



WATER AND SANITATION  
FOR HEALTH PROJECT

Operated by  
CDM and Associates

Sponsored by the U.S. Agency  
for International Development

1611 N. Kent Street, Room 1002  
Arlington, Virginia 22209 USA

Telephone: (703) 243-8200  
Telex No. WUI 64552  
Cable Address WASHAID

**CARE PROJECT MANAGEMENT  
WATER WORKSHOP  
FREETOWN, SIERRA LEONE  
JULY 1-8, 1985**

**WASH FIELD REPORT NO. 159  
OCTOBER 1985**

The WASH Project is managed  
by Camp Dresser & McKee  
International Inc. Principal  
cooperating institutions and  
subcontractors are: Associates  
in Rural Development, Inc.,  
International Science and  
Technology Institute, Inc.,  
Research Triangle Institute,  
Training Resources Group,  
University of North Carolina  
at Chapel Hill.

**Prepared for  
Office of Health,  
Bureau for Science and Technology  
U.S. Agency for International Development  
Activity No. 133**

WASH FIELD REPORT NO. 159

CARE PROJECT MANAGEMENT WATER WORKSHOP  
FREETOWN, SIERRA LEONE  
July 1-8, 1985

Prepared for the Office of Health, Bureau for Science and Technology  
U.S. Agency for International Development  
under WASH Activity No. 133

by

James A. Carney, Jr.

October 1985

Water and Sanitation for Health Project  
Contract No. 5942-C-00-4085-00, Project No. 936-5942  
Is sponsored by the Office of Health, Bureau for Science and Technology  
U.S. Agency for International Development  
Washington, DC 20523

## Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	ii
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. PLANNING AND DESIGN.....	2
2.1 Initiation with CARE.....	2
2.2 CARE Planning Activities.....	2
2.3 Integration of Technical Trainers.....	3
2.4 Redesign of Workshop.....	3
2.5 Materials Preparation.....	4
2.6 Preparation in Freetown.....	4
3. WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION.....	6
3.1 Workshop Goals.....	6
3.2 Participants.....	6
3.3 Workshop Design and Workbook.....	6
3.4 Training Staff.....	8
3.5 Logistics.....	9
3.6 Modifications in Schedule and Design.....	9
4. ASSESSMENT.....	10
4.1 Daily Feedback.....	10
4.2 Participant Evaluation.....	10
4.3 Trainer Assessment.....	11
4.3.1 Methodology.....	11
4.3.2 Schedule.....	11
4.3.3 Staff.....	11
4.3.4 Participants.....	12
4.3.5 Support.....	12
5. OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
5.1 Overview of Outcomes.....	13
5.2 Recommendations of Participants.....	13
5.3 Recommendations of Trainers.....	13
5.4 Conclusions.....	14
 APPENDICES	
A. List of Participants.....	15
B. Work Plan (May 10 - June 26, 1985).....	17
C. Summary of Workshop Evaluations.....	19
 FIGURES	
1. CARE Project Management/Water Workshop (July 1-8, 1985).....	7

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The WASH Project assisted the Program Department of CARE in planning and conducting a workshop on project management for water and sanitation projects. The workshop, which was held on July 1-8, 1985 in Freetown, Sierra Leone, was attended by 35 people: 26 from 15 CARE country offices in Africa, 4 from the Ministry of Energy and Power in Sierra Leone, and 5 Peace Corps Volunteers from Sierra Leone. The overall purpose of the workshop was to provide participants with practical information and experience in the technical, community participation, and management aspects of water and sanitation projects in the field.

The workshop was organized around the four stages of the project cycle: planning and design, project start-up, implementation, and project conclusion. Three themes were used for each of the stages: project management, community participation, and technical applications. Elements from these three themes were introduced at the appropriate stage in the project cycle. This approach was chosen based on input from the CARE program staff, the CARE country offices, and the experience of the five-member training team. Each session included a presentation of information or concept, some discussion of that presentation, and a small group exercise to draw on the experience of the participants and to apply the information or concept to the management of actual projects.

Overall, the participants indicated that the workshop achieved its goals. They reported that it had either met or surpassed their expectations and that the six goals had been largely met. Further, they stated that the materials and the learning process had been interesting, engaging, and useful. The participants also said that more time or fewer topics would have been helpful.

The participants departed with specific action plans for implementation in country. Other outcomes included:

- Increased knowledge of project management
- Productive interchange of experience and knowledge
- Greater understanding of CARE policy and approaches to project management.

