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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this final evaluation is to identify and summarize the relevance, effectiveness, transferability and impact of the Permanency Planning activities initiated by the World Association for Children and Parents (WACAP) and implemented by Pentru Fiecare Copil o Familie (PFCF), a Romanian entity created to ensure the project's continuity, in Resita, Judet Caras-Severin.

Resita was chosen as the new site because it indicated the highest degree of collaboration between childcare institutions and local government entities, and the community as a whole appeared supportive of the project goals. The Cooperative Agreement with the Government of Romania was re-negotiated and project objectives were redefined.

The Mission of WACAP/PFCF Permanency Planning in Resita is threefold: 1) to prevent the institutionalization of children at risk of abandonment; 2) to facilitate family placement of abandoned and institutionalized children; and 3) to enhance the collaboration between child welfare institutions and local government structures and among the institutions themselves.

Five people were given intensive social work training, were affiliated with institutions within the existing GOR child placement framework, and continue to receive on-going supervision. These Social Assistants (SAs) work with the institutions 1) to identify and counsel mothers at risk of abandoning their children; 2) to facilitate access to the necessary legal and government agencies in order to secure birth certificates for children within the prescribed 15 days after birth; 3) to place abandoned and institutionalized children with extended or adoptive families. Through competent social work practice, the SAs have been able to provide support in the form of counseling, family intervention, housing or employment, which in 86 percent of the cases has resulted in a decision by mothers to keep their children. In the remaining cases, they have been able to obtain the mother's cooperation in securing a birth certificate and declaring the child abandoned, which allows the implementation of a permanent plan for the child's future.

The Social Assistants, who work as a team and meet almost daily, are having a significant impact on the entire child placement system in Judet Caras-Severin. Social work is, therefore, contributing to the development of civil society and more fully participative democratic institutions by providing mechanisms for regular collaboration and cooperation among government organizations and NGOs at the local level. Community-based care is becoming the preferred strategy for institutionalized and abandoned children. Stakeholders are being identified and invited to participate in social services to children. A cadre of competent volunteers is being trained to support and extend this effort. Regularly scheduled case-review conferences take place at the Commission for the Protection of Minors (CPM) and involve representatives of all the relevant agencies, the Social Assistants, and concerned families. "All-systems" meetings bring together representatives of these same institutions to discuss issues of mutual concern.
PFCF has taken the first step in establishing a Permanency Planning program in Judet Caras-Severin. Program and institutional sustainability require that it receive additional support for leadership development, improved governance, public education and system-wide reinforcement. Much has been accomplished in terms of establishing credibility with local GOR personnel and community leaders. Financial sustainability requires interim and longer-term support as a priority; additional and alternative resources need to be developed and PFCF needs independence from GOR to maintain its credibility. Sustainability of human resources requires additional supervision, T/TA, accreditation for SAs, further development of the volunteer program and improved stakeholder involvement in the areas of public education, resource development and governance. WACAP PFCF has been resourceful in building links, collaborating with and sharing resources with other PVOs.
SUMMARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The PFCF project should be continued and every effort should be mobilized to identify the financial and human resources required to diversify the funding base and support management development to build on the success of the project to date. Interim funding should be identified to allow additional time to develop and implement a longer-term funding and sustainability plan.

2. PFCF should continue service delivery with a renewed emphasis on T/TA, supervision, all-systems collaboration, and modeling.

3. PFCF emphasis must be placed on development of effective governance, management skills and systems, especially modeling good management practices.

4. PFCF, in collaboration with WACAP, should develop a detailed workplan, based on the findings and recommendations of this evaluation, to cover two periods: 1) November and December 1995, after which the current funding cycle ends; and 2) for a possible extension of six months, starting in January 1996. The planning process can become a mechanism for more staff involvement in identifying program and organizational development priorities. These can then serve as the basis for project monitoring, which needs to be implemented and reinforced. These activities will require additional human resource input.

5. PFCF should continue to build upon policy and administrative changes in the child welfare system to include the sharing of ideas and strategies for change with other child welfare advocates throughout Russia.

5a. USAID/Romania grantees working in the field of Permanency Planning should initiate a mechanism through which they can share experiences and discuss possible avenues for future collaboration and cooperation.

6. USAID/Romania grantees working in the field of Permanency Planning should undertake an in-depth follow-up study of the current status of children placed in non-institutional care and reintegrated into their birth families, using consultants external to their respective projects.

7. USAID/Romania should encourage US PVOs, working in both domestic and foreign adoptions, to maintain separate and distinct programs for both services until such time as Romanian perceptions and attitudes change concerning PVO motivation and a more trusting environment is established.

8. All current and future Permanency Planning programs should integrate family planning components into their service provision.
LESSONS LEARNED

1. Needs assessments, local input, site-selection criteria and stakeholder involvement are critical factors in project success.

2. Training reinforced with guided practical application increases effectiveness of activities and credibility of programs. Understanding of the Romanian cultural and historical context and Romanian adaption of training material is critical to the impact of training programs.

3. Projects that model alternative systems delivery, and/or behaviors, reinforce their practical application.

4. Economic reform in Romania is lagging behind NGO development, making Board development and diversification of funding difficult.

5. Lack of social services is perhaps the greatest barrier to children leaving institutions and a contributing factor to children entering them.

6. Systematic and intensive internal training and supervision (group, individual and peer-consultation) in addition to external modular social work training leads to the formation of a sustainable team of social work practitioners, recognized and welcomed by the stakeholders in the community.

7. There is risk to donor credibility and to NGO development when a project is abandoned before it develops adequate means to become sustainable.

8. Resources can be maximized and the outcomes multiplied when donors can effectively link grant recipients to one another.

9. Community interest and involvement (i.e., stakeholder involvement) based on expressed needs are requisites for project success.
FINAL EVALUATION

Purpose

The primary purpose of this final evaluation is to identify and summarize the relevance, effectiveness, transferability and impact of the project activities in light of the stated objectives in the Resita project site. It will summarize lessons learned, achievements, results, and the impact of this project in preventing the institutionalization of children at risk of abandonment and in facilitating family placement of abandoned, institutionalized children.

Objectives

The objective of the evaluation is to answer the following questions:

1. Did WACAP respond appropriately and take necessary action based on the lessons learned from the Mid-term Evaluation?

2. To what extent were the revised project objectives, as outlined in the Detailed Implementation Plan of March 1995, achieved or not achieved?

3. In what ways did the project demonstrate that it is possible and cost-effective to prevent abandonment of children at risk and to facilitate family placement of institutionalized children within the existing legal and governmental system linkages?

4. In what ways did barriers and opportunities within the existing child welfare system, the project design and/or the implementation of the project have an impact on the achievement of the project goals?

5. How effective was the social work training provided by this project?

6. How successful has the project been in approaching sustainability in the community?

7. What are the lessons learned from the successes and challenges of implementing this project that will be important to future planning of similar projects in Romania?

8. Given the achievements of the project in Resita in ten months, what general project achievements might be expected at future intervals of two, five and ten years, should the project have funding to continue?
Methods

Empirical data derived from project documentation and quarterly reports, as well as group and individual interviews with appropriate project staff, participating community and institutional representatives, consumers (Romanian adoptive family, reintegrated family or previously institutionalized child) and Social Assistant trainers were used to obtain evaluation findings.

