

PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)

PAGE 1

|                                    |  |                      |                           |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. PROJECT NO.<br>512-11-680-263.5 | 2. PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>July 1971 TO Dec. 1972 | 3. COUNTRY<br>Brazil | 4. PAR SERIAL NO.<br>73-3 |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------------|---------------------------|

5. PROJECT TITLE

University Administration Improvement and Reform (Terminal PAR)

|   |                                      |                    |                                   |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY 1966 Ends FY 1973 | 7. DATE LATEST PROP<br>Dec. 27, 1969 | 8. DATE LATEST PIP | 9. DATE PRIOR PAR<br>Oct. 4, 1971 |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|

|                  |  |                                    |  |
|------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 10. U.S. FUNDING | a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ 1,359,000 | b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ | c. Estimated Budget to completion After Current FY: \$ |
|------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|

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

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| a. NAME<br>University of Houston | b. CONTRACT, PASA OR VOL. AG. NO.<br>GOB 12-598 |
|----------------------------------|---|

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         | USIV | HOST |                    |                                    |

The execution of the project improved significantly in several important respects during the period covered by this report. However, the principle maintained by the Council's Executive Secretariat that it must serve all universities and respond to their varied requests for assistance continued to prejudice attempts to bring project resources to focus on a limited number of institutions and a limited number of fields or areas of administration. The Council agrees with the principle of concentration in theory; it has been unable to devise a system to put it into practice. No re-designed project proposal has come from the Council and the project is being allowed to terminate at the end of the year.

Nevertheless, recognizing that Brazilian universities, by and large, are far from achieving the administrative and structural goals called for in university reform legislation and have many administrative and organizational problems which could benefit from experience and expertise available in the U.S.; recognizing the importance of the Council as an institution representing the interests of all Brazilian universities; recognizing the services it has performed for institutions of higher learning with resources of the project and its own resources; recognizing the stature it has gained so far as a viable organization capable of coordinating assistance activities for universities; it is recommended that continued assistance be provided to the Council, and to universities through the Council,  
ut  
(see Continuation Sheet)

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| D. REPLANNING REQUIRES  | E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW |
| REVISED OR NEW: <input type="checkbox"/> PROP <input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> PRO AG <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P |                           |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE | MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE |
|   | William A. Ellis: 12/29/72                             |

Cleared by: ARavelli, HRO

**PROJECT APPRAISAL REPORT (PAR)**

PAGE 1

|                |                          |            |                   |
|----------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|
| 1. PROJECT NO. | 2. PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>TO | 3. COUNTRY | 4. PAR SERIAL NO. |
|----------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------|

5. PROJECT TITLE

|   |                     |                    |                   |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| 6. PROJECT DURATION: Began FY _____ Ends FY _____ | 7. DATE LATEST PROP | 8. DATE LATEST PIP | 9. DATE PRIOR PAR |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|

|                  |  |                                    |  |
|------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 10. U.S. FUNDING | a. Cumulative Obligation Thru Prior FY: \$ | b. Current FY Estimated Budget: \$ | 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. |
|  |                                   |
|  |                                   |
|  |                                   |

**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 |  |                                    |
|                |       |      | utilizing resources of appropriate on-going USAID programs.<br><br>The Council has made a formal request for assistance during the first half of 1973 involving in-service training for Brazilian university administrators in U.S. institutions and the services of high level specialists to help conduct several seminars and provide some consultation services. |                                    |

|   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| D. REPLANNING REQUIRES<br>REVISED OR NEW: <input type="checkbox"/> PROP <input type="checkbox"/> PIP <input type="checkbox"/> PRO AG <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/T <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/C <input type="checkbox"/> PIO/P | E. DATE OF MISSION REVIEW |
|---|---------------------------|

|   |  |
|---|--|
| PROJECT MANAGER: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE | MISSION DIRECTOR: TYPED NAME, SIGNED INITIALS AND DATE |
|---|--|

|                     |                                 |  |                   |                |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------|
| AID 1020-25 (10-70) | PROJECT NO.<br>512-11-680-263.5 | PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>July 1971<br>TO December 1972 | COUNTRY<br>Brazil | PAR SERIAL NO. |
| PAGE 2 PAR          |                                 |  |                   |                |

**II. PERFORMANCE OF KEY INPUTS AND ACTION AGENTS**

| A. INPUT OR ACTION AGENT<br>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 Houston   |                             |   |              | X |   |              |   |   |   |        |   |      | X |
| 2.   |                             |   |              |   |   |              |   |   |   |        |   |      |   |
| 3.   |                             |   |              |   |   |              |   |   |   |        |   |      |   |

Comment on key factors determining rating: Services called for in the Contract with the Council are being performed satisfactorily and improvements have been noted in consultations and follow-up activities. Despite recognized difficulties stemming from the nature of the Council and its approach to university problems, more could have been done toward helping the Council develop new procedures and criteria for giving project resources greater focus. More "feed-back" information could have been provided to the Council and USAID on the project which could have led to improved performance, determination of new tactics, and possibly the definition of new objectives.

