

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

1. BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS.
2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT "DOT MATRIX" TYPE.

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office <u>S&T/POP/IT</u> (ES# _____)		B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Slipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY <u>89</u> Q <u> </u>	C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
---	--	--	---

D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report.)

Project No.	Project / Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)
936-3033	University Overseas Service Program (Population Services Fellowship Program)	FY 84 FY 89	7/89		\$4,287

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director

Action(s) Required	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
1. Review the unsolicited proposal submitted by the University of Michigan to continue the Population Services Fellowship Program.	Curtin S&T/POP	1/90
2. Authorize a follow-on project with a Life of Project period of ten years. Initial authorization should be for five years.	Curtin S&T/POP	3/90
3. Award a new Cooperative Agreement to University of Michigan.	M/SER/OP/HP	4/90
4. New Cooperative Agreement should allow funding for buy-ins and allow placement of fellows at national, international, and international government agencies (e.g., A.I.D., International Planned Parenthood, World Health Organization, etc).	Curtin S&T/POP	4/90

(Attach extra sheet, if necessary)

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: (Month) July (Day) 11, (Year) 1989

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

Name (Typed)	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Signature	Leslie Curtin		Irene Koek	Duff Gillespie
Date	<u>1/17/90</u>		<u>1/22/90</u>	<u>1/22/90</u>

A B S T R A C T

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

In July 1984, the A.I.D. Bureau of Science and Technology, Office of Population (S&T/POP) awarded a \$3.7 million five-year Cooperative Agreement to The University of Michigan (UM) for the University Overseas Service Program, also known as the Population Services Fellowship Program (PSFP). The purpose of the program is to provide population and family planning organizations in less developed countries with technical expertise provided by recent graduates of U.S. universities, and at the same time provide the graduates with valuable overseas experience. The ultimate goal of the project is to increase the cadre of international population professionals.

This evaluation constitutes the only external evaluation of the project. The purpose of the evaluation was to examine the impact of the project in terms of meeting its objectives of providing overseas experience to recent U.S. graduates and providing technical expertise to the local organizations, and to assess the effectiveness of the program's management. The consultant hired to conduct this evaluation reviewed documents provided by UM and S&T/POP; conducted interviews with former interns, project staff and faculty at UM associated with the project; and attended an annual meeting of the PSFP Advisory Board.

The evaluation concluded that the project has succeeded beyond expectations. To date, over 30 interns have been placed in 17 countries. This achievement has been made possible in part due to UM's ability to attract over \$1,000,000 in "add-ons" from USAID Mission funds. The project has made a significant contribution to the development of experienced international family planning specialists and has provided host agencies with qualified and highly valued technical assistance. Recommendations include:

- (a) the project should be extended at the University of Michigan for at least another four years beyond the current Project Assistance Completion Date of December 1990;
- (b) A.I.D. should raise the ceiling for funding to allow for additional central funds and "add-ons"; and
- (c) efforts to obtain Mission support for placements should expand and A.I.D. cooperating agencies should help arrange placement opportunities.

C O S T S

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			
John F. Marshall	Dual & Associates (Project #936-3024)	23	\$8,694	S&T/POP
2. Mission/Office Professional Staff		3. Borrower/Grantee Professional		
Person-Days (Estimate) <u> 5 </u>		Staff Person-Days (Estimate) <u> 5 </u>		

2

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART II

SUMMARY

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)

Address the following items:

- Purpose of evaluation and methodology used
- Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
- Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)
- Principal recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office:

S&T/POP/IT

Date This Summary Prepared:

1/16/90

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

Evaluation of the Population Services Fellowship Program (Aug. 3, 1989)

Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation was threefold: (a) to assess the impact of the Population Services Fellowship Program (PSFP) in terms of meeting its objectives of providing overseas experience to recent U.S. graduates in the population and family planning fields while at the same time providing inexpensive technical assistance to family planning organizations in less developed countries; (b) to assess the effectiveness of the program's management; and (c) to examine the effect of the program's need to rely on Mission funding since 1986.

Methodology

The evaluator reviewed a wide range of project-related documents and interviewed key personnel at the University of Michigan and in A.I.D./Washington. Specifically, the evaluator studied project files; held semi-structured interviews with former fellows, Program Advisory Board members, and project staff; attended a meeting of the Advisory Board; and interviewed S&T/POP staff familiar with UM and the PSFP project.

Purpose of Activity

In July 1984, S&T/POP entered into a five-year cooperative agreement with UM to provide recent graduates with field experience for entry-level positions in the population and family planning fields and provide host countries with inexpensive technical assistance. This was part of S&T/POP's long term strategy of responding to the need for population/family planning experts with international field experience.

Findings

This first full external evaluation found that the project has succeeded beyond most expectations. To date, 30 PSFP Fellows have been placed in 17 countries, an achievement made possible in part by the program's ability to obtain \$1,000,000 through Mission funded "add-ons". Of the 21 PSFP fellows who have completed their placements, 14 are currently employed by A.I.D. Cooperating Agencies, four others are working in LDC family planning programs supported by other agencies, two are studying population in graduate school, and one, just returned from the field, is looking for employment. The program has clearly been effective in providing young professionals experience that allows them to obtain attractive jobs in international population and family planning.

