

PD AAT-693

45728



intraH

Trip Report

#0-238

Travelers: Dr. James Veney, INTRAH Evaluation Officer
Dr. Margarita Miranda, INTRAH Consultant
Dr. Christopher Burr, UNC Faculty Member

Country Visited: NIGERIA

Date of Trip: February 4-16, 1986

Purpose: To conduct a Training Evaluation
Workshop in Port Harcourt for
Eleven (11) Participants From Five
States in Southeast Nigeria

Program for International Training in Health
208 North Columbia Street
The University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514 USA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **i**

SCHEDULE DURING VISIT **ii**

I. PURPOSE OF TRIP **1**

II. ACCOMPLISHMENTS **1**

III. BACKGROUND **3**

IV. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES **4**

V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS **4**

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS **4**

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Persons Contacted

Appendix B

Workshop Participants and Facilitators

Appendix C

Workshop Curriculum

Appendix D

Materials Developed During the Workshop

Appendix E

List of INTRAH Materials Distributed

Appendix F

**Participant Reaction Form Results and Pre -Post
Test Questions and Scores**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dr. James E. Veney, Professor of Health Policy and Administration and INTRAH Evaluation Officer, INTRAH consultant Dr. Margarita Miranda, and Dr. Christopher Burr, Department of Health Policy and Administration, School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, travelled to Lagos and Port Harcourt, Nigeria on February 5, 1986 to participate in the final stages of development for a workshop on INTRAH Program Training Evaluation. Drs. Veney and Miranda conducted the workshop, which was held from February 10 to February 15 in Port Harcourt at the Presidential Hotel.

The workshop was jointly sponsored by the National Health Planning and Research Directorate, Federal Ministry of Health, Nigeria and INTRAH. Co-trainers were Mr. Ayodele Akin-Dahunsi, Principal Planning Officer and Mr. Anthony Isama, Health Planning Officer, National Health Planning and Research Directorate, Federal Ministry of Health, Lagos. Two resource persons from universities in the five state area (see Persons Contacted, Appendix A) also assisted.

There were eleven participants from the five states in southeast Nigeria: Anambra, Benue, Cross River, Imo and Rivers. During the workshop, preliminary forms for follow-up evaluation of INTRAH trainees were developed.

Through verbal assessment, participants expressed a high level of satisfaction with the results of the workshop, but also expressed some frustration with the limited time available for it.

SCHEDULE DURING VISIT

February 5, 1986

8:00 p.m. Arrival by Drs. Veney, Miranda and Burr at Murtala Muhammed Airport, Lagos, Nigeria.

February 8, 1986

9:00 a.m. Meeting at Federal Ministry of Health, National Health Planning and Research Directorate with Dr. Sulaiman, Director, Mr. Akin Dahunsi, Principal Health Planner, and Mr. Isama, Health Planning Officer of the FMOH.

9:30 a.m. Continued meeting at FMOH with Mr. Akin Dahunsi and Mr. Isama to discuss course content and curriculum.

11:00 a.m. Visit to Coopers and Lybrand to discuss course financial arrangements with Mr. Kokuyi, Senior Manager.

2:30 p.m. Continued work at FMOH on course content and curriculum.

February 7, 1986

8:30 a.m. Visit to FMOH to drop off course materials to be typed and duplicated.

9:00 a.m. Meeting with Ms. Keys MacManus, AID Affairs Officer.

- 1:00 p.m. Meeting at FMOH to confirm arrangements for workshop.
- 2:00 p.m. Return visit and meeting with Mr. Kukoyi at Coopers and Lybrand to make sure he would send a Coopers and Lybrand representative to Port Harcourt to pay workshop participants on the first day of the activity and to pick up the bank draft for hotel reservations.
- 3:00 p.m. Trip to British Caledonia Office to confirm outbound flight for London.

February 8, 1986

- 10:00 a.m. INTRAH team travelled via domestic airline to Port Harcourt.
- 12:00 noon Arrival at Presidential Hotel, Port Harcourt, workshop venue.
- 3:00 p.m. Meeting with Prof. Edward Opuada Iwo-Nte Banigo, Vice Chancellor of Rivers State University of Science and Technology, to request that he open the INTRAH workshop.

February 10 to February 14, 1986

Conducted workshop (see Workshop Curriculum, Appendix C for workshop schedule).

February 15, 1986

- 8:00 a.m. INTRAH team departed Port Harcourt for Lagos.

February 16, 1986

1:30 a.m. Departure Lagos by Drs. Veney, Miranda and Burr.

7:30 p.m. Arrival RDU Airport by Drs Veney and Burr.

Dr. Miranda proceeded to San Juan from New York
City.

I. PURPOSE OF THE VISIT

1. To complete the final stages of curriculum development for a workshop on INTRAH evaluation design for five states in southeast Nigeria.
2. To conduct the workshop, working with two Nigerian co-trainers.

