

PN-AAT-317

PN 41220

Suez Community Health Personnel Training Evaluation Study

2639136

Development Alternatives, Inc.
1823 Jefferson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

000435

000083

S

October 1980

SUEZ COMMUNITY HEALTH PERSONNEL TRAINING EVALUATION STUDY

by

Edwin Charles
Barbara Larson

Development Alternatives, Inc.
1823 Jefferson Place, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

October 1980

PREFACE

This study suggests procedures for evaluating certain aspects of the performance and social impact of the Suez Canal University Faculty of Medicine (SCU/FM), a new medical school located in the Suez region of Egypt. The school is being established by the Government of Egypt with assistance from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

The field research and analysis underlying this report were carried out in August, September and October 1980. Three individuals participated for periods of seven weeks, three weeks and one week respectively. The work was done almost entirely in Egypt with the time of the team members divided about equally between Cairo and Ismailia (the site of the new medical school).

Team members interviewed the Dean and the senior faculty of the SCU/FM, personnel from Egypt's Ministry of Health (MOH) including officials at both national and local levels, directors of affected hospitals and health centers and other health practitioners, and the Director of the Office of Special Health Programs of the Boston University Health Policy Institute, the primary support contractor for the USAID assistance. The extensive and generous cooperation of these individuals is gratefully acknowledged.

These efforts resulted in the formulation of a comprehensive evaluation procedure for the new medical school suggesting the creation of an evaluation committee and the preparation of an annual evaluation report on the status of the school and its social impact. The present study is an adaptation of that longer report.

Attention here is focused on the issue of institutional cooperation between the SCU/FM and the MOH and on the closely related subject of the adequacy of health care facilities affiliated with the SCU/FM as training sites.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.	1
DATA TO BE INCLUDED AS A BASIS FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS	2
COLLECTION OF THE DATA.	4
SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS.	6
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PHYSICIANS IN CHARGE OF THE HEALTH CENTERS AFFILIATED WITH SCU/FM	9
APPENDIX B: QUESTIONS FOR PHYSICIANS IN CHARGE OF THE HEALTH CENTERS AFFILIATED WITH SCU/FM.	11
APPENDIX C: QUESTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE PERMANENT COMMITTEE FOR HEALTH SERVICES AND MEDICAL EDUCATION IN THE SUEZ AREA	13
APPENDIX D: QUESTIONS FOR SENIOR FACULTY	15
APPENDIX E: QUESTIONS FOR USERS OF HEALTH SERVICES	17

INTRODUCTION

The establishment of the new Suez Canal University Faculty of Medicine (SCU/FM) is intended to provide a variety of innovative medical services -- primarily within the five governorates of the Suez Canal area. It is the purpose of this study to suggest a procedure for monitoring the effectiveness of linkages between the new medical school and the health delivery systems in that region.

The study focuses attention on the impact of the SCU/FM on the performance of the health delivery systems and on the nature of the cooperation developed between the medical school and the Ministry of Health (MOH) officials and practitioners.

It is recommended that a report summarizing and evaluating these conditions be compiled for submission on July 15, 1981 and annually thereafter. A suggested format for such a report is included in this study (page 6). It is to be submitted to the United States Agency for International Development, the sponsor of this study and a major contributor to the support of the new medical school, and to the Minister of Health, the Governors of the five affected governorates, the President of Suez Canal University, and the Dean of SCU/FM.

DATA TO BE INCLUDED AS A BASIS FOR THE
ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS

The following listed data seem appropriate to serve as a basis for the evaluations:

Statements from the Directors of Health (or their designates) of each governorate in which health facilities are being used as SCU/FM training sites, to include:

- A list of the facilities designated as training sites for SCU students indicating type and location of each;
- A statement of the level of budgetary support for these facilities indicating changes in this support during the last year;
- An indication of the degree to which these facilities or their equipment have been modified because of their use as SCU/FM training sites.

Responses of professional staff at the clinical training sites. The evaluation report should include summaries of these responses based in part on:

- A printed questionnaire form to be completed by the physicians in charge of affiliated health centers (see Appendix A);
- Responses to interviews with these physicians (sample interview questions are included as Appendix B);
- A printed questionnaire form to be completed by the director of each affiliated hospital. These will be modifications of the Appendix A format and will make reference to the hospital staff and facilities which are directly affected by the SCU/FM training program. Out-patient services will be included.
- Responses to interviews with these directors.