The record of PSFP in providing inexpensive technical assistance has also been commendable. PSFP fellows are well qualified and highly motivated, and the list of their practical accomplishments within LDC agencies is impressive. Requests by host country agencies for PSFP fellows' extensions and replacements testifies to the value placed on their technical contributions.

Advertising for the PSFP has been highly effective, and review and selection of PSFP fellows -- one task in which the Advisory Board plays a major role -- is excellent. The selection of field sites went according to plan until the amount of central funds decreased and the project was urged to seek Mission and Regional Bureau funding to place fellows. At that point, although UM and the A.I.D. Cognizant Technical Officer (CTO) devoted time and energy to obtain such funding, and were successful at doing so, the range of possible countries in which to place fellows narrowed considerably. The identification of host agencies became more difficult, and the pace of placing PSFP fellows began to slow.

Pre-field orientation of PSFP fellows has been uneven, in part a result of the widely differing backgrounds and knowledge of PSFP fellows. While satisfactory for most, some PSFP fellows felt they would have been better prepared if UM had given more attention to language needs, to providing background on the character of the specific host agency to which they were assigned, and to developing better job descriptions at the beginning of the placements.

Monitoring and supervision of PSFP fellows in the field is also a task made difficult by the substantial variation in the needs of PSFP fellows and in the characteristics of placements sites. Some PSFP fellows have excellent local supervisors and others prefer to be essentially on their own. A sizeable proportion of PSFP fellows felt that better supervision would have helped them learn more and increase their impact.

The logistical and physical arrangements have been satisfactory for nearly all the PSFP fellows and the salary sufficient. Program management displays flexibility when extraordinary requests are raised and justified.

Debriefing at both Ann Arbor and Washington is generally satisfactory, although it could be made more useful if its aims were more clearly spelled out to the PSFP fellows. PSFP fellows seeking jobs found the post-field sessions particularly useful.

Recommendations

1. The PSFP continues to fill an important need, and should be extended at UM for at least four years beyond the current project end date in December 1990. UM management has displayed the capability to handle the project well, and there is no evidence that another institution would be able to carry out the same objectives significantly more effectively or efficiently.
2. A.I.D. should raise the ceiling for funding to allow more "add-ons" and make every effort to provide core funds sufficient for UM to continue undertaking its management tasks responsibly.
3. Adjustments in the A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement should be made so that UM, building on links established by the placement of PSFP fellows, can receive external funds for other/institutional strengthening activities at host agencies (e.g., joint research, on-site training) without the additional funds counting toward the funding ceiling for PSFP.

4. Efforts to obtain buy-in support for placements should be redoubled with the advisory board playing a larger role, A.I.D. Cooperating Agencies helping to arrange opportunities, and renewed appeals to A.I.D. country missions and to private foundations.

5. UM should have closer contact with PSFP fellows in the field, particularly during the first half year. Advisory Board members should be asked to help with these tasks.

Lessons Learned

1. Providing recent population graduates with opportunities to work overseas can make a significant contribution to the development of experienced international family planning specialists.

2. The placement of PSFP fellows in local or national family planning programs has shown that such indigenous settings give the quality of professional experience that PSFP is designed to provide.

3. With the need to solicit "add-ons," S&T/POP should encourage country missions and regional bureaus to take a more active stance in locating sites and supporting the program.

ATTACHMENTS

K. Attachments (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier; attach studies, surveys, etc., from "on-going" evaluation, if relevant to the evaluation report.)

"Evaluation of the Population Services Fellowship Program"
August 3, 1989. Report No. 88-033-091. Population Technical Assistance Project, Dual & Associates, Inc. and International Science and Technology Institute, Inc.

COMMENTS

L. Comments By Mission, AID/W Office and Borrower/Grantee On Full Report

S&T/POP/IT agrees with this favorable evaluation, and is very impressed with the thoroughness, care, and fairness with which it was prepared.

We agree that the project should either be extended for an additional period of time and the project ceiling raised substantially, or that the project should be re-authorized as a new ten year project. We agree with most of the recommendations presented in the final report except those which are commented on below.

The major thrust of the recommendations regarding the Advisory Board is that the Advisory Board should play a more active role in the Program, which would include being assigned responsibility to help monitor and supervise one or two fellows, visit fellows in the field, scout possible placement sites, and negotiate "add-ons." The Advisory Board, however, is a policy-making board, not a full-time directorial board, and their work is essential pro bono. It would be unreasonable to expect the Advisory Board to invest the level of energy and time necessary to generating "add-ons" for this Program. To engage the Board as suggested in the evaluation would involve far greater central fund expenditures on the part of the PSFP than is currently possible.

The next issue involves the set of recommendations related to the selection and orientation of fellows. The crux of the recommendation is that the PSFP should provide fellows with training in language as well as a course on the socio-cultural aspects of their host country. In the best of all worlds, this would be a possibility, but it is currently prohibited by two factors. One, the complicated logistics of securing a placement, make it impossible to guarantee that the necessary time for such pre-training would exist. Second, the travel, living, and tuition expenses of providing lengthy pre-field training would increase the cost of placing a fellow dramatically. Furthermore, those extra funds would be virtually impossible to procure from Mission buy-in funds.

Finally, we do not agree that the UM should receive external funds for other/institutional strengthening activities at host agencies (e.g., joint research, on-site training, additional technical assistance) in which they have built links through the placement of fellows. There are other mechanisms which already exist within S&T/POP to provide such assistance.