

PN-AAN-387  
1501-30811

9260055/62

SEMINAR COMPLETION REPORT  
TRAINING OF TRAINERS IN MANAGEMENT  
COCHABAMBA, BOLIVIA  
January 26 - February 26, 1981

FINAL

Submitted to:

Lou Faoro  
Project Manager  
Office of Rural Development and  
Development Administration  
Agency for International Development  
Washington, D.C. 20523

Submitted by:

Practical Concepts Incorporated  
1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Bolivia Team Members

Donald E. Spears	- Director/Trainer	
Vicente Sarubbi	- Trainer	
John Tabor	- Trainer	
Elizabeth Freedman	- Trainer/Logistician	May 11, 1981

1501-30811-9260055

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### SECTION ONE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- A. Introduction
- B. Participants
- C. Achievements

### SECTION TWO SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE SEMINAR

### APPENDICES

- A. List of Participants by Organization, Title/Function and Mailing Address
- B. Training of Trainers in Management Agenda
- C. Participants' Evaluation Responses
- D. Weekly Evaluation Questionnaire

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### SECTION ONE

#### A. INTRODUCTION

A Seminar in the Training of Trainers in Management (TTM) series was conducted in Cochabamba, Bolivia, in January and February of 1981 at the Hotel Emperador. This Seminar was presented by Practical Concepts Incorporated under terms of contract AID/SOD/it-C-0006 with the U.S. Agency for International Development and with the cooperation of the Bolivian Ministry of Planning and Coordination (MPC) and the nine Department Development Corporations (DDC's). The Seminar had several complementary objectives including:

- instruction of Department Development Corporation managers in key management principles and practices;
- creation of additional demand and appreciation for improved management skills on a "spread effect" basis in the DDC's managerial cadre;
- demonstration of the utility of the TTM-type approach for providing such skills; and,
- partial institutionalization within the DDC's of the ability to carry out comparable seminars in the future.

The Seminar began officially in Cochabamba on January 26, 1981, and was completed on February 26, 1981. All the participants were Bolivians and the Seminar was conducted in Spanish. The Seminar immediately followed a five-day Executive Management Seminar (EMS) which concluded on January 23, 1981 in the same location. In addition to the normal classroom lecture/workshop modes of instruction, the Seminar included two days of site visits to on-going projects under the jurisdiction of the host DDC, CORDECU. Teams of participants investigated the design and implementation

aspects of the reforestation project and the tea/crop replacement project which they visited. The participants also visited a series of projects in a nearby industrial park.

The Seminar opening ceremonies included a welcome from Eduardo Rivas, Acting President of CORDECO (host corporation) and remarks by Donald E. Spears, PCI Trainer and Director of the TTM Seminar. Closing ceremonies featured congratulatory remarks from Lic. Gonzalo Riveros, the Director of Regional Planning, Lic. Jaime Mariscal, President of TTM participant group, Lt Col. Augusto Sanchez V., President of CORDECO, Dr. Enrique Garcia A., PCI Team Leader of Rural Development Planning Project, and Donald E. Spears, Seminar Director. During the presentation Lic. Riveros announced the newly adopted policy of the Ministry of Planning and Coordination that all development projects must use the Logical Framework and PMS tools in their design and implementation.

## B. PARTICIPANTS

There were 30 participants in the five-week Seminar, 28 of whom were male and two of whom were female. (List of participants is included as Appendix A.) With the exception of two individuals, one an economist and the other an employee of the Artisans Marketing Association, all other participants were employees of the Departmental Development Corporations (DDC's). Seven of the country's nine departments were represented. The smallest delegation came from the department of Tarija with three representatives attending and the largest delegation from the Chuquisaca with six participants.

By background the participants were economists, engineers and agricultural technicians. However, nearly half of the group's members said that they had taught adults in a formal setting such as a university at some time during their career. They were all currently involved in some aspect of project design or implementation in their respective DDC's, with the exception of those two participants who worked outside the DDC's.

An introductory process which included a summary of personal learning objectives and a written "Needs Assessment" questionnaire indicated that the participants had been adequately briefed on the content of the course and that their expectations were within the range of the course objectives. With few exceptions the group was seen as generally homogenous regarding such aspects as education background, work experience, and position.

Periodic adjustments were made in the course curriculum based on weekly analysis of evaluation and feedback instruments collected from the participants. An example of such an adjustment was the expansion of time and attention given to the designing of real projects to be later utilized in the back home situation. The training techniques section was also enlarged at the request of participants.

