

Workshop Report

Training of Trainers Workshop

on

Outbreak Communication

18-20 July, 2006,
PAHO, Washington DC, USA

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Disease outbreaks are inevitable, and often unpredictable, events. The environment surrounding an outbreak is unique in all public health sectors. Outbreaks are frequently marked by uncertainty, confusion and a sense of urgency. Communication plays a critical role in the management of outbreaks. Unfortunately, there are many instances of communication failures which have delayed outbreak control, undermined public trust and compliance, and unnecessarily prolonged exacerbated economic, social and political turmoil. The World Health Organization (WHO) believes more focus needs to be placed on communication expertise and views effective risk communication as essential to outbreak control as epidemiological training investigation and laboratory analysis. Now, as a threat of an influenza pandemic is looming, knowing how to communicate effectively during an outbreak is even more critical for all Member States.

In early 2004, WHO began an effort to construct evidence-based, field-tested communication guidance that would promote the public health goal of rapid outbreak control while minimizing the social turbulence which is a feature of many outbreaks and cause the least possible disruption to society. The work began with an extensive review and narrowing of the risk communication literature, to identify a few of good features that made for effective communication practices. Finally, these few features were assessed by outbreak control experts from a wide variety of cultures, political systems and countries with different economic development. This resulted in a short list of best practices for outbreak communication.

Following this consultation, WHO has been asked to distribute this core information on outbreak communication to the regions and countries that are currently undergoing, or are liable to experience emergencies. As a step towards this effort, the Communication Disease Surveillance (CDS) department, in collaboration with the Health Action in Crises (HAC) department, designed a training course on the key aspects of outbreak communication that are based on the five key components identified. In order to ensure that a wider audience may benefit from this training, the workshop was designed as a Training of Trainers on Outbreak Communication. This workshop will allow those who have taken this course to take the material back to their work places and train others in the key fundamentals of Outbreak Communication.

The Training of Trainers workshop targets WHO communication experts as well as communication officers from the Ministries of Health in outbreak and pandemic prone countries who will agree to serve as trainers within their own countries and/or the Region. The pilot workshop was delivered in Washington D.C. USA, from 18 to 20th July, 2006.

1.2 Objective

The objective of this workshop is to train a group of professional communication personnel in risk and outbreak communication strategies so they in turn can serve as trainers to prepare a coordinated communication response for avian/pandemic influenza.

The key goals were to:

- Create a cadre of trained trainers.
- Enhance national capacity for a quick, transparent and coordinated communication response.
- Build a network of risk communicators who share ideas, messages and strategies.

The expected outcomes of this workshop were:

- Trained trainers pledged to share outbreak communication tools.

- Shared risk communications guidelines and work plans.
- Action plans geared toward developing further training and evaluation.
- A mechanism for communicators to maintain a network

1.3 Workshop Outline

The workshop was delivered in three main parts- i) Facilitation skills, ii) Outbreak Communication, iii) Action planning. They were composed of the following modules:

i) Facilitation Skills

- How do adults learn
- What makes a good facilitator?
- Communication Skills
- Giving and receiving feedback
- Managing difficult participants

ii) Outbreak Communication

- Gathering Information
- Dealing with Internal Communication
- First Announcement
- Communication Surveillance
- Communicating with the Public
- Communication Checklist
- Implementing, Operationalizing, and Evaluating the Communication Plan

iii) Action Planning

- Planning for Action and Follow Up

2. Structure and Methodology

2.1 Agenda

The workshop was conducted over three days. The participants were encouraged to practise their facilitation skills throughout the workshop by leading some of the energizers and the group works. The agenda was modified following the needs of the participants and the flow of the workshop. The rough agenda is as follows. For a detailed agenda, refer to Annex I.

