

PD-A 1 5-4-89
1300

92

006828

000496

003783

**VISIT TO BURKINA FASO TO
CONDUCT A SUPERVISION
WORKSHOP AND REVISE THE
SUPERVISION CURRICULUM**

JANUARY 23 - FEBRUARY 17, 1993

Jana Ntumba

FAMILY PLANNING MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

Project No.: 936-3055

Contract No.: DPE-3055-Q-00-0052-00

Task Order No.: TWP-19-BF

CONTENTS

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II.	INTRODUCTION	2
III.	PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF WORK	2
IV.	BACKGROUND	2
V.	WORKSHOP PREPARATION	3
VI.	WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION	3
VII.	CURRICULUM REVISION	4
VIII.	RECOMMENDATIONS	5
	1) <u>Extension of the Revision Activity</u>	5
	2) <u>Implementation of Next Supervision Workshop</u>	5
3)	<u>Supplementary Training in Management and Training for Burkinabe Team</u>	6

ANNEXES:

- Annex 1: List of Burkinabe Trainers
- Annex 2: List of Workshop Participants
- Annex 3: Workshop Evaluation Results
- Annex 4: Curriculum Revision Schedule
- Annex 5: Areas of Curriculum to Revise

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mrs. Jana Glenn Ntumba, Deputy Director of the Management Training Program at MSH, completed a consultancy for FPMD in Burkina Faso, from January 23 to February 17, 1993, during which time she worked with the Directorate of Family Health to implement a supervision workshop for provincial level supervisors. This was the next to last workshop in a series of six designed to strengthen the supervisory system of Burkina Faso through training in supervision for provincial supervisors.

In collaboration with Burkinabe counterparts, Mrs. Ntumba achieved the following objectives: 1) to prepare the supervision workshop in Burkina Faso; 2) to conduct the two-week workshop for 25 participants; and 3) to revise and finalize the supervision workshop curriculum.

The team spent one week preparing for the workshop. During this time, team members were responsible for reviewing the management training material and taking care of logistic and administrative tasks. During the workshop, the team acted as co-trainers and systematically observed the process of each session in order to provide suggestions for revisions. In daily debriefing meetings, the trainers discussed the workshop and proposed curriculum modifications.

However, the time allotted for curriculum revision was inadequate (four days). Nonetheless, the team was able to identify all aspects of the curriculum needing modification, to delegate responsibilities to all team members, and to submit a proposal to extend the activity by a week to ensure the completion of final versions.

I. SOMMAIRE EXECUTIF

Madame Jana Glenn Ntumba, la Directrice Adjointe du Programme de Formation en Gestion de MSH, a réalisé une consultation pour FPMD au Burkina Faso du 23 janvier au 17 février, 1993 pour travailler avec la Direction de la Santé de la Famille pour exécuter un atelier sur la supervision pour les agents provinciaux. C'était l'avant-dernière intervention d'une série de six qui avait comme but de renforcer le système de supervision au Burkina Faso à travers la formation en supervision pour les superviseurs provinciaux.

Les objectifs du voyage de Madame Ntumba étaient: 1) de préparer l'atelier de supervision en collaboration avec les co-formateurs burkinabè; 2) de conduire l'atelier de deux semaines pour 25 participants en collaboration avec les co-formateurs burkinabè; et 3) de réviser et finaliser le curriculum de supervision en collaboration avec les collègues burkinabès.

L'équipe a passé une semaine à préparer l'atelier. Cette préparation a inclus un aspect constitution de l'équipe ainsi que la maîtrise de la matière et du processus de la formation et la planification des aspects administratifs. Pendant l'atelier, l'équipe a travaillé selon le modèle de la co-formation et a observé systématiquement le déroulement de chaque séance

pour pouvoir apporter des suggestions lors de la révision. Pendant les réunions journalières, les formateurs ont fait la mise au point pour l'atelier ainsi que pour les modifications à envisager pendant la révision.

Les quatre jours accordés à la révision du curriculum ne suffisaient pas compte tenu de l'importance des révisions à faire pour rendre le curriculum plus approprié. Néanmoins, l'équipe a identifié tous les aspects du curriculum à modifier, a assigné les responsabilités aux membres de l'équipe, et a fait une proposition d'étendre l'activité de révision pour permettre une bonne finalisation du processus.