#### C. ACHIEVEMENTS

This Seminar enjoyed the benefits of a high level of enthusiasm for the course content which had been transferred from the participants of the EMS which preceded it. Initial skepticism was minimal so that formulation and acceptance of unified objectives was almost immediate. Executives from the DDC's had already emphasized the importance of active participation and concentrated effort to course participants prior to their arrival. As a result many of the participants grasped the major concepts during the first week of the course and readily accepted leadership roles within their working teams.

Members of workshop teams were changed each week so that each participant might benefit from the resources represented in other seminar participants. We realized that this effort had been successful during the third week when a group of participants stated how much they had learned by working on a weaker team that week because they had to work harder.

Acceptance of the TTM program and tools was most notable by the fact that during the last half of the Seminar participants worked on their own time beyond midnight almost every night in the training room. Some even sought and received help from trainers in designing projects that they were involved with through civic organizations to which they belonged.

Each participant demonstrated the ability accurately use Logical Framework and PMS tools by fully developing a back-home project design and implementation plan. All participants completed individual problem analysis instruments, detailed Logical Frameworks for their projects, logical diagrams, performance networks, responsibility charts as well as plans for monitoring and reporting. A few participants voluntarily went on to complete Logical Frameworks for the evaluation of their back-home projects. One or two participants completed all of these instruments for more than one back-home project. In well over half of the back-home projects for which there was already a high degree of assurance that the projects would actually be implemented in the near future.

According to the assessment of the Seminar training staff all participants mastered the basic Logical Framework concepts and the Project Management System tools. Over half of the group demonstrated that they could more than adequately design seminars and lead training teams in presenting these materials. All other participants were seen as capable of serving as presenters and advisors on training teams.

## SPECIAL FEATURES OF THE SEMINAR

---

### SECTION TWO

A few unusual factors affected the dynamics and process of carrying out this TTM seminar. Those that are mentioned here are those which have implications for future TTM programs and for future work in Bolivia. Most significant among them were:

- The scheduling of the TTM immediately following the EMS seminar;
- The presence of wide spread support for PMS methods prior to implementing the course;
- The involvement of the sponsoring agencies in the logistical details of the course; and,
- The fact that almost all participants had been explicitly told that they would have the opportunity and obligation to apply the skills and methods imparted in the course.

Among these factors the first one, having to do with the close scheduling of the two seminars, is the only one seen as having a potentially negative impact. It left the trainers with very limited time to respond to the information they had gained from the EMS participants and the EMS participants themselves had little or no opportunity to reconsider the recommendations that they had made earlier regarding TTM participant selection.

The second factor, related to the receptive environment, was completely positive and refreshing. This seemed to have come from a strong awareness within the DDC's of the need for a more systematic approach to project design and implementation. As relatively new organizations these agencies were well focused on broad objectives and they had obviously been encouraged by a strong team of advisors in their search for better ways to achieve them. As a result most of the participants arrived at the seminar with high expectations to work hard and learn a lot. The fact that all of the country's universities had been closed for several months might also have been a factor in creating this high level of appreciation for the opportunity to receive advanced training.

The fact that the DDC's were obliged to use a specific number of hotel rooms in exchange for the hotel's agreement to provide free training space proved to be complicated and problematic. Such an arrangement requires that all those who must adhere to the original contract have a clear advance understanding of their obligations. Unfortunately these details had not been adequately communicated and the work of resolving the ensuing conflicts distracted some participants during the first few days of the course.

Other aspects of agency involvement in the logistics of the course worked well to enhance the training experience. In addition to providing clerical support, the Development Corporation of Cochabamba arranged all aspects of our transportation and meals for that trip and they gave a final luncheon for all participants following the graduation ceremonies. By CORDECO filling such a vital role as the local host agency the training staff was allowed to attend to course content and special project design problems as they arose.

Participants seemed to have known in advance that the course requirement to design a project and a total plan for its implementation was not just an academic exercise. Many had been briefed by their superiors regarding which projects were likely to receive consideration and funding once they returned to their regular duties. This made the job of keeping the focus on reality an easy one for the training staff. However, it also made it difficult to have participants do broad problem analysis before selecting a particular solution to be carried out through the project.

