

PN-AMW-003

47399

TRAINING OF TRAINERS

KARA, TOGO

A Report Prepared By:  
TOM LEONHARDT, CCCD/CDC  
PAPE GAYE, PRITECH

During The Period:  
FEBRUARY 24 - 28, 1986

TECHNOLOGIES FOR PRIMARY HEALTH CARE (PRITECH) PROJECT

Supported By The:  
U.S. Agency For International Development  
AID/DPE-5927-C-00-3083-00

AUTHORIZATION  
AID/S&T/HEA: 7/8/86  
ASSGN. NO: SS 116

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
II. TRAINING ACTIVITIES . . . . .	2
III. SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANT EVALUATIONS . . . . .	9
IV. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	9

APPENDIX: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

## I. INTRODUCTION

From February 24 - 28, 1986 Pape Gaye and Tom Leonhardt, training consultants to the CCCD Project for the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), conducted a Training of Trainers Workshop in Kara, Togo. The workshop was held at the Kara Hotel.

Guinea, Burundi, Togo and Ivory Coast sent participants. The CCCD Project in Conakry sent two doctors who are presently the national coordinator and the head of EPI; Burundi sent four doctors who are working in the medical zones; Togo was represented by the national coordinator, the head of EPI activities, and the CDD and Malaria coordinators at the national level. The Ivorian delegation, headed by Technical Officer Bob Weierbach, consisted of four people who work with the Institut National de Sante Publique (A CCCD collaborating agency). Three are actively involved in health education and one works in the field as an Agent Technique Sanitaire. WHO sent Dr. Armand Razakaso from the regional office in Bamako as an observer.

The goal of the workshop was to allow the participants the opportunity to improve their skills in planning, executing and evaluating training sessions within the framework of CCCD project activities.

During the four and a 1/2 days of the workshop, the trainers were able to introduce the participants to:

1. Basic training theory (principles of adult education and the experimental learning cycle);
2. Procedure for designing training sessions (needs assessment, objectives, activities, materials and evaluations).

The participants also had time to plan and present a model training session (based on a CCCD theme) which was evaluated by the facilitators and by the participants themselves.

## II. TRAINING ACTIVITIES

### A. Monday, February 24, 1986

The program opened at 10:00 a.m. due to the very late arrival of the Burundian delegation the night before. Dr. Karsa, head of the Togolese delegation, gave a brief welcome speech and there were no other opening formalities. (We had been to the prefecture that morning to pay a courtesy call, but the prefet was not in.)

Introductions were made by having the participants write their name, country, profession, and special CCCD skills on a 1/2 piece of flip chart paper. As each participant introduced himself, the paper was hung on the wall so we could see the spelling of the name and also avail ourselves of his special skills during the week if we ran into a technical problem. This is a good way to break the ice with professionals without resorting to games.

Participants' expectations were also handled in a structured way. Each participant was asked to complete two sentences. The first: "This workshop will be a success for me if...." The second sentence: "I expect from this workshop....." The participants then met in small groups to pool their expectations; presentations of the group work were made. The facilitator, after putting the expectations on the flip chart, compared them with the goal and objectives of the workshop prepared by the co-facilitator.

Each expectation was carefully discussed and if it was not to be the theme of a presentation during the workshop, the reasons were given. In light of the goal, objectives and expectations, the schedule for the remaining time was reviewed and consensus was reached with the participants concerning how the time should be spent. This ended the morning session.

We began the afternoon session with a group discussion of the norms. We categorized the norms as "pedagogical" (for example: "Don't monopolize the floor") and "administrative" (for example: "No smoking in the conference room"). The norms remained posted during the workshop and were referred to several times.

Administrative details were next on the agenda. Since the co-facilitators had little or no control over such things as per diem, transportation, etc. the concerns were noted, to be dealt with by the proper person. Concerns were very few, it should be noted, and mainly evolved around issues of transportation back to Lome. All participants had, by then, left the Hotel Kara for less expensive lodging.

In order to standardize vocabulary and meaning, we planned an activity to find an operational definition of training and to clear up any misconceptions the participants might have about what constitutes "training".

Each participant was asked to complete the sentence, "For me training is....." Several volunteers then wrote their definitions on pieces of flip chart paper.

Using their ideas, we located common elements in the definition and constructed a definition that was finally acceptable to the group.

"Training is a dynamic process which allows a group or an individual to acquire the knowledge, skills or attitudes necessary to accomplish a given task."

As a kind of pre-test the facilitator administered to the participants the Training Styles Inventory. After completing the inventory, participants compared "scores" (actually indications of training style preference) and the facilitators talked about the implications of certain training styles vis-à-vis certain kinds of learning situations. We drew the conclusion that a trainer must be ready to adapt his style to the learning needs of his participants.