II. INTRODUCTION

The Family Planning Management Development (FPMD) Project and its predecessor, the Family Planning Management Training (FPMT) Project, have worked with the Directorate of Family Health (DFH) to develop a fully adapted curriculum and protocols for a Supervision Workshop for provincial level supervisors. Following the first five Supervision Workshops, the curriculum was produced in draft form to serve as a Trainer's Guide to Burkinabe trainers who will offer the workshop on a regular basis to supervisors throughout the country.

The draft curriculum was field tested in January 1993 in a final workshop facilitated by a team of DFH and Directorate of Studies and Planning (DEP) trainers in collaboration with an FPMD consultant. This field test served as the basis for the final revision of the supervisory curriculum which will be finalized, printed, and distributed to the DFH.

III. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF WORK

The purpose of FPMD consultant Jana Glenn Ntumba's visit was to field test and finalize the supervisory curriculum for provincial level supervisors. The objectives of Mrs. Ntumba's trip were: 1) to prepare the Supervision Workshop in collaboration with Burkinabe co-trainers; 2) to conduct the two-week Supervision Workshop for 25 participants in collaboration with Burkinabe co-trainers; and 3) to revise the supervisory curriculum in collaboration with Burkinabe counterparts.

IV. BACKGROUND

In March 1992, Mrs. Ntumba visited Burkina Faso to prepare for the Supervision Workshop and do a preliminary revision of the curriculum developed under FPMT. At this time the Burkinabe team was unavailable for full time workshop preparation and preliminary curriculum revision. As a result, the objective of the visit was revised to focus on the development of two aspects of the curriculum identified as needing further development by

the FPMD team in collaboration with the DFH: 1) an overview of the supervisory system, and 2) the problem-solving approach to supervision, focusing on the interpersonal relationship between the supervisor and the supervisee.

During consultation with Dr. Bakouan and the DFH, it was decided that these new aspects of the curriculum would be developed but not included in the field test of the curriculum so as to allow for a true test of the curriculum as it existed. Then, based on observations during the field test which would either confirm or negate the need for these two elements, they would be integrated during the final curriculum revision.

V. WORKSHOP PREPARATION

The preparation phase of the workshop, from January 25 through 30, had three objectives: 1) to do team building with the training team (see Annex 1); 2) to master the material for and plan each session; and 3) to make decisions regarding all administrative aspects of the workshop. The process of team building was both structured and unstructured, including discussions designed to allow the members of the team to familiarize themselves with each other styles as well as to identify areas of strength and expertise in relation to the curriculum. Although the Burkinabe trainers all knew each other they had never worked together as a co-training team in a workshop, so the team building effort was appreciated by all.

Based on an analysis of strengths and expertise, responsibility was assigned to co-training teams for specific workshop sessions. The co-training teams worked together to master the content and methodology and to prepare all lectures and supporting materials for their sessions. For some, the preparation of the sessions was mostly review of material they knew; for others, the preparation required significant research and learning of new material.

Administrative issues were raised throughout the preparation week in such a way as to involve all members of the training team in the decision making process. These issues included opening and closing sessions, planning and managing the field trip, the development of competency evaluations (instead of pre- post- tests), and daily and final workshop evaluations. The team decided to assure that there was always one observer to take notes related to the revision of the curriculum. In addition they planned to have daily debriefing sessions to discuss the progress in the workshop and to raise issues needing further discussion during the curriculum revision.

VI. WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION

The workshop was held from February 1 through 13 in the DEP Conference room. There were seventeen participants from 11 provinces (see Annex 2). In his opening address, DFH Director, Dr. Didier Bakouan explained to the participants that the purpose of the workshop

was to field test the curriculum before final production and solicited their assistance and contributions in the process of revision. As a result, the group made an effort to evaluate sessions with curriculum revision in mind. This provided the training team with useful information which they were able to use in their discussion of revisions.

The training team conducted the workshop adhering to the curriculum as faithfully as possible except when there was team agreement that a particular session needed some modification before implementation. Although there were a few flaws in the implementation of certain sessions because the trainers had not yet mastered the co-training model, working in this way enriched the workshop and added an important dimension to the experience of the Burkinabe trainers. One of the most outstanding features of the workshop was the varied experience and different styles of the trainers. Because the team approach allowed enough flexibility for each trainer to feel free to use his or her own style, the workshop was lively, varied, and stimulated the on-going interest of all participants.

At the end of each day, the team met for a debriefing meeting to review session evaluations, to discuss co-training difficulties, to hear observations of the daily recorder and to propose revisions to the curriculum. Notes from these meetings were filed to be used as reference materials during the curriculum revision.