II. ACCOMPLISHMENTS

1. The workshop curriculum was developed and the training was implemented (see curriculum in Appendix C).
2. Eleven participants attended and completed the workshop. Rivers State, the state in which the workshop was held, sent three persons for the entire workshop. Other states represented were: Anambra, Benue, Cross River and Imo. Two university resource persons were also present through the entire period.
3. The participants learned about the INTRAH plan for evaluation as it is to be applied within Nigeria. They developed a set of preliminary data categories for the assessment of INTRAH activities within states in which INTRAH has worked in the past two years. These data categories will serve as a basis for design of data collection instruments to be used during an evaluation of INTRAH projects, which is scheduled to take place during April, May and June 1986 in Bauchi, Imo, Kwara, Niger, Ondo and Plateau States.

4. In verbal reactions to the workshop, the participants expressed a high level of satisfaction. The INTRAH participant reaction form results illustrated a generally positive reaction to the workshop on the part of the participants (see Appendix F.) The primary criticism of the workshop was the limited time available. Five of 13 persons who responded to the participant reaction forms (all participants and the university facilitators) indicated that there was too much material covered and the same number indicated that the time available was somewhat too short (questions 5 and 6). Ten respondents checked additional time as something that would have improved the workshop.

Many respondents also indicated that they did not have the opportunity to practice skills during the workshop. In particular, 8 of 13 respondents seemed less than totally satisfied with opportunity to practice skills during the workshop (question 10) and 8 also indicated that more time to practice skills and techniques would have improved the workshop (question 16). This is not surprising, as content was largely conceptual rather than skill oriented. There was unanimity among respondents in their willingness to recommend the workshop to others without hesitation (question 15).

5. On the pre- and post-tests of knowledge gained during the workshop, the group mean was 11.7 of 24 questions answered correctly on the pre-test, and 14.6 of 24 questions answered correctly on the post-test. Despite an average increase, the null hypothesis of no change in correct responses between the pre- and post-tests can not be rejected at the .05 level of significance. Further, the sixty percent average correct rate on the post-test would suggest that modifications in the test might be considered for the upcoming state-level evaluation short courses scheduled for July 1986.

III. BACKGROUND

This workshop on the INTRAH evaluation plan for state level personnel is part of the overall plan for the evaluation of INTRAH training activities in Nigeria. It follows a ten week short course on evaluation conducted in Chapel Hill North Carolina in May/July 1985 at which two federal level evaluation resource persons were in attendance, who were co-trainers in the workshop reported herein. This workshop took on added significance as it served as a test site for the development of data requirements to be applied during an April/May/June 1986 assessment of INTRAH conducted training/technical assistance activities in six Nigerian states in which INTRAH has worked during the PAC I and PAC II contracts. It should be noted that this workshop also represented the first in a series that are designed to introduce the INTRAH evaluation strategy in all the states of Nigeria.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES

The one-week workshop on the INTRAH evaluation strategy for Nigeria state level evaluation resource persons, was held at the Presidential Hotel in Port Harcourt, Rivers State, from February 10 through February 15, 1986. Four trainers (two international and two national) and eleven trainees participated in the workshop. In addition, two facilitator-observers attended from universities in Rivers and Anambra States. One observer from the U.S., who will serve as a trainer in subsequent workshops, also attended. Names and titles of all facilitators and participants are given in Appendices A and B.

The workshop was conducted as a participatory training event in which a combination of presentations and directed exercises were employed. The workshop curriculum and materials are detailed in Appendix C.

V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Course Content

1. The workshop provided the opportunity to review the INTRAH state level evaluation plans in Nigeria. Participants left the workshop with a knowledge and understanding of how INTRAH proposes to carry out evaluation.
2. The workshop also provided the opportunity for work by the participants in small groups to develop data categories that may be used to assess the effectiveness

of INTRAH training within the states of Nigeria where INTRAH has worked during the PAC I and PAC II contracts. These data categories will serve as the basis for design of data collection instruments to be used in the evaluation of INTRAH activities in Nigeria.

3. In general, the workshop appears to have been a positive experience and a good opportunity for state level evaluation personnel to provide input to the INTRAH evaluation strategy. It is probable, however, that the pre-post test is not a good assessment of what was covered in the workshop given the positive response to the workshop indicated on the participant reaction forms but the low average score on the post-test.

B. Administration

1. Despite some early concern on the part of the co-trainers that the participants would be dissatisfied with the hotel and eating arrangements (INTRAH payed the hotel directly for room and three meals each day), this was not bourn out during the course of the workshop. However, if all persons at the workshop had stayed in the hotel as was planned, the per person cost would have exceeded the budgeted per diem by about ten Naira per day. In future workshops it might be preferable to guarantee the room bill for the participants, but provide them with the remainder of per diem to be applied to food and incidentals.

