

PN-ABW-242
95291

TRAINING REPORT

**WORKSHOP ON
LAND USE PLANNING METHODOLOGIES
IN
SOCIAL FORESTRY**

**Pakistan Forest Institute
Peshawar, Pakistan**

November 10-21, 1991

Submitted to:

**Pakistan Forestry Planning and Development Project
USAID/Winrock International
Islamabad, Pakistan**

by

**Dr. Jo Ellen Force
Ms. Deborah Forester**

**Department of Forest Resources
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho, U. S. A.**

November 24, 1991

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
INTRODUCTION	1
COURSE OBJECTIVES	1
COURSE SCHEDULE	2
PARTICIPANTS	3
EVALUATION	3
OBSERVATIONS	6
RECOMMENDATIONS	8
CONCLUSION	9
APPENDICES	
A - Course Schedule	
B - Participants, Instructors & Facilitators	
C - Evaluation Forms	
D - Adult Learning	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The workshop "Land Use Planning Methodologies in Social Forestry" was presented at the Pakistan Forest Institute (PFI) in Peshawar, Pakistan, from November 10-21, 1991. The two primary instructors were from the Department of Forest Resources, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, U. S. A. Twenty Pakistani foresters attended the workshop. Technical and financial support was provided by the Pakistan Forestry Planning and Development Project, Winrock International.

The course consisted of the following major topics: general land use planning theory, concepts and principles; land and tree tenure; developing goals and objectives; working with farmers; agroforestry concepts, classifications, and configurations; social impact assessment theory and methods; gender analysis; communication processes; financial analysis of agroforestry alternatives; and decision-making. Experiential learning techniques were used to meet the educational objectives and to increase class participation and interest. Specific training methodologies used were: small group discussions, large group discussions, lectures, individual exercises, role plays, and field exercises. Class was held from 8:30 AM until 2:00 PM six days a week. Two field trips were arranged to conduct exercises collecting social impact assessment data and to observe farm forestry activities.

The participants' responses on the pre- and post-workshop questionnaires and the final evaluation indicate that participants had broadened their knowledge on topics presented in the workshop. The greatest increased understanding appears to have been in the area of land and tree tenure and financial analysis of forestry activities. These were the two areas where the participants had the least understanding initially. The overall evaluation of the workshop organization and delivery was favorable.

Recommendations include the following: 1) Future training activities need to focus on developing problem-solving skills; the process of training is as important as the material presented. 2) Potential Pakistani trainers should be sent to U. S. based "Training of Trainers" workshops to increase their experiential learning capabilities and training skills. 3) Once participants are selected for training, information on course objectives should be provided to the participant prior to arrival at the course. 4) Process-oriented goals rather than target-oriented goals should be established and rewarded in social forestry activities.

INTRODUCTION

The workshop "Land Use Planning Methodologies in Social Forestry" was presented at the Pakistan Forest Institute (PFI) in Peshawar, Pakistan, from November 10-21, 1991. Dr. Jo Ellen Force and Ms. Deborah Forester from the Department of Forest Resources, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, U. S. A., were the primary instructors. Ms. Mamoona Wali, Sub-divisional Forest Officer, Winrock International (WI), Islamabad, Pakistan, assisted in the workshop and led a session on gender analysis and the involvement of women in forestry in Pakistan. Ms. Carol Dohmen from the Malakand Social Forestry Project gave a presentation on the involvement of women in that project. Support services were provided by Fazli Subhan, PFI, and George Blake and Tahir Malik, WI.

The following report first presents the course objectives and their achievement. This is followed by a description of the course schedule and the participants' backgrounds. The results of evaluations conducted before, during and after the course are presented followed by the instructors' observations. Finally, recommendations are made.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Six learning objectives were developed in collaboration with WI personnel. The overall objectives were:

1. To provide forest officers with the training needed to define, analyze and evaluate land use planning processes as they apply to social/farm forestry projects in Pakistan;
2. To train forest officers in developing appropriate goals and measurable objectives for social/farm forestry activities;
3. To demonstrate the importance of involving local people in planning forestry activities and to learn desirable extension techniques;
4. To present the theory and methodologies to determine the social impacts of alternative social/farm forestry activities;
5. To develop and evaluate alternative social/farm forestry strategies; and
6. To enable the participants to train others in their districts to work together to achieve the social/farm forestry objectives.