Materials reviewed prior to and used as reference during the evaluation process included: the original Permanency Planning project proposal, the Mid-term Evaluation, the revised Detailed Implementation Plan and Logical Framework, the corresponding budgets and quarterly reports, and the signed agreements with Romanian officials.

A team building and planning meeting was convened in Resita with the five team members the first day of the evaluation. The team was composed of a representative of WACAP-Seattle, USAID/Bucharest, two Romanians and the team leader. The interviews were conducted in various configurations to assure the broadest possible analysis from various perspectives. The final day in Resita was spent analyzing the data to compile findings, recommendations and lessons learned which were presented to USAID/Bucharest in a debriefing session. The findings and recommendations were also presented to the PFCF staff in Resita to assure that they were clearly understood prior to the evaluation team's departure. A final debriefing is scheduled with AID in Washington.

BACKGROUND

History of WACAP Involvement in Romania

In March 1991, WACAP signed agreements with the Ministry of Health (MOH) and the Ministry of Education (MOE) to begin a Permanency Planning pilot project. these agreements assigned WACAP the County of Arges, where the pilot project was initiated with WACAP funds.

In May 1993, WACAP received USAID/Government of Romania local currency funding (from the USAID FY 1990 PL480 Title II and 416 Program) through Local Currency Agreement No. ROM 0138-L-93-0003 in the amount of 45,798,000RL to expand Permanency Planning services in Judet Arges. On September 24, 1993, WACAP received USAID funding through Cooperative Agreement No. 0032-A-0003046-00 in the amount of $421,588 for a period of 22 months through July 23, 1995. This agreement was amended in September 1994, increasing the total agreement amount to $567,467 through December 1995. In September 1994, anticipating the termination of the funding period of the Local Currency Agreement, WACAP received approval of budget revisions for the Cooperative Agreement mentioned above, which since that date have included all direct costs in Romania.

The initial goal of the project was to provide comprehensive Permanency Planning services to the institutionalized children in Judet Arges and to children at risk of abandonment in maternity
The priorities of Permanency Planning are as follows:

1. Prevent abandonment of children by counseling mothers at risk of abandoning their children.
2. Return the child to the birth parents.
3. Return the child to an extended family member.
4. Encourage the birth parents to visit the child in the institution regularly.

Only when the above actions fail, are the following actions pursued:

1. Encourage the parent to take an active role in the child's future by consenting to the adoption of the child. (If the parents do not take an active role in planning for the child's future, do not visit the child for six months, or cannot be located after a diligent search, apply for abandonment according to the existing law.
2. Domestic adoption.
3. International adoption.

The original design of the project in Arges used a study done by UNICEF as a baseline for its measurements. This study indicated that 70 percent of institutionalized children could have Permanency Plans implemented and of that 70 percent, 23 percent could return home, 27 percent could be adopted and 50 percent would remain in institutions.

Mid-term Evaluation

A Mid-term Evaluation of the WACAP Permanency Planning Project in Judet Arges was carried out in late 1994. The recommendations from this evaluation included:

1. Resume Project in Alternate Location
2. In-depth Review of Cooperative Agreement
3. Redesign Project

These recommendations provided a detailed blueprint for activities which the evaluation team felt necessary if WACAP was to be successful in achieving the EOP objectives. WACAP implemented all of the above recommendations.

Relocation of Project

In January 1995, an in-depth analysis and site-selection evaluation were undertaken in five potential sites. With only ten months of funding remaining, it was clear that selecting a site with substantial collateral resources was pivotal to the success of the project. Resita in Judet Caras-Severin was chosen because it indicated the highest degree of collaboration between institutions caring for children and local government entities and had community resources which appeared supportive of the goals of the project.
Juridic Entity status, which had been a significant barrier to the implementation of the project from its inception, was obtained at the same time with the project becoming titled, "Pentru Fiecare Copil O Familie," or "For Every Child a Family."

The new site location for the project took into account the lessons learned from the pilot project in Judet Arges and the findings and recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation; project goals and implementation strategies were adjusted accordingly. The project was redesigned to: (1) strengthen services at the entry points of children into the institutional system; (2) strengthen linkages in the community between those providing care for, and making decisions about, the placement of abandoned or institutionalized children; and (3) strengthen services to high-risk birth families. The new design emphasized early intervention and prevention of abandonment by providing counseling to mothers at risk of abandonment in maternity hospitals and prompt social service interventions for newborn abandoned children. Priority was placed on the training of Social Assistants to ensure appropriate Permanency Planning for institutionalized children by providing the SAs with skills in family reunification and domestic adoption.

The site was officially opened March 1, 1995. During the month of March an office was located, refurbished and furnished. Two volunteers and one staff member were relocated from the Arges site. Changes were made to management, administration and USAID communication, again following the recommendations of the Mid-term Evaluation. Ten staff members were hired, including five full-time Social Assistants; all employees were contracted in accordance with Romanian law. Social Assistants received a minimum of 60 hours of training during the month of March. The project entered into Cooperative Agreements with four institutions of the child welfare system and governmental offices, including the Tutelary Authority, the Director of the Judet Leagan, the Directia Sanitaria, and the President for the Commission for the Protection of Minors (CPM) and held the first "all-systems" meeting in the community. By the end of March all the target goals were established in the revised Detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) for relocating the project.

Current Romanian Context

In the Introduction to a brochure entitled, "Guidelines for Adoptive Placement of Romanian Children," published by UNICEF in 1995, it is stated that Romania ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child in October 1990, by the Law No. 18/1990. As a signatory to this international document, Romania is obliged to bring its legislation, policy and practice regarding child protection into line with the provisions of the Convention.

The Committee for the Support of Child Care Institutions (CSIOC) was formed according to the Government Decision No. 1032/17.09.1990, as a government body aiming at the improvement of care and education for children, through increased collaboration with and between like-minded bodies inside and outside Romania. At present the National Committee for Child Protection, formed according to the Government Decision No. 103/18.03.1993, is working and has prerogatives in this field.
The Romanian Adoption Committee (CRA) was formed according to the Government Decision No. 63/22.01.1991. The formation of the CRA must be seen in relation to the modification of the adoption procedures. Until the issuing of Law No. 11/1990, national adoption was under the authority of the local administration (the tutelary authorities of the Mayor's Office), while international adoption was under the sole control of the President.

After the issuing of Law No. 11/1990, a unification of these two procedures resulted, the approval for national adoptions being given by a judge's office and for international adoptions by the Courts:

Through the modifications to and the reissuing of Law 11.1990 in 1991, it is stated that "the Romanian Adoption Committee has been formed, as a government body, for the supervision and support of child protection measures through adoptions and for the promotion of international cooperation in this matter."

Starting from the principle that every child has the right to a family, the CRA proposes adoption as a permanent solution for children deprived of the care of their biological families.

With a view to achieving this goal, the CRA cooperates with childcare institutions, with the tutelary authorities and the minors protection commissions (CPM), in order to obtain full and correct information about the children whom these measures concern.

The CRA is formed with representatives of the following Ministries: MOH, MOE, Secretariate of State for the Handicapped, MOLSP, MOJ, MOI, MOFA, MOF, and the Office of Local Public Administration. The president of the CRA is nominated by the MOH.

