

PW ABU-701
94367

CDM



THE CONSORTIUM FOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT
Clark-Atlanta University, The University of Connecticut, Indiana University,
University of Pittsburgh, Washington State University

CHAD TRAINING PROJECT REPORT

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORKSHOP

OCTOBER 14, 1991 - NOVEMBER 9, 1991

THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Division of International Affairs
University of Connecticut

Chad Project Report
K.P. Moseley
20 November 1991

1. INTRODUCTION

L'Atelier de Perfectionnement en Vulgarisation was held in N'Djamena, Tchad, 14 October-9 November 1991. This workshop, devoted to themes relating to rural development and extension work, was organized by the University of Connecticut's Division of International Affairs. It is the second in a series of five seminars for development training in Chad, financed by USAID and contracted to the Consortium for Development Management, of which UCONN is the lead institution.

This workshop was organized in collaboration with the Ministry of Rural Development, especially with two of its agencies, the Office Nationale du Développement Rurale (ONDR) and the Direction de l'Enseignement et de la Formation Professionnelle Agricoles (DEFPA). Consultations were held with these organizations, as well as with USAID, during preparatory trips made to Tchad in 1991 by Dean Richard Vengroff of the Division of International Affairs. In the course of these visits, various organizational and logistical details were also worked out, while teaching materials were prepared by the Division in Storrs.

Two of the three trainers arrived in N'djamena on October 12th. Despite political disturbances the following day, the workshop was able to take off as scheduled on October 14th. An informal opening ceremony was held that morning, the Director of DEFPA presiding. Within a few days the seminar had reached its full complement of 26 participants. Virtually all participants were technical or extension agents, almost half of whom were employed by the ONDR. The rest represented a variety of government agencies, such as ONADEH, the Service de l'Élevage, and SODELAC, as well as a few NGOs (e.g. Africare).

2. TRAINING ORGANIZATION

A. The Program

The workshop covered a wide variety of topics (see program, attached). Major themes were:

- the development process; the elaboration and implementation of projects
- social factors; the importance of local context and local input in development work
- marketing; the organization and functioning of cooperatives
- financial analysis
- management: MBO; the Training & Visits approach
- evaluation, cost-effectiveness, and analysis of social impact
- methods of research: observation, surveys, interviewing techniques.

As the seminar progressed, the overall program and approach were continuously reappraised in light of local realities and the characteristics of the participants themselves. About half of the stagiaires, particularly the ONDR personnel, were just beginning their careers, while there was a handful of fairly senior agents who had been working in rural development for 10 or 20 years. Six of the participants were women. Taking these variations into account, participants were divided into five groups for purposes of study exercises and team discussions.

The program itself was also modified in several ways. Most generally, there was an ongoing effort to further adapt the topics and materials to the specific needs and aptitudes of the participants. A more specific innovation was the introduction of fieldwork into the program. While this decision reflected the judgement and predilections of the trainers, it was reinforced by the concern expressed by DEFFPA and ONDR representatives, that the training be closely geared to the local realities that extension agents would be likely to face.

In light of this, three major field exercises were arranged, as follows:

Oct. 22. Markets and marketing in N'Djamena. Five groups were formed, to look, respectively, at the marketing of fruits, vegetables, livestock and meat, millet, and fish.

Oct. 26. Agricultural production: projects, groupements, and entrepreneurs. Five groups, again, to look at grain, vegetables, rice, and two poultry ventures, in the N'djamena area.

Nov. 7. Economic organization at the village and household levels. Group discussions with community spokesmen, and interviews with household heads, at five sites in and around Darda.

Each field trip was preceded by presentations of relevant general materials (e.g., marketing, social organization, research techniques), and by the identification of issues and questions to be raised. Following the field visits, each group wrote up its findings, and also presented an oral report to the rest of the class.

B. Other Activities

Another change was to invite guest speakers to the seminar. This was done on two occasions:

Oct. 31. Presentation by three DEFFPA trainers on Training of Trainers and problems of effective extension activities in the field.