At the conclusion of the workshop participants were asked to rate how well they had achieved the objectives on a scale from 1 (not achieved) to 5 (fully achieved). The participants' assessment of their achievement of each of the objectives is presented in Table 1. In our assessment, the participants' ratings are a reasonable reflection of their accomplishments, with the exception of objective 6, where they appear a bit optimistic regarding their ability to train others, particularly if experimental learning methods are to be used.

Table 1. Participant rating¹ their achievement of course objectives.

Objective	Participants' Rating
1. Define, analyze and evaluate land use planning processes	4.0
2. Develop appropriate goals and objectives	3.6
3. Understand the importance of involving local people	4.6
4. Determine the social impacts of social forestry activities	3.9
5. Evaluate alternative social forestry strategies	3.6
6. Be able to train others to work in social forestry	3.8

¹ Rating are on a scale from 1 (not achieved) to 5 (fully achieved)

COURSE SCHEDULE

The revised course schedule, as actually presented, is in Appendix A. The course consisted of the following major topics: general land use planning theory, concepts and principles; land and tree tenure; developing goals and objectives; working with farmers; agroforestry concepts, classifications, and configurations; social impact assessment theory and methods; gender analysis; communication processes; financial analysis of agroforestry alternatives; and decision-making. Experiential learning techniques were used to meet the educational objectives and to increase class participation and interest. Specific training methodologies used were: small group discussions, large group discussions, lectures, individual exercises, role plays, and field exercises. Class was held from 8:30 AM until 2:00 PM six days a week. Two field days were organized. The first day was to the Charsadda area, NWFP, with the purpose of training the participants

in "Participant Observation" techniques for collecting social impact data. The second day was to the Attock area, Punjab, to conduct group interviews with farmers working in Project activities there. In both exercises participants were divided into teams for data collection purposes, analysis of data, and reporting data to the class the following day.

PARTICIPANTS

Twenty male participants from the Northwest Frontier Province (10), Punjab Province (5), Azad Kashmir (2), Balochistan Province, Northern Areas and Islamabad attended the course. Nine were Sub-Divisional Forest Officers or Forest Range Officers from the provincial Forest Departments; four were from the Pakistan Forest Institute; and the remaining participants were from the WI Technical Assistance Team, the Punjab Forest Research Institute, the Pakistan Agriculture Research Council, the Agha Khan Rural Support Program, and the NWFP Agriculture University, Peshawar. Eight participants have been in their present job for one year or less; nine for 3-8 years; and the remainder for more than eight years. Three have been working in forestry for one year or less; six for about 5 years; two for 12 years; and the remainder for 20 or more years. One-half of the participants have a M. Sc. degree in forestry and the others have a B. Sc. A list of the participants' names and addresses is in Appendix B.

EVALUATION

Mid-Course Feedback. At the end of the first week, participants were asked to respond individually and anonymously, in writing, to the following statements: "The most interesting idea/concept or information I learned this week was . . ."; "The most useful information I learned this week was . . ." and "I recommend that next week . . ." An idea/concept from every topic presented the first week was mentioned most interesting by at least one participant. The most frequently mentioned most interesting topic was the material on social impact assessment theory and methods, followed by agroforestry classification systems, agroforestry in Pakistan, social forestry and land use planning processes.

The most frequently mentioned responses to "The most useful information . . ." included a content-oriented topic (agroforestry) and a process-oriented topic (experience sharing with other participants). This latter response reinforces the importance of using experiential training techniques when providing training for Pakistani foresters and indicates that the participants recognize the value of using such techniques, even though these techniques were new to many of the participants. There were no significant changes recommended for the second week of the workshop.