## Chapter 1

### INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the activities undertaken in the planning and conducting the CARE Project Management Water Workshop held from July 1 through 8, 1985 in Freetown, Sierra Leone.

On October 24, 1984, John Austin of AID/S&T/H and Fred Rosensweig of the WASH Project met with CARE program staff at CARE/New York to discuss ways in which the WASH Project could assist and support CARE development activities in the field of water and sanitation. One of the outcomes of this meeting was an agreement that WASH and CARE would collaborate in planning and implementing a training workshop for CARE project managers in Africa. This workshop was planned to cover both project management and technical skills for project managers involved either directly in water projects or in the planning of future projects in water and sanitation.

The workshop, which took place in Freetown, Sierra Leone, from July 1 through 8, 1985, focused on skills needed in community participation, technical applications, and project management for water projects. Each of these elements was examined within the context of the project cycle -- planning and design, project start-up, implementation, and project conclusion.

WASH Activity No. 133 was signed on January 25, 1985. WASH agreed to provide a training consultant and two technical resource people to assist CARE in planning and implementing the workshop. The overall planning for the workshop was carried out by Jim Carney, the training consultant, in conjunction with Helen Seidler, CARE Program Department's Training Unit director, and Dr. Mary Ruth (Rudi) Horner, head of the Primary Health Care Unit. The two technical resource people, Paula Donnelly Roark, for community participation and Fred Weber, for technical applications, were closely involved in the design and delivery of the workshop.

## Chapter 2

### PLANNING AND DESIGN

#### 2.1 Initiation with CARE

Following the October 1984 meeting in New York, where the concept of a project management/water workshop was originated, Dr. Rudi Horner circulated a letter in early December to the CARE Africa country offices that either had or contemplated having water projects. The letter introduced the idea of the workshop and invited input from the staff regarding the agenda.

In late December Dr. Horner met at WASH with Fred Rosensweig, Craig Hafner, and John Austin (AID/S&T/H) to further develop the workshop idea. From this meeting came a work plan which detailed the activities to be undertaken as well as a schedule of tasks with budgeted consulting days. At the end of February, Jim Carney was contracted by WASH to be the training consultant for the workshop. He immediately initiated contact with CARE by telephone, and he and Ms. Seidler of CARE scheduled the initial planning days.

#### 2.2 CARE Planning Activities

On March 12, 1985, the initial planning for the CARE Project Management Water Workshop began at the CARE offices in New York. Jim Carney met with Helen Seidler, Rudi Horner, and Tom Zopf, CARE Director for Evaluation and Sectoral Assistance, to learn more about the CARE organization and its training needs, and to establish the overview and purpose of the workshop. Tentative dates were established, and the responses from the country offices to the December letter were reviewed.

During two more planning days at the end of March, the team of Horner, Seidler and Carney developed the goals statement (see Section 3.1) and a framework for the workshop. The goals statement was subsequently enhanced by input from Beryl Levinger, Assistant Executive Director for Programming, Tom Zopf, and Rudy Ramp, Regional Manager for Africa. The design framework for the workshop, which at that time was viewed as a six-day event, was based both on the field input and on the needs identified by CARE program staff.

Originally, there were to be three major modules: project management, community participation and education, and technical operations and maintenance; as well as a site visit and an applications session. The project management module was to be presented in three parts, based on three stages of the project cycle -- project planning and design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. The field visit would include reports by teams of participants and a critique in the context of the elements covered in the modules.

One of the applications sessions was to focus on how to transfer what was learned in the workshop by the participants back to their respective country staff. This particular session was in response to CARE's desire to increase the exchange of knowledge among field staff, and to begin to create a broader base of shared field experience.

As field responses to the December letter continued to arrive during March, it became apparent from the comments that the staff perceived the planned workshop as being primarily technical in content. As a result, the planning team prepared a cable that emphasized the broader nature of the workshop and the expanded participant base. The cable, which was sent April 3, listed the goals of the workshop, stated project management as a central theme, and requested that national staff members be included as participants. Because the workshop focus would have broader application than the technical aspects of water and sanitation, the cable was sent to all 15 CARE Africa countries, rather than to the 10 original countries having either current or anticipated water projects. It was emphasized that the workshop would be relevant for all project managers in the field.