Nov. 2. Round table discussion of issues relating to rural development and extension in Tchad, led by Mssrs. Mady (ONDR), Pokou (World Bank), and Kiram (Élevage), with the Director of DEFFPA as discussant.

Both of these sessions were very well received by participants, and stimulated lively discussion.

On November 7th, on our return from fieldwork near Darda, an informal farewell luncheon was held, a convivial gathering much appreciated by all participants. A formal closing ceremony was held on Nov. 9th, covered by the local television and radio, with M. Belhaj acting as M.C. Speeches by M. Tedambi, representing USAID, and Dr. Moseley, representing the trainers, were followed by a vote of thanks on behalf of the stagiaires, and an eloquent closing speech by the Director of DEFFPA. A formal buffet followed, much appreciated, again, by the invitees.

A final event, in addition to the publicity mentioned above, was an interview and panel discussion requested by Radio Chad. Kruse and Belhaj, assisted by several stagiaires, talked about development issues and the achievements of the seminar. Entitled "La Radio Rurale rencontre les agents de développement," it was scheduled to be aired on the 12th of November.

C. Materials

Certain details concerning the characteristics of the participants, on the one hand, and the desiderata of the host organizations, on the other, only emerged during Dean Vengroff's final visit to Chad, just before and in some cases only after the workshop had begun. In view of this, a preemptive strategy was adopted, of assembling as wide an array of training materials as possible, with further selection or adaptation expected in the field.

Some of our materials were what one would conventionally use in project management training, and, as expected, were a bit advanced for some of the participants. These were modified accordingly. Thus, for instance, the rather demanding materials on the "cadre logique" were truncated in favor of more down-to-earth discussions of the actual organization of extension work in Tchad, and of the Training and Visits system being encouraged by the World Bank. Treatments of the social context and social impact of development work were leavened with references to the agenda and methodologies being promoted by "Recherche-Action-Développement" (RAD), a relatively populist, participatory approach that has won considerable support within DEFPA and the ONDR. Generally, the more complex written materials were used more as reference material and as guides to classroom discussion, than as assigned texts to be read in full detail.

On the other hand, it was found that, even where the subject matter was complex, participants responded very well to concrete applications and problem-solving exercises, whether this involved mathematical computations (as in financial analysis), fieldwork (e.g. marketing, social factors), or role-playing (e.g. simulations concerning project managers, or the impact of a project in "Saloko"). Moreover, some of the materials were already quite appropriate for this set of participants, particularly the CARE materials on communication and adult training, and the very well written and accessible book, Deux Epis de Mais. The World Bank collection on extension work also proved very helpful, as did the documentation on development theory and practice in Chad supplied by M. Gaudin of DEFPA.

D. Trainers

The workshop personnel were as follows:

Dr. K.P. Moseley, sociologist, University of Connecticut
Mr. Gregory Kruse, agricultural economist, Technoserve
Dr. Mohammed Belhaj, public administration, Training Division, Ministry of the Interior, Morocco.

M. Dehala Gandaoua, an economist working at DEFPA, assisted as our local counterpart.

Moseley and Kruse met with Dean Vengroff for orientation sessions on the 10th and 11th of October, departing on the 11th for Paris, and arriving N'Djamena the 12th. Belhaj joined the group on the 26th. As their specialties suggest, the team was very well balanced as regards areas of expertise; all three, moreover, had extensive field experience in one or another aspect of the work.

Moseley acted as overall team leader, although with extensive input and support from Kruse, and the two collaborated extensively in both the practical administration of the seminar and in the ongoing delivery and reconceptualization of the program itself. Kruse, in collaboration with DEFPA's M. Gaudin, was especially instrumental in setting up the fieldwork trips. Moseley helped with research agendas and in liaising with other development institutions and personnel; she set up and chaired the Roundtable on development issues in Chad. Belhaj provided support in various training and logistical areas, including strategic contributions as regards the formal aspects of the closing ceremonies, in collaboration with M. Tedambi of USAID.