2. As the Nigerian co-trainers will be traveling and working with the INTRAH trainers on a routine and intensive basis over the next several months on a number of activities, it would be appropriate to provide these persons with a per diem equivalent to that which the INTRAH consultants receive. This should be paid directly to them in the form of travel advance and reimbursement against hotel receipts, just as is done for INTRAH personnel.

3. All persons invited were able to attend. However, it was clear that eleven participants and two university based facilitators represent the lower limit of number of persons for effective group work on the subjects of this workshop. Because of this, it was decided that it would be desirable to combine the last three workshops into two and conduct both of these in the month of July, 1986. The present plan is to combine the states, except for Kwara, that were to attend both July workshops into the first July workshop. Kwara State and the states scheduled for the November workshop would be rescheduled for July. Under this revised plan, a workshop would take place in Jos for Bauchi, Borno, Gongola, Kaduna, Kano, Niger, Plateau and Sokoto States from July 7 to 12, and in Ibadan for Abuja, Bendel, Kwara, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, and Oyo States from July 21 to 26.

APPENDIX A

Persons Contacted

National Health Planning and Research Directorate, Federal
Ministry of Health

Dr. A. B. Sulaiman, Director

Mr. Ayodele Akin-Tahunsi, Principal Health Planner

Mr. Anthony Isama, Health Officer I

AID Affairs Office, Lagos

Ms. Keys MacManus, AID Affairs Officer

Rivers State University of Science and Technology,
Port Harcourt

Prof. Edward Opuada, Iwo-Nte Banigo, Vice Chancellor

Workshop Participants and Facilitators

See Appendix B.

Coopers and Lybrand

Mr. M. Kokuyi, Senior Manager

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT AND FACILITATORS

TRAINERS

Dr. James E. Veney (Jim)
INTRAH Evaluation Officer
Professor, School of Public Health
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C. USA 27514

Dr. Margarita Miranda (Maggie)
INTRAH Consultant
Associate Professor
School of Public Health
University of Puerto Rico
Box 5067
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936

Mr. Ayodele Akin-Dahunsi (Dale)
Principal Health Planner
Federal Ministry of Health
Federal Secretariat Phase II
Ikoyi Road, Lagos, Nigeria

Mr. Anthony Ike Isama (Tony)
Health Planning Officer
Federal Ministry of Health
Federal Secretariat Phase II
Ikoyi Road, Lagos, Nigeria

PARTICIPANTS

Dr. Rosemary Alewo Abdullahi
Ag. Chief Health Officer
Ministry of Health (HQ)
Makurdi, Benue State

Mrs. Bernice Akpan (Bernice)
Asst. Chief Public
Health Nurse Tutor
Ministry of Health (HQ)
P M B 1049 Calabar
Cross River State

Mrs. Susannah Onyoche Attah
Assistant Chief, Health Sister
Government Health Officer
HSMB, Makurdi, Benue State

HSMB, Makurdi, Benue State

Dr. Christopher Burr (Chris)
Observer
School of Public Health 201A
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C., USA 27514

Mrs. Grace Chinyere Chijicke
Principal Health Sister
Health Office
Naukka, Anambra State

Miss Stella A. C. Dike
Principal Public Health Sister
Coordinator, Family Planning Program
Ministry of Health
Owerri, Imo State

Mrs. Elizabeth Aniema Itata
Higher Medical Records Officer, Lecturer
Ministry of Health
School of Health Technology,
Calabar, Cross River State

Mrs. Georgiana D. T. Iworima
Senior Health Sister/Community Health Officer
(Facilitator)
Public Health Division
Health Services Department
University of Science & Technology
Port Harcourt, Rivers State

Dr. Truth T. Martyns-Yellowe
Medical Officer of Health
Ministry of Health, Family Health Clinic
28 Potts Johnson
Port Harcourt, Rivers State

Mrs. Grace Ogbonna
Public Health, Nurse Coordinator
Imo State Family Planning Program
Ministry of Health
Owerri, Imo State

Dr. Austin O. Okore
Senior Lecturer in Demography and Economics
Department of Economics, University of Nigeria
Naukka, Anambra State

Mrs. Victoria Olomobo (Victoria)
Community Health Supervisor
Family Planning Clinic
Planned Parenthood Family Planning Clinic
Orogbum, Port Harcourt, Rivers State

Dr. Gideon O. Ude (Jim)
Senior Consultant
Medical Director
Anambra State Hospitals
Management Board
Enugu, Anambra State

Miss Rosaline N. Yaboh (Rose)
Health Sister
Community Health Officer MCH/FP
Ministry of Health
Comprehensive Health Centre
Orogbum, Port Harcourt, Rivers State

APPENDIX C

WORKSHOP CURRICULUM

WORKSHOP GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A. Goal:

To improve family planning programs and training activities in Nigeria through the involvement of state level staff in program evaluation and ultimate assumption of the INTRAH evaluation system and responsibilities, with INTRAH staff support, by state and federally based evaluation resource persons in Nigeria.