### 2.3 Integration of Technical Trainers

By early April, it was clear to the planning team that a need existed for two technical resource trainers, one in community participation and one in project design and evaluation with engineering experience in water and sanitation. Terms of Reference for these two resources were drawn up and sent to WASH on April 11. By April 25, the services of Fred Weber for design and evaluation and Paula Roark for community participation were engaged. They were contracted for four planning days in May and June with the planning team, in addition to the workshop itself, and subsequent follow-up consultations in selected CARE countries in Africa, if requested.

In early May, Dr. Horner, Ms. Seidler, and Mr. Carney met to further elaborate on the elements of the design in preparation for the initial meeting with Weber and Roark. Outlines were developed for each module, including the elements for each section. The project management elements were more detailed since Carney, himself, would be the trainer for those sessions. The other technical areas were left fairly open, so that the two technical trainers could provide the design.

### 2.4 Redesign of Workshop

On May 9 and 10, the full training team met for the first time. Following an overview of the work completed since March and the design framework, the team explored the various technical and community participation elements, both conceptual and applied, that could be included in the workshop. As the conceptual discussion progressed, the trainers arrived at a more integrated design which would include community participation and technical applications at each stage of the project. This discussion resulted in some fundamental changes in the design, and an increase in the length of the workshop from six to eight days, with two half days free.

The project cycle became the framework and vehicle for the workshop. Stages in the cycle were expanded to four (planning and design, project start-up, implementation, and project conclusion), with monitoring and evaluation becoming an activity within each stage. Each of the three technical areas, management, community and technical, would be addressed within each stage of the cycle, so that the import of each area for that stage would be covered. (See Section 3.2 for outline of workshop design.)

The new design was far more sophisticated than the earlier one in that it required integrating the three technical areas so that the presentations, activities, and materials linked together coherently. The logic of flow from stage to stage within the cycle also had to be carefully integrated. Rather than having separate topical modules, the workshop now was a model of a project from beginning to end.

To prepare for this design, the team generated a work plan at the end of the May 10 session which was to be completed for the next team planning session in June (see Appendix B). It was also agreed that an additional session at the end of May for Ms. Seidler, Dr. Horner, and Mr. Carney was necessary to move ahead on administrative support, and materials and supplies planning.

This next session on May 30 had an additional benefit. Mike Viola, the country director (CD) in Sierra Leone, was in town and was able to provide the team with useful insights and agreements for support from the country office. He also was able to assist the team with information about on-site technical resources (for example, UNDP and WaterAid). Even though Mr. Viola would be gone from Sierra Leone before the workshop began, his involvement helped the planning process and made the transition to the new Acting CD, David Neff, much easier. At this same session, plans for the field visit were completed, and the task and applications for the visit were developed.

The final planning session in the United States for the entire training team took place on June 10 and 11. At this session, the team went through each stage of the design, detailing the subject matter to be covered. Most of the training materials were identified at this stage, although the process for training delivery was still not completely worked out. An additional planning day with Ms. Roark, Mr. Carney, and Ms. Seidler was held in mid-June at WASH, to further develop the training process and materials applications for the community participation elements.

## 2.5 Materials Preparation

The decision was made in late May that the materials and supplies would be hand carried to Sierra Leone rather than shipped. As a result, the training materials were assembled both at CARE and WASH during the first two weeks of June and packed as hand baggage.

## 2.6 Preparation in Freetown

The team arrived in Freetown on June 27. Intensive preparations for the workshop began with a review and in some cases revision of the design, process and materials. Workbooks were assembled and the meeting room arranged. Room and meal arrangements were made, and billing procedures were established.

The major focus of time and energy was on completing the integration of the technical elements. Given the short planning time with the technical trainers, the team found that the complexity of the design and the lack of prior experience in working together meant that numerous design issues had to be resolved on site. During the three days prior to the workshop, the team concentrated on addressing these issues.

The workshop began on Sunday night, June 30, with a reception at the Bintumani Hotel. The first full day of activity took place the following day.

## Chapter 3

### WORKSHOP IMPLEMENTATION

#### 3.1 Workshop Goals

The goals of the Freetown workshop were to:

1. Enhance project management skills within the context of water and sanitation projects
2. Expand the project manager's knowledge of and ability to manage the technical resources available in designing, implementing, and evaluating water and sanitation projects
3. Address specific managerial and technical concerns of CARE project managers in key problem areas of water and sanitation projects
4. Provide opportunities for participants to share experience and knowledge, to enhance a common understanding and capability
5. Enable participants to plan specific applications from the workshop to their own project management responsibilities
6. Assist participants in developing strategies for the transfer of skills and knowledge to others at their country offices.