E. Logistics

The workshops were held six days a week, from 7:30 A.M. to 2 P.M. except on Fridays, when work ends at noon to permit observance of Muslim prayers. DEFPA provided a good-sized and well-equipped meeting room, as well as secretarial and logistical support.

The workshop was beclouded to some extent by the political situation in Chad. Military confrontations and disorders occurred from the early hours of Oct. 13th, and throughout the day; a curfew was in effect for four or five days thereafter, and the regions north and east of the capitol

continued to be considered insecure. In this context, field visits were more than usually difficult to arrange, and were restricted to a narrow geographical scope.

This situation also had an impact on the relations between the training team and USAID. The latter felt obliged to restrict the movements of the team, to minimise risk, and required the trainers to move from the Hotel du Chari to the Novotel for security reasons. A misunderstanding occurred concerning the timing of the move. The team had also erred in not having arranged for an entry briefing with USAID at the beginning of their stay; the security situation was partly responsible for this delay.

Apart from such minor contretemps, USAID staff were helpful and cordial. The expeditors at the airport were invaluable. M. Tedambi provided a most congenial liaison and a great deal of helpful advice. The check-cashing privileges at the Embassy were most appreciated, as was access to the Embassy clinic. A briefing by the Embassy security officer was also of great interest. At USAID, a briefing was finally held with Dr. Anita Mackie, the incoming officer charged with rural development issues. At a later date, Dr. Mackie also came to observe the workshop proceedings for awhile. A frank and detailed debriefing was held with M. Tedambi before our departure.

Relations with DEFFPA were excellent, thanks particularly to the unfailing cordiality of the Director, the stream of useful inputs, contacts, and advice provided by M. Gaudin, and the devoted assistance provided by our ever-patient local counterpart, M. Gandaoua. Along with other staff, drivers, and DEFFPA vehicles, they made a particularly critical contribution as far as the fieldwork exercises were concerned. M. Gaudin also provided the team with written materials concerning rural development in Tchad that proved very important for our work. DEFFPA provided significant secretarial support as well, especially as regards typing and photocopying services.

Our collaboration with ONDR, on the other hand, seemed to have been stillborn. Some ONDR staff - like some of their counterparts at DEFFPA - were rather critical of the approach and contents of our initial program (as too sophisticated, abstract, etc.). Unlike the DEFFPA colleagues, however, few positive inputs or suggestions were forthcoming. M. Mady of ONDR, our illuminating roundtable speaker, was a notable exception in this regard.

Other logistical arrangements were quite satisfactory. Our driver, Al haj Issaka Algady, was superb; his car was in excellent condition and included an A/C. He is most highly recommended for any future work in Tchad. The car was available six days a week, roughly from 7 AM to the early evening, generally with a break in the afternoon, and occasionally with a further outing at night.

The catering service, the Restaurant Moultopha, was also most assiduous in its duties, and did much to maintain our energies during what sometimes felt like very long, hot days. Two waiters were on duty, with ingredients for coffee and tea, from roughly 7AM to 2 PM. Instead of the two breaks with sandwiches as originally planned, we substituted bread and butter at breakfast time (7:30) and a single break with sandwiches and soft drinks at around 11 AM. The quality of the sandwiches was acceptable; the quantity abundant.

Financial provisions for ongoing workshop expenses proved more than adequate. Savings were made as regards allocations for computer rental (Kruse brought his own laptop, and we were unable to find a compatible printer to rent), for opening and closing ceremonies (already partly covered by the catering contract), and for the second local trainer (ONDR did not provide a suitable appointee, and we used a variety of other assistants and speakers instead). Local transportation and transportation of workshop materials were the two items where allocations were fully used up.

Many "miscellaneous" expenses had to do with reproductions and stationary supplies, and in fact we were always short of paper and pens. Perhaps a separate allocation might be added for this in future, or more supplies could be carried in. Those we brought from the States (not to speak of the invaluable calculators) were well worth the overweight. An allocation for fieldwork expenses might also be in order, if this kind of activity is to be encouraged.

