AID 1025.1 (7-71) (FACE SHEET)

1st Revision 931-00090 (2)

NONCAPITAL PROJECT PAPER (PRCP)

I. PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

PD-AAC-543-B1

1. PROJECT TITLE

COST METHODOLOGIES - EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY

APPENDIX ATTACHED ☐ YES ☐ NO

2. PROJECT NO. (M.O. 1095.2) 931-11-690-090

3. RECIPIENT (specify)

☐ COUNTRY

☐ REGIONAL ☒ INTERREGIONAL TA BUREAU

4. LIFE OF PROJECT

BEGINS FY 76

ENDS FY 77

5. SUBMISSION

☒ ORIGINAL Dec. 21, 1975 DATE

☐ REV. NO. DATE

CONTR./PASA NO.

II. FUNDING ($000) AND MAN MONTHS (MM) REQUIREMENTS

A. FUNDING BY FISCAL YEAR	B. TOTAL $	C. PERSONNEL (1) $	C. PERSONNEL (2) MM	D. PARTICIPANTS (1) $	D. PARTICIPANTS (2) MM	E. COMMODITIES $	F. OTHER COSTS $	G. PASA/CONTR. (1) $	G. PASA/CONTR. (2) MM	H. LOCAL EXCHANGE CURRENCY RATE: $ US ____ (U.S. OWNED) (1) U.S. GRANT LOAN	(2) COOP COUNTRY (A) JOINT	(2) COOP COUNTRY (B) BUDGET
1. PRIOR THRU ACTUAL FY												
2. OPRN FY												
3. BUDGET FY 76	200	97.5	30				102.5					
4. BUDGET +1 FY												
5. BUDGET +2 FY												
6. BUDGET +3 FY												
7. ALL SUBQ. FY												
8. GRAND TOTAL												

9. OTHER DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

(A) NAME OF DONOR	(B) KIND OF GOODS/SERVICES	(C) AMOUNT

III. ORIGINATING OFFICE CLEARANCE

1. DRAFTER William R. Charleson	TITLE Specialist, TA/EHR	DATE Dec. 21, 1975
2. CLEARANCE OFFICER James B. Chandler	TITLE Director, TA/EHR	DATE Dec. 21, 1975

IV. PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

1. CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Project PID approved Oct. 24, 1975

2. CLEARANCES

BUR OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE	BUR OFF.	SIGNATURE	DATE
	Carl Fritz		TA/EHR	David Sprague	12/11/75
	Robert Mills				

3. APPROVAL AAs OR OFFICE DIRECTORS

SIGNATURE AA/TA, Curtis Farrar

DATE

TITLE

4. APPROVAL A AID (See M.O. 1025.1 VI C)

SIGNATURE

DATE

ADMINISTRATOR, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

COST METHODOLOGIES - EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY

I. Project Summary and Recommendations

A. Recommendations

It is recommended that $200,000 of FY 1976 grant funds be allocated to carry out this project.

B. Description of Project

The purpose of this project is to provide, in two phases, LDC and AID education planners and decision makers with the methodological and procedural means to:

1. analyze the costs of projects using modern educational technology (Phase I); and
2. analyze the cost effectiveness/benefits of using alternative technological systems instead of or in addition to current systems (Phase II).

This project has been designed and would be implemented and evaluated to further the joint goals of the Education Technology and Finance KPAs. To assure a broad based participatory enterprise, the TA Bureau requests that Regional Bureaus nominate representatives to serve on a project advisory panel. This panel may be expanded to include representatives from LDCs and AID Missions if deemed advisable by the AID/W advisory panel. The panel will be constituted as a formal advisory and review panel which, meeting periodically, will be charged with monitoring project activities and, on the basis of project performance under Phase I, make recommendations for the scope and funding of Phase II activities.

The project will assign high priority to the development and use of costing methodologies to be used in conjunction with the planning and execution of proposed educational technology projects. Additionally, priority will be given to assisting Missions and LDCs which request assistance in modifying existing educational programs. In all cases selection of field sites for testing analytical methodologies will be approved by the project's advisory panel.