B. Objectives:

- To prepare 19 states and Federal Capitol Territory state level personnel (two from each state) to assist Federal level evaluation resource persons in the evaluation of INTRAH sponsored training activities within INTRAH training states.
- To provide selected state level evaluation personnel with the theoretical and practical capabilities in program evaluation, program management and data collection and analysis to assist, in an effective manner, the Federal level INTRAH evaluation resource persons in the assumption of responsibility for INTRAH evaluation within training states and to serve as evaluation resource person within those states.
- To provide the state level evaluation personnel with a working knowledge of the INTRAH evaluation strategy to enable them to begin to participate actively in and to support evaluation of INTRAH sponsored family planning training taking place in their states.

- To provide and encourage opportunities for skill transfer from the Federal level evaluation resource persons through in-country workshops and other technical assistance to state level evaluation persons.

Port Harcourt Evaluation Workshop

INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES

(Terminal Objectives)

By the end of the training the participants will:

- define what role the State Evaluators will have.
- discuss the evaluation activities they will undertake.
- define the relationship and coordinating mechanisms with the National Level Evaluators.
- develop a plan for their evaluation activities.

DAY 1 OBJECTIVES

The participants will:

1. become acquainted with each other.
2. explain INTRAH overall program strategy.
3. compare different definitions of evaluation.
4. list different types of decisions that can be based on evaluation information.
5. identify the five different types or levels of evaluation and the purpose of each one.
6. define formative and summative evaluation and explain the difference.

DAY 1 AGENDA

8:30 - 9:30	Registration Introduction/Opening
9:30 - 10:30	Bio-Data Form Pre-Test
10:30 - 11:00	Coffee Break
11:00 - 12:00	Get Acquainted Exercise
12:00 - 12:30	Overview of INTRAH Program
12:30 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 2:00	Workshop Overview
2:00 - 3:00	Basic Concepts on Program Evaluation
3:00 - 3:15	Tea Break
3:15 - 4:30	Exercise 1 - Type of Evaluation
4:30	Reflections

DAY 2 OBJECTIVES

The participants will:

1. describe INTRAH's evaluation design.
2. list national level evaluators' role.
3. discuss how program objectives will provide a framework for program evaluation.
4. review WHO Technical Report approach to program goals and objectives.
5. review a list of Family Planning Program Goals and Objectives to determine
 - a. how they compare with the WHO approach.
 - b. how complete and measurable they are.
 - c. identify evaluation criteria having program objectives as a framework.

DAY 2 AGENDA

8:30 - 9:30	Continuation of Exercise 1 in groups
9:30 - 10:00	Group Report and Discussion
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break
10:30 - 11:30	INTRAH's Evaluation Design
11:30 - 12:30	Federal Level Evaluators' Roles
12:30 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 3:00	Impact Evaluation/Baseline Data Program Objectives
3:00 - 3:30	Tea Break
3:30 - 4:30	Exercise 2 - Program Objectives Criteria for Evaluation
4:30	Group Report

DAY 3 OBJECTIVES

The participants will

1. describe why baseline data is needed in program evaluation.
2. determine what information is going to be collected at the State Level for baseline.
3. explain how program impact is going to be evaluated at INTRAH program.
4. specify state evaluator roles in relation to baseline/impact evaluation information.
5. review a set of forms to collect and report service statistics in family planning and discuss advantages and disadvantages of them.
6. compare the set of forms with what they are using now and suggest how their State can improve in collecting and reporting service statistics on family planning.

DAY 3 AGENDA

8:30 - 9:00	Where We Are
9:30 - 10:00	Exercise 3 - State Baseline Data
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break
10:30 - 11:30	Group Reports
11:30 - 12:30	Role of State Evaluator
12:30 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 2:00	Service Statistics Information System
2:00 - 3:00	Forms To Be Used
3:00 - 3:30	Tea Break
3:30 - 4:30	Operation of the Information System
4:30 - 5:00	Role of the State Evaluator in the Service Information System.

DAY 4 OBJECTIVES

The participants will

1. explain the purpose of using Pre- Post-Test for INTRAH training evaluation.
2. Describe how the 10% sample follow-up study is going to be organized and what their participation will be.
3. Describe two approaches to performance appraisal and discuss the importance of performance appraisal for training evaluation.
4. Explain the Nigerian approach to the 3% sample follow-up of the trainees.
5. Design a draft of the questionnaire for the 3% sample follow-up survey.
6. Specify the state evaluators' roles in the 3% sample follow-up study.