#### 3.2 Participants

Thirty-five participants attended the workshop: 26 from CARE, 5 Peace Corps volunteers, and 4 CARE counterparts from the Ministry of Energy and Power in Sierra Leone. CARE staff came from 15 countries and was made up of 17 international and 9 national staff. One of the national staff, Elizabeth Bilongo of the Congo, served as an interpreter for the French-speaking participants (see Section 3.3). The inclusion of national staff at the workshop reflected CARE's desire to increase the level of experience and exposure of the project-level national staff.

The Peace Corps participants had just completed their in-country training and were to be involved in water and health projects in Sierra Leone. Ministry participants included the senior manager for all rural water projects in Sierra Leone as well as three field staff who are involved with water projects. A list of the participants, by country and nationality, appears in Appendix A.

#### 3.3 Workshop Design and Workbook

The design and schedule of the workshop, as described in Chapter 2, is outlined in Figure 1 on the following page. The intent of the design was to provide both cognitive input and theory, as well as opportunities for application of the concepts through various forms of exercises. Each conceptual or application input by the trainers was followed by some activity

**Figure 1**

CARE PROJECT MANAGEMENT/WATER WORKSHOP -- JULY 1 - 8, 1985

FREETOWN, SIERRA LEONE

<p>1 MONDAY - July 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opening &amp; Introductions</li> <li>• Nature of workshop</li> <li>• Agenda review</li> <li>• Water and sanitation as focus</li> <li>• Introduction of project cycle</li> </ul>	<p>2 TUESDAY - July 2</p> <p><u>PLANNING &amp; DESIGN</u> (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• discipline of planning</li> <li>• position of project manager</li> </ul> <p><u>PROJECT START-UP</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• start-up issues</li> <li>• operating plan</li> <li>• village selection</li> </ul>	<p>3 WEDNESDAY - July 3</p> <p><u>PROJECT START-UP</u> (continued)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• supervisory skills and methods</li> </ul> <p><u>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• understanding project limitations</li> <li>• implications of local decision making</li> <li>• technical and operational issues</li> </ul>	<p>4 THURSDAY - July 4</p> <p><u>SUBWORKSHOPS</u></p>
<p>-----</p> <p><u>PROJECT PLANNING AND DESIGN</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• goal setting w/ the community</li> <li>• organizational capability to implement community participation process</li> <li>• choosing the best water supply system</li> <li>• water and health</li> </ul>	<p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• maintenance agreements</li> <li>• information, management and learning systems</li> <li>• roles and relationships of project manager</li> </ul> <p>-----</p> <p>Technical aspects of water systems</p>	<p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• management issues</li> <li>• community participation issues</li> <li>• monitoring and evaluation issues</li> </ul> <p>-----</p> <p>Films</p>	<p>-----</p> <p>FREE</p>
<p>5 FRIDAY - July 5</p> <p><u>PROJECT CONCLUSION</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• options at time of conclusion</li> <li>• evaluating for continuity</li> <li>• final project evaluation</li> <li>• close-out planning</li> </ul> <p>-----</p> <p>2:30 - 4:30 SUBWORKSHOPS</p> <p>4:30 - 5:30 FIELD BRIEFING</p>	<p>6 SATURDAY - July 6</p> <p>FIELD VISIT</p> <p>WITH</p> <p>ANALYSIS TASK</p>	<p>7 SUNDAY - July 7</p> <p>FREE</p> <p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Site visit reports and critique</li> </ul> <p>-----</p> <p>Discussion of Framework and Guidelines</p>	<p>8 MONDAY - July 8</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How CARE favors/disfavors participation process</li> <li>• Applications to current projects</li> <li>• Transfer of workshop learnings to others</li> </ul> <p>-----</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow-up planning</li> <li>• Workshop evaluation</li> <li>• Closing</li> </ul>

that built on the concepts, in order to keep the participants actively involved in the process.

In addition, two time periods were set aside for subworkshops on subjects of particular concern to the participants. As issues arose that required further exploration, these were listed on a flipchart and were subsequently combined into subworkshop topics. These workshops, held Thursday morning and Friday afternoon, covered subjects in greater depth than during the regular sessions, such as planning and management systems, counterpart relations, health issues, applications of the "QARQ" formula (quantity, access, reliability, and quality of water), and alternative water systems.