TA/EHR believes that by linking the development of the methodologies to their immediate utilization, through consulting of project staff to Missions and in field test applications of methodologies in support of new technology projects, otherwise theoretical methodologies will be tempered by operational reality; i.e., the views and experience of AID and LDC users.

Project Issues

The following issues have been raised during the preparation and dissemination of the PID.

1. The AA/TA noted that it might be desirable to link Phase II

of this project to Phase II of the Nonformal Education-Cost Methodologies Project which will be initiated at approximately the same time. TA/EHR welcomes this suggestion and will introduce this item for consideration by the advisory panels of both projects during their respective first phases.

2. USAID/Indonesia asked, "will technologies include satellite delivery, radio, video tapes..." The project will consider all modern educational technology which is appropriate for mass communication. Therefore, television, radio and satellites clearly fall within the concerns of this project. The use of video tapes, cassettes, etc. will also be considered if, in the opinion of the project's advisory panel, such technologies represent viable mass communication possibilities. The Mission further noted that "to cost out components effectively...the output of the system should be considered within the analysis framework and taken into account..." TA/EHR agrees with USAID/Indonesia and intends to assure that "system output" will be considered in more than one way.

   USAID/Indonesia also asked, "How are real costs defined?" This project defines real costs to mean inputs in physical terms. Social and opportunity costs will be dealt with by the project, but they will be defined as social and opportunity costs. Cost Benefit/Methodologies will be included in the project, but may not, for obvious reasons, receive the field testing that will be given to cost effectiveness. This project will use the following operational definitions in the pursuit of methodological development:

   a. Cost Analysis or resource analysis is the starting point for all cost considerations in education technology.
   b. Cost Effectiveness analysis uses information developed in resource analysis and relates such measures to outputs for the purpose of ascertaining which of the feasible alternatives will result in the 'maximum' educational output. As educational output is multidimensional, the term 'maximum output' is used here to mean an output that can be increased on no one dimension without either being decreased on another or violating the budgetary constraint.
   c. Cost Benefit, the third step in the educational planning/decision making process, concerns the measurement of the relationship between the outputs of the educational system and various economic and/or social goals.

3. LA/DR, AID/W notes that, where possible, this project should be linked to the Cost Methodologies-NonFormal Education and that both "...should be developed in careful coordination with Regional and Mission offices, so as to take maximum advantage of ongoing efforts rather than simply 'start from scratch." TA/EHR agrees with this observation and, as stated above, will make every effort to assure that such possibilities are carefully considered by the project's advisory panel.

PART II.

A. Background

This project will assist LDCs and Missions in their joint efforts to improve the coverage and relevance of education (formal and non-formal) through the development and use of new or improved instructional technologies which are appropriate for the needs and capacities of LDCs. While the project is to be undertaken within the educational cost and finance emphasis area of TA/EHR, its design and implementation are undertaken in collaboration with the educational technology KPA of TA/EHR.

Activities under the cost and finance KPA are:

To improve the efficiency of education through the development and utilization of cost saving methodologies; to identify and develop resources to supplement government expenditures to education; to develop and utilize methodologies for more effectively relating improvements in education to improvements in income, employment and equity; and to focus upon the identification, development and use of measurement and other analytical tools to assist LDC planning, implementation and resource allocation decision making processes.

LDCs have been turning more and more to consideration of alternative technological delivery systems to reduce the cost of and/or improve formal education and to reach heretofore neglected groups (e.g., adults, rural school age populations, women) by non-formal means when it is felt that formal, traditional means are inappropriate or too expensive. AID and other donor agencies have invested and continue to invest considerable time and money in developing and/or adapting educational technologies for use in and by LDCs. Efforts range from satellites, to TV, radio and at times textbooks. Currently AID is sponsoring such efforts in Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, Ivory Coast, Indonesia, Korea, Phillipines and Paraguay. Additional work is contemplated in Nepal, Pakistan and Costa Rica. While these efforts represent the development and use of different applications of modern educational technology, all were promulgated on the assumption that a desired educational outcome (e.g., relevance, coverage, or both) could be achieved more readily by the development and use, within a specific educational process, of a revised educational delivery system based on new educational technology.(1)

