

93206600154

CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PL-1) - PART I

Report Symbol U-44

1. PROJECT TITLE <b>Abstracted 118/84 LB</b> Population Field Information Services <b>93206600-2</b> <b>PD-AA6-437-B1</b>	2. PROJECT NUMBER 932-0660	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/POP/IE
	4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the issuing unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <b>FY 79</b>	
<input type="checkbox"/> REGULAR EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION		

5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES			6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING		7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION	
A. First PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>70</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>79</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>80</u>	A. Total	\$ <u>2,480,000</u>	From (month/yr.)	<u>10/76</u>
			B. U.S.	\$ <u>2,480,000</u>	To (month/yr.)	<u>4/79</u>
					Date of Evaluation Review	<u>5/30/79</u>

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

A. List decisions and/or unresolved issues cite those items needing further study. (NOTE: Mission decisions which anticipate AID/W or regional office action should specify type of document, e.g., program, SPAR, PIC, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>Future output from this project should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>—not be prototypical in character.</li> <li>—attempt to be more country-specific and probably produced for fewer countries than the current 60 or so.</li> <li>—be so designed as to encourage local LDC talents and take more advantage of indigenous media production facilities.</li> <li>—focus on assistance to village level workers; provide training for them in related fields (e.g., family welfare, MCH, nutrition) and in IEC program planning, based on their own research.</li> <li>—utilize more extensively audio cassettes, videotape, school curricula and social channels.</li> </ul> <p>1. Give more attention to "selling" Population Officers on the merits and potential of IEC media (including those being utilized in Social Marketing efforts). This to be accomplished in part by more visits to USAIDs.</p> <p>3. More systematic approach is needed in developing IEC country-specific strategies, overall program management and performance measuring mechanisms, and in materials distribution.</p>	Marschal Rothe	As future IEC programs strategies are designed and implemented.

9. INVENTORY OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVISED PER ABOVE DECISIONS			10. ALTERNATIVE DECISIONS ON FUTURE OF PROJECT	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project Paper *	<input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change	
<input type="checkbox"/> Financial Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/T		B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or in follow-on Project	<input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/C	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)	C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project	
<input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement	<input type="checkbox"/> PIC/P		This document approved 10/27/79	

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Name and Title)		12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval	
Marschal Rothe, Project Officer, DS/POP/IE Sixberry Waters, Jr., Ph.D., The George Washington Univ. *Project Paper for a succeeding similar project (No. 936-3004, Family Planning IEC Field Support, in preparation).		Signature <i>J. J. Speidel</i>	
		Typed Name J. J. Speidel	
		Date 10-23-79	

13. Summary

This activity began three years ago as an offshoot of the Rapid Diffusion of Population Research Findings Project (which had been started four years earlier as a scientific information service for family planning program leaders and medical professionals around the world). In 1976 the Office of Population perceived that it would be also useful to offer this kind of data at the popular level in multi-media form: i.e., films, slidesets, filmstrips, booklets, posters, charts, cassettes, etc. By the end of 1976 the Population Field Information Services had started producing such materials as Resource Sets under some 10 topical headings. Since then there have been numerous subject changes, according to the current priorities and needs of Missions and the AID/W geographic and functional divisions.

An in-house evaluation of the Project was stipulated, in the contract with The George Washington University (GWU), for November 1978 under the Project Officer's guidance. By that time, however, it was determined that an intensive/external evaluation should be made to gauge the advisability of letting the project run full-term (i.e., 9/30/79)\*. The American Public Health Association (APHA) was asked in December 1978 to enlist a team of expert consultants, but holiday and academic commitments prevented their actual recruitment and field site assignment until late February 1979.

Members of the team were: Dr. Robert Crawford, Associate Professor in Communication Arts, Cornell University; Dr. Gerald Hursh-Cesar, consultant (1975-1979) with A.I.D., University of California, U.S. Office of Education, National Institute of Education; and Dr. William F. Grady, College of Education, Temple University.