Day 1	Day 2	Day 3
Introduction	II-3. First Announcement	Simulation Exercise
Context Setting: Update on Avian Influenza, Pandemic Preparedness and Response	II-1. Gathering Information	II-5. Communication Checklist
I-1. Introduction to Outbreak Communication	II-2. Dealing with Internal Communication	II-6. Implementing, Operationalizing, and Evaluating the Communication Plan
Training of Trainers	II-4. Communication Surveillance and Communicating with the Public	Planning for Action and Follow Up
		Evaluation
		Close

2.2 Methodology

Each session was composed of a short presentation on the key learning points followed by group activities. The group activities provided an opportunity for participants to practise and apply the knowledge gained from presentations and their work. Participants were divided into different groups based on their preferred language, and other ad-hoc groups formed through different activities. On the third day, participants were split into three groups, and they went through a simulation activity where they incorporated all that they had learned during the first two days. Participants were also provided with a set of background documents to help them understand the topics better.

Each half day, a time-keeper and "summarizer" were nominated. The Time-Keeper ensured that the time schedule was respected and the summarizer gave a presentation at the end of each half day on what they had learned.

2.3 Participants

There were 49 participants from the WHO Country Offices in the region, Ministries of Health, Ministries of Education and other government sectors. Most of the participants were communication officers in their respective agencies, although there were some who came from a health related technical background. In addition, about 20 observers were also present, from USAID, CDC, PAHO and WHO. The observers became also active participants as the training progressed, bringing the number of actual participants to almost 80.

2.4 Resource persons

The workshop was facilitated by Dr Gaya Gamhewage, HAC, WHO/Geneva the main resource person was Mr Dick Thompson, CDS, WHO/Geneva. Other resource persons, speakers and co-facilitators included Ms Bryna Brennen, and Dr Otavio Olivia of PAHO, Mr Gregory Hartl and Ms Hyo Jeong Kim from WHO/Geneva, Ms Critiana Salvi from WHO/EURO and Mr Bill Hall from US Dept of Health and Human Safety. The design of the workshop ensured that many of the participants were drawn in as resource persons during the course of the workshop.

3. Evaluation and Recommendations

3.1 Method

The workshop was evaluated at two levels by the participants. The first was a daily evaluation performed after each day on each module. The second was an overall evaluation performed at the end of the workshop on the structure, methodology and content of the workshop. For the evaluation forms and the full result, please refer to Annexes 3,4 and 5.

The participants also filled out an action plan to show how they will deliver this training in their own countries. These plans will be followed up and feedback from these trainings will be used to update and fine-tune the current Outbreak Communication training.

3.2 Daily Evaluation

Daily evaluations were performed after each day on a flip chart where participants marked their ratings for each session and made comments as well as in the morning when a short discussion was held on what they had learned the previous day.

Day 1

The first day was well received with high satisfaction shown for all sessions. The Introduction was well received, although some regretted that the participants were not introduced individually.

However, with the high number of people in the room, it would have been too time consuming to introduce each person. This was compensated for in the second day, when the participants introduced themselves in two groups, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon. Following the session on the key principles of Outbreak Communication, there was much discussion on building trust. Trust was seen as the main objective for which the four other principles, announcing early, transparency, communication surveillance, and planning, provided the means to achieve this goal. Overall, it was felt that the morning of Day 1 provided the technical grounding for the workshop and the parameters for interaction among the participants and facilitators. Several facilitation techniques were well demonstrated and the energy level of the participants was maintained at a high level for the duration of the sessions.

The Training of Trainers session built on the high energy level and interest shown by the participants in the facilitation skills. Participants were told to blow up a "fear balloon" with their fears for facilitation written on it. At the end of the session, participants who felt they had acquired the skills that would help to alleviate their fear burst their balloons. The majority of the participants were able to burst their balloons, supporting their high appreciation for the skills transmitted throughout the afternoon session. They felt that "the approach used was new and different".

Day 2

The second day began with a quick review of the communication skills touched upon in Day 1. Participants were broken into groups and given a picture, based upon which they were asked to create a poster with a succinct and clear public health message. Participants were very active and much appreciation was shown for the way this session was handled. Afterwards, participants practised making first announcements based on a scenario of a possible Avian Influenza outbreak. The session on First Announcements were highly appreciated, with 100% of respondents giving it satisfactory rating.

The afternoon sessions of Day 2 were given a slightly lower mark, mainly due to the technical nature of the topics covered. Some believed that the presentations were too generic, and should have been more detailed and related to the political and health situations of the countries.

