



# intraH

**TRIP REPORT B - # 459-1  
and 2**

**Travelers:** Ms. Constance Newman,  
INTRAH Evaluation Officer  
Dr. Kinnard White, Professor,  
UNC School of Education, INTRAH  
Consultant

**Country Visited:** Togo

**Date of Trip:** March 2-12, 1994

**Purpose:** To conduct and evaluate a  
performance evaluation workshop  
for francophone Africa regional  
resource persons, March 7-11, 1994.

**Program for International Training in Health**

**PAC IIb**

**University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514 USA**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY . . . . .	i
SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES . . . . .	ii
I. PURPOSE OF TRIP . . . . .	1
II. ACCOMPLISHMENTS . . . . .	1
III. BACKGROUND . . . . .	1
IV. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES . . . . .	1
V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	5

APPENDICES

- A. Assignment Description
- B. Workshop Calendar, Goal, General and Specific Objectives, Methods and Materials
- \*C. Workshop Exercises, Handouts and Readings
- D. List of Participants
- E. Workshop Applications
- F. Summary of Participant Reaction Forms

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

From March 3-11, 1994, INTRAH Evaluation Officer Ms. Constance Newman and INTRAH Consultant Dr. Kinnard White planned, conducted and evaluated a performance evaluation workshop for thirteen (13) francophone Africa resource persons who will participate in INTRAH project evaluation activities scheduled for the last year of the PAC IIB contract. The workshop was financed by INTRAH central funds earmarked for impact evaluation.

The five-day performance evaluation workshop covered three main topics: the development of performance assessment instruments, data analysis and presentation methods and sampling procedures. The workshop calendar, goal, general and specific objectives, materials and methodology are found in Appendix B.

Ms. Newman and Dr. White briefed with INTRAH Regional Evaluation and Supervision Specialist Mr. Onanga Bongwele and debriefed with Mr. Bongwélé and the following INTRAH staff: Regional Director for Francophone Africa Mr. Pape Gaye, Program Officer Ms. Maureen Corbett, Regional Clinical Officer Dr. Manuel Pina, and Consultant Mrs. Noëlie Hounzah. A plan to apply workshop learnings was developed (Appendix E).

SCHEDULE OF ACTIVITIES

- March 2** Ms. Newman and Dr. White arrived in Lomé.
- March 3-4** Ms. Newman and Dr. White briefed with INTRAH Regional Evaluation and Supervision Specialist Mr. Onanga Bongwélé and made final revisions to the workshop schedule.
- March 7-11** Dr. White and Ms. Newman conducted and evaluated the workshop.
- March 12** Dr. White and Ms. Newman debriefed with Mr. Bongwélé and the following INTRAH staff: Francophone Regional Director Mr. Pape Gaye, Program Officer Ms. Maureen Corbett, Regional Clinical Officer Dr. Manuel Pina, and Consultant Mrs. Noëlie Hounzah. A plan to apply workshop learnings was developed.

## **I. PURPOSE OF THE TRIP**

The purpose of the trip was to conduct and evaluate a francophone regional performance evaluation workshop for resource persons who will participate in INTRAH project evaluation activities during the last year of the PAC IIb contract. The workshop was financed by INTRAH central funds earmarked for impact evaluation.

## **II. ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- A. A 5-day performance assessment/evaluation workshop was planned, conducted and evaluated.
- B. Skills and knowledge of 13 participants in performance assessment/evaluation were developed.
- C. Dr. White and Ms. Newman briefed and debriefed with INTRAH regional office staff. During the debriefing a plan was developed to apply workshop learnings in the short and long-term (see Appendix E).

## **III. BACKGROUND**

The INTRAH Regional Office in Lomé has been conducting performance assessment/evaluation as a part of trainee evaluation since 1987. The demand for resource persons, able to conduct and to train others to conduct high-quality performance assessments has increased and performance assessment has been featured in almost all INTRAH in-country projects in the francophone region during PAC IIb. This performance assessment/evaluation workshop was developed in response to an increasing need for resource persons who can provide technical assistance in this technology to host country nationals involved in INTRAH-assisted projects.

## **IV. DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES**

- A. **Preparation Phase**: Because Dr. White and Ms. Newman had begun planning this workshop several months in advance (October 1993), the preparation of workshop materials

during the three-day preparation phase in Lomé was minimal.