The team members individually visited at least two of these countries: Tunisia, Kenya, Indonesia, Thailand, Brazil, Peru, and Mexico, returning for an initial debriefing by DS/DAA/HRD (Dr. Stephen Joseph) on March 20. In addition to examining contractor performance and project accomplishments, the team at that time was enjoined to suggest in its report IEC strategies that A.I.D., and the Office of Population in particular, should formulate and adopt for the future. On May 30, the Team returned to AID/W for discussions with DS/POP officers and GWU Project Director (Mr. Douglas Larson), and for a further de-briefing by DS/DAA/HRD. At the latter meeting, those present beside the evaluators were: Dr. J. Joseph Speidel and Ms. Patricia Baldi, both of DS/POP/DIR; Marschal Rothe, DS/POP/IE, Project Officer; Robert Haladay, DS/POP/FPSD, the new American Public Health Association Project Officer; William Allie, DS/PO, and Mr. Larson.

\* later extended (in September 1979) to 12/31/79

In the latter discussions, team members focused on seven main issues which they felt must be addressed in planning future AID population IEC strategies:

- A problem of selectivity, e.g., whether AID should comparatively fund heavily IE programs in a few selected countries, or to make modest allocations to a larger number, perhaps around 60 or so (as were first targeted by PIP II for its prototypes distribution). A compromise between these extremes was considered feasible.
- A decision (or perhaps several) must be made on what audience or audiences must be targeted: whether the elite, family planning program workers, village level workers, or potential acceptors. The team leaned toward village level workers for most countries but acknowledged that in some countries the elite must be first approached "for a while".
- Local relevancy and specificity (cultural, religious, etc.) must be carefully considered in the IE design and approach for any developing countries. Production of prototype to serve "across the board" should be abandoned.
- Mobilization of local skills and resources must be undertaken in any such family planning IEC effort. In most LDCs there are talents largely untapped and facilities (commercial and otherwise) that have not been sufficiently recognized and utilized for population IEC campaigns. These must be identified and factored into any successful program strategy.
- AID population staff must give more attention to working with colleagues in other elements of the Agency where there are valuable data, experience, and know-how in the very kinds of situations and problem solving that face IE strategists.
- Some sort of determination must be made early on with regard to media production priorities: how much emphasis to put upon which media -- perhaps at the very critical time when the needs for materials are still being assessed, and outputs and approaches are still being studied or designed. Nonetheless, the overall IEC approach should be multi-media in scope.
- One of the greatest difficulties will be evaluating the "bottom line" -- changes of attitude among reproducing couples. The problem will not be so much in determining what their beliefs and practice were and are, or in how much they have changed, but rather in what made them change -- what element of what message or medium. Much study still is needed in this kind of communication research.

\*14. Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation was conducted in a six-week period, February 21 through April 6, 1979, with three consultants (names listed above) comprising the team, under the auspices of the American Public Health Association (APHA). The consultants were experienced in communication and evaluation. Marschal Rothe of DS/POP/IE represented AID/Washington, and Ms. Suzanne Olds, Technical Assistance Director at APHA, represented that organization.

a. Work Plan

The team found it necessary to reconcile varying statements of its task in the Project Evaluation Summary (PES) which the team was asked to follow in its summary and in the "General Task of the Evaluators" which outlined the specific questions of this evaluation.

In order to consolidate the requirements of both of the above documents, the team drafted on February 26 a first Plan of Work that described different levels of objectives (goal-purpose-output-input), their indicators, sources of data, and limitations of findings. The principal use of this paper was to ensure agreements within the team as to the limitations of its evaluation. Specifically, it was decided that it was necessary to get AID and APHA acknowledgements that the study of PIP-II in-country programming effectiveness as well as achieved effects on different audiences was beyond the capability of this evaluation.

On March 1, a second Plan of Work was produced by the team and discussed with Mr. Rothe and Ms. Olds. It was agreed that the study of project effects and effectiveness was outside the purview of the evaluation.

This paper listed indicators to be studied in the field as related to three questions about (a) project management, (b) product delivery, and (c) circumstantial project impact.

