9310165 (2)
PD-AAC-

Summary Report on U/Mass 211 (d) 18 Month Review 3p.

Conducted March 11 and 12, 1976 by TA/RES, Thomas Eliot and
3/12/76 TA/EHR, B. Wilder

The items contained in the memo of March 10, 1976, from B. Wilder to Mr. Thomas Eliot concerning "topics for discussion in 18 month Project Design Review..." (attached) served as the outline for AID/W concerns for the review. Those items not covered during the sessions organized by U/Mass were discussed on the final day of the review. The following presentation is organized using the memo mentioned above.

I. Goal Level

No discussion required.

II. Purpose Level

A. Purpose statement:

Definition of what is meant by institutional capacity and competence beyond the grant agreement and log framework language was not accomplished. It was agreed that the definitional problem was real, important and should be addressed at intervals. No specific changes were called for at this time.

B. End of Project Status:

Objectively verifiable indicators 3 and 4 are still reasonable. However, the means of verification selected may have to be modified. In essence the degree to which 3 and 4 will be achieved may fall short of expectations. The director of the NEC (now NEP) has, since the inception of the grant, been granted tenure status. Therefore, $\frac{1}{2}$ of #3 has been achieved. The other half is more uncertain now than two years ago when the proposal was written. It has not been abandoned as an objective but financial conditions at the time the grant is terminated will be the crucial factor. The same factor of finances also controls the chances of achieving #4.

The creation of a "Center" for non-formal education in the physical sense is not the concept most likely to achieve lasting support from the U/Mass. It is to be termed a "Program" within the Center for International Education. The original choice of terms was unfortunate.

C. Means of Verification:

By way of clarification the "Director" referred to in this column of the purpose section is that of the Center for International Education. He is also the director of the Non-formal Education Program.

D. Assumptions:

The review of outputs to ascertain their achievability and whether they would lead to purpose attainment was a main concern during the entire review. The general concensus was that the assumption as stated was valid. It was the judgement of the review group that the outputs will lead to purpose achievement. Further, that the outputs are achievable. Both statements can be made with more certainty now than during the original design phase with the exception of the degree of likelihood that the U/Mass will hire two staff on a permanent basis. (The first has been put on tenure since the grant began. Whether the second will be made permanent depends upon the financial situation of the University when the grant terminates). The attached paper entitled, "Minor Changes Recommended as a Result of the 18 Month Review of the U/Mass 211 (d) Grant" details the minor changes recommended as a result of the review of the grant document and Log Framework.

III. Output Level

A. Assumptions were reviewed and no changes were recommended.

B. Outputs were reviewed and in each case it was found that:

1) They contribute to purpose achievement.
2) Are necessary for purpose achievement.
3) The magnitudes are achievable given resources available, although the effects of inflation have caused some adjustments in the work plan.
4) The magnitudes are necessary for purpose achievement.
5) Current progress was reported in a report prepared by U/Mass for the review and is attached.

C. Answers to Specific Questions:

1) A tentative research agenda has been prepared. It is presented in the modified Log Framework output sheet number three and in the 18 month review report. The "Research Task Force" in the Center is in the process of further defining this agenda.

2) The effects of Center members engaging in consultations has been beneficial to the grant operation and the

development of response capability. Consultation activities have provided field experience, allowed Center activities to be planned in a more realistic context, and has saved funds by allowing grant activities to be "piggybacked" on trips funded by others.

3) The continum from a casual communication through a linkage to a field site with a resident representative was discussed. A clarification of the U/Mass concept of this continum is presented in their report prepared for the review.

4) and 5) The redefinition of what constitutes a site was briefly discussed. Considering the remaining sites will be funded through a separate project, the detailed discussion will be carried in the context of the new project.

IV. Other Issues and Questions

A. See attachment concerning recommended modifications.

B. The question how to more effectively utilize the AID/UMass Liaison Group was not adequately answered. Further discussions will be held in AID/W to identify ways of increasing the Liaison Group's effectiveness.

C. The Non-formal Education Program does not seem to have been successful in involving other elements of the U/Mass in grant activities.

D. and E. No new ways to more effectively link U/Mass grant activities with other TA/EHR grantees and contractors were identified.

F. The expansion of Center for International Education staff during the past 18 months has provided adequate personnel and leadership, so no hiatus should develop during any possible sabbatical of the grant direction.

G. Involvement of other institutions from the "Five University" consortium in New England to date has been lacking. However, a conference to involve them has been planned.

V. Summary

With the minor exceptions noted above the grant activities are progressing satisfactorily.