Dr. White and Ms. Newman briefed with Mr. Bongwélé and spent two planning days revising the workshop calendar, organizing handouts, developing a schedule of readings, reviewing needs assessment results and discussing roles and responsibilities. Since Dr. White did not speak French, the workshop was structured so that content was transmitted via short readings and during fairly structured question and answer periods supported by simultaneous translation (into French or English) by Ms. Newman.

The workshop started on schedule, with only one participant arriving late. The workshop focused on three main areas (for each there were separate group exercises): the development of performance assessment instruments by two groups of FP clinicians and two groups of trainers; data analysis/scoring instruments and writing a report using tables and graphs; and selecting samples (random, stratified, cluster, convenience, purposive).

Because there was no time for data collection in the field, the data analysis/scoring/report writing small group exercise was based on simulated data sets. Likewise, the sampling exercise--carried out in plenary session--was based on a simulated case (see Appendix B, "Methods and Materials").

A final large group exercise aimed at identifying lessons learned for how INTRAH conducts performance assessments and recommendations for future practice. These "lessons learned" were discussed during a debriefing session with the workshop facilitators and RO/L staff. Based on the most actionable

recommendations, a plan was developed for short- and long-term applications (see Appendix E).

B. **Monitoring and Evaluation of the Workshop:** The following evaluation methods were used:

1) **Training Needs Assessment Questionnaire:**

Participants had responded to a training needs assessment questionnaire sent out by INTRAH in early November 1993. The results were used to design the curriculum. During the orientation to the workshop, participants were given a needs assessment results sheet showing the learning needs most frequently checked (those items with which participants were either "Not very familiar" or "Not at all familiar"). Then participants were shown where in the week's schedule these needs would be addressed.

2) **Process Review:** A process review was held at the end of each day in the form of "What went well?" and "What could have been improved?" This review, in particular, allowed the facilitators to adjust aspects of the simultaneous translation.

3) **Review of Small Group Products by Facilitators:**

There were two exercises which took place in small groups, and for which there were tangible products. The first products were performance assessment instruments, with instructions, developed by two trainer groups and by two clinician groups (with all groups except one having only three people). The second products were 4-5 page performance evaluation reports written by two trainer and two clinician groups, based on simulated data sets.

The facilitators reviewed each instrument, prepared detailed written feedback for each group and then met with each group to discuss the feedback. This allowed group-specific issues to be dealt with and resolved.

Careful review of the products of group work allowed the facilitators to identify problems and to gauge the quality of work (which was generally quite high).

- 4) **Participant Reaction Form**: The ratings for this workshop were high (all responses either strongly positive or positive, i.e. "strongly agree", or 5 on a 5-point scale; and "agree", 4 on a 5-point scale), given what may have been perceived as unusual methodology. For example, each module was introduced by technical readings, with no lecturette. The participants appreciated these readings (in French) which were the main vehicle for transferring workshop content (as opposed to lecturettes, for which translation would have been unwieldy).

Also, participants were satisfied with the simultaneous translation during question/answer sessions, even though this was believed by a small portion of participants to have limited the amount of group interaction and participant/trainer interaction that was possible throughout the workshop.

Of particular note were the following results: 100% of participants strongly agreed that the workshop was relevant to their work, 85% strongly agreed that the facilities and other material aspects of the workshop were satisfactory, and,

despite the fact that this workshop had no real field practicum, 85% strongly agreed that the group work was helpful in applying concepts (see Appendix F for scores and percentages, by question).

- 5) **Participant Follow-up Questionnaire**: During the debriefing, it was decided that a questionnaire would be drafted by the end of April 1994 and that it would be sent to workshop participants as soon as possible. The purpose of this questionnaire would be two-fold: to track the application of workshop learnings and to enable RO/L to monitor problems in applications.

## V. **FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### 1. **Finding**

Participants expressed a wish to have a field practicum, especially in data collection via observation. Given the time constraints of a 5-day workshop, this was not possible.

#### **Recommendation**

If this workshop is held in the future, a field practicum should be included and the workshop duration lengthened. Data from real clinic observations would replace the simulated data set used in the second exercise (on instrument scoring, data analysis and summarization and report writing).