One financial problem that surfaced occasionally in the course of the stage had to do with participants' material expectations. Although the existing per diems seemed up to par, the team was taken aback by the intensity of demands for still more, especially for payments for non-working days; these were rejected, as were the repeated demands for provision of daily transport (in kind) to and from the seminar. Another minor problem was the cashing of traveller's checks, a lengthy and exhausting process in the local banks which we ended by delegating to our ever-patient local counterpart.

3. PARTICIPANT ASSESSMENT OF COURSE

An evaluation form was synthesized from models supplied from UCONN and from M. Tedambi/USAID, and administered on the last teaching day. The results were quite positive. Over 90 percent felt that the workshop had satisfied their expectations, and a third wished it had gone on even longer than it did. The section of the course that received the highest overall rating was marketing (over 90 percent approval on all three indices - written materials used, potential utility in future work, usefulness of field exercise). This topic came up fairly early in the course, materials were straightforward, presentation was well organized and unrushed, connections with the fieldwork were clearcut. There was also an unexpected degree of interest in financial analysis, with fully 100 percent desirous of further training in this domain.

Overall, there was somewhat less enthusiasm concerning the fieldwork that one would have hoped, less than 70 percent rating it as "tres utile" in any of the topical sections. This may reflect, on the one hand, a sense that these exercises were "added on" to the original program, presenting participants with extra work. On the other, field trips were arranged more or less at the last minute, sometimes without much time for elaborating the research agenda and/or for analysing results. This was particularly the case with the field trip to Darda, squeezed in during the last few days of class. As for teaching materials, there was a rather lukewarm response (only about 60 percent approval) to the texts on cooperatives and cost-effectiveness, perhaps simply because trainers did not highlight the materials on hand.

4. EVALUATION OF TRAINING DELIVERY

As suggested earlier, there was some criticism from DEFPA and ONDR staff that our training materials were too advanced, and oriented more to project management than to extension work. Our interaction with the stagiaires also suggested the need for adaptation in these respects. On the whole, the team was quite successful in responding to this situation, cutting and simplifying some materials, adding others, increasing the inputs from participants, devising fieldwork exercises, etc. Generally, reading and lectures were minimized in favor of discussions and assignments done in teams.

A related problem was the heterogeneous character of the participants in the stage, which mixed together young debutants and persons with considerable seniority and experience. It was not always easy to find a voice and approach appropriate to both, whether from the academic or the pedagogic point of view. The workshop employed a collegial and participatory approach which was in some cases misunderstood or abused by participants, particularly the younger ones. There were some problems with discipline,

particularly as regards the order and tone of classroom discussions, the promptness of resumption of sessions in the morning and after breaks, and regularity of attendance throughout the day. At the same time, participants suggested that they would have liked even more responsibility and participation in the planning of fieldwork and other events, a not unreasonable suggestion as regards the senior personnel.

Notwithstanding these problems, the workshop functioned quite well most of the time. On a day to day basis, a particularly successful element was the participant work teams which were the framework for much classroom activity as well as for the trips to the field. Stagiaires showed great responsibility, collegiality, and capacity for self-organization at this level; existing hierarchies of age and seniority, taken into account in the selection of each group, probably played a part here.

The special events devised by the trainers - the field trips and the invited speakers - were also quite successful, despite their somewhat impromptu and hurried preparation. The adaptation and replacement of teaching materials was also satisfactorily carried out, as noted above. The particularly notable contributions of Mr. Kruse, in both these domains, should be singled out for special mention.