In May-June 1992, the CRA and the former CSIOC organized a series of seminars, in coordination with "International Social Service" and with "Defense for Children International." The issue was "The Child and the Family in the Romanian Protection System." The aim of the seminars was to emphasize the importance of family for a child and to present alternative methods of protection in line with the principles of the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Resulting from the discussions and proposals made during the seminars, a practical course of action was decided upon, to promote cooperation between the childcare institutions and the CRA and to put into practice the legal provisions regarding adoption.

The legal framework for child protection in Romania is defined by: the UN Convention of the Rights of the Child; the Romanian Constitution; the Family Code; Law No. 3/1970, regarding the protection of certain categories of minors; Law No. 11/1990 republished on 26 July 1991, regarding approval of adoptions, amended by Law No. 65 of 22 June 1995; Law No. 47/1993, regarding abandonment of children declared by the Court.
Conditions Impacting Permanency Planning Services

--- An inflation rate in 1993 of over 300 percent and over 62 percent in 1994.
--- Wages that are not keeping up with inflation. Average gross monthly wages/salaries as of July 1995 were 289,000RL (approximately $143).
--- According to the Romanian Institute for the Quality of Life, 40 percent of the population is considered to be living below decent standards, of which 13 percent are characterized as "severely inadequate"; i.e., lacking food for family consumption.
--- In 1992, over 55 percent of total household consumption was spent on food; for peasants this constituted 75 percent.
--- Involuntary unemployment is a new concept in Romania. The 1994 official rate of unemployment for the country was 10.9 percent, in Judet Caras-Severin 11.1 percent and in Judet Timis 7.6 percent. According to the Romanian Human Development Report (GOR and UNICEF) there were 616 children institutionalized in Judet Caras-Severin in 1993.
--- While only 12% of income is spent on housing and durable goods, families of one or two generations live together in one- and two-room apartments in cities and in small houses in the countryside (average number of rooms is 2.5).
--- Rural houses often rely on wells for erratic water supplies and do not have inside lavatories; 53.7 percent of Romanian dwellings lack piped water.
--- While there are many people trained as engineers, mathematicians and physicians, there are very few individual trained in modern business management.

In addition to the current social problems, a pre-1989 pro-natalist population policy forced women to have unwanted children or to resort to self-induced or very expensive black-market abortions. Mothers received a special bonus for having more than three children and penalties were levied against those without children in the form of a celibacy tax. Physicians could be fined for deaths of infants under one year old in their care. Therefore, excessive injections of vitamins and tonics were administered under less than ideal hygienic conditions with unsterilized syringes and needles used for multiple injections. This legacy has resulted in the worst maternal mortality rate and second worst infant mortality rate in Europe, over 700 institutions housing about 100,000 abandoned and handicapped children and over half the AIDS cases reported in Europe.

PERMANENCY PLANNING IN RESITA

The mission of WACAP/PFCF Permanency Planning Project is threefold:

1. To prevent institutionalization of children at risk of abandonment.
2. To facilitate family placement of abandoned and institutionalized children.
3. To strengthen the linkages between the existing disparate child welfare institutions and the local government structures—and among the institutions themselves—by improved collaboration.

As Patricia Bates wrote in an article published earlier this year, "The principles underpinning this effort involved prevention as the primary focus: with the recognition that the least restrictive environment and family reunification best promotes healthy growth in a child; and that a social
assessment of each child toward a permanency plan is essential toward individualizing the growth potential of each child."

To address the challenge of the Permanency Planning project, WACAP first requested collaborating institutions to submit names of candidates for the positions of Social Assistants. The proposed candidates were screened and five selected, only one of whom had received previous social work training (the Bethany Social Assistant Training Program in Timisoara). The SAs participated in an intensive in-service group training program and receive individual case consultation and supervision provided by an experienced social work educator brought from the U.S. as training coordinator for the LOP. The interagency selection process, the training program, on-going consultation, regular supervision by the trainer and daily peer-supervision are all factors which contribute to the success of the project.

The Social Assistants (SAs) are affiliated with institutions within the existing GOR child placement framework: (1) Tutelary Authority; (2) The Committee for the Protection of Minors; (3) the Maternity Hospital; (4) the Leagan (orphanage) where abandoned children are placed until the age of three. The project has signed cooperative agreements with these institutions which form a network with the SAs to facilitate: 1) the identification of mothers at risk of abandoning their children; 2) access to the necessary legal and governmental agencies to secure a birth certificate for a child within the prescribed 15 days after birth, in order to avoid a protracted legal process to have a child without a birth certificate declared abandoned by the agency which has the authority to legally move or place a child. The SAs--who work as a team, meet almost daily and are affiliated with key GOR institutions--are having an impact on the entire child placement system in Judet Caras-Severin. This systemic impact is best evidenced in regularly scheduled case-review conferences which take place at the CPM and involve representatives of all the relevant agencies, SAs and concerned families and "all-systems" meetings which bring together representatives of these same institutions to discuss issues of mutual concern. It should be noted that the latter, while providing a much needed forum for communication and collaboration in the community as expressed by everyone interviewed, needs to be strengthened by insisting that the same person represent an institution at all meetings and that they contribute to the agenda rather than its being established by WACAP/PFCF. In these ways the project is contributing to the development and evolution of civil society and more fully participative democratic institutions in Romania. One GOR representative, when referring to these meetings which he considered essential, stated, "This is democracy."

The services provided by SAs to meet the mission objectives as stated above include identifying mothers at risk of abandoning their children. With the collaboration and cooperation of Maternity Hospital staff, they are meeting with and counseling mothers who might be considering abandoning their children in the hospital. Through capable social work practice, the SAs have been able to provide support in the form of counseling, family intervention, housing or employment, which in 86 percent of the cases has resulted in a decision by mothers to keep their children. In the remaining cases SAs have been able to obtain the mother's cooperation in securing birth certificate to facilitate declaring the child abandoned which facilitates implementing
a permanent plan for the child's future.

The SAs also carry out social assessments of families to facilitate the placement of abandoned or institutionalized children in a family. These assessments are done at the request of the cooperating agencies and institutions and, according to evaluation team members, appear to be comprehensive and complete. This involves, in some cases, tracking down parents of abandoned children who have been placed in the Leagan to attempt to obtain their cooperation in having the child declared abandoned, which in at least one case has resulted in a family reunification. In other cases, it involves providing documentation to the Romanian Adoption Committee to have a child declared legally eligible for adoption and/or identifying prospective adoptive parents for children. This latter activity has been occurring in two ways: SAs have actively sought out prospective parents, carried out the necessary social assessments and provided counseling and support to the prospective parents, while they at the same time work their way through the maze of obstacles which must be overcome before a domestic adoption can be legalized. This comment is based on interviews with a number of parents who have or are in the process of adopting a child, all of whom state that it is an incomprehensible process to them, rife with frustration, none of which they could have accomplished on their own without the support of the PFCF SAs. Included in their suggestions for services which could facilitate the process for others were access to legal and medical counseling. The evaluation team also believes that in some cases the parents who have already succeeded in adopting a child could provide a support network to each other and to those who might wish to become adoptive parents. These parents are also a resource to PFCF to do program planning and development, to become Board members, to do public education and to assist with the resource development. It should be noted that the adoptive parents whom the evaluation team interviewed came from all walks of life and social situations—urban and rural milieus, various educational and economic backgrounds—and in every case were impressive individuals who have exhibited courage and tenacity in securing the adoption of a child. They are truly pioneers in the development of Permanency Planning in Romania and it is to be hoped and expected that their experience will make it easier for those who come after. As one prospective mother stated, "It is not difficult when you love them (i.e., the children)." Another said, "It was love at first sight and we would have done whatever was required to adopt this child."