Contractor complied with terms of contract.

|                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C. PARTICIPANT TRAINING | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|                         |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |

Comment on key factors determining rating:

No plan for training was developed as called for in the PROAG. Selection of trainees remained essentially unstructured in terms of project objectives.

|                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| D. COMMODITIES | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Comment on key factors determining rating:

Not applicable

|                        |                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|------------------------|---------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| E. COOPERATING COUNTRY | a. PERSONNEL CRUB   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|                        |                     |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |
|                        | b. OTHER CRUB & GOB |   |   |   |   | X |   |   |   |   |   |   | X |

Comment on key factors determining rating:

A. PERSONNEL. Considerable improvement took place in CRUB's coordinating efforts. It conducted a survey of the interest of universities in consultations and seminars and of their preference as to fields in which services were desired. This helped establish a basis for further concentration of effort but CRUB failed to determine criteria for refining selection of institutions, participants and areas.

B. OTHERS. There are no assured means of financing continued activities after the Project terminates. Interest in university administration matters is mounting, however, and CRUB believes it will be successful in obtaining continued support for assistance activities. An encouraging development has been a significant number of non-project activities either sponsored by CRUB or coordinated by CRUB during the period under review.

|                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| F. OTHER DONORS | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Not Applicable  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

(See Next Page for Comments on Other Donors)

|                    |                                 |  |                   |                |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------|
| AID 1020-25(10-70) | PROJECT NO.<br>512-11-680-267.5 | PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>July '71. -- Dec. '72 | COUNTRY<br>Brazil | PAR SERIAL NO. |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|--|-------------------|----------------|

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

### III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

| A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS   |   | TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount) |              |        |         |         | END OF PROJECT |
|--|---|----------------------------------|--------------|--------|---------|---------|----------------|
|  |   | CUMULATIVE PRIOR FY              | CURRENT FY * |        | FY ____ | FY ____ |                |
|  |   |                                  | TO DATE      | TO END |         |         |                |
| 1. Consultant advice and reports recommending admin. & organ. improvements at individual universities.<br>No. of consultations. Assumption: one W/W one consultation | PLANNED   | 225                              | 316          | 316    |         |         | 316            |
|  | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE  | 224                              | 267          |        |         |         |                |
|  | REPLANNED   |                                  |              |        |         |         |                |
| 2. Trained Brazilian administrators:<br>a) No. of persons trained in short courses<br>No. of short courses   | PLANNED   | 180                              | 184          | 185    |         |         | 185            |
|  | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE  | 182                              | 185          |        |         |         | 9              |
|  | REPLANNED   |                                  |              |        |         |         |                |
| b) In-service training. No. of persons. M.A. degree training. No. of persons   | PLANNED   | 35                               | 40           | 23     |         |         | 23             |
|  | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE  | 16                               | 25           |        |         |         | 3              |
|  | REPLANNED   |                                  |              | 23     |         |         |                |
| c) No. of Seminars and short courses in Brazil.  | PLANNED   | 53                               | 43           | 43     |         |         | 43             |
|  | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE  | 25                               | 33           |        |         |         |                |
|  | REPLANNED   |                                  |              |        |         |         |                |
| B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS  | COMMENT: Many changes have been introduced as a result of consultant services. Consultant services improved during the period under review. Some very good reports were made and follow-up visits occurred in several universities. Numerous letters of appreciation received by the Council from universities. |                                  |              |        |         |         |                |
| 1. Changes in administrative procedures and structures resulting from consultant services.   | COMMENT: CR has shown initiative in conducting several seminars outside of this project. While still unable to devise a good system for focusing on problems and institutions, it did conduct a useful survey of interest in administrative problems among Brazilian universities.                              |                                  |              |        |         |         |                |
| 2. Increased competence by the Council of Rectors in planning and coordinating on-going program.   | COMMENT: Some 53 articles, studies, translations, manuals and guides have been prepared and disseminated by the Council. A number of these publications are the direct results of this project. Others are the outcome of Council initiative.   |                                  |              |        |         |         |                |
| 3. Completed manuals on univ. admin. & studies of admin. problems of Brazilian universities.   |   |                                  |              |        |         |         |                |

(Cont'd next page)

1. Number of ... of consultant services were devoted to seminars and consultations at

|                                  |             |                 |         |                |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|
| AID 1020-25(10-70)<br>PAGE 3 PAR | PROJECT NO. | PAR FOR PERIOD: | COUNTRY | PAR SERIAL NO. |
|----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|

