10000	27500	65050
EHLA							1500	1500	3000
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27550</b>	<b>13665</b>	<b>30900</b>	<b>72115</b>

LATIN AMERICA /CARIBBEAN	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
LAC Regional									
EHPP	3		60	60	104	94	782	167	1270
EHRE	226	130	300	113	71				840
EHED		190	225	100	329	348			1192
EHSP	500	250	193	220					1163
EHAC	210	50	80						340
EHL D	8400	7750	8000	8000	8000	8000	6156	6500	60806
EHMA	1097	1150	3822	3990	4182	6015	5386	5300	16701
EHVT						498	500	500	1498
<b>Total</b>	<b>10436</b>	<b>9520</b>	<b>12680</b>	<b>12483</b>	<b>12686</b>	<b>14955</b>	<b>12824</b>	<b>12467</b>	<b>98051</b>
ROCAP									
EHPP	35								35
EHRE	300								300
EHMA	500		1250	2150	1100		2400	2125	9525
EHZZ						134			134
<b>Total</b>	<b>835</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1250</b>	<b>2150</b>	<b>1100</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>2400</b>	<b>2125</b>	<b>9994</b>

**APPENDIX D**  
**FUNDING DATA**  
**105 ACCOUNT ALLOCATIONS: THE CENTRAL BUREAUS**

AGENCY FOR  
 FY 1987 CONGRESSIONAL PR  
 SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL S CATEGORIES  
 BY BUREAU  
 (IN \$000)

The Bureau for Science and Technology	FUNC SUBCAT	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 ESTIMATE	1987 REQUEST	TOTAL
<b>Education and Human Resources</b>										
Planning/Policy Analysis	EHPP	1,739	1,100	1,839	2,178	3,125	3,992	4,100	4,250	22,373
Research	EHRE	---	---	---	---	---	868	455	900	2,223
Elementary Education	EHED	1,000	950	2,470	1,759	1,190	500	---	---	7,869
Admin/Managerial Education	EHMA	1,191	1,002	589	962	607	675	125	475	5,626
Prof/Scientific Education	EHSP	1,527	2,262	115	---	622	605	1,520	1,175	7,826
Adult/Community Education	EHAC	4,602	3,540	735	1,549	1,074	795	900	600	13,795
Vocational/Technical Education	EHVT	---	---	65	---	---	---	---	---	65
Labor Development	EHLA	---	---	835	794	790	647	700	700	4,466
<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATION</b>		<b>10,109</b>	<b>8,854</b>	<b>6,648</b>	<b>7,242</b>	<b>7,408</b>	<b>8,082</b>	<b>7,800</b>	<b>8,100</b>	<b>64,243</b>

-90-

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES

OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORIES  
BY CENTRAL BUREAU  
(IN \$000)

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED	TOTAL
<b>Office of Education</b>									
EHPP	1237	260	876	1250	2223	3200	3300	3350	21371
EHRE						868	455	900	2223
EHED	1000	950	2470	1759	1190	500			7869
EHMA		380	50					250	680
EHSP			115		622	605	1520	1175	4037
EHAC	4602	3540	735	1549	1074	795	400		12695
EHVT			65						65
<b>Total</b>	<b>6839</b>	<b>5130</b>	<b>4311</b>	<b>4558</b>	<b>5109</b>	<b>5968</b>	<b>5675</b>	<b>5675</b>	<b>43265</b>
<b>Office of International Training</b>									
EHPP	452	691	731	803	694	792	800	900	5863
EHAC							500	600	1100
EHSP	1527	2262							3789
EHLA			578	595	700	647	700	700	3920
<b>Total</b>	<b>1979</b>	<b>2953</b>	<b>1309</b>	<b>1398</b>	<b>1394</b>	<b>1439</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2200</b>	<b>14672</b>
<b>Office of Rural and Institutional Development</b>									
EHPP	100	149	232	125	208				814
EHMA	1191	622	539	962	607	675	125	225	4946
EHLA			257	199	90				546
<b>Total</b>	<b>1291</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>1028</b>	<b>1286</b>	<b>905</b>	<b>675</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>6306</b>

**AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
 FY 1987 CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION  
 SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORIES  
 BY BUREAU  
 (IN \$000)**

The Bureau for Food for Peace and Volun- tary Assistance	FUNC SUBCAT	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 ESTIMATE	1987 REQUEST	TOTAL
<b>Education and Human Resources</b>										
Planning/Policy Analysis	EHPP	---	153	100	---	---	---	---	---	253
Prof/Scientific Education	EHSP	---	309	---	95	40	---	---	---	444
Adult/Community Education	EHAC	836	267	---	---	300	330	300	350	2,383
Vocational/Technical Education	EHVT	1,111	338	384	---	1,638	6,795	---	---	10,266
Labor Development	EHLA	1,000	1,112	---	---	---	---	---	---	2,112
US Institutions (PVOs)			388	506	1,051	190	347	1,100	650	4,232
<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATION</b>		<b>2,947</b>	<b>2,567</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>1,146</b>	<b>2,168</b>	<b>7,472</b>	<b>1,400</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>19,690</b>

-92-

CREATIVE ASSOCIATES

**AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**FY 1987 CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION**  
**SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS IN FUNCTIONAL SUBCATEGORIES**  
**BY BUREAU**  
**(IN \$000)**

The Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination	FUNC SUBCAT	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 ESTIMATE	1987 REQUEST	TOTAL
Education and Human Resources										
Planning/Policy Analysis	EHPP	389	293	1,090	848	767	1,253	1,000	1,100	6,740
Not Classified	EHZZ	---	---	---	103	---	---	---	200	303
<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATION</b>		<b>389</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>1,090</b>	<b>951</b>	<b>767</b>	<b>1,253</b>	<b>1,000</b>	<b>1,300</b>	<b>7,043</b>

-93-

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL 105 ACCOUNT FUNDS  
BY CENTRAL BUREAU  
1980-1987

BUREAU	1980 ACTUAL	1981 ACTUAL	1982 ACTUAL	1983 ACTUAL	1984 ACTUAL	1985 ACTUAL	1986 REQUEST	1987 PROPOSED
Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance	3.0%	2.0%	1.0%	1.0%	2.0%	4.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Program and Policy Coordination	0.4%	0.3%	1.0%	0.8%	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%	0.7%
Science and Technology	10.0%	9.0%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	4.0%	4.0%	5.0%
TOTAL	13.4%	11.3%	8.0%	7.8%	8.6%	8.7%	6.5%	6.3%