

PD-AAM-743/62  
698-041005

Project Completion Report  
USAID/Ghana

Project Title: Village Development Through Non-Formal Education (AIP)

Project Number: 698-0410.15 Functional Account: E/HRD

Date Authorized: 9/29/78 Authorized By: Charles B. Johnson  
A/DIR, USAID/Ghana

Amount Authorized  
For Life of Project: \$370,000 (Grant)

Amount Obligated  
During LOP: \$370,000 (Grant)

Obligating Documents: OPG No. 641-0410-78-16

Original PACD: 9/30/81 Revised PACD: 3/31/82

Project Pipeline At PACD:

Project Purpose: The purpose of the Village Development Through Non-Formal Education (VIDED) Project was to improve the quality of life of village dwellers in the Eastern Region in Ghana by:

- (1) developing the capacity of the People's Education Association (PEA) to support village improvement activities
- (2) providing support and training for rural leaders engaged in village improvement projects, and
- (3) expanding and institutionalizing non-formal education approaches and techniques developed during collaboration with the University of Massachusetts (UMASS) Center for International Education (CIE).

1. Summary of Project Inputs:

This Ghana's Village Development Through Non-Formal Education (VIDED) Project was financed by USAID (\$370,000) and implemented by an operational Program Grant to the People's Education Association of Ghana (PEA) with a sub-contract to the University of Massachusetts (UMASS) for technical assistance and commodities.

A. Technical Assistance:

PEA contracted with University of Massachusetts, CIE (\$150,680) for the technical services of an Administrative Advisor for one year and a Trainer for two years for the following:

- Administrative Advisor to assist project coordination during first year of project.
- Trainer consultant who designed and executed training programs for the project and trained a Ghanaian staff member.
- Advisor provided pedagogical advice and expertise in non-formal education to project staff.
- General support to the People's Education Association in its education activities
- Assisted PEA in commodities procurement.

B. Commodities:

The project provided \$38,000 for 3 vehicles (two automobiles and one pickup truck), 1 styling machine, cyclostyling writer, 2 manual typewriters, training materials and office supplies. etc.

C. Participant Training:

Six Ghanaians were trained in the areas of participatory development to respond to the initiatives of the communities at the local level and in the design and implementation of rural development projects.

D. Other:

N/A

E. Host Country Inputs:

PEA provide personnel, equipment, office/meeting space in U.S. dollars equipment as follows: Personnel (\$54,000) Office/meeting space (\$36,000) and equipment and supplies (\$39,440).

II. Status of Project at PACD:

A. Construction: - None

B. Delivery of Commodities:

All commodities funded by this project have been delivered.

C. Delivery of Technical Assistance:

The last technical advisor from UMASS (Administrative Advisor) left PEA rolls in September, 1981, and the contract with UMASS ended on March 31, 1982. Therefore, all technical assistance under the project has been completed except the printing and distribution of the project's final report - which is being finalized by UMASS.

III. To What Extent Has the Project Been Achieved:

The PEA/NFE has made a positive impact upon targetted communities and groups and has performed satisfactorily in terms of accomplishing its stated objectives. The major force limiting performance has been lack of project staff (turnover, late recruitment) and loss of voluntary community facilitators. Many are teachers who have departed Ghana for employment in neighboring countries.

The project was successful in meeting its objectives. Improvements in village life were achieved through such accomplishments as the provision of pipeborne water and the establishment of a rural health Clinic in one village, the construction of a school block in another, improvement of the road leading to another, increased availability of soap in the region, and the construction and sale of the more sanitary water-sealed toilet.

IV. What Additional Inputs Are Required By A.I.D., the Host Country Or Donors to Assure Achievement of Project Purpose:

None.

V. Recommendations:

A. What Further Monitoring Is Required By A.I.D.? What Staffing Implications Does This Raise

No further monitoring is required except to ensure that the final report is completed and distributed. Therefore, there is no need for additional staff time. However, it is recommended that the Mission maintain passive contact with PEA through its National Secretariat at the Institute for Adult Education, Legon and its Eastern Region Officers so as to demonstrate continuing interest.

E. Is a Follow-On Project Anticipated? Why?

The People's Education Association Non-Formal Education Project PEA/NFE initiated from the 1976 (211-D grant funded) University of Massachusetts Non-Formal Education Program. When the term of office of the UMASS team ended in December 1977, funding negotiation continued and in October 1978, a grant was signed between the United States Agency for International Development and the Eastern Regional Executive of the PEA. Therefore, no follow-on to this project was ever anticipated.

C. Has This Project Produced Any Development Lessons or Experiences Which Would Warrant It Being Presented To AID/W as a Replicable Project:

The NFE Project has contributed to the visibility of the PEA in the communities visited (Okorase, Archeampong, Kukurantumi, Koforidua). PEA's field activities contributed to a more competitive environment within which government would work. The PEA presence in the community development field has made them popular with community leaders and has, endeared them to local government officials. Both the PEA and the government agencies have improved their community image with their improved effectiveness at the local level.

The NFE project has initiated a major innovation to their regular PEA adult education and literacy activities, namely, the promotion of physical and income-generating projects. There is a noticeable qualitative difference in what participation is required from organizers, local leaders and community members. Mission was impressed with the ability of the project to work with groups involved to identify problems resources, technical assistance, to solicit inputs distribute returns from the income-earning activities. Because of the positive increase in community presence and innovations in the use of small scale economic enterprises, PEA (Eastern Region) has been an example to other PEA group of what can be accomplished with minimum organization and technical assistance in project planning and implementation at the local level.

D. Is an End-of-Project Evaluation Recommended? Why?

Mission conducted a comprehensive management review of the project in December 1980. This management review was conducted to determine the project's performance in terms of the original grant objectives and efficient management practices. No end-of-project evaluation is recommended.

E. Other Comments:

This Mission feels it appropriate to offer several comments regarding the development and implementation of this project. First, implementation was rather difficult because of the vague and/or incomplete manner in which the project was documented (i.e., the ProAg and Grant Agreement with PEA). In fact, the PEA Grant Agreement was not even dated at the time it was signed. Secondly, the Mission has found (in dealing with other indigenous PVOs as well as PEA) that project implementation is extremely slow and requires an inordinate amount of Mission Staff time due to the inexperience of the PVOs in operating within the AID maze of rules, regulations, and restrictions. This "hidden cost" of implementation skews considerably the return on investment of the project. As an example, the Mission found that the Conditions Precedent to Disbursement included in the PEA grant were not fully understood by PEA nor was the implication of non-satisfaction of these conditions comprehended. As a result the Mission was drawn into

the situation of having to guide the PVO step-by-step through the process of satisfying Conditions Precedent before actual project implementation could begin.

Finally PEA turned in a better than satisfactory performance in the overall implementation of the grant in terms of accomplishing the stated objectives and made some positive impact upon the groups and communities it came in contact with during the life of the project.

Report Prepared By: James R. Washington, Project Manager  
Date Prepared March 18, 1983

Clearances: A/DIR P PRM P CONT OK EXO 10/3