
The EVALUATION Project

PROJECT WORKPLAN

Fiscal Year 6:

October 1, 1996 - September 30, 1997

Carolina Population Center

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Tulane University

The Futures Group

Contract #DPE-3060-C-00-1054-00

c 1'

THE EVALUATION PROJECT WORKPLAN
FISCAL YEAR 6: September 30, 1996 - September 29, 1997

I. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the Evaluation of Family Planning Program Impact Project (hereafter The EVALUATION Project) is to strengthen the capacity of USAID and host-country institutions to evaluate the impact of population programs on fertility. The Project is intended to achieve the following objectives:

- consistently defined evaluation impact indicators to be used across population project and program evaluations;
- methodologies developed by this contract to be applied in USAID's central and field population projects and programs; and
- new population projects to have a plan for impact evaluation included at the project design stage.

The EVALUATION Project has been executed by the Carolina Population Center (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), in collaboration with The Futures Group International and Tulane University. The Project has operated within a set of related activities organized around three elements:

- Improved measures of family planning program impact and use of existing data--The focus of this effort has been on the preparation of reference documents, working groups reports, and impact and methodological studies.
- Technical assistance and training--The focus of this effort has been on improving institutional capacity to carry out family planning program evaluations among host-country, USAID/W, USAID, and Cooperating Agency (CA) staff. Training has occurred in the form of U.S.-based and overseas workshops. Technical assistance takes place at all levels of implementation.
- Dissemination--The focus of this effort has been on ensuring that the research findings and improved methodologies are widely available and their use encouraged.

The level of effort devoted to each element has shifted over the course of the five years of the Project. Overall, the outputs of the Project have been well received and in an Agency climate concerned with improving performance monitoring and evaluation of resource use, the Project is well positioned to strengthen these capabilities in the field and centrally. The benefits of the project's efforts along these lines are now emerging from project efforts in Tanzania, Morocco, India, Peru, Ghana and Brazil.

II. OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES FOR PROJECT YEAR 6

All project activities are developed and implemented with the USAID/CTO's advice and approval. Project work in Year 6 will focus on the following activities:

- Technical assistance in six to ten countries, focusing on building local capacity to plan and execute program evaluations;
- Technical assistance on evaluation issues to USAID/W, Cooperating Agencies, and other donors;
- Three overseas family planning evaluation training workshops, at least one of which is regional;
- Four domestic family planning evaluation training workshops for USAID staff and staff of Cooperating Agencies;
- Continued work on an dissemination of findings from the family planning program impact studies and cost studies begun under the current contract;
- Continued refinement and testing of the family planning and reproductive health indicators and the index for measuring sustainability;
- Continued dissemination of existing reference documents; and
- One advisory group meeting.

The above activities address 3 strategic objectives (SOs) of the PHN Center's results framework: (SO1) increased use by women and men of voluntary practices that contribute to reduced fertility; (SO2) increased use of safe pregnancy, women's nutrition, family planning and other key reproductive health interventions; and (SO4) increased use of proven interventions to reduce HIV/STD transmission. These are mapped to specific SO subresults in Table 1. The activities are discussed in detail in sections III to VIII of the workplan. Section III discusses field and central *technical assistance*; Section IV discusses *training* activities; Section V is on *impact and methodological studies*; Section VI refers to activities related to *refining and testing FP/RH indicators*; Section VII details the *dissemination* activities and *advisory group* meetings; and Section VIII summarizes project staffing for Year 6.

III. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The EVALUATION Project will continue to provide technical assistance on evaluation to USAID/W and its cooperating agencies and to USAID Missions. In this extension period, the Project is now allowed to provide related technical assistance to donor organizations when requested and approved by USAID/W.

a. Technical Assistance to USAID/W, CAs and Other Donors

Central funds: Tsui (1.0 months), Guilkey (1.0 months), Knight (3.0 months), UNC Faculty (1.0 month), TBN UNC Research Associate (3.0 months), UNC assistants (1.0 months), Stover (1.0 months), Ross (2.0 months), Foreit (1.0 month), Loganathan (1.0 month), McKinnon (4.0 months), Hotchkiss (0.5 months), Florence (0.5 month).

