

9320627-②
PD-AAS-660-B1

9320627001501
attached 9320627001701

Unclassified
CLASSIFICATION

PROJECT EVALUATION SUMMARY (PES) - PART I

Report Symbol U-447

1. PROJECT TITLE Training of Family Planning Managers Contractor: Centre for Population Activities (CEFPA)		2. PROJECT NUMBER 932-0627	3. MISSION/AID/W OFFICE DS/POP/TI
5. KEY PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION DATES		4. EVALUATION NUMBER (Enter the number maintained by the reporting unit e.g., Country or AID/W Administrative Code, Fiscal Year, Serial No. beginning with No. 1 each FY) <u>81-12</u> <u>12/17/80</u>	
A. Final PRO-AG or Equivalent FY <u>77</u>	B. Final Obligation Expected FY <u>80</u>	C. Final Input Delivery FY <u>81</u>	6. ESTIMATED PROJECT FUNDING A. Total \$ _____ B. U.S. * \$ <u>1,247,865</u>
7. PERIOD COVERED BY EVALUATION From (month/yr.) <u>9/77</u> To (month/yr.) <u>4/80</u> Date of Evaluation Review <u>5/14/80</u>		1. REGULAR EVALUATION <input type="checkbox"/> SPECIAL EVALUATION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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., airgram, SPAR, PIC, which will present detailed request.)	B. NAME OF OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR ACTION	C. DATE ACTION TO BE COMPLETED
<p>Although this project was implemented substantially as planned, the evaluation showed that there was not a concomitant achievement of objectives and benefits. Therefore, instead of extending the project and contract for two years as contemplated in the PP, both will terminate at December 31, 1980. A new PP will be designed for funding in FY 1981 which will take the evaluation findings into account and call for competitive bidding of the implementation contract.</p> <p>* Obligation dates and figures are for the present project design and contract only. Figures subject to change upon approval of redesigned PP.</p>	B. Kennedy DS/POP/TI	Aug. 1981

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"/> Financial Plan <input type="checkbox"/> Logical Framework <input type="checkbox"/> Project Agreement <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation Plan e.g., CPI Network <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	A. <input type="checkbox"/> Continue Project Without Change B. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change Project Design and/or <input type="checkbox"/> Change Implementation Plan C. <input type="checkbox"/> Discontinue Project

11. PROJECT OFFICER AND HOST COUNTRY OR OTHER RANKING PARTICIPANTS AS APPROPRIATE (Names and Titles)	12. Mission/AID/W Office Director Approval
Barbara Kennedy DS/POP/TI	Signature <i>J. Speidel</i> Typed Name J. Joseph Speidel, DS/POP Date 12/17/80

13. Summary

This three-year project was initiated in 1977 under Contract AID/pha-C-1187 with the Centre for Population Activities (CEFPA) to train family planning (FP) managers/instructors and to provide technical assistance on training and management to selected institutions in LDCs. The three types of CEFPA training programs include: (1) U.S. Based Leadership Training Program (LTP); (2) Basic Management Training Program (BMTP), which is conducted in-country or regionally; and (3) Training of Trainers (TOT), which CEFPA uses to institutionalize the management and supervision training function in LDCs. In March 1980, or in the middle of Program Year 3 of the contract an intensive outside evaluation was conducted to determine contract performance to date, the validity of project activities and to make recommendation for future program action in the area of FP management training.

The evaluation team spent time in AID/W, at CEFPA headquarters and conducted field site visits in Mauritius and Nepal. Approximately 25% of the entire number that had received direct training under the contract were interviewed, as well as trainee supervisors, supervisees and other persons in sponsoring agencies.

The findings of the evaluation reported that the contractor met all contractual obligations and that their flexibility and organizational strength contributed to a good performance record. The continuing need to train family planning managers from less developed countries (LDCs) in specific management and skills which would impact upon improved program performance was clearly documented. But at the same time the evaluation report highlighted a number of problems associated with the present contractors training design, selection of participants and evaluation and follow-up procedures.

In light of the findings of the evaluation and of a site visit made by the Project Monitor to a CEFPA Regional Training Program in Mauritius, it was decided that there was not sufficient justification to warrant extending the present contract by two years. Instead, a new project to support the training of family planning managers will be developed in FY 1981 which will incorporate the findings and recommendations of the evaluation report.

14. Evaluation Methodology

The purposes of the evaluation were to evaluate the impact of CEFPA training and assess the impact of that training as a basis for future A.I.D. funding decisions.

As originally proposed in the project paper, the three member evaluation team made field site visits to Mauritius and Nepal as well as interviewing some participants and staff of three sponsoring agencies in Nairobi, Kenya. The team also had discussions and debriefings with A.I.D. and CEFPA staff in Washington, DC.

