PD-AAM-107
ISN-15077

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

1. PROJECT TITLE

Rural Pilot School Development

2. PROJECT NUMBER: 522-0170 / 15

3. COUNTRY OR OFFICE: HONDURAS

4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit, e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY)

☐ REGULAR EVALUATION ☐ SPECIAL EVALUATION

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES

A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY 81
B. Final Obligation Expected FY 82
C. Final Input Delivery FY 83

6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING

A. Total $ 681,383
B. U.S. $ 233,805

7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION

From (month/yr.) April 1980
To (month/yr.) November 1981
Date this Evaluation Review 10/5/81 - 11/27/81

8. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues; cite those items need of further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., airgram, SPAR, PIO, which will convey detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
1. Approve 3rd year budget for 1982-1983 in the amount of $96,805 to continue project implementation.	Ortega/Gillies	May 1, 1982
2. Modify nutritional goal to read, "the nutritional intake of children at targeted schools be increased through the consumption of produce from program gardens, orchards and beekeeping projects.	Ortega	May 18, 1982
3. Determine whether or not project is to be funded for an additional two-year period.	Ortega/Gillies	June 30, 1982
4. Authorize additional funds to hire short term consultant for researching and writing the final evaluation for the project.	Ortega/Gillies	March 1, 1983

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS

☐ Project Paper
☐ Financial Plan
☐ Logical Framework
☐ Project Agreement
☐ Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network
☐ PIO/T
☐ PIO/C
☐ PIO/P
☐ Other (Specify) N/A
☐ Other (Specify) N/A

10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT

A. [X] Continue Project Without Change
B. ☐ Change Project Design and/or ☐ Change Implementation Plan
C. ☐ Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Typed Name and Title)

Ambrosio J. Ortega - AID Project Officer
Albertina Canteno - AID Asst. Project Officer
Jaime Ramirez - DGE Project Officer
Susan Caprasse - P.C. Project Officer
Lorena [illegible] - DGE Asst. Project Officer

12. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

Signature: Ronald L. Nicholson
Typed Name:
Date: 27 Dec 82

13. Summary

Honduras faces a grave problem of malnutrition, especially in the rural areas and among children. This problem can be partially explained by the decisions peasants make regarding what to raise and how to raise it. It has been argued that these decisions are dependant on the peasant's socio-cultural and educational background. As a consequence, improved nutritional status may occur if adequate information and training programs are developed.

This project is part of a strategy to introduce new agricultural practices among peasant families by means of an A.I.D.-funded OPG. Project objectives have been based on three assumptions. One, that rural children attending school can become an important recipient group and that they can be trained in vegetable farming and small animal management. Two, that if the produce grown is prepared to accompany school snacks, new eating habits could be introduced in rural communities. And three, that if rural education is oriented toward the needs of the rural world parents could not only be motivated to send their children to school, but they could become interested in school projects to the extent of adopting the agricultural practices being taught. In the long run, this adoption could improve the nutritional status of involved rural families.

Project tactics were based on the implementation of horticultural, small animal and manual arts sub-projects in different pilot schools and their affiliates. The MOE and CARE signed an annual program agreement whereby the MOE agreed to provide funds to defray some program administrative costs and to provide personnel at the individual school level. A separate bilateral agreement was signed by the Peace Corps and the MOE, assigning Peace Corps Volunteers to work in selected Rural Pilot Schools.

Progress in the introduction of the indicated practices and habits has been encouraging. This conclusion is based on the following results.

(1) First, all pilot schools which were expected to initiate projects did so in 1980 and 1981. In some cases, the degree of participation in project implementation exceeded expected outcomes. Some of the indicated pilot schools took advantage of lower implementation costs and executed more than one sub-project per year, as was initially planned.
(2) Second, approximately 60% of the pilot and affiliated schools which were expected to initiate school gardens did so.
(3) Third, 79% of the participating schools actually organized daily classes in agriculture as planned.
(4) Fourth, all planned project management seminars intended for school teachers were held.
(5) Fifth, no problems were encountered in the procurement of commodities for sub-project implementation. Participating schools were able to obtain the necessary educational materials as expected.

There are indications that the project is beginning to have some impact. Seventy percent of the participating schools have reported that children are transferring the knowledge acquired through the projects to their homes. In addition, 67% of the participating schools report more contact with their communities since the program began. And finally, 83% of these schools have indicated that community members have requested assistance in initiating at the farm level projects similar to those being implemented at the school.