DAY 4 AGENDA

8:30 - 9:00	Where We Are
9:00 - 10:00	Evaluation of Program Effect on Trainees (Knowledge) Pre- Post-Test during the Training
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break
10:30 - 11:30	Performance Appraisal on the Job (Training Effect on Behavior, 3% Follow-Up)
11:30 - 12:30	Principles on Questionnaire Design
12:30 - 1:30	Lunch
1:30 - 3:30	Exercise 4 - Design of an FU questionnaire and Survey Schedule
3:30 - 4:00	Tea Break
4:00 - 5:00	Group Report

DAY 5 OBJECTIVES

The participants will

1. explain INTRAH requirements for evaluation of training activities.
2. list trainers' roles in the evaluation of training activities and state evaluation roles.
3. Develop a plan for state evaluators' participation in INTRAH evaluation.

DAY 5 AGENDA

8:30 - 9:00	Evaluation of a Training Activity
9:00 - 10:00	State Evaluator Role
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break
10:30 - 12:00	Exercise 5 - Plan for State Evaluator Participation in INTRAH Evaluation
12:00 - 1:00	Lunch
1:00 - 3:00	Plan Development (Continuation)
3:00 - 3:30	Tea Break
3:30 - 4:30	Group Report
4:30 - 5:00	Reflections

DAY 6 OBJECTIVES

The participants will

1. discuss what coordinating mechanisms will be useful between state trainees and state evaluators.
2. discuss the coordinating mechanism required between state evaluators and federal evaluators to implement the INTRAH evaluation.
3. suggest how the coordinating mechanisms can be implemented in Nigeria.
4. present their reactions to the workshop and their recommendations for the workshop to be developed in other Nigerian states in the near future.

DAY 6 AGENDA

8:30 - 10:00	Workshop Evaluation
10:00 - 10:30	Coffee Break
10:30 - 12:00	Closing Ceremony

APPENDIX D

MATERIALS DEVELOPED DURING THE WORKSHOP

TOT Follow-Up Questionnaire

What have you done so far in terms of training?

1. Have you done any training? Yes _____ No _____

2. If yes, how many? _____

3. Types of training done: _____

4. When was the first and last training?

First _____ Last _____

5. Number of participants at each training:

1	6
2	7
3	8
4	9
5	10

6. Did you do any follow-ups? Yes _____ No _____

7. What are their addresses, if available?

8. If unable to make available, name of person who can provide them:

9. What was the content of the trainings conducted?

10. What materials did you use?

11. Who initiated the training (request)? _____

12. What was the length of each training? _____

13. Were there other trainers involved?

Yes _____ No _____

14. What other responsibilities do you have apart from being a trainer?

_____ Service providing

_____ Motivational

_____ Others (Specify)

15. What has been the effect of your training so far?

A) Any feedback? Yes _____ No _____

B) Was the training method appropriate? Yes _____ No _____

C) What was the average score of the participants? _____

16. What was the Pre/Post result or range of the participants?

17. Where do you work now?

Agency _____

Clinic _____

Please: You are requested to fill in the relevant answers to the questions below. Check the appropriate blanks.

Coding

1. State: _____

2. Name of TOT participant:

3. Address: _____

4. Age (years)	15-24	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	25-34	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)	
	35-44	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)	
	45+	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)	

5. Sex	Male	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Female	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)	

6. Marital Status	Married	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Single	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)	
	Divorced	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)	

7. Educational Qualification	Illiterate	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Primary	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)	
	Secondary	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)	
	Tertiary and Above	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)	

8. Job Description:

At First Training: _____

Currently: _____

9. Number of trainings conducted

1-5	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)
8-10	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)
11+	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)
None	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)

10. Types of F.P. training conducted

Management/Supervision	<input type="checkbox"/>
Info/Communication/Educ	<input type="checkbox"/>
Natural Method	<input type="checkbox"/>
Clinical Method	<input type="checkbox"/>
Others (Specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>
None	<input type="checkbox"/>

Specify _____

11. Length of time trained: _____

12. Number of trainees trained

None	<input type="checkbox"/>	(1)
Below 10	<input type="checkbox"/>	(2)
10-20	<input type="checkbox"/>	(3)
21-30	<input type="checkbox"/>	(4)
30+	<input type="checkbox"/>	(5)
Don't Know	<input type="checkbox"/>	(6)

13. Where did you train?

- | | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Teaching Hospital | (1) |
| Nursing/Medical School | (2) |
| Sch. Health Tech. | (3) |
| Health Center | (4) |
| Others (Specify) | (5) |

Specify _____

14. Status of training facilities available to you:

- | | |
|--------------|-----|
| Adequate | (1) |
| Not Adequate | (2) |
| None | (3) |
| Don't Know | (4) |

15. How often do you follow up your trainees?

- | | |
|-----------------|-----|
| Quarterly | (1) |
| Half Yearly | (2) |
| Yearly | (3) |
| Never | (4) |
| Other (Specify) | (5) |

Specify _____

16.A. Who supports the program?