### 2. **Finding**

Direct interaction between participants and the lead trainer was reduced because the lead trainer did not speak French.

Because of the need to do simultaneous translation (from English to French or French to English) during large group meetings/discussions, free exchange of ideas was somewhat hampered.

**Recommendation**

In a non-French speaking person is the lead trainer for a primarily French-speaking group of participants, it may be impossible to eliminate translation constraints. However, it is possible to allot more time for large group discussion in French in order to increase group exchange and interaction.

**3. Finding**

Due to time constraints the importance of performance assessment/evaluation as a tool for monitoring and evaluating the quality of care was only briefly covered during the introduction to the workshop.

**Recommendation**

In future performance evaluation workshops, there should be more time given to presenting performance evaluation within the (Bruce/Jain) framework of quality of care and identifying indicators that may be measured via performance assessment.

**4. Finding**

The subject of how to train observers was treated within the context of a general discussion on the use of performance assessment instruments. However, given the importance of training observers for improved reliability of data, the allotted time to address this issue was inadequate (especially with regard to the steps involved in training observers using role plays and videotapes).

**Recommendation**

If this workshop is given in the future, a module on how to train observers should be considered. This might include training observers using role play and discussion of what should go into making and using a videotape.

APPENDIX A

Assignment Description

# Program for International Training in Health

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
School of Medicine

208 North Columbia Street, CB# 8100  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Cable: INTRAH, Chapel Hill, N.C.  
Telephone: (919) 966-5636  
TLX 3772242  
ANSWERBACK: UNCCHINTRAH  
FAX NO.: (919) 966-6816

## ASSIGNMENT DESCRIPTION

### PERFORMANCE EVALUATION WORKSHOP March 7-11, 1994

#### Purposes

1) To help 12 participants to develop skills needed to construct and use high quality assessment instruments and to use results to improve job performance.

#### Team

Dr. Kinnard White, INTRAH Consultant

Mme. Constance Newman, INTRAH  
Evaluation Officer

#### Specialty

Educational Measurement,  
Performance Evaluation,  
Data Analysis, Sampling

INTRAH Evaluation Policy  
and Applications,  
Technical French  
Translation

#### Objectives

1. To brief with INTRAH Regional  
Evaluation/ Supervision Specialist  
(including review of assignment  
description, review and  
organization of training materials,  
finalization of objectives, setting  
up training room, etc)

2. To conduct a performance  
evaluation workshop.

3. To evaluate a performance  
evaluation workshop.

4. To debrief with the INTRAH  
Regional Director and  
Evaluation/Supervision Specialist.

5. To write a trip report which  
includes recommendations for future  
action.

#### Responsibility

White, Newman Bongwele

White, Newman

White, Newman

White, Newman, Corbett

Newman

The logo for INTRAH, featuring the word "intra" in a stylized, lowercase font with a globe icon above the 'i', followed by "h" in a larger, bold, uppercase font.

### **Expected Outcomes**

1. Performance evaluation skills of 12 Francophone Africa region evaluation resource persons developed.
2. Briefing and debriefing held with INTRAH Regional Office Director and Evaluation/Supervision Specialist held and recommendations for future action made.
- 3) Trip report written.

### **Reference Materials**

Excerpts from French Translation of Nakuru Performance Evaluation Curriculum

INTRAH Performance Evaluation Instruments Used in Francophone Africa

INTRAH Guidelines for Clinical Procedures in Family Planning

INTRAH Trainers' Jobs, Tasks and Performance Standards

RO/N Draft Trainers' Follow-up Instrument in French

APPENDIX B

Workshop Calendar, Goal, General and Specific Objectives,  
Methods and Materials