Final Evaluation. The final evaluation form used is in Appendix C. The results on the achievement of course objectives were presented earlier. Two-thirds of the participants reported that the level of presentation was "about right" and the others said it was "too simple." This latter response is surprising as the questions that were asked during presentation of most of the material often indicated a poor understanding of the concepts, and as instructors we were concerned that the poor English ability of some of the participants was limiting their understanding.

The material on agroforestry was mentioned by half of the participants as the material the participants believe they will use most when returning to their jobs. One-third mentioned "financial analysis" and a variety of other topics were mentioned by 1-3 participants. Nearly half of the participants stated that "all were useful" when asked "which material will you use least?" Four said that they will use "gender analysis" the least and a specific agroforestry system (taungya), financial analysis and social impact assessment were mentioned by 1-2 participants.

The results on useful topics were reinforced by the response to the question recommending topics to be expanded, shortened, omitted or added. Only five topics were mentioned to be shortened or omitted and none by more than one person. Agroforestry and planning process were most frequently mentioned as topics to expand; several also mentioned that more field trips should be added. Two participants suggested adding material on tree species and two suggested a Pakistani instructor be added to "share his experience", but no specific topic was mentioned.

Participants were asked to rate the instructors in four areas: knowledge of subject, training ability, ability to relate material to Pakistan, and overall effectiveness. Average ratings for the two lead instructors in all four areas were above 3.6 on a scale of 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent). For both instructors the highest rating was in overall effectiveness (4.8 and 4.2) and the lowest rating was in the ability to relate material to Pakistan (4.2 and 3.6). This latter finding is consistent with our experience training international participants in other workshops: unless an instructor has had extensive experience in a participant's home country, s/he is seldom rated "excellent" on this criteria. Participants' comments on the instructors were quite positive overall. Ms. Wali, a woman forester from Pakistan, led the unit on gender analysis. Her average ratings ranged from 3.0 to 4.1 on the four criteria. Most participants' comments were very favorable and it was clear that many were impressed with Ms. Wali's work as a pioneer woman forester and her potential as an instructor.

Nineteen of the participants stated that they would recommend the course to other individuals with a background similar to theirs and the average rating on their overall satisfaction with the workshop was 4.2, where 5 represented "extremely satisfied. There

were several comments on the evaluations stating the importance of social forestry workshops for Pakistani foresters and that they were pleased with what they had learned in this workshop.

Pre- and Post-Workshop Questionnaire. A course content-oriented questionnaire (Appendix C) was administered anonymously during the first session of the workshop and repeated at the end of the workshop. Sixteen participants completed the pre-workshop questionnaire and 20 participants the post-workshop questionnaire. Responses were grouped into the following categories: demonstrates a good understanding of the concept, demonstrates some understanding of the concept, did not understand the concept, and no answer. The results are in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Pre- and Post-Workshop Questionnaire.

		Good Under- standing	Some Under- standing	Did not Under- stand	No Answer
Land-use planning	Pre	50	31	19	0
	Post	70	30	0	0
Land and tree tenure	Pre	0	19	44	37
	Post	40	55	0	5
Agroforestry defined	Pre	81	13	6	0
	Post	90	10	0	0
Agroforestry systems	Pre	38	38	0	25
	Post	80	20	0	0
Benefits of on-farm trees	Pre	69	25	6	0
	Post	100	0	0	0
Social forestry	Pre	37	44	19	0
	Post	70	30	0	0
Social forester	Pre	37	63	0	0
	Post	100	0	0	0
Financial analysis	Pre	0	19	56	25
	Post	40	15	40	5
Forestry adopters	Pre	12	62	25	0
	Post	55	35	10	0
Forestry data needs	Pre	63	31	6	0
	Post	65	25	10	0
Data collec- tion methods	Pre	56	25	13	6
	Post	70	25	0	5

All numbers are percent of participants. Sixteen participants took the Pre-Questionnaire; 20 the Post-Questionnaire.