On regular occasion, USAID/W has requested EVALUATION project assistance to review performance monitoring plans and indicator definitions or assist its partner donors in evaluation activities. For example, EVALUATION staff have been collaborating with the Office of Population's Results 1.3 working group to identify a means for tracking USAID efforts toward increasing organizational sustainability. EVALUATION staff also recently participated in an evaluation workshop organized by IPPF's Arab World Regional Office for its affiliates. EVALUATION staff, under separate funding support, recently conducted a training workshop for World Bank staff on monitoring and evaluating reproductive health programs. EVALUATION staff, upon request, have also provided CAs feedback on project evaluation plans, e.g., to AVSC International, SEATS II, MotherCare, PRIME, and PROFIT. Senior EVALUATION staff participate as ex-officio members on advisory groups for POLICY, ORTA/LAC, ORTA/AFR, and FHI's Cooperative Agreement and Women's Studies Project.

The EVALUATION Project proposes to organize two technical support groups for evaluation, one aimed at donor agency representatives and the other at CA evaluation officers. The purpose of the evaluation support groups will be to facilitate, support and enhance the technical capacity and development of institutional staff with evaluation responsibilities. The concept of the donor evaluation group will first be vetted with the Project's Policy Advisory Group, and a first meeting is planned for late March 1997. The second support group with CA evaluation officers will continue the dialogue begun during the Project's training workshop with these individuals in July 1996, and a proposed first meeting date is December 1996.

In addition, EVALUATION Project senior and junior staff will be available to respond to other technical assistance requests from USAID/W, CAs and other donor organizations during year 6. It is expected these will involve specialized requests to review and comment on material, carry out specialized analyses, or attend consultation meetings on evaluation issues.

b. Technical Assistance to USAID Field Missions

Central funds: Tsui (4.0 months), Guilkey (2.0 months), Buckner (2.0 months), UNC faculty (4.0 months), Knight (3.0 months), Bardsley (6.0 months), TBN UNC Research Associate (3.0 months), Singh (11.0 months), UNC assistants (10.0 months), Stover (.5 month), Berg (.5 month), Foreit (2.0 months), Kak (3.0 months), Loganathan (1.0 month), Mostajo (3.0 months), Lassner (2.0 months), Futures analyst pool (.9 month), Bertrand (6.7 months), Brown (2.5 months), Magnani (4.0 months), Eckert (3.0 months), Florence (5.5 months), Hotchkiss (3.0 months), Tulane assistants (8.0 months)

Buy-in funds: Brown (3.0 months), Edwards (4.0 months), Lakssir (4.0 months), Senior Fellow (1.0 month), Tulane Assistants (15.0 months)

The EVALUATION Project has provided technical assistance in monitoring and evaluation in such countries as Morocco, India, Brazil, Peru, Ghana, Tanzania, Ecuador, Guatemala and other countries,

as requested. Field support commitments have been received for a number of these countries. In year 6 the Project expects to continue supporting the various models for developing local capacity and skills in program evaluation begun during the project's first five years--from planning an evaluation strategy, to providing special analyses for a USAID Mission or host-country institution, to helping implement a population sector evaluation plan.

Increasingly the Project's role has been to advise host-country family planning programs and USAID missions on the most efficient strategy of data collection to allow optimal performance monitoring and evaluation of the impact of their assistance programs. Follow-up surveys of facilities or sample clusters have occurred in Tanzania and Morocco and will occur in Brazil, Ghana and Peru in the near future.