While a few countries seemingly used advanced technological innovation as a lead edge to effect large scale reform throughout the entire educational

1. Educational technology here means the use of modern mass communication techniques (e.g., radio, television) designed and used primarily for reaching very large numbers of people. That other technologies are important (e.g., books) is readily conceded. This project, however, will limit itself to studying and developing analytical methodologies to be used in support of modern mass communication technologies.

system (e.g., teachers, salaries, administration, testing, pedagogy) and were willing to pay (perhaps excessively) for reform, most nations consider using advanced educational technology to do traditional or marginally revised things at lower unit costs. Whatever the initial reason, it seems clear (from the results of a small "state of the art" study recently completed for TA/EHR[1] and from other informed, solicited sources) that cost and cost effectiveness/benefit assumptions about educational technology remain largely untested. While there may be good reasons for the absence of cost/benefit studies, there seems to be little justification for accepting the paucity of cost and cost/effectiveness studies.

There is a rather large body of descriptive information (viz. Coombs, Hallak, Tickton, etc.), but, in the main, what has been produced has not dwelt upon or used cost analysis. By and large, efforts to date in educational technology have not been directed toward the development or use of analytical methods which permit the identification of variables that determine costs and cost effectiveness, nor toward the organization of such variables into a total cost function. Indeed, if anything, the descriptive case studies attest that the improvement of cost analysis for educational technology will not happen when cost considerations are treated as residuals to other project concerns. They must be faced directly by those who are concerned more with analytical method than with technological innovation.

The project proposed herein will follow up on the findings and recommendations of the aforementioned small GTS project as well as Agency experience in the design and application of educational technology programs.

B. Detailed Description

This project has two parts:

1. Part I (which follows on the findings and recommendations of the aforementioned GTS project) will be directed toward the development of methodologies for costing education technology programs; the testing of the methodologies through field work undertaken collaboratively with LDCs and Missions; and the preparation and dissemination of the methodologies and field test results by means appropriate for use by LDC planners and decision makers.

Emphasis will be given to the development and testing of cost methodologies in a range of country settings which typify significantly different levels of analytical need and capacity in the area of costing educational programs.[2] Decisions concerning the sites selected will be based upon criteria developed by the contractor and approved by AID/W.

1. Cost Analysis for Educational Planning and Evaluation: Methodology and Application to Instructional Technology (AID/TA/EHR Contract No.931-11-999-987-73).

2. The range of analytical needs and capacities will be developed as a typology. Needs will be described in policy terms; capacity of available data base, personnel, hardware, software, etc.

Where possible, efforts will be linked to providing cost analysis within educational projects funded by the Agency. The timing and phasing of thi part of the project is given in the attached phasing chart.(1)

2. Part II of the project will consist of the development of methodologies for making cost/effectiveness and cost/benefit analysis of educational technology projects; the testing of the methodologies through field work undertaken collaboratively with LDCs and Missions; and the preparation and dissemination of the methodologies and field test results by means appropriate for use by LDC planners and decision makers. As in the development of cost methodologies, emphasis will be given to producin methodologies which are appropriate for a range of LDC capacity. It is expected that the criteria developed in the first part of the project wil serve for site selection in part II.

The two aforementioned activities will be phased and funded in accordance with the following procedure(1) Phase II will be initiated only after formal Agency approval of the results of Phase I.

3. Project Goal

The goal of this project is to increase the usefulness and use of economic measurement tools in education planning, decision making and management.

a. Sub-Goal - to increase the usefulness and use of economic measurement tools for planning and managing educational technology programs.