Based on the results of the pre-workshop questionnaire it appeared that most participants had some knowledge about the majority of the topics to be covered. Notable exceptions to this included the concepts of land and tree tenure and financial analysis of forestry activities. Eighty percent of the participants either failed to answer these questions or did not demonstrate knowledge of the subjects. Participants demonstrated they had more awareness of social forestry, agroforestry, and social data collection concepts than we had been told they would have.

Answers to the post-workshop questionnaire were generally more complete and demonstrated a better understanding of concepts than those given at the beginning of the workshop. Participants appeared to learn about topics with which they were initially unfamiliar as well as to increase their knowledge about topics such as social forestry, agroforestry, and social data collection. All but one participant had at least some understanding of land and tree tenure concepts. Whether participants have a good understanding that tenure may be made up of several different rights is not clear from the responses. Over half of the participants demonstrated an understanding of financial analysis by the end of the workshop. Many of the participants who answered the question incorrectly demonstrated some knowledge of the long-term nature of forestry investments.

OBSERVATIONS

Course content. The overall course content was well received and appeared to be relevant to the current forestry situation in Pakistan and the USAID/GOP forestry project. Almost all substantive material was new to at least some of the participants and the post-workshop questionnaire results indicate that improvement was made on the participants' understanding of all concepts. Time was short and it will be difficult to sustain any new perspectives without reinforcement as they return to their work.

Although most all of the participants were familiar with agroforestry concepts at the start of the workshop, both the pre-workshop questionnaire results and, more importantly, the questions asked during the workshop indicate they had little useable technical knowledge about agroforestry systems other than boundary plantings with a few exotic species. They were very interested in the agroforestry material and in obtaining more information. There appears to be a lack of dispersal of technical agroforestry information to the field foresters. They should be encouraged to join social/agroforestry networks, particularly those that provide free materials to foresters from developing countries. Participants were given information about sources of free materials such as the International Council for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) publication "Agroforestry Today" and the Overseas Development Institute "Social Forestry Network Newsletter."

Unquestionably, one of the greatest benefits of the workshop to the participants was the opportunity to meet and work with foresters from other provinces in Pakistan. For many, this workshop was the first such opportunity since their training at PFI. Participants worked well in teams and shared much valuable information about activities in various parts of Pakistan.

There was considerable interest in the course manual. Our concept of a manual for adult learners is that it is dynamic and partially created by the participants. Materials are added as needs arise during the course and as participants generate them during class activities. Therefore, it is not possible to provide a completed manual until the course is finished. The manual is also of limited use to anyone who has not participated in the course, because the process of presenting the material can not be isolated from the material itself.

Participants. The participants' interest in the workshop appeared to increase as the workshop progressed. Attendance was maintained throughout the Closing Ceremony. Many of the participants selected are not currently in positions where they will have an opportunity to use much of the workshop material. They were also surprised to have homework assignments for which they were accountable the next day, but they did do many of the assignments at least partially. English-language ability varied considerably and appeared to be a handicap to several.

Logistic Support. Logistic support was provided by both WI and PFI. Generally, the workshop arrangements went smoothly. The field trips were particularly well-organized and carried out in a timely and professional manner by all those involved, including the local professionals in the areas we visited.

Modest changes in the physical facilities at PFI would enhance PFI's capability to conduct adult education training activities. The process of adult learning is very different from the traditional university educational process of lecturing to students. A room is needed that has moveable small tables where participants can work in groups of 2-6, enough for the instructors to easily move around the room to assist as needed. Possibly, the examination room on the second floor of the Education wing would be suitable if it had different furniture and was available throughout a workshop period. Rooms for small group meetings near the main classroom should also be available.