Based on past involvement and knowledge of future needs and expansion of effort, the projected types of technical assistance activities to be provided in year 6, by country of past involvement, are:

Country	Proposed technical assistance activities
Tanzania	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Conduct repeat facility survey ● Collect family planning expenditure data (fieldwork to be subcontracted to an in-country organization) ● Conduct in-country training workshops in evaluation ● Carry out impact and other evaluation studies
Brazil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Continued local technical assistance on performance monitoring for USAID/Brasilia ● Evaluation studies of situation analysis and DHS data
India	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Continued evaluation support on performance-based disbursement framework for IFPS project ● Support evaluation capacity building at SIFPSA with PERFORM data analyses ● Carry out evaluation studies for USAID and IFPS Project CAs ● Further dissemination of PERFORM survey results
Morocco (core)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Continued support to MOPH on implementation of evaluation plan ● Secondary evaluation analysis of 1992 and 1995 DHS data ● Continued support of use of carte sanitaire data for program evaluation
Morocco (buy-in)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regional workshops on use of service statistics ● Studies and secondary analysis/professional linkages ● A junior and senior fellow ● Dissemination of studies through workshops and publications ● Technical assistance at SEIS
Ghana	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Technical assistance in development of a management information system for evaluation

Country	Proposed technical assistance activities
Central America HIV/AIDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance to regional project in identifying data sources for indicators in results framework • Establish a system of routine data collection, monitoring and reporting to a local institution • Special evaluation studies, as required
Africa/ARTS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct a regional workshop on the relative efficiencies of alternative organizational structures for the delivery of family planning services
Peru	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued technical assistance in the evaluation of PASARE, the mission-supported population project • Training and implementation in evaluation activities for the family planning program regional offices

IV. TRAINING

Central funds: Tsui (1.5 months), Guilkey (1.0 months), UNC faculty (2.0 months) Bardsley (6.0 months), Knight (3.0 months), UNC consultants (3.0 months), Berg (.5 month), Foreit (2.0 months), Loganathan (2.0 months), Bertrand (0.3 months) Brown (0.5 months), , Tulane assistants (2.0 months)

The EVALUATION Project will in Year 6 carry out three overseas one-week workshops and four domestic workshops to train in monitoring and evaluation methods for family planning and reproductive health programs. The development and availability of the *EASEVAL Software for Program Evaluation* has been well received through training workshops. It will continue to be incorporated into workshop curricula.

One workshop will be regional focusing on performance monitoring for STD/HIV projects in Central America, while the other two overseas ones will be in-country. The following locations, primary skill emphases, and schedule for overseas and domestic workshops are proposed:

Type/ Location	Primary emphasis in evaluation training	Proposed duration/date
OVERSEAS		
Central America (Guatemala)	Indicators for performance monitoring of STD/HIV projects	One week January 1997
REGIONAL		

Type/ Location	Primary emphasis in evaluation training	Proposed duration/date
Tanzania REGIONAL/ Anglophone	Monitoring and evaluation of family planning programs (Will include AFRICA/ARTS-supported training content)	One week June 1997
Morocco REGIONAL/ Francophone	Monitoring and evaluation of family planning programs (Will include AFRICA/ARTS-supported dissemination content)	One week March 1997
India IN-COUNTRY	Methods for evaluating the impact of family planning and reproductive health programs	One week January 1997
DOMESTIC		
USAID/W	Methods for monitoring and evaluating family planning and reproductive health projects	Two days January 1997
USAID/W	Program data sources and data collection for indicators for results frameworks	Two days January 1997
CAs	Evaluation designs for assessing project impact	Two days March 1997
CAs	Evaluation of reproductive health projects	Two days July 1997

The Project will develop a computer-based presentation tool (using PowerPoint or a similar software available to USAID staff in the field and centrally) on monitoring and evaluation of family planning/reproductive health programs. This evaluation tool will be built upon pedagogic material used in the group training workshops. Such a presentation program will be accompanied by a manual (either the project's forthcoming Evaluation Manual or an abridged version of it) and distributed to USAID/W and mission USAID staff. It will allow the user to step through the screens and familiarize him- or herself with basic precepts of monitoring and evaluation and issues pertinent to family planning and reproductive health programs.