Another design factor was the creation of French-speaking table groups. Several members of the national staff spoke primarily or solely French, while others and a number of the international staff were bilingual. Most of the trainers were either bilingual or could understand French as well. As a result, the French-speaking participants could work, and in some cases make presentations, in their own language. While not a perfect solution, it did enable some greater participation on the part of these attendees.

The team had brought three films for use at the workshop. Two were on water projects and the third on health and sanitation. Rather than use them as a training device, the films were used for information sharing and were shown in the evening of the third day. The films, which were largely well received, were useful at that point in expanding the scope of the participants thinking and discussion on water, sanitation, and community participation issues.

The site visits played a useful role in the workshop. These visits actually did what they were designed to do, which was to allow the participants to observe a water project in process and find out from the community their perspectives on the project. The participants would then be able to test the workshop concepts against an actual project situation. Particularly in the Moyamba district, where participants were able to observe well sites at various stages of development, did the site visit provide a useful applications opportunity.

In the opening session, each participant was presented with a workbook with dividers for the seven sections of the workshop. As the workshop progressed, the participants "built" their own workbook with the various handouts provided during the course of each session. These handouts included exercises, articles, case studies and worksheets from the sessions. At the conclusion of the workshop, therefore, each participant had a full workbook of materials for reference as well as a training guide for use in the country office.

### 3.4 Training Staff

The training team of Rudi Horner and Helen Seidler of CARE, and Jim Carney, Paula Roark, and Fred Weber from WASH delivered the various training sections of the workshop. In addition, Rudy Ramp, the CARE Regional Manager for Africa, chaired a session during the application section on the last day, which linked CARE policy to field applications within the context of the concepts presented in the workshop.

The site visits were ably organized and coordinated by Jaime Henriquez and David Neff of the CARE Sierra Leone office. Howard Bell of WaterAid, technical advisor to the Peninsula Project, guided that group on its visit. Foday Moiba, field engineer for the Moyamba project, provided leadership and translation in the local dialects for the Moyamba site visits.

### 3.5 Logistics

The workshop was held at the Hotel Bintumani in Freetown, Sierra Leone. The Bintumani is located on the coast, approximately eight miles from the center of Freetown. By and large, the facilities were comfortable, although the lack of air-conditioning in the conference room was problematic. The most significant problem was the breakdown in telephone service thereby making communication with the CARE-Freetown office difficult. As a result, delivery runs between the hotel and the office were made several times a day.

Of invaluable help on administrative matters were Sue Ellen Rinker and Hawa George from the CARE Sierra Leone office. They assisted the training team with transportation and logistical problems, and their knowledge of the local community proved extremely useful.

### 3.6 Modifications in Schedule and Design

Even during the planning phase, the training team had realized that there was a tremendous amount of material to be covered in the workshop. During the first two days of the workshop, it became apparent that in order to keep a reasonable schedule, there would have to be some modifications of the design. As a result, some of the project management segments were eliminated and some of the technical elements of project implementation were compressed. These modifications, as well as the trainers adhering more closely to allotted time frames, enabled the team to cover the various sectors leading up to the site visit without any noticeable loss in the quality of the workshop process.

## Chapter 4

### ASSESSMENT

#### 4.1 Daily Feedback

The training team decided that it would be useful to have feedback from the participants on a daily basis, to assist them in any redesign efforts and to provide the participants with the opportunity to have input regarding how the workshop should progress.

At the end of each of the first four days, the participants were asked to respond to the following questions:

1. What was the most useful segment of the day? Why?
2. What was the least useful segment of the day? Why?
3. How satisfied were you with the day?
4. Were any particular segments:

Too long \_\_\_\_\_ too short

Old stuff \_\_\_\_\_ new material

Engaging \_\_\_\_\_ boring

Very relevant \_\_\_\_\_ not relevant

Too simple \_\_\_\_\_ too complicated

Too much detail \_\_\_\_\_ not enough usable information

The process worked well. Most participants wrote fulsome answers, serious and comical, all of which gave the trainers valuable insights into how the workshop was going, what modifications should be made as well as what the participants were thinking and feeling.

#### 4.2 Participant Evaluation

Appendix C summarizes the workshop evaluations, completed during the last day. The evaluation contained nine questions addressing the content, the methodology, the site, and improvements. The summary includes the responses from all CARE participants, with the exception of those from Chad who were involved in only three days of the workshop because of travel difficulties.