Day 3

Day 3 began with a simulation exercise that brought together all the sessions covered thus far. The participants were divided into three groups and each group had to first do a presidential meeting based upon which they needed to give a press conference. The simulation exercise was received with enthusiasm, as it allowed the participants to apply the theories learned to real-life situations.

The other two sessions, "Communication Checklist" and "Operationalization of the Communication Plan" were also given high marks. The third day finished on a high note with the participants showing their appreciation for the workshop as well as the networking they had been able to do during the workshop with the other participants. Several participants stressed the need to continue the network through sharing of information and knowledge so that they would be better prepared for an AI outbreak if and when it should occur.

3.3 Overall Evaluation

The overall evaluation is designed to assess the workshop in general, the content of the course, trainers, methodology and ways to improve the course. See Annex 3 for the evaluation form.

The workshop was rated on average at 8.4 on a scale of 10. The lowest score for the workshop was 6 and the highest 10. The facilitators were rated on average at 8.7 on a scale of 10 although some participants gave different points to different facilitators.

Participants appreciated the simulation exercise, the training of trainers sessions, and the five key principles on Outbreak Communication the most. The question and answer sessions as well as the group works were also highly rated, as it allowed to break the monotony of the workshop as well as allow them to apply the principles.

The sessions that participants found the least useful were varied among each individual, although many pointed out that the afternoon sessions for every day were too long with too many presentations. Participants agreed that shorter presentations with more time for application would have been useful. Participants also felt that the exercises for application and group work for each session differed in the depth. Some were too generic, such as the Gathering Information session, while others were more adequate for the specific outbreak scenarios.

In terms of the logistics of the workshop, participants found there were too many people, which resulted in too many people in each group for the group works. Also, a better physical setup of the breakout space was seen to be necessary, so that the group members could see and hear each other better.

Participants felt in general more confident in doing outbreak communications themselves, and in advising others on useful communication principles for outbreaks. They also felt more confident in taking these messages to the senior political leaders, and in convincing them to prepare for an outbreak with a concrete communications plan. In addition, many replied that they would commence the workshops in their own regions when they went back.

83% of the participants replied that they would recommend changes to their communication plan based on this workshop. The changes involve;

- Making first response a part of their communication plan
- Developing communication plans
- Improving and strengthening current communication strategies by adding a communication plan for outbreaks based on the five principles
- Conducting communication surveillance
- Improving capacity to respond quickly and not be overly concerned with confirming all information
- Concentrate on the coordination of social communication during an outbreak
- Integrating the outbreak communication plan into pandemic preparedness plans
- Clarifying roles and responsibilities and establish task priorities
- Using the checklist to revise communication plan

3.4 Recommendations for Next Workshop

Some of the key learning points from this pilot workshop are as follows. These points should be taken into consideration for future implementation of this workshop.

- *Time management:* Agenda should be reviewed to allow for shorter days with equal intensity.
- *Smaller group of participants:* 80 participants for one workshop is too big a group for all participants to know each other well. Trainings act not only as an opportunity for learning, but are also important occasions for people working in the same sector to network and get to know different ways of practising. Networking is also a way to

take the learning forward after the training finishes, as it would allow participants to focus on the topic through sharing ideas, practises and knowledge by communicating with each other. The ideal number of participants would be around 30 and it is essential to keep this number in mind when planning future workshops.

- *Inclusion of more hands-on experience:* Participants were very interested in the practical experience related by some facilitators of their work in the field. Sharing of experiences allows participants to easily see how the theory may be implemented in real life situation. In future workshops, modules should contain a balance of theory and real-life experience. Participants could be drawn upon for this section even more.
- *Sharing of more tools:* Some of the sessions need the development and use of practical tools. It is necessary to share the tools with participants as in many cases this would provide a good starting point for participants to conceptualise their own communication plans. The tools do not necessarily have to be official documents or structures; they can be also used simply as a guidance for facilitating the understanding of participants and the tools could be improved based on the feedback provided by participants.
- *Sharing of more background documents:* Some background documents were provided in this workshop. However, during this workshop, little reference were made to the documents. In future workshops, it is essential to include the documents in the participant folders so that each participant will have at least one copy of all background documents. They should also be referred to constantly within the workshop in order to provide consistency.
- *Fine-tuning of modules:* Based on the experience of delivering this pilot workshop some of the modules need to be reviewed and fine tuned. Initial recommendations include
 - Introduction to Avian Influenza: Need to develop an introductory module in AI
 - 5 Keys of Outbreak Communication: Need to be re-iterated throughout the workshop and make certain that all the modules are linked explicitly with this concept
 - Internal Communication: need to re-work this module for content and methodology. Core concepts should be clearly defined
 - Gathering Information: Need to redefine the objective of this session and the tools (Talking Point) and experiences of technical staff need to be better incorporated
 - Simulation: Instructions need to be clearer
 - Operationalization: Need to re-name the module and make it more operational; Directions need to be provided on how to develop an actual communication plan based on what has been learned in the workshop
 - Definitions of key terms and concepts: A new module or a clear annex?