V. CONTINUED EFFORT ON SELECTED IMPACT AND METHODOLOGICAL STUDIES

Central funds: Tsui (1.5 months), Guilkey (3.0 months), Hermalin (2.0 months), UNC faculty (2.0 months), Mancini (6.0 months), UNC assistants (1.0 months), UNC consultants (2.0 months)

The EVALUATION Project has been guided in all its activities by an underlying conceptual framework that intersects family planning service supply with population-based contraceptive demand. The project has supported 25 studies of family planning evaluation methodology or impact. Results for most of the completed studies have been compiled into a *Findings* report that will be published in the project's year 5.

Three studies are still in process and their findings would be disseminated in year 6. The proposed level of effort (in person-months) for the continued effort on the selected impact and methodology studies -- the main ones are described below -- is 17.5 person months.

a. Family Planning Costing Methodology

Level of effort: 7.0 months

The objective of this pilot effort is to define and test procedures for estimating the cost of family planning programs at the national level and, where possible, at the facility level. One part of the pilot effort addresses costing reproductive health interventions. The countries selected for test sites include: the Philippines, Bangladesh, Ghana, Ecuador, Nigeria and the Ivory Coast. The study involves collaboration with researchers at Family Health International and various in-country organizations, including the University of the Philippines' Health Finance Project and the Research, Evaluation Resources and Development Consultancy, a Nigerian NGO.

The results of the pilot effort will be shared at a dissemination seminar to be held in late October 1996 in Washington, DC. The seminar will allow project researchers to receive feedback from other professionals working on cost measurement. If the methodology is well received, it could be refined and extended to one or two other countries. In particular, multilateral donor organizations should be informed of this methodology to determine if a coordinated strategy of monitoring funding assistance for family planning and reproductive health programs can be implemented.

Final substantive work on results of this effort will be in the direction of relating program outputs and other production measures, such as new acceptors or couple-years of protection, to the costs to gauge the levels of effectiveness and efficiency.

b. Comparative Assessment of Family Planning Program Impact

Level of effort: 8 months

This study was formulated late in the EVALUATION Project's cycle, as a final wrap-up activity. Its objective is to carry out a comparative analysis of the impact of family planning programs on reproductive preferences, contraceptive behavior, and fertility. The study has involved literature reviews and secondary and primary data analyses. The analyses has involved data from 10-12 Demographic and Health Surveys and an additional 4 surveys that offer longitudinal comparisons.

A final dissemination seminar on the results of the study, to be held in Washington, DC, and a series of publications ("white papers") are proposed for early 1997, in conjunction with the project advisory group meeting.

The balance of 2.5 of the total allocated 17.5 person months will be assigned to other impact study effort that may be requested during the year as core-supported activity.

VI. INDICATOR REFINEMENT AND TESTING

Central funds: Tsui (1.5 months), Hermalin (1.0 months), Knight (3.0 months), UNC faculty (1.0 months), TBN Research Associate (3.0 months), UNC assistants (3.0 months), UNC consultants (2.0 months), Stover (.5 month), Foreit (.5 month), Ross (.5 month)

USAID/G/PHN continues to emphasize performance monitoring of its results defined in its strategic framework. Many of the Office of Population's results are now to be tracked with a series of indicators. However, many of those indicators have not been fully developed or tested and information sources are not clearly identified with each indicator. Consequently, there is need for USAID and CA staff to contribute towards clarifying the system of indicators to be used for monitoring the Office's achievement of its results. In the forthcoming year, The EVALUATION Project will assist the Office of Population, as needed, to refine the definition of and test some of these indicators. One leading piece will be finalizing and testing the sustainability index described below.