The workshop was quite successful, both in terms of training the provincial level supervisors who attended and in terms of field testing the curriculum. Evaluation results confirmed that the workshop is perceived as a positive tool in the training of Burkinabe supervisors and provided important information about aspects of the curriculum requiring revision (see Annex 3).

VII. CURRICULUM REVISION

From February 15 through 18, Mrs. Ntumba worked with the Burkinabe training team to revise the curriculum based on observations made during the workshop concerning the appropriateness and effectiveness of both content and methodology and to review the FPMD evaluation framework and results of the Baseline Evaluation¹ (see Annex 4). They agreed upon certain fundamental changes required in the basic concept of supervision upon which the curriculum was based and discussed the implications of these changes for specific content areas and workshop sessions. As previously identified during the discussions of March 1992, the interpersonal relationship between the supervisor and supervisee was considered a key element missing from the basic supervisory concept. In addition, the concept of the supervisory system as proposed by the FPMD Evaluation Team was accepted wholeheartedly by the team after the field test and much related discussion.

¹The Supervisory System of Burkina Faso's Family Planning Program: A Baseline Evaluation, 1992 Bassolet, Benavente, Benon, Madden, Nyameogo, Seligman

In planning the field test, neither FPMD nor the Burkinabe team expected that the revisions required to finalize the curriculum would be as substantial as they were. Modifications were required in five areas: 1) Generalizations about Supervision, 2) Human Relations in Supervision, 3) Interpersonal Communication, 4) Motivation, and 5) Styles of Leadership and Delegation (see Annex 5). These modifications will require changing the supporting reference documents as well. As a result, the team was unable to finalize the curriculum during the time scheduled.

Mrs. Ntumba and the Burkinabe team have assigned responsibilities for various aspects of the revision which remain to be done. It was decided that certain aspects of the curriculum would be more effectively addressed by Mrs. Ntumba in Boston due to the availability of reference documents. Other aspects should be modified and adapted to the Burkinabe context by the Burkinabe training team.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

To assure that the efforts made to date will be followed up in such a way as to guarantee high quality of the final product and outcome, there are three major categories of recommendations, as follows:

1) Extension of the Revision Activity

Mrs. Ntumba and the Burkinabe team recommend that the curriculum revision activity be extended by five days to allow for the Burkinabe team to concentrate their efforts. Our concern is that without this concentrated effort, the process will become dispersed and the observations made during the workshop may lose their significance.

There are unexpended funds remaining from the workshop (since there were 17 rather than the 25 anticipated participants) which could be made available to finance the extension of the revision activity. Assumptions about time frames and deadlines for the integration of modifications, technical revisions, and final production need to be flexible given the other responsibilities of both the FPMD consultant and the Burkinabe team. However, it is hoped that all technical revisions and final editing of the curriculum would be completed to allow for a production deadline of early fall, 1993.

2) Implementation of Next Supervision Workshop

It is highly recommended that the first Burkinabe team to implement the next Supervision Workshop using the final curriculum be the same team that collaborated on this field test and curriculum revision activity. If this team can master the finalized curriculum (which they have contributed to creating) as well as have an opportunity to perfect their use of the co-training model, they can serve as effective mentors to other trainers with whom they will work to offer the workshop in the future. It would be far less effective to have a new team

work with the finalized curriculum the first time it is used to teach a course.

3) **Supplementary Training in Management and Training for Burkinabe Team**

Based on the workshop evaluation results, the observations of the FPMD consultant, and individual discussions with Burkinabe team members, it is recommended that members of the Burkinabe team be considered for supplementary training in the areas of management and training. Although all members of the team master basic training skills, they are limited in their ability to use a variety of methods and techniques. In addition, there were numerous problems encountered in the workshop which could have been avoided if the team was more skilled in the management of a training program.