A statement by the Dean of the SCU/FM listing projects of the medical school intended to upgrade skills of the physicians and paramedical personnel of affiliated training sites. A list of the training programs, workshops and seminars undertaken by the SCU/FM for this purpose and the numbers of affected professional staff will be included.

Responses of the members of the Permanent Committee.

The members of this committee include the five affected MOH undersecretaries, the five Directors of Health in the Suez area, and three representatives of the senior faculty of the SCU/FM. This committee has been established to facilitate cooperation between the new Faculty of Medicine and the Ministry.

Each member of this committee should be interviewed and a summary of their responses should be included in each evaluation report. Reactions will be focused on events of the past 12 months and will be based on questions such as those included in Appendix C.

Responses of the senior faculty to questions regarding their relationships with the MOH. Sample questions are included as Appendix D.

Responses from users of health services. Data should be assembled to indicate the reaction of users of affiliated health centers and hospitals to the impact on these facilities

of the SCU/FM program. Both faculty and students should participate in the collection of these data in order to develop an increased awareness of community health needs. Introductory efforts in this direction should be initiated early in the 1981/82 academic year. The evaluation committee should oversee a sample survey of user opinion for their annual report in 1982 and thereafter although no such effort should be undertaken for the initial annual report in 1981. Sample questions for this purpose are included in Appendix E.

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

It is proposed that an evaluation committee be established as the primary agency for the preparation of the annual evaluation reports and for the collection, summarization, and distribution of the data relevant to these evaluations. It is recommended that this committee be composed of a representative from each SCU/FM department (or department cluster) and an equal number of non-SCU/FM members. The non-SCU/FM members will include at least one MOH representative from each of the governorates. It seems appropriate that neither the SCU nor the MOH members of the evaluation committee be members of the permanent committee already established to coordinate SCU/FM and MOH relations.

The evaluation committee is to be empanelled not later than December 1, 1980, by the joint direction of the Under-secretary for International Affairs of the Ministry of Health and the Dean of the SCU/FM.

The evaluation committee will request the submission of the written statements which are to be included as a basis for the annual evaluation reports. The written statements are described in Section II (p. 2 above) and include statements by the Directors of Health, by the directors of affiliated hospitals and health centers, and by the SCU/FM dean. The committee should specify that these statements are to be received by the chairman of the committee on or before May 30.

The evaluation committee will conduct the interviews as specified and will prepare summaries of interview responses. The committee will indicate, wherever possible, a quantitative tabulation of those responses. These summaries plus the statements referred to in the preceding paragraph will be attached to their report.

SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR THE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORTS

Improvements in health care delivery which seems attributable to the joint MOH-SCU/FM program. The report should indicate the basis for assuming that any given change is attributable to the program. Specific subjects to be covered may include:

- Number, frequency and kinds of services;
- Quality and accessibility of services offered;
- Efficiency of management and organization of services;
- Incidence of service in relation to the size of the population potentially served.

The sources of data for this information are:

- Statements regarding facilities and budget support from the Directors of Health in each governorate;
- Questionnaire responses of directors of affiliated hospitals and health centers;
- Interviews with medical and paramedical professionals at these facilities;
- Opinions of users of health services (beginning 1982).

The effectiveness of cooperation between MOH officials and practitioners and the SCU/FM, in respect to:

- Local Health Centers;
- Hospitals;
- Relations between officials (both regional and national) and the SCU staff.

Attention should be focused on the degree to which mutual support has been given and matters of disagreement resolved. Special achievements and problem areas should be designated.

The sources of data for this information are:

- Reports from health centers and hospitals;
- Responses of members of the permanent committee;
- Responses of senior faculty;
- Statement by dean of the SCU/FM regarding programs to upgrade skills of participating professional staff.

8-

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PHYSICIANS IN CHARGE OF THE
HEALTH CENTERS AFFILIATED WITH SCU/FM

A printed form will be given to each respondent requesting answers in writing to these questions. This information will be supplemented with responses in personal interviews as outlined in Appendix B.

1. List the staff assigned to your center. Specify the area of specialization of each, the length of his or her total professional service and how long he or she has served at this facility.
2. What was the total number of persons served by your facility during March and April? Specify how many received each (general) type of service which you offered. Include home visits separately.
3. Which of the following items of equipment do you have at your center? Please indicate whether any item is not in operating condition: (List of usual equipment will follow).