Intensive adult education workshops also need intensive support systems during the workshop. Typists and copy-machine operators were available but were not always able to respond within a reasonable time to needs in order to provide feedback to the participants in a timely manner. The workshop often required extra hours on the part of all workshop personnel and the availability of the facilities and support systems after the participants had left for the day.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Much progress has been made to expand forestry activities involving rural people in Pakistan. However, continued improvement in land use planning for social forestry activities will require more training of the Pakistani foresters as social forestry activities have focused on motivating farmers to plant trees. In the future the focus is expected to shift to activities that will sustain the gains made to date, such as improved tree management and extension activities, including on-farm research as well as on-station research. To support this shift, the following changes in training activities are recommended.

Related to the training process and the selection of trainers:

- 1) shift the philosophical approach to both forestry and forest education; as stated by the participants in the final workshop session summarizing what they had learned: The Forest Department must change from 'police' to 'extension' or from 'push' to 'pull' when working with the rural people."
- 2) recognize that the process of future training for Pakistani foresters is more important than additional technical information at this point; the Pakistani foresters need to develop problem-solving skills. It is critical that the concept of a "tool box" of possible answers for a given situation be adopted by Pakistani social foresters.
- 3) identify and select trainers who have a sincere interest in social forestry and in training; seek faculty volunteers from Pakistani institutions that are willing to emphasize the development of problem-solving skills rather than the delivery of facts and "recipes".
- 4) send potential faculty to U.S. based "Training of Trainers" workshops to increase their experiential learning capabilities and training skills; adult learning principles need to be incorporated into all in-service training activities (For a brief discussion of key adult learning concepts, see Appendix D.)

Related to participants:

- 1) involve the District Forest Officer level in the workshops; participants should be actively working in social forestry positions or be anticipated trainers or instructors for future workshops.
- 2) increase representation from provinces other than NWFP in workshops; try to involve more agriculture extension people in workshops.

- 3) once participants are selected, provide information on the course objectives to the participant prior to arrival at the course.

Related to course content:

- 1) develop more Pakistan social forestry examples and case studies, including both community and farm forestry.
- 2) expand the agroforestry material, including collecting information relevant to practices currently being used in Pakistan.
- 3) expand land use planning process exercises if a longer workshop were conducted.

Related to Forest Department/Project activities:

- 1) set and reward social forestry process-oriented goals (such as number of farmers attending Forest Department village meetings or number of farmers requesting Forest Department assistance) rather than target-oriented goals (such as numbers of seedlings distributed).
- 2) develop better communication channels and sharing between and within provinces so that those who are trying to practice social forestry behaviors have a support system.

CONCLUSION

All indications are that this training activity was successful and did contribute to the achievement of Project goals. We are pleased to have had this opportunity to work in the social forestry program in Pakistan.

APPENDIX A
COURSE SCHEDULE

DAILY SCHEDULE

Sunday, November 10, 1991

- A. Opening Ceremony
Introductory Remarks
Introduction of Participants
- B. Workshop Organization and Schedule
Pre-Test Questionnaire and Biodata Survey
Training Objectives - getting goal agreement
Distribute Training Materials
- C. General Planning Theory, Concepts and Principles
(Force)

D&D as a specific planning framework for farm forestry
(Forester)

Hand-outs: Planning definitions; NFMA process;
G-H Planning Schematic; D&D
overview.

Reading assignment:

"Beyond Community Woodlots: Programmes with
Participation", Michael M. Cernea. ODI Social
Forestry Network Paper 11e. Winter 1990.

"The Importance of Land and Tree Tenure in
Agroforestry." 1987. Louise Fortmann.
Perspectives in Agroforestry. Technical Report
No. 1. Washington State University, Pullman,
Washington. October 6, 1987.

Monday, November 11, 1991

- A. Land and Tree Tenure - Implications for Forestry
Projects (Force)

Small group discussion on Cernea and Fortmann readings

- B. Developing Goals and Objectives (Force)
- C. Introduction to Agroforestry (Forester)

Definitions, basic concepts, characteristics of
agroforestry systems

Assigned Reading: Buck, L.E. 1989. Agroforestry
extension training sourcebook. Module 2 Lesson 3.