4. Conclusion

The pilot workshop on Training of Trainers for Outbreak Communication was well delivered and received in general with excellent results in the increase of knowledge and motivation among the participants. The evaluations showed high levels of increased understanding of the importance of the five key principles in Outbreak Communication and having a communication preparedness plan, especially in light of the possibility of a global Avian Influenza outbreak. Personal action plans show that participants are motivated and ready to apply the knowledge gained, and to deliver the trainings in order to impart this knowledge to colleagues and senior level staff. Participants were also eager to continue the networking started during the workshop among the communications officers working in the Region to better prepare for an outbreak.

The workshop may be seen as a success from all points of view, having satisfied all the objectives. It also helped to strengthen the collaboration between communication officers working in the PAHO region, which may be considered as a bonus achievement of the workshop. In short, the workshop helped not only to increase knowledge and awareness on Outbreak Communication, but it also helped to strengthen the network of communications officers.

The third positive aspect of this workshop is that it provided an opportunity and space to converge many levels and layers of WHO around the a key public health issue: AI. The workshop was made possible only with the close collaboration of PAHO and HQ. It also brought together countries and sub-regional networks and facilitated renewed contact and interaction between communicators in MoHs and WHO country offices. It ensured technical collaboration between technical departments: CDS, HAC and DGO media and communications. It also brought in the regional Office for the European region.

Some of the shortfalls of the workshop include the need to provide clear modules introducing both AI and key concepts of risk communication and to concretize the core knowledge and information two of the modules. There is also a clear need to have more practical tools that can be used directly by communicators. Future workshops need to be reviewed for relevance to the region that is being targeted.

But despite designing and delivering a success workshop, the real proof of learning will be observed in the months to come through the implementation of individual works plans that were developed during the workshop by participants. This will require close follow-up and support from PAHO and CDS and will also require support for networking amongst the participants.



Day 1 – TUESDAY 18 JULY 2006

- 0800 – 0830** **Registration**
- 0830 – 1000** **Opening: Welcome to the Workshop**
Carissa Etienne, PAHO Assistant Director
Introduction to the Workshop: Regional Context
Bryna Brennan
Workshop Methodology
Gaya Gamhewage, Gregory Hartl
- 1000 – 1030** **Context Setting:**
Update on Avian Influenza, Pandemic Preparedness and Response
Otavio Oliva
- 1030 – 1045** **Break**
- 1045 – 1230** **I-1 Introduction to Outbreak Communication**
Dick Thompson
- 1230 – 1330** **Lunch**
- 1330 – 1500** **Training of Trainers Session 1:**
How do adults learn? What makes a good facilitator? A facilitator's bag of tricks
Gaya Gamhewage
- 1500 – 1515** **Break**
- 1515 – 1730** **Training of Trainers Session 2:**
Communication Skills, Giving and receiving feedback, Managing difficult participants
Gaya Gamhewage
- Evening Session: Group assignments on delivering a briefing on Outbreak Communication**
Facilitation Team

DAY 2 – WEDNESDAY 19 JULY 2006

0830 – 0930	Presentation of Group Work and recap of day 1 Gaya Gamhewage and Participant
0930 – 1030	II-3 First Announcement: Part I Gaya Gamhewage, Bryna Brennan
1030 – 1045	Break
1045 – 1230	II-3 First Announcement: Part II Dick Thompson
1230 – 1330	Lunch
1330 – 1430	II-1 Gathering Information (group work) Cristiana Salvi
1430 – 1545	II-2 Dealing with Internal Communication Cristiana Salvi
1545 – 1600	Break
1600 – 1700	II-4 Communication Surveillance Gregory Hartl
1700 – 1800	Communicating with the Public Gregory Hartl