- | | |
|---------------------|-----|
| Government | (1) |
| Non-Govt. (Specify) | (2) |
| Don't Know | (3) |

Specify _____

B. What type of support?

- | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|-----|
| Manpower | <input type="checkbox"/> | (1) |
| Financial | <input type="checkbox"/> | (2) |
| Material (Specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> | (3) |
| Others (Specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> | (4) |
| Don't Know | <input type="checkbox"/> | (5) |

Specify _____

C. What is the level of support?

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----|
| Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | (1) |
| Not Adequate | <input type="checkbox"/> | (2) |
| None | <input type="checkbox"/> | (3) |
| Don't Know | <input type="checkbox"/> | (4) |

Any other comments, please: _____

CLINICIANS EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Surname: _____

Other Names: _____

Maiden Name (if married): _____

Home Address: _____

Name of Clinic: _____

Zone (where clinic is located): _____

State: _____

Country: _____

Educational Qualifications:

Primary: _____

Secondary: _____

Post Secondary: _____

Professional Training:

Nursing: _____

Midwifery: _____

Public Health: _____

Medicine: _____

Other (Specify): _____

What is your job specification:

Pre-Clinical Training: _____

Presently: _____

How has your clinical training helped you?

How many clients attend your clinic?

Daily: _____

Weekly: _____

Monthly: _____

How do your clients get information about f/p?

Are you serving community recipients of f/p?

Yes

No

If not, why not? _____

What strategies of improvement do you suggest?

What communication methods do you use for:

Community Education? _____

Client Counseling? _____

Motivation? _____

Which commodities are highly accepted by most clients in your clinic? Please list in order of priority.

What steps do you use for your clients' selection?

Histories Taking: _____

Surgical: _____

Gynecological: _____

What other screening examinations do you do to guard against side effects or complications?

Do you have a standard protocol for your clinic?

Yes

No

Which method(s) of sterilization do you use in your clinic?

APPENDIX E

LIST OF INTRAH MATERIALS DISTRIBUTED

Katz, F. M., Guidelines for Evaluating a Training Programme for Health Personnel, WHO Publications # 38, 1978.

Veney, J., and Kaluzny, A., Evaluation and Decision Making for Health Services Programs, Prentice-Hall Inc., 1984.

WHO Public Health Papers, Assessing Health Workers' Performance, 1980.

Windsor, R., Baronowski T., Clark, N., and Gutler G., Evaluation of Health Promotion Programs, Mayfield Publishing Co., 1984.

APPENDIX F

PARTICIPANT REACTION FORM RESULTS AND
PRE -POST TEST QUESTIONS AND SCORES

INTRAH PARTICIPANT REACTION FORM

For each set of statements below, please check the one that best describes your feelings about this training.

1. Workshop objectives were:

- | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| a. Very clear | b. Mostly clear | c. Somewhat clear | d. Not very clear | e. Not clear at all |
| 7 | 4 | 2 | | |

2. Workshop objectives seemed to be achieved:

- | | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------------|---------------|
| a. Entirely | b. Mostly | c. Somewhat | d. Hardly at all | e. Not at all |
| 3 | 10 | | | |

3. With regard to workshop material (presentations, handouts, exercises) seemed to be:

- 10 a. All material was useful
- 3 b. Most materials were useful
- _____ c. Some material was useful
- _____ d. Little material was useful
- _____ e. No material was useful

4. Workshop material presented was clear and easy to follow:

- | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| a. All the time | b. More than half the time | c. About half the time | d. Less than half the time | e. None of the time |
| 3 | 9 | | | |

N.A. 1

5. The amount of material covered during the workshop was:

- a. Too much b. Somewhat too much c. Just about right d. Somewhat too little e. Too little
- | 1 | | 4 | | 8 | | | | |

6. The amount of time devoted to the workshop was:

- a. Too much b. Somewhat too much c. Just about right d. Somewhat too little e. Too little
- | | | | | 8 | | 5 | | |

7. For the work I do or am going to do, this workshop was:

- a. Very useful b. Mostly useful c. Somewhat useful d. Not very useful e. Not useful at all
- | 8 | | 3 | | 2 | | | | |

8. Possible solutions to real work problems were dealt with:

- a. All the time b. More than half the time c. About half the time d. Less than half the time e. None of the time
- | 4 | | 7 | | 2 | | | | |

9. In this workshop I learned:

- 7 a. many important and useful concepts,
5 b. several important and useful concepts,
1 c. some important and useful concepts,
___ d. a few important and useful concepts,
___ e. almost no important or useful concepts.

10. In this workshop I had an opportunity to practice:

- 3 a. many important and useful skills,
1 b. several important and useful skills,
6 c. some important and useful skills,
2 d. a few important and useful skills,
___ e. almost no important or useful skills.