4. Project Purpose

To provide analytical methodologies to assist planners to make decisions:

a. about the costs of educational technology projects;

b. concerning the cost effectiveness/benefit of alternative technological education systems; and

c. concerning the costs or cost effectiveness of employing such methodologies

5. Conditions Expected at the End of the Project

a. LDC and AID planners and decision makers will have available for use methodologies for estimating costs and cost/effectiveness/benefits of alternative programs using educational technology which are appropriate for a range of decision making needs and capacities;

b. LDC and AID planners and decision makers will have selected case studies of specific field applications of the methodologies with information concerning estimation of the costs of using one methodology over another.

(1) See page 7

SEQUENCE OF ACTIVITIES IN PHASE I & II
(I = cost studies and II = cost effectiveness/benefit)

PHASE I (1 yr.) — PHASE II (1 yr.)

(1) I. — 4 mo. — ½ mo. — 5 mo — ½ mo — 1 3/4 mo — ¼ mo

a. Preparation of methodological manual
b. Development of typology and use for site selection
c. Correspondence with Missions and LDCs re collaboration

(*) Review of manual and site selection with AID/W

a. Field Testing in cooperation with AID/W, Missions and LDCs
b. Preparation of draft dissemination plan

(*) AID/W review of field work, planned revision and dissemination plan.

a. Revision of manual
b. Write-up of final manual (s) and case studies.
c. Dissemination activites (workshops)

(*) Final AID/W review of entire effort "costs"

II.

a. Preparation of plan for state of art study cost/effectiveness/benefit

(*) AID/W review of plan for state art Cost/Eff/Ben.

a. State of art study with findings and recommendations

(*) AID/W review of state of art cost/eff/benefit

a. Preparation of outline for manual

(*) AID/W review of draft outline and go/no go signal

Phase II of activity II would follow the same sequence and activities as in above I if approval for second phase funding is forthcoming.

(1) Note: state of art study completed under prior small GTS project.
(*) Formal evaluation/planning meetings with TA/EHR, Regional Bureaus and Missions/LDCs as deemed appropriate by AID/W.

c. LDC and AID planners and decision makers will have participated in one or more seminar/workshops (depending on what is deemed appropriate by the advisory committee) for the purpose of discussing the methodologies and case studies as well as their adoption and continued use by LDCs.

6. Outputs of the Project will be:

a. a set or sets of published methodologies for estimating the costs of educational technology projects to include (for Phase I):

(1) a range of methodologies which are related and relatable to a specified range of analytical need and capacity in LDCs;

(2) detailed case studies of specific applications of the methodologies;

(3) a procedural guide for assisting users to determine which of the offered methodologies is most appropriate for a particular country's analytical needs and capacities;

b. a set or sets of published methodologies for estimating the cost/effectiveness/benefit of educational technology projects to include (for Phase II):

(1) a range of methodologies which are related and relatable to a specified range of analytical needs and capacities in LDCs;

(2) detailed case studies of specific applications of the methodologies; and

(3) a procedural guide for assisting users to determine which of the offered methodologies is most appropriate for a particular country's analytical needs and capacities.

c. report on the development of a typology of analytical (costs and cost effectiveness/benefit) needs and capacities and its application with respect to the project's site selection for field trials of methodologies; seminar site selection and follow-on recommendations;

d. one or more seminar workshops (size, number and content to be determined during the course of Phase I in consultation with the project's advisory committee);

e. the provision of advisory services to other planned or on-going educational technology projects. That is, it is expected that the provision of methodological guidelines and guidance (during and upon completion of Phases I and II), an output of this project, will be used as inputs to on-going or planned technology projects (when called upon and funded by such other technology projects).

7. Projects Inputs

a. AID will provide:

(1) $200,000 over a period of two years. The two years will be spread over two phases (approximately one year each). Funding for the second phase will be contingent upon acceptance of work done under phase I and approval of the work design for phase II;

(2) staff from TA/EHR, Regional Bureaus and, if appropriate, USAID Missions to serve on a project advisory/review panel (for continuous monitoring of project activities) and to participate in the seminar/workshops;

(3) access to on-going and planned technology programs (with LDC concurrence) for the purpose of providing field site opportunities to the project or getting advice from the project on cost or cost/effectiveness/benefit considerations.