It must be noted that WACAP has been most successful in linking training and technical assistance (in the form of supervision) and in establishing a network among the participants, which is central to the implementation of Permanency Planning. Through their professionalism, commitment, tenacity, innovation and sometimes sheer stubbornness, these SAs have modeled sound social work practice and demonstrated to the community that Romanians have the capacity to look after their own children, thus helping to re-establish a sense of pride and optimism through their participation in the project.
Impact of Permanency Planning in Resita

In eight months (March through October 1995), 22 mothers were counseled about their options regarding their children. Of these counseled mothers, 19 (or 86%) decided to keep their children. Of the 96 cases assigned to the project, 64 social evaluations were completed. Of these 64, 28 children were reintegrated with their birth families and 8 were adopted, 5 domestically. A summary of total projected activities compared with the number of activities actually accomplished is appended to this report. Also appended is an article from Adoption Today, describing anecdotally the significant impact of Social Assistants' intervention.

TRAINING

Social work training was disrupted in Romania in 1968, when the last university-educated generation of Social Assistants graduated. Since 1989, several state and private universities and institutes have opened Social Assistance departments. A number of NGOs have also started to offer social work training. But, because social work as a profession did not officially exist for over twenty years, the need for social work practitioners in Romania remains immense.

PFCF/WACAP has offered a variety of external and internal training/technical assistance, employing foreign and Romanian trainers and addressing both social work and staff development needs. Social Assistants from local institutions and other NGOs have been invited to participate in the training sessions.

Edward Bates, an experienced social work educator, has been the principal trainer for the PFCF SAs, providing extensive group-training as well as individual case consultation on a daily basis.

In order to "develop a team of trained social assistants to provide social services in collaboration with government institutions and other NGOs" (cf. Output 3.1 of the Logical Framework), the PFCF SAs, together with their counterparts in local institutions (e.g., the Ministry of Health) and NGOs (e.g., "Primavara," a Norwegian Habilitation Center) have participated in three social work modules developed by Holt International (external training) as well as in group training at the PFCF office conducted by Ed Bates and several guest lecturers (internal training). The PFCF SAs also received individual T/TA from Ed Bates. In the last few months, they have begun their own peer consultation/supervision.

The Holt Series

Immediately after being hired, the SAs participated in two week-long, consecutive social work modules developed and conducted for Holt International by Rebecca Davis, Ph.D. and William Saur, Ph.D. Ana Munteanu, an Romanian SCI-trained co-trainer, assisted them.

Module I, FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIAL WORK PRACTICE, was conducted at the PFCF office in Resita, March 13-17, 1995.
Module II, CHILD WELFARE PRACTICE, was conducted at two training sites: in Bucharest for the more experienced SAs, March 18-22, 1995; and in Constanta for the less experienced SAs, March 25-29, 1995. Five of the six SAs attended the first two modules. The sixth, hired later, received the materials and individual assistance from Ed Bates.


The SAs, including one from a local GO and one from an NGO, found the materials and training style of the first two modules extremely appropriate and the techniques and strategies applicable to the Romanian context. All the PFCF SAs said the third module was less successful in the above-mentioned respects, with the notable exception of a short workshop given in Iasi as an integral part of the third module by a Romanian social work lecturer, Mihaela Ianasi.

Internal Training, Technical Assistance and Supervision

Ed Bates was full-time Social Work Supervisor/Trainer from the inception of the project until September, when he was appointed Project Manager. He has continued to work as a supervisor and trainer on a part-time basis.

Internal T/TA has been provided in three ways: group training; individual TA/supervision; and more recently, peer consulting/supervision.

Guest lecturers have also been invited periodically to conduct training sessions with the PFCF staff. SAs from local GOs and other NGOs have also attended. Speakers included Jim Bates, MSW, a US-based consultant, who presented CULTURE AND TAXONOMY OF SOCIAL SERVICES; Ecaterina Stativa, a Romanian sociologist from the Bucharest Institute for Mother and Child, who spoke on FAMILY ISSUES; Viorel Deca, a Romanian law student, who presented the ROMANIAN ADOPTION LAW; and Kim Gromko and Susan Gyetvay, who presented CHILDREN ISSUES, SELF-ESTEEM, INSTITUTIONAL CARE.

These guest lecturers delivered a total of 44 hours of training from March through September 1995. The SAs found these sessions very useful, especially the ones relating to legal issues and institutional care.

Methodology and Tools

The methodology used for the in-house training included: presentations, small group discussion, peer learning, individual case conferences, and recording/assessment review (in approximately equal percentages) and (to a lesser extent) role playing, guest lectures, and community/home visits. The main tools used in in-house training have been: modeling (in the context of training), literature/materials, and group dynamics.
The SAs were enthusiastically appreciative of the in-house training. The excellent rapport established between trainees and trainer/supervisor was obvious to the evaluation team throughout its visit. Especially helpful was the incremental approach used in the group sessions. It was this group training that eventually led to what the SAs called, with evident pride, "our team." One SA said she considers herself lucky to have colleagues who help and a boss who listens.

The educator's purpose had been to take a small group of untrained potential social workers and present to them some of the basic skills and values of social work practice. He observed professional growth in all the trainees, although only one of them had had previous social work training before the project began. The educator used training as an empowering tool and has confirmed the success of this approach: the SAs now seem capable of satisfying at least part of their training/supervision needs through peer-consulting/supervision.

During individual and group interviews, the SAs impressed the evaluators as a team of committed and confident professionals, despite their short experience in the social work field. One SA declared, "Working as a Social Assistant, I have found my vocation." Another one, a former nurse, remarked, "Now I see myself as a social worker forever."

Training strengths identified by the educator were: incredible enthusiasm and eagerness to learn on the part of the SAs; willingness to learn sufficient English to communicate well in a relatively short time; peer modeling, which solidified the team concept; positive rapport between trainer and trainees; group dynamics; immediate support of the community in learning needs from an operational standpoint.

Training barriers have been: language (initially); trainees' limited background and/or experience; the time frame (trainees were assigned cases immediately after completing the first two Holt modules, or two weeks after the beginning of the project in Resita); the trainer's lack of knowledge about Romania's legal and cultural system; insufficient research and knowledge about Gypsy families; lack of certain content-specific materials; and the trainer's inability to review recordings directly.

Materials

The SAs expressed general satisfaction with the quality, applicability and appropriateness of the training materials. Those developed during the internal training sessions were exhibited on flip charts around the walls of the conference room on the PFCF premises. Particularly applicable were materials presented by E. Stativa and M. Ianasi. Most useful aspects of the training were: teamwork; interviewing techniques; advocacy; ways to approach the consumer; consumers' self-definition; the effect of institutionalization on children; and trusting the consumer.
Training Needs Yet to be Actualized

The SAs identified the following individual training needs:

- counseling for parents of HIV-positive children, children with special needs, and handicapped children
- organizing parents' support groups
- establishing a PFCF newsletter to inform the community about the organization
- ways to shorten the separation of mother and child after birth
- introducing a nutritional program for children at Resita hospital
- establishing a temporary shelter for battered wives, mothers and children
- lobbying for a lawsuit against physical abuse of children by parents
- working with parents who are mentally ill

At the time of the evaluation, SAs were in the process of looking for ways to improve their written records.

