

• AFR PD-AAA-530-A1

Proj. 6180617
PN-

370.71

H314

②
DUPLICATE

An Evaluation
of
Project Agreement
"Teacher Education for East Africa"

No. 618-11-650-617

August 15, 1969

by

Dr. Fred E. Harris

Dr. Frank L. Holmes

A7R-420

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1858 NS

②

T/BLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Part</u>	<u>Page</u>
Preface	1
Background of the Project	4
The Project Agreements, Objectives and Operations Plan . .	8
Project Agreements	8
Objectives	8
Plan of Operation	10
Provision for Tutors	11
Provision for Staf Educators	12
Professional Qualifications and Length of	
Duty Tours of Instructional Personnel	12
Funding	14
Analysis of Project Design	16
Tutor Program	22
Analysis of Operations	22
Administration Staffing	22
Recruitment, Selection and Orientation of Tutors	24
Logistics of Supply	28
Contractual Arrangements and	
Professional Standards	29
Assignments	37
Liaison with Tutors	38

<u>Part</u>	<u>Page</u>
Professional Objectives and Functions	41
Evaluation Processes	43
Phasing Out	45
The Institutes of Education	48
Origin and Purposes of the Institutes	48
The Institutes and TEEA	49
Contributions by the TEEA Educators	50
Evaluation	51
Strengths of the Project Agreement and the TCCU Contract	52
Weaknesses of the Project Agreement and the TCCU Contract	55
Recommendations	60
Summary and Conclusion	64
Projection	67

Appendix A

Partial List of Persons Interviewed by Evaluation Team
or Present in Discussion Groups

Preface

Pursuant to the request of the East African Division, AID/Washington, Dr. Fred E. Harris and Dr. Frank L. Holmes, who had been asked to serve as an Evaluation Team for Project Agreement, No. 618-11-650-617, "Teacher Education for East Africa," reported to AID/Washington on July 6, 1969 to receive their orders and begin their assignment.

The Team spent approximately four days in AID/Washington being briefed by Dr. Edwin H. Trethaway, Chief of ESA/Afr/ID., AID/W and Mr. Marshall L. Fields, Assistant Chief of ESA/Afr/ID., AID/W and making a careful review of the documentation, correspondence and records pertaining to Project operations. This period of orientation and preparation was followed by one and a half days of a heavy schedule of conferences at Teachers College, Columbia University on the institution's contract operations on campus and in the field. Included in the discussion periods were the available members of the TCCU staff, Chief of the Overseas Contract Party, graduate assistants and graduate students, American and African, who had maintained relationship with either the TEA or TEEA contracts in the East African countries during the period of operation, 1961-69.

The Evaluation Team left New York on the evening of July 11 and arrived in Kampala, Uganda, on July 12, 1969. During the following week, July 13-19, the team pursued

an onerous but most useful schedule of conferences, official and unofficial, with senior officers of the USAID Mission, Ministry of Education, and with educational personnel, American, African, British and other expatriates, attached to the TCCU Contract, Teacher Training Colleges, Institute, University and College of Education. In addition, a number of visits were made to urban and rural colleges and schools on all educational levels. A similar schedule to that prepared for Uganda was followed in Kenya, July 20-26, and in Tanzania, July 27-August 3. On the latter date, the Team returned to Nairobi to prepare a report on its findings.

On August 11, 1969, the Evaluators spent both the morning and afternoon sessions reviewing their preliminary draft report, with USAID Regional and Country administrators and educational advisors of the East African Missions. On August 15, 1969 the final copy of the Evaluation Report was presented to the USAID Regional Education Advisor and to the USAID Country Educational Advisors of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, for their review, comments and submission to AID/Washington.

The Evaluation Team has been most appreciative of the support and cooperation it has received from representatives of the USAID/East African Education Divisions; AID/Washington; Campus and Field Staffs of the Teachers College, Columbia University Contract; East African Ministries of Education and their constituent institutions, and other

educational and governmental personnel, including African, American and other expatriates, directly and indirectly involved with TEEA project activities.

In presenting their report, the Evaluators are keenly aware of its shortcomings which arise from the difficulties encountered in reconstructing events, extracting accurate historical information, sifting conflicting perceptions of past and current happenings to reach acceptable convictions and then, attempting to write an accurate and comprehensive evaluation of project operations to-date, including realistic recommendations which might help to upgrade and expand operations from now to the termination date of the Project Agreement, December 31, 1971.

The Evaluators have attempted to discharge their obligations in a professional manner. The Team is hopeful that its findings and recommendations will be useful to the USAID Missions, the Governments of East Africa--Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, in their efforts to resolve some of the inevitable problems encountered with contract operations in developing nations.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Fred E. Harris, Consultant
Vice-President Evansville University
Evansville, Indiana

Dr. Frank L. Holmes, Consultant
AID/Washington

Background of the Project

To establish a basis for understanding of the Project with which the evaluators must deal, the following brief history of the Teacher Education for East Africa (TEEA) Project has been prepared.

The concept for a "Teacher Education in East Africa Program" originated at a Conference held in Princeton, New Jersey, December, 1960. The Conference was attended by educators belonging to the faculties of various institutions of higher learning and representatives of the Government of the United States, the United Kingdom and the East African countries of Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda and Zanzibar. The Conference concluded that the most urgent needs of the East African countries were: 1) to replace the departing expatriates from secondary schools with better qualified teachers, and 2) to accelerate the planned expansion of the secondary school system.

An important outgrowth of the Conference was that the Agency for International Development negotiated a Contract, AIDc 1911, April 25, 1961, Teachers for East Africa (TEA), with Teachers College Columbia University (TCU), to discharge the following functions: 1) supply qualified secondary teachers in cooperation with the United Kingdom to help the East African Governments (GEA) to meet their teacher emergency needs, and 2) provide assistance to the aforementioned Governments and to Makerere University College to enlarge and upgrade training programs for secondary school teachers.

From its inception, TEA was viewed as a joint Anglo-American Program. In 1961 and 1962 the number of American teachers serving under the TCCU contract exceeded the supply of British teachers. In 1963 and 1964 the numbers of American and British teachers were approximately equal. During the life of the Project, 1961-67, the total number of British teachers was larger than the 464 supplied by the United States.

American teachers were recruited on an annual basis by "Waves." They served under two year contracts and were posted in more than 100 secondary schools throughout Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.

As previously indicated, TEA was considered by the United States Government, and that of the United Kingdom, as an emergency measure to relieve the critical shortage of secondary teachers in East Africa. As early as 1962 the United States Government began seeking ways to terminate the TEA/TCCU program within a period of two-three years. When the decision became known, the Peace Corps asked to be allowed to replace TEA teachers with qualified Peace Corps Volunteers. In 1964 "Wave 4" of TEA teachers was the last group recruited by TCCU. The services of TEA contract personnel were ended by 1967. Peace Corps volunteers are continuing to be used in Kenya and Uganda.

The contributions of the TEA teachers are considered significant by the East African Governments. Briefly,

their response to the teacher supply problem confronting the East African countries helped to fill a critical need. Additionally, their imaginative approach to education problems has influenced East African educators to seek more meaningful ends to be served by their secondary schools. Despite the valient efforts of the East African Governments to increase the supply of teachers during the period 1961-64, there continued to be a drastic shortage of elementary and secondary teachers throughout East Africa. The problem was aggravated seriously by rapidly growing enrollments at the upper primary and secondary levels.

The decision to terminate the TEA Project provided the setting for AID and TCCU to direct their attention to other important aspects of educational development for the Region. With encouragement from the TEA Chief of Party, the East African Ministries of Education and the University of East Africa began giving serious consideration to the countries' most urgent educational requirements.

The basic idea for the development of the "Teacher Education for East Africa Program" (TEEA) evolved at the Annual Conference of the University of East Africa held at Mombasa, Kenya, January 27-30, 1964. It resulted in the establishment of a National Institute of Education in each of the three East African countries. The purpose of the Institute was to serve as the vehicle for institutionalizing cooperative working relationships among the

Ministries of Education, Teacher Training Colleges and the Colleges of Education of the Universities of East Africa on problems related to: 1) developing and expanding teacher training programs, 2) providing in-service up-grading programs for teachers, 3) curricula development, d) educational research, 4) selection and use of instructional materials, and 5) a medium through which all educational agencies in the countries concerned might coordinate their educational efforts in the field of teacher education.

The Mombasa Conference requested United States assistance in supplying experienced American educational personnel to fill positions as tutors in their Teacher Training Colleges and as staff educators in their Institutes and University Colleges of Education. From March 27, 1964 to July 1, 1966 the program functioned under TCCU's direction. Its operations were carried on through "Letters of Agreement" between the Agency for International Development and Teachers College Columbia University. The Contract AID/Afr 420 between AID and TCCU, was signed on June 27, 1966 and the TEEA program was authorized to begin its operations on July 1, 1966. By means of additional Agreements between the contracting parties, the Program, which will be discussed and evaluated in the following pages of this report, will continue to December 31, 1971.