The paper guided the team's in-country activities and became the basis by which the team agreed on the content and format of its final report.

b. Country Selections

Using criteria provided by Mr. Rothe, countries\* to which PIP-II materials have been sent were scored on a three-step scale. At one end of the scale were countries judged to be "good" in terms of IEC activities. The criteria for rating the quality of country programming were varied, e.g., the country Family Planning IEC program was considered to be strong; the USAID population officer was experienced and actively supportive of IEC efforts; sufficient quantities of PIP-II materials have been sent to the

\* 66 initially targeted

country and sufficient time has elapsed for their adaptation and use; the political climate of the country was considered stable and the relationships between the Government and USAID family planning activities sufficiently clear as to permit meaningful study.

Altogether, about one-fourth (15) of the countries were judged to be in the "good" category. About one-half (33) were judged to be "poor"--either on the basis of lack of responsiveness to the project or lack of AID involvement in family planning/IE activities--and, consequently, lack of contact with this project. The remaining one-fourth of the countries were classified at "intermediate".

It was decided for the team's field visit to select countries that would represent each of the three types and to visit countries in regional groups: Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Each consultant would visit at least two countries in each region. Those chosen are shown below, each ranked (1-good, 2-intermediate, 3-poor) according to the DS/POP criteria used to distinguish them.

Latin America: Dr. Grady

- (1) Mexico - March 14-18
- (2) Peru - March 13-14
- (3) Brazil - March 6-12

Africa: Dr. Crawford

- (1) Tunisia - March 3-8
- (2) Kenya - March 9-15
- (3) Ghana (not visited, border closed)

Asia: Dr. Gérald Hursh-Cesar, Consultant

- (1) Indonesia - March 4-10
- (2) Nepal (not visited, Thailand (rank 1) substituted)  
March 12-13

c. Interviews and Consultations

In the Washington area, the team met with 13 AID/W officers and one former Population Officer. The team consulted twice with GWU staff, once in a two-hour meeting prior to departure on their field trips, and again March 20 (two team members attending) at GWU project headquarters.

Overseas, some 65 persons were contacted in the seven countries visited.

d. Access to Project Documents

The evaluation team was provided original or copies of documents pertinent to the project insofar as possible. A large number of files were sequestered last year by several investigative offices, however, and were not available.

• 15. Contractor Performance in Terms of Inputs and Outputs

(Introductory Note: There was and is disagreement between the evaluators, the Project Officer, and the Project Director over certain findings in the evaluation report. These were discussed at length on May 30, 1979, after the Project Officer and Project Director submitted memoranda refuting and attempting to clarify several points in the draft report, as submitted. The final report now reads that "various earlier statements that the evaluation was unfair or inaccurate were withdrawn at that meeting". It adds that the meeting "did not, however, resolve major differences among the participants...on three issues: (1) respondents' perceptions of the project, (2) the use of project management plan, and (3) the criteria for measuring contractor performance.

The Project Officer who drafted this Project Evaluation Summary (PES) believes that nothing is to be gained by prolonging this dissension. He has confined the remaining PES narrative to salient points raised by the evaluation team.)

\* \* \*

Evaluators found the contractor's performance deficient with regard to the project's three basic outputs: Population Information Campaign Resource Sets; establishment of ad hoc Field Services Teams; and field action topics coverage in national and international media.

Components of the Resource Sets were said to be too heavily weighted toward 16mm films. Use of the sets was not "functionally understood" in the field. Materials were said to be focused more on elite audiences than on village level audiences.

Development of ad hoc Field Services Teams did not materialize as planned, the report states, because the Contractor was occupied with other project activities and because the prototype materials failed to generate country requests.

Only in Mexico, the team felt, had the contract objective of adapting and processing materials for mass media use been met. Here, it was noted, one film ("Mexico: Year 2000") was prepared in 35mm format for commercial motion picture house showing. The team added that "in general, high levels of competence, expertise, and creativity on the part of the GWU staff are found in designing, developing, and producing 16mm motion picture films. However, while the 16mm motion picture films are of high professional quality, other media materials are not as well conceptualized, designed, or produced".

After the first year of the project, when a few of the more active and interested field population officers became familiar with its capabilities, priorities for materials production changed, necessitating frequent work plan revisions. These affected the selection of subjects, content sub-topics, media, quantities, and the appropriate cultural treatment to be given illustrations, language texts, etc. The evaluating team did not fully understand--and the Project Officer failed adequately to explain--how this mechanism was utilized repeatedly to guide the contractor and more definitively spell out his responsibilities. The evaluation faults the contractor for having no overall, comprehensive management plan on paper. The report in the section entitled "Summary of Performance", concedes, however, that contractor performance was "affected adversely by changes in contract objectives, budgets, and authorizations".