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONS FOR PHYSICIANS IN CHARGE OF THE
HEALTH CENTERS AFFILIATED WITH SCU/FM

1. Have there been any changes in your administrative practices during the past 12 months which have helped or hindered the work at the health center? Describe them and comment. (Interviewer: Probe for changes in record keeping practices, circulation of traffic, etc.)
2. Has the presence of students and faculty here been on balance a positive or negative experience?
 - a. What have been the benefits? (Probe for: upgrading of skills and status; assistance with workload; more efficient organization and better managerial techniques; upgrading of facilities; more laboratory work.)
 - b. What have been the drawbacks? (Probe for possible disruption of activities, competition with faculty, poor interaction with staff.)
3. Have you personally benefited from your recent association with the SCU/FM? How and in what ways? (Probe along same lines as above.)
4. Has student interaction with patients been appropriate? Have they interacted well with patients? With other staff? With you? Describe the nature of their interaction. Have their skills been appropriate to the tasks performed and were they performed under adequate supervision?
5. Have you been able to use the students in areas of health care service that you would not otherwise have been able to provide? If so, what?
6. Have you participated with SCU students in any special projects related to public health (e.g. sanitation or nutrition) or family planning?
7. Do you feel that you are effectively supported in your efforts by the public? By the MOH? (Probe to examine possible problem areas.) What are your plans for the future?

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF THE PERMANENT COMMITTEE FOR
HEALTH SERVICES AND MEDICAL EDUCATION IN THE SUEZ AREA

1. Do you feel that this committee has been effective during the past year in reference to its goal of integrating education and health services in the Suez area?
2. Has it met often enough? Have the meetings been productive?
3. What do you see as the major achievements of the committee? What more do you feel it might do?
4. Have any new projects been undertaken jointly by MOH and SCU in the past year? If so, what are they? What have been the respective responsibilities of MOH and SCU? How have they worked out?
5. In areas where MOH-SCU have jointly agreed to certain projects and commitments over the last year, how well have they lived up to their respective commitments? Have they provided staff, equipment, and services on time? Have there been any specific problems in living up to the terms of their agreement?
6. Have MOH representatives had any input (formal or informal) into the SCU organization or curriculum in the following areas? If so, what and how? (For example, representation on University committees; impact on curriculum design and on-site training; other.) Have there been jointly sponsored workshops or seminars during the last 12 months?
7. Have permanent councils of SCU and MOH members been established in each governorate of Suez and Sinai? Have these seemed to function effectively?

APPENDIX D

QUESTIONS FOR SENIOR FACULTY

1. How long have you served on the staff of SCU?
2. Do you feel that there has been developed an effective mechanism for stimulating cooperation between the SCU/FM and MOH? Is there a way in which compromises can be reached when problems arise? Have you any suggestions as to how these procedures can be improved?
3. How are hospital resources (equipment, staff, authority and responsibility) allocated between SCU and non-SCU physicians? Is this a source of dispute? How have disputes of this type be resolved?
4. During the past 12 months have you personally observed the process of data collection or diagnosis at any local health centers or at the out-patient facilities of local hospitals? Do these activities seem to be carried out satisfactorily?
5. Have you participated in the "group practice" plan?
6. Approximately what portion of your personal income is derived from private practice other than under the group practice plan?
7. What suggestions do you have for improvement in methods of faculty compensation?

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONS FOR USERS OF HEALTH SERVICES

1. Statement of background data on interviewee: Age, sex, occupation and/or income, location, education.
2. How often have you used the health center in the last month? (If not, when was the last time you used it?) For what? Were you satisfied with the care you received? Why or why not? Was the treatment successful?
3. How often have you consulted a private physician in the last month? (Follow up with other questions as above.) Were you referred? Or did you go there first with your complaint?
4. How often have you consulted a traditional health care practitioner (a daya or a hallaq) in the last month? (Follow up with other questions as above.)
5. In general, do you prefer to go to the local health center, a traditional health care practitioner, or a private physician first? For what kinds of things and why?
6. Would you say the services at this health center are excellent? good? fair? poor? What could be done to make them better?
7. Have you been visited by anyone from the health center in the last month? By whom and for what?
8. How have you been treated by the doctors, nurses, and midwives in the health center? How would you describe their manner towards you?
9. Has there been any noticeable difference in the services offered or the quality of health care since the students and faculty came to your center? If so, what? Could you describe the changes?