



*executive committee of
the directing council*

PAN AMERICAN
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION

*working party of
the regional committee*

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



86th Meeting
Washington, D.C.
June-July 1981

Provisional Agenda Item 12(b)

CE86/25 (Eng.)
11 May 1981
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

STATUS OF THE EVALUATION OF PAN AMERICAN CENTERS: LATIN AMERICAN CENTER
FOR PERINATOLOGY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (CLAP)

This document describes the plan of action and scheduled events for the evaluation of the Latin American Center for Perinatology and Human Development (CLAP), located in Montevideo, Uruguay. The Evaluation Team is composed of Dr. Eduardo Jurado García, Director of the National Institute of Perinatology, Mexico, and Dr. Dalva Coutinho Sayeg, Director of the Child Institute of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. The Executive Committee's attention is directed to the timing of the evaluation process for this Center, which calls for visits to the field by the Team in mid-May 1981. As a result, the Final Report will not be completed and available for distribution and perusal prior to the 86th Meeting of the Executive Committee. Nevertheless, a preliminary report could be completed by mid-June.

EVALUATION OF THE LATIN AMERICAN CENTER FOR
PERINATOLOGY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

1. Introduction

The Latin American Center for Perinatology and Human Development (CLAP) is located in Montevideo, Uruguay.

While the record, functions and prestige of this Center are well-known, the evaluation will assess in depth the extent to which the Center has accomplished the purposes stated in its Agreement and the responsiveness of performance to the Organization's policies and strategies. From analysis of and reflection on these two parameters will emerge findings on which to decide the future role and direction of the Center.

2. Timetable of Activities

The evaluation of CLAP will involve the following stages:

- a) Compilation of the basic documentation and relevant materials.
- b) Assembly of the evaluation team: Washington, mid-May 1981.
- c) Review of the documentation and statement of the terms of reference: Washington, first week of May 1981.
- d) Visit to the Center in late May.
- e) Writing of the first draft of the report: fourth week of May.
- f) Analysis of commentaries and writing of the Final Report by mid-June.

3. Terms of Reference

An outline of some of the questions and issues that will be addressed by the evaluation include:

3.1 Purposes

The present Agreement encompasses six specific purposes, in relation to each of which the following questions should be asked:

- 3.1.1 What are the accomplishments of the last five years?
- 3.1.2 Should or should not these purposes be continued in the future?
- 3.1.3 Are there other purposes which should be included?.

3.2 Investigative Tasks

- 3.2.1 Describe the salient lines of research pursued in the last five years.
- 3.2.2 Assess their relevance to the purposes of the Center, to the principles laid down in the Plan of Work, and to the policies and strategies of PAHO.
- 3.2.3 Establish proportions between the volumes of clinical research, operations research, and the development of appropriate technologies.

3.3 Manpower Development Tasks

- 3.3.1 Compile a list itemizing the types and numbers of courses conducted in the last five years, with data on numbers of participants and their places of origin, occupations and ages.
- 3.3.2 Analyze the foregoing information and endeavor to assess the relevance of the content of those courses to the purposes of the Center and PAHO.
- 3.3.3 Assess the extent to which the instruction provided by CLAP has promoted the conduct of teaching activities in the countries. What is the proportion of the courses organized in the countries, away from the headquarters in Montevideo?
- 3.3.4 Estimate whether each of the different types of courses will remain in demand over the next five years.
- 3.3.5 Suggest types of training that have been omitted in the past and which, in the judgment of the evaluators, could be added in the future.

3.4 Tasks in Technical Cooperation with the Countries

- 3.4.1 Estimate the amount of cooperation offered and required by the countries in the last five years.
- 3.4.2 To what extent did this cooperation serve the purposes of the Center and PAHO?
- 3.4.3 Was there machinery for the routine processing of CLAP cooperation through the regular channels of PAHO?
- 3.4.4 To what extent did this cooperation contribute to the generation and development of capabilities and programs in the countries?
- 3.4.5 To what extent did the Center perform its assigned functions in the dissemination of knowledge?
- 3.4.6 What varieties of audiovisual materials did the Center produce, in what quantities, and how were they distributed?

3.5 Administration

- 3.5.1 Were there administrative mechanisms as called for in Clause VI of the Agreement? In other words, did the Liaison Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee function routinely?
- 3.5.2 What changes would be desirable in the future? Describe and justify them.
- 3.5.3 If possible, point out errors and shortcomings in the Administration of the Center, if any.

3.6 Personnel

- 3.6.1 Compile a list of the current staff, and tables showing their occupations, and nationalities. Analyze these characteristics and relate them to the volume of work.
- 3.6.2 Make a projection of the research, teaching and technical cooperation activities over the next five years and relate it to the needs for personnel of different grades.