16. Validity of Assumptions

Important Assumptions

(As listed in the Non-Capital Project Paper/PROP approved 5/5/76)

Assumptions for Achieving Goal Targets:

Improved health and well being are benefitted by lowered fertility and reduced population growth rates.

Family Planning acceptance can be promoted through information and education programs.

Assumptions for Achieving Purpose:

The sets and other information can be easily understood and rapidly communicated.

Evaluation Findings

(As listed in Executive Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations of 6/7/79 Team Report)

Not discussed

"This evaluation measures only contract performance...the contract has been active only two years. This is an insufficient time for project results to show up as durable effects on individuals and institutions in developing countries."

"There is debate over the value of the resource set concept. But there is no project documentation that indicates that GWU was relieved of the contracted requirement to produce multi-media campaign sets."

No evidence found by team in countries visited that resource sets were known, used, or functionally understood.

The (project) strategy depends on the network of population officers, but little was done to enlist their active and coordinated support.

In general, the in-country family planning officials interviewed were aware of GWU film making activities but were unaware of other specific materials or services under the contract.

There are a large number of IE projects, or projects with an IE component, functioning in the priority LDCs which need and will readily make use of the information prepared and processed by this project.

Assumptions for Achieving Outputs:

Large quantities of relevant scientific and experience based information are available.

Such information can be presented in a variety of interesting, effective ways that can be adapted and effectively used in many LDCs.

A contractor/grantee in the Washington area has or can assemble talents necessary to carry out this action.

"Materials were judged (by the LDCs) to be superfluous to priority problems, populations, and communications systems...GWU team members gave evidence that they consult, digest, and use existing technical information for film and other media treatments. The use of materials arises with the situation; however, there is no on-going literature search and review in support of a continuing information strategy...Films and slide presentations were being used in several countries, but in no instance was there visible evidence that print, radio, or slide, or film materials issued as parts of the resource sets had been adapted within the country..."

Program management was in the hands of a small, four-person staff of expert film makers. The contract called for an expanded staff which presumably would have included specialists in other media and in non-formal education.

Assumptions for Providing Inputs:

Sufficient funds will be available.

No discussion in report.

PHA/POP will have sufficient professional manpower to monitor and collaborate.

No attempt was made to "sell" population officers on use of the materials.

Contractor/grantee will have or hire necessary skills including field knowledge for major regions.

The GWU team did not make adequate use of consultants or in-country specialists.

17. External Factors

After this project got underway (Oct. 1, 1976) a number of unforeseen external factors came into play in various countries where the project's materials or services were originally targeted. These changes altered considerably--for better or worse--the climates of acceptability, the settings into which the program outputs were to be introduced, and their utilization, at least up to the time of this evaluation.

Brazil:

The team report acknowledges that the stationing of an AID Population Officer in Brasilia in January 1979 (two months before Dr. Grady went there as a team member and 28 months after the project started) was a factor making "the future of family planning IE&C programs in Brazil an optimistic one". The report observes that the Population Officer (Samuel Taylor) established channels of communication with the major family planning agencies in the country, sent some of project materials to BEMFAM, the principal local organization, and informed others of their availability. Reactions to these items were mixed, Dr. Grady reported, ranging from "very good to not so good".

Mexico:

An almost un hoped for decision by the leadership of the Mexican Government family planning program opened new vistas for the project's assistance in 1978 and 1979. Its teams and outputs quickly became welcome-- and used.

Dr. Grady found in his evaluation visit that the Population Officer (Mr. Thomas Donnelly) had received project materials and distributed them to the appropriate IEC officials of the Coordinacion Planificacion Familiar which had such a demand for them that little or no sharing with other agencies could be undertaken at that time (mid-March 1979). "Primary use has been 16mm film", Dr. Grady reported. The head of the Mexican Maternal and Child Health Organization, Dr. Sergio Correu Azcona, told Dr. Grady he was aware of the various films produced by the project and found them to be very desirable although he had no supplies of them at the time. He added that they appeared to be used to their maximum capacity, meanwhile, by the Coordinacion organization.