Evening assignment: Preparation for Simulation Exercise

DAY 3 - THURSDAY 20 JULY 2006

0830 – 0900	Recap of Day 2 Gaya Gamhewage and Participant
0900 – 1230	Simulation Exercise
1230 – 1330	Lunch
1330 – 1430	II-5 Communication Checklist Dick Thompson, Bryna Brennan
1430 – 1530	II-6 Implementing, Operationalizing and Evaluating the Communication Plan Bill Hall
1530 – 1545	Break
1545 – 1645	Planning for Action and Follow Up Bryna Brennan
1645 – 1715	Course Evaluation Gaya Gamhewage, Gregory Hartl, Bryna Brennan
1715 – 1730	Workshop Closure PAHO

Facilitation team:
Dick Thompson, Gaya Gamhewage, Bryna Brennan, Gregory Hartl, Cristina Salvi, Hyo Jeong Kim

Annex 2. List of Participants

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS / LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES				
Last name	First name	Unit	Institution	Country
Acevedo Zamora	Byron	Dirección General de Comunicación y Acción Comunitaria en Salud	Ministerio de Salud	Nicaragua
Acosta Mendez	Maria de la Luz	Dirección de Promoción de la Salud	Secretaría de Salud	México
Allison	Catherine	Public Health of Canada	Communications Executive	Canada
Baker	Ryan	Media Relations	Public Agency	Canada
Benjamin	Cynthia	Health Education Unit	Ministry of Health	Antigua
Blake	Alecia	Information Services	Government HQ	St. Kitts
Brennan	Bryna	Special Advisor for Social and Media Communication	PAHO/WHO	USA
Bumpas	Janet	Technical Officer	PAHO	USA
Bustamante Castillo	Xinia	Comunicación Social	OPS/OMS	Costa Rica
Calderón Villar	Inés	Comunicación Social	OPS/OMS	Peru
Campbell	Christine	Public Relation & Communication	Ministry of Health	Bahamas
Carter Taylor	Denise	Health Education Officer	Ministry of Health	Barbados
Caycedo Giglioli	Paola Rosanna	Asesora de Comunicación Social	Ministerio de la Protección Social	Colombia
Cerón	Claudia	Comunicadora Social, Oficina de Comunicaciones	OPS/OMS	Colombia
Contreras	Alfonso	SDG/HS	PAHO	USA
Costi Ribeiro	Lucio Demétrio	Assessoria de Comunicação	Ministério da Saúde do Brasil	Brasil
Coursen	Wendy	Avian Influenza Unit	USAID	USA
Delgado	Gustavo	Varias	OPS/OMS	Uruguay
Deodat	Rovin	Communication Consultant	Ministry of Health	Guyana
Drayton	Diane	Information Officer	Ministry of Health	British Virgin Islands
Echalar	Ricardo	Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean	USAID	USA
Epstein	Daniel	Public Information	PAHO HQ	USA
Escobar Sanchechez	Orles	Dirección de Vigilancia a la Salud	Secretaría de Salud	Honduras
Fiabane	Alejandra	Depto de prensa y comunicación	Ministerio de Salud	Chile
Fuenmayor	Eduardo	Oficina del Coordinador Residente	Coordinación del Sistema de Naciones Unidas	Venezuela
Gabriel	Wenn	Department of Environmental Health	Ministry of Health	St. Lucia