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

The following institutional assessment was carried out to evaluate the organizational development capacity of Pentru Fiecare Copil O Familie (PFCF), the Romanian NGO created by WACAP to sustain program activities after the life of the project. It is based on the Institutional Assessment Instrument developed by World Learning, Inc., which will be one of the assessment instruments used to assess Romanian NGO capacity by the WLI Democratic Network project in Romania. This instrument identifies six components or functional areas of organizational life and the characteristic criteria or indicators of performance in each component. These six functional areas are:

- Governance
- Operations and Management Systems
- Human Resources
- Financial Resources
- Service Delivery
- External Relations

Each component is dependent on and shaped by the other components. Interaction among these components, when functioning efficiently, affects the sector as a whole and produces the synergy that results in effective institutions.

Each organization exists within and is affected by the environment and larger world that surround it and must adapt to the forces and changes in this environment by changing the structure and processes of its internal components. Differentiation must be made between the institution that formally exists on paper and the informal system, which is what people actually do. Neither
system is to be preferred because both exist and are necessary.

Institutional development is both a development strategy and an organizational intervention. As a development strategy, institutional development aims to promote and facilitate the establishment of a thriving community of national development institutions. As an organizational development intervention, institutional development assists local institutions to become more effective, viable, autonomous and legitimate. Institutional development is also a participatory process whereby the members and constituents of an organization become committed to improving the functioning of their organization as they identify its needs and determine how they themselves can meet these needs. While training is an important component of organizational development, it does not, of itself, equal organizational development. Organizational development is an ongoing process that optimizes an organization's performance in relation to its goals, resources and environment.

The evaluation team added Sustainability to the above list of indicators since financial, programmatic and organizational sustainability are crucial to the evaluation and the future of PFCF.

1. Governance

Juridical status for Pentru Fiecare Copil o Familie (PFCF) was granted on 2/10/95 according to Romanian Law. A fully Romanian Board of Directors is in the process of being developed but is not yet fully functioning nor taking a leadership role in the organization's development. It appears that members are committed to PFCF goals, but their interests, expectations and agendas may be beyond the current focus and workplan of the organization. Like all Romanians, the members lack experience on Boards, which requires assistance across the spectrum of all National NGOs, to further develop their own definition of the roles and responsibilities of Board members. While a Mission Statement has been drafted, it is only beginning to be known outside the organization and there is no systematic annual planning or design of job functions based on the Mission nor the strategies required to achieve it. By-Laws have been developed and are affixed as an appendix. While there is growing recognition that constituency/community has a stake in the outcome of activities, only certain influential members are being consulted or invited to participate in some decisions and PFCF is only beginning to become aware that they have a possible role as an advocate for stakeholders. Legislation concerning Permanency Planning is in place and referred to in another part of this report, but requires further development. Leadership to the organization is new, and while the individual is an enthusiastic and innovative individual, she requires time and additional training to better understand her role as team leader to provide meaning and direction to employees and monitor their performance.

2. Operations and Management Systems

The Management Information System (MIS) is rudimentary and requires development and application. There is a lack of understanding of the importance and potential of data utilization and how to use information effectively. Computers are used primarily for word-processing or
spreadsheet work. A Logical Framework is being used for quarterly reports. There is a Romanian administrative staff in place, but filing and recording systems are not used comprehensively and operating manuals need to be developed. Procedures for charting and reporting by Social Assistants are in place and social assessments appear adequate. Personnel administration systems exist, but informal employment practices persist. Requirements for employment, recruiting, hiring and termination need to be defined. Strategic and Operating Plans need to be developed, based on analysis of existing resources with staff and community/constituency involvement which should include a review of staffing and job functions in relation to the workplan. Further project development requires an overall programmatic framework. Monitoring and Evaluation mechanisms, other than those of the donors and WACAP, need to be created. An information network system exists which includes an "all-systems" meeting and case-review conferences. A staff retreat was recently held, but regularly scheduled staff meetings and structured supervision and evaluation sessions require further development.

3. Human Resources

Staff roles and job functions are based on the current WACAP project and some gaps exist between skill requirements and those of staff, since most of the Social Assistants had no prior social work experience; job descriptions are being revised due to recent staff changes. A staff evaluation system based on performance of job requirements as documented in job descriptions is lacking. Present human resources are overextended, with staff responding to a multitude of demands from the community, not necessarily related to the Organization's Mission. An in-house training and technical assistance program is a strength and provides credibility to the project, although no plan exists to provide accreditation to the Social Assistants for this training. The SAs, who use a teamwork approach to clinical work, provide modeling of social work techniques and practice to the staff of institutions in which they work. Under the terms of the Memoranda of Agreement which have been signed, SAs are placed within GOR institutions with assigned supervisors. The new Director General has multiple responsibilities and relatively little managerial experience. Salaries are slightly higher than in the external market and benefit systems reflect Romanian regulations. Attempts are made to mediate conflict, but mediation techniques and conflict resolution mechanisms are required. Staff meetings, although regular, are informal and unstructured; selected staff are consulted on some decisions, intra-NGO communication is conducted on an informal basis; and consciousness is developing on the part of staff that communication breakdowns and overlaps occur. There is evidence and interest in the value and need for representation of different constituencies and ethnic minorities, but there is no established policy. The program has and continues to provide both expatriate and local volunteer support (6 expatriates and 20 locals, since the beginning of the project) to institutions and has developed a recruitment and training program.
4. Financial Resources

Possible underexpenditures for the present WACAP budget are being analyzed and the evaluation team is recommending that, should such funds exist, WACAP apply to USAID for a No-Cost Extension, so that PFCF could continue to function while raising additional funds. PFCF is presently dependent on two donors, USAID and WACAP, and has received additional material donations from the community and through WACAP. PFCF must diversify its funding base and develop new resources if it is to continue, since local funding opportunities are limited due to the poor local economy. Although the Log Frame identifies additional fundraising as an objective for this quarter and potential project resources have been identified, at present there is no plan, mechanism or staff identified to carry out fundraising. Existing management, accounting and budgeting systems are based on external needs and reflect requirements of GOR/USAID/AID/WACAP. Three separate accounting systems are used, two of which are automated and one manual, to accommodate GOR reporting requirements, and are routed through WACAP/Bucharest as a mechanism to provide financial controls and an internal audit. An external audit was carried out by Coopers Lybrand when the Arges project was terminated. PFCF appears to be in compliance with all the reporting and labor requirements but will need to incorporate expert legal and financial advice into their planning and management decisions.