The progress observed in the accomplishment of planned outputs and objectives can be partly explained by the commitment of involved institutions in project implementation. CARE has played an important role in project management. This institution has been responsible for the review and approval of sub-project proposals, for sub-project supervision and for the procurement of commodities. The MOE, on the other hand, has provided the necessary project personnel at the school level, and it has complied with a Project Agreement clause requiring the Ministry to provide CARE with funds to defray some of the administrative costs associated with the program. If Peace Corps had provided the promised volunteers during the first and the second years of this project, all pilot and satellite schools expected to initiate vegetable gardens and sub-projects of other types would have done so. In this regard, it should be pointed out that in 1980 only 68% of promised PCV participation in the project was made effective and in 1981, this percentage decreased to 43%.

14. Evaluation Methodology

This was an interim evaluation. Two questionnaires prepared jointly by the MOE, CARE and PC were used. One of them addressed general project implementation issues. The other was more specific and dealt only with the implementation of chicken and pig sub-projects. A total of 18 schools were evaluated in November 1981 by CARE field supervisors. Fourteen of these schools have participated in the project since 1980 and the other 4 did not become involved until 1981. Interviews were carried out with school principals as well as with some school teachers directly connected with the project.

15. External Factors

As a consequence of the present economic situation in Honduras, the MOE made no budgetary provision for the field supervision of school sub-projects. This implied the assignment of additional responsabilities to CARE's supervisors and an increase in CARE's overhead costs.

Peace Corps was unable to provide the full complement of PCV's during the first two years of the G.P.G. because of constraints on the number of PCV's available in the country.

16. Inputs

The four institutions participating in the project agreed to provide different types of support for project implementation. CARE and MOE were to participate in project management and supervision, Peace Corps was to provide personnel for project design and execution, and AID was to provide the necessary funds for the procurement of materials and equipment.

For the 1980-1981 period, CARE budgeted $32,472 to cover administrative and supervisory costs but it actually spent $60,909. The doubling of these costs can be explained by three factors. First, in 1980 a PCV was responsible for the procurement of materials and for assisting CARE with individual project supervision. During 1981, however, no replacement was provided and CARE had to hire personnel to perform his duties. Second, schools designed projects to satisfy their specific needs. This required more support than anticipated to review them and to procure the material and equipment required to implement them. Third, because the MOE was not able to provide the necessary personnel for field supervision, CARE had to increase its supervisory support program.

The MOE input contribution consisted of a subsidy to CARE and of salaries paid to school personnel involved in the sub-projects being implemented. This Ministry budgeted inputs for the 1980-81 period amounting $196,190. Actual expenditures, however, totaled to $208,155.

The Peace Corps agreed to provide 25 PCV's in 1980 and 28 in 1981. Actual participation was below these numbers in as much as only 17 and 12 PCV's, respectively, were assigned to the project in these years.

The following table indicates AID funding to the project. The first column shows obligated amounts, the second shows actual expenditures and the third shows the balance available as of November 25, 1981.

Materials and Equipment	Total Amount Obligated 4/80 to 4/82	Actual Expenses through 11/25/81	Balance Available
1. Seed, fertilizer, tools	$ 17,600.00	$ 18,799.73	($ 1,199.73)
2. Individual projects	81,000.00	54,327.95	26,672.05
3. Educational materials	5,500.00	1,900.29	3,599.71
4. Seminars	12,500.00	10,521.15	1,978.85
5. Vehicles	9,000.00	9,782.82	(782.82)
6. Overhead	9,700.00	7,717.23	1,982.77
7. Contingency	1,700.00	124.89	1,575.11
	$137,000.00	$103,174.06	$ 35,808.49

The following conclusions can be drawn from the data presented in this table:

(1) 75% of obligated funds for the project have been already spent.

(2) The funds expended for educational materials, seminars and overhead are within the amounts budgeted.

(3) The amounts budgeted for the seeds, fertilizer and tools and for vehicles were underestimated.

(4) The number of schools implementing sub-projects was lower than expected. The bugetary provision for this line item was not totally expended. A.I.D. approved a $5,000 line item transfer from Individual Projects to Seed, Fertilizer and Tools. It is likely that A.I.D. will approve other line item transfers as the need arises.