This course was originally designed as a modified TIM which directed itself to the practitioner of PMS methodology rather than to the trainer of other practitioners. However, as a result of suggestions from EMS participants the training of trainers aspect of the course was revitalized and included in the course. While this aspect of the course was adequate and well received the short notice shift in the course design made it impossible to include the opportunity for participants to review their training techniques on videotape. Such direct feedback would have been beneficial.

Fortunately this particular TTM experience provided us the opportunity to learn more from our success than our mistakes. There were, however, a few important points resulting from both and they should be considered here.

As has been mentioned in the final report on the EMS which preceded this TTM, there was a need for more time between the two seminars. Only a few of the EMS participants had the opportunity for even the briefest of discussions with their subordinates before those subordinates came to the TTM as participants. Such discussions are essential if we are to take full advantage of the executives' enthusiasm for the material at the time when it is most fresh and meaningful for them. Secondly, the training staff can certainly use a few extra days to make changes in plans and course design to accommodate the recommendations of the EMS participants.

Several benefits are possible from involving local agencies in the logistical aspects of presenting a TTM seminar. Overall the unity which developed from the sense of shared responsibility was perhaps the major advantage. The course also benefited from the local agencies' awareness of resources and alternatives for resolving problems. However, like most coordinated efforts, the need for high quality communication was great. While there are risks involved when the training staff is dependent on another organization these can be reduced by agreement on clear roles and responsibilities from the beginning.

The fact that the participants would have both the opportunity and the obligation to apply the skills they learned in the course added great vitality to the experience. This situation arose from several circumstances which may have been unique to the time and place of this particular TTM. However, our conclusion is that whenever possible steps should be taken to guarantee that participants arrive at the training site with the assurance they will shortly after the course be expected to use their new skills.

At the conclusion of the TTM Lic. Rivero, the Regional Director for Planning and Coordination, announced an organizational policy change which would require the use of PMS methods in the design and implementation of all projects in all of the DDC's. As long as this is done in a step-by-step manner, building on progress to date and taking advantage of the newly trained TTM graduates, we are hopeful that the use of PMS methods will help Bolivia's development efforts. There is concern that the Bolivians may move too fast, and the methodology become simply a constraint. All concerned have been sensitized to the dangers of too much enthusiasm, and hopefully will proceed with care.

Since individual participants returned to their jobs with thoroughly designed project implementation plans of their own and with copies of the project designs created by each of their fellow participants these projects should soon become a part of the plans of operation of the various corporations. Several individual participants were already slated to conduct seminars in PMS methodology at the conclusion of the TTM.

---

**APPENDIX A: List of Participants by Organization, Title/Function  
and Mailing Address**

---

NOMBRE: Mario Antonio de Achá  
TITULO:  
INSTITUCION: Min. de Planeamiento y Coordinación  
CARGO: Asesor Dptc. de Planificación  
DIRECCION: General Achá s/n. La Paz, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2-1891

---

NOMBRE: José Arciénega Echalar  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CODETAR  
CARGO: Jefe Dptc. de Planificación  
DIRECCION: Av. de las Américas calle España, Tarija, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: # 3272 Casilla # 1369

---

NOMBRE: Percy Baptista Lazarte  
TITULO: Ingeniero  
INSTITUCION: CORDEPAZ  
CARGO: Jefe Dpto. Forestal  
DIRECCION: Av. Arce esq. Pinilla, La Paz Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 367317

---

NOMBRE: Crissel Saenz de Bellott  
TITULO: Licenciada  
INSTITUCION: CORDEPO  
CARGO: Encargada de Costos, Min. Ind. y Com.  
DIRECCION: Av. Perú, Potosi, Bolivia  
TELEFONO:

NOMBRE: Ronald Camacho Santivañez  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDECH  
CARGO: Economista Dpto. de Planificación  
DIRECCION: Junín 176 , Sucre, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2143. (Domicilio 2037)

---

NOMBRE: Oscar Carvallo Cabrera  
TITULO: Ingeniero  
INSTITUCION: CORDECO  
CARGO: Jefe Div. de Infraestructura  
DIRECCION: Pacata Alta , Cochabamba, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 47568 (Oficina 2-8250)

---

NOMBRE: Gastón Caveró C.  
TITULO: Agrónomo  
INSTITUCION: CORDECH  
CARGO: Jefe Dpto. Crédito Extensión  
DIRECCION: Sucre, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 4051