### 4.3 Trainer Assessment

#### 4.3.1 Methodology

The experiential learning methodology, with its emphasis on participation and interaction worked well for this workshop. While there was a great deal of information to be provided to the participants, perhaps too much, there was sufficient time for the type of discussion and exercises that are the bases for interactive learning. Though the workshop was fairly well structured, there was sufficient flexibility so that the trainers could redesign, when necessary, and the participants could feel that the team was responsive to their needs.

The most difficulty was encountered in the complexities of the integrated design. Because the trainers had not worked together previously, and had different backgrounds in training, it was time consuming and challenging to develop a process for the workshop that pulled all the pieces into a coherent whole. Despite the difficulties, the training team was able to do that to the satisfaction of the participants.

#### 4.3.2 Schedule

The length of the workshop (seven working days) seemed appropriate. With more honing and refining of the design and delivery of the first three days, the workshop model would be excellent. More time would be a luxury; less time would severely reduce the quality of learning for this broad and complex set of topics.

#### 4.3.3 Staff

The model of a training team with a lead trainer, the CARE training director, a health specialist, and technical trainers in community participation and technical aspects of water projects, is an effective one. It becomes crucial, however, for such a diverse group to have more time together for planning and design prior to the workshop. Integrating a multidisciplinary group of trainers into a team is not an easy task. It is one thing to have technical presenters come in and deliver a specific module. It is quite another to have several different trainers combine their efforts in an integrated approach. Yet the integrated model results in a superior workshop in that it provides all the relevant elements as they relate to each other in a chronological flow. Earlier involvement of the technical trainers, plus two to three more preworkshop planning days would be sufficient to overcome this difficulty.

The staff worked long hours, even during the workshop. Reviews of the daily feedback and staff planning sessions were held each day until the site visit. These efforts resulted in more effective training delivery and were noted by the participants who commented on the smooth running of the workshop.

Following the workshop, the training team reviewed the entire process, gave each other feedback, and provided input for this report. These sessions were beneficial in assessing the results of the effort and provided useful ideas for future workshops of this type.

#### 4.3.4 Participants

Having national staff at the workshop was an asset. Not only was their participation a recognition of their contributions to CARE, but it also provided valuable insights and unique perspectives to the work in the sessions.

The French-speaking participants were somewhat handicapped by the fact that all the presentations were in English. Having a CARE staff person translate at the table during the presentations was helpful, but translation is a challenging and exhausting task. Even when bilingual staff took turns, it was difficult for a nonprofessional translator to keep up with the flow of the presentations and discussions. The use of professional translators and the addition of all written materials in both languages would have substantially alleviated this problem.

It also was valuable to have participants from the counterpart ministry and the projects themselves. They provided an in-country perspective that was most useful. The Peace Corps participants, even though almost "burned out" from prior training, remained actively involved throughout. Particularly for those who were becoming part of a CARE project, the workshop provided them with pertinent information about CARE and project management in general. The international staff, almost all of whom were project managers, were the backbone of the workshop. Their enthusiastic participation, useful critique, and willingness to share their experience contributed significantly to the success of the workshop.

#### 4.3.5 Support

The support was excellent from all sources. The WASH Project office and CARE Headquarters staff provided full and effective support throughout the planning stages, from policy guidance to clerical assistance. In Sierra Leone, the CARE country office staff gave wholeheartedly of their time, energy and resources. Despite the constant disruptions the workshop caused in the operations of the office, David Neff and his staff were unfailingly warm and helpful. Without their support, the workshop would have been far more difficult to deliver, and much less successful in providing the participants with an effective learning environment.

## Chapter 5

### OUTCOMES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5.1 Overview of Outcomes

On the basis of the evaluation, the daily feedback, and comments from the participants, the conclusion is that the workshop was successful. All reported that it had met their expectations, and the majority noted that it had met its goals. Oral feedback on the last day indicated the participants' strong feelings that this had been a valuable and useful learning experience.

From the trainers' professional viewpoints, it was in fact a successful workshop. The design, despite its complexity, held up well, the content was relevant, and the training process was effective. The participants worked hard, were actively engaged throughout, and concluded with solid plans for applications upon their return. A sense of excitement and involvement prevailed throughout, although some remarked on the intense pace and the lack of time to absorb all of the information.