5. Service Delivery

PFCF is accumulating more and more expertise in the field of Permanency Planning and is doing an excellent job of demonstrating this expertise to the community. Additional training and technical assistance in the various sectors will facilitate more efficient delivery of appropriate services while increasing the possibility that PFCF could implement a fee-for-service and other cost-recovery mechanisms. PFCF is becoming a community referral and resource center and is currently a dumping ground for difficult cases in the community, but additional services could be developed over time. Services are both donor and need driven, responsive to some expressed needs of stakeholders, linked to diverse resources such as housing and employment, and reflect the quality of training, commitment and diversity of community; but community/constituency input is not sought in defining services. Their status as an NGO, and subsequent institutional independence, allows for flexibility and effectiveness and contributes to credibility. There is very little, if any, duplication of services and the need for PFCF services is acknowledged by a wide range of local institutions and officials. A diversity of Permanency Planning approaches--such as reintegration, domestic adoption and foster care, institutional involvement and types of families identified for placements--is being pioneered in this community, generating a sense of pride and changing the image of Romania as an unlimited resource for international adoption. Field work and going out into the community are key to success and credibility. Some T/TA and material support are being provided to other individuals and institutions involved with the project. Networking mechanisms are in place for the community but not for the country. The project is having a noticeable and appreciable impact on policy and attitudinal changes. Transportation is critical to the success of the project since the majority of placements are in rural areas.
6. External Relations

There is involvement of a diversity of local and country institutions (e.g., GO, NGOs, academic institutions, churches, and the media). Additional training is required for local police, using linkages with the Craiova/Norway project. There is limited stakeholder involvement with both program and resource development. There is a lack of general and broad-based awareness of problems which can be addressed through Permanency Planning. The project is respected and credible among those who know about it, but PFCF has yet to actively promote activities to the general public and key GOR decision-makers and needs to participate, establish linkages and share information with other programs outside of Caras-Severin. There is an understanding that public relations is a management function of an NGO and a staff member has recently been recruited to undertake public relations activities. Common interests are being identified and local GOR representatives consider PFCF a partner, leader in the field of Permanency Planning and a valuable resource. Collaboration is being established with different government groups and other projects around specific sectoral activities; there is evidence of increased dialogue and receptivity among the various institutions involved in the project. The organization is becoming increasingly known and trusted by others in the NGO community (with whom it is beginning to share resources, such as training materials and programs), but it continues to lack experience with collaboration. PFCF is beginning to develop local volunteer support and to seek technical assistance from government and NGO resources in the community. There continues to be an expressed need to create special institutions rather than change approaches to serving special needs populations (like the severely handicapped and the HIV-positive), but PFCF is doing an excellent job of modeling alternative approaches in institutions where the medical model is the norm. The current success of the project raises the possibility of GOR relinquishing its responsibility for services.

7. Sustainability

PFCF is a good first step in establishing a Permanency Planning program in Judet Caras-Severin, but program and institutional sustainability require additional support for leadership development, improved governance, public education and system-wide reinforcement. Much has been accomplished in terms of establishing credibility with local GOR personnel and local government leaders. Financial sustainability requires interim and longer-term support as a priority; additional and alternative resources need to be developed and PFCF needs continued independence from GOR to maintain its credibility. Sustainability of human resources requires additional supervision, T/TA, accreditation for SAs, further development of the volunteer program and improved stakeholder involvement (such as adoptive parents) in the areas of public education, resource development and governance. WACAP/PFCF has been resourceful in building links, collaborating with and sharing resources with other PVOs.
VOLUNTEER PROGRAM

WACAP, and now PFCF, has and continues to use creatively volunteer assistance to support their efforts in the institutions. Since the beginning of the project in Arges, WACAP has recruited six expatriate and 20 Romanian volunteers with a range of skills and experience to work in several institutions for varying lengths of time. At present, a Canadian volunteer who previously worked in Arges has recently been named the Coordinator of Volunteer Services by the Director of the Leagan. Through collaboration with an ecumenical church initiative, PFCF has recruited local volunteers to whom they provide a training program prepared and organized by the Canadian volunteer, who speaks Romanian fluently. This provides another avenue for modeling professional behavior within the institutional context and an opportunity to re-establish a tradition of volunteerism among Romanians to involve them in addressing some of the social problems in their community.

STAKEHOLDERS

Since the term stakeholder is new to many Romanians and since the involvement of stakeholders is critical to the success and sustainability of a project, it is important to have a common understanding of the term and what it implies.

A stakeholder is someone who perceives a stake or interest in a given situation. A stakeholder in social services to children is an individual or group with a direct interest in the use and management of services and institutions related to child placement.

A range of categories or institutions which have the potential to impact social services to children include the following:

Community-level stakeholders:

--traditional authority structures
--local governance structures
--party political structures
--self-interest organizations (parents' associations, NGOs, churches)
--service organizations
--private sector or entrepreneurial actors

External institutional stakeholders:

--government or state political forces
   --regional or subregional administration
   --government line ministries
   --agencies/project administration
Communities are not homogeneous entities. Within a given community there are conflicting interests among various groupings. The social position of individuals within each group will determine to a large extent the context within which people can or cannot interact with all resources found within the community.

Conflicts within communities can be managed by collective agreement and compliance. One of the great challenges facing those interested in child welfare is to promote consensus among peoples with varying and often conflicting interests within the community and between the community and other social structures. In the case of Permanency Planning in the Romanian context, this is especially critical, for the culture has come to accept institutional placement as being in the best interest of the child, due to the current economic situation in the country, to the decentralization process (which is placing more responsibility at the local level without the financial and sometimes organizational means to do so) and to the underpinning of social structural remnants and ethnic groups striving to maintain identity and functional purpose.

Child welfare policy and services which will prove socially sustainable require representatives from all stakeholder groups to meet, communicate and ultimately negotiate in good faith. Guaranteeing appropriate representation of politically less powerful stakeholder groups, such as the poor or ethnic minorities, in the planning process, promoting their participation and determining the terms and conditions of participation are not easy tasks but are essential to long-term success.

**COST EFFECTIVENESS**

WACAP collaborated with Holt International, UNICEF and USAID/Bucharest as a part of a cost-benefit work group. The goals of the work group are to develop a process and a product to demonstrate cost-benefit analysis methodology for comparing institutionalized care vs. alternative care (i.e., Permanency Planning, domestic adoption, reunification and temporary foster care) for abandoned children or children at risk of abandonment. Cost-benefit analysis can be used in comparing service options, in program improvement, and in education and advocacy with policymakers. The cost-benefit group has met three times and plans to continue meeting, doing analysis and developing user-friendly reports early in 1996.
WACAP has prepared a working-draft cost analysis and report of Permanency Planning projects in Arges and Resita. WACAP and Holt worked together to prepare reports that included similar categories and definitions. The reports include detailed cost data in nominal and real terms (actual expenditures discounted by inflation rates).

To date, the work group has been able to document the costs of institutionalized children from several institutions in Judet Timis. Additional data is needed to form a more credible basis for comparison. The group is now attempting to obtain additional cost data from institutions.

Based on very preliminary analysis of the data obtained to date, the operating costs of Permanency Planning services are lower than the operating costs of institutions.

Recommendations re: cost effectiveness

1. WACAP and PFCF staff should review and comment on the working-draft report.
2. PFCF should attempt to obtain data from the Leagan and Maternity Hospital, using standards developed by the work group.
3. PFCF should identify Romanian counterparts in Resita who would be willing to review and comment on the report.