The Project Agreements, Objectives and Operations Plan

A. Project Agreements:

The initial Project Agreement, "Teacher Education in East Africa," No. 618-11-650-617, (TEEA No. 1) was approved on May 27, 1964. Subsequent Project Agreements to furnish continued support to the original TEEA Agreement were approved as follows: TEEA, No. 2, May 28, 1965; TEEA, No. 3, April 4, 1966; TEEA, No. 4, May 26, 1967; TEEA, No. 5, (801); June 21, 1968, and TEEA (909), as amended, supercede all previous TEEA Agreements. Under the terms of the last Agreement AID has agreed to continue its assistance to teacher education in East Africa to December, 1971.

B. Objectives:

The purposes of Project Agreement, TEEA No. 1, June, 1964, was to: 1) assist the East African Governments (Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda) to expand and improve their systems of teacher education in order to place the nations in a better position to meet the manpower requirements of their economic development programs, and 2) enter into a contract with Teachers College Columbia University (TCCU) to supply up to thirty American teachers for assignment as tutors in the Teacher Training Colleges (ITC) in East Africa, beginning September, 1964.

It is important to note that the Government of the United States, through its Agency for International Development (AID), and the Government of the United Kingdom agreed to provide matching contributions to support the project.

The intervening Agreements, TEEA No. 2 - No. 5, and their amendments, were concerned mainly with changes in logistic support of the contract staff.

The objective of Project Agreement, TEEA No. 6 (909), with which the Evaluation Team is concerned chiefly in its appraisal of the Project, is to continue cooperation among the East African Governments, the University of East Africa and its constituent colleges, and the Government of the United States for the purpose of improving systems of teacher education in East Africa. It is contended that these cooperative efforts will assist the Governments of the East African countries to meet their educational goals and the manpower needs of their economic development programs.

Under the Project Agreement, AID agreed to continue assistance to the TEEA program through the TCCU contract, by: 1) supplying teacher training specialists (tutors) to the Teacher Training Colleges, 2) providing teacher training specialists (staff educators) to the Institutes of Education in the three countries, and 3) supporting a headquarters staff to administer the Project. These

commitments will be fulfilled by AID through the continuation of its TCCU contract to December 31, 1971.

C. Plan of Operation

The "Scope of Work" outlined in the AID/TCCU Contract of July 1, 1966, which the Contractor is to perform, is summarized as follows:

- 1) provide teachers to East African secondary schools through December, 1967, a task started under an earlier contract;
- 2) recruit qualified Americans to serve as tutors in the major colleges of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda;
- 3) recruit staff educators for assignments in the various Institutes of Education and Colleges of Education of the University of East Africa;
- 4) conduct an orientation period of not to exceed seven weeks for tutors, staff educators and their families;
- 5) work with the Ministries of Education in the three countries to assure the appropriate placement of tutors and staff educators;
- 6) support the Curriculum Development Center, Institutes of Education and Faculties of Education in the East African countries by providing staff educators and appropriate equipment:

- 7) provide training where necessary to members of the administrative staff;
- 8) provide periodical counsel to the professional field staff;
- 9) provide adequate logistic support services to the field staff and their families; and
- 10) make periodic evaluations of the overall program.

D. Provision of Tutors (TEEA)

From 9/64 to 3/69, with a school-year being considered from August of one year to that of the next year, the Contractor has supplied the following numbers of tutors.

	Number of TEEA Tutors by Country					
	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Kenya	4	15	14	22	33	33
Tanzania	8	13	13	19	19	10
Uganda	9	23	26	27	34	34
Totals	21	51	53	68	89	80

It is projected that during the final year of the contract the number of tutors will be reduced to 32 with country assignments as follow: Kenya--15; Tanzania--1; Uganda--16; total of 32 for 1970-71. The Grand Total of U.S. tutors supplied during the period 1964-71 will be 394. The composition of the staffs of the Teacher Training Colleges in the three countries

in 1969 was comprised of 9% American teachers, 51% other expatriate teachers and 40% nationals. The number of Teacher Training Colleges in which TEEA tutors have served under the Contract have ranged on an annual basis from 15 to 40.

E. Provision of Staff Educators:

The numbers of staff educators supplied to the Institutes of Education in the East African countries and to the University College and Kenyatta College, Nairobi, and Makerere College, Uganda, during 1964-69, are as follows: 1964--1; 1965--6; 1966--10; 1967--10; 1968--9 and 1969--9. The number projected for 1970-71 is 8, making a total of 53 during the life of the contract. Country assignments included: Kenya 21, Tanzania 13 and Uganda 19. The subject matter areas of specialization in which the staff educators have provided professional assistance have included: mathematics, science, primary education, education psychology and instructional materials.

F. Professional Qualifications and Duty Tours of Instructional Personnel:

Tutors were required to present a minimum of a Master's Degree, preferably in the field of teacher education, and five years of teaching experience or the professional equivalent. Staff educators were required to present a Ph.D. in the area of specialization

in which they were to offer instruction and five years of teaching experience or the professional equivalent. The tours of duty for tutors and staff educators ranged from 21-27 months.

G. Duties of Instructional Personnel:

The functions of tutors and staff educators, respectively, are:

1) Tutors:

- a) providing pre-service instruction in the Teachers Colleges;
- b) providing in-service instruction to serving teachers;
- c) demonstrating modern teaching methods and assisting in improving the curriculum at the Teachers' Training College to which they were assigned, and
- d) collaborating with the staffs of the Institutes of Education and University Colleges of Education in promoting the up-grading of the curriculum and of teaching methods.

2) Staff Educators:

- a) serving as consultants in their subject matter fields to curriculum groups assigned to improve and modernize syllabi;

- b) teaching in appropriate in-service training and up-grading courses offered by the Teachers Colleges and the local University College;
- c) conducting classroom demonstrations in their areas of specialization, and
- d) teaching regular courses of instruction in their special subjects at the University College to which they are assigned.

H. Funding:

The obligations and expenditures of the TEEA Project to July 1, 1969, as shown by the Controller's recorders, USAID/Kenya are as follows:

	Obligation	Actual Expenditures
1964	3000,000.00	-----0-----
1965	850,000.00	-----0-----
1966	1,073,331.40	641,869.37
1967	917,000.00	872,232.24
1968	1,062,502.30	977,477.53
1969	<u>2,435,342.53</u>	<u>1,241,970.69</u>
	<u>₡6,638,676.23</u>	<u>₡3,733,549.83</u>
Add: Accruals		1,289,000.00
Totals to 6/30/69	<u>₡6,638,676.23 (1)</u>	<u>₡5,022,549.83 (2)</u>

Note: (1) An additional request for ₡2,023,000 has been submitted for 1970-71.

(2) The total does not include ₡19,470.23 contributed by the Uganda and Tanzania Governments.

Estimated total cost of the Project, December 31, 1971, based on obligation requests, will be: \$8,661,676.23.

Combined costs of the TEA And TEEA Projects, from 1961 to 1971, are: \$4,772,436.84 (actual and \$8,661,676.23 (estimated) or a grand total of \$13,434,204,27.

Analysis of the Project Design

Conceptualization of the problem precedes the design of the program. It is assumed that the more adequate conceptualization is, the more likely it is that the design will be adequate.

Clearly, at the time of the Princeton Conference, the teacher shortage at the secondary level was perceived as being critical enough to cast the response on a one to one basis. In other words, there was a shortage of secondary teachers; the response was to reduce the shortage by increasing the supply. It appears from this vantage point as conceptualization at a stimulus-response level.

The successor project, TEEA, was a response to the critical need for tutors and for an increase in quality of instruction. The Institutes established to support the need for an increase in the quality of instruction were promising; their programs were more or less open-ended. That is, the opportunities of the educators to work on syllabi, to do pre-service and in-service education and to consult on educational problems, involved the identification of alternative work projects, the assigning of priorities and the selection of an appropriate course of action. Yet, all of this takes place in a fairly narrowly defined field, e.g., mathematics, as the educator is essentially a specialist.

The tutor supply program, it must be concluded, emphasized supply as a primary goal. In this sense, it was again a response at the most elementary level of planning. Was there not an opportunity when the problem was being considered to examine educational needs on a broader basis? In none of the three countries can it be said that there are now adequate tutors to replace those who are being terminated. In fact, in at least one country the situation may be worse with respect to supply. Could not the present situation have been foreseen and a broader range of educational needs considered? Given the fact that African tutors are not now available, one might question the planning efforts of the Ministries involved. Could not an assessment made at the time of the planning of the TEEA program have shown the need for increased support for the planning segment of the Ministries?

Taking another approach, why was the program not designed in 1964 to provide for the production of tutors? Were not adequate demographic data available?