For the participants, the outcomes appear to be:

- Increased knowledge of project management within the context of water and sanitation projects
- Productive interchange of experience and knowledge
- Plans for specific applications from the workshop to their own projects
- Increased understanding of CARE policy and approaches to project planning, implementation and evaluation.

#### 5.2 Recommendations of Participants

Most of the participant recommendations addressed time and content. Recommendations included adding more days to the workshop or reducing the number of topics to be covered. Either of these approaches speaks to the third issue, that is the need for more time to read and absorb the material and to internalize the experience.

The concern for the French-speaking participants was reflected in the recommendation for bilingual presentations and material and professional translation. Attendance by more national staff was recommended by two participants.

#### 5.3 Recommendations of Trainers

With the modifications in the design suggested in Section 4.3, no need exists either to increase the workshop duration or to reduce the content significantly. The workshop design is a well-conceived one and can be

delivered within this time frame. More training team planning is needed to integrate the content with the process, so that methods of delivery and presentation can be carried out more expeditiously.

The collaboration of the WASH training consultant with the CARE program staff was valuable and important for both sides. Because the workshop was CARE's first attempt at such an undertaking, this collaborative process was particularly useful in developing a new planning and design methodology. As mentioned above, earlier involvement of the technical resources, and more time given to refining and integrating the different content and process elements of the design, would improve similar workshops in the future.

#### 5.4 Conclusion

This workshop was an exciting and demanding event and provided CARE project managers with valuable information and applications. It has the potential to be the prototype for future CARE and other PVO workshops on management of water and sanitation projects. The collaboration of WASH and CARE has resulted in a successful first step toward more effective management of water and other types of projects in those 15 African countries.

APPENDIX A  
List of Participants

CARE Water Workshop Participants

<u>MISSION</u>	<u>PARTICIPANTS</u>	<u>NATIONALITY</u>
CAMEROON	Michael Godfrey	American
CHAD	Mark Henderson Herve de Wergifosse Khalil Djidda	American Belgian Chadian
COMOROS	Christy Gavitt	American
CONGO	Robert Moyembo Elizabeth Bilongo (interpreter) Leo MacGillivray	Congolese Congolese Canadian
EGYPT	Bruce Buckle Paul Barker	American American
ETHIOPIA	Mogus Fassil	Ethiopian
KENYA	Raymond Kohut Geoffrey Chege	Canadian Kenyan
LESOTHO	Dan Roth Puseletso Kaibe	American Basuto
MALI	Greg Duly Aly Djiga	Canadian Malian
MOZAMBIQUE	Peg Clement	American
NIGER	Hassane Ganda Mike Ahearn Bruce Bjornson	Nigerian American Canadian
SOMALIA	Nick Webber	British
SUDAN	Steve Wallace Haileselassie Gebreselassie	American Ethiopian
UGANDA	Paul Van Westendorp	Canadian
SIERRA LEONE	Jaime Henriquez	Chilian
PEACE CORPS	Temple Bell Bill Bell Lisa MacKensie Joe Hadden Betsy Hobkirk	American American American American American
SIERRA LEONE MINISTRY OF ENERGY & POWER	Horatio Wright Foday Moiba K.D.K. Mara Roland Davies	Sierra Leonean Sierra Leonean Sierra Leonean Sierra Leonean

APPENDIX B

Work Plan  
May 10 - June 26, 1985

## Work Plan -- May 10 - June 26, 1985

By June 10:

- Detailed outline of each workshop module, including process and working materials to be used. (Jim, Paula, Fred)
- Hotel site visit details and mission support information received and disseminated to us. (Helen)
- Resource materials to CARE by June 1. (All)
- Workbooks, materials and supplies developed and obtained. (Helen and Jim)
- Additional planning session needed in DC or NYC, approximately week of May 10. (Helen, Jim, Paula and Rudi)

Planning Session, June 10 and 11 (Helen, Rudi, Fred, Paula and Jim)

- Finalize Design
  - Integrate module outlines into design guidelines
  - Present working materials to be used for reproduction
  - Clarify and specify session by session roles and responsibilities
- Decide integration of other resources
- Figure out how to handle the manual
- Develop outline of report
  - Determine specific task responsibilities for report
- Finalize travel and logistics

APPENDIX C  
Summary of Workshop Evaluations

AFRICA PROJECT MANAGEMENT/WATER WORKSHOP

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP EVALUATIONS

1.) What did you find most useful in the workshop?