**ANNEX 1
LIST OF BURKINABE TRAINERS**

BENON Abou Roland	Assistant de Santé	DEP	MSASF
COMPAORE Félix	Educateur Social	DSF	MSASF
CASSALOM Pauline	Educateur Social	DSF	MSASF
ILBOUDO Franceline	Assistante de Santé	DSF	MSASF
OUEDRAOGO B. Arsène	Conseiller de Santé	DEPF	MSASF

ANNEX 2
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<u>NOM/PRENOM</u>	<u>FONCTION</u>	<u>PROVINCE</u>	<u>LOCALE</u>
COULIBALY Amadou	Médecin	Kossi	CM Nouna
ZOUNGRANA Victorine	SFE	Oubirtenga	Ziniaré
OUEDRAOGO Habibou	SFE	Kadiogo	Ouaga
KI Célestine	Médecin	Bam	Kongoussi
PARE Anne	Médecin	Séno	Dori
DADJOU Moussa	Médecin	Bazèga	Saponé
TRAORE Germain	Médecin	Kadiogo	DSF
OUEDRAOGO Aïssata	IDE	Yatenga	Ouahigouya
OUEDRAOGO Boureima	Médecin	Yatenga	Ouahigouya
NEBIE Badémié	Pharmacien	Ganzourghou	Zorgho
TOE Alain	Médecin/DPSAS	Sissili	Léo
GUIRE Abdoulaye	Médecin/DPSAS	Soum	Djibo
DONDASSE Louise	ASS/Santé	Kadiogo	DSF
NIKYEMA Sylviane	SFE	Séno	Dori
TAPSOBA Patrice	Médecin	Namentenga	Tougouri
ZOUNDI M. Thérèse	Médecin	Kadiogo	Pissy
ZEBA Jean Jacques	Médecin	Kadiogo	Ouaga

**ANNEX 3
WORKSHOP EVALUATION RESULTS**

EVALUATION FINALE

Séminaire : Formation en supervision Lieu : Ouagadougou
Date : 1 février - 12 février 1993

A. ASPECTS EDUCATIONNELS

Veillez évaluer les éléments ci-dessous en dessinant un cercle autour d'une des notes sur l'échelle donnée ci-dessous.

EXCELLENT= Au dessus
des attentes des participants

BON= Satisfait des
attentes des participants

Insuffisant= En dessous
des attentes des participants

Les Résultats sont en caractère gras.

1. Veuillez donner votre évaluation générale du cours

Excellent	Bon	Insuffisant
9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
(9)	(5)	

2. Veuillez donner votre évaluation de chaque aspect éducationnel selon l'échelle ci-dessous :

	<u>Excellent</u>	<u>bon</u>	<u>Insuffisant</u>
Atteinte des objectifs du cours	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyenne: 7,50	(13)	(3)	
Atteint de mes objectifs personnels	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyenne: 7,25	(13)	(3)	

Pertinence du contenu pour mon travail	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyenne: 7,18	(14)	(1)	
Efficacité des méthodes et techniques de formation	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyenne: 7,00	(10)	(6)	
Organisation du cours (l'ordre des thèmes)	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyenne: 6,56	(9)	(7)	
Utilité des matériaux didactiques	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyenne: 6,43	(5)	(11)	
Efficacité des formateurs	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyenne: 6,50	(7)	(9)	
Qualité des matériaux didactiques	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyenne: 5,87	(5)	(10)	(1)

3. Veuillez évaluer la durée du cours (3) trop longue (11) parfait (1) trop court

Veillez utiliser la liste suivante pour répondre aux question 4 et 5.

1. Unité 1 : Introduction à la fonction de supervision
2. Unité 2 : Aspects interpersonnels
3. Unité 2.1 : Communication
4. Unité 2.2 : Motivation
5. Unité 2.3 : Délégation
6. Unité 3 : Styles de supervision
7. Unité 4 : Mise en place d'un mécanisme de supervision
8. Unité 5 : Préparation d'un Plan de supervision
9. Unité 6 : Visite sur le terrain
10. Unité 7 : Gestion des conflits et Feed-back interpersonnel
11. Unité 7.1 : Gestion des conflits
12. Unité 8 : Exploitation des informations
13. Unité 9 : Résolution des problèmes
14. Unité 10 : Analyse du système de supervision
15. Unité 11 : Elaboration d'un plan d'action pour améliorer la supervision

4. Veuillez donner les 3 unités les plus pertinents pour votre travail. Marquez seulement le numéro (1-24) de l'unité, pas le titre de l'unité

5. Veuillez donner les 3 unités les moins pertinents pour votre travail. Marquez seulement le numéro (1-24) de l'unité, pas le titre de l'unité

6. Sur quel thème auriez-vous bien voulu passer plus de temps ?

Voilà les Résultats des Questions 4,5 et 6:

Numéro de Question: 4 5 6

1. Unité 1 :	(4)	(3)	(0)	Introduction à la fonction de supervision
2. Unité 2 :	(3)	(2)	(3)	Aspects interpersonnels
3. Unité 2.1 :	(3)	(0)	(0)	Communication
4. Unité 2.2 :	(4)	(0)	(1)	Motivation
5. Unité 2.3 :	(2)	(3)	(1)	Délégation
6. Unité 3 :	(3)	(0)	(1)	Styles de supervision
7. Unité 4 :	(3)	(1)	(1)	Mise en place d'un mécanisme de supervision
8. Unité 5 :	(10)	(0)	(0)	Préparation d'un Plan de supervision
9. Unité 6 :	(5)	(6)	(2)	Visite sur le terrain
10. Unité 7 :	(0)	(1)	(0)	Gestion des conflits et Feed-back Interpersonnel
11. Unité 7.1 :	(2)	(0)	(2)	Gestion des conflits
12. Unité 8 :	(4)	(0)	(2)	Exploitation des informations
13. Unité 9 :	(1)	(0)	(0)	Résolution des problèmes
14. Unité 10 :	(0)	(2)	(2)	Analyse du système de supervision
15. Unité 11 :	(5)	(2)	(4)	Elaboration d'un plan d'action pour améliorer la supervision

7. Quels sont les thèmes que vous auriez aimé voir inclus dans le cours ?

Les Résultats: -Différences entre supervision et évaluation
-Formulations des problèmes et des objectifs
-La Direction

8. Veuillez écrire ci-dessous d'autres suggestions sur les aspects éducationnels du cours

Les Résultats: -Améliorer la prise en charge participants

B. ASPECTS ADMINISTRATIFS

1. Veuillez donner votre évaluation sur les aspects ci-dessous énumérés en cerclant le chiffre de votre choix sur l'échelle ci-après

	Excellent	Bon	Insuffisant
Nourriture pourvu	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyen: 4,12	(0)	(8)	(8)
Salle de formation	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyen: 4,65	(2)	(10)	(2)
Soutien administratif	9 8 7	6 5 4	3 2 1
moyen: 5,56	(3)	(12)	(1)

2. Veuillez écrire dessous d'autres suggestions sur les aspects administratifs du séminaire.

Les Résultats: -Rembourser les frais de transport à temps

-Les per diems sont insuffisants

-Que le contact sur l'horaire soit respecté car la participation intellectuelle déminée une fois l'heure débordée

-Donnez un repas consistant à 12h

ANNEX 4
CURRICULUM REVISION SCHEDULE

le 15 février

matin: déterminer le programme
 identifier les unités à modifier et les tâches y associées
 repartir le temps disponible
 "gestion des conflits"

soir: résolution des problèmes

le 16 février

matin: "introduction à la fonction de supervision"
 "motivation"
 "gestion des conflits" (suite)

soir: "analyse du système de supervision"

le 17 février

matin: "gestion des conflits" (suite)
 "généralités sur la supervision"

soir "glossaire"
 "définition opératoire"

le 18 février

matin: identifier les tâches qui restent à faire et répartir les responsabilités entre l'équipe
 Burkinabe et Mme. Ntumba
 se mettre d'accord sur la définition opératoire
 recommandations pour le manuel des participants

Annex 5
AREAS OF CURRICULUM NEEDING REVISION

*** indique les révisions majeures**

Table de matières

Emploi du temps

Guide pour la séance d'ouverture

Généralités sur la supervision*

Module A: Relations humaines dans la supervision*

Unité 1: Communication interpersonnelle*

Unité 2: Motivation*

Unité 3: Styles de leadership et délégation*

Unité 5: Choix de techniques (question de stratégie)

-instruments

-détermination des activités

-détermination des ressources

-développer un calendrier

Unité 6: Visite sur le terrain

Unité 7: Feedback interpersonnel et gestion des conflits*

Unité 8: Exploitation des informations

Unité 9: Résolution des problèmes*

Unité 10: Analyse du système de supervision*

Unité 11: Elaboration d'un plan d'action

Synthèse

Annexes

Auto-évaluation des compétences

Evaluation finale (revoir questions sur la page 2)

La supervision (d'Almeida)*

Définition opératoire*

La relation interpersonnelle*

La motivation (à remplacer)

Cas 17 (trois documents à enlever)

Les douze étapes...à contrôle efficace (à enlever)

L'exercice sur la gestion des conflits*

La gestion des conflits*

Protocole pour la résolution des problèmes*

Questionnaire sur l'analyse du système de supervision*

Glossaire (à ajouter)