---

NOMBRE: Roberto Chávez de los Ríos  
TITULO: Doctor  
INSTITUCION: CORDECH  
CARGO: Jefe Sección Pecuaria  
DIRECCION: Camacho 226 Sucre, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 4051

NOMBRE: Juan José Dueñas Gutierrez  
TITULO: Ingeniero Agrónomo  
INSTITUCION: CORDEPO  
CARGO: Técnico de Planta  
DIRECCION: Nogales # 990 La Paz esa. Omiste, Potosi, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2229 Casilla 230

---

NOMBRE: Fernando Díaz Romero M.  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDEPAZ  
CARGO: Técnico Div. de Planificación  
DIRECCION: Edificio Sta. Isabel 2° Messanino, La Paz; Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 367313 / Bloque "A"

---

NOMBRE: Edmundo Espinoza Rossel  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDEOR  
CARGO: Jefe Accidental Cpto. de Planificación  
DIRECCION: Potosí 1035, Oruro, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 52926

---

NOMBRE: Alberto Tomás Gordillo Fernández  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CODETAR  
CARGO: Técnico I  
DIRECCION: Juan Michel Saracho, Tarija, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 3272

NOMBRE: Juñic Guzmán Gutierrez  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CODEBENI  
CARGO: Director de Planificación  
DIRECCION: Joaquín de la Sierra # 418, Trinidad, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 777

---

NOMBRE: Luis Carlos Landfvar Moreno  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CODEBENI  
CARGO: Técnico de Proyectos  
DIRECCION: Av. 18 de noviembre # 615, Trinidad, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 900

---

NOMBRE: Sonia Lourdes López Uzeda  
TITULO: Licenciada  
INSTITUCION: CORDEPO  
CARGO: Analista de Proyectos  
DIRECCION: La Paz Casilla 230, Potosi, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2323

---

NOMBRE: Jaime A. Mariscal Guzmán  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDEPAZ  
CARGO: Economista de Proyectos  
DIRECCION: Av. Arce Ed. Sta. Isabel 2º Mezanine, La Paz, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 367316

NOMBRE: Hugo Martínez Mejía  
TITULO: Ingeniero Civil  
INSTITUCION: CODEBENI  
CARGO: Sub-Gerente  
DIRECCION: Jaquín de la Sierra, Trinidad, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 923

---

NOMBRE: Jaime Mendoza Nogales  
TITULO: Ingeniero  
INSTITUCION: CODETAR  
CARGO: Jefe Dpto. Agropecuario Forestal  
DIRECCION: Av. de las Américas (Calle España), Tarija,  
TELEFONO: 3885 Bolivia

---

NOMBRE: Roberto Montoya Caballero  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDECO  
CARGO: Jefe Div. Planificación Operativa  
DIRECCION: Av. Aroma Final Oeste, Cochabamba, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2-5280

---

NOMBRE: Enrique Murguía Oropeza  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDECH  
CARGO: Economista Dpto. Proyectos  
DIRECCION: Boquerón 218, Sucre, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 4703 - 4438

NOMBRE: Braulio Orc O.  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDEPO  
CARGO: Jefe Dpto. Planificación  
DIRECCION: Casilla 320, La Paz, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2323

---

NOMBRE: Demetrio Guisbert R. d. O.  
TITULO: Ingeniero Civil  
INSTITUCION: CORDEOR  
CARGO: Supervisor de Obra  
DIRECCION: Petcsf 1035 , Oruro, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 52926

---

NOMBRE: Raúl Quintana Campos  
TITULO: Ingeniero  
INSTITUCION: CORDECH  
CARGO: Jefe Dpto. Industrial  
DIRECCION: Av. del Maestro 330 , Sucre, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2556 - 2565

---

NOMBRE: Alfredo Ramallo Cáceres  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDEOR  
CARGO: Economista Departamento Planificación  
DIRECCION: Petcsf 1035 , Oruro, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 10387

NOMBRE: Victor Rico Arancibia  
TITULO: Ingeniero  
INSTITUCION: CORDEOR  
CARGO: Jefe Dpto. de Organización y Control  
DIRECCION: Potosí 1035 , Oruro, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 50387

---

NOMBRE: Meisés Rodríguez Espinoza  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDECO  
CARGO: Jefe Div. de Auditoría  
DIRECCION: Ladislao Cabrera 351 , Cochabamba, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2-1096 - 2-8250