N.A. = 1

11. Workshop facilities and arrangements were:

a. Very good	b. Good	c. Acceptable	d. Barely acceptable	e. Poor
5	6	2		

12. The trainer/trainers for this workshop was/were:

a. Very effective	b. Effective	c. Somewhat effective	d. Not very Effective	e. Not effective at all
10	3			

13. The trainer/trainers for this workshop encouraged me to give my opinions of the course:

a. Always	b. Often	c. Sometimes	d. Rarely	e. Never
8	5			

14. In providing information about my progress in training, the trainer/trainers for this workshop were:

a. Very effective	b. Effective	c. Somewhat effective	d. Not very effective	e. Not effective at all	
6	5	1			N.A. = 1

15. 13 a. I would recommend this workshop without hesitation,

_____ b. I would probably recommend this workshop

_____ c. I might recommend this workshop to some people

_____ d. I might not recommend this workshop

_____ e. I would not recommend this workshop.

16. Please check any of the following that you feel could have improved the workshop.

- 10 a. Additional time for the workshop
- 1 b. More limited time for the workshop
- 4 c. Use of more realistic examples and applications
- 8 d. More time to practice skills and techniques
- 3 e. More time to become familiar with theory and concepts
- 1 f. More effective trainers
- 4 g. More effective group interaction
- 1 h. Different training site or location
- 3 i. More preparation time outside the training sessions
- 5 j. More time spent in actual training activities
- 2 k. Concentration on a more limited and specific topic
- 2 l. Consideration of a broader and more comprehensive topic
- m. Other (specify) _____

17. Below are several topics that were presented in the workshop. Please indicate the usefulness of the topics to you in the scale at right.

	very useful			hardly useful		NA
	1	2	3	4	5	
a. <u>01</u>	8	3				NA=2
b. <u>502</u>	10	1				NA=2
c. <u>604</u>	10	2				NA=1
d. <u>602</u>	10	2				NA=1
e. <u>424</u>	10	2	1			
f. <u>424</u>	10	3				
g. <u>423</u>	9	1	1			NA=2
h. <u>901</u>	8	3	1			NA=1
i. <u>511</u>	6	4	2			NA=1
j. _____						

18. For the following techniques or resources, please check the box on the right that best describes your view of their usefulness for your learning in this workshop.

Techniques/ Resources	very useful			hardly useful		does not apply	NA
	1	2	3	4	5		
a. lectures	12	1				<input type="checkbox"/>	
b. group discussions	12	1				<input type="checkbox"/>	
c. individual exercises	6	2	2			<input type="checkbox"/>	NA=2
d. group exercises	9	2				<input type="checkbox"/>	NA=2
e. clinical sessions						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
f. field trips						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
g. handouts/readings	10	4				<input type="checkbox"/>	NA=3
h. books	8	3				<input type="checkbox"/>	NA=2
i. audio-visuals						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

19. From the list below, please indicate the three (3) areas in which you feel additional training in a future course would be most useful to you.

 a. Counselling and/or client education

 4 b. Provision of Clinical Methods (IUDs, pills, diaphragms, injections)

 c. Provision of Non-clinical Methods (condoms, foaming tablets, foam)

 1 d. Provision of Natural Family Planning Methods (rhythm, sympto-thermal, mucous)

 2 e. Supervision of Family Planning Services

 8 f. Management of Family Planning Service System

 8 g. Planning/Evaluation of Family Planning Services

 8 h. Policy Making/Direction of Family Planning Services

 1 i. Community Based Distribution of Contraceptives

 2 j. Community Based Outreach, Education or Information

 1 k. In-Service Training in Family Planning

 1 l. Pre-Service Teaching/Tutoring in Family Planning

 m. Other (specify) _____

20. Additional Comments: _____

Feel free to sign your name. (Optional)

May, 1985

29

PRE-POST TEST QUESTIONS

This test will help us to obtain baseline information about your knowledge of program evaluation. Please write your name and the date in the space provided below. You will have about 30 minutes to finish the test.

Name: _____

Date: _____

Choose the correct answer(s):

1. Evaluation is
 - a. a continuous process
 - b. a one-time only activity
 - c. based on criteria
 - d. based on intuition singularly developed
 - e. cooperatively developed

2. Formative evaluation is evaluation done:
 - a. at the beginning of a programme
 - b. while a programme is underway
 - c. at the end of a program
 - d. all of the above

3. Formative evaluation refers to:
 - a. The need to form evaluation groups before proceeding.
 - b. Evaluation that will effect subsequent program activity.
 - c. Evaluation of the form of a process, rather than the content.
 - d. The process of recording evaluation activity.