9

**ATELIER DE LOME SUR L'ÉVALUATION DE LA PERFORMANCE**

DU 7 au 11 Mars 1994

HEURE	LUNDI 07/03/94	MARDI 08/03/94	MERCREDI 09/03/94	JEUDI 10/03/94	VENDREDI 11/03/94
08:00-09:00	<b>Ouverture</b> - Orientation .Rationnelle, But .Q.R.B. .Revue des objectifs/emploi de tps -Traduction -Normes -Lecture - Logistiques	Module III:continué "Élaboration.."	Discussion des lectures pour le module IV	Module IV Exercice II (cont.)	Discussion de la lecture pour le Module V "L'échantillonnage"
09:00-10:30	Lecture pour modules II & III (1-5) (1-9)				Exercice III "L'échantillonnage"
10:30-11:00	P A U S E C A F E				
11:00-12:00	Discussion		-Revue des techniques pour résumer et décrire les données		L'échantillonnage"
12:00-15:00	P A U S E M I D I				
15:00-18:00	Module III Exercice I : Elaboration d'un instrument  Dist. des matériels Revue de processus	- Feed-back sur les instruments - Questions relatives à l'élaboration et l'utilisation des instruments  Dist. des matériels Revue de processus	Module IV Exercice II : Cotation et rédaction d'un rapport (4-5 pages)	Feed-back/ Discussion, Synthèse  Distrib/mat	Module VI -Résumé -Applications -Evaluation

10

LOME' WORKSHOP  
ON  
JOB PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION  
March 7 - 11, 1994  
Kinnard White  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

RATIONALE, GOALS AND GENERAL WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

A. RATIONALE

This workshop is designed to build performance evaluation skills for a group of resource persons from the region in preparation for PAC IIB final evaluation activities in Francophone Africa. The workshop is expected to result in increased human resources and direct application of acquired skills during the implementation of over 20 evaluation activities planned in Burkina Faso, Cape Verde, Cameroon, Rwanda and Togo beginning in the second and third quarters of CY 1994. These activities include curriculum development for performance evaluation, training of trainers in training and in performance evaluation, trainee follow-ups, impact data collection and final project review.

This workshop will help solve the problem of lack of trained personnel to carry out the planned activities while providing INTRAH with an opportunity to promote uniform understanding of its PAC IIB Evaluation Plan.

B. WORKSHOP GOALS

The two goals of the workshop are to help the participants:

- a]. develop the skills needed to construct and use high quality assessment instruments so that they can make accurate evaluations of the job performance of trainers and providers of family planning clinical services, and
- b]. learn techniques for synthesizing assessment data so that justifiable evaluative conclusions can be made with parallel recommendations for follow-up and further training.

C. GENERAL WORKSHOP OBJECTIVES

Participants in the workshop will learn to:

- a]. construct assessment instruments that accurately measure the performance of critical job skills,
- b]. select the most appropriate procedures to observe on the job performance of critical job skills so that accurate data related to the quality of job performance can be obtained,
- c]. set standards for minimally acceptable levels of job performance,
- d]. organize and analyze the data obtained from assessments to accurately evaluate the quality of job performance,
- e]. write clear, concise and usable conclusions and recommendations based on the evaluation information, and
- f]. use appropriate procedures to select representative samples.

SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES, PROCEDURES, MATERIALS AND TIME  
ALLOCATIONS FOR THE LOME WORKSHOP ON  
JOB PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

March 7 - 11, 1994

Kinnard White

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

I. ORIENTATION TO THE WORKSHOP

During the orientation to the workshop the participants will review

1. The rationale, goals, and expectations for general objectives to be met by the workshop, and
2. The schedule and how the workshop procedures fit the rationale, goals, and general objectives for the workshop.

TIME ALLOCATION

8:00 - 8:45 (7-3-94)

1/10

## II. INTRODUCTION TO JOB PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

**OBJECTIVES:** The participants will be able to

1. Explain the difference between assessing knowledge and skills [e.g., dimensions of performance];
2. Explain the relationship between performance assessment [measurement] and performance evaluation;
3. Explain the role that sampling plays in all assessments and evaluations;
4. Describe the key characteristics of quality job performance assessment instruments;
5. Describe the purpose of job performance assessment;
6. Describe factors that may influence the quality of job performance.

### PROCEDURES

1. Presentation of the basic concepts related to job performance assessment and evaluation—the language and logic of job performance assessment and evaluation.