---

NOMBRE: Miguel Vargas Rivas  
TITULO: Licenciado  
INSTITUCION: CORDECO  
CARGO: Economista Parque Industrial  
DIRECCION: Villa Moscú, Cochabamba, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 42341

---

NOMBRE: Carlos Vargas Abularach  
TITULO: Veterinario Zootecnista  
INSTITUCION: CODEBENI  
CARGO: Div. Proyecto Sanidad Animal  
DIRECCION: La Paz 651, Trinidad, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 480

NCMBRE: Luis Zapata Escóbar  
TITULO: Ingeniero  
INSTITUCION: CORDEPAZ  
CARGO: Estadístico en Planificación  
DIRECCION: Edificio Santa Isabel Av. Arce , La Paz, Bolivi  
TELEFONO: 367313

---

HOMBRE: Edmundo Zelada Seoane  
TITULO: Ingeniero Químico  
INSTITUCION: CORDECH  
CARGO: Jefe Unidad Planificación y Proyectos  
DIRECCION: Manuel Molina , Sucre, Bolivia  
TELEFONO: 2288 - 1585

---

---

**APPENDIX B: Training of Trainers in Management Agenda**

---

AGENDA

TRAINING OF TRAINERS IN MANAGEMENT

COCHABAMBA, BOLIVIA

WEEK ONE

Monday, January 26, 1981

AM Inauguration  
Participant Introductions

PM "Seal Hunt"

Tuesday, January 27, 1981

AM Needs Assessment  
PMS Cycle Presentation  
Successful Project Identification exercise

PM Logic Chain and Narrative Summaries

Wednesday, January 28, 1981

AM Analysis of Assumptions  
Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs)

PM OVIs workshop  
Means of Verification (MOVs)

Thursday, January 29, 1981

AM "Inca" casestudy  
Logic Diagrams

PM Information Systems

Friday, January 30, 1981

AM "Inca" case presentations "Evaluation" Successful Projects exercise

PM Blue-Green game

WEEK TWO

Monday, February 2, 1981

- AM Relationships between Programs, Projects and Plans of Operation  
Creativity exercises
  
- PM Analysis Trees
  - problems
  - alternatives
  - objectives

Tuesday, February 3, 1981

- AM Radio Correspondence case
  
- PM Work on real project-identification

Wednesday, February 4, 1981

- AM OV's  
Group reports--Radio Correspondence
  
- PM "Hollow Square" game

Thursday, February 5, 1981

- AM Logic Diagrams  
Time Analysis  
Real Projects
  
- PM Bar Charts

Friday, February 6, 1981

- AM Radio Correspondence exercise  
Responsibility Charting
  
- PM Performance Networking  
Real Projects

WEEK THREE

Monday, February 9, 1981

AM Preparation and Presentation of Radio Correspondence case

PM "Coal Corporation" Analysis

Tuesday, February 10, 1981

AM Motivation Theory  
Feasibility Studies

PM Information Systems  
Real Projects

Wednesday, February 11, 1981

AM Surlandia case

PM Surlandia case

Thursday, February 12, 1981

AM/PM Surlandia Part II

Friday, February 13, 1981

AM Leadership

PM Decision Making for Managers

WEEK FOUR

Monday, February 16, 1981

AM Real Projects

PM Evaluation

Tuesday, February 17, 1981

AM Evaluation

PM Real Projects

Wednesday, February 18, 1981

AM Communication  
Real Project Reconstruction exercises

PM Field Trip team preparation

Thursday, February 19, 1981

AM/PM Field Trip to Forestry Project -- CORDECO

Friday, February 20, 1981

AM/PM Field Trip to Chapari Tea Project -- CORDECO

WEEK FIVE

Monday, February 23, 1981

- AM Field Trip Project Team Analysis
- PM Field Trip Project Presentations  
Real Project Individual Presentations

Tuesday, February 24, 1981

- AM Training Techniques and Methods
- PM Preparation for Training Practice  
Real Project Individual Presentations

Wednesday, February 25, 1981

- AM Individual Practice Training Presentations
- PM Real Project Individual Presentations

Thursday, February 26, 1981

- AM Evaluation  
Graduation
- PM Graduation Luncheon

---

**APPENDIX C: Participants' Evaluation Responses**

---

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANTS' EVALUATION RESPONSES

Answers of the responding participants:

Question 1: The readings (articles/books) were:

0	very difficult
1	quite difficult
14	not too difficult
11	not difficult at all

Question 2: The written handouts were:

1	too many
13	quite a lot
12	not too many
0	not many at all

Question 3: The workshop cases were:

0	very difficult
3	quite difficult
17	not too difficult
6	not difficult at all

Question 4: The pace/speed of instruction was:

1	too fast
5	quite fast
19	not too fast
1	not fast at all

Question 5: The staff as trainers were:

15	very good
11	quite good
0	not so good
0	not good at all

Question 6: The training facilities were:

2	very good
12	quite good
12	not so good
0	not good at all

Question 7: The living accommodations were:

4	very good
9	quite good
6	not so good
0	not good at all

Question 8: The concepts of TTM were:

0	very difficult to understand
1	quite difficult
15	not difficult
10	not difficult at all

Question 9: The TTM technical vocabulary:

0	very difficult to understand
0	quite difficult
9	not too difficult
17	not difficult at all

Question 10: The staff's foreign language accents were:

0	very difficult to follow
0	quite difficult
6	not too difficult
20	not difficult at all

Question 11: The total amount of work required was:

1	too much work
19	quite a lot
5	not too much
1	not much at all

Question 12: The number of TTM topics covered was:

- 1 too many topics
- 19 quite a lot
- 6 not too many
- 0 not many at all

Question 13: The training technique of practical workshops was:

- 18 very good
- 7 quite good
- 1 not very good
- 0 not good at all

Question 14: The use of PMS tools for analysis of key management problems/back-home projects was:

- 16 very helpful
- 9 quite helpful
- 0 not too helpful
- 0 not helpful at all

Question 15: The final week's review of TTM topics helped me understand:

- 15 all topics better
- 10 some topics better
- 1 not many topics
- 0 none at all

Question 16: As a reinforcement of learning, the practice teaching sessions were:

- 18 very helpful
- 8 quite helpful
- 0 not too helpful
- 0 not helpful at all

Questions 17, 18, 19, and 20

<u>Topics</u>	<u>Most Interesting</u>	<u>Least Interesting</u>	<u>Most Useful</u>	<u>Least Useful</u>
Creative Problem Solving	16	1	10	2
Logical Framework	23	1	21	0
Performance Monitoring	20	3	16	0
Evaluation/Monitoring	20	3	18	2
Communication	17	3	11	1
Back-Home Project	10	5	10	4
Practical Training	18	1	10	1
Management Theory	6	6	5	11
Human Factors	11	5	9	2

---

APPENDIX D: Weekly Evaluation Questionnaire

---



QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS: 4 Weeks

1. What is your opinion of the past week?

	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Average</u>
Week 2				2	10	3	4.06
Week 3				3	14	8	4.32
Week 4				1	15	8	4.48
Week 5					13	10	4.43

2. & 3. How satisfied were you with the topics dealt with?  
To what extent were they useful to you?

<u>Week 2</u>	<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Utility</u>
a. Relation between Program & Project	3.74	4.41
b. Creativity	4.04	4.46
c. Analytical trees	3.96	4.25
d. Radio/Correspondence Case	4.16	4.38
e. Probabilities of Success	3.73	4.04
f. Real Projects	3.41	3.96
g. Time Analysis	3.77	4.33
h. Hollow Square (game)	4.42	4.50
i. Bar Charts	4.42	4.63
j. Responsibility Charts	4.00	4.50
<u>Week 3</u>		
a. Coal Corporation	4.15	4.29
b. Motivation	3.81	4.04
c. Feasibility	3.54	3.61
d. Reporting & Monitoring System	4.07	4.21
e. Real Projects	3.07	3.89
f. "Surlandia" Case	4.46	4.50
g. Leadership Styles	3.96	4.21
h. Decision Making	4.19	4.17
<u>Week 4</u>		
a. Real Projects	4.11	4.59
b. Evaluation (Congruency Analysis)	3.67	4.04
c. Evaluation (Method & Process)	3.59	4.04
d. Communication	4.33	4.37
e. Reconstructing a Logframe	4.44	4.67
f. Discovering a Logframe	4.19	4.44
g. Forestry Project (Excursion)	4.17	4.29
h. Tea Production Project (Exc)	4.31	4.37

Week 5

Satisfaction

Utility

a. Presentations on Excursion	4.42	4.31
b. Training	4.42	4.58
c. Real Projects	4.46	4.50
d. Training presentations	4.65	4.62

What was your opinion of the Course?

<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>Average</u>
				5	21	4.81