UNEXPECTED OUTCOMES AND CHANGES IN MENTALITY IN RESITA

The outstanding aspect of WACAP/PFCF intervention is the impact which it is having on the system charged with movement of institutionalized and abandoned children. In a mere eight months, based on an in-depth feasibility study, WACAP and the project staff have introduced the concept of Permanency Planning to a community, established PFCF organizationally, trained and developed a dedicated and enthusiastic staff which had little or no previous experience in social services, established mechanisms for interagency collaboration which was hitherto unknown, modeled sound social work practice and through their innovation and commitment demonstrated to this community that institutionalization of children is an alternative to community-based care and not the reverse.

Institutions are now owning responsibility for the alternatives to institutionalization and are taking renewed civic pride in the successes of family reintegration and domestic adoption. "This shows that Romanians can take care of Romanian children and not have to rely on international adoptions." Officials at the CPM indicated that they now send cases which recommend "institutionalization of a child" back to the Tutelary Authority if they feel that not enough has been done to keep the children out of institutions. Eleven cases assigned by TAs from outside of Resita have been given to PFCF staff for evaluation. The project approach is embraced by GOR officials, who do not appear threatened. The Director of Health Reform said that the activities and success of the SAs have shown that persistence pays off and that alternative solutions can be found. This he attributed to the "democratic process" and the "American approach."
Both clients and GOR representatives see the program as more credible because it is initiated from an NGO rather than government. GOR officials have requested that the project be maintained outside of GOR structures in order to continue to be focused on the Mission of PFCF to provide children with families. "We must do what is in the best interests of the children" was cited by representatives of the MOH and CPM. The Director of Health Reform said that the PFCF multi-systems approach helped to "cut through bureaucracy." The training and experience demonstrated by this NGO are seen as open, democratic and creative, which leads to more dialogue. Teamwork is seen as effective and leading to more positive results. This open approach has carried over into institutional relations, with the SAs acting as intermediaries.

Examples of behavior changes include: the CPM is intervening with other institutional processes to assure that domestic adoption and family reintegration are given priority and have personally intervened on behalf of parents with children who are on the CRA list which makes them eligible for foreign adoptions; the MOLSP is transferring monthly allowances for children to a local NGO who is providing care to street children, a new policy in Romania; nursing staff in both maternity hospitals and Leagans were observed to pay more attention to patients and children; nurses in maternity hospitals have requested training from SAs in techniques to better identify mothers at risk of abandoning their children; the categories of persons eligible to foster or adopt has been broadened to include single women and non-family members; an ecumenical church has supported activities which have resulted in volunteer recruitment to the project. There was extensive debate about how to address the issue of schooling for HIV-positive children by all members of the CPM and while options mainly focused on building new facilities and/or continued segregation due to perceived community response, some members suggested investigating what was being done in other Judets.

There is a growing recognition for the need to justify programs to fiscal decision-makers and requests have been made to have the project assist in the process. The MOH wants to create 3 to 4 SA positions from current medical assistant positions. They have some statistics that show a reduction of children in the hospital and are tracking the impact for that institution. A member responsible for education at the CPM stated that "we know these programs cost less and benefit children, but the budget staff doesn't understand that," and suggested that the cost-benefit report could be of value to them in their attempts to change current fund allocation policy.

POSSIBLE FUTURE SCENARIOS

While it is difficult to look into the future since so many of the variables simply cannot be projected at this time and much depends on unknown factors, it is possible to identify elements which are likely to continue to affect the development of Permanency Planning in Romania. Given the current state of the economy and prospects for recovery, it is reasonable to believe that Romania shall have to continue with the problem of abandoned children in the foreseeable future. However, if community-based resources continue to be developed and Permanency Planning implemented throughout the country, there should be fewer children placed in Leagans. With the success of WACAP's program and the establishment of PFCF, public awareness will improve
about abandoned children and the need to develop community resources. This will increase the number of families and volunteers who will wish to become involved.

PFCF has any number of alternatives which it can pursue. It can expand services to include Permanency Planning for older children now housed in the Casa de Copi, develop expertise for placing HIV-positive children, provide sexuality education and pregnancy counseling in the area of prevention or provide temporary foster-care services. In the coming years as additional resources become available and attitudes change, further Social Assistants charged with the responsibility of Permanency Planning can be integrated into appropriate GOR institutions. PFCF could develop expertise as a community-based Social Service Center, providing services to populations for whom fewer services are available. At present, discussions are taking place to establish group homes in villages, using local resources. It could further develop its volunteer projects, such as providing temporary foster care to mothers requiring medical attention who would otherwise be forced to place their children temporarily in institutions.

What is certain is that PFCF shall have to continue to raise funds, develop alternative resources and study possible cost-recovery initiatives, establish links with the private business sector and lobby the GOR to improve legislation and develop new funding mechanisms. It should continue the work undertaken by WACAP with the cost-benefit work group to identify possible approaches to encourage the GOR to redirect current resources into the development of community Social Services and expand Permanency Planning programs.

There is no doubt in the minds of the evaluation team that the commitment, energy, initiative, and innovation exist among members of the current remarkable staff of PFCF to continue to develop this Romanian institution and its programs.
APPENDIX
FINDINGS

* The Resita phase of the project has been operational since March 1995 and was planned for completion by December 31, 1995. This means that activities have been implemented for 8 out of 10 months (80% completed).

* Summary of total projected activities as compared to actuals for major activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
<th>ACTUALS 4/1-11/1</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mothers counselled</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother kept child</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Certificates obtained for newborns</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Assigned-Hospital</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases Assigned-Leagan</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases assigned other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases assigned</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social evaluations completed</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegrated</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>127%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>D=5 I=3</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up visits- 3 per case reunified</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up per case- adoption</td>
<td>no standard in DIP</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

file: wacapst
RECOMMENDATIONS RE: CASE FILES

Service delivery is tracked through case files. These contain information on the child-clients and their birth families, if known.

Included in each file are: the child's picture; reports on home visits and discussions with parents, potential adoptive parents, foster family, or extended family; and recommendations/solutions suggested by the Social Assistant.

Arrangements are sometimes made for parents with only an eighth-grade education to receive specific job training. However, follow-up on the completion and impact of this training has not been done, so no record of it exists in the file.

Recommendations:

1. The recording system should be standardized to facilitate the Social Assistant's work. A format should be created to include: date; client's name; Social Assistant's name; type of de-institutionalization proposed (reintegration or domestic adoption); whether clients are found or not found on home visit; if found, a summary of discussions and conclusions/suggestions.

2. Notes on the follow-up of a client's situation should be more detailed and specific in order to determine whether the action taken has been in the best interest of the child.

3. The amount of follow-up work should be equal to the rest of the work a Social Assistant does for a successful outcome of the case.
BY-LAWS

of the Association "FOR EVERY CHILD A FAMILY"

CHAPTER 1 - NAME, HEADQUARTERS, PURPOSE AND DURATION OF THE ASSOCIATION

Art.1 - The association established in these by-laws is a non-governmental, apolitical, non-profit association and shall be known under the name "FOR EVERY CHILD A FAMILY".

Art.2 - The headquarters of the association are in: Râșina, Blvd. A.I.Cuza, Câmin 30 Decembrie, Caraș-Severin County.