### MATERIALS AVAILABLE

1. The following handouts summarizing basic knowledge related to the objectives listed will be used:
  - 1]. "Introduction to Job Performance Assessment and Evaluation"
  - 2]. "Characteristics of an Effective Job Performance Assessment"
  - 3]. "Notes on Basic Assumptions of Job Performance Assessment"
  - 4]. "Notes on Keys to Conducting a Successful Job Performance Assessment"
  - 5]. "Using Job Performance Assessment Information to Support and Improve Worker Performance"

### TIME ALLOCATION

[Obj. 1-6] 9:00 - 10:30 (7-3-94)

### III. HOW TO CONSTRUCT AND USE JOB PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS

**OBJECTIVES:** The participants will be able to

1. Break a complex job into specific critical job tasks;
2. Select observable indicators for determining how well each specified critical job task is performed;
3. Determine which type of rating plan will best fit the job tasks to be rated and the goals of the job performance assessment;
4. Determine an appropriate cut-off score to classify performance as acceptable or unacceptable;
5. Determine the best method for collecting data using a specified job performance instrument [e.g., direct observation; simulation, etc.];
6. Specify the procedures that should be followed and the data that should be collected to field test a job performance assessment instrument;
7. Specify the objectives and procedures necessary to train observers/raters in how to use job performance assessment instruments;
8. Write clear instructions for using a specific job performance assessment instrument.

#### PROCEDURES

1. Presentation of basic knowledge and illustrations of available state-of-the-art techniques for constructing quality job performance assessment instruments.
2. Hands-on practice to develop skill in using specific procedures to construct job performance assessment instruments for specific jobs.
3. The participants will be provided with systematic, detailed feedback on the quality of the job performance assessment instruments that they construct in the workshop and on the procedures that they have specified for using the instruments.

#### MATERIALS AVAILABLE

1. The following handouts describing techniques and procedures related to the objectives listed will be used:
  - \* 1]. "Identifying Job Tasks"
  - \* 2]. "Selecting Job Performance Indicators"
  - \* 3]. "Suggestions on How to Specify Manageable and Meaningful Job Performance Criteria"
  - \* 4]. "Notes on Selecting Job Performance Criteria"
  - \* 5]. "Principles for Selecting Critical Indicators of a Job Task"
  - \* 6]. "Constructing a Rating Plan"
  - \* 7]. "Example of a Behavioral Checklist"
  - \* 8]. "Example of a Behavioral Summary Scale"
  - \* 9]. "Notes on What to Consider When Choosing Between a Checklist and a Rating Scale"
  - \* x 10]. "Procedures for Selecting a Cut-Off Score to Classify Performance as Acceptable or Unacceptable"
  - \* \* 11]. "Procedure for Making Observations"
  - \* \* 12]. "Suggestions on Specifying the Conditions to Observe Job Performance"
  - \* \* 13]. "Notes on Making and Recording Observations/Ratings"
  - \* \* 14]. "Notes on Training Observers/Raters"
  - \* \* 15]. "Instructions for Writing Instructions/Guidelines for Using the Instrument"
  - \* \* 16]. "Checklist for Evaluating the Job Performance Assessment Instrument You Have Constructed"

2. Examples of job performance assessment instruments:

- "Instrument to Evaluate the Performance of Agents Trained in Family Planning" [Burkina Faso]
- "Instrument to Evaluate Trainers Conducting Training in the Classroom" [Burkina Faso]

3. Descriptions of jobs be used to conduct job task analyses, derive specific critical job performance indicators, and construct job performance assessment instruments:

- "Counseling and Screening for IUD Insertion." In, Guidelines for Procedures in Family Planning, INTRAH, 1992, pp. 137 - 148.
- "IUD Insertion and Post-Insertion Counseling." In, Guidelines for Procedures in Family Planning, INTRAH, 1992, pp. 149 - 161.
- "Trainers' Jobs #2-6: Designs Curriculum [#2], Prepares Resources [#3]; Organizes Training [#4], Manages Training [#5], Conducts Training [#6]." In Intrah PAC IIB Evaluation Plan, Vol I, pp. 57 - 86.