a. Development of a Sustainability Index

Level of effort: 11.5 months

At the request of USAID's Center for Population, Health and Nutrition, the EVALUATION Project has been assisting in the development of a measure of sustainability. Ongoing effort has led to developing indicators at two of three levels of family planning program implementation--outcome (results level) and program (intermediate result level). Indicator development for the organizational (sub-result level) will be the responsibility of the FPMD project at Management Sciences for Health. In year 6, EVALUATION effort will be focused on conducting four in-country studies to test ways for rapid measurement of program-level sustainability. The Project is considering siting the four test studies in India, Morocco, Peru and Egypt.

b. Developing and testing other indicators

Level of effort: 3 months

The residual of 1.5 person months will be allocated to other indicator development and testing effort that may be requested during the year. Several areas of need have been identified informally -- family planning and reproductive health cost indicators, service integration indicators, and a summative reproductive health output indicator.

VII. DISSEMINATION AND ADVISORY GROUPS

Central funds: Tsui (.5 month), Buckner (4.0 months), TBN information officer (6.0 months), Betts (3.0 months), UNC administration (4.0 months), Stover (.5 month), Foreit (.5 month), Ross (.5 month), Bertrand (.3 month)

Dissemination activities in year 6 will continue to exploit the means and formats for sharing the results of project efforts. To date these have included producing findings bulletins and wallcharts (in collaboration with the Population Reference Bureau), preparation of the *Findings* overview, archival of project working papers and reports on its World Wide Web Home Page, and research presentations at conferences. A second dissemination need is reprinting reference documents.

a. Project Documents

Level of effort: 13.0 months

The Project will reprint and distribute selected reference manuals, working group reports, and working papers. At a minimum, additional copies of the *Handbook of Indicators for Family Planning Evaluation*, the updated *EASEVAL* manual, and the *Reproductive Health Indicators Working Group Report* will be printed. It is expected that the *Evaluation Manual* will need a second printing during year 6 as well. The expected volume of reprinting is as follows:

Handbook	2000 copies
EASEVAL	1000 copies
RHIWG report	500 copies
Evaluation Manual	2000 copies

b. Advisory Groups

Level of effort: 4.5 months

Because a number of major study results and technical assistance applications (such as impact evaluations in Tanzania, Morocco and India) are in need of wide dissemination, a dissemination seminar, of at least two and one half day duration, is planned for February 1997. This meeting would include presentations on (1) significant study and country results by the original researchers, (2) reviewer commentary, and (3) panel discussions. It is proposed that this dissemination seminar provide the basis for assembling members of the Project's Technical and Policy Advisory Groups in year 6.

VIII. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED LEVEL OF EFFORT AND BUDGET

A summary table of the EVALUATION Project's proposed staffing plan for the SOW activities is provided in Table 2. A total of 252 person months is programmed ed to complete the detailed scope of work.

a. Management/administration effort

Level of effort: 58.9 person months

Approximately 22 percent of the requested level of effort is allocated to management and administration. The 58.9 person months are distributed across the three organizations as follows: 44.0 at UNC, 5.9 at Futures and 9.0 at Tulane. UNC's 44.0 person months include 9.0 for the project manager, 6.0 for the contract officer, 20.0 for administrative assistance, 6 for internal evaluation and reporting, and 3.0 for senior project management.