Art.3 - The purpose of the association is humanitarian and charitable with the following goals:

- preventing the abandonment of children in the maternity and pediatric section of the County Hospital;

- preventing the institutionalization of children coming from disorganized families or from families with material and social problems;

- collaboration with specialized social institutions in order to deinstitutionalize children and integrate them into other families when reintegration with the natural family is not possible;

- helping (material help) families with many children and abandoned children or children without parents;

- providing social and educational assistance to families-at-risk of abandoning their children and also to families where the children are abused, in order to defend the child's rights.

Art.4 - In view of reaching the proposed goals, the association shall cooperate with the Sanitary Direction of the County of Caraș-Severin and its units, with the Caraș-Severin District School Inspectorate, with the Tutelary Authority, with the Caraș-Severin Committee for Protection of the Minors, with the Office of Labor Direction, etc.

Art.5 - The association shall be established for an undetermined period of time and it shall be terminated with the accord of the majority of the members.
Art. 6 - The association is functioning with a minimum of 21 members.

Art. 7 - The association shall be managed by a Board of Directors formed of a president and six members, elected by the General Assembly of the members for a period of one year.

These are:

Mărioara Dragomirescu
Liubică Raichici
Edward Bates
Aglaiă Bălan
Ion Imbrescu
Erica Răza
Constantin Gruescu

Art. 8 - The Board of Directors shall bear the responsibility for performing the proposed activity in conformity with the by-laws and shall represent the association in its official contacts with the State forums, bodies and organizations.

Art. 9 - The Board of Directors shall encourage and coordinate the voluntary participation of private persons and other domestic and foreign associations in respect of reaching the propose goals.

Art. 10 - Members of the association may become the persons which shall adhere to its program and which shall express this wish in writing. The Board of Directors shall approve the receiving of new members, which shall keep this title only due to their active support afforded to the association, by way of the performed services.

Art. 11 - The incomes of the association shall come from: matriculation donations, donations from domestic and foreign organizations and other sources. Any financial and material means given as above mentioned shall constitute the association's patrimony and shall be used in conformity with the legal provisions. At the date of the establishing, the association has a fund of lei 50,000.

Art. 12 - The Board of Directors of the association shall use the financial means pursuant to the approved budget and shall be held responsible for it by the General Assembly of the members. The incomes coming from foreign associations shall be managed only after the approval of the association's president and in conformity with the budget plans proposed by the donors.

Art. 13 - Once a year, a censors' commission, appointed by the Board of Directors of the association, shall check the financial reports of the association.
Art.14 - For each of the branches established by the association in conformity with the legal provisions, the Board of Directors shall appoint a manager, based on the approval of the General Assembly.

CHAPTER 3 - FUNCTIONING OF ASSOCIATION:

Art.15 - The highest leader body of the association's activities is the General Assembly of its members.

Art.16 - The General Assembly shall validly decide and deliberate with a simple majority of votes concerning the patrimony of the association, the establishing of the branches, the election of the leaders as well as in any other questions for which it has been called together, including changes in the by-laws of the association.

Art.17 - Member's status of the association may be obtained by any person who wishes it, by lodging a written application addressed to the Board of Directors, in which the person in case shall mention the reason he/she wants to become a member and that he/she has read the association's by-laws and that he/she shall adhere to it. The member's status shall be approved in the meeting of the Board of Directors, with simple majority of votes (50% + 1) of the votes of its members.

Art.18 - In the regard of establishing the procedure to be followed in any other different situations and of the behavior of the association's members, the Board of Directors shall draw up the Internal Order Regulations, valid for any member of the association, the leaders included.

Art.19 - Depending on the subsequent necessities of the association, the General Assembly may proceed to changes in these by-laws, with a simple majority of votes.

Drawn up and typed by the party in five copies; after the signing and certification, four copies are being released.

Authorized representative,
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**PERSONS CONTACTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amzoi Nicolao</td>
<td>President of Commission for Protection of Minors (CPM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balan Aglaia</td>
<td>Chief of Tutelary Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bornhoffer Erica</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciomaga family</td>
<td>Reunified Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Boteanu Lia</td>
<td>Sanitary Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Soran Gavril</td>
<td>Resita County Hospital Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Lazarescu</td>
<td>Chief of Pediatric Section in Resita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bortun Florin</td>
<td>Chief of New-born Section in Resita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rizea Erica</td>
<td>Collaborator of the Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Preda Adrian</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Sanitary Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Vuia Eliza</td>
<td>Leagan Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Urechiatu</td>
<td>Hospital Resita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galgan family</td>
<td>Adoptive parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gherghina Boici</td>
<td>Director, Primavara Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gril Ileana</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iosifoni Gheorghe</td>
<td>Education Inspectorate, member of CPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iova Crina</td>
<td>Secretary of CPM (from Casa de Copii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litu Anca Laura</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihai Baldea</td>
<td>Administrative Director, Primavara Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miulescu family</td>
<td>Adoptive parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutascu family</td>
<td>Reunified Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olariu Nelu</td>
<td>Chief Assistant in Sanitary Direction, member of CPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmi Elise</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plesca Mariana</td>
<td>Reunified Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popa Mircea</td>
<td>Mayor of Resita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popov Alona</td>
<td>Tutelary Authority, member of CPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puscas family</td>
<td>Adoptive parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torbjorn Persen</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, Primavara Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valcu Carmen</td>
<td>Social Assistance Office in Labor Direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Staff Members</td>
<td>PFCF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Kerekes</td>
<td>Social Assistant Leagan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plavitiu Doni</td>
<td>Labor Direction, representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasilie Ana</td>
<td>Director TA County Council, CPM vice-president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Bates</td>
<td>WACAP Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Lee MacIntyre</td>
<td>A.I.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Knowles</td>
<td>WACAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Romania's sponsorship law "a mess"

Corporate executives and leaders of nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) agree that Romania's current sponsorship law is "practically a mess" and must be improved by increasing tax benefits to companies who contribute to charities. Their conclusion came at the end of a recent conference in Bucharest on "Resourcing the NGO Sector: Advantages and Disadvantages of Current Fiscal Regulations." The event was organised by the Centre for the Development of Nongovernmental Organisations, with funding from the Soros Foundation for an Open Society and the support of the PHARE programme of the European Union.

The purpose of the conference, according to organiser Lorita Constantinescu, was to develop a climate in which representatives of the social and economic sectors could identify opportunities for cooperation. The programme included case studies on corporate sponsorship of NGOs, presentations by representatives of UNITER, "Save the Children", the Ratu Foundation, the Black Sea University and the National Travel Club for Youth. Among the topics discussed were "Cooperation between the World Bank and NGOs," "International Trends in Corporate Giving," and "Regulations for Sponsoring Charities."

Opening the session was American billionaire philanthropist, George Soros, who told the more than 100 corporate and NGO participants that "it is extremely important that people who care about society should find a way of working for society. And especially in a market economy, it is important that there should be support for such activities, because the market alone cannot meet all the social needs."

Participants included representatives of the Soros Foundation, the Phare Programme, numerous NGOs, several Romanian banks, the US Agency for International Development, the British Council, the Estaur Foundation, the Placement Consulting Centre, the International Centre for Non-Profit Law, and dozens of commercial companies with Romanian and mixed capital.

Various solutions were proposed for improving Romania's sponsorship law. The most popular involved significantly increasing the 5% tax exemption given to companies who make charitable contributions.