Or, in another area, was it sound planning to place so much emphasis on the "exemplar" role of the tutor as a means of improving teacher education? Were the assumptions in this respect so exaggerated as to be unrealistic?

The various segments which have been given primary consideration in the program appear to be as follow:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Problem Definition</u>	<u>Response</u>
TEA	Shortage of Secondary Teachers	Supply Secondary Teachers
TEEA	Shortage of Tutors	Supply Tutors
	Need to Improve Instruction	Install Specialists in Institutions. Emphasize Exemplar Role of Tutors

Extending this diagram, essentially through interpolation, it is now suggested that a program be structured as follows:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Problem Definition</u>	<u>Response</u>
TTE (1)	Shortage of Tutors	Train Tutors for Teachers Colleges

Project design should go as far as possible to assure success in attaining the goals of the project and that, in turn, the goals should be selected on the basis of a comprehensive analysis of the educational needs. The simplicity of the designs noted here do not suggest that this was done although there is no information to indicate that it was not. As approached here, it is suggested that a fairly singular response--supplying tutors--to the shortage of tutors should have been by-passed or reduced in scope to permit an emphasis on the training of tutors.

- (1) Proposed on an informal basis: Tutors for Teacher Education.

Given a full supply of tutors and a goal of bona fide intent and effort to improve education, two other factors would deserve immediate attention: planning capabilities in the ministries and educational leadership in the teachers colleges. Related factors must have relationship in programming. It would seem that, as a minimum, the tutor must be trained, that the supply must be assured on a continuing basis, and that his performance as a tutor not be blocked by poorly trained principals. If these three items can be accepted now, why were they not considered at the time the project was designed?

While all of these questions regarding design might be valid and relevant, it should be noted that the situations within which operations must be conducted do not always lend themselves to responses of a maximum quality. It has been said that the reason the programs were of their specific design in 1964 is that the total environment did not permit a more comprehensive design. It is difficult for the Evaluation Team to assess such matters. To be sure, a stimulus-response level tutor training program is not adequate for today's needs and, indeed, it may carry with it the same incomplete goals-achievement some persons now see in the current program.

A corollary of design is that administration for one must reflect the other. Here we speak of administrative organization. While comprehensive analysis of administrative organization is not a part of this report, some related questions might be useful.

With a project having built-in isolation for field personnel, is it not reasonable to expect that administrative services should reach those persons? The evaluators have observed that the tutors in the Kampala region tend to view their tasks with understanding and with high morale. Is this due to the opportunity they have to "get into Kampala to visit TEEA Headquarters" from time to time? Is this evidence of the importance of getting administration out of Headquarters?

The administrative organization chart in the June, 1969 work plan seems unnecessarily complex. This characteristic is reflected in operations. Apparently, the authority of the TEEA Director is now defined; this has not always been so.

Also, lines appear to be crossed within AID from time to time and between AID and TCCU. Liaison between AID/U and TEEA/K is strong and successful. Certainly this is not equally true in the other countries. Then, too, it is noted that a Country Education Advisor is Project Director for what is classified as a Regional Project.

While this arrangement may be desirable for some reason, it presents some problems with respect to the regional nature of the Project.

Clearly, there is a need to activate administration at the tutor level--perhaps to improve the Country Chairman concept. There is a need to clarify the regional nature of the Project; it now appears to be substantially and unevenly bi-lateral. There is a need to determine where functional authority rests at all levels and to keep tutors advised on the point.

The design of the project is set. It can be modified only with difficulty during the duration of its operation. There are, however, real possibilities for improving the design of successor projects if imagination can be applied to broadening and deepening the impact possibilities of activities and flexibility permitted in their operation.

The Tutor Program

A. Analyses of Operations:

1. Administrative Staffing

The work of the field staff, supported by the headquarters staff at TCCU, has varied in effectiveness. The variations were apparently caused by:

a) inadequate manpower in the field staff occasioned, in part, by severe delays, often as much as eighteen months, in recruitment by TCCU and b) communications problems, many of which were associated with structural factors. It is reasonably clear that the field staff is without depth in educational leadership personnel, but this is compensated for in part by the leadership offered by the Chief of Party. Limitations imposed by distance and the associated problems of logistics reduces the validity of a staffing pattern which places too much emphasis on the leadership of one person. Single person leadership requires short lines of communication.

The depth of interest in the project displayed by the headquarters staff gives assurance of broad-field leadership and professional concern. Certainly this project is not a mere program unit. It has professional support. Nevertheless, there is agreement that the program faltered in the

latter part of 1968 partly through the need for increased effectiveness in TCCU operations. Then too, logistic questions to be discussed later were at times below reasonable levels of expectation.

The degree to which the rich resources of the University have been utilized in the project appears, in practice, to be limited, except for the contributions of TCCU staff.

While not all of the staff of the project are TCCU members, the recruitment and selection of non-institution staff members have been carried out with care and efficiency. Liaison and personal relationships between those persons responsible for day to day operations and those responsible for professional structure and design seem to be effective and supportive.

A recent field staff addition in instructional materials should be productive but it raises a series of significant questions:

If an instructional materials person can be justified, cannot other instructional support personnel also be justified? If other instructional support personnel can be justified, how can the choice of a media specialist be justified as the first staffing choice in the instructional support area?

If the staffing choice can be justified, how does this action relate to the position that the tutors are Ministry of Education employees and that the only instructional role they can play is that of "exemplar"? In other words, what is the difference between exemplifying standards in media and exemplifying them in curriculum and instruction--especially since an able media person will not compartmentalize instruction, materials and curriculum.

It is not indicated that the action taken may not be fruitful; it is indicated that it does not appear to square with stated program definitions and that the staffing may become fragmented and isolated as a result of apparent inconsistency.

While no direct evaluation of staff morale was attempted, there is evidence that it varies in terms of the operational smoothness of the program. This, of course, is a normal relationship.

2. Recruitment, Selection and Orientation of Tutors:

Central to the effectiveness of the TEEA project was the task of placing effective tutors in the field. Recruitment procedures involved mailing of thousands of announcements, inserting announcements in

journals, person to person communication and favorable support by former tutors.

The selection process involved screening by professionals, a consultant and by a team of interviewers.

The results of the recruitment and selection processes are, by consensus, among the most rewarding parts of the project. The Master's degree requirement and a mean experience of 12 years for approximately 90 tutors now in the field represent success at the criteria level and go a long way in assuring success at the operations level. Most tutors with whom the evaluation team talked in the field gave evidence of being self-reliant, self-directing, and capable of exceptional initiative. When asked what support they had received from the TCCU-TEEA staffs other than minimum logistic support, few indicated that they expected much or that they got much. In further confirmation of this configuration of a capable person in a professional environment having limited parameters, few tutors had any comments on the project as a whole. Apparently the tutors were selected with the idea that, except for local direction, they would be self directing, goal seeking professionals. If this was the intent in recruitment and selection, it was largely successful.

The orientation program for the tutors is in part an academic course at TCCU. There is now some doubt about whether this is a wise approach as there is some doubt about the length of the orientation period. The length of the orientation period for the TEEA tutors was adopted from the TEA program. This may not be appropriate since the two groups vary around such factors as: age, training, experience, size of family, permanence of residence and "free" time. The content of the orientation period is not generally questioned except for the usefulness of the instruction in Swahili. There is question about the degree to which the perspective of the orientation staff on the projected tutor experience retained fidelity to reality. Unnecessary questions have arisen in the field regarding loans for cars, refrigerators, etc. These problems were heavily concentrated in one "wave" of tutors. Given the expense in time, money and program that it costs to correct such matters, it could be false economy to refuse the TEEA Chief of Party permission to return to the States to participate in the orientation program. He is the one man who should know what is going on.

Note should be made of the essence of Jean Pierre Jordaan's recommendations with respect to orientation. (1)

He recommends that:

- a) tutors be allowed to rest for a day or two before beginning their African orientation;
- b) early sessions focus on "house-keeping" details common to all; (2)
- c) a clearer division of labor be made between the TCCU and the East African orientation staffs to avoid overlapping;
- d) the reading material required in the TCCU orientation be sent to the tutor at the time he is accepted into the program, and
- e) TCCU staff continuously review their materials to be sure that they are up-to-date.

One point related to recruitment and selection needs to be considered. Many of the persons selected as tutors were without direct experience or training in elementary education. This creates the professionally questionable situation in which a person is training teachers to teach what he has not taught or is not trained to teach. The arguments to support such a staffing program are well known but they are hardly acceptable

- (1) Report of Dr. Jean Pierre Jordaan, TEEA Consultant and Recruitment and Selection, on his trip to East Africa, August-September, 1968. Unpublished.
- (2) The same problem of logistics noted in the FY '68 report appears here.

to teacher trainees who have had training and experience in elementary education. The tutors recommended that more persons with training and experience in elementary education be included in the group.