TIME ALLOCATION

- [Obj. 1 & 2] 11:00 - 12:00 (7-3-94)
- [Obj. 2 & 3] 15:00 - 16:30 & 17:00 - 18:00
- [Obj. 4 & 5] 8:00 - 10:00 (8-3-94)
- [Obj. 6 & 7] 10:30 - 12:00
- [ Obj. 8 ] 15:00 - 16:30

[Evaluation of Job Performance Assessment Instruments Constructed, and Discussion of Specific Issues Related to Constructing Job Performance Assessment Instruments]  
17:00 - 18:00 (8-3-94)

#### IV. HOW TO SCORE, ANALYZE, INTERPRET, DRAW CONCLUSIONS AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON JOB PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS

**OBJECTIVES:** The participants will be able to

1. Score a job performance assessment instrument using
  - a]. analytic and holistic scoring methods,
  - b]. differential weighting of specific job tasks,
  - c]. cut-off scores to determine if job performance meets established standards;
2. Summarize and analyze scores using
  - a]. averages and percentages,
  - b]. graphs and bar charts;
3. Draw conclusions about the job performance supported by job performance assessment data;
4. Write recommendations based on the analyses of job performance assessments.

#### **PROCEDURES**

1. Presentation of basic knowledge of state-of-the-art procedures for using assessment data to evaluate job performance and training programs.
2. Hands-on practice to develop skill in scoring, analyzing, interpreting and making recommendations using job performance assessment data.
3. The participants will be provided with detailed, systematic feedback on the quality of the analyses done, the presentation of these analyses in a report, and the conclusions and recommendations that they report using a simulated data set.

#### **MATERIALS AVAILABLE**

1. The following handouts describing techniques and procedures related to the objectives listed will be used:
  - 1]. "Scoring and Analysis Methods"
  - 2]. "Form for Writing Summary Job Performance Evaluation Report"
2. Example reports containing analyses, conclusions, and recommendations based on job performance assessment data.

"Summary Report on the Job Performance of Service Providers on Counselling and Pelvic Examination"

3. Two data sets of job performance ratings will be used for participants to practice

- a). scoring the assessments using prescribed scoring rules
- b). summarizing and analyzing the scores
- c). writing conclusions based on the analyses and summary of the scores
- d). writing recommendations based on the analyses of the data.

DATA SET I. Scores for Ten [n = 10] Trainers On the "Instrument to Evaluate Trainers Conducting Training in the Classroom"

DATA SET II. Scores for Ten [n = 10] Clinicians On the "Instrument to Evaluate The Performance of Agents Trained in Family Planning"

#### TIME ALLOCATION

[Obj. 1] 8:00 - 10:00 (9-3-94)  
10:30 - 12:00

[Obj. 2] 15:00 - 16:30  
17:00 - 18:00

[Obj. 3] 8:00 - 10:00 (10-3-94)

[Obj. 4] 10:30 - 12:00

[Feedback on the Quality of Participants' Data Analyses and Written Report]  
15:00 - 16:30 (10-3-94)

[Summary and Discussion of Specific Evaluation Issues]  
17:00 - 18:00 (10-3-94)

## V. HOW TO USE SAMPLING PROCEDURES

**OBJECTIVES:** The participants will be able to

1. Describe the logic of generalization from sample to population;
2. Use the following sampling procedures to select samples
  - a]. Probability procedures
    - (i). simple random sample
    - (ii). stratified random sample
  - b]. Non Probability procedures
    - (i). convenience sample
    - (ii). purposive sample;
3. Explain the effects of using each of the sampling procedures described in # 2 above;
4. Justify the choice of a particular sampling procedure.

### PROCEDURES

1. Presentation of basic knowledge of procedures for selecting samples from a population.
2. Hands-on practice using a simulation to develop skill in using different sampling procedures to select samples from a population and to illustrate the effects of using different sampling procedures.

### MATERIALS AVAILABLE

1. The following handouts describing techniques and procedures related to the objectives listed will be used:
  - 1]. "Selecting a Sample"
2. A simulated sampling exercise that has the following elements will be used:
  - a]. a map of a geographic area divided into regions;
  - b]. cases [persons with assigned scores] within each geographic area [the population of persons and areas];
  - c]. instructions for selecting the following types of samples
    - (i). simple random,
    - (ii). stratified random,
    - (iii). convenience (non-random),
    - (iv). purposive (non-random)

### TIME ALLOCATION

- [Obj. 1] 8:00 - 10:00 (11-3-94)  
 [Obj. 2] 10:30 - 12:00  
 [Obj. 3]  
 & 15:00 - 16:30  
 [Obj. 4]