The EVALUATION Project

Table 1
Year 6 Activities

ACTIVITY/DELIVERABLE	LEAD PERSON RESPONSIBLE	FUNDING SOURCE	MAPPED TO USAID STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK															
			SO1				SO2				SO3				SO4			
			1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Reference Documents																		
Conceptual Framework	Tsui	Central Funds	x		x													
I/M Studies																		
Program Impact Study	Tsui et al	Central Funds	x	x	x													
FP Cost Study	Guilkey et al	Central Funds	x		x	x												
Working Groups																		
Service Delivery	Bertrand/Brown	Central Funds	x															
Sustainability	Tsui/Knight	Central Funds	x		x													
Technical Assistance																		
Morocco Core	Bertrand	FS (335k)	x		x		x											
Brazil	Berg/Lassner	FS (250k)	x		x													
Philippines	Guilkey	Central Funds	x															
Tanzania	Guilkey	FS (500k)	x		x			x							x			
Peru	Foreit/Mostajo	FS (250k)	x		x													
Ecuador	Strickler/McCann	FS (50k)	x		x													
India	Tsui	FS (450k)&OYB(600k)	x	x	x		x											
Ghana	Foreit	FS (50k)	x															
USAID/Other Donors	Tsui/Guilkey	Central Funds	x		x													
Central America	Bertrand	OYB (170k)													x		x	
Training (Overseas)																		
Central America	Bertrand	OYB													x		x	
India	Tsui/Knight	FS/Central Funds	x		x													
Africa Regional	Guilkey/Knight	FS (100k)	x		x													
Morocco	Bertrand/Brown	FS	x		x													
Training (Domestic)																		
APHA Presentation (EASEVAL)	Berg	Central Funds	x		x													
WS 1	Foreit	Central Funds	x		x													
WS 2	Foreit	Central Funds	x		x													
WS 3	Foreit	Central Funds	x		x													
WS 4	Foreit	Central Funds	x		x													
Dissemination																		
Reference Docs	Tsui/Lacey																	
Working Group Reports	Betts	Central Funds	x															
	Betts	Central Funds	x															

The EVALUATION Project
 Table 1
 Year 6 Activities

ACTIVITY/DELIVERABLE	LEAD PERSON RESPONSIBLE	FUNDING SOURCE	MAPPED TO USAID STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK															
			SO1				SO2				SO3				SO4			
			1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
I/M Findings Document	Buckner	Central Funds	x															
Wall Chart	Buckner	Central Funds	x	x														
Bulletins	Buckner	Central Funds	x	x														
Working Paper Series	Betts	Central Funds	x															
Senior Fellows																		
Knight	Tsui	Central Funds	x		x													
Junior Fellows																		
Lakssir	Bertrand	Buy-In	x		x													
Advisory Groups																		
TAG	Tsui	Central Funds	x															
PAG	Tsui	Central Funds	x	x				x										
Internal Evaluation	Buckner	Central Funds			x													
BUY-INS																		
Morocco Buy-In	Bertrand et al	Buy-In	x		x		x											

Note: Combined FS

SO1: Increased use by women and men of voluntary practices that contribute to reduced fertility.

SO2: Increased use of safe pregnancy, women's nutrition, family planning, and other key reproductive health interventions.

SO3: Increased use of key child health and nutrition interventions.

SO4: Increased use of proven interventions to reduce HIV/STD transmission.

TABLE 2:
All SUBCONTRACTORS
EVALUATION ACTIVITIES STAFFING PLAN (CORE CONTRACT: YEAR 6)

(person-months)

Summary	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE							TA/USAID	TRAINING		I/M	INDICATORS	DISSEM	TAG/PAG	MGT/ADM	Summary	
	Brazil	CA	Ghana	India	Morocco	Peru	Tanzania		Overseas	US							
Futures	3.0	1.5	1.4	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	5.9	35.3	Futures
Tulane	4.5	7.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	9.0	49.7	Tulane
UNC	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.0	0.0	0.0	13.0	10.0	5.0	11.5	17.5	14.5	13.0	4.5	44.0	167.0	UNC
TOTAL	7.5	8.5	1.4	38.0	22.2	4.0	16.0	19.0	7.0	16.8	17.5	16.0	13.0	6.3	58.9	252.0	TOTAL

TABLE 2:
FUTURES GROUP INTERNATIONAL
EVALUATION ACTIVITIES STAFFING PLAN (CORE CONTRACT: YEAR 6)

(person-months)