While there are problems of recruitment, selection and orientation, there is little evidence that the magnitude of any of them is great enough to diminish seriously the prospects for success in the project. Of the three elements mentioned, the orientation program is most in need of review.

3. Logistics of Supply

The problems of logistics of supply have been professionally treated by many persons and it is quite clear that the successes of logistical support personnel generally go unheralded. On the other hand, there are many supply problems in this project which merit attention.

On page 16 of the FY 1968 report, the following problems are noted: utilities payments, compensation for families transporting children to school, car loans, refrigeration, signing of contracts, medical service extensions, salary top-off for local hire personnel, visas for tutors, storage of household effects, etc. The evaluators must conclude that most of the aforementioned items should have been responsibly scheduled at the policy, program and supply levels

well before 1968. TCCU must have had adequate experience to build up competency beyond the performance level indicated. Some problems grow out of changes in the program, but those which are of non-recurring origins should quickly find a level of administrative responsibility which does not tolerate excuses.

4. Contractual Arrangements and Professional Relationships

As has been noted by many persons, there are inherent ambivalences and even contradictions built into the tutor's contractual arrangements. At one level it is noted that TCCU performs the tasks of recruitment and orientation and provides logistic backstopping, and that the tutors are direct hire employees of the EAG. Since it is unlikely that many, if not most of the tutors, might have accepted the posts on a direct hire basis without the agency services of TCCU, a question arises regarding the implied role of TCCU in the tutor-government contract. It is quite clear that the tutors signed contracts with the host Ministry and it is also clear that they identify with TCCU. However, they probably accepted the assignment because of TCCU previous to receiving a Ministry contract. Hence they are operating on many points on the basis of an oral contract with TCCU.

There is an absence of equity in the Contractual relationship as it is operated. On the strength of the

promise of the agent (TCCU), and under a signed agreement to render services, the prospective tutor resigns or takes a leave of absence from his position, disrupts family life, undergoes a training program, and moves to East Africa. He seldom receives a contract until he arrives at post and often not for weeks or months later. The fact that the prospective tutor cannot know all of the conditions he will encounter, the contractor should see that he is informed of conditions as fully as possible, because the Agent's responsibilities tend to increase rather than diminish as contract operations develop. The fact that Professor Jordaan would make the suggestion that trainees who are judged to be poor field risks be separated from the program (3) illustrates the extremely limited contractual equity of the prospective trainees. We would question Jordaan's recommendation that trainees found to be unsuitable previous to assignment be separated from the program previous to assignment. It appears to us that an oral contract exists, that the prospective tutor has invested more than good faith and that significant professional concerns are involved. He is not responsible for TCCU's errors in selection, but he has no defined contractual rights. A more appropriate response to poor selection would be to find an alternative assignment.

(3) Jordaan, "Report" p. 7 op cit.

TCCU, as an academic institution, has a responsibility to protect the contractual and professional rights of the tutors even though it may be determined that its definition of agency role constitutes its sole obligation.

Between the time the prospective tutor signs the Agreement tendered by TCCU on behalf of the agencies it serves and the time a bona fide teaching contract is signed by the tutor and the Ministry of the host country, many acts are performed by TCCU that far exceed an agency role. Serious consideration should be given to the proposition that the tutors are actually employees of TCCU and are in effect seconded to the various Ministries. The absence of a formal contract between TCCU and the tutor or the denial of a contractual relationship when such a defacto relationship exists should not impair the rights of the tutor under the system.

This principle applies to the contractual relationship of the tutor and the host government. Many reasons were given as to why it is impossible for contracts with specified salaries to be tendered to the tutors before they leave the United States. Something as fundamental as a sound contractual relationship for the tutors should be a pre-condition to the agency or intra-governmental relationship.

This is not to imply that there is not sensitivity to or concern for the problems of the tutors. Country Chairmen have been appointed, but the value of the system is uncertain because they have not had the time or money to function effectively. The intensive problems have been few and fortunately have not involved matters of sensitive intra-governmental concern. Nevertheless, the contractual relationships should be clearly defined and strengthened to protect the interests of the tutors.

AID and TCCU have been most responsive to the need for changes in professional matters such as salary, retirement, etc. While the tutors, some of whom were undoubtedly accustomed to the negotiation approach to such matters, were not all willing to accept a formula worked out without their continuing involvement, the formula arrived at seems to have been evidence of an effective response to tutor concerns. However, despite the efforts of all persons concerned to create a salary and benefit system commensurate with professional obligations involved, there are indications of one or two cases where some type of adjudication may be appropriate.

It is not implied that most tutors are interested largely in professional benefits. Many with whom the Team talked were quite unconcerned with such matters.

Their faith has been rewarded by continuing efforts of the TEEA Chief of Party to monitor, assess and communicate such matters as required. The new professional support arrangements for the tutors are believed to be adequate.

Note should be made of the fact that the evaluators found the situation created by the serious deterioration in administrative procedures in late 1968 and early 1969 to have a more serious impact on the program and on morale than was indicated by any office with whom it consulted. It is difficult to conceive of the combination of circumstances which legitimately could have permitted capable professionals to be stranded without reasonable and adequate support. Some sold stocks on a low market, another borrowed against his equity in his retirement fund in the States and others fell back on savings accounts. Some reportedly had no reserves and were forced to depend on the assistance of relatives or colleagues.

With respect to the renewal of the two year contract, it is noted that the first line of authority is the Ministry of Education. This point was clear to all tutors with whom the Evaluation Team talked. The point of concern is that some tutors in the August, 1968 "Wave" were convinced that they would have an opportunity to renew their contracts for another two

years if their performance were satisfactory. Yet, the Evaluation Team was advised by AID that the Contract for TEEA for some time had been scheduled to terminate, except for terminal administrative operations, in December, 1971. How could this happen? It is noted that in one of the preliminary drafts of the work plan for the project, TCCU expressed surprise at the 1971 termination target, noting that it considered the phase-out date to be subject to further study. Yet, TCCU pinpoints November 25, 1968 as the date on which it learned of the 1971 date for concluding contract operations. Clearly, inadequate or incomplete communications created a situation which impaired the anticipated professional options of the tutors. An academic institution, even if restricted to an agency role as suggested, has the obligation to determine the validity of the statements, open or implied, which govern the professionals with whom they are dealing. The renewal option, reported to have appeared in the announcements in educational journals, is not given in the form entitled, "Acceptance of Terms and Conditions," or the form entitled, "Terms and Conditions of Training and Employment."

On the whole, the role of the contractor is projected in several lights. The appointment of a professional Chief of Party and staff, the special functions of the

Regional Operations Officer, the appointment of Country Chairmen and the Chief of Party's apparent residual authority to withdraw tutors are at variance with the statements by TCCU in the form entitled, "Terms and Conditions of Training and Employment," to the effect that "Teachers College is acting as an agent for the Agency for International Development in recruiting, selecting and training teachers. Teachers College has no control over or responsibility for the conditions of employment in East Africa." If, on the other hand, the statement of terms and conditions represent the legal and programmatic parameters of the relationships, two questions arise:

- a) Did the TEEA project meet the fundamental AID requirement that its projects be self-cancelling through the generation of national or program capabilities? A supply role, exclusively agency in nature, would not appear to do so.
- b) If TCCU was not responsible for "conditions of employment" in East Africa and if AID transferred its operational responsibility through contract, who is responsible to these ninety professionals for "conditions of employment" other than the GEA? How does this statement by TCCU square with the

July 1, 1966 AID/TCCU contract which provides that the Contractor is to work with the Ministries of Education in the three countries to assure the appropriate placement of tutors and staff educators? If "Conditions of Employment" are not a part of consideration in "appropriate placement," how are they defined? The team had not found evidence to support the conclusion that this contract provision has been handled with a clear intent to define "appropriate placement," to implement the action in a manner consistent with that definition and to take appropriate corrective measures where necessary. The team found tutors whom it believed to be placed in clear contradiction of a reasonable concept of "appropriateness."

On the operational level, both TCCU and AID have shown an interest in the "Conditions of Employment" of the tutors. However, the sporadic and uneven responses of TCCU and AID, regardless of where the responsibility lies, have left many tutors with a feeling of uncertainty. It is believed that in this respect the TEEA project does not meet the common program requirements of definition, continuity, balance, visibility, communication and control. Presently there are mature tutors in the field

who question why they were placed in a situation where their professional contributions are substantially reduced or cancelled by field conditions and who are perturbed by factors on which they report they have had no counsel or support.

If TCCU's responsibility is exclusively agency in nature, could not another agency have carried out the program as well or perhaps better than TCCU. Could not the Office of Education have been considered for the recruitment and selection task? It has been noted that the agency role contributed to a fuller involvement of the EA/ME at the logistic and professional levels. Perhaps this is accurate with special reference to housing, but there is little direct evidence that the ME have used or adopted any techniques in working with TEEA tutors that are not used in working with other expatriates.