5. LESSONS LEARNED

Of the innumerable lessons provided by this workshop experience, the following might be highlighted:

a) Pedagogically, one was impressed again by the value of hands-on exercises - e.g. role-playing, fieldwork - in heightening participants' involvement in the learning process. We could have given even more time to such activities, and also to greater reflection and evaluation at the end of each exercise, so the lessons obtained could be made explicit and sink in.

b) Participant input in discussion also engendered a great amount of valuable substantive information - as did, more formally, the roundtable discussion we held. This sort of input was extremely helpful in connecting the general skills and information we could provide with concrete aspects of the local environment.

c) At the same time, one was impressed - less happily - with the continuing need for hierarchy, the meting out of rewards and punishments, for an orderly learning environment to be maintained. We should have been much clearer and stricter in this regard, from the start - particularly, as in this case, where junior and middle-level staff were involved. Judging

from their effectiveness at the level of the study teams, the few senior staff that were in the group could have been more extensively coopted in this effort.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORKSHOPS

A. Recommendations for Host Ministry

Some divisions or ministries sent fairly senior, responsible people to the seminar, while others sent youngsters just out of school. Greater coordination and consistency in the selection of stagiaires would be extremely helpful in future, as would perhaps greater forewarning of the sorts of people being sent.

Insofar as junior and middle-level staff are involved, it would be helpful to have the ministries, too, continue to play a role as far as discipline is concerned. Stagiaires could be informed in writing of the exact terms of the seminar, as regards stipends and so on, and could be required to give their signed assent; this would help avoid the unpleasant wrangling that we encountered over the levels of benefits. Ministries could also request assessments of the comportment and performance of stagiaires in the course of the seminar.

B. Recommendations for USAID

C. Recommendations for CDM

A major recommendation of the trainers would be that future workshops of this sort allow for more time and work preparatory to the workshop sessions as such. This might be envisioned at three different points:

- (a) more extensive collection of general information, planning and project documents, and relevant teaching materials, at the planning stage. These could be used both to familiarize the trainers with the local situation and to guide the adaptation/creation of new materials for the specific workshop being prepared;

(b) more lead time for trainers - once in the country, and before the workshops begin - to meet with representatives of collaborating institutions, collect further materials, set up field trips, check credentials and needs of participants, and make any final program revisions that may be necessary;

(c) incorporate field exercises explicitly into the program, including extra time for participants to work up research designs or carry out other activities in the field.

Our emphasis on fieldwork reflects two other observations made during our stay. First, there is a new attention in Chad to participatory development approaches, to tailoring projects more closely to fit local realities, and to the responsibilisation of peasants and peasant communities. Application of this approach requires that extension agents be learners as well as teachers, researchers as well as vulgarisateurs, and that they make strategic use of socio-economic knowledge as well as technical expertise.

Conventional extension training, however, makes little provision for such skills. This points to three major areas in which additional training could be valuable: (a) the general parameters and findings of geography/economics/sociology/anthropology as regards African rural communities; (b) more applied forms of knowledge in such areas as marketing and basic accounting; (c) fieldwork and research techniques, including informal/non-obtrusive observational and conversational skills.

A number of participants showed a strong interest in financial analysis, and additional basic materials and exercises in this domain are recommended for similar workshops in future. Simulation and role-playing exercises also proved quite successful. These should be retained, and others specifically focussed on situations concerning extension workers might be devised.

Dr. Mackie suggested that training of higher-level cadres - or a training of trainers approach - might prove a more advantageous use of high-level foreign expertise in future. She indicated that USAID would welcome requests from host-country institutions along this line, and this point was subsequently relayed to M. Gaudin (a Swiss cooperant) and the Director at DEFPA. In fact, a CDM workshop on training of trainers in Chad is already slated for February 1992.