Tuesday, November 12, 1991

- A. Introduction to Social Impact Assessment (SIA) (Force)
 - Theory; Conceptual Framework of Human Ecology System
 - Hand-out of Model
- B. SIA Measurement Techniques (Force)
 - Including RRA, and focusing on participant observation in preparation for the afternoon's exercise
- C. Field trip -- Participant Observation Exercise in Charsadda area
 - Homework: Summarize observational data

Wednesday, November 13, 1991

- A. Analysis of Participant Observation Data
 - Report on what was learned during the exercise. based on observations, begin to trace the impact of a tree planting program, using the human ecology model.
- B. Agroforestry Classification Systems (Forester)
 - Focusing on classifications by configurations
 - Hand-out: Nair, P.K.R. 1985. Classification of agroforestry systems
- C. Pakistani Agroforestry Systems (Forester)
 - Participants were asked to discuss in small groups the agroforestry systems they are familiar with in Pakistan and to report to the class.
 - Assigned Reading: Gender analysis case study from Kenya

Thursday, November 14, 1991

- A. Continue Pakistani Agroforestry Systems (Forester)
- B. Gender Analysis Case Study Discussion

View "Gender Analysis: Strengthening Winrock Projects", a 12.5-minute video produced by Winrock International.

- C. Gender Considerations in Pakistan

Ms. Mamoona Wali, Sub-Divisional Forest Officer, Winrock International, presented a summary of the activities she is involved with concerning women in the Taxila area.

Ms. Carol Dohmen, Malakand Social Forestry Project, Swat, gave a presentation on the involvement of local women in the Malakand Project.

Assigned Reading: Evans, Patrick T. 1988. "Agroforestry in Paraguay". Women in Natural Resources 9(2):29-34. (Article presents adoption-diffusion principles and their application to extension forestry work in Paraguay.)

Friday, November 15, 1991

No class

Saturday, November 16, 1991

- A. Adoption-Diffusion of Innovations (Force)

Theory; Principles; Designing farm forestry innovations; characteristics of early adopters.

- B. Developing Social Surveys (Forester)

Participants developed a survey to be done in the field as group interviews with farmers. Goal was to identify farmer's interest in forestry activities.

Sunday, November 17, 1991

- A. Communication Strategies (Force)
 - Exercises on communication skills were conducted
- B. Role-playing interviews (Forester)
- C. Finalize survey after the pre-testing during role play (Forester)

Monday, November 18, 1991

Conduct survey in field

Participants worked in three groups, interviewing groups of farmers in the Attock District, Punjab.

Homework: Summarize/analyze survey data

Tuesday, November 19, 1991

- A. Report results of village survey
- B. Financial analysis of agroforestry alternatives for farmers (Force)

Wednesday, November 20, 1991

- A. Multi-attribute decision-making models (Force)
- B. Summarize concepts learned during the workshop.

Thursday, November 21, 1991

- A. Course Evaluation and Post-test Questionnaire
- B. Closing ceremony

Presentation of Certificates

APPENDIX B
PARTICIPANTS, INSTRUCTORS AND FACILITATORS

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS, INSTRUCTORS AND FACILITATORS