(5) Only minor expenses have been incurred against the contingency line item.

It has been recommended that in order to produce the expected outputs by the end of the project, the following modifications are needed with regard to inputs:

(1) that the third year's budget should include a provision for assisting CARE with the costs involved in project implementation, and
(2) that the MOE should be required to comply with the terms of the Project Agreement terms by providing the required funds for supervisory personnel to monitor field activities.

17. Outputs

Expected Results	Progress Observed
Establishment of 25 individual school projects in 1980 and 28 in 1981.	Targets surpassed. 33 individual school projects in both 1980 and in 1981.
125 school gardens to be planted in 1980. Of this total, 25 correspond to pilot schools and 100 to their affiliated schools.	53% accomplished. A total of 66 school gardens planted in 1980. Of these, 17 corresponds to pilot schools and 49 to their affiliated schools.
140 school gardens to be planted in 1981. Of this total, 28 correspond to pilot schools and 112 to their affiliated schools.	67% accomplished. A total of 94 school gardens planted in 1981. Of these 18 correspond to pilot schools and 76 to their affiliated schools.

2 project management seminars to be held in both 1980 and 1981.	Target met.
160 classes in agriculture to be given per year in each of the participating schools both in 1980 and 1981.	79% accomplished. 126 classes in agriculture per year in each participating school in 1980 and 1981.
Educational materials to be provided to 25 and 26 pilot schools in 1980 and 1981, respectively.	17 and 18 pilot schools served during the 1980 and 1981 school years, for a rate of accomplishment equal to 68% and 64%, respectively.

18. Purpose

The purpose of this project is two-fold: first, to increase the nutritional intake of children at targeted schools, and second, to initiate self-sufficient sub-projects at the school level.

In connection with the nutritional intake of school children, 72% of the schools report that students are consuming the produce from the vegetable gardens either as part of the school snack or by taking the vegetables home where they are later consumed.

In connection with the self-sufficiency of sub-projects it should be pointed out that the evaluation concentrated on pig and chicken projects, which have an average life of 15 and 10 months, respectively. It has been argued that this is too short a period to determine their self-suffiency over the long run. However, the following findings can be pointed out:

(1) Nine out of the ten schools having pig projects have reported that no further outside assistance is required. These schools have all recommended similar projects for other schools.

(2) All seven schools that started chicken projects either with their own funds or with project funds indicate that the projects are self-sufficient. All of them are able to purchase feed concentrates and medicines from the sale of eggs, and six of them can replace stock from the proceeds.

19. Goal

The goals of this project are:
(1) that "more children in communities served receive an appropriate education," and
(2) that "community members actively participate in the life of the school".

In connection with the first goal, the following findings can be pointed out:

- 72% of the schools report improved agricultural techniques, and
- 100% report that the project allowed the children to practice what they had learned in class.
- 67% of the schools report lower dropout rates and improved attendance, but there are no base line data to prove or refute the linkage between these findings and schools' participation in the project.

In connection with the second goal, the evaluation has indicated that:

- 83% of the schools report that their communities have requested and received technical assistance related to implementing projects similar to those undertaken in the school;
- 67% of the schools reported increased contact with their communities which is demonstrated by the fact that 32 communities contributed labor, transportation, equipment, local materials, land and economic assistance to the various project school. Only 2 schools reported that they had not received any type of assistance from the community..

20. Beneficiaries

If the project had had the coverage initially planned, especially as regards the expected assistance from Peace Corps, the target of 18,000 rural school children would have been reached.

Even so, the direct beneficiaries of this project to date are:

(1) the 14,512 primary school children in the various participating pilot and affiliated rural schools,
(2) the 380 teachers who have participated in training programs sponsored by the project, and
(3) the communities that have received technical assistance from teachers in replicating at the farm level projects undertaken at the schools.

21. Unplanned Effects

None.

22. Lessons Learned

1. The role of children as development target groups and as adequate channels for the diffusion of innovative messages.

2. Role of PVO's (e.g., CARE) in rural development.

3. MOE involvement.

23. Special Comments

1. Issues addressed

2. Recommendations
   1. Enforce participation of MOE in supervisory activities.
   2. Help CARE with its administrative costs.
   3. Final evaluation to be carried out by external consultant.
   4. Extension of project.