5. Assignments

The right of the appropriate Ministry of Education to make assignments within the bounds of the TCCU/AID contract, apparently has been clear to the tutors from the beginning. The tutors recognize the professional limitations within which they operate and express willingness and enthusiasm for confrontation with problems. None of the tutors with whom the evaluators talked implied an interest in a "soft" assignment.

6. Liaison with Tutors

The operations officer of the TEEA headquarters staff indicated that he is supposed to spend much of his time in the field. Various limitations on the time in the field have been operative, but the tutors in the Uganda area seemed to know him well and to respect his work. According to the reports by tutors on visitations, it must be concluded that much of this interaction took place in the Kampala office. It appears that the more remote the college or the region from Kampala, Nairobi or Dar es Salaam, the less frequent contact the tutors have had with TEEA headquarters.

Regardless of the question about the limitation of the role of TCCU to that of an agent, the machinery for and expectation of visits exists. There is real question about the priority given by the TEEA staff to visiting tutors. In one country, the AID Education Officer was given much credit for liaison work; in another it was the Regional Operations Officer; and in the third country, the only available record of a recent visit, not focused on a specific problem, was of that by the Regional Education Officer.

Even the work plan submitted by TCCU in June, 1969 is not clear on the matter of visitations. A table showing a plan of seven or eight visitations to each

tutor each year is footnoted to indicate that some visits may be by two or more TEEA representatives, thereby reducing the actual number of projected visits.

An analysis of the responses to a questionnaire circulated by TEEA headquarters in November, 1968 yields some interesting data on visitations:

At that time the composite East Africa experience of the tutors in Uganda was approximately 44½ years. The tutors who responded to the inquiry indicated they had received visits as follows: TEEA/K staff, 13; country chairman, 1; TEEA-Institute personnel, 20; TC/NY staff, 0; and AID personnel, 2.

In Tanzania the composite East Africa experience of the tutors was just over eighteen years. The reported visits were as follows: TEEA/K staff, 12+; (4) country chairman, 13 plus local contacts within the compound where the country chairman lived; TEEA Institute personnel, 14 plus local contacts; TC/NY staff, 1; AID personnel, 19+.

In Kenya the composite East Africa experience of the tutors was 43 years. The reported visits were as follows: TEEA/K staff, 41; country chairman, 5; TEEA Institute personnel, 4; TC/NY staff, 9; AID personnel, 25. Of the 41 TEEA/K visits, 37 were to one institution, Kenyatta Teachers College; of the 9 TC/NY visits, all were to that institution.

(4) + indicates additional visits noted but number not given.

Considering the total of approximately 106 man years of service, and eliminating Kenyatta Teachers College, a special case, only 29 visits by TEEA/K staff members are reported. This is only about .27 visits per man-year of tutor service. In other words, on a linear basis, 27 visits would be made in 106 years.

The data are affected by several factors. Some respondents reported visits; others reported visitors. Some persons did not answer the question; others used words such as "many," "social," and "a number." Some recorded AID Agriculture visits.

Despite these limitations, it seems reasonably clear that in terms of visits, the tutor is largely a forgotten man. This fact stands in marked contrast to the full professional roles the tutors are expected to fulfill.

A serious complaint received from most of the tutors with whom the evaluators talked was that mail directed to TEEA headquarters and TCCU-TEEA headquarters often received a tardy response and on many occasions, no response at all. An office assistant at TCCU-TEEA headquarters, Miss Susan Bruce, is credited with being especially responsive and helpful.

The annual conference for tutors is greatly appreciated and, in the view of the tutors, is effective as a communications device.

7. Professional Objectives and Functions

Reduced to the simplest terms, the TEEA tutor supply project had two objectives: a) provide tutors on an interim basis pending national and regional development in education, and b) exert a positive influence on the quality of education through the tutor's role as an "exemplar" (5). Factually, the "exemplar" role extended to special teaching duties, work on syllabi, developing instructional resources and extra curricular activities, etc. The "exemplar" role in which the tutor illustrated how to define, approach and solve problems is thought to contribute more to institutionalization than most given individual teaching activities.

The willingness of the tutors to create new approaches, to adapt to unusual situations, to shift to new assignments and to serve as a member of the group was noted by many Ministry officials and principals. Again this appears to be a result, at least in part, of an excellent recruitment and selection process.

Previously discussed, the ambivalence of TCCU/TEEA regarding professional functions bears a direct relationship to this topic. Specifically, what is the function of the TEEA field staff with respect to professional support for the tutors? If it is restricted to broad

(5) It is noted some sources discount this second objective.

field leadership through annual conferences, it is clear that the conferences have been held. It is much less clear to the tutors that there was significant follow-up on the conferences. The leadership role of the TEEA Chief of Party in planning the Conferences of the University of East Africa is clear: it has been significant. This effort, however, contributed only indirectly to the professional tasks of the tutors. The Conference, undoubtedly, contributed to the better understanding of the larger problems affecting teacher education in East Africa.

If, on the other hand, the TEEA staff was expected to support and amplify the exemplar role of the tutor at a professional level, it must be concluded that, for the project as a whole, the goal was not reached. In fact, it was hardly approached except through the Conferences. One can hardly ascribe a successful tutor-exemplar support role to the Institutes. Analysis of 106 composite years of tutor service shows only 38 visits to tutors by Institute personnel and some of these visits were related to teaching practice supervision.

In terms of objectives, tutors were supplied. The exemplar role, except as a product of individual tutor ability, remains elusive.

8. Evaluation Processes

Evaluation processes used by TCCU in carrying out the TEEA project included visits to the field by TCCU program officials, a survey by the Regional Operations Officer, field study by Dr. Jean Pierre Jordaan, an evaluative study by Dr. Jordaan and evaluative interviews by TEEA/EA personnel.

In addition, AID/EA, AID/W, TEEA/EA and TCCU must have utilized various evaluation processes to have identified the problems and opportunities leading to various contract revisions and amendments. So far as the evaluation team learned, no other evaluation efforts took place. It should be noted that evaluative comments appear in various annual AID reports and it is believed that much of the day to day correspondence between TCCU and TEEA/EA would be found to be evaluative in tone and content.

The Jordaan study focused on the tutor's professional responsibilities--goal orientations, goal maintenance, perceived impact on students and colleagues, identifiable accomplishments, etc., and involved fifty out of fifty-seven first and second year tutors active as of June, 1967. The responses showed a consistent estimate of appreciable success in the tutor's role. Generally, two-thirds to three-fourths of the respondents on most questions indicated a strong level of goal accomplishment.

No data are available to show how the program was modified, if at all, as a result of the Jordaan study. The critical point, of course, is that this study dealt with perceived success and that it is not based on measurable objectives.

Evaluation of the performance of the tutors is in a large measure the responsibility of the Principals of the Teacher Training College. Many references to positive evaluations appear in various reports. Each Ministry of Education reported satisfaction with the performance of the tutors. It is believed that this response was general in nature and that it reflects the fact that few tutors had presented problems significant enough to command Ministry attention. Quite certainly, it was not based on a systematic, objective evaluation of professional performance. It can also be argued, of course, that the quality of the tutors made a systematic evaluation unnecessary. Such a position would be countered by little available negative evidence. The wide-spread acceptance of the contributions of the tutors caused all persons with whom the Team talked to spotlight the success of the recruitment and selection process.

The study conducted by the TEEA staff (Regional Operations Officer) utilized a questionnaire made up largely of open-ended and factual data questions.

significant number of the questions were of evaluative import. On the whole, the response confirmed the configuration of capable professionals working in a limited environment with limited professional support and a troubled system of logistics.

The control point with respect to evaluation, however, is related to the presence or absence of an on-going, systematic, programmed and scheduled series of evaluative efforts based on specific criteria, defined and measurable sub-goals and comprehensive project goals.

So far as can be determined, the evaluation processes reached no such level of sophistication.

9. Phasing-Out

There is little doubt that the termination process needs additional attention. The following points of view, widely at variance one with another, have been expressed or appear in the reports:

- a) ICCU believes the tutor program might well continue and be phased into a tutor training program.
- b) AID/W accepts December, 1971 as the terminal date for tutors in the field.
- c) GOU/ME wants a minimum of thirty tutors a year for some years to come, believing it impossible to become self-sufficient in this respect before 1978.
- d) The United Republic of Tanzania believes that with the rapid adoption of Swahili as the medium of instruction in the primary schools and its imminent adoption in (Primary) Teacher Training Colleges, the period of

usefulness of the TEEA tutors may already have passed.

- e) One insightful African, in a private conversation, said in substance: "You measure the field too narrowly. If you stop short of the real goal--Africanization, you have really contributed nothing."