Day one ended by having the participants mark as they left the room on a large drawn thermometer what they felt the "learning temperature" in the room had been during the first day. The range on the thermometer was from 0° to 100°C. The average temperature was about 75°. This kind of informal daily evaluation which takes up very little time is an excellent way to keep breaking the ice.

We asked for volunteers to do the daily "rapport de synthèse" which would be given each morning before the start of the session.

B. Tuesday, February 25, 1986

After the report of the previous day's activities, we tackled the subject of adult learning.

The participants were asked to complete the sentence, "I learn best when...." The participants were divided into groups to pool their answers and prepare a list of conditions which facilitate adult learning. During the large group session, after each group presented its findings, a definitive list was drawn up. The facilitator then led a discussion about whether or not these conditions were universal (applied to "educated" as well as "village level trainees") and if so, what were the implications for a trainer.

For the next activity, the facilitator administered the Personal Learning Styles Inventory. This inventory, when completed and scored, gives a person an idea of his own learning style (experimental, active, conceptual or involved). The conclusions gained from this inventory are many but the principal one is that people learn differently: some like to plunge in, some like to reflect, some like to generalize, etc. Learning styles vary from individual to individual. The participants then discussed the implications of the variety of learning styles for a trainer.

Following directly after the Learning Styles Inventory, the facilitator presented the Experiential Learning Cycle (ELC). During a small lecture, the facilitator showed that a training activity must complete the cycle in order to assure that all participants had the chance to benefit from the training experience, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THEIR OWN STYLE OF LEARNING. The ELC is a difficult

concept, so by using a concrete example, we followed the cycle through its various stages. (We came back to the cycle on Friday morning during the time set aside for further exploration of difficult concepts.)

After lunch we introduced the "canevas de formation", different activities which need to be carried out by a trainer to prepare for a training session:

Needs Assessment	Materials
Objectives	Timing
Content	Evaluation
Activities	

We stressed that a series of training sessions, related to the same topic (for example ORT), made up a module and that a series of modules made up a training program. Therefore, it was important to know how to set up a single training session. Each element of the "canevas de formation" would be treated so as to prepare the participants for the practical session which would require them to design and execute a training session before their peers in order to receive feedback on 1) how their session had been planned according to the "canevas" and 2) how they had performed as trainers.

1. How to inventory training needs:

Using the group discussion technique of question/answer, the facilitator elicited from the participants that it was first necessary to collect all relevant job information about the person to be trained: job description, task analysis using supervisory visits, interviews, etc. This information should then be analyzed and a list of needs drawn up from which priority training needs are taken. The participants suggested that whenever possible, a trainee should be contacted in advance so that the training program could be designed with his specific needs in mind. Once these priority needs are identified, the training staff can begin targeting the behavioral objectives for the training program.

2. Behavioral Objectives:

To start the session on behavioral objectives, the facilitator asked the group for ideas and examples of what they felt were behavioral objectives. These were noted on the flip chart. A discussion ensued concerning the differences between goal and objectives. It was decided that a goal was broader than an objective and didn't need to be stated in measurable terms. This led to a discussion of the criteria for a behavioral objective and we decided that these were most important: measurability, action verbs, and trainee (not trainer) capabilities. Each participant was then asked to write a behavioral objective; the objectives were compared and judged against the criteria. To help the participants, we listed acceptable verbs that can be used in behavioral objectives (list, describe, tell, enumerate, etc.). After several practice tries, it was obvious that more were needed. We closed the session on objectives by summarizing what we had discussed and by stressing that everything in a training session flowed from the correct formulation of training objectives.

### 3. Session Content

In a small lecture, the facilitators introduced content stressing that once the objectives for a session have been drawn up, they dictate what the content of the session will be. The trainer should write out the content of his session in as much detail as he feels will be helpful. The content, of course, will be what the participants need to know (or know how to do) at their level. We used an example: Malaria - Objective: At the end of the lesson, the participants will know the signs and symptoms of malaria. We wrote out the content for a lesson on malaria and used doctors as our target group. The content was very clinical and detailed. Next we looked at the "malaria" for the above objective content for a lesson aimed at village health workers. It was much less detailed.

The facilitator finished the day by asking the participants to do a quick self evaluation: on the way out of the room, to write on a piece of paper what percentage they had participated during the day. The percentages ran mostly between 40-60%.

#### C. Wednesday, February 26, 1986

The day started with a report of the previous day's activities from the committee. The facilitators then led a discussion on the self-evaluations done at the conclusion of Tuesday's session. The discussion centered on what the facilitator could do to help the participants increase their participation. It was stated that participation should be understood in the indirect sense of the word, large group, small group, reading, oral, listening, etc. Most participants felt that the program was structured so as to allow maximum participation.

