

9310165 (4)
PO-ADL-

REPORT U-464

AID 1020-23 (10-70)

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

PAGE 1

1. PROJECT NO. 931-11-696-158-3149158		2. PAR FOR PERIOD: 6/1/74 TO 3/11/76		3. COUNTRY TA Bureau		4. PAR SERIAL NO. 48	
5. PROJECT TITLE A Grant to the University of Massachusetts, Center for International Education to strengthen and develop its competence in Non-formal Education for the developing World.							
6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 74		Ends FY 79		7. DATE LATEST PROP 5-16-74		8. DATE LATEST PIP	
						9. DATE PRIOR PAR NA	
10. U.S. FUNDING		a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$		b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$		c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$	
11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)							
a. NAME University of Massachusetts, Center for International Education				b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO. 211 (d) AID/TA Grant # G-1112			

I. NEW ACTIONS PROPOSED AND REQUESTED AS A RESULT OF THIS EVALUATION

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
USAID	AID/W	HOST		
			1. Hold Meeting of AID/UMass Liaison Group to identify actions necessary to more effectively involve the liaison Group in Grant activities.	June 1976
			2. Request that contracts attach memo of clarification to Grant document reflecting minor changes recommended in 18 month review report.	May 1976

D. REPLANNING REQUIRED: REVISED OR NEW: PROP PIP PRO AG PIO/T PIO/C PIO/D

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
B. Wilder *B. Wilder* 4/9/76

MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
James B. Chandler, *J. B. Chandler* 4/15/76

Section III Standard Key Questions (PAR)

A. Project Inputs

1. Were key inputs supplied according to the plan by:
(a) AID, (b) action agent, (c) cooperating countries, (d)
multilateral organizations and/or (e) other donors?

Yes no

2. Were assumptions regarding the supply of inputs valid?

yes no

3. Rate performance of action agent against plan:

outstanding satisfactory unsatisfactory

See 18 month Design Review Report attached. The grantee did not get the first field site established as early as planned. However, this was largely due to circumstance in the LDCs beyond their control.

B. Transformation of Inputs into Outputs

4. Given the answers above, i.e., progress to date in supplying inputs, changes in assumptions, etc., is the management hypothesis that the totality of the resources applied to the project will be sufficient to produce the predetermined outputs by the specified target still valid?

yes no If no, explain.

The answer above is predicated on the assumption that funding for two additional field sites can be obtained through sources other than the 211 (d) grant.

5. Was the approach or course of action originally selected, i.e., project design and/or methodology, the most appropriate?

yes no If no, what changes need to be made in either inputs, workplans, and/or output expectations?

The 18 Month Design Review Report did not recommend any major changes.

C. Project Outputs

6. List the output indicators, their planned targets, and the actual performance achieved for each under the period under review.

See pages 13-17 of the Annual Report.

a. Was actual performance less than planned target?

yes no

b. what changes, if any, were necessary in outputs, output indicators, target dates, and assumptions?

None

c. Did action agent's reports provide adequate progress data

yes no

D. Program Goal

7. Give atatement of programming goal - if different from attached matrix - and/or key problem are addressed.

Is it same as in PROP?

yes no

8. Does achievement of project purpose - in relation to other sector or KPA activity - still have the same priority and significance in contributing to the programming goal?

yes no

9. Are assumptions for achieving goal and measure of goal achievement still valid?

yes no

Are they reflected in the attached matrix?

yes no

10. If appropriate, comment on project interactions with:
(a) other interregional, regional or Mission GTS projects;
(b) 211 (d) institutional grants; (c) interregional or mission research projects; and (d) other U.S. Government agencies.

The U/Mass Center for International Education has numerous contacts with other TA/EHR grantees and contractors. The Information Center being developed with grant funds is extending their contacts in the U.S. and with the LDCs. Several U/Mass staff have been utilized on a consultant basis by the regional bureaus, missions and other AID contractors.

Section IV Issues Narrative

See 18 month Project Design Review report.