<u>Response</u>	<u># Responding</u>
"Fit"	4
"QARQ"	9
Situational Leadership	3
Discussions re community participation	5
Framework and guidelines for CARE	2
Site visit	4
Project cycle, project planning, design, and conclusion	12
Management skills	3
Group interaction & sharing experiences	3
Korton model	2
Farmer System's research approach	1
Sub-workshop on water systems	1
Project manager's role	3
Rudy Ramp	1

2.) What did you find least useful in the workshop?

<u>Response</u>	<u># Responding</u>
Discussion of bottlenecks	1
Initial presentation of environmental and political aspects of water	1
Project manager communication network	1
Case studies	5
Films	2
Review and critique of "Guidelines..." book	2
Technical information on water/wells	6
Monitoring and evaluation	1
Sub-workshops	1
Heuristic model	1
Water and Health	1
The reception on June 30	1
Site visit	1

3.) Did the workshop meet your expectations?

YES - 25

NO - 0

Relevant Comments:

<u>Comment</u>	<u># Responding</u>
Surpassed expectations	9
Would have preferred fewer subjects (so that more time could be devoted to a particular subject)	2
Well organized	3
Trainers well-informed	3
Will help participant in his/her position	8
Sharing experiences with others extremely beneficial	5
Helped participant understand how CARE operates	1

4.) Were you satisfied with the opportunities to influence workshop agenda?

YES - 21

NO - 0

Relevant Comments:

<u>Comment</u>	<u># Responding</u>
Yes and no. Enough opportunity in conference room, but not enough time to prepare for next session.	1
Trainers helpful/always available after hours to discuss point & answer questions	3

5.) Did the workshop, in your opinion, meet its goals?

$\frac{24}{\text{Largely MET}}$  1  $\frac{0}{\text{Largely UNMET}}$

To enhance project management skill: in the context of water & sanitation projects.

$\frac{19}{\text{Largely MET}}$  4  $\frac{2}{\text{Largely UNMET}}$

To expand your knowledge of and ability to manage the technical resources available in design, implementation and evaluation of water & sanitation projects.

5.) continued...

<u>18</u>	2	<u>4</u>
Largely MET		Largely UNMET

\*To address your specific managerial & technical concerns in key problem areas of water & sanitation projects

<u>25</u>		<u>0</u>
Largely MET		Largely UNMET

To provide opportunities for you to share experience & knowledge, in order to increase common understanding & capability.

<u>22</u>	2	<u>1</u>
Largely MET		Largely UNMET

To enable you to plan specific applications from the workshop to your own project management responsibilities

<u>19</u>	2	<u>4</u>
Largely MET		Largely UNMET

To assist you in developing strategies for the transfer of skills & knowledge gained at this workshop to others at your mission

\*One participant split: "Met" for managerial aspects, "Unmet" for technical.

6.) Of the various training techniques...which did you enjoy the most?

<u>Response</u>	<u># Responding</u>
Small group tasks	17
Sub-workshop sessions	11
Case studies	4
Films	7
Lecturettes	7
Field trip	2
Discussions	10
Role plays	5
Individual tasks	7
Structured exercises	7
Report-back sessions	1

Which did you find the most productive?

<u>Response</u>	<u># Responding</u>
Small group tasks	9
Lecturettes	6
Field trip	2
Case studies	1
Structured exercises	5
Discussions	7
Role play	1
Individual tasks	4
Sub-workshops	7
Report-back sessions	2
Films	2

7.) Was the pre-conference information adequate?

YES - 11                      NO - 11

Relevant Comments:

<u>Comment</u>	<u># Responding</u>
"I don't think more pre-conference information would have changed my input."	2
An agenda/reading materials should have been sent to missions in advance	6

8.) Was the Hotel Bintumani an appropriate site?

Yes - 21                      NO - 4

Relevant Comments:

<u>Comment:</u>	<u># Responding</u>
Too far from town	7
Nice, comfortable setting	5
Too difficult to get to Sierra Leone	1
Hotel management helpful & responsive	2

9.) How might this workshop be improved?

<u>Response</u>	<u># Responding</u>
Attendance of more national staff	2
More specific, real case studies	1
Time for each mission to talk about its specific projects	1
Focus on fewer topics so that each can be covered in more depth	5
Schedule more time for reading of handout materials	4
Add extra days to conference	6
More details to mission prior to conference	1
Conduct conference in both French & English/ professional translator should attend	3