The following resources were used, based on the Evaluation Plan:

- AID/W and CEFPA staff and documents
- USAID staff and documents
- interviews with training program participants and supervisors
- performance observations
- records of participants' agencies

In-country documents were considered essential (organizational charts, annual reports, workplans, etc., were received and reviewed). Approximately 25% of the total trainee population was interviewed.

Data collection was based on three different interview methods. Each day's interview data was coded to the relevant framework question and team members debriefed each other on their findings.

15. External Factors

In Mauritius, it was found that the counterpart agency, Mauritius Family Planning Association (MFPA), was having problems recruiting FP candidates for training. In Nepal, leaders of the CEFPA counterpart agency, FP-MCH, were reportedly at odds with the ICHP (another MOH program) over major program and personal issues. ICHP is officially charged with absorbing FP-MCH activities and personnel and this made contract work in Nepal difficult at times. BMTF participants in Mauritius and Nepal have stated that it is difficult to apply their CEFPA training because of bureaucratic procedures of their organization and short training time (usually ten days).

16. Inputs

No problems have been identified that indicate a need to change the mix or type of inputs to produce desired outputs.

17. Outputs

For future project design, outputs need to be clearly defined as well as to permit easy measurement. It was difficult to assess the impact or institutionalization of training as it was never clearly defined.

The project outputs of the current contract included:

- three U.S. based leadership workshops
- twelve in-country workshops
- providing technical assistance to in-country management workshops

Development of training materials (guidebooks, training exercises, A-V materials) were also included.

18. Purpose

The purpose, as stated in the project paper, was:

To improve the effectiveness of executives, managers, and supervisors of LDC family planning programs by transferring the capability for conducting management and supervisory training to selected priority LDCs and providing technical assistance to selected key family planning agencies to assist in the institutionalization of providing management and supervisory training on a continuing basis.

CEFPA has followed closely the workplan specified in the 1977 contract. Start-up time was short and it has had relatively easy access to the countries on which the contract focused.

CEFPA has trained 255 persons in 2½ years of a planned three-year program. It has met an EOPS condition which stated that 90 FP managers/supervisors will have completed leadership training in the U.S. and 240 managers/supervisors from cooperating family planning agencies will have been trained in-country or at regional workshops.

Other EOPS conditions stated the following:

— That performance of trainees who have been taught family planning management/supervisory skills should improve - since there was no pre- or post-testing by CEFPA it was impossible to judge whether this condition had been met.

— LDC FP training centers would utilize Grantee's methodology and technical assistance materials following withdrawal of project support - institutionalization will not occur in Nepal because FP-MCH top staff didn't understand CEFPA's function; lack of formal agreement with FP-MCH; instability of counterpart team membership; poor relationship between staffs of FP-MCH and ICHP. However, in Mauritius the MFPA was receptive to CEFPA. Two regional programs were delivered to Zambia ("spin-offs"). Problems arose with duplication of training (e.g., UNFPA) and lack of key personnel support.

— In-country management/supervisory training would be conducted on a continuing basis in three-five countries at the end of five years - CEFPA training in Mauritius and Nepal expanded into two in-country workshops in Zambia, and a proposed Swaziland workshop.

19. Goal/Subgoal

The goal, as stated, is "...to improve the management of family planning programs."

The evaluation found that there was little actual application of the knowledge and skills acquired from the BMFP training. Two reasons cited were bureaucratic procedures and supervisors who were unsympathetic to new ideas; short training time was another problem. In Mauritius, communication and management skills were cited as the most frequently applied skills acquired during CEFPA training. In Nepal, trainees cited planning and delegation. However, minimal evidence was produced to back up these claims.

20. -- Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of this project were the supervisors and managers of family planning programs in LDCs whose effectiveness was improved, thus establishing a cadre of trained FP managers/supervisors. This would have a wider impact of delivering greater and more efficient FP/MCH services to poor women, and therefore, decreasing population growth in the selected LDCs. In Nepal, nearly all of the participants were middle-level managers and supervisors in Nepalese FP program or linking agencies. However, in Mauritius, at least six participants in the regional BMFP program did not work in FP or linking agencies. Seven trainees were not supervisors.

21. Unplanned Effects

Not pertinent at this time.

22. Lessons Learned

CEFPA showed flexibility in adapting its BMTP program delivery in Nepal to suit the requirements and demands of the Nepali situation. This is demonstrated by translating some of the training materials into the native language and adjusting the program to respond to comments on its design.

Problems within organizations (MFPA or ICHP) may hamper the efforts of even well-trained managers to make changes. Training may be used more as a bureaucratic award.