Egypt:

Due in no small measure to the urging and support of the AID Mission in Cairo, and the World Bank, the Egyptian Government in 1977 and 1978 commenced a fresh effort to carry family planning information to the people. In several meetings in Washington and Cairo with high level Egyptian officials (the latter headed by the Minister of State for Information and Culture and director of the State Information Service), the GWU project was asked to provide help in program design and to develop IEC materials, leading off with a film on population problems facing Egypt between now and the turn of the century.

Shortly afterward, a Project Agreement was signed between USAID/Cairo and the Information and Culture Ministry to fund these and other IEC activities bilaterally. USAID/Cairo asked specific project help for a new motion picture undertaking, and a writer and producer were dispatched to start work in Egypt, only to find the Ministry dissolved and the population IEC plans of the State Information Service and the AID Mission in disarray.

The evaluation report states, "it was decided (for our team) not to visit Egypt because of the feeling of AID/Washington staff that the suddenness and magnitude of USAID involvement there created a situation in which study of IEC activities was not likely to be productive". The project lost considerable momentum and time in the "Egypt initiative", which is now to be assisted through another contract awarded to a University of Chicago group in September 1979.)

Indonesia:

In 1978 the project was asked by the Population Officer in Jakarta and by the then head of IEC activities in the national family planning program (BKKBN) to develop a series of short silent color films on family health which would contain a sub-message on family planning that could be widely used in Indonesian villages. These were requested in Super-8mm form so they could be shown in the "Montron" hand-held viewer which uses a natural light source, is durable and inexpensive. Development of these films was taken up by the GWU project as a priority response to a strong mission request. Most other materials from the project, as the evaluator (Dr. Hursh-Cesar) points out, were not being used, copied, or adapted. But, as for the Super-8mm films, he notes further that "optimism is very high for the utility of the medium". While GWU was to make and fund pre-print materials, the viewers and cartridges were to be bought through Mission funds. Realization of this innovative sub-project has been slowed in 1979, however, by technical mishaps at the manufacturer's labs; by the BKKBN's desire to make new film changes; by delays in pre-testing arrangements in Indonesia; and by the assignment to the Mission of new population officers who appear to give the experiment less priority than their predecessor.

## 18. Lessons Learned

The following points stand out in the team evaluation and in the reported experiences of both project management and the AID project monitorship. They have provided guidelines in the past six months for operation of the Field Information Services, and they should serve as caveats when any similar new project is designed:

- Prototype efforts are probably far less effective in most instances than country-specific materials. In this project the mid-contract course change was late-- and not well documented.
- The project should have made more use of LDC design and production capabilities, and have pressed for more frequent adaptation.
- The network of population officers should have been brought more closely into the picture, with better notification and explanation of what materials were going to their posts, and how they could be best used or adapted for use.
- Distribution from Washington was faulty, and provision for meaningful feedback on in-country use, reproduction, etc. was insufficient.
- AID/W too often changed its instructions on materials content and production priorities.
- AID/W was responsible for authorization delays, budget cuts, and short-term funding in some instances, with resulting detriment to the project's progress.
- The ad hoc Field Services Team mechanism was insufficiently pressed by either the contractor or AID/W, was never understood or relied on by the Missions, and was essentially ineffective as far as the purposes for which it was designed.
- The project suffered from a lack of agreed upon, objective measures of contractor performance, to the end that the contractor felt his responsibilities were being discharged primarily through material outputs, whereas AID was defining its objectives in terms of audience effects, to be achieved largely through prototypical items.

On this last point there appears to be no clearcut final assessment, for, as the evaluation report states (in the Executive Summary, page 1):

"It was recognized, however, that the limited time and resources with which the evaluation was conducted precluded answering questions about the effectiveness of materials in

reaching in-country audiences and producing changes in information, attitudes and behavior."

19. An Appreciation

While the differences in view between the evaluators, the contract staff, and the AID monitor have been considerable, the monitor would like to call attention to the body of information on IEC activities in the several countries visited by the team members. This is valuable data and it has provided the Information/Education Division a number of interesting insights that might otherwise have gone unnoticed.