The exact contract termination date has been set. However, it is believed that it will be modified as much by the report of the group assigned to do a comprehensive study of "Teacher Education in East Africa" as it will by the findings noted in this report. While the TEEA project is classified as a regional project and while conditions at its inception may have justified this approach, it appears that the political-economic-social conditions in the participating countries have become increasingly differentiated. This recognition of existing conditions changes the context of education; thus, the project is modified. While the East African Community might have been an inspiration for the regionalization of the idea at the time of inception, it should be noted that the Community as reflected in its constitution, deals largely with matters having greater historical continuity with respect to cooperation than does teacher education.

From the point of view of the Evaluation Team, there are real reasons--largely based on the differences among the countries--to consider different terminal dates for each country. This decision must be related to any successor project which might be developed. For that reason, validating a decision regarding the terminal date is difficult at this time. The only reason for re-opening the

1971 terminal date question would be to improve the decision and to provide for differentiation among the nations involved or, perhaps, to relate the tutor program more effectively to a possible successor project. This is not to imply that there are no opportunities for regional activities; the current activities are not adjusted to regional realities.

One emerging commitment is that the USAID should support the development, including staff, of two Teachers Colleges in Uganda, seems to support the concept that training continuity should be maintained in that country. It does not necessarily follow that contract continuity is equally essential. Considerations and decision making on this point, however, are beyond the province of this evaluation team.

The Institutes of Education

A. Origin and Purposes of the Institutes

Basically an adaptation of a British form, the Institute has no direct American counterform. Essentially dealing with the problems of applied education, the Institutes cut across functions shared by several educational units in the States and, indeed, formalize within their structure that which the pragmatic American assumes to be a characteristic of almost every element of knowledge: applicability. Even the term used here, "applied education," might cause many Americans to ask: "What other kind is there?" There has been no need in the States to raise an institution to deal with the applied aspects of education. The efforts in this area are shared by many units of the education establishment and on a much less formally defined basis.

Within the British tradition, however, focusing as it does on formal learning, professional education emerged as a more or less formal study. Under this condition, another institutionalized unit had to be created to deal with applied matters. It is normal that the tradition of British education should influence the structure of education in East Africa. Over-burdened Ministries cannot undertake the tasks of in-service education, scholarly research and the development of syllabi. It is not appropriate to the structure and purposes of the universities or the capabilities of the Teachers Colleges to undertake such tasks. The schools have less direct responsibilities for curriculum development and in-service education than is common in the American system. Thus, the Institute emerged as the unit handling many of the research and application functions in education.

It is not unexpected that Americans might show less than perfect achievement in dealing with such a unit. Another problem affecting the performance of the Americans is the ultimate authority of the Ministry of Education in many educational matters. Working within or close to the governmental-political orbit usually is not a part of the experience of the American educator. This is especially true of the experience of the advanced scholar who often has a cultivated disdain for government and politics based, of course, on his determination to be academically free and his recognition of the difficulties in containing governmental power.

The functions of the Institutes in East Africa appear to be quite similar in nature: operational research, in-service education and curriculum development. This latter item, curriculum, includes instructional media. One of the Institutes may emerge as a degree granting unit. On a cooperative basis, Institute personnel now work with colleges of education in pre-service education.

B. The Institutes and TEEA

The TEEA personnel assigned to the Institutes (staff educators) represent various fields of specialization within education. Unfortunately, the Evaluation Team was able to interview only a few of these persons. Most of them had departed their posts. Never-the-less, based on the interviews held, it is clear that the success of the TEEA educator varies largely in terms of the effectiveness of the leadership of the Institute to which he is assigned. To be sure, many factors influence the level at which a Director of an Institute may be able to function at any given time, and many of these factors are not common to modern American experience.

The TEEA educator can be expected to function effectively unless blocked. He is of that quality. The problems faced by the staff educators are often external to the Institute. In some cases, however, movement is so slow that frustrations run high. Part of these limitations grow out of the inadequately defined status of the Institutes. Basically, the question revolves around their relationship to the Ministries and to the Universities. Apparently, Institute Directors would prefer to be associated with the College Department of Education of the University rather than with the Ministry. On the other hand, it appears that ultimate authority rests in the Ministry regardless of the day to day autonomy enjoyed by the Institutes. And, of course, authority, by definition, must be ultimate.

This problem has affected TEEA educators unevenly. For some it does not appear as a problem; for others, contributions are diminished in value.

C. Contributions by the TEEA Educators

Generally, the specialized goals of the specialized educators have been attainable. They have made major contributions in mathematics and science. Syllabi have been produced and effective in-service education programs are in process. Because of the close association of the TEEA educators with East Africa specialists, the practices and programs on which they are working have excellent prospects of becoming permanent. Ministry personnel indicated a heavy dependence upon the efforts of the specialists as did the principals of the Teachers Colleges.

D. Evaluation

Again, in the Institutes, as in the tutor program, there is little or no evidence of professionally acceptable evaluation efforts.

Liaison has been maintained and person to person communications have been easy because of the limited number of the TEEA staff educators.

While there is general consensus that the educators' efforts have been productive, when conditions permit, one might ask: what would be the effect of increasing the number of educators to a size equal to the tutor force? Would the uneven effectiveness noted in the smaller group be amplified? All persons appear to agree on the fact that Institute positions provide special opportunities for improving education. When asked how to maximize effectiveness while reducing the professional operations staff of five or ten persons, the TEEA Chief of Party gave an answer spotlighting the use of the educator in the Institute.

However, so far as systematic, professional evaluation is concerned the Team found no evidence of compliance with the Contract provision that TCCU would make periodic evaluations of the overall program.

Strengths of the Project Agreement
and the TCCU Contract

A. Project Agreement

The important merits of the Agreement as viewed by the Evaluation Team, are:

- 1) Objectives were designed to meet Sector and Mission needs calling for the development of a manpower training and upgrading program in the field of elementary and secondary education for the East African countries--Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda.
- 2) Project flexibility and scope permitted the development, implementation, review, refinement and continuing operation of pre-service and in-service programs, staffed by competent American personnel, required to fulfill the important professional and logistic functions and activities demanded by a long-term training and improvement program for elementary and secondary teachers.
- 3) Financing of the Agreement was adequate to carry-out a well-conceived, goal-oriented program in teacher education suited to the requirements of the East African countries.
- 4) AID/W's ability to interest a prestigious and potentially qualified institution of higher learning (TCCU) to undertake a long-term teacher education contract for East Africa.

B. TCCU Contract

The major strengths of the Contract as seen by the Evaluation Team, are:

- 1) Willingness of TCCU to accept a long-term AID contract in the field of teacher education and to assign top ranking

professors to design, implement and supervise its activities.

- 2) Ability of TCCU to capitalize on its reputation in teacher education to secure the cooperation of the three East African countries, namely, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda, to participate in a regional program to expand and improve the training of East African elementary and secondary teachers and teacher training tutors at the pre-service and in-service levels.
- 3) Ability of TCCU to obtain the United Kindom's approval and support of the overall TEEA project and to secure the interest and support of other Anglo nations in teacher education activities in the three East African countries.
- 4) Ability of TCCU to interest a relatively large number of American educators to serve as tutors and staff educators under the TEEA project.
- 5) Selection of competent candidates relative to their academic training, teaching experience and personal adaptability.
- 6) Willingness and flexibility of U.S. trained tutors and staff educators to accept teaching assignments, curricula and administrative responsibilities outside of the fields of specialization when such services were required to carry out and broaden the instructional programs of the institution to which they were assigned.
- 7) Ability of U.S. educational personnel to convince headmasters, national and other expatriate teachers of their ideas and means for expanding and upgrading the educational and extra-curricular programs of their respective institutions.

- 8) Ability of U.S. tutors, because of their superior academic qualifications, by and large, to those presented by national and expatriate teachers from other countries, to interest students and staff members in using instructional materials they were able to provide and procedures they were able to devise for broadening curricula beyond the strict limitations of accepted syllabi.
- 9) Ability of U.S. tutors to serve as "exemplars" in their colleges by demonstrating modern instructional principles, methods and procedures in the classroom work.
- 10) Ability of U.S. tutors to develop and implement in-service programs for elementary and secondary teachers that were specifically adapted to the up-grading of large numbers of East African teachers.
- 11) Contributions of the staff educators, through teaching and in-service programs, in the Institute Programs are considered especially effective in the areas of 1) curricula development, implementation, coordination and evaluation; 2) research; 3) upgrading in-service elementary teachers, and 4) selection and utilization of audio-visual and other instructional materials.
- 12) Adequate financing of the Contract provided by AID.

Weaknesses of the Project Agreement and
TCCU Contract

A. Project Agreement

The main deficiencies of the Agreement and related documentation, as observed by the Evaluation Team, are:

- 1) failure to spell-out in concise terms the nature and extent of the responsibilities for Contract operations that should be assumed by Regional and Country USAID Educational Advisors, and
- 2) failure to differentiate between contract activities which should be carried-out as bi-lateral functions and as regional functions.