4. Summative evaluation refers to:
 - a. Evaluation of the content of a process, rather than the form.
 - b. Evaluation that is carried out to determine if evaluation groups should be formed.
 - c. Retrospective evaluation.
 - d. Quantitative evaluation.

5. "Baseline," in evaluation term refers to:
 - a. The document prepared as a result of the initial assessment of a situation before program intervention begins.
 - b. The line at the bottom of a Gantt Chart that is used to keep track of the time that a program is in operation.
 - c. The basic evaluation problem that is being considered.
 - d. The original program document, describing what the program is designed to do.

6. Evaluation is the collection and analysis of information by various methodological strategies to determine (select all that apply):
 - a. Relevance of program activities
 - b. Progress of program activities
 - c. Efficiency of program activities
 - d. Effectiveness of program activities
 - e. Impact of program activities

7. Data on the prevalence of diarrhea is collected to decide if a preventive program is necessary. The statement above is related to the following type of evaluation:
 - a. effectiveness
 - b. efficiency
 - c. relevance
 - d. progress
 - e. impact

8. The number of new family planning methods acceptors is compared with the proportion of acceptors stated in the objectives for the year. This is an example of the following type of evaluation:
 - a. effectiveness
 - b. efficiency
 - c. relevance
 - d. progress
 - e. impact

9. Which of these statements best describe the function of health service records in a country:
 - a. Health service records provide information on maternal and child health services.
 - b. Health service records provide information concerning activities of an organization or service.
 - c. Health service records provide information on Family Planning Services.
 - d. Health service records provide information on all activities carried out in every health institution, so that correct decisions could be made to improve the health services in a country.

10. In order for a record to be useful they should satisfy all but which one of the following criteria:
 - a. complete
 - b. accurate
 - c. timely
 - d. comparable
 - e. massive
 - f. legible

11. The major focus of INTRAH's evaluation activity will be:
 - a. Assessing the quality of training in host-country medical and nursing schools.
 - b. Assessing the quality of training being provided in INTRAH sponsored training courses
 - c. Assessing the effectiveness of INTRAH sponsored training through trainee follow-up.
 - d. Assessing the extent to which country leaders accept INTRAH support.
 - e. Assessing the extent to which INTRAH assistance is associated with increased FP capabilities in host countries.
 - f. All of the above.
 - g. a, c, and d above.
 - h. b, c, and e above.

12. The WHO hierarchy of objectives approach to goals and objectives is helpful in program planning to:
 - a. allow staff to know what is expected from the program in concrete terms
 - b. provide management with a program monitoring tool
 - c. assist evaluators in developing performance criteria to measure accomplishments of the program
 - d. provide understanding of the relationship between operational activities and results expected
 - e. all of the above
 - f. a & c above.

13. The following is an example of a complete and measurable program objective:
 - a. To reduce infant mortality by 20 percent in the country.
 - b. To train 45 TBAs among village volunteers in District X by December 1986, using the core training team.
 - c. To double antenatal consultations to pregnant women in 5 years in Region X.
 - d. To reduce mortality and morbidity of the rural population
 - e. a and b
 - f. b and c

14. The major advantage of a probability over a non-probability sample is that:
 - a. A probability sample is less expensive to draw.
 - b. A probability sample can provide an estimate of its own accuracy.
 - c. A probability sample can be selected by a person with only a little training.
 - d. A probability sample is likely to be smaller.

15. The size of a good sample must be:
 - a. At least 100 cases or persons.
 - b. At least 10% of the population.
 - c. At least 50% of the population.
 - d. Is not related to population size.

16. If one wished to take a good sample of families from a large, scattered population living in many small widely separated villages but where it is expected that all villages would be quite similar, one would be advised to use:
 - a. Simple random sampling.
 - b. Stratified sampling.
 - c. Cluster sampling.
 - d. Haphazard sampling.

17. Problems of non-probability sampling include:
- a. The possibility that easy or attractive cases will be chosen.
 - b. No capability for assessing the relative accuracy of the sample.
 - c. Bias.
 - d. All of the above.
 - e. A and C above.
18. The first step in designing a questionnaire is:
- a. to construct a preliminary version.
 - b. to list the type of data needed.
 - c. to develop a (training) protocol.
 - d. to specify the objectives of collecting information.

Pre-Post Scores

<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>Pre</u>	<u>Post</u>
1. Dr. Rosemary Abdullohi	14	21
2. Mrs. Bernice Akpan	14	16
3. Mrs. Sussanah Attah	7	11
4. Mrs. Grace Chijioke	9	13
5. Ms. Stella Dike	15	17
6. Mrs. Elizabeth Itata	7	10
7. Dr. (Mrs.) Truth Martyns-Yellowe	16	20
8. Mrs. Grace Ogbonna	17	17
9. Mrs. Victoria Olobo	7	8
10. Dr. Gideon Ude	12	16
11. Mrs. Rosaline Yaboh	11	12