(4) It is expected that Missions, currently calling upon AID/W for assistance with the design and execution of technology projects, will find it to their advantage to draw upon the project's resource in the area of cost analysis either directly (Mission funding) or through the use of other AID/W centrally funded support for educational technology outside this project (e.g., A.E.D.).

(5) LDCs are expected to participate to the extent that they continue to explore if not mount with AID assistance the uses of educational technology and contribute data, people, etc. to the design, implementation and evaluation of such technology efforts.

PROJECT ANALYSIS III.

A. Appropriateness of Place and Timing of Project

Although a number of LDCs and Missions have identified needs for these undertakings, this project will not, a priori, be mandated for a particular site or country. Rather, project efforts will be directed to provide methodologies for significantly different levels of country analytical need and capacity. Sites chosen for testing methodologies will need, therefore, to correspond to the extent possible with representative country settings (as developed in the typology). Within the aforementioned typology, every effort will be made to utilize existing or planned technological efforts which are or will be supported by AID.

The timing of efforts contemplated within this project could, perhaps, best be described as "overdue". Conservatively, AID has spent some $5,000,000 on educational technology projects in approximately ten countries. These earlier efforts have not benefited from available, systematic, methodological approaches for assessing costs and cost effectiveness/benefits. They have contributed to analysis by demonstrating the need for it as well as the difficulties associated with developing systematic cost analysis. To assure that educational technology efforts are guided by better understandings of cost and cost effectiveness, it is essential that existing and future educational technology efforts benefit from and contribute to a more ordered

analytical understanding of cost and cost effectiveness/benefit. This is necessary because: (1) most new technology efforts are cost additive and could, in the long run, be justified to the extent that they reduce unit costs or aid in meeting some other measurable objective; and (2) there is more than one technology available and costs should enter into considerations of selection of methodology.

In short, if the Agency is to continue needed efforts in developing and providing educational technology, it must make every effort to assist LDCs in determining the cost implications of such undertakings.

2. This project has no environmental implications.

B. Financial Analysis and Plan

1. This project does not lend itself to classical rate of return analysis. While it might be possible to attribute some rate of return, the number of analytical steps (from the provision of a technological delivery system to projected income streams for likely beneficiaries) is so great and the data so scattered, findings would likely be little better than speculation at this time. Indeed this is one of the reasons this project is needed.

The project addresses the needs of the poor majority, as results will permit AID and governments to make better decisions about the cost and cost/effectiveness of educational technology projects which, in the main, address the needs of the poor majority.

2. The tentative budget for the project is given below:

Total Project Costs(1)
(Items by Sources - thousands $)

Item	TA/EHR AID/W	Other AID/W Projects(2)	AID/LDC Missions(3)	Total
Senior Staff*	$ 60	$20	$20	$100
Research Asst.	15	10	10	35
Admin/Sec.**	12			12
Salary Subtotal	87	30	30	147
* Benefits @ 15%	9			9
**Benefits @ 12%	1.5			1.5
Salary Total	97.5	30	30	157.5
Consultants	10	5	5	20
Travel	20		10	30
Services	20		5	25
Materials & Publications	10	2	5	17
Overhead	42.5			42.5
GRAND Total	$200.0	$37	$55	$292.0

(1) Two years: Phase I $90 and Phase II $110.

(2) Represents AID/W contract sources for methodological services in the

area of educational technology. Some of these monies will be diverted to use by staff of this project (or sub contractorshired under it) thus linking otherwise disparate methodological endeavors (design, evaluation, etc.).

(3) Missions can be expected to draw on the resources created by this central project.

Government contributions should be taken in kind; i.e., data, research staff, etc. which otherwise would have to be purchased by the project.

3. In conclusion, the project activities outlined here are urgently needed to guide and learn from program activities in the area of educational technology. This project will be structured to draw upon (where and when possible) existing or future AID technology projects. Those projects, in turn, will draw upon this project (for cost design elements, if not particular consulting services in the area of costs). This interdependence of projects will lead to lower costs than otherwise possible.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS IV.

