

PD-AAB-473-E1

RS/PS
REPORT U-446
5960012-14

PAGE 1

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

A.I.D.
Reference Center
Room 1656 HQ

1. PROJECT NO. 596-11-660-012.1	2. PAR FOR PERIOD: Aug. 1, 1965 ^{TO} Apr. 1971	3. COUNTRY ROCAP	4. PAR SERIAL NO. 5p
------------------------------------	--	---------------------	-------------------------

CSUCA Regional Institutions: Sanitary Engineering

6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY '65 Ends FY '71	7. DATE LATEST PROP Dec. 28, 1970	8. DATE LATEST PIP May 22, 1969	9. DATE PRIOR PAR
10. U.S. FUNDING	a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 427,870	b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ 40,000	c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$

11. KEY ACTION AGENTS (Contractor, Participating Agency or Voluntary Agency)

a. NAME	b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.
The University of North Carolina	Contract AID/1a-305

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

A. ACTION (X)			B. LIST OF ACTIONS	C. PROPOSED ACTION COMPLETION DATE
USAID	AID/W	HOST		
X		X	1) Determine major problems confronting <u>re-search</u> projects and prepare plan of action.	May 1971
X		X	2) Analyze the effect of <u>part-time teaching</u> staff on quality of overall graduate level education.	June 1971
X		X	3) Prepare plan for improvement in follow-up of student graduates for placement data and curriculum improvements.	June 1971
X		X	4) Review North Carolina proposal of 3/5/71 requesting additional funding in the light of scheduled FY 1971 contract phase-out.	Sept. 1971
X		X	5) Review goal and means of verification.	June 1971
X		X	6) Review with contractor, CSUCA and San Carlos U. the prospects for future financial viability, post-ROCAP inputs, particularly in view of deficiency of financial support from Central American organizations.	June 1971
X		X	7) Review and clarify interpretation of "regionalism" with CSUCA and San Carlos U. in terms of financial support and staffing.	June 1971

D. RE-PLANNING REQUIRES

REVISED OR NEW: PROP PIP PRO AG PIO/T PIO/C PIO/P

E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW: April 26, 1971

PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
J. Glenn Coombs, C/HRD *JGC 4/26/71*

MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE
Oliver L. Sause, Director *OLS*

AID 1020-25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO. 596-11-660-012-1	PAR FOR PERIOD: 1965 Aug. to April 1971	COUNTRY ROCAP	PAR SERIAL NO.
---------------------	---------------------------------	---	------------------	----------------

II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS

A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT CONTRACTOR, PARTICIPATING AGENCY OR VOLUNTARY AGENCY	B. PERFORMANCE AGAINST PLAN							C. IMPORTANCE FOR ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE (X)					
	UNSATISFACTORY		SATISFACTORY			OUT-STANDING		LOW			MEDIUM		HIGH
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	
1. University of North Carolina					X								X
2.													
3.													

Comment on key factors determining rating: There was no experience within the Faculty of Engineering at San Carlos University in operating a graduate program, hence great importance was placed on the role of contract advisors. The Contractor's performance has been strong in the areas of direct assistance; i.e., with curriculum, research, consultants, administration. It has been relatively weak in motivating the staff.

The contractor was very responsible to requests from the regional institutions and continually evaluated progress in terms of the long-term plan developed for this project.

4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING			X										X	
-------------------------	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Comment on key factors determining rating: Although many staff members have graduate degrees, most were received several years ago, therefore up-dating through advanced training was considered necessary. While the staff has attended 9 short-term training courses, only one member has studies for the PhD degree. A major limitation in providing training, particularly studies of a long-term nature, is the fact that a large number of the staff are part-time employees.

5. COMMODITIES					X						X			
----------------	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--	--

Comment on key factors determining rating: The importance of supplies and equipment is related to their impact on research and teaching. While these programs are of high importance, commodities do not play a major role in their success. Essentially all the commodity needs of the project have been met on schedule.

6. COOPERATING COUNTRY	a. PERSONNEL				X								X		
	b. OTHER														

Comment on key factors determining rating

While the personnel of the school have a relatively high level of academic preparation, many lack the desired level of professional orientation. The fact that most employees are part-time is the single most serious problem. Furthermore, all staff members are from Guatemala which is undesirable for a regional program. Other inputs, i.e., physical plant, budget support, on the part of San Carlos University and the Government of Guatemala have been quite satisfactory, while financial contributions through CSUCA have been deficient.