Gamarra de Cáceres	María Graciela	Dirección de Vigilancia de la Salud	Ministerio de Salud	Paraguay
Ganhewage	Gaya	Health Action in Crises	WHO	Switzerland
Gonzalez	Franklin	Sub Proceso de Cercadeo Social	Ministerio de Salud	Panama
Gopaul	Sunita		Ministerio of Health	Trinidad & Tobago
Gudiel Lemus	Mario Roberto	Centro Nacional de Epideología	Ministerio de Salud	Guatemala
Gutierrez	Vilma	Centro Inteligencia Sanitaria	OPS/OMS	Nicaragua
Guzmán	Rosario	Area de Información y Gestión del Conocimiento	OPS/OMS	Dominican Republic
Hall	William	Director, Press Office	Department of Health and Human Services	USA
Hannover Saavedra	Susasna	Gestión del Conocimiento y Comunicación en Salud	OPS/OMS	Bolivia
Harben	Kathryn	Coordinating Office	CDC	USA
Hartl	Gregory	Communication Adviser	WHO	Switzerland
Hernandez	Seth	National Emergency Management Organization	Government Press Office	Belize
Howe	Trevor	Environmental Health Department	Ministry of Health	Montserrat
Huerta	Piedad	Promoción de Salud - El Paso	OPS/OMS - USMBFO	USA
Jasmin	Jacques Antoine	Communication	Ministry of Health	Haiti
Kentish	Civilla	Senior Health Educator	Ministry of Health	Anguilla
Kim	Hyo-Jeong	Health Action in Crises	WHO	Switzerland
London	Ayesha	Communications	IICA	USA
Lopes	Rosane	Comunicación Social	PANAFTOSA/OPS	Brasil
Marshal	Peg	LAC/RSD	USAID	USA
Montilla	Isaias	Gestión Información	OPS/OMS	Panama
Moreta Félix	Porfiria Altagracias	Plaza de la Salud	Circulo de periodistas de la Salud (CIPESA)	República Dominicana
Negru	Liuba	Press and Media Relations Officer	WHO Regional Office for Europe	Denmark
Parada	José Balmore	Comunicaciones	OPS/OMS	El Salvador
Peroune	Renee Franklin	Health Promotion	Paho	Guyana
Phillip	Lydia	Health Promotion Department	Ministry of Health	Grenada
Picado Villalobos	Floribeth	Prensa y Relaciones Públicas	Ministerio de Salud	Costa Rica
Posada Velásquez	Silvia	Comunicación Social	OPS/OMS	Guatemala
Rivera	Gladys	Comunicaciones	Ministerio de Salud	El Salvador
Rodríguez Jaramillo	Martha	Comunicación Social	OPS/OMS	Ecuador

Romano	Rose Mary	Center for Global Health	Academy for Education Development	USA
Rowe	Donna-Marie	Public Relations Department	Jamaica Information Service	Jamaica
Rutz	Daniel	CDC	USDHHS	USA
Salvi	Cristiana	Information Outreach	WHO Regional Office for Europe	Italy
Samuel-Lettsome	Vicki	Information Officer	Ministry of Education & Culture	British Virgin Islands
Sanchez	Kathy	External Relations	IDB	USA
Sanchez	Marisabel	President	Links Media Communications	USA
Scotland	Anthony	Environmental	Ministry of Health	Dominica
Simpson	Ian	Director General's Office	WHO	Switzerland
Sloate	Lori	Communication Officer	WHO	Switzerland
Temple Brown	Nelle	Who Liason Office	WHO	USA
Thompson	Dick	Team Leader, Pandemic and Outbreak Communications	WHO	Switzerland
Varela	Jose Luis	Asesor de la Ministra	Ministerio de Salud	Uruguay
Wilson de Andrade Filho	Carlos	Communication Officer	PAHO	Brazil
Wyllie	Patsy	Health Promotion Unit	Ministry of Health and the Environment	St. Vincent & the Grenadines
Zapesochny	Valeria	Oficina de prensa y Comunicación	Ministerio de Salud	Argentina

Annex 3. Overall Evaluation Form

Training of Trainers Workshop on Outbreak Communication
Organized by the Pan American Health Organization/World Health Organization
Washington DC, USA, 18-21 July 2006

In order to build on our successes and improve the next workshops we would appreciate your comments and suggestions.

Overall, on a scale of 1-10 (10 the highest), how would you rate the workshop? _____

Overall, on a scale of 1-10 (10 the highest), how would you rate the facilitators? _____

What part of the workshop did you like most? _____

What part did you like the least? _____

What is your opinion on the Workshop Methodology? _____

What would you do differently? _____

How will you use the information? _____

Will you recommend changes to your communication plan based on this workshop?
Yes....No.....
If yes, what type of changes?

Would you like to be part of a global network of risk communicators? If so, please send an email to Bryna Brennan, Special Advisor, Social and Media Communication, PAHO.
brennanb@paho.org

Optional:
Name _____ Title _____

Annex 4. Results of Overall Daily Evaluation

What part of the workshop did you like most?

- Simulation Exercise (13)
- Facilitation techniques & Adult learning (4)
- Communication skills (4)
- Interactive sessions
- Lessons learned from presentations
- Information presented
- Gaya's energy
- Question and Response

What part did you like the least?

- Too long sessions, especially the afternoon ones (6)
- Administrative hitch (per diem etc.)
- Introduction briefing on influenza
- Poor coffee breaks
- All group members should be required to play a part in the scenario
- Gathering Information presentation
- Working on the communication plan

What is your opinion on the Workshop Methodology?

- Excellent sharing
- High interaction level
- Excellent facilitation
- Some presenters could have been assisted for enhanced performance
- Confidence building
- Adequate time for feedback
- Lively and fun
- Activities and presentations built on each other in succession: Could be applied immediately
- Time to absorb material
- Build up to simulation very good
- Scenarios allowed participants to put lessons into practice
- Good balance between presentations and interactive exercises
- Participants should present for two minutes
- Too European/Western structure

What would you do differently?

- Finish earlier (2)
- Shorter afternoon sessions (2)
- Better use of space so that all can be seen and heard (3)
- Production of poster and formulation of message: Give more time and the options to arrange photos
- Make presentations more interactive: like last one with practical aspect
- Briefing with President should have been staged for all to critique
- More discussion to supplement power points
- Too much information for amount of time (2)
- Ask some countries to present lessons learned that can be applied to all pandemics
- Curtail verbal contributions when no new insights added

- Too large groups
- More efficient use of time

How will you use the information? _____

Will you recommend changes to your communication plan based on this workshop?
Yes....No.....
If yes, what type of changes?



Annex 5. Daily Evaluation Form and Results (%)

Day	Session	⊗	☹	☺	Comments
1	Introduction			100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Etienne - Excellent Comments ▪ Otavio - Needs better organized presentations for this audience ▪ It could be well to have presentation of participants during introduction
1	Overview of Outbreak Communication		14	86	
1	Adult Learning/Making Presentations		10	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please consider having most if not only group sessions after lunch. I was having a hard time maintaining a high energy level in the afternoons.
1	Facilitation and Communication Skills			100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The approach used was new and different, more exciting.
2	First Announcement		35	65	
2	Gathering Information	18	29	53	
2	Dealing with Internal Communication	35	35	30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Se necesita un relato mas detallado de la situación política y sanitaria
2	Communication Surveillance	39	22	39	
3	Simulation Exercise			100	
3	Communication Checklist			100	
3	Implementing, Operationalizing and Evaluating the Communication Plan		30	70	

Annex 5: Individual Evaluation Responses

What part of the workshop did you like the best? (73)

- Simulation Exercise (15) **20.5%**
- Group Work (8) **10.96%**
- Communication skills: (8) **10.96%**
 - Internal communication
 - Communication Surveillance
 - 5 Components of communication (2)
- Facilitation techniques (7) **9.6%**
- Sharing and interacting with participants (4) **5.5%**
- Gaya's energy (3) **4.1%**
- Bill Hall's lectures (3) **4.1%**
- Otovio's lectures
- Energy of workshop
- Organisation of workshop
- Lessons learnt from presentations
- Preparation for press conference
- Country/Regional discussion w/ specific examples
- Poster/Message exercise (hands on)
- Adult Learning
- Capacity Building
- Scenarios
- First day session
- First Announcement
- All parts were good

2) What aspects did you like the least? (45)

- *Nothing* (5) **11.1%**
- Too long days, esp. the afternoons (8) **17.8%**
- Too time pressured (4) **8.9%**
- Christiano's presentation (3) **6.7%**
- Listening to translation (2) **4.4%**
- Poor coffee breaks (2) **4.4%**
- Long presentations (2) **4.4%**
- The Q & A session was too long and had too many questions (2) **4.4%**
- Style of the speeches
- Presentations were too technical
- Content slow
- Presentation on gathering information
- Last part of workshop
- Exercises were not explored with same depth
- Working on the communication plan
- All group members should be required to play a part in the simulation
- Not enough info on first Announcement, especially simulation dynamics
- HHS exposition too long and useless
- No knowledge about Latin America

- Introduction briefing on Influenza
- Handouts and English CD
- Addressing the payment (per diem)
- Internal communication
- List of Verification
- Part 11-1, 11-2, and 11-4 of the afternoon session of the last day

3) What is your opinion on the workshop methodology? (50)

- Excellent (11) **22%**
- Excellent-good participation (8) **16%**
- Good balance between presentations and interactive exercises (2) **4%**
- Good based on group facilitation techniques (2) **4%**
- Last day was very tiring, especially the afternoon (2) **4%**
- Large workshop well managed (2) **4%**
- Not enough time to delve into exercises (2) **4%**
 - Not enough time to absorb material
- Long sessions
- Great group work
- Language difficult
- Themes could be better organized
- Excellent facilitation
- Excellent sharing
- Nice style
- Good pace
- Good variety of methods
- Confidence Building
- Gave necessary info for simulation
- Build up to simulation very good
- Scenarios allowed participants to put lessons into practice
- Adequate time for feedback
- Participant should present for two minutes
- Too European/Western structures
- Good based on didactic material
- Last session was dynamic
- Introduction on how to motivate group interest was good
- Some presenters could have been assisted for enhanced performance
- Best part: 5 best practices for communicating with the public

4) What would you do differently? (39)

- *Nothing* (6) **15.4%**
- More sharing of info and experiences between countries and participants (4) **10.3%**
- Too much info to digest in short time (4) **10.3%**
- Finish earlier (3) **7.7%**
- Change technical content (2) **5.2%**
- Larger room, better use of space (2) **5.2%**
- More discussion to supplement power points (2) **5.2%**
- Production of poster and formulation of message: Give more time and the options to arrange images

- More understanding of Caribbean and central and south American Structure
- Make language uniform at all levels
- Curtail verbal contributions when no new insights are added
- Longer sessions between coffee breaks
- More interactive sessions after lunch
- Make last day more dynamic
- Add session on dealing with international/national media
- Add more info on national plans particularly how to decide one's country's position
- Add more simulations to different components
- Too long Q & A session
- Too large groups
- Include more activities
- Add more case studies
- Provide constructive criticism for presentations
- Briefing with President should have been staged for all to critique

5) How will you use this information? (65)

- Train others (13) **20%**
- Share the information colleagues (11) **16.9%**
- Prepare/Modify Communication Plans (Avian Influenza) (10) **15.4%**
- Improve techniques on capacity building (9) **13.8%**
- Take message to senior politicians, Ministries & NGO leaders (5) **7.7%**
- Build into national plan (5) **7.7%**
- Apply info to other areas of work (2) **3.1%**
- Increase knowledge (2)
- Adapt theories and apply to my country (2) **3.1%**
- Incorporate as necessary (2) **3.1%**
- Use info for mobilization
- Will be used at meetings and committee sessions
- More confidence in doing press briefings
- Strengthen facilitation skills

6) Will you make changes to your communication plan? If yes, what will they be? (48)

- *No* (3) **6.25%**
- Will improve current communication plan (22) **45.8%**
 - Strengthen National Plan (6)
- Define roles and responsibilities (4) **12.5%**
- Include methodology in the following items: (4) **8.3%**
 - Prepare a first announcement
 - Identify spokesperson
 - Conduct communication surveillance
 - Change survey on internal communication
 - Include a communication representative
- Incorporate material: (4) **8.3%**
 - Capacity building
 - Information management
 - 5 best communication practices
- Change structure but not content of communication plan (2) **4.2%**

- Share info (2) **4.2%**
- Improve Training: (2) **4.2%**
 - Add exercises
 - Prepare policies
- Improve coordination for crises operation (2) **4.2%**
- Increase knowledge
- Add establishment of Communications Network for PI
- N/A