A. Administrative Arrangements

The following organizational inputs are envisaged:

1. The contractor.

TA/EHR proposes to let this contract to Dr. Dean Jamison of Educational Testing Services on the basis of predominant capability. TA/EHR has determined that Professor Jamison provides the cost methodological work in support of educational technology programs (under sub-contract) to Stanford University (Nepal, El Salvador, and Nicaragua); Mexico (AID) ; Ivory Coast (AED); Indonesia (MSU). Informed sources at the World Bank, Harvard University, Stanford and Berkeley attest to his preeminence in the economics of educational technology. Dr. Jamison's parent organization (ETS) has considerable experience in supporting such work and has appropriate administrative and logistical support capacity.

2. AID. TA/EHR will have primary responsibility for monitoring the contract activities. The offices of educational technology and cost and financing of education will jointly serve as TA/EHR monitors of the design, implementation and evaluation.

TA/EHR asks each Regional Bureau to nominate a representative to the project's advisory panel. This panel, in collaboration with others (e.g., Mission staff and/or LDC personnel as deemed appropriate by the panel), will approve all phases of work (see phasing activity chart for timing and purpose of formal review meetings). The review panel will also make recommendations to the Agency concerning the activities and funding of Phase II of the project.

Within the limits of the typology noted before, project field activities will go forward in sites where AID has or plans to secure and use the advice and recommendations (design, implementation and evaluation) of both Missions and LDCs. It should be noted that most current and planned technology projects are using the proposed contractor on an ad hoc consultant basis.

The administration of the project should pose no problems which TA/EHR, with the cooperation of Regional Bureaus, cannot handle with current staff.

B. Implementation Plan

1. December 75 - February 1976 approval of PP.

2. February - March 1976 approval PIO/T and Request for Non-Competitive Procurement:

If Approved	If not Approved
3. April 76 - May 1976 Contract negotiated and signed	3. April - June 1976 Competitive procurement procedures.
4. Project activities begin May - June 1976	4. June 1976 contractor selected.
	5. June 1976 Contract negotiated and signed.
	6. Project activities begin July - August 1976

The phasing (items X times) are given in the draft activity/phasing chart. This chart will be revised during the contract negotiation and will be subject to revision (within the terms of the contract) at the periodic review sessions plotted on the activity/phasing chart.

C. Evaluation

1. Procedures: This project will be evaluated periodically by its advisory panel (comprised of staff from AID/W, Missions and LDCs). The time and objectives for these periodic evaluation meetings are given in the activity chart for phases I and II.

2. Substance: Evaluation for this project is basically of two types:

a. Control and revision: The advisory panel through its periodic review sessions is to evaluate contractor performance (timing and quality of work) under each phase. Based on findings, the advisory panel will approve initiation of subsequent phases or revisions to the project's design or implementation procedures.

b. Project impact evaluation: It is important to note that this project is to produce, test and disseminate a variety of cost effective analytical procedures. Each is designed to test the validity and cost effective utility

of the analytical methods which are developed to meet the needs and capacities of LDCs at varyingly significant levels of need and capacity. The primary method for accomplishing this evaluation will be to relate the analytical methods produced to the typology of host country need and capacity developed under phase I and validated under phases I and II. The specific details of evaluation will be worked out during phases I and II and approved by the advisory panel.

This project will not be evaluated in terms of whether or not it has produced universally valid analytical instruments. There are no universal yardsticks against which such work can be judged, as decision settings are not homogeneous.

Work under this project and other similar efforts in other sectors should be seen as part of a longtitudinal process in which efforts are directed toward improving decisions by improving reliability and reducing risk. No quantum jump to 100% reliability and zero risk (i.e., no universally valid analytical instruments) is possible. Any effort which relates the reliability requirements of decision makers to the input capacity of their society and relates both to the cost/effective adoption of analytical instruments should be accepted as representing a meaningful step in this long process.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX – PROP WORKSHEET