The facilitators introduced the next topic on the "canevas de formation", the training activities used to help participants meet the session objectives. Since most of the activities we were going to study were known to the participants, we broke them into small groups to do an analysis of each activity. The small groups were to study the following activities: case study, demonstration, role play, lecture, and discussion. For each training activity they were to decide: 1) if it was best suited for knowledge, attitude or practices; 2) was it an active or passive method; 3) was it easy or difficult for a trainer to manage; 4) how much time did it take; and 5) what were the necessary steps to prepare for the activity?

The resultant grid is displayed in Table I, on the following page.

TABLE I: ACTIVITY ANALYSIS

TECHNIQUE/CRITERIA	K.A.P.	TIME	A/P	D/E	STEPS
CASE STUDY					
DEMO					
ROLE PLAY					
LECTURE					
DISCUSSION					

The next two items on the "canevas" were treated quickly since time was short and many of the participants had asked for hints on how to evaluate training.

1. Materials and Equipment (Human Resources)

Materials used during any training session should be simple, easily available, inexpensive and adapted to the reality of the training program.

Also included in this part of the "canevas" are the people responsible for the various training activities. Their names should appear so they will know what to prepare for the session and how much time they have.

Visual aids would come in this category and might constitute a whole workshop for that topic alone.

2. Time

It was suggested that during the planning of any training session, the time necessary for each activity should be estimated as a function of every thing that needed to be done, i.e., introductory lectures, breaking into groups, reporting, etc. Our conclusion: timing training activities is very difficult and only comes with experience and practice.

3. Evaluation

In order to open the discussion on evaluation, the facilitators asked the participants what experiences they had had in the past, either doing an evaluation themselves or being evaluated. These were recorded and the reasons for evaluations discussed.

The three areas of training evaluation, effective, cognitive and psychomotor, were introduced. Next, evaluation elements were presented. These included the trainer, the trainees, the materials, the techniques and the logistics. During the ensuing discussion, the major point emphasized was that those people evaluating a training program need to decide what to evaluate and then chose the right tools for carrying out the evaluation.

The group then discussed two of the most common tools: scales and questionnaires, and the advantages and disadvantages of each as an evaluation tool.

After lunch, anxious to give the participants as much time as possible for their preparations, the facilitators decided not to do "communications" but to do a very brief lecture on group dynamics. The lecture focused on 1) what is a working group, 2) the definition of dynamics as a combination of task and process activities, 3) implicit and explicit leadership and the necessity for having a leader to coordinate the group's work, and 4) the necessity of maintaining a balance between process and task activities. The participants wanted to study some communication techniques but were unable to do so because of time constraints.

For the practical exercise, the facilitators gave the following task to the participants:

Plan and present a training session based on the Experimental Learning Cycle. There were some conditions imposed:

1. The session should be no longer than 45 minutes.
2. Everyone in the group had to help prepare the session, but not necessarily present it.
3. The subject had to be CCCD-related.
4. There was no need for needs analysis, but the group presenting should have a target group of trainees in mind.
5. The presentation will be judged by all based on:
  - a. pertinence of the objective and if it was established according to the criteria for behavioral objectives;
  - b. appropriate content for trainees;
  - c. activity appropriate for helping the trainees meet the objective;
  - d. all necessary supplies, equipment and personnel listed; and
  - e. did the session provide a way to test the participants' knowledge.

Feedback would be given to the group by the facilitators and by the other participants. The groups worked until they had finished planning their sessions.

It might be noted here that a misunderstanding did arise. The facilitators had wanted each group to actually plan and give a training session, but the groups understood that they were only to present the plan. This led to some confusion on Thursday, however the groups rallied and did put on a demonstration session.

D. Thursday, February 27, 1986

The facilitators divided the participants into four groups and the day went according to plan. Each group presented for 45 minutes and approximately 30 minutes were devoted to providing the group feedback. It was stressed that feedback should be objective, not subjective, and that it should focus on areas of improvement.

At the end of the day, the Ivorian delegation gave a half hour presentation on the Visual Aids that they had brought.

E. Friday, February 28, 1986

From 7:30 - 9:00 a.m. the facilitators answered questions from the participants on topics they hadn't clearly understood. Most of the time was spent on the ELC and its implications for a trainer. The facilitators reviewed the schedule and the workshop objectives. The participants were divided into groups by country and were given the following tasks:

1. Share personal experiences and knowledge gained during the workshop.
2. Make a common list of the most important teachings learned from the workshop and be prepared to present two or three.
3. Outline what you see as the eventual application of the workshop teachings in your own country.