Staff	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE							TA/USAID	TRAINING		IM	INDICATORS	DISSEM	TAG/PAG	MGT/ADM	TFG	
	Brazil	CA	Ghana	India	Morocco	Peru	Tanzania		Overseas	US							
Stover		0.5						1.0				0.5		0.5	0.5	3.0	Stover
Berg	0.5									0.5						1.0	Berg
Foreit	0.5		0.5			1.0		1.0		2.0		0.5		0.5		6.0	Foreit
Loganathan				1.0				1.0		2.0						4.0	Loganathan
McKinnon								4.0								4.0	McKinnon
Neeraj Kak				3.0												3.0	Kak
Mostajo						3.0										3.0	Mostajo
Ross								1.0				0.5		0.5		2.0	Ross
Lassner	2.0															2.0	Lassner
Social Science Pool		1.0	0.9													1.9	Social Science Pool
Sorensen															5.4	5.4	Sorensen
SUB-TOTAL	3.0	1.5	1.4	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	1.5	0.0	1.5	5.9	35.3	SUB-TOTAL

TABLE 2:
TULANE UNIVERSITY
EVALUATION ACTIVITIES STAFFING PLAN (CORE CONTRACT: YEAR 6)
(person-months)

Staff	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE							TA/USAID	TRAINING		I/M	INDICATORS	DISSEM	TAG/PAG	MGT/ADM	TUL	
	Brazil	CA	Ghana	India	Morocco	Peru	Tanzania		Overseas	US							
Bertrand		3.0			3.7					0.3				0.3		7.2	Bertrand
Brown					2.5					0.5						3.0	Brown
Magnani	2.0				2.0		1.0									5.0	Magnani
Eckert					3.0											3.0	Eckert
Florence	1.5	1.0			3.0			0.5								6.0	Florence
Hotchkiss	1.0				2.0		1.0	0.5								4.5	Hotchkiss
Speizer					0.5											0.5	Speizer
Macintyre					0.5											0.5	Macintyre
Patton														1.0		1.0	Patton
Tulane Assistants		3.0			5.0		1.0		2.0						2.0	13.0	Tulane Assistants
Poe															6.0	6.0	Poe
SUB-TOTAL	4.5	7.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	3.0	1.0	2.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	9.0	49.7	SUB-TOTAL

9

TABLE 2:
UNC
EVALUATION ACTIVITIES STAFFING PLAN (CORE CONTRACT: YEAR 6)

(person-months)

Staff	TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE							TA/USAID	TRAINING		I/M	INDICATORS	DISSEM	TAG/PAG	MGT/ADM	UNC	
	Brazil	CA	Ghana	India	Morocco	Peru	Tanzania		Overseas	US							
Tsul				4.0				1.0	1.0	0.5	1.5	1.5		0.5	2.0	12.0	Tsul
Guilkey							2.0	1.0	1.0		3.0				1.0	8.0	Guilkey
Hermalin											2.0	1.0				3.0	Hermalin
Buckner				2.0									3.0	1.0	6.0	12.0	Buckner
UNC Faculty				2.0			2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0				10.0	UNC Faculty
Bardeley				3.0			3.0			6.0						12.0	Bardeley
Mancini											6.0					6.0	Mancini
TBN Res. Assoc.				3.0			1.0	3.0				3.0				10.0	TBN Res. Assoc.
Knight				2.0			1.0	3.0		3.0		3.0				12.0	Knight
Singh				11.0												11.0	Singh
Info Officer													6.0			6.0	Info Officer
UNC Assistants				6.0			4.0	1.0			1.0	3.0				15.0	UNC Assistants
Betts													2.0	1.0	9.0	12.0	Betts
Heath															6.0	6.0	Heath
Admin													2.0	2.0	20.0	24.0	Admin
Consultants				1.0					2.0	1.0	2.0	2.0				8.0	Consultants
SUB-TOTAL	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.0	0.0		13.0	10.0	5.0	11.5	17.5	14.5	13.0	4.5	44.0	167.0	SUB-TOTAL