SEMINAIRE SUR LA VULGARISATION LISTE DES STAGIAIRES

No	NOM & PRENOMS	STAGIAIRE
1	ABDELKERIM BLAGUE	ONADEN
2	ABDERAMANE SERAH	ARPE
3	ADAM ABDELKERIM	Division d'Animation et vulgarisation Ministère de l'Élevage
4	AMADOU ZADANG	Société du Développement du LAC (SODELAC)
5	BEASSOUM MBAILAO	DEPPA
6	BEMADJI RONAYE ALICE	ONADEN
7	BEMONGUEN NDIGDE	ONDR
8	BEVIA RESPA	CARE-Telad
9	DANGAYE SADJIGOTO	Division d'Animation et vulgarisation Ministère d'élevage
10	DJERO OSEE	ONDR
11	DJIME ADOUM	ONADEN
12	DJIMRANGAR MIANAL	ONDR
13	DJIMTOLOUM MBAIGANGDJIM	ONDR
14	DINGAMASBEYE NADOUNGAR	SODELAC (Société du développement du LAC)
15	DOUKMON DEMANGUET	ONDR
16	LAOUDION LELMIAN	ONDR
17	MADJINGAYE MERINAN	DFPE (Direction des forêts et Protection de l'environnement)
18	MANTA JULIENNE	Ministère de l'Élevage
19	MAHOULI NEWINE	ONDR
20	MBAIBAROUM NDOUBA	ONDR
21	MOIMOU NINGATOLOUM	ONDR
22	NDADI ALLAH	Centre de formation professionnelle Agriculture - DEPPA
23	NELOUMTA MADIBE	SODELAC
24	NGARBAROUM BAISSALAM	Eaux et forêts - Division des Eaux-Pêches et Aquaculture
25	NGARLEITA EDOUARD	ONDR
26	TAKEMNAGAR MBOGOTA	ONDR

ATELIER DE PERFECTIONNEMENT EN VULGARISATION

THE CONSORTIUM FOR DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

Programme des Activités: 14 Octobre-09 Novembre 1991

Lundi, 14 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Ouverture du Séminaire -Allocution de Bienvenue -Tour des Installations de Formation/Recherche	<u>Administrateurs</u>
Mardi, 15 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	-Le Cadre de Développement -Le Cycle des Projets	<u>Moseley</u> <u>Cruse/Moseley</u>
Mercredi, 16 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Le Cycle des Projets (suite) <i>Simulation: "Identification d'un Projet de Développement"</i>	<u>Cruse/Moseley</u>
Jeudi, 17 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Aspects Socio-culturels des Projets de Développement	<u>Moseley</u>
Vendredi, 18 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Les Populations-Cibles: Organisation /Associations Paysannes	<u>Moseley/Cruse</u>
Samedi, 19 Octobre 7:30 - 12:00	Elaboration de Projets à la Base	<u>Cruse/Moseley</u>
Lundi, 21 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	-Communication et Développement -La Communication dans les Projets	<u>Moseley</u> <u>Cruse/Moseley</u>

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

Mardi, 22 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Le Rôle du Marketing dans la Gestion des Projets	<u>Cruse</u>
Mercredi, 23 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Marketing et Coopératives	<u>Cruse</u>
Jeudi, 24 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Analyse Financière des Projets	<u>Cruse</u>
Vendredi, 25 Octobre 7:30 - 12:00	Analyse Financière des Projets (suite)	<u>Cruse</u>
Samedi, 26 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Analyse Financière des Projets (suite)	<u>Cruse</u>
Lundi, 28 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Management des Ressources Humaines: Management par Objectifs (MBO) -Simulation: "Cotonnière la Fiesta"	<u>Belhaj</u>
Mardi, 29 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	La Vulgarisation -Organisation -Communication en Vulgarisation "la Formation des Adultes"	<u>Belhaj/Cruse</u>
Mercredi, 30 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Le Cadre Logique	<u>Belhaj/Cruse</u>
Jeudi, 31 Octobre 7:30 - 14:00	Le Cadre Logique (suite) Simulation: "Le Projet Rizicole de	<u>Belhaj/Cruse</u>
Vendredi, 1er Novembre 7:30 - 12:00	Planification et Suivi de Projets: Méthodes du Chemin Critique (CPM)	<u>Belhaj/Cruse</u>