In connection with the foregoing statements, a further word of explanation on "weaknesses" as they relate to the Project Agreement, and later documentation and the relationships they entail, might be helpful to AID/W's project managers.

Currently, there exists a considerable lack of agreement among TCCU tutors, staff educators and other contract field and campus personnel and representatives of Ministries of Education, as to the interpretation to be given to the Goals or Objectives as stated in Project Agreement No. 618-11-650-617. Much of the confusion appears to have arisen from AID/W's: a) restatement of goals or purposes in subsequent documentation, including the TCCU Contract, b) broader or less rigid interpretation of goals given in correspondence and in oral discussions, and c) non-insistence of TCCU's providing its contract staff with an adequate briefing on project objectives.

B. TCCU Contract

The deficiencies of the Contract, as observed by the Evaluators, seem to stem from the Contractor's failure to:

- 1) provide AID/Washington and the USAID's concerned with a comprehensive and acceptable work-plan until the project had been in operation for almost four years;
- 2) reduce the length and revise the curriculum, lectures and experiences of the orientation program in the light of the criticisms offered by the trainees and the USAID's field staff;
- 3) define the responsibilities and authority of the campus staff and field staff for the management of local and regional contract operations;
- 4) supply the headquarters field office with an adequate number of competently trained personnel able to provide the professional and logistic services required to support a program of wide spread and varied educational activities;
- 5) appoint Country Chairmen with designated authority and sufficient time to carry out their responsibilities;
- 6) establish bench marks for governing the progress and determining the achievements of the project;
- 7) recruit and select more qualified tutors for elementary rather than secondary positions since the majority of tutors were to be assigned to Elementary Teacher Training Colleges;
- 8) recognize that many tutors were over-qualified academically for their positions and that less well-trained and better

experienced elementary classroom teachers might have been able to work more effectively with East African teacher trainees;

- 9) supply overseas personnel, tutors and staff educators, with a firm contract or an acceptable "Letter of Agreement" which would clarify the official duties of overseas personnel, the computation of base salaries and total earnings, method of payment and tax deductions, shipment of household effects, customs clearances, payment of light bills and medical bills, household equipment provided, re-employment rights, relationships to TCCU and to the East African Ministries of Education to which they were to be attached, and other important responsibilities and privileges;
- 10) answer promptly the correspondence of tutors and staff educators addressed to the TCCU Coordinator or the Chief of Party;
- 11) arrange more frequent in-country meetings for the field staff to provide program direction and coordination and to improve and sustain staff morale;
- 12) arrange with the respective Ministries of Education, with the Chief of Party working with the USAID educational advisors, for the re-assignment of under-employed or in-appropriately employed tutors and staff educators;
- 13) reduce the time lag, now running from six months to eighteen months minimum, in supplying overseas personnel with their requested lists of instructional supplies;

- 14) secure AID/Washington's permission to purchase foreign publications and instructional equipment requested by tutors and staff educators when such materials are better suited to their instructional programs and can be purchased at a lower cost than similar items available in the U.S.;
- 15) limit the number of two-year contracts for tutors and staff-education since the time often is insufficient for the majority to make the adjustments required to develop effective working relationships with students, colleagues and administrators;
- 16) avoid delays in the payment of salaries and receipted bills, thus eliminating unwarranted hardships imposed on families that do not have the resources to finance their living costs for extended periods;
- 17) coordinate the medical and health care program, including evacuation, for contract personnel with that for USAID employees;
- 18) notify field staff members whose contracts are not to be renewed at least six months before their departure date of the action to be taken to avoid difficulties with their return travel and re-employment opportunities in the U.S.;
- 19) conduct a systematic evaluation study of contract activities until four years after operations began;
- 20) develop a broad gauge participant program to train a cadre of professional educators qualified to fill top level leadership positions in the Ministries, University Colleges

of Education, Institutes, Teacher Training Colleges, Research and Curriculum Laboratories, etc., in each of the three countries. The areas of specialization in which training should be sponsored include: administration, school legislation, school finance, supervision, curriculum development, statistics, child growth and development, educational research, etc.

Recommendations

After careful consideration of the problems confronting the TCCU Contract in East Africa, the Evaluation Team submits the following recommendations as a basis for improving and expanding the professional and logistic services that are to be provided under the terms of the Contract to December, 1971. Furthermore, the suggestions are offered in the belief and hope that if they are followed or adapted in some reasonable degree that the end results of the TEEA effort will be more productive and rewarding to all parties concerned.

- I. Clarify the objectives of the project to eliminate the confusion that now exists.
- II. Increase the size of the headquarters staff to permit its providing the administrative, professional and logistic support needed for more effective contract operations.
- III. Transfer the headquarters staff to Nairobi to allow closer working relationships with the East Africa Regional USAID staff if the responsibility for the overall project is to remain with the Regional Office.
- IV. Appoint a well-qualified Country Chairman in each of the three countries. Locate them for convenience of operation in the capital cities. Assign them appropriate liaison, professional and logistic duties which can be more effectively handled on a local than on a regional basis. Reduce regular work loads, if tutors or staff educators are used, to provide sufficient time to discharge assigned responsibilities promptly and effectively. Appropriate the funding needed to cover operating costs for travel and communications.

- V. Establish clear lines of administrative and operational responsibilities and authority for in-country and regional activities to be carried out by the Regional Education Advisor, Country Educational Advisors and Contract Chief of Party.
- VI. Establish a project planning and review committee with membership comprised of the Regional Education Advisor, Country Educational Advisors and the Contract Chief of Party. This body should meet at least quarterly to review Contract achievements, problems, planning and coordinating functions among the three nations. full report on the deliberations of each meeting should be submitted to each USAID and to AID/W.
- VII. Expand the Institute In-Service Training Program in a manner which will offer deeper and broader training in fields most essential to up-grading instructional and administrative activities and functions. It is suggested that the training programs: a) use the services of short-term consultants, American and African, in conjunction with those of available qualified on-the-job staff educators and tutors to direct and conduct the programs; b) be offered in a series of 1-3 sessions during succeeding vacation periods for depth of training in areas requiring such treatment; c) limit enrollments to 2-3 groups of 20-30 participants, limited, in general, to supervisors, tutors and administrators, at any session to achieve the benefits of small group instruction and the multiplier concept for maximizing effort and influence; d) rotate the services of consultants and support staff on a staggered schedule among the

three countries so that each can benefit from their services and relate them to national as well as regional needs;

e) conduct simultaneous programs in each of the countries but in different subject areas to maximize offerings and to avoid any criticism of favoritism, and c) appoint the Regional Advisor after consultation with the Committee suggested under item VI, to recruit and direct the programs.

- VIII. Determine, and then record in official documentation, TCCU's responsibilities for instructional support and liaison with tutors in the field, maintaining, of course, fidelity to principle of Ministerial autonomy.
- IX. Provide tutors with instructional support in the field on a regular basis utilizing a pattern similar to that of the modern educational supervisor. Require regular reports to AID/W on the operations.
- X. Define the relationship of TCCU to the tutors at each stage of employment in legally and professionally acceptable terms, and reduce to a contract which adequately reflects the equity of the tutor in the relationship.
- XI. Prepare a schedule of information and action on all matters of logistics, assign specific responsibility for follow through, and include, if possible, contract penalties to assure compliance.
- XII. Establish a general budget for instructional materials against which tutors can draw as justified, discontinuing the allotment practice.

- XIII. Establish an evaluation program covering all aspects of the project. The program should be scheduled, systematic, comprehensive, functional and professional. The reports should be made available to all parties, including the tutors and educators.
- XIV. Provide Contract personnel with the same medical and health care services and emergency evacuation privileges now accorded USAID employees.
- XV. Review the question of phasing-out the program to provide for differences now existing in the three countries.

Summary and Conclusion

The TEEA Project, a successor to the TEA Project, grew out of a Conference held at Mombasa in 1964. Utilizing two organizational units, a tutor supply program and three National Institutes of Education, the TEEA Project focused on the "exemplar" role of the tutors and the in-service education, curriculum, instructional materials development, educational research and coordination roles of the Institutes.

Operated under AID Contract AFR-420, as established, and amended, with Teachers College, Columbia University, the TEEA Project will supply 394 two-year Contract tutors by 1971, terminal date of the project, and 53 two-year Contract institute staff educators. The estimated cost of the project is \$8,661,676.23.

The Evaluation Team found the project design to be faulty in that it did not meet the fundamental AID criterion that projects shall be self-cancelling through the generation of replacement personnel and, further, that it was conceived in response to only a partial segment of recognizable educational needs of the East African countries.

Lines of authority and responsibility have not been adequately defined within AID, between the Contractor and the field party and between AID and the Contractor.

Apparently two thirds to three fourths of the tutors perceive of themselves as successful in their roles as supply teachers and "exemplars." Likewise, Ministries express satisfaction with the tutors. The recruitment and selection process is accepted as a strong program element.