7. OTHER DONORS				X									X	
-----------------	--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

AID 1020-25(10 70)	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD: Aug.	COUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 3 PAR	596-11-660-012.1	1965 to Apr. 1971	ROCAP	

II. 7. Continued: Comment on key factors determining rating of Other Donors

The School is dependent on PAHO for scholarship support for students which amounts to \$63,000 per year. PAHO assistance has been well received and apparently will continue. As noted below, the financial contribution of CA/P regional agencies is only about 1% of the total. Starting in 1971, the Swiss Government grant of \$160,000 over a 3-year period will become available to the School.

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS		TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount)					
		CUMU- LATIVE PRIOR FY	CURRENT FY		FY 72	FY --	END OF PROJECT
			TO DATE	TO END			
Regional School Alumni* and graduates (*still have thesis requirement to complete for B.S. degree)	PLANNED	60	0	13	0		73
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	70	13				
	REPLANNED			-	-		83
Technical Papers and Reports Published	PLANNED	25	2	3	0		28
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	18	0				
	REPLANNED			3	-		21
Short Courses and Seminars	PLANNED	15	0	3	0		18
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	16	0				
	REPLANNED			3	-		19
Consultation and As- sistance Trips in CA/P Region	PLANNED	10	1	1	0		11
	ACTUAL PERFORM- ANCE	5	0				
	REPLANNED			0	0		5
B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS	COMMENT: 5 research projects are in progress. 14 consultants have assisted these projects. Overall progress has been less than planned in terms of both quality and quantity. Review of projects suggested.						
1. Research	COMMENT: The curriculum is well developed with 5 courses in the 1st semester and 7 in the 2nd. The students have practical internship between semesters. Improvements are continually being made in curriculum.						
2. Curriculum	COMMENT:						
3.							

AID 1020-25 (10-70) PAGE 4 PAR	PROJECT NO. 596-11-660-012.1	PAR FOR PERIOD: Aug. 1965 to Apr. 1971	CCOUNTRY ROCAP	PAR SERIAL NO.
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------	---	-------------------	----------------

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP? YES NO

To develop a permanent, accredited regional graduate program in Sanitary Engineering at San Carlos University.

B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.	2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.
<p>End of project status: September 1971</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) School of Sanitary Engineering graduating minimum of 10 engrs/yr. 2) Recognition of "accreditation" by other sanitary engineering societies or organizations, institutions. 3) CSUCA Committee (Comité Consultivo) meeting yearly with full CA/P representation. 4) CSUCA, EPIS, San Carlos replace ROCAP financial inputs. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Average of 10 graduates a year over past 5 years. 2) The school is well-recognized. It is regularly used by WHO, PAHO, others as a resource for sanitary engineering skills. 3) 5 meetings in past 5 years. 4) Questionable whether school can exist at present level without external financial support. 1970 contract with Swiss provides \$160,000 for 3 years. Support from CA/P agencies needs improvement.

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

CSUCA (Consejo Superior Universitario Centroamericano) implements its Regional Integration plan for higher education.

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.

A strong regional graduate school in Sanitary Engineering contributes directly to the CSUCA integration plan for developing regional institutions and acts as a pilot in the development of other regional institutions proposed in the CSUCA plan. In addition, success in achieving the purpose of this project supports CSUCA's assumption that regional institutions have a role in the development of human resources in Central America.

AID 1020-25 (10-70)	PROJECT NO.	PAR FOR PERIOD:	CCOUNTRY	PAR SERIAL NO.
PAGE 4 PAR	596-11-660-012.1	Aug. 1965 to Apr. 1971	ROCAP	

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged.

2. Same as in PROP? YES NO

<p>B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.</p> <p>5) Regular production of research and technical papers.</p> <p>6) School functioning w/o outside TA.</p> <p>7) Sanitary Engineering curriculum compatible with basic undergraduate level studies in CA universities.</p> <p>8) Professors annually participating in professional meetings.</p>	<p>2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.</p> <p>5) 18 technical papers produced in 5 years.</p> <p>6) Use of technical consultants is steadily declining. Noticeable improvements have been made on the part of the faculty in their ability to upgrade curriculum, engage in research and to provide adequate administration.</p> <p>7) Applicants from representative CA universities have been admitted with no deficiencies in basic educational preparation noted.</p> <p>8) Average of 3 ERIS professors attend meeting each year.</p>
--	---

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal

B. Will the achievement of the project purpose make a significant contribution to the programming goal, given the magnitude of the national problem? Cite evidence.