Samedi, 1er Novembre 7:30 - 11:00	Planification et Suivi de Projets (suite) Méthodes du Chemin Critique (CPM)	<u>Belhaj/Cruse</u>
11:00 - 14:00	Evaluation des Projets: -Objectifs -Types d'Evaluation	<u>Belhaj/Cruse</u>
Lundi, 4 Novembre 7:30 - 14:00	L'Analyse Coûts-Efficacité <i>Simulation: "Gille Jande"</i>	<u>Belhaj/Cruse</u>
Mardi, 5 Novembre 7:30 - 14:00	Analyse de l'Impact Social des Projets	<u>Moseley/Cruse</u>
Mercredi, 6 Novembre 7:30 - 14:00	Analyse de l'Impact Social des Projets	<u>Moseley/Cruse</u>
Jeudi, 7 Novembre 7:30 - 14:00	Les Méthodes de Recherche -Echantillonnage -Elaboration d'un Questionnaire	<u>Moseley/Belhaj</u>
Vendredi, 8 Novembre 7:30 - 12:00	Les Méthodes de Recherche -Collecte de Données -"Interviews" et "Focus group"	<u>Moseley/Belhaj</u>
Samedi, 9 Novembre 7:30 - 14:00	<i>Synthèse</i> Clôture du séminaire	Equipe de Formation

Notes: Deux pauses-café sont observées chaque jour à l'exception des Vendredis, respectivement de 9:30 à 10:00 et de 12:30 à 13:00.

ATELIER DE PERFECTIONNEMENT EN VULGARISATION

N'DJAMENA, 14 OCTOBRE AU 09 NOVEMBRE 1991

EVALUATION

APPENDIX 3

EVALUATION GENERALE : (Mettre une croix devant votre réponse)

1. L'atelier globalement :

a) a satisfait vos attentes

87.5%

b) n'a pas satisfait vos attentes

8.33%

c) a dépassé vos attentes

4.17%

Rémarques supplémentaires

.....
.....

2. La durée de l'atelier était

a) trop longue

8.33%

b) suffisante

58.34%

c) trop courte

33.33%

Rémarques supplémentaires

.....
.....

II. le contenu de l'Atelier

1. parmi les sujets traités lors de l'atelier, quels sont ceux où plus de temps aurait-il dû être consacré ?

.....
.....

BEST AVAILABLE DOCUMENT

III. UTILITE

1. Quelles sont les possibilités que vous prévoyez pour appliquer la formation que vous avez reçue dans cet atelier ?

2. Que pensez-vous en général de la méthode de formation présentée dans cet atelier ?

IV. QUESTIONS SUR CERTAINES ACTIVITES

1. Concernant le marketing :

a) le materiel était approprié

oui 95.65% non 4.35% sans opinion 0.0%

b) Pensez-vous que ce vous avez appris vous sera utile dans dans votre travail ?

oui 100% non 0% sans opinion 0%

c) La visite sur le terrain a été

très utile 69.56% utile 26.09% inutile 4.35%

V3

V4

V5

2. Concernant la visite des associations rurales et des coopératives :

- V6 a) Le matériel était approprié
 oui 59.10% non 22.73% sans opinions 18.17%
- V7 b) pensez-vous que ce vous avez appris vous sera utile dans votre travail ?
 oui 95.65% non 0% sans opinion 4.35%
- V8 c) La visite sur le terrain a été
 très utile 65.22% utile 30.43% inutile 4.35%

3. Concernant l'analyse financière :

- V9 a) Le matériel était approprié ?
 oui 81% non 19% sans opinions 0%
- V10 c) Vous avez le sentiment que vous avez bien compris les techniques introduites.
 oui 82.61% non 13.04% sans opinions 4.35%
- V11 d) Pensez-vous qu'il vous sera utile d'approfondir vos connaissances dans ce domaine ?
 oui 100% non 0% sans opinions 0%

4) Concernant le thème sur les facteurs sociaux et l'impact social des projets de développement :

- V12 a) Le matériel était approprié ?
 oui 78.26% non 13.04% sans opinions 8.7
- V13 b) Pensez-vous que ce vous avez appris vous sera utile dans votre travail ?
 oui 100%
- V14 c) La visite sur le terrain (Darda) a été
 très utile 52.17% utile 30.43% inutile 17.4%