During the plenary, each group shared what they had learned and went on to complete the trainee styles inventory (taken originally as a pre-test).

Scores were compared (pre-test and post-test), and the facilitators lead short discussions on why scores may or may not have changed. An overall evaluation sheet was distributed (unfortunately badly translated) and completed by the participants.

A short closing ceremony with certificates ended the workshop.

III. SUMMARY OF PARTICIPANTS EVALUATIONS

1. On a scale of 1 through 5, the participants were asked to rate how effective this course had been in preparing them for their work as trainers. The course received a 4.4
2. Most participants felt that the most significant accomplishments were centered around the ELC, the elements of a training program, and the practical exercises.
3. The most widely suggested recommendation was that more time was needed to study communication and group dynamics in more depth.

IV. CONCLUSIONS, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The workshop was too short to allow the participants a real TOT experience. Four and a 1/2 days were only sufficient to expose them to basic training theory and to allow them one short practical experience.

Recommendation: Make sure future TOTs are two weeks long in order to assure complete coverage of such essential topics as group dynamics, communication theory and skills, and feedback; and also to allow each group of participants the time to plan and present a second training session so feedback from peers and facilitators can be incorporated during the first practice training session.

2. Although all the participants seemed to enjoy and derive benefit from the workshop, some of them, it appeared, will play little or no role in training activities within the CCCD project.

Recommendation: For future TOTs, set up some criteria to determine who will participate. These might be:

- a. the participant will be called upon to deliver training sessions himself.
  - b. the participant will be directly involved in planning CCCD training sessions on the national or peripheral levels.
  - c. the participant will be involved in the development of training curricula.
  - d. the participant will be involved in developing visual aids or job aids for use in training programs.
3. Two of the Guinean participants, originally scheduled to attend the workshop, were unable to do so because of a lack of lead time for making logistical arrangements.

Recommendation: While understanding the difficulties involved in making arrangements for this type of intercountry workshop, every effort should be made in the future to plan far enough in advance so that travel plans, advances, etc. can be made to allow all participants to attend.

4. The trainers used French TOT materials recently developed for use in another project. There was little lead time to plan the Kara workshop and if these documents hadn't been available, much more time would have been needed for preparation. Some of the documents used had been translated from English, and were not acceptable from this point of view.

Recommendation: The training office of CDC should look into the possibility of putting together a packet of TOT documents which have been edited and corrected. These can be sent out to the countries and will then be ready for future TOTs.

5. This workshop should be viewed as the first of a series of TOTs destined to develop a core group of master trainers in each of the Francophone countries.

Recommendation: Have follow-up workshops which would have as their themes the following training topics:

- a. in-depth study of training techniques
- b. developing training curriculum
- c. skills for master trainers

The same group of participants could be trained in the above areas and new participants selected as well to continue the TOT training process.

6. Participants and trainers both agreed that much could be gained by sending observers from one country to another during training programs. The facilitators were very glad to welcome to the Kara TOT Dr. Razakaso for WHO Bamako as an observer.

Recommendation: Dr Razakaso has expressed an interest in helping to facilitate training programs in other countries and every effort should be made to bring him on board. It would be interesting if some kind of exchange program could be instituted whereby one person already trained at a TOT could assist in facilitating training programs in a country other than his own.

7. The Hotel Kara is an excellent site for training programs. The only disadvantage is its distance from Lome. The TOT was one day shorter than if it had been held in Lome because of the time necessary to transport the participants up country. However, the facilitators understand the reasons for having the TOT in Kara and recommend it as a future site.

APPENDIX A

List of Participants

NAME	COUNTRY	TITLE
Traore Moussa	Ivory Coast	Health Educator
Niangnehi Sia	Ivory Coast	Health Educator
Bamory Diarra	Ivory Coast	Agent Technique de Sante
Kotan Daniel	Ivory Coast	Health Educator
Dr. Haba Fasson	Guinea	Coordinator National
Dr. Alpha Teli Diallo	Guinea	CDD Coordinator (LMD)
Dr. Devo Vignon	Togo	LMD
Dr. Karsa Tchasseu	Togo	Coordinator National
Dr. Gayibor Anani	Togo	Malaria
Dr. Komla Siamevi	Togo	Health Education
Dr. Razakasoia Armand	OMS	Personnel Bamako
Dr. Ntjijinama Audace	Burundi	Chief Medical Officer
Dr. Gacukuzi Dominique	Burundi	Chief Medical Officer
Dr. Bigirimman Claver	Burundi	Chief Medical Officer
Dr. Nathobari Stanislas	Burundi	Chief Medical Officer
Mr. Bob Weierbach	Ivory Coast	Technical Officer