- 3.6.3 Review the training provided for the staff of CLAP itself.
- 3.6.4 Interview staff members of different grades and listen to their opinions on the satisfaction afforded by their functions and working conditions, and on their own prospects and those of the Center.
- 3.6.5 In the judgment of the evaluators, to what extent should the Center continue to employ international staff beyond 1982?

3.7 Financing and Budget

- 3.7.1 Analyze the budget in relation to the origins of the funds. In what amounts and proportions have extrabudgetary funds been received in the last five years? Who were the donors and what is the relevance of these extrabudgetary projects to the purposes of the Center and PAHO?
- 3.7.2 Consider whether the distribution of the budget accords with the activities and products expected of the Center. Apply this criterion to both the regular budget and to the extrabudgetary funds.

3.8 Plant and Equipment

- 3.8.1 Give a succinct description of the plant and accommodations available for the equipment and the staff.
- 3.8.2 Assess the suitability of these installations for the activities of the Center in the light of the requirements for patient care, research, teaching, study, and administrative work.
- 3.8.3 Give a succinct description of the equipment and materials on hand for care and research, and those available for administrative and audiovisual support, and building services.
- 3.8.4 Assess, both individually and in general, the relevance of the items of equipment, their state of repair, and the availability of personnel qualified to operate them.
- 3.8.5 In the light of the purposes of CLAP and the level of its activities, indicate which equipment would have to be provided over the next two years.

3.9 Coordination

- 3.9.1 Evaluate how relations have proceeded with the Country Office, the national authorities, and the Area VI Office. It would be useful to interview the Country Representative, the Minister of Health, the Chief of Maternal and Child Health, the Chief of Statistics, and university authorities.
- 3.9.2 Scrutinize the Center's relations with other PAHO projects in the country and at the regional level, and with project AMRO-5103 in particular.
- 3.9.3 Evaluate the extent of the participation of the CLAP personnel in, and their attitude toward, the extra-budgetary projects.
- 3.9.4 Suggest steps that could be taken to improve the coordination of related projects and the participation of the personnel of CLAP in them.

4. Outlook

In this evaluation it is important to provide indications as to the future of the Center beyond 1982. Hence, recommendations will have to be formulated on the following points:

- 4.1 Will the priorities of maternal and child health in the Region imply higher or lower priority for the area of operations of this Center?
- 4.2 Will the countries still have the same needs for technical cooperation or will they have already developed their own capabilities?
- 4.3 What will be the ideal proportion among teaching, research and technical cooperation with the countries two years hence?
- 4.4 What possibility will there be of the Host Country's absorbing the present functions of CLAP through a national center?
- 4.5 What are the options for the Center? Consider the following possibilities:
 - a) Conversion into a national center;
 - b) Establishment of a regional network of WHO collaborating centers of which this would be one;

c) Discontinuance of the specific activity;

d) Dispersion of the international staff to different Areas so as to provide advisory services to the countries in accordance with their requests.

5. Staff Required to Conduct the Evaluation

Selection of the Evaluation Team was based on the need for:

1. A perinatologist of established reputation and in a directorial position at a similar center;
2. A pediatrician with training in public health, experience in health administration and exercising functions in manpower training for maternal and child care.

On the above basis the Director of PASB selected Dr. Roberto Jurado García, Director of the National Institute of Perinatology, Mexico, and Dr. Dalva Coutinho Sayeg, Director of the Child Institute of the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, to conduct the evaluation.



*executive committee of
the directing council*

PAN AMERICAN
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION

*working party of
the regional committee*

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



86th Meeting
Washington, D.C.
June-July 1981

Provisional Agenda Item 12(b)

CE86/25, ADD. I (Eng.)
19 June 1981
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

STATUS OF THE EVALUATION OF PAN AMERICAN CENTERS: LATIN AMERICAN CENTER
FOR PERINATOLOGY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT (CLAP)

Stages Completed in the Evaluation

In the first months of the year the consultants who would constitute the Evaluation Committee were chosen, the guidelines for self-evaluation and outside evaluation were drawn up, and information on CLAP since its establishment was collected and classified.

In April 1981 the guidelines and instructions for self-evaluation were sent to CLAP and complementary documentation dating from 1971 was requested.

In the last week of April the Director of CLAP came to PAHO Headquarters and took part in discussions and clarifications on the evaluation process.

The consultants constituting the Evaluation Committee, Drs. Dalva Sayeg and Eduardo Jurado García, took up their duties on 18 May at PAHO Headquarters. For one week they held interviews with technical, administrative and management officers concerned with the Center. They also reviewed the documentation and cleared up doubts about the conduct of the process.

They then traveled to Uruguay, where for two weeks they worked with the PASB officers of CLAP, interviewed national authorities and Uruguayan staff members of CLAP of different professional categories, and visited some field and community work areas.

In the week of 7-14 June they returned to Washington and, with logistical support from the Division of Comprehensive Health Services, analyzed their findings and wrote a draft report, which is in process of printing and final review.