5. Concernant le thème sur le Management par objectifs

a) Le matériel était approprié ?
V15 oui 86.96% non 13.04% sans opinions 0%

b) Pensez-vous que ce vous avez appris vous sera utile dans votre travail ?
V16 oui 86.96% non 4.34% sans opinions 8.70%

6. Concernant le thème sur les techniques de planification (GANTT, PERT)

a) Le matériel était approprié ?
V17 oui 86.96% non 8.70% sans opinions 4.34%

b) Pensez-vous que ce vous avez appris vous sera utile dans votre travail ?
V18 oui 100% non 0% sans opinions 0%

7. Concernant le thème sur l'analyse coûts-efficacité.

a) Le matériel était approprié ?
V19 oui 60.87% non 21.74% sans opinions 17.39%

b) Pensez-vous que ce vous avez appris vous sera utile dans votre travail ?
V20 oui 69.57% non 0% sans opinions 30.43

Tableaux d'evaluation

X₁: v1

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	21	87.5%	-Mode
2	2	3	2	8.333%	
3	3	4	1	4.167%	

X₂: v2

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	2	8.333%	-Mode
2	2	3	14	58.333%	
3	3	4	8	33.333%	

X₃: v3

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	22	95.652%	-Mode
2	2	3	1	4.348%	
3	3	4	0	0%	

X₄: v4

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	23	100%	-Mode
2	2	3	0	0%	
3	3	4	0	0%	

X₅: v5

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	16	69.565%	-Mode
2	2	3	6	26.087%	
3	3	4	1	4.348%	

Tableaux d'evaluation

X6: v6

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	13	59.091%	-Mode
2	2	3	5	22.727%	
3	3	4	4	18.182%	

X7: v7

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	22	95.652%	-Mode
2	2	3	0	0%	
3	3	4	1	4.348%	

X8: v8

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	15	65.217%	-Mode
2	2	3	7	30.435%	
3	3	4	1	4.348%	

X9: v9

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	17	80.952%	-Mode
2	2	3	4	19.048%	
3	3	4	0	0%	

X10: v10

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	19	82.609%	-Mode
2	2	3	3	13.043%	
3	3	4	1	4.348%	

Tableaux d'evaluation

X11: v11

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	23	100%	-Mode
2	2	3	0	0%	
3	3	4	0	0%	

X12: v12

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	18	78.261%	-Mode
2	2	3	3	13.043%	
3	3	4	2	8.696%	

X13: v13

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	3	100%	-Mode
2	2	3	0	0%	
3	3	4	0	0%	

X14: v14

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	12	52.174%	-Mode
2	2	3	7	30.435%	
3	3	4	4	17.391%	

X15: v15

Bar:	From: (\geq)	To: ($<$)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	20	86.957%	-Mode
2	2	3	3	13.043%	
3	3	4	0	0%	

Tableaux d'evaluation

X16: v16

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	20	86.957%	-Mode
2	2	3	1	4.348%	
3	3	4	2	8.696%	

X17: v17

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	20	86.957%	-Mode
2	2	3	2	8.696%	
3	3	4	1	4.348%	

X18: v18

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	22	100%	-Mode
2	2	3	0	0%	
3	3	4	0	0%	

X19: v19

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	14	60.87%	-Mode
2	2	3	5	21.739%	
3	3	4	4	17.391%	

X20: v20

Bar:	From: (≥)	To: (<)	Count:	Percent:	
1	1	2	16	69.565%	-Mode
2	2	3	0	0%	
3	3	4	7	30.435%	

Evaluation seminaire - Tchad

*** Les sujets les plus utiles (par ordre d'importance) selon les participants sont:**

- la gestion des projets
- les communications et le développement
- l'analyse financière et le marketing
- les aspects sociaux des projets
- la Vulgarisation

*** La méthode de formation utilisée a été jugée très positive et pratique à 90.50%**

*** Les sujets que les participants aimeraient inclure dans les prochains séminaires:**

- les méthodes d'échantillonnage et d'élaboration de questionnaires
- la formation des adultes
- les différentes méthodes de vulgarisation
- l'audiovisuelle