Participants

1. Syed Vigar Akther, Range Forest Officer, AK Forest Department, Muzaffarabad
2. Mubashar Nabi, Range Forest Officer, AK Forest Department, Muzaffarabad
3. Baz Muhammad, Regional Program Leader Outreach, TAIPAN Project, NWFP Agriculture University, Peshawar
4. Wahid Rasheed, Research Officer, Punjab Forestry Research Institute, Faisalabad
5. Muhammad Saleem, Research Officer, Punjab Forestry Research Institute, Faisalabad
6. Imtiaz Ahmed, Deputy Director (Forestry & Environment), Pakistan Agriculture Research Council, Islamabad
7. Asif Jah, Forest Manager, Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar
8. Kifayatullah Baloch, Range Forest Officer, NWFP Forest Department, c/o Soka Nallah Division, Abbottabad
9. Muhammad Ibrahim Baloch, Range Forest Officer, FP&DP, Dera Allah Yar, Naseerabad, Balochistan
10. Ayaz Mehmood, Sub Divisional Forest Officer, Winrock International, Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar
11. Gohar Rahman Marwat, Sub Divisional Forest Officer, (Winrock International), Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar
12. Syed Zainul Arifeen, Assistant Silviculturist, Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar
13. Syed Shakeel Haider Zaidi, Assistant Economic Botanist, Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar
14. Muhammad Asif Majeed, Private NGO, Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar
15. Gul Nabi Khattak, Research Officer, Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar
16. Ijaz Hussain Shah, District Farm and Energy Officer, Pakkah Garha, P.O. Ismailabad, Sialkot
17. Nazir Ahmad Malik, Sub Divisional Forest Officer, Second Barani Area Development Project, 58 Margalla Road, Islamabad
18. Anwar Ali Khan, Regional Program Forester, The Aga Khan Rural Support Program, Skardu, Baltistan
19. Umar Farooq, Range Forest Officer, NWFP Forest department, Abbottabad
20. Chaudhary Jamil Ahmed, Sub Divisional Forest Officer Farm Energy Forestry Project, 234 Block No: 4, Jauharabad, Punjab.

Instructors and Facilitators

1. Dr. Jo Ellen Force, Department of Forest Resources, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA
2. Ms. Debbie Forester, Department of Forest Resources, University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho, USA
3. Ms. Mamoona Wali Muhammad, Sub-divisional Forest Officer, Winrock International, 58 Margalla Road, F 7/2, Islamabad
4. Ms. Carol Dohmen, Malakand Social Forestry Project, Saidu Sharif, Swat
5. Fazli Subhan, Senior Research Officer FP&DP, Pakistan Forest Institute, Peshawar
6. Dr. George M. Blake, Training and Research Adviser, FP&DP, 58 Margalla Road, F 7/2, Islamabad
7. Tahir Wadood Malik, Training and Communications Coordinator, FP&DP, 58 Margalla Road, F 7/2, Islamabad

APPENDIX C
EVALUATIONS FORMS

BIODATA FORM

1. Please print your name as you would like it to appear on your certificate.

2. What name would you like to be called by in class? _____

3. What is your mailing address?

4. In what province do you work? _____

5. What is your present position (title, organization)?

Title _____

Organization _____

6. Please briefly describe your present job.

7. How many years have you been in your present position? _____

8. How many years have you been working in forestry? _____

9. Do you have a BS or an MS? What year did you receive it?

Highest Degree _____

Year _____

10. Please list the title and year of any other workshops you have attended.

FINAL EVALUATION
WORKSHOP ON
LAND USE PLANNING METHODOLOGIES IN SOCIAL FORESTRY
November 10-21, 1991

To what extent did you achieve the following objectives in this workshop:

	Not Achieved	1	2	3	4	5	Fully Achieved
1. Define, analyze and evaluate land use planning processes		1	2	3	4	5	
2. Develop appropriate goals and objectives.		1	2	3	4	5	
3. Understand the importance of involving local people		1	2	3	4	5	
4. Determine the social impacts of social forestry activities		1	2	3	4	5	
5. Evaluate alternative social forestry strategies.		1	2	3	4	5	
6. Be able to train others to work in social forestry.		1	2	3	4	5	

Comments: _____

7. Was the level of presentation of the material
____too simple? ____about right? ____ too complex?

8. Which material covered in the course will you use most when returning to your job? Please explain:

9. Which material covered in the course will you use least?

10. Did the field trips provide you with practical applications of the course content? Please explain.

11. Based on your needs, if this course were offered again to participants with backgrounds similar to yours, what topics would you recommend be :

Expanded: _____

Shortened: _____

Omitted: _____

Added: _____

INSTRUCTORS

Name of First Instructor: Jo Ellen Force

Please rate your major instructors in the following areas:

	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Excellent
Knowledge of Subject		1	2	3	4	5	
Training Ability		1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to Relate Material to Your Country		1	2	3	4	5	
Overall Effectiveness		1	2	3	4	5	

Comments: _____

Name of Second Instructor: Debbie Forester

Please rate your major instructors in the following areas:

	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Excellent
Knowledge of Subject Matter		1	2	3	4	5	
Training Ability		1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to Relate Material to Your Country		1	2	3	4	5	
Overall Effectiveness		1	2	3	4	5	

Comments: _____

Name of Third Instructor: Mamoona Wali

Please rate your major instructors in the following areas:

	Poor	1	2	3	4	5	Excellent
Knowledge of Subject Matter		1	2	3	4	5	
Training Ability		1	2	3	4	5	
Ability to Relate Material to Your Country		1	2	3	4	5	
Overall Effectiveness		1	2	3	4	5	

Comments: _____

15. Would you recommend this course to other individuals with a background similar to yours? _____ Yes _____ No

Please explain why or why not? _____

16. Please rate you overall satisfaction with this course:

Not satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 Extremely satisfied

17. What final comments do you have on this workshop:

Pre- and
POST-WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

- 1. What is land-use planning?
- 2. What is the difference between land tenure and tree tenure?
- 3. Define agroforestry.

Give two examples of agroforestry practices in the area where you work.

4. Name four benefits of having trees integrated into farming systems.

5. What is social forestry?

6. How is the job of a social forester different from that of other foresters in Pakistan?

7. Are forestry investments generally more financially attractive when interests rates and inflation are high or low? Why?

8. List 3 or 4 characteristics describing the type of farmer who is likely to plant trees.

9. What kinds of data would you collect to better understand the farmers in your district?

10. What methods would you use to collect the data you listed in number 9?

APPENDIX D
ADULT LEARNING

DIRECTIONS TO INSTRUCTORS OF ADULT LEARNING WORKSHOPS

Workshops for adult professionals should be designed to be highly participatory as an individual participant's achievement of long term learning objectives will be increased if lecturing can be kept to a minimum. A variety of learning strategies should be employed throughout the units: individual and small-group problem-solving, small-group discussion, case studies, field trips, small-group exercises, and laboratory exercises. Although a variety of reading materials and lists of additional sources may be provided, it is not expected that independent reading or other homework exercises are major sources of learning in the workshop. Reading materials are supplementary to class and field trip activities wherein most of the learning is expected to occur. It is also anticipated that participants will learn as much from interaction with each other as with instructors. The desired atmosphere in the course is one of colleagues with similar concerns from many settings meeting together to share information, insights, and successful strategies.

It is important to remember that most participants will be well aware of the value judgments and social control effects that are implicit in forest management and will, therefore, be sensitive to attempts to outsiders to define what is best for their home situations. Instructors should take care not to insist or imply that they know what is right for the participant's country or that what is done in America or any other country is right for the participant's setting. Instructors should present their material for analysis and adoption or rejection by course participants.

All learning should be fun. It is hoped that workshops can be fun for both participants and instructors while at the same time being a highly productive learning experience. A goal of the workshop is for an atmosphere of learning together in a non-threatening, non-authoritarian and highly participatory manner.

Some Known Observations About the Way Adults Learn

1. Adults learn best within a secure, non-threatening and accepting environment.
2. Effective learning takes place when the learner is motivated to learn.
3. Adults learn best when the learning material builds upon their previous experience, bears relevance to their current experience, and is applicable to their future experiences.

- 26
4. Adults learn in different ways and at different speeds, for each will relate their learning experience to their own values, beliefs, attitudes and experiences. Thus, adult learners need to feel respected as individuals and be given the right to decide for themselves whether or not to accept what they learn.
 5. Learning is a thinking process. Adults learn better when they are allowed to work out their own conclusions.
 6. Adults learn best when their needs, difficulties, attitudes, and interests are expressed, recognized, respected, and addressed.