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

III. KEY OUTPUT INDICATORS AND TARGETS

| A. QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS<br>FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS                                      |   | TARGETS (Percentage/Rate/Amount) |            |        |         |         | END OF<br>PROJECT |
|--|---|----------------------------------|------------|--------|---------|---------|-------------------|
|  |   | CUMU-<br>LATIVE<br>PRIOR FY      | CURRENT FY |        | FY ____ | FY ____ |                   |
|  |   |                                  | TO DATE    | TO END |         |         |                   |
|  | PLANNED   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | ACTUAL<br>PERFORM-<br>ANCE  |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | REPLANNED   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | PLANNED   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | ACTUAL<br>PERFORM-<br>ANCE  |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | REPLANNED   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | PLANNED   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | ACTUAL<br>PERFORM-<br>ANCE  |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | REPLANNED   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | PLANNED   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | ACTUAL<br>PERFORM-<br>ANCE  |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
|  | REPLANNED   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
| B. QUALITATIVE INDICATORS<br>FOR MAJOR OUTPUTS (cont'd)                              | COMMENT:  |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
| xx 4. Shared experiences and practices among universities on administrative matters. | One of the readily recognized benefits of the project has been the bringing together of univ. administrators to discuss common issues and problems. The Association of University Administrators which has grown out of this project is still a latent organization with great potential. |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
| xx 5. Better communication between Rectors and their staffs.                         | COMMENT: In some universities rectors have established procedures for sharing consultant services and experience of trainees with university staff. The project has required interaction of rectors with staff members.   |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |
| 2.   | COMMENT:  |                                  |            |        |         |         |                   |

|                                   |                                 |                                      |                   |                |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| AID 1020-25 (10-70)<br>PAGE J PAR | PROJECT NO.<br>512-11-680-263.5 | PAR FOR PERIOD:<br>July '71-Dec. '72 | COUNTRY<br>Brazil | PAR SERIAL NO. |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged. 2. Same as in PROP?  YES  NO

Assist Brazilian institutions for higher education to improve their administrative practices and organizational structures.

| B. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.  | 2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.   |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Up to 12 Braz. univ. have organizational structures and trained staff for improved administration and have adopted effective administrative practices in some sectors.</p> | <p>1. The Council states it has data to substantiate this statement (a). While project resources have been made available and used in direct services to over 40 institutions and while the Council has refused to devise a system to focus resources on a limited number of institutions and administrative areas, the greater interest of some institutions in project services led to a degree of "natural concentration". Although not all aspects of administration in universities showing the greatest interest in the project can be said to have been affected by project resources, it can be shown that certain areas of administration in these institutions were improved by the project.</p> |
| <p>2. Up to 12 additional univ. have started developing necessary internal structures and gathering minimum qualified staff required for a more adequate administration.</p>     | <p>2. Through training programs and seminars significant members of staff members in up to 12 additional institutions have been brought into contact with improved practices and organizational structures and they are having an effect on their institutions, reinforced by consultant services and published materials. (Cont'ed next page)</p>   |

V. PROGRAMMING GOAL

A. Statement of Programming Goal ~~The project is terminating at the end of 1972.~~ However, in view of the importance of good university administration to higher education and the fact that CR has become a recognized institution representing the interests of all Braz. universities, such requested assistance as can be provided to it, and through it to universities, by utilizing resources from other on-going programs, such as Participant Training or Technical Support, should be considered sympathetically. (Cont'ed)

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. **Yes. Most Brazilian universities are undergoing extensive restructuring and are attempting to adopt improved practices.** While project resources are very small and in relation to the problems involved, they have made significant contributions in some areas, particularly academic credits, flexible academic systems, campus planning and maintenance and student registration and records, which are essential to a more efficient higher education and which have an impact on the entire educational system.

|                     |             |                 |         |                |
|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|----------------|
| AID 1020-25 (10-70) | PROJECT NO. | PAR FOR PERIOD: | COUNTRY | PAR SERIAL NO. |
| PAGE 4 PAR          |             |                 |         |                |

IV. PROJECT PURPOSE

A. 1. Statement of purpose as currently envisaged. 2. Same as in PROP?  YES  NO

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>a. 1. Conditions which will exist when above purpose is achieved.</p> <p>3. CR committed to and capable of stimulating university improvement and reform activity.</p> <p>4. CR a recognized resource coordinating center for activities in (3) above.</p> <p>5. Continuing program of university self-improvement sustained by Brazilian financial and personnel resources.</p> | <p>2. Evidence to date of progress toward these conditions.</p> <p>3. By its statutes the CR is committed to university improvement and reform. As long as it continues to receive financial support for activities of this nature, it will stimulate activity toward those ends.</p> <p>4. CR is now such a recognized coordinating center.</p> <p>6. While CR does not now have the financial means to stimulate and maintain a program of university self-improvement when project or project-related resources terminate, CR's Executive Secretary is confident that such resources will be found. There now exists a good number of qualified individuals and of institutions which have model administrative practices in some fields to provide local human resources and facilities for continued self-improvement programs. In special instances foreign personnel resources may still be useful or even essential, however.</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.