Summary	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Important Assumptions
A.1. Goal To improve the performance of the education sector of developing countries. Sub-goals 1. To increase the usefulness and use of economic measurement tools in education planning, decision making and management particularly as such tools are applied to the planning and management of educational technology programs.	A.2. Measurement of Goal Achievement a. The education and training systems of LDCs serve larger proportions of their populations, provide more relevant education and training, or both. Sub goals: LDC and AID education planners and decision makers have available and use the methdologies to diagnose existing educational delivery systems and posit realistically their improvement through the adoption of cost effective educational technologies. AID assessments (DAPS and Sector Assessments) reflect more thorough understandings of the use and costs of modern technology. LDC plans and programs for educational technology increase in number and in quality.	A.3. *(as related to goal)* A. That improved methodologies will lead to improved analysis which will contribute to improved performance and coverage within the educational systems of the LDCs. B. That improved performance in schools will lead to improved performance in the market place which will increase the likelihood of improving equity, employment and income disparities. C. That improved education analysis will lead to improved assistance requests.
B.1. Purpose The Project's purpose is to provide LDC and other (e.g., AID) planners and decision makers with analytical methodologies which are: 1. required to make decisions about the costs of educational technology projects; 2. required to make decisions concerning the cost effectivness/benefit of alternative technological education systems: and 3. to provide those requiring the costing methdologies with methods for estimating the costs of employing such methdologies	B.2. End of Project Status 1. LDC and AID education planners and decision makers will have available for use methdologies for estimating costs and cost effectivness/benefits of alternative programs using educational technology and that the methdologies available to them will be appropriate for a range of decision making needs and capacity. 2. LDC and AID education planners and decision makers will have case studies of specific field applications of the methdologies with information concerning the estimation of the costs of using the methdologies; 3. AID and LDC staff will have met to discuss methods & next steps.	B.3. *(as related to purpose)* A. That planning agencies will have willingness and capacity to employ cost analysis when considering the improvemen of their educationalsystems. B. Such Agencies will use methods if they ar able to determine which methods to use within their own respective policy and resource constraints. C. AID will incorporate such analysis within its own policy and program documents.
C.1. Outputs: published methodologies for estimating the costs of educational technology projects to include(PhaseI):a range of methodologies related to a range of LDC analytical needs and capacities;detailed case studies of applications; a procedural guide for determining which of the methodologies are appropriate for a given country situation. For Phase II - similar publications covering the methdologies for cost/effectivness/benefit decisions. Seminar/workshops held in connection with field trials and the provision of advisory services to Missions and LDCs.	C.2. Output Indicators 1. Published methdologies for estimating the costs and cost effectivness/benefits of education technology projects which include a range of methods; an outline of procedures for determing which method to use for a specific country situation; and specific case studies of methdological applications. 2. A report of the design and application of a typology of analytical needs and capacities. 3. One or more seminar/workshops involving AID and LDC staffs. 4. Advisory services are asked for and given. Note: The number of publications and the extent of their dissemination will be decided by the advisory panel to the project.	C.3. *(as related to outputs)* A. There is a growing effective demand for improved analysis which can be satisfied, in part, by the provision of more readily usable analysis which users can relate to their own needs and capacities. B. The utility of methodologies is enhanced to the extent that potential users are aware o able to understand and subsequently modify specific 'other country'application!
D. 1. Inputs: $200,000 to cover two years of operation broken into two phases and meet the contractor costs necessary to provide methdologies,publications and advisory services. Cost considerations of other ed. technology projects will feed this project. Staff from TA/EHR, Regional Bureaus, Missions and LDCs will serve on advisory panel.	D.2. Budget/Schedule	D.3. *(as related to inputs)* AID/W can control the analytical inputs to AID centrally funded projects in educational technology and therefore assure that this project will be usefully related to all centrally funded technology projects. Missions call upon TA/EHR for assistance in project design and evaluation which can be provided, in part, through this project.

	Year 1	Year 2	Total
Salaries	40	57.5	97.5
Consultants	5	5	10
Travel	10	10	20
Field Srvc.	10	10	20
Mat. & Pub.	5	5	10
Overhead	20	22.5	42.5
	90	110.	200.