Confusion exists over the objectives of the tutor program: How and in what ways is the Contractor responsible for supporting the "exemplar" role of the tutor? The Contractor's program reflects ambivalence at this point.

The contractual and professional rights of the tutors are largely unprotected under arrangements which do not reflect their equity. Since TOCU claims to have only an agency role, the Institution works with tutors under an Agreement which clearly does not protect the tutors' interests.

Liaison with the tutors ranges from satisfactory to poor. In two of the three countries, AID personnel appear to be making more visits to confer with tutors than the Contractor's field staff personnel. In part, this reflects a shortage of personnel in the field staff and the ambivalence regarding role and responsibility.

Annual conferences for tutors and the University of East Africa have fulfilled their objectives.

Institute programs vary greatly in terms of quality of leadership. In some there is little productive work; in one there is commendable progress.

Available information on evaluation activities by the Contractor indicates that this element falls short of Contract requirements.

The termination of the project is scheduled for 1971. Because of the increasingly differentiated situations in the three countries, this decision should be reviewed.

The prestige of the Contractor brought great possibilities to this project; however, there is evidence that successes have not been maximized and some obvious failures have been neglected. Granted, few institutions in the United States had the potential leadership on its faculty to mount a program of the magnitude of this project involving as it does international cooperation in teacher education on an unprecedented scale. However, in light of this fact, it is difficult to see how the Contractor could permit poor project design, ambiguities regarding objectives, administrative inefficiencies and unclear lines of responsibility to impair its efforts.

Projection (1)

The needs for assistance in teacher education continues to exist in East Africa. As the TEEA project is in its final stage of operation, consideration must be given to methods by which the investment in time, energy and money that it represents can be made more productive and secure.

The inputs represented in the Tutor and Institutes programs can be connected to future programming provided they are no longer allowed to function in isolation but are coordinated with other needs.

Accepting the principle that related needs must be considered through related program elements and noting that each set of relationships is dynamic rather than static, we find the following sets of conditions:

- I. Need for teachers → Need for tutors → Need for tutor-trainees
- II. Adequate supply of teachers, tutors and tutor trainees → Adequate planning → Adequate capacity for planning; adequate planning machinery
- III. Adequate leadership for teachers and tutors → Adequate training for leadership → Adequate planning and adequate institutions.

Line I --- The need for teachers reflects the need for tutors and in turn the need for tutors reflects the need for trainers for tutors.

Line II --- Tutors and tutor-trainers must be supplied in adequate numbers. This action requires planning capacity and structures.

Line III --- Well-trained tutors require educational leadership in their colleges. This recognition calls for unprecedented leadership training, which in turn spotlights the planning role as

(1) This sketch of a projection of needs and possible future programming is included for illustrative purposes.

the essential and often the missing ingredient in building the institutions within which this growth process takes place.

Based on this sketch of functional, interdependent needs one can extract the following points around which the needs cluster:

1. Leadership training, especially as related to planning, at the top-levels of education.
2. Adequate tutor supply at a quality level.
3. Leadership training for the leaders of tutors, namely, Principals of Teacher Training Colleges.

Adequacy in teacher training is dependent on supply and quality institutional leadership. Supply and quality of institutional leadership is dependent on the supply and quality of leadership at the national level and, in this instance, on the international level.

In line with this reasoning, future programming might well emphasize the following activities or units:

1. An East African Regional Planning Unit to be responsible for the planning and coordination required to assure supply and quality in teacher education.
2. Leadership training projects for two groups: a) national and international leaders, b) principals and supervisors of teachers colleges and c) needed specialists.
3. In-service programs for tutors should be provided on a continuing basis with opportunities to complete appropriate degrees and certificates.

To provide the talent input necessary to support these three programs, an institution or a consortium of institutions in the United States might well establish extension centers at the three Universities or Institutes. The programs offered should be combined with appropriate internships in the States, and culminate in Stateside degrees when undergraduate prerequisites can be met or certificates justified.

In any case, hard supply figures and contract performance figures should be established for each group. The total input levels should be recognized by all groups and goal-achievement expected.

Short of a bold program to develop a significant cadre of leaders at the several levels of planning and education, the problems of education in each country apparently will continue, despite other worthy inputs.

Partial List of Persons Interviewed by/or
Present in Discussion Groups

USAID/W

Dr. Ed Trethaway, Chief ESA/Afr/ID., AID/W

Mr. Marshall Fields, Asst. Chief ESA/Afr/ID., AID/W

Teachers College
Columbia University

Dr. R. Freeman Butts
Associate Dean for International Studies
first Director for Teachers for East Africa

Dr. Carl J. Manone
Chief of Party
Teacher Education in East Africa Project
1966 - present

Mr. Carl L. Graham
Director
Office of Overseas Projects

Mr. C. Scott Kelly
Campus Coordinator, TEEA
and Assistant Director, Office of Overseas Projects

Dr. Karl W. Bigelow
Director, Afro-Anglo-American Program in Teacher Education, 1960-69
Director, Center for Education in Africa, 1962-66

Dr. Robert J. Schaefer
Dean of Teachers College

Mr. Enoch Rukare
Chief Inspector, Teacher Education, Uganda Ministry of Education
Presently Afro-Anglo-American Fellow at Teachers College,
Columbia University

Dr. Albert Beninati
TEEA Educator, Mathematics Specialist
Institute of Education,
University College, Dar es Salaam, 1965-69

Dr. John H. Fischer
President of Teachers College

Prof. Arthur J. Lewis
Chairman, Department of Educational Administration
Formerly Chief of Party, Teachers for East Africa, 1963-64

Prof. Ralph R. Fields
Professor of Adult and Higher Education

Kenya

Mr. James Greene
Acting Director, E/ORA

Mr. Harold Snell
Director, USAID/Kenya

Mr. George Corinaldi
Education Officer, USAID/Kenya

Mr. Thomas McDonough
Education Officer, E/ORA

Mr. J. K. Njeroge
Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Education

Mr. Kyale Mwendu
Chief Education Officer, MINED

Mr. H. J. Kanina
Chief Inspector of Schools, MINED

Mr. A. H. Muraya
Teacher Training Officer, MINED

Mr. Joseph Lijembe
Secretary, Kenya Institute of Education

Individuals Interviewed at
Teacher Training Colleges
Kenya

Kenyatta College

Mr. and Mrs. Ray Bassett
Country Chief

Machakos Teacher Training College

Mr. King'ori
Principal

Mr. Daniel Kiminyo
Teacher

Mr. Robert Stokes
TCCU Tutor

Mrs. Helen Wollinford
TCCU Tutor

Highridge Teacher Training College

Miss Salome Molega David
Principal

Kenya Institute of Education

Mr. Barry Nogeli
TEEA Staff Educator

Mr. Roger Meyer
TEEA Staff Educator

Mr. Joseph Lijembe
Secretary

Mr. Jackson Kingali
Deputy Secretary

Uganda

TEEA

Mr. Joseph Durham
Administrative Associate

Mr. LeRoy Smith
Operations Officer

Mr. Edward Rubin
Instructional Materials Specialist

USAID

Mr. Mueller
Director, USAID/Uganda

Dr. Harold Adams
Education Officer, USAID/Uganda

Makerere University College

Principal Lulic

Mr. James Senabola
Deputy Secretary of the Faculty

TCCU

Dr. Edwin Schelske
Educator (Education)

Dr. John Cavanaugh
Educator (Science)

Dr. Leonard Feldman
Educator (Mathematics)

Ministry of Education

Mr. William Rwetsiba
Permanent Secretary

Mr. Philip Oayo
Senior Education Officer, Teacher Training

Mr. Ernest Sempebwa
Chief Education Officer

Mr. James Fryada
Chief Inspector of Schools

Teacher Training Colleges

Bishop Willis

Iganga Sancta Maria TTC
Nkonkonyeru (Sister Paulina)

United Republic of Tanzania

USAID/Tanzania

Mr. Charles J. Nelson
Director

Dr. Noel T. Myers
Chief Education Advisor

Dr. Willie A. Whitten
Education Advisor

Ministry of National Education

Mr. Augustine Mwingira
Principal Secretary

Mr. E. K. Mucna
Director, Teacher Education

Mr. Daniel Mhando
Asst. Teacher Education

Mr. J. D. Mganga
Director of National Education

Institute of Education

Mr. George Kibodya
Director

Dar es Salaam Teachers College

Mr. Sofania Tunginie
Principal

Mr. George Key
TEET Tutor

Mr. Jesse Mullins
TEET Tutor

(P73)

-6-

Mowapwa Teachers College

Mr. Peter J. Cole
TEEA Tutor

Marangu Teachers College

Mr. Henry J. Hector
TEEA Tutor

Mr. George D. McLeod
TEEA Tutor

Mr. John W. Schober
TEEA Tutor

Mr. James A. Hense
TEEA Tutor