## VI. WORKSHOP SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION OF SPECIFIC ISSUES

### MATERIALS AVAILABLE

- 1]. "General Advice on Constructing and Using Job Performance Assessment Instruments"

### TIME ALLOCATION

17:00 - 18:00 (11-3-94)

APPENDIX D

List of Participants

APPENDIX D

**List of Participants**

Mrs. Justine Belem, Burkina Faso  
Dr. Aliou Boly, Mali  
Mr. Onanga Bongwélé, INTRAH/Lomé  
Mr. Bula Bula Lie-Lie, Zaire  
Ms. Maureen Corbett, INTRAH/Chapel Hill  
Mr. Pape Gaye, INTRAH/Lomé  
Mrs. Noëlie Hounzah, Togo  
Mr. Joanny Kaboré, Burkina Faso  
Mrs. Emilie Mensah, Togo  
Mrs. Viviane Mukakarara, Rwanda  
Dr. Manuel Pina, INTRAH/Lomé  
Dr. Anne Charlotte Royer, France  
Dr. Boniface Sebikali, Rwanda

APPENDIX E

Workshop Applications

Mise en application des recommandations de  
l'Atelier Régional en Evaluation de la Performance

7 - 11 Mars 1994

Lomé - Togo

WHTBD'S	WHO	BY WHEN
<p>1. Finaliser les prototypes d'instruments d'évaluation de la performance pour les prestataires cliniques.</p> <p>- Pretester pendant le suivi du Cameroun et autres suivis.</p>	<p>- Manuel - Bongwélé CH : - Marcia - Cathy</p>	<p>D'ici la fin du PAC IIB</p> <p>10 Avril 1994</p>
<p>2. Préparer une note technique donnant les directives pour renforcer les aspects techniques des instruments dans les curricula (inclure des suggestions de dates, des attentes d'INTRAH pour les instruments de supports de données).</p>	<p>Bongwélé</p>	<p>10 Avril 1994</p>
<p>3. Préparer un prototype d'instrument d'évaluation de la performance des Formateurs.</p> <p>- Envoyer à ROL, la disquette d'instrument.</p> <p>- Menér des séances de travail pour passer en revue les instruments, revoir les indicateurs, décider s'il faut inclure les échelles de notation et préparer pour l'utilisation pendant le suivi final au Cameroun.</p>	<p>- Candy  - Bongwélé - Gaye</p>	<p>18 Mars 1994</p> <p>Au plus tard 10 Avril 1994</p>
<p>4. Préparer le prototype d'instrument d'évaluation de performance des encadreurs.</p>	<p>- Pina</p>	<p>Au plus tard 10 Avril 1994</p>
<p>5. Pour le suivi du Togo, préparer une vidéo à utiliser pour la préparation des équipes de suivi.</p>	<p>- Gaye - Hounzah - Pina - Mensah (ATBEF) - (Joanny)</p>	<p>31 Mai 1994</p>

WHTBD'S	WHO	BY WHEN
6. Revoir le matériel développé à Abidjan (1987-1988) en vue de préparer un protocole pour le management du suivi.  - Draft  - Finaliser	- Newman - Bongwélé - Kaboré  - Candy  •	Fin Juin 1994  Mi Sept. 1994
7. S'informer sur la disponibilité d'E.P.I. Info. . disponibilité . utilisation	- Maureen	Fin Mai 1994
8. Préparer un checklist (provisoire) définissant les tâches pendant la planification du suivi.	- Bongwélé	10 Avril 1994
9. Préparer un questionnaire à l'intention des participants à l'Atelier Régional d'Evaluation de la performance pour apprécier la mise en application des acquis.	Draft: - Maureen	Au plus tard le 25 Mars 1994

#### Autres Recommandations

- A. Donner l'occasion à chaque équipe de revoir les instruments d'évaluation de performance dans le curriculum de formation :
- Burkina,
  - Cap Vert,
  - Cameroun,
  - Togo.
- B. Inclure (à partir de maintenant) dans les descriptions de mission, les attentes d'INTRAH pour une plus grande utilisation des graphiques et tableaux dans la section du rapport de voyage décrivant l'évaluation de l'activité.
- C. Rappeler pendant le briefing.
- D. La dernière visite de revue/monitoring de projet, avant le suivi devra inclure un recensement des attentes du Ministère et de l'USAID pour le suivi y compris (groupe-cible, régions à couvrir, dates, l'équipe nationale, les objectifs du suivi...).

24

APPENDIX F

Summary of Participant Reaction Forms

Activity title Home Performance Evaluation  
*workshop*

Date of Activity March 7-11, 1994

**INTRAH PARTICIPANT REACTION FORM**

The purpose of this form is to give trainers information about the quality of this training activity.

For each set of statements below, please check the response that best describes your feelings or reactions about this aspect of the training.

1. Workshop objectives were clear and were achieved.

5. Strongly Agree	4. Agree	3. Undecided	2. Disagree	1. Strongly Disagree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 62%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 38%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Both the amount of content covered and the length of the workshop were about right.

5. Strongly Agree	4. Agree	3. Undecided	2. Disagree	1. Strongly Disagree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 46%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 54%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

*26*

3. This workshop was directly related to the work I do or am going to do.

5. Strongly Agree	4. Agree	3. Undecided	2. Disagree	1. Strongly Disagree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 100%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Possible solutions to my real work problems were dealt with in this workshop.

5. Strongly Agree	4. Agree	3. Undecided	2. Disagree	1. Strongly Disagree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 38%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 62%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. Workshop facilities and arrangements were quite satisfactory.

5. Strongly Agree	4. Agree	3. Undecided	2. Disagree	1. Strongly Disagree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 85%	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 15%	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

6a. The trainer(s)/preceptor(s) for this workshop was/were effective in helping me to learn and apply concepts and skills.

5. Strongly Agree    4. Agree    3. Undecided    2. Disagree    1. Strongly Disagree  
 62%     38%           

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6b. The practice sessions of this workshop helped me to apply concepts and learnings.

5. Strongly Agree    4. Agree    3. Undecided    2. Disagree    1. Strongly Disagree  
 85%     15%           

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

If applicable:

*N/A*

6c. The field practice sessions of this workshop helped me to achieve competence and confidence in performing the skills and techniques contained in the learning objectives for the workshop.

5. Strongly Agree    4. Agree    3. Undecided    2. Disagree    1. Strongly Disagree  
               

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. Please check any of the following that you feel could have improved the workshop.

a. Use of more realistic examples and applications

b. More time to practice skills and techniques

c. More time to discuss theory and concepts

d. More effective trainers

e. More effective group interaction

f. Different training site or location

g. More time to prepare for training sessions

h. Focus on more limited and specific topic(s)

i. Focus on a broader and more comprehensive topic

j. Other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

Please explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. Below are major **topics** that were presented in the workshop. Please indicate the usefulness of the topics to your work in the scale at right.

**Trainers: Please be sure to fill in topics before administering this form.**

	5	4	3	2	1
	very				not at all
	useful				useful
a. <u>N/A</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
h. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
i. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
j. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
k. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
l. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
m. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Please comment:

---

---

---

---

---

9. Below are **training materials** used during the workshop. Please indicate how well each contributed to your understanding or learning:

**Trainers: Please list by title, or refer to the specific session, the handout/material about which you would like feedback.**

	5	4	3	2	1
	very well				not at all well
a. <u>NA</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
b. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
c. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
d. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
e. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
f. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				
g. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>				

10. Below are **training materials** used during the workshop. Please tick off which of these you plan to use in your work situation or share with colleagues:

**Trainers: Please list by title or refer to by session, those materials about which you are seeking feedback**

	<u>Plan to use/share</u>
a. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>

31

11. For the following training methods/techniques, please check the box on the right that best describes your view of their usefulness for your learning in this workshop.

**Trainers: Below, please add methods/techniques on which you want feedback; please cross out those methods that do not apply.**

<u>Training Methods/ Techniques</u>	5	4	3	2	1	does not apply
	very useful				not useful	
a. lectures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. group discussions	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. individual exercises	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. group exercises	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. field trips	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. process reviews	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. demonstrations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. <u>Readings</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. Materials or training methods/techniques that were not suitable for your country, please list them and explain why they were not suitable.

---



---



---



---

13. Additional Comments:

---



---

Feel free to